



**David Library of the American Revolution**

## **Finding Aid on South Carolina**

**including the**

**British Colonial Office Papers (CO5)—South Carolina**  
**David Library Microfilm Set 550b**

*Prepared by David Swain, Volunteer Researcher, December 2019*

# Contents

## CO5 British Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina

They are contained in Volumes (or bundles of manuscripts) numbered by the British Public Records Office from 358 through 535. As recorded in the *British Public Record Office List of Colonial Office Records*, reprinted by Kraus Reprint Corporation, New York, 1963, the South Carolina Papers are organized into categories as follows:

---

• Board of Trade Correspondence (BT numbered sets A. to P.; Drafts)	Volumes 358 to 381 (1720 to 1775)
• Secretary of State Correspondence	Volumes 382 to 397 (1699 to 1784)
• Entry Books of Letters, Commissions, Warrants, Grants, Instructions, Etc.	Volumes 398 to 410 (1674 to 1781)
• Acts (of the Colonial Government)	Volumes 411 to 424 (1663 to 1770)
• Sessional Papers (of the Colonial Government)	Volumes 425 to 507 (1721 to 1773)
• Shipping Returns	Volumes 508 to 511 (1716 to 1765)
• Miscellaneous	Volumes 512 to 535 (1759 to 1782)

---

## Tables: List with Numbers and Approximate *Locations*

### *Contents*

**Table 1:** CO5 British Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina available on microfilm at the David Library of the American Revolution (DLAR)

### *Contents*

**Table 2:** CO5 British Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina NOT available on microfilm at the DLAR

### *Contents*

**Table 3:** Summary Contents of David Library (DLAR) Microfilmed Papers for South Carolina, by Reel and Volume, including Dates, Document Numbers, and Frame Numbers

### *Introduction: Winners and Losers*

### **Table 4**

RETURN OF PEOPLE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA, CHARLESTOWN, 13th DECEMBER, 1782.

*Introduction: Top Officials*

**Table 5:** Lords of Trade, According to Dates of First and Last Recorded Signature on Microfilmed Draft Letters from the Board of Trade and Plantations, for dates from 1720 to 1774

*Introduction: Top Officials*

**Table 6a:** Secretaries of State for the Southern Department (1727 to 1768)

*Introduction: Top Officials*

**Table 6b:** Secretaries of State for the Colonies (1768 to 1782)

*Introduction: Top Officials*

**Table 6c:** Secretaries of State for the Home Department (1782 to 1789)

*Introduction: Top Officials*

**Table 7a:** Transition Governor of South Carolina

*Introduction: Top Officials*

**Table 7b:** Royal Governors of South Carolina (1721 to 1775)

*Introduction: Top Officials*

**Table 7c:** Leaders of British Military Occupation and Rule in Charleston, for over two years, with a Civilian Component

*Introduction: Colonial Leadership*

**Table 8:** Longevity of South Carolina Governors and Acting Governors

*Introduction: Archival Confusion*

**Table 9:** Analysis of Numbered Letters: (with contextual notes)

- between Board of Trade and South Carolina Governors/Acting Governor, and
- between Secretaries of State and South Carolina Governors/Acting Governor

*Introduction: Archival Confusion*

**Table 10:** Locations of Actual Documents and Abstracts of Documents, for Incoming and Outgoing Correspondence Separately

*Introduction: Archival Anomalies*

**Table 11:** Archival Anomalies in the Microfilmed South Carolina Colonial Papers

*Introduction: Archival Anomalies*

**Table 12:** Contents of Reel 8 Volume 397: A Collection of Batches of Papers

*Reel 3 volume 382 beginning*

**Table 13:** Summary of Content and Organization of Microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence and related documents found in Reels 3 (Volume 382) through 8 (Volume 397)

*Reel 4 Volume 386 beginning*

**Table 14:** Understanding the fractured chronology of Volume 386

*Reel 8 Volume 397 beginning*

**Table 15:** Changing content in Secretary of State incoming correspondence

*Reel 8 Volume 397 end*

**Table 16:** Shift of important issues in Secretary of State incoming correspondence (Reel 8 documents 172 to 205, August 1781 to mid-1782) from British allegiance and loyalty, colonial obedience, and military progress to economic prosperity, including the status of slavery

*Reel 13 beginning*

**Table 17:** South Carolina Microfilmed Papers as Organized into Two Distinct Categories—"Royal Colony" (1720 to 1775) and "Post-Colony" (1775 to 1782)

*Reel 13 beginning*

**Table 18:** Contents of "Miscellaneous Papers" in Reel 13

*Reel 13 Volume 513 beginning*

**Table 19:** Summary of results for Ascertaining the Depreciation in Paper Currency by Board of Police, November 1780

*Reel 13 Volume 513 beginning*

**Table 20:** Chronology of Meeting Summaries of Proceedings in Volumes 519 and 521 to 526 for the Board of Police and Volume 520 for the Council, 1780 to 1782

*Reel 14 beginning*

**Table 21:** Contents of Miscellaneous papers in Reel 14

*Reel 14 Volume 527 beginning*

**Table 22:** Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance, Charleston, mid-June 1780 to July 1781

*Reel 14 Volume 535 beginning*

**Table 23:** Demands Brought Against the Sequestered Estates, January 1781

## DLAR Collection of CO5 South Carolina Colonial Papers

The David Library of the American Revolution's (DLAR) collection of microfilmed documents includes most but not all of the CO5 South Carolina Colonial Papers. **Table 1** and **Table 2** below identify what papers are included in the DLAR microfilm collection and what papers are not.

---

**Table 1: CO5 British Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina available on microfilm at the David Library of the American Revolution (DLAR)**

- Board of Trade Incoming Correspondence

Reel 1	Volumes 376, 377	(1756 to 1764)	(BT numbered sets L., M.)
Reel 2	Volumes 378 to 380	(1764 to 1775)	(BT numbered sets N. to P.)
Reel 3 begin	Volume 381	(1722 to 1774)	Outgoing drafts
- Secretary of State Incoming Correspondence

Reel 3 end	Volume 382	(1699 to 1724)	
Reel 4	Volumes 385, 386	(1744 to 1776)	
Reel 5	Volumes 389, 390	(1748 to 1767)	
Reel 6	Volumes 391 to 394	(1767 to 1772)	(SS numbered sets A. to D.)
Reel 7	Volumes 395, 396	(1773 to 1777)	
Reel 8	Volume 397	(1780 to 1784)	
- Board of Trade Abstracts of Land Grants

Reel 9	Volume 398	(1674 to 1765)	
Reel 10 begin	Volume 399	(1768 to 1773)	
- Board of Trade Abstracts of Commissions, Instructions, Etc.

Reel 10 end	Volume 400, 401	(1720 to 1739)	(Parts A.& B.)
Reel 11	Volume 404	(1760 to 1774)	(Part E.)
Reel 12 begin	Volume 405	(1774 to 1775)	(Part F.)
- Board of Trade Abstracts of Incoming Correspondence

Reel 12 ctd.	Volume 406	(1721 to 1756)	
--------------	------------	----------------	--
- Secretary of State Abstracts of Correspondence

Reel 12 ctd.	Volumes 407, 408	(1766 to 1782)	(Outgoing)
Reel 12 end	Volumes 409, 410	(1767 to 1781)	(Incoming)

- Miscellaneous: Treasurer's Accounts  
Reel 13 begin Volume 512 (1759 to 1763)
- Miscellaneous: Board of Police  
Reel 13 ctd. Volume 513 (1777 to 1780) Evidence laid before commissioners to ascertain depreciation in paper currency  
Reel 13 ctd. Volumes 514 to 518 (1781 to 1782) Orders; Dockets of causes for trial; Lists of causes; Rules; Receipts for papers, etc.  
Reel 13 end Volume 519 to 526 (1780 to 1782) Proceedings
- Miscellaneous: Declarations and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance  
Reel 14 begin Volumes 527 to 529 (1780 to 1781) (Declarations)  
and 532 to 534  
Volumes 530, 531 (1780 to 1781) (Certificates of Declarations)
- Miscellaneous: Demands Brought Against Sequestered Estates  
Reel 14 end Volume 535 (1781)

---

**Table 2: CO5 British Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina NOT available on microfilm at the DLAR**

---

- Board of Trade correspondence  
Volumes 358 to 375 (1720 to 1757) (BT numbered sets A. to K.)
  - Secretary of State correspondence  
Volumes 383, 384 (1715 to 1743)  
Volumes 387, 388 (1715 to 1746)
  - Board of Trade Abstracts of Commissions, Instructions, Etc.  
Volume 402, 403 (1768 to 1773) (Parts C., D.)
  - Acts of Colonial Government  
Volumes 411 to 424 (1663 to 1770)
  - Sessional Papers of Colonial Government (Council, Assembly, Council in Assembly)  
Volumes 425 to 507 (1721 to 1773)
  - Shipping Returns  
Volumes 508 to 511 (1716 to 1765)
-

---

**Table 3: Summary Contents of David Library (DLAR) Microfilmed Papers for South Carolina, by Reel and Volume, including Dates, Document Numbers, and Frame Numbers**

**Reel 1**

**Volume 376**

**Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), begin**

February 3, 1756 to July 20, 1760      Documents 1 to 84      [Frames 1 to 214]

**Volume 377**

**Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), continue**

May 6, 1760 to July 2, 1764      Documents 85 to 194      [Frames 1 to 438]

**Reel 2**

**Volume 378**

**Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), continue**

August 20, 1764 to November 10, 1767      Documents 1 to 88      [Frames 1 to 275]

**Volume 379**

**Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), continue**

May 30, 1768 to November 6, 1770      Documents 89 to 156      [Frames 1 to 157]

**Volume 380**

**Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), end**

October 16, 1770 to November 10, 1775      Documents 157 to 222      [Frames 1 to 151]

**Reel 3**

**Volume 381**

**Board of Trade Correspondence (outgoing drafts)**

August 16, 1720 to October 25, 1774      Documents 1 to 151      [Frames 1 to 393]

(drafts may have been written in letter books with possibly one or more missing, resulting in gap with no drafts dated between November 28, 1738 and June 25, 1764)

**Volume 382**

**Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), begin**

July 24, 1699 to August 22, 1724      Documents 152 to 211      [Frames 1 to 134]

**Reel 4**

**Volume 385** (Volumes 383 and 384 [1715 to 1748] not microfilmed here)

**Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue**

August 26, 1719 to March 30, 1753      Documents 1 to 64      [Frames 1 to 227]

(mostly 1743 to 1753, with a 1719 outlier, organized into two sets, from 1743 to 1750, and from 1750 to 1753, each set organized in roughly reverse chronological order)

## **Volume 386**

### **Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue**

? 1721 to August 19, 1775                      Documents 65 to 139                      [Frames 1 to 209]  
(mostly 1753 to 1761, with substantial gaps between 1757 and 1759, and with outliers to 1721 and to 1775; organized into several sets, each roughly chronological, but with the sets themselves not organized chronologically)

## **Reel 5**

**Volume 389** (Volumes 387 and 388 [1715 to 1746] not microfilmed here)

### **Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue**

January 30, 1747 to December 31, 1751                      Documents 1 to 110                      [Frames 1 to 264]

## **Volume 390**

### **Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue**

November 3, 1762 to October 8, 1767                      Documents 111 to 187                      [Frames 1 to 231]

## **Reel 6**

### **Volume 391**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue**

November 10, 1767 to December 10, 1768                      Documents 1 to 37                      [Frames 1 to 80]

## **Volume 392**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue**

November 8, 1768 to December 9, 1769                      Documents 38 to 65                      [Frames 1 to 59]

## **Volume 393**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue**

May 6, 1769 to December 24, 1770                      Documents 66 to 129                      [Frames 1 to 131]

## **Volume 394**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue**

January 21, 1771 to December 14, 1772                      Documents 130 to 208                      [Frames 1 to 182]

## **Reel 7**

### **Volume 395**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue**

December 16, 1772 to October 28, 1773                      Documents 1 to 29                      [Frames 1 to 78]

## **Volume 396**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue**

December 24, 1773 to November 26, 1777                      Documents 47 to 172                      [Frames 1 to 319]

## **Reel 8**

### **Volume 397**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), end**

May 1, 1779 to March 1, 1784                      Documents 1 to 205                      [Frames 1 to 458]

## **Reel 9**

### **Volume 398—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

#### **Abstract of Land Grants, begin**

February 9, 1674 to October 31, 1765                      1 Document                      [Frames 2 to 142]

## **Reel 10**

### **Volume 399**

#### **Abstract of Land Grants, end**

May 7, 1767 to May 18, 1773

11 Documents

[Frames 1 to 71]

### **Volume 400**

#### **[Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc. (incoming and outgoing) Part A**

August 15, 1720 to August 20 1730

Numerous Documents

[Frames 1 to 395]

### **Volume 401**

#### **[Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc. (incoming and outgoing) Part B (Parts C and D not microfilmed here)**

October 21, 1730 to July 19, 1739

Numerous Documents

[Frames 1 to 418]

## **Reel 11**

**Volume 404** (Volumes 402 and 403 [Parts D and C, 1739 to 1760] not microfilmed here)

#### **[Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc. (incoming and outgoing) Part E (Parts C and D not microfilmed here)**

November 11, 1760 to October 25, 1774

92 Documents

[Frames 1 to 498

plus unnumbered 500 to 513]

## **Reel 12**

### **Volume 405**

#### **[Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc. (incoming and outgoing) Part F**

June 20, 1774 to June 1, 1775

7 Documents

[Frames 1 to 148]

### **Volume 406**

#### **Abstracts of letters to the Board of Trade (incoming)**

July 13, 1721 to December 6, 1756

163 Documents

[Frames 1 to 55]

### **Volume 407**

#### **Abstracts of letters from Secretary of State (outgoing), begin**

August 8, 1766 to October 8, 1767

11 Documents

[Frames 1 to 10]

### **Volume 408**

#### **Abstracts of letters from Secretary of State (outgoing), end**

February 20, 1768 to February 6, 1782

106 Documents

[Frames 1 to 158]

### **Volume 409**

#### **Abstracts of letters to Secretary of State (incoming), begin**

December 8, 1766 to June 1, 1772

101 Documents

[Frames 1 to 254]

### **Volume 410**

#### **Abstracts of letters to Secretary of State (incoming), end**

April 27, 1772 to December 28, 1781

79 Documents

[handwritten Frames 1 to 313  
stamped Frames 1 to 158]



<b>Volume 526</b>		
<b>Board of Police: Board Proceedings, end</b>		
September 5 to October 29, 1782	1 Document	[Frames 1 to 19]
<b>Reel 14</b>		
<b>Volume 527</b>		
<b>Declarations of Allegiance to the King, begin</b>		
Mid-June to late August 1780	205 Declarations	[Frames 1 to 69]
<b>Volume 528</b>		
<b>Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue</b>		
Late August to mid-September 1781	282 Declarations	[Frames 1 to 94]
<b>Volume 529</b>		
<b>Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue</b>		
Mid-September to early November 1780	291 Declarations	[Frames 1 to 98]
<b>Volume 530</b>		
<b>Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the King, begin</b>		
May 1780 to June 1781	297 Certificates of Declaration	[Frames 1 to 100]
<b>Volume 531</b>		
<b>Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue</b>		
May 1780 to June 1781	303 Certificates of Declaration	[Frames 1 to 101]
<b>Volume 532</b>		
<b>Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue (from Volume 529)</b>		
Early November 1780 to late April 1781	297 Declarations	[Frames 1 to 98 plus 1A & 14A]
<b>Volume 533</b>		
<b>Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue</b>		
Early May to mid-June 1781	147 Declarations	[Frames 1 to 50]
<b>Volume 534</b>		
<b>Declarations of Allegiance to the King, end</b>		
Late May to late July 1781	87 Declarations	[Frames 1 to 29]
<b>Volume 535</b>		
<b>Demands brought against Sequestered Estates</b>		
January 5, 1781	2 documents	[Frames 1 to 79]

---

# Introduction

## Contents of the Introduction

---

### **Historical Context: The British Royal Colony of South Carolina (from before 1720 to 1775)**

- Economic Development**
- Relations with Spain and later with France**
- Relations with Georgia**
- Relations with Indian Nations**
- Separation, Boundaries, and Relations with North Carolina**
- Evolution and Divergence of Values after 1763**
- Prosperity, Freedom, and Rights vs Loyalty and Obedience to the King**
- From Protest to Rebellion to Revolution**

### **Transition between Death of a Colony and Birth of a State (from September 1775 to December 1782)**

- Governor Campbell's Response to Collapse of South Carolina Colonial Government**

#### **Attempting to Re-establish the Colonial Government:**

- 1<sup>st</sup> try: Military Attack on Charleston, June 28, 1776
- 2<sup>nd</sup> try: Encouraging Loyalist Insurgency in the Interior, 1775 to 1777
- 3<sup>rd</sup> try: British Military Siege and Capture of Charleston, May 12, 1780
- 4<sup>th</sup> try: General Clinton's Offer of Parole/Amnesty/Pardon to Prisoners of War Who Declare Allegiance to the King, 1780
- 5<sup>th</sup> try: British Military Occupation of Charleston, including a Board of Police and Declarations of Allegiance, May 12, 1780 to December 14, 1782
- 6<sup>th</sup> try: Bull's Last Stand Leading the Board of Police, 1781 to 1782
- 7<sup>th</sup> try: Cornwallis' "Offensive" Military Operation in Southern Colonies, 1781

- The Rug Pulled Out:** End of Attempts to Re-establish Colonial Government after Cornwallis Surrender and Parliament withdrawal from Commitment to the War, October 1781 to February 1782

- From Colonial to Post-Colonial Thinking:** Preparing for British Evacuation of Charleston and Beyond, 1781 to 1782 and Beyond

#### **Changing Values: Loyalty vs. Prosperity**

- State of South Carolina:** Alternative Government on the Threshold, 1782

- Evacuation of Charleston and Demise of Colonial South Carolina, December 14, 1782**

- Winners and Losers:** Demographic and Geographic Impacts of Britain's Evacuation of Charleston, December 1782

## **Colonial Government Structure**

**British Empire Structure**

**Royal Colony of South Carolina Structure**

**British Military Structure for Occupation of Charleston**

## **Top Officials of British and South Carolina Colonial Governments**

**King**

**Lords of Trade**

**Secretaries of State**

Secretary of State for the Southern Department (1727 to 1768)

Secretary of State for the Colonies (1768 to 1782)

Secretary of State for the Home Department (1782 to 1789)

**Colonial Governors and other leaders in South Carolina**

Transition Governor (1719 to 1721)

Royal Governors (1721 to 1775)

Charleston Occupation Leaders (1780 to 1782)

British Military Commander

Intendant General of Board of Police

## **Colonial Leadership: Longevity and Effectiveness in Office**

## **Organizing Correspondence: Focus on Archiving**

**Archival Organizing:**

Chronological Bundles

Document Numbering by Archivists

Letter Numbering by Writer

Maintaining and Numbering Extracts, Abstracts, Summaries,  
and Transcripts of Actual Documents

**Archival Confusion:** Too Many Numbering Systems

**Archival Anomalies:** Time Gaps, Irregular Ordering; Unexpected Contents

## **Secondary References**

---

## Historical Context: British Royal Colony of South Carolina (from before 1720 to 1775)

A British proprietary colony of **Carolina** was established in 1663, centered on the site of what became the city of Charleston, which developed as one of the few urban centers in British North America (along with Philadelphia, New York, and Boston). Between 1719 and 1729 that colony morphed 1) into two separate colonies of North Carolina and **South Carolina** and 2) into a **royal colony**, under the King's control rather than that of private trustees.

### Economic Development

Both the proprietary colony and the royal colony were preoccupied during their early years mostly with issues of **economic development**. The British Empire supported colonization to provide economic benefits for the home territories. If the colonies themselves prospered, that was an added benefit, not the prime goal. The colonies were expected to provide primarily agricultural goods, both for human consumption and as raw materials for manufacturing in the home country. Commerce and trade also were intended to benefit home-country people and only secondarily colonists.

In the British governmental system, the **Board of Trade and Plantations** sought to encourage, regulate, and even subsidize economic development on the colonies. In some ways, the Board of Trade is like an American Chamber of Commerce, except that the latter is a private interest group, while the Board of Trade functioned near the top levels of the British government, engaging in aspects of governance and intergovernmental relations. In South Carolina, the economic model the Board of Trade encouraged was plantation agriculture, using African slave labor to produce subtropical staple crops such as grains, rice, cotton, indigo, and hemp, as well as timber and naval stores.

In South Carolina, colonial government found it necessary to engage in three kinds of external relations to support economic development (as well as frontier security): relations with **Spain**, relations with **Georgia**, and relations with **Indians**. Only after 1763 did these governance/relations functions get taken over by the **Secretaries of State**. To a large extent, concern for these relations and their changes over time became the primary concerns of colonial governments like South Carolina's until after 1763. (See several extended notes after Reel 1 document 1.)

### Relations with Spain and later with France

Before the 1750s, the imperial/colonial empire of **Spain** represented the most proximate and hostile competitor European power for South Carolina. Spanish Florida was an important northern corner piece of Spanish American territory. Until 1733, South Carolina and Spanish Florida shared a lengthy but ill-defined frontier border. Relations between the Spanish and English in this colonial backwater were occasionally hostile.

Incursions and provocations on both sides led to periodic flurries of diplomatic activity, gloomy predictions of dire danger for South Carolina, and calls to expand the colony's security forces and fortifications.

By the 1750s, the growing influence of the French north and west of British America shifted Britain's strategic focus, leading to the French and Indian War from 1754 to 1763 in America (Seven Years War from 1756 to 1763 in Europe).

In 1763, Europe and Britain's American colonies came out of these wars with Britain the winner and both France and Spain hostile losers. In subsequent years, the situation did not change much by the mid-1770s—except for Britain's relations with her American colonies. In 1763 Britain and America were, by definition, on the same side. By 1775 they had become enemies. This provided some leverage for France and Spain to get back at Britain—by allying with the American colonies. The results were significant in determining the outcome of the Revolutionary War. France was a hard-to-get ally for the Americans, but a French fleet showed up on the Virginia coast in fall 1781 at just the right moment to rule the waves just long enough to deny to General Cornwallis' British army supplies and an escape route by sea, forcing Cornwallis to surrender. The dominoes that toppled as a result of this surrender led inevitably to American victory.

Spain also bided its time getting involved, until the timing was right for them to launch successful attacks against British West Florida from New Orleans and Havana. In May 1781, the result was British loss of an American colony that was not even among the 13 rebellious colonies. The 1783 Paris peace treaty returned British East Florida as well to Spain control (Florida had been Spanish since the 16<sup>th</sup> Century but had been awarded to Britain in 1763.) (See in Reel 8 British General Henry Clinton's report with supporting documents to Secretary of State Germain with details on how in March 1780, Spain conquered Mobile in West Florida with minimal British resistance. These papers apparently were filed by Secretary of State archivists under "South Carolina" only because Clinton sent his report to Germain while he was at Charleston in May 1780, having just captured that city from its American defenders after a siege.

## Relations with Georgia

Georgia was established in 1733 as a proprietary colony, its territory carved out of what had previously been considered Carolina territory, all the way to the border with Spanish Florida. Now, South Carolina no longer faced Spanish territory directly. But it did face a new British colonial competitor, Georgia. In an interesting episode of the 1750s and early 1760s, South Carolina Governor Thomas Boone made an aggressive economic and political point of advertising **land grants available in territory located south of the Altamaha River**. This coastal territory is a fair distance south of Georgia capital Savannah, adjacent to the border with Spanish Florida. After 1733, this territory had no claim to being contiguous with any South Carolina territory. Naturally the colonial Governor of Georgia complained to London, and the British government required South Carolina to disavow these land grants (see note after Reel 1 document 160 and related documents).

With less competition, both Georgia and South Carolina responded to British government policy and pressures from European countries for Britain's colonies to support organized **settlements of Protestants** especially from France, Germany, and Switzerland. In South Carolina, several such settlements were both officially encouraged and publicly subsidized, especially in the 1730s and the 1760s. Names of settlements included Purryville (or Purryborough, which was French Swiss) and New Bordeaux (which was French and German). Names of organizer/promoters included Jean Louis Gilbert and Jean-Pierre Purry (both initially in 1731), and Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre (1764 and in the early 1770s at New Bordeaux). Another group of Germans, supported by South Carolina, settled in the disputed territory south of the Altamaha River in Georgia before being forced to move. Germans settled independently as well in scattered locations in South Carolina's interior uplands. Today these settlements are no longer ethnically identifiable, although the place names continue to be used. (See especially note after Reel 2 document 176 and surrounding documents.)

## Relations with Indian Nations

Together and separately, all of the English colonies contended with problematic and often hostile relations with **Indian Nations** whose territories English settlers had taken over and continued to expand into. English policy sought if possible to accommodate rather than to exterminate Native Americans. For the British, Indians (their term) were useful intermediaries (potential pawns—allies rather than foes) in the ongoing hostilities among European nations for world imperial and colonial power. British officials held “**talks**” and signed **treaties** with Indian leaders, stylized negotiations designed to elicit friendship, to convince Indian nations to side with and fight for the British side in European wars fought in America, and to intimidate Indians into patterns of peaceful coexistence. They gave “**presents**” to Indians, “free” goods designed to attract friendship and to foster obedience and dependency, and they operated **trading** posts, selling European goods to Indians, also to foster dependency. On the colonial frontiers, Indians were not welcome intermediaries but competitors for land. In the Native American warrior cultures, competition meant violence. The British did not understand this, so, when their various “carrots” did not work, British colonial officials did not hesitate to use the stick.

After years of simmering hostility tempered by presents and trade with the Creek Indians, the expanding South Carolina frontier encountered the Cherokee Indians farther inland in the late 1750s. South Carolina Governor Henry William Lyttelton tried the usual “carrot” approaches but quickly lost patience and led his militia in 1759 into what has since been named the **Anglo-Cherokee War**, a brutal, bloody, frontier confrontation that left the Cherokee population decimated and its lands, crops, and homes burned. It took the British three summers to do the job. When the militia failed to subdue the Indians in 1759, regular British soldiers were borrowed in the summer of 1760, but their leader didn't understand the degree of brutality required and left South Carolina prematurely for more attractive military activities. Finally, in 1761, a sufficiently brutal British army force completed the ugly task.

Since Governor Lyttelton had left South Carolina in spring 1760 (promoted to be Governor of Jamaica), it fell to Lieutenant Governor William Bull II, as acting governor, to guide South Carolina through this sordid period.

After this demonstration of brute power, Indian relations became more subdued. At about the same time, the Seven Years War ended in 1763. This European war, called the French and Indian War in America, pitted France and Spain against Britain (and its colonies). In America, the British used various approaches, seeking to maintain positive Indian relations and reduce the numbers of Indians allied with the French. South Carolina participated in these efforts with various Nations, except for the Cherokees whom they had just defeated.

(Since Indian affairs were so important for South Carolina economic development and settlement expansion, as well its security from frontier violence, correspondence on the subject was pervasive. In the Secretary of State correspondence, especially in Reel 3 and 4, see frequent correspondence in the 1750s and early 1760s about trade, presents, and negotiations for friendship with particular Indian Nations. Both Board of Trade and Secretary of State correspondence, in Reels 1 and 5 respectively, contain detailed, overlapping, and duplicative correspondence about the violence of the Anglo-Cherokee War between 1759 and 1761. Although by the late 1760s and early 1770s, South Carolina had moved on to focus more on political issues that were leading toward revolution, isolated correspondence as late as 1774 occasionally reports on frontier violence involving Indians and raises the possibility of impending war with the Indians.)

## **Separation, Boundaries, and Relations with North Carolina**

Britain won the war, giving the British King an opportunity to try a new approach to calm down frontier violence. This approach was **separation**. His **Declaration of 1763** drew a line along the crest of the Appalachian Mountains. Land to the east was available for colonial settlement. Land on the west side was reserved as Indian territory. The line never worked very well, partly because many frontier people refused to accept it and partly because European population expansion continually shifted the actual boundary line on the ground.

Boundary lines on the frontier were also becoming necessary to manage population growth and mobility in frontier areas between colonies. By as early as 1757, surveying a **North Carolina/South Carolina boundary line** had become a political priority. By as late as 1772, the issue remained open and unresolved. Between those years, the South Carolina Colonial Papers reveal multiple, frequent efforts draw, redraw, and extend the boundary running from the Atlantic Ocean to the mountains, between the colonies of North Carolina and South Carolina. The issue seemed perennial. Surveying a line was a time-consuming physical challenge on the frontier, but it was also fraught with political consequences, which often slowed down or stalemated the surveying. Plus, as soon as a line could be surveyed, settlement patterns changed and a line once agreed to became obsolete.

Both governors had a stake in supporting efforts to establish a firm boundary, but both wanted to influence the decision-making process to the advantage of his colony. As a sampling of the documentary evidence, see:

Reel 1 document 8 and note following	(1757)
Reel 2 document 160 and note following	(1763)
Reel 6 document 196	(1772)

## **Evolution and Divergence of Values after 1763**

In the years immediately following the end of the war period of 1754 to 1763, **major changes were altering the values and culture of British America**. It was a time to focus on domestic prosperity and private entrepreneurialism, on opportunity on the frontier rather than on fear of the Indians, who were being subdued by military force. This, many argued, made it a time to reduce governmental burdens from the heavy demands of wartime. However, the British government had large war debts to pay off, and loyal Britishers were expected to pay, including especially those living in the American colonies, who had, from a British perspective, gained the most from the expenses of the war.

## **Prosperity, Freedom, & Rights vs. Loyalty & Obedience to the King**

Ripples from this **new mindset began to flow together into streams of thought that challenged unquestioned acceptance of Britain's "burdens" and that posited "rights" of British people to prosper free from such burdens**. From the perspective of British governments both in London and in the colonies, the new mindset increasingly was viewed to be dangerous to the sovereignty of the British political and imperial system. As some Americans raised the concepts of **prosperity, freedom, and rights**, governments responded with concepts of **loyalty and obedience** to the King. The result was an emerging and growing **protest movement against British authority**. In 1765, the British Parliament stepped into this morass with the Stamp Act, which they conceived to be a relatively harmless way to raise some revenue to pay down on the war debt.

## **From Protest to Rebellion to Revolution**

If they had been paying more attention to politics already current in their American colonies, they would have been warned against such unrealistic thinking. Since the late 1750s, **South Carolina's Commons (lower) House of Assembly** had begun and was gradually escalating a **running battle with the Governor and his Royal Council** over various issues of financial and political control in South Carolina's colonial government. Documents scattered throughout the Board of Trade and Secretary of State's official correspondence with dates from 1758 to 1775 tell a story of progressively less civil discourse and less institutional mutual respect, along with greater differences in constitutional positions and greater intransigence in insisting on those positions.

See in particular the following clusters of documents:

Reel 1 documents between about 32 and 48	(1758 to 1759)
Reel 1 documents between about 141 and note after and 151	(1762)
Reel 2 documents between about 15 and note after and 67	(1765 to 1766)
Reel 2 documents between about 122 and note after and 145	(1770)
Reel 6 documents between about 8 and 191	(1770 to 1772)
Reel 7 documents between about 29 and 128	(1773 to 1775)

An interesting articulation of the **“rebel” position** caused a stir in Charleston in February 1775. **William Henry Drayton** was a younger member of one of South Carolina’s oldest and wealthiest planter families. Consistent with his background, he had already been appointed to positions of political leadership in the colonial government and in 1766 had supported the government on enforcement of the Stamp Act. However he, having struggled like others of his generation with the issues of loyalty vs. freedom, made his choice known in a very public way, by writing out his argument in a published **pamphlet**. Naturally, acting governor Bull and the Council found it necessary to suspend William Henry from its membership. The Council member leading the discussion on suspension was his father, John Drayton, and he was married to William Bull II’s daughter—one of many examples of leading families splitting by generation over loyalty vs. rebellion. William Henry Drayton went on to be a vocal and influential “rebel” leader, including serving on the Continental Congress in 1778-1779. While in Philadelphia, he died after having contracted typhus. (For the text of William Henry’s pamphlet, see Reel 7 document 77. For the controversy over the pamphlet and William Henry’s suspension from the Council, see note after Reel 2 document 218 and surrounding documents.)

This corpus of documents plus a scattering of many more, understood together, provide a remarkable reflection of the overall economic/political/constitutional debate turned into conflict that eventually led the British Empire and 13 of its American colonies to war and then separation, resulting in demise of the Royal Colony of South Carolina.

The demise of colonial South Carolina is a complicated matter, however. It was not caused alone by a movement of American protest, rebellion, and revolution, although this was a crucial ingredient. It also came about because of missed opportunities and inadequacies in the functioning of the colonial government of South Carolina itself. These South Carolina Colonial Papers tell mostly the story of the royal colony of South Carolina—from the British, colonial perspective. They also tell us something of the story of the American anti-colonial movement, also from a British perspective.

Before moving on to the transition period during which colonial South Carolina died a slow death, it will be useful to review in summary form from a more American perspective the outlines of the movement’s **progress from protest to rebellion to revolution**. This perspective tells a story of American reaction to British abuses and injustices by a colonial system that did not understand American values, rather than, as the British saw it, a story of American excessive, obsessive, unjustified, and unconstitutional conflict against a benevolent British system.

Sometimes changes come about slowly, without a specific instigator, influence, or tipping point. Sometimes “watershed moments” are evident. In the case of British-American colonial separation, the movement for change in South Carolina began sometime in the 1750s without fanfare as expressions of **protest** within the system.

In the mid-1760s, something sparked the protest movement to begin thinking in terms of **rebellion** against aspects of the system rather than merely protesting within the system. The South Carolina Colonial Papers suggest that the spark came from the mixing of contrasting, conflicting sources: Newly optimistic thinking, following Britain’s military victory over France, Spain and Indian Nations in 1763, about opportunities for private prosperity with a reduced governmental burden, clashed with British governmental pressures to increase the financial burden on colonists to pay off the war debt. This explosive combination first combusted as a result of British attempts to enforce its new Stamp Act in 1765 and 1766. Although Parliament soon repealed this tax, it seemed intent in subsequent years on adding fuel to this fire with the Townshend Acts of 1769, the Tea Act of 1773, and the so-called Intolerable or Coercive Acts of 1774. Another source of sparks for South Carolina was the more intensely rebellious fire burning in Boston, whose “radical” example “inflamed” South Carolina protest thinking and instilled fear among the colonial leaders of the supposedly more conservative southern colonies. (On Colonial South Carolina’s perspective on Massachusetts protest and rebellion against the Townshend Acts, Tea Act, and Intolerable or Coercive Acts, see Reel 7 document 95 [February 22, 1775] and note after it.)

Protest is by definition negative and in practice, largely vocal. Rebellion raises protest to greater levels of anger, encouraging a shift of tactics from arguing to taking action, often destructively. A step beyond both angry protest and mob violence is to begin **thinking organizationally and toward building alternative futures**, rather than simply tearing down what is. In this regard, South Carolina’s “rebels” learned lessons from colonies to the north, especially Massachusetts but also Virginia. In South Carolina, ad-hoc **committees of correspondence, committees of safety**, etc. emerged in the decade after 1765 at both province and local levels. By late 1774, these had evolved toward becoming alternative governmental structures—a **Provincial Congress** with legislative functions that first met on June 1, 1775 and a **Council of Safety** with executive functions that first met on November 30, 1775. [On Committees of Correspondence and Safety and development of the Provincial Congress and Council of Safety, see especially Reel 7 document 90 and note after it, and documents 103 to 117.

