Return to the Cow Pens! 225th

William T. Ranney’s masterpiece, painted in 1845, showing the final cavalry hand-to-hand combat at Cowpens, hangs in the South Carolina State House lobby. Most modern living historians believe that Ranney depicted the uniforms quite inaccurately. Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton’s British Legion cavalry is thought to have been clothed in green tunics and Lt. Col. William Washington’s cavalry in white. The story of Washington’s trumpeter or waiter [Ball, Collin, Collins] shooting a legionnaire just in time as Washington’s sword broke is also not well substantiated or that he was a black youth as depicted. Ranney recreated the scene in oils, probably from a traditional retelling or from an account of the Battle of Cowpens recorded in John Marshall’s biography of George Washington. According to Marshall, ”a waiter, too small to wield a sword" saved the life of a relative of George Washington during the battle. Just as Lieutenant Colonel William Washington, leader of the patriot cavalry, was about to be cut down by a sword, the black man ”saved him by wounding the officer with a ball from a pistol." Ranney depicts the unnamed man as a bugler astride a horse, as Morgan and Washington battle three British soldiers.

“Cornet Thomas Patterson of the 17th Dragoons saw the stalemate and charged at Washington. When Patterson swung his sword at Washington he was “cut down by the Colonel’s orderly serjeant.” Patterson was not killed, but he was seriously wounded. The other British officer was ready to saber Washington, but a “Negro boy named Collins” rode in and shot the British officer in the shoulder. The third officer, possibly Tarleton, “retreated 10 or 12 steps and wheeled about and fired his pistol which wounded Washington’s horse.” Patrick J. O’Kelley, Nothing but Blood and Slaughter, Vol. Two.

Backyard Archaeology – ARCHH Up!

The Archaeological Reconnaissance and Computerization of Hobkirk’s Hill (ARCHH) project has begun initial field operations on this built-over, urban battlefield in Camden, South Carolina. We are using the professional-amateur cooperative archaeology model, loosely based upon the successful BRAVO organization of New Jersey. We have identified an initial survey area and will only test properties within this initial survey area until we demonstrate artifact recoveries to any boundary. Metal detectorist director John Allison believes that this is at least two years’ work. Since the battlefield is in well-landscaped yards and there are dozens of homeowners, we are only surveying areas with landowner permission and we will not be able to cover 100% of the land in the survey area.

We have a neighborhood meeting planned to explain the archaeological survey project to the landowners. SCAR will provide project handouts and offer a walking battlefield tour for Hobkirk Hill neighbors and anyone else who wants to attend on Sunday, January 29, 2006 at 3 pm. [Continued on p. 17.]

Fired British caliber musket balls recovered from test lot #1 on the Hobkirk’s Hill battlefield. [Photo by ARCHH team member- archaeologist Carl R. Steen.]
Editor / Publisher’s Notes

We kick off in this month’s magazine an exploration into a dimension of the American Revolution that has not been well studied by SCAR and even poorly reported in standard history texts. In listening to a lecture by Dan Morrill, he points out that one of the causes of the Revolutionary War and of the Colonists deciding to fight revolved around the Indian policy, especially about Indian lands west of the 1768 proclamation line. The study of the Indian policy is very complex and not given well to black and white analysis. It is easy to generalize and say that Cherokees and Creeks were always British allies and the Catawbas were allied with the Patriots. But even amongst the Cherokees and Creeks, there were allies and enemies and those alliances often have been stereotyped. Overlying this study is the personal, economic, family, and traditional trading relationships between coastal merchants, backwoods trading post operators, and political, military, and social leaders of the different tribes of Native Americans.

First articles are on Emisteseguo written by historian Robert Scott Davis professor at Wallace State College in Hanceville, Alabama and Dr. Jeff Dennis of Morehead State University, Kentucky. We explore the role of the Creeks in the Revolution, not only in terms of the military campaigns but also in terms of the social, political-diplomatic, and economic histories. This gives us some insight as to these complex relationships.

In working last year on the Thomas Sumter Symposium, it was fascinating to talk with Dr. Jeff Dennis about his research on the relationships of South Carolina leaders such as Christopher Gadsden, William Henry Drayton, Henry Laurens, Thomas Sumter, and various Native American leaders. What was especially intense was his long-standing, personal relationship with the Cherokee, developed at the end of the French and Indian War when Sgt. Thomas Sumter accompanied three Cherokee warriors to London. And when the British successfully invaded South Carolina in 1780, Thomas Sumter went to the Catawba Indian Nation to begin to organize his militia resistance to the invaders.

While I have tended to focus on the conventional protagonist paradigm of British-Loyalist-Tory vs. American-Patriot, it is important that we study the war and conflicts from more varied and broader perspectives to teach us a better understanding.

Searching for Information

SCAR has future articles planned on the Battles of Kettle Creek, the second siege of Augusta, and Musgrove Mill. SCAR wants to publish materials on the Battles of Long Cone, 2d Cedar Spring-Thompson’s Peach Orchard-Wofford’s Ironworks-Clifton, Ramsour’s Mill, Green Spring, Great Bridge and Beattie’s Mill. We are looking for reports, pension statements, private letters, maps, and archaeological finds to explain the action and put these battles on the ground. If you will share information you have gathered on these battles, either privately or are willing to submit something for publication, it would be greatly appreciated.

SCAR has located historians who are working on studies of SC Patriot militia Gen. Thomas Sumter’s Battles at Blackstock’s Plantation and Hanging Rock that SCAR will eventually publish. Share information you have gathered on either of these battles by contacting SCAR. A story unshared may become a site unspared.

SCAR Corps of Discovery – Cool Weather Battlefielding Season

During the last few months, SCAR has accompanied the Corps of Discovery sharing informal tours of Revolutionary War sites. Now that the first frosts blanketed our Southern woods, upon invitation of a host who will plan a trip and obtain landowner access permissions, SCAR publishes a meeting date, time, and tentative Revolutionary War related sites to be visited and invites all interested to car pool, join the hike and enjoy informal on-the-ground, interpretive presentations of research. A volunteer host/planner/guide is mandatory to plan the trip, to secure landowner permission for entry on private property in advance, to seek out local expertise, and to do some basic research on the sites. SCAR takes suggestions of field trips and volunteers to lead some trips. Public sites can also be included to insure knowledgeable guides are available to the group (i.e. if you have not toured the Cowpens battlefield with cartographer and part-time park interpretative ranger, John Robertson, you have not toured this National Historic field). These field trips are not “professionally” led, organized, or always presented by world-class scholars. However, they are free (except small admission fees to parks and the like) and you supply your meals and transportation. Your participation contributes to the dynamic exchange of information. Often the Corps’ discovery of little-known battlefields creates the forum.

The Southern Campaigns Corps of Discovery is a group of friends who enjoy researching, finding, and touring the actual Revolutionary War battle sites. Details of each field trip are posted in the Calendar of Upcoming events. You are invited to join in the fun. SCAR will keep you posted.

A Corps of Discovery field trip will be led by Mike Scoggins on Sunday, January 22, 2006 to visit upcountry South Carolina sites. We will leave from the York County Museum in Rock Hill, SC at 9:00 am. Please contact Mike (micsoggins@ehmuseums.org) if you are interested in sharing a York or Chester County, SC site or going.

SCAR editors Charles B. Baxley and David P. Reuwer will lead a walking tour of the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill in Camden, SC at 3 pm on Sunday, January 29, 2006. Open to the public.

The Corps of Discovery will mobilize again to tour the Kettle Creek battlefield near Washington, Georgia on February 11, 2006. Army Historian and SCAR author Steven J. Rauch will lead this trip and discussion.

Lincoln County, NC historian Darrell Harkey will lead a Corps of Discovery tour following Lord Cornwallis through southern North Carolina on his infamous Race to the Dan River on March 11, 2006. We will stop at Lincolnton, NC at the site of Lord Cornwallis’ destruction of his heavy baggage on the Ramsour’s Mill battlefield.

Military historian / living history expert Patrick J. O’Kelley will lead a Corps of Discovery field trip on April 1, 2006 to Revolutionary War sites in central North Carolina. Instead of doing the obvious large battles, we will go from Fort Bragg to the coast. This will include the sites of the Piney Bottom Massacre, Burnt Swamp, Tory Hole, Fort Johnston, Brunswick Town, Wilmington and Moore’s Creek Bridge. Patrick knows the ways on Fort Bragg, so that alone will be interesting since the ground is almost unchanged from what it was then, dirt roads and all.

Plan to join us as it sounds like fun! Tell us about your research and trips to discover our Revolutionary War heritage. Share in SCAR.

Placefinders

John Robertson has started to catalogue and post on a limited access Internet site a data exchange of Revolutionary War site maps and documentation – placefinders.
Welcome

SCAR heartily welcomes Owen Glendening, the new Deputy Director of Interpretation at the Culture & Heritage Museums of York County, SC. Owen, newly imported from Indiana, is getting the Mike Scoggins special crash course in the Southern Campaigns that won the American Revolution. Owen and his team are refining the important role their institutions will play in the discovery and interpretation of the backwoods role in the Revolutionary War effort.

Huzzah!

A SCAR’s hat’s off this month goes to Tariq Ghaffar and John Allison, Jr. for their organizational work and leadership in the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill archaeological survey project. Tariq, an instructor at Camden Military Academy, spends his summers working as a professional archaeological field technician. He has undertaken training and field supervision of the volunteers working on the Hob Kirk Hill archaeological survey with great professionalism under the direction of our experienced archaeologist. John Allison, a Columbia, SC based professional wealth manager, has likewise undertaken to organize, train and supervise field work to professional standards for metal detectorists who volunteer to work in the project.

SCAR Roadtrips

January promises to be a great month for getting out in the southland. Charles B. Baxley, SCAR Editor and Publisher, will be at the 225th celebrations at Cowpens and Baxley, along with David P. Reuwer, SCAR’s glad-handing grammarian, will attend the SCRW roundtable in Rock Hill, SC and the Corps of Discovery roadtrip the next day. We will also present at Hopewell Presbyterian Church to commemorate the 225th Anniversary of the Battle of Cowan’s Ford on January 28, 2006 and will conduct a Battle of Hobkirk Hill walking tour on January 29, 2006. We hope to see you there!

Planning & Research

Planning is about complete for the Nathaniel Greene Symposium and Battlefield Tours to be held on April 21-23, 2006 in Camden, SC. SCAR hopes you can join us for our learning, sharing, fellowship, and entertainment.

SCAR will co-sponsor a conference on Gen. Nathanael Greene’s greatest battlefield victory at the Battle of Eutaw Springs on September 9, 2006 in Eutawville, SC. Mark this date for great presentations, a battlefield tour (no you will not need SCUBA gear), commemorative ceremony, lively debates, and fellowship.

Cartographer John Robertson (jr1@jrshelby.com) is offering a new fully searchable and complete set of all issues of SCAR on one compact disk for sale quarterly. SCAR has reviewed the operation of this research tool and uses it in publication of this magazine.

Salute to John Edward Allison, Sr.

Our RevWar family lost a fine amateur historian, investigative detectorist and Southern gentleman with the recent passing of John Edward Allison, Sr., age 75, of Rock Hill, SC. John spent his avocation of over 30 years locating and studying Revolutionary War battlefields over the Palmetto state; he located many battlefields through study and metal detection. SCAR pays its due respects with obligations to him for pioneering work on the ground. Now he is crossing and plodding those heavenly fields where the higher rewards and golden finds never fail. SCAR gives its condolences to our fellow travelers John, Jr., and Jimmy and their families.
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Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution magazine is published online by Woodward Corporation. All editions may be downloaded from the website below or from John Robertson on CD. Color graphics really enhance the magazine. 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 you editor. Please submit all proposed articles as a MS Word document.

Please contact us at P. O. Box 10, Lugoff, South Carolina 29078-0010 or cbaxley@charter.net or (803) 438-1606 (h) or (803) 438-4200 (w). www.southerncampaign.org
Calendar of Upcoming Events

Please submit items to post upcoming Southern Campaigns programs and events of interest to Revolutionary War researchers and history buffs. Before you go, always call ahead to confirm events and admission policies. To add events, please contact Steven J. Rauch, calendar editor at sjrauch@aol.com or steven.rauch@us.army.mil.

January 14 - 17, 2006 – Cowpens National Battlefield, Cherokee County, SC - Battle of Cowpens 225th anniversary. Programs 9 am to 5:00 pm Saturday and Sunday. January 14th at noon SCAR editor Charles B. Baxley discusses 18th century military communications, Don Hagist at 1 p.m.; Michael Scoggins and Dr. Bobby G. Moss at 3 pm; and Dr. Christine Swagger at 4:00 pm.

January 14-15 battlefield walking tours given by several SCAR members throughout the day. Also, SCAR author Mickey Beckham will be signing copies of his new novel set in the Revolution, Colonial Spy.

January 16 - March to the Cowpens - led by Revolutionary War re-enactors, over 75 have signed up to hike the Green River Road route from Gen. Daniel Morgan’s camp at Grindal Shoals on Pacolet River to the Cowpens battlefield, following the route take by General Daniel Morgan and Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton. January 17th – 7:00 am - special tour of the battlefield at the hour of the battle. http://www.nps.gov/cowp/Cowp225events.htm or (864) 461-2828.

January 17, 2006 – Spartanburg, SC - Rededication of the General Daniel Morgan Monument, Morgan Square in downtown Spartanburg, SC at 2:00 pm. Info/contact: City of Spartanburg at 864-596-3105


January 17, 2006 – Spartanburg, SC – Spartanburg County Library. Come spend an evening with Gen. Daniel Morgan, a re-enactment by D’øyłe Moore. 7:00 pm at the Barrett Community Room. Free.

January 21, 2006 – Rock Hill, SC – Southern Campaigns Revolutionary War Roundtable. The winter 2006 meeting of the Southern Campaign of the Revolutionary War Round Table will be held at the Museum of York County, 4621 Mt. Gallant Road, Rock Hill, SC on Saturday, January 21, from 10:00 am until 4:00 pm. This is the first public forum of the Round Table, which consists of professionals and amateurs actively engaged in Revolutionary War research, preservation and interpretation. Encouraged is an active 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 states. Events will include brief introductions at 10:00 am, a tour of the “Liberty or Death: Rebels and Loyalists in the Southern Piedmont” exhibit and free flowing roundtable discussions. Admission is free with a “Dutch Treat” lunch available. Interested parties should bring paper, pictures, artifacts, maps, their research interests, and/or a request for help to share. Info/contact: roundtable host Mike Scoggins at micscoggins@chmuseums.org or telephone (803) 684-3948, ext. 31 or contact SCAR.

January 22, 2006 – Rock Hill, SC – Corps of Discovery field trip to upcountry SC Revolutionary War sites. Lead by historian Mike Scoggins, visit: William “Billy” Hill’s Iron Works, Stallion’s Plantation, the skirmish at Bigger’s Ferry, Rev. the Rev. Simpson’s Fishing Creek Presbyterian Church site, Capt. Christian Huck’s defeat at Williamson’s Plantation, and others. Tour departs at 9:00 am from the Museum of York County - 4621 Mt. Gallant Road, Rock Hill, SC. The public is invited, but please call or email to reserve a space. Small fee to offset cost of bus.

Info/contact: Mike Scoggins at micscoggins@chmuseums.org or (803) 684-3948, ext. 31 or contact SCAR.

January 28, 2005 - Huntersville, NC - Hopewell Presbyterian Church - 10500 Old Beattie's Ford Road; celebrate the 225th anniversary of the Battle at Cowan's Ford. At 9:30 am SCAR Editors David P. Reuwer and Charles B. Baxley will make a presentation on the Revolutionary War in the Carolina backcountry. At 11:00 am commemorative ceremony at the grave of NC Patriot militia General William Lee Davidson, honoring Gen. Davidson and those who died on February 1, 1781 while engaging the British at the crossing of the Catawba River. Former North Carolina State President, Grady Hall, Sons of the American Revolution, will conduct the wreath laying ceremony. Info/contact: event coordinator: Darrell Harkey, 704-736-8442 (office) and 704-732-1221 (home). 211 West Water Street, Lincolnton, North Carolina, 28092

January 29, 2006 – Belle Isle Plantation near Cross, SC. 3:30 pm commemoration ceremony at tomb of SC Patriot militia Gen. Francis Marion. Sponsored by the Francis Marion Society. For further information, contact Carol Daniels: kent@schistorystore.com or call Carol at (843) 394-3202.

January 29, 2006 – Camden, SC - Hobkirk’s Hill battlefield walking tour. You are invited to take a guided walking tour of the Hobkirk’s Hill battlefield with SCAR editors Charles B. Baxley and David P. Reuwer. Free and open to the public. To join the tour, meet at Greene and Fair Streets in Camden at 3 pm. For more information contact SCAR. For more information on the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill see www.hobkirkhill.org.

February 10-11, 2006 - Boyd's Ferry in South Boston, Va. - "Crossing of the Dan" 225th Anniversary. Living history, guest authors, Gen. Nathanael Greene interpretation, and period music. Jack Buchanan will present a lecture titled "A River Not Too Far: The Crossing of the Dan" and Larry Babits will explain the “Race to the Dan” at The Prizery, South Boston, Virginia. For more info/contact: Dan Shaw for more detail dan@possumhollow.us or (434) 575-7253 http://www.prizery.com/Crossing/Celebration.htm

February 11, 2006 – Washington, Georgia – The Battle of Kettle Creek 227th anniversary commemoration. Battle of Kettle Creek film and discussion at the Mary Willis Library at 9:00 am and walking tours of the Kettle Creek battlefield at 11:00 am and 12:00 pm lead by US Army historians Steven J. Rauch and Dr. Walt Andre from the US Army Signal Center, Fort Gordon, Ga. Chicken & Pork Bar-B-Que served at the battlefield picnic area between 11:30 am and 1:00 pm. SAR/DAR Wreath Ceremony at the battlefield monument at 2:00 pm, featuring U.S. Army Signal Corps Band & Ceremonial Detachment from Ft. Gordon, Ga. For more information contact: Bob Ramsaur at WFRAMSUAR@aol.com The Corps of Discovery will meet in Washington, Ga. and take a battlefield tour of Kettle Creek led by military historian and SCAR contributor, Steven J. Rauch.

February 12, 2006 – Elijah Clark State Park, Lincoln, Georgia – Battle of Kettle Creek Commemoration. 2 pm – 4:30 pm. Learn how Georgia’s Revolutionary War hero Elijah Clark led the pioneers to a victory at Kettle Creek. Special program for Kettle Creek participants: wreath ceremony at General Elijah Clarke’s Gravesite, tour of Elijah Clarke Museum, and living history presentations. $3 parking fee. 2959 McCormick Highway, Lincoln, GA 30817 located 7 miles northeast of Lincoln on US Highway 378. For more information, contact: (706) 359-3458 or http://gastateparks.org/net/calendar/details.aspx?calendardate=16994&v=40790.0.1.5

February 18-19, 2006 – Huntersville, North Carolina – 225th Anniversary of the Battle of Cowan’s Ford. Join a celebration of
March 4-5, 2006 – King’s Mountain National Park - Park 75th Anniversary.  Kings Mountain will mark the park's 75th anniversary with a series of special events. Explore the park's newly reopened museum. Special exhibits highlight the history of the park. Guided tours to the battlefield and a militia encampment. Event is free, open Saturday 9-5 & Sunday 9-3. Info/contact: Kings Mountain National Military Park at 864-936-7921 or www.nps.gov/kimo.

