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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to describe, record, and analyze the violence which occurred in colonial South Carolina during the period 1700-1740. Areas of interaction among three groups of people resulted in incidental or full-scale violence and were the basis for the study. The interaction among the three groups included the following: Indian-white, white-white, and Negro-white.

Concerning the incidence and degree of violence during the time period under study (1700-1740), Indian-white violence was both greater in number and severity than either white-white or Negro-white violence. Indian-white violence occurred not only as a reaction of the Indian to his displacement by another race, the white race, but also as a result of intemperate and unjustified use of the Indian by the white man. The results of this ill use of the Indian by the white man were the Tuscarora and Yemassee wars during the second decade of the eighteenth century.

Least significant was the white-white violence in this period. Political violence was minimal and, for all purposes, was non-existent in the change from proprietary to royal authority in 1719. However, the violence among white individuals did express the attitude of instability in a colony which was growing at a very rapid rate.

The severity of Negro-white violence did not approach that of Indian-white violence in the period under study, but the distinct separation of the two races was apparent and white reaction to Negro violence was extremely harsh. The tensions which were to lead to the break-down of the South’s society in the nineteenth century were fostered during this period of the eighteenth century. The Stono Rebellion in 1739 was merely a precursor which southern whites failed to interpret properly and led, instead of more equitable treatment for the Negro, to the punitive slave law of 1740.

Violators of the laws, especially Negroes and Indians, when discovered and captured were treated quickly and without ceremony. Violence, in most cases, did not herald any lasting social change beyond self-preservation in the period 1700-1740.
VIOLENCE IN COLONIAL SOUTH CAROLINA
1700-1740
INTRODUCTION

On the thirteenth of March in 1735 George Stevens was found in the back country of South Carolina with three cuts on his head, one deep cut on his back, his stomach cut open, lacerations covering his entire body, and his scalp gone.¹ Approximately one hundred years later Nat Turner led a rebellion of Negro slaves against white slave owners in southern Virginia, but the rebellion was quickly suppressed.² From 1882 to 1903 violence toward the Negro was quite intense as almost two thousand Negroes were killed by lynch mobs in the South.³ In the summer of 1966 Charles Whitman, a young man under severe strain and tension, climbed to the top of the tower of the library on the main campus of the University of Texas and shot and killed or wounded forty-four people.⁴ Two years later Robert F. Kennedy, while campaigning for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, was assassinated by a lone gunman in Los Angeles, California. Violence has permeated American history from the seventeenth century through the twentieth century.

Violence is an integral part of America's society. In the past decade the United States was especially confronted by a rapid increase in urban violence; for example, the racial disorders in several large metropolitan centers such as Detroit, Chicago, and Los Angeles; student unrest and
protest on college campuses such as Columbia University, San Francisco State College, and the University of California at Berkeley; demonstrations, like those in Chicago in 1968 during the Democratic National Convention which resulted in multiple arrests of the participants involved, protesting the draft and opposing the conflict in Vietnam; and, criminal violence, organized and unorganized, in the cities. The violence which has been and still is manifested in our national life stems from a number of sources which include the following: "the psychological residues of slavery, the coexistence of mass consumption with pockets and strata of sullen poverty, the conflict among competing ethics that leaves many men without clear guides to social action, . . . [and] a celebration of violence in good causes by our revolutionary progenitors, frontiersmen, and vigilantes."5 Dr. Richard M. Brown, who is presently studying patterns of violence in the United States, suggests that "violence is ostensibly rejected by us [the American people] as a part of the American value system, but so great has been our involvement with both negative and positive over the long sweep of our history that violence has truly become a part of our unacknowledged (or underground) value structure."6

Segregating one minute section of the United States and focusing on South Carolina during the first four decades of the eighteenth century, the role and influence of violence in that colony is significant and provides a foundation for
descriptive study and analysis. Strictly defined, violence, according to Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr, is "behavior designed to inflict physical injury to people or damage to property. Collectively, and individually, we may regard specific acts of violence as good, bad, or neutral, depending on who engages in it and against whom." In evaluating the significance of violence in South Carolina during the period 1700-1740, the above definition is expanded upon by utilizing Richard M. Brown's definitions for the categories of violence. Dr. Brown divides violence into two broad categories—positive violence and negative violence. Negative violence is defined as "violence that seems to be in no direct way connected with any socially or historically constructive development. Varieties of negative violence are criminal violence, feuds, lynching, the violence of prejudice (racial, ethnic, and religious violence), urban riots, freelance multiple murder, and assassination." Positive violence, as Dr. Brown sees it, "is a broad term that relates violence to the popular and constructive movements" in our nation's history. Examples of positive violence include the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the wars with Indians (to control the land), vigilante violence, agrarian uprisings, labor violence, and police violence—"to protect the public against the criminal and disorderly." In addition, each of the two categorical divisions are subdivided into high-level or collective violence and low-level or individual violence. High-level or collective violence
involves one group or several groups of people committing violent activities; e.g. mob violence or urban riots. Low-level or individual violence usually involves one individual committing a violent act against another individual; e.g. murder or rape.

During the first four decades of the eighteenth century in South Carolina both positive and negative violence, individual and collective, occurred in Indian-white, white-white, and Negro-white relations. The first chapter describes Indian-white violence and concentrates particularly upon collective violence in the Tuscarora War, 1711-1713; collective and low-level violence in the Yemasee War, 1715-1717; and concludes with the portrayal of the miscellaneous but continuing Indian-white violence of the third and fourth decades of the eighteenth century. Chapter two presents white-white violence including political violence within South Carolina, the attempts of the French and Spanish to eliminate the British settlers from the infant but growing colony, the activities of pirates along the coast of North and South Carolina, an incident of fanatical religious violence, and various and sundry incidents of violence. The third and concluding chapter depicts Negro-white violence with emphasis on the Stono Rebellion in 1739. The conclusions of Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr concerning individuals or groups who commit violence are notably relevant to the events included in each chapter. They remark that "men's frustration over some of the
material and social circumstances of their lives is a necessary precondition of group protest and collective violence. The more intense and widespread frustration-induced discontent is among a people, the more intense and widespread collective violence is likely to be. And finally, "people are most strongly disposed to act violently on their discontent if they believe that violence is justifiable and likely of success." 


CHAPTER I
INDIAN-WHITE VIOLENCE

After the first settlements were established in South Carolina during the last quarter of the seventeenth century, a flourishing Indian trade arose and resulted in substantial profits. The proprietors of South Carolina appropriated, almost exclusively, this Indian trade. Guns, powder and shot, trinkets, rum, and any other articles acceptable to the Indians were traded for their furs and skins. Through 1747 the Indian trade for valuable furs and skins was the second most important trade in the colony; the trade in rice being the most important. The Indian trade led to two distinct developments for the colony during the first two decades of the eighteenth century: the exploitation of the Indians by the inhabitants of South Carolina in Anglo-Spanish and Anglo-French affairs, and the abuse of the Indians by corrupt and egocentric men of dubious moral standards.

South Carolinians utilized the friendship of many Indian tribes during the first ten years of the eighteenth century to help them harass and attack Spanish settlements located near St. Augustine in the Florida territory, Spanish and French settlements near Pensacola and Mobile, and Indian tribes hostile toward the English or in collusion with the Spanish and French. During a session of the Commons House
of Assembly in 1701, a conference committee "defined the normal Indian policy of the province, advising that the 'Tallabooses and other Friendly Indians be not Discourag'd from making war upon those Indians that are our and their Enemies.'" The South Carolina traders dominated the Indians in areas which today comprise portions of Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama. In May 1702 these traders (referred to by the Spanish as Indian slave traders) and a force of Creek Indians raided the Spanish Indians at Tallahassee and ravaged the Spanish mission, Timucuan, at Santa Fe, located sixty miles west of St. Augustine. With an ardent desire to revenge these recent hostile activities of the Creeks and English Indian traders, Spanish forces under the command of Captain Uriza, numbering nine hundred strong and composed primarily of Apalachee Indians, set out to attack and devastate settlements in South Carolina in the summer of 1702. However, the Creek Indians friendly to the Carolinians told them of the approaching Spanish force and their nefarious intentions. Anthony Dodsworth and other Carolina traders at Coweta gathered a force of five hundred Creek Indians and marched them to meet the invading force of Apalachee Indians under Uriza's command. The two forces met in the evening hours on the banks of the Flint River, a branch of the Chattahoochee, in Georgia. No struggle occurred that particular evening as "the bloody war-god calmly awaited the beams of day." Early the next morning before the sun had started to rise, the Creeks started
their fires, arranged their blankets to feign sleep, and hid in the adjacent forest to lay in wait for the Apalachean attack. The Spaniards and Apalachees quietly entered the camp and accosted the empty blankets but were immediately attacked by the lurking Creeks and English Indian traders. The Creeks' attack on the Apalachees was a complete success, killing several members of the attacking force, capturing other members, and driving the remainder in desperate flight to the forest. 

With the outbreak of war on the European continent in 1702, Governor James Moore demanded an offensive against the Spanish and their Indian allies in Florida. The Commons House of Assembly passed an act on September 10, 1702 giving authorization for equipping an expedition against Florida, particularly the Spanish and Indian settlements in and around St. Augustine. Moore had approximately eight hundred men under his command, five hundred Carolinians and three hundred Indians, with Colonel Robert Daniel second in command. Using small ships the South Carolinian force arrived at St. Augustine on October 27, 1702 and controlled the town by the twenty-ninth, except for a moated castle. Moore used his meager battery of four guns unsuccessfully against the well fortified castle; therefore, he changed his tactics and attempted to starve out the Spanish before they could receive aid from Havana. As the siege progressed (lasting a total of eight weeks and three days) the morale among the Carolinians and Indians ebbed and Moore finally
had to set fire to his ships, the town and its churches, and retreat toward Fort Royal. Shortly after the attack on St. Augustine failed, a party of Creeks and English invaded the Apalachee country in March 1703 and destroyed the Spanish missions of San Jose de Ocuia, Patali, and San Francisco.  

In December 1703 Colonel James Moore, formerly governor of South Carolina, headed an expedition of fifty Carolina volunteers and one thousand Indians into the territory of the Apalachean Indians near St. Augustine. Moore was to try again to subdue the Apalacheans and therefore lessen Spanish-Indian strength in the territory adjacent to South Carolina. Ayaville was the first settlement to come under attack. Ayaville was well fortified and repulsed the first assault; however, the Carolinians and Indians set fire to the chapel on the second assault and quickly routed the settlement. Moore's losses among the South Carolina volunteers were fourteen wounded and two killed—Francis Plowden and Thomas Dale. They captured approximately fifty male Indians, more than one hundred Indian women and children, one white friar, and they killed twenty-five men in the two assaults.  

The colonel wrote "I never see or hear of a stouter or braver thing done than the storming of the fort." The next morning the Spanish force, comprised of twenty-three Spaniards from Fort St. Louis and four hundred Indian allies under the leadership of Captain Ruiz Mexia, renewed the struggle with Colonel Moore's force. Once again the Carolinians and their Indian allies defeated the combined
Spanish and Indian contingent. The Spanish lost five or six men killed, nine men including Captain Mexia captured, while their Indian allies lost two hundred captured. Among the South Carolina volunteers Captain John Bellinger was killed and Captain Fox died from wounds. After the victory Colonel Moore was unable to withhold many of his Indian allies from unmercifully torturing several prisoners at the stake. As the force returned through Apalachee country five towns surrendered unconditionally, the land surrounding the towns and the missions were completely destroyed, and Colonel Moore returned to South Carolina with thirteen hundred Apalacheans (some one thousand women and children and three hundred men who were brought to Savannah Town as free Indians) and three hundred twenty-five slaves. The Colonel reported to the governor in Charleston that "the Indians have now a mighty respect for the whites. Appalachia is now reduced to so feeble and low a condition that it can neither support St. Augustine with provisions nor distract, endanger or frighten us." "All of which," he boasted in his report to the proprietors, "I have done with the loss of 4 whites and 15 Indians, and without one Penny charge to the Publick."  

During Queen Anne's War, 1702-1713, the Yemasee Indians deserted the Spaniards and allied themselves with the English to revenge the deaths of several of their chiefs at the hands of the Spanish. In retaliation, the Yemasees often waited in the vicinity of St. Augustine to capture a lone
Spaniard or to make a late night attack upon an isolated house. According to Dr. Hewit, the Yemasees as well as other Indian tribes, often inflicted the following tortures upon those they captured:

On the bodies of these unfortunate prisoners they were accustomed to exercise the most wanton barbarities, sometimes cutting them to pieces slowly, joint by joint, with knives and tomahawks; at other times burying them up to the neck under ground, then standing at a distance and marking at their heads with their pointed arrows; and, at other times, binding them to a tree, and piercing the pointed sticks of burning wood, which last, because the most painful and excruciating method of torture, was the most common among them.