Thus, organizing against, without a vision of “what next,” morphed into organizing for separation and for creation of new, alternative governmental institutions. This was no longer either protest or rebellion. It was verging into **revolution**.

On **September 15, 1775**, the protest/rebellion pressures of South Carolina “rebels” brought about the **collapse of the colonial government** in Charleston. This might have been a decisive revolutionary moment. Yet the colonial government collapsed into something of a vacuum, partly because South Carolina’s alternative, provisional governmental institutions were not sufficiently strong and experienced to rise up and take over and partly because military hostilities had already begun in earnest at Boston, so the potential cost of “just taking over” was difficult and scary to calculate.

Yet, the fall of the colonial government did create a greater incentive to establish effective alternative government in South Carolina. The power vacuum caused by loss of the colonial government was a potential threat to anyone’s prosperity or law and order. And, the vacuum offered an opportunity for a new government to be established without competition. So the chance was there for **a new State of South Carolina government**, and it was grasped. In **March 1776** a first constitution for the State of South Carolina was adopted and put onto effect. Like other early state constitutions, it contained flaws, some of which were quickly recognized and amended. So this was also a watershed time, as the promise of the long process of protest to rebellion to revolution began to pay off in a positive manner with a new form of government. This was not a perfect government but at least it was based on the premise of self-governance (for white males at least) that had been so important from the very beginning of the protest movement. (Little information on the development of the State of South Carolina government is contained in the British South Carolina Colonial Papers. The exception is the interaction between South Carolina State Governor John Mathews and British military commander General Alexander Leslie over the status of slavery during the British evacuation of Charleston in late 1782, on which, see the section in the **Introduction** below on “The State of South Carolina: Alternative Government on the Threshold, 1782.”

While separate states were engaged at their level in creating alternative governments, the time had come for **government building at the united, “continental” level**. The watershed date was **July 4, 1776**, as the Continental Congress took the decisive, symbolic, revolutionary step of convening representatives of all the new states to declare their **independence as sovereign entities, united under a single “continental governmental structure.”** Determining the constitutional details of that structure took several additional years to think through and agree upon.

## **Transition between Death of a Colony and Birth of a State (from September 1775 to December 1782)**

Most of the CO5 South Carolina Colonial Papers reveal the historical record of a British royal colony during its lifetime, from about 1720 to September 1775. However, this colony did not “die” all at once. A sub-story in these papers tells of the slow death of the colony during a transition period of over seven years, from September 1775 to December 1782.

When does a colony actually “die?” In South Carolina’s case, what combination of pressures on it and its own dysfunction caused its decline until it tipped over the edge of never return? Can particular tipping points or “**watershed moments**” be identified that perhaps particularly contributed to the colony’s demise? The sections below offer thoughts on these questions, based on the South Carolina Colonial Papers.

## **Governor Campbell’s Response to Collapse of the South Carolina Colonial Government**

On **September 15, 1775**, the accumulated pressures of South Carolina’s “rebel” movement of protest and rebellion verging into revolution, merged with the accumulated dysfunction of the colonial government to tip that government over the edge. Its governor fled for his personal safety to a British warship anchored in Charleston harbor. The government ceased to function, and several other leaders of the government sailed home to England. The governor did not leave but instead took up residence on the ship in the harbor and began what he appears to have thought was another phase of his governorship. The British government apparently shared that view.

With hindsight, it seems apparent that, actually, the royal colony of South Carolina died on that day in September. As things worked out, the colony was never successfully re-established. Yet equally apparent is that those living through it, on the British side at least, felt at the time that colonial South Carolina was not yet dead and could potentially be revived.

On that date in September, Governor William Campbell certainly was an “emperor without clothes,” a **governor without a government**. Yet he still held a Commission to be Governor, and he knew that his job was to do what he could to re-establish and lead that colonial government. (For glimpses into Campbell’s post-colonial “governor” activities, between December 1775 and January 1777, see Reel 7 documents 158 to 171). Initially, Campbell sought refuge, with his wife and private secretary Alexander Innes, on the HMS *Tamar*. From there, although now dependent on the official hierarchy of the British Navy, he began lobbying useful naval officers to obtain transport on naval vessels to places he wanted to get to in order to perform what he conceived to be his ongoing responsibilities as governor. One of his duties was to remain at his post in South Carolina. Since that was dangerous at the moment, he opted in December 1775 for transport to Savannah.

In early January 1776, the *Tamar* sailed to Cape Fear for repairs. Campbell was allowed to transfer to the armed ship *Cherokee*, which sailed for the mouth of the Savannah River, joining other British warships there, preparing for a possible southern attack by British forces. Campbell wished both to remain near possible action in South Carolina and to seek ways to consult with and influence top British military officials toward mounting a southern campaign. He soon found ways to do both.

## Attempting to Re-establish Colonial Government:

### (1<sup>st</sup> try): Military Attack on Charleston, June 28, 1776

By June 1776, Campbell was aboard the HMS *Bristol*, flagship of a British fleet under command of Admiral Peter Parker, with troops under General Henry Clinton's command. This force attempted an **attack on Charleston's defenses on June 28, 1776**. The outcome was indecisive, which, for the British, meant defeat, since they were not prepared to sustain the attack.

Instead, the forces withdrew, and the *Bristol* sailed to New York, with Campbell aboard, giving him the opportunity to meet with the British military's top officials. Unmentioned in the correspondence is the fact that Campbell, on the deck of the *Bristol* during the attack on Charleston, had received a significant wound from a flying wood splinter. His stay in New York was therefore extended, as he both recovered from his wound and sought to lobby top military officials. In January 1777, Secretary of State Germain had given him permission to return to England for a leave of absence.

### (2<sup>nd</sup> try): Encouraging Loyalist Insurgency in the Interior, 1775 to 1777

Meanwhile, as South Carolina remained in limbo, with no colonial government in operation but no official action to disband it, there was a war on. Although the military war had begun far to the north at Boston, South Carolina was likely to become a war zone, and Governor Campbell had been hoping that would be sooner rather than later. In the meantime, the southern colonies were already finding that peace and stability were hard to come by as various groups of armed combatants were marching around and confronting one another with lethal weapons. These early confrontations were mostly between irregular troops or bands of loyalists or rebels, mostly against each other and mostly in interior and frontier areas.

In late 1775 and 1776, Campbell was enthused about the **possibilities for a loyalist insurgency** that would swing the southern colonies toward Britain by taking control away from the planter-class leaders of the "rebel" movement. He had corresponded with **Thomas Brown**, a capable and charismatic Scotsman who had settled near Augusta to get rich as a planter (see Reel 7 document 149, dated October 18, 1775, and notes after it). After being tarred-and-feathered by rebel irregulars for refusing to sign the "associator" pledge of allegiance, Brown had become a radicalized frontier loyalist. East Florida's Governor Patrick Tonyn recruited him to lead a band of militia called the Florida Rangers. Brown trained these frontier troops to fight alongside regular British troops. In 1777-1778 the Rangers helped defend East Florida from rebel incursions from Georgia. In 1779, they contributed favorably to British victories to capture Savannah and (twice) Augusta. Brown and his Rangers had less influence on South Carolina, at least partly because Campbell returned to England early in 1777, leaving no one to "lobby" for a South Carolina royalist movement, until the military returned.

Once back in England, Campbell does not seem to have played any significant role as governor, although he still retained the title, Commission, and presumably the responsibility. The question remained unanswered as to what Campbell's further gubernatorial role might be. In September 1778, he died at age 48 from complications with his unhealed war wound from the 1776 failed invasion of Charleston. Significantly, the King did not appoint a successor governor after Campbell died, further leaving South Carolina in governmental limbo.

### **(3<sup>rd</sup> try): British Military Siege and Capture of Charleston, May 12, 1780**

Two years after Governor Campbell's death and close to four years since the South Carolina government had collapsed, the British military strategy again turned southward, and in May 1780, that strategy returned Charleston to British military control. This success did not mean, however, that South Carolina colony had been re-established, although it did raise hopes in that direction. Still, military success and British occupation at Charleston signaled that South Carolina could not yet be written off as no longer British in some important sense.

If South Carolina was a frequent battleground, its capital, **Charleston**, was meant to be the opposite. General Henry Clinton's southern strategy began, under his personal command, with a classic military operation to capture Charleston. Early in 1780, his army arrived from New York and deployed a standard siege around the city. General Benjamin Lincoln and his defending Continental Army held out as long as possible but were forced to surrender on **May 12, 1780**. (See especially General Clinton's lengthy report on the final days of the siege and negotiations for capitulation with General Lincoln, in Reel 8 documents 69 to 132.)

### **(4<sup>th</sup> try): General Clinton's Offer of Parole/Amnesty/Pardon to Prisoners of War Who Declare Allegiance to the King, 1780**

This should have been a watershed day as Britain shifted back toward a policy of re-establishing the South Carolina colony. Clinton took the first optimistic step by declaring that any and all among the 6,000 prisoners of war he had just captured would be paroled (more accurately granted amnesty or even a pardon) if they would declare allegiance to the King and settle in South Carolina. These former Continental Army soldiers and associated persons were thus expected to become part of a new loyalist population that would form the **foundation for a new civil colonial government** at Charleston. Clinton's thinking was akin to Governor Campbell's in 1775-1776 and just as unconfirmed by reality. Others disagreed with the Clinton/Campbell approach. Staunch loyalist but practical realist Georgia Governor James Wright strongly opposed Clinton's approach, and the Secretary of State in London vetoed it. (See Reel 8, documents 146 to 148, dated in June 1780. See also the background note at the beginning of Reel 14.)

**(5<sup>th</sup> try): British Military Occupation of Charleston, including a Board of Police and Declarations of Allegiance, May 12, 1780 to December 14, 1782**

As a result, Britain again became a ruling force in South Carolina, for the first time since September 1775—not with a civilian colonial government but with a **military occupation** in Charleston alone. This “government” had some longevity, from May 1780 until the end of December 1782. Yet it did not succeed in re-establishing civil government. The closest it came was to create a civilian arm of the military occupation command, an institution named the **Board of Police**. Its officials were appointed by the commander at Charleston. As a government entity, it had only limited authority, under military law. It had no legislative functions, operated a civilian judicial system, and may have administered a few urban services not otherwise available since the colonial government had never incorporated Charleston with its own municipal government. (The official correspondence provides only scattered bits of information about the Board of Police. See Reel 8 documents 175 and 180 to 182, dated in August 1782, concerning petitions and the quality of services being provided through the Board.) Archived Board of Police documents found in Reel 13 (Volumes 513 to 526) reveal something about the functioning of the Board of Police, in particular its judicial function. Most useful are the summaries of *Proceedings of the Board of Police*, which contain detailed information about individual court cases and lists of potential jurors. One of the *Proceedings* Volumes (520) contains separate proceedings for a Council, which seems to have had a limited “governing” function similar to that of the prior colonial Council of South Carolina.

One of the Council’s responsibilities seems to have been to approve petitions of prisoners of war to declare allegiance to the King. This was responsive to efforts encouraged by Governor Campbell and General Clinton toward re-establishing civil colonial government in South Carolina. Judging from the large numbers of, filled-out **declaration of allegiance forms** archived in the microfilmed documents, the declaration process was at least somewhat successful. However, it never matured into a critical mass to support a re-instated civilian government. (See declarations of allegiance archived in Reel 14, Volumes 527 to 534, with Volumes 527 to 529 and 532 to 534 containing about 1,309 filled-in, signed, and attested “Declarations” [three per printed-form page, in approximate chronological order from June 1780 to May 1782], and with Volumes 530 and 531 containing a separate archive about 600 slightly different “Certificates of Declaration” forms [similarly printed, filled in, signed, etc. but with seemingly random dates scattered from June 1780 to May 1782]. The significance of the separate forms and different dating is not clear. See note at beginning of Reel 14 Volume 527 for more information on Charleston’s archives of declarations and certificates of declaration of allegiance.)

### **(6<sup>th</sup> try): Bull's Last Stand Leading the Board of Police, 1781 to 1782**

If occupied Charleston was not a full colonial success, it was not for lack of trying by **Lieutenant Governor William Bull II**. After the fall of the colonial government in September 1775, he had remained in South Carolina, primarily to attend to personal affairs as the “rebel” government was confiscating much of his property. Although nominally still Lieutenant Governor, he had no government to govern. Most of South Carolina’s top colonial government officials returned to Britain during this period. In May 1777, Bull also had left South Carolina, returning to Britain.

When General Henry Clinton defeated and occupied Charleston in May 1780, Bull was offered one last chance to lead a British colony through a time of transition. The British government in London encouraged Bull and other leaders of the former colonial government to return to Charleston, with the expectation of re-establishing British colonial rule in South Carolina. Bull, still with his Lieutenant Governor title, returned in February 1781. Governor Campbell would probably have returned as well had he not died over two years before.

As already noted, Bull returned to a Charleston without a civilian government and with a British occupation based on military command and martial law. The one exception was the Board of Police, and this is where Bull became involved. He served as the Board’s **Intendant General** (top leader), replacing his friend James Simpson, former Attorney General of the former South Carolina colonial government, who moved to New York, where he served as General Clinton’s personal secretary. Others of Bull’s former governmental colleagues who were Board of Police members included Egerton Leigh, Edward Savage, and Thomas Knox Gordon. In some small sense, the Board of Police, meeting as the Charleston Council, was a shadow of the South Carolina’s colonial government. But only a shadow.

For William Bull II, being Intendant General held a significant level of responsibility. Yet it was not at the level of governing a British colony, as he had done for so many years. Clearly, he was working in Charleston now for a cause, not for career advancement. In his new position he exercised mostly operational leadership rather than executive or governing authority. The latter was reserved for the military leadership.

### **(7<sup>th</sup> try): Cornwallis’ “Offensive” Military Operation in Southern Colonies, 1781**

Although General Clinton’s conditional amnesty effort to jump-start a loyalist citizenry as the basis for a new colonial civil government had not succeeded, his thinking didn’t change. Having secured Charleston militarily, he ordered General Cornwallis into the field for an offensive operation whose purpose was to roust out the supposed hordes of loyalists scattered across rural South Carolina and use them to extend military control throughout its territory, in preparation for re-establishing the colony’s former colonial government—and then for replicating the process in the other southern colonies and beyond.

Unfortunately, Cornwallis, while initially enthusiastic, soon discovered, to his great regret, that the assumption of strong loyalist support in the hinterland was unrealistic. (See Reel 8 documents 133 to 171 and 184, 185.)

By mid-1781, the status of British rule in South Carolina was mixed at best. Charleston's martial law with attempts at providing some urban services had not spawned a stable, viable enclave of British colonial rule. Nor had the military's attempt to re-establish a British colony in the interior of South Carolina, built on expected foundations of strong loyalist support.

### **The Rug Pulled Out: End of Attempts to Re-establish Colonial Government after Cornwallis Surrender and Parliament withdrawal from Commitment to the War, October 1781 to February 1782**

Before any more attempts could be made to re-establish colonial South Carolina, and before Charleston's quasi-civilian Board of Police could mature or evolve into something closer to real civil government, General Cornwallis surrendered his army at Yorktown, Virginia in October 1781, and Parliament responded in February 1782 by pulling the rug out from under the entire British war effort, including British occupation of Charleston and any hope to re-establish a South Carolina colony.

After Cornwallis learned that loyalist fervor was not going to be his vanguard for a triumphal march through the southern colonies, preparatory to pushing on to conquer the northern colonies as well for British colonialism, his army's march turned into a furtive quest for supplies. Through a combination of unfortunate decisions by General Cornwallis, fortuitous decision making by General Washington, and the timely but temporary availability of French naval assistance, Cornwallis was trapped between the French fleet (which denied him the supplies he needed and an escape route by sea) and the Continental Army (which denied him escape by land).

The surrender at Yorktown shook the foundations on which the British Parliament's pro-war coalition was built. In February 1782, Lord North's government collapsed. The new Parliamentary majority disavowed the war effort and, among other specifics, commanded the military to evacuate occupied Charleston forthwith. This changed the military's mission from managing an occupied city to preparing for and implementing the huge task of withdrawing from that city, with not only the military personnel but also all civilian families who wanted to leave, along with their property. The deadline date for evacuation was set for December 14, 1782.

## From Colonial to Post-Colonial Thinking: Preparing for Evacuation and Looking Beyond, 1781 to 1782 and Beyond

Suddenly public discourse shifted, among loyalists at least, from the challenges of re-establishing civil government and colonial life in a reconstituted South Carolina colony to—issues of **protecting slavery**, specifically, insistence that the buying, working, and selling of slave property should remain solely in the hands of planter/owners, with no external restrictions. As recognized below, additional issues were also felt to be important, especially economic issues of trade, credit, debt financing, and more, but the future of slavery was the major gut issue of immediate concern, arousing the most passionate defense, and allowing the least degree of compromise.

When the British evacuation was announced, the South Carolina planter class was split three ways politically—rebels, loyalists wishing to remain, and loyalists wishing to leave with the evacuation—and they split bitterly over one slavery issue. Those wishing to remain in South Carolina insisted adamantly that no slave from within the colony/state should be allowed to leave. But those planning to leave insisted as adamantly on their right to take their slaves with them. The British military command supported the leaving owners who wanted to take their slaves with them. But they also further complicated the situation by insisting that slaves who had assisted the British cause should be given their freedom.

### Changing Values: Loyalty vs. Prosperity

A broader look at the documents microfilmed at the end of the archived Secretary of State incoming correspondence (Reel 8 documents 172 to 205, except for documents 184 and 185) suggests more than a knee-jerk reaction to an immediately perceived crisis, as with the issue of slavery. Beyond that level of thinking, which was real and attention-grabbing but not all that was going on, was a larger, more complex process in which changing times were altering the mix of relevant public concerns. (See note at end of Reel 8 with **Table 16**, which illustrates changes in issues considered important in documents 172 to 205.)

In an oversimplified nutshell, issues of **loyalty and obedience to a “foreign” king, parliament, sovereign, and empire**, etc. were giving way to issues of accomplishing successful **self-rule at home**, ensuring that **politics and government would serve the interests of “the people”** rather than those of the sovereign, the government, the colony, or the empire, and that the public issues of primary interest were those that **fostered private prosperity and individual freedom**. The documents here only hint at the change in the direction in thinking. They do not tell the story, which, in any case, was just then beginning to emerge.

In Reel 8, the incoming Secretary of State correspondence for South Carolina (as microfilmed) ends abruptly in mid-October 1782 (as final preparations were being made to evacuate Charleston in December). A gap exists in this correspondence between document 171 and before, with dates of **January 31, 1781 and earlier**, and document 172 and after, with dates of **August 31, 1781 and later**. Correspondence **prior to the gap** ended to focus on matters of **war power, British sovereignty, and colonial authority**. **After the gap**, a distinctly different focus seems to have emerged, based more on **post-war hopes for and concerns about economic prosperity**.

Some of the documents with later dates are petitions and memorials from merchants in England and in South Carolina, seeking in the post-war period either to retain existing **trading partners** or to develop new ones. All are interested in **free-trade policies**. Others memorialized for reduced regulation of **debt and credit opportunities**, and others yet in favor of allowing “**neutral bottoms**” (English, American, and neutral vessels) to carry trade products among markets.

Two letters with the earlier focus on war, sovereignty, and colonialism were misfiled before microfilming, causing confusion in the changes otherwise clear before and after the gap. Documents 184 and 185, dated August 20 and 21, 1780, are up-beat war letters written by General Cornwallis to Secretary of State Germain. In microfilmed order, they appear among other correspondence dated in August 1781, whose subject matter is quite different.

The **slavery** issue was also, of course, an **economic** issue. But it was much more in addition—a **social**, a **cultural**, and above all else, a **race** issue. More immediately also, there was the issue of relations between South Carolinians who had been “rebels” and those who had been “loyalists” but had chosen to remain in South Carolina as the war was ending. **Rebel-Loyalist hostilities** remained raw wounds because the two sides had been vilifying each other for so long, and because both sides had confiscated property (especially plantation land and slaves) from the other.

The tangle of confiscations, claims, counter claims, and debts made resolution problematic and hostilities further frayed. (See especially the ledger dated January 5, 1781 of “*Demands Brought Against Sequestered Estates*,” in Reel 14, Volume 535.) **Sequestered estates** were confiscated plantations by another name. In South Carolina, British military officials used this term for plantations identified by a Commissioner of Sequestered Estates, that were owned by prominent “rebel” plantation owners, against whom lists of loyalists had made claims for loans due or damages payable. The official policy was that the sequestered plantations would be operated by available slaves to produce food for the British military forces in the southern colonies. While that may have been accomplished to some extent, the hostility factor suggests that a good deal of private vengeance and greed were involved.

Besides this cluster of economic concerns were political concerns that now had to refocus from hostility and war to toward **peace, popular public governance, and American sovereignty**. This included improving the functioning of South Carolina State government. These papers, being British and colonial, do not dwell much on such issues of the future, except to hint at their relevance, as in the 1782 correspondence about the State's role in the issue of the mobility of slaves during the evacuation. By that time, the 1776 State Constitution had already been substantially amended in 1778 to fix initial glitches.

## **State of South Carolina: Alternative Government on the Threshold, 1782**

Meanwhile, the **State of South Carolina** government, such as it was, had been trying to catch up with what people were thinking it should be. During the British occupation of Charleston, which had been the colonial capital and was expected to be the State capital, the State government had been convening at the small town of Jacksonboro, about 35 miles west of Charleston. Seeking to represent planter interests, Governor John Mathews decided to enter the fray on the current, pre-evacuation slavery issues. He sought first to cut a deal with British military commander General Leslie on the (legal) movement of slaves, while, second, he was also engaging in certain behind-the-scene (illegal) intrigues that included "rescuing" (actually kidnapping) slaves who were about to be transported away. Mathew's maneuvering backfired, revealing both the ineptitude of the nascent State government and the imperious nature of the military power exercised by General Leslie. (See Reel 8 documents 176 to 179 and 189 to 204, dated in August and October 1782.) Meanwhile, planning continued for an on-time evacuation of Charleston.

## **Evacuation of Charleston and Demise of Colonial South Carolina, December 14, 1782**

So, **December 14, 1782** was a watershed day, but in different ways for different people (see also "winners and losers" below).

- The cause of South Carolina colonialism finally failed on this day. The last vestige of British authority sailed away, leaving behind those who had chosen to remain as citizens of the State of South Carolina and the United States of America.
- The cause of creating independent states in America received a considerable boost, as the British impediment to development of a new State of South Carolina was eliminated, although the State's initial government had not yet proved its competency.
- Although much mending of relationships and settlement of property ownership claims remained to be resolved, members of South Carolina's planter class remained reconfirmed in their one nonnegotiable demand from society and government, that they would be left alone to do as they wished with their African slaves.

- And, for South Carolina's slave population, this day was a deep but predictable disappointment. At this time, neither the planters nor the slaves were likely to have anticipated that, 83 years later, the American government would be requiring emancipation of all slaves.

### Winners and Losers: Demographic and Geographic Impacts of Britain's Evacuation of Charleston, December 1782

The evacuation was both an ending and a beginning. Those who remained looked forward to something new and different in South Carolina, whether that might appear positive or negative. The white civilian families who left in the evacuation were seeking, if they could find it, the status quo ante—a return to the stability of British rule that included support for slavery and slave labor. Of course the slaves who left with their masters must have had different preferences, but they were not asked. **Table 4** provides secondary clues about the demographics of those who left and where they went. In summary, a total of 5,327 “Blacks” left Charleston with the British. Of these, all but 153 were bound for places dominated by plantation agriculture using slave labor. Unsubstantiated estimates suggest that South Carolinians may have used force to keep about another 25,000 slaves from leaving with the British.

**Table 4**

RETURN OF PEOPLE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA, CHARLESTOWN, 13th DECEMBER., 1782.

From Whence Embarked	To What Place	Whites.....			Blacks	Total
		Men	Women	Chil'd'n		
Charleston	Jamaica	600	300	378	2,613	3,891
Charleston	East Florida	630	306	337	1,653	2,926
Charleston	" "	166	57	119	558	900
	England	137	74	63	50	324
	Halifax	163	133	121	53	470
	New York	100	40	50	50	240
	St. Lucia	20			350	370
	TOTAL	1,816	910	1,068	5,327	9,121

Source: Mass. Historical Society Miscellaneous Papers, 1769-1793. Vol. V, p. 139

### Colonial Government Structure

In the big picture, the colony of South Carolina was but a small bit in the intercontinental empire the British were busy conquering, organizing, and colonizing. Still, as colonies went, those along the Atlantic coast of North America were better organized, more highly developed, and more prosperous than some others. And each colony had a direct connection with British power at the top, primarily through the Board of Trade and the Secretary of State.

## **British Empire Structure** (relevant to Colonial South Carolina)

**The King:** Sovereign ruler, sharing power with Parliament

**Parliament:** Representative, elected House of Commons;  
Appointed House of Lords

**King's Privy Council:** Key advisors to King; appointed

**Privy Council Committee for Plantations:** Responsible for advising on colonial matters pertaining to trade and plantations

**Board of Trade and Plantations** (among many Ministries): The economic development arm of the British colonial system. Like a chamber of commerce, a lobbying organization. But also a governmental agency, which wielded considerable clout in colonial economic development plus governmental operations and foreign policy until the mid-1760s, when the Secretary of State assumed most of these responsibilities and powers. As the American protest/rebellious/revolutionary movement heated up, the Board of Trade was relegated to secondary status in relation to the Secretary of State.

**Secretary of State office** (among many Ministries): Until the late 1760s, Secretaries of State for the Southern Department shared power with the Board of Trade to promote economic development and to help provide protection needed to foster colonial expansion, especially in relations with the Nations of Indians that lived on the interior frontiers, or even along the coasts. After 1768, Secretaries of State for the Colonies wielded more direct power in guiding and regulating colonial governmental authority, relations with foreign powers and Indian Nations, and more.

## **South Carolina Royal Colony Structure**

**Colonial Governor:** Appointed by the King with Royal **Commission**; guided by initial **General Instructions** and possibly **Additional Instructions** from King

**Lieutenant Governor:** Appointed by the King; usually a member of the Council; answerable to the Governor

**Chief Justice:** Appointed by the King, usually a member of the Council; head of the colonial judicial system; answerable to the Governor but in practice professionally independent within the judicial system

**Justices:** Appointed by the King; judges in the colonial judicial system; answerable to Chief Justice but in practice professionally independent in most cases

**Attorney General:** Appointed by the King; usually a member of the Council; head of the prosecution and incarceration parts of the colonial judicial system; answerable to the Governor but in practice professionally independent in his realm, but guided by the Chief Justice

[also other individual appointed officials of lesser rank]

[Recommendations from the Governor and/or Council: were frequently recognized and honored by the Board of Trade, Secretary of State, and Privy Council officials who directly influenced royal appointment making.]

**Royal Council/Upper House of Assembly:** Advisors to Governor; appointed by the King (usually recommended by the Governor); also sat as upper legislative house of the colony's Assembly

**Commons House/Lower House of Assembly:** Elected legislative body

## **British Military Structure for Occupation of Charleston**

**Background:** When the colonial government of South Carolina collapsed under pressure from an American colonist "rebellion" on September 15, 1775, the only remaining British authority in the colony was military, exercised where and when military force could enforce it. In May 1780, British military power successfully captured Charleest (but not the rest of South Carolina), and imposed military occupation on the city.

**Military Command:** Headed by the military commander at Charleston; appointed as part of the British Army military structure; operated under martial law; answerable to the British Commander for the Southern Department, who was answerable to the Commander in Chief for British Forces in North America.

**Board of Police:** Quasi-civilian governmental structure created by and answerable to the military commander at Charleston, who appointed the Board members and other officials; meant to help fill the government services gap because Charleston had no city government under colonial law; operated certain functions, under military control but not martial law, especially a civilian judicial system; and, through the Charleston Council, approved petitions for declarations of allegiance to the King.

## **Top officials of the British Government (relevant to South Carolina) and of South Carolina Colonial Government**

### **The King**

George II	ruled 1727 to 1760
George III	ruled 1760 to 1820

## Lords of Trade

They collectively operated the Board of Trade and Plantations; appointed by the King. In practice, they made a practice of signing their outgoing correspondence individually, apparently depending on who happened to be in the office when a particular letter was being finalized (and perhaps edited). Reel 3 Volume 381 documents 1 to 151 contain drafts of outgoing letters from the Board of Trade. Each was signed by several Lords of Trade.

The list below compiles the names of those whose signatures appear on drafts and the span of time during which each Lord was actively signing correspondence. The microfilmed correspondence is dated from 1720 to 1738 and from 1764 to 1774, with a large gap between the two sets. Since these drafts were written into letter books, it is likely that an entire letter book or letter books have been lost.

Dates of first and last signature do not necessarily reflect dates of service for a member of the Board of Trade. Each may have started serving earlier than the first signature date and may have continued serving after the last signature date. This list illustrates the hands-on involvement of individual Lords of Trade during two lengthy periods in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century.

---

**Table 5: Lords of Trade, According to Dates of First and Last Recorded Signature on Microfilmed Draft Letters from the Board of Trade and Plantations, for dates from 1720 to 1774**

<u>Lord of Trade</u>	<u>Date of first recorded signature</u>	<u>Date of last recorded signature</u>
Charles Cooke	August 16, 1720	August 30, 1720
Paul Docminique	August 16, 1720	August 10, 1738
Martin Bladen	August 16, 1720	November 28, 1738
Earl of Westmorland	August 16, 1720	February 28, 1735
(The Earl of Westmorland was 1 <sup>st</sup> Lord of Trade from 1719 until 1735)		
John Chetwynd	August 30, 1720	July 22, 1724
Thomas Pelham	December 20, 1722	February 17, 1738
Sir J. Hobart	June 19, 1723	[one date only]
Richard Plumer	July 26, 1723	November 28, 1738
W. Cary	November 17, 1727	February 20, 1730
T. Frankland	November 17, 1727	April 15, 1730
Orlando Bridgeman	November 17, 1727	May 5, 1737
Edward Ashe	February 20, 1730	June 6, 1738
Archer Croft	May 23, 1730	November 28, 1738
James Brudenell	June 10, 1730	November 28, 1738
Earl FitzWalter	June 26, 1735	June 14, 1737
R. S. Herbert	September 1, 1737	July 6, 1738
Sir John Monson	September 1, 1737	August 10, 1738
(John Monson, 1 <sup>st</sup> Baron Monson, was 1 <sup>st</sup> Lord of Trade from June 1737 until his death in 1748)		

[Note: **Major gap** in microfilmed drafts of outgoing Board of Trade correspondence **from after November 28, 1738 until before June 25, 1764.**]

Earl of Hillsborough	December 24, 1764	February 15, 1765
	September 15, 1768	December 28, 1771
(Wills Hill, 1 <sup>st</sup> Earl of Hillsborough, was 1 <sup>st</sup> Lord of Trade from 1763 to 1768; as Secretary of State for the Colonies, he remained the leader in fact of the Board of Trade until 1772)		
Soame Jenyns	December 24, 1764	February 21 1774
(Soame Jenyns was 1 <sup>st</sup> Lord of Trade after Hillsborough became Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1768 until 1779)		
Edward Bacon	December 24, 1764	[one date only]
Bamber Gascoyne	December 24, 1764	
	November 2, 1772	October 25, 1774
Jeremiah Dyson	December 24, 1764	July 13, 1767
Lord Orwell	February 15, 1765	[one date only]
Lord Dartmouth	December 24, 1765	July 11, 1766
	November 1, 1772	October 25, 1774
John Roberts	December 24, 1765	June 21, 1771
George Rice	January 24, 1766	July 25, 1766
William Fitzherbert	January 24, 1766	December 28, 1771
Viscount Palmerston	January 24, 1766	July 4, 1766
Viscount Clare	January 6, 1767	July 22, 1767
(Robert Nugent, 1 <sup>st</sup> Earl Nugent)		
Thomas Robinson	July 22, 1767	November 22, 1769
Edward Eliot	July 6, 1769	June 21, 1771
1 <sup>st</sup> Earl of Lisburne	July 6, 1769	November 22, 1769
William Northey	November 21, 1770	November 24, 1770
George Greville	November 21, 1770	October 25, 1774
Robert Spencer	December 7, 1770	October 25, 1774
Thomas Whately	February 13, 1771	April 24, 1774
Lord Garlies	November 2, 1772	[one date only]
(Earl of Galloway)		
Whitshed Keene	February 21, 1774	June 20, 1774

## Secretaries of State

The British government included multiple Secretaries of State. Generally, only one of these had direct responsibilities in relation to the American colonies. This Secretary of State shared responsibilities for colonial development with the Board of Trade. The Secretary of State's "state" responsibilities included relations with foreign nations in colonial competition with Britain (especially Spain and France during this period) plus, most importantly, relations with the Indian Nations adjacent to settled areas of the British colonies. As policy priorities changed, Secretaries of State changed title, were reorganized, and gained or lost power in relation to the Board of Trade.

---

**Table 6a: Secretaries of State for the Southern Department (1727 to 1768)**

Responsible for southern North American colonies plus Carribean and West Indian colonies until 1768.

John Carteret, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Lord Carteret	March 1721 to March 1724
Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1 <sup>st</sup> Duke of Newcastle	April 1724 to January 1746
John Carteret, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Earl of Granville	February to April 1746
Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1 <sup>st</sup> Duke of Newcastle	April 1746 to February 1748
John Russell, 4 <sup>th</sup> Duke of Bedford	February 1748 to June 1751
Robert Darcy, 4 <sup>th</sup> Earl of Holderness	June 1751 to March 1754
Thomas Robinson	March to October 1754
Henry Fox	Nov. 1754 to Nov. 1756
William Pitt (Elder)	December 1756 to April 1757
Robert Darcy, 4 <sup>th</sup> Earl of Holderness	April to June 1757
William Pitt (Elder)	June 1757 to October 1761
Charles Wyndham, 2nd Earl of Egremont	October 1761 to August 1763
George Montague-Dunk, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Earl of Halifax	September 1763 to July 1765
Henry Seymour Conway	July 1765 to May 1766
Charles Lennox, 3rd Duke of Richmond	May to July 1766
William Petty, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Earl of Shelburne	July 1766 to October 1768

**Table 6b: Secretaries of State for the Colonies (1768 to 1782)**

In 1768, Secretaries of State gained power at expense of Board of Trade as priority issues shifted from economic development to colonial regulation and governance; jurisdiction changed to include all North American colonies, not just the southern ones.

Wills Hill, 1 <sup>st</sup> Earl of Hillsborough	February 1768 to August 1772
William Legge, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Earl of Dartmouth	August 1772 to November 1775
George Germain, 1 <sup>st</sup> Viscount Sackville	November 1775 to March 1782

Germain was the last of the Secretaries of State for the Colonies. When Lord North's "war government" fell in early 1782, Germain's term as Secretary of State ended. As Britain sought to move on from a failed war in America, the Secretary of State office again reorganized and changed terminology. What had been the colonial office now became the office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department (or Home Secretary). Political instability also returned temporarily.

