

Put in Laura Polay ^{Striker} file
From Organization to Society: Virginia in the Seventeenth Century

Sigmund Diamond

I have been informed by some of the officials of this society, who ought to know, that, though some papers on historical topics have been delivered before at these meetings, this is the first formal session that has been devoted to the subject of historical sociology. We might conclude, then, that we have here an example of that concept beloved of philosophers but never before seen on land or sea by ordinary mortals-- the tabula rasa, that blank tablet without impressions of the present or vestiges of the past. But such a conclusion would, of course, be quite erroneous. This is not the place for a full-scale history of the subject of historical sociology; but preliminary to a few general remarks about the subject and, above all, to an effort to present through empirical research an example of the way in which historical knowledge may contribute to sociological theory, it might not be inappropriate simply to illustrate the fact that efforts both to illuminate the past through the use of sociological concepts and to enrich sociology with historical knowledge have a rather long tradition.

During the course of his inaugural lecture in 1892 as professor of economic history at Harvard University, William James Ashley warned his audience that a specter was haunting, if not all mankind, then at least the historical profession:

The general cultivated public . . . wants to know how individuals and episodes are related to some large whole, and what the significance of it all has been. If scholars competently trained will not try to satisfy this natural and laudable desire, incompetent writers will The historian and the economist may expel Nature with the fork of the Seminary and the Deductive Method; but Nemesis stands very near the shoulder of 'Pure Economics' or 'Pure History'-- and in America it usually calls itself Sociology.¹

But the terror in Professor Ashley's words should not create the impression that the only relationship between Clio and sociology would be one approximating rape, for she has often been a coy, sometimes even a willing partner. So much attention has been devoted to the pioneering role of the Johns Hopkins University History Department in introducing the seminar method and in raising standards of historical scholarship in this country, that it has gone unnoticed that one of its earliest Ph.D. theses--and what must surely be one of the first serious efforts at participant-observation in this country--was John Johnson's Rudimentary Society among Boys,² published in 1884, a study of the organizations and attitudes of the boys at a private school near Baltimore. What matters here is not Johnson's simplistic evolutionary scheme, which is now thoroughly outmoded, but that the conception of history which then informed the members of the Hopkins seminar forced them far beyond the traditional limits of the proper subject matter of history. "When the publication of the Johns Hopkins University Studies began," Herbert Baxter Adams wrote in his introduction to Johnson's work, "it was not anticipated by the editor that any contributor would descend lower in the scale of institutional subjects than Towns, Parishes, Manors, etc. . . . Modern students are finding historical and sociological materials in such imaginative writings as Plato's Republic, More's Utopia, and Bacon's Nova Atlantis, but there are few scholars who have thought it worthwhile to utilize the wealth of fact and illustration for institutional history which lies at our very doors."³

It is in Adams's use of the phrase "to utilize the wealth of fact and illustration for institutional history" that we have, I think, an important clue to some at least of the really serious efforts that have been made to utilize historical knowledge for sociological theory. In Johnson's work, in Albert Shaw's study of Icaria,⁴ the Cabetian utopian

community in Iowa, in Arthur F. Bentley's economic history of a Nebraska township⁵--all products of the Hopkins seminar--and in many similar works, the accomplishment, however we may denigrate it today because of our greater stock of information about the subjects they studied, came about not because they attempted to define the scope and method of the discipline they practiced or because they borrowed eclectically bits and pieces of concepts from another discipline to apply to their own. It came about because they undertook to explore problems with which the conceptual and methodological apparatus of their own science was inadequate to deal, and in the undertaking they made findings and raised questions that became the common property of all the social sciences.

It was in this spirit that, in 1913, Gay S. Callender, the distinguished economic historian, washed his hands of economics because, though it "ought to be a theory of development," it persisted in being "merely an explanation of the way in which human beings produce wealth and share it as income under a given set of social conditions" and called for a rapprochement between history and sociology to do for sociological theory what the stubbornness of economists had prevented in economic theory. Historians, he wrote, are coming to have a broader conception of their field. "It is not difficult to make out in general what this conception is, though as yet it has not been very definitively formulated. Probably the best way to describe it in a phrase is to call it the sociological view of history. As a rule historians will object to this term. It does not seem possible to them that any body of theory composed so largely of somewhat loose generalizations as sociology, can have anything in common with careful scientific history. Even more than the economist, the sociologist seems to them prone to play fast and loose with the facts. He is an utter stranger to the chastening influence of 'source materials.'

He rarely uses any documents except perhaps 'human documents.' How times have changed! Nevertheless it is to sociology that the new conception of history is most akin and it is with the sociologist that the historian is coming to have most in common . . . The failure of historians to recognize this kinship with sociology is matched by the indifference of sociologists to history. . . . The institutions of the 'Todes and the peaceful Arifuras' continue to receive more attention at their hands than the German kingship, the village communities of medieval Europe, or the feudal system. Few students of sociology in our universities are ever advised to take such an admirable sociological course as the early constitutional history of England."⁶

My experience of sociology departments is still too limited to permit me to venture any statements about the courses that graduate students are advised to take these days, except for statistics; and certainly contemporary sociologists seem far more interested in the less-than-peaceful juvenile delinquent than in the peaceful Arifura. Nor would I agree, as Callender seems somewhat vaguely to suggest, that the nourishing of his sympathy is sufficient reason--though it is certainly a good reason--for the sociologist to study the German kingship or the feudal system. But part of the coolness with which many sociologists are likely to greet Callender's statement arises, I feel, from the terminology he used to categorize the material he was calling to their attention. Suppose, instead of using as he did the limited categories of geography and chronology, suppose, instead of talking of village communities of medieval Europe and feudal systems and German kingship and English medieval constitutional history, he had used more analytic and inclusive categories--status, values, socialization, organization, stratification, sanction, legitimacy. And suppose he had pointed out that there are profound--and still not fully solved--problems in the use of these concepts: the circumstances under

which new values arise and old values change in a society; the way in which new social classes are created and the means by which they take their place in the social order; the implications for the problem of order of the way in which under changing conditions privileged statuses alter the bases of their legitimation in order to maintain the consensus that we are told is a functional prerequisite of society; the reasons for the discrepancy between the causes for the creation of institutions and the effects they actually have; how changes in status, by creating new networks of reciprocal relations, fundamentally alter the behavior of the persons concerned. And suppose, finally, that Callender had demonstrated that all of these problems--and more--are implicit in the historical topics he had suggested, and that, because they all involve change over time, both their very perception as problems and their solution require historical knowledge. Would the sociologist, under these conditions, be as likely to brush aside the import of his proposal?

Even so brief a review may serve to remind us, first of all, that historical sociology, broadly defined, is no recent innovation but has had a long period of gestation. When we recall that Gargantua was carried in his mother's womb for no less than eleven months and, according to Dr. Rabelais' prognosis, "for so long, yea longer, may a woman carry her great belly, especially when it is some masterpiece of nature, and a person predestined to the performance . . . of great exploits,"⁷ we may perhaps be pardoned for having hopes for our child. Such a review permits us, moreover, to take stock of those efforts that were made in the past, to separate the promising from the false starts, and, perhaps most important, so to relate our own research and speculation to the significant work of the past as to enhance the possibility of creating a unified body of theory.

There is a sense, I suppose, in which even the most anti-historical of persons will, in unguarded moments, pay tribute to the importance of the passage of time as necessary for the attainment of perspective. Writing in 1754, only two decades before the outbreak of the American Revolution, about the great English colonizing adventures of the seventeenth century, David Hume said:

Speculative reasoners during that age raised many objections to the planting of these remote colonies, and foretold that, after the draining of their mother country of inhabitants, they would soon shake off her yoke, and erect an independent government in America: but time has shown that the views entertained by those who encouraged such generous undertakings were more just and solid.

Exactly what it was that "time showed," in this case I do not know, unless it is that we must be careful to remember that history is not an election in which all the returns are in by midnight of the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

But we are no more concerned with the uses of history for the achievement of perspective than we are with it for the cultivation of the observer's sympathy or for the sake of being interdisciplinary. Rather are we concerned with it--and it is this, I think, that links our efforts with the more imposing ones made by our predecessors--to discover those problems of importance for sociological theory that emerge and can be analyzed only when phenomena are studied in their historical dimension. Such an interest in historical knowledge necessitates, it seems to me, a kind of research which, if it is no more conscious of the requirements of methodological rigor than typical historical research, is perhaps somewhat more conscious of a different set of problems. It is less narrative, more analytical; less concerned with telling the "whole" story than relating selected aspects of it to a body of principles; and more discriminating in the selection of hypotheses which guide the investigation and provide canons

of relevance for the material to be studied. There is, of course, a price that has to be paid for undertaking historical research with the conscious objective of enriching social theory. It is the price of the tension that must inevitably arise between the historical goal of verisimilitude--the portrayal of phenomena in all their aspects, with all of their complexity--and the theorist's goal of abstraction--the selection of those aspects that relate to the problem under investigation. But this will remain an inescapable problem of social analysis so long as people stubbornly persist in acting in accordance with what they feel to be sufficient reasons and not in accordance with the categories imposed by the investigator. And since it is inescapable, it is better to be fully conscious of the hypotheses that guide us than to remain ignorant of them.

Historical sociology has its standing monuments, of course, but even more it has its fields littered with artifacts and curiosities, the remains of broken systems and shattered theoretical foundations that could not support the weight they were asked to bear. Under the circumstances, an essay into the field might seem an enactment of the proverb that fools rush in where angels fear to tread; but when we remember the admonition that nothing is gained if nothing is ventured, we are forced to reconcile ourselves to the unhappy thought that our directives on this point are contradictory and that in all probability here, as elsewhere, man has free will to decide his own fate. It is with consciousness that, through the exercise of free will I have placed myself in jeopardy, this enquiry into some general social problems that may be studied in the context of seventeenth century Virginia is undertaken.

II

Virginia in the seventeenth century has been a time and a place so much written about that it would seem difficult indeed to find anything new to say about it or to see any new significance in its history. It has been used to illustrate some of the unique qualities of Englishmen, as when Philip Alexander Bruce wrote that it "was as if the Englishman was more responsive to the primordial impulses of Nature; as if civilization had not been able to repress in him that purely animal instinct which leads the bees to swarm forth from the original hive, and beasts to migrate blindly without any apparent motive in a search for food."⁹ It has been used to justify sectionalism and white superiority, to provide the basis of the Cavalier myth of southern history, to demonstrate the inherent weakness of communism, and to show that Fascism was once tried in the United States. And of course it has been written about soberly and accurately.