Although the colonists of South Carolina did not object to the harassment of the Spanish by the Yemasees, knowledge of their use of heinous torture on captives and the flagrant display of scalps in Charleston forced the Carolinians to offer the Yemasees rewards for live Spanish captives. Upon the payment of ransom to the South Carolinians, the captive Spaniards were returned to their own territory.

In 1710 an anonymous pamphlet, probably authored by Thomas Nairne, commented upon the ability of the South Carolinians and their Indian friends to harass the Spanish settlements in the Florida territory: "There remains not now, so much as one Village with ten Houses in it, in all Florida, that is subject to the Spaniards; nor have they any Houses or Cattle left, but such as they can protect by the Guns of their Castle of St. Augustine, that alone being now in their Hands, and which is continually infested by the perpetual Incursions of the Indians, subject to this
Province.

During the first decade of the eighteenth century the English were also able, substantially through the activities of the profit oriented and too often unscrupulous Indian traders, to harass Spanish and French settlements from Pensacola to Mobile and to subdue and control Indian tribes from the outlying regions of South Carolina to the Mississippi River. An alliance, ratified in 1705, between the Creek Indians and South Carolina revealed the desire of the English to eliminate the French and Spanish from America and to control the Indians. The alliance declared the Creek Indians "acknowledged not merely their 'Hearty Alliance,' but also their 'Subjection' to the Crown of England, . . . [and pledged] All the English Friends and Allies are in like Manner ours, and all their Enemies are hereby Our declared Enemies. Lastly, We do Assure your Honour, we will with our Utmost Power Assist the English, and Endeavour to give a Total Rout to all their and our declared Enemies, the French and Spanish, not suffering them to settle themselves hereafter in any of Our Territories or Dominions, not within reach of our Arms.

As well as the Creek tribes, such as Talapoosa and the Alabama, the Chickasaws and the Yazoo joined in the English supported raids and assaults upon the Indian tribes allied with the French and Spanish. Early in 1705 the Chickasaw seized several families of Choctaw who had come to visit the Chickasaw village and sold them to the English; however, the Choctaw retaliated by killing a group of Chickasaws returning
from Mobile. The following autumn the Choctaw were attacked by a large force of Carolina Indians, approximately three or four thousand according to French accounts, presumably under the leadership of Carolina Indian traders. The Choctaw villages and lands were devastated, and numerous persons were imprisoned. Two years later Thomas Welch disclosed the manner in which the raid was organized and executed in a petition to the proprietors of South Carolina for the return of Indian slaves taken from him by Governor Nathaniel Johnson. Welch reported he had "Led a party consisting of five English, and 300 Indians [not three or four thousand as reported by French accounts] against the Chacta Indians Allies to the French and Enemies to the crown of England... [and had] furnished the said 300 Indians with Ammunition for this Enterprise upon a Contract that if they had Success, they should pay fifteen Slaves" to him. In March of the following year the Chickasaws made another raid upon a Choctaw village and took more than one hundred prisoners. A reign of terror by the Creeks and other tribes friendly with the English set-in against the lesser tribes which had previously allied themselves with the French. The Carolinians then changed their tactics and moved to assault the French and Spanish at Mobile and Pensacola.

During the summer of 1707 the Talapoosas under the leadership of English Indian traders burned and plundered the dwellings near the fort at Pensacola. The attacking Indians killed eleven Spaniards, captured fifteen more Spaniards,
and took a dozen Indians as slaves before returning to their base camp among the Upper Creeks. An unsuccessful attack was attempted against Pensacola the ensuing November. Thomas Nairne, provincial Indian agent in 1708, planned to attack Mobile in the spring or summer of 1708 with a force of fifteen hundred Indians under the command of fifty-one Englishmen, but Nairne was arrested and put into jail by Governor Nathaniel Johnson in June 1708. It was not until the fall of 1711 that another concerted attack was made by the English and their Indian allies upon the Indians allied with the French and Spanish. Captain Theophilus Hastings, Thomas Welch, and Emperor Brims of Coweta led a force of thirteen hundred Creeks through Choctaw settlements destroying the villages, killing people who resisted, and taking prisoner those who failed to escape. Some four hundred houses were destroyed, but Hastings was able to kill only eighty Choctaw and capture one hundred thirty prisoners. With a much smaller force than that available to Hastings, Thomas Welch killed and captured about the same number of Choctaw.22

The employment of Indians by the people of South Carolina started dissipating during the second year of the second decade of the eighteenth century and was practically non-existent by 1715. In the second decade South Carolinians were involved in two major conflicts with the Indians: the Tuscarora War in 1711 and 1712, and the bloody Yemasee War of 1715 through 1718.

In the autumn of 1711 John Lawson and Baron de Graffenried
trespassed on lands claimed by the Tuscarora Indians and were made captives. Baron de Graffenried, who had arrived in North Carolina during a period of political turmoil, was taken by the Tuscaroras because they had been informed he intended to possess and expel them from their land. John Lawson, the surveyor-general for the proprietors, had marked out some acreage which belonged to the Tuscarora Indians; therefore, the Tuscaroras also seized Lawson. Lawson was murdered in a most cruel manner. The Indians “stuck him full of fine small splinters of torch-wood, like hog’s bristles, and set them gradually on fire.” Baron de Graffenried was not tortured and eventually escaped from the Tuscaroras. After their act of violence and de Graffenried’s escape, the Tuscaroras hastily met and planned a general massacre. In small parties on the night of September 22, 1711, they entered several homes in a gracious manner and asked for provisions, but they showed dissatisfaction with the reaction of the settlers and barbarously murdered white men, women, and children. In the vicinity of Roanoke more than one hundred thirty people were slaughtered. Women were laid upon the house floors and great stakes were driven through their bodies; from other pregnant women the infants were ripped out, and hung upon trees; and so hotly did the Indians pursue the survivors that the dead were left unburied, a prey to dogs, wolves, and vultures.” The killing endured three days and terminated as the result of the Indians fatigue and drunken state.
The governor of North Carolina immediately relayed a message to South Carolina asking for assistance in suppressing the Indian raids. In South Carolina the Commons House of Assembly, Council, and Governor Craven agreed to aid the distressed people of North Carolina and appropriated four thousand pounds for an expedition to North Carolina. Colonel John Barnwell left South Carolina in November 1711 for the desolated settlements with a small group of thirty militia and a considerable body of Indians—218 Cherokees under captains Harford and Trustons, 79 Creeks under Captain Hastings, 41 Catawbas under Captain Cantey, and 28 Yemasees under Captain Pierce. As Barnwell's force advanced through Tuscarora country, the Indians retreated to a wooden breastwork or palisade fort, the Torhunta or Narhontes fort, approximately twenty miles to the west of Newbern, North Carolina. On January 28, 1712 his force attacked the Indians and thoroughly defeated them. In the engagement, more than three hundred Indians were killed and one hundred Indians were made prisoners. The Indian survivors cowered within the confines of their defenses and sued for peace. Barnwell and his force then destroyed several other Tuscarora towns and accepted surrender terms from the Tuscaroras at Hancock's Town. Barnwell, nicknamed "Tuscarora Jack," negotiated a peace treaty with the Indians and returned to Charleston.28

Hostilities erupted in North Carolina soon after Colonel Barnwell's return to Charleston, and further activities in-
volving atrocities by the Tuscarora Indians reached South Carolina. Once again North Carolina's governor appealed to South Carolina for help, and again the colony responded by sending Colonel James Moore, son of the late governor, with more than seventy white men and eight hundred friendly Indians to North Carolina. After some unusually intemperate weather, Colonel Moore, on March 20, 1713, laid siege to the Indians' fort at Taw River near the village of Nahucke and handily defeated them. Moore's force killed 192 and captured 391 Indians with several hundred Tuscaroraas burning to death in the fort; Moore's losses were thirty-five Indians and twenty-four whites wounded. An extremely ambitious individual, Colonel Moore gathered one hundred eighty men and continued the pursuit of the remaining Tuscarora Indians and forced them from North Carolina.29

Three years after the hostilities of the Tuscarora War in North Carolina, South Carolina was engulfed by the bloodiest Indian war in Carolina history. English Indian traders were intruding upon Indian lands, abusing Indian women, taking Indians as slaves, cheating on transactions involving the buying of Indian skins and captives, seizing Indian property for unpaid debts, and charging exorbitant prices for goods.30 For example, Cornelius Meckarty reported to the commissioners of the Indian trade of South Carolina on June 20, 1712, that Captain John Cochran visited an Indian town (Tomatly Town) and demanded a slave from an Indian named Nonohebau for the use of a canoe the past year
or he would beat him and take his wife. At the same session Meckarty disclosed that the Yemasee Indians believed Captain Thomas Nairne was attempting to confiscate their lands. Complaints against Alexander Nicolas, an Indian trader, were made by the Altimahaw King and several of his warriors to a specially convened session of the Board of Commissioners of the Indian Trade for South Carolina on October 25, 1712. They revealed Nicolas had murdered his pregnant Indian wife, whipped two other Indian women, and caused a general state of unrest among the Indian warriors. In the late summer of 1713 John Dixon told the commissioners that Thomas Welch threatened to kill him if he attempted to release two Indian women and their brother whom Welch was holding as slaves. The Board of Commissioners revoked the trading licenses of Eleazer Wiggon and Alexander Long in May 1714 for their actions in supplying the Cherokees with munitions and encouraging them to make war upon the Euchee Indians. In 1715 a Virginia trader named David Crawley reported to his agent in London that "Indian burderners... were forced to carry packages seventy to one hundred pounds in weight for three to five hundred miles. 'And when they had sent the men away about their business, or they were gone hunting, [I] have heard them brag to each other of Debauching their wives.'" The Euchees, Yemasees, and other Indian tribes dislike these corrupt practices and felt the debts they were made to pay unjust; therefore, they revolted against the English. Simultaneously, the Spanish and French countenanced the
rebellious actions of the Indians against the English and provided them with supplies. The Spanish also befriended the Indians and offered protection for their families in St. Augustine.  

Nine days before the vicious and bloody war began, Sanute, an Indian closely attached to the John Fraser family (Fraser supposedly being an honest Indian trader), came to Fraser's house and told the man's wife "that the English were all wicked heretics, and would go to hell, and that the Yamassees would also follow them, if they suffered to live in their country; that now the governor of St. Augustine was their king; that there would be a terrible war with the English, and they only waited for the bloody stick [the emblem of war] to be returned from the Creeks before they began it." Sanute said the Yemasees were uniting with the other Indian tribes in the Carolina territory and with the Spanish to wage war against the English. Sanute also told Mr. Fraser that if his family was captured he would kill them with his own hands rather than have them suffer a horrible death at the hands of his fellow Indians. Fraser fled with his wife and child to the safety of Charleston but revealed none of his actions to his neighbors.  

