Editor’s Notes

The plans for our Thomas Sumter Symposium (April 8-9-10, 2005) and battlefield tours have really jelled. We have a great line up of presenters to cover Gen. Sumter’s multifaceted life. Dr. Dan Morrill, a dynamic speaker, will kick off with Sumter’s early service in the French and Indian War and the American Revolution. I am excited to announce that Dr. Jeff Dennis of Morehead State University will travel with us and talk about his recent research on Thomas Sumter’s travels with Lt. Henry Timberlake’s Expedition to take three Cherokee Chiefs to meet the great white father, King George III, in London. Dr. Tom Powers from USC Sumter will talk about our great Gamecock as a militia and State Troop Commandant. Thomas Sumter Tisdale, descendent and author of the popular book on Thomas Sumter’s aristocratic, French daughter-in-law, will talk about Sumter’s extensive post Revolutionary War activities as a political leader and businessman. We will end the Friday classroom session with an audience participation panel discussion on “The Gamecock”. Friday night, Historic Camden at the Kershaw-Cornwallis House will host our guest at their great “Groaning Board”, a feast of heavy hors d’oeuvres and friendly discussion. On Saturday, we will visit four important battlefields: the site of Gen. Sumter’s first victory at Hanging Rock; his first attack on the British Provincial Volunteers of New York at Rocky Mount on the Catawba River; Sumter’s narrow escape at Fish Dam Ford of the Broad River with archaeologist Wayne Roberts; and tour the site of Sumter’s defeat of Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton at Blackstock’s Plantation on the Tyger River with Dr. Allan Charles. Saturday night we serve our guest dinner followed by the impeccable Howard Burnham’s premier of an original monologue, in the character of Thomas Sumter. On Sunday, we will visit Sumter’s final home site and tomb in Stateburg; visit two important sites in his 1781 “Dog Days” of summer campaign to “thunder at the gates of Charles Town” which ended in his defeat at Quinby Bridge/Shubrick’s Plantation; and return to a visit and reception at the Sumter Museum. Make your plans to join us for this program, excellent entertainment and great fellowship.

As the British renewed their initiatives to re-conquer their rebellious New World colonies in the Southern Department in December 1778, Southern Campaigns fans will be treated to many 225th anniversary events in the next two years. Reenactments, memorial services, scholarly conclaves, and tours are now being planned and scheduled. We will keep you informed with a list of events and contacts for which we need your help. Please submit your scheduled events and contact information. Southern campaigns sites at Petersburg, Va. (April 2005), Charleston, SC and Lancaster County, SC for Buford’s Massacre at the Waxhaws (May 2005), Beckhamville, SC and Ramseur’s Mill, NC (June 2005), Brattonsville, SC (July 2005), Camden, SC (August 2005) and Kings Mountain, SC (October 2005) are already planning major 225th Southern Campaign anniversary events.

We received the wonderful news of the satisfaction of the purchase money mortgage on the Battle of Camden site in December with State of South Carolina funds. While there is much more work to be done in property acquisition, planning, research, and interpretation at Camden, the public’s permanent access to this important battleground is now guaranteed. We understand that various non-profit and governmental agencies are now working on obtaining several other important Palmetto State Revolutionary War sites. We hope we can announce several milestone acquisitions here soon. This preservation work and current focus is critical as we have irrevocably lost most of the Revolutionary War battlefield historic context by over-development at Hobkirk Hill, much of Eutaw Springs and Stono Ferry, all of Charleston, Augusta, Charlotte, and Savannah, some of Guilfords Courthouse, and most of Ramseur’s Mill and Cowan’s Ford. Re-locating the “lost” Revolutionary War sites, appropriately marking them, and widely disseminating the facts of what happened where are the most powerful tools we have to spread the knowledge base to build public awareness and influence to encourage cooperative uses of these sites entrusted to our generation. Please help us pry this information from the dusty archive files, the archaeology departments, and knowledge base of local historians, property owners and collectors. We have over 200 Revolutionary War battle and skirmish sites to document in South Carolina alone. We need your help! Even the over-built sites like Charleston, Ramseur’s Mill, Hobkirk’s Hill, Augusta, Granby, Eutaw Springs, Orangeburg, Savannah, and Charlotte can be appropriately marked and interpreted.

We plan to be in Charleston, SC the weekend of February 25th to attend the South Carolina Historical Society’s presentations on 18th century South Carolina and the annual convention of the Society for Military History organized by Professor Jennie Speelman at The Citadel. We hope to see you there.

We thank John Robertson of Shelby, NC for the great job he does as volunteer webmaster, librarian and organizer of the voluminous materials we share on the Battle of Camden website at www.battleofcamden.org. John and the Battle of Camden research volunteers have amassed the best-documented revolutionary war battle on the web. John, retired as an industrial engineer and manager by profession, is an engaging interpreter of Gen. Daniel Morgan’s great victory at Cowpens. John has taught himself cartography and his maps have made Dr. Christine Swager’s youth oriented
Revolutionary War books have the best maps of the southern campaigns going. I wholeheartedly recommend Chris’s *Come to the Cow Pens*, not only as a good teen interest story, but also for John’s excellent maps. I got a sneak preview of one of John’s new maps for Christine’s upcoming book on the Battle at Eutaw Springs and it is awesome. John has undertaken an exciting new mapping project that he will share with us soon.

Again we must reiterate that this is not Charles Baxley’s newsletter; it is a shared open forum for all fellow cohorts – rebel or loyalist partisans alike. Your input, criticism, contribution, and assistance are needed and appreciated.

Your contributions of money and articles, and my “real” job may continue to allow a monthly publication schedule. As there is no subscription fee at this time, we solicit your voluntary contributions in proportion to your evaluation of the product. An email notice and web-based distribution of the SCAR Newsletter has ameliorated some of my printing and mailing costs. We remain glad to print and mail a copy to anybody without access to a high-speed Internet service and a printer; however, electronic publication allows us to use better color graphics and save printing and postage costs. We will email folks on our email list a note when the new edition of *SCAR* has been posted; you may review or download and print the current and previous newsletters from our website at www.southerncampaign.org. Please let us know your email address and preferred medium. To improve the publication, better maps and graphics are desirable and a volunteer with layout experience would be great.

Please send any names, addresses and email contacts of persons you know who are interested in sharing our study of the Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution and we will add them to our list.
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Among students of the American War of Independence, the name Nathanael Greene stands as a familiar one. Outside of this rather narrow circle, however, Greene remains a little known figure in American history. He has not often received attention from biographers, especially in comparison to other leaders of the Revolution. Terry Golway seeks to remedy this state of affairs with, *Washington’s General Nathanael Greene and the Triumph of the American Revolution*. The author simultaneously presents a very readable narrative that will entertain and educate general audiences, but one that will raise the eyebrows of experts on the period.

As a biography, Golway describes the life of Nathanael Greene in lucid prose that holds the readers’ attention. The Quaker up-bringing, along with the early tendency toward self-improvement through study are well describe. Likewise, Nathanael’s desire for personal achievement and recognition, his tendency toward self-pity during periods of failure, and his concern, possibly to the point of fixation, with how others saw him are all presented in a balanced and objective light. There are several qualities in Terry Golway’s treatment of the life of Nathanael Greene, however, that will raise the eyebrows of serious students of the period. These difficulties fall into two broad categories, content and style.

When it comes to content, the simple fact is that *Washington’s General* lacks the sort of nuanced understanding of the War for Independence that most scholars would expect. Two examples of serious students of the period. These difficulties fall into two broad categories, content and style.

Charles B. Baxley…………………………Editor

*Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution* is dedicated to the study of the War for American Independence in the Southern Department from 1760 to 1789. We facilitate the exchange of information on the Southern Campaigns’ Revolutionary War sites, their location, preservation, historic signage, interpretation, artifacts, and archaeology as well as the personalities, military tactics, units, logistics, strategy, and the political leadership of the state. We highlight professionals and amateurs actively engaged in Revolutionary War research, preservation and interpretation to encourage an active exchange of information. All are invited to submit articles, pictures, documents, events and suggestions. We feature battles and skirmishes, documents, maps, artifacts, Internet links, and other stories.

*Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution* is published by Woodward Corporation. I respectfully acknowledge that the title for this newsletter is also a great book written by Dr. Dan L. Morrill. I claim no copyrights on reprinted articles, photographs, maps and excerpts contained in these materials. Copyrights are reserved to the authors for articles, maps, and images created by others and to myself on other original materials. I often edit old documents for easier reading and insert comments as to names, alternative dates, and modern punctuation and spelling. I also from time to time forget to appropriately reference my sources, to whom I offer my humblest apologies.

Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution’s letter and email publication policy: the author must sign all letters and emails and include a telephone number and return address for verification. We reserve the right to select those letters and emails that contribute to the cause, and to edit them for clarity and length. Letters and emails published may not reflect the opinion of your editor. Please contact us at P. O. Box 10, Lugoff, South Carolina 29078-0010 or Hebbaxley@charter.net or (803) 438-1606 (h) or (803) 438-4200 (w).
should suffice on this count. First, in describing the Delaware River defenses, Golway says that they were composed of sunken ships (p.150). In point of fact, the river defenses included a network of obstacles, mainly large wooden boxes, filled with stone in order to sink them. These devices were referred to as chevaux-de-frise, and had long wooden poles with iron spikes on the ends to rip the hulls of British shipping coming up the Delaware. Likewise, Golway declares that Fort Mifflin “fell to the British on November 15” (p.151). This is simply incorrect—the fort was actually abandoned on the night of November 16-17, 1777. Likewise, Fort Mifflin had withstood a tremendous bombardment, and was little more than a smoldering ruin by that time, but it had succeeded in its purpose having slowed the Royal Navy’s efforts at bringing fresh supplies to William Howe’s army in Philadelphia.1 Golway falls into errors when treating Greene’s southern campaigns as well.

In the case of Greene’s southern campaigns, Golway’s error is more one of interpretation. He repeatedly insists that Greene’s victory at the battle of Eutaw Springs was not a victory at all! He asserts that the contest was in fact a draw, which Greene portrayed to Congress as a success for American arms. Furthermore, Congress played along with this deception in order to manufacture a concrete success in the sector (280-285). The problem is that for all of Golway’s harping on the fact that Greene withdrew his troops, the British under Francis, Lord Rawdon (sic Lt. Col. Alexander Stewart) followed suit shortly thereafter. Tactically, there are a number of ways to view Eutaw Springs. From a strategic standpoint, however, the battle was certainly a victory for the Patriot side. As already eluded to, Washington’s General contains problems in areas besides the content.

Stylistically, the author uses a method of citation that is very difficult to follow. This, in turn, makes verifying sources and facts much more taxing than need be. Again, the citation stands as a problem that will perplex experts and scholars. By the same token, general readers will more than likely read the book, enjoy the narrative, and not even notice the issue.

For all its shortcomings, which will certainly irk the specialist, Washington’s General is a solid description of the life of Nathanael Greene. As such, it serves a purpose in that it keeps his name in the public eye, and thus may help gain the general some of the attention he deserves for his efforts in the country’s behalf. As stated at the outset, Greene is a much-neglected figure from the War of Independence, as the author correctly points out he did not even have a memorial in Washington, D.C. until 1877! Terry Golway’s biography at least begins to remedy that neglect.

Jim McIntyre
Moraine Valley Community College
Palos Hills, Illinois

SCAR needs your help…please submit your suggested Revolutionary War library lists, book sources and book reviews. SCAR would like to build and share a master reference library list on the Southern Campaigns.

SCAR needs your help…please submit lists of documents, maps, and manuscripts available in various archives, libraries, private collections. We especially need to inventory the collections at Duke, the University of North Carolina, William and Mary and the University of Virginia and the Maryland and Delaware archives and historical Societies.


Blackstock’s Plantation Battlefield Preservation

Palmetto Conservation Foundation (PCF) and the Johnson Development Corporation cooperating in a purchase of 800 acres of land on January 27, 2005 will ultimately protect an additional 55 acres where much of the Battle at Blackstock’s Plantation was fought. The site is on the Tyger River in the Cross Keys area of Union County, South Carolina. The other half of the Blackstock’s battlefield was acquired by PCF in 2001 from International Paper Company.

When this large tract was placed on the market in November by Forest Investment Associates, PCF Board Member Tom Hanna, requested Spartanburg businessman, George Dean Johnson to help PCF save this historic site for public use. “George is a good business man and also a worthy citizen who knows and respects the value of historic sites. We could not have done this without his help.” PCF will close with Johnson Development on the 54-acre tract that contains half of the battlefield, in March or April. When PCF gets the entire package together and the South Carolina State Budget and Control Board approves the acquisition, PCF will deed the 110-acre Blackstock’s Plantation battlefield tract and a 40-acre Musgrove Mill battle tract to the state, as State Historic Sites that will be operated by the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism (PRT).

PCF and PRT are cooperating in planning for the Blackstock’s Plantation battlefield to become a State Historic Site with an interpretation park for the public. The park will interpret the battle with kiosks, panels, brochures, and three hiking trails through the battlefield. The site is also the trailhead for the Blackstock’s Passage of the Palmetto Trail.

On a project cost of $237,000, PRT has committed $87,000, and PCF will give land and improvement valued at $100,000. A campaign for the remaining $50,000 will be conducted with businesses and agencies in Union County, South Carolina. According to George Fields, Military Heritage Director of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation, “This has been a long road requiring seven years of patience and persistence, and I rejoice that these site are permanently preserved and will serve the public as parks.”

Blackstock’s Plantation Battlefield – photo by George Fields

The Battle at Blackstock’s Plantation was a large and crucial battle in November 20, 1780, where Gen. Thomas Sumter’s all militia army of approximately 1,100 defeated British Regulars and Provincials led by Lt. Col. Banastre “Bloody Ban” Tarleton who had recently enjoyed a string of victories in South Carolina. Sumter’s eleven militia colonels mobilized their men and stood defiantly as Tarleton watched the slaughter of his troops from a nearby hilltop.
Blackstock’s was a significant Patriot victory, lifting the morale of the backcountry Patriots and encouraging Patriot Southern Department Gen. Nathanael Greene to send Continentals led by Gen Daniel Morgan into the Backcountry of South Carolina to fight the British. The combined force of Continentals and Georgia and Carolinas militias turned the British tide six weeks later at Cowpens and started the British Army on its way to the Yorktown surrender nine months later.

This property, with almost a mile of natural beauty on the Tyger River, has tremendous recreation potential in addition to its historic value. “The terrain at Blackstock’s is the best preserved of all the unprotected battlefields that I have seen,” said George Fields, “Its remoteness and standing forests kept the soil of the steep hills intact. A visitor today can see it as it looked in 1780.”

After my fascinating tour of the Blackstock’s Plantation battlefield with local resident Jack Burnett, I became even more impressed with the fighting spirit and organizational ability of the Patriot backcountry militias. Lt. Col. Tarleton and his feared British Legion mounted troops were dispatched by Lord Cornwallis to hunt down Gen. Thomas Sumter by name after Sumter’s militia humiliated British Maj. James Wemyss at Fish Dam Ford of the Broad River. Sumter carefully selected his defensive terrain and these commandants were able, upon their horses, to watch the action and see each other from the hilltops. Jack is a key volunteer in the conservation, maintenance and security at Blackstock’s and uses his special talents to explain the action of November 20, 1780 in human terms.

George Fields reports, “Jack Burnett is the best volunteer with whom I’ve ever worked. He researches diligently, works hard, and contributes generously. The success at Blackstock’s is largely due to him. Moreover, he makes preservation work fun. He always has another angle to consider in research, and a day with him on a historical site is exciting.”

A 225\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary Preservation Victory at the Battle of Camden Site

For the first time in 225 years a substantial portion of the Battle of the Camden National Historic Landmark is permanently preserved and will serve the public with an interpretation park. In December, the Palmetto Conservation Foundation (PCF) received a grant of $341,250 from the South Carolina Conservation Bank to complete the payment for 310 acres purchased in an emergency move in 2002 when the property went on the market.

The Hobkirk Hill Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the original Camden battlefield preservation and commemoration organization, increased the size by approving the permanent protection by an easement or donation of its six acres located in the center of the battlefield.

The newly acquired 316 acres comprises the core of the battlefield and the center in the designated landmark area of 1300 acres. “We hope this is just the first phase of protecting the landmark property.” Project Director George Fields said, “The land acquisition plan prepared by PCF for the American Battlefield Protection Program calls for us to acquire approximately 500 acres with fee simple title, so that there is enough land to build a national or state park. The remaining landmark area around the park could then be protected by a combination of easements and purchases from willing landowners by other conservation programs.”

An interpretation of this battlefield with kiosks, interpretation signs, and three trails will be developed on the acquired property before the battle’s 225\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary in August 2005. The trails are roughed in so hikers can walk over the North Carolina and Virginia Patriot militias’ daybreak positions.

Palmetto Conservation Foundation, as lead organization, is negotiating with the National Park Service for a grant that will be used to restore the property to its historic conditions when the battle was fought, researching the locations of unmarked graves estimated to be over 500, and providing an interpretation program for the public. The battlefield will be restored to a sandhills longleaf pine forest, with a low density of understory plants with good visibility and maneuverability under the great pines. PCF and the Battle of Camden Friends organization have committed to raising the matching funds for the project.

“I think it’s a great example of local, federal, state and private entities working together to preserve an important part of our American heritage,” SC Senator Vincent Sheheen who has been very involved with the project said, “and we are grateful that the Conservation Bank helped the project take this first big step.”

The Battle of Camden Friends Fund supports these activities, and contributions are urgently needed. You may send a tax-deductible gift to this fund with a check payable to Palmetto Conservation Foundation (1314 Lincoln Street, Suite 305, Columbia, SC 29201-3154), which serves as the administrative agent for the project.

The Katawba Valley Land Trust, PCF, Federal, State of South Carolina, and local governments, Historic Camden Revolutionary War Site, the Kershaw County Historical Society, and other concerned organizations and private landowners are cooperating in an Advisory Council to direct the preservation, interpretation, funding and operations of this national treasure. For more information on the battle, the committees, and future plans or to volunteer your help please visit our website at www.battleofcamden.org.