**Table 6c: Secretaries of State for the Home Department (1782 to 1789)**

In 1782 Secretary of State policies shifted again as Britain withdrew from its failed attempt to subdue American colonial rebellion by military force. “Foreign” policies were de-emphasized, while “home” policies were emphasized. At the same time, the Board of Trade was abolished.

William Petty, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Shelburne  
(he became prime minister in July 1782)  
Thomas Townshend, 1<sup>st</sup> Viscount Sydney

March to July 1782

July 1782 to April 1783 and  
December 1783 to 1789

---

**Colonial Governors and Charleston Occupation Leaders**

During a transition period between 1719 and the mid-1720s, South Carolina changed from being a proprietary colony (since 1663) to a Royal Colony. A transition governor helped make the change. Thereafter, royal governors ruled colonial South Carolina until 1775. During Britain’s war to stamp out the American rebellion, Charleston was ruled briefly (from May 1780 to December 1782) under British military occupation by other kinds of leaders.

**Table 7a: Transition Governor of South Carolina**

Governor during transition between proprietary and royal colonies; appointed by a convention responsible for negotiating and managing the transition.

James Moore

1719-1721

**Table 7b: Royal Governors of South Carolina (1721 to 1775)**

Appointed by the King; received a royal **Commission** symbolic of the sovereign power each exercised as the King's ruling representative to the colony; when first appointed, received extensive written **General Instructions**, which served as the governor's official guide to ruling as the King wished; some governors received **Additional Instructions** when particular added guidance was deemed necessary.

Francis Nicholson	May 1721 to May 1725	
Arthur Middleton	May 1725 to December 1730	(Acting)
Robert Johnson	December 1730 to May 1735	
Thomas Broughton	May 1735 to November 1737	(Acting)
William Bull Sr.	November 1737 to December 1743	(Acting)
Samuel Horsey	(appointed 1738 but never served)	
James Glen	December 1743 to June 1756	
William Henry Lyttelton	June 1756 to April 1760	
Thomas Pownall	(appointed in 1760 but never served)	
William Bull II	April 1760 to December 1761	(Acting)
(Lieutenant Governor 1759 to 1775)		
Thomas Boone	December 1761 to May 1764	
William Bull II	May 1764 to June 1766	(Acting)
Charles Greville Montagu	June 1766 to May 1768	
William Bull II	May 1768 to October 1768	(Acting)
Charles Greville Montagu	October 1768 to July 1769	
William Bull II	July 1769 to September 1771	(Acting)
Charles Greville Montagu	September 1771 to March 1773	
William Bull II	March 1773 to June 1775	(Acting)
William Campbell	June 1775 to September 1775	

**Table 7c: Leaders of British Military Occupation and Rule in Charleston, for over two years, with a Civilian Component**

After lack of colonial government in South Carolina since September 1775, British military siege and capture of Charleston in May 1780, followed by military occupation rule for over two years in Charleston only, not the rest of South Carolina; still no civil government, except for military creation of quasi-civil governmental Board of Police to operate civil judicial system and certain urban services; military commander in full charge but delegated limited authority to Intendant of Board of Police to manage authorized services.

**British Military Commander**

Brigadier General Alexander Leslie	? 1780 to December 1782
------------------------------------	-------------------------

**Intendant General of Board of Police**

Former Attorney General James Simpson	Late 1780 to mid-1781
Lieutenant Governor William Bull II	Mid-1781 to December 1782

## Colonial Leadership: Longevity and Effectiveness in Office

This volunteer researcher has had the privilege to create DLAR Finding Aids for the CO5 Colonial Papers of four contiguous (but very different) southern colonies. These include West Florida, East Florida, Georgia, and now South Carolina. With this perspective in mind, here are a few (un-researched) comparative impressions about how longevity in colonial leadership might influence the effectiveness of colonial rule, based on South Carolina's remarkable record of instability and lack of longevity (except for Governor Glen and Lieutenant Governor Bull).

The premise is that the history of a British colony is influenced considerably by the capabilities of and approach taken to governing by its colonial governors. One measure of his capabilities is a **governor's longevity in office**. At the least, this is a measure of the degree of stability in governing and managing economic development within the colony. Comparing colonies can be instructive in understanding the trajectory of their colonial experiences. Certainly other factors are at play as well, but these thoughts focus on longevity and effectiveness.

To oversimplify shamelessly, British **West Florida's** governors were generally weak and ineffective, even when present. One result was the ease with which Spain subdued West Florida militarily in early 1781. By contrast, **East Florida** benefited from having relatively few governors who remained in office for longer periods and were capable administratively and skilled politically. By contrast with West Florida, East Florida maintained its colonial integrity until 1785, as the governor organized and implemented a British evacuation on a British schedule and largely on British terms, despite the fact that the 1783 Treaty of Paris had returned imperial control of both Floridas to Spain.

Colonial **Georgia** differed considerably from East Florida politically, although they both had strong, capable governors. The latter remained staunchly loyalist throughout the revolutionary period and contributed militarily on the British side of the Southern Campaign in the later years of the war. Georgia, on the other hand, was split politically but with enough intensity on the anti-British side to sustain a successful rebellion and revolution. However, the colony's sole major governor, true-blue loyalist **James Wright**, led the colony steadfastly from 1760 to 1782, except during a three-year period of exile from 1776 to 1779. By contrast, **South Carolina's** governorship changed hands 11 times between 1756 and 1775. Five out of the 11 leaders were a single person, the perennial Lieutenant Governor **William Bull II**, who stepped up to govern without the title each time a governor left or took a leave of absence (see **Table 8** below).

Despite the appearance of loyalist longevity and stability suggested by Bull's total of almost 17 years as Lieutenant Governor (1759 to 1775), and his cumulative total of over 9 years as acting governor (spread between 1760 and 1775), Commons House of the Assembly exhibited more consistent and effective institutional longevity on the rebel side between 1758 and 1775.

As a result of this and other differences, South Carolina's colonial government crumbled under pressure in 1775 (except for later military rule in Charleston, during which Bull made a sixth appearance), while Georgia's colonial government held out until 1782 (except for three years of exile). (See more on Bull's life and public-service contribution to colonial South Carolina in the note after Reel 8 document 180.)

Two generations of the William Bull family combined to provide long-term public service in South Carolina. This unique stretch brought the colonial government not just longevity but also a fairly consistent level of organization competence. **William Bull Sr.**'s contribution in a previous generation sounds remarkably like his son's. He served as Lieutenant Governor for just over 17 years (from 1738 to 1755), and for six of these years, he served as acting governor (from 1737 to 1743).

---

**Table 8: Longevity of South Carolina Governors and Acting Governors**

(The Intendant General of the Board of Police is included for completeness, although it has little bearing on effectiveness.)

Francis Nicholson	Served 5/1721 to 5/1725 (did not resign until 1729)	(replaced)	4 yr. 1 mo.
Arthur Middleton	Served 5/1725 to 12/1730	(acting)	5 yr. 8 mo.
Robert Johnson	Served 12/1730 to 5/1735	(died)	4 yr. 6 mo.
Thomas Broughton	Served 5/1735 to 11/1737	(acting; died)	2 yr. 7 mo.
William Bull Sr.	11/1737 to 12/1743	(acting)	6 yr. 2 mo.
Samuel Horsey	(appointed 1738 but never served)		
James Glen	Served 12/1743 to 6/1756	(recalled)	12 yr. 6 mo.
William Henry Lyttelton	Served 6/1756 to 4/1760	(promoted)	3 yr. 11 mo.
Thomas Pownall	(appointed 1760 but never served)		
William Bull II	Served 4/1760 to 12/1760	(acting)	1 yr. 9 mo.
Thomas Boone	Served 12/1761 to 5/1764	(recalled)	2 yr. 6 mo.
William Bull II	Served 5/1764 to 6/1766	(acting)	2 yr. 1 mo.
Charles Greville Montagu	Served 6/1766 to 5/1768	(5 mo. leave)	12 mo.
William Bull II	Served 5/1768 to 10/1768	(acting)	5 mo.
Charles Greville Montagu	Served 10/1768 to 7/1769	(27 mo. leave)	10 mo.
William Bull II	Served 7/1769 to 9/1771	(acting)	2 yr. 3 mo.
Charles Greville Montagu	Served 9/1771 to 3/1773	(resigned)	1 yr. 7 mo.
	(total time active as Governor		3 yr. 5 mo.)
	(total time with Governor title		6 yr. 10 mo.)
William Bull II	Served 3/1773 to 6/1775	(acting)	2 yr. 5 mo.
William Campbell	Served 6/1775 to 9/1775	(fled Charleston)	4 mo.
		(end of colonial government)	
<b>Lieutenant Governor</b>			
William Bull II	Served early 1759 to 9/1775		almost 17 yr.
	(total time acting as governor		9 yr. 1 mo.)
<b>Intendant General of the Charleston Board of Police</b>			
James Simpson	Served 6/1780 to 2/1781		8 mo.
William Bull II	Served 2/1781 to 12/1782		1 yr. 10 mo.

---

## Organizing Correspondence: Focus on Archiving

The core materials found in the South Carolina Colonial Papers are correspondence. In a sense, the British Empire ran on **written communications**. In the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, governments functioned at the speed of the preparation, delivery, and organized archiving of written correspondence.

**Preparation** depended on the availability of paper, ink, quill pens, scribes, and (hopefully) legible handwriting. Employed scribes—clerks and secretaries—could make a difference in legibility. Yet the colonial governors of South Carolina tended to write their own letters.

**Delivery** of government correspondence was probably as reliable and rapid as was available during an era when mail was delivered by land mostly on horseback and by sea in sailing ships. An intercontinental imperial/colonial governmental system could operate only as quickly as a paper letter could be shipped across the Atlantic Ocean and then a response could be prepared and shipped back. Major uncertainties existed in cross-Atlantic mail delivery, the most significant of which were stormy weather and hostile humans, whether enemy naval ships, privateers, or pirates. These could either delay or doom a ship's passage to or from England. To reduce the probability of delay or doom, multiple copies of letters, dispatches, etc., were sent on separate ships. Letters found in the microfilmed documents might be identified as an **original**, a **duplicate**, a **triplicate**, etc. Or a letter might be identified as a **copy**, meaning usually that it was being sent to a different recipient than the person to whom the letter was addressed.

**Archiving** of governmental correspondence was necessary to keep government going. In the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, before the advent of computers or even typewriters and copiers, all archiving was manual and paper-intensive. For both current operations and subsequent follow-up, reference, and changes, all the accumulated paper that mattered had to be organized, stored, and perhaps indexed so that particular letters could be retrieved as needed.

These observations about organizing correspondence focus on **archiving**.

### Archival Organizing:

#### 1. Chronological Bundling

The first level of **archival organizing**, practiced for the CO5 South Carolina Colonial Papers and for most archiving of historical materials, was to **bundle the documents physically into Volumes** of manageably sized bunches of documents, arranged in chronological order.

This archival organizing is, of course, especially useful for researchers as well, and its lack can be a major headache. A major good reason for a Finding Aid is to assist scholars in picking through the seeming chaos of a manuscript collection to understand and use the archivists' organization (or to deal with the lack thereof), so that they can focus on the materials they need for a particular research project.

The South Carolina Colonial Papers are an interesting example of reasonably well organized archived papers of one British royal colony, which existed from about 1720 to 1775, and, some might argue, longer. As outlined above, three major British bureaucracies interacted to govern the colony of South Carolina: The King and Privy Council, the Board of Trade and Plantations, and the office of the Secretary of State. To oversimplify considerably, the King and Privy Council controlled policy, made decisions, and handed down orders, while the Board and Secretary offices implemented policies, orders. Thus, most of the paperwork was done at the Board and Secretary office level, although certain paperwork to and from the King and Privy Council also was archived by the Board and Secretary offices.

In practice, the archiving of the Board of Trade and Secretary of State offices was done separately, although personnel and operations were intertwined. They also were done differently, although overlaps and borrowing of methods are evident. The processes of both also evolved over time, especially encouraged by the reorganizational thinking, during the last half of the 1760s, of two individuals, the Earl of Shelburne and the Earl of Hillsborough. Each spent time as a leader among the Lords of Trade before being appointed a Secretary of State. Hillsborough followed Shelburne, with Shelburne innovating, Hillsborough institutionalizing, and subsequent Secretaries of State continuing to use the methods they had established.

The innovations that Shelburne and Hillsborough introduced and institutionalized went beyond chronological organizing to include a second, third, and fourth, different way of **numbering documents for archival purposes**:

## **2. Numbering of Documents by Archivists**

- Since 1720 the Board of Trade had used a system for **numbering individual official-correspondence documents within each Volume**. The Volume was assigned a letter (starting with A. for the first Volume chronologically). Then, each document within that Volume was assigned a consecutive number in the order in which the letters were placed in the Volume. The Board of Trade used this system for official-correspondence documents with dates from 1720 to 1775 (Volume 358 [A.] to volume 381 [P.])

Beginning in 1767, Secretary of State Shelburne borrowed this system from the Board of Trade and applied it to establish the same document numbering system for Secretary of State papers, beginning with Volume 391 [A.]. The practice was continued in Volumes 392 [B.], 393 [C.], and 394 [D.] (1767 to 1772) but was abandoned seemingly abruptly in the middle of Volume 394 after document D.18. (July 10, 1771).

### 3. Numbering of Letters by Authors

- Beginning in 1766, Secretaries of State, beginning with Shelburne and running through Lord Germain (and beyond?), began a practice of **numbering their letters** to colonial governors and to request that the governors similarly number their letters to the Secretary of State. For Secretaries and Governors who retained office for a long time, the numbers of consecutively numbered, chronologically ordered letters could become quite long. The “record” in South Carolina was compiled by Lieutenant Governor William Bull II, who through a long career in public service with no change in title, recurringly led South Carolina as an acting governor when the colony had no governor or when a governor was away on leave. Through one particularly long stretch of governing the colony, he wrote 90 numbered letters.

For the Secretaries and Governors and their archivists, this numbering process must have been quite useful. From a researcher’s perspective, it can become confusing. For instance, On May 4, 1771, Hillsborough (in London) wrote his letter No. 46 to acting governor Bull, while on May 7, 1771, Bull (in Charleston) wrote his letter No. 46 to Hillsborough. Bull wrote more frequently than Hillsborough, so Bull’s series of letters had caught up with and then overtook Hillsborough’s. Confusion also comes when a Secretary or a Governor leaves office or goes on leave. In some cases, a new incumbent started a new series with No. 1; in others, he continued a previous series of his own or started with the following number after his predecessor’s last letter.

For a summary analysis of the use of numbered letters by Secretaries of State, South Carolina colonial governors and South Carolina colonial acting governor, see **Table 9** below.

#### 4. Maintaining and Numbering Extracts, Abstracts, Summaries, and Transcripts of Actual Documents

- Starting in 1766, the archivists and scribes in the Secretary of State office began a third project, which may have seemed logical as the sheer number of official-correspondence documents expanded. Besides archiving the **actual documents** of correspondence and other kinds of documents in Volumes, the scribes began to keep **letter books with abstracts** of the Secretary of State's official incoming and outgoing correspondence. For microfilm locations of actual letters and abstract letters in the South Carolina Colonial Papers, see **Table 10** below.

Abstracts are different from extracts, but the two are easily confused. A few definitions may help:

- **Extracts** are found frequently, especially as enclosures to letter, throughout these microfilmed documents. Extracting suggests that a certain portion of document text has been selected and quoted without the remaining text. The person doing the extracting usually has a purpose for selecting and quoting specific text. Although extracts may be accurate copies of original text, a historian using them must be aware of the purpose for which certain text was selected and other text was not.
- **Abstracts**, rather than selectively quoting, often summarize the content of a full document. A **summary** includes paraphrases and other explanatory language rather than quotes. Those writing summaries exercise discretion or motivation in the wording they choose. Depending on the nature of the contents and the closeness of paraphrases to the original text, summaries usually cannot be "trusted" by historians to be accurate without also consulting the original document. A particular version of summarizing is called abstracting. In this particular sense, an **abstract** is a document that is more formally summarized in detail, usually organized into differing content subjects in separate sections often identified by a sequence of letters. Reels 10, 11, and 12 in the South Carolina Colonial Papers letter books are full of summaries and abstracts.
- **Transcripts** take abstracting a step further, transcribing a full copy or transcription of an entire document, word for word, rather than simply summarizing it. Depending on the unbiased and careful accuracy of transcribers, historians may selectively rely on transcripts as accurate, especially when original documents are unavailable. Especially in Reels 11 and 12, especially beginning in 1768, many abstracted documents are full transcripts of original documents.

# Archival Confusion: Too Many Numbering Systems

As the Secretary of State office soon learned, **using both individual letter numbers and general numbering of documents in abstract letter books caused confusion.** Initially, each separate document, when written into an abstract letter book, was assigned a number, in the order in which each document was entered. So, if a letter No. 3, for instance, was written as the sixth letter in the book, it was assigned two different numbers. To avoid this difficulty, at first, the number assigned to an official letter was the same as its archival abstract number. But This caused a new problem for those trying to keep track of the flow of correspondence. It created the appearance of missing letters, since the numbered letters were scattered chronologically among other documents, not together in consecutive order. To resolve this issue, later abstract books assigned no numbers to documents (especially circular letters) that were not official correspondence personally from a secretary of state to a governor. Then, the official letters in a Volume could be assigned consecutive numbers.

The Board of Trade archivists also created abstract documents in different way. Rather than abstracted correspondence, four Volumes in Reels 10 to 12 contain **abstracts of documents pertaining to “Commissions, Instructions, Etc.”** (referring to the **Commission** the King issued to each new royal governor and to the formal lists of **General Instructions** the King delivered to each one, plus subsequent **Additional Instructions** sent to sitting governors, as needed. Other kinds of documents are also included, especially various kinds of written communication between the King and/or his Privy Council and the Board of Trade.

Many of the abstract documents, especially in the Secretary of State letter books, are also found as actual documents in the microfilmed collection. However, some, including a few numbered letters, are found only as transcripts. Thus, the transcribing process has helped in a small way to ensure almost full series of numbered letters in these microfilmed papers.

---

**Table 9: Analysis of Numbered Letters:** (with contextual notes)

- **between Board of Trade and South Carolina Governors/Acting Governor, and**
- **between Secretaries of State and South Carolina Governors/Acting Governor**

**BOARD OF TRADE to Governor MONTAGU**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------	---------------	--------------------------

Note: The Board of Trade did not number its outgoing letters.

**MONTAGU to BOARD OF TRADE**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------	---------------	--------------------------

Note: Governor Montagu did not number his letters to the Board of Trade. Between August 6, 1766 and November 10, 1767 he sent seven microfilmed letters to the Board of Trade (Reel 2 documents scattered between 64 and 88)

**Lieutenant Governor and acting governor BULL to BOARD OF TRADE**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 1	May 30, 1768 to		Reel 2 document 91
	No. 5	September 6, 1768	X	Reel 2 document 95

Note: After his letter No. 5, Bull discontinued numbering his letters to the Board of Trade.

**SECRETARY OF STATE SHELburne to MONTAGU:**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 2	October 25, 1766 to		Reel 5 document 167
	No. 9	October 8, 1767	X	Reel 5 document 184

Nos. 1, 3, 4, and 7 are circular letters in Volume 407 abstracts of correspondence, so no letters to individuals received these letter numbers. Letters No. 5 and No. 8 are not found in the actual microfilmed documents. They are found only as full transcripts in the abstracts of correspondence in Reel 12, Volume 407, documents 7 and 10 respectively. Thus, only five of nine were actually written, and all of them are found here as actual documents or abstract transcripts.

**MONTAGU to SHELburne**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 2	March 5, 1767 to		Reel 5 document 176
	No. 12	March 25, 1768	X	Reel 6 document 9

Early Montagu to Shelburne letters were unnumbered. Unnumbered, microfilmed letters are dated between June 29 and December 8, 1766 (scattered in Reel 5 between documents 149 and 171). Numbered letters #1, #3, #4, and #7 are not microfilmed and are not otherwise accounted for.

**SECRETARY OF STATE HILLSBOROUGH to MONTAGU**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 3	February 20, 1768 to		Reel 6 document 7
	No. 28	July 15, 1769	X	Reel 6 document 47

Among letter numbers 3 to 28, only 13 actual letters were written, numbered, and sent (Nos. 3, 8, 10, 16 to 23, 26, and 28). They also are all microfilmed here. The remaining letter numbers were assigned to circular letters. Montagu was on a first leave from May 23 to October 30, 1768. Lieutenant Governor William Bull II served briefly as acting governor—not long enough to generate a new series of numbered letters between Hillsborough and Bull. Hillsborough wrote letter No. 28 just before Montagu left for his second health-related leave of absence on July 30 1769.

### **HILLSBOROUGH to BULL**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 29	November 4, 1769 to		Reel 6 document 54
	No. 53	July 1, 1772	X	Reel 6 document 191

Apparently Montague did not experience the health improvement he had sought by spending several months in northern colonies in 1768. Therefore, less than a year later, Montagu embarked on a much longer leave of absence. Spent in England, this second leave lasted from July 30, 1769 to September 15, 1771. After a four-month break, between letters No. 28 and No. 29, Hillsborough resumed the same number series, now corresponding with acting governor Bull. This series lasted until letter No. 53, dated in July 1772, as Hillsborough was leaving office as a Secretary of State. Among his letters No. 29 to No. 53, all are found as actual letters in these microfilmed documents except for the following: No. 32 is not found in the actual microfilmed document but is found as a full transcript in the abstracts of correspondence in Reel 12, Volume 408, document 36. No. 38 was a circular letter number in Volume 408 and therefore was not used for a numbered letter to Bull.

### **MONTAGU to HILLSBOROUGH (1)**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 1	5-13-68 to		Reel 6 document 12
	No 12	6-30-1769	X	Reel 6 document 49

All 12 numbered letters are microfilmed here; Montague wrote no letter No. 4 and two letters No. 5. The first No. 5 letter is probably actually No. 4, written on September 9, 1768 in New York, where Montagu was on his first health-related leave of absence. Letter No. 3 was written on May 13, 1768, just before he left. No. 5 was written on November 21, 1768, soon after he had returned. The last letter in this series, No. 12, is dated soon before Montagu left for his second leave of absence, from July 30, 1769 to September 11, 1771, this time in England.

### **BULL to HILLSBOROUGH**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 13	August 12, 1769 to		Reel 6 document 51
	No. 53	August 19, 1771	X	Reel 6 document 168

As acting governor during Montagu's second leave of absence, from July 30, 1769 to September 11, 1771, Bull continued Montagu's numbered letter series with Hillsborough, rather than starting a new series. Letter No. 53 is dated soon before Montagu's return.

## **MONTAGU to HILLSBOROUGH (2)**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	unnumbered; actually No. 1	Sept 26, 1771 to		Reel 6 document 169
	No. 4	April 27, 1772	X	Reel 6 document 186

Upon arrival on September 11, 1771, back in Charleston after his second leave of absence, Montagu decided to start a new series of numbered letters to Hillsborough.

All four numbered letters are found as actual documents in these microfilmed documents. Six additional unnumbered letters from Montagu to Hillsborough (between documents 192 and 202 in Reel 6, dated from June 25, 1772 to October 20, 1772) cover the period from Montagu's return to the end of Hillsborough time as Secretary of State.

## **SECRETARY OF STATE DARTMOUTH to MONTAGU**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 1	September 27, 1772 to		Reel 6 document 198
	No. 5	January 6, 1773	X	Reel 7 document 1

All five of Dartmouth's microfilmed numbered letters to Montagu are microfilmed here. He does not seem to have written additional numbered or unnumbered letters to Montagu after the end of January 1773.

## **MONTAGU to DARTMOUTH**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------	---------------	--------------------------

Montagu wrote no numbered letters to Dartmouth that have survived to be microfilmed. He did send three unnumbered letters to Dartmouth (Reel 6, document 206, dated November 4, 1772; Reel 7 document 5, dated January 4, 1773; and Reel 7 document 6, dated January 21, 1773). During this same period, Dartmouth's numbered letters to Montagu tended to be negative in their evaluation of Montagu's governing decisions. Montagu's responses indicated his displeasure with the criticism. This verbal clash led to action: On March 6, 1773, Montague boarded a naval ship and sailed for England. As governor, he thus had left his post without permission. Apparently he simply became fed up with the rebellious situation in South Carolina and was unable to find a way to deal with it that he thought would be effective and that also was acceptable to the political leadership in London. On April 10, 1773, he wrote another unnumbered letter to Dartmouth (Reel 7 document 8) from Falmouth Harbor, England, announcing his arrival in Europe and his intention to go immediately to London to meet with Dartmouth, which he did, and then he resigned as governor.

**DARTMOUTH to BULL**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 6	June 10, 1773 to		Reel 7 document 1
	No. 17	December 10, 1774	X	Reel 7 document 82

With Montagu no longer governor, William Bull II once again found himself acting as governor until the King could appoint and send to Charleston a replacement governor. Dartmouth's last numbered letter to Montagu was No. 5. Rather than starting his numbering over again, he numbered his first letter to Bull No. 6. All numbered letters in this sequence are found in the microfilmed documents.

**BULL to DARTMOUTH**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 54	March 30, 1773		Reel 2 document 199
	No. 90	May 15, 1775	X	Reel 7 document 105

Governor Campbell was expeditiously appointed by the King to succeed Montagu in March 1773. However, he took a very long time to settle his affairs and find suitable transport to carry him and his belongings to Charleston. He finally arrived there on June 18, 1775. By that time, the rebellious situation in South Carolina had escalated beyond reversal.

**DARTMOUTH to Governor CAMPBELL**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 18	July 5, 1775 to		Reel 7 document 107
	No. 19	November 7, 1775	X	Reel 7 document 134

Governor Campbell finally arrived in Charleston on June 18, 1775, despite having been appointed Governor in March 1773. He was not governor for very long. He attempted futilely for a few months to exercise the King's authority. However, as the days went past, his government crumbled around him. By September 15, 1775, the South Carolina Colonial Government had collapsed and Campbell, fearing for his personal safety, had fled to the relative safety of a British warship in Charleston harbor. Dartmouth had time to write only two numbered letters to the new governor whose government had in the meantime collapsed. He chose to continue the sequence of letter numbers that had begun with Governor Montagu in 1772 and had been continued through Bull's lengthy acting governorship.

**CAMPBELL to DARTMOUTH**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 1	July 2, 1775		Reel 7 document 108
	No. 11	January 23, 1776	X	Reel 7 document 160

As a new Governor, Campbell began a new letter numbering series shortly after his arrival in Charleston on June 18, 1775. Letters No. 1 to No. 11 are all found as actual documents and were microfilmed. By mid-September, Campbell had lost his government and was living aboard naval ships, first in Charleston harbor and then, in early 1776, at the mouth of the Savannah River. Meanwhile, Germain had replaced Dartmouth as Secretary of State for the Colonies on November 10, 1775.

### **SECRETARY OF STATE GERMAIN to CAMPBELL**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 1	December 23, 1775 to		Reel 7 document 151
	No. 3	January 14, 1777	X	Reel 7 document 171

Germain's infrequent correspondence followed Dartmouth's with Governor Campbell, although Germain started his own new letter-number series. All three of Germain's numbered letters to Governor Campbell are found in the microfilmed documents. They were spaced about every six months, the first (December 23, 1775) with promising news about a southern campaign to recapture Charleston, the second (June 14, 1776) in anticipation of news about the attempt to recapture Charleston (which failed on June 28, 1776), and the third (January 14, 1777), making clear to Campbell that no new southern campaign would be planned for some time.

### **CAMPBELL to GERMAIN**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 12	July 8, 1776 to		Reel 7 document 160
	No. 14	November 29, 1776	X	Reel 7 document 168

Campbell's numbered correspondence to Germain was more frequent than that to Dartmouth but was discontinued by the end of November in 1776, after only three letters, all of which are actual documents. He misnumbered No. 12 as No. 13 but corrected the error in his actual No. 13. By June 1776, Campbell was present, on the fleet's flagship, for the British military's failed attempt to recapture Charleston, during which he suffered a significant wound from a flying wood splinter. The flagship took him to New York, where he lobbied top military officials for a southern campaign but was told not to expect anything soon. With this gloomy forecast in mind, Campbell returned to England, where he lived for two years before dying in 1778 from complications resulting from his unhealed wound. No subsequent Governor of South Carolina was appointed, either at Campbell's death or at the recapture of Charleston in May 1780. After over two years of military occupation in Charleston, the British evacuated in December 1782, acknowledging their failure to crush the American rebellion by force.

### **GERMAIN to BULL**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 1	April 4, 1781 to		Reel 12 abstract transcript, Volume 408 document 102
	No. 4	February 6, 1782	X	Reel 12 abstract transcript Volume 408 document 106

No actual-document correspondence between Germain and Bull is found during this period among the microfilmed documents. However, full transcripts of four numbered letters from Germain to Bull (No. 1 to No. 4) are found in Reel 12 Volume 408 documents 102, 104 to 106. In addition two unnumbered letters, also transcripts, are found in documents 100 and 101, dated January 8 and March 29, 1781 respectively. The reason for the Secretary of State's new interest in communicating with the remaining ranking member of the South Carolina colonial government, which had crumbled but not officially died in September 1775, was the changing fortunes of war.

In May 1780, General Henry Clinton's siege army had successfully forced the surrender of General Benjamin Lincoln's defending "rebel" army at Charleston. This victory set off the imaginations of British and loyalist sympathizers alike that something like the old South Carolina royal colony could be recreated. Lieutenant Governor William Bull II was expected to be a leader in reestablishing a proper British civil government. So, Bull returned to Charleston, still recognized with his old title of Lieutenant Governor. He soon earned a new title as Intendant General in the quasi-civil government for the city of Charleston called the Board of Police, which was established by the real British governing power on the ground, the British military. As Germain was sending his letter No. 4 the British government in which he served, under Prime Minister Lord North, was being voted out in Parliament, signaling the end of the British commitment to destroy the rebellion in America by force. He abrupt policy change was implemented in South Carolina by a deliberate evacuation of Charleston, completed in December 1782. Thus ended British hopes for re-establishing colonial rule in South Carolina. William Bull and many other South Carolina loyalists left with the British troops, seeking a better life as British subjects in places such as the West Indian colonies or Nova Scotia, or in England or Scotland.

#### **BULL to GERMAIN**

<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Date on letter</u>	<u>Latest</u>	<u>found in Document</u>
X	No. 1	February 16, 1781		Reel 12, abstract transcript Volume 410 document 72
	No. 5	July 2, 1781	X	Reel 12, abstract transcript Volume 410 document 77

Bull's return visit to Charleston was relatively short, but he seems to have kept busy with judicial and other city government affairs through the Board of Police. Two unnumbered letters follow the five numbered letters, dated November 11 and December 28, 1781 (documents 78 and 79 respectively in Volume 410 in Reel 12). As Charleston's future was weighed in the balance in early 1782. Bull's correspondence ceased as 1781 ended, and Germain's shortly into 1782. The history of the British Royal Colony of South Carolina and of its leaders soon became a story of the past. The official, numbered letters of South Carolina's colonial government—and a large quantity of other documents—remain for us researchers to read and seek to understand.

---

**Table 10: Locations of Actual Documents and Abstracts of Documents, for Incoming and Outgoing Correspondence Separately**

<b>Board of Trade correspondence</b> (February 3, 1756 to November 10, 1775) Reel 1 (Volumes 376, 377) Reel 2 (Volumes 378, 379, 380)	incoming	actual
<b>Board of Trade correspondence</b> (August 16, 1720 to October 25, 1774) Reel 3 (Volume 381)	outgoing drafts	actual
<b>Secretary of State correspondence</b> (July 24, 1699 to November 26, 1777) Reel 3 (Volume 382) Reel 4 (Volume 385, 386) Reel 5 (Volume 389, 390) Reel 6 (Volume 391, 392, 393, 394) Reel 7 (Volume 395, 396)	incoming	actual
<b>Secretary of State correspondence</b> ; mostly General Henry Clinton military reports and other post-colonial correspondence, not all pertaining to South Carolina (March 2, 1779 to March 1, 1784) Reel 8 (Volume 397)	incoming	actual
<b>Board of Trade Land Grants</b> (February 9, 1674 to May 18, 1773) Reel 9 (Volume 398) Reel 10 (Volume 399)		abstract
<b>Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc.</b> August 15, 1720 to July 19, 1739 and November 11, 1760 to June 1, 1775 Reel 10 (Volume 400, 401) Reel 11 (Volume 404) Reel 12 (Volume 405)	incoming & outgoing mixed	abstract
<b>Board of Trade correspondence</b> (July 13, 1721 to December 6, 1756) Reel 12 (Volume 406)	incoming	abstract
<b>Secretary of State correspondence</b> (August 8, 1766 to February 6, 1782) Reel 12 (Volume 407, 408)	outgoing	abstract
<b>Secretary of State correspondence</b> (December 8 1766 to December 28, 1781) Reel 12 (Volume 409, 410)	incoming	abstract

**Treasurer of South Carolina's Account** actual  
(1758 to 1763)  
Reel 13 (Volume 512)

**Charleston Board of Police:** actual  
Evidence on depreciation of paper currency November 5, 1780;  
Judicial orders, dockets, lists of causes, rules, and  
receipts for papers April 1781 to November 25, 1782;  
Proceedings of the Board of Police June 13, 1780 to October 29, 1782  
Reel 13 (Volume 513 to 526)

**Declarations of Allegiance to the King** actual  
(mid-June 1780 to late July 1781)  
Reel 14 (Volume 527 to 534)

**Demands Brought Against Sequestered Estates** actual  
(January 5, 1781)  
Reel 14 (Volume 535)

## Archival Anomalies: Time Gaps, Irregular Ordering, and Unexpected Contents

The South Carolina Colonial Papers contain several archival anomalies that deserve mention.

Time Gaps in manuscript collections are an expected occurrence. The cause of any particular gap is more difficult to discern. Acts of nature? Accidents of people? A few major gaps in the South Carolina Colonial Papers are summarized below. Also, one reel among the 14 in this microfilmed collection is uncharacteristically unorganized in the order of documents microfilmed. Finally, one of the 14 reels contains documents not directly related to colonial South Carolina, probably because of anomalous archival filing. These examples of archival anomalies are summarized in **Table 11**.

**Table 11: Archival Anomalies in the Microfilmed South Carolina Colonial Papers**

### Time Gap

<b>Reel 3</b>	<b>Volume 381</b>	<b>Board of Trade outgoing draft correspondence</b>
Content of existing Volume: August 16, 1720 to October 25, 1774 Documents 1 to 151		
Gap in the middle of the Volume, with neither warning nor explanation.		
<b>Gap after:</b>	Document 116	<b>November 28, 1738</b>
<b>Gap before:</b>	Document 117	<b>June 25, 1764</b>

Possibly one or more letter books are missing.  
No other Volumes of microfilmed manuscripts in this collection contain Board of Trade outgoing draft correspondence during the gap period.  
(For more on this gap, see note at beginning of Volume 381.)

### Time Gap and Irregular Ordering

#### **Reel 4      Volume 385      Secretary of State incoming correspondence**

Content of existing Volume: August 26, 1719 to March 30, 1753      Documents 1 to 64

Most documents are dated in a **core period between 1743 and 1753**. The few outlier documents are attachments to correspondence dated within the core period.