Six days later two Indian traders, William Bray and Samuel Warner, hurried into Charleston and warned the governor and the Indian board that a united plot by the Indians (supposedly formulated by the Creeks) was being contrived to eliminate the English from South Carolina. Bray sub-
stantiated his fears by referring to an incident which happened to his wife while he was looking for missing slaves near St. Augustine. "A Yamasee Indian came to his Wife and told her he had a great matter to tell her which was that the Creek Indians had a design to Cut off the Traders first and to fall on settlements and that it was very neare."\(^39\) Samuel Warner also had heard the Creeks were unsatisfied with their Indian traders, particularly one trader named John Jones, and "that upon the first afront from any of the Traders they would down them and so go on with it."\(^40\)

On the day preceding the Yemasee War, Governor Craven sent Captain Thomas Nairne, John Cochran, William Bray, Samuel Warner, and several other Indian traders to visit the Yemasee chiefs at Pocotaligo to see if the Indians were discontented. Captain Nairne asked the chiefs to reveal their grievances to him, but they replied they had no grievances against the English. The chiefs related they only desired to go hunting the next morning. Captain Nairne and his associates were satisfied, feasted with the Indians that evening, and slept at the Indian camp with no fears. However, early on the morning of April 15, 1715 the cries of war sounded in the Indian camp. The Indian chiefs were armed and proclaimed vengeance upon the English. The round-house or council room, where the English visitors were sleeping, was attacked and resulted in the deaths of Captain Nairne, who was burned at the stake, John Wright, and
Thomas Ruffly. John Cochran, his wife and four children were held prisoners and shortly afterwards slain. Captain Burroughs of the militia escaped (though wounded twice) from the attacking Indians by swimming a river and running until he reached Port Royal. He gave the alarm of the Indian attack to the people living in the vicinity of Port Royal. The heroism of this man saved more than three hundred persons residing around St. Helena as these people crowded aboard a ship in the harbor at Port Royal and watched the Indians destroy their livestock and dwellings. Yet as Captain Burroughs was escaping and warning people of their imminent danger from the Indians, the Yemasees assaulted the houses in Pocotaligo and its neighboring plantations, brutally massacring more than ninety persons.41

After the initial outbreak of violence, the Yemasee War, according to David D. Wallace, was divided into three periods: 1) the attempt by the Yemasees to annihilate the colonists which was stopped by Governor Craven's campaign concluded in June 1715; 2) invasion of the northern Indians in June 1715 until the Cherokees joined forces with the English in January 1716; and, 3) the sporadic yet treacherous Indian hit-and-run attacks until formal peace with the Creeks in November 1717.42

During the first period of the war the Yemasees divided into two parties to attack Port Royal and St. Bartholomew's. Because of Captain Burrough's warning, only a few families were slaughtered at Port Royal; yet, approximately one
hundred colonists were captured and killed at St. Bartholomew's. The savages continued toward the Stono River burning all houses, churches, and buildings useful to the Carolinians. About one hundred ninety people were murdered in the fifty mile distance between the Combahee and Stono Rivers. The Reverend Mr. Osborne and several others fortunately escaped to Charleston. Mr. William Bray, his wife and children, and many other people were captured and held as prisoners; however, when trying to escape they were all mercilessly killed.43

All Indian tribes from Florida to Cape Fear River were combined in the conspiracy to annihilate the English in South Carolina. After the Yemasees had delivered their fiendish blows and destroyed the border settlements, the Cowetas, Talapoosas, Abihkas, Alabamas, and Choctaws joined the Yemasees in murdering Indian traders or forcing them to flee after their trading-houses were broken into and ravaged. In the revolt against the traders in the area primarily south and west of Charleston the Lower Creeks, under the leadership of Emperor Brims, were held responsible for controlling and leading the attacks, including the deaths of several western traders in Chickasaw country. However, the most distressing news was the probable membership of the Cherokees in the conspiracy against the English. Early in May 1715 after reports were received that northern Indian tribes, including the Saraws, Waccamaws, Santee, and Cape Fears among others, had butchered several traders, the in-
habitants of the St. James Santee area north and west of Charleston were thrown into a general state of fear.

The southern force of Indians was calculated at six thousand Bowman and the northern force at six hundred to one thousand. Governor Charles Craven, after muster, could raise only twelve hundred men, and therefore he declared martial law and named Robert Daniel Deputy Governor. He then rode out of Charleston with two hundred forty volunteers to meet the Yemasees at Pocotaligo. Colonel Mackay raised another force of men and traveled by water to join Governor Craven at Pocotaligo. Camping near the Combahee River sixteen miles from the Indians' town, Governor Craven's troops were attacked by five hundred Yemasees early the next morning. Craven was surprised by the attack, but he regained his composure and ordered his troops to fight. After three-quarters of an hour the governor's troops routed the Indians, wounding many, slaying many others, while only losing one sentinel. Meanwhile, Colonel Mackay unexpectedly sprung upon the Yemasee town, Pocotaligo, driving the Indians from the town and confiscating great quantities of provisions accumulated by the Yemasees, including much of the booty they had taken from the English. Mackay was then informed of another fort containing two hundred Yemasees; he immediately sent one hundred forty men to attack this fort. A courageous young man, John Palmer, assisted Mackay's forces by scaling the walls and shooting at the Indians within their trenches; however, he was forced to withdraw. Palmer
and his men rescaled the walls and drove the Indians from the fort headlong into the withering fire of Mackay's forces. Mackay's force continued the pursuit of the Indians and captured numerous Yemasee Indians who were then sold by Charleston merchants to the slave markets of Jamaica and New England.45

While Palmer and Mackay were repulsing the southern Indian contingent, Governor Craven returned to Charleston to meet the threat of invasion by marauding Indians approaching from the north. The Indian atrocities began with a small party of Indians visiting the plantation of Mr. John Herne near the Santee River, procuring provisions from him, and then insidiously murdering him and all persons on the plantation. Upon hearing news of the slaughter at Hern's plantation, Captain Thomas Barker and twenty-six other men were killed. The unfortunate death of Barker and several members of his party caused the people of Goose Creek to panic and to flee toward Charleston. Nevertheless, seventy white men and forty Negroes commanded by Captain Redwood remained within a makeshift breastwork to defend themselves. The Indians attacked the fortification but failed to rout the defenders and agreed to terms of peace.46 "Captain Redwood who listening too much to the insinuations of making Peace disarmed his own Men, and Suffered the Indians to come amongst them, who taking the Opportunity drew out their knives and Tomahacks from under their Cloaths and knock'd 22 of Our Men on the head, burnt and plundered the Garrison."47 On June
13, 1715, according to McCrady, Captain Chicken of the Goose Creek militia met and repulsed the advance of the northern group of Indians. The following account from a letter dated July 19, 1715, was probably the battle in which Captain Chicken stopped the northern Indians' advance:

... Captain Chicken March'd from the Ponds with 120 Men and understanding that they were got to a Plantation about 4 Miles distant ... Chicken divided his Men into three parties, two of which he Ordered to March in part to Surround them, and in part to prevent their Flight into an Adjacent Swamp but before the Said party could arrive to the post designed them, two Indians belonging to the Enemy Scouting down to the Place, where Captain Chicken lay in Ambuscade he was obliged for fear of Discovery to Shoot them down, and immediately fell upon the body, routed them and as is Supposed killed about 40 besides their wounded they carried away took two Prisoners and released 4 white Men, ... 49

In the summer of 1715 Governor Craven went northward with one hundred white men, one hundred Negroes, and number of friendly Indians to meet Colonel Maurice Moore from North Carolina near the Santee River to carry the war to the Indians. However, the southern Indians, consisting mainly of Apalachees and Yemases numbering seven hundred, "came down on New London and destroy'd all the Plantations on the Way, besides ... Lady Blakes, ... Colonel Evans and Several others have burnt Mr. Boone's Plantation and the Ship he was building." The governor, returning hastily from the Santee River, advanced upon the marauding Indians and with "his approach the Indians fled over Ponpon Bridge and burnt it having killed 4 or 5 White Men." Colonel Fenwick of the Carolina militia obtained information which
revealed "that the Indians were at one Jackson's house near the Ferry, he [Colonel Fenwick] fell upon them next morning by break of Day and out of 16 he killed 9 and took 2 Prisoners with the Loss of one White Man, and one Negro wounded, he also took 4 of the Perriaugors loaded with Provisions and Plunder."\(^5\) Fenwick immediately notified Captain John Palmer of his successful action and told him hostile Indians still lurked in the nearby river area. Palmer, Captain Burrough, and Captain Stone "made the best of their way to Daffers key (by which place the Indians must of necessity pass) to lay in wait for them about 2 days after they spied 8 Perriaugors coming towards them Capt Stone with his Men went a Shore and lay in Ambuscade . . . as soon as the Perriaugors had doubled the Point Capn Palmer made up to them, which the Indians perceiving immediately threw their Guns into the River and leapt overboard, and made towards the Place where Capt Stone lay and 35 were killed and two taken Prisoners being all that belonged to the other 2 [periagos] made their Escape without Arms and naked into the woods."\(^5\) Governor Craven reached the remainder of the retreating Indians at their main camp near Saltcatchers and fought a bloody battle in which the Indians were driven southward and forced to flee to St. Augustine.\(^5\)

A letter from Thomas Broughton in Charleston, March 10, 1716 revealed the circumstances which led to the peace treaty between the Cherokees and English settlers of South
Carolina in January 1716 and described the last organized collective act of violence in the Yemasee War. In the fall and winter of 1715 the English sent representatives to the Cherokee nation to make peace with them and then to form an alliance to engage the Creeks and other belligerent Indian tribes; however, through early January 1716 all efforts had failed as the Cherokees desired to remain peaceful with all Indian tribes. In late January 1716 "whilst our people were among the Charikees there comes Sixteen of ye head men of the Creek and Yamasee Nations to the Charikes, who made it their business to perswade the Charikes to kill all the Whitemen among them and had an army of five hundred men within Ten miles of the place to have assisted them their Argument had prevailed So far . . . that Charikes were upon the point of falling upon Our men but as providence Order'd it they Chang'd their minds and fell upon the Creeks and Yamases who were in the Towns and kill'd Every man of them Since which the Charikes have been again down in our Settlements for Arms and Ammunition to Carry on the War against their and Our Enemies. The alliance of the Cherokees with the South Carolinians changed the direction of the Yemasee War in favor of the English.

From the late summer and early fall of 1715 until the final peace with the Creeks in November 1717, Indian forays were, with the exception of the Cherokee-Creek-Yemasee clash of January 1716, almost always small in number of participants and victims as the fighting regressed to bush or guerilla
tactics on a low rather than high or collective violence level. For example, in a letter from Charleston dated November 16, 1715 the Indians were said to have "been pretty quiet of late and wont appear to come to a decisive Battle they pursue their old method of Bush fighting and one or other of our Scouts are daily shot down without ever seeing an Enemy and without prospect of being revenged by the rest for the Indians lye perdue in some narrow Defile where they have learned our people will pass or near some good Spring and being hidden by the Bushes pour in their volley and then Scour off into the Woods so two or three men are killed... not come to a General Engagement being very sensible the War Inriches themselves and impoverishes us..."

The following summer the Indians continued their guerilla activities as revealed in a letter to the Lords Proprietors on August 6, 1716, which reported "they have already began to make Incursions amongst us, in Small parties, having by that means Destroy'd Several or our Inhabitants very Lately, Last week in Particular, Major Henry Quintyne, and Several others were killed near Port. Royal, by ye Yemasees..."

In a letter from Charleston on March 29, 1717, it was stated that one "Wm Steed was kill'd at a Cowpen about 6 Miles from Edystow River Bluff..."

From another letter dated April 8, 1717, it was disclosed that Indians still lurked about inhabited areas committing isolated acts of violence as two white men had recently been murdered in the vicinity of Fort Edisto. And in a letter from Cornelius Bradley to
the Board of Indian Commissioners, read during a special summons of the commission in April 1717, the nefarious handiwork of the Indians was explicitly depicted as Bradley said he "perceived the corpses of seven persons in the water" including that of Mr. Joseph Thompson near Port Royal.62

Nevertheless an uneasy peace was being approached in the summer of 1717 when the Chickasaws made peace with the English and the Creeks sent a flag of truce to negotiate a possible peace treaty with the English. The Commons House of Assembly reported the following to the Lords Proprietors on June 4, 1717:

... The last Week came to Town sixteen of the head Men of the Chickasaws Nation, and we have made a firm Peace with them, And on Sunday last came to Town and English Man ... and two Chief Indians of the Nation call'd ... Creeks, and they desire in Behalf of their people to have peace and a Trade with us. They offer to restore all the White people they have amongst them ... and all the Negroes and Horses they have taken during the War; Tis believed they have not less than forty Negroes and above 500 Horses; So we have assured them of safe Conduct, and have given them leave to come with what force they please for their own Safety to Our Savanna Garrison ... and then with their Emperour (Brim's) and twenty more to come to our nearest Garrison, which we call the Ponds ... This last if it take good Effect will entirely end Our Indian War; the Creeks ... shall fall upon the Yamasees and endeavour to extirpate them and then ... we shall have a firm peace with them as long as the Sun and Moon Shall Shine ... 63

Finally in late 1717 an uneasy peace reigned over the territory inhabited by the South Carolinians and the many indigenous Indian tribes.