Our interest is in neither the more lurid phases of Virginia history nor in a chronological recital of events, but in the utilization of certain aspects of that history to raise significant questions concerning the creation of new statuses and the circumstances under which the character of an organization may be so completely changed as to transmute it into something which is not, properly speaking, an organization at all, but a society. It must be conceded at the outset that the group we have selected for study was pathetically small. In 1607, when the Virginia Company established a settlement at Jamestown, its population numbered 105; and in 1624, when the crown revoked the charter of the Company, the population of Virginia amounted to just over 1,200, despite the fact that the Company had sent more than 5,000 emigrants during that 17-year period.¹⁰ But just as a limited duration of time is no necessary detriment to a study of this kind, because there are periods of history when the rate of change is accelerated,

so, too, the limited size of the group affords no accurate measure of the importance of the enterprise. Judged in terms of its outcome, its importance is self-evident. But judged even in terms of the criteria of importance imposed by contemporaries, the verdict must be the same. The articles on the Virginia settlement in the Kölnische Zeitung and the Mercure Françoise; the running series of reports from the Venetian ambassadors in London to the Doge and Senate; the letters from Jesuit priests in England to the Propaganda Fide in Rome and the newsletters from Venice and Antwerp in the Vatican archives; the continuing stream of dispatches from the Spanish ambassadors to King Philip III, pressing him to attack Jamestown, advising him of the latest decisions of the Virginia Company, and relating their efforts to recruit English spies; and the existence in the royal archives at Simancas of a description of the layout of Jamestown and the earliest known map of the town, the work of an Irish spy in the service of Spain¹¹—all of this is eloquent testimony of the position of Virginia in the international relations of the seventeenth century and of the concern felt in the capitals of Europe in the Virginia Company's undertaking. Nor was the expression of this concern merely verbal. In August, 1613, when the population of Virginia barely exceeded 200, the settlement at Jamestown had a decidedly cosmopolitan cast, for it contained 18 prisoners—15 Frenchmen, including two Jesuits and several members of the nobility, a Spanish spy, Don Diego de Melina, a renegade Englishman in the pay of Spain, and an Indian princess, Pocahontas.¹² In any event, however, neither size nor long duration in time is crucial to the purposes of our enquiry.

At the May Day, 1679, exercises at the College of William and Mary, one of the student orators—who must have been a sophomore—exclaimed:

Beholdings we see already that happy time when we shall surpass the Asiaticians in civility, the Jews in religion, the Greeks in philosophy, the Egyptians in geometry, the Phoenicians in arithmetic, and the Chaldeans in astrology. O happy Virginia.¹³

We may be intrigued by the ingenuousness of the student, but our interest is not in showing how the retrospective wisdom of the modern can often dim the luster of the wisdom of the ancients, for that would be too cheap a victory. Rather are we interested in the statement as evidence of the fact that in 1679--and for some time earlier--Virginia was a society and Virginians were conscious of being members of a society and nothing if not ebullient about its prospects. For it had not always been so.

At its inception--and for a number of years thereafter--it had been a formal organization, and if the joyous outburst of the student reflects its character at a later date, its earlier character is better revealed by the instructions given by the Virginia Company to Sir Thomas Gates on the eve of his departure for Jamestown in May, 1609:

. . . you must divide yo^r people into tennes twenties & so upwards, to every necessary worke a competent number, over every one of w^{ch} you must appointe some man of Care & still in that worke to oversee them and to take dayly accounte of their laboures, and you must ordayne y^e every overseer of such a number of workemen Deliver once a weeke an accounte of the whole committed to his Charge. . . .

For such of yo^r men as shall attend any worke in or nere aboute every Towne you shall doe best to lett them eate together at reasonable houers in some publique place beinge messed by six or five to a messe, in w^{ch} you must see there bee equality and sufficient that so they may come and retourne to their worke without any delay and have no cause to complain of measure or to excuse their idleness upon y^e dressinge or want of diet. You may well allowe them three houers in a somers day and two in the winter, and shall call them together by Ringinge of a Bell and by the same warne them againe to worke.¹⁴

And if in later years "O happy Virginia" could be a spontaneous outcry of its citizens, it could not have been earlier. Testifying in 1625 about conditions under the administration of Sir Thomas Dale in 1614-16, Mrs. Perry, one of the fortunates who survived more than a few years in the first quarter century of Virginia's history, revealed that

in the time of Sr: Thomas Dales Government An leyden and June Wright and other women were appoynted to make shirts for the Colony servants and had six mels full of silke threed allowed for making of a shirte, w^{ch} yf they did not p^rforme, They had noe allowance of Dyott, and

because their threed naught and would not sewe, they tooke out a
revell of y^e lower p^{ie} of y^e shirte to make an end of y^e worke, and
others y^t had threed of their owne made it up wth that, See the
shirts of those w^{ch} had raveled out proved shorter then the next,
for w^{ch} fact the said An leyden and Jura Wright were whipt, And An¹⁵
leyden beinge then wth childe (the same night thereof miscarried.)

Our first inquiry, then, must be into the characteristics of the
original settlement at Jamestown, characteristics which changed so markedly
during the course of the next quarter century.

The history of the Virginia Company is too well known to need re-
telling here, but since it is one of our major theses that the nature of
the social relationships established in Virginia was determined by the
objectives of that body and by the organizational imperatives it faced, it
is perhaps appropriate to summarize briefly the major characteristics of
that organization. Virginia was not established as a colony to take its
place among the territories governed by the British crown; it was not a
state, and, properly speaking, it was not a political unit at all. It was
property, the property of the Virginia Company of London, and it was
established to return a profit to the stockholders of that company. Under
the political and economic conditions that obtained in seventeenth century
England, speculators in overseas expansion could count on no support from
the government except verbal encouragement and some legal protection, and
sometimes precious little of those. Under the circumstances, therefore,
colonization, though it might be surrounded by the trappings of patriotic
and religious purpose, had to be undertaken as a private business venture;
and the first charge imposed on the property was the return on the shareholder's
investment. During most of the history of American historiography this
episode has been dealt with primarily in terms of the motivation of the
participants--did they come to establish religious freedom, or to seek a
haven for the politically persecuted, or to found a "First Republic?"--and

it is true that those who joined the Virginia enterprise did so for many reasons. Some, like Richard Norwood, were footloose and fancy free after having completed their apprenticeships. Robert Evelin wrote his mother that he was "going to the sea, a long and dangerous voyage with other men, to make me to be able to pay my debts, and to restore my decayed estate again . . . and I beseech you, if I do die, that you would be good unto my poor wife and children, which God knows, I shall leave very poor and very mean, if my friends be not good unto them. . . ." In its promotional literature the Virginia Company took advantage of this broad spectrum of motives and cast its net wide to snare the purses and the bodies of all sorts and conditions of persons in support of a venture in which

. . . profite doth with pleasure joyne,
and bids each chearefull heart,
To this high prayesed enterprise, 16
performe a Christian part.

But from the point of view of the managers of the enterprise, this was perceived less as a problem of motivation than as the problem of achieving an organizational form through which the resources and energies of the participants could be mobilized. The basic objectives of the promoters in establishing a plantation in Virginia are quite clear; they sought to exploit the mineral resources which they were certain were there, they were in search of that elusive will-o'-the-wisp, a water route to the Pacific through North America, and they wanted to monopolize whatever local trade existed and whatever oriental trade would be developed with the opening up of the northwest passage. They had as their first objectives, then, those that gave promise of a quick return on investment and thereby stimulated hope of reducing the overhead charges that would be involved in later stages of the plantation's development.¹⁷

The organizational form adopted for the venture was not created by the promoters; the roots of the joint-stock company, though it was still

subject to considerable experimentation, lay deeply embedded in English history. Nor were the proprietors totally without experience themselves in the establishment of plantations or unaware of the experience of others. Sir Thomas Smythe, a leader of the Virginia enterprise, was one of the merchant princes of London, a governor of the East India Company, the Muscovy Company, and many others. And they had before them the experience-- which was, as we shall see, not entirely an unmixed blessing--of the colonizing efforts of Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Humphrey Gilbert, of the trading posts established by the great commercial companies, of Spain and Portugal, and of the founding of plantations in Ireland.¹⁸ What they established was a business organization, and though the form of that organization was changed at various times during the Company's history, those changes were at all times dictated by the need to make the business pay, which, in the words of Sir Edwin Sandys, one of the two great leaders of the Company, was "that wherupon all man's eyes were fixed."¹⁹ Its problems were those of any organization with the same specific set of ends and with that structure. It sold shares, begged contributions, and organized lotteries to raise the necessary funds; it was concerned to recruit a proper labor force; it had to cope with the problem of adequate supervision and administration so as to maintain its authority; it engaged in a full-scale advertising campaign to sell to potential adventurers and planters the glories of a land where the "Horses are also more beautiful, and fuller of courage. And such is the extraordinary fertility of that Soyle, that the Does of their Beere yeelde Two Fawnes at a birth, and sometimes three." And it was confronted with the petty harassments of enjoining those whose goodwill was needed for the success of the organization. "Talkinge with the King," wrote the Earl of Southampton to Sir Robert Cecil, "by chance I told him of the Virginia Squirrills which they say will fly, whereof there are

now divers brought into England, and hee presently and very earnestly asked me if none of them was provided for him . . . I would not have troubled you with this but that you know so well how he is affected to these toys. . . .²⁰

But though the Company's plans were eminently rational and though the means it devised, in both London and Virginia, were consciously calculated to effectuate those plans, its grand design suffered from a fatal flaw: the fact that reality was far different from what the Company expected. Its model had been the East India Company and its dream had been to reproduce the Spanish looting of a continent, but conditions in Virginia were not those of India or Mexico and Peru. "It was the Spaniards good hap," wrote Captain John Smith later in the history of the Virginia Company,

to happen in those parts where were infinite numbers of people, whoe had manured the ground with that providence that it afforded victuall at all times; and time had brought them to that perfection they had the use of gold and silver, and the most of such commodities as their countries afforded; so that what the Spaniards got was only the spoile and pillage of those countries people, and not the laboure of their owne hands. But had those fruitfull Countries been as Salvage, as barbarous, as ill-peopled, as little planted laboured and manured, as Virginia; their proper laboure, it is likely would have produced as small profit as ours. . . .

But we chanced in a land, even as God made it. Where we found only an idle, improvident, scattered people, ignorant of the knowledge of gold, or silver, or any commodities; and careless of anything but from hand to mouth, but for baubles of no worth; nothing to encourage us but what accidentally was found nature afforded. Which were was could bring to recompence our paines, defray our charges, and satisfie our adventurers; wee were to discover the country, subdue the people, bring them to be tractable civil and industrious, and teach them trades that the fruits of their laboure might make us recompence, or plant such colonies of our owne that must first make provision how to live of themselves ere they can bring to perfection the commodities of the countrie. . . .²¹

But though the error in conception made by the leaders of the Virginia Company was, from their viewpoint, a grievous one, it is also thoroughly understandable. It is true that the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century was a period of rapid expansion in the organization of trading companies; no less than 34 were chartered during that time. But the significant point is that the Virginia Company was the eighteenth to

be founded, and of the previous seventeen, whose experience could be taken as models, all but two dealt with countries within the European seas or with settled communities along the African coast. Nor can even the remaining two--the East India Company and the China Company--really be considered as exceptions, for, like the others, their problem was to exploit the already existing labor force of a settled society.²² For the Virginia Company, the problem--and it is in this that the crucial difference lies--was to recruit a labor force.