March 11, 2006 – Corps of Discovery field trip – southern North Carolina.  Lincoln County NC historian Darrell Harkey will lead a Corps of Discovery tour following Lord Cornwallis route through south-central North Carolina on his infamous Race to the Dan River.  We will stop at the site of Lord Cornwallis’ destruction of his heavy baggage on the Ramsour’s Mill battlefield of the previous summer to make a "flying army" to chase Gen. Daniel Morgan and Nathanael Greene to Virginia.  The public is invited, but please call or email to reserve a space.

March 14 - 19, 2006 – Greensboro, NC - Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, NC –Battle of Guilford Courthouse 225th Anniversary.  The park will hold its lecture series on March 14 – 17.  All programs for this year's events are free and open to the public.  Reservations are required for attendance at each program (call 336-288-1776, ext. 228). The anniversary of the battle will be observed the weekend of March 18 - 19 with an encampment. The park will also coordinate with the City of Greensboro and conduct a battle re-enactment that will be staged approximately 2.5 miles west of Guilford Courthouse National Military Park at Price Park located on New Garden Road near Bryan Blvd. The re-enactment will take place on Saturday and Sunday afternoons, March 18-19, 2006. Info/contact: Guilford Courthouse National Military Park or see www.march1781.org.  Inquiries regarding the re-enactment please call 336-545-5315.

March 4, 2006 – Fayetteville, NC – Corps of Discovery field trip. Military historian and living history expert Patrick J. O’Kelley will lead a Corps of Discovery field trip to Revolutionary War sites in central North Carolina.  The route will go east from Fayetteville to the coast including; the Piney Bottom Massacre, Burnt Swamp, Tory Hole, Fort Johnston, Brunswick Town, Wilmington, and Moore’s Creek Bridge.  This is a car pool trip, no fees. The public is invited, but please call or email to reserve a space. SCAR will keep you posted as this event develops. Contact: Patrick O’Kelley, event host, at goober.com@juno.com.

April 1-2, 2006 – Mason Neck, Virginia - Gunston Hall, the plantation home of George Mason, will host a Revolutionary War reenactment. Info/contact: Mike Cecere http://www.gunstonhall.org.

April 21 - 23, 2006 – Camden, SC – 225th Anniversary of the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill and Gen. Nathanael Greene Symposium. Historic Camden Revolutionary War Site and SCAR host a symposium and battlefield tours on Gen. Nathanael Greene in conjunction with the celebration of the 225th anniversary of the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill.  Scheduled speakers include Chief Editor of the Greene papers, Dennis M. Conrad; noted author John Buchanan; Professor Robert M. Calhoon; novelist Charles F. Price, Jim McIntyre, Greg Massey, Jim Piechuch, and Professor Larry Babits, all noted Nathanael Greene scholars, who will speak on their latest research and publications.  You will also have an opportunity to walk Greene’s important Hobkirk’s Hill and Eutaw Springs battlefields with knowledgeable guides. Saturday evening entertainment will feature noted thespian Howard Burnham’s portrait of Greene.  Schedule and registration information will be posted at www.southerncampaign.org.

May 6 - 7, 2006 - Summerton, SC - 5th annual Victory at Fort Watson, William严肃ing of the 225th anniversary of the 25 April 1781 Battle of Petersburg, it will also be observing three additional 225th anniversaries related to the battle: the subsequent bombardment by General Lafayette on British forces occupying Petersburg on 10 May 1781; the death and burial of British Major General William Phillips in Petersburg on 13 May 1781; and the arrival and occupation of Petersburg by Lord Cornwallis’ army (with Phillips' merged army) on 22-25 May 1781.  Info/contact: robert.paul.davis@us.army.mil.

May 6th - 17, 2006 - Summerton, SC - 5th annual Victory at Fort Watson. 225th anniversary commemoration of the 1781 Southern Campaigns and sharing life on the backcountry frontier of the Santee River. Re-enactors demonstrate living history with battles, gunsmithing, open-fire cooking, textile production on looms, woodworking, musket firing; play 18th century games and share camp life.  Wildlife and nature expo includes guided nature walks/talks, wildlife exhibits.  Open daily 10 am to 3 pm.  May 6th at 2 pm the Francis Marion Swampfox Brigade Color Guard of the SCSSAR and the Scots Branch High School JROTC will commemorate the Patriots victory. SCSSAR info/contact and wreath laying: Muriel K. Hanna at 803-478-4179 or www.singletonchapter.org.  Admission and parking are free, food is available. The weekend events are sponsored by Friends of Santee NW Refuge, The Col. Matthew Singleton Chapter, South Carolina Sons of the American Revolution, and Swamp Fox Murals Trail Society. The Santee National Wildlife Refuge is at I-95, Exit 102, US 15/301 6 miles south of Summerton, SC. Encampment, re-enactment or wildlife expo info/contact: George Summers at 803-478-2645 or www.francismariontrail.com or www.swampfoxtail.com or www.clarendonmurals.com.
May 6-7, 2006 – King’s Mountain National Park - British Army Occupation Weekend. In 1781 the British Army under Cornwallis passed by the Kings Mountain battlefield on their way to Guilford Courthouse. This weekend re-enactors will camp at the park and represent the British Army on campaign. German Jaegers, Scottish Highlanders, British Regulars, and local Loyalists will discuss uniforms, equipment and weapons. Event is free, open 9-5 Saturday & 9-3 Sunday. Info/contact: Kings Mountain National Military Park at 864-936-7921 or visit www.nps.gov/kimo.

May 12 - 14, 2006 - Ewing, Virginia - Wilderness Road State Park - Raid at Martin’s Station. Slip into the shadows of Virginia’s 1775 wilderness as more than 150 living historians re-enact life at Joseph Martin’s frontier fort. Two cultures clash and the flames of war once again ignite on Virginia’s frontier. Activities include a re-enactment of Native Americans burning a cabin at Martin’s Station, tours of Native American warrior and colonial militia camps, frontier fort life, and 18th century vendors and colonial traders selling wares. Visit http://www.virginia.org/site/description.asp?AttrID=23887&Sort=A&MGrp=3&MCat=11 for details.

May 20 - 21, 2006 - Ninety Six, SC – Gen. Nathanael Greene’s Siege of Ninety Six. The 225th anniversary celebration continues with an encampment of British, Loyalist and Patriot (Continents and militia) forces and will focus on the 28-day siege (the making of gabions/fascines and various components of siege warfare). A wreath-laying ceremony featuring 18th century entertainment, including music. Contact Ninety Six National Historic Site for details.

June 2 - 3, 2006 – Augusta, Georgia – 225th Anniversary of Liberation of Augusta from Loyalist control – Symposium. This symposium will highlight the events and the American Revolution in Augusta and environs will be held at the Augusta Museum of History on June 2, 2006. Dr. Edward J. Cashin and US Army historian [and SCAR contributor] Steven J. Rauch along with others will speak at the symposium that will include the operational situation in 1781; Loyalist Col. Thomas Brown; Georgia Patriot militia Col. Elijah Clarke, SC militia Gen. Andrew Pickens, and Lt. Col. “Light Horse Harry” Lee who recaptured Augusta from its British/Loyalist occupants. On June 3d a celebration of the 225th anniversary of the Battle of Augusta (siege of Ft. Cornwallis) presented by the City of Augusta and the Augusta Richmond County Historical Society. This event will include the re-enactors participating in the Colonial Times sponsored “Under the Crown” colonial events in North Augusta that weekend. 3 pm presentation at the Celtic cross behind Saint Paul’s Church (6th and Reynolds) and 4 pm battle re-enactment. Visit http://www.colonialtimes.us/crown_event.html.

June 3-4, 2006 - Columbia, Va. - 225th Anniversary Battle of Point of Fork. In keeping with the actual events of the engagement, the reenactment will occur on either side of the river, and in the river using authentically reproduced 18th Century James River Bateaux. Visit www.virginiacampaign.org/pointoffork or info/contact: Columbia Events Coordinator Sarah Anderson at Post Office Box 779, Columbia, Virginia or (343) 842-2277.

June 10 and 11, 2006 – Lincolnton, NC - Battle of Ramsour’s Mill anniversary weekend. Featuring a parade, BBQ, and presentations. Info/contact: event coordinator: Darrell Harkey, 211 West Water Street, Lincolnton, North Carolina, 28092. 704-736-8442 (office) or 704-732-1221 (home) hiscord@charter.net

June 24-25, 2006 - Williamsburg, VA. - Under the Redcoat home.earthlink.net/~colscoy/UTR.html

July 15-16, 2006 – Williamsburg, VA. - 225th of the Battle of Green Spring. This event is held on the grounds of the Williamsburg Winery. For more information, contact: info@battleofgreenspring.org or see http://www.battleofgreenspring.org.


September 9, 2006 – Eutawville, SC – 225th Anniversary of the Battle of Eutaw Springs Conference & Tour. SCAR and the Church of the Epiphany present a conference and guided battlefield tour on General Nathanael Greene’s greatest battlefield victory at the Battle of Eutaw Springs. Mark this date for great presentations, a battlefield tour (no, you will not need scuba gear!), commemorative ceremony, and fellowship. Conference fee of $45.00 includes the conference, battlefield tour, lunch, snacks, reception, and materials; registration deadline is September 5th. Info/contact SCAR.

October 6-8, 2006 - Knoxville, Tennessee – “Warfare and Society in Colonial North America and the Caribbean”. Sponsored by the Omohundo Institute of Early American History and Culture and the University of Tennessee Center for the Study of War and Society http://www.wm.edu/oieahc/conferences/warfare.htm at the University of Tennessee Conference Center. Info/contact: the Omohundo Institute at (757) 221-1115.

October 7-8, 2006 – King’s Mountain National Park - Battle Anniversary Weekend. Commemorate the 226th anniversary of the battle of Kings Mountain. Events will include a wreath laying ceremony on Saturday and re-enactor camps. Free, open Saturday 9-5, Sunday 9-3. Info/contact: Kings Mountain at 864-936-7921 or visit www.nps.gov/kimo.

October 18 - 22, 2006 – Yorktown, Va. – 225th Anniversary of the Siege of Yorktown - In a four day commemoration of this important event sponsored by the Colonial National Historical Park, the Brigade of the American Revolution will collaborate with Endview Plantation as well as the British Brigade and other living history organizations to mark the 225th anniversary of the British surrender, concluding a series of observances along the Washington-Rochambeau Trail stretching over seventeen months from Rhode Island to Virginia. Musket & artillery demonstrations. Civilian and medical programs. Military engineering, demonstrations at Colonial NHP and Endview Plantation. Recreation of the Allied assaults on Redoubts 9 and 10, defense of the Fusiliers’ Redoubt, and Abercrombie’s Sortie. Info/contact: info@siegeofyorktown.org and see www.siegeofyorktown.org

Letter to the Editor

Charles, December 16, 2005

I sit here laughing at myself for past academic blindness in the subject of "Burr's Mill" as featured in the article by John A. Robertson in your latest issue of SCAR.

First, with sincere humility, let me mention that I am very informed on the subject of the history and genealogy of what was South Carolina’s Ninety Six District, specifically of some of the formed counties of it, and especially of present Union County, SC. Also, I am probably the same on the subject of Major Joseph McJunkin of there.

For years, I have had dozens of persons from all over the U.S. to contact me about the absence of records for persons in that county whom they knew were there and couldn't understand why. They had gleaned those names from past writings. Due to the names, it was obvious to me why. The Scots-Irish of that early date retained their Scottish brogue and "burr." One example was Major McJunkin's mention of the McDonald family when it was actually the McDaniel family. The list continues. Many of the records in the hand of McJunkin that I have proves that.

General Daniel Morgan, born in 1736 in either Hunterdon County, N.J., or County Derry, Ireland (there is still controversy), certainly was not familiar with the names in present Union County, South Carolina. Someone, possibly McJunkin, but certainly Scot-Irish, must have told him that he was camped at Byers Mill and he heard it as Burr's Mill and so wrote in his communiqué to General Greene.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Robertson has solved the problem of the location of "Burr's Mill," even though he was not aware of the reason for the mistaken name.

As an aside, there have been mentions of the Spartan Regiment in your publications. The late Wes Hope, in his book, The Spartanburg Area in the American Revolution, mentioned (page 5) that the insignia was a thirteen-pointed star "on the stock of a rifle." There can be no doubt that he was referring to the rifle of Col. John Thomas, Sr., which was being used by his son, Capt. Robert Thomas, when he was killed in the second Battle of Mud Lick Creek (the home of Col. James Williams). That rifle was obviously picked up that day by a Briton and carried to England when Charleston was vacated. It is now in the British Arms Museum in Windsor Castle in London. Numerous photographs of it appear in my forthcoming book, The Legacy of Father James H. Saye, A Presbyterian Divine. Rev. Saye, as you well know, was the grandson-in-law of Major McJunkin and had acquired all of McJunkin's writings and records. I am attaching a photo that shows that insignia on the ornately silver inlaid rifle stock. The insignia inscription, unreadable in this photo, reads, "States United We Are One." An authority on such rifles viewed the photos and wrote a summary history of it, which appears in my forthcoming book. We have determined, from records, that Col. Thomas had the insignia engraved in 1776.

I send my sincere congratulations and appreciation for your website. I look forward to it each month. You are to be congratulated for your effort and devotion.

Cordially,
Bob Stevens bobhist@yahoo.com
Darlington, SC

Photograph of the ornately carved stock, which appears to the editor to be made of tiger maple, of Col. John Thomas’ (Sr.) rifle. The silver inlaid thirteen-pointed star insignia inscription reads, "States United We Are One." By permission, The Royal Collection, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. Furnished courtesy of Robert J. Stevens, Darlington, S.C.
Battle at Blackstock’s Plantation
225th Anniversary

by Ron Crawley

As a young man, I was present in 1975 when the Musgrove Mill property was turned over to the State of South Carolina, and politicians at that event proudly predicted a State Park would soon be established. It took over 25 years for their prediction to come to pass with the establishment of the Musgrove Mill State Historic Site. Now, another parcel of private property has been entrusted to the state with the same hope of soon becoming a State historic site. William Blackstock's Plantation, the site of SC Patriot militia Gen. Thomas Sumter's great victory, stopping the feared British cavalry officer, Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton, was formally deeded to the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism (SCDPRT) on November 19, 2005.

Reenactors Denley Caughman, Henry McMillan and myself braved frigid temperatures and spent Friday night encamped on a hilltop thought to be SC Patriot militia Lt. Col. Henry Hampton's position during the battle 225 years earlier. We were accompanied by two of my daughters, Hunter (9) and Taylor (5), who complained less about the cold than their elders, and probably enjoyed the camping experience more. The field before us was littered with markers from a recent archaeological dig by the South Carolina Institute of Archeology and Anthropology. In fact, one red flag marker was later located inside one of the tents hastily set up in the darkness! In the morning, we discovered our water containers had frozen solid. Henry, who was the only one of our number who decided to "rough it" by the fire rather than retreat to a tent, was found with a thick covering of frost. Of course, our horses with heavy winter coats made it through the night just fine.

Saturday's dedication ceremony began with a welcome by Brigadier General George Fields, USA, Ret. George had long been a driving force in making the acquisition of the entire battlefield at Blackstock's Plantation a reality and serves as the Military Heritage Director of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation (PCF). Remarks from contributors included Rebecca Winn of International Paper, Donny Betenbaugh from the Union County Council, Eric Holland of the Timken Foundation, and Col. William Whittener of the Union County Historical Society. After an address by Phil Gaines, Director of State Parks, the deed was officially transferred from PCF to SCDPRT. The ceremony concluded with a reenactment of General Thomas Sumter by Howard Burnham, perhaps the most entertaining portion of the program.

Living historians from the 2nd South Carolina Regiment, the New Acquisition Militia and the 3d Continental Light Dragoons portraying McCall's State Troops were a welcome addition to the Saturday festivities. The dragoons displayed some of the skills required of the mounted arm by charging head and ring posts with swords. Afterwards, the militia provided an excellent firing demonstration. Both demonstrations were accompanied by oral presentations, including question and answer periods for the spectators, estimated by park officials to number about 100 persons.

Dan Murphy, in period dress of a South Carolina State Trooper, talks to the crowd while Ron Crawley on “Lebon” (gray gelding) and Henry McMillan on "Lex" (black gelding) wait for their turn at the “head” posts. The head post, shown above in the left side of the photograph, was often used as a cavalry drill to practice mounted sword attacks against infantry. [Photo by Hunter Crawley.]

In a demonstration of the speed and power of mounted troops, Henry McMillan, mounted on “Lex”, performs a flawless forward cut and sends a cabbage head, neatly sliced in two, flying. This practice drill is undoubtedly the origins of Cole slaw. [This amazing photograph with perfect timing to capture the motion of the horse in mid stride, recoil of the saber and flying cabbage was taken by 9 year old Hunter Crawley, daughter of the author.]

Attendance was much lighter on Sunday for the ceremony honoring the anniversary of the battle, probably due to the threat of rain that never amounted to more than a temporary "drizzle" at the site. Representatives from the Daniel Morgan Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), the Fairforest, Henry Laurens, and Kate Barry Chapters of the DAR, as well as the Children of the American Revolution, Children of the American Colonists, and Sons of the American Colonists were all present to lay a wreath at the monument, as members of the SC Independent Rangers, a local militia living history unit, helped out with a ceremonial salute to the men that fought at Blackstock's Plantation.

South Carolina State Park officials were pleased with the weekend. Interpretive Ranger Brian Robeson said, "In all, it was a very successful weekend and we hope to do another event out there before too long." Future events would please the reenactors, many of who indicated a desire to continue to support the park. Long-term plans include developing the site into an interpretive park with kiosks, panels, brochures, and hiking trails. Now, if we can just do it in less than 25 years this time.

Ron Crawley, Gramling, SC. roncrawley@schistory.net 3d Continental Light Dragoons / McCall's State Troops

★
British Lt. John Money - 63rd Regiment of Foot - Killed at Blackstock’s Plantation
November 20, 1780.

by Charles B. Baxley

While visiting the Blackstock’s Plantation battlefield with a group led by George Fields, the question surfaced concerning the rank of British officer John Money and whether or not he was killed by the Patriot militia at the Battle of Blackstock’s Plantation. A fellow guest posited that Money was a lieutenant colonel and killed at Blackstock’s Plantation; I said that I thought he was a lieutenant and that he was not killed. George Fields suggested that Money was of lesser rank than lieutenant colonel but he could not remember Money’s rank precisely. My friend cited Dr. Allen Charles’ excellent book, *The Narrative History of Union County* (S.C.), as his source of Money’s lieutenant colonelcy. I could cite no particular source other than my quiet imperfect memory. Does it really matter? Of course not, but the details and thinking through the research are interesting.

First, about British Army ranks in the Revolutionary War. Their standard officer ranks are similar to modern 21st Century US Army, US Marine Corps, and US Air Force ranks except junior officers titles were coronet, ensign and captain-lieutenant in 18th Century British military establishment as compared to the conventional 2nd lieutenant, 1st lieutenant, and captain of the modern United States Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force. To offer more confusion, often regular establishment British Army officers were given greater Provincial rank, consummate with their responsibilities in the Provincial Regiments formed of local Loyalist citizens, recruited for the duration of the necessity; trained, equipped, and paid by regular British Army standards.

To add another level of confusion, 18th Century armies also occasionally conferred brevet rank - a temporary field rank usually for the duration of the war. I have not seen British officers brevetted for one mission, but they used their Provincial ranks until their unit was decommissioned at which time these officers would return to their old unit at their old ranks.