The corrupt and often cruel practices of the English Indian traders prior to 1715 were primarily responsible for
the initial Indian attacks on the English people and their settlements, but French and Spanish support of the violent actions of the Indians helped to prolong the war and added to the number of deaths suffered by the English. For example, Thomas Broughton informed the Lords Proprietors in March 1716 of news he received from a Mr. John Smith who escaped from the Creeks at Pensacola earlier that year. Broughton wrote "that whilst he [Smith] Stay'd there Several of the Creeks came to that place ... [and] they acquainted him [that] the French at Mobile had Supply'd them with Arms and Ammunition and had Sent considerable presents to the head men of those Nations who are now our Enemies with a design to Engage them Entirely to their Own Interest ... [also] that they [the French] had Sent up a perriaugar with Sixteen field pieces and a Company of men to Settle a Fort among the Albamas ..."64 On April 28, 1716, Broughton added in another letter to the Lords Proprietors "that the French have promised the Creeks yt as soon as there is Warr between Great Britain and France ... they will join themselves with them and our other Enemy Indians and totally destroy this province, and in the mean time they supplied them with Arms and Ammunition ..."65 In July 1716 Broughton sent an additional report to the Lords Proprietors concerning Spanish and French influence in aiding and abetting Indian attempts to harass and destroy the English settlement in South Carolina. He wrote that "the greatest and most war-like part likewise of our Indians which were in Friendship
with this Government are now in ye Interest of ye French and Spaniards, and as we are informed, not only protected but abetted and Set on by them to disturb, and (if possible) ruine this colony."

However the most complete and reliable information sent to the Lords Proprietors in reference to the indictment that Spanish and French influence upon the Indians prolonged the Yemasee War and visibly increased the number of settlers either killed or wounded was contained in a letter dated August 6, 1716, and in the copies of certificates of two affidavits from Colonel Robert Daniel dated August 13, 1716. In the former Hugh Brian, who had been a prisoner of the Yemasee Indians at St. Augustine since 1715, gave an account of his experiences during his imprisonment. Brian "had heard the Indians telling one another oftentimes that the Spanish perswaded them what they could to Kill the English, provided they did not Let them see it Done. And he has all along been an Eye witness to the Spaniards furnishing ye Yamasees with whatever they wanted to carry on the War against us; His Master once Carried him amongst the Creeks ... while he was there divers Parties of Indians came in with Ammunition from Mobile and Pensecola who also Encourage the Indians all they can to Destroy us." Included in the same letter was a charge against the Spanish for permitting the Yemasees to hold prisoner white women and children as well as Negroes slaves, while the English did not permit their Indian allies to retain or imprison any
Spaniards but instead turn the prisoners over to the English who then returned them to St. Augustine. The affidavits of James Cochran and George Duckett accused the Spaniards of "incouraging the Yamasee Indians against the people of Carolina, and buying Plunder from and protecting the sd Indians." Deputy Governor Robert Daniel wrote the following of the affidavit signed by James Cochran:

Know Ye that having Several complaints and Information Given unto me that the Spanish Government at St. Augustine Did Intise Stir Up and Incourage the Yamasees and other Nations of Indians to make continual Deprecation on his Majesties Subjects of this province committing frequent Murders on their persons and Robbing them of their Slaves Goods and their Cattle and conveying them to St. Augustine and there Disposing of them to the Spaniards who openly bought them of the said Indians I the Govr aforesd Did . . . Commission and Appointed Major James Cochran . . . to be Agent for this Government to St. Augustine to Demand the Prisoners Slaves and other Effects belonging to his Majesties Subjects which were in possession of the Spaniards who Bought them of the said Yemasee Indians . . . at his arrival at St. Augustine he Did there See Several of his own Slaves in possession of the Spaniards as also Several other Slaves who told him they belong'd to his Majesties Subjects of this province and were Carried and Sold to the Spaniards by the sd Indians . . . also Saw Several Perriagos there which he was Inform'd belonged to his Majesties Subjects . . . The sd Cochran further Deposeeth that he was Inform'd that the Yamasees had a constant supply of ammunition from the Spanish Government.

The Deputy Governor further incriminated the Spanish by recounting from George Duckett's affidavit:

George Duckett a Shipwright now Living in Charles Town Butt Lately at Port Royall and having been Several Voyages to St. Augustine Since the beginning of this Indian Rebellion . . . he saw Several Slaves belonging to his Neighbours at Port Royal in possession of the Spaniards and bought by them of the Yamasee Indians who Plundered and Robbed
the sd Slaves of . . . Majr Cochran and of James
Patterson Collo Barnwell Mrs Ford Mr Dicks Mrs
Graham Mr Adams and one Slave belonging to himself
. . . Duckett further Deposeth that the sd Yamasee
Indians During his Stay amongst them at St
Augustine Inform'd and Assured him that the
Spaniards Supplied them with as much Gunpowder and
Ball as they Demanded and that the Spaniards
Bought all Such Goods of them the sd Indians which
they plundered or Robbed from his Majesties
Subjects Inhabitants of this province.$71

Even after the peace treaty was signed with the Creek
Indians in late 1717, Governor Johnson wrote of the unfavorable effect the French and Spanish had upon the Indians of
neighboring South Carolina, the settlers' servants and
slaves, and those individuals who had committed crimes.
Johnson protested "as to the Warr with the Indians I have
since my coming made Peace with Severall Nations . . . but
Treatys . . . are very precarious, so long as the French
from Mobele and Spaniards from St Augustin live and built
Forts amongst them and doe continually by presents and
Furnishing them with Arms and Amunission and buying the
Slaves and plunder encourage them to warr upon us . . . also
Servants Slaves Robbers and Debtors frequently escape from
hence there and when demanded can have no return . . . ."$72
The continuing support of Indian forays against the English
settlers by the French and Spanish remained a source of
irritation between the respective governments through the
first four decades of the eighteenth century.

After the eviction of the Yemases to St. Augustine and
the coming of a tenuous peace with the Creeks in late 1717,
Indian scalping parties wandered from the St. Augustine area
into South Carolina and Georgia for the next twenty-three
years barbarously killing white men, confiscating Negroes, and taking their plunder and prisoners to the safety of Spanish territory. While these isolated but violent incursions were being committed by the Indians with Spanish and French support, the English attempted to eliminate Spanish control of St. Augustine as an effective supply base and sanctuary for the Indians harassing the English. Robert Johnson expounded upon the need for the English to control St. Augustine by remarking that "it would be of great advantage not only to the Province but to the rest of the English Empire in America to have St. Augustine taken from the Spaniards for it would make a Notable barrier to his Majesties Dominions upon the Main, it wou'd be a place of Refuge and relief to his Majesties Subjects that are in distress . . . It wou'd put an end to the distresses the Settlement lies under by the depredations of the Indians abetted and Incouraged by the Spaniards . . ."73 In October 1719 English Indian allies, in response to recent Yemasee depredations upon English settlers, attacked the St. Augustine area. This expedition against the Spanish and the Yemasees included fifty Indians, a half-breed named Griffen, one man named Musgrove, one white man, and Oweeka (a Creek Indian who led the attackers).74 John Barnwell reported the following:

... they gott to ye Indian towne 4 hours before day on Munday ye 12th Instant and having sent out their Spys or Scouts ... As soon as ye Scouts returned, they divided their body into three parts and Fell on three towns att once but did not take
above 24 prisoners as the Yemasees received warning of the proposed attack and escaped and killed 5 or 6 Indians by reason of ye sd discovery but they burnt all the provisions and houses and took a good deal of plunder. Tuloomota one of ye towns was with in a mile of ye Castle of St Augustine ... and the Indians burnt a Fine Church there ye Fryer Escaping but some of his domesticks and his plate and ye plunder his house fell into their hands ... The Indians Appointed to Rendezvous att ye Palatchee ... but when they came there they found it deserted upon which they sett Fire to their Corn houses and round house this town is Four miles from St Augustine. . . . 75 

The Spaniards attempted to attack the Indians but failed miserably losing fourteen killed and ten taken as prisoners. The Indians, who were primarily Creeks, sent seven of the prisoners, after taking their clothes, back to the main Spanish contingent and kept the remaining three prisoners as hostages. The Creeks informed John Barnwell that several people, including Mr. and Mrs. Cord, the Burrow's child, Marcus, and an Indian woman had all been murdered by the Indians living in the vicinity of St. Augustine.76 However, after the successful skirmish against the pro-Spanish Indians residing near St. Augustine, the English and their Indian allies did not attack this area until 1728.

During the time between the two major English sponsored attacks on St. Augustine, October 1719 and March 1728, the belligerent Indians and Spanish constantly invaded and ravaged the rural regions of South Carolina. In May 1720, Thomas Hepworth wrote "that the Indians to the Northward of this Settlement [Charleston] have again broke out War against the inhabitants settled in those parts and that the Indians to the Southward of this Colony also have lately
made incursions and depredations on our settlements there by
killing some people and carrying away diverse slaves . . . "77
Three months later William Day told Colonel John Barnwell a
group of Indians with a few Spanish forces assaulted St.
Helena killing one man and capturing one white man and sev-
eral slaves.78 On February 11, 1723, Antonio Rexidor wrote
that during the attack of the Uchisa Indians upon his
settlement he lost three slaves.79 In a letter to the
governor, Francis Nicholson, it was noted an "Indian named
Wanie . . . had three hats full of money from the Spaniards
for the three Scalps by him brought to St. Augustine . . . "80
John Sharp reported an Indian incursion in November 1724 when
some two hundred Indians attacked his house, and "after
having fired two vollies upon my house . . . the Savage dogs
entered upon my house, Plundering and Carrying off everything
of Vallue, Stripping me of all, leaving me nothing but A
pair of Breeches, and a pair of old Shoes to Cover my
Nakedness . . . "81 In the same month the governor was in-
formed of the murders of three Indian traders by the Creeks
near the village of Norgoutchee.82

Arthur Middleton, President of the Council, wrote a de-
tailed report to the King in June 1728 listing the Indian
intrusions in South Carolina from August 1726 to the attack
upon St. Augustine by the English under the leadership of
Colonel John Palmer. Middleton said the Spanish were respon-
sible for sending not only the Indians against the English
but also the former slaves of the English settlers.83 "The
Indians they send against us are sent out in small Partys headed by two three or more Spaniards and sometimes joined with Negroes, and all the Mischief they doe is on a sudden and by surprise, And the Moment they have done it, They retire againe to St. Augustine. In August 1726 the Cusabo Indians attacked the house of Richard Lawson on French's Island and murdered Lawson and his wife. The following month a party of seven Yemasees killed John Edwards and took four Negro slaves with them on their return to St. Augustine. Ten months later (June 1727) a group of Indians from St. Augustine entered the settlements near Port Royal and murdered William Laver and John Sparkes, destroyed their homes, but spared the lives of their wives. The Indians warned the women that another war party was coming which would spare no person's life. The next month Mathew Smallwood, John Annesly, Charles Smith, Albert and John Hutchinson were traveling in Smallwood's periago toward Fort King George on the Altamaha River when they "were sett upon by thirty four Indians that came from Augustine, Twenty six where of them were Yamasees ... and murdered and Scalped all the five persons above mentioned, and then robbed them of all they had on board ... At the same time they took three other Prisoners one John Gray and William Gray and one Beans and Carryed them to St. Augustine. While they were imprisoned in St. Augustine William and John Gray heard the governor of St. Augustine urge a group of forty-eight Indians and two Spaniards to kill all the English people
they encountered and to take all their Negro slaves. The governor offered them thirty pieces of gold for each white man's scalp and one hundred pieces of gold for each live Negro brought to St. Augustine. This war party murdered two white men and captured ten Negro slaves, but they were pursued by a group of fifteen South Carolinians who killed seven members of the war party (six Indians and one Spaniard) and recaptured the Negro slaves. In September 1727 some runaway slaves and Indians murdered a few people at French's Island and took twelve people as prisoners to St. Augustine. Finally, in October of the same year a schooner manned by Spanish and Negroes landed at David Ferguson's plantation and ravaged the premises and seized seven Negro slaves.87

While the harassment of English settlers continued, Arthur Middleton convened the Commons House of Assembly on August 27, 1727, "and upon Mature Advice with my Council, We agreed to form a Party of a hundred White Men and about a hundred Indians to goe and Cutt off these Yemasees who thus annoyed our Southern Frontiers, and sent them under the Command of Coll John Palmer."88 Colonel Palmer, a hero of the late Yemasee War, with his party of seventy-nine whites and ninety friendly Indians marched toward St. Augustine, and on March 9, 1728, he destroyed the Yemasee settlements near St. Augustine. Palmer forced the Yemasees and the inhabitants of St. Augustine to take asylum in the castle. He then ravaged and burned houses, destroyed provisions, killed approximately thirty Indians, and took fifteen other Indians
as prisoners. Two years after Palmer's expedition the English and the Cherokee Indians, in an attempt to stop Indian-white hostilities, proposed a treaty in which punishments would be given to those persons responsible for the crime or crimes. The proposed treaty stated "that if by any Accidental Misfortune it should happen that an English Man should kill an Indian the King or Great Man of the Cherokees shall first complain to the English Governor and the man who did it shall be punished by the English Laws as if he had killed an English Man And in the manner if an Indian kills an English Man the Indian who did it shall be delivered up to the Governor and be punished by the same English law ...".