The Battle of Camden site is open to the public. It is located on the modern Flat Rock Road (S-28-58), then called the Great Waxhaw Road, about five miles north of Camden, SC.

Blackstock’s Plantation Monument – photo by editor

Gen. Thomas Sumter’s colonels at the Patriot’s victory at Blackstock’s Plantation were: William Hill, Edward Lacey, Henry Hampton, William Bratton, Thomas Taylor, John Twiggs, Richard Winn, Benjamin Few, Thomas Brandon, Joseph Hayes, and Elijah Clarke. SC\textsuperscript{AR} is looking for information on these important Revolutionary Patriot leaders. Your input is invited.
Worshiping at the Shrine of Liberty:  
The Preservation of the Kings Mountain Battlefield  

Robert M. Dunkerly

York County, South Carolina is well known as the site of the battle of Kings Mountain, one of the most decisive American victories of the Revolution. Today the site is preserved as a National Military Park, yet the park itself has a fascinating history with strong ties to the local community. The battlefield was the scene of grand celebrations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and it was through the efforts of local citizens that a park was created here at all. While we often focus on the event for which a site is famous, there is often a long and colorful history at a historic site. Moreover, each event held at the battlefield reflected the values and traditions of those at the time.

Fought on October 7, 1780, the significance of Kings Mountain lay in its timing. This had been a bleak year for the Americans, with much of South Carolina overrun by English troops. Yet on Kings Mountain Major Patrick Ferguson’s army met defeat at the hands of various militia groups from Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia. American riflemen had won a stunning victory: it was one of the few major battles of the Revolution fought between Americans, won by the rifle, and won entirely by militiamen. The British army under Lord Charles Cornwallis never fully recovered from the blow.

In 1780 this area of the Carolina piedmont was the frontier, there were few roads or towns in the region. The battle was fought on an secluded, rocky spur that, even into the twentieth century, was quite isolated. As settlers moved into the area and forests were cleared for farms, the site became a local landmark. In 1815, after another war with England, the first commemoration occurred at Kings Mountain.

Dr. William McLean, a Congressional candidate from Lincoln County, North Carolina, organized a celebration to honor those who fell in the battle. Immediately following the battle the American and Loyalist dead had been hastily buried in mass graves, and wolves had scattered the remains over the years. For the occasion McLean reburied the remains with dignity and placed a marker to honor Major William Chronicle, who fell at the head of his Gaston County men. Seven veterans who had fought in the battle were present to see this marker dedicated. Although small and somewhat unimpressive, the Chronicle Marker is the second oldest Revolutionary War monument in the United States.¹

During the prosperous antebellum years, the nearby town of Yorkville (now York) grew into the county seat. In 1855, Micah Jenkins and Asbury Coward, both graduates of the Citadel, founded the Kings Mountain Military Academy here. That year, on the 75th anniversary of the battle, the academy cadets joined local citizens in a celebration on the battlefield.²

Special guests included John Preston, grandson of American commander Colonel William Campbell, and historian George Bancroft, former Secretary of the Navy who had completed one of the first comprehensive histories of the United States. The three-day celebration drew nearly 15,000 visitors. Among other things, the spectators enjoyed military reviews by the Kings Mountain Military Academy cadets and South Carolina militia groups. Large barbecue trenches were dug to prepare massive amounts of food for the crowds. One tragedy marred the event when a Columbia artillery battery began firing after the ceremony. While ramming down a blank charge, a gun prematurely went off, taking off the arm of the gunner and hurling the rammer over the heads of spectators (the wounded man survived). Despite the tragedy, the event was a success, and organizers looked forward to continued observances.³

The celebration at the battleground became an annual event, interrupted only by the Civil War. Forced to close the school during the war, Coward reopened it afterwards and continued his interest in the battlefield. He spearheaded efforts to mark the battle’s Centennial in 1880.⁴

The one hundredth anniversary of the battle of Kings Mountain was celebrated in grand style with typical Victorian fanfare. A three-day observance began on October 5th and continued, largely nonstop, until the 7th. Local citizens, both from York County, South Carolina and Cleveland and Gaston Counties of North Carolina formed the Kings Mountain Centennial Association to oversee the event. Speakers, parades, militia demonstrations, pageants, fireworks, picnics, and other festivities attracted nearly ten thousand visitors. The guests must have enjoyed themselves immensely: over the course of the celebration as more than one-hundred kegs of beer were consumed!⁵

Chronicle Markers. The original marker stands on the left, it became badly weathered over the years, and in 1915 a new marker was placed carrying the same inscription. Photo by author.

Centennial Celebration at Kings Mountain from “Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper”, October 30, 1880.

Militia units came from as far as Charleston, Greenville, Statesville, Salisbury, Rock Hill, and even Richmond, Virginia, joining the local Kings Mountain Military Academy cadets. The troops drilled and performed musket and artillery volleys for the enjoyment of the crowds. While a reenactment had been planned, organizers felt there were not enough troops and the hilly nature of the terrain prohibited a good view, so a parade was held instead.⁶

Local high school bands played patriotic music, and crowds were entertained by speeches from Senators and local civic leaders. Edward Everett, the main speaker at the dedication of the Gettysburg National Cemetery in 1863, composed an address published by the Yorkville Enquirer. The governors of North Carolina, South Carolina,
Virginia, and Tennessee all attended. Flags of the original thirteen colonies draped the grandstand. One speaker, capturing the feeling of the occasion, remarked that the participants were “worshipping at the shrine of liberty.” Others spoke of the “lessons of patriotism” and “sacred soil” of Kings Mountain. Proposals to build a chapel, resort hotel, and golf course were discussed but failed to take root.\(^7\)

Victorian Americans promoted such activities that promoted citizenship, intellectual debate, and morality. Long and formal patriotic speeches, rousing martial music, and military parades were typical activities at historic sites. These events also captured the spirit of Reunification in the post-Civil War years. The National Centennial of 1876, just a few years before, also fostered an interest in celebrating American history.\(^8\)

The 1880 celebration culminated with the unveiling of an impressive memorial, today known as the Centennial Monument. In an elaborate ceremony full of pageantry and fanfare, a group of young ladies, each representing a state who sent men to the battle, unveiled the monument.\(^9\)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{centennial_monument}
\caption{Centennial Monument and Celebration. “Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper”, October 30, 1880.}
\end{figure}

Monuments were seen as appropriate ways to forever memorialize the people and events of Kings Mountain. During this period, monuments rose at other battlefields and historic sites like Jamestown, Guilford Courthouse, Cowpens, Yorktown, and the many Civil War sites.

Hand in hand with the celebration was a movement to purchase and preserve the battle site. The Kings Mountain chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in York led this effort. The DAR purchased 39.5 acres, the core of the battlefield consisting of the ridge where Ferguson’s army was surrounded. Not only did the DAR take the first step in preserving the battlefield, they also began to petition Congress for Federal recognition, and they would be the driving force behind the later creation of a National Military Park at the site.\(^10\)

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{U.S. Monument. Photo by author.}
\end{figure}

After the enormous public interest that manifests itself in the elaborate 1880 Centennial celebration at Kings Mountain, public interest began to wane. York’s chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, who owned the battlefield ridge, remained tireless promoters of the site’s importance. The DAR was successful in gaining Congressional funding for a monument at the site in 1909, today known as the US Monument. Designed by the prestigious New York firm of McKim, Mead, and White, the US Monument is a classical obelisk. The monument’s dedication was another cause for celebration, with fireworks, a reenactment, and military drill by units from Salisbury, Rock Hill, Columbia, and elsewhere. Many Senators, Civil War veterans, and local dignitaries attended this event. With the monument now in place, the group continued to press for further protection of the site, and the approach of the battle’s sesquicentennial provided an opportunity to gain that recognition.\(^11\)

The Federal government had organized many National Military Parks by the 1920s, including Gettysburg, Shiloh, Chickamauga, and Guilford Courthouse. Supported by Congressmen from North Carolina, the DAR saw their dream fulfilled with the creation of Kings Mountain National Military Park in 1930. The one hundred fiftieth anniversary celebration promised to be even larger than the one held in 1880.\(^12\)

The main speaker for the event was President Herbert Hoover, reflecting the enormous public interest in the site. The President arrived in the town of Kings Mountain, North Carolina, and rode to the site in a limousine. To reach the battlefield a new road was built, today’s Route 216, which still carries traffic through the park.\(^13\)

The 1930 celebration was again a three-day event, beginning on October 5th. The town of Kings Mountain hosted pageants reenacting famous scenes of the Revolution such as Lexington and Concord, Paul Revere’s ride, and of course, the battle of Kings Mountain. On the battlefield itself picnics, speeches, barbecues,
fireworks, and bands entertained the crowds. Over one hundred news organizations from across the nation covered the activities.\(^4\)

**Ft. Bragg Army Band March in front of President Hoover’s Stand in Kings Mountain.** “Charlotte Observer”, October 7, 1930.

