TIMOTHY BLOODWORTH

Timothy Bloodworth, New Hanover County revolutionary patriot and United States Senator, has received relatively little attention from historians during the course of the last two centuries. His pronounced democratic tendencies may have militated against his exposure among the patrician writers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But principally explaining Bloodworth's lack of recognition is the absence of a substantial corpus of personal papers. Other than the public records and a few letters, most information about Bloodworth is derivative. Nevertheless, his is a worthwhile story—that of a man of humble origins who helped to shape the course of events during momentous times, and one that is particularly relevant during these years of the bicentennial remembrance of the birth of the American republic.

Born in the Rocky Point district of New Hanover County in 1736, some ten years following the permanent settlement of the Cape Fear, Bloodworth grew and matured with the region. Lacking formal education, Bloodworth was self-instructed, later evidencing a familiarity with such natural rights philosophers as the Swiss jurist Emerich de Vattel. Financially, Bloodworth realized little assistance from his father, a man of moderate means at best, who had four (possibly five) grown sons and a daughter with whom Bloodworth, the eldest, had to share the paternal inheritance. Not until his mother's death in 1786 did Bloodworth secure title to the plantation on which he lived.1

Bloodworth epitomized the success that was possible for an aspiring, energetic, eighteenth century American in a fluid society, expanding economy, and open polity. Occupationally, he was a dillennial worker, working at various trades—tavernkeeper, ferrykeeper, physician, preacher, blacksmith, wheelwright, watchmaker, and planter. Doubtlessly Bloodworth derived the bulk of his income from his farms. By 1790, he owned 9 slaves and had received grants for 4,266 acres of land. While this may not have compared favorably with the many magnificent estates in the Lower Cape Fear, it certainly elevated Bloodworth above the average farmer in the area.2

Nonetheless, throughout his political career it was the common man to whom Bloodworth turned for support. According to Archibald Maclaine in 1784, Bloodworth's popularity rested upon the “popular cry.” Wrote another, as a politician, Bloodworth “resolved almost to fierceness, and [was] almost radical in his democracy.” On the other hand, he was conservative within the framework of democracy. In the national congress in 1786, Bloodworth opposed the adoption of the dollar as the country's principal monetary unit and the use of the decimal system as the measure of accounts because they were “contrary to . . . long Usage.”3

At the age of 25, in 1761, Bloodworth began his rise to prominence when he was selected to serve on the New Hanover County petit jury. Three years later he served on the grand jury and was appointed overseer of the road from Negro Head Point to Long Creek Bridge. In 1766, the county court appointed Bloodworth searcher or patrol for the Rocky Point district. But after that brief flurry of public exposure, Bloodworth maintained a low profile until the outbreak of the Revolution.4

At the approach of the American Revolution, Bloodworth was a confirmed patriot who opposed British measures of taxation and discrimination against the American colonies. He was early a member of the New Hanover Safety Committee, which combined with the Wilmington Safety Committee in January 1775 to spearhead the independence movement in the Lower Cape Fear. Throughout the year Bloodworth served faithfully, if not conspicuously, on the Wilmington-New Hanover Safety Committee. In 1776, the Fifth Provincial Congress appointed him a justice of the peace for New Hanover County, a position from which he resigned in April 1778.5

Independence and statehood in 1776 found North Carolina divided politically between the “Conservatives” and “Radicals.” The latter, who included Bloodworth, favored a democratic government, liberal use of paper currency, and harsh treatment of the loyalists. Reluctantly the Radicals endorsed the Articles of Confederation, a constitution proposed by the Continental Congress to establish a national government. Yet they remained suspicious of centralized power. Most became Antifederalists in the North Carolina struggle over the ratification of the Federal Constitution in 1787-1789.

Bloodworth reacted strongly to the loyalist issue. He
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PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

Now that it is February and another successful Candlelight Tour, under the capable leadership of Susie Withers, is past and another year is in its infancy (with most of our resolutions having already been broken), we can start looking forward to the spring, and our thirtieth birthday party and a few other things.

This spring the Public Television channel will have a program on Frederic Chopin and George Sand which was filmed in part at the Latimer House. I wish I could give you the exact date that the film will be shown, but Mr. Bill Hanna, the director, could only tell me that it would be some time in the spring. We’ll notify you if we do get the exact date. Watch for it!