Another consideration is that sometimes military jobs imply a rank. Such example: a company then, as now, was/generally commanded by a captain (not to be confused with a Naval Captain, which is the equivalent to an US Army, US Marines, or USAF full colonel). So, a lieutenant acting as a company commander may often be called “captain.” Also, each grouping of regiments or of brigades, has a staff officer called the Brigade Major, which job may not necessarily be filled with an officer of major rank, but could be referred to as “Major.”

Now back to John Money in 1780. He was a regular British officer in the 63rd Regiment of Foot. Dr. Allen Charles did refer to Money as “major” in his article on the Battle of Blackstock’s Plantation, published in the April 1996 Union County Historical Association “Historical Newsletter” as did George Fields in his draft explanation of the Blackstock’s battle dated December 31, 2004. However, Dr. Charles in his book, *The Narrative History of Union County, South Carolina,* did not mention John Money by either name or rank. Other popular 20th Century sources, Robert D. Bass’ *Gamecock and Green Dragoon,* refer to Money as a “major”. Gen. Thomas Sumter’s biographer, Anne King Gregorie, fails to mention Money.

This meant that I really needed to review the primary sources. The British military was an organized bureaucracy. Many monthly regimental rosters, payroll records, unit supply and discipline reports, and other correspondence found their way back to England where many unit records are stored in the British Public Records Office in Kew Gardens, London. Also, many permanent (regular establishment) regiments maintain their own museums and archives. We can consider Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton’s official report to his boss, Lord Cornwallis as a contemporary document: Tarleton refers to “Lieutenant Money” as “wounded, but not dangerously”, at his victory at Blackstock’s Plantation. Further reading in Tarleton’s book reports Lt. Money’s death, so my friend was correct about John Money’s eventual death from wounds received at the Battle of Blackstock’s Plantation. Lord Cornwallis, in his report to his boss, Gen. Henry Clinton, reported “Lieutenant Money’s death in his letter of December 3, 1780 and adds the comment: “a most promising officer”. A perhaps better source of John Money’s military rank from the British regular establishment army’s point of view is the War Office’s *A List of all the Officers of the Army: viz. The General and Field Officers of the several Troops, Regiments, Independent Companies and Garrisons*... published by regiment in London; as of 30 June, 1780. It reports John Money is a Lieutenant in the 63rd Regiment of Foot and that he served as its adjutant until replaced by Lt. Henry Bethune Starke [of the Battle of Fishdam Ford fame] on May 30, 1780. Thus the British record is consistent. John Money was a regular establishment lieutenant. Lt. Money also served as aide-de-camp to Lord Cornwallis and accompanied him to Charlotte, NC and back to Winnsboro, SC.

Now, the even more interesting question: why does it appear that American contemporary historians promoted Lt. John Money to a major? My initial hypotheses were: that it made John Money’s death sound better to Patriot ears (propaganda value), Money held brevet rank, or Money had Provincial rank in another regiment. Money was commanding a detachment of the 63rd Regiment of Foot at Blackstock’s Plantation, so he was with his own men. British sources have Money as a lieutenant and American sources as a major.

So to track the source of Lt. John Money’s penned promotion would take more study of the secondary sources over time. No lesser authorities than J.B.O. Landrum in his 1897 *Colonial and Revolutionary History of Upper South Carolina* reports “Major” Money killed at the Battle of Blackstock’s Plantation (p. 251) and cites 18th century historian, physician and revolutionary, David Ramsey, M.D. (Ramsey’s *History of South Carolina,* p.221) as his source. Col. Richard Winn, an eyewitness at the battle, also refers to Money a “major” in Winn’s late-in-life memoir. Lt. Col. Henry “Light Horse Harry” Lee, while not present at the battle, also calls John Money a major in his book, *The American Revolution in the South,* (p. 206 fn). Since the American contemporary histories called John Money major and the British reports and official lists referred to Money as a lieutenant, could there be some Patriot propaganda value in killing Tarleton’s major?

My final clue was found in Gen./Gov. William Moultrie’s book, *Memoirs of the American Revolution, So Far As It Related to the States of North and South Carolina, and Georgia.* There I found reproduced an order issued in Charleston, SC, dated June 30, 1780, and signed by John Money as “Town Major” - no doubt a military position and one fresh in the minds of the then prisoners and future historians, Gen. William Moultrie and David Ramsey, MD. This appears to answer the question; both are correct. Lt. John Money served in Charleston in the summer of 1780 as “town major” for some time while these contemporary historians were prisoners there.

---

SCAR thanks the generous financial contributors who have helped defray some of the costs of publication and distribution of our magazine. Also, SCAR would not amount to much without the authors and researchers who generously share their labors of love. Please consider submitting news items, photos and short articles as well as scholarly theses. When you meet a SCAR financial or research contributor, please thank them for all of us.
Passing the Torch – Children of the Revolution at Blackstock’s Plantation

These youngsters are members of the Fort Pickens Society (Chapter) of the CAR (Children of the American Revolution) from Abbeville and McCormick Counties [SC], shown before the monument at William Blackstock's Plantation on the Tyger River, where they have just completed a "mini-reenactment" of that battle (based on local tradition plus Lt. Col. "Light Horse Harry" Henry Lee's version) using PVC pipes as rifles and grasshoppers. The Cambridge Chapter of the SAR offers this service and other tours of Revolutionary Sites and homes in the Laurens County, SC area to families, school groups, adult and youth groups of at least four persons, free of charge. Contact Compatriot Joe Goldsmith via e-mail at joeg5950@yahoo.com.


The Mayor and City Council of the City of Spartanburg request the honor of your presence at the

Rededication of the Daniel Morgan Monument

on the occasion of
the 225th Anniversary of the
Battle of Cowpens

Tuesday, January 17, 2006
2:00 P.M.
Morgan Square
Sam Fore on Lt. Col. James McCall

by David P. Reuwer

“If I wasn’t in a library, I was writing to a library,” said Sam Fore, historical archivist with Williamsburg’s Rockefeller Library. “I like to take lessons from history.” SC State Historical Site Musgrove’s Mill hosted this historian and SCAR family member speaking on little-known Patriot James McCall and problems with historical research. “We need to go out and look at the primary documents for ourselves.” We all could do well to take Sam’s practical admonition closer to heart. Tenacity is the primary quality America wants in her soldiers, qualified Sam as he reported a personal army story. This is the stalwart attribute McCall embodied fighting in the Revolutionary War. It may also be the foremost quality necessary for historical research.

Sam Fore holds forth on SC Patriot militia cavalry leader, Lt. Col. James McCall at Musgrove Mill.

James McCall (1741-1781) gifted us. He tenaciously fought in 17 Southern Campaigns engagements, reported his historian son, Capt. Hugh McCall. Sam described from primary sources, including James McCall’s son’s book, 11 of these battles including the first siege of Ninety Six, Cherokee Expedition, Kettle Creek, Musgrove Mill, first siege of Augusta, Fish Dam Ford, Blackstock’s Plantation, Long Cane, Hammond’s Store, Cowpens, and Beattie’s Mill. Sam noted that after a lengthy and grueling campaign against the Cherokee, in which McCall was captured for a time, the young freedom fighter could not wait to get another company of men to continue his mission. McCall also got a message of intelligence out to be printed in the Virginia Gazette and made public to the satisfaction of his family, so that they knew he was ok. These early military experiences for McCall had a direct bearing on his later Revolutionary War performance. McCall was often one of the elite soldiers selected for special operations because of his reliability and durability. Then too, he was one chosen for his ability “to spirit up the people” where and when needed. After the Patriot surrender of Charles Town, during Gen. Andrew Williamson’s units’ roll call, only five men among many wanted to continue the fight against the British. Guess who was one of those?

Displayed to my left where I sat listening to Sam’s presentation was part of Joe Goldsmith’s backcountry project, wherein was quoted Draper on James Williams. “He was every inch a patriot…he was rough, rash and fearless.” Also describes the never-to-quit McCall. Sam reported, “history is a people’s experience because it takes more than one to get it done.” So does historical research to bring their lessons forward to us.

Presentation on Lieutenant Colonel James McCall, Given at Musgrove’s Mill State Historic Site, Clinton, South Carolina, on December 17, 2005 by Sam Fore

Good morning. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak with you today. Brian Robeson has designated my talk as “James McCall: A Backcountry Patriot.” However, I have added the subtitle of “Problems in Historical Research.” You will see why as we go along. I was approached to write a few entries on Revolutionary War subjects for the upcoming South Carolina Encyclopedia a few years ago and among the list of potential subjects offered me was James McCall. I must admit here that my initial interest in McCall was self-serving in that I was curious to explore his role only so much as he acted with William Washington during late December 1780 through early March 1781. But as I looked into the records for information, I came to respect and admire him.

This is not going to be a straight lecture for many reasons. Firstly, I want to focus on examining as many primary sources relating to the subject as possible. If there is one thing with which I want you to come away from my presentation today, it is to seek out the primary documentation – that is, manuscripts written during the subject at hand. As you can imagine, this takes lots of time, but it is well worth it. Secondly, look at secondary works with a doubtful eye. Consider the authors’ motives and points of view before accepting their story. Judge Johnson’s Life of Greene is a good example of this. True, he wrote of the southern campaigns with many primary sources at his disposal, as well as interviews with Greene’s associates during the war and his memories of the times. But, there is just as much a political message for the times in which he wrote the book as there is history of a portion of the Revolutionary War. Lastly, I feel that history should be collaborative. We are all laborers in the fields of history and we’re tilling the same gardens to the same end. So why not cooperate? With that in mind, I’d like to open the floor to discussion at the end of my ramblings and we can all gain a better understanding of this man and his remarkable life.

Now back to the subject. First problem: I have yet to see any manuscript materials written by McCall. At all. Second problem: there are very few items written during the revolutionary period that mention McCall specifically. The earliest is a listing of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina militia, dated June 7, 1766.1 He appears in the ranks with his father, James McCall, Sr. Next, he is mentioned in a report of the Reverend William Tennent during his tour of the South Carolina interior in the late Summer of 1775. Tennent writes to the Council of Safety in Charleston from the Long Canes that “three volunteer companies are formed” there with Captain James McCall as the third commander.2 He next appears a few months later in a listing of volunteers and militia before the “Fortified Camp” at South Carolina Department of Archives & History.

2 William Tennent to the South Carolina Council of Safety, Sept. 1, 1775, Robert W. Gibbes Collection of Revolutionary War Manuscripts, S213089.
Ninety Six in November 1775. It is important to notice that McCall has the largest company of the 25 present; with 54 soldiers above average number of 21. He undoubtedly had to have been a charismatic leader. Jewish Patriot Francis Salvador writes to William Henry Drayton in July 1776 that McCall and a party of 20 men had been dispatched by Andrew Williamson to Seneca "to make prisoners of some white men" and that the detachment had been ambushed. Seven men, including McCall, were captured. The next is an interesting Virginia connection that I have tracked down during my time at the Rockefeller Library. In a letter from Colonel William Christian to Patrick Henry, dated October 14, 1776, Colonel Christian reports on the Cherokee Expedition from East Tennessee and adds a note at the end "Cap' Ja' McCall of South Carolina who was taken prisoner by the Cherokees is now with me and a brave man. He has a wife and five children and wishes it to be published in the Gazette that he is here and well, by this means it will get in the Carolina paper and reach his family." Sure enough, Purdie's Virginia Gazette of November 1, 1776 reads: "Cap' Ja' McCall, of South Carolina" is in Colonel Christian's camp "in good health; and desires this piece of intelligence to be made publick, for the satisfaction of his family." Not much appears about our hero until the autumn of 1780. On November 8, 1780, Colonel Benjamin Few of Georgia informs Major General Horatio Gates from the Tyger River that he has detached Colonel Twiggis and Colonel McCall to the southward in order to "keep the spirits of the people" until he can follow with the rest of the Army. There are several primary sources that clearly document his involvement with the Battle of Cowpens and the Race to the Dan. Unfortunately, the last document I have to share is one from McCall's friend Andrew Pickens to General Nathanael Greene referring to the "late Col' M'call" on May 3, 1781.

Not a lot, is there? I'm certain there is more; it just has to be fleshed out. Now let us move on to the secondary sources. First, and most importantly, is the two volume The History of Georgia by Hugh McCall. The son of James McCall, Major Hugh McCall published the first volume in 1811. It is the second volume published five years later, however, that deals almost exclusively with the Revolutionary War. In the narrative of the second volume Major Hugh McCall tells of his father's involvement with the Loyalists at Ninety Six in late 1775. He then tells of his father's mission to capture British Indian agent Alexander Cameron in the summer of 1776. He tells of his capture and ultimate escape weeks later. After the loss of his command and his capture and torture, he goes on to say that McCall convinced Colonel Christian to give him several men from his command to return to the place of his confinement to complete the initial mission. McCall returned to the Indian encampment only to find that Cameron had fled. The narrative relates McCall's role in the battles of Kettle Creek in 1779; Musgrove's Mill, Augusta, Fishdam Ford, Blackstock's, Long Cane, and Hammond's Store in 1780; and Cowpens and Beattie's Mill in 1781. He also tells of Clarke and McCall contracting smallpox in April and of his father's untimely death.

More importantly is the foreword to the 1909 reprint of this work by the noted Georgia historian, Otis Ashemore. He quotes the notes of another son: Thomas McCall. Thomas tells of the family's Scottish roots, from two subsequent generations in Northern Ireland, and then the move to Pennsylvania. He relates the senior James McCall marrying Janet Harris and settling into a farm on Canaconcheque Creek in southeastern Pennsylvania, giving the date of August 11, 1741 for James McCall, Jr.'s birth. He conveys the family's move to western Virginia and, after attacks by Indians, to Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. Here he mentions his father's service "as an advisor" during the Regulator movement in North Carolina and his father's move to Long Cane in 1771 or 1772. He then credits his father as being a captain of minute men in South Carolina as early as 1774 and dying of smallpox and a wound in April 1781. Lastly, he states that his father was in seventeen engagements with the enemy during the Revolutionary War.

Another important source is the notes and pension narrative of Samuel Hammond. In his notes, which seemed to be published in the Charleston Courier for several dates in the late 1850's and abstracted in Joseph Johnson's Traditions..., Hammond tells of General Andrew Williamson visiting the camp of Andrew Pickens in the late spring of 1780 to read the terms of surrender of the American Army in Charleston and to call for continued resistance. Of Pickens' command, only five chose to persevere – two officers and three privates. Naturally, McCall was one of those five. (It is regrettable that Hammond does not give the numbers of the rest of Pickens' command.) He goes on to tell of McCall being called upon to approach Pickens, due to their close friendship, and implore him to re-enter the fight. In his pension narrative, Hammond tells of being promoted to the rank of Major in McCall's regiment before Cowpens, McCall having been promoted to the command of a regiment of

---

3 "A Report of the Militia and Volunteers on Duty in the Fortified Camp ay Ninety Six...", Nov. 19, 1775, Robert W. Gibbes Collection of Revolutionary War Manuscripts, S213089, South Carolina Department of Archives & History.
7 Virginia Gazette, Nov. 1, 1776.
10 McCall, Hugh. The History of Georgia: Containing Brief Sketches of the Most Remarkable Events, Up to the Present Day. 2 Volumes. (Savannah : Seymour & Williams, 1811-1816).
12 Johnson, Joseph. Traditions and Reminiscences, Chiefly of the American Revolution in the South... (Charleston: Walker & James, 1851), 149-154 & 508-515.
From this we can see that there are problems with my brief investigation. Can Thomas McCall’s notes be fully trusted - especially coming from a second-hand source? What of the years 1777 and 1778? Was McCall at King’s Mountain? If not, why not? Note that one son said that he died of wounds and smallpox, and the other son said just smallpox. I could go on, but the bottom line is that more research needs to be conducted to gain a more complete picture of this patriot. We all see different resources and, moreover, some see them differently. We can only gain a better picture of James McCall through collaboration. But before we discuss the details and analyze what we have heard, I want to refocus a moment and use this biography as an example of why we study history. When I was a soldier, I attended a brigade staff exercise once where a retired four-star general oversaw our performance. I recall that he asked each of us what had served in the Second World War, and the Korean and Viet Nam conflicts, so he was more than familiar with the skills of soldierly duty. At the end of the exercise and his evaluation, he asked each of us what one trait the U.S. Army requires in their leaders more than any other?


A young historian with the National Park Service named Jerome A. Greene published in 1976 The Allies at Yorktown: A Bicentennial History of the Siege of 1781. This spiral-bound, in-house monograph was released in a limited edition. Rangers and other staff at Colonial National Historical Park in Virginia relied on it to interpret the Yorktown Campaign for the many American and foreign visitors who flocked to the famous battleground during the American Revolution Bicentennial. A few years ago, Theodore Savas of Savas Beatie LLC, encouraged Greene to produce an expanded and updated version of his Bicentennial study. Savas believed that the Yorktown saga was not properly covered in the historical literature on the War of Independence. Even though Greene had established himself as one of the leading historians of the Indian wars that bloodied the American West after 1865, he heeded Savas’ request, and students of the Revolution can rejoice in the result. Greene’s The Guns of Independence: The Siege of Yorktown, 1781 is the most detailed and accurate military account of the campaign that effectively broke Great Britain’s doomed effort to reclaim the Thirteen Colonies.

On one level, The Guns of Independence is a well-written and exhaustively documented campaign history. At the same time, it serves as an authoritative guide to the Yorktown battlefield and the siege works that the opposing armies erected there. As Greene revised his original monograph, he took pains to immerse himself in the scholarship on Yorktown and the Revolution in the South that has appeared since 1976. He also studied the archaeological reports from the various digs conducted in and around Yorktown, using that data to sharpen his reading of the written record.

Greene begins his book by tracing the decisions and events that brought British Lieutenant General Charles, Earl Cornwallis, and his 5,500-man army to Yorktown. He then describes how General George Washington and General Jean Baptiste, Comte de Rochambeau, took advantage of the temporary availability of French naval supremacy to trap Cornwallis. As the book moves into the period of the siege, Greene carefully surveys the redoubts, batteries, and other earthworks that the opposing sides erected around Yorktown and the lesser British post at Gloucester Point on the north bank of the York River. Greene also takes his time in describing the various patrols, sorties, and bombardments that punctuated the siege, shining a light on incidents that are usually glossed over or wholly omitted from other histories of Yorktown. If anyone wants to know what British, United States, or French forces were doing at any particular point in the siege, this is the first work to consult.

Greene tries hard to maintain his objectivity, but there is no doubt that his sympathies lie with Washington and Rochambeau and the men who followed them to victory. His bias shows especially in dealing with the thousands of slaves who fled to Cornwallis’s army as it swept through Virginia in the spring and early summer of 1781. Like the indignant Virginia planters who found it impossible to believe that their blacks would cast their lot with the enemy rather than live in bondage, Greene insists on characterizing these freedom seekers as “captured” by the British. In actual fact, the slaves who joined Cornwallis did so voluntarily, and there is no credible evidence that the British ever took or held them against their will.

Despite such criticism, The Guns of Independence is a laudable achievement. It deserves a place in any library devoted to military operations in the American Revolution, especially those emphasizing the war in the South.