The microfilmed order of documents is confused, as follows:

From **November 1751**:      in approximate *reverse chronological order*      To **1743**  
then

From **1753**:      in approximate *reverse chronological order*      To **1750**  
followed by:

#### **Reel 4      Volume 386      Secretary of State incoming correspondence**

Content of existing Volume: ? 1721 to August 19, 1775      Documents 65 to 139

Most documents are dated in a **core period between 1753 and 1760**; a few earlier outliers are attachments to correspondence dated within the core period. Fewer documents are found between 1760 and 1775.

The microfilmed order of documents is confused and fragmented, with several significant gaps, as follows:

##### Document numbers (in order)

65 to 71

72, 73, 83

74 to 82

84 to 139

    between 102 and 103

    between 104 and 105

##### Years of correspondence (out of order)

1760 to 1761

1772 to 1775

scattered dates, including [no date],  
from 1721 to 1736, about 1760, with no date

1753 to 1760 with gaps as follows:

**gap from December 1756 to December 1757**

**gap from December 1757 to May 1759**

(For more on the gap from 1756 to 1759 in Reel 4 and on the anomaly of the reel's archival confusion and fragmentation, see notes at beginning of Volumes 385 and 386.)

### Time Gap

#### **Reel 5      Volumes 389, 390      Secretary of State incoming correspondence**

Content of Volume 389: January 30, 1747 to December 31, 1751      Documents 1 to 110

Content of Volume 390: November 3, 1762 to October 8, 1767      Documents 111 to 187

**Gap between Volumes: From December 31, 1751      To November 3, 1762**

Reason for gap is not evident. No gap exists in Volume numbering, and no indication is found that documents are missing. (Note at beginning of Volume 390 indicates potential locations of documents elsewhere in these microfilmed documents which might help fill the gap. For actual documents, these locations are in Reels 1 and 4. However very few documents actually might fit into the gap because date periods do not match well. The same is true for a few abstract documents in Reels 10 to 12.)

### **Time Gap, Irregular Ordering, and Unexpected Contents**

#### **Reel 8      Volume 397      Secretary of State incoming correspondence**

Content of Volume 397:      May 1, 1779 to March 1, 1784      Documents 1 to 205

Volume is indexed as final Volume in a series of Secretary of State incoming correspondence. Similar to prior Volumes in this series, the previous Volume (396, in Reel 7) contains correspondence and related documents chronologically ordered between December 24, 1773 and November 26, 1777. It concludes after the fall of the South Carolina colonial government in September 1775. Its final documents pertain to Governor William Campbell's efforts, made after his government had collapsed, to find ways to re-establish it, a quest that proved fruitless, after which Campbell sailed home to England in 1777, without further plans. Reel 7, therefore, ends at a real ending.

Yet Reel 8 follows. It indeed contains Secretary of State incoming correspondence, but it does not follow the pattern of the previous Volumes, and it begins after a significant time gap. The **time gap** is from **November 26, 1777 to May 1, 1779. But Reel 8 is not organized chronologically, so the gap is deceiving**, because this Volume contains a series of **separate batches of papers** archived with no breaks or headings.

Some of these batches pertain directly to South Carolina but some do not. Three of the batches are reports with supporting documents compiled by General Henry Clinton and sent to Secretary of State Germain from Charleston on May 13, 1780, immediately following completion of his victory over Charleston the day before. The subjects of the three reports are Spanish success in conquering West Florida; negotiations for a general exchange of prisoners of war in New York, and description of General Benjamin Lincoln's final negotiations to capitulate and surrender at Charleston. Although two of these did not pertain directly to South Carolina, each was filed by the archivists under "South Carolina," perhaps because Clinton sent them all from Charleston. In addition, the West Florida and Charleston capitulation reports with their multiple supporting documents were sent to and received by Germain twice, and each set was microfilmed twice.

In addition to Clinton's reports, this Volume contains other batches of documents. They include some miscellaneous incoming correspondence but most is military correspondence to Germain concerning progress of General Cornwallis' "offensive" campaign in 1781 from South Carolina northward that ended at Yorktown, Virginia, and about the British Army's 1781 to 1782 occupation of Charleston, followed by preparations for its evacuation. **Table 12** contains a descriptive list of the batches of content in Volume 397. (See **Table 15**, located at the beginning of Reel 8, for an expanded and differently focused version of this table.)

---

---

**Table 12: Contents of Reel 8 Volume 397: A Collection of Batches of Papers**

- **Documents 1 to 7** **January 3, 1781 to March 1, 1784**  
**Miscellaneous, time-scattered, post-colonial government documents**  
pertaining to individual situations, grievance, and claims
- **Documents 8 to 56** **March 2, 1779 to March 24, 1780**  
**Conquest of British West Florida Colony by Spain:** Letter from Clinton to Germain dated May 13, 1780 at Charleston, with numerous support documents, describing in detail Spain's conquest of Mobile (Pensacola was not conquered until May 1781). Content not directly related to South Carolina, but sent by Clinton from Charleston to Germain. Letter with support documents were microfilmed and apparently sent twice.
- **Documents 57 to 68** **September 30, 1779 to March 30, 1780**  
**General exchange of prisoners of war:** Letter from Clinton to Germain dated May 13, 1780 with support documents, containing details of the negotiations, which were not successful; content not directly related to South Carolina, but sent by Clinton from Charleston to Germain.
- **Documents 69 to 132** **May 1 to May 14, 1780**  
**Last stage of siege and negotiation of capitulation** by General Benjamin Lincoln at Charleston: Letter from Clinton to Germain dated May 13, 1780, with support documents, describing the process in detail; content directly related South Carolina. Letter with support documents were microfilmed and apparently sent twice.
- **Documents 133 to 163** **May 14, 1780 to June 5, 1780**  
**Clinton's plans to gain massive loyalist support and for Cornwallis to take offensive in South Carolina and other southern colonies to re-institute British civil government;** correspondence and support documents; content directly related to South Carolina
- **Documents 164 to 171, 184, 185** **July 28, 1780 to January 31, 1781**  
**Correspondence about progress of Cornwallis' offensive war;** erosion of optimism about loyalist support despite particular military victories
- **Documents 172-205 (except 184, 185)** **August 31, 1781 to mid-October 1782**  
**Correspondence about British military occupation of Charleston and about preparations to evacuate Charleston,** focusing on post-colonial economic issues, especially slavery

Note that an extended version of **Table 12** is found in **Table 15**, found at the beginning of Reel 8, Volume 397.

---

## Secondary References

This Finding Aid is not a fully researched, footnoted, and referenced scholarly work. Rather, it is a guide to where research by others can begin. Nevertheless, searches for contextual information to use for notes in this Finding Aid led from time to time to useful secondary references, which in some cases have been added as documentation to the appropriate notes in the Finding Aid. Although most of these sources focus on quite specific subjects, some that may be of more general interest are listed here.

- Barger, B. D., "Charles Town Loyalism in 1775: The Secret Reports of Alexander Innes," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 83, No. 3 (July 1962), pp. 125-136.
- Barnwell, Joseph W., "The Evacuation of Charleston by the British in 1782," *The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (January 1910) pp. 1-26/
- Cashin, Edward J., *Guardians of the Valley: Chickasaws in Colonial South Carolina and Georgia*. University of South Carolina Press, 2009.
- Cashin, Edward J., *The King's Ranger: Thomas Brown and the American Revolution on the Southern Frontier*. Fordham University Press, 1999. Previously published by University of Georgia Press, 1989.
- Farley, M. Foster, "The South Carolina Negro in the American Revolution, 1775-1783," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 79, No. 2 (April 1978) pp. 75-86.
- Greene, Jack P., *Quest for Power: The Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689 to 1776*. University of North Carolina Press, 1963.
- Lewis, J. D., *The Provincial & State Government in SC During the American Revolution*, an on-line paper at [carolana.com/SC/Revolution/sc\\_revolution\\_provincial-government.html](http://carolana.com/SC/Revolution/sc_revolution_provincial-government.html).
- Mercantini, Jonathan, "The Great Carolina Hurricane of 1752," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 103, No. 4 (October 2002), pages 351-365.
- Mercantini, Jonathan, *Who Shall Rule at Home?: The Evolution of South Carolina Political Culture, 1748-1776*. University of South Carolina Press, 2007.
- Oliphant, John, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756-1763*. Louisiana State University Press, 2001.

David Swain, Volunteer Researcher  
David Library of the American Revolution  
December 2019

**Organizational Caveat:** Work to create this Finding Aid was conducted in 2018 and 2019 when the David Library of the American Revolution (DLAR) was located at Washington Crossing, Pennsylvania and was operating as a separate entity. This work was completed just as the David Library was entering a partnership with the American Philosophical Society (APS) in Philadelphia and becoming the APS's David Center. References throughout this Finding Aid to the DLAR collection and its microfilmed CO5 Colonial Papers of South Carolina remain accurate, as the DLAR's collection will remain identifiable and will be available at the American Philosophical Society's David Center.

## Reel 1 (Volumes 376, 377)

### Volume 376—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), begin

February 3, 1756 to July 20, 1760

Documents 1 to 84

[Frames 1 to 214]

**Note:** DLAR's microfilmed papers of Board of Trade incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin with Volume 376 of the Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina. This Volume contains documents dated beginning in 1756. English settlement began in the Carolinas in the 1650s, and a single proprietary colony of "Carolina" was established before 1700. In 1712, South and North Carolina were separated politically, and by 1729, each had become a royal colony. During a transition period, especially from 1719 to 1724, institutions of royal colonial government were established provisionally and began functioning. The archived South Carolina Board of Trade incoming correspondence papers include Volumes 358 to 375, which are not among the Volumes microfilmed in the DLAR's collection. These contain incoming correspondence with dates from 1720 to 1757.

**Note:** Board of Trade correspondence in these microfilmed South Carolina Colonial Papers is found as originals, copies, duplicates, and triplicates and as actual manuscript documents or as abstracts, extracts, summaries, or transcripts of actual documents. See note after Reel 1 document 1 for more on copies, duplicates, triplicates, etc. See a section in the Introduction for more on for more on abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts. Although archivists of these documents frequently sought to separate incoming and outgoing correspondence, the distinction sometimes confused rather than helped organize correspondence. An example is orders from the King, which were incoming from the King to the Board of Trade but outgoing from them to the colonies. As a result, some such orders are found in either or both incoming and outgoing correspondence.

**Note:** Most Board of Trade incoming correspondence pertaining to colonial South Carolina is found in Reels 1 and 2, with dates between February 3, 1756 and November 10, 1775, and no major gaps. About 30 documents of outgoing correspondence are scattered among the incoming documents, with dates mostly between 1756 and 1761 and between 1767 and 1772. Many of these are orders of the King, either to approve or disapprove South Carolina colonial acts or to appoint South Carolina colonial officials. To understand the more complex situation of Board of Trade outgoing correspondence in the South Carolina Colonial Papers, see note at the beginning of Reel 3 Volume 381.

**Note:** Archivists (probably in the Board of Trade Office) wrote descriptive notes for many of the manuscript documents. These are generally microfilmed with the documents. On these notes, archivists provided their own numbers by manuscript Bundle or Volume. Where found, this Finding Aid reports these numbers as "BT numbers." Volume 376 begins with L.1. and ends with L.84., with no microfilmed document in the Volume not having a BT number and with no breaks in the consecutive numbering.

**Note:** In this Volume, none of the letters of official correspondence is numbered by the writer. Gaps in correspondence are thus more difficult to identify since they can be sequenced only by date.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

1. September 15, 1757 [no Frame Number]  
Duplicate letter from [South Carolina Royal Governor] [William Henry] Lyttelton at Charleston to the Lords of the [British] Board of Trade [and Plantations], reporting that Colonel [Archibald] "*Montgomery's Highland Battalion*" [generally known as Montgomerie's Highlanders, the 77<sup>th</sup> Regiment of Foot] had arrived at Charleston having "*lost but Seven Men in their passage & landed in good health*," expressing appreciation for the newly arrived security to benefit all the surrounding colonies; reporting that Governor [John] Reynolds [of Georgia] had informed him that "*a considerable number of Persons without any Lawfull Authority*" had settled "*Southward of the River Alatomaha [Altamaha]*", who had expressed concern about their protection from Indians; conveying a report from Lieutenant [Charles] Taylor, British commander at Frederica, about movements of Creek Indians who were planning to attack a Spanish fort near St. Augustine, "*which fort is garrison'd by Negros whom they hope to bring away in Order that they may dispose of them to the English as Slaves*"; but expressing doubt that "*as they are as perfidious as Savage, there can be no reliance upon their designs*", suggesting that something should be done to curtail both unauthorized settlements and uncontrolled Indians to avoid conflict with Spain, as well as a possible unwanted alliance between Spain and the Indians; inquiring as to whether the strip of land south of the Altamaha River was considered "*as a part of this Province, or of Georgia, or is an undetermined Frontier*"; reporting on the military status of the colony [no BT number assigned, but it would be L.1.] [with enclosures, documents 2 to 6] [first page of letter microfilmed twice]  
[**Note:** Letters from colonial governors were often sent multiple times on separate ships, in hopes that one of the letters would get through or get through faster to England. Thus, an "**original**" letter would be sent plus perhaps several "**duplicate**" letters. A "**copy**" was usually the copy of a letter sent possibly at a later time and usually to another recipient. Use of these terminology conventions was usually but not always observed. Thus, a document identified as a "duplicate" might in fact be a "copy" or vice versa.]

[**Note:** The British **Board of Trade and Plantations** somewhat resembled a chamber of commerce in an age of royal mercantilism. It was governed by a group of Lords appointed by the Crown and thus was a part of government. Yet its purpose was to encourage settlement and economic development that would benefit the mother country's economy as well as the royal government. Until America became a political and military problem for England in the mid-1760s, British colonial governors looked to the Board of Trade for direction and financial support. Later, Secretaries of State for the Colonies would eclipse the Board of Trade's colonial powers. See note after Reel 3 document 1.]

[**Note:** The British **Royal Colony of South Carolina** began as the British proprietary colony of Carolina in 1663 (see lists of governors in the **Introduction, Table 7a, b, c.**) Its original northern boundary remains today its line between North Carolina and Virginia. The southern boundary was initially the 31<sup>st</sup> Parallel, an approximation of today's Georgia-Florida boundary. But in 1665 Britain extended its claim southward to the 29<sup>th</sup> Parallel, provocatively including St. Augustine and the central, occupied area of Spanish Florida. Proprietors Anthony Ashley Cooper and John Locke developed the initial Grand Model for the Province of Carolina, including the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina. Until 1712, Charleston was capital of the entire province. In this year, separate proprietary governments were established for North and South Carolina. This lasted until only 1719, when the Crown established a process to purchase the proprietors' interests. When this was accomplished in 1729, the King established separate Royal Colonies of North Carolina and South Carolina. A total of 15 different men served as Royal Governor of South Carolina between 1730 and 1775, interspersed with 7 periods during which an acting governor stood in when no governor had been appointed or a governor was absent.

**William Henry Lyttelton, 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Lyttelton** (1724-1808) was Governor of South Carolina from 1756 to 1760. He succeeded Governor **James Glen** (1701-1777) who served from 1743 to 1756 but had been recalled, with help from some political enemies, after what the British interpreted as the ignominious defeat by the French and their Indian allies of Major General Edward Braddock's British army near Fort Duquesne in July 1755 (see notes after document 125, 126 for a more nuanced interpretation of Glen's recall and replacement as governor). As governor, Lyttelton had to deal with hostile war relations, during the colonial French and Indian War (1754 to 1763) and European Seven Years War (1756 to 1763), with enemy powers **France** and **Spain** as well as with their various **Indian-nation allies**. He also had to maintain relations with his fellow colonies. On the west this meant **Virginia**, with whom he competed for western frontier lands and with whom he sought to cooperate in relations with the Indian nations living on the same frontier. On the south it meant **Georgia**, with whom he needed to cooperate in relations against Spanish Florida (until 1763) and with whom he competed for potential new territory in the political no-man's-land between Georgia's southern border and Spanish Florida's northern border. Lyttelton himself left most of these issues unresolved in spring 1760, when he was appointed governor of Jamaica.

He departed from Charleston on April 5, 1760, leaving the affairs of South Carolina colony in the hands of Lieutenant Governor **William Bull II** (1710-1791). Between 1760 and 1775, while officially remaining Lieutenant Governor throughout the period, Bull was called on five separate times to serve as acting governor of South Carolina. In this first instance, Bull stood in as governor from April 5, 1760 until December 22, 1761, when South Carolina's next governor, **Thomas Boone**, arrived in Charleston. For more on William Bull II, see note after document 39. For more on Thomas Boone, see note after document 108.]

**[Note: Relations with Spain:**

**Fort Frederica**, located on St. Simons Island, the Georgia sea island just south of the Altamaha River, was in the 1740s and 1750s Britain's military and settlement outpost closest to the territory of Spanish Florida. During the European War of Jenkins' Ear (1739 to 1748), after a failed military attempt commanded by James Oglethorpe to capture St. Augustine, Spanish forces invaded the unclaimed territory between the St. Johns River and the Altamaha River, seeking to wrest Fort Frederica from British control. This time, Oglethorpe was successful in defending the fort in the 1742 Battle of Bloody Marsh. He later led another unsuccessful British effort against St. Augustine. By 1758, the Seven Years War (1756-1763; the 1754-1763 French and Indian War in North America) had begun and again, Spain sided against Britain, although it formally joined the conflict in only 1762 and 1763.

The fort garrisoned by Negroes mentioned in this letter was **Fort Mose**, located in the salt marshes northwest of St. Augustine. Spanish authorities welcomed and settled runaway slaves from English plantations to the north. Although not re-enslaved by the Spanish, former slaves were segregated. Fort Mose was established with dual purposes—as a separate place for African settlers to live and as one in a chain of outer defensive positions around St. Augustine, to be defended by its African inhabitants.]

**[Note: Relations with Georgia:**

The Royal Colony of Georgia had three governors: **John Reynolds**, from 1752 until 1758 (less than a year after the date of this letter), was an unfortunate failure at administration. However, it took six years to replace him. **Henry Ellis**, from 1758 until 1760, was a better administrator, but his health soon failed. He requested to be replaced and left Georgia for England in November 1760, to be replaced by Georgia's third and last governor, **James Wright**, from 1760 until 1782.]

Lyttelton had to maintain positive relations with **Georgia**, not only because it was his colony's buffer with Spanish Florida but because of the unsettled British colonial lands along the coast between the Altamaha River and the St. Johns River. Each colony sought to guard against the other's sneaking in some settlers, while at the same time taking advantage, if possible, of opportunities to strengthen its own claim to the land.

Starting in the 1750s and heating up after 1763, when Spanish Florida became British East Florida, South Carolina accelerated its efforts to gain control over the non-contiguous territory south of the Altamaha River and north of the St. Marys River (the newly recognized northern boundary of British East Florida). In the late 1750s, the issue between South Carolina and Georgia was an “illegal” settlement in this strip named New Hanover. Georgia responded with protests to the South Carolina government and legal appeals to the British government, which eventually sided with Georgia, affirming its southern border at the St. Marys River. For more on this land dispute with Georgia, see note after document 161.]

**[Note: Relations with Indians:**

The **Creek** Indians mentioned in this letter were one of four major tribes of Native Americans who called the southeastern region of North America home. The other three were the **Chickasaw**, **Choctaw**, and **Cherokee**. In South Carolina, the two major tribes were Creek and Cherokee. Other smaller tribes included the **Catawba**, **Yamasee**, and **Apalachee** Indians.

British relations with the nearby Indian tribes had never been truly peaceful and friendly. Before South Carolina’s royal colony had been established in 1729, the Carolina colony had fought a war against the Yamasee Indians in 1715 to 1717. Between 1743 and 1756, South Carolina Governor Glen had earned a reputation as a relatively skillful negotiator of friendship with the Indians (see document 126 and the note after it on Treaty of Saluda Old Town in 1755). Lyttelton had a different approach to Indian relations, which was less friendly, less flexible, and which, in practice, proved to be less successful.

Indian relations were influenced by how the British colonies defined their **western boundaries**: **South Carolina** (originally Carolina) and **Virginia** originally claimed lands stretching to the Pacific Ocean, soon limited by the reality of geography and international relations to the Mississippi River. Even after North Carolina split away from South Carolina in 1712, it continued to claim a far western frontier. By the 1750s it was South Carolina (claiming what later became Tennessee, and Virginia (with various broad claims for what became Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, and southwestern Pennsylvania), who saw the need to **cooperate against the perceived joint threat of Cherokee violence** on their joint frontiers.

In the late 1750s, during the time of this South Carolina correspondence, frontier violence was considered a serious problem by the governors of both South Carolina and Virginia, as was the threat of war. The French and Indian War/ Seven Years War included both “normal” European hostilities plus a complex web of relations with the various Indian nations. Like France, Britain strained to maintain friendships and alliances with certain nations and, if possible, to convert hostile nations to their side. So, for South Carolina and Virginia, trying to maintain what had been friendly relations with the Cherokee Nation was essential to allow peaceful settler expansion into the frontier and also to defend each colony from potential military attack by French forces and their Indian allies. Unfortunately, in the late 1750s British relations with the Cherokee were deteriorating dangerously.

In this context, Lyttelton welcomed the arrival of Montgomerie's Highlanders in Charleston in 1757 as needed assistance to defend all the southern colonies. This was, however, short-term protection. By sometime in early- or mid-1758, the Highlanders had been shipped off to Philadelphia (see document 21). When Montgomerie was ordered back to Charleston in 1760 with 1,200 Royal Scots along with his own Highlanders, the situation had worsened after two years of increasing Cherokee violence on the far western South Carolina and Virginia frontier, answered with increasingly hostile British/South Carolina/Virginia responses. By early 1759, "domestic" hostilities had escalated into declared war between South Carolina and the Cherokee Nation, later named the **Anglo-Cherokee War** of 1759 to 1761 (for more on this war, see note after Reel 4 document 123). Going on the attack, Governor Lyttelton himself ineptly led his colony's militia in a military campaign against the Indians. After tricking the head Cherokee chiefs with an offer to talk, he seized them as hostages, to be released only after the Cherokee Nation agreed to his harsh treaty terms. These efforts not having subdued the Indians, Lyttelton requested military assistance from Major General Jeffrey Amherst, who was then leading the British campaign against French Quebec. In 1760, Amherst responded by sending Colonel Montgomerie back to Charleston with his expanded army of 1,200 troops, and Lyttelton sent them into the interior to subdue the Cherokee by force. Although Montgomerie applied force, killing Indians and burning their villages, the Cherokee did not surrender, instead successfully besieging and capturing British Fort Loudoun. To this affront to the British military, Amherst responded by removing the less than effective Montgomerie and replacing him with Colonel James Grant (who had been second in command under Montgomerie and an expanded army of 2,600 troops. In 1761, Grant proved a more effective killer of Indians and devastator of their crops and villages, crushing the remaining Cherokee resistance. This did not make the Cherokee friendly to the British, but at least they were too devastated to ally with France.]

**[Note: Jeffrey Amherst, 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Amherst** (1717-1797) served a long and distinguished professional career in the British Army from 1735 to 1795, finally retiring as a field marshal. In 1760, he was a major general and commander-in-chief of British forces in North America. In addition, he had replaced Governor Loudoun as royal governor of Virginia in 1759, a position he retained until 1768. Simultaneously, he was governor of Quebec from 1760 to 1763.]

**[Note: James Grant, Laird of Ballindalloch** (1720-1806) had a long career as both a military officer and colonial governor. In 1757, he was a major in Montgomerie's Highlanders when they were sent to South Carolina. Still with the Highlanders, he marched with General Forbes' army to capture Fort Duquesne in 1758. Then, in 1760, as a colonel, he was second in command under Montgomerie in the 1760 campaign against the Cherokee and in 1761 led the British army that crushed Cherokee resistance and ended the Anglo-Cherokee War. Between 1763 and 1775, he left military service, serving as the first royal governor of Britain's new colony of East Florida from 1763 until 1771. In 1775, back in the army as a General, he led British troops at the Battle of Long Island, in New Jersey, and in the Philadelphia campaign in 1777.

In 1778, he was reassigned to the Caribbean, where his troops contested with the French for control over colonial islands, and where he served briefly as governor of St. Lucia and even more briefly as lieutenant governor of Cuba. He did not return to North America.]

2. October 7, 1756 [5; actually the 8<sup>th</sup> frame]  
Copy of letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to “*William Gray, Robert Lucas, Robert Baillie & other the Inhabitants of a Settlement between the Rivers Altamaha & St. Juans* [St. Johns]”, offering them grants of land in the portion of South Carolina north of the Savannah River if they willingly leave their unauthorized settlement south of the Altamaha River and apply to settle on legal South Carolina land [BT number L.2.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s September 15, 1757 letter to the Board of Trade, document 1]
3. August 16, 1757 [7]  
Copy of letter from Mark Carr at Sunbury [Georgia] to Lyttelton, replying on behalf of the settlers of what they called New Hanover, to his letter; stating that they had sought to escape from both Georgia and South Carolina because of mistreatment; expressing the feeling that their cause was legitimate and that no good reason existed to label them lawless [BT number L.3.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s September 15, 1757 letter to the Board of Trade, document 1]  
**[Note: Sunbury** is now a ghost town but was once a fortified town and the second seaport of colonial Georgia after Savannah, located on the Medway River (now called Blackbeard’s Creek), north of Sapelo Island, between the Savannah and the Altamaha Rivers.]
4. February 3, 1756 [9]  
Copy of agreement of rules among settlers, calling themselves loyal British Subjects, at New Hanover, described as a “*part of Florida*”, agreeing to follow them “*till otherwise directed by Authority*”; containing 12 numbered items; “*Signed by above Forty of the Inhabitants*” followed by  
May 30, 1757  
Copy of address resulting from a meeting of inhabitants of New Hanover to Lyttelton, stating that the inhabitants had had difficulty deciding how to respond to Lyttelton’s offer of land elsewhere if they would move from New Hanover; stating that one of the difficulties was the insulting way they had previously been treated by [former] Governor Glen and the Council [of South Carolina]; reporting their resulting resolutions as follows: That they would not remove from New Hanover or leave their plantations and possessions, partly because Governor Lyttelton had not specifically ordered them to do so, and partly because Spain had already ordered them to leave, and they did not want to abandon the area to Spanish—or Indian—control; stating that they intended to claim the St. Marys River [not the farther north Altamaha River or farther south St. Johns River] as the southern border of English territory; signed by 42 named individuals [each part of BT number L.4.] [both enclosed with Lyttelton’s September 15, 1757 letter to the Board of Trade, document 1]

5. May 4, 1757 [13]  
Return of South Carolina militia to Lyttelton, including reports of numbers of officers and sergeants, private men, alarm men, and total men for 10 units of men designated as troops, regiments, or companies; reporting a total of 6,594 men [perhaps an approximation of the force Lyttelton led in battle against the Cherokee in 1759] [BT number L.5.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 15, 1757 letter to the Board of Trade, document 1]
6. January 7, 1757 [no Frame Number]  
Copy of General Account of Ordnance Stores, with detailed categories and descriptions, for both Charleston and "*several forts remote from Charles Town*" [edges of the microfilmed document are too dark to be legible] [BT number L.6.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 15, 1757 letter to the Board of Trade, document 1]
7. November 3, 1757 [15]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that he opened a new General Assembly, which had approved construction of additional barracks for another 1,000 troops; reporting on other defense improvements, including building a fort at Port Royal [about half way between Savannah and Charleston] and improving Fort Prince George at Keowee; reporting on Indian affairs, including talks with the Chickasaw Nation and other news [BT number L.7.]  
**[Note: Fort Prince George]** (named when the fort was built in 1753 for the prince who in 1760 became King George III) was located in Cherokee territory alongside a major trading post and the Cherokee town of Keowee, on the Keowee River, a tributary of the Savannah River, in what is now northwest South Carolina. While the fort endured occasional Indian attacks, the British saw it after 1760 as a staging place for attacks on the Cherokee Indians. Completion of Keowee Dam in 1971 submerged the entire area under a reservoir lake.]  
**[Note: Cherokee Towns:]** The Cherokee Nation's homeland stretched from the Appalachian foothills in today's northwestern South Carolina over the mountains to the Tennessee River valley in today's eastern Tennessee. The Cherokee lived in relatively permanent large and small settlements throughout their territory. Different tribal families "ruled" different areas of settlements with some coordinated rule among the areas. The British recognized three geographically separated areas of settlement, which they called the Lower Towns, the Middle Towns, and the Overhill Towns. The **Lower Towns** were located in today's South Carolina, northwest of today's Greenville and south of Franklin, North Carolina. The most important Cherokee town among the Lower Towns was Keowee. The British, recognizing the importance of this town, built Fort Prince George nearby (see note above). The **Middle Towns** were in the mountain valleys northwest of the Lower Towns, centered near today's Franklin, North Carolina, near the height of land between streams flowing eastward toward South Carolina and the headwaters of the Little Tennessee River, a larger river flowing out of the mountains into the Tennessee River southwest of today's Knoxville, Tennessee.

The southernmost of these Middle Towns, called Echoee, became important during the Anglo-Cherokee War, in 1760 (see note on Indian relations after document 1 and documents 83 to 85) and again in 1761 (see document 118). The **Overhill Towns** were located along the Tennessee and Little Tennessee Rivers, in today's eastern Tennessee. The "capital" town of the entire Cherokee Nation, called Chota, was located here, and it was near Chota that the British (through a combined effort of the Virginia and South Carolina colonies) built another frontier fort, which they named Fort Loudoun (see notes after documents 1, 24, and 83, and scattered documents between 31 and 98). In 1760, this fort was successfully besieged by Cherokee Indians during the Anglo-Cherokee War, forcing the surrender of its garrison (see scattered documents from 53 through 117 on the siege and its aftermath).]

8. November 30, 1757 [17]

Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning the northern boundary of South Carolina with North Carolina, which would be resurveyed from the northwestern source of the Cape Fear River; also needed was surveying a western border; pointing out that Georgia remained "*in a Weak & Infant state*" regarding defense, and that therefore, South Carolina was "*in reality the South frontier of His Majesty's North American Dominions*"; commenting on the great expense of defense preparations; raising questions about the Pee Dee River boundary between North and South Carolina; raising other questions about previous boundary decisions that remained unclear; arguing that the boundaries should be inclusive of particular territories of particular Indian nations; also arguing for increasing South Carolina's area suitable for white settlement, so that the imbalance in other areas between the many Negroes and few whites could be balanced [BT number L.8.] [with enclosure, document 9]

**[Note:** Drawing a **boundary line between North and South Carolina** up the Cape Fear River from the Atlantic Ocean would have been considerably more generous to South Carolina than a boundary line up the Pee Dee River. In 1712, when North and South Carolina were separated into two colonies, an approximated boundary was drawn on a map as angled straight lines running more or less half way between the two rivers. The true boundary remained uncertain until surveyed in 1771. This remains the eastern portion of the boundary between the two states today.

Starting in 1762, concerted efforts began to establish, maintain, and update boundaries between South and North Carolina that would accommodate wishes in both colonies for settlement expansion, while minimizing frontier conflicts with Indians. Royal Agent for South Carolina Charles Garth submitted a petition on the subject to the Board of Trade sometime in 1762 (document 128). See other 1762 and 1763 documents later in Reel 1. In 1764, work started on surveying a "temporary" boundary (document 189). Surveying was reported to be completed in December 1764 (Reel 2 document 19). See follow-up documents dated in 1766 and 1768 in Reel 2. By 1770, South Carolina was pushing for an extension of the boundary line around Catawba Indian territory. In Reel 2 document 160, Garth was again petitioning the Board of Trade on the matter.]

9. [no date] [22]  
Note by Lyttelton with names he recommended to Board of Trade to become members of the South Carolina Council, including John Guerard, Chief Justice Peter Leigh, and Christopher Gadsden [BT number L.9.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's November 30, 1757 letter to Board of Trade, document 8]
10. [no date] [23]  
Memorial of James Wright, agent for the of South Carolina, to Board of Trade, seeking to obtain delayed royal approval for an act setting fees for public officials, which was initially passed by the South Carolina Assembly in 1743 [BT number L.10.]  
**[Note: James Wright (1716-1785) had come from England to South Carolina in 1730, where he became a prominent attorney and plantation owner. His law practice led him into public office by 1747, when he became Attorney General for South Carolina. By 1757, he was working for South Carolina in London as South Carolina's Agent to the Crown. Crown Agents for British colonies served primarily as financial go-betweens, advocating for funding requested by colonial governments, processing requests for funds, and allocating funds approved.**  
In May 1760, Wright was appointed to be Lieutenant Governor of neighboring Georgia. This was actually a planned transitional position, as Georgia's Governor Ellis had already received approval to relinquish his governorship due to poor health. Wright arrived in Savannah in October 1760. In December, Ellis departed for England, and Wright became Governor of Georgia, a position he held until July 1782. In this position, he continued to interact with the governors of South Carolina, and, as time went on and the American revolutionary movement emerged, he became quite critical of what he observed to be South Carolina's increasing tilt toward the rebel cause.]
11. April 1, 1758 [25]  
Copy of King's order approving John Guerard to serve on the South Carolina Council, replacing James Kinlock, who had died [BT number L.11.] [another copy of this order is in document 76]  
**[Note: John Guerard's** father, John Guerard, was brought up in a noble French Huguenot family. He came to South Carolina via London in the late 1600s, becoming a planter and politician. John Jr's son Benjamin Guerard sided with the rebels in the Revolution and was elected Governor of South Carolina in 1783.]
12. June 25, 1758 [27]  
Letter from Samuel Martin at Treasury Chambers to Board of Trade, transmitting James Wright's memorial as Agent for South Carolina [document 10] for Board of Trade consideration [BT number L.12.]

13. December 6, 1757 [29]  
Copy of order of the King, affirming Lyttelton's suspension of William Wragg from the South Carolina Council [BT number L.13.]  
[Note: **William Wragg** (1714-1777) was an attorney, politician, and plantation owner, who served in public offices off and on from the 1750s, not always with approbation. See documents 31, 36, Reel 2 document 186, Reel 6 document 41, and Reel 7 documents 114, 140 plus note after document 140. Years later, when the Revolution broke out, Wragg remained a loyalist, but paid a heavy price, by being banished from Charleston. Two years later, at age 63, he died at sea in 1777.]
14. December 6, 1757 [31]  
Copy of order of the King, concurring, in recognition of all South Carolina had done to improve its defenses, with the Board of Trade's recommendation that a "*Skilful Engineer*" be sent to South Carolina to provide needed expertise in the construction of fortifications for the colony [BT number L.14.]
15. January 27, 1758 [33]  
Copy of order of the King, confirming a South Carolina act "*incorporating the Winyah Indigo Society*" [BT number L.15.] [see Reel 2 documents 77, 195 for further legal consideration of the Society's incorporation in 1766 and 1772]  
[Note: The **Winyah Indigo Society**, originally organized in the 1740s as an agricultural and social club for indigo planters, it met monthly in the Old Oak Tavern in Georgetown, South Carolina. By 1757 it had become established enough to sponsor a school, which perhaps led to the colonial South Carolina act which the King confirmed in 1758. Sometime before the Civil War, the Society built its own hall, which survived the war, still stands today, and has recently been renovated as the Georgetown County Public Library. See Reel 2 documents 77 (1766) and 195 (1772), and Reel 3 document 144 (1771) for more on the Winyah Indigo Society and the extended efforts to incorporate it.]
16. [no date] [35]  
Memorial of South Carolina Agent Wright to Board of Trade, concerning payment for goods to be used as presents for Indian nations on South Carolina's borders; followed by  
December 6, 1758  
Account of goods proposed to be bought as presents for Indians nations on South Carolina's borders, totaling £1,240.4.8 [BT number L.16.]
17. December 22, 1757 [39]  
Quadruplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, sending for review two adopted South Carolina bills designed to enforce the parliamentary act [Mutiny Act] requiring colonies to house and provision troops, which in South Carolina was interpreted to require that troops should not be billeted in private homes but should be quartered in public spaces such as barracks [BT number L.17.]