The Incinerators’ Garden is to be the Cape Fear Garden Tour during the Azalea Festival in April. The garden should be glorious with a multitude of tulips which Heide Trask donated and planted in the freezing December cold.

Congratulations are in order for Diane Cashman who was chosen by the Historic Preservation Foundation of North Carolina to receive a 1985 Gertrude S. Carraway Award of Merit for her outstanding efforts in the field of historic preservation.

Last but not least I want to thank all the docents and volunteers who make the Latimer House such a warm and beautiful spot for all of our visitors. Many people tell me they feel that real people live there and have just stepped out for a moment. That is a real tribute!

Sincerely,

Jean Anne Sutton

* * *

GIFTS TO THE SOCIETY

The Society gratefully acknowledges the following gifts:

GIFTS TO THE ARCHIVES

James Alfred Miller, Jr. and Jerry R. Roughton

Xeroxed copies of Wilmington saloon tokens and bank notes from the Bank of Wilmington and Bank of Cape Fear.

St. James Church

History of St. James Church 1729-1979 by Leora Hiatt McEachern (assisted and completed by Bill Reaves).

Diane Cobb Cashman

Original manuscript of “The History of the Cape Fear Country Club 1896-1984.”

Jewel Spangler Smaus

Mary Baker Eddy: The Golden Years by Jewel Spangler Smaus (autographed by the author) and “Family from New England to the Black Hills,” an eight part article about Mary Baker Eddy’s son George W. Glover II by Jewel Spangler Smaus.

CORRECTION TO THE LAST ISSUE: The 1861-1865 research materials donated by Mrs. Robert W. Williams were compiled by the late Leora McEachern and Isabel Williams—not Isabel McEachern as printed.
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vigorously supported proposed legislation in 1784 to banish prominent British sympathizers, and offered a long list of names for consideration in what appeared to some to be an effort "to depopulate New Hanover County." While in the North Carolina legislature in 1784, Bloodworth objected to the Treaty of Paris, 1783, which concluded the Revolutionary War and recognized American independence, because the pact contained provisions for indemnifying British creditors and protecting loyalist rights. Almost twenty years later Bloodworth remembered that

a large portion of our citizens, unmindful of their social obligations, deserted the interest of their country, & joined the hostile band, with a number of our domestics [slaves], who all united their efforts, by plunder, fire and sword, to subjugate the Free Sons of America, who were contending for the natural rights of Freemens.

During the course of the Revolution, Bloodworth served the county and state in several capacities. He was an entry taker for New Hanover County, commissary for the army, and supplier of cannon. In the process Bloodworth advanced money from his own pocket to further the revolutionary cause. He was elected from New Hanover County to three consecutive terms in the North Carolina house of commons, 1778-1780, coming within one vote of being a unanimous choice on the part of the county electorate in the last year. In 1778, the legislature vacated Bloodworth's seat because he occupied the position of entry taker and the state constitution prohibited multiple officeholding. The New Hanoverian promptly resigned as entry taker, stood for reelection, and won.

When Bloodworth was selected by the legislature in 1780 to replace John Ashe as the treasurer of the Wilmington district, his lack of expertise in financial affairs or indulgent personality may have betrayed him. County sheriffs foisted worthless paper money on the treasurer when accounting for the state taxes. At Bloodworth's resignation from the treasuryship in 1783, the legislature considerably granted him additional time to collect the necessary funds from the guilty parties.

The New Hanover electorate returned Bloodworth to the lower house of the legislature in 1783, 1784, and 1787. His seating in 1783 was subject to controversy, for some felt that it violated the twenty-fifth article of the state constitution which denied eligibility of state office to any receiver of public monies until the sums had been fully accounted for and paid into the state treasury. After an affirmative vote in Bloodworth's favor, fourteen members of the house of commons, mainly Conservatives led by Archibald Maclaine, registered a protest. They charged that ignoring the constitution after successfully contending for constitutional principles in the independence movement against Britain would establish a "tyranny of a more dangerous tendency... among ourselves."