Reviewed by Gregory J. W. Urwin of Temple University


David K. Wilson’s *The Southern Strategy* is an excellent history of the Revolutionary War battles in the Southern colonies from Great Bridge, Virginia, in December 1775 through the fall of Charleston and the Battle of the Waxhaws in May 1780. Somewhat surprisingly, however, the “southern strategy” itself gets limited coverage. “Southern strategy” is the term used by historians to describe the British government’s plan to retake control of the Southern colonies using Loyalists, Indians and slaves to supplement a limited number of British regular troops. Wilson devotes only two brief sections to the southern strategy itself, looking first at its origins at the outbreak of the Revolution and then at its revival in 1778. His interpretation echoes that of most other historians, concluding that British plans to conquer the South were flawed because they greatly overestimated the number of loyalists in those provinces. As a bad plan that was badly executed, the southern strategy had little chance to succeed. In his discussion of British policy, Wilson focuses almost exclusively on the role of Loyalists, giving only cursory attention to Indians and slaves. He also does not delve deeply into the actual formulation of the southern strategy by British officials.

Minor criticisms aside, Wilson does an outstanding job of covering the many battles that led to the British conquest of Georgia and South Carolina by the summer of 1780. Frequently overlooked engagements such as Great Bridge and Briar Creek in Georgia (March 1779), and Stono Ferry in South Carolina (June 1779) are described in great detail. Each chapter on a specific battle is accompanied by an order of battle section listing the units engaged on each side, their numbers and casualties. Not only are these sections a valuable addition to the text, but they also represent impressive research. Wilson also links these battles to the larger southern strategy to support his view that British officials overestimated loyalist strength. For example, he points out that at the Battle of Moore’s Creek Bridge in North Carolina (February 1776) the actual number of loyalist participants was barely half of the 1,400 said to have been present. Readers seeking a new interpretation of British strategy will not find it in this book. Anyone interested in the military history of the Southern campaigns will be well satisfied and will eagerly await Wilson’s planned second volume on the final years of the war.

**Reviewed by Jim Piecuch**

---

**The British Are Coming!**

**Benedict Arnold’s 1781 Raid of Richmond**

**by Mike Cecere**

The war returned to Virginia in 1781 with the arrival of a British expedition under the infamous American traitor, Gen. Benedict Arnold. On December 31st, 1780 word reached Governor Thomas Jefferson in Richmond that a number of ships were off the Virginia Capes. Their identity and destination were unknown, so Jefferson responded cautiously. With most of the state’s militia weary of service, the Governor wanted confirmation that the ships were a threat before he mobilized any troops. Jefferson sent Virginia Patriot militia General Thomas Nelson to the region to investigate and “take such measures as exigencies may require.”

Jefferson concluded that the report was a false alarm when two days passed without further word. On January 2nd however, he was shocked to learn that a strong British force had entered the James River. Benedict Arnold’s 1,200 man expedition included German jagers (riflemen), mounted Rangers, the 80th British Regiment, and a regiment of Loyalists. Arnold’s mission was to disrupt Virginia’s war effort and reduce the state’s aid to General Nathanael Greene’s army in the Carolinas. Once he realized the danger, Governor Jefferson scrambled to organize Virginia’s defenses. He informed General Nelson that:

> Orders go out by the members of the Assembly to call together Half the Militia of the most convenient Counties...and one fourth from more distant Counties. We mean to have four thousand six hundred Militia in the Field."

The not too flattering Thomas Hart limps hand engraving of Gen. Benedict Arnold was published in London in 1776 after the Patriots failed attempt to capture Quebec. The original plate is now in the British Museum, but some scholars question whether it is an authentic likeness.

Jefferson’s hopes were severely hampered by the sluggish response of war weary Virginians. Less than a hundred men assembled at Hood’s Point, an important artillery position overlooking the James

---

River. On January 3rd, they weakly challenged Arnold’s approach by firing a few shots before fleeing. Arnold continued upriver and landed at Westover Plantation the next day. On the evening of January 4th, he led his troops overland towards Richmond. They arrived outside Virginia’s capital the next afternoon and brushed aside the local militia. Public stores and buildings, as well as a few private dwellings, were pillaged and destroyed. An important foundry outside of Richmond was also damaged.

The next day Arnold’s British troops loaded over forty boats with plunder and sent them down river while they marched back to Westover Plantation. Arnold was eager to return to the protection of his transport ships before Virginia’s militia grew too strong. Captain Johann Ewald of the jaegers recalled that sixty men, fatigued by the rapid pace of the return march, straggled behind and fell into American hands.

Arnold’s force returned to Westover Plantation and the protection of the ship’s guns on January 7th. They remained there until January 10th, when they boarded the ships and continued down river. Reports that the Virginians were waiting at Hood’s Point prompted Arnold to send a force by land to seize the post. The detachment found the battery unoccupied; however, on their return to the ships, however, they were ambushed and suffered over forty casualties. Arnold continued down river and landed at Isle of Wight on January 15th. Five days later, his force entered Portsmouth after a number of skirmishes with local militia.

Arnold and his force would remain in Portsmouth for the next three months, too weak to venture out against the alarmed Virginia militia, but too strong to be forced from Portsmouth. When a French naval squadron arrived in March and severed Arnold’s link to the sea, the Americans began to seriously consider an assault on Portsmouth. The arrival of a British relief force in late March chased the French squadron away and more than doubled the size of the Portsmouth. The next day Arnold’s British troops loaded over forty boats with plunder and sent them down river while they marched back to Westover Plantation. This ended American plans for an assault and put Virginia back on the defensive.

---

5 Boyd, “Arnold’s Invasion as Reported by Jefferson in the Virginia Gazette, 13 January, 1781,” The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. 4, p. 269
6 Ewald, p. 261.
8 Ewald, p. 268.
9 Ibid.
10 Ewald, p. 271.
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Michael A. Cecere teaches in Fairfax County, Virginia, he is a living history hobbyist and has published several excellent books including: An Officer of Very Extraordinary Merit - Charles Porterfield and the American War for Independence; They Behaved Like Soldiers: Capt. John Clinton and the Third Virginia Regiment 1775-1778; and CAPTAIN THOMAS POSEY AND THE 7TH VIRGINIA REGIMENT.

umfspock87@cs.com
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New Fully Searchable CD Version of Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution Available

John Robertson, in cooperation with SCAR, is producing a fully searchable, composite compact disk (CD) of all issues of SCAR.

Features/advantages of the SCAR magazine on Compact Disk (CD):

Each release of the SCAR on CD include full version of all previous SCAR newsletter up to and including the most recent at the time the CDs are mailed out. There is no need to keep more than the last version of the CD received. A menu is provided on the SCAR on CD that allows one to jump immediately to any issue of particular interest. Each issue of the magazine comes up on your computer displaying its first page, with a bar on the left showing “bookmarks” which function as table of contents; one click allows you to jump directly to any magazine feature or article, and also provides a link back to the main menu. This “table of contents” can easily be turned on and off from any page in any issue. For those unable to download the magazine from the Internet, or who have difficulty doing so, SCAR on CD will provide you with the same versions (plus some additional and powerful features) for your computer you obtain with a download. The Adobe Acrobat Reader program is free for your computer. For some who have the capability of viewing the Adobe versions of the magazine on your computer, but have no way of downloading them from the Internet on your computer, the SCAR on CD will provide an alternative to receiving the expensive to copy and mail printed versions. The Adobe files show all images and maps in color, unlike the photocopied versions that are in black and white. For those would like to have printed color versions, it is possible to print (or to have your local Kinko’s, OfficeMax, UPS Store, etc., do it for you) the color versions from the SCAR on CD just the same as it is possible to do with a downloaded version on your home computer’s printer. Each SCAR on CD will contain a consolidated Adobe index, including all matter in all issues up to and including the most recent on the CD. Since all issues to date will be included on each SCAR on CD, this will require no hard drive space on your computer. When a new issue of the SCAR on CD is obtained, the old one may be discarded, donated to your local library, or given to a friend.

Those desiring to receive the next issue of the SCAR on CD should send a check for $20.00 (addressed to, and made out to) John Robertson, 500 Woodside Drive, Shelby NC 28150.

jr1@jrshelby.com
Battle of Green Spring Preservation Update
by Todd Post, 225th Coordinator [www.battleofgreenspring]

With the recent discussions about providing input to change a government policy for the good of the hobby, I thought I would offer an opportunity for people to thank government officials for their support of battlefield preservation and to encourage them to continue support in the upcoming year. On December 13, 2005 the James City County Board of Supervisors approved $2.9 million toward the Jamestown Campsites and Yacht Basin acquisition. This means we need about $3.8 million in additional funding to complete the purchase next December. We hope that $1 million of this will come from an addition federal grant from NOAA’s Coastal & Estuarine Land Conservation Program (CELCP).

Thanks to legislative members for leadership/assistance/support in securing $2 million from NOAA’s Coastal & Estuarine Land Conservation Program in FY 06 for the permanent protection of the 198-acre Jamestown campground and public marina. This appropriation has leveraged over $6,750,000 in local, state and private funding and has enabled James City County and its partners to make great strides in raising the $12.5 million purchase price. An additional appropriation of $1 million in FY 07 is vital to completing this important acquisition. CELCP funding will: provide permanent protection of 110 acres of open space with frontage on the James River and Powhatan Creek; provide canoe and kayak access to the Powhatan Creek and James River “blueways”; preserve portions of the biologically-rich Powhatan Creek Natural Area; protect portions of an important 1781 American Revolution battlefield; protect the views from Jamestown Road, the Jamestown Ferry and the National Park Service's Colonial Parkway - the gateways to the Jamestown historic core; provide the first segment of the Virginia Capital Trail, a segment of the East Coast Greenway; link an array of local, state and federally protected lands and resources which include Historic Jamestowne on Jamestown Island (managed by the National Park Service and APVA) and the Jamestown Settlement (owned and managed by the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation); and provide the site for “Anniversary Park” - an essential venue for the Jamestown 2007 educational, cultural, and commemorative signature events and community activities aimed at drawing worldwide attention. Special thanks also go to Senator Norment and Delegate Callahan for their leadership in securing $3 million for the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation. This $3 million will enable JYF to acquire up to 10 acres of the 198-acres and adds significant dollars toward to over acquisition price and success of this important project.

For more information on what you may do to support acquisition of the important Revolutionary War site, contact Todd Post at todd.post2@verizon.net.

Excerpt of an artistic French map of the Battle of Green Spring on the James River, Virginia found in the Library of Congress labeled “Plan du terrain à la rive gauche de la rivière de James vis-à-vis Jamestown en Virginie ou s’est livré le combat du 6 juillet 1781 entre l’armée américaine commandée par le Mis. de La Fayette et l’armée angloise aux ordres du Lord Cornwallis.” [Signé:] Desandroüins.
http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/map_item.pl
The Archaeological Reconnaissance and Computerization of Hobkirk’s Hill (ARCHH) project has begun initial field reconnaissance on this built-over, suburban battlefield. We are using the professional-amateur cooperative archaeology model. The topographic map above identifies our initial survey area. We will only test properties within this initial survey area until we demonstrate artifact recoveries to any boundary. Since the battlefield is in well-landscaped yards and there are dozens of homeowners we are only surveying lots that we receive landowner permission. We will not attempt to cover 100% of the land with in the survey area.

ARCHH is fortunate to have the guidance of an experienced group of archaeologists. Our professional archaeology advisors include Prof. Larry Babits of East Carolina University, Carl R. Steen of Diachronic Research Foundation, Jason Smith of the Borough Plantation, Bobby Southerlin and Dawn Reid of Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Inc., Jim Legg of SCIAA, and Project Archaeologist Tariq Ghaffar. Bobby Southerlin is the project’s senior archeological consultant.

We selected two lots which are under new house construction to test to 1) determine if any 18th Century military artifacts are present, 2) to refine our search protocols, and 3) to perfect our data collection, cataloguing and posting techniques. As previously reported, we recovered thirteen 18th Century military artifacts on test lot #1, on the west side of Broad Street where Col. Campbell’s Virginians made a trailed arms flanking maneuver down Hobkirk’s Hill. Our second test lot (with a new house almost completed thereon) at the NE corner of Greene and Lytton Streets, is formerly part of the Holly Hedge property. John Allison, Jim Legg, and Tariq Ghaffar have almost finished a detailed survey of test lot #2. Thus far on test lot #2, our team has recovered one piece of flattened lead (may or may not be colonial period) along with much yard trash. Remember, negative areas searched may mean we are outside the metallic 18th Century battlefield metallic object scatter area that the areas have been worked by other metal detectorist or destroyed by landscaping, but this negative information is also critical for our survey.

Project Archaeologist Tariq Ghaffar is also available to capture data from old finds, so if you know anyone who has Hobkirk’s Hill battlefield relics, we would like to identify, photograph and locate them for our catalogue and database. If anyone has a connection with some unused, secure space near Hobkirk Hill that we can access and borrow for our artifact conservation lab and temporary storage space, please let SCAR know.

The skilled labor for the project is based upon volunteers. Each will be trained in the project’s protocols and rules. Volunteers will sign a written agreement that outlines our agreement to adhere to the project’s protocols and professional archaeological standards. John Allison will orient all field volunteers and supervise field operations.

Mike Jones, our computer guru, is working on getting the detailed archaeology site maps and catalogue on-line on the ARCHH website at www.hobkirk.org. This website also contains many historic documents and battlefield maps. His prototype map is found at http://www.hobkirkhill.org/prototype. Please give Mike any suggestions. We will plot the finds on a master Geographic Information System available by the Internet.

Project Archaeologist Tariq Ghaffar has designed a spreadsheet to catalogue our finds that Mike Jones will put on-line. Tariq has measured and mapped the test lot #1 and reports the finds in the article below. Archaeologist Carl Steen has photographed the test lot #1 artifacts. Tariq has gridded the search areas and mapped test lot #2. Tariq has the test lot #1 artifacts for conservation and presentation to the landowners. Carl Steen, Jim Legg, and Jason Smith helped with the initial object classification.

Any contributions to support this project may be made through Historic Camden so they are tax deductible. Please coordinate your donations with Joanna Craig, director at Historic Camden. Let SCAR know if you wish to lend a hand with the project. We need volunteers with administration, communications, surveying & mapping, cataloging, photography as well as metal detection abilities.
Update: Archaeological Reconnaissance & Computerization of Hobkirk’s Hill
Test Lot One
by Tariq Ghaffar, Project Archaeologist

Fig. 1: 617 Greene Street. Property looking west across broad open area. New home foundation completed.
[Photo by Tariq Ghaffar.]

The first property addressed on the metal detector survey of the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill was that of 617 Greene Street, owned by Mr. and Mrs. William P. “DeeBo” Kelly, III. This property was selected first due to imminent impact caused by the sell-off and development of a south parcel of the lot. The lot was metal detected three times—once in April by John Allison and George Beall, in October 2005 by David Reuwer and John Allison, then again on December 10, 2005 by John Allison and James Allison after timber was cleared, stumps were pulled and construction on a new home [for Charles V. B. Cushman, III, Esq.] was begun.

The lot (treated not as two pieces of land, but as a whole) consists of 2.31 acres. It lies on the south side of Greene Street and on the mid southern slope of the west Hobkirk’s Hill. The standing Kelly residence, built near the putting green of the Kirkwood Golf Course in about 1900, lies on the upper northern portion of the property on an area that is terraced, heavily planted, and landscaped. The terrain continues to the south in what appears to be a natural southerly slope, with few trees or obstructions (referred to in Fig.1 as broad open area)

at the time of our visit on December 10th. Between the two visits, large mature hardwoods had been removed from the southwestern portion of the lot, to provide a drive access to the southwest subdivided parcel. The removal of these arboreal obstructions allowed metal detectors to examine previously unsurveyable ground on the second visit. A house foundation was also constructed in the southwest quadrant of the property between visits. By the time the lot was photographed (see Fig.’s 1 & 2), much change appeared to have taken place, though the topographic terrain remained the same. In short, disturbance caused by construction (up to December 10, 2005) seemed minimal and superficial.

Fig. 2: New driveway opened by construction on Test Lot #1 at 617 Greene Street property looking south – down Hobkirk Hill from NW property corner on Greene Street.
[Photo by Tariq Ghaffar.]

Thirty metallic artifacts were recovered from the property. They were broken into six primary categories. These categories are the same as those being used to sort the artifacts recovered from the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology’s survey of the Battle of Camden. The categories consist of: lead shot associated with the battle (S); arms and accoutrements, not including ammunition (A); clothing artifacts (C); iron and lead canister shot (G); miscellaneous artifacts, probably or possibly associated with the battle (M); and of miscellaneous artifacts not associated with the battle (N).

Antique post card of the Hobkirk Inn, built as Pine Flat on Lyttleton and Greene Streets in Camden, SC. This mansion was converted to a tourist hotel in about 1900 and later reconverted into a single-family residence. Note the 18th Century cannon used as a lawn decoration. Antidotal evidence from artifacts recovered on these grounds suggests that fighting was heavy on these grounds on April 25, 1781. See picture of an officer’s sword in Kennedy and Kirkland’s Historic Camden, Vol. 1, p. 257. The Hobkirk Inn is at the southern base of the eastern flank of Hobkirk Hill.
Fig. 3: Rough Field Map—plotted numbers correspond with bag numbers. North portion of lot not surveyed. The south-center of this lot was excavated in 1989 and Hurricane Hugo yard debris was buried explaining the lack of 18th Century metallic artifacts in this area. [Sketch map by Tariq Ghaffar.]

Archaeologists Jason Smith, James B. Legg and Tariq Ghaffar, as well as ARCHH team members and various experts on certain types of historic artifacts examined all the artifacts. As of this writing, conservation of artifacts has not yet begun. All artifacts photographed are in their un-conserved state. They will be re-photographed after conservation has taken place.

Eighteen of 30 finds on the property consisted of lead shot. These were analyzed using Daniel Sivilch’s chart of musket ball weights and calibers (see Figure 11 and as published in Vol. 2, Number 1 SCARe, January 2005), levels of patina and second opinions of numerous and experienced archaeologists and amateur researchers. By this process, 11 of the shots were determined to be associated with the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill (S). Three were determined to be possibly or probably associated with the battle (M), and four were determined to not be associated with the battle (N).

Antique post card of Holly Hedge pond, the site of the spring in a hollow on the east flank of Hobkirk Hill used by Gen. Greene’s troops.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS #</th>
<th>Bag#</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Artifact Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>492.6</td>
<td>515.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perforated Lead Strap with Tooled Edge</td>
<td>Indet. 18th Century</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>489.5</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harmonica Reed Plate</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>476.3</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Light bulb Collar</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>448.5</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (31.0 g; .7011 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lead Ball Fragment</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>456.5</td>
<td>515.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckshot (3.6 g; .3420 cal.)</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>435.5</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (21.6 g; .6216 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century French</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>450.4</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckshot (1.5 g; .2555 cal.)</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td>518.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Squarish Lead Slug (16.1g; .5636 cal.)</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>436.5</td>
<td>545.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckshot (1.75 g; .2715 cal.)</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>437.5</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckshot (5.4 g; .3915 cal.)</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>449.5</td>
<td>537.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 cm iron strap/plate</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>475.5</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (29.7 g; .6912 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>451.6</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eagle Effigy Bayonet Pommel (zinc alloy)</td>
<td>20th Century German</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>477.5</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (30.5 g; .6973 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>475.5</td>
<td>539.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckshot (2.6g; .3069 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>475.5</td>
<td>539.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckshot (2.7g; .3108 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>439.5</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckshot (5.5g; .3939 cal.)</td>
<td>Indet. 18th Century</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>447.5</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (22.7g; .6319 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century French</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>452.5</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern Ball Bearing</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>485.5</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (23 g; .6347 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century French</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>452.5</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (30 g; .6935 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>472.5</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brass Leather Rivet</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brass Leather Rivet</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>443.5</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9cm x 4cm Lead Strap w/ Small Perforation</td>
<td>Indet. 18th Century</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>437.5</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brass Finial w/ Screw at Base</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>438.5</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5 cm Brass Tube w/ Funnel-shaped end</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>472.5</td>
<td>543.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (32.4 g; .7115 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>453.5</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fired Musket Ball (29.5 g; .6896 cal.)</td>
<td>18th Century English</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>440.5</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unidentified Brass Machine Part</td>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4: Artifact Catalog for 617 Greene Street**

Of the eleven lead projectiles determined to be of the battle, six are musket balls of a caliber (.68-.70) typical of the 18th Century English army. Five shots, consisting of two musket balls of the caliber (.63-.66), compatible with French-made muskets supplied to and used by the Continentals, and three pieces of buckshot of a caliber (.29-.31), consistent with Continental Army use during this period, comprise the remainder.