[**Note:** A **Mutiny Act** was a British law designed to control British soldiers' and sailors' behavior when living among civilians. A Mutiny Act was in force for just one year and had to be renewed annual. The issue that upset South Carolinians was that families could be required to house and provision British soldiers and officers in their homes, which appeared to them to be both a financial imposition and an invasion of privacy. A less onerous South Carolina solution was to use public monies to house and provision troops in public barracks and similar structures.]

18. August 7, 1758 [41]  
Duplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning a planned joint military expedition with the colony of Virginia in western Virginia, to be organized from Winchester, which would include as many Cherokee Indians as possible; [Edmund] Atkin, the "*King's Agent for Indian Affairs*" was to seek to engage the Indians in this expedition; reporting that the Assembly had reserved up to £20,000 from the money allocated to raise a regiment in South Carolina to be used for "*encouraging & fitting out the Indians to join His Majestys Forces & for defraying all Charges that might be incident thereto*"; with additional details; concerning the money to be used to pay for the South Carolina militia to be involved in this expedition; suggesting that a separate Indian agent be assigned to each tribe, with communications among them through the royal governor, who could also be given monopoly control over the Indian trade with their respective tribes and be placed in control of distributing presents, and who would have access to military force, if necessary, to quell any disturbances; suggesting that this plan, by placing an agent living with each tribe, would earn respect from the Indians and make it easier to obtain intelligence concerning the situation in the tribe as well as with the French; reporting on the importation of Negroes into South Carolina as follows: from June 1, 1756 to June 1, 1757, 1,661; from June 1, 1757 to June 1, 1758, 3,571; reporting on plans for military facilities [BT number L.18.] [with enclosures, documents 19, 20]  
[**Note:** For the colonial system in North America to work—and to expand—the British government realized it needed the capability to communicate with and seek to manage relations with the various Indian Nations on the western frontiers of each colony. Rather than leave this process to individual colonies, the British divided the territory of its colonies into a Northern Department and a Southern Department, and appointed a single person, who had some understanding of and experience with the Indian tribes and their cultures, to serve as **Superintendent of Indian Affairs** for each department. The first two individuals to serve in this capacity were Sir William Johnson for the Northern Department and **Edmond Atkin** for the Southern Department. Atkin was appointed in 1756. After Britain was victorious in the Seven Years War/French and Indian War in 1763, the colonies gained jurisdiction over large new areas of frontier lands, formerly claimed by the French, but actually occupied and controlled by the Indian nations.

Expansion of British America's frontier territories boosted the importance of the Superintendents of Indian Affairs and led to Atkin's being replaced by a new, highly qualified Superintendent for the Southern Department, **John Stuart**. From 1761 until his death in 1779, Stuart played a significant role in managing Indian affairs in each of the southern colonies, from Virginia to the newly acquired colonies of East Florida and West Florida. See note after document 57.]

19. June 3, 1758 [51]

Copy of Talk by Little Carpenter at Fort Prince George to his "*brother*" the Governor of South Carolina, acknowledging receipt as presents of arms to fight the enemies of South Carolina and the Cherokee Nation; confirming the alliance between South Carolina and the Cherokee Nation to go jointly to Virginia to fight these enemies [BT number L.19.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's August 7, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 18]

[**Note:** A **Talk** was a structured meeting of Indian chiefs and warriors with colonial government officials, or a formal communication in writing to or from a group of chiefs and/or warriors. Often, each side would make alternating, formal, declaratory position statements that, as the process unfolded, allowed each side to respond to the other, leading to negotiated agreements, which, after a Talk, might be written up (by the colonial officials, in English) as a Treaty. Talks were based on a presumed relationship of sovereign leaders discussing, debating, and ultimately deciding important issues. By the conventions of many Talks, each side referred to the other as "friends" or "brothers." The concept of some form of legal equality came from the European concept of **sovereignty**. Since Indians were not subjects, much less citizens, in order to negotiate with their tribal entities, which the British called **Nations**, some concept of sovereignty had to be granted to them. Yet in practice, sovereignty for Indian tribes/nations was inherently unequal. In many Talks by British officials, Indian leaders were referred to as "children" and, fairly commonly in communications among Europeans, but not in Talks, as "savages" or worse.]

[**Note:** **Attakullakulla** (spellings differ) (c. 1708-1777) or **Little Carpenter**, as the British called him, was a leading chief in the Cherokee Nation between the late 1750s and about 1775. In the 1750s and early 1760s, he sought to maintain Cherokee friendship with the British against the French. He negotiated treaties on behalf of the Cherokee Nation with Britain in 1755 (Treaty of Saluda Old Town) and 1761 (in Charleston), at the end of the disastrous (for the Indians) Anglo Cherokee War of 1758 to 1761. This war began, despite Little Carpenter's best efforts, when some Cherokee warriors engaged in violence against British settlers on the frontier. In late 1759, when Little Carpenter and other Cherokee chiefs sought to negotiate peace with South Carolina in Charleston, Lyttelton took them hostage, and forced them to sign a harsh treaty intended to subdue the Indian violence. Later, when Indian violence escalated rather than dissipated, most of the hostage chiefs were massacred by British soldiers and Britain declared war on the Cherokee. Little Carpenter escaped the massacre, and soon after saved the life of Britain's Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department, John Stuart.

But, as is evident from the 1761 treaty terms dictated by South Carolina's Lieutenant Governor William Bull II, Little Carpenter's loyalty to Britain forced him to accept on behalf of the Cherokee a humiliating defeat of such severity that the Cherokee Nation never fully recovered.]

20. July 2, 1758 [53]  
Extract of letter from George Turner [identity not found] at Fort Prince George to Lyttelton, concerning conveyance by wagon of goods from Charleston as presents for the Cherokee Indians; concerning difficulties of keeping the Indians moving, despite the encouragement of Little Carpenter, as they relied on the omens revealed by "*conjurers*"; expressing frustration at the delays and waste of public money and at the conduct of Little Carpenter, who caused additional difficulties and delays [BT number L.20.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's August 7, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 18]  
[**Note:** Numerous documents throughout these microfilmed colonial papers of South Carolina are identified as "**extracts**," especially when they are enclosures sent with a letter. Extracting suggests that a certain portion of the text in a document has been selected and quoted without the remaining text. See note at the beginning of Reel 9 Volume 398 for more on the differences between extracts, abstracts, summaries, and transcripts.]
21. October 2, 1758 [55]  
Duplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, conveying Virginia Lieutenant Governor [Francis] Fauquier's report of violent incidents between Cherokee Indians and Virginia settlers in Halifax and Bedford Counties, Virginia [in today's south-central Virginia]; fearing that French settlers in the interior were encouraging the Cherokee against British settlers; reporting on other movements of Indians to Fort Prince George, and of [Brigadier] General [John] Forbes, and of Montgomerie's Highlanders, who had left South Carolina for Philadelphia [where they became a part of the army Forbes commanded, which successfully subdued Fort Duquesne in late 1758 (see note below)]; expressing concern that the effort to entice Cherokee Indians to go on an expedition to frontier Virginia would be "*render'd fruitless*"; hoping that some of the £50,000 recently passed by Parliament to help the colonies construct and repair fortifications would soon be allotted to South Carolina [BT number L.21.] [with enclosures, documents 22 to 24]  
[**Note:** **Francis Fauquier** (1703-1768) came to America when appointed Lieutenant Governor of Virginia in 1758. Until his death, he served actually as acting governor in the absence of appointed governors the Earl of Loudoun (1756 to 1759) and Jeffrey Amherst (1759 to 1768).  
[**Note:** Career military officer **Brigadier General John Forbes** (1707-1759) came to America in 1757 as adjutant general to Virginia Governor Loudoun. In late 1757 he was selected to lead the British/American colonial military campaign to capture Fort Duquesne. Embarking from Philadelphia, the expedition spent most of 1758 cutting an overland route through wilderness forests to the fort.]

After inclusive British attempts to capture the fort (led by then Major James Grant), the British successfully negotiated with the Indians allied with the French to change sides, after which Fort Duquesne was no longer defensible by the French alone. In October 1758, they evacuated and burned the fort, leaving to the British the smoldering ruins. Forbes was ill during much of the long march and died in March 1759.]

**[Note: John Campbell, 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Loudoun** (1705-1782) came to America in 1756 as commander-in-chief of British forces and Governor General of Virginia. Early in the French and Indian War, his not very successful military efforts were focused mostly on Canada. An expedition to capture Louisburg in 1757 was abandoned when Loudoun judged the French defenders too strong to attack. Then, also in 1757, while he and his army were occupied elsewhere, the French captured and burned Fort William Henry, on Lake George in New York. Sometime in 1758, he was recalled and replaced as commander-in-chief by Major General Jeffrey Amherst, who also became (absentee) governor of Virginia from 1759 until 1768. Under both absentee governors, Fauquier remained in charge in Alexandria as Virginia's acting governor.]

22. August 7, 1758 [59]

Copy of Talk by Tiftoe, the Wolf, and other headmen of the lower towns of the Creek Nation, at Fort Prince George, to the Governor of South Carolina, expressing hope that peace can be re-established between their Nation and South Carolina; asking that the Indians be fitted out for fighting with the British; followed by

July 28, 1758

Copy of Talk by the Emperor Old Hop and headmen of the upper Cherokee Nation, at Chota, to the Governor of South Carolina, expressing shame and sorrow that certain Cherokee Indians had engaged in violence against white people; wishing to re-establish the path of peace with the British; asking that this Talk be sent on to the Governor of Virginia; signed by Old Hop, Standing Turkey, Little Carpenter, and Woolin Awah [identity not found] [BT number L.22.]

[enclosed with Lyttelton's October 2, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 21]

**[Note:** Although **Tiftoe** appears to have been a Creek Indian, he seems to have come from the Cherokee town of Keowee and apparently negotiated with the British in conjunction with the Cherokee.]

**[Note: Kanagatoga** (c. 1690-1761), called **Old Hop** by the British because he limped, was the "emperor" or lead chief of the Cherokee Nation. He had accomplished the consolidation of the four Cherokee settlement areas in 1743-1744. Little Carpenter and Standing Turkey, both nephews of Old Hop, were other leading chiefs. While Little Carpenter led a faction of Cherokee who persistently sought peaceful accommodation and friendship with the British, Standing Turkey led a faction of more warlike Cherokee who favored the French over the British. Relations between Britain (which on the ground meant the colonies of Virginia and South Carolina) and the Cherokee Nation had deteriorated considerably by the late 1750s.

Cherokee violence against British settlers provoked the governors of the two colonies. Governor Lyttelton of South Carolina declared war on the Cherokee Nation in 1758 (the Anglo-Cherokee War).. The Cherokee “Emperor” Old Hop, having lost control over the destiny of his tribe, died in 1761, shortly before the war ended with bloody Cherokee defeat.]

[**Note:** The Cherokee town of **Chota** was at this time the de facto capital of the Cherokee Nation. It was located on the Little Tennessee River, a few miles upstream from its confluence with the Tennessee River, in eastern Tennessee south of present-day Knoxville.]

23. September 26, 1758 [61]  
Copy of Talk by Lyttelton at Charleston to “*Friends & Brothers*”, headmen and warriors of the middle and lower settlements of the Cherokee Nation, stating the desire to return to peace with the Indians but, “*mark what I say to you*”, if the Indians failed to return to peaceful friendship, trade with the British would end and the British army would wage war on the Indians [BT number L.23.]  
[enclosed with Lyttelton’s October 2, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 21]  
[**Note:** This is a good example of a Talk by a British official that abandoned the concept of equal sovereignty to lecture and threaten the Cherokee—just when the “talker,” Governor Lyttelton, was on the verge of declaring war against the Cherokee Nation.]
24. July 29, 1758 [63]  
Copy of Talk by Little Carpenter at Fort Loudoun to the Governor of South Carolina, expressing desire that “*the Cloud will soon be over, and that everything will go on as usual*”, stating that “*we shall always stick by you & your People*” [BT number L.24.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s October 2, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 21]  
[**Note:** This **Fort Loudoun** (there were several named for Governor Loudoun of Virginia), was built by the British in 1756 and 1757, intentionally located across the Little Tennessee River from the important “capital” Cherokee town of Chota, near the confluence of the Little Tennessee and the Tennessee River, south of present-day Knoxville. Initially the intent was cordial friendship, which Little Carpenter is still seeking to preserve, but relations were turning hostile, resulting in the Anglo-Cherokee War of 1758 to 1761. The Cherokee were enraged when South Carolina Governor Lyttelton led a militia force into Cherokee territory in 1759, capturing and holding hostage several Cherokee chiefs at Fort Prince George, who soon after were massacred. In 1760, Cherokee warriors loyal to Standing Turkey’s more warlike view of relations with the British, retaliated by besieged Fort Loudoun for seven months until its South Carolina militia garrison commander Captain Paul Demere was forced to surrender. The British army’s own retaliation that followed, led by Colonel James Grant (who soon after became royal governor of British colonial East Florida from 1763 to 1771) was brutal, destructive, and devastating to the Cherokee, who in 1761 were crushed into submission.]

25. December 1, 1758 [65]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, conveying correspondence about the situation with the Cherokee Indians involving both Virginia and South Carolina [BT number L.25.] [with enclosure, document 26]
26. November 8, 1758 [67]  
Extract of conference between Lyttelton and deputies of the Cherokee Nation, led by Tiftoe; concerning settlement of differences between the Cherokee and South Carolina; followed by  
November 14, 1758  
Extract of conference, continued, between Lyttelton and deputies of the Cherokee Nation, led by Tiftoe, concerning settlement of differences between the Cherokee and South Carolina, including text of Lyttelton's September 26, 1757 Talk to the Cherokee [also document 23]; followed by  
November 16, 1758  
Extract of conference, concluded, between Lyttelton and deputies of the Cherokee Nation, led by Tiftoe, concerning settlement of differences between the Cherokee and South Carolina [all parts of BT number L.26.] [all enclosed with Lyttelton's December 1, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 25]
27. December 2, 1758 [71]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting the proceedings of the South Carolina Assembly from October 6, 1757 to May 19, 1758 [not microfilmed here], with additional information about plans for building new barracks; reporting that the Assembly had approved funding for the quartering of soldiers, especially officers, at a much lower level than the full cost, adhering to the policy that they could not be quartered in private homes, a situation neither he nor the Commissary had been able to resolve, especially since the Commissary depended on the Assembly for his salary; commenting on the conflicting pressures of trying to abide by orders from Britain, while being sensitive to the rights and privileges of the people, but of being impeded by the separate powers of the Assembly [BT number L.27.] [with enclosures, documents 28, 29]
28. February 28, 1758 [75]  
Copy of letter from Lieutenant Colonel Henry Bouquet, [commander at the time of British troops at Charleston], to Lyttelton, describing how the Assembly, by resolution, had voted one shilling a day for quartering subaltern officers but nothing for field officers, captains, and staff officers, and that the housekeepers for the officers were given no allowance from the province; pointing out that the law requires the province to provide funding for full quarters costs equally for all officers; requesting that Lyttelton take the necessary steps to ensure that South Carolina abides by the law [BT number L.28.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's December 2, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]

[**Note: Henry Bouquet** (1719-1765) was a native of Switzerland who enlisted as an officer in the British army. Prior to 1763, his military career was unremarkable. However, in that year, he caused a stir by advocating to, and in conjunction with, General Amherst a scheme for what today would be called biological warfare. The idea was to infect blankets with small pox and then distribute them to Indians who were threatening the security of Fort Pitt. Two years later, when Bouquet was assigned to duty at Pensacola, the capital of the new British colony of West Florida, he died suddenly of a disease thought now to be yellow fever. Whether this was a case of divine justice has not been substantiated. The issue on which he was commenting in this letter is an early example of the kinds of political and economic rights issues that increasingly arose in the 13 British colonies and eventually drove them toward revolution and independence from Britain.]

29. February 18, 1758 [77]  
Triplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning Lyttelton's efforts to encourage Indians on the frontier to oppose the French and cooperate with the British; describing with satisfaction a report from Fort Loudoun via Little Carpenter that of a group of Indians had killed several French settlers, taken two French men and one woman prisoner, and observed a French fort thought to be located near the confluence of the Hogohegee and Ohio Rivers; describing efforts to set and reduce prices charged by Indian traders; describing efforts to reach the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians [BT number L.29.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's December 2, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]  
[**Note:** The geography mentioned in this letter is not clear. What the Cherokee Indians called the **Hogohegee River**, and Europeans later renamed the **Holston River** after a British explorer, is one of several tributaries of the Tennessee River, originating in far southwestern Virginia. The rivers today called the Holston and the French Broad merge east of Knoxville, in eastern Tennessee, to create the Tennessee River, which eventually flows into the Ohio River in what is now far northwestern Tennessee. Therefore, the Hogohegee River only technically has a confluence with the Ohio River. The possible French fort reported to have been observed might have been located at the **confluence of the Holston (Hogohegee) and the French Broad** where the Tennessee River begins (rather than at a confluence with the Ohio), putting it fairly close to Fort Loudoun, which sat near the confluence of the Little Tennessee and Tennessee Rivers, not far southwest of Knoxville. See also notes on geography after documents 98 and 101.]
30. February 21, 1759 [79]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that Little Carpenter and nine other Cherokee deserted the British military effort shortly before Brigadier General Forbes and his troops successfully reduced Fort Duquesne, that they had been captured, unarmed, and sent to Williamsburg [BT number L.30.]

31. April 14, 1758 [81]

Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, thanking them for their positive responses to his efforts to improve the fortifications of South Carolina; reporting that he had responded to the King's orders concerning settlements along the coast south of the Altamaha River, had jointly ordered, with the Governor of Georgia, that the settlers move from these settlements, and that inspection by militia at Fort Frederica indicated that the particular settlement in question [New Hanover] had indeed been abandoned; reporting other news of moves to reinforce Fort Loudoun; reporting additional violence by Indians, some of it intertribal violence among Indians; reporting with concern about private conversations supposedly going on between Indian leaders and the French, who were trying to sway Indian friendship away from Britain; stating that Little Carpenter had returned to Keowee from Virginia and had sent Lyttelton a friendly Talk; reporting other Indian news; reporting that Atkin, who had been in Augusta, was moving on to visit with the Creek Nation; reporting that the Assembly had passed the annual tax act including a total of £115,470.6.9½, of which £18,109.12.5 was surplus from the previous year, with additional details; reporting that the Assembly had disallowed two expenditure items in the contingency services account, and, questioning the Assembly's legal authority to question such expenditures, with details; when Lyttelton attempted to make the payments, the Assembly refused to honor the payments; recommending George Austin and Egerton Leigh to serve on the South Carolina Council, replacing William Wragg (who had been suspended) and Charles Pinckney (who had died) [for more on Austin and Leigh, see note after document 36] [BT number L.31.] [with enclosures, documents 32 to 35]

[**Note:** This **Charles Pinckney** (?-1758) was a South Carolina planter, attorney, and politician, serving as the colony's Attorney General (1733), Speaker of the House (1736, 1738, and 1740), Chief Justice (1752-1753), and Agent for the colony (1753-1758). The Pinckney family was prolific and wealthy as plantation and slave owners, merchants, and slave traders. It also produced a number of notable political leaders for the colony and later the State of South Carolina, as well as the United States. Several of Charles' direct relations played significant roles. One of Charles' sons, **Charles Cotesworth Pinckney** (1746-1825) fought in the Revolutionary War and later signed the U.S. Constitution. Another son, **Thomas Pinckney** (1750-1828) served in the U.S. House of Representatives, as Governor of South Carolina, and as Minister to Britain and then Envoy to Spain. In the latter position, he negotiated the 1795 Treaty of San Lorenzo (or Pinckney Treaty) which codified U.S.-Spanish boundaries. **Colonel Charles Pinckney** (1731 or 1732-1782), a cousin of Charles Cotesworth and Thomas Pinckney, became a loyalist during the Revolutionary War but died in South Carolina before the war officially ended. His son, **Governor Charles Pinckney** (1757-1824) sided with the Americans, fought in the Revolutionary War, served in the Continental Congress and later the U.S. House of Representatives, signed the U.S. Constitution with his cousin Charles Cotesworth, and was governor of the State of South Carolina from 1806 to 1808.]

32. December 8, 1758 [87]  
Address from Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina to Lyttelton, questioning some of the amounts in the account for contingency expenses, while approving an estimate for the current year of £1,800 [BT number L.32.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's April 14, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 31]  
[Note: The structure of the **colonial government of South Carolina** consisted of 1) a Commons House of Assembly—a lower legislative body of members, elected by white, property-owning, taxpaying males, to represent the various parishes but not necessarily resident of the parish each represented; 2) a small Upper House of Assembly that also served as Royal Council to the Governor—appointed by the King and playing both a legislative and executive function; and 3) a Governor and a Lieutenant Governor—each appointed by the King, who wielded royal executive power over the entire government, including (theoretically at least) veto power over both legislative houses.  
In practice, **Commons House**, whose members came largely from the élite planter/merchant class, apparently sought to use the public legislative body “of the people” to further the members’ own, private, economic benefits and to gain protection for themselves and their property against slave disturbances and Indian violence. To accomplish these goals, they sought greater control, in relation to the Governor, over several aspects of colonial government rule, including especially colonial finances and the election process of Commons House itself.  
This 1758 address from Commons House represents an early skirmish on the issue over financial control. This issue became more intense in 1760 and 1761 (besides this address, see documents 33, 48 to 50, 73, 126, dated between 1758 and 1761).  
Between 1760 and 1764 the second conflict emerged over control of the Commons House electoral process (see documents 102, 164 to 166, 183 to 185, dated between 1760 and 1764). Both of these issues seem at this time to have been conceived of as primarily internal, provincial matters. The motives of Commons House members were to increase their power vis à vis the Governor and Council, largely for the private benefit of the members themselves.  
After 1765, the contest between Commons House and Governor began to be redefined as part of the larger conflict to protect the declared rights of (often élite) British subjects in America against alleged abuse by royal authority. By the early 1770s, the result in Charleston had become a functional stalemate in South Carolina government. This was resolved only after South Carolinians overthrew their colonial government in favor of first a provisional “rebel” government and then an independent state government, as a part of the American Revolution. See also note after Reel 2 document 15.]

33. [no date] [89]  
Copy of address from Lyttelton to South Carolina Assembly, responding to Commons House's address to him of December 8, 1758 [document 32], expressing surprise that the Assembly would question his order to pay £119.10.0., using Contingency Services money, to James Laurens & Co. for stores for use of the garrison at Frederica; with justifications for his order; hoping that the Assembly would agree with his justifications; stating that he would accept the same amount for contingencies as last year, although he had hoped they would agree with him on the need for more money [BT number L.33.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's April 14, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 31]
34. [no date] [91]  
"Minutes of my Proceedings" by H. Hyrne, under a Commission and Instructions from Lyttelton dated January 5 and 6, 1759, to go to Savannah and from there, with a commissioner from Georgia (James Edward Powell), to the settlement of New Hanover to order the inhabitants to leave, since their settlement had not received royal approval; containing detailed daily entries: having left Charleston on January 17 and met with the inhabitants on February 3, all agreed that they should move, but some expressed intention to move to Spanish territory; a paper [with text included], was prepared, indicating that such a choice would not be looked upon favorably by the British, which all present signed; having arrived back at Charleston, after delays, on March 14, 1759; followed by Copy of Lyttelton's order for the settlers to move "*published at New-Hanover, & on Cumberland Island*" [the settlers at New Hanover had previously been settlers on Cumberland Island [BT number L.34.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's April 14, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 31]  
[Note: A Hyrne family had been in South Carolina since 1700. Further information on H. Hyrne has not been found.]  
[Note: The location of the **New Hanover** settlement is not clear but might have been on St. Simons Island, a sea island south of the Altamaha River near present-day Brunswick. **Cumberland Island** is two sea islands south of St. Simons, not far north of the St. Marys River.]
35. March 6, 1759 [95]  
Copy of letter from [Captain] Thomas Goldsmith [commanding officer at Charleston] to Lyttelton, reporting having traveled on February 5, 1759 to New Hanover and then to Cumberland Island and finding that each had been abandoned by settlers [BT number L.35.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's April 14, 1758 letter to Board of Trade, document 31]
36. June 26, 1759 [96]  
Order from the Privy Council, concerning the King's confirmation of appointments of George Austin and Egerton Leigh to serve on the South Carolina Council, replacing William Wragg who had vacated his seat and Charles Pinckney, who had died, respectively [BT number L.36.]

[**Note: William Wragg**, a member of the South Carolina Council, had been suspended. Evidently, he was replaced by **George Austin**. **Charles Pinckney** was Agent for the colony of South Carolina from 1753 until his death in 1758 as well as a member of the Council. Pinckney had previously served as Chief Justice in 1752 and 1753. His successor as Chief Justice was **Peter Leigh**, from 1753 until he died in 1759. Peter's son **Egerton Leigh** now succeeded Charles Pinckney on the Council. A few years later, in 1765, the King appointed Egerton Leigh Attorney General for South Carolina, a position he held until 1774, when he fled the impending Revolution, returning to England. For more on Charles Pinckney and his family, see note after document 31. Regarding Peter Leigh, see also note after document 40.]

37. May 8, 1759 [98]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on visits by Indians, Catawba (King Hagler) and Cherokee (Little Carpenter), the former of whom had acted well during General Forbes' conquest of Fort Duquesne, although the latter had deserted the effort but was still a valuable ally; reporting having received a part of the Indian gifts sent by [South Carolina Agent James] Wright; reporting, as related by [Georgia] Governor Ellis, on movements by various Indian groups in the interior; reporting that Captain [Richard] Dudgeon, engineer, had arrived from Philadelphia [after having previously worked under General Forbes on projects related to the building of Fort Pitt from the ruins of Fort Duquesne]; commenting on a parliamentary act allowing impressment of sailors on British warships; offering the opinion that the policy could be "*hurtful*" in time of war, if too many of the seamen were impressed, and not sufficient regular, trained British sailors were in ship crews [BT number L.37.]
38. November 27, 1759 [101]  
Order of the King appointing Thomas Pownall to become governor of South Carolina, replacing Lyttelton [who was being appointed governor of Jamaica] [BT number L.38.]  
[**Note: Thomas Pownall** (1722-1805) was a British colonial official and British politician. He was personally interested in the American colonies, traveling among them starting in 1753. He was an early, if lonely, British supporter of limiting colonial taxation. From 1755 until 1757, he was Lieutenant Governor of New Jersey, and, from 1757 to 1760, Governor of Massachusetts. Although appointed Governor of South Carolina in 1760, he never served, returning instead to England, where he became a long-time member of the House of Commons. John Adams, among others, thought of Pownall as an exceptionally capable royal governor. Soon after 1760, Pownall published a well-received book entitled *Administration in the Colonies*. One wonders how South Carolina history might have been different if Pownall had served its governor during this period. Thomas' younger brother was **John Pownall**, who knew the American colonies well from a different perspective, as secretary to the Board of Trade from 1758 to 1776 and as an Undersecretary of State from 1768 to 1776.]

39. November 27, 1759 [103]  
Order of the King appointing William Bull II Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina [BT number L.39.]  
[Note: **William Bull II** (1710-1791) served for a long time as Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, from 1759 until 1775. Although never earning the title of Acting Governor, five times during his long tenure as Lieutenant Governor, he was called upon to rule the colony during the absence of a governor in the colony—a total combined time period of almost nine years. His father, William Bull, had earlier served as King's Counsel for South Carolina and as acting governor from 1737 to 1743, when acting governor (after Governor Robert Johnson died in office) Thomas Broughton also died in office.]
40. September 1, 1759 [105]  
Duplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that 19 settlers had been "*Scalp'd*" on the Yadkin and Catawba Rivers by Cherokee Indians, in territory reported to be on North Carolina's frontier; surviving inhabitants had applied to South Carolina for protection; reporting other indications received of Cherokee friendship; yet seeking to send reinforcements to Fort Loudoun; reporting on garrison strengths at Fort Loudoun and at Fort Prince George and of the large quantity of gifts sent to the Cherokee but also discontinuing trade in the Yadkin/Catawba Rivers area; reporting on false rumors that the Cherokee and Creek Indians had allied to fight against the British; hoping to take advantage of the Indians seeking peace; reporting on other Indian violence in the area of the Broad River; reporting quiet among the Creeks and a treaty of peace negotiated by "*Indian Agent*" Atkin with the Choctaw Nation; also reporting good relations with the Chickasaw Indians; concerning Commons House's position concerning new orders to raise colonial troops; reporting on a parish rector's behavior, preaching the imminent end of the world but instead resigning and returning to England, followed by unrest among Negroes, for which "*one Philip John a free Mulatto, [who preached a vision of black insurrection and white death] was tried, Whip'd and branded for endeavouring to Stir up Sedition among the Negroes*"; reporting that Chief Justice Peter Leigh had died and that James Michie had been appointed in his place [see also note after document 36] [BT number L.40.] [with enclosures, documents 41 to 50]  
[Note: **James Michie** served as Chief Justice for only a short time before dying, in London, in July 1760.]
41. May 22, 1759 [109]  
Copy of Talk from Lyttelton to Old Hop and Little Carpenter, stating that despite agreements for peace, at least 25 settlers had been killed by Cherokee Indians recently; therefore requiring a response from Old Hop and Little Carpenter that they reaffirm their promises and punish those Indians guilty of the outrageous violence against settlers [BT number L.41.] [Frame 109 microfilmed twice] [another copy of this Talk in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 108] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]

42. June 27, 1759 [111]  
Copy of Talk from Old Hop and Little Carpenter at Fort Loudoun to Lyttelton, responding to Lyttelton's Talk [document 41] by stating Little Carpenter's position that all should be peace again between the Cherokee and the British [BT number L.42.] [another copy of this Talk in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 109] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]
43. July 10, 1759 [113]  
Copy of letter from Captain Paul Demere [commander] at Fort Loudoun to Lyttelton, relating the gathering he had had with Little Carpenter and many of his warriors at Fort Loudoun, in which he read Lyttelton's Talk [document 41] and Little Carpenter delivered his Talk [document 42], the Cherokee said they had done what they could against the Indians who were violent, Little Carpenter suggested that this would not satisfy Lyttelton but hoped that Lyttelton would pardon the Indians in order to maintain peace and friendship [BT number L.43.] [another copy of this letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 110] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]
44. July 22, 1759 [115]  
Copy of extract of letter from Demere at Fort Loudoun to Lyttelton, stating that Little Carpenter had been pressured by young warriors, despite his better judgment, to leave Fort Loudoun to join a fight against a French Fort; stating discomfort that Little Carpenter was leaving because of "*bad Talks*" among warriors of the Cherokee towns of Settico and Tellico; hoping he can "*prevent any thing that may happen, but very little dependance can be put on the promise of those Savages*" [BT number L.44.] [another copy of this extract in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 111] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]  
[Note: **Settico** (also spelled Citico) and **Tellico** were two of what the British called Overhill Towns of the Cherokee, both located up the Little Tennessee River from Fort Loudoun in today's eastern Tennessee. In 1979, Tellico Dam on the Little Tennessee River flooded the sites and area of most of the Overhill Towns.]
45. August 3, 1759 [117]  
Extract of letter from Lieutenant [Richard] Coytmore, [commander] at Fort Prince George to Lyttelton, reporting on information obtained through Creek Indians about a secret meeting at which the Creek messengers encouraged the Cherokee to side with the French against the British, and the Cherokee headmen there agreed to join with the French "*conditionally that you [the Creeks] will first kill all the white people belonging to the English in your nation*"; reporting that a group of young Cherokee warriors had recently left to make war against settlers on the frontier of either Virginia or North Carolina

[BT number L.45.] [another copy of this extract in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 112] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]

46. May 1, 1758 [actually 1759] [119]  
Copy of letter from John Buckells with the Chickasaw Nation to Jerome Courtonne, reporting on intelligence gained on war movements of various Indian nations, with dates from June 5, 1758 to April 3, 1759, including Chickasaw and Choctaw Indians, who had been at war against each other; reporting having learned that the Choctaw were considering changing from being allies of the French to the British [BT number L.46.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40] [another copy of letter is in Reel 4 document 113, also misdated 1758]  
**[Note: John Buckells and Jerome Courtonne were both Indian traders, especially with the Chickasaw Nation. Both may have been in touch with Lyttelton, providing information to colonial officials. John was known by several similar last names, perhaps starting with Bucknell, going through maybe Bucknells and then Buckells, before morphed to Buckles. A transcript of a journal written by Courtonne was produced by the Genealogical Society of Utah in 1952. Called *Indian Book, 1754-1757*, it includes, besides some letters and other documents, a diary of a trip Courtonne took from Augusta to and with the Chickasaw people, between July 1755 and April 1756. Courtonne died in 1761.]**
47. [no date] [122]  
Copy of address of Lyttelton to South Carolina Assembly, concerning the King's request that each colony raise a large number of troops and then to maintain their cost; proposing an increase in the annual estimate to pay the needed cost; seeking support to approve the costs, plus costs for additional fortifications, for which the engineer Captain Richard Dudgeon has come to Charleston to help plan and construct [Frame 122 microfilmed twice] [BT number L.47.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]
48. July 9, 1759 [124]  
Copy of address from Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly to Lyttelton, responding to his address [document 47], stated resolutions that "*the Regiment should not be continued any longer in the pay of this Province*"; that three companies should be continued until January 1, [1760]; that certain money should be expended for current regimental expenses but that additional money should be removed from the regiment's fund to be used for other expenses; and that the commissary general should sell excess regimental equipment purchased for the "*Highland & Royal American Battalions*"; also reporting having deferred consideration of what should be done about fortifications; justifying these resolutions, which were known to be contrary to the governor's wishes, based on

- “nothing but a consideration of the heavy Charges the Province has labour’d under, during the present War, & the inutility as well as impracticability of raising or continuing a Regiment as the operations of the Campaign are already enter’d upon”* [BT number L.48.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]
49. [no date] [126]  
Copy of address of Lyttelton to South Carolina Assembly, responding to Commons House address [document 48], suggesting that the Assembly should reconsider, that although taxes were higher during the war, the colony was prosperous and not in poverty, that the colony could not afford not to fund the regiment, that dangers of both Indian and French hostilities were real [BT number L.49.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]
50. July 13, 1759 [128]  
Copy of address from Commons House of South Carolina Assembly to Lyttelton, responding to Lyttelton’s address [document 49], reaffirming its discontinuation of funding for a South Carolina regiment, but, given the danger of Indian hostilities, authorizing the Governor to raise two troops of Rangers, to be paid by the South Carolina until November 1, 1759 or until the General Assembly meets [BT number L.50.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s September 1, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 40]
51. September 10, 1759 [130]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on ongoing issues with the French, Indian affairs, and frontier settlements; commenting on a new parliamentary act respecting changes in colonial election procedures, which, in his opinion, were *“too inconsiderable to have any any [sic] sensible Effect upon the State of this Government”*; expressing a more positive attitude toward an act respecting *“spreading of malignant & contagious distempers”*; concerning an act for the taxation of transient people, he finds it *“not to be unequitable”* [BT number L.51.] [with enclosure, document 52]
52. June 6, 1759 [132]  
Extract of South Carolina Council meeting at which Maximillian Morris *“and his Half Breed Son Johnny”* [apparently an informer to the British; identify note found] had testified about the situation in the interior with *“French Indians”* in Creek Indian settlements near the forks of the Coosa River [somewhere in today’s Georgia or Alabama] [BT number L.52.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s September 10, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 51]

53. October 16, 1759 [134]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on intelligence about and plans to respond to Cherokee violence against Britain's interior forts, especially Fort Loudoun; reporting end of the Assembly session; reporting recruitment for the militia; reporting other information about Indian affairs [BT number L.53.] [duplicate letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 114] [with enclosures, documents 54 to 63]
54. September 12, 1759 [138]  
Copy of letter from Maurice Anderson [apparently an informer to the British; identity not found] at Fort Loudoun to Lieutenant Coytmore [at Fort Prince George], reporting information about hostile Indian activities at Settico and Tellico [BT number L.54.] [another copy of this letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 117] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
55. September 13, 1759 [140]  
Copy of letter from Demere at Fort Loudoun to Lyttelton, reporting on matters with the Indians at the fort [BT number L.55.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 116] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
56. September 26, 1759 [142]  
Copy of letter from Coytmore at Fort Prince George to Lyttelton, reporting on Indian relations at the fort [BT number L.56.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 115] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
57. September 26, 1759 [144]  
Copy of letter from Captain John Stuart at Fort Prince George to Lyttelton, reporting tense relations with the Indians, as they were demanding ammunition; predicting that the consequence of the necessity of refusing to supply the ammunition "*will be an open & declared war*"; with details [BT number L.57.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 118] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]  
**[Note: John Stuart** (1718-1779) was a Scottish native who moved in 1748 to South Carolina. From his base in Charleston, he became familiar with the southern tribes of Native Americans. During the Anglo-Cherokee War (1758-1761) he served as a Captain in the South Carolina Militia. After the war, he succeeded Edmond Atkin as royal Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department, serving from 1761 until 1779. In this capacity, he helped negotiate many treaties with Indian nations and otherwise sought to maintain positive relations for the British with the Indians in southeastern North America.