The highlight for many local residents was a presidential visit by Herbert Hoover, whose ancestors hailed from North Carolina. The President, joined by the governors of both Carolinas and Georgia, addressed the audience from a grandstand overlooking the battlefield. Secret Service agents kept onlookers back from the stage, and the entire North Carolina State Police force was present, all thirty six of them.\(^5\)

An estimated 70,000 visitors listened to President Hoover’s speech, which was broadcast live by radio across the United States and Great Britain. This is believed to be the one of the largest public gatherings in the nation up to that point. Bringing together such a large crowd in the days before interstate and widespread air travel was truly an incredible feat. Special excursion trains brought people from as far as Columbia, Raleigh, Asheville, Goldsboro, and Danville, Virginia. After arriving at the Kings Mountain station, visitors were on their own to reach the battlefield, ten miles away. Taxis and even personal cars offered rides, but many walked (taxis charged 75 cents for the fare, one way). As the roads were unpaved many complained of the dust. An estimated 25,000 gallons of drinking water were brought to the site for the event. With all these activities and throngs of people, amazingly the only incident reported was one drunk driving arrest.\(^6\)

The ceremony took on a festive tone, with many activities that may seem inappropriate to us today. Visitors were encouraged to hunt for relics or scour the woods for walking sticks and souvenirs. Workers removed the battlefield’s trees to accommodate seating for the crowd and to create massive parking lots. Roads, trails, grandstands, food pavilions, exhibit booths, and comfort stations were built on the battlefield. The forest seen today in the park contains few trees older than seventy years old.\(^7\)

Many local civic groups were present, including chapters from the Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Society of Cincinnati, the American Legion, and others. Local Boy Scouts set up food concessions and high school bands from Charlotte as well as Winthrop University’s choral group all participated.\(^8\)

As before, the culmination of this observance was the unveiling of a new monument, a stone marker at Major Patrick Ferguson’s grave. With the conclusion of the elaborate ceremony, the citizens of York County finally had a National Military Park in their area. As before, the 1930 celebration revealed the values and aspirations of those at the time. American strength and unity were stressed in the turbulent years following World War I and in the midst of the Great Depression.\(^9\)

Like other Military Parks, the site was operated not by the National Park Service, but the War Department. Military historians had been dispatched to study and evaluate the site, and military groups used sites like Kings Mountain for training and study of tactics and leadership. Shortly afterward, however, in 1933, the War Department did transfer the battlefield to the National Park Service as part of a larger transfer of historic sites to that agency. Lands adjoining the battlefield ridge were purchased and added to the park throughout the 1930s.

The park benefited immensely from Depression era public work projects such as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). The CCC built roads, bridges, and structures, most of which are still in use today. Many local men labored here with the CCC, and former workers still hold reunions annually. In the 1940s the Park Service decided to give half of the site’s 10,000 acres to the state of South Carolina to form a state park for recreation.\(^10\)

Kings Mountain subsequently experienced many of the phases or trends seen in other historic sites. During the Bicentennial the park installed new markers on its battlefield trail and built a new visitor center. The enthusiasm of living history, along with the approach of the battle’s bicentennial in 1980, inspired the creation of the Overmountain Victory Trail Association. This group has recreated the march of the American army every year since, camping at their stopping points, and keeping the history of the march alive.

While Kings Mountain holds national significance as a crucial American victory during the Revolution, local citizens of Cherokee, Gaston, Cleveland, and especially York Counties can be proud of the close ties they have with the formation of the park. The peaceful trails and quiet woods found in the park today belie the many large and boisterous celebrations held on these ridges in the past. Each commemoration tell us more about present: the aspirations, views, and values of those at the time, than about the past itself.

In 2000 and 2001 the park conducted a series of archaeological tests. Among other things, battle and commemorative period artifacts were found on the site, and ground penetrating radar revealed two burials at Ferguson’s grave (the only known grave on the battlefield). It had always been tradition that one of Ferguson’s servants, Virginia Paul, was killed in the action and buried with him. The testing confirmed that two burials are under the rock pile at Ferguson’s Grave. With further study, the musket and rifle balls and gun parts found can shed light on troop movements and actions during the battle.

**Ferguson’s Grave.** Recent testing shows what appears to be two burials under the rocks. Photo by author.
This year is the 225th Anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain. The park is planning a series of special events from October 7-9 that will commemorate this anniversary with dignity and educate the public about this important battle and the people involved. For more information readers may log onto www.nps.gov/kimo.
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David Reuwer and student Brian O’Quinn before interesting earthworks at Parker’s Ferry, S.C.
A - Battle of Coosawhatchie
On May 3, 1779, Patriot Lt. Col. John Laurens (former aid-de-camp to Gen. George Washington and eldest son of United States President Henry Laurens) and 250 men were in position on a slight rise near the bridge at Coosawhatchie. They were guarding the road against the expected assault by about 2400 British soldiers lead by Gen. Augustine Prevost from Savannah. Against orders, Laurens and his men crossed the river and formed in line for battle. After a sharp skirmish, with many of the soldiers and Laurens himself wounded, they fell back to the Tullifinny River, about two miles east. This action was an important delay so that Gen. Benjamin Lincoln could return the main Southern Department Patriot army to defend Charleston.

B - McPherson's Plantation
Home of Isaac McPherson, described by Dr. Uzal Johnson, a loyalist surgeon, as “a great Rebel, a man of property.” The
British occupied the plantation March 14-17, 1780, after unsuccessfully trying to chase down 50 American troops on horseback. During their stay the British engaged in what they thought was a skirmish with the enemy but mistakenly attacked their own troops. Descendants of Isaac McPherson and his brother continue to live in the McPhersonville area.

C - Saltketcher Bridge
The British left McPherson’s Plantation on March 18, 1780 and marched to the crossing of the Saltketcher (now the Salkehatchie) River, where a bridge had stood before the beginning of the war. They were met by 80 American militiamen who tried to prevent their crossing. The British Light Infantry crossed the river below this spot and came up behind the Americans. A captain and 16 privates were bayoneted to death by the British, who then spent the night at nearby Ogilvy’s Plantation.

D - Fort Balfour (at Pocataligo)
By the fall of 1780, to maintain control of the Beaufort District and protect the King’s Highway between Savannah and Charleston, the British built an earth and palisade fort at this key crossroads and named it after the British commander of occupied Charleston, Lt. Col. Nesbit Balfour. In April of 1781, Patriot Col. William Harden was detached by Gen. Francis Marion with 100 men. On April 14, Col. Harden convinced old Loyalist friends from Beaufort, who were in command of Fort Balfour, that he had more troops than he did and that they should surrender. They believed him and did. Learning that British soldiers were on the way from Charleston, Col. Harden and his men burned the garrison.

E - The Trailhead
Located behind the Lowcountry Visitors Center in a gazebo designed to reflect 18th century architecture and landscaping, narrative signs explain the role South Carolina’s Lowcountry played in the War of Independence.

Lowcountry Council of Governments, Post Office Box 98 Yemassee, SC 22945 (843) 726-5536

Excerpt from Mills’ Atlas of Beaufort District, 1825
Calendar of Upcoming Events

Please submit items to post upcoming Southern Campaigns programs and events that may be of interest to Revolutionary War researchers and history buffs.

February 12, 2005 – Kettle Creek Battlefield near Washington, Ga. – The Georgia Society and the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution and the Kettle Creek Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution host a celebration the 226th anniversary of the Revolutionary War Battle of Kettle Creek. The Kettle Creek battle, fought on February 14, 1779, resulted in a victory for Patriot forces that totally defeated a Tory force of 600 intent on helping the British dominate north Georgia. The Kettle Creek battlefield site is located eleven miles west of Washington, Georgia in Wilkes County. Maps and directions to the battlefield may be found at www.rootsweb.com/~gawilkes/.


http://www.nps.gov/kimo/pphtml/events.html

February 25, 2005 - Charleston, SC - The South Carolina Historical Society and the South Carolina Department of Archives & History presents a day of lectures on 18th century South Carolina at the historic Dock Street Theatre. This program is a part of the Societies Sesquicentennial Celebration. Tickets are free, but register in advance with the South Carolina Historical Society, 100 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC 29401-2299, call 803-896-6187 or email symposium@scdah.state.sc.us. For program specifics log onto www.schistory.org

February 25 - 27, 2005 – Charleston, SC - The Citadel will host the Society for Military History’s Annual Conference. Brandeis University Professor David Hackett Fischer, author of Washington’s Crossing, Paul Revere’s Ride and Albion’s Seed, will keynote SMH banquet. For details of the program and registration information see: http://citadel.edu/history_dept/News%20and%20Announcements/Societyformilhist/SMHAnnPage.htm

March 5, 2005 – Kings Mountain National Military Park, SC - Women’s History Day Re-enactors will demonstrate and discuss the role of women during the Revolution. Presentations will include medicine, cooking, spinning and weaving, clothing, and more.

http://www.nps.gov/kimo/pphtml/events.html


www.nps.gov/nisi

April 8-9-10, 2005 - Camden, SC – “Campaigning with the ‘Gamecock’”: Life and Campaigns of Brig. Gen. Thomas Sumter - Historic Camden Revolutionary War Site, Joanna Craig, Charles B. Baxley, and David P. Reuwer co-host a symposium featuring South Carolina militia Gen. Thomas Sumter “The Gamecock” with extensive battlefield trips to Gen. Sumter’s battlefields. Please reserve your seats early as attendance is limited by bus capacity. For more information call Joanna Craig at Historic Camden (803) 432-9841 or see the symposium postings on www.southerncampaign.org E-Mail: hiscamden@camden.net.