What to call this battle? As a local growing up at the foot of Hobkirk Hill, we always called the sandy hill by its shorthand name “Hobkirk Hill”. Only later did I speculate that it was named for a person, making the possessive form, “Hobkirk’s Hill”, more technically appropriate. Unfortunately, I do not believe any land grant or other evidence has surfaced showing that anybody named Hobkirk ever owned the hill. The great local historians, Kennedy and Kirkland, who wrote *Historic Camden* in 1905, also called it “Hobkirk’s Hill” and the battle fought thereon, the battle of “Hobkirk Hill”. The editors of the Greene papers call it “Hobkirk’s Hill” in their notes, but Gen. Nathanael Greene, in his official report simply called it the “Hill”. Since it was fought closer to Camden than the Battle of Camden/Gum Swamp, it was sometimes called the “2d Battle of Camden”, especially in pension affidavits. Camdenite, Samuel Mathis, wrote an extensive report on the battle in 1819 to Gen. William Richardson Davie, called it “Hobkirk’s Hill”. My friend, Dr. Larry Babits, who has done much research on the soldiers who fought in this battle, prefers to call it the “Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill”. So there you have it. Ed.
Antique post card of the magnificent Kirkwood Hotel, built on the crest of west Hobkirk Hill in Camden. The hotel faced south and a nine-hole golf course was built in front of the hotel on the western portion of the Hobkirk’s Hill battlefield. The hotel was torn down during WWII, but some of the retaining walls shown in this photograph are extant. The Kirkwood Hotel was named for Capt. Robert Kirkwood of the Delaware Continental line, hero of the Battles of Camden and Hobkirk’s Hill.

Fig. 5: Continental shot. Top row, left to right: FS #’s 7, 19 & 21. Bottom row, left to right: FS #’s 16 & 17. [Photo by Carl Steen.]

Fig. 6: Weights and extrapolated calibers of shot recovered from 617 Greene Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS, #</th>
<th>Bag #</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Caliber</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.0g.</td>
<td>.7011</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6g.</td>
<td>.3420</td>
<td>Indet-too large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.6g.</td>
<td>.6216</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5g.</td>
<td>.2555</td>
<td>Indet-too small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1g.</td>
<td>.5636</td>
<td>Indet-slug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.75g.</td>
<td>.2715</td>
<td>Indet-too small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4g.</td>
<td>.3915</td>
<td>Indet-too large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.7g.</td>
<td>.6912</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.5g.</td>
<td>.6973</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.6g.</td>
<td>.3069</td>
<td>Continental buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.7g.</td>
<td>.3108</td>
<td>Continental buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.5g.</td>
<td>.3939</td>
<td>Indet-too large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.7g.</td>
<td>.6319</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.0g.</td>
<td>.6347</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.0g.</td>
<td>.6935</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.4g.</td>
<td>.7115</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.5g.</td>
<td>.6896</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remaining seven pieces of shot (see Fig. 8) are comprised of a rectangular slug of lead, designated (M), as its original size/shape is unknown, a lead ball fragment (M), which appears to have been incidentally cut out of a tree by a saw or axe, two pieces of buckshot determined to be too small for the military period (N), and two pieces of buckshot which were determined to be too large for the military period (N). In addition, these remaining seven shots include a piece of buckshot (FS# 18) measuring .3939 cal., which is probably 18th Century shot, was included as a probable/possible associate of the battle (M), despite its large caliber, as it appears (like FS. #’s 16 & 17) to have been fired, it has a prominent mold-mark, and it exhibits a high level of patination.

Six other non-projectile artifacts possibly or probably associated (M) with the battle include a 31mm x 16mm lead strap with a slot cut in the center of it and exhibiting shear-marks on its edges, a 130mm x 40mm iron strap/plate with at least one possible attachment hole, whose shape is suggestive of a musket butt-plate (M), two brass leather rivets which are archaeologically ubiquitous and could be associated with any period from the 18th Century through today (M), a 9cm x 4cm lead strap with a small nail-hole punched through it (M), and a brass finial, whose function is undetermined, with a screw in its base (M). (See Figure 9.)

An afternoon chucker of polo in Camden. The extant historic polo field was located north, behind the Kirkwood Inn. This was probably the area of the Virginia Continental’s camp on April 23 and 24, 1781. The crest of the hill is visible in the background of the polo field photograph. The camera is facing southeast, the direction of the Virginians flanking maneuver towards Lord Rawdon’s army at the south base of the other side of the hill.
Six non-projectile artifacts whose affiliation seemed to be not related to the battle were also recovered. They included a modern light bulb collar, a harmonica reed plate (no earlier than mid-19th Century), a modern ball-bearing, an unidentified brass machine part, a brass tube with a funnel shaped edge (which appears to be a piece of modern plumbing), and a zinc alloy eagle-effigy knife pommel, determined to be a German SS policeman’s ceremonial dress bayonet, likely a WWII souvenir (see Fig. 10).

To summarize, 30 artifacts were collected. Of those, ten were discounted as not relevant to the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill. Of the remaining twenty artifacts, nine may or may not be associated with that day’s events, and eleven are consistent with military arms of those armies at that period of history (see Fig. 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of Artifacts</th>
<th>% of Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the eleven pieces of shot that were readily identifiable as being from the battle, six were determined to be British musket balls and five (including three musket balls made for French muskets, and two pieces of buckshot of the caliber almost exclusively preferred by Continentals at this time) were diagnosed as American. All musket balls were fired. None were dropped. Though buckshot does not exhibit traits indicating fired or unfired condition as readily as ball, the two pieces of buckshot recovered and typed as being Continental, based on caliber, do exhibit signs of impact from firing.

In conclusion, three questions regarding this property’s data might be asked in reference to the limited amount of work done so far on Hobkirk’s Hill survey. First - are these significant concentrations of artifacts? Second - are there any battle factors that can be surmised from this property’s data? And third - what other questions does this data raise?

In response to the first question: yes, there may be a concentration of artifacts. Artifacts seem to be concentrated in the mid-west and the southwest corner of the property (See Fig. 12) with the exception of three diagnostic artifacts next to the far eastern boundary. Given the small sampling of the battlefield overall, not much can be surmised from the concentrations at 617 Greene Street alone. However, with the systematic survey of surrounding properties, this property’s small part of the big picture will become clearer. Note too, a) ARCHH only did approximately two-thirds of this lot due to extant built features and b) anecdotal proof was provided ARCHH that a large hole was dug in the center-south of the subject lot to dispose of Hurricane Hugo debris in 1989.

Secondly, we can infer certain things about the Battle of Hobkirk’s Hill as it pertains to 617 Greene Street. We can infer that this lot of west Hobkirk’s Hill was well-fought-over ground. These current finds are consistent with the archival history that the Continental Line right flank with arms trailing advanced down hill over this lot. But we cannot induce either the extended location of the Continental line or the British line, given an apparent absence of dropped ammunition, arms, accoutrements and clothing artifacts. We can also infer that the address probably lies either between where the lines were located, or possibly on a periphery of military action. This little cluster of evidence does show that the Virginian flank was taking fire as it descended.

Of course, as with any archaeological investigation, new questions are raised with each find. Did the Virginia Regiments of the Continental Army stand or even camp on the property to the north, uphill and on the other side of modern Greene Street? How far to the south would the British line be located? Had the Continentals begun to use irregular buckshot since the Battle of Camden? And who brought a Nazi knife to Hobkirk’s Hill? Only future investigations can answer these questions, but given the amount of data found at 617 Greene Street, the quality and quantity of data yet to be yielded by other properties is promising.
"Our greatest enemy and principal warrior of the Creek nation":

THE STORY OF THE CREEK WARRIOR EMISTESEGO

by Robert Scott Davis

During the last decade of the colonial period and the American Revolution, the British depended heavily upon the influence of Indian leader Emisteseguo, "the Big fellow" (also called Guristersigo, "the Magnificent"), to keep the Creek Indians in line. He was the first in a long line of leaders so controlled by whites to manipulate the Creeks.

The father of Emisteseguo, however, upon his death, made the future warrior promise to always be a friend of the British, a commitment that must have been difficult for the young man to keep but which served him well until his death. He began his rise in 1763 at Augusta, Georgia when the British discovered Emisteseguo had some influence with the Mortar, the most anti-British of the Creek headmen. The following year The Big Fellow aided the British in having two Cherokees assassinated to prevent a Creek-Cherokee anti-British alliance being arranged by the Mortar. He increasingly became a mediator between the Creeks and such British leaders as Indian Superintendent John Stuart and Georgia Governor James Wright, particularly at the 1763, 1768, and 1773 treaties of Augusta; at a meeting of the Upper Creeks in 1764; and following the deaths of Georgians settlers by Creek war parties in 1773-1774. He also helped Stuart to suppress illegal Indian traders and, in 1771, to squelch a potential Creek-Shawnee anti-British alliance. In 1766, Emisteseguo arranged for the assassinations of Creek warriors for killing white settlers—the first such killings in thirteen years. The Creek leader was not blind to his people being used, robbed, and abused by the American colonists and their leaders but no matter how much he protested, he always obeyed his British masters.

Emisteseguo's rise in influence was mutually self-serving. Among the Creeks, he represented the British power that had humbled the Cherokees, while the King's agents needed him to obtain more land for the Georgia settlers and to mitigate problems that could lead to a war or a multi-tribe anti-white alliance. Emisteseguo was the only one of the five major medal chiefs created by the British who was not an old man and a reluctant ally. He was also one of the first of the new generation of Creek leaders that followed the end of the long rule by the Brims. Georgia Governor James Wright commissioned Emisteseguo as commander and head warrior of the Creeks on September 6, 1768.

From the 1760s to the American Revolution, the British orchestrated a war between the Creeks and an alliance of the Choctaws and the Chickasaws to keep the Indians at war with each other rather than against the colonists. Emisteseguo played a major role in that effort. The fighting began in 1765 with a challenge issued to Emisteseguo by the Choctaws, against whom he won a major victory near Little Tallassee in 1767. He was, however, wounded in a Choctaw ambush in 1773. With the death of the Mortar in another ambush during the following year, Emisteseguo became the most powerful leader among the Creeks. The British finally ended that war in the early days of the American Revolution so that the Indians might be set against the rebelling Americans.

The Big Fellow had unlikely beginnings. Although his father was a headman who had been awarded a minor medal by the British for his support, his mother was a slave and the Creeks traced descent through the female parent. Emisteseguo was also

Emisteseguo and Creek Diplomacy

by Jeff Dennis, Morehead State University

Dr. Robert Scott Davis describes the life and career of Emisteseguo, a leading spokesman and warrior among the Upper Creek (Muscogulge) nation during the era of the American Revolution. With engaging narrative, Dr. Davis comments upon Emisteseguo's rise to prominence as a British-appointed "medal chief" and recounts his most memorable martial exploits. The author identifies well the headman's importance during an increasingly disruptive and tragic time in his people's history. Whereas Dr. Davis emphasizes Emisteseguo's career as a warrior, I will briefly explore his contributions in diplomacy.

The second half of the eighteenth century differed dramatically from the first—particularly for those indigenous peoples who bordered upon European settlement. Prior to the 1760s, careful military alliances and ample commerce with Indians were understood as essential elements for colonial success. Native leaders adroitly bargained among competing imperial powers and colonies, forcing them to operate upon a multi-tiered and trans-cultural "middle ground." Conditions changed markedly for Native Americans with the defeat of France and the rapid expansion of British American settlement following the Seven Years' War. No longer did colonists regard Indians as crucial allies and trading partners. Instead they increasingly ignored native autonomy and boldly moved to wrest away huge tracts of land. Tensions with native communities escalated throughout eastern America during the waning colonial years. Wishing to avoid a costly repeat of Pontiac's War (1763-64), imperial policy-makers too were nonplussed by the colonists' unauthorized invasions.

Little wonder that during the Revolutionary era the majority of native peoples favored British order over American usurpation. For England offered at least some aegis against the aggressive and otherwise non-negotiable intrusion upon their homes and lands. In return, native peoples offered British administrators such as southern Indian superintendent John Stuart important allies for empire. The demarcation of boundary lines, a well-regulated and balanced trade, the officially sanctioned punishment of interlopers in Indian territory: such policies, it was hoped, could keep the colonists in check.

Among the Creeks, Emisteseguo of the village of Little Tallassee was John Stuart's most trusted associate during the late 1760s and 1770s. "War honors and skillful eloquence" already had prepared Emisteseguo's rise within the Muscogulge nation, when Stuart awarded him the "great medal" in 1765. "A man of clarity and great good sense," Emisteseguo engaged quite capably in both village and imperial politics. In particular, his diplomacy promoted two objectives. First, Emisteseguo always sought a generous and steady trade—without which his people would be bereft of essential material and military power. Second (and dependent upon the first objective) was Emisteseguo's determination to protect Upper Creek lands. "An occasional limited purchase might be entertained, but only when it somehow promoted the Muscogulges' overall strategic advantage."

Emisteseguo became well acquainted with John Stuart during the intertribal Congress of Augusta in 1763. Early the following year, he communicated Upper Creek acceptance of the treaty to Royal Governor James Wright of Georgia. Therein, Emisteseguo accentuated that Georgians must keep their slaves and livestock, as well as themselves, on the correct side of the anticipated boundary line. In response to colonists' grievances concerning attacks and theft, Emisteseguo blamed the Lower Creeks, (who lived to the south and east of the Alabaman Muscogulges), and he chided them further for ceding land.
a member of the Tyger Clan, the most anti-British of the Creeks, and had been born in Little Tallassee, a village of the Abeik tribe of the Upper Creeks that stood almost within sight of French Fort Toulouse.

During the American Revolution, Emisteseguo remained steadfastly loyal to the British. In 1776, when the Cherokees attacked the southern frontier against the wishes of British Indian Superintendent John Stuart, Emisteseguo successfully kept most of his people out of the fighting. In 1777, pro-American Creeks nearly succeeded in having him assassinated because of raids he led against the Georgians. He was only saved by the physical intervention of a new Creek headman, Alexander McGillivray, whose position as Creek leader Emisteseguo now recognized. In the spring of 1778, he attempted to lead 600 warriors to the British army in Savannah. They were defeated on the Georgia frontier and Emisteseguo's son was captured but later released as a peace gesture. Nevertheless, in 1781, Emisteseguo led 1,000 warriors against the settlements in present-day Tennessee and Kentucky.

The Big Fellow’s last and most famous battle took place on June 24, 1782, when he attempted to break through the American lines around British occupied Savannah. He must have known that the war would soon end in an American victory and a final evacuation of the king’s army in Georgia. With 150 warriors, a British officer, and a British flag, Emisteseguo attacked what he thought was only a picket at Gibbons Plantation but was actually an entire American camp. At first the Creeks were successful but American General Anthony Wayne rallied his men and personally led a bayonet charge against the Indians. The fighting became hand-to-hand, with bayonets, tomahawks, clubs, and swords, before the Creeks finally withdrew. Many of these warriors and the white men who accompanied them, however, reached the British lines to join some 1,000 Cherokees brought into the besieged town by Georgia Loyalist militia Colonel Thomas Waters.

The Indians, like many of the escaped slaves and white Loyalists would be abandoned by the cause they had come to serve, but not The Big Fellow. During this fight, Emisteseguo shot Wayne's horse and then rushed forward to kill the general with a club while Wayne lay trapped under the fallen horse. A trooper, however, killed the Creek headman with a sword before he reached the general. Ironically, Anthony Wayne had, eight years before and as a Pennsylvania assemblyman, urged an American alliance with Emisteseguo against the Chootaws. He now eulogized him in 1782 as "our greatest enemy and principal warrior of the Creek nation." As was common in such battles, Emisteseguo and the other fallen Indians were not buried but, in the words of Georgia Governor John Martin, were "left to the ravenous wolves and the birds of the air."

Robert Scott Davis serves as professor of history and the director of the Family & Regional History Program at Wallace State College, P. O. Box 687, Hanceville, AL 35077-0687. His more than 1,000 publications on southern history and records began with his report on the Kettle Creek Revolutionary War Battlefield in 1974. This May, Mercer University Press will publish his book GHOSTS AND SHADOWS OF ANDERSONVILLE. Home: (205) 429-5251. Office: (256) 352-8265; Office FAX: (256) 352-8228; Office e-mail: gens@hiwaay.net

Returning home, Emisteseguo took care to report to the Mortar and the Gun Merchant. These older, more established headmen were not as sanguine about treating with the English, and they were more suspicious of new trading houses proposed for Mobile and Pensacola along the Gulf Coast. Unable to secure their support for the posts, Emisteseguo tactfully praised his elders’ talks and waited for a more propitious occasion to further his crusade for trade.

The following year, 1765, Emisteseguo accompanied the Mortar to a congress convened at Pensacola. Having prepared rapprochement on both sides of the Indian line, Emisteseguo now got what he wanted: in exchange for ceding a thin strip of land from Pensacola to Mobile, the Creeks were awarded a Gulf Coast trade with prices to be set lower than those afforded by Carolina or Georgia. Capping off the conference, Emisteseguo, the Mortar, and three other Muscogulge headmen were selected as “medal chiefs.”

Had the agreements negotiated at Augusta and Pensacola been honored, native as well as imperial spokesmen would have been satisfied. The problem was, by the late 1760s, both sets of leaders were losing influence among their people. When in 1768 London failed to support Stuart’s ambitious agenda for Indian trade regulation, colonists became emboldened, heightening their attack upon the superintendent’s carefully designated boundary lines; in open defiance of his authority, the southern colonies and even private individuals negotiated purchases upon Indian lands that already being invaded by itinerates and squatters.

Young warriors in several southeastern villages refused to stand the insult. Some trespassers were killed. Many others were stripped of their possessions and driven out. To protect the Upper Creeks and their trade, Emisteseguo repeatedly visited and soothed Georgia and West Florida officials, insisting that peoples other than his own were responsible for the acts of violence. Concerning the less egregious issues of confiscation and eviction, the southern Indians received encouragement from the imperial superintendent: “When you meet white hunters in the woods,” Stuart counseled the Creeks in 1771, “you have a right to the skins of your own deer and the guns with which they were killed,” and to oblige “such offenders to remove.”