When the Revolution occurred, he left Charleston, first for Georgia and then for West Florida, continuing his service as Superintendent of Indian Affairs until he died in Pensacola in 1779.

58. [no date] [146]  
Copy of address from Lyttelton to South Carolina Commons House, rejecting strong advice from some in both Commons House and the Council to declare war on the Cherokee, given the increasing violence by them against settlers and British forts; stating that "*it is my sincere Inclination to do nothing which may be supposed to have the most remote tendency to prevent a good accommodation with these People*" [BT number L.58.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
59. [no date] [148]  
Copy of address from Lyttelton to both houses of South Carolina Assembly, announcing its adjournment until March 20, 1760 because Commons House was not fully supporting his approach to the Indian emergency [BT number L.59.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
60. October 6, 1759 [150]  
Copy of address from Commons House to Lyttelton, recognizing the need for militia to repel Indian "*Invasions, & to obtain an adequate satisfaction from them*", and Commons House not having agreed to pay for "*the number of Men which Your Excellency may think necessary*," requesting that he provide an estimate for the cost of the additional militia [BT number L.60.] [another copy of this address in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 120] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
61. October 11, 1759 [152]  
Copy of address from Commons House to Lyttelton, unanimously advising against declaring war on the Cherokee "*until all hopes shall be lost of obtaining a reasonable & adequate Satisfaction from them*" [BT number L.61.] [another copy of this address in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 122] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
62. [no date] [154]  
Copy of address from Lyttelton to Commons House, stating that 1,500 militia would be required for the "*intended Expedition*" and that his requested draft of 1,000 men toward that total is important and necessary [BT number L.62.] [another copy of address in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 121] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]

63. [no date] [156]  
Copy of address from Lyttelton to Commons House, notifying the members that he was taking steps to obtain British troops from Brigadier General [John] Stanwix, then commander of British troops in the Southern Provinces of North America, to meet the Indian threat; reminding them of their obligation to pay for British troops and other military expenses [BT number L.63.] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 16, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 53]
64. October 23, 1759 [158]  
Duplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, explaining his decision that an accommodation could not be negotiated by treaty with the Cherokee, making a war strategy necessary, with justification, including that the South Carolina Council had insisted on full and complete satisfaction against Cherokee instances of violence against settlers, that the Indians present to negotiate did not officially represent the Cherokee Nation and could not enforce their negotiated positions, that taking time to discover whether a treaty was being observed by the Indians would require too much inactive time, that not using force now would require going back to the Assembly for more money; declaring his intention to set out in three days, himself in command, with the regular and militia troops then in Charleston [BT number L.64.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 125] [with enclosure, document 65]
65. October 18, 1759 [162]  
Extract of meeting of South Carolina Council, which records a Talk between Lyttelton and several Cherokee headmen; followed by  
October 19, 1759  
Extract of meeting of South Carolina Council, with continuation of the Talk of the previous day, describing the action of some angry warriors against Fort Loudoun because the fort refused to trade with the Indians; seeking to stop the war violence by both sides and re-establish peace; followed by  
October 22, 1759  
Extract of meeting of South Carolina Council, with continuation of the Talk, with Lyttelton insisting on full satisfaction for the Indian violence of the recent past, stating that, the British and their settlers had endured the Cherokee violence for too long and that "*the time is come, that they will exact Satisfaction, if it is not given*"; with this statement, Lyttelton concluded the Talk [BT number L.65.] [another copy of extracts in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 126] [enclosed with Lyttelton's October 23, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 64]

66. [various dates in late 1759] [167]  
“*Extracts from letters received from the Speaker of the House of Assembly in S<sup>o</sup>. Carolina*”, traveling with Lyttelton’s military force; written to [and copied in the handwriting of] James Wright, South Carolina Agent, and delivered by him to the Board of Trade, including:  
October 27, 1759  
Reporting that yesterday, the Governor and his expedition left Charleston; stating that “*We are in Great hopes that he will have no Occasion to make use of the Force he has with him to Obtain Satisfaction*”; followed by  
November 10, 1759  
Reporting the hope that friendly Cherokee would help restore peace by granting the Governor’s wish for satisfaction; followed by  
December 1, 1759  
Reporting, with the army at “96”, the optimistic expectation “*that matters will be Settled Amicably*”; followed by  
December 5, 1759  
Reporting that Lyttelton was going to meet with the Indian leaders at Fort Prince George; followed by  
December 14, 1759  
Reporting that Lyttelton was [apparently] negotiating a treaty with the Cherokee [all parts of BT number L.66.]  
[copy of extracts from letters in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 127]  
**[Note: Ninety Six** (or Camp 96) was a frontier fort, settlement, military way station, and trading post along the wilderness “Cherokee Trail,” near present-day Greenwood, SC, west of Columbia. Today, the small, rural town of Ninety Six, South Carolina retains the name of the wilderness camp. Its name came from the inaccurate belief that it was 96 miles from Keowee. **Keowee**, in turn, was originally a Cherokee village on the Cherokee Trail, near which in 1753 the British built a sizeable military structure they called Fort Prince George. It was located in what is now the northwest corner of South Carolina, not far south of Franklin, North Carolina. The site of Keowee now lies beneath the waters of reservoir Lake Keowee.]
67. December 29, 1759 [169]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Fort Prince George to Board of Trade, explaining that he had concluded a treaty with the Cherokee and that, as a consequence, he was holding as hostage 21 “*principal warriors*” “*for the delivery of an equal number of those, who have been guilty of murdering His Majesty’s Subjects, in addition to three others, which have already been deliver’d up to me to be put to Death, or otherwise disposed of, as I shall think proper*”; reporting that small pox had broken out in his army, that “*I am threaten’d with a very general Desertion*”, and that he would shortly be marching back to Charleston to conclude the “satisfaction” [BT number L.67.] [with enclosure, document 68] [copy of letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 129]

68. December 26, 1759 [171]  
Copy of treaty between Lyttelton for the British and Little Carpenter and other chiefs for the Cherokee Nation itemizing what the Indians must do to provide “satisfaction” for the murdered British colonists; signed by Lyttelton and six Cherokee chiefs [BT number L.68.] [another copy of treaty in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 130] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s December 29, 1759 letter to Board of Trade, document 67]
69. December 10, 1759 [173]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Fort Prince George, to Board of Trade, reporting on outbreaks of both measles and small pox especially among the Indians but also threatening the army; reporting on plans to return to Charleston with some hostages [BT number L.69.]
70. January 21, 1760 [175]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on having concluded his campaign successfully, and that local funds would pay the expense of the short war, since this was a local matter, and British funding should not be necessary to cover the costs; reporting that all the troops were back in Charleston except for 70 who remained at Fort Prince George; reporting having given orders for large supplies of provisions to be given to the Cherokee; reporting that small pox had arrived in Charleston via a ship from Philadelphia [BT number L.70.]
71. March 8, 1760 [177]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on the Indian attack on Fort Prince George that led the garrison in the fort to kill all the Cherokee chiefs held hostage; reporting that Lieutenant Governor Bull was prepared to be acting governor in Lyttelton’s place, as Lyttelton was preparing “soon to embark on board the *Trent Man of War for England*” [BT number L.71.] [with enclosure, document 72]  
[**Note:** Lyttelton left Charleston on April 5, 1760, leaving Bull in charge of the South Carolina colony. Since the next governor, Thomas Pownall, was expected to arrive soon, Bull was expecting only short-time duty as acting governor. Since Pownall never served, further delay kept Bull in his acting position until December 22, 1761 when a new governor, Thomas Boone, finally arrived.]
72. February 24, 1760 [179]  
Extract from letter by Ensign Alexander Miln, at Fort Prince George, to Lyttelton, reporting in detail on the attack by Indians on the fort followed by general violence, followed by the militia’s killing the hostage warriors in the fort [BT number L.72.] [enclosed with Lyttelton’s March 8, 1760 letter to Board of Trade, document 71]

73. February 22, 1760 [181]  
 Duplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on the Indian violence at Fort Prince George, his request to General Amherst for British troops to reinforce protection of Fort Loudoun [where angry Cherokee warriors were just beginning a siege of the fort] with militia from Forts Moore [near present-day Aiken, South Carolina] and Augusta [Georgia]; reporting on further bad relations with Commons House over what they considered rights of British subjects concerning paying for troops; acknowledging with thanks receipt of his promotion to be governor of Jamaica, after returning to England [BT number L.73.] [with enclosure, document 74]
74. February 7, 1760 [186]  
 Copy of speech by Lyttelton to General Assembly, taking credit for having carried out the Assembly's wishes to demand satisfaction from the Cherokee Indians for their murders of British settlers; informing them that he had asked General Amherst for British regular troops to protect the colony and its forts from Indian attacks in the future; concerning other business needing the Assembly's attention for domestic protection; followed by  
 February 7, 1760  
 Copy of address from Assembly responding to Lyttelton's speech to Assembly dated February 7, 1760, referring to a prior Lyttelton speech to Assembly dated October 13, 1759 [not microfilmed here], asserting that demands made on the Assembly to take certain required actions improperly limited the Assembly's liberties and privileges to make its own decisions; followed by  
 [no date]  
 Copy of address from Assembly responding to Lyttelton's speech of February 7, 1760, looking forward to the arrival of troops requested from General Amherst for protection against the Indians and agreeing to pay for their necessary expenses; followed by  
 February 13, 1760  
 Copy of address of Assembly responding to Lyttelton's speech of February 7, 1760, stating that the Assembly had approved a resolution to recruit 1,000 troops and to pay salaries at certain amounts per rank, with the officers paying for their own furnishings, with time limits; also stating that "*with respect to Fort Loudoun, we are of opinion that, in the present calamitous State of this Province, that Fort cannot be reliev'd by this Government*"; followed by  
 February 14, 1760  
 Copy of message from Lyttelton to Assembly, objecting strongly to the language used in Assembly's address of February 7, 1760  
 [all parts of BT number L.74.] [all enclosed with Lyttelton's February 22, 1760 letter to Board of Trade, document 73]

75. May 13, 1760 [189]  
Order of the King approving appointment of David Graeme to be Attorney General of South Carolina, replacing James Wright [BT number L.75.]  
[Note: James Wright had been Attorney General for South Carolina since 1747. However, beginning in 1757, he was appointed South Carolina's Agent, whose duties he carried out in London. Yet it appears to have taken three years to replace him in South Carolina as Attorney General. See note after document 10.]
76. April 1, 1758 [191]  
Copy of order of the King appointing John Guerard to the South Carolina Council, replacing James Kinlock, who had died [BT number L.76.] [another copy of this order is in document 11, including note]
77. June 16, 1758 [193]  
Copy of order of the King approving payment to Henry McCullough a certain amount in response to his delayed petition for the salary owed him as Inspector of the Quit Rent in both North and South Carolina [BT number L.77.]
78. April 7, 1759 [195]  
Copy of order of the King approving South Carolina Agent James Wright's memorial seeking additional military support for South Carolina, in the form of artillery and a new detachment of troops to man the artillery, to be sent by the British Commander in Chief in North America to South Carolina [BT number L.78.]
79. April 7, 1759 [197]  
Copy of order of the King approving South Carolina Agent James Wright's memorial seeking additional military support for South Carolina, in the form of ordnance and stores for the artillery also approved, to be sent to South Carolina [BT number L.79.]
80. April 7, 1759 [199]  
Copy of order of the King approving South Carolina's hiring and paying a storekeeper for the ordnance and stores being sent to South Carolina; providing for him to keep records and periodically report the amounts of ordnance and stores being stored; followed by  
March 5, 1759]  
List with detailed itemization of "*A Proportion of Ordnance and Stores Proposed to be sent to South Carolina*" prepared by the Office of Ordnance; followed by [no date]  
List of "*Stores proposed to be sent to...South Carolina, to render what is there already, complete for Service*"  
[all parts of BT number L.80.]

81. November 27, 1759 [203]  
Copy of order of the King that a Commission for and warrant for payment to incoming Governor of South Carolina Thomas Pownall be sent for execution by Secretary of State William Pitt (Elder) [BT number L.81]  
[Note: Pownall never actually served as Governor of South Carolina. See note after document 38 and document 87]  
[Note: **William Pitt** (Elder) served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1756 to 1761.]
82. June 30, 1760 [205]  
Letter from William Bull, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina and acting governor following Lyttelton's departure [for more on **William Bull II**, see notes after document 1, 39, and 71; Bull served as acting governor from April 5, 1760 until December 22, 1761], at Charleston, to Board of Trade, reporting on the bad situation with the Cherokee Indians, all of whom except for those in Little Carpenter's town were enemies of the British; reporting on Colonel [Archibald] Montgomerie's destructive military assault, staged from [Fort Prince George, near] Keowee, against the Cherokee; reporting that the siege of Fort Loudoun [over the mountains on the Tennessee River south of today's Knoxville] continued; reporting trader intelligence that the Spanish garrison at Pensacola had been expanded; reporting that meanwhile, Governor Ellis of Georgia was maintaining more peaceful relations with the Creek Indians but was not pressing for justice against Indian murderers of settlers on the Georgia frontier; conveying other news [BT number L.82]
83. July 20, 1760 [207]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, describing Colonel Montgomerie's campaign against the Indians, starting on June 24, 1760 from Keowee, with a bloody encounter near Echoee, about 60 miles northwest of Keowee [on the route over the mountains, probably near present-day Franklin, NC, where the route began following the Little Tennessee River down], after which Montgomerie did not press onward but instead returned to Keowee, after which he determined he and his troops should return to New York via Charleston; Bull reporting that he wrote to Montgomerie, pointing out that, so far, his military actions had inflamed the Indians against the British without significantly harming their ability to make war on the colony, to which Montgomerie responded [text quoted in letter] that he had done his best, stating his conviction that he had followed his orders to make a military appearance in the frontier but not to pursue the Indians throughout the vast frontier area; Bull stating that Montgomerie should be allowed to go because he had not been useful, and that Bull would defend South Carolina against an Indian invasion, if necessary, with the resources at hand; including additional news [duplicate letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 132] [with enclosure, document 84] [BT number L.83.]

[**Note:** Besides not following up more effectively against the Cherokee in the Middle Towns territory, Montgomerie's destructive campaign was abruptly halted, far short of reaching the Overhill Towns down the Little Tennessee River and without delivering relief to Fort Loudoun, whose garrison had withstood a Cherokee siege since February 1760, and who were finally forced to surrender on August 9.]

84. July 12, 1760 [211]  
Copy of letter from Bull at Charleston to Colonel Montgomerie, stating South Carolina's consternation at Montgomerie's having retreated so early from Keowee after the engagement at Echoee; urging him to return to the frontier and keep military pressure there so that the French could not invade with their Indian allies; with details of the situation and how Montgomerie should respond [BT number L.84.] [another copy of letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 133] [enclosed with Bull's July 20, 1760 letter to Board of Trade, document 83]

## **Volume 377—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), continue**

May 6, 1760 to July 2, 1764

Documents 85 to 193

[Frames 1 to 438]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Board of Trade incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina continue in Volume 377 of the Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina. This Volume contains documents dated mostly between 1760 and 1764, until the end of Thomas Boone's time as Governor.

**Note:** Archivists (probably in the Board of Trade Office) wrote descriptive notes for many of the manuscript documents. These are generally microfilmed with the documents. On these notes, archivists provided their own numbers by manuscript Bundle or Volume. Where found, this Finding Aid reports these numbers as "BT numbers." Volume 377 begins with BT number M.1. and ends with M.109. These numbers are continuous (although in a few places not documented), except for one printed *Gazette* issue, which was assigned no BT number.

**Note:** In this Volume, none of the letters of official correspondence is numbered by the writer. Gaps in correspondence are thus more difficult to identify since they can be sequenced only by date.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

85. September 9, 1760 [1]  
Letter from [Lieutenant Governor and acting governor of South Carolina] William Bull [II] at Charleston to the Board of Trade and Plantations, reporting on the changing and still unresolved situation with the Cherokee Indians [BT number M.1.] [with enclosure, document 86]  
[**Note:** Reference is made to a letter from Bull to Board of Trade dated August 30, 1760, which is not microfilmed here. Between July 20, 1760 and August 30, 1760, Bull may have written other letters not microfilmed here. During the interval, the situation with the Cherokee had further deteriorated. By August, Colonel Archibald Montgomerie had left Charleston for New York and Fort Loudoun's British garrison had succumbed to a seven-month siege, surrendering to the Cherokee on August 9.]
86. [no date; probably shortly after September 7, 1760] [3]  
Copy of letter from Major Lewis to Colonel Byrd [probably Major Andrew Lewis and Colonel George William Byrd, both of the Virginia Militia], reporting that Fort Loudoun had surrendered with all its ammunition, etc. and that the garrison was to be marched to Fort Prince George; however, most of its officers had been killed by Indians only 15 miles away from Fort Loudoun. Supervisor of Indian Affairs, Captain John Stuart, was one of the few to survive; reporting that Little Carpenter had done his best to keep some Cherokee people in alliance with Britain [for more on John Stuart, see notes after documents 1, 18, 57; for more on Little Carpenter, see note after document 19] [BT number M.2.] [enclosed with Bull's September 9, 1760 letter to Board of Trade, document 85]
87. November 10, 1760 [5]  
Letter from Thomas Pownall at London to Board of Trade, stating that, during his approved leave in England, he had not yet been able to finalize the private matters for which his leave was approved; nevertheless, recognizing the "*Critical State*" of affairs in South Carolina, offered to leave immediately to begin his duty there if so ordered, despite his formerly expressed preference to continue to serve as Governor in Massachusetts rather than move to South Carolina [see notes after documents 38 and 81] [BT number M.3.]
88. May 6, 1760 [7]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that Lyttelton had left Charleston for England on April 5, 1760; reporting that Colonel Montgomerie and his soldiers would reach Fort Prince George by the end of May, thereafter to leave with some portion of those soldiers with him; reporting on steps being taken to maintain friendly relations with the Creek and Chickasaw Indians;

hoping that the Cherokee would be “*chastened for their past Outrages, tho’ I do not conceive it for His Majestys Interest that they should be extirpated, or driven from their present Country into the arms of the French for Various and obvious Reasons*”; reporting that Fort Loudoun had been attacked by Cherokee Indians led by Standing Turkey on March 20, 1760, with the outcome of their siege unclear and attempts to be made to resupply the garrison there; reporting that he had communicated with Governor [Francis] Fauquier of Virginia urging him quickly to withdraw his garrison from Fort Loudoun [for more on Francis Fauquier, see note after document 21]; reporting taking steps to supply the Indian women with ribbons and paint as an attempt to use them to reduce the hostility of their warrior husbands; praising Georgia Governor Ellis for his attempts to keep the Creek Indians peaceful and friendly [BT number M.4.]

89. May 8, 1760 [11]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting intelligence that the Cherokees in the Fort Loudoun area were seeking an alliance with the Spanish in New Orleans; reporting that he had been working hard to provide assistance to Colonel Montgomery as he and his troops prepare to march into the frontier interior country; offering suggestions on ways the war with the Cherokee might be ended: suggesting that if Fort Loudoun were evacuated by the British, the French would probably quickly fill the vacuum and, once they were there, it would be much more difficult to dislodge them again; suggesting that if attempts were made to “*extirpate*” or “*exterminate*” the Indians, which he considered to be “*scarcely practicable*”, the entire territory would remain so hostile to the British that the French would find an easy way to enter and control the territory and would provide ample mountainous territory toward which large numbers of Negroes could escape; suggesting a more positive approach: “*after a proper Chastisement and Submission [the Cherokees] should be received into our favour again*”, which would hopefully make them friendly again and help to make their Indian neighbors friendly as well, and reduce the influence of the French among the Indians [BT number M.5.]
90. May 14, 1760 [13]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on a new crisis at Augusta involving Creek Indians, who were sharply divided between those favoring the British and those favoring the French; fearing that the French may be able to take advantage of this situation; reporting seeking to gain Creek favor by distributing many presents among them [BT number M.6.]
91. May 27, 1760 [15]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on the death in South Carolina of John Cleland, Surveyor and Comptroller of Customs for Georgia and the Bahamas; reporting having notified Virginia Governor Fauquier as well [BT number M.7.]

92. May 29, 1760 [17]  
Duplicate letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on the killing of Indian traders by Creek Indians in the Augusta area; fearing that the war with the Cherokees could spread to the Creek; reporting on putting the militia in readiness for whatever might come; wishing to blame French “*mischie*” by spreading around “*plenty of Indian Trading Goods*”; fearing the small size of the white population (about 32,000) compared with the Negro population (about 52,000); stating that “*I say nothing of our being much exhausted for several years past by very high Taxes*”; counting potential numbers of enemy men, including about 800 Louisiana French, 2,000 Cherokee, 2,000 Creek, 5,000 Choctaw, plus other Indians brought by the French from [what is now] Illinois and Indiana country; reporting that Montgomerie was about to march from Ninety Six [west of today’s Columbia, South Carolina] to Keowee [in the foothills in South Carolina, expecting to arrive in early June; concerning cooperation with Virginia to relieve Fort Loudoun and lack of cooperation from Governor Dobbs of North Carolina; P.S. dated May 31, 1760 with new intelligence from Captain Demere [commander] at Fort Loudoun and from Little Carpenter [pro-English, peace maker Cherokee chief], none of it positive [BT number M.8.]  
[Note: Governor **Arthur Dobbs** (1689-1765) was governor of North Carolina from 1753 until his death in 1765. He governed a colony that was largely rural, with no urban center like Charleston or Savannah. Although North Carolina had officially separated from South Carolina in 1712, and although its territory theoretically extended westward to the Mississippi River, settlement here pushed westward only slowly—both because the overall population was sparse, and because what we call the Great Smoky Mountains were a steep geographic barrier to expansion. South Carolinians found their way through the mountains farther south, via the Little Tennessee River, in what is now North Carolina, into modern-day eastern Tennessee. Virginians skirted around the mountains farther north and down the Shenandoah River valley, all in Virginia then and now, and kept going into what is now eastern Tennessee. In the 1760s, the official map recognized both the mountains and the Tennessee River valley as part of western North Carolina. These anomalies of population and political geography help explain the informal frontier alliance between colonial South Carolina and Virginia in 1760, in which North Carolina was a distinct and reluctant junior partner.]
93. June 17, 1760 [21]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that Montgomerie had won a first battle against the Cherokee, which he had publicized openly in South Carolina; also reporting a more gloomy prediction from second-in-command James Grant that “*it is next to impossible for us to think of proceeding over the Mountains*” and what they had won was only because of the good luck of surprise, an assessment Bull had suppressed;

admitting some uncertainty in a dangerous situation of whether this war could be concluded successfully using the prevailing British policy of “*settling matters with the Cherokees, with as much Honor and Satisfaction, as prudence*”; fearing spread of the war, reporting having reinforced the fort at Augusta; expressing concern about relieving Fort Loudoun, even with Virginia’s assistance, given the uncertainties of Montgomerie’s marching there in time, over the mountains [BT number M.9.] [with enclosure, document 94]

94. June 7 to 16, 1760 [23]  
Printed edition of the *South Carolina Weekly Gazette*, featuring a lengthy letter by Bull describing Montgomerie’s victory over the Cherokee [BT number M.10.] [enclosed with Bull’s June 17, 1760 letter to Board of Trade, document 93]
95. July 2, 1760 [24]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting two vacancies on the South Carolina Council, George Saxby who resigned and John Cleland who had died; recommending that they be replaced by two from a list in the letter of six “*gentlemen*” [BT number M.11.]
96. August 31, 1760 [26]  
Duplicate letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on the capitulation of Fort Loudoun to the Cherokee, which placed considerable arms and ammunition in the hands of the Indians; reporting uncertainty of the location or actions of Montgomerie’s army; remarking on the “*The difficulty of carrying War into such a Country*”; reporting the willingness of the Assembly to pay for troops of [militia] rangers to protect the colony; still hoping that Virginia, with its easier access to Fort Loudoun [not directly over the mountains] would send militia troops to recapture the fort; summarizing the situation and need for more military protection, while awaiting news on the status of Fort Loudoun [BT number M.12.]
97. August 15, 1760 [29]  
Duplicate letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that Montgomerie had “*punished, tho not subdued*” the Cherokee at Echoee in the Middle Towns; stating that General Amherst’s instructions now direct Montgomerie to withdraw nearer to the coast to prepare for being moved to New York; remaining partially optimistic “*Altho’ the disirable End of effectually chastising the Cherokees intended by General Amherst was not quite accomplished*”; stating that Montgomerie had wished either not to undertake this campaign or not to take all his troops with him; describing his own efforts using ranger militia, to man forts in the wilderness to protect frontier South Carolina from the Indian dangers [BT number M.13.]

98. October 21, 1760

[31]

Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, congratulating the British government for the military success of reducing all of Canada to British control; reporting that in September, the Cherokee had violated the Capitulation of Fort Loudoun by murdering Captain Demere and three other officers, along with 23 private men and 3 women; reporting speculation that the French might try to use Fort Loudoun's cannon to capture Fort Prince George [near the Lower Towns of the Cherokees, across the mountains]; meanwhile, seeking to arrange a prisoner-of-war exchange of captured Cherokee warriors for the Fort Loudoun garrison, perhaps at Fort Ninety Six [west of today's Columbia], not at Fort Prince George; stating the intent to resupply Fort Prince George, while also ordering the garrison there that, if no relief can be sent there, they should evacuate "*in the case of Extremity*"; reporting that efforts were underway by Virginia Militia Colonel Byrd, camped on the Kannaway River about 220 miles E of Loudoun, to start peace discussions with the Cherokee, assisted by Little Carpenter and John Stuart (whom Little Carpenter had helped to escape from the Cherokees and had come to Byrd's camp [see document 86]; listing seven articles to be included in a peace treaty, which Bull was doubtful would be accepted by the Cherokee; reporting that although the Creeks remained peaceful, he did not trust that this would continue; pleading for "*powerful assistance*" to meet these dangers, for which he had also pleaded to Amherst; hoping that winter would give the British an advantage against the Indians, they "*not being so well clothed*"; reporting a request to Amherst to help defray some of South Carolina's military costs for wagons and carriages needed for a winter campaign; suggesting a British attempt in winter "*for the reduction of Mobile; New Orleans, and Louisiana, during the present Enmity of the Cherokees and the wavering Disposition of the Creeks*"; P.S. dated October 24, 1760, reporting the successful resupplying of Fort Prince George [BT number M.14.] [duplicate letter is in document 99; copy of this letter is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 139]

[**Note:** The geography mentioned in this letter is not clear. The Kannaway River is probably the **Kanawha River**, then in Virginia, now in West Virginia. The New River, which flows northwestward out of the Appalachian Mountains, changes name at Kanawha Falls to the Kanawha River, which flows onward, through today's Charleston, West Virginia, into the Ohio River at Point Pleasant, West Virginia (where in October 1774, the Battle of Kanawha—Virginia militia under Colonel Andrew Lewis against Indians led by Shawnee chief Cornstalk—occurred during Lord Dunmore's War). Kanawha Falls, which might have been the location of Byrd's camp, is more like 270 miles than 220 miles from Loudoun on the Little Tennessee River, and the direction is more northeast than east. . See also notes on geography after documents 29 and 101.]

99. October 21, 1760 [35]  
Duplicate letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, [copy of document 98], with additional P.S. dated October 29, 1760, reporting on more Indian murders northeast of Ninety Six, and proposing to build a larger fort in that area [BT number M.14.]
100. November 13, 1760 [41]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on friendly overtures from Choctaw Indians, who had not enjoyed friendship with the French; stating that, since he doesn't trust the Cherokee, he believes peace may be achieved with them only "*by Force or Terror*"; describing warlike Indian actions and French intrigues; still seeking to exchange Cherokee prisoners of war for the prisoner garrison of Fort Loudoun; reporting that the governors of both North and South Carolina were willing to cooperate with a South Carolina campaign against the Indians; describing a plan of attack he had shared with General Amherst; hoping that Governor Ellis of Georgia, now on his way back to London, may successfully plead the cause of the colonies' need for military protection [BT number M.16.]
101. December 17, 1760 [44]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that General Amherst had agreed to send 1,600 regular troops under Lieutenant Colonel [James] Grant to South Carolina against the Cherokee; reporting attempts to recruit additional militia troops from South and North Carolina and Virginia; reporting having received the accounting of supplies sent to Fort Prince George; passing on information that the French had built a new fort on the Tennessee River, downstream from Fort Loudoun about the same distance down as Fort Assumption on the Ohio River is upstream; hoping that this news would encourage closer relations between the British and Indians [BT number M.17.]  
[for extract of this letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, see Reel 4 document 66]  
[**Note:** The geography mentioned in this letter is not clear. No French Fort Assumption has been found to be located on the upper Ohio River, and the Tennessee River flows the other way, through Tennessee, then Alabama, and Tennessee again before reaching the Ohio River in the far northwestern corner of Tennessee. In 1739, a Fort Assumption was built by the French on the "Fourth Chickasaw Bluff" on the Mississippi River, on the site of today's Memphis, Tennessee. However, the French abandoned it again in 1740, so it is not a likely candidate for mention in a South Carolina British letter in 1760. Another, more likely possibility is the French Assumption Trading Post established in 1700 and soon fortified with a **Fort Assumption**, located where the Tennessee River flows into the Ohio River. The fort was built on the northern side of the Ohio River (now Illinois). In 1731 a bloody encounter with Indians occurred here, causing the French to rename the place **Fort Massacre** (which the British apparently shortened to **Fort Massac**). The French rebuilt the fort in 1757 and further strengthened it in 1760 (which would have gotten the attention of the British).]

It remained in French hands until 1763, when the French abandoned it as the French and Indian War ended with French defeat, after which Chickasaw Indians burned it. After remaining abandoned during the Revolutionary War, President George Washington ordered it rebuilt in 1794. Lewis and Clark met there in 1803, Aaron Burr and James Wilkinson allegedly made conspiratorial plans there, in 1805, to conquer Mexico and the American southwest, and the New Madrid Earthquake severely damaged it in 1812. Rebuilt in time to play a minor role in the War of 1812, it was abandoned for good thereafter. See also notes on geography after documents 29 and 98.]

102. November 12, 1760 [46]  
Legal opinion by Matthew Lamb at Lincoln's Inn to Board of Trade on 14 provincial laws passed by South Carolina in December 1758, including acts for more effectual relief of insolvent debtors and for improvement of church wardens, an ordinance correcting errors, acts concerning suppling evidence when wills cannot be produced, preventing the spread of "*malignant and Contagious Distempers*", concerning collection of taxes in two parishes, taxing transient persons, and a ferry across the Santee River, regulating sales by auction, concerning election of Commons House representatives, discounts, construction of a parish parsonage at Charleston, and use of raised tax money; finding no points of law or other objections to any of them [BT number M.18.]  
[**Note:** **Sir Matthew Lamb** (1705-1768) was a distinguished barrister associated with the Lincoln's Inn, perhaps the most prestigious of the four private legal societies called the Inns of Court in London. He apparently was providing legal advice to the Board of Trade as a private attorney, not a government official. He provided similar services, until his death in 1768, to the Board of Trade concerning laws passed by the colony of Georgia (see the DLAR's Finding Aid for British Colonial Office Papers for Georgia).]
103. January 28, 1761 [48]  
Letter from Bull to Board of Trade, reporting that [George] Fenwick had resigned from the Council, and he had appointed John Drayton in his place; stating that he had two additional vacancies but that several people had turned down the position; recommending Drayton's approval for the position [BT number M.19.]  
[**Note:** Not surprisingly, the gentlemen who controlled South Carolina's colonial government came from among the wealthiest and most powerful families in the colony. The Fenwicks, Draytons, and Bulls, among others, fit the mold closely and, in addition, were intimately intermarried.]