It must be understood, therefore, that, in conformity with its objectives and organizational form, the establishment planted by the Virginia Company at Jamestown was a private estate, which, in the absence of an amenable local labor force, was worked on the basis of imported labor. Basic policies were laid down in London by the General Court of the Company, the body of those who had purchased the £12 10s shares or who had been admitted for favors in the Company's behalf; the management and direction of affairs were entrusted to agents of the shareholders; and the supervision of those whose labor in Virginia was necessary for the attainment of the Company's objectives was placed in the hands of officials appointed in London.

Under the circumstances there were many potent inducements to English investors to purchase the Company's £12 10s shares, a price, incidentally, which was the Company's estimate of the cost of transporting a settler to Virginia. Under the charter of 1606 they were guaranteed that after a five-year period, during which the settlers in Virginia would be supported by a stream of supplies sent at Company expense, the profits gained through trade and the discovery of minerals would be divided among the investors in proportion to the number of shares they held, and grants of land would be made to them on the same basis. But what were to be the inducements to become the labor force of a company trading post?

It should at once be noted that the English, like the Spaniards, made some effort to mobilize native labor. For the Company, the key to the integration of the Indians into the labor force was in the ease with which, it was anticipated, they could be converted to Christianity and thereby won over as well to the secular values of Europeans. To them would accrue spiritual benefits; the Company, already blessed with those, would receive something more substantial. As a certain "Maister Captaine Chester" put it:

The land full rich, the people easilie wonne,
whose gaires shall be the knowledge of our faith
And care such ritches as the country hath.²³

But though the Company succeeded for a time in exacting some tribute from the local tribal chiefs in the form of goods and weekly labor services, the Indians proved unwilling to accept the Company's spiritual and secular offerings. Long before the Indian uprising of 1622 gave an excuse to the settlers to engage in a campaign of extermination, it was clear that the Virginia Company would be forced to import its own labor force.²⁴

Between 1607 and 1608, when its charter was changed, the Virginia Company sent over 300 persons to Jamestown. In terms of their quality, they were what would be expected of a group whose objective it was to explore the territory and seek precious metals, a disparate crew of adventurers and roughnecks--from the scum of London to decayed aristocrats--all imbued with the hope that after a short period in Virginia they would return home with their fortunes in their purses. The social composition of the original labor force, the tasks they were expected to perform, and the nature of the settlement they were expected to establish can all be inferred from the passenger lists of the first expedition and the three subsequent supplies that were sent out by the Company before its charter was modified in 1609. The original expedition numbered 105 persons, of

whom we have the names of 67. Of these 67, 29 were listed as gentlemen and six were named to the local council; the rest were listed by occupation-- 1 preacher, 4 carpenters, 12 laborers, 1 surgeon, 1 blacksmith, 1 seiler, 1 barber, 2 bricklayers, 1 mason, 1 tailor, 1 drummer, 4 boys, and 2 were unidentified. In the three succeeding supplies, the rather high proportion of gentlemen was not substantially reduced, nor did the range of occupations alter significantly. Seventy-three of the 120 persons in the first supply of 1608 can be identified. In this group, gentlemen exceeded laborers by 26 to 21. The remainder was made up of an odd assortment of crafts, including jewellers, refiners, and goldsmiths--bespeaking the expectations of the Company--apothecaries, tailors, blacksmiths, and--quite testimony to the fact that gentlemen must be gentlemen whether in the wilds of Virginia or a London drawing-room--one perfumer. In brief, the two most striking characteristics of this original labor force are, first, the presence of so high a proportion of gentlemen and, second, the absence of any occupations indicative of an intention to establish a settled agricultural community.²⁵

From the point of view of the promoters of the Virginia enterprise, these men were not citizens of a colony; they were the occupants of a status in--to use an anachronistic term--the Company's table of organization, and the status was that of workman. Such other qualities or attributes that they possessed might have been of importance when they were in London or Norwich or Bristol, but what counted in Virginia was that they should accept the directions of their superiors and that they should be willing to work. Even under the best of circumstances, the problem of maintaining discipline and authority would have been crucial to the success of the Company. How, if there were no way of settling disputes or of keeping workers on their jobs, would there be a return on the shareholder's investment; and how, equally as important, would it be possible to minimize the risks of loss, for it must be remembered that not until

Lord Palmerston's Joint Stock Act of 1862 did the principle of limited liability become enacted into law.²⁶ But these were hardly the best of circumstances, for the vary social composition of the original labor force intensified what in any case would have been a grievously difficult problem. In the long intervals between the arrival of supplies under the direction of the Company's admiral, Christopher Newport, conditions in Jamestown bordered on anarchy; men were beaten by their officers, plots to escape the country were hatched, and insubordination was rampant. The Company's administrative methods, characterized by the utmost laxness, could not cope with the situation. "I likewise as occasion moved me," wrote President Wingfield, discussing the supplies in Virginia, "spent them in trade or by gift among the Indians. So likewise did Captain Newport take of them . . . what he thought good, without any waste of his hand mentioning the certainty; and disposed of them as was fitt for him. Of these likewise I could make no account. . . ." Nor did the high percentage of aristocrats help matters. Unused to the heavy work of axing timber, they cursed so much at the blisters on their hands that the president of the council ordered a count to be made of every curse; at the end of the day's work a can of cold water was poured down the sleeve of each offender for every curse he had uttered. To Captain John Smith, the problem was the presence of too many gentlemen: ". . . for some small number of adventurous Gentlemen to make discoveries, and lie in Garrison ready upon any occasion to keepe in feare the inconstant Salvages, nothing were more requisite; but to have more to wait and play than worke, or more commanders and officers than industrious labourers was not so necessarie. For in Virginia, a plaine Souldier that can use a Pick-axe and spade, is better than five Knights . . .; for men of great place, not inured to these incounters, when they finde things not suitable,

grow many times so discontented, they forget themselves, and oft become so carelesse, that a discontented melancholy brings them to much sorrow, and to others much miserie." His own solution of the problem, during his presidency of the council, was to attempt to enforce the rule that "he that will not worke, shall not eate . . . for the labours of thirty or forty honest and industrious men shall not be consumed to maintain 150 idle varlets."²⁷ Clearly, even if the mortality figures had been less gruesome than they were--in July, 1609, between 80 and 100 were alive of the 320 who had been sent since 1607²⁸--qualitative considerations alone would have dictated a change in the composition of the labor force. For the Company the situation was brought to a head with the realization that there were to be no quick returns from metals and trade and that profits would have to be made through the cultivation of the land and the exploitation of agricultural resources.

It would be a serious mistake to believe that the Company ever relied fundamentally on the recruitment of involuntary labor, but it would be equally erroneous not to recognize that, so desperate were its labor requirements and so necessary was it to keep the goodwill of those authorities who favored the transportation of undesirables, it felt compelled to resort to forced labor.

As early as 1609, a letter from Lisbon revealed that the Portuguese were transporting 1,500 children over the age of 10 to the East Indies and suggested that the same be done in the case of Virginia. Shortly thereafter the Privy Council notified the Mayor of London that the plagues of the city were due mainly to the presence of so many poor persons, and recommended that a fund should be raised, with the help of the commercial companies, to send as many of these as

possible to Virginia. The Virginia Company promptly gave an estimate of the expenses involved and of the terms that would be offered to the emigrants; but though a large sum of money was raised, no persons were actually transported at that time. In 1617, however, the City of London raised £500 to pay the cost of shipping 100 children to Virginia where they were to be apprenticed until the age of 21, thereafter to be the fee simple owners of 50 acres of land each. So pleased were the Company and the Virginia planters by the arrangement that in November, 1619, Sir Edwin Sandys wrote to Lord Mayor Sir William Cockaigne, who was also a member of the Company, requesting an additional 100 children on the same terms, except that they were to become "Tennants upon the publique lands" instead of landowners after their apprenticeships. The difference between the Company and the London common council as to the terms on which the children should be sent was settled with the understanding that seven years after the completion of their apprenticeships they would be given 25 acres at an annual rent of sixpence. It is evident that not all the children were pleased by the future arranged for them. In January, 1620, Sandys wrote to Sir Robert Naunton, the king's principal secretary, that "it falleth out that among those children, sundry being ill-disposed, and fitter for any remote place than for this Citie, declare their unwillingness to goe to Virginia: of whom the Citie is especially desirous to be disburdened; and in Virginia under severe Masters they may be brought to goodnesse." Since the City could not deliver and the Company could not transport "these persons against the wills," Sandys appealed to the Privy Council for the necessary authority. It was quickly given. Exact figures cannot be determined, but before the demise of the Company in 1624, additional shipments of

children had been delivered to Virginia, and it is evident that several hundred must have been involved.²⁹

Concerning the shipment of convicts and rogues and vagabonds the information is scanty. Some convicts were certainly in Virginia before 1624, though we do not know how many; but the Virginia Company was antagonistic to the importation of such persons and, in any case, convict-dumping on a large scale did not become a characteristic of the colonial scene until the second half of the seventeenth century.³⁰ So, too, was the Company antagonistic to the importation of rogues, possibly because, unlike the case of the London children, it was forced to assume the cost of transportation. It engaged in the practice under pressure from King James I. For one group of 50 boys sent out in 1619, the Company expected to receive £500 in tobacco from the planters to whom they were indentured, but as late as October, 1622, it had received only £275.15.6 and Governor Yeardley was told that the planters "should be caused to make satisfacion for the 22^{li} 4:6:11^{ch} is reasynginge due unto the Companie this yeare in good leafe Tobacco. . . ." That still others were sent is certain; the Court Book of Bridewell Hospital records that in 1620 Ellen Boulter was "brought in by the Marshall for a Vagrant, that will not be ruled by her fether or her friends," to be kept at her father's charges to go to Virginia.³¹

But throughout its history the Company was dependent upon the recruitment of voluntary labor, and especially was this true when, following the realization that profits would have to be made from agricultural staples and not minerals, it was reorganized under the new charter of 1609. The change in objective not only emphasized the necessity of recruiting a larger labor supply but required that it be qualitatively different from the earlier one, for now that the

glitter of gold was vanishing the Company needed not soldiers of fortune but sober workmen who would be able to extract from the land the food supplies necessary for their own support and the staples whose export would produce profit for the shareholders.³² But what could the Company offer as sufficient inducement to motivate large numbers of persons to come to Virginia, especially when--as the evidence indicates--enthusiasm for emigration from England was confined to the wealthy, who themselves were hardly likely to exchange the comforts of life in England for the dangers of life in Virginia.³³ The difficulties the Company faced in this respect were exacerbated by the whispering campaign started by settlers who had already returned from Virginia. ". . . some few of those unruly youths sent thither," said a Virginia Company broadside of 1609,