By the early 1770s, the invasion of Indian country was becoming a huge problem that no orders from Charleston or London and no actions taken by Little Tallassee or Cussita were going to solve. Emisteseguo recognized probably as well as anyone the symbiosis between well-regulated trade and preservation of tribal lands. He knew that when one objective failed so must the other - with the loss of Muscogulge autonomy as the inevitable result. Accelerating these difficulties - and to the delight of Georgia officials - during the last colonial decade, the Creeks warred invariably with the Chootaws.

Stuart and Emisteseguo joined forces to strongly oppose the so-called “New Purchase” of sixty square miles along the Savannah River foisted by colonial traders upon the Creeks late in 1771. Negotiated the previous year with the Cherokees, who were not the true possessors of the land, the sale was hyped as a reasonable and effective means of relieving the growing Indian trade debt. Muscogulges were outraged. Emisteseguo threatened war if the purchase was approved. But he was outflanked by Lower Creek leaders who caved in to the traders. For his part, John Stuart did everything he could to block the cession. In 1773, however, charmed by Georgia Governor James Wright, the imperial Board of Trade decided to ratify the purchase. Violence erupted along the Georgia frontier. To preempt full-scale attack, the colony invoked a trade embargo. Completely frustrated, Emisteseguo and other imperial leaders could only accept the inevitable.
As the sun hung low on the morning of August 19, 1780, Colonels Elijah Clarke, James Williams, and Isaac Shelby were preparing their men for what one of them would later refer to as one of the hardest fought battles of the Southern Campaign of the American Revolution. Their force of some 200 men was comprised of militia from areas of Georgia, North and South Carolina, and the Watauga settlement who had come together to attack a Loyalist force they believed to be about 200 strong camped on the south side of the Enoree River at the home of Edward Musgrove. What they learned upon their arrival would change everything. Not only were there 200 Loyalists at Musgrove’s Mill, but another 300 hundred men, most of whom were British Provincial Regular soldiers, had arrived the previous evening, bringing the total force to 500 men. Outnumbered and, seemingly, outmatched, the Patriots still chose to fight rather than retreat. Using classic guerilla tactics, the Patriots were able to lure this joint British force of Loyalist militia and Provincial Regulars into a clearing north of the Enoree River, where, after a short but ferocious fight, the Patriots could claim a resounding and morale boosting victory.

With the 225th anniversary year of the Battle of Musgrove’s Mill upon us, it is a good time not only reflect on the importance of the battle, but to look forward also to the promising future of the site where the battle took place.

In May 2003, Musgrove Mill State Historic Site officially opened its gates as the 46th park in the South Carolina State Park Service. Visitors to Musgrove Mill State Historic Site can learn about the Battle of Musgrove’s Mill through a fiber-optic exhibit located on the park’s Visitors’ Center, which also includes exhibits on Heroines of the American Revolution and the Southern Campaign of the American Revolution. The site also includes a ½ mile interpretive trail that identifies the Edward Musgrove home and mill sites, as well as areas where the Loyalists and Provincials had set up their camp prior to the battle, as well as a picnic area and access to scenic Horseshoe Falls.

That is the present; the future of the park is very bright. Currently, the site of the Battle of Musgrove’s Mill owned by the park is not open to the public, but that is only temporary. Plans have begun on an interpretive trail through the battlefield, as has a plan to restore the field to its historic appearance. And, although there is no timetable for completion of these projects, the plans are well underway.

So, as we remember and pay tribute to the men that fought for America’s freedom on that hot summer morning 225 years ago, let us also look ahead to how future generations will be able to experience the Battle of Musgrove’s Mill. The future is very bright, indeed.

**Park Ranger Brian Robson**  
brobson@scpprt.com

---

Sources:
Bast, Homer. *"Creek Indian Affairs, 1775-1778."* Georgia Historical Quarterly 33 (1949): 1-25.
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Following the New Purchase, the once confident headman from Upper Tallassee never quite recovered the degree of influence or optimism he formerly enjoyed. In the final years before the Revolution he seemed despondent, even fatalistic, concerning the future of his nation. Anglo-American aggression, and not native-imperial alliance, now shaped the future of Creek trade and lands. Moreover, with a four-hundred percent growth in population during the 1760s and early 1770s, Georgia “was no longer a fledgling colony.”

When the Revolution came, Emisteseguo saw it as an opportunity for the Creeks and other native peoples to reestablish their independence. For if they could help defeat the Americans, a grateful Crown might once again provide generous trade and protect native lands. To Emisteseguo’s disappointment, however, during the Revolution most Muscogulges maintained neutrality. Few towns wished to risk suffering such enormous violence as that visited upon the Cherokees in 1776. Even so, some warriors, particularly those from villages less proximate to American settlement, did serve in support of the British. Among Upper Creeks, Emisteseguo and the young Alexander McGillivray were the most prominent. From his exile in Florida, John Stuart helped coordinate southern Indian auxiliaries until his death in 1779. Emisteseguo fought on until falling in the attack before Savannah in 1782; at that time, he probably was well into his seventh decade of life. The two old friends remained resolute to the end, devoted to mutually supportive causes for which they long had dedicated their lives and careers.

---

3 J. Russell Snapp offers a fascinating biography of the southern Indian superintendent in John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier: *A Study of Indian Relations, War, Trade, and Land Problems in the Southern Wilderness, 1754-1775* (Ann Arbor, 1944).
4 Braund, “The Creek Indians, Blacks, and Slavery,” *Journal of Southern History* 57 (1991): 601. Through the “great medal” and especially through the creation of policies that respected Indians and their lands, John Stuart won many influential native friends during his sixteen-year tenure as superintendent. On most occasions, the Indian leaders seemed amenable and eager to follow the imperial line. Yet, to Stuart’s chagrin, even the most “loyal” headmen sometimes ignored or contradicted his admonitions. The superintendent generally assumed at such times that his friends must have been duped or confused, that of course he knew what was best. Stuart probably never imagined that his native counterparts might be able to match and in certain respects even exceed him in complexity of understanding and strategic efficacy. See, e.g.: Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution* (New York, 1993), 205-08;
Lee McGee, the late Wes Hope, John Allison, David Reuwer and Will Graves hold forth on Earle’s Bridge over the North Pacolet River.

The article printed below, “Battle of Musgrove's Mill, August 19, 1780”, was written by William T. Graves. (willgraves@bellsouth.net) It is based on his exhaustive research on SC Patriot militia Col. James Williams, one of the three cooperating Patriot militia commanders at that battle. Graves’ book, James Williams: An American Patriot in the Carolina Backcountry (ISBN 0-595-21374-X, www.iuniverse.com), is a great example of modern scholarship on leaders in the Southern Campaigns. Col. James Williams, derided by his contemporary South Carolina Patriot militia leader, Col. William “Billy” Hill, whose Memoirs, published late in Hill’s life, severely criticized Col. Williams’ actions after leaving Gen. Thomas Sumter’s camp in August 1780 to carry out Williams’ primary duties to protect his neighbors in his home militia district, the Little River area of the Ninety Six District. Graves’ revisionists look at Col. Williams, his life, motives and contributions to the Patriot effort calls Hill’s motives for his criticism of Williams into question. As more documentation on Williams’ life and military service has come to light, Graves is working to publish an expanded second edition of his book. We are getting a preview of the new information with his article on the Battle of Musgrove Mill, where the combined militias of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia successfully defeated a larger British Provincial force.

Graves, a Duke University graduate, is a retired attorney who lives in Charlotte, N.C. He is a frequent contributor to SCAR and a great friend to have.

Editor ★

Allan Gallay, The Formation of Planter Elite: Jonathan Bryan and the Southern Colonial Frontier (Athens, 1989), 127-52; and Braund, Deerskins and Duffels, 166.

5 It was James Wright who regaled Emisteseguo’s clear thinking and “great good sense.” Emisteseguo established good personal relations with the Georgia governor. In one instance, the Creek headman noted how he and his Anglo counterpart were of the same “Tyger Family.” This was a clever connection, for Emisteseguo was a member of the tiger (panther) clan, while the House of Hanover boasted a lioncel on its coat of arms. David H. Corkran, The Creek Frontier: 1540-1783 (Norman, 1967), 269; Claudio Saunt, A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and the Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816 (New York, 1999), 20-21.

6 Corkran, Creek Frontier, 237-49.

7 Snapp, John Stuart, 79-103; Corkran, Creek Frontier, 255ff; Braund, Deerskins and Duffels, 145. Emisteseguo acted upon the superintendent’s advice in 1771 when he raided and ransacked a particularly unscrupulous trading post called the “Buzzard’s Roost.” Georgians were outraged and Emisteseguo prudently made a pacifying apology. Ibid.

8 Alden, South in the Revolution, 128 ff; Gary B. Nash, Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, 1982), 263-64; Braund, Deerskins and Duffels, 133-37. Cussita ranked as the leading Lower Creek village during the late colonial period. Corkran, Creek Frontier, 240.

9 Ibid, 277-84; Braund, Deerskins and Duffels, 150-61; Snapp, John Stuart, 116-33; Alden, John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier, 300-305; Louis De Vorsey, Jr., The Indian Boundary in the Southern Colonies, 1763-1775 (Chapel Hill, 1966), 165-80.

10 Ibid, 277-84; Braund, Deerskins and Duffels, 150-61; Snapp, John Stuart, 116-33; Alden, John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier, 300-305; Louis De Vorsey, Jr., The Indian Boundary in the Southern Colonies, 1763-1775 (Chapel Hill, 1966), 165-80.

11 Braund, Deerskins and Duffels, 160. Emisteseguo expressed deep pessimism in an exchange with trader William Gregory in 1772; as did other Creek headmen, he felt “increasingly powerless” in his efforts to preserve Creek lands and independence. Joshua Piker, Okfuskee: A Creek Indian Town in Colonial America (Harvard, 2004), 189-91.


13 O’Donnell, Southern Indians in the American Revolution, 80-82, 122-23; Corkran, Creek Frontier, 237. Upon John Stuart’s death at Pensacola (March 21, 1779), the southern Indian department was thrown into chaos. Although record numbers of southern warriors allied with the British following the captures of Savannah and Charleston, poor imperial coordination and uneven funding handicapped their effective employment. Snapp, John Stuart, 193, 204-09.
Battle of Musgrove's Mill, August 19, 1780
by Will Graves

A band of 200 mounted Patriot militiamen from the Carolinas and Georgia completed an overnight 40-mile trek from their camp at Smith's ford on the Broad River to within a mile of Edward Musgrove's mill on the Enoree River in the pre-dawn hours of Saturday, August 19, 1780. Their objective was to attack what they thought was a similarly-sized force of South Carolina Tory militia camped there. When they arrived, they learned from a local sympathizer that the Tories had been reinforced during the night by 300 British Provincialists. Finding themselves outnumbered by more than 2 to 1 and unable to affect a retreat on their exhausted horses, the Whigs quickly formulated a plan to take up a defensive position hoping to avoid detection by the British long enough to recuperate sufficiently to retreat or, if unsuccessful in avoiding detection by the enemy, to engage them as best they could. Contact was made and the ensuing rout of the Provincial and Tory forces at Musgrove's Mill provided a desperately needed boost in morale to the Whigs who were in danger of being completely overrun in South Carolina. Coming just three days after the crushing defeat of the Continental Army's southern department under General Horatio Gates at Camden and one day after the thrashing of Patriot forces under Colonel Thomas Sumter at Fishing Creek, the victory at Musgrove's Mill demonstrated to the much maligned Whig partisans that they were capable of successfully confronting the better trained and equipped British and Loyalist forces that controlled most of South Carolina and all of Georgia, and who were preparing to invade North Carolina. Although the Patriots' hasty retreat from Musgrove's Mill resulted in no gain of territory, the psychological importance of Whig partisans standing up to and defeating the Loyalist forces steeled the nerve of the Patriots throughout the southern backcountry. That resolve would be needed for their decisively important involvement in the battles at King's Mountain and Cowpens, two battles that were pivotal in America's struggle for independence from Great Britain.

Reconstructing the details of the battle of Musgrove's Mill presents some challenges. There are only four first-hand accounts of it from the Whigs' perspective. The descriptions given by those four participants vary significantly. Only the short report given by James Williams, one of the commanders of the Patriot militia, was written contemporaneously. The only other militia commander present at the battle who is known to have given an account of it is Col. Isaac Shelby. He wrote his account in 1814, 34 years after the events he describes. At that time, Shelby was 64 years old and serving the second of his two non-consecutive 4-year terms as governor of Kentucky. The most detailed of the four accounts was given by Samuel Hammond, one of Williams' subordinates. Unfortunately, Hammond's account bears no date and the original appears to have been lost. The sole known source of his account is its purported transcription given by Johnson in his Traditions and Reminiscences, published in 1851. The inability to completely authenticate Hammond's account has caused some historians to disregard it. Hammond also made a very brief mention of the battle in his pension application filed in November 1832. The final Patriot account was given by Joseph McJunkin, another subordinate of Williams. McJunkin makes only passing reference to his involvement at Musgrove's Mill in his pension application dated December 25, 1833. At age 82, he gave a somewhat more detailed description in the narrative he dictated in 1837 to his grandson-in-law, the Reverend James Hodge Suyse.

From the opposite perspective, the infamous Tory David Fanning gave the only account known to have been made by any of the participants defeated by the Whigs at the battle of Musgrove's Mill. In addition to Fanning's brief acknowledgment of the battle in his memoir, there are several references to it in diaries or correspondence from British or Tory sources that help establish the date of the engagement and the identities of the Provincial and Tory forces that participated in it.

Sometime after the battle of Hanging Rock on August 6, 1780, Williams, Colonel Thomas Brandon, Lieutenant Colonel James Steen, Captain Samuel Hammond, Captain Joseph McJunkin, and their followers decided to leave Sumter's camp near Fishing Creek. There is no record of the exact number of men who accompanied Williams when he left Sumter's camp. Prior to their departure, Sumter received communications from Gates urging Sumter to join forces with him in his planned invasion of South Carolina aimed at Camden. In keeping with the independent mindedness of the Carolina backcountry militiamen, Williams and his followers evidently determined that they would be better employed harassing the British positions in the more western portions of the State where they, their families and friends resided. They withdrew to the camp of Colonel Charles McDowell at Smith's ford on the Broad River where they found Colonel Isaac Shelby from the Watauga region of western North Carolina and Colonel Elijah Clarke from Georgia with their men. Shelby and Clarke shared Williams' interest in harassing the British and Loyalists in the deep backcountry of South Carolina: Shelby because his western North Carolina home was threatened by Major Patrick Ferguson's aggressive recruitment of Tory militia and Clarke because of his consuming interest in liberating Augusta from British control. While at McDowell's camp, Williams, Shelby and Clarke learned of the Tories gathering at Musgrove's Mill. Recognizing their opportunity to strike a blow against his Majesty's forces, they determined to attack the Tories.

The exact nature of the Tory encampment at Musgrove's Mill is not known. It does not appear to have been a fortified position permanently garrisoned by either Tory or Whig forces. Although the road and ford just east of the mill would have been a strategically important point of access into and out of this part of the backcountry, there is no record of Musgrove's mill being occupied on a continuous basis by either party. The mill's position near the road and ford makes it logical to assume that British, Loyalist and Whig forces used the mill from time to time to grind corn and wheat into flour, the basic staple of a backcountry militiaman's and soldier's diet.

On the occasion of the battle, Musgrove's mill probably was serving as a gathering area for local Tory militia commanded by Colonel Daniel Clary. In early August, Clary had been ordered by Col. John Harris Cruger, commander of the British regulars at Ninety Six, to muster his Dutch Fork (SC Loyalist) Militia Regiment in support of Ferguson's force. The exact strength of Clary's command is not known but estimates are that he had at least 100 men with him at Musgrove's mill on August 18.

In his account, Shelby tells of a Captain William Hawsey, "an officer of considerable distinction among the Tories," being wounded at the height of the battle. Since Hawsey is not known to have been a member of Clary's regiment, Hawsey's presence strongly suggests that other Tory units were gathering at the mill. The best estimate is that all together there were about 200 Tories at the mill as the sun rose on August 19, 1780.
Composite of Robert Mills’ Atlas of South Carolina District maps, published in 1825 showing the area of the Patriot’s approach from NC Patriot militia Col. Charles McDowell’s camp at Smith’s Ford on the Broad River to Musgrove Mill on the Enoree River. Map by John A. Robertson.
Sometime during the late evening of the 18th or early morning hours of the 19th, the Tories were joined by about 300 provincials under the command of Colonel Alexander Innes. Like the Tories under Clary, Innes’ force was under orders from John Harris Cruger to reinforce Ferguson. Innes’ provincial force included about 100 men of his south Carolina Royalist mounted regiment, a light infantry company of the New Jersey Volunteers, and a detachment from the 1st battalion of Delancy’s New York Brigade, part of John Harris Cruger’s own regiment. There is also evidence that the Loyalists may have been using Musgrove’s house or the area around his home as a field hospital caring for men wounded in the skirmishes between the Whigs and Loyalists at Cedar Springs, Wofford’s Iron Works and probably Hanging Rock, as well as other recent backcountry engagements. Doctor George Ross is known to have been at Musgrove’s mill treating the injured and wounded Loyalists at the time of the battle of Musgrove’s Mill.

When the Whigs under Williams, Shelby and Clarke departed McDowell’s camp on August 18, their intelligence was that Ferguson and his force of Tory militia numbering more than 1,000 men were encamped somewhere between McDowell’s camp at Smith’s ford and Musgrove’s mill. The Whigs received word from a local sympathizer that the Tories had been reinforced during the night by Innes and his troops. The provincial forces under Innes’ command were not Tory militia. They were well trained provincials schooled in the discipline and tactics of the regular British army and dressed in the uniforms of the regular army. Their presence presented the Whigs with a significantly different challenge than the Whigs anticipated when they began their trek the evening before.

To avoid encountering this much-larger force, the Whigs traveled in the woods until complete darkness and then took to the road to cover ground more quickly. Arriving about a mile from Musgrove’s mill just prior to first light on the morning of the 19th, the Whigs received word from a local sympathizer that the Tories had been reinforced during the night by Innes and his troops. The provincial forces under Innes’ command were not Tory militia. They were well trained provincials schooled in the discipline and tactics of the regular British army and dressed in the uniforms of the regular army. Their presence presented the Whigs with a significantly different challenge than the Whigs anticipated when they began their trek the evening before.

To further complicate matters, a scouting party sent out by the Whigs encountered a Loyalist scouting party. Shots were exchanged between the two parties. The advantage of surprise that the Whigs had hoped to have over their enemy was lost.

Finding themselves outnumbered and deprived of the benefit of surprise, Shelby, Williams and Clarke hurriedly held a council to decide how to proceed. Because they had traveled all night at a breakneck pace, their men and horses were exhausted. Retreat was not an option. The commanders decided to take up a defensive position at the top of the wooded hill that rose up from the river on its north slope. They deployed their men behind trees in a 300-yard long line that straddled the road leading to the ford of the Enoree River. Each of the colonels commanded his own men with Shelby’s men being posted on the American right flank, Williams’ men in the center and Clarke’s men on the left flank. It is likely that some of the men cut bushes and limbs to form a makeshift breastwork on the crest of the hill filling in the gaps between the trees and providing a modicum of cover to those militiamen unfortunate enough to find themselves treeless.