April 16-17, 2005 – Petersburg, Virginia - 14th Annual Commemorative Battle Reenactment. This event is an observance of the Revolutionary War battle fought in Petersburg on April 25, 1781, and is an open event for all Revolutionary War period reenactors and free to visitation by the general public. For further information write or call: Director of Tourism, 15 West Bank Street, Petersburg, VA 23804 Telephone: 804-733-2402 / 804-733-2404 FAX: (804) 861-0883 E-mail: petgtourism@earthlink.net http://www.petersburg-va.org/revwar/invitation.htm

April 23 and 24th, 2005. Musgrove’s Mill State Historic Site, Clinton, SC - 3rd Annual Living History Festival - Living History Camp with both military and civilian re-enactment units. Weapons and tactics demonstrations, grounds tours, and more. 864-938-0100 brobson@scprt.com

April 30-May 1, 2005 – Kings Mountain National Military Park, SC - Hesse-Kassel Jaeger Korps encampment; re-enactors, representing the German troops who fought in the Revolution, will be camped at the park. Soldiers will demonstrate the unique Jaeger rifle, used to combat the American long rifle in the Revolution.

http://www.nps.gov/kimo/pphtml/events.html

May 12, 2005 – Charleston, SC – The Charleston Museum hosts “THE SIEGE OF CHARLESTON, 1780” - LECTURE & BOOK SIGNING AT 6:30 p.m. Museum’s Assistant Director, Carl Borick, presents a lecture and signing of his book, A Gallant Defense which examines the reasons for the shift in British strategy to the rebellious southern colonies, the efforts of their army and navy to seize Charleston. In addition to covering the military aspects of the campaign around Charleston, the book also delves into the effect that it had on the civilians of the South Carolina Lowcountry.

http://www.charlestonmuseum.org/event.asp?ID=54


http://www.revwarcharleston.com

May 13, 2005 - Charleston, SC - Grand British Ball at Charleston’s Old Exchange Building, from 7:15pm until midnight. Authentic 1780 Grand British Ball at Charleston’s Old Exchange Building to celebrate the fall of Charleston to the British Crown Forces and toast King George III as part of the 225th Anniversary of the Siege & Fall of Charleston. Participants must be in period correct clothing for the 1780 time period in either British military dress or civilian attire. Continental army uniforms are inappropriate. Music will be provided by the Charleston Chamber Orchestra. Dance caller will be John Millar of Colonial Williamsburg. Hors d'oeuvre, finger foods, and non-alcoholic drinks are included. Ticket cost is $35 per person and all net proceeds going towards educational programs on the American Revolution. Tickets limited to 180 persons. For more information:

http://www.charlestonball.org

May 28-29, 2005 – Kings Mountain National Military Park, SC - “Military Through the Ages”. Soldiers representing each period of American history will discuss uniforms and demonstrate historic weapons.

http://www.nps.gov/kimo/pphtml/events.html

May 27-29, 2005 – Lancaster, SC - 225th Anniversary of Col. Abraham Buford’s defeat at the Battle of the Waxhaws (Buford’s Massacre). Weekend educational and commerative events planned.

http://www.discoversouthcarolina.com/whattodo/revwar.asp
June 4-5, 2005 - Beckhamville (Great Falls), SC - 225th Anniversary of the skirmish at Alexander’s Old Field.  
http://www.battleofbeckhamville.com/index.html

June 11-12, 2005 – Lincolnton, NC - Battle of Ramseur’s Mill 225th Anniversary event featuring free Bar-B-Que, and for campers, straw, wood, and water are available as well as choice camp sites. Events are still in planning stages including a real shooting match with the 1st prize being a custom made rifle by Todd Carpenter, gunsmith. Hosted by Locke's Militia and Davie's Partisan Rangers. For more information contact Darrell Harkey at 704-736-8442 or email hiscord@charter.net.

June 25-26, 2005 – Salem Crossroads, SC (near Winsboro), SC - The Battle of Mobley’s Meetinghouse 225th Anniversary. A small band of Whig militia under Capt. John McClure, Maj. Richard Winn, and Col. William Bratton attacked and dispersed a gathering of local Tory militia in northwest Fairfield County, South Carolina near the Little River in early summer of 1780. The re-enactment will be held on the grounds of the historic Feasterville Female Academy and Boarding House, 7 miles north of Salem Crossroads on SC Highway 215 North. The public is invited to watch morning drills, an encampment, and a small re-enactment will bring this historic event to life. Contact Pelham Lyles at Fairfield County Museum, 231 South Congress Street, Winsboro, SC 29180. 803-635-9811 or fairfieldmus@chestertel.com

http://www.chmuseums.org/HBreexhibit.htm

June 27, 2005 – Charleston Museum - BATTLE OF SULLIVAN’S ISLAND 6:30 p.m. In school, students learned that Gen. William Moultrie commanded the fort on Sullivan’s Island, Gen. Charles Lee doubted the fort would hold, Sergeant William Jasper selflessly jumped upon the parapet to replant the blue rebel flag and the backcountry S.C. Militia, commanded by Col. William “Danger” Thompson of Belleville, stopped Lord Cornwallis’ Army at Breach Inlet. But, what happened to the main characters in the drama that was the Battle of Sullivan’s Island once all the smoke cleared? Carl Borick, assistant museum director, will lecture on the interesting fates of the heroes and villains of the famous battle in commemoration of Carolina Day (June 28).  
http://www.charlestonmuseum.org/event.asp?ID=55

July 8, 2005 - McElvey Center, York, SC and the Museum of York County, Rock Hill, SC - 8:00 AM—5:00 PM. “Huck’s Defeat and the Revolution in the South Carolina Backcountry, May-July 1780,” a symposium at the McElvey Center, 212 East Jefferson Street, York, SC 29745. Presentations: “The British Strategy in the South in 1779 and 1780” by Dr. Rory Cornish, Associate Professor of organizers are actively seeking to communicate with descendants of these soldiers.  
http://www.chmuseums.org/HBhucksymp.htm

History and History Department Chair, Winthrop University, Rock Hill, SC; “The Partisan Counteroffensive in the Carolina Backcountry in the Summer of 1780” by Dr. Walter Edgar, Claude Henry Neuffer Distinguished Professor of History, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; “Loyalist Mobilization in the Carolina Backcountry in the Summer of 1780” by Dr. Carole Troxler, retired Professor of American History at Elon University, North Carolina; “Provincial Soldiers at the Battle of Huck’s Defeat” by Todd Braisted, commander of the Brigade of the American Revolution and creator/editor of The Online Institute for Advanced Loyalist Studies; “Rev. John Simpson, Presbyterian Minister and Rebel Leader” by Melissa Massey, research assistant at Kennesaw State University and curatorial assistant at the Root House Museum, Marietta, Ga.; “Whig and Tory Leaders at the Battle of Huck’s Defeat” and “The Battle of Huck’s Defeat” by Michael Scoggins, research historian, Culture & Heritage Museums, York, SC. Followed by a reception at the Museum of York County to highlight the opening of the Liberty or Death exhibition.  
http://www.chmuseums.org/HBhucksymp.htm

July 9-10, 2005 – Brattonsville, SC - Battle of Huck’s Defeat at Williamson’s Plantation. Historic Brattonsville hosts a 225th anniversary celebration of this backcountry Patriot victory. Saturday, July 9, will feature reenactments of Huck’s Defeat at Williamson’s Plantation on the actual site of this Patriot victory and Gen. Thomas Sumter’s first action as commandant of the SC Militia at the Battle of Rocky Mount. Sunday, July 10 will feature reenactments of the Battle of Stallions (or Stallings) Plantation, which took place in York County in the late summer of 1780, and Gen. Sumter’s victory at the second Battle of Hanging Rock. For fans of Revolutionary War battle reenactments, this promises to be a great weekend. Saturday activities will also include a reunion, at Historic Brattonsville, of descendants of the men who fought on both sides of the Battle of Huck’s Defeat, including descendants of Whig militiamen, Tory militiamen, and Provincial soldiers of the British Legion and New York Volunteers. A list of known and probable soldiers who fought in this battle is posted at http://www.chmuseums.org/HBancestors.htm and the


August 20, 2005 – Musgrove’s Mill State Historic Site, Clinton, SC - 225th Anniversary celebration of the Patriot victory at the Battle of Musgrove's Mill. Guided tour of the battlefield followed by a memorial service at the battlefield. Space is limited, contact Brian L. Robson, Interpretive Ranger, Musgrove Mill State Historic Site 864-938-0100 brobson@scprt.com

October 22, 2005 – Brattonsville, SC, first reenactment of the Battle of Kings Mountain at the Historic Brattonsville site.
"Campaigning with the 'Gamecock'"
Life and Campaigns of Brig. Gen. Thomas Sumter

Symposium and Battlefields Tours—April 8-10, 2005

Flush from the success of the Banastre Tarleton and Camden Campaign Symposia, Historic Camden Revolutionary War Site announces a symposium & battlefield tours pertaining to the life and military campaigns of “The Gamecock”: Patriot Brigadier General Thomas Sumter.