English attempts to halt Indian depredations against South Carolinians were not successful as incidents of Indian violence continued in the fourth decade of the eighteenth century. Though the intrusions were fewer in number than during the previous two decades, the extreme viciousness of the isolated attacks did not diminish. In August 1732 the South Carolina Gazette reported that an Indian trader named Peter Shaw was murdered and scalped and his servant seriously injured. During the ensuing winter the Tuscarora Indians, who had recently returned to the North and South Carolina back country after their defeat in the Tuscarora War of 1711-1712, were accused by the governor of South Carolina, Robert Johnson, of having acquired the services of five other Indian tribes in stealing slaves and
horses from Carolina planters, of murdering old men and women, and of robbing and destroying plantations in the back country areas of South Carolina. Johnson wanted the friendly Catawba Indians to attack and defeat the rebellious Tuscarora Indians, but he sent William Wales, an Indian trader, to discuss the raids with the belligerent Indians and ask for a complete redress of all grievances. However, incidents persisted as related by a story in the South Carolina Gazette in December 1732 of the cruel slaughter of four men in a rural area of South Carolina. The paper stated that Simon Leach, Robert Johnson (no relation to the then governor of South Carolina), Mr. Lewis, and a half-breed were "found dead . . . with their Heads cutt off, and their Horses and Goods carried away; it is supposed to be done by the Chactaws, at the Instigation of the French." As 1732 passed relations between the white inhabitants of South Carolina and neighboring Indian tribes remained quite unstable.

Two and one-half years of Indian violence and slaughtering as exemplified by the violent death of George Stevens in March 1735 (refer to the Introduction) and the intrusions of the Tuscarora Indians prompted Lieutenant Governor Thomas Broughton to issue a proclamation against the Tuscarora Indians. Broughton declared "whereas Those who inhabit the Outer-Settlements of this his Majesty's Province, as well as many others, living and residing in the same, have and do daily receive many and notorious Abuses,
from the Tuscaroraw Indians, is so much that great part of their Estates and Properties are carried away and destroy'd by the Indians; And whereas the General Assembly of this Province . . . have agreed to allow a Reward to any such person whatsoever, Freeman or Slave, who shall kill any Tuscaroraw Indian, of Fifty Pounds Current Money, and Sixty Pounds Current Money, for every Tuscaroraw Indian who shall be taken alive, upon such persons delivering such Indians to the Publick Treasurer of this Province . . . "95 In July 1736 fourteen Cusabo Indians located a party of one hundred Tuscarora Indians; whereupon, they killed and scalped two of the Tuscaroras and returned to Charleston to receive their fifty pound rewards.96 The following March seven Indians from a tribe of the Upper Creeks confederacy murdered a Spaniard, an Indian, a mulatto, and a Negro when a gun "belonging to one of their People who had been killed with his Family some time ago" was found in the possession of the four men.97 However, English attempts to gain sufficient Indian allies to eliminate those Indians who opposed them were not entirely successful.

In May 1736 a group of Yemasee Indians attacked and slew two women of the Ochese tribe, a tribe of the Lower Creek Indians who were on a friendly basis with the Carolinians.98 And, in October of the same year a man living at Point's Creek returned home and found "his Wife, another Woman, 3 children and a Negro murder'd and burnt, some of their clothes all bloody were found a little way off
The uneasy relations between the South Carolinians and several of the native Indian tribes continued through 1740 as reports came to Charleston of continuing support of the Indian violence by the French and the Spanish. William Bull wrote the governor of South Carolina that the French wished to "destroy or Subdue all the Indians in Friendship with the English and by that Means with their Indians to carry an easy War into all the Settlements of the English along the Sea Coast ..." With the approach of the fifth decade of the eighteenth century the Carolinians and their Indian neighbors had a tenuous relationship at best.

Indian-white relations reached their lowest ebb in colonial South Carolina during the first four decades of the eighteenth century. Collective and low-level violence was widespread and as described culminated in the wicked and vicious Yemasee War of 1715-1718. In reference to the Indian violence of this period, both collective and individual violence, Dr. Richard M. Brown notes that "the norms of Indian warfare were ... at a more barbaric level than those of Western Europe. Among the Indians of Eastern America torture was an accepted and customary part of warring. In their violent encounters with Indians, the white settlers brought themselves down to the barbaric level of Indian warfare. Scalping was adopted by white men ... Broken treaties, unkept promises, and the slaughter of defenseless women and children all, along with the un-
European atrocity of taking scalps, continued to characterize the white American's mode of dealing with the Indians.101 The justification for the Indians' violence can easily be found in the exploitation of the Indians by the many greedy, egotistic, and unscrupulous Indian traders as well as in the real and potentially greater dispossession of Indian land by white settlers. One recent historian has taken these factors (among others) into account and described the interactions of the two societies within a cultural framework. He says "the pattern of interrelation between white and Indian, at least in its limits, was set by the integral nature of the two cultures and its history can be written only by accepting its tragic implications for the Indian and proceeding to the business of analyzing the cultural clash between the two societies. One need not sanction the self-righteousness of the white man's society or see any merit in the dishelved individualism that underlay its rush for conquest to understand the Indian's desperate situation. The process of his decline derives no meaning from the assertion of the white man's guilt, without the context of cultural disintegration the accusation is gratuitous. Within that context, however, it takes on a fitting pathos."102 Indian-white violence in South Carolina, with its rapidly advancing economy, its ambitious inhabitants who desired to possess and utilize large tracts of land, and the mother country's great need to secure Great Britain's colonial position against Spain and France in North America, was inevitable during the first
four decades of the eighteenth century.
CHAPTER II
WHITE-WHITE VIOLENCE

South Carolina faced political instability from within which resulted in sporadic acts of low-level and unorganized high-level violence as well as external aggression from belligerent Indians during the opening years of the eighteenth century. Spain attempted to capitalize upon the weaknesses of Carolina's proprietorship by direct assault during the first decade of the eighteenth century and thereafter by harassment, including both the remaining years of South Carolina's proprietorship (to 1719) and into her years as a royal colony. Incidents of white versus white crime and fanaticism were only sparingly reported before the South Carolina Gazette published its first edition in 1732, but with the advent of a weekly newspaper the number of reported acts of violence increased substantially.

The final nineteen years of South Carolina's proprietorship and her first ten years as a royal colony recorded periods of political instability which led to dissension by people opposing the actions of the Commons House of Assembly, the Council, and Governor. In the Commons House of Assembly in February 1703 John Ash presented a new bill pertaining to the managing of elections and authorization of aliens voting rights. Governor Moore opposed the bill, and the Commons
had Ash arrested at the governor's request. Rioting started a few days later, lasting four or five days, and those dissenting were "assaulted and set upon in the open Street, without any Provocation or Affront by them given or offer'd. The said Thomas Smith was set upon by Lt. Col. George Dearsby, who with his Sword drawn, and the Point held at the same Smith's belly, swore he would kill him, and if he had not been prevented, would have done the said Smith some considerable Mischief to the endangering of his life." John Ash was assaulted by the "rude, drunken, ungovernable Rabble, ... who set upon the said Ash, used him Villanously and Barbarously." In failing to suppress the rioters, Governor Moore let the rabble enter John Smith's home, throw his pregnant wife on the floor, mistreat her, and cause her to bear a dead child. The efforts by John Ash to introduce a new election bill therefore proved useless as the election of 1703 was permeated by illegal voting procedures.

When Governor Tynte died in the summer of 1709, the three deputies, Fortescue Tuberville, Robert Gibbes, and Thomas Broughton, had to choose an interim governor among themselves. Between the morning and afternoon sessions, Fortescue Tuberville changed his vote which altered the election's decision of a temporary governor. However, it was disclosed that the governor-elect, Robert Gibbes, bribed Tuberville and, therefore, Colonel Thomas Broughton demanded the governorship. Broughton, with a group of ardent followers, marched to Charleston to replace Gibbes and run
the government. An ensuing scuffle damaged neither side, and Gibbes remained in control of the governor's seat. Ten years later the proprietary government abdicated to royal authority in a bloodless revolution.6

Colonel William Rhett was especially displeased with the change in governmental control, though he never really liked the manner in which the proprietors allowed South Carolina to be run, and manifested his displeasure by "raising Mutiny and Comotions . . . against his Majesty by calling together 70 or 80 men in Arms to fire on the Shoreham Man of War and the Comand'r Howard."7 Colonel Rhett and his men also fired upon the officers and men occupying the customs house, but Rhett was wounded and his men were dispersed by members of the militia.8 Approximately two years later, in May 1721, Colonel Robert Johnson, governor of South Carolina when governmental authority was stripped from the proprietors by a popular revolution, attempted to restore himself as governor of South Carolina. One hundred twenty men "headed by Collo Johnson and Capt. Hildersly [the preceding October Robert Johnson granted Hildesley a commission to be the colonel of the local troops] when they had got under Arms and upon their March they detached two Gentlen of their Council with the Inclosed letter from Colle Johnson which made us [the inhabitants of Charleston who led the popular revolution and favored living under royal authority] put ourselves in the best posture of Defence Wee could to receive them."9 Johnson, Hildesley, and their
men shortly thereafter appeared before Charleston, but after only three shots from the guns of the fort Johnson agreed to peaceably settle the issue. The Colonel "promised and gave his honor That he would never trouble his head with the present Government any more And immediately order'd all his Men to be disbanded and sent about their business." All the men with the exception of Captain Hildesley complied with Colonel Johnson's order; therefore, Hildesley was placed under house arrest the following day to prevent any bodily harm to himself. For the next six years a degree of political stability prevailed in South Carolina.

On June 11, 1727 Landgrave Thomas Smith was charged with "High Treason in conspiring and endeavoring to raise an Insurrection in this his Majesties province to subvert his Majesties Government and to levy War against his Majesty." In arresting Thomas Smith at his home on the morning of the twelfth of June, the constables and other spirited and too zealous citizens horrified Smith's pregnant wife and caused his eldest daughter to have a seizure of fits which led to a protracted illness. Approximately one year later Thomas Smith, son of Landgrave Thomas Smith, was discharged from arrest when he promised to quiet some two hundred people who wanted to overthrow Arthur Middleton and the other Council members. At the same time Middleton ordered the treasurer to withdraw warrants against a number of men who were going to kill the provost marshal over an incident regarding the levying of public taxes for the support of South Carolina's
government. The following year Landgrave Thomas Smith was discharged from the colony's Council because he "hath Greatly favoured and abetted such Riotous and Tumultous proceedings in order to get himself proclaimed as President and Commander in Chief And being Charged with Treason for Conspiring to Levy War And indeavouring to raise an Insurrection in our province and to Subvert the Government." Political instability receded into practical non-existence during the 1730's as royally appointed officials successfully administered South Carolina's government.