Having lost the element of surprise and being deprived of the option of immediate retreat, the colonels devised a strategy that would take maximum advantage of their position. Captain Shadrack Inman of Clarke’s command along with about 15 of his men was sent forward under instructions to proceed to the river and fire upon the enemy. If the enemy chose to return fire and engage Inman’s troops, he was to feign retreat and lead the Loyalists into the heart of their compatriots’ defensive line on the timbered ridge. Inman and his men were to file off to their right (i.e., the left flank of the American line) as they retreated up the hill toward where their compatriots waited to ambush the advancing enemy. Inman’s small force was matched by a like number of mounted riflemen posted on the Patriots’ right flank under the command of Captain Josiah Culbertson. The mounted riflemen on each flank were to bring cross-fire to bear on the enemy as they advanced up the hill.

Taking the bait dangled by Inman and his men, the Loyalists crossed the river and deployed in ranks within 150 to 200 yards of the Americans. They commenced firing while advancing in formation in their usual disciplined fashion. Firing uphill, they apparently over-shot the Whigs and consequently inflicted few casualties on them. The fact that Loyalists commenced firing far in advance of the 100-yard effective range of their smoothbore brown Bess muskets indicates that perhaps Inman and his men stayed exposed to fire from the Loyalists in a position well in front of the Whig line and that perhaps the Loyalists were unaware of the presence of the larger Whig force. Another possibility is that the Loyalists deployed and opened fire early in an attempt to intimidate the Whigs by displaying their numbers and flashing the much-feared bayonets with which they no doubt intended to charge the Americans at some point during the engagement. Whatever the reason for it, this premature fire filled the battleground with smoke, obscuring the Loyalists’ view of the defensive position of the Whigs. The Whigs, on the other hand, were instructed to hold their fire until the Loyalists got within a range of 50 to 60 yards. They stayed protected behind their trees and makeshift breastworks: they had no intention of deploying in formal battle lines and exposing themselves openly to their enemy’s fire or bayonet charge.

When the Whigs opened fire, they exacted a gruesome toll on the Loyalist officers and men. The first volley from the Americans rocked the Loyalists causing a momentary retreat. The Loyalists quickly regrouped only to take a second volley that caused them to break in disorderly retreat to the opposite side of the Enoree River. The disorganized retreat probably resulted from so many of the officers being seriously wounded and removed from the battlefield. Among the seriously wounded were Innes, Major Thomas Fraser, William Chew, and Ensign John Campbell. Command of the retreating Loyalist forces devolved to Captain George Kerr of Delancy’s New York Brigade. Kerr was one of only two Loyalist officers not wounded in the fight. Once he had his troops back on the south side of the Enoree River, Kerr was able to establish a rear guard to cover a more organized retreat of his force from their original encampment at Edward Musgrove’s house and mill.

Fanning says the Loyalists retreated about a mile and a quarter before they encamped. This statement varies somewhat from Williams’ statement that the Whigs chased the British and Tories about 2 miles. The two statements, however, may not be as inconsistent as they seem if Fanning measured the retreat from the site of the Tories’ original camp while Williams measured the Whigs’ chase from the spot where the Americans sprung their ambush.

An excerpt of John Robertson’s interpretation of the 1780s “Benson Admeasurment” map - Spartanburg History Museum.
Williams reported that during the 15 minutes the battle lasted the Loyalists suffered 60 killed on the battlefield, the greatest part he identified as being "British." Since there were no regular British troops at the battle, he was doubtless referring to the red-coated Provincial forces under the command of Innes. Williams' estimate of 60 killed on the field is known to be overstated because, in his official report, he states that Innes and Fraser were among those killed. Both of these men survived their wounds and later returned to active duty. In addition to those killed, 70 prisoners were taken by the Americans. No estimate of the wounded was given by Williams or in the Loyalist reports, but it is reasonable to assume that a substantial portion of the troops were wounded during the battle.\(^\text{43}\) Williams listed the American losses as three killed on the field and eight wounded, one of whom was thought to be mortally wounded.\(^\text{44}\) From the other accounts, Captain Shadrack Inman, who led his mounted troops into the fray and was shot down while pursuing the retreating enemy, is known to have died from his wounds.

The reason the casualties suffered in the engagement were so disparate was that the Americans, with the exception of Inman and his troops, never exposed themselves to open fire until they emerged from their cover to chase the retreating enemy from the field. The Whigs stayed behind cover firing their rifles and muskets with deadly accuracy at close, effective range. The Loyalists, on the other hand, armed only with notoriously inaccurate smooth bore muskets, fired prematurely and from exposed ranks. Their red-coated ranks presented an easy target for the camouflaged Whig marksmen. Marching up the steep slope from the Enoree River to the Whigs' position at the top of the hill, the Loyalists never were able to deploy the bayonet charge so feared by the backwoodsmen.

Musgrove's Mill appears to be the first use by the Southern backcountry Whigs of the ambush tactics they learned from their encounters with their Cherokee and Creek adversaries in the earlier Indian campaigns. While the engagements at Ramsour's Mill,\(^\text{45}\) Brattonsville,\(^\text{46}\) Rocky Mount,\(^\text{47}\) Hanging Rock,\(^\text{48}\) and even Fishing Creek\(^\text{49}\) were clearly not traditional affairs with formal lines of opposing forces drawn up in face to face combat as would be mandated under traditional 18th Century rules of war, neither were any of them engagements in which one force exposed itself by deploying in ranks in accordance with the rules while the other force remained concealed and protected behind defensive positions. One very valuable lesson that the backcountry soldiers clearly learned at Musgrove's Mill was that there was great advantage to defending a position affording cover when facing an attacking force deployed in ranks. This is a lesson that was applied to full advantage on numerous occasions by the backcountry militia. Even at King's Mountain\(^\text{50}\) where the Whigs were the attackers, however, they were able to adaptively apply the lessons learned at Musgrove's Mill by taking full advantage of the protection offered by the trees on the slopes of King's Mountain rather than trying to advance up the mountain in formation. They knew full well that doing so would have disastrous consequences.

After the battle, the Whigs initially intended to press ahead to attack the British and Loyalist forces occupying the star fort at Ninety Six. At some point, however, either immediately before the commencement of the fight or immediately after the Loyalists had been chased from the field, the Whigs learned of the defeats of Gates at Camden and Sumter at Fishing Creek. This disturbing news, coupled with their genuine but misplaced apprehension that Ferguson with his troop of 1,000 Tories was in the immediate vicinity, convinced the Whigs that their best option was to retreat as quickly as possible. Shelby indicates that he retreated into the North Carolina mountains leaving the prisoners taken at Musgrove's Mill in the custody of Clarke. Clarke too decided to affect his retreat leaving the prisoners in the custody of Williams to deliver them. Sometime prior to September 5, 1780, Williams delivered the prisoners to the remnants of Gates' Continental forces assembled at Hillsborough, North Carolina thereby bringing the battle of Musgrove's Mill to a most advantageous conclusion for the victorious, reinvigorated Whigs.

\(^\text{1}\) Musgrove's Mill State Historic Site is located on south side of the Enoree River in Laurens County, South Carolina off of SC Highway 56. The site is just west from the point of conjuncture of the modern Spartanburg, Union and Laurens county lines. The exterior of the visitors' center for the site is an interpretation of Edward Musgrove's colonial-era home and is located adjacent to the home's original location. The Musgrove home survived well into the 20th Century. The mill site is located below the visitors' center on the south bank of the Enoree River. Only parts of the foundation and the dam structures remain. Most of the combat that occurred during the battle took place on the north side of the Enoree River in what is today Union County, with perhaps a portion of the battleground lying in Spartanburg County. As will be noted in this article, however, at least the conclusion of the battle took place on the south side of the Enoree River in modern Laurens County. Present day Highway 56 is believed to lie very close to where the colonial-era road lay at the time of the battle.

\(^\text{2}\) Because of the awkwardness of referring to the Provincial and Tories forces jointly throughout this article, the term "Loyalist" will be used occasionally when referring to these forces collectively. A distinction, however, must be drawn between the Provincials and the Tories. The terms "Provincial" or "Provincials" are used to refer to forces made up of Americans who formally enlisted in the British army but who served in units composed entirely (or almost so) of their fellow American loyalists. Provincial units were trained and disciplined in the same manner as regular British army units. Occasionally, Provincial forces were commanded by British regular army officers. The terms "Tory" or "Tories" are used to refer to militia or partisan forces consisting of Americans who remained loyal to the King and Great Britain. The militia or partisans were citizen soldiers who came together for short term citizen-soldier service when called to serve under officers who were men of prominence in their local communities but who were not professional soldiers. The term "British" will be used in reference to the professional British regular army.

\(^\text{3}\) Horatio Gates (1728-9-1806) was born in England and served as an officer in the British Army. He was with Braddock at his defeat in the French and Indian War. He became a friend of George Washington and settled in Virginia. Upon the outbreak of the Revolution, he was commissioned as a Brigadier General in the Continental Line. He was credited with the defeat of Gen. Johnny Burgoyne at the Battle of Saratoga, New York while commanding the Northern Department of the Continental Army. He was sent to command the Southern Department in the summer of 1780 and suffered an humiliating defeat at the Battle of Camden in August of that year. On December 2, 1780, in Charlotte, Gen. Nathanael Greene as commander of the Southern Department replaced him. Boatner, Encyclopedia, 412-415.


\(^\text{5}\) Thomas Sumter (1734-1832) was a lieutenant colonel in the 2nd (later, 6th) Rifle Regiment of South Carolina State Troops in the spring and summer of 1776. He and his regiment were later transferred to the Continental Line. He resigned his commission as a Continental officer on September 19, 1778 and remained inactive until after the fall of Charleston in May 1780. The South Carolina backcountry Whig partisans rallied around Sumter once he retook the field after the British burned one of his plantations. He was promoted by SC rebel Governor John Rutledge to the rank of Brigadier General of the SC militia in October 1780 and thereafter was the ranking officer of the South Carolina Patriot militia until the end of the war. Robert D. Bass, Gamecock: The Life and Campaigns

6 The Battle of Fishing Creek is summarized in O'Kelley, Slaughter 2, 277-286.
7 James Williams (1740-1780) was a South Carolina militia commander. He served as a captain under Maj. Andrew Williamson in the First Battle of Ninety Six and rose in rank to become the colonel in command of the Little River Regiment of SC Whig militia. After the fall of Charleston, he challenged Thomas Sumter for command of the South Carolina backcountry militia but died from wounds sustained at King's Mountain. His death prevented a showdown between Williams and Sumter to succeed SC Patriot militia Gen. Andrew Williamson as commander of the backcountry militia. William T. Graves, James Williams: An American Patriot in the Carolina Backcountry, Writers Club Press, San Jose, 2002. 
8 Williams' account reads as follows:

Col. Williams, Col. Shelby & Col. Clarke with a party of South Carolinians and Georgians in Number about Two Hundred, March'd from the North Side of Broad River on the 17th August in Order to attack Two Hundred Tories on the Innere (sic, Enoree) R[iver] at Musgrove's Mills, but on the Night of the 18th the Tories were reinforced by Col. Innis with Two Hundred Regular Troops and One Hundred Tories, our party meant to Surprise them, but were discovered[;} this obliged us to send a small party of Horse to reconnoiter them, and if found they were in a disposition to attack us, they were ordered to Skirmish with them and lead them on to our main body.

And being formed across the road, our line Extended at least 300 Yards in length, on a Timbered Ridge, and Twenty Horse were ordered on each flank, waiting the Enemy's Approach. They Advanced within 200 Yards and formed a line of Battle, and moved on within the distance of 150 Yards, and then began a very heavy fire.

But Col. Williams gave orders that not a man should fire until the Enemy came within Point blank Shot, and every man take his Tree, and not fire until orders were given, and that every Man take his Object sure, and not to fire till the Enemy was within 80 Yards distance. A warm fire began that lasted about 15 Minutes, which our brave firends (sic) to their Distressed Country, Obliged the Enemy to retreat, and we drove them about Two Miles. We Kill'd dead on the field 60 of the Enemy the greatest part British, and took 70 Prisoners, among the Killed was a Major Frazer of the British, one British Captain and Three Torie (sic) Captains, Col. Innis of the British by report mortally Wounded by Two balls one in the neck, the other broke broke his Thigh. Our loss in this Action was only Three Killed on the field, Eight Wounded, one of which is Mortal.

Hillsborough 5th Sept. 1780
S/ Jas. Williams


10 Shelby's account reads as follows:

General McDowell continued to maneuver on the north side of Broad River, not being in force to attempt an attack upon Ferguson camp, until the 18th of August at which time he received information that five hundred Tories were encamped at Musgrove's Mill on the Bank of the Enoree River. Colonel Shelby & Lieut. Col. Clarke were again selected by General McDowell to head the detachment destined to cut up that party of Tories. McDowell's camp was then at Smith's ford of Broad River forty miles or upwards from the Tories encamped at Musgrove's--Major Ferguson lay about half way with all his force and only two or three miles from the route our party had to travel. They commenced their March from Smiths ford at sun about one hour high on the evening of the 18th of August, 1780, with seven hundred picked men well mounted, amongst whom were several of the field officers of McDowell's Army who volunteered their services and they were joined by Col. Jno. (sic) Williams and his followers making all together a force of between seven and eight hundred picked men--They traveled through the woods until dark, then took the road, and traveled fast all the night great part of the way in canter, never stopped even to let their horses drink, & arrived within half a mile of the enemy camp just at break of day, where they were met by a strong patrol party of the enemy, coming out to reconnoiter-- a sharp fire commenced in which several of the enemy fell & they gave back to their camp; at this juncture a country man who lived in sight came up & informed Colonel Shelby that the enemy had been strongly reinforced the evening before with six hundred regular troops, from Ninety Six, the Queens American regiment from New York commanded by Col. Innes--The Americans after a hard travel all night of forty miles or upwards were too much broke down to retreat, they prepared for a battle as fast as possible, by making a breast works of logs and brush which they completed in half an hour, when the Enemy's whole force appeared in full view, their lines lay across the road upwards of half a mile in length, a small party under Capt. Shadrack Inman had been sent on to skirmish with the Enemy as soon as they crossed the river (for their Camp was on the south side at Musgrove's plantation) -- Capt. Inman had orders to give way as the enemy advanced--when they came within 70 yards of our breast works, a heavy & destructive fire commenced upon them. The action was bloody & obstinate for upwards of an hour and a half. The Enemy had gotten within a few yards of our works: at that juncture Colonel Innes who commanded the enemy was badly wounded and carried back, and every other regular officer except one Lieutenant of the British was either killed or wounded when the enemy began to give way, just at that moment also Capt. Hawsey an officer of considerable distinction among the Tories was shot down near our lines while making the greatest efforts to animate his men. The Tories upon the fall of Capt. Hawsey broke in great confusion, the slaughter from thence to the Enoree River about half a mile was very great, dead men lay thick on the ground over which our men pursued the enemy-- In this pursuit Capt. Inman was killed while pressing the enemy close in his rear-- great merit was due to Capt. Inman for the manner in which he brought on the action-- and to which the success of the day was greatly to be attributed. This action was one of the hardest ever fought in the United States with small arms. The smoke was so thick as to hide a man at the distance of twenty yards----Our men took two hundred prisoners during the action, and would have improved the victory to great advantage, their object was to be in Ninety Six that night distant 25 or 30 miles and weak and defenseless. But just after the close of the action an express arrived from General McDowell with a letter to him from Governor Caswell informing of the defeat on the 16th of our Grand Army under General Gates near Camden. In this situation to secure a safe retreat was most difficult task our small
party broke down with fatigue two hundred British prisoners in charge, upwards of forty miles advance of General McDowell who retreated immediately and dispersed upon the receipt of the news of Gates’s defeat— Ferguson with 3000 men almost directly in their rear. It required all the Vigilance and exertion which human nature was capable of to avoid being cut to pieces by Ferguson’s light parties— it was known to Col. Shelby that he had a body of dragoons and mounted men. That would endeavor to intercept him which caused him to bear up towards the mountains. The enemy pursued as was expected fifty or sixty miles until their horses broke down and could follow no further— It is to be remarked that during the advance of upwards of forty miles and the retreat of fifty or sixty, the Americans never stopped to eat, but made use of peaches and green corn for their support. The excessive fatigue to which they were subjected for two nights and two days effectually broke down every officer on our side that their faces & eyes swelled and became bloated in appearance as scarcely to be able to see.

This action happened at the most gloomy period of the revolution just after the defeat and dispersion of the American army, and is not known in the history of the Revolution. After our party had retreated into North Carolina clear of their pursuers, Colonel Shelby crossed the mountains to his own country and left the prisoners taken in the action in the possession of Col. Clarke to carry them on to the North until they could be safely secured; he gave them up shortly after to Colonel John Williams to conduct them to Hillsborough in North Carolina, at this period there was not the appearance of a Corps of Americans embodied anywhere to the Southward of Virginia— In this action the Americans loss was small compared with that of the enemy who over shot them as they lay concealed behind their breast works. The loss of Capt. Inman was much regretted, he fell gloriously fighting for his country on the 19th of August, 1780, with many other brave spirits who volunteered their services on that occasion and defeated the enemy far superior in force to their own.

Shelby & Hart Collection #659z in the General and Literary Manuscripts, Manuscripts Department, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

11 Samuel Hammond (1757-1842) was a Virginia native who volunteered initially in that province as an infantryman in the battle against the royalist governor, Lord Dunmore. From December 1775 to December 1778, he served as a captain in the Virginia militia. He then moved to the portion of the Ninety Six District of South Carolina that later became Edgefield County and was commissioned a captain in the State troops under the command of Col. LeRoy Hammond, his uncle. He fought in many skirmishes and battles including the engagements at Spirit Creek, Stono Ferry, the 1779 siege of Savannah, Hanging Rock, Musgrove's Mill, King's Mountain, Blackstock's Plantation, Cowpens, Guilford County Court House, Augusta, Eutaw Springs and Dorchester. Bobby Gilmer Moss, Roster of South Carolina Patriots in the American Revolution, (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1994) (hereinafter cited as Moss, SC Patriots) 408.

12 Hammond's account reads as follows:

Before this affair a few days, Colonels Williams and Bratton, of South-Carolina, Colonel Clarke, of Georgia, Colonel Isaac Shelby, of the Virginia or Holston settlement, McCall, Hammond and Liddle of the Ninety-Six brigade, formed a junction in the State of North-Carolina, near General McDowell's rendezvous, ___ county. General McDowal was consulted on the propriety of making an excursion into South-Carolina, to look at the enemy, and to commence operations against their out-posts, if they should be found assailable with our force. The general countenanced the proposal, and stated that he would co-operate with us, if he saw any opportunity for doing good by the joint force. Two active and enterprising men were sent in, to look at and obtain intelligence as to the position of the outposts of the enemy nearest to us. Having received information from those men that there was a party at Musgrove's Mills, on Enoree river, that was altogether tories, and not over two hundred in number, it was determined to march with all possible dispatch to attack them. Information was given to General McDowal, and our little band was put in motion. We marched twenty or twenty-five miles, on the 16th; halted and fed and refreshed for an hour, and after dark set out upon our march again. In the course of the night, Colonel Bratton turned off the line of march, intending to pass through his own neighborhood, and to fall in with us again before day. This was injudicious in every point of view, for it afforded more than a double chance to the enemy of gaining intelligence of our approach, and a probability of our not falling in with them, or of their aiding us in the affair; and this proved to be the case, for they did not rejoin us until the affair was over. General McDowal advanced a few miles, but declined joining in the enterprise. Our march was silently and skillfully conducted, and we arrived near the post about daylight. It was agreed by Colonels Williams, Shelby and Clarke, that the command should be conjoint; the plan of operations was agreed upon; and, as the precise situation of the enemy's camp had not been clearly discovered, it was determined to halt half a mile from the place, and send in two men to be relied upon, to reconnoiter the post and obtain the information wanted. They performed the duty— saw the situation of the enemy—found them on the opposite side of the river from our position, and, unfortunately, on their return, fell in with and were fired upon by a patrol of the enemy. Thus disappointed in the hope of surprising them, it was resolved to send in sixteen well mounted, expert riflemen, to fire at the enemy, and draw them on to attack us upon the hill. This was done; our horses were picketed three hundred yards in the rear beyond the hill, and we were formed a little upon the descent, towards the enemy, Each colonel took his station to command his own men. The sixteen sent out, were, in retreating, to fall on the left flank of the enemy, and from their horses keep up a fire upon them. As they advanced, this command was united to Captain Shadrick Inman, of Georgia—a like number placed on the right flank, with the same orders. There were sixteen men left, also, as a main guard, on our horses; this reduced our whole effective force, including officers, to about ___ men. These were placed in one line, in scattered or open order, and were ordered not to fire until the enemy were within fifty yards, and also to be governed by a single shot from Colonel Shelby; to be steady and take good aim. Being thus prepared, the enemy were drawn out. They came, flushed with the hope of an easy victory, in full trot. Reinforcement had joined them the day before, of which we had no information; Colonel Innis and Major Fraser, with one hundred and fifty regulars-York volunteers—had joined the tories.