104. January 29, 1761 [50]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting the arrival of Colonel Grant with 1,200 regular troops and making plans to send them [along with additional militia troops] to the frontier against the Cherokee; reporting that Grant intends to “take the Field” on March 10, 1761; not expecting assistance from North Carolina but hoping for help from Virginia; giving an account of planning and preparations in South Carolina; reporting on the caring for frontier families disrupted by the last campaign against the Cherokee by settling them near forts and providing assistance for survival; also helping meet subsistence needs of Chickasaw Indians; reporting on an increased crop of rice this year than the previous year; concerning the Assembly’s acting quickly but more by resolution than by acts to provide the required funding for the campaign [BT number M.20.]
105. [no date] [54]  
Table of “*Vessels Entered at the Port of Charles Town*” between January 5, 1760 and January 5, 1761, reported for ships, snows, brigantines, sloops, and schooners (total 229 vessels), coming from 14 British empire ports, plus table of imports during the same time period, including sugar, molasses, rum, wine, beer, biscuit, flour, salt, and Negroes (3,740); followed by Table of “*Vessels Cleared at the Port of Charles Town*” between January 5, 1760 and January 5, 1761, reported for the same vessel types (total 241 vessels), bound for several ports, including Britain, Portugal, Africa, various British colonies, and Monte Cristo; plus table of exports during the same time period, including pitch, tar, turpentine, [?], indigo, staves, timber/boards, beef, corn and peas, and tanned leather [BT number M. 21.]  
[Note: The island of **Monte Cristo**, made fictitiously famous in Alexander Dumas’ novel, is one of several islands close off the coast of Tuscany, Italy in the Tyrrhenian Sea. Now a part of Italy, in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century it may have had more independent status as an entrepôt for international trade whose vessels called at American colonial ports such as Charleston.]
106. February 17, 1761 [56]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on receiving the news of the death of King George II and accession to the throne of King George III and of public recognition of the event in South Carolina, with details; concerning negotiations on behalf of both Georgia and South Carolina with the Creek chief Wolf King by Governor James Wright of Georgia [BT number M.22.]  
[Note: **James Wright** (1716-1785) had come from England to South Carolina in 1730, where he became a prominent attorney and plantation owner. His law practice led him into public office by 1747, when he became Attorney General for South Carolina. By 1757, he was working for South Carolina in London as South Carolina’s Agent to the Crown. In May 1760, Wright was appointed to be Lieutenant Governor of neighboring Georgia. This was actually a planned transitional position, as Georgia’s Governor Ellis had already received approval to relinquish his governorship due to poor health.

Wright arrived in Savannah in October 1760. In December, Ellis departed for England, and Wright became Governor of Georgia, a position he held until July 1782.]

107. February 17, 1761 [58]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, stating that he would seek to collect and send to London a copy of all South Carolina laws, as requested [BT number M.23.]
108. March 20, 1761 [60]  
Order of the King approving Board of Trade's recommendation that Thomas Boone, current governor of New Jersey, be appointed governor of South Carolina in the place of Thomas Pownall [for more on Thomas Pownall, see note after document 38 and document 87] [BT number M.24.]  
**[Note: Thomas Boone** (c. 1736-1812) was an English gentleman with no preparation for politics or governing but strong family connections that led to his being appointed a colonial royal governor. Shortly after moving to South Carolina to possess his plantation inheritance, he was appointed to be Governor of New Jersey. He served there, from 1759 to 1761, too briefly to make much of an impression. From 1761 to 1764 he was Governor of his adopted colony, South Carolina. In this capacity, he appears to have exercised a skill for antagonizing important interests—first the Creek Indians (during the French and Indian War), next the Assembly of South Carolina, and finally, Governor Wright of Georgia.  
Wright's and Georgia's aggravation stemmed from Boone's strangely conceived plan to sell land grants to speculators and wealthy friends in the strip of Atlantic coast south of the Altamaha River and north of the St. Marys River. For more on this dispute, see note after document 160.  
By 1764, the antagonisms Boone's governorship had stirred up caught up with him. He (officially) took a leave of absence to return to England to defend himself before the Board of Trade against complaints contained in a lengthy petition from the South Carolina Commons House, in particular concerning Boone's intervention into Commons House election results. The Board of Trade sided with Commons House, and Boone was relieved of his governorship, effective just a few days after his ship left Charleston. Boone remained in England for the remainder of his life. In 1782, his South Carolina property was confiscated by the victorious revolutionaries.]
109. March 17, 1761 [62]  
Order of the King approving Board of Trade's recommendation that William Bull and David Graeme be continued in their respective positions in South Carolina of Lieutenant Governor and Attorney General [BT number M.25.]  
**[Note: David Graeme** had served as Chief Justice from 1749 to 1752. He had become Attorney General in 1757, succeeding James Wright, Attorney General since 1742 until he became South Carolina's Agent in London. Graeme served until 1764.

During 1764, two other men also were Attorney General, James Moultrie, followed by John Rutledge. The office settled down again from 1765 to 1774 under Attorney General Sir Egerton Leigh. In 1774 and 1775, James Simpson was the last colonial Attorney General.]

110. March 20, 1761 [64]  
Order of the King approving recommendation of Board of Trade that Charles Skinner be appointed Chief Justice of South Carolina in place of Peter Leigh, who had died [BT number M.26.]  
[Note: South Carolina had difficulty keeping **Chief Justices** in the 1750s. James Grame (apparently no relation to David Graeme; the last names are consistently spelled differently) had served in the position from 1749 to 1752. Charles Pinckney succeeded him in 1752 to 1753, resigning to become the colony's Agent in London, followed by Peter Leigh from 1753 until he died in 1759. Very briefly James Michie succeeded Leigh, but he also died in office in July 1760. William Simpson succeeded Michie, also briefly, until 1762, when Charles Skinner was appointed. Skinner remained in the office until 1771.
111. April 30, 1761 [66]  
Order of the King granting Thomas Boone leave to return to England to deal with private matters before moving to South Carolina to assume his duties as governor [BT number M.27.]
112. December 2, 1760 [68]  
Legal opinion from Matthew Lamb at Lincoln's Inn to Board of Trade, concerning laws passed by South Carolina during 1758 concerning approvals of new roads in two areas, concerning relief for the poor, concerning raising and granting provincial funds for public expenses; plus ordinance appointing Henry Bedon "*Country Waiter for the Port of Charles Town*"; all of which he finds legal [BT number M.28.]  
[Note: In colonial South Carolina, **customs officials** were classified as either comptrollers or waiters, and they generally were assigned to Charleston or to "the country." How these distinctions are significant in the appointment of Henry Bedon is not clear.]
113. June 6, 1761 [71]  
Legal opinion from Matthew Lamb at Lincoln's Inn to Board of Trade, concerning laws passed by South Carolina between May and August 1760, concerning small pox in Charleston; concerning exportation of "*Grain and other Provisions Arms Ammunition Strouds Duffils and Plains*"; concerning maintaining a drain or sewer on Elliot Street in Charleston; empowering certain persons to receive certain sums of money; concerning raising and granting provincial funds for public expenses; concerning raising and granting provincial funds to pay for costs of the war with the Cherokees; concerning establishing and regulating an artillery company in Charleston; and concerning provision of funding for provincial soldiers, all of which he finds to be legal [BT number M.29.]

[**Note:** **Stroud** was a heavy blanket-like fabric, often colored. Among other uses, it apparently was favored for Indian blankets. **Duffil** (or duffel or duffle) was a heavy woolen fabric made especially in the Dutch town of Duffel, near Antwerp. It was commonly used to make rough clothing, as well as the large (duffel) bags in which men carried them. **Plain** was ordinary cotton fabric.]

114. April 30, 1761 [73]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on military progress in the Anglo-Cherokee War and expecting that soon “*they will be sincerely disposed to make a Peace on Terms which we may think reasonably satisfactory*”; reporting that the disposition of the Creeks “*seems to subside apace, from the Conferences which Governor Wright and I have held with their Chiefs*”; tying success with the Creeks to convincing them “that their Supply of Goods depends on their maintaining peace with the English”; believing that French influence among the Creeks was diminishing; reporting having appointed attorney William Burrows Master in Chancery for South Carolina, to succeed [John] Barnett, who had died; reporting having “*at length and with great difficulty*” collected and sent to London a compilation of South Carolina’s current laws [BT number M.30.]  
[**Note:** A **master in chancery** was a court official, usually an attorney, an “expert” in collecting evidence, taking testimony, and verifying their accuracy and truth. A chancery court handled civil dispute cases in which ascertaining the accuracy of evidence and the truth of testimony was crucial for resolving the dispute. **William Burrows** filled this position in South Carolina from 1761 until his death in 1775. His predecessor had served since 1755.]
115. May 16, 1761 [75]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on plans for Virginia and South Carolina military to attack the Cherokees from the north and the south, even if Governor Dodd of North Carolina was unable to send troops; reporting that heavy rains had slowed the advance of Colonel Grant’s troops to Ninety Six and that Colonel Byrd’s troops were farther away than South Carolina’s; followed by enclosure:  
April 29 to May 6, 1761  
Printed edition of *South Carolina Weekly Gazette*, which contains provincial and international news and [perhaps] news of the Cherokee Indian war [dark microfilming makes this *Gazette* difficult to read]  
[both are parts of BT number M.31.]
116. May 28, 1761 [79]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting having appointed Thomas Bromley clerk of Commons House, replacing Childermas Croft who had died [each was a favorite of Commons House, which, at this time, positively influenced each one’s appointment; **Reference:** Jack P. Greene, *Quest for Power: The Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689 to 1776*. University of North Carolina Press, 1963;

reporting that Colonel Grant would soon arrive at Keowee [and Fort Prince George] from Ninety Six; stating that his army includes 2,250 “*effective Soldiers, Regulars and provincials, Horse and Foot, besides about 200 Regulars, too sick and infirm*” to serve [BT number M.32.]

117. June 14, 1761 [81]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that, while at Fort Prince George, Colonel Grant had been approached by Little Carpenter, seeking a peace, to which Grant “*gave a Civil Answer*” that no peace could be considered until all soldiers of the Fort Loudoun garrison still prisoners of the Cherokee were released; reporting that about 70 Cherokee had put themselves under Grant’s protection; stating that Grant’s army was to have marched from Fort Prince George on June 7, 1761; reporting that a man driving a pack train of Indian presents out of Augusta had been murdered by Cherokee Indians and of having warned the Creek Indians about the violence, seeking their declaration of war against the Cherokee [BT number M.33.]
118. July 17, 1761 [83]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that Grant’s troops had found the Cherokee warriors in fair numbers at Echoee, near where Montgomerie’s army had gotten stalled a year ago, but that this time, the Indians failed; the army had moved on, burning 15 middle Cherokee towns and 1,400 acres of corn and beans; reporting that “*All the Indians in the middle, lower, and Back settlements are drove into the Mountains*”; reporting that Grant was satisfied with the performance of his troops and that some Chickasaw and Catawba, plus a few Mohawk Indians had also performed well; reporting that Grant’s troops had returned to Fort Prince George, and that Grant intended to talk peace with Little Carpenter; hoping that Grant’s army would have “*inflicted such suffering, and strike such Terror, and raise such Apprehensions of famine, as will humble their late Insolent contempt of our Power and incline them to sue sincerely for peace*” [BT number M.34.]
119. September 23, 1761 [85]  
Duplicate letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting having negotiated with Little Carpenter a preliminary peace treaty with the Cherokee, which he himself had written in strong language to ensure the Indians understood their great defeat, which Grant had declined to deliver to the Indians, but which Bull was able to impose himself; reporting that the treaty was being considered by the Cherokee Nation; fearing that as long as the French were in Louisiana, they would intrigue with the Creek Indians and make Creek friendship with Britain uneasy; therefore recommending an expedition against Louisiana; worrying about the dangers of white soldiers being away, involved in war against the Indians, in areas of South Carolina where whites already were outnumbered by Negroes; reporting on several acts passed by the South Carolina Assembly [with enclosure, document 120] [BT number M.35.] [extract of letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 70]

120. September 23, 1761 [88]  
Copy of the text of the preliminary peace treaty, called "*The Terms of PEACE to be granted to the Cherokee Indians*" [BT number M.36.] [enclosed with Bull's September 23, 1761 letter to Board of Trade, document 119] [incomplete copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 71]  
[Note: Unlike some other treaties, this treaty, actually signed on September 22, 1761, was given no name (by both geographical convention and the realities of power, it would have been called the Treaty of Charleston). After it was approved by the Cherokee, it remained in effect until 1776, ushering in 15 years of relative peace between the British and Cherokee. On November 9, 1761, the Cherokee signed a separate but similar treaty with the colony of Virginia.]
121. December 5, 1761 [89]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade; expecting Governor Boone to arrive soon; reporting that, based on Grant's advice, he had disbanded the regiment that had fought the Anglo-Cherokee War because it was no longer an effective force due to desertions and the expiration of enlistments; however, he was keeping 4 ranger troops, 300 men, since the Cherokee peace treaty still had not been agreed to by the Indians; reporting evidence that the Cherokee were in disagreement about the treaty, so that maybe it would not be accepted by the Cherokee Nation [BT number M.37.]
122. December 24, 1761 [91]  
Letter from Thomas Boone, Governor of South Carolina, at Charleston, to Board of Trade, announcing his arrival at Charleston and the beginning of his rule as South Carolina's governor [BT number M.38.]
123. February 28, 1762 [93]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade [referencing a letter from him dated December 31, 1761, not microfilmed here], stating that while the negotiation with the Indians continues, supplies of goods were being limited; suggesting that South Carolina could not alone treat successfully with the Indians unless adjoining colonies consistently apply the same policies of Indian relations; worrying a bit that "*we are more given to Obedience to the Crown, than harmony with one another*"; making the argument that South Carolina was once again inadequately defended with an adequate military force [BT number M.39.]
124. [no date] [97]  
Memorial to the Treasury from James Glen, seeking reimbursement for expenses he incurred [in 1755] while he was Governor of South Carolina and just after he had suffered a fever, traveled to meet with Indians, expenses that were not covered by his salary because he was no longer officially the governor [BT number M.41.] [enclosed with J. West at Treasury's March 3, 1762 letter to Board of Trade document 124] [for more on Glen's effort to be reimbursed for personal expenses related to his diplomacy with the Cherokee Indians in 1755, see Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 documents 142 to 147]

**[Note:** The timing and terms of **Glen's termination as Governor** of South Carolina are complicated. He did not leave Charleston until April 1761, although he was officially replaced as governor by William Henry Lyttelton in June 1756, when Lyttelton arrived in Charleston. Yet by 1754, political enemies in London, including some in the Board of Trade, were seeking to have Glen recalled. In that year, William Pitt (Elder) was offered the governorship but was soon after offered a more lucrative deal, and declined. Then, in early 1755, Lyttelton was offered the position, and he accepted. Meanwhile, after British General Braddock's disastrous defeat trying to capture Fort Duquesne in July 1755, Glen was conveniently blamed to support his recall, although that was in process well before. For whatever reason, it took Lyttelton a long time to get to Charleston to assume his duties. During this lengthy transition period, Glen's salary was apparently cut off and assigned to Lyttelton, before September 1755, although Lyttelton had not yet fully assumed his position. Under these circumstances, it may seem remarkable that Glen in the fall of 1755 put so much energy and personal wealth into talking with and negotiating a treaty with the Cherokee Indians, even as he was ill with and recovering from a serious fever, if he did not have a healthy sense of his duty to the Crown.]

125. June 18, 1761 [99]  
 Authentication by Bull of Thomas Bromley's certification of copies from the South Carolina's Assembly's proceedings [documents that follow]; followed by  
 April 27, 1761  
 Copy of memorial from James Glen to South Carolina Commons House describing his unreimbursed expenses as governor and seeking reimbursement; followed by  
 April 23, 1761  
 Copy of "*Account of monies paid for the Publick by James Glen Esq<sup>r</sup>. late Governor referred to in his Memorial to the Commons House of Assembly*", with descriptive details and generalized amounts of expenses totaling £1,084; followed by  
 April 29, 1761  
 Copy of sworn statement by Dr. Alexander Garden of South Carolina, concerning James Glen's having undertaken a trip in May 1755 to meet with Indians even as he was recovering from a fever, including details of the urgency of the trip Glen took and of the trip itself and of the kinds of expenses Glen incurred; followed by  
 April 6, 1761  
 Copy of sworn statement by two South Carolina justices of the peace, one a former militia colonel, who were involved with Glen's 1755 trip to meet with Cherokee headmen at Saluda, 200 miles from Charleston, describing the meeting and the kinds of expenses it incurred, with details  
**[Note:** **Saluda**, South Carolina is now a rural town 20 miles southeast of Ninety Six and 50 miles west of Columbia. Today, it is about 150 road miles from Charleston. In the 18<sup>th</sup> Century it was a Cherokee Indian town. Recent archeological exploration has identified remains of an ancient village here between 5,000 and 2,000 years ago.]; followed by

April 21, 1761

Copy of sworn statement by James Beamer, who had been a trader in Cherokee country, who understood the relations between Indians, British, and French in 1754, and was involved in Glen's meeting with Cherokee headmen in May 1755; describing the meeting and the kinds of expenses it incurred, with details, and that Glen had pledged his credit to pay the expenses; followed by  
[no date]

Report of the committee [of the South Carolina Assembly] to whom the James Glen memorial was referred, concurring that Glen had been deprived of his salary because of appointment of another governor and had thus been unable to pay with public money for the expenses he instead personally incurred, thus deserved reimbursement for the amount requested in his memorial; followed by  
May 8, 1761

Extract from proceedings of South Carolina Commons House of Assembly, reporting that the members voted in the negative, against the committee report, pointing out that Glen had already, in 1756, sought reimbursement from the Crown, and that the mother country, not the colony, should take financial responsibility; however, budgeting up to £200 in the next tax act to pay for (and thus to limit) any obligation that might later revert to South Carolina; followed by  
[no date]

Authentication by Bull of Clerk of the Council's certification of extract from proceedings of the Upper House of the South Carolina Assembly [also the Council]; followed by

June 17, 1761

Extract from proceedings of South Carolina Upper House of Assembly, concurring with the Commons House that Glen "*is well entitled to the Sum Mention<sup>d</sup> in his Account & entertain no doubt but his Majesty's Goodness will amply reward the merit of his Services*"; followed by  
[no date]

Copy of address of Commons House of South Carolina Assembly to the King, being introductory statement for additional text [not microfilmed here] expressing "*our [positive] Sentiments of his [Governor Glen's] Services*"; followed by  
[no date]

Authentication by Bull of Deputy Secretary of South Carolina George Murray's certification that the following document was a true copy; followed by  
[no date]

Summary of Governor Glen's several-day conference with Cherokee headmen, including texts of Talks by the chief headman [Little Carpenter] and Governor Glen; descriptions of ceremonies; and agreements to sign a treaty between them in which the Cherokee declared their friendship with the British "*forever*" and their willingness to go to war against Britain's enemies, "*signed in the Woods between Charles Town & Chota, at a Place Called Saluda*"

[**Note:** What Governor James Glen in his memorial tended to call a “meeting” with the Cherokee resulted in an important treaty, now known as the **Treaty of Saluda Old Town**. Saluda was selected as the location because it was about half way between Charleston and Keowee. The treaty was negotiated between Glen and Little Carpenter, whose Cherokee name, spelled creatively, was used in the treaty text, and was signed on July 2, 1755. Its contents were carefully crafted to give the impression of gains for each side. In reality, it was a major victory for the British. In stark numbers, it transferred control of some 360,000 square miles of formerly Cherokee territory, located in what is now central and northwestern South Carolina, to British sovereignty. This transfer was made to look like the extension of British protection against the dangers of attack from the French and Indian nations allied with them. From the British perspective, it was a means of controlling the Cherokee to keep them allied with the British against the French.]; followed by

[no date]

Authentication by Bull of Deputy Secretary of South Carolina George Murray’s certification that the following document was a true copy; followed by

[perhaps January 12, 1756]

*“Historical Relation of Facts delivered by Ludovick Grant Indian Trader To his Excellency the Governor of South Carolina”*; having been commanded [presumably by still Governor Glen] to provide information on *“any Surrender of the Country of the Cherokee to the crown of Great Britain in 1729 or at any other time, And also any thing relative to any Surrender or Sale of all or any part of their Lands at any time before or since”*; stating that he had lived for about 30 years with the Cherokee; stating no knowledge of such surrenders but suspecting that such an agreement might have occurred *“when Sir Alexander Comings was in the Cherokees, & when he carried over 6 or 7 of them to London”* in 1730; describing Comings as a strange man, who agreed to take these Indians to London but warned them not to say anything about surrendering any lands to Britain; describing how, when the South Carolina Governor withdrew from trading with the Indians, they successfully went to Virginia, which supplied them as they needed; describing how certain Europeans [apparently in the early 1730s], one of whom, named Pryber, may have been a French agent, lived with the Cherokee, instructing them never to concede anything to the British and to treasure their lands; describing his unsuccessful attempts to apprehend this agent and bring him to British justice; but reporting that he had been captured in Georgia, imprisoned, and died, but that this had not reduced the efforts of French agents in the area; describing British purchase in 1746 or 1747 of a tract of land from the Cherokee, near the Lower Towns [the land near Keowee where Fort Prince George was built, the British having convinced the Cherokee that a British fort would provide protection for the Indians], and ongoing Cherokee resistance to the idea of selling or otherwise surrendering all their lands, with details about the purchase of land for the fort and the Talks made during the purchase;

based on all this, worrying about the consequences, at the Saluda Old Town Treaty negotiations, of the British laying claim to more Cherokee lands, because settlers had already taken much territory without legal authority, to the point that it appeared that only with King George's permission would they be able to live on their own lands

**[Note: Ludovic Grant (1696-1758)** came from one the families in the Scottish Grant clan and, like many, became a soldier early. In 1715, he was on the wrong side of the Jacobite Rebellion and was exiled, so to speak, to Savannah, before Georgia became a colony. He soon became an Indian trader and, sometime after, married a full-blooded Cherokee woman and lived with the tribe for many years. This sworn statement must have been made between July 1755 when the Treaty was signed at Saluda and sometime in 1758, when Grant died. .]

**[Note: Sir Alexander Comings** (or Cumings or Cummings) must have been eccentric. In 1729, in England, he apparently had some sort of vision of saving or civilizing the Cherokee. He sailed to Charleston and from there traveled into Cherokee territory, living with the Cherokee for some time. He actually accomplished his scheme of persuading six or seven Cherokee people to travel with him to London to meet the great king, George III. What was supposed to happen next, after the trip, is not clear. He had other grandiose schemes that did not materialize—for instance, reducing the British national debt substantially by settling three million Jewish people in Cherokee territory and to eliminate taxation in the American colonies by introducing a vast system of banks and local currencies.]

**[Note: Glen's case defending his approach to relations with Indians** and justifying his request for reimbursement from public funds for his meeting and treaty making with the Cherokee in 1755 was both practical and idealistic. Both British colonial economic-development policy and British foreign policy favored maintaining positive, peaceful, friendly relations with Indian nations—both to allow for economic prosperity to thrive and for the French enemy to be weakened.

Glen appears to have applied these practical policies with what he felt was an idealistic sense of humanity toward the Indians. To demonstrate the superior (or at least worth paying for) nature of his approach to Indian relations, he cites three examples of note—his own effort of meeting and treaty making with the Cherokee at Saluda, Ludovic Grant's life with the Cherokee, and (through Grant's testimony) Sir Alexander Comings' creative approach to civilizing the Cherokee. Other colonial governors shared some small degree of this sense of humanity in their dealings with Indians, including James Wright in Georgia and, perhaps surprisingly, James Grant in East Florida. However, neither of them was consistent in this regard and Glen seems to have worn these values more on his sleeve than his fellow governors, who may have seen friendship and peace more as practical policy alternatives to be substituted for with violence when "necessary."

The context of this defense is different too. As Glen was gradually being politically assassinated by enemies in Britain, he chose to defend his record on a high ethical plane. By contrast, both Wright and Grant were relatively effective policy strategists and administrators, and each of their records held up well to scrutiny. Grant governed from 1764 to 1771, leaving while East Florida was still on the ascendant. Wright governed Georgia from 1760 to 1782. In the end, it was his idealism as an intransigent, patriotic loyalist that was his undoing. He was not brought down by a cadre of political enemies but by the full weight of Georgia's entire revolutionary movement, and even that did not fully succeed until near the end of the Revolutionary War.]; followed by [perhaps January 12, 1756]

Transcription of a "*Conversation*" between Governor Glen and Chiconunta, a Cherokee headman, formerly named Ouconicaw, the last Indian alive who went to England; Glen asking why Chiconunta had gone on the visit to England; Chiconunta describing how he had been strongly urged to go and that fears of the long distance had been minimized, so he and six others had agreed to go to meet the great king; Glen asking whether surrendering land was part of why the trip was to be taken; Chiconunta responding that no such purpose was mentioned and that the Cherokee at Saluda were willing to give up land only because their trusted friend Glen was asking

[all part of BT number M.42.] [all enclosed with J. West at Treasury's March 3, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 124]

[Scrivener's note at end of all the items in document 126, identifying them all as "*Papers produced by M<sup>r</sup>. Glen in Support of the Allegations of his Memorial*"]

126. November [?], 1762 [144]  
 Memorial of Charles Garth [Agent] of South Carolina, at Inner Temple, to Board of Trade, presenting an act passed by the South Carolina Assembly "*to regulate the Trade with the Cherokee Indians by taking the same into the Hands of the Service*", as a means of reducing French influence in the trade and with the Indians and of solidifying British friendship with the Cherokee; wishing for the British government to have neighboring colonies to use the same system, so that all remain on an equal footing in relation to the Indians [BT number M.43.]  
**[Note: Charles Garth** was a well connected Member of Parliament who also served as **colonial Agent to the Crown** for at least three colonies. His "career" as Colonial Agent began because he was related to Governor Thomas Boone of South Carolina, who selected him as that colony's Agent in 1762. He served this colony in this capacity until 1775. During the mid-1760s, he simultaneously served as Agent for Maryland and Georgia. Maryland did not rely on a full-time Agent in London, and Garth worked for that colony only during the period of Stamp Act agitation. In Georgia, the Assembly sought to hire Garth as an Agent independent of Governor Wright, who refused to approve his appointment. Since Garth could not count on being paid regularly by Georgia, he was this colony's Agent from 1764 only until late 1767 or early 1768.

Many colonial Agents played a role mainly of facilitating the processing of requests for financial payments from the Treasury. As South Carolina's Agent, Garth went well beyond this role, seeking to act as the colony's advocate and lobbyist on policy matters of special interest to the colony, including settlement of frontier boundaries between South and North Carolina (especially scattered references in Reel 1 between documents 8 and 163 and in Reel 2 between documents 1 and 160. In this role, he did not always advocate for the colony's official position as expressed by the governor. See, for instance, Reel 1 documents 182, 195 and Reel 2 documents 82, 93, 145, 158 to 160, 194, 199. In 1764, Garth successfully lobbied in London in favor of the Commons House's petition to remove and replace Governor Boone. In 1770, he worked successfully again in favor of Commons House's position, against that of Lieutenant Governor Bull, on control over colonial finances. It is this tendency that may have attracted the Georgia Assembly to attempt to hire Garth as its Agent, which failed only because of Georgia Governor Wight's adamant opposition.]

127. [No date] [146]  
Memorial of South Carolina Agent Garth to Board of Trade, requesting on South Carolina's behalf, that the British government establish an official boundary between North and South Carolina, in order to reduce uncertainties and increase control over settlements in the border frontier areas, and also to allow greater control over the Indians; pointing out that establishment of a Georgia colony had infringed on what had been South Carolina territory, and hoping not to be similarly squeezed on its northern border [BT number M.44.] [See note after document 8]
128. May 29, 1762 [148]  
Copy of act passed by South Carolina Assembly establishing colony-operated trade with the Cherokee, limited to take place only at Fort Prince George at Keowee; naming licensed traders under the new system; providing for a paid "factor" to be in charge of the trade and two clerks to manage the paperwork and financial transactions; with other regulatory provisions [BT number M.45.]
129. [no date] [153]  
Copy of report of South Carolina Assembly on the history of the North Carolina/South Carolina boundary, stating that original boundary was the Cape Fear River and that an early settlement up the river was called Brunswick, located beyond South Carolina's governing boundaries of that time; stating that this settlement should now be designated as part of South Carolina; making other requests to identify the boundary line equitably for South Carolina; pointing out that the interior watersheds of both the Pee Dee and Santee Rivers naturally lie within what should be South Carolina as well; wishing to encourage settlement of white people in the interior to help protect the lower areas that were more populated by Negroes;

stating the importance of boundaries to denote the colonial jurisdictions that were the legal entities that related to the Indian tribes [BT number M.46.]

[**Note: Brunswick** (on the west side of the river was the first port town on the Cape Fear River. Later, Wilmington (on the east side, farther upstream) outstripped Brunswick in growth. Today, Brunswick is a rural county, while Wilmington is a small city. Both are in today's North Carolina. When the straight-line boundary was finally determined, it was drawn starting from more or less half way between the combined mouth of the **Santee and Pee Dee Rivers** and the **Cape Fear River**. The Santee originates in uplands northwest of today's Georgetown, South Carolina, while the Pee Dee River comes from north of Georgetown. Both begin in today's North Carolina, and the two join near Georgetown to flow into the Atlantic Ocean together. The Cape Fear River originates in and flows entirely through today's North Carolina.)]

130. September 14, 1762 [157]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting having dissolved the Assembly because it "*seemed desiring of determining themselves the sole Judges of an Act of Assembly*" and wished to "*assume to themselves privileges no ways belonging to them*"; also expressing frustration at the difficulty of finding proper persons to appoint to the Council; listing the current Council members:: Lieutenant Governor William Bull, Othniel Beale, Henry Middleton, Egerton Leigh, John Guerard, Chief Justice Charles Skinner, John Drayton, and Daniel Blake [BT number M.47.] [with enclosure, document 131]
131. [date illegible] [159]  
Printed edition of an unidentified gazette with illegible and incomplete date, with text of a South Carolina act "*suppressing and preventing of private lotteries*" plus letter from Governor Boone concerning this bill and the Assembly's activities, that was followed by Boone's dissolving of the Assembly [microfilming too dark to be easily legible] [BT number M.48.]
132. [?] 29, 1762 [161]  
Memorial from Garth to Board of Trade, concerning growing indigo with public inducements in South Carolina, based on a British law enacted in 1748, extended once to 1755, and currently extended until 1763; hoping that it would not be allowed to expire [BT number M.49.]
133. October 9, 1762 [163]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning a land dispute involving Catawba Indians in the boundary area not yet resolved between South and North Carolina, the Indians being particularly upset about North Carolina's surveying a line through an Indian burial area; complaining about Governor [Arthur] Dobbs of North Carolina, who "*seems to forget his publick Character, whilst he is asserting his private pretentions*" [BT number M.50.]

134. October 15, 1762 [165]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, stating that he was sending another copy of his October 5, 1762 letter to Dobbs [document 136], to make sure the Board of Trade receives it from Boone and not through Dobbs [BT number M.51.]
135. October 5, 1762 [167]  
Copy of letter from Boone at Charleston to Dobbs, protesting strongly against Dobbs' involvement in making land grants in territory claimed by South Carolina in the boundary dispute between North and South Carolina [BT number M.52.] [probably enclosed with Boone's October 15, 1762 to Board of Trade, document 135]  
[**Note:** Governor **Arthur Dobbs** (1689-1765) was governor of North Carolina from 1753 until his death in 1765. The original proprietary colony of Carolina, founded in 1663, consisted of a wide north-south swath of territory running from Cape Hatteras on the east to the Smoky Mountains in the west and theoretically beyond. In 1712 North and South Carolina were separated into two proprietary colonies, both of which had been re-established as royal colonies by 1729. By 1762, western frontier boundaries still had not been authoritatively established between North and South Carolina and between them and Virginia. As settlers migrated westward in all three colonies, by 1760, South Carolina and Virginia were unhappy with Dobbs for failing to "pull his colony's own weight" during the colonial war against the Cherokee Indians (see note after document 92). Dobbs did not seem much interested then in encouraging North Carolina settlement to his colony's far, mountainous west. Yet, by 1762, his aggressive acts to encourage settlement in the unsurveyed frontier territory between North and South Carolina were an affront to South Carolina. South Carolina's protest to the Board of Trade precipitated action in London to determine at least a temporary boundary line, to be recognized by both colonies. For more on the boundary issue, see document 152. For more on Dobbs' role in the Indian treaty signed at Augusta on November 10, 1763, see note after document 177.]
136. [no date] [169]  
Memorial of South Carolina Agent Garth to Board of Trade, seeking British government support for the growing of rice in South Carolina by allowing direct transport of the colony's rice to foreign ports in Europe and America [BT number M.53.]
137. December 17, 1762 [171]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on his difficult relations with the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly, after having to dissolve it in September and now seeking to follow the King's Instructions in allowing a new election and new Assembly session;

describing other, financial difficulties with the Commons House concerning possibly withdrawing the garrison at Fort Prince George to save the money for its maintenance [BT number M.54.] [with probable enclosures, documents 139 to 151—documents 138 to 151 all “*Rec’d Read March 9, 1763*”]

138. November 22, 1762 [175]

Copy of speech of Boone to both houses of South Carolina Assembly, celebrating with the Assembly the positive trends of military events and relations with the Indians, and hoping that the Assembly would engage in a businesslike session to deal with various laws and expenditure issues that need attention [BT number M.55.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138]

139. [November 23, 1762] [177]

Copy of address of Commons House to Boone, thanking him for his speech to Assembly the previous day; promising to attend to the matters suggested by Boone, especially the Militia Act and law for regulating buildings in Charleston [BT number M.56.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138]

140. November 23, 1762 [179]

Copy of address of Upper House of South Carolina Assembly to Boone, stating concurrence with Boone’s optimistic outlook in his speech to the Assembly [BT number M.57.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138]

141. December 4, 1762 [181]

Copy of letter of Commons House to Boone, inquiring about the reason for his dissolving the Assembly; stating that “*the reasons given in your Excellency’s Speech for the late dissolution, tend to deprive this House of a most Essential Privilege*” and stating “*the danger of such a precedent*”, this being the privilege “*of solely examining and determining the validity of the Election of their own Members*” [BT number M.58.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 1]

**[Note:** Beginning in 1720, archivists at the Board of Trade numbered the Board’s accumulated official correspondence, including related documents. In 1766, secretaries of state and colonial governors began numbering their official letters to each other. These two differing approaches to numerical organization of paper documents were both institutionalized and became routine.

Occasionally, other temporary numbering systems were used. Governors sometimes numbered attachments they sent with an official letter. Central-office archivists also used temporary numbering systems for certain, sometimes obscure, purposes. In a few cases, authors of letters or other documents may have numbered particular letters or related documents.

Several examples of such limited document numbering found in the South Carolina Board of Trade and Secretary of State incoming correspondence are summarized below:

Reel 1 documents 141 to 150: These documents have been numbered by a Board of Trade scrivener or archivist with numbers 1 through 10. A significant example of such limited document numbering begins with this document 141 in Reel 1, running through document 150. They all relate to a 1762 conflict over control of the election process in South Carolina between the Royal Governor and the Commons House of the colony's Assembly. This conflict was about testing the boundaries of legislative v. executive power within the colony and of local American v. central British power—harbingers of conflicts that intensified during and following the 1766 Stamp Act conflict toward armed conflict and revolution a decade later.

Reel 4 documents 99, 100: These two letters were written in late 1756 by Captain Raymond Demere, a British army officer occupied in building forts on South Carolina's frontier in Cherokee territory, to Governor William Henry Lyttelton of South Carolina. They reported on intelligence received about deteriorating relations with the Cherokee Nation (who were also being actively wooed by the French). A Secretary of State scrivener or archivist identified these letters as No. 1 and No. 2. No other correspondence from Raymond Demere or about the Cherokee situation were similarly numbered, and the utility of numbering these isolated but directly related letters is not clear. For more on Raymond and his brother Paul Demere, both captains in the British army, see note after Reel 4 document 99.]