(being of most leaved and bad condition) and such as no ground can hold for want of good direction there, were suffered by stealth to get aboard the ships returning thence, and are come for England againe, giving out in all places where they come (to colour their owne misbehaviours, and the cause of their returne with some pretence) most vile and scandalous reports, both of the Country itselife, and of the Carriage of the business there. . . .³⁴

The Company was now determined to be discriminating in the selection of settlers: "And for that former experience hath too cleerly taught, how muche and manie waies it hurtheth to suffer Parents to disburden themselves of lascivious sennes, masters of bad servants and wives of ill husbands, and so to degge the business with such an idle crue, as did thrust themselves in the last voiage, that will rather starve for hunger, than lay their hands to labor."³⁵ Alderman Robert Johnson warned the Company that at all costs three types of persons were to be shunned. "First certain bad citizens of London; second Papists, and third evil affected Magistrates. And as for the

general sort that shall go to be planters, be they never so poor, so they be honest and painfull, the place will make them rich:-- We must first employ all kind of Artificers, as carpenters, shipwrights, Masons, Sawyers, Brickmakers, Bricklayers, Plowmen, Sowers, Planters, Fishermen, Coopers, Smiths, Metal-men, Tailors, Turners, and such like."³⁶ It was conceded that some "base and disordered men" might inveigle themselves into the body of settlers, but they could not do too much harm for, as the Reverend William Crashaw preached in a sermon on the departure of Governor de La Warr to Virginia, "The basest and worst men trained up in a severe discipline, sharp lawes, a hard life, and much labour, do prove good members of a Commonwealth." Even, "if you will, the very excrements, of a full and swelling state . . . wanting pleasures, and subject to some pinching miseries," will become "good and worthe instruments and members of a Common-wealth."³⁷

Clearly, if what faced prospective settlers in Virginia were "severe discipline, sharp lawes, a hard life, and much labour," substantial concessions would have to be offered to induce them to emigrate. The status the Company was asking them to accept was that of servant, employee of the Company, but it was one thing to create a position and quite another to get men to fill it. Since perpetual servitude was obviously no inducement, the Company was required to limit the period of service and to make other concessions. The Company's promises, spread through the country in a major advertising effort, were such as to whet the appetites of prospective emigrants. Every settler over the age of ten, whether he paid his own way or was shipped at Company expense, was promised one share of stock in the Company, with potential

dividends from the profits of trade and a land grant to be made at the time of the first division after seven years. Every "extraordinary" man--such as "Divines, Governors, Ministers of State and Justice, Knights, Gentlemen, Physicians" or such as were "of worth for special services"--were given additional shares according to the value of their persons. Profits and land grants were a matter of the future; for the present, the Company expected, in return for assuming all the costs of settling and maintaining the plantation and providing supplies to the emigrants, that each settler would work at tasks assigned him under the direction of Company-appointed officers. For a period of seven years, all supplies were to be distributed through the Company store, all exports were to be shipped through the Company magazine, and all land was to be held by the Company.³⁸ In effect, the Company created the status of landowner in order to induce persons to accept the status of non-landowner; it was asking emigrants to accept the present burdens of membership in a lower status in anticipation of the future benefits they would receive upon promotion to a higher status. Looked at from the point of view of the structure of an organization, this was simply the device of automatic progression, promotion to a higher position in the table of organization after a limited tenure in a lower position. From the point of view of a society, however, this was a guarantee of social mobility and, as we shall see, it seriously compromised the Company's ability to secure its organizational objectives.

That the Company expected the combination of limited servitude and potential landownership to solve its labor problem seems quite clear; sufficient numbers of workmen would be induced to emigrate to Virginia and, having arrived, would be motivated to do the work that was essential to the Company's success. Virginia planter and London adventurer were to be united in a single organization, bound together by a common set of interests. Do not discourage the planters, the London stockholders were admonished, "in growing religious, nor in gathering riches, two especiall bonds (whether severed or cojoined) to keepe them in obedience, the one for conscience sake, the other for fear of losing what they have gotten: without the first they are prophane, without the second desperate, and apt for every factious plot to be instruments of mischief....the land is before you to dispose to every man for his house and ground, wherein to employ himselfe for his own benefit, that no man may lie idle nor unprofitable." How the planter's concern for his own interests was to benefit the Company was quite clear. "...the Planters," wrote Alderman Johnson, "will be in such hope to have their owne shares and habitations in those lands, which they have so husbanded, that it will cause contending and emulation among them, which shall bring fourth the most profitable and beneficiall fruites for their loynt stock."³⁹

But land for the settlers and profits for the stockholders were affairs of the future, and both were dependent upon the skill and speed with which the planters could be molded into an efficient labor force. It was of the utmost importance, therefore, for the Company to establish its authority in Virginia and maintain the necessary discipline, and for the achievement of these purposes the Company was not content to rely simply on the self-discipline it hoped would be the eventual product of the effort to obtain profits. The

first step was taken with the issuance of the new charter of 1609. During its first three years in Virginia, the Company felt, "experience of error in the equality of Governors, and some ~~evils~~ rages, and follies committed by them, had a little shaken so tender a body." To avoid the evils of divided authority, "we did resolve and obtain, to renew our Letters Patents, and to procure to ourselves, such ample and large priviledges and powers by which we were at liberty to reforms and correct those already discovered, and to prevent such as in the future might threaten us...under the conduct of one able and absolute Governor...."⁴⁰ But changes in the formal structure of authority were not sufficient.

Religion, too, was counted upon to do its part in maintaining order. Doctrinal conflict was minimized from the start by the ban on Catholics, but what really distinguishes the role of religion under the Virginia Company was its conscious utilisation for disciplinary purposes. No less an authority on colonization than Richard Hakluyt had pointed to the advisability of taking along "one or two preachers that God may be honoured, the people instructed, mutinies better avoided, and obedience the better used."⁴¹ The Company was quick to take the hint. Religion was used to screen prospective planters before their arrival in Virginia and it was used to discipline them after their arrival. "We have thought it convenient to pronounce," stated the Company in a broadside of 1609, "that...we will receive no man that cannot bring or render some good testimony of his religion to God...."⁴² And during the time that Sir Thomas Dale's code of Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall was sovereign in Virginia - from May, 1610, to April, 1619 - the settlers were marched to church twice each day to pray for their own relief from dissension and for the showering of blessings upon the shareholders: "...O Lord we earnestly beseech thee to receive us into thy favor & protection, defend us from the delusion of the devil, the malice of the heathen, the invasions

of our enemies, & mutinies & dissentions of our own people.... And heere
O Lord we do upon the knees of our hearts offer thee the sacrifice of praise
& thanksgiving, for that thou hast moved our hearts to undertake the per-
formance of this blessed work, with the hazard of our person, and the hearts
of so many of our nation to assist it with meanes and provision, and with
their holy prayers. Lord look mercifully upon them all, and for that
portion of their substance which they willingly offer for thy honour &
service in this action, recompence it to them and theirs, and reward it
seven fold into their bosomes, with better blessings....⁴³

In a society of ranks and orders, deference is owed to certain persons
by virtue of their social position, and the Company attempted to maximize
the potentiality for discipline in such an arrangement by appointing to
leading posts in Virginia those persons to whom obedience was due because
of their high status. Insofar as it was possible, the Company selected
only persons of high birth to be governor; when it was not possible, as in
the case of Governor Yeardley, it quickly, and it seems surreptitiously,
secured for him a knighthood.⁴⁴ And at all times the governors were urged
to surround themselves with the pomp and circumstance of high office, the
better to impress the governed. "You shall for the more regard and respect
of yo^r place," read the Company's instruction to Sir Thomas Gates,

to beget reverence to yo^r authority, and to refresh their mindes
that obey the gravity of those laces under w^{ch} they were borne
at yo^r discrecion use such formes and Ensignes of government
as by our letters Pattents wee are enabled to grant unto you,
as also the attendance of a garde upon your pson....⁴⁵

Ultimately, however, the Company relied upon a military regimen and
upon the imposition of force to obtain labor discipline. Governor de la
Warr had been instructed that his men were to be divided into groups and
placed under the charge of officers "to be exercised and trayned up in
Martiall manner and warlike Discipline."⁴⁶ Settlers were forbidden to return

to England without permission and their letters were sealed and sent first to the Company in London before being forwarded.⁴⁷ But the full code of military discipline was not worked out until the arrival in Jamestown in 1611 of Captain Thomas Dale, marshal of the colony, who had been granted a leave of absence from his post in the Netherlands army at the behest of the Company. The improvements that the Company had been able to make in the quality of its labor force did not satisfy Dale. On the very ship that brought him to Jamestown, he reported, were 300 men who had been found in "riotous, lasie, and infected places," men so "full of mutinie and treasonable intendments," of "such diseased and crased bodies" that not 60 were fit for service.⁴⁸ Dale determined to set the situation right. When, a number of years later, Sir Thomas Smythe was summoned before the committee on grievances of the House of Commons, he conceded that the laws had been strict, stricter than in England, but he attempted to excuse them by arguing that some had been promulgated "ad terrorem."⁴⁹ Be that as it may, Dale supplemented the usual list of religious offenses and crimes against the state and the person with a series of enactments designed to protect the Company and based obviously upon the situation in Virginia. Slander against the Company, its officers, or any of its publications was punishable by whipping on the first offense, three years in the galleys on the second, and death on the third. Unauthorized trading with the Indians, escaping to the Indians, theft, the killing of any domestic animal without consent, false accounting by any keeper of supplies were all punishable by death. Fraud committed by cooks, bakers, or fishermen employed by the Company was to be punished by the loss of the offender's ears on the first offense, one year on the galleys for the second, and three years on the galleys for the third. Failure to keep regular hours of work subjected the offender to the pain of being forced to lie neck and heels together all night for the first offense, whipping for the second, and one year's service in the galleys for the third.⁵⁰

Moreover, Dale provided a vade mecum for each distinct military rank in Virginia from colonel to private soldier. Since all persons had both military and civilian functions, his guide offers us some important clues into the nature of labor discipline and what was expected to provide the motivation to work. "...because we are not onely to exercise the duty of a Souldier, but that of the husbandman, and that in time of the vacancie of our watch and ward we are not to live idly, therefore the Captaine...shall...demand of the Sarient Major, what service, worke, and businesse he hath in charge, from the Governor, to command him and his men to goe upon him the next morning... in which worke the Captaine himselfe shall do exceeding worthily to take paines and labour, that his Souldiers seeing his industry and carefulnesse, may with more cheerfulness love him, and bee incouraged to the performance of the like in that businesse whereupon they are imployed, contrariwise himselfe taking his ease, and inioyning them to toile and worke, may breed... a weariness of the businesse in the imployed...."