The symposium will be held at the Kershaw-Cornwallis House at Historic Camden from 1:00-5:00 pm on Friday, April 8th. Lead presenter, Dr. Dan L. Morrill, history professor at UNC-Charlotte and author of Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution, will address Thomas Sumter’s life up to 1780 – his early Virginia years, military service in French and Indian War, London trip with three Cherokee Chiefs to meet King George III, financial problems, move to South Carolina and service as an officer in the Continental Army. Dr. Thomas L. Powers, USC-Sumter history professor, will discuss Gen. Sumter, the gutsy partisan commander of the SC militia during the 1780-81 Southern Campaign and the tactics and battles that earned him the name of the “Gamecock.” Thomas Sumter Tisdale, Jr., a Charleston lawyer and author of A Lady of the High Hills, a biography about the general’s daughter-in-law, will review Sumter’s distinguished post-war years in politics and business. The symposium will close with a panel discussion about Thomas Sumter by the presenters and Dr. Jeffrey W. Dennis, professor of history at Morehead State College, Ky.

Entertainments will include a candlelight reception at the Kershaw House on Friday evening and, on Saturday evening, an elegant dinner and premier performance of a dramatic monologue on the “Gamecock,” written and presented by noted British thespian and playwright, Howard Burnham of Columbia, SC.

Saturday and Sunday are devoted to field trips. Each day, attendees will travel by bus to some of the Gamecock’s important battle sites, many of which are unmarked and on private property. Bus guides will be Charles B. Baxley and David P. Reuwer, acclaimed battle sites tour guides of the Tarleton and Camden Campaign symposia. An attorney by profession, Baxley is past president of the Kershaw County Historical Society and creator-editor of the in-depth newsletter, Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution. An adjunct professor of historic preservation at the College of Charleston for the past five years, attorney Reuwer’s second vocation is the documentation and preservation of Revolutionary War battlefield throughout the South. Reuwer was the lead surveyor of the Eutaw Springs Battlefield.

Each field trip will include opportunities to walk some of the battle sites and hear riveting presentations by on-site guides. Saturday will focus be on some of Sumter’s important battles in the upcountry – from his victories at Rocky Mount on the Wateree River, Hanging Rock, Fish Dam Ford of the Broad River, and Blackstock’s Plantation on the Tyger River to his utter defeat at Fishing Creek (Catawba Ford). Sunday’s tour will encompass Sumter’s 1781 “Dog Days” of summer campaign to “thunder at the gates of Charles Town,” which ended in defeat at Quinby Bridge/Shubrick’s Plantation. The field trip will end with a visit to Sumter’s grave and a tour of the Sumter Museum, highlighted by the premier viewing of a newly acquired portrait of Thomas Sumter and a wine & cheese reception.

Registration for this symposium is limited to 50 (bus capacity), so take advantage of the early registration fee: $250/person or $450/couple. Full registration fees: $275/person or $500/couple. Historic Camden or Kershaw County Historical Society member fees are $225/person and $400/couple. Friday mini symposium and candlelight reception fee: $55/person, $90/couple. Spouse dinner theatre fee: $35/ person (evening seating capacity 50). Early Bird Registration deadline: March 15, 2005. Final Registration deadline: March 25, 2005 (non refundable after this date). Payment may be made by cash, MasterCard/Visa (phone or mail), or check made payable to Historic Camden and mailed to P.O. Box 710, Camden. SC  29020.

For more information call Joanna Craig at Historic Camden (803) 432-9841 E-Mail: Hhiscamden@camden.net or see the symposium postings on Hwww.southerncampaign.org H
Heart shaped silver medal, with initials that appear to be “A. I.”.

Front of medal showing inscription “Reward of Merit”.

This silver medal, found near Chesnut Street in Camden, SC, appears to be of the period of the Revolutionary War. It was recovered in the area of Lord Rawdon’s approach to Gen. Nathanael Greene’s Maryland and Delaware Continental pickets who were posted before the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill on April 25, 1780. No contemporaneous record is its issue or loss has been located. It is about one (1) inch across and 1.25 inches high. It was shaved or filed on one side. Its owner speculates that it may have belonged to a Maryland Continental soldier named Abraham Irvin.

On August 7, 1782, at his Newburgh, New York headquarters, Washington devised two badges of distinction to be worn by enlisted men and noncommissioned officers. The first was a chevron to be worn on the left sleeve of the coat. It signified loyal military service. Three years of service with "bravery, fidelity and good conduct" were the criteria for earning this badge; two chevrons meant six years of service.

The second, named the Badge of Military Merit, was the "figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk edged with narrow lace or binding." This badge was for "any singularly meritorious action" and permitted the wearer to pass guards and sentinels without challenge. The honoree's name and regiment were inscribed in a Book of Merit.

Gen. George Washington issued precursors to the modern Purple Heart to three soldiers - Sgts. Elijah Churchill, William Brown, and Daniel Bissell, Jr. On May 3, 1783, Churchill and Brown received the Purple Heart, then called the Badge of Military Merit, from Gen. Washington, its designer and creator. Bissell received his on June 10, 1783. These three are the only known recipients of the award during the Revolutionary War. [http://www.cmohs.org/medal.htm](http://www.cmohs.org/medal.htm)

Lord Francis Rawdon awarded a silver medal to Sgt. Hudson of his Volunteers of Ireland provincials for bravery at the Battle of Camden. This medal is in the Irish National Museum in Dublin. [http://battleofcamden.org/meritmedal.htm](http://battleofcamden.org/meritmedal.htm)

Any information or opinions would be welcomed.

CBB
The Continental Army of the Southern Department: Insurgent Peacekeepers?  

James McIntyre

When the invader pierces deep into the heart of the weaker country and occupies her territory in a cruel and oppressive manner, there is no doubt that conditions of terrain, climate, and society in general offer obstacles to his progress and may be used to advantage by those who oppose him. In guerrilla warfare, we turn these advantages to the purpose of resisting and defeating the enemy.  

These words of Mao Tse-Tung describe the Chinese strategic situation in relation to the Japanese in the late 1930s. Francis Marion, Thomas Sumter, Nathanael Greene, or any other observer of the Patriot predicament could just as easily have written them after the Battle of Camden in 1780. Numerous historians have commented on the likeness between the fighting in the South during the American War of Independence and various modern guerrilla movements, including that of China, in some depth.  

Usually, these examinations focus primarily on the actions of partisan fighters such as Francis Marion and Thomas Sumter. By the same token, some have even looked at Nathanael Greene’s methods in the South as reflective of what Mao called ‘mobile warfare’. The connections in the literature so far have focused on the similarities in a very narrowly military sense.  

This paper proposes is to investigate the war in the Southern states in general, and South Carolina in particular, from a broader perspective. It accepts that conflict on one level constituted an insurgency, or guerrilla war. In so far as the insurgency aspect is concerned, it is “the attempt by a militarily inferior faction (the insurgents) operating within a geo-political system, by use of guerrilla warfare and population control measures, to usurp control of that system from the militarily dominant faction (the de facto government).” Within the framework of the war in the South as an insurgency, the paper explores the role of the Continental Army under Major General Nathanael Greene as a force for the restoration and preservation of legitimate government. The focus will be on the role of the military force in state formation, or in this case, state reformation. The means used for gaining control of the population form an integral part of the discussion as well.  

This investigation requires some discussion and clarification as to the meaning of the terminology. Take the term ‘legitimate’ when applied to government to connote that government has achieved acceptance as the recognized state by the majority of the local population. ‘State formation’ is the expression used here to refer to the process of creating such a government. One of the premises for a government to take form is that a certain amount of stability has to exist within the society as a whole. We seek to discover what the Continental Army in the South did and what it refrained from doing in order to foster a level of stability commensurate with the recreation of a stable, legitimate state.  

By 1780, or the late 1770s, it would have appeared to any outside observer that the this type of state had already been formed by the South Carolina revolutionaries, and that it could be dated back to 1775. The ground on which this state rested, however, was far from stable. While the Patriots in the low country did manage to erect a new government in 1775, they did so predominantly in their own interests. The government they created did not garner the immediate, or even the slow recognition of the majority of the backcountry population. When backcountry residents did recognize the government instituted in Charleston their recognition stood as far from either enthusiastic or complete. While a full account of the early history of the Patriot movement is far beyond the scope of this essay, suffice it to say that the Patriot government, while it functioned until 1780 in South Carolina, was not erected upon very firm foundations.  

Under these conditions, South Carolinians were in no way prepared for the British onslaught that ran over them that summer. Charleston fell to the British under Sir Henry Clinton on May 12, 1780 after a month-and-a-half long siege. The capitulation of one of the largest and richest cities in the young nation marked the high point of British military success in the war, and conversely, the nadir of American military fortunes. The loss of between 4,500 and 6,000 troops was the worst military defeat suffered by the Patriot cause during the entire conflict. It is often described as one of the worst defeats for American arms in our entire national military history. At the same time, civilian government in South Carolina came to an end during the siege, when the governor and council told Major General Benjamin Lincoln to hold Charleston and promptly abandoned it themselves. The only troops held as prisoners after the fall of Charleston were the Continentials and they were held for exchange.  