While South Carolina's internal political violence never reached the peak intensity associated with a sustained effort of collective or group violence but most often involved infrequent incidents of individual or low-level violence, Spanish attempts to eliminate the English from South Carolina were made in one concerted attack (with French assistance) upon Charleston and thereafter in harassment of Carolina's frontier settlements and English sea trade. On August 24, 1706 Captain Stool, commander of a private sloop out of New York, warned South Carolina officials that four or five French ships loaded with Spanish troops were headed toward Charleston to destroy the city and its inhabitants. Subsequently, the lookouts sighted the foreign craft approaching Charleston. Colonel William Rhett "caused an alarum to be made, and dispatched away a Messenger with a letter to the Governour giving him an account of the same; and other messengers with letters to
the severall Captains of the Companies in the Country to order them to make ye alarm and to march forthwith with their Companies to town . . . "17 The following three days companies of militia reported to Charleston and camped in close proximity to Charleston to help defend the strategic harbor city from the expected assault by the combined French and Spanish force. Despite a sickness in Charleston which had incapacitated many people, Governor Johnson brought forces bivouaced near Charleston into the town to meet the enemy. Wednesday morning, August 28, 1706, Colonel William Rhett was given command of four ships, one brigantine, two sloops, and one fire ship, to combat the enemy naval force. Monsieur LeFabure, admiral of the French ships, sent a message to Governor Johnson to surrender, but Johnson refused and maintained he "would defend it [Charleston] in ye name and by ye authority of ye Queen of England, and that he valued not any force he [Monsieur LeFabure] had and bid him goe about his business."18

On Thursday the Spanish and French landed men on a stretch of land between the Wando River and the sea, burning two vessels moored near Colonel Darsley's store house and then destroying his store house. Another contingent of the enemy landed on James Island and set fire to a house, but they were driven to their ship by Indians who were accompanying Captain Drake's men to combat the invaders. Before dawn on Friday one hundred men under the command of Captain Cantey and Captain Fenwick assaulted a force of one hundred
sixty Spanish and French troops on the neck of land between the Wando River and the sea. The Carolinians routed their adversaries killing and wounding twelve men, causing six or seven men to drown in a nearby stream while trying to escape, and taking thirty-three others prisoners. The South Carolina force only lost one man killed in the action. The next day Colonel Rhett, now serving as a temporary vice-admiral, sailed toward the enemy fleet with his original fleet of four ships plus three additional ships and forced the French ships to flee from Charleston harbor. The following afternoon Captain Watson patrolled the area for any remaining enemy ships, and though he found no ships he did manage to capture an additional fourteen prisoners on the neck of land between the Wando River and the sea. And martial law, in force since the preceding Tuesday, was no longer in effect.¹⁹

However it was not until the following Tuesday that the Carolinians successfully halted the threat of a Spanish and French conquest of Charleston and the neighboring settlements. Captain John Fenwick and "his Company with some others of ye patrol came up with ye enemy [near Sewee Bay] who thought they were more in number than ours and advantagiously posted, yet our men charging of them and severall of ye enemy falling ye rest cried out for Quarter, so they killed about twelve or fourteen of ye enemy and took about fifty prisoners and brought them to Charles Town amongst wch prisoners was Captain John Pacquerean ye Comander of the said ship [the French ship which landed the enemy
troops at Sewee Bay. That same evening Colonel Rhett forced the ship which had transported enemy troops to Carolina to surrender to him. Rhett's prize included some eighty to ninety prisoners. Two days later Colonel Rhett returned to Charleston with the captured French ship and several officers from the enemy landing force. South Carolinians were finally responsible for the capture of more than two hundred thirty prisoners, both Spanish and French. France abandoned further efforts to attack Charleston, to directly engage other Carolina settlements, or to confiscate English trading ships, but Spain continued to torment South Carolina, take English ships involved in sea trade, and threaten to invade South Carolina through Charleston.21

Lord Hamilton wrote to the proprietors in June 1716 that Spanish vessels continued to take British vessels after a peace had been concluded with Spain. He noted "the British vessels have been taken on the Seas passing on their lawful Occasions by Spanish vessels under Colour of Commissions ... and frequently by vessels [which] have no Commissions, for which no other Pretence has in some cases been found than that some few Spanish Pistols or inconsiderable Sums of coined Silver of that Nation ... has been found on board ... some Vessels indeed have been seized on their Coast on Suspicion of Trade, and have been detain'd and kept without any Proof of their having traded, and without any legal Condemnation."22 Three years later the Council of South Carolina warned the proprietors that
Spain intended to invade their colony with "large Levies of men with Shipping to Endeavour to retake from the English and french In America all Such Places as ever did belong to the Crown of Spain or was ever Claymed by it."\(^{23}\) The invasion force was supposed to include fourteen ships, fourteen hundred men, field pieces, scaling latters, and other war materials.\(^{24}\) South Carolina reacted to the proposed invasion by constructing breastworks, fortifying the port of Charleston, fitting out four ships to meet the invading force, and stationing two small vessels near St. Augustine to warn of the approach of the invasion force.\(^{25}\) Spain did not make an assault upon Charleston but reverted to hit-and-run attacks upon English sailing vessels.

In a letter to the Board of Trade dated September 6, 1720, Colonel James Moore, Jr. complained of Spain's capturing colonial and English sailing vessels near the coasts of South Carolina and Virginia. Moore explained he returned fifty prisoners to St. Augustine and the Spanish returned the same number of prisoners to Charleston, but the Spanish refused to return any English vessels or goods which had been confiscated by Spanish privateers.\(^{26}\) One and a half years later John Lloyd wrote to Lord Carteret, Secretary of State to the King, and asked for men and supplies to be sent to South Carolina to halt Spanish seizure of English vessels and theft of Negro servants.\(^{27}\) During the summer of 1727 Charleston reported Spanish privateers were responsible for taking four more English ships, the *Lydia*, the sloop
Two Brothers, the sloop Betty, and a ship captained by John Hall, and sailing them to the Spanish controlled port of Havana. In September of the same year a man-of-war and a sloop fitted out with fourteen guns began sailing the coast of South Carolina and noticeably reduced the amount of Spanish seizures of English trading ships. While Spanish privateers were capturing English ships and confiscating their goods, pirates were committing treacherous acts of violence along South Carolina's coast.

In 1700 Governor Joseph Blake wrote the following account to the Lords Proprietors concerning the execution of eight pirates and the need for armed English naval ships to keep the Carolina coast free from further activities by pirates:

... I informed [you] of two Pirats that I had in my Custody yt did belong to one Hind a notorious Pirat, but that I had noe evidence as then against them, ... since while some persons are arrived here that had been taken and plundered by them, so that I have brought them to their tryall here, they have been found Guilty are condemned and to be executed two days hence: I have likewise seaven other piratts that now lye condemned sixe of which are att the same to suffer death the other who is the least guilty I save to be executioner to the rest. I am sure nothing but Examples of this nature will put a stop to those barbarous villaries, the sea now so abounding with them that a ship cannot stirr for them in this part of the world, the pirat the seaven did belong to had in three months time taken seaventeen English vessells, and upon a difference amongst themselves turned those (yt we have condemned) ashore ..., they have watered in a river a little to the Southward and were got out to sea again before I could come up with them, it takeing up some time to fitt out two sloopes as I did against them haweing none in readinesse, wherefore I most Humbly begge yor Lordship would be pleased
to addresse his most sacred Majestye yt he would be pleased to order one of his small friggatts to attend this Government and the Bahamas, in order to the keeping the Coast clear from Pirats, for as it now is there doth hardly a ship come through the Gulfe or on our Coast but is plundered. . . .

The activities of the pirates did not cease with Blake's plea, but it was not until the latter part of the second decade of the eighteenth century that the pirates posed a distinct threat to the colony of South Carolina.

South Carolina's trade with England continually increased during the eighteenth century, and in 1718 trade with England was estimated at £160,000 sterling. The peak of pirate incursions along the Carolina coast and into Charleston harbor occurred in 1718. In June 1717 Governor Daniel imprisoned four pirates, Stephen James deCossey, Francis deMont, Francis Rossoe, and Emmanuel Erando, charging them with confiscating three vessels, the Turtle Dove, the Penelope, and the Virgin Queen, near Jamaica in July 1716. The pirates were summarily tried and convicted in June 1717 and executed on July 3, 1717. A King's dispatch was published and spread throughout South Carolina in September 1717 proclaiming that all pirates who surrendered in the following twelve months, and who had committed no piratical acts after January 5, 1718 would be completely pardoned. This act failed to affect the scurrilous activities of Edward Teach, Stede Bonnet, and Richard Worley.

On May 22, 1718 Edward Teach, commonly known as Blackbeard, lay off the Carolina coast near Charleston with two large ships, one a large French ship mounted with forty
guns and the other a sloop mounted with twelve guns, and two small ships which were the tender ships. Teach commanded the larger ship while a man named Richards captained the other armed sloop. They stopped several vessels including a ship commanded by Captain Clark which left Charleston harbor. From each ship Teach imprisoned important people and confiscated valuable merchandise. Samuel Wragg and his son were two of the individuals held by the pirate. Teach, holding Wragg, his son, and several other persons prisoner, sent one of Clark's passengers and Richards to Governor Johnson with a message "to send them a Chest of Medicines which [if] was Refused by the Government they would immediately put to Death all the persons that were in there possession and Burn their Ships and would not only Content them Selves with that [but] Threatnd to Come over the Barr for to Burn the Ships that Lay before the Towne and to Beat it about our Ears as the Town is at present in a very In-different Condition of making much Resistance." The chest of medicines was sent immediately to Teach, and upon receiving them Samuel Wragg, his son, and the other prisoners were put ashore in a very dishelved condition. Teach left Charleston harbor filled with the plunder of several ships including fourteen slaves from a brigantine from Angola, the merchandise of a ship from Boston, and the terrified respect of Charleston's citizenry.

In September 1718 Colonel William Rhett, with a commission to pursue and suppress all pirates in the vicinity
of Charleston, searched for the pirate named Vane but encountered Stede Bonnet, or Thomas as he was then named, near Cape Fear on the twenty-sixth of September. During the evening Bonnet's ship, the Royal James with eight guns and a crew of fifty men, and Rhett's two ships, the Henry commanded by Captain Master and the Sea Nymph commanded by Captain Hall, prepared for the ensuing day's battle. On the twenty-seventh the battle occurred. Being outnumbered two to one by Rhett's ships, Bonnet attempted a "running conflict" to reach the open sea. As Bonnet and Rhett moved toward the open sea they ran their ships aground, and during the next five hours the Henry and the Royal James engaged in a cannon and small arms battle. The Henry's final position after running aground revealed her deck to the Royal James, and hence, she suffered more casualties in the struggle. The Sea Nymph's position after running aground placed her out of range to aid the Henry. However, when the tide came in the Henry and the Sea Nymph righted themselves about an hour before the pirate ship righted itself, and "Collo Rhett making the Signall . . . to Board him [the Royal James], which the Pirate seeing sent a White Flagg, and after some short time, Surrender'd, on Collo Rhett's Promising he would interceed for Mercy . . ." During the course of the struggle the Carolinians lost twelve men killed, ten on the Henry and two on the Sea Nymph, and twenty-eight men wounded, fourteen on each ship; the pirates lost seven men killed and four wounded. Six Carolinians and two pirates died of
wounds suffered in the engagement. Thirty-three of Bonnet's crew were tried, and twenty-nine men were found guilty and condemned by Judge Nicholas Trott to be hanged. They were hung in November 1718. Four of the crew were acquitted, and one turned state's evidence. Disguised as a woman, Stede Bonnet along with his sailing master, David Herriot, escaped, but Bonnet was recaptured and Herriot shot to death on Sullivan's Island in early November. Bonnet was condemned by Judge Trott to hang, and the sentence was executed on December 10, 1718.39

Richard Worley, a pirate of infamous fame, was in command of two ships which he anchored near Sullivan's Island in early November 1718. Governor Johnson commanded a force of four ships which sailed toward and anchored close to Worley's ships. Worley mistakenly took the ships for merchant vessels and the deception enabled Governor Johnson's ships to maneuver Worley's ships between themselves and Charleston. Two of the South Carolina ships approached the pirate sloop, and the Carolinians boarded the vessel; all the pirates on the deck were either killed or wounded. Meanwhile, Governor Johnson chased the pirate ship, Eagle, and fired one shot killing two men and forcing the ship to surrender. Worley, who was on the sloop, was killed in the battle in Charleston harbor along with twenty-six other pirates. On November 19, 1718 twenty-four men from Worley's ship came to trial. Nineteen men were found guilty and hung while five men were acquitted.40
The execution of forty-nine men, thirty men from Bonnet's crew and nineteen men from Worley's crew, demonstrated South Carolina's reaction to the crimes endured from the recent Yemasee War through the capture of Worley's crew in November 1718. The tolerance level of the colony's inhabitants towards criminal or violent activities was very low and the desire for punishing the offenders was extremely high. Pirate activity on the South Carolina coast was much more infrequent after the November 1718 executions. In 1724 a few pirates were imprisoned in Charleston, and in 1728 one pirate executed.\textsuperscript{41}

Incidents of white versus white violence occurred throughout the eighteenth century, and in 1724 the Dutartre family vividly illustrated the power a religious fanatic could wield over people anxious to believe in someone or something. Descendants of French refugees who migrated to South Carolina after the issuance of the Edict of Nantes, the Dutartres were respectable, poor, God-fearing inhabitants of South Carolina. Peter Rembert, a Moravian preacher who lived with the family, told them they were the chosen people to communicate with God. The Dutartre family completely withdrew from society. Peter Rembert, second husband of the eldest Dutartre daughter, was proclaimed their prophet. During a "visit" from God, Rembert was told to wed the youngest Dutartre daughter, a virgin, and let his wife (who had been a widower previous to her marriage to Rembert) wait for God to restore to life her dead husband.
The family, in the eyes of God as visualized by Rembert, was now purified.