Of the ensign: "...concerninge the publike and dayly manual businesse which appertaine to our settling there as Planters of a Colonie, he is to make it his duty, to be a diligent not only overseer, but labourer himselfe... that the necessary and dayly taskes of such workes and husbandry...may be in due time accomplished and brought to passe."

Of the corporal: "His duty is to provide that none of his Squadron, be absent, when the drumme shall call to any labour, or worke, or at what time soever they shall be commanded thereunto for the service of the Collonie, in the performance of which said workes he is to be an example of the rest of his Squadron by his owne labouring therein, and by encouraging and calling upon others at any time negligent, idle and slothfull, that thereby giving incouraging to his superior officers he may be held by them worthy of a higher place."

Of the private soldier: "He shall continue at his worke until the drumme beat, and...he conducted into the church to heare divine service, after which he may repayre to his house or lodging to prepare for his dinner, and to repose him until the drumme beate shall call him forth againe in the afternoone....the Generall having understanding of his promptitude and diligence may conferre upon him, and call him into place of preferment and command."⁵¹

What is so striking about Dale's Code - and all the other institutions in Virginia at the same time - is the way in which it stripped from people all attributes save the one that really counted in the relationship which the Company sought to impose on them, their status in the organization. Punishments were inflicted upon offenders without regard to extraneous social attributes and behavior was expected to conform to a set of prescriptions the major characteristic of which was that the rights and obligations that persons owed each other depended on their position within the organization. In this respect, the contrast between Dale's Code and the first set of laws the settlers were able to enact for themselves at the General Assembly of 1619 is startling. For then, considerations other than status within an organization were fundamental.

"...in detestation of Idleness be it enacted," the Assembly decreed, "that if any man be founde to live as an Idler or renegade, though a freedman, it shall be lawful for that Incorporation or Plantation to which he belongeth to appoint him a Mr to serve for wages, till he shewe apparant signes of amendment."

Or - "Against drunkenness be it also decreed that if any private person be found culpable thereof, for the first time he is to be reproved privately by the Minister, the second time publicely, the thirde time to lye in boltes

12 howers...and to paye his fee....But if any officer offende in this crime, the first time he shall receive reproof from the Governour, the second time he shall openly be reprooved in the church by the minister, and the third time he shall first be comitted and then degraded."

Or - "It shalbe free for every man to trade with the Indians, servants only excepted...."

Or - "All persons whatsoever upon the Sabaoth daye shall frequente divine service and sermons both forenoon and afternoone....And every one that shall transgresse this lawe shall forfeite three shillings a time to the use of the church....But if a servant in this case shall wilfully neglecte his Mr's commande he shall suffer bodily punishments."

Or consider the following petition drafted by the Assembly:

...that the antient Planters of both sortes, viz., suche as before Sir T. Dales' depart were come hither upon their owne charges, and suche also as were brought hither upon the Companie's coste, maye have their second, third and more divisions successively in as large and free manner as any other Planter. Also that they wilbe pleased to allowe to the male children, of them and of all others begotten in Virginia, being the onaly hope of a posterity, a single share a piece, and shares for their wives or for themselves, because that in a new plantation it is not known whether man or woman be more necessary.

For the planters in Virginia, other statuses than those in the organization were now clearly important; considerations of length of residence and of varying degrees of freedom now determined not only the nature of punishments but the rights and obligations of persons. No longer were the relationships between persons determined exclusively by the positions they held within a single system, the organization of the Company. In 1609, each person in Virginia had a single position, and the nature of the relationship that existed between persons flowed from the behavior that each was expected to follow by virtue of the position he held. But in 1619, each person held a number of statuses and each status implied a different form of behavior

in a multitude of relationships. The contrast may be stated more simply. In 1609, Virginia was an organization, in which position within a single relationship determined behavior. In 1619, Virginia was a society, in which behavior was in some way determined by the totality of positions each person held in a network of sometimes complementary, sometimes contradictory relationships. The key to this process by which Virginia was transformed from an organization to a society lies in the concessions the Company was forced to offer to induce persons to accept positions in the organizational relationship, for those concessions so multiplied the number of statuses and so altered the status of persons that a system of relationships was created where only one had existed before.

The fact is that the reforms the Company instituted in 1609 were not sufficient either to swell the supply of labor migrating to Virginia or to motivate the planters who were there to work with the will the Company expected. Nor did the severity of Dale's Code help matters. "No man will go from hence," wrote Captain John Smith, "to have less freedom there than here." But if the settler would find liberty, profit, honor, and prosperity in Virginia, then he would be a more devoted servant than if he encountered "bondage, violence, tyranny, ingratitude and such double dealing, as binds freemen to become slaves, and honest men [to] turn knaves."⁵³ The Company had hoped that by its reforms it would be able to obtain, not "idle and wicked persons; such as shame, or fear compels into this action," but "fit and industrious" persons, "honest sufficient Artificers."⁵⁴ Yet so unproductive were the reforms that as late as 1616 John Wolfe could indicate to Sir Robert Rich that what had been was still the Company's most serious problem; our greatest want, he wrote, is "good and sufficient men as well of birth and quality to command, soldiers to marche, discover and defend the country from invasion, artificers, labourers, and husbandmen."⁵⁵ And so dissatisfied had the settlers become with their situation that, in a letter smuggled to the Spanish ambassador in London with

connivance of English sailors, Don Diego de Molina, the prisoner in Jamestown, reported that "a good many have gone to the Indians, of whom, some have died at their hands, and others have gone out to sea, being sent out to fish, and those who remain do so by force and are anxious to see a fleet come from Spain to release them from this misery.... Since I came here I have been acceptable to the people here, and they have sympathized with me, in proportion to their own misery, but with real good will."⁵⁶ The hope that Don Diego attributed to the colonists was, no doubt, the wish of a patriotic Spaniard; but it is nevertheless true that some settlers did flee to the Indians, that the Company did succeed in obtaining authority to deport to Virginia those settlers who had escaped back to England, and that Coles and Kitchens, who had been Don Diego's guards, were executed in 1614 for organizing a plot to escape to Florida.⁵⁷

Faced with the crisis created by the shortage of labor, by the unwillingness of labor, and by the desperate need to increase productivity in order to reduce the need for supplies from England and to increase exports from Virginia, the Company made a further series of concessions even before 1616, the date on which the seven-year period of servitude was to expire. In 1614, Governor Dale instituted a kind of modified right to the private ownership of land. Colonists of superior quality were given three acres and exempted from the common labor for eleven months of the year, in return for the payment of an annual rent in corn, which was used to increase the stock of supplies; less deserving colonists were to work on the Company land with only one month of the year at their own disposal. The men employed in building Charles City were given the promise of absolute freedom if they remained on the job for three years. New immigrant families were promised a four-room house, tools and supplies, and twelve acres of land on condition that they be planted in food crops.⁵⁸ By the end of 1616, when the first division of land - which amounted to 50 acres per person, not the hundred

that had been promised - was declared, the settlement in Virginia was considerably more complex than it had been earlier. Society was now stratified into the following positions: 1) Officers, who supervised the settlement in the interests of the Company; 2) Owners in fee simple who had received their land-grants; 3) Servants, some of whom worked on the Company lands and were supplied from the general store, some of whom were rented out to tenants and landowners as laborers, and others of whom were artificers, who were forced to maintain themselves on the time allotted to them for that purpose by the Company; 4) Tenants, who paid rent to the Company for the land allowed to them, but who owed only one month's labor service; 5) Residents of Charles City, whose period of servitude was limited to three years.⁵⁹

The growing complexity of the situation was enhanced not only by the fact that some persons had occupied positions different from the ones they now held, but, even more, by the fact that very different prospects for the future were attached to each position.

Limited though these concessions were, they did for a time improve the economic situation in Virginia and they did meet with the approval of the planters. "Formerly," Ralph Hamor wrote,

when our people were fedde out of the common store and laboured iently in the manuring of the ground, and planting corne, glad was that man that could slippe from his labour, nay the most honest of them in a generall businesse, would not take so much faithfull and true paines in a weeke, as now he will doe in a day, neither cared they for the increase, presuming that howsoever their harvest prospered, the generall store must maintaine them, by which meanes we reaped not so much corne from the laboures of 30 men, as three men have done for themselves.⁶⁰

We need not be concerned with the savage factionalism of the later history of the Virginia Company. What does concern us is that in 1619, under the leadership of Sir Edwin Sandys, the Company engaged in an intense effort to make of Virginia the profitable investment it had always hoped it would be. Though it was faced with declining financial resources, with

internal bickering, and with increasing evidence that the King was losing patience with its meager achievement, the Company decided to pin its hopes on a quick return. The key to profits, it felt, lay in raising the value of the Company lands through increasing the population of Virginia and in diversifying products by limiting tobacco cultivation and by bringing in labor skilled in iron-working, silk raising, wine making, timber cutting, and the like. The success of these efforts, obviously, rested upon the strength of the additional inducements that could be offered to both investors and potential emigrants.⁶¹

As always, one of the principal devices used by the Company to attract emigrants and to increase productivity was that of easing the terms on which land could be acquired. The effect of the reform was to create within the structure of the Company a new group of statuses differentiated from one another in terms of the amount of property attached to each or the length of time required to obtain land on the part of those who were not yet entitled to it:

- 1) "Ancient planters" who had come to Virginia at their own cost before 1616 received 100 acres per share in perpetuity rent free.
- 2) "Ancient planters" who had come to Virginia at Company expense received 100 acres at an annual rent of 2s after the completion of their seven-year period of servitude on the Company's land.
- 3) All persons who came to Virginia after 1616 at their own expense received 50 acres at an annual rent of 1s.
- 4) All persons who came to Virginia after 1616 at Company expense were to receive 50 acres after having worked on the Company's land for seven years, during which time half of their produce belonged to the Company and half to themselves.

5) All tradesmen who followed their crafts received a house and four acres of land so long as he plied his trade in that house.

6) All persons who paid for the transportation of emigrants received 50 acres per person.