Undismayed by the protest, the General Assembly remained favorably disposed toward Bloodworth. It chose him to be one of the state's representatives to the national congress in Philadelphia in the mid-1780s. Admittedly, membership in that body was rarely regarded as a high honor by North Carolinians. Most treated such office with disdain, for the pay, if forthcoming, was nugatory, and the congress was considered a mere debating society.

Like most North Carolina representatives, Bloodworth little influenced congressional affairs. Though elected in December of 1785 for the first of three terms, there is no record of his attendance in Philadelphia. Relected in December 1786, he resigned in mid-August the following year. An unrelenting legislature sent Bloodworth to Philadelphia for a third time in 1788 in what must have been an agreeably short term to Bloodworth. The Articles of Confederation government was replaced by that of the Federal Constitution in March of 1789.

During his brief tenure in the congress Bloodworth fought to protect the interests of North Carolina and the southern states. He was also concerned about national encroachment upon the rights of the states. As he confided to Governor Richard Caswell in 1786, the congress had recently passed an ordinance to regulate Indian affairs and "after repeated endeavors, we have obliged the Superintendent for the Southern District, to act in conjunction with the Authority of the State in all matters wherein the Legislative Rights of the States may be concerned..."

Superceding the controversy over Indian relations was the proposed Jay-Gardoqui Treaty with Spain. Southerners believed that the pact favored northern commercial interests at the expense of southern agrarianism. More particularly, Bloodworth opposed the treaty because it encroached upon the rights of the states. He did not believe that the congress could "dispose of any of the privileges (the right of navigation of the Mississippi River)... of the undivided States, without their consent..." Furthermore, the agreement would alienate the loyalties of citizens living between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River and deprecate land values in that region.

More broadly, the treaty-making power of the congress, by which a simple majority of the states was sufficient to approve a covenant, frightened Bloodworth. He wrote, "if seven States can carry on a treaty, or, in other words, will persist in the measure, it follows, of course, that the Confederated compact is no more than a rope of sand..." Apparently, Bloodworth's penchant for democracy stopped short of majority rule in the national legislature. He and others who voiced reservations about the approval of treaties by the congress were eventually rewarded. The Federal Constitution of 1787 contained the stipulation that a two-thirds majority of the Senate was necessary for the ratification of a treaty.

Suspicious as he was of centralized power, Bloodworth was willing to accord the Articles government a desperately-needed taxing power to keep the government afloat. As he observed in September 1786, "if a more efficient government is not obtained, a dissolution of the Union must take place." However, an amendment designed to allow the government to levy a tariff on imports failed to secure the necessary unanimous approval of the states in 1786.

As the prestige of the government declined and the amendment failed of ratification, a successful movement to replace the Articles gained momentum. The Conven-
ation at Philadelphia in 1787 drafted a new constitution which envisioned a far more powerful national government and submitted the proposal to the states for ratification in late 1787. Throughout the country proponents of the new constitution, called Federalists, organized to battle the critics of the document, who were styled Antifederalists.

North Carolina held its first convention to consider the ratification of the Federal Constitution in Hillsborough in 1788. The Antifederalists, who claimed a clear majority throughout the state and in the convention, were led by Willie Jones, Samuel Spencer, Thomas Person, and Bloodworth, the last being one of New Hanover County’s six representatives to the convention. The Federalists, despite their small numbers in Hillsborough, insisted upon a detailed examination of the document before the question of ratification was put to a vote.16

Bloodworth and the North Carolina Antifederalists basically abhorred the creation of a powerful national government that would threaten states rights and local self-determination. More especially, Antifederalists ideas of government rested upon their understanding of human nature: the belief that man was activated by self-interest, which in politics translated into a lust for power. Thus government should be kept as close to the people as possible, and within the governmental structure there should be explicit and detailed checks upon the rulers. As Bloodworth said, “in so important a case as a constitution, every thing ought to be clear and intelligible, and no ground left for disputes.”17

In the course of the debates at Hillsborough the Antifederalists pointedly examined the relationship between the federal and state governments. Bloodworth charged that Article VI of the Constitution by which the Constitution, laws of the United States, and treaties were deemed the supreme law of the land would produce an “abolition of the state governments.” The sovereignty of the national government “absolutely annihilates them.” In the early nineteenth century the Marshallian court fulfilled Bloodworth’s prophecy in the Hillsborough Convention that whenever federal and state laws conflicted, the latter “must be destroyed.”18