Following quickly on the heels of the smashing victory at Charleston came another stunning British success at the Battle of Waxhaws, also known as Buford’s defeat, on May 29, 1780. Here the last Continental troops in the Southern theater were defeated, though controversy still rages around the treatment accorded the survivors by Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton. The last symbol of the authority of the Continental Congress in the South was gone.  

Congress reacted quickly to this widening dilemma in the South, though it may be argued in retrospect that the actions the body proceeded into were not the wisest. They chose Major General Horatio Gates, the hero of Saratoga, to go to the South, gather together those Continentals still available, and begin the reconquest of the region. The plan did not turn out that way. Instead, the Patriots were dealt another defeat, this time at the Battle of Camden on August 16, 1780. Lord Cornwallis not only defeated the regulars and militia sent to oppose him that day, he more than destroyed the reputation of Horatio Gates as a military commander Cornwallis destroyed the main symbol of the Continental Congress, or better yet the Revolutionary government as an effective tool in preserving the revolution—the Continental Army of the Southern Department. At the same time, the British were again in position to secure their gains.  

The British seemed to be winning at this game of securing the region. Quickly, their troops branched out across the state after the fall of Charleston and took control over a number of significant geographic points, such as Ninety-Six, Camden, and George Town. Much of the ease of the British expansion of power has been linked to the uncommitted nature of the backcountry to the Revolutionary cause earlier in the conflict. While there did exist a predilection in some localities for the British, the British themselves seemed incapable of taking advantage of it. British control remained infirm by any calculation, even after the Patriot defeat at Camden. The partisans were already well-established and wreaking havoc within Cornwallis’s lines of communication. Much of this was due to the actions of Cornwallis himself, in going from a policy of pardons and parole to attempting to coerce military service from the local inhabitants. So though the Battle of Camden was a grave loss to the young nation, it did not end the Patriot movement in the South.  

Political legitimacy in South Carolina remained a contested zone. Either side could seize effective control of the populace and the region if they managed to do enough of the right things, while not making too many mistakes. These right things fall into any computation of what leads to the final victory of one side over another. They include such accomplishments as garnering the support of the local populace, as well as the perception that they were in fact the legitimate authority in the region. The British quickly learned just how elusive these attributes could be. They found that they could not operate with impunity in the region. Likewise, they discovered that they were unsafe outside of a few strategically placed enclaves. The defeat of Major Patrick Ferguson at the Battle of King’s Mountain on October 7,
1780 is testament enough on this point. The Patriots did not abandon the South to the British, far from it.

On October 30, 1780, the Continental Congress resolved to send Major General Nathanael Greene into the military vacuum of the Southern theater. Congress gave Greene the control of “all the regiments and corps raised or to be raised from the states of Delaware to Georgia, inclusive, until the further orders of Congress or the Commander in Chief.” This was not a vast military host by any stretch of the imagination. His forces had to be rebuilt around the hard core of roughly 900 Maryland and Delaware Continentals, survivors of the Camden debacle. Nor were these troops well supplied. The lack of supply brought with it all the usual attendant problems of discipline, such as the soldiers plundering the local populace. Immediately upon taking command, Greene addressed the challenge of reestablishing discipline in the ranks. He took two approaches to this problem. First, Greene initiated strict enforcement of the laws against plunder, having the first two men convicted for stealing publicly executed. Second, he began work at securing provisions for the men huddled around Hillsborough, North Carolina. Greene began to search for regular troops with which to fill his depleted ranks. He constantly wrote to Congress, to the respective States and to Gen. Washington, attempting to get reinforcements and supplies. Greene showed he possessed a clear sense of the types of difficulties he would encounter. For instance, in writing to the Maryland legislature for reinforcements, Greene specified that any troops forwarded to him be equipped for “actual service.” One response he received from Washington shows a sense of humor and a touch of exasperation at his subordinate’s entreaties: “Every support that is in my power to give you from this army, shall cheerfully be afforded; but, if I part with any more troops, I must accompany them, or have none to command….” For much of his time in the South, Greene would have to rely on his own initiative in a number of areas, recruiting and supply standing out as among the more challenging. Winning local support for the Patriot side was certainly another.

Mao once said, “Military action is a method used to attain a political goal. While military affairs and political affairs are not identical, it is impossible to isolate one from the other.” Greene must have possessed some inkling of this, for he was certainly aware in November of 1780 that he could not hope to retake the Southern States with the meager military forces at his disposal. He would need to augment his forces in order to accomplish his mission, and as the above makes clear, he could not count on reinforcement from the North. Nathanael Greene would have to gain and rely on the support of the local Patriot leaders in order to wrest control of the Southern States from the British. He had to remain above their internecine struggles, and thus present the Continentals under his command as a force representing the legitimate authority in the theater, with that legitimacy derived from the Continental Congress. The goal was political, while the action, at times, had to be military. Balancing these two often-competing drives was nothing if not precarious.

The campaign Greene launched is so familiar that only the briefest retelling is necessary. On the military front, Greene split his forces, going against all the standard dictates of military logic, and sent a portion of them into South Carolina with Daniel Morgan. This maneuver eventually brought on one of the most stunning Patriot victories of the entire war at the battle of Cowpens. Cowpens resulted in the well-known race to the Dan River and eventually the battle of Guilford Courthouse on March 15, 1781. Greene attempted to duplicate Morgan’s tactics. Though he did not inflict as strong a defeat on the British as Morgan, Greene had to leave the field, but he did manage to inflict enough damage on Cornwallis’s troops that any pursuit of the “defeated” Americans was out of the question for the British general.

Shortly after the confrontation at Guilford Courthouse, Greene made one of his most crucial decisions, to reenter South Carolina. This decision was made based as much on its political as military in its merits, a fact often expressed in Greene’s communications. Once in South Carolina, the Continentals had to play several roles as corollaries to their overall strategy of regaining the South. First, was the military role, which required that they defeat the British, or at least keep them in check. Second and much more delicate by far, was the reintroduction of some form of law and order, leading to the eventual reconstitution of a civilian government. In all of these areas the support of the militia was necessary; however, this support often varied.

Militia support in the military role is simple enough, they were needed for the troops they could put in the field and equally important, for the intelligence they could supply. This aspect never lost its importance; even late in the war there are several examples of Greene writing to the militia leaders requesting information. While the service of the militia in a purely military role was very useful, this was not so true regarding the political mission in the South. In the political realm, things were often more difficult. The militia often seemed as if they were acting at odds with the policies the Continentals sought to put in place. For example, there is a letter from Greene to General Rutherford of the North Carolina militia in which Greene tells the latter to attempt to restrict the wanton use of violence.

If we suffer those [passion and resentment] to influence us, a sense of injuries will often hurry us into acts of the most horrid cruelty; and, whatever may be the opinion of people respecting severity, both philosophy and experience prove, that persecution does but confirm the error it is meant to destroy. And, therefore, I think those measures highly unwarrantable, which curry the marks of cruelty; and in fact only increase our enemies.

The notion that the use of indiscriminate or unnecessary violence increased the number of enemies they had to confront is common sense. It exemplifies the necessary combination of simultaneous political and military thinking. Thinking of this sort was paramount if the Patriot side hoped to retake the south. By restraining the militia when it came to their activities vis-à-vis the loyalists, the Continentals, chiefly Greene, helped win adherents to the Patriot cause. While Greene was working to generate an environment where some form of stable government could develop in the South, his opponent, Lord Cornwallis, was working at consolidating his previous gains.

Cornwallis continued as a strategy of adding to consolidate. In other words, add South Carolina to hold Georgia, and North Carolina to hold South Carolina and so forth. He continued this policy into Virginia. His fighting in Virginia, as well as orders from Clinton, led Cornwallis to hold up in Yorktown where he was officially besieged by a Franco-American force with the siege concluding in favor of the allies on October 19, 1781. News of this climactic event reached Greene’s headquarters in the last week of October 1781. For many, the war was over—or that is how it is usually described in the literature. The description holds some merit, in that most contemporaries felt an increasing sense of war weariness after the victory at Yorktown. This made the conduct of further operations, no matter how necessary, that much more difficult to organize.

The most arduous fighting for the Continentals in the South came after Cornwallis’s capitulation at Yorktown. At the same time, it can be argued that this was a truly crucial period for the reestablishment of stable state apparatus. Still, in these extremely trying circumstances, Nathanael Greene never lost sight of his main objective. So much is evidenced by his communication to Governor John Rutledge of South Carolina dated December 9, in which Greene lays out the strategic situation of the Army of the Southern Department in late 1781. Greene began by describing the obstacles ranged against the Patriot cause, and their possible meaning: “From the preparations making in Charlestown for its defense and from the measures taken to incorporate the Tories and embody the negroes, as well as Spirit up the Savages, it appears the
Enemy have farther designs upon this country.”35 The war was far from over in South Carolina, at least from General Greene’s standpoint. He then went on to place events in the South in their global perspective. “It is difficult to tell what will be their plan; nor can we form an idea how far European politics may affect our operations here.”36 Greene next presented the Governor with what he viewed as the tasks confronting the Patriots and their concerns: “Our attention is naturally directed to two objects, one is to cover this country, the other, to drive the Enemy from their strong holds[,] an additional force to our present strength may be necessary for either, or both...”37 Finally, Greene describes the possibilities that might await the Patriots in the South: “A change of sentiment may also take place among the Inhabitants, new difficulties arise and the issue of the war be protracted, if not rendered doubtful.”38 The possibility for change in the civilian attitude to the patriot forces stood as a genuine challenge to Greene. With the small force at his command, he could not hope to conquer and occupy the South.