They advanced in three columns—the regulars, commanded by Major Fraser, in the centre—the militia on the right and left. Advancing, at the distance of one hundred and fifty yards, they displayed and gave us a fire, which was not returned but from our flanking parties. They then advanced with trailed arms; their columns displayed, and were allowed to come within forty yards, when the signal was given, and their ranks thinned. They fell back, and before a second fire they formed and again advanced. On the second fire, they fell back in confusion. The fire then became brisk, and was kept up on our side. The tories saw the regulars fall back in disorder, and they also gave
ground in confusion, and in fact without any thing like pressure on our part.

Our troops, encouraged by this disorder, rushed on with more boldness than prudence. The mounted riflemen on both flanks charged into the ranks of the retreating foe, and they fled and re-crossed the river in great disorder. On our part, we were so scattered and out of order, that it was determined to halt, form, and send for our horses to cross the river. This caused a necessary pause, during which we received information, by express, that General Gates had been defeated and his army dispersed; that Colonel Sumter, after much success, had been overtaken by the enemy, and also defeated and his army dispersed; and to crown all, that Colonel Ferguson was advancing towards us, and within a few miles, with a considerable force. Thus circumstanced, we were compelled to give over further pursuit, and seek our own safety by a hasty retreat.

The result of this little affair was a clear speck in the horizon, which would have been otherwise very much overcast. We had one captain-S. Inman-a brave man and good officer, with four men killed and eleven men wounded. The British lost Major Fraser, and eighty-five men killed; Captain Innis and several other officers wounded, the number not known. One captain of regulars, two captains of tories, and seventy-three privates--mostly York volunteers--were taken prisoners. Our retreat was hasty, and continued, without halting, day or night, to feed or rest, for two days and nights. We entered North-Carolina, and passed down towards Charlotte with our prisoners. Colonel Shelby left us near Greenville, and we encamped near Charlotte, with a few continental troops who had escaped from Gates' defeat. We made a stand here, to collect more men from the defeat, and form for a further expedition. Here the prisoners were committed to Major S. Hammond, while Colonels Williams and Clarke returned to the western frontier of South-Carolina. The prisoners were conducted to Hillsboro' and delivered up there. This little affair, trifling as it may seem, did much good in the general depression of that period. Out numbers continued to increase from that time, and all seemed to have more confidence in themselves.


The relevant part of Hammond's pension application reads as follows:

In August 18 or 19 was with Col. Williams of Carolina, Clark of Georgia & Col. Shelby from over the mountains in the Battle of Musgrove's Mills on Enoree River 96 District. The Enemy were defeated, Col. Innis commanding officer of British wounded, Major Fraser 2nd in command killed, a number of prisoners taken who were committed to Applicant's Care & Safety. Conveyed to Hillsborough N. Carolina. While at that place received the appointment of Major with a Brevet commission as such from Gov. Rutledge with orders to command the militia from Col. L. Roy Hammond’s Regiment of 96. Had conference with Board of War & obtained from Mr. Pen an order on the commissaries & Quartermasters for the So. Western frontiers of North Carolina, for Rations of provisions & forage, for the S. Carolina & Georgia militia, who might assemble for active service.

The relevant part of McJunkin's pension application reads as follows:

I then fell under the Command of Col. Williams & hearing at Smith's ford that the British & Tories were encamped at Musgrove’s Mill on Enoree River marched 40 miles that night & attacked the Tories as day broke and defeated them on 20th August 1780, and at the Close of this action we received Word that both Sumpter & Gates were defeated, which Caused us to abandon the Idea of Crossing the River to attack the British; having passed Ferguson’s on our right we retreated towards the mountains.

The relevant part of McJunkin's 1837 narrative reads as follows:

...after the British American Troops had taken possession of ninety six I continued scouting on the Indian lines until the 21st August, when Colonel Innis forwarded his march up to Musgroves Mill on the Innoree River. I then Joined them with a party of 14 men the morning following the pickets were attacked by a party of Rebels. Col. Innis ordered us to advance and Support them which we did, and followed them until we arrived where the main body lay in ambush under the command of Colonel Williams. Col. Innis was unfortunately wounded with Several other officers. We engaged them for Some time and then Retreat about a mile and a quarter where we encamped and in the night marched off towards ninety Six under the command of Captain Depister, and the next morning I and my Small party Returned back to the Indian lines.


Thomas Brandon (1741-1802) was a South Carolina Patriot militia officer who served under James Williams at Musgrove's Mill and King's Mountain and under Thomas Sumter at Blackstocks and later engagements. Phil Norfleet has a biographical note covering Brandon posted at http://sc_tories.tripod.com/thomas_brandon.htm. See, also, Moss, *SC Patriots* 95.

James Steen (1734-c.1781) was a successful planter who, at the time of the Revolution, resided in the Thicketty Creek area of what was once the northern part of Union County (formed in 1785) and is now part of Cherokee County (formed 1897), South Carolina. He is believed to have been stabbed to death in Rowan County, North Carolina, while trying to arrest a Tory. Moss, *SC Patriots*, 894.


Sumter also must have decided that his remaining forces were better used in harassing the British and Loyalists in the backcountry.
than in becoming part of Gates' force. Sumter met with Gates and persuaded Gates to reinforce Sumter with 100 Maryland Continentals, two cannon, and 300 North Carolina militiamen to protect Gates' right flank and intercept supplies at the Catawba/Wateree River. Sumter's arguments may well reflect Sumter's awareness that militia units were ill-suited to being deployed in combat formations where they would be expected to hold fast when confronted by the more disciplined, experienced professional soldiers of the British army. The wisdom of this view was confirmed. The militia units that did serve under Gates' command at Camden cut and ran when they were fired upon by red-coated ranks of soldiers whose muskets were topped with bayonets. The militia's failure to hold their positions was a major contributor to the rout of Gates' army at Camden. Whatever his foibles otherwise may have been, Sumter should be commended in this instance for his astute assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of his partisan forces. Sumter's forces thus augmented successfully captured Cary's Fort at the Wateree Ferry below Camden, captured needed supplies, cattle, sheep, and horses, and intercepted reinforcements from Ninety Six headed for Lord Cornwallis at Camden; however, these victories were overshadowed by Sumter's crushing defeat at Fishing Creek on August 18, 1780.

Colonel (later General) Charles McDowell, 1743-1815, was a commander of North Carolina Whig militia after the fall Charleston in 1780. William S. Powell, ed., Dictionary of North Carolina Biography, 6 vols. (Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1979-1996), Vol. 4, 142. Col. McDowell's successful strategy usually involved maintaining a strong yet mobile base camp and dispatching troops to attack selected British/Loyalist targets while maintaining a clear path of retreat into the relative safety of the western North Carolina mountains. Thus, McDowell as the Burke County North Carolina Patriot militia commander, while usually not personally in battle, maintained his strategic view and communications with the “over mountain men” led by Col. Sevier and Shelby, monitored the ever present Cherokee threats, and organized the combined Georgia - South Carolina - North Carolina militia forces which successfully attacked British Capt. James Dunlap near Prince’s Fort, captured Fort Thicketty (Fort Anderson) from Tory Capt. Patrick Moore, Dunlap and Maj. Ferguson at Thomson’s Peach Orchard-Wofford’s Iron Works-Clifton (2d Cedar Springs), and the embodied Loyalist militia (and Lt. Col. Innes by accident/good fortune) at Musgrove’s Mill. McDowell’s combined Patriot militias then dispersed. When Maj. Ferguson invaded North Carolina in September 1780, McDowell stopped Dunlap and Ferguson at Cane Creek. He then summoned the North Carolina militias to his farm at Quaker Meadows and started the reembodied joint militias rendezvous at the Cowpens to attack Maj. Patrick Ferguson at Kings Mountain. McDowell dispatched his brother Maj. Joseph “Quaker Meadows Joe” McDowell with militia to support Gen. Daniel Morgan’s defeat of Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton at Cowpens. These actions effectively opened Lord Cornwallis’ right flank.

Elijah Clarke (1733-1799) was the North Carolina born commander of Whig militia forces from the backcountry portions of Georgia, later known as Wilkes County. He participated in the engagements at Kettle Creek, the first Cedar Springs, Musgrove's Mill, King's Mountain, Blackstock's Plantation and the several sieges of Augusta. Boatner, Encyclopedia 233-234. Clark’s biography was written by Louise Frederick Hays, Hero of Hornet’s Nest: A Biography of Elijah Clark (1733 to 1799); (New York, NY, Stratford House, Inc., 1946).

Patrick Ferguson (1744-1780) was a Major in the 71st Regiment of Foot (Frazier’s Highlanders). Commissioned by British commander Sir Henry Clinton as Inspector of Loyalist Militia shortly before Clinton’s departure for New York, as such, Ferguson served somewhat independently under British Southern Department Commander Lord Cornwallis and was charged with recruiting and training Tory militia in the western portions of North and South Carolina. At the time of the Musgrove's Mill engagement, he was believed by Patriot intelligence to be somewhere close by the mill, but was in fact at Col. Richard Winn's plantation near modern day Winnsboro, South Carolina. By modern roads, Winnsboro is approximately 55 miles from Musgrove's Mill State Historic Site. The Patriot accounts that the enemy was passed on their right were thus mistaken. Ferguson was the commanding officer of the Tory militia units defeated at the Battle of King's Mountain on October 7, 1780. As a commissioned officer of the British Army, he was the only member of the regular army present at that battle. All of the other Loyalist participants at Kings Mountain were American Whigs or Tories militia members. M. M. Gilchrist, Patrick Ferguson: 'A Man of Some Genius' (NMS Publishing, Edinburgh, 2003)

Clay was a prominent backcountry militia officer residing in the area of Ninety Six District that later became Newberry County, SC. His property was confiscated at the end of the war but he successfully petitioned the South Carolina State Legislature to be allowed to remain in South Carolina where he regained prominence after the war. Bobby Gilmer Moss, The Loyalists in the Siege of Fort Ninety Six (Blacksburg, S.C.: Scotia-Hibernia Press, 1999) 23-24.

John Harris Cruger (1738-1807) was a Provincial officer from New York who accompanied Lt. Col. Archibald Campbell in his highly successful expedition to recapture Georgia as a Crown colony in late 1778 and early 1779. He participated in the successful defense of Savannah from the combined Patriot and allied French forces in September-October 1779. He succeeded Lt. Col. Nisbet Balfour as commander of the British and Loyalist forces posted at Ninety Six. He successfully defended that location against the siege mounted by Gen. Nathanael Greene in the late spring of 1781. He was at the Battle of Eutaw Springs on September 8, 1781. He participated in the defense of Charleston for the remainder of the war. At the conclusion of peace, his New York properties having been confiscated, he removed to London where he lived out his life. Boatner, Encyclopedia, 310-311.

Cruger to Cornwallis, 4 August 1780, Cornwallis Papers, P. R. O. 30/11/63: 13-14.


Cruger to Cornwallis, n.d. [17 August 1780], Cornwallis Papers, P. R. O. 30/11/63: 93.

The composition of Innes' command is taken from the account given by Roderick Mackenzie, a British officer of the 71st Highlanders who in 1877 published a short book entitled Strictures on Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton's History. In his book, Mackenzie takes Tarleton to task for failing to even mention the battle fought at Musgrove's Mill. Though Tarleton was not involved in the battle, Mackenzie's view was that a proper history of the Southern Campaign by a "correct historian" would necessarily have to include an account of the battle at Musgrove's Mill. Roderick Mackenzie, Strictures on Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton's History, (London: R. Faulder, 1877).

Mackenzie's account of the battle reads as follows:

35
An action which a detachment from the garrison of Ninety Six had with an American corps, upon the 19th of August, 1780, would certainly have excited the attention of a correct historian.

Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton's force, as an author, seems to be compilation; he might therefore have given the American account of this affair, either from Ramsay, or from the Scots Magazine of December, 1780; but as it has entirely escaped his attention, you may depend upon the following statement, as it comes from unquestionable authority.

The Americans, under Colonels Williams, Shelby, and Clarke, were strongly posted on the Western banks of the Enoree; their numbers have not been precisely ascertained, probably five hundred. The detachment of British troops, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Innes, consisted of a light infantry company of the New-Jersey volunteers, a captain's command of Delancy's, and about one hundred men of the South Carolina regiment mounted. The troops passed the river, the infantry drove the enemy at the point of the bayonet, and the horse, though but lately raised, and indifferently disciplined, behaved with great gallantry; but in the moment of victory, the commandant, Major Fraser, Captain Campbell, Lieutenants Chew and Camp, five out of the seven officers present, were wounded by a volley from the Americans. The British troops, consequently unable to avail themselves of the advantages which now offered, were conducted by Captain Kerr to the Eastern side of the river, where they remained till reinforced by Lieutenant Colonel Cruger.

The text of Mackenzie's book is posted at http://home.golden.net/~marg/bansite/src/stri
tures1.html.

31 O'Kelley, Slaughter 2, 197-199.
32 Ibid., 233-236.
33 Ibid., 221-233.
34 In his diary, Dr. Uzal Johnson, a loyalist surgeon under Ferguson's command, has an entry dated August 10, 1780, in which he reports that the wounded were sent to Musgrove's mill on the Enoree River to be attended by Dr. Ross. Bobby Gilmer Moss, Uzal Johnson, Loyalist Surgeon: A Revolutionary War Diary (Blacksburg, S.C.: Scotia Hibernia Press, 2000) (hereinafter cited as Moss, Uzal Johnson) 53-54.
35 The Patriots' intelligence was wrong. Ferguson and his Loyalist militias were in the Spartan District and participated in the intense ten-mile stand, fight and withdraw battle starting at Thomson's Peach Orchard-Wofford's Iron Works-Clifton (so called 2d Battle of Cedar Spring) on August 8, 1780. Sometimes between the 2d Cedar Springs battle on August 8 and August 18, Ferguson had moved to the east so that on the night of the 18th-19th of August 1780, Ferguson and his men were camped at Colonel Richard Winn's plantation near Winnsboro, South Carolina. This is some 55 miles due east of Musgrove's mill. Moss, Uzal Johnson, 57-58. Consequently, Ferguson was too far away from the Whig's path of march to be an immediate threat to them. Ferguson camped at Culbertson's Plantation on August 10th, then continued east to the Fish Dam Ford on the Broad River [site of the defeat of British Maj. James Weymss by Gen. Thomas Sumter, yet to come in November 1780] where they joined with Lt. Col. George Turnbull who had withdrawn from his post at Rocky Mount on the Catawba River and some Loyalist militia. Journal of Capt. Alexander Chesney: Adjutant to Maj. Patrick Ferguson, Bobby Gilmer Moss, (Blacksburg, S.C.: Scotia Hibernia Press, 2002) 21-23.
36 Charles B. Baxley noticed that the 1786 map of Spartan District recently reproduced by the Spartanburg County Historical Association depicts the site of the battle as being about 1.7 miles northeast of the ford of the Enoree River. Baxley made the estimate by applying the map's scale to the distance between the ford and the symbol used by the cartographer to mark the spot of the battle. The fact that the cartographer placed the battle this far from the ford should be given some credence because the cartographer would have visited the area within six years of the battle and probably based his placement of the symbol on statements from area residents who had been on the battlefield immediately after the battle. Baxley indicates that such placement of the battle would have it occurring at the very top of a long rise up from the ford rather than at the top of an intermediate hill currently thought to be the site of the Whig's defensive position. Details for obtaining a copy of this map were given by Susan Turpin on pages 11-12 of the December 2005 issue of SCAR.
38 In his account, Shelby mentions that the men throw up a breast works. See note 3 supra. Shelby's account, however, is the only one that mentions a breast works.
39 Exactly who came up with the strategy is not known.
40 Saye, McJunkin Memoir, 16.
41 Ibid., 16.
42 The other Loyalist officer who evidently emerged from the battle unwounded was Colonel Daniel Clary, the Tory militia commander who was gathering his Dutch Fork Militia Regiment at Musgrove's mill. Clary, who continued to reside in the Carolina backcountry after the war, related his experience at Musgrove's mill to his neighbors. As he later told the story, at some point during the battle two Whig militiamen grabbed his horse's bridle intent on taking him prisoner. Without hesitation, he had the presence of mind to say to his would-be captors in a stern and commanding voice: 'Damn you, don't know your own officers!' When the intimidated Whigs released the bridle, he made good his escape. John Belton O'Neall, The Annals of Newberry, Historical, Biographical and Anecdotal (Charleston: S. G. Courtenay & Co., 1859) 71, 313.
43 The staff of the Musgrove's Mill State Historic Site estimates the British and Tory casualties as being 63 killed, 90 wounded and 76 taken prisoner. See, SCAR, Vol. 1, No. 1, September 2004, 14 posted at www.southerncampaign.org/newsletter/s1n1.pdf
44 The Historic Site staff estimates the Whig casualties at 4 killed and 8 or 9 wounded. Ibid.
45 O'Kelley, Slaughter 2,180-187.
46 Ibid. 190-197. The Battle of Brattonsville is also known as Huck's Defeat and the Battle of Williamson's Plantation.
47 Ibid. 211-216.
48 Ibid. 221-233.
49 Ibid. 277-284.

1854 Letter from Maj. Samuel Hammond’s Son to Lyman Draper

Charleston Sc Ca
August 14th /1854

Lyman C. Draper

My Dear Sir:

Your friendly letter of 11th March past, has just been received, in consequence of a four or five months absence from home. This fact I trust will be deemed sufficient cause, as well as an apology for my long silence, and seeming neglect. I need not assure you Sir, that I take pleasure in making a reply to your communication, the more so now, as it affords me the opportunity to return my grateful acknowledgement to yourself and the Society for the honor conferred upon me by appointment of honorary membership of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. The
The State of South Carolina commissioned John Hiatt to research and produce a Historic Resource Study on the Battle of Musgrove Mill in 2000. His excellent report is available for sale from the Musgrove Mill State Historic Site.

1776 Virginia Light Dragoon used in the banner is from an illustration by Charles M. Lefferts (1873-1923) now in the collections of The New-York Historical Society. Later cavalry uniforms were probably green or white. Used by permission of The New-York Historical Society.