The Antifederalists also objected to the lack of protection for personal rights. Bloodworth, for example, deplored the failure of the proposed governance document to guarantee trial by jury in federal civil causes. Jury trial, of course, was one of those basic English rights for which the American colonials had contended and which the states had guaranteed their citizens upon gaining their independence.19

Although the Federalists warned of the dangers of remaining beyond the new government (and a sufficient number of states had already ratified the Constitution to ensure the organization of the United States), Bloodworth discounted the risks. He considered “the disadvantages of a temporary exclusion from the union... trifling,” asking “if a few political advantages could be put in competition with our liberties.” The New Hanover delegate believed that North Carolina’s refusal to accept the Constitution would place added pressure upon the United States to adopt amendments to protect personal liberties and to curtail national power. In fact, such demands from various states, though hardly North Carolina’s holdout, resulted in the ratification of ten amendments in 1791, the Bill of Rights.20

Although the Antifederalists were immediately successful in Hillsborough by postponing a decision regarding the Constitution, the Federalists led by Samuel Johnston, James Iredell, and William R. Davie launched an educational, propagandistic campaign that reversed the decision of the following year. In 1788, Bloodworth represented New Hanover in the state senate, and suffered the dismay of witnessing a legislative call for another convention to meet at Fayetteville. The ever-popular Bloodworth was again a member of the New Hanover delegation at the Fayetteville Convention. And he was in the minority on an affirmative ballot of 194 to 77 to ratify the Federal Constitution.21

Although opposed to ratification, Bloodworth did not hesitate to seek to represent North Carolina in the national congress. However, the state legislature, in which he was serving in the senate for a second consecutive term in 1789, overlooked his bid for a senatorship, preferring Samuel Johnston and Benjamin Hawkins, known proponents of the Constitution. Bloodworth promptly shifted his attention to a seat in the House of Representatives from the Cape Fear District. He was elected in 1790, the only opponent of the Constitution to represent North Carolina in the first Congress.22

As Bloodworth took his seat in Congress on April 6, 1790, political division again rent national and state politics. The Federalist party, which early identified with President George Washington and Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton, favored a diversified economy, a powerful central government, and an elitist rule. The opposition Jeffersonian Republicans reposed their faith in an agrarian order and the ability of the people to govern themselves. They feared that excessive national authority would undermine state autonomy and personal liberties.

During his brief stint in Congress, Bloodworth evidenced his Jeffersonian Republican political sympathies by his opposition to Hamilton’s financial program, which most Southerners felt was intended to serve Northern commercial interests and to augment the power of the central government. In that respect, Bloodworth voted against the Assumption Bill and the excise tax, deeming the latter “obnoxious.” Both measures, however, ultimately secured the approval of Congress. Bloodworth reacted to the charged political atmosphere by writing, “the dignity of stations are not sufficient to exempt mankind from human foibles. Party spirits prevail and private interest is pursued in the grand council of the nation.” But the New Hanoverian was far from an innocent bystander.23

While Bloodworth labored in Philadelphia, friends and political allies worked to secure his reelection. In December 1790, members of the General Assembly from New Hanover, Onslow, Brunswick, Duplin, Bladen, Sampson, and Moore counties (partially representing the Cape Fear District) publicly endorsed Bloodworth’s reelection. The election, however, found Federalist William Barry Grove of Fayetteville winning 65 percent of the votes, mainly on his strong showing in Cumber-
land and Robeson counties. Bloodworth remained active in local and state politics. His defeat for congressional reelection was assuaged by his election to the state house of commons in 1791. At that time foreign affairs and the European wars of the 1790s further inflamed party passions. The Federalists identified with England; the Republicans, with France. As a lieutenant-colonel of the militia in the Wilmington District in 1794, Bloodworth showed his Francophobia. When Governor Richard Dobbs Spaight ordered the militia to seize a French privateer and its prize which had sailed into the port of Wilmington, Bloodworth refused the executive’s command. He resigned his commission and criticized Spaight in what was apparently a popular stand. Later in the year Bloodworth was elected to the house of commons from New Hanover County and he was chosen speaker of that body.