One way to keep the sentiments of the people from souring with respect to the Patriot side was to make it the side of law and order. Greene worked to this end in several ways. First, as we have already seen, Greene attempted to reduce the violence employed by the militia. There were others, such as his response to a Colonel Stephen Drayton regarding the latter’s question about a parole granted him. Essentially, Drayton wanted to see if the parole remained binding. Greene’s answer to this query is telling: “Paroles should be treated with respect and delicacy otherwise Military operations become cruel and barbarous as it will be for the interest of the parties to put such to death as cannot be conveniently carried off.”39 Thus the parole was binding. Greene’s support of the parole can be seen as an attempt to restore some of the conventions of warfare, and in so doing, return some level of law and order to the region. Actions such as this might, if repeated enough times, serve to create the kind of environment in which a stable political entity could coalesce. This same concern for restoring some sort of constraints on violence in the region persists throughout Greene’s writings.

Specifically, there are the instructions he imparted to General Anthony Wayne of the Pennsylvania Line, when the latter received orders to move his troops into Georgia and reestablish the Patriot authority in that State. These instructions are worth quoting at length for they show the hard won wisdom of Greene’s experiences in the region:

Try by every means in your power, to soften the malignity and dreadful resentments subsisting between whig and tory; and put a stop, as much as possible, to that cruel custom of putting them to death after they have surrendered themselves prisoners. The practice of plundering, you will endeavour to check as much as possible; and point out to the militia, the ruinous consequences of the policy. Let your discipline be as regular and as rigid as the nature and constitution of your troops will admit.40

Try to soften the resentment between Whig and Tory. Instructions such as these can easily be taken as incorporating the role of the peacemaker within that of the military commander. Wayne received some fairly specific and sound instructions on how to accomplish the task, i.e., put a stop to the killing of prisoners. Again, restore some of the rules of war, and with them, some of the boundaries that help to hold a civilization together. Ending the practice of killing prisoners especially would help the patriot cause on a number of levels. First, it brings with it a certain added level of legitimacy to the side that initiates the policy. Secondly, it would reduce the ferocity of the fighting if the enemy soldier, whether they were a regular regular, or more importantly, an irregular, knew that they can surrender and hope to be treated with the rights due to a prisoner of war.

For his mission in Georgia, Wayne never had more than five hundred men, and rarely over 300. With this tiny force, Wayne had to reinstate the “authority of the Union within the limits of Georgia.”41 Writing to Colonel Walter Stewart on February 25, 1782, Wayne expressed a sense of being daunted by the task facing him in Georgia: “The duty that we have performed on the present occasion was much harder than that of the Children of Israel; they had only to make brick without straw, but we have our army to form without men, provisions, forage and almost every apparatus of war; to provide without boats, bridges, etc.; to build without the materials except what we stood from the stump, and what is yet more difficult than all, to make whigs out of tories, and with them to wrest this country out of the enemy, all of which we have affected with the help of a few regular dragoons.42

Anthony Wayne’s mission in Georgia was certainly no easy one. By this time the nation was weary, and thus the support needed to win in the South was slow in coming from the North. At the same time, the very bonds of civilization seemed on the verge of dissolution. The situation was one in which “The horrid depredations & murders committed in this country by one inhabitant upon another, i.e. by whigs and tories indiscriminately beggars all description.”43 Wayne and his small force were successful over time at vanquishing the forces of the crown and more importantly, the local loyalists, thus retaking Georgia for the United States.

As time went on, the methods employed by both commanders bore fruit, as loyalists began to take the oath of allegiance to the United States. Likewise, the backbone of loyalty in the south, the British army, was withdrawn to a few small enclaves, and finally left the region altogether.

Finally, it should be clear at this juncture that the success of the Patriots in the South was not due to what they did on the battlefield alone. In fact, it could be argued with some viability that it was in spite of what occurred on the battlefields. By the standards of the day, Greene lost many of the major engagements he commanded.44 True, he also inflicted casualties on his opponents that made it impossible for them to follow up their victories. Still, the success of the American cause in the South was due as much to what the Continental Army, the symbolic and realistic coercive power of the cause did not do. They did not wantonly violate people’s rights to life or to property. There was no ‘Sumter’s law’ to induce enlistments in the Continental ranks. Their commander tried to restrain his men from plundering, and to reimpose some of the boundaries of civilization on the region. Part and parcel of this was a certain respect for the rules of war, as attested to above in his support of Colonel Drayton’s parole, as well as the injunctions not to kill prisoners.

Did the Continental Army take an active role in the rebuilding of the state in South Carolina? The answer to that remains unclear. More than being active participants, though, it seems that the army guarded the practice as it developed on a local scale.45 It did intervene in order to prevent reciprocal justice, and a return to excesses of violence that would again plunge the region into a civil war. In many cases, such as Greene’s relationship with Governor John Rutledge, the Continental’s allowed for local preference to assert itself. Whether this was a conscious choice on Greene’s part or not remains unclear at the current juncture. The end result remained much like what a recent commentator has referred to as taking a “positive, supporting approach” with regards to working with local authority.46 The restraint of violence between local factions, therefore, proved an important activity in that it allowed for the process to take place, giving local preference a chance to assert itself. In the final analysis, this all meant that government in South Carolina and Georgia, was not something imposed from without, but instead stood as an internal development.

Not all of the success of the Patriot cause in the South should be directly attributed to what the Continental Army did in the region alongside the militia. Much of it belongs also to what the British and their loyalist supporters did not do. They never did set up a real
civillian government in South Carolina or Georgia, or wherever else the British held control over that matter, a practice often criticized by the loyalists themselves.47 There was no chance for a legitimate state to develop, and political legitimacy, the right to rule as it were, remained a contested ground. The Patriots won the contested ground in part because of the actions of the Continental Army. The army acted as a force that curbed the breakdown of social control. It allowed for the return of a certain amount of stability, enough at least to begin the process of recreating a state structure. Much of the credit for this deservedly belongs to Nathanael Greene and his subordinate, Anthony Wayne. Greene seemed to possess a keen perception of what his role in the South was, both militarily and politically. Greene never lost sight of the connection between the two. He adroitly directed the forces at his disposal, meager as they often were, towards the attainment of his goal: the return to some form of civilian government in the Southern States, and their subsequent return to the United States.

Nathanael Greene’s success in both of these endeavors is probably best summed in the speech given by John Rutledge, thanking him for his exertions in the aid of South Carolina: “We have now full and absolute possession of every part of the state; and the legislative, judicial, and executive powers, are in the free exercise of their respective authorities.”47
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In More Than Roman Valor: The Revolutionary War Fact Book, Robert Dunkerly gives his readers a coherent, organized overview of the significant personalities, events and sociopolitical influences that shaped and defined the American Revolution. Though not aimed at readers seeking a detailed examination of such personalities, events and influences, Dunkerly gives structure to the often jumbled perceptions Americans have of this seminal event in their history.

Bert Dunkerly, a native of Pennsylvania, is well qualified to author this ambitious undertaking. He holds a bachelor's degree in history from St. Vincent College and a masters degree in historic preservation from Middle Tennessee State University. He has worked at numerous historic sites, including Jamestown, Williamsburg, and George Washington's birthplace. He is currently employed as a Park Ranger at Kings Mountain National Military Park in South Carolina where he interprets that significant engagement and its place in the Southern Campaign.

The book is organized into fifteen chapters entitled (1) The Colonies; (2) Campaigns; (3) The Road to Revolution; (4) Revolutionary War Timeline; (5) Armies; (6) Weapons; (7) The War Afloat; (8) The Declaration of Independence; (9) People; (10) Remembering the Revolution; (11) Symbols; (12) Glossary; (13) Historic Sites; (14) Appendix-Military Enlistments; and (15) Bibliography. Such organization allows the reader seeking a glance into a specific aspect of the war to readily locate a cogent, if brief, look at the subject. One relatively minor criticism of the book is that the absence of an index frustrates efforts to pull together all references to a particular person or event. That said, however, the division of the book into the specifically targeted chapters/topics lends itself to ready assimilation of the wealth of information it presents.

As an example of the many merits of this book, the bibliography is helpfully divided into sections listing important works in African-American History; General History/Reference; Archaeology; Colonial Life and Culture; Political Events; People and Personalities; Army Life and Equipment: The Common Soldier;
Military History: Battles and Campaigns; Women in the Revolution; and Guides to Historic Sites/Historic Preservation Sources.

*More Than Roman Valor* is a worthy addition to the libraries of those who want a synoptic introduction to the important people, battles and influences of the American Revolution. Those seeking resources for further, more detailed ventures into the rich history of the Revolution will find abundant leads in this gem of a book.

*More Than Roman Valor: The Revolutionary War Fact Book* by Robert M Dunkerly, pp. 264, is available at the bookstore at Kings Mountain National Military Park, as well as through online bookstores. The price is $21.95.
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