7) Company officers were entitled not only to their regular land-grants but were supported by the labor of tenants-at-halves on large tracts of land reserved by the Company for that purpose.⁶²

8) Indentured servants, whose transportation was paid by the Company or by private associations of investors and who were then sold to planters on their arrival in Virginia, were entitled to "freedom dues" including a land grant - on the expiration of their servitude.⁶³

Nor was this all. Determined to improve the morale of the colonists and, eventually, to relieve the Company of the burdensome cost of transporting labor from England, Sandys began in 1620 to ship women to Virginia to become wives of the planters. There had been marriages in Virginia before, of course, but the supply of single women, restricted to the few female servants of married couples, was far smaller than the demand. Now, however, the Company organized the shipment of women on a business basis, forming a separate joint-stock company for the purpose. The planters were assured that "extraordinary diligence and care" had been exercised in the choice of the women and that none had been selected "of whom we have not had good testimony of their honest life and carriage...." Though the women were, in any case, to be paid for by the planters at the rate of 120 lbs. of the best leaf tobacco per person and though the Company conceded that it was dubious as to its authority to control marriages - "for the libertie of Mariadge we dare not infrindg" - it nevertheless discriminated between classes of planters in the bestowal of the women. "And though we are desirous that mariadge be

free according to the law of nature," the Company wrote to the Governor and Council of Virginia, "yett would we not have these maids deceived and married to servants, but only to such freemen or tenants as have meanes to maintaine them...." That marriage was to be considered a preferred status was indicated by the Company's advice to the Governor that "you may assure such men as marry those women that the first servants sent over by the Company, shalbe assigned to them; it being o^r intent to preserve families, and to prefer married men before single persons."⁶⁴

And, finally, in a radical departure from previous policy, the Company limited the scope of martial law and, in an effort to gain the consent of the planters to its new program, ordered Governor Yeardley to convene an assembly of elected representatives from each district in Virginia. The Company did not intend by its action to diminish its own authority, for the Governor was given the right to veto all enactments of the General Assembly and the General Court of the Company in London retained the right to disallow its decisions. Rather was it the Company's hope that the degree of acceptance of its program and its administration of affairs would be increased if they had the added sanction of approval by representatives of the planters themselves.⁶⁵ We shall shortly see how the Company's intentions were in part frustrated by the planters' seizure for their own purposes of an instrumentality created to serve the purposes of the organization.

In a sense, the Company's reforms succeeded only too well. Lured by the new prospects in Virginia, 4,749 emigrants departed from England between November, 1619, and February, 1625, nearly twice as many as had gone during the entire period from 1607 to 1619.⁶⁶ But while the Company's propaganda could speak blandly of the "orderly proceeding there," of "each man having the shares of Land due to him," and of "the laudable forme of Justice and government,"⁶⁷ actual conditions in Virginia were quite different. Goodman

Jackson "much marvelled that you would send me a servant to the Companie," young Richard Freethorne wrote to his parents, "he saith I had beene better knocked on the head, and Indeede so I fynde it now to my great greefe and miserie, and saith, that if you love me you will redeeme me suddenlie, for wch I doe Intreate and begg...I thought no head had beene able to hold so much water as hath and doth daylie flow from mine eyes....But this is Certaine I never felt the want of ffather and mother till now, but now deare freinds full well I knowe and rue it although it were too late before I knew it." "To write of all crosses & miseries w^{ch} have befallen us at this tyme we are not able," said Samuel Sharp. "So the truth is," Edward Hill wrote to his brother, "we lyve in the fearefullest age that ever Christians lived in..."⁶⁸

but though Company policy was not responsible for all of the suffering endured by the settlers - including the great Indian Massacre of 1622 - it was responsible for intensifying their sense of deprivation by having raised their expectations. "My Master Atkins hath scolded me," Henry Brigg wrote to his brother, Thomas; "If yo^u remember he tould me that for my Diett the worst day in the weeke should be better then the Sunday, & also he swore unto you that I should never serve any man but himselfe: And he also tould us that there they pale out their groundes from Deere & Hoggs. But in stead of them we pale out o^r Enemyes....we have but a wyne quart of Corne for a day and nothing else but Water, and worke hard from Sun rising to Sun sett at felling of trees...." "If the Company would allow to each man a pound of buster and a pounce of Chese weekely," wrote a planter to Sir John Worsenholme, "they would find more comfort therin then by all the Deere, Fish & Fowls is so talked of in England of w^{ch} I can assure yo^u yo^r poore servants have nott had since their comirge into the Contrey so much as the sent....As for the Incouraging men to come over in my opinion better means may be

used then by putting them in vayne hopes...." "I am pswaded George Thorp wrote to John Smyth of Wibley, "that more doe die of the disease of their minde then of their body by having this country victualls over-praised unto them in England & by not knowing, they shall drinke water here...."⁶⁹

No doubt the chasm between expectation and reality contributed to the planters' alienation from the organizational relationship into which they had been lured by the Company's promises. But that relationship was affected even more by the development of a network of incompatible relationships that followed inevitably from the Company's concessions to its labor force.

At one time in Virginia, as we have seen, the single relationship that existed between persons rested upon the positions they occupied in the Company's table of organization. As a result of the efforts made by the Company to get persons to accept that relationship, however, each person in Virginia had become the occupant of several statuses, for now there were rich and poor in Virginia, landowners and renters, masters and servants, old residents and newcomers, married and single, men and women; and the simultaneous possession of these statuses involved the holder in a network of relationships, some congruent and some incompatible, with his organizational relationship.

Once the men in Virginia had been bachelors who lived in company-provided barracks. Now they lived in private houses with their families, and though the Company attempted to make use of the new relationship by penalizing each "Master of a family" for the crime of swearing committed by those under his authority⁷⁰ - hoping thereby that the master would use his authority for the suppression of the crime - it can hardly be doubted that its action involved the head of the family in a conflict of loyalties.

Once all persons had been equal before Company law and penalties had been inflicted solely in accordance with the nature of the offence. Now, however, the General Assembly found that "personnes of qualitie" were "not fitt to undergoe corporall punishment...."⁷¹

Once considerations of length of residence were irrelevant in determining the obligations of persons to the Company. Now, however, it was enacted that all "y^e olde planters, y^t were heere before, or can in at y^e laste cominge of Sr. Tho: Gates they and their posteritie shalbe exempted from their psonall service to y^e warres, and any publique charge (Churches dewties excepted) that belonges ptticularly to their psones...."⁷²

Once all land had been owned by the Company. Now much of it was owned by private persons and even more had been promised to them, and the opportunities for the creation of private fortunes involved the planters in a new relationship with the Company. No longer was the planter willing to have his tobacco exported through the Company at a fixed price, when, as a free landowner, he wanted to be permitted to strike his own bargain with the purchaser. No longer was the planter willing, at a time when labor meant profit, for the Company to divert to its own use the services of persons "before y^e holdings of a generall Assemblies, to give order for y^e same...." Nor were the planters alone affected by the opportunities for wealth. Officers of the Company, who were expected to administer its program in Virginia, saw the change to subvert it to their own purposes; "...the servants you allow them, or such as they hire," Captain John Smith told the Company, "they plant on their private Lands, not upon that belongeth to their office, which crop alwaies exceeds yours, besides those which are your tenants to halfe, are forced to row them up and downe, whereby both you and they lose more than halfe." Indeed, the Company found it increasingly difficult to get planters

to accept positions on the local Council: "S^r George is taken up with his private....Capt. Hamor is miserable poore and necessities will inforce him to shift....Capt: Mathews intends wholie his Cropp, and will rather hazard the payment of forfeitures, then performe our Injunctions....M^r Blanie is now married in Virginia, and when he hath discharged your trust in the Magazine wilbes a Planter amongst us....And I would you could persuade some of qualities and worth to come out...."⁷³

The increase in private wealth tended to subordinate status in the Company to status in a different kind of relationship among the planters. The muster roll of early 1625 shows 48 families bearing various titles of distinction; 29 of these families are numbered among the 177 families to whom patents of land had been granted by May, 1625, and three more - two ministers and a doctor - were entitled to land by virtue of the official positions they held. These 48 families alone held 266 of the approximately 487 white servants in Virginia, 20 of the 23 Negro servants, and one of the two Indian servants.⁷⁴ These were the families at the apex of Virginia society, determined to uphold their rights as ever against other persons and sometimes going beyond their rights. Acting through the General Assembly, they insisted upon scrupulous enforcement of contracts of servitude, forbade servants to trade with the Indians, and, so as not to lose their labor, regulated the right of their servants to marry. Nor, as the chronic complaints bear witness, were they loath to keep their servants beyond the required time.⁷⁵ That aspect of the relationship between master and servant was eloquently revealed in the petition to the Governor of Jane Dickenson in 1624. She

Most humble sheweth that whereas her late husband Ralph Dickenson Came ov^r into this Country fower Yeares since, obliged to Nicholas Hide deceased for y^e terme of seaven yeares, hee only to have for himselfe & yo^r petitioner y^e one halfe of his labors, her said husband being slaine in the bloody Masseacre, & her selfe Caried away

wth the Cruell salvages, amongst them Enduring much misery for teen monthes. At the Expiration it pleased God, so to dispose the hartes of the Indians, y^t for a small ransome yo^r petitioner wth divers others should be released, In Consideration that Doctor Potts laid out two poundis of beades for her releasement, hee allea- geth yo^r petitioner is linked to his servitude wth a twofold Chaime the one for her late husbandes obligation & thother for her ransome, of both w^{ch} shee hopeth that in Conscience shee ought to be discharged, of y^e first by her widdowhood, of the second by the law of nations, Considering shee hath already served teen monthes, tow much for two pound of beades.th The prizes note standing D^r Pott refuseth to sett yo^r petitioner at liberty, threatening to make him serve her the uttermost day, un- less she poure him 150^{li} waight of Tobacco, she therefore most humbly desireth, that you^u wilbe pleased to take w^t Course shalbe thought iust for her releasement fro^t his servitude, Considering that it much differeth not from her slavery wth the Indians....⁷⁶

But that was only one aspect of the relationship. Conditions in Virginia were now more fluid than they had been, and persons of low status might also rise. Secretary of State John Pory wrote Sir Dudley Carleton that "our cowkeeper here of James citty on Sundays goes accoutered all in freshe^t flaminge silke; and a wife of one that in England had professed the black arte, not of a schollar, but of a collier of Croydon, wears her rough bever hatt with a faire perle hat band...." The Company was opposed to such un- seemly displays of wealth on the part of persons of low estate,⁷⁷ but there is no evidence that it succeeded in preventing them. That there was hostility between rich and poor is evident from the trial of William Tyler. He had told Captain Hamor that even if "hee were a man of meanes yet he would nott be one of the Counsell, Capt. Hamor asked Tyler why, To w^{ch} Tyler answered that his Conscience would not suffer him because he could not doe righte. To w^{ch} Capt. Hamor said doe you know any of the Counsell that doe any man wronge. Tyler answered y^e poore man could hardly gett any righte and that the great men would hold all together...."⁷⁸ But one wonders if William

Tyler retained his beliefs, for in the Census of 1625 he is listed as the master of six servants.