Captain Peter Simmons, magistrate and militia officer, learned that Peter Rembert and Judy Dutartre, the youngest Dutartre daughter and Rembert's second wife, were living together contrary to the law and issued warrants for their arrest. Rembert told the Dutartre family to resist (even though the family was prohibited by religious beliefs to use weapons to resist) any vile men who would attempt to arrest the prophet or his wives. The constable approached the Dutartre home but was driven away by gun fire from within. Captain Simmons and a small body of militia accompanied the constable on his return to the Dutartre house to serve the warrant. After reaching the house the militia was fired upon by the Dutartre family. Captain Simmons was killed and several members of the militia force were wounded. The militia then fired their weapons into the house, killed one woman, and arrested the remaining six people. 42 On September 23, 1724 at the Court of General Sessions, "Michael Boineau, Peter Dutartre John Dutartre Daniel Dutartre and Peter Rembert were Indicted Arraigned Tried and Convicted of the Mrder of Peter Simmons Esqr. Whereupon the Court pronounced against them the following Sentences . . . Michael Boineau Peter Dutartre Daniel Dutartre John Dutartre and Peter Rembert . . . to the place of Execution where they should be Severally hanged by the Neck until they are dead." 43 Boineau, Rembert, and Peter Dutartre were to be hung on the
ninth of October, while John and Daniel Dutartre were to be executed on the twelfth of the same month. After the three men were hung on the ninth, Governor Nicholson pardoned John and Daniel Dutartre. Shortly thereafter one of the pardoned Dutartre’s killed a man, and consequently he joined his brother on the gallows.\textsuperscript{144}

Collective violence involving white versus white or non-white individuals, whether organized or unorganized, was reported quite extensively in the colonial records of South Carolina during the first forty years of the eighteenth century, but incidents of white versus white individual or low-level violence were only sparingly reported until Eleazer Phillips and then Thomas Whitmarsh started publishing a weekly newspaper in 1732, the \textit{South Carolina Gazette}. With the deaths of Phillips in 1732 and Whitmarsh in late 1733, Lewis Timothy came to South Carolina and published the \textit{South Carolina Gazette}. The Timothy family controlled the publication of the newspaper through the colonial period with the exception of the period between March 1772 and November 1773.\textsuperscript{145} During the period 1732 to 1740 the \textit{South Carolina Gazette} reported the following incidents of white versus white low-level violence: two robberies, four cases of manslaughter, seven murders, four executions for crimes, seven accidental deaths, seven suicides, threeblings, one death committed in self-defense, one ear cropping, and two burned hands.\textsuperscript{146}

In 1732 Joseph Summers was hung for being an accessory
before the fact to burglary and robbery. Summers' wife and child went to the gallows and watched him die. He denied "to the last, that he was Guilty of the Fact for which he was to suffer, but acknowledg'd that he had too often committed Crimes for which he deserved Death, and that Lying, Swearing, Theft, Whoring, and a general Neglect of Divine Ordinances, were the Vices that filled up the unhappy Measure of his Life." 547 Five years later John Blakely was hung in Charleston for robbing a man on a road outside Charleston. Sarah Chamberlain was hung in March 1738 for maliciously murdering her bastard child. While in 1740 John Perrins was hung for bestiality. Six murders, in addition to Sarah Chamberlain's treacherous act, reported during the period 1732-1740 in South Carolina involving only white participants included the following: Mr. Gough was murdered by an insane individual; Christopher Dennis was killed by Mr. Robinson and Michael Cairno when he refused to serve the two men any more drinks and they hit him on the head with a gun and kicked him in the stomach; the sons of the widow Holton, five and seven years old, died of an overdose of Opiate administered by their mother; Don Francisco de Hey was murdered by an unknown assailant; and, in May 1740 Samuel Batters murdered a sailor in Charleston harbor. Finally in April 1735 a marshal of Charleston was acquitted of any charges in killing a Mr. Gordon for resisting arrest. 548

Manslaughter involving white persons occurred four times during the period 1732 to 1740. In December 1732 Captain
Frost beat a sailor to death, and in December 1735 Doctor Patrick Tailfer beat his apprentice to death. Samuel Terrence, an Indian trader, killed a Mr. Riscue with a fire-brand in February 1736. One month later James Torrent killed a man by striking him on the head with a pewter mug. Samuel Terrence and James Torrent "both indicted for Mrder, guilty of Manslaughter, were brought up to Court and prayed the Benefit of Clergy--and were burnt in Hand and discharged." As well as the punishment of burning a person's hand for committing a crime, whippings were used as a means of punishment. On March 20, 1738, Alexander Forbes "being convicted of stealing a Briddle, Saddle, and one Pair of Boots, was ordered to be whipt, at the Cat's Tail, on Friday Morning next: Which Discipline he underwent the Time Twelve Month." Two years subsequent to Forbes's whipping, Timothy Randall was sentenced to be whipped for stealing two silver spoons from Mrs. Elisha Butler, while Elizabeth Davis was also sentenced to be whipped for stealing a tea kettle and other possessions from one Anne Murray. However, all physical punishments were not inflicted as the result of a court's decision as illustrated by the following incident:

We are inform'd that a certain Gentlemen in the Country having some business in Town left one of his reported Friends at his House to take care of his Spouse and to manage his Affairs in his absence. The Gentleman at his return hearing by one of his Negroes that his Friend had used a little too much Familiarity with his Wife, immediately took a loaded Pistol and went to meet his Friend in the Fields, who avoiding the blow, fell a wrestling with him, but the Gentleman calling his Negroes to assistance, cut off his Friends Ears...
Additional low-level violence involving caucasians during the 1730's manifested itself in seven recorded incidents of suicide. Four suicides occurred in 1732: Miss Fanny Braddock; Mr. Barnard Marret, who was thought to be insane, hung himself; a white servant of Mr. Robert Sinclair wilfully drowned himself; and, Thomas Morrison, who also was considered to be insane, drowned himself. Captain Robert Robinson, in August 1735, purposely fell overboard and was eaten by sharks. In May 1736 Charles Lowndes "(who, being parted from his Wife, was put in Prison by Order of the Government and Council, for not being willing to allow her a Maintenance) shot himself through the Head, and instantly died." While in December of the same year "one Williams a Taylor by Trade, in St. John's Parish, living unhappy with his Wife, shot himself through the Head." Accidental deaths as well as suicides signified that violence was inherent in colonial South Carolina where a prospering economy and a volatile social structure were present. Two accidental deaths occurred in 1732: one George Keith died in prison in January because of "his intemperate Way of living," and in May a man was killed by a cow. In June 1733 a cabin boy, Roger Davis, on the ship Betty Hope died of injuries acquired during a voyage and declared by a special Court of Admiralty as accidental. In May 1736 Mr. William Moore was hunting with some gentlemen when one man missed his intended target and accidentally killed Mr. Moore. In December 1636 "the Wife of Mr. Brian a Carpenter, coming home by
herself in the Evening, she went into the Kitchen, and sitting before the Fire she fell into a Fit, (as 'tis supposed, she being frequently seized with Fits) and tumbling with the Chair on her Back into the Fire, nobody then being present, she was found burnt to death in a miserable manner." And, two accidental deaths happened in 1740: Benjamin Walker was inadvertently shot by George Harris and Gideon Norton accidentally shot his wife while showing her how well he had cleaned the muzzle of the gun. White versus white violence, whether carefully organized or the result of some spontaneous action, was an integral characteristic of the settlement and growth of South Carolina's society during the period 1700-1740.
CHAPTER III
NEGRO-WHITE VIOLENCE

Incidents of violence between the white man and the Negro during the first forty years of the eighteenth century represented an insoluble problem which culminated in the infamous Stono Rebellion in 1739 followed by the stringent slave law of 1740. According to Herbert Aptheker, seven major Negro slave plots or revolts occurred from 1700 through the Stono Rebellion in 1739. On September 2, 1702, Captain William Davis and Captain Wilkinson testified to the Commons House of Assembly that a "negro man of Mr. John Williamson's who is now in Irons at his master's House for threatening that he with other negroes would Rise and Cut off the Inhabitants of this Province." Shortly thereafter Governor Johnson dispatched a statement calling for stricter enforcement of the slave acts and codes. And, in South Carolina a statute passed in 1704 provided for the stricter enforcement of slaves and their activities during times of crises, and a "system of coastal 'watch' stations, which became a main feature of the defensive measures taken by that province, was made to serve the additional purpose of apprehending slaves who might attempt an escape to St. Augustine." Rewards were given to those individuals who would volunteer for duty in these "watch" stations. In
1711 South Carolinians were apprehensive about the actions of "several Negroes who keep out, armed, and robbing and plundering houses and plantations." The rebellious Negroes were headed by a Negro named Sebastian; however, upon his death the forays by the Negroes diminished and eventually ceased. In 1713 the final recorded slave conspiracy of the second decade occurred. The projected revolt was crushed in its infancy when a Negro of Captain David Davis told the Captain of the intentions among the Negroes in the Goose Creek region.

During the 1720's and 1730's the Negro population in South Carolina increased rapidly. In 1720 Negroes numbered approximately twelve thousand, and by 1739 they were estimated numbering near forty thousand. In addition to the increasing number of Negroes, the problems with the Indians (Tuscarora and Yemasee Wars), and the promise of freedom in Florida by the Spanish heightened Negro desire to rebel and escape. In June 1720, a slave revolt, undoubtedly inspired by the above factors, transpired in South Carolina in which "a very wicked and barbarous plott of designe of the negroes rising with a designe to destroy all white people in the country them to take the town [Charleston] in full body but it pleased God it was discovered and many of them taken prisoners and some burnt and some hang'd and some banish'd. I think it proper for you to tell Mr. Percivall at home that his slaves was the principall rogues... 14 of them are not at the Savanna towne and sent for by white and Indians
and will be executed as soon as they come down they thought
to gett to Augustine and would have gott a creeke fellow to
have been their pulott but the Savana garrison took the
negroes up half starved and the creeke Indians would not
join them or be their pulots." Ten years later another
slave revolt was recorded in a letter from Charleston on
August 20, 1730, but the capture of the leaders ended the
conspiracy.11

In the early 1730's the white citizenry of South
Carolina became quite apprehensive as Negro crimes and un-
rest seemed to be rapidly increasing. Yet white reaction to
Negro violence was often as brutal if not more brutal than
the initial incident of violence by the black person or per-
sons. For example, in January 1732 Mr. Charles Jones pursued
a Negro who had robbed him, and "coming up with the Negro,
he resented and fought him, and he struck the Lock of his
Musket into the Negro's Scull and kill'd him. He went and
told a Justice what he had done, who ordered him to cut his
(the Negroe's) Head off, fix it on a Pole, and sit it in a
Cross Road, which was done accordingly ..."12 During
the following October more than two hundred Negroes were
gathered, and while meeting one Negro stabbed another Negro
in the neck. On January 20, 1733 a Negro knocked a boy off
his horse and stole the horse, but he was caught the next day
and hung two days later. In August 1733 a Negro man was ex-
ecuted for murdering an overseer with an axe. Eight months
later a Negro, named Quesb, was found guilty of burglary and
subsequently hung; his head was severed from his body after death and hung on the gallows.  

White reaction to these incidents of violence in 1732, 1733, and early 1734 was the passage of an act entitled "An Act for the better ordering and governing of Negroes and all other Slaves in the Province," and its subsequent publication in the South Carolina Gazette on May 4, 1734.  

The following provisions of the new slave act were especially restrictive and punitive:

. . . no Master, Mistress, Overseer, or other Person whatsoever . . . shall give their Negroes or other Slaves leave on Sundays, Fast-days, Holy-days, or any other Time, to go out of the Plantations, without a Letter or Ticket, . . . and every person, who shall see any Negro, or Slave, out of his Master's Plantation, without a Ticket, or Leave in writing from his Master . . . are impower'd to correct such Slave by whipping, not exceeding Twenty Lashes if an overseer does not apprehend a strange Negro or slave on his master's plantation he must forfeit twenty shillings . . . Provided always nevertheless, that every Master, Mistress, or Overseer, shall and may have Liverty to whip any strange Negro, or other Slave coming to his Plantation . . . unless it shall appear to them, that the Business or Errand of the said Slave was to the Master or Mistress of such Plantation . . .

And for the better Security of all such persons that shall endeavour to take any Run-away, or shall examine any Slave for his Ticket, passing to and from his Master's or Mistress's Plantation, it is hereby declared lawful for any white Person, to beat, maim or assault, and if such Negro or Slave cannot otherwise be taken, to kill him, who shall refuse to show his Ticket, or by running away, or Resistance, shall avoid being apprehended or taken . . .