While in the General Assembly of 1794-1795, Bloodworth was chosen to represent the state in the United States Senate, to which decision staunch Federalist Samuel Johnston reacted, “O tempora! O mores!” Bloodworth proceeded to vote against the ratification of the Jay Treaty in 1795 and opposed the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. He even had the audacity to oppose Congress’ adulatory address to President Washington upon the chief executive’s retirement. As Bloodworth left the Senate in 1801, Thomas Jefferson, who had led his party to victory over the Federalists in 1800, was inaugurated as president.

When Bloodworth returned to his home in 1801, New Hanover County voters promptly elected him to the state house of commons. In his last term as a state legislator, Bloodworth strongly advocated the establishment of a state penitentiary. Ahead of his time in the effort, Bloodworth contended that the penal code was “cruel and unjust, because our punishments are by no means proportioned to the crimes the commission of which they punish.” Incarceration was preferable to the death sentence in many instances, for often it was a more equitable punishment and it would serve as a more effective deterrent to potential criminals. Having short memories, people would quickly forget an execution but would more likely remember one who was languishing in prison.

Although Bloodworth left elective political office at the conclusion of the legislative session in 1802, he remained politically active. He delivered the keynote address to a Republican sponsored Fourth of July rally in Wilmington in 1802. In his speech Bloodworth called for harmony in political circles, ironically at the same time the Federalists were holding their own Fourth of July celebration in the same town.

Another Republican who called for party reconciliation was President Jefferson, who sought to soothe ruffled feelings following a heated election campaign in 1800. Nevertheless, the president was not averse to the use of the spoils system to reward Republican party faithfuls. A beneficiary of Jefferson’s largesse was Bloodworth, appointed Collector of the Port of Wilmington in 1802.

During the ensuing five years inefficiency or incompetency marked Bloodworth’s office. When he was replaced by Robert Cochran in 1807, Bloodworth owed $22,500 to the United States. In a suit brought before the federal district court in late 1809, the government obtained a judgment on the $10,000 bond (plus costs) that had been posted by Bloodworth and his securities David Jones, Samuel Ashe, William Devane, and Christopher Dudley, Jr.

Thus Bloodworth’s last years were ones of financial disability. Presumably he lost the bulk of his estate, for the U.S. marshal began to sell Bloodworth’s property, including two half-acre lots in South Washington. After retiring to his home near Burgaw, the patriot and politician died in 1814. It was a tragic end for one who had labored so diligently on behalf of the American people, more particularly, those of North Carolina, and most particularly, the “common man” whose interests were rarely identified or championed.

Dr. Watson, a native of Rocky Mount, North Carolina, obtained his Ph.D. in History from the University of South Carolina. He is Professor of History at UNC-Wilmington where he has been teaching since January 1971.
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The Latimer House has a great need for some very ordinary, unexciting, non-historic paraphernalia. So look in your attic and your closets. You will be surprised to find that you own a large store of late 20th century artifacts. See what you can spare for us.

Here is what we need: a coffee pot, a coffee urn, cups and saucers, luncheon plates, drinking glasses, knives (kitchen, paring, and bread), saucepans, a kitchen stool, a step ladder, a swivel typing chair, a desk lamp, and a vacuum cleaner.

Please contact Jean Scott at The Latimer House.

Many thanks,

Stanley Brooks

The St. Thomas Celebration of the Arts

The 1986 St. Thomas Celebration of the Arts will take place February 13-16. Special events include:

MUSICAL THEATER—The 1986 Festival debuts with an evening of sights and sounds from Broadway's rich musical theater history, Encore "Broadway Music At Its Best" featuring, John Raitt. February 13, 8:00 p.m., Kenan Auditorium.

JAZZ—On the Festival's second night, the celebrated acoustics of Wilmington's storied Thalian Hall will combine with the magical talents of guitarist Charlie Byrd Trio to deliver an evening of unparalleled jazz. February 14, 8:00 p.m., Thalian Hall.

CLASSICAL—Classical music in the innovative and exciting package known as the Amherst Saxophone Quartet graces the Festival's third evening of distinguished entertainment. February 15, 8:00 p.m., Thalian Hall.

DANCE—The Festival closes with the talent of one of the country's most well-known ballet companies, The Ballet America Concert Dancers, on display. February 16, 8:00 p.m., Thalian Hall.