The ultimate stage in the transition of Virginia from organization to society was reached when the settlers came to feel that the new relationships in which they were now involved were of greater importance than their participation in the company relationship, when their statuses outside the organization came to dictate their behavior. For at that point they were no longer willing to accept the legitimacy of their organizational superiors. William Weldon warned Sir Edwin Sandys that the planters who now had land were grumbling at Company policy: "All w^{ch} inconveniencies I persuaded them to beare wth patience & Obediencce untill I acquainted them wth my restraint of plantinge Tobacco w^{ch} is a thinge so distastefull to them that they will wth no patience indure to heare of it bitterly Complayninge that they have nce other meanes to furnish themselves with apparell for the insuinge yere but are likely as they say (and for aught I Can see) to be starved if they be debarred of it."⁷⁹ From general discontent it was but a short step to ridicule of Company officials and outright refusal to accept a Company assignment. "Complements I must refuse," William Capps wrote to John Ferrar, "and begin I must somewhere, and thus first...The old snoker our (I know not how to terme him but) Governour, so good so carefull mild, Religious, iust, honest that I protest I thinke God hath sent him in mercie for good to us, he undergoeth all your cares & ours and I feare not but god will bless him in all his pceedinges but who must be th^e Instrument to make all this whole againe? Why Capps: all voyces can sett him forth about the businesse: But who must pay him his hyre? The Contrey is poore and the Companie is poore and Capps is poore already, & poorer he will be if he follow this course." Like other men, planter Capps believed that "Charity first begins at home," and he divorced his own interest from that of the Company: "I will forswear

ever bending my mind for publique good, and betake me to my own profit with some halfe a score men of my owne and lie rooting in the earthe like a hog, and reckon Tobacco ad unguem by hundrethes, and quarters...."⁸¹

That the Company could no longer expect to command obedience was clear, for even its officers in Virginia perceived themselves as having a set of interests distinct from those of their London superiors and turned their backs to their authority. "Such is the disposicion of those who glorie in their wisdomes," wrote George Sandys, the treasurer in Virginia, to his brother, Sir Miles, "that they will rather Justifiye and proceed in their Errors than to suffer a supposed disgrace by reforming them...Who dierre themselves by the wronginge of others; objecting unto us their Instructions, whereof manie are infeasible and the most inconvenient, for to say the truth they know nothing of Virginia...." "Such an Antipathy is there betweene theyr vast Comands and o^r grumbling Obedience," Sir Francis Wyatt wrote to his father:

Mingling matters of honor and proffitt often overthrow both. They expect great retournes to pay the Companies debt, and wthall great Projects that are nearly charge to be effected: For me I have not a third part of my men to insable me to either....I often wish little M^r Farrar here, that to his zeale he would add knowledge of this Countrey.⁸²

In 1607 there had been no "Countrey," only the Virginia Company. It was the Company's fate to have created a country and to have destroyed itself in the process. More than a century later, James Otis wrote bitterly:

Those who judge of the reciprocal rights that subsist between a supreme and subordinate state of dominion, by no higher rules than are applied to a corporation of button-makers, will never have a very comprehensive view of them.⁸³

His comment was intended as an observation on contemporary political affairs, but we can detect in it a verdict on history as well.

The Company had been faced with the problems of motivating its members to work for the ends which it was created to achieve and, at the same time, of maintaining the discipline that was essential for its organizational integrity.

The solution it adopted for the first problem made it impossible to solve the second; and the burden of achieving order and discipline now became the responsibility not of an organization but of a society. The effort to solve that problem is, of course, nothing less than the history of the United States; and while we cannot relate the full history of that effort here, it may be instructive to dwell for a moment upon a proposal for its solution made at a time when the members of the society first became conscious of the fact that they themselves must bear the burden of finding the solution.

Among the papers found in the Sackville collection in Kent is a document entitled "A Form of Policy for Virginia," written late in the history of the Virginia Company when it was already apparent that it had failed. The proposal was never adopted, but it is significant none the less, for, as Professor Fernand Braudel reminds us, "Victorious events come about as a result of many possibilities, often contradictory, among which life finally has made its choice. For one possibility which actually is realized innumerable others have been drowned. These are the ones which have left little trace for the historians. And yet it is necessary to give them their place because the losing movements are forces which have at every moment affected the final outcome...."⁸¹

The significance of the document lies in its awareness of the problems of motivation and order, in its realization that those problems could no longer be solved by instructions handed down through a chain of command, and in its conscious application of particular social inventions to solve them. Written in the language of a royal proclamation, the document first makes clear its understanding of the problems of discipline and motivation and its concern to solve them through the acceptance by the members of the society of a common outlook, rather than through the directions of a supreme authority: "Wee ...knowinge that the perfection and happinesse of a commonwealth, lyeth...

first and principally in the government, consisting in the mutuall duties of commanding and obeyeing, next in the possessing things plentifully, necessarie for the life of man, doe professe that...we intend wholly the good of our subjects...endeavouring to cause both England and Virginea, to endowe each other with their benefittes and profits that thereby layeing aside force and our coactive power, we may by our justice and bountie marrye and comkinde those our provinces to us and our soveraigntye in naturall love and obedience...."

The problem of order was solved by the meticulous enumeration of every social status that was to exist in Virginia, with a specification of the rights and obligations that inhered in each. The problem of motivation was solved by the granting of both economic rewards and social privileges to each status and by the opportunity given to move from one status to another: "...the meanest servant that goeth (God see blessing him and his endeavours, that hee can purchase and an estate in England or compasse to carrie over or drawe over with him of his friends and adherences the number of 300 men) he may become a lord patriot which is the greatest place the commonwealth canne beare." The problem of consensus was solved through devices to enhance the mutual affection of these statuses: "...to the end that love may be mayntayned, and that these degrees may not estrange the upper orders from the lower, we wish that the heires and eldest so nes of the upper orders may marrye with the daughters of the lower orders...And that the daughters of the upper orders being heires may marrye with the sones of the lower orders, makeing choice of the most vertuous, soe as vertue may advance both men and women to marriages, and that all degrees may bee thereby bound together in the bonds of love that none may be scorned but the scorner. To this end alsoe, although we would not have you imitate the Irish in their wilde and barbarous maners, yet we will commend one custome of theirs unto you, which is that the poorer sort

sueing to gett the nursing of the children of the lordes and gentry, and breedinge upp in their minorities as their owne, this breedinge...doth begett anoether nature in them to love their foster children and brethren, as if they were naturally bread of the same parentes...."

Written in the margin of the document, by whom we do not know, is a lengthy commentary. Concerning the importance of status and order, the following is written: "...this maintenance of their degrees will immoveably fixe the frame of the collonie...." Concerning the importance of mobility and motivation, the following is written: "See framinge the government that it shall give all men both liberty and meanes of riseinge to the greatest places and honours therein, whereby they will receave such content that they will all strive to maintaine it in the same forme we shall now settle it...."⁸⁵

Shakespeare had written

Take but degree away, untune that string
And hark, what discord follows.

The author of the document agreed. He rested his hopes for stability on the attachment of each person to a position in which recognized rights and responsibilities inhered. What he did not realize is what may be learned from the history of the Virginia Company, that each man is attached to many positions, that each position involves him in a separate relationship that imposes its own necessities, and that his behavior is the product of all the positions he holds and, because he has a memory, of all the positions he once held.

III

What we have attempted here is the analysis of a particular kind of social change, the transformation of an aggregate of persons characterized at the outset by the fact that the relationship between them was constrained to that implied by the position each man held in an organization, into a

society, characterized by the existence of an interlocking but not congruent set of relationships, in each of which the position held by a man might be different from his position in the others.

The generalizations that seem to emerge from our study are of two kinds, conclusions that are based upon the events of the time and place that we have analyzed and hypotheses of a more abstract kind that derive from the analysis of these historical particulars but can be stated in such a way as to be of more general applicability.

There seems little room for doubt about some of the conclusions we have drawn: that the character of seventeenth century North American society was shaped decisively by the fact that, in contrast to the situation in Latin America, the creation of the society was accomplished through the recruitment of a voluntary labor force; that higher statuses in that society were created as a result of the need to induce persons to accept positions in lower statuses; and that the behavior of persons in that society was determined not only by the opportunities for advancement that existed, as Whiggish interpreters of our history would have us believe, but, as well, by the fact that these opportunities were less than people had been led to expect.

With respect to more general hypotheses that emerge from this study it may be hazarded that the mechanism, though not the causes, of social change consists in the multiplication of the statuses that persons hold and in the alteration of those they once held, for this involves them in such a proliferating series of new relationships, each with its own duties and rights, as to alter their behavior in a decisive fashion. Whether these changes in position are responded to favorably or unfavorably, with further consequences for the behavior of the persons involved, depends upon the history of the group.

The testing of these hypotheses, of course, would involve the examination

of still other consciously selected historical situations for the purpose of comparison - the experience of the British in establishing other colonies in North America and in coping with a totally different problem in India, of the French in Canada and the Spanish in South America, of the reasons for the difference between the blueprint in accordance with which utopian communities were planned and the outcome of their establishment, and the like. Heroin lies the design for a research in historical sociology.

1. William James Ashley, Surveys: Historic and Economic (London, 1900), 30.
2. In Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, II (Baltimore, 1884), No. 10.
3. Ibid., II (Baltimore, 1884), No. 10, 5.
4. Albert Shaw, Icaria, A Chapter in the History of Communism (New York, 1884).
5. Arthur F. Bentley, The Condition of the Western Farmer as Illustrated by the Economic History of a Nebraska Township, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 11th series, VII-VIII (Baltimore, 1893).
6. Guy S. Callender, "The Position of American Economic History," American Historical Review, XXIX (1913-14), 81, 82, 85-87.
7. Gargantua and Pantagruel, chapter two.
8. Quoted in Alexander Brown, The Genesis of the United States (Boston and New York, 1897), 63-64.
9. Philip Alexander Bruce, Social Life of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century (Richmond, 1907), 25-26.
10. Ibid., 15, 17-18; "The Virginia Census, 1624-25," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, VII (1899-1900), 364-67; Edward Channing, A History of the United States (New York and London, 1905-1925), I, 204-05.
11. See, for example, Brown, Genesis, I, 142, 180 note 1, 244-45, 393-99, II, 595-96, 738, 741; Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs... in the Archives and Collections of Venice..., XI, Nos. 52, 466, 794, 821; Carl Russell Fish, ed., Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and Other Italian Archives (Washington, 1911), 150 ff.; Henry Chandler Poorman, Jamestown and St. Mary's (Baltimore, 1938), 37, 38; Alexander Brown, The First Republic in America (New York and Boston, 1898), 48, 50, 51-52, 62, 79-80, 121, 123, 125, 152, 160, 184-85, 218-19. See also Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, VIII, No. 79, for the interrogation of Francis Maguer, the Irish spy.
12. Brown, Genesis, II, 700-06.
13. Quoted in Louis B. Wright, The First Gentlemen of Virginia (San Marino, 1940), 109.
14. Susan Myra Kingsbury, ed., Records of the Virginia Company (Washington, 1906-35), III, 21.
15. "Minutes of the Council and General Court," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XXIII (1915), 138.
16. Wesley Frank Craven and Walter B. Hayward, The Journal of Richard Norwood, Surveyor of Bermuda (New York, 1945); Brown, Genesis, I, 142; "London's Lottery," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, V (1948), 259-64.