It is likewise further Enacted, That in case any Negro, or other Slave shall harbour, conceal, entertain, and give Victuals to any run-away Slave . . . such Negro or Slave by order of the Justice of the Peace shall be severely whipped, not exceeding Forty Lashes . . .
Despite the new act and stricter enforcement, a Negro, named Abram, was hung for assaulting and robbing a Mr. Streeter. Therefore, on March 26, 1737 the South Carolina Gazette, representing the dominant white view, published an act which further restricted slave activities and added punishments for violations of the slave acts:

Negroes and other Slaves in Charlestown after the Hour of 8 in the Evening, from the 29th of Sept. to the 25th of March, and after the Hour of 9 in the Evening, from the 25th of March to the 29th of Sept. shall be obliged to have and carry with them a Lantern with a Candle lighted therein, or an open Ticket in writing signed by their Master... if not the watch-men or any other white person carry them to the Watch-house or Main-guard in Charlestown, until the next morning... then whipped the next morning at the publick whipping-post in Charlestown.

Three months after the act was passed the government of South Carolina was responsible for the expulsion of three Negro boys for stealing goods from Mr. Moses Mitchell. The following December the Commons House of Assembly presented thirty-six separate proposals for revising and making more effective all previous acts governing the activities of Negroes and other slaves. From these proposals the following emphasized South Carolina's arrested state of uneasiness toward the Negroes:

Third, That no Slave be permitted to go out of his Master's House or Plantation without a Ticket on Pain of moderate Correction.

Fifth, Any Negro who shall refuse to undergo an Examination when out of his Master's Plantation may be pursued and moderately corrected but if such Slave shall assault with any Sort of Weapon and refuse he may be lawfully killed.
Fourteenth, Slaves attempting to go off the Province to be punished with Banishment or Death.

Fifteenth, Slaves striking a White Person for the third Offense to suffer Death, the first and second Offense to be punished at the Discretion of the Magistrates . . .

Nineteenth, Marshal not to employ Slaves, but every Monday Morning to inflict 20 Lashes on Runaways.

Twentieth, Military Officers have Power to raise their Companies against Slaves and to have the same Power as the Justices of the Peace.

During late 1738 and early 1739 as an increasing number of slaves were deserting, the Commons House of Assembly declared on January 17, 1739 "The Desertion of our Slaves is a Matter of so much Importance to this Province that I doubt not but you will readily concur in Opinion with me that the most effectual Means ought to be used to discourage and prevent it for the Future, and to render as secure as possible so valuable a Part of the Estates and Properties of his Majesty's Subjects the Inhabitants of this Province." Again on January 19, 1739 the Commons House of Assembly reported on the desertion of slaves from South Carolina, but placed the cause of the Negroes desertion upon the Spanish in St. Augustine. Captain Caleb Davis had gone to St. Augustine to bring his run-away slaves back to South Carolina; however, the Governor of St. Augustine replied that all Negroes deserting to St. Augustine were free and would serve in Spain's military force in Florida. The Upper House of Assembly responded in February 1739 to the remarks of the Spanish governor of St. Augustine by announcing that
all Negroes who had been or would be caught attempting to flee to St. Augustine would be punished according to the laws in force. Pursuant to the statement made by the Upper House of Assembly, a slave, named Caesar, was executed in April 1739 for desertion and afterwards hung in chains in Charleston for all Negroes to see. An accomplice of Caesar, a young boy named Alloboy, was whipped for the same charge. This display of strict enforcement of the slave acts and codes was used to inhibit Negro desires to desert to St. Augustine. In April 1739 a bill was brought before the Upper House of Assembly which encouraged white men to savagely revenge all those incidents and acts of violence the blacks had committed against the whites. It read that: "for Negro Men taken up beyond Savannah River and brought home alive the sum of £40 a piece, For women taken and brought as above £25 a piece For Children under twelve years of age £10 a piece . . . And then Encouragement be given for bringing in the Scalps of such Men or Women Negro Slaves that are already Deserted or shall hereafter Desert who shall be found beyond Savannah River and cannot be taken and Brought home alive . . . each Scalp with Two Ears £20 to be paid out of the Publick Treasury . . .".

The offer of freedom to the Negro in St. Augustine heightened the tensions of the white people in South Carolina, and, in response, the South Carolina Gazette published a statement asking Lt. Governor William Bull to demand all men to carry weapons to church or forfeit twenty
The culmination of the Negro unrest and the restrictive legislation by the Commons House of Assembly was the Stono Rebellion in 1739.

The insurrection began on Saturday evening September 9, 1739, with about twenty Negroes breaking into a store near Stono (approximately twenty miles south and west of Charleston), murdering two guards in the warehouse, and ravaging the warehouse of all guns and ammunition.

Appointing one slave, Jemmy, as their leader, the Negroes marched toward Florida to join their comrades in freedom. In their march toward Florida, the Negroes burned and destroyed all houses they passed or could easily reach, and murdered all whites therein. For example, they entered the house of one Mr. Godfrey and slaughtered him, his wife and his children, confiscated the weapons and ammunition, and then burned the house. As they continued their march, the Negro party increased to seventy-five or eighty slaves.

Lt. Governor Bull encountered the rebellious group of slaves, but managed to evade them and returned to Charleston where he was able to muster the militia and pursue them. Mr. Golightly also encountered the slaves, avoided them, and raced to the Presbyterian church in Wiltown with the information of the rampaging slaves. Mr. Golightly and several men from the church, who had taken their weapons to church, pursued the Negro band about eight miles from the said church in Wiltown. The Negroes, who had marched some fifteen miles from Stono, were caught by the militia and de-
feated in a short and bloody battle. Fourteen of the Negroes were killed, more than forty taken prisoner, and the remainder fled to the safety and seclusion of the woods. Many of the captured Negroes were shot or hung; forty-four Negroes and twenty-one whites died during the course of the uprising.27

The insurrection in September 1739 led to revisions in slave laws. On December 14, 1739, the Commons House of Assembly, in asking for better ordering and governing of slaves, proposed the following:

1st. A Clause to inhibit any Number of Slaves more than five from travelling together in any of the High Roads or Public Paths in this Province at any Time or Times whatever, without having a white Person in Company with them; 2. A Clause to regulate the Manner of working Slaves upon the High Roads, so that too great Number be not suffered to work together at the same Place; 3. A Clause to regulate the Time of Persons working their Slaves, so as to prevent their being over wrought; 4. A Clause to prohibit Slaves being taught to write, and to prevent their being used or employed in Writing when taught; and 5. A Clause to restrain and prevent the Settlement or keeping of a Plantation or Plantations with any Number of Slaves thereon without a White Man able to serve in the Militia of this Province being on such Plantation with such Slaves.28

In May 1740 the revised slave law was passed and became the law used through the Civil War and the termination of slavery. The new law provided that slaves were not to work on Sunday, were to be sold no liquor, be properly fed and clothed, and treated in an equitable manner.29

Though the new law of 1740 provided for equitable treatment for all Negro slaves, the races have remained as
separate entities in the twentieth century as in the eighteenth century with incidents of violence between the races and intolerance by whites (and blacks in some cases) as prevalent today as in the first half of the eighteenth century. The impression which the Stono Rebellion left on the populace of South Carolina (and the South in general) has been, unfortunately, at best only superficial.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSIONS

During the time period under study, 1700-1740, South Carolina was a rapidly developing British colony, both in population growth and economic productivity. With these areas of colonial development increasing at a rate faster than that in which established societal patterns could properly and normally mature, South Carolina's societal structure was quite unstable and unusually susceptible to divisive pressures, either internal or external. The reaction to events or situations which could possibly disrupt the status of prosperous individuals and those individuals hoping to attain a position of respect and wealth in South Carolina was the use of the most expedient means to obtain the desired results. Violence and the use of force, organized or unorganized, legal or illegal, were two of the primary means to solve those situations or events which had the potential to destroy South Carolina's infant societal structure. Violence was, therefore, not only considered as an incidental part of colonial South Carolina's value structure but became an integral part of its development.

In relations with the Indians native to colonial South Carolina and the neighboring land areas, the newly implanted immigrants assumed an attitude of friendship and amiability
to secure the support and aid of the Indian tribes. The English Indian traders and inhabitants of South Carolina used their cultivated friendship with the Indians to drive the Spanish and French from the borders of the colony and to improve their economic well-being. The relationship of the English settlers with the Indians was forced to be as good as possible because the Indian trade in valuable furs and skins during the first four decades of the eighteenth century was the second most important trade of South Carolina. The means used by the English to retain their preferred position with the Indians included the use of violence to suppress and eliminate not only the French and Spanish who desired to annihilate the English in South Carolina and attempted to turn the Indians against the English, but also the use of violence against those Indian tribes which conspired with the French and Spanish to eliminate the English from South Carolina. During Queen Anne's War, 1702-1713, the English were quite successful in obtaining sufficient Indian allies to carry out raids against the Spanish and their Indian allies in and around the vicinity of St. Augustine. The English Indian traders tolerated the use of torture by the Indians on their captives, and they eventually used some of the same methods of torture (for example, scalping) on their own captives.

Through their cultivated friendship with the Indians many English Indian traders took unfair advantage of their Indian allies by actions which caused the once friendly
Indians to react by violent actions against the English settlers in North and South Carolina. The Tuscarora and Yemasee wars in the second decade of the eighteenth century exhibited some of the most cruel tortures and widespread Indian-white violence in American history. Both Indians and whites used tortures to demoralize as well as to defeat one another. Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr have noted that "men's frustration over some of the material and social circumstances of their lives is a necessary precondition of group protest and collective violence. The more intense and widespread frustration-induced discontent is among a people, the more intense and widespread collective violence is likely to be."¹ The Indians believed the possession of their lands by the white man and the nefarious activities of the cruel and selfish Indian traders were the necessary preconditions to protest through a collective action of violence. The English settlers reacted to the Indians' use of force and torture by assimilating many of the means of torture used by the Indians to defeat the Indians. The English justified their use of violence because they wanted to preserve their race and way of life. The competing ethics of the two races caused an inevitable clash with the white man reigning supreme over the Indian. After the conclusion of the Yemasee War, the Indian tribes in and around the colony of South Carolina assumed an inferior position to the white man. Even though the two races believed their use of violence was justified, little if any positive actions resulted.
The clash between the Indians and the whites from 1711 to 1718 produced a strong desire among the people of the colony to have punitive action taken against any individual who violated the laws of the colony. The best example of this desire for law and order occurred in the fall and winter of 1718 when some forty-nine men were executed at Charleston for piracy. The action against the pirates was a reaction to the breakdown of law and order during the previous eight years. Though the desire for strict adherence to the constituted body of laws was high in South Carolina, the white citizens of the colony experienced no restriction upon their rights as individuals. However, a concerted and successful effort was made during this period to restrict the day-to-day lives and activities of the Negro race.

The white citizens of South Carolina feared the Negro during this early period of the eighteenth century. They feared the Negro because of his rapidly increasing numbers, and because the Negro desired to be free and to be treated as a human being capable of being responsible for himself and his dependents. The Negroes' supposed innate docility and stupidity was noticeably absent during the first four decades of the eighteenth century as seven slave rebellions or plots in addition to numerous incidents of individual violence were recorded. White reaction to a Negro rebellion or incident of violence provoked by a Negro upon any white person was almost always quick and harsh treatment by either those people directly involved in the incident with the
Negroes or by the legal authorities of South Carolina. Not only was reaction by whites quick, harsh, and all too often impulsive, but it was often much more brutal than the original offense committed by the Negro. For example, in 1732 a white man killed a Negro who had robbed him and then was told by the authorities to cut the Negro's head off and place it on a post where it would serve notice to all Negroes for the punishment of a crime committed by a Negro.

In addition to punitive action used in cases involving one Negro and one white, Negroes involved in plots to overthrow their masters were, if captured, either hanged or burned. Whites again used violence as the most expedient means to preserve their society. In the aftermath of the slave rebellions restrictive acts were passed by the Commons House of Assembly, the slave act of 1740 being the most comprehensive and restrictive, to curb and hopefully stop Negro acts of violence. Though the acts did restrict the Negro in his daily activities, his submissiveness to white authority was never complete and it was not until 1865 that the Negro attained the minimum of legal freedom from white authority.

Violence was integral to South Carolina with its prospering economy and its open-class social system. With the ability to move from one class to another in South Carolina the most useful and expedient means to preserve the social structure was used. Violence was a part of the value structure of South Carolina during the period 1700 to 1740.
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