17. Susan Myra Kingsbury, An Introduction to the Records of the Virginia Company of London (Washington, 1905), 14; Wesley Frank Craven, The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 1607-1689 (Baton Rouge, 1949), 70; Philip Alexander Bruce, Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century (New York and London, 1896), II, 16-20.
18. Herbert Levi Osgood, The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century (New York and London, 1904, 1907), I, 32-34, II, 30-32; Bruce, Economic History, I, 3-4.
19. Wesley Frank Craven, Dissolution of the Virginia Company (New York, 1932), 24. For an account of the structure of the Company, see William Robert Scott, The Constitution and Finance of English, Scottish and Irish Joint-Stock Companies to 1720 (Cambridge, England, 1910), II, 247-59, 266-88.
20. The quotations are from A Declaration of the State of the Colonie and Affairs in Virginia (London, 1620), in Peter Force, Tracts and Other Papers, Relating... to the... Colonies in North America (Washington, 1835-45), III, 5, and Brown, Genesis, I, 357. For a list of publications sponsored by the Company, see Kingsbury, Introduction, appendix.
21. John Smith, Description of Virginia and Proceedings of the Colonie (Oxford, 1612), in Lyon Gardiner Tyler, ed., Narratives of Early Virginia (New York, 1907), 178.
22. Susan Myra Kingsbury, "A Comparison of the Virginia Company with the Other English Trading Companies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1906 (Washington, 1907), 162-63.
23. Quoted in Keith Glenn, "Captain John Smith and the Indians," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, LII (1944), 231 note 12.
24. Wesley Frank Craven, "Indian Policy in Early Virginia," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, I (1944), 65-82.
25. John Smith, Description of Virginia, in Tyler, ed., Narratives, 125-26, 140-41, 159-60; Thomas Jefferson Wortembaker, Patrician and Plebeian in Virginia (Charlottesville, 1910), 5-9; Bruce, Social Life, 39-43.
26. Wesley Frank Craven, An Introduction to the History of Bermuda, reprinted from William and Mary Quarterly, 2nd series, XVII, Nos. 2, 3, 4; XVII, No. 1 (1937-38), 32-35.
27. The quotations are in Osgood, American Colonies, I, 46-47; Smith, Generall Historie, in Tyler, ed., Narratives, 331-32; John Smith, The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia (Oxford, 1612), in the A.G. Bradley edition of Edward Arber, ed., Travels and Works of Captain John Smith (Edinburgh, 1919), I, 149. See also Osgood, American Colonies, I, 50, 54-55; Bruce, Economic History, I, 197.
28. Channing, History, I, 204.

29. Calendar of State Papers, East Indies, 1571-1616, No. 432; Brown, Genesis, I, 252-54; E. Ribton-Turner, A History of Vagrants and Vagrancy (London, 1887), 141; Kingsbury, ed., Records, I, 304-06, 270, 359, III, 259; Acts of the Privy Council of England, Colonial Series, I, No. 42; Abbot Emerson Smith, Colonists in Bondage (Chapel Hill, 1947), 147-49; Richard S. Morris, Government and Labor in Early America (New York, 1946), 385.
30. Smith, Colonists, 94-95; Morris, Government and Labor, 323.
31. Kingsbury, ed., Records, I, 520, II, 108; Smith, Colonists, 139-40.
32. Craven, Virginia Company, 29-33; Scott, Joint-Stock Companies, II, 250-52; Philip Alexander Bruce, Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century (New York and London, 1910), II, 237-41.
33. Smith, Colonists, 44-46.
34. Brown, Genesis, I, 355.
35. Ibid., I, 356.
36. Nova Britannia (London, 1609), in Brown, First Republic, 78-79.
37. A Sermon Preached in London before the right honourable Lord La warre, Lord governor and Captaine Generall of Virginia (London, 1610), quoted in Perry Miller, "Religion and Society in the Early Literature: The Religious Impulse in the Founding of Virginia," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, VI (1949), 31; Brown, Genesis, I, 364.
38. James Curtis Ballagh, White Servitude in the Colony of Virginia, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 13th series, VII-VIII (Baltimore, 1895), 15-17; Craven, Virginia Company, 29-33; Craven, Southern Colonies, 85-90; Smith, Colonists, 8-10; Kingsbury, "Comparison," op.cit., 163-69.
39. The New Life of Virginea...Being the Second Part of Nova Britannia (London, 1612), in Force, Tracts, I, 17-18; Nova Britannia, in Force, Tracts, I, 26.
40. A True and Sincere Declaration (London, 1609), in Brown, Genesis, I, 342.
41. Quoted in Craven, Southern Colonies, 64.
42. Appendix to A True and Sincere Declaration, in Brown, Genesis, I, 352.
43. For the Colony in Virginea Britannia, Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, &c (London, 1612) in Force, Tracts, III, 68.
44. Kingsbury, ed., Records, III, 216-19.
45. Ibid., III, 15.
46. Ibid., III, 27.
47. Ibid., III, 22.

48. Dale to the Earl of Salisbury, August 17, 1611, in Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, James I., I, No. 26.
49. Walter F. Prince, "The First Criminal Code of Virginia," Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1899 (Washington, 1900), I, 313-14.
50. For the full text of the code, see For the Colony in Virginia Britannia. Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall &c (London, 1612), in Force, Tracts, III. See also Prince, "Criminal Code," op.cit., 311-63.
51. For the Colony in Virginia Britannia, in Force, Tracts, III, 41, 49-50, 55, 61-62.
52. Kingsbury, ed. Records, III, 164, 165, 170, 173, 160.
53. Quoted in Perry Miller, "Religion and Society," op. cit., 37.
54. Appendix to A True and Sincere Declaration (1609), in Brown, Genesis, I, 352; Virginia Company broadside of 1610, in Brown, Genesis, I, 439.
55. Quoted in Charles H. Andrews, The Colonial Period of American History (New Haven, 1934-38), I, 113-14.
56. Brown, Genesis, II, 648-49.
57. Morris, Government and Labor, 169-71
58. Ballagh, White Servitude, 22-23; Osgood, American Colonies, I, 75-77; Bruce, Economic History, I, 212-15; Craven, Southern Colonies, 116-17; Smith, Colonists, 10-11.
59. Bruce, Economic History, I, 216-17, 220-22; Ballagh, White Servitude, 20-22; John Rolfe, Relation of Virginia (London, 1616), in Edward D. Neill, History of the Virginia Company of London (Albany, 1869), 107-08.
60. A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia...(London 1615), 17.
61. Craven, Virginia Company, passim, but especially 168-71; Craven, Southern Colonies, 145-47; Scott, Joint-Stock Companies, II, 266-88; Kingsbury, Introduction, 34-35, 40-41, 94-95.
62. "Instructions to Governor Yeardley, 1618," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, II (1894-95), 161-62; Bruce, Economic History, I, 226-33, 511-14; Ballagh, White Servitude, 25-28, 31; Craven, Virginia Company, 50-57; Craven, Southern Colonies, 127-29. For shipping lists of emigrants broken down into the above categories see Kingsbury, ed., Records, III, 115-16, 239-40.

63. Smith, Colonists, 11-17; Ballagh, White Servitude, 28-30; Bruce, Economic History, II, 11-18; Morris, Government and Labor, 395.
The earliest known contract of indenture is that between the proprietors of Berkeley Hundred and Robert Coopy of North Nibley, Gloucestershire: "That the said Robert doth hereby covenant faithfully to serve the said S^r Willm, Richard George and John for three years from daye of his landinge in the land of Virginia, there to be employed in the lawfull and reasonable workes and labors of them...and to be obedient to such governore his and their assistants and counsell as they... shall from tyme to tyme appoynt and set over him. In consideration whereof, the said S^r Willm Richard George and John do covenant with the said Robert to transport him (with gods assistance) with all convenient speed into the said land of Virginia at their costs and charges in all things, and there to maintayne him with convenient diet and apparell meet for such a servant. And in thend of the said terme to make him a free man of the said Country theirby to enjoy all the liberties freedoms and priviledges of a freeman there, And to grant to the said Robert thirty acres of land within their Territory or hundred of Bartley...." Kingsbury, ed., Records, III, 210-11.
64. Kingsbury, ed., Records, III, 115, 493-94, 505.
65. Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Virginia under the Stuarts (Princeton, 1914), 38-39; Craven, Virginia Company, 70-80; Craven, Southern Colonies, 127-29; "Proceedings of the First Assembly in Virginia, Held July 30, 1619", in Colonial Records of Virginia (Richmond, 1874).
66. Samuel H. Yonge, "The Site of Old 'James Towne,' 1607-1698," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XI (1903-04), 399-400.
67. A Declaration of the State of the Colony (1620), in Force, Tracts, III, 5-6.
68. Kingsbury, ed., Records, IV, 59, 61-62, 239, 234. See also ibid., IV, 41-42, 232, 235-36.
69. Ibid., IV, 235-36, 312-32, III, 417. See also ibid., III, 456.
70. Proclamation of Governor Wyatt, June, 1622, in Kingsbury, ed., Records, III, 659.
71. Act of March, 1623/24, in ibid., IV, 584.
72. Act of March, 1623/24, in ibid., IV, 582.
73. Ibid., IV, 561, 581; Smith, Generall Historie, in Tyler, ed., Narratives, 356; George Sandys to John Ferrar, April 11, 1623, in Kingsbury, ed., Records, IV, 110-11.
74. The figures, which are to be used with caution because the accuracy of the data on which they are based may be questioned, are derived from the muster rolls in John Camden Hotten, The Original Lists of Persons of Quality; Emigrants, Religious Exiles...Who Went from Great Britain to the American Plantations, 1600-1700 (London, 1874) and the list of land patents in Kingsbury, ed., Records, IV, 551-58.
75. Smith, Colonists, 226-29; Kingsbury, ed., Records, IV, 128-30.

76. Kingsbury, ed., Records, IV, 473.
77. Pory to Carleton, September 30, 1619, in Tyler, ed., Narratives, 285; Kingsbury, ed., Records, III, 469.
78. "Minutes of the Council and General Court, 1622-24," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XIX (1911), 379.
79. Kingsbury, ed., Records, III, 263.
80. Ibid., IV, 76.
81. Ibid., IV, 38-39.
82. Ibid., IV, 71, 237. See also ibid, IV, 455-57.
83. The Rights of the British Colonies asserted and proved (Boston, 1764), in Samuel Eliot Morison, ed., Sources and Documents illustrating the American Revolution... (2nd ed., Oxford, 1929), 8.
84. Quoted in Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Public Opinion and the Classical Tradition," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXI, No. 1 (Spring, 1957), 53.
85. Kingsbury, ed., Records, IV, 411, 417, 424-25, 416, 419.