Reel 5 document 134: A draft letter written on June 20, 1765 to the Board of Trade by Secretary of State for the Southern Department Lord Halifax, concerns whether the government should pay for certain surveying done in Cherokee territory pursuant to a treaty between South Carolina and the Cherokee Nation. A scrivener or archivist identified this as a "*Letter of Reference*" and assigned it a No. 7. Since no other letters of reference are found among the microfilmed documents, numbered or not, this remains an isolated instance whose context is only hinted at.

Reel 5 documents 149, 150: A June 29, 1766 letter from Governor Charles Montagu of South Carolina to the Board of Trade combined with an undated report pertain to the issue of former Governor Thomas Boone's petition for payment of claimed unpaid salaries. A scrivener or archivist, probably in the Secretary of State office, numbered these two documents No. 16 and No. 17. Each was also identified as being in "*Lords of Trade's, of the 3<sup>d</sup> Sept' 1766*", apparently indicating that these two documents, perhaps with many others, had been delivered to the Secretary of State by the Board of Trade. No similar letter numbers or designations are found in the microfilmed documents.

Reel 5 documents 151 to 159, except for 156 and 157: These seven documents were numbered from 44 to 50 by scribes or archivists in either the Board of Trade or the Secretary of State office. The context is unclear, especially given the possibility of missing documents from this numbered set from 1 to 43 and beyond 50. The content, however, is quite clear. The documents all pertain to the 1766 power conflict in South Carolina between the Chief Justice Charles Skinner against the unusually combined Assembly and Governor.

142. [no date] [183]  
Copy of report of Commons House Committee on Privileges and Elections, declaring as a “*fundamental & inherent Right and privilege of the Commons House of Assembly of this Province Solely to examine & finally determine the Election of their own Members*”; since the Commons House’s exercise of this right and privilege on September 13, 1762 “*was not in any degree Infractions or Violations of the Election Act*” it was not proper grounds to dissolve the Assembly based; including details and justifications; offering specific resolutions, including one asserting the opinion that dissolution of the Assembly, under the known circumstances, “*was a most precipitate unadvised unrepresented procedure of the most dangerous consequence being a Great violation of the Freedom of Elections & having a manifest Tendency to Subvert & destroy the most essential & invaluable rights of the people & reduce the power & authority of the House to an abject dependence & subserviency to the Will & opinion of a Governor*” [BT number M.59.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 2]
143. December 6, 1762 [185]  
Copy of Boone’s answer to the Committee Report of Commons House [document 143], stating that while Commons House had been engaged with this “*remonstrance*” “*in which your indignation rises against your Governor*”, it had been ignoring the proper issues before it, and that it should return to addressing those issues [BT number M.60.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 3]
144. December 6, 1762 [187]  
Copy of letter of Commons House to Boone, responding to Boone’s answer [document 144], stating that Commons House had been diligently busy on all of its proper business and that its members find it “*extremely unfortunate to find our reasonable and necessary remonstrance construed into Indignation against your Excellency*” [BT number M.61.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 4]

145. [no date] [189]  
Copy of report of Commons House summarizing its inquiry into needs for a new arsenal and other defense expenses; suggesting that the Governor should be economic in his requests because funding was not readily available [BT number M.62.] [probably enclosed with Boone's December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 5]
146. December 7, 1762 [191]  
Copy of Boone's response to Commons House report on the need for a new arsenal, stating that the Assembly appears to have forgotten that consideration of funding for this had been "*removed*"; stating that "*I shall proceed to give you an Answer to your report & remonstrance*" [BT number M.63.] [probably enclosed with Boone's December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 6]
147. December 7, 1762 [193]  
Copy of Boone's answer to Commons House's "*Report and Remonstrance*", explaining with details how Commons House was misled in its understanding of the Election Act and its enforcement; asserting that no fundamental and essential right existed for Commons House to control its own elections precisely because that would allow it to call illegal elections, and only Parliament could prescribe the rules for elections; stating that Commons House had on its side a King who was ready to "*brush [aside] an arbitrary and imperious Governor that dares to trample on the people's liberties*" [BT number M.64.] [probably enclosed with Boone's December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 7]
148. December 11, 1762 [195]  
Letter of Commons House to Boone, responding to Boone's answer [document 148], disputing both facts in his answer and his interpretation of rights and privileges, with details, especially about the qualifications and practices of church wardens in relation to election results and in other particular issues; justifying Commons House's actions and its interpretation of its rights, while reasserting the right to control its own elections [BT number M.65.] [probably enclosed with Boone's December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 8]
149. December 11, 1762 [203]  
Boone's answer to Commons House's response to Boone's previous answer [document 149], reminding Commons House of his previous response, that the House should return to its proper duties, since "*if you think that forty more messages of this Sort, can be of the least Service to the Province*", the members of Commons House were mistaken [BT number M.66.] [probably enclosed with Boone's December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 9]

150. December 16, 1762 [205]  
Copy of resolution of Commons House, stating that since Boone had refused to acknowledge his breach of privilege, Commons House “*will not enter into any further Business with him untill His Excellency shall have done Justice to this House on this important point*” [BT number M.67.] [probably enclosed with Boone’s December 17, 1762 letter to Board of Trade, document 138] [identified by Board of Trade archivist as Item No. 10]
151. March 13, 1763 [207]  
Report of Committee of Council of Board of Trade, concurring with recommendations from a committee charged to respond to Boone’s correspondence about land disputes between North Carolina and South Carolina [documents 134 to 136]; recognizing the lack of an agreed upon boundary between the two colonies and the long time expected until surveying of an official boundary can be completed; agreeing to implement a temporary [straight, surveyed] line based on a line agreed on in 1735, angling northwestward from the mouth of the Little River, unequally between the mouths of the Pee Dee/Santee Rivers and the Cape Fear River, now to be extended to the 35<sup>th</sup> parallel of north latitude and then westward along the parallel to the edge of lands claimed by the Catawba Indians; ordering Instructions to be drawn for North and South Carolina to execute the necessary surveying [BT number M.68.]  
[Note: The modern state boundary differs from this description, beginning at the mouth of the Little River, as did the 1735 line, but angling more west than north and turning due west south of the 35<sup>th</sup> parallel. The westward line now crosses the Catawba River, which likely flows through what once was territory of the Catawba Nation.]
152. March 13, 1763 [209]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning Boone’s request for King’s Instructions given Governor Lyttelton for appeals court procedures, which he requested a year ago and was unable to implement because he had not received them [BT number M.69.]
153. January 29 to February 3, 1763 [211]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, with [evidently] news and comment [microfilmed darkly and with tiny print; therefore not very readable] [no BT number is assigned to this document, unique among the documents in Reel 1]
154. March 29, 1763 [213]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing proceedings of the South Carolina Assembly, including documentation of the Commons House’s inappropriate actions; still unsure as to how prevalent these rights attitudes were in the colony [BT number M.70.]

155. May 31, 1763 [215]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, providing additional documentation of the improper actions of the Assembly regarding control of the election procedures and results, since previous documentation had apparently not convinced the Board of Trade; declaring that the Assembly's action had been as inappropriate as if it had asked the governor to approve a Negro to serve on the Assembly [BT number M.71.] [with enclosure, document 157]
156. September 10, 1762 [217]  
Extract from proceedings of South Carolina Assembly, stating that a particular election scheduled in St. Paul Parish had not been held as scheduled [BT number M.72.] [enclosed with Boone's May 31, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, document 156]
157. May 31, 1763 [219]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, acknowledging receipt of orders and instructions [BT number M.73.]
158. June 17, 1763 [221]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, acknowledging receipt of 1761 Instructions for boundary lines with Indian territory; stating that he is unaware of any complaints from Indian Nations about those boundaries at this time [BT number M.74.]
159. August 3, 1763 [223]  
Letter from C[harles] Jenkinson, Secretary to Treasury, to John Pownall, Secretary to Board of Trade, stating that the proposal from [Alexander] McNutt to transport French Protestants to settle in South Carolina should be supported, but that no exemption from quit rents should be allowed, but instead, the Crown would pay £100 to McNutt in compensation for his efforts [BT number M.75.]  
[Note: **Charles Jenkinson, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Liverpool** (1729-1808), was a young, rapidly rising politician in the early 1760s. Among his early appointments, he served from 1763 to 1766 as Secretary to the Treasury. He remained in favor through the Lord North administration, serving as Secretary of War in 1782. From 1786 until 1804, he was President of the Board of Trade. Late in life, he was awarded the title of 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Liverpool.] [see transcript of related document dated November 18, 1763 in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 40]
160. August 17, 1763 [225]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, expressing his concern that anything in his conduct had been deemed by the Board of Trade "*inconsistent with & prejudicial to his Majestys interest & authority*" concerning settlements beyond South Carolina's accepted boundaries, as alleged by officials in Georgia;

defending his observation of these boundary lines, which he enumerates, and defends South Carolina settlement in lands south of the Altamaha River; stating that he had ceased approving new land grants in the area since receiving the Board of Trade's communication on the subject, but hoping that the existing grants would be honored as legal [BT number M.76.]

[**Note:** This was a **land dispute** between two British royal colonies, Georgia and South Carolina. The territory at stake was the flat lowlands sloping gently upward from the Atlantic coast **between where the Altamaha River and the St. Johns Rivers empty into the ocean**. This is roughly half the extent of present-day Georgia's Atlantic coastal strip. South of this territory was Spanish Florida. British-Spanish hostilities through most of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century before 1763 made this a contested border with a wide but ill-defined colonial no-man's land. Of course it was not actually a no-man's land but relatively prosperous land occupied by groups of Creek Indians. Before 1733, the British colony of Carolina (South Carolina after 1712) bounded the Indian territory that bounded Spain's territory. In 1733, the new British colony of Georgia was carved out of South Carolina territory, including the Indian lands adjoining Spanish Florida. Until the late 1750s, little colonial settlement occurred in the area.

When, in 1758, a group of English and German settlers moved in on their own, Georgia still had not organized an official process for authorized settlement. Rather than welcoming the new settlers, Georgia's government used the law and threats of force to drive them out, with the support of the South Carolina government. However, only a few years later South Carolina Governor Boone organized an "official" effort to encourage colonial settlement along the coast south of the Altamaha River. Boone issued South Carolina land grants for these lands, despite the facts that this was still officially Creek Indian territory, it was no longer geographically contiguous to South Carolina, and Georgia's colonial government protested vehemently.

Beginning in 1763, Georgia Governor James Wright issued strong protests to South Carolina Governor Boone and to the Board of Trade in London. He also signed treaties with the Creek Indians, especially in 1763 and in 1765, in which he was able to persuade the Creek Indians to cede to Georgia (not South Carolina's) control over the south-of-Altamaha territory and to regularize frontier boundaries between Georgia and the Creek Nation. In 1763, with Britain's takeover of Spanish Florida, the Georgia-Florida boundary was also established and regularized at the St. Marys River, between two British colonies, Georgia and East Florida.

Still, settling the legality of South Carolina's land grants in this territory took years. Georgia Governor Wright pressed his case with the government in London until, in 1767, the Board of Trade formally declared the South Carolina land grants illegal, requiring the settlers either to leave or to obtain land grants from Georgia. Yet, the legal wrangling went on well into 1768.

Meanwhile, by 1764, Boone had been forced by the South Carolina Commons House to return to England to defend his policies before the Board of Trade—which sided with the Assembly and Wright, relieving Boone of his governorship. Boone remained in England for the remainder of his life. In 1782, his South Carolina property was confiscated by the victorious revolutionaries.

Documentation of the Georgia side of this dispute can be found in the Georgia Colonial Papers, for which the DLAR has prepared a separate Finding Aid available through its website or blogsite. In that finding aid, see Reel 1 documents 33 to 66 (1763); Reel 2 documents 30, 35, 36 (1764 to 1765), document 109 (1767 invalidating of South Carolina land grants), and document 148 (1766 boundary settlement); Reel 3 documents 131, 132 (1758); and Reel 6 documents 129, 137 (1768).

On the South Carolina side, see Reel 1 documents 1 to 4, 13, 34 (1756 to 1759) and this document 161 and note (1763).]

161. October 30, 1763 [229]  
Letter from British officer Francis Randolph to “*My Lord*” [apparently Board of Trade], pursuant to his memorial seeking to settle in a North American colony and to obtain a land grant, requesting that, under the King’s new Proclamation, settlement in all the colonies be put on the same footing, but, under the circumstances, selecting South Carolina as his choice [BT number M.77.]  
[**Note:** The King’s **Royal Proclamation of 1763**, made official on October 7, 1763, forbade colonial settlement west of a line the King drew along the highest ridges of the Appalachian Mountains, and created an Indian Reserve on the western side. Many Americans disliked the proclamation because it restricted their heretofore unlimited opportunities for westward settlement. From the King’s perspective, the purpose was not to restrict as much as to manage settlement in an orderly fashion, so that colonial governmental control would be maximized and conflict with the Indians would be minimized. From this British officer’s perspective, the issue may have been that the Proclamation voided a large number of land grants (for land west of the Appalachian Mountains) already made to British subjects as their reward for having fought in the Seven Years War/French and Indian War.]
162. September 15, 1763 [231]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, acknowledging receipt of Instructions, which he intended to follow, including celebrating the recent peace [at the end of the Seven Years War/French and Indian War]; stating that he and Governor Dobbs would soon meet to talk about implementing the temporary boundary line between North and South Carolina [BT number M.78.]
163. September 15, 1763 [233]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing an “*extraordinary*” petition from Commons House to Board of Trade, after Boone had dissolved the Assembly on September 13, 1763; offering details in support of his actions [with enclosures, documents 165, 166] [BT number M.79.]

164. [no date] [237]  
Copy of petition of Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina to the King, asserting its "*undoubted Right*" to make final judgment on those elected to sit in Commons House; stating that Boone had violated this right by refusing to administer the "*state oath*" to one properly elected person, after which Commons House had determined not to do business with this governor, and the governor responded in kind, refusing to provide justice to Commons House; noting that this standoff was delaying public business and endangering economic progress; asking for relief from the King [BT number M.80.] [enclosed with Boone's September 15, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, document 164]
165. [September 2, 1763] [239]  
Copy of speech from Boone to Commons House, suggesting that the legislative body return to work after a serious delay [dated copy of speech text in document 167]; followed by  
[no date]  
Copy of address from Commons House to Boone, responding to his speech to them of the previous day, stating that it had been doing all its business; thanking Boone for operating a government with minimal expenses, thus both saving money and reducing Commons House's workload; signed by William Bull, now Speaker of Commons House; followed by  
September 3, 1763  
Copy of Boone's response to Commons House, thanking Commons House for their positive opinion of him as governor and suggesting that they prove their worth by going to work; followed by  
September 3, 1763  
Copy of message from Boone to Commons House, reporting on new violence and murder by Creek Indians against South Carolina settlers; suggesting that Commons House's delays in doing business were dangerous for the safety of the colony [another copy of message in document 167]; followed by  
August 26, 1763  
Copy of affidavit of Richard Henderson of St. Paul Parish in Augusta, enclosed with previous letter, reporting on the murder of settlers by Indians; followed by  
September 3, 1763  
Message from Boone to Commons House, stating that Thomas Skottowe had been approved to be Clerk of the House "*& now requires admission to his Office*";  
**[Note: Thomas Skottowe III (1735-1788) went on to serve as Register and Secretary of the British colony of South Carolina until the Revolutionary War.]**  
"*And then the House came to the Following Resolutions*" [another copy of message in document 167]; followed by  
September 3, 1763  
Copy of resolutions of Commons House, which maintained that Boone had "*not done justice to the House*" and therefore the House "*will strictly adhere to their said Resolutions*", and a committee to address a petition to the King seeking redress [see copies of resolutions also in document 167]; followed by

September 5, 1763

Copy of message by Boone to Commons House, expressing concern about its resolutions; entreating the House to “*give me both your advice & assistance that the poor unfortunate back settlers may not fall a prey to the merciless savages whilst you are prosecuting a dispute that may probably not be decided until we have nothing to contend for*”; stating he was enclosing a letter supporting his alarm over Indian violence [text of this message also in document 167]; followed by

August 31, 1763

Copy of letter from Colonel William Richardson at Waxhaw to [Boone?] describing Catawba Indian violence in the Broad River area and the “*pitiful*” situation of the settlers;

[**Note:** This **William Richardson** may be the Presbyterian minister who wrote a 1758 report on missionary work with Cherokee Indians (although this does not explain why he is identified as a colonel in this document. During the early 1760s, he was a prominent missionary minister to the Waxhaw Indians, a small tribe apparently related to the Catawba Indians. They had been decimated in the 1715 Yemasee War and never regained organizational strength. Their home territory was located south of present-day Charlotte, North Carolina, on both sides of today’s North-South Carolina boundary around what is now Lancaster, South Carolina and Waxhaw, North Carolina. Richardson’s missionary Presbyterian church, which must have ministered to the remaining survivors of the Waxhaw Indians, was located where the town of Waxhaw is today. The Waxhaw Indians are no longer a recognizable group. This William Richardson was the maternal uncle of **William Richardson Davie** (1756 to 1820), who grew up in Waxhaw after being adopted by Richardson in the early 1760s. William R. Davie grew up to be an early North Carolina partisan for revolution, and, after the war, a Governor of North Carolina and a founder of the University of North Carolina.); followed by

September 9, 1763

Copy of message from Boone to Commons House, enclosing two letters confirming the Indian violence, with statement by Boone that they “*were to the same affect as the former ones*” [and thus were not copied here; see similar statement in document 167]; followed by

September 10, 1763

Copy of message from Boone to Commons House, stating that sums of money had been authorized to pay for the provincial regiment, but that Commons House had not enacted any tax to raise the money, which was greatly needed [text also quoted in document 167] ; followed by

September 13, 1763

Copy of message from Boone to Commons House, stating his readiness to administer oaths to two new House members who were properly elected [text also in document 167] [BT number M.81.]

[all enclosed with Boone’s September 15, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, document 164]

166. August 18, 1763 [247]  
Copy of proclamation of Boone, calling the Assembly to convene on September 1, 1763; followed by  
September 1, 1763  
Copy of proceedings of Commons House, stating that the House met and then adjourned until the next day; followed by  
September 2, 1763  
Copy of proceedings of Commons House, recording having voted not to replace the speaker, Benjamin Smith, who was absent, and to report this to Boone; after which the House voted Rawlins Lowndes to be speaker because Boone was awaiting the Assembly to be in session, and Boone approved this choice of speaker; after which Boone addressed the Assembly; text of Boone's speech quoted in full in the proceedings [copy of same speech in document 166]; followed by  
September 3, 1763  
Copy of proceedings of Commons House, beginning with text of Boone's message to Commons House concerning murders by Indians of settlers [in the Long Cane Creek area, a tributary creek of the Savannah River northeast of today's McCormick, South Carolina; see document 181] [text also in document 166]; also text of Boone's message about Thomas Skottowe, clerk for the House [text also in document 166], whose appointment was held up by the House; recording having created a committee to address Boone regarding "*the dispute Subsisting between The Governor, and the House, relating to their Privileges*" [text of resolutions also in document 166]; followed by  
September 5, 1763  
Copy of proceedings of Commons House, including text of Boone's message about the need for the House to take action to protect back country settlers from Indian violence [text also in document 166]; concerning other matters, including approving newly elected members to the House; followed by  
September 6, 1763  
Copy of proceedings of Commons House, which did no business and adjourned for the day; followed by  
September 7, 1763  
Copy of proceedings of Commons House, reporting that new House members [Christopher] Gadsden and [William] Moultrie had taken the state oath from Governor Boone; reporting that John Skottowe had been approved to be Clerk of the Assembly and quoting the text of Governor Boone's Commission and the House's oath of office, which included a requirement to keep the House's business secret; including other appointments business;  
**[Note: Christopher Gadsden (1724-1805) was a Charleston merchant and early leader in the South Carolina revolutionary movement. A decade after being elected to the Commons House, he helped found the South Carolina Sons of Liberty, served in the First and Second Continental Congresses and the South Carolina Provisional Congress, while also serving in the South Carolina militia and the Continental Army. Gadsden was in Charleston when it was captured by the British military in 1780.**

After his parole by General Clinton was revoked by Major General Cornwallis, he was imprisoned in St. Augustine for most of a year. Returning to South Carolina, he resumed his leadership in the new state government. His grandson James Gadsden successfully negotiated the 1853 Gadsden Treaty with Spain that brought southern Arizona and New Mexico into the United States.

**William Moultrie** (1730-1805) was a South Carolina planter, politician, and active military man. In the South Carolina militia before the Revolutionary War, he fought Indians in 1761 during the Anglo-Cherokee War and soon after fought runaway slaves on Sullivan Island, in the Charleston area. During the Revolutionary War, in 1776, his Continental Army troops, operating on the same Sullivan Island, successfully defended Charleston against a British attempt to capture the city (in 1780, the British succeeded). A U.S. fort was later built on Sullivan Island, named for Moultrie. Its cannon fired the first shots of the Civil War toward Fort Sumter. Following the Revolutionary W, Moultrie served as South Carolina Lieutenant Governor in 1784-1785 and as Governor in 1785-1787 and 1792-1794.]

followed by

September 8, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, which adjourned immediately for the day; followed by

September 9, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with further business about appointments and oaths; concerning two letters received from Boone concerning the Indian violence [not quoted in the proceedings; see similar entry in document 166]; followed by

September 10, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with further business about appointments and oaths; concerning money to pay for the provincial regiment, quoting text of Boone's message [text also in document 166]; after debate, postponing approval of Sir John Colleton as a member of the House; including committee's text of a petition to the King about the dispute on privileges between the House and Governor [text also in document 165]

**[Note: Sir John Colleton, 1<sup>st</sup> Baronet (1608-1666)** was a prominent founder and early leader of South Carolina. The family remained prominent through the lives of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Baronets John Colleton. The Sir John Colleton elected to Commons House in 1763 appears to be the 4<sup>th</sup> Baronet (1738-1778). He appears to have been a less prominent leader (and perhaps thus more palatable to Commons House, although it still delayed deciding the validity of his election.);

followed by

September 12, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with further business about appointments and oaths; followed by

September 13, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with further business about appointments and oaths, including text of Boone's message expressing his willingness to administer oaths to any properly elected person [see text also in document 166]; including other business concerning paper bills of credit and other matters; followed by

September 14, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, adjourning until the following day; followed by

September 15, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, adjourning until the following day; followed by

September 16, 1763

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, adjourning until the following day [BT number M.82.]

[all identified as being enclosed with Boone's September 20, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, however, this letter is not microfilmed here, and no BT number is missing.]

167. September 27, 1763 [259]

Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing documents concerning the dispute between the Assembly and Council [with enclosures, documents 169 to 172] [BT number M.83.]

**[Note:** Although referred to, in this and documents 169 to 172, as the South Carolina Council, it identifies itself in document 172 as the Upper House of the Assembly.]

168. May 28, 1762 [261]

Copy of message from Commons House to Council, accusing the Council of altering bills Commons House had passed, which Commons House felt undermined its rightful privileges, with examples from an Indian Trading Bill and a Streets Bill [BT number M.84.] [enclosed with Boone's September 27, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, document 168.]

169. May 29, 1762 [263]

Copy of message from Commons House to the Council, concurring with one amendment made by the Council to the Indian Trading Bill, but rejecting all other alterations made by the Council, since they were "*our Sole Right*" [BT number M.85.] [enclosed with Boone's September 27, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, document 168.]

170. September 24, 1763 [265]  
Copy of address of Council to Boone, concerning Commons House having refused to accept a message from the Council that requested its committee to sit with a committee of Commons House on a matter requiring joint consideration, having to do with the disposal of old paper money, which was part of a larger dispute between the two; dispute also over the use of "Speaker" of Commons House rather than "President" which Commons House prefers; arguing that the Council had done nothing to diminish Commons House's privileges and that this dispute should not be interfering with doing provincial business; signed by the speaker of the Upper House of the South Carolina Assembly [BT number M.86.] [enclosed with Boone's September 27, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, document 168.]
171. [no date] [267]  
Copy of Boone's response to Council's address, taking note of Commons House's having denied to the Council its privileges, which Boone intends to pass on for the King's consideration [BT number M.87.] [enclosed with Boone's September 27, 1763 letter to Board of Trade, document 168.]
172. [no date] [269]  
Copy of memorial to Board of Trade from Richard Cumberland, Provost Marshal of South Carolina, pleading for assistance to provide a proper public jail for the colony at Charleston; stating that its lack causes the colony unnecessary expense and danger from having to house those jailed in private homes [BT number M.88.]
173. January 24, 1764 [271]  
Draft [outgoing] letter from Dunk Halifax [Secretary of State for the Southern Department] at St. James's to Board of Trade, submitting a copy of the proceedings at the Congress of Indians and British at Augusta in November 1763, along with copy of letter from Boone "*giving his Reasons for having refused the Cherokees, at the said Congress, to send up Traders amongst Them*", plus copy of a "*Plan for the Management of Indians in general*" written by Boone, all of which were enclosed in Boone's November 24, 1763 letter to Halifax [extract in document 176 [with enclosures, documents 175 to 177] [BT number M.89.]  
[**Note: Charles Wyndham, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Egremont** (1710-1763), had served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from October 9, 1761 to August 21, 1763. Dunk Halifax, or formally, **George Montagu-Dunk, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Halifax** (1716-1771), had previously served as First Lord of the Board of Trade between 1748 and 1761. On September 9, 1763, he replaced **Egremont** as Secretary of State for the Southern Department and held the position until July 10, 1765.]

174. [no date] [273]  
“A rough Sketch of a Plan for the Management of Indians in General and Conducting of the Necessary Commerce with them upon the principles of Justice towards them and security to the Colonists”; proposing that the management of Indians should be standardized among the British colonies; proposing with underlined text that “those disgraceful Conferences, where their Insolence is instantly displayed, be for ever laid aside; those ignominious tributes, under the Name of Presents, be utterly abolished” and that the “immense expence” of provisions for the Indians be saved for colonists [BT number M.90.] [enclosed with Halifax’s January 24, 1764 letter to Board of Trade, document 174] [previously enclosed with Boone’s November 24, 1763 letter to Halifax, extract in document 176; copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 121]
175. November 24, 1763 [278]  
Extract of letter from Boone at Charleston to Halifax, explaining that “an express application from the Cherokee for Traders to be sent amongst Them was refused” based on Boone’s policy against Indian trading; stating his reasons for opposing the Indian trade and his wish that all colonies would adopt the same policy [BT number M.91.] [enclosed with Halifax’s January 24, 1764 letter to Board of Trade, document 174] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 120]
176. October 1 to November 21, 1763 [280]  
Copy of proceedings of British officials Arthur Dobbs, Governor of North Carolina; Francis Fauquier, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia; Thomas Boone, Governor of South Carolina; and John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department, with several chiefs of several Indian Nations: Beginning with Preparations at Charleston by Dobbs, Fauquier, Boone, and Stuart, and discussion by them via letters quoted in the proceedings to and from absent Governor James Wright of Georgia, concerning the preferred location for the Congress (Charleston or Augusta or Saluda Old Town; the absent Governor James Wright of Georgia favoring Augusta); Stuart, having left Charleston for Augusta, reporting from there by letter to the governors in Charleston on October 15 that some Indians were there and were disappointed that the British were not there; including copy of Talk of Lower Creek Indians, September 16, 1763, expressing dissatisfaction with relations between Indians and whites; including copy of undated Talk of Lieutenant Barnard to several Lower Creek head men and warriors, telling them that their fears of bad relations with the British were ill founded, and that the British wished to be friendly with the Indians; including copy of undated Talk by Stuart to the Indians at Augusta; concerning convening the Congress at Dorchester, South Carolina [today a rural county just northwest of Charleston]; concerning payment of expenses for the Congress; concerning Wright’s determination to go to Augusta, because the Indians refused to go to Dorchester, as reported also by Stuart at Augusta;

including copy of [James] Colbert's journal reporting on his trip from Augusta to talk with Upper Creek, Choctaw, and Chickasaw Indians between July 13 and September 27, 1763; by early November, with all four governors in Augusta, final preparations made for a Congress there, which convened on November 5, 1763, with the four governors, Stuart, and numerous Indians from Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Cherokee Nations plus several interpreters, including James Colbert; Followed by Proceedings of the Congress itself, opened with text of a Talk by Stuart and continuing with texts of Talks by various Indian chiefs, including those from the Catawba Nation as well as the others identified in advance; Followed by text of the "*Pacification*" or Treaty, dated November 10, 1763, "*for the Preservation and Continuance of a firm and Perfect Peace & Friendship*" between British and Indians, with a preamble, four articles, and signatures; followed by text of Cover Letter from the four governors and Stuart at Augusta to the Secretary of State for the Southern Department, the Earl of Egremont, dated November 10, 1763 [actually the Earl of Halifax had been Secretary of State since September 1763; see note after document 74] describing the Congress and conveying the treaty; including follow-up correspondence among the governors on costs of the Congress from Boone, back at Charleston [BT number M.92.] [enclosed with Halifax's January 24, 1764 letter to Board of Trade, document 174]

[**Note:** The Georgia Colonial Office Papers also contain documents from this treaty. See the DLAR's Finding Aid on these papers as follows: manuscript copy of the treaty, Reel 1 document 79; printed copy of treaty, Reel 5 document 179; copy of cover letter from four governors and Stuart, Reel 6 document 25.]

[**Note:** **Francis Fauquier** (1703-1768) was from a well-to-do French family who had emigrated to England. In 1758, he came to Virginia after having been appointed Lieutenant Governor. He never rose to the title of Governor, yet he acted as chief administrative officer (Governor in all but name) under two absentee Governors, the Earl of Loudoun (1756-1763) and Jeffrey Amherst (1763-1768). Thus it was that he represented Virginia in negotiating this treaty, along with the other governors of southern British colonies. For more on **Arthur Dobbs**, see notes after documents 92, 136; for more on **Thomas Boone** see note after document 108; for more on **James Wright**, see note after documents 10, 106.] For more on **John Stuart**, see note after document 57.]

177. April 7, 1764 [334]  
 Letter from Boone to Board of Trade, declaring that he had decided, because of Indian violence since the Augusta treaty had been signed, to stop all trade with the Creek Indians; reporting having asked Governor Wright of Georgia to join his stoppage of trade and to get cooperation from Florida; however, reporting that those in the other colonies and John Stuart no longer supported this policy; suggesting that he and his Council should be able to decide such policy issues themselves; contesting Stuart's insistence that concurrence be obtained from the Indians as well; making suggestions for stricter control of the Indians [with enclosure, document 179] [BT number M.93.]

178. March 7 to April 6, 1764 [340]  
“*Copy of South Carolina Minutes of Council 1764 relative to the Claims of M<sup>r</sup>. Stuart*”, including:  
March 7, 1764  
Copy of minutes of Council meeting, including information about attacks by Indians on settlers, with texts of February 18, 1764 letter from Major Robert Farmar at Mobile, and February 14, 1764 letter from John Miller at Euchee, and Talks of several Indian headmen;  
**[Note: Euchee** is the name of a smaller tribe of Indians decimated during the Yemasee War and other Indian conflicts in the early 18<sup>th</sup> Century, who once lived in territory stretching from today’s Tennessee to central Florida. The name is found today in several areas in Tennessee and Georgia. John Miller’s location might be what is now a rural settlement about 20 miles west of Augusta.];  
followed by:  
April 2, 1764  
Copy of minutes of Council meeting, concerning other information received from Governor Wright about Indian violence, with text of Boone’s response to Wright dated in March 1764, suggesting stopping Indian trade, text of Wright’s response to Boone, wishing to use a stoppage of trade only as a last resort, and text of Lieutenant Charles Taylor’s letter from Fort Prince George [which he commanded] to Boone dated in March 1764; followed by  
April 4, 1764  
Copy of Minutes of Council meeting, containing text of Boone’s April 2, 1764 letter, at Charleston, to Captain [Augustine] Prévost, informing him about the Indian violence and Boone’s closing the Indian trade at Fort Prince George, ordering Prévost to send his troops into the frontier territory along the “*North Side of Savannah River between Shavers Creek & Long Cane Creek*” to protect settlements in that area, followed by text of Prévost’s April 2, 1764 reply, at Charleston, to Boone, informing him that both Fort Prince George and Fort Moore were “*destitute of Provisions*,” making them difficult to defend. Nevertheless, he would do what he could; containing the Council’s discussion about command of troops in South Carolina, especially the working relationship between [Captain Augustine] Prévost and [General Jeffry] Amherst to meet the needs for arms and troops in South Carolina, especially at Fort Prince George, given its great importance both for security against the Indians and for protection of the Indian trade; with the Council’s consideration of John Stuart’s, and James Wright’s changes of opinion, no longer supporting a coordinated colonial policy of closing the Indian trade, which Boone supported; deciding to communicate this deplorable situation to the Board of Trade, seeking appointment of a Superintendent of Indian Affairs more attuned to proper policy;  
**[Note: Fort Moore**, like **Fort Prince George**, was located on the frontier between white settlement and Indian territory, about 20 miles northeast of Augusta, on the way to Fort Prince George. Founded in the early 1700s, it was abandoned in 1763 as no longer useful. For more on these two forts, see Reel 3 document 4 and note after (1720).]

[**Note: Augustine Prévost** (1723-1786) was a Swiss-born soldier and officer in the British Army, assigned to the 60<sup>th</sup> Royal American Regiment of Foot. He and his younger brother, **Jacques Marcus (Marc) Prévost** (1736-1781) had joined the British Army on the same day in 1756. Each fought in America during both the Seven Years War of 1756-1763 and the Revolutionary War of 1775-1783. In 1764, Augustine Prévost, now a Captain, may have been the commander of the detachment of British troops assigned by Commander of British troops in North America Major General **Jeffrey Amherst, 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Amherst** (1717-1797), to protect South Carolina. He thus answered to General Amherst, who had been Commander in North America since the late 1750s, but who, by 1763 was being replaced as commander in chief in America by General Thomas Gage. Nevertheless, Boone maintained that, while assigned to protect the colony of South Carolina, Prévost also properly answered directly to Governor Boone.]  
followed by

April 6, 1764

Copy of minutes of a Council meeting, concerning provisioning Prévost's troops so that they could march into the frontier immediately; containing text of Boone's April 4, 1764 letter to Prévost in which he informs Prévost of the Council's willingness to provide provisions and ammunition for a frontier expedition and ordering Prévost not to abandon any fortified station; containing text of draft letter, not yet dated, to be sent to Board of Trade complaining about Stuart [all appear to be part of BT number M.94. but are not so identified] [enclosed with Boone's April 7, 1764 letter to Board of Trade, document 178]

179. January 13, 1764 [355]

Extract from letter by Lieutenant [James] Dunnet at Fort Augusta concerning relations with the Indians; stating that although "*These Creeks are cursed fellows*", their response to the closing of trade had not been disturbances;  
followed by

January 13, 1764

Extract of letter from Lieutenant [probably Lachlan] McIntosh at Fort Moore reporting that all was "*quiet & peaceable in this part*"  
[both part of BT number M.95.]

180. December 30, 1763 [357]

Copy of proclamation from Boone, calling an immediate meeting of the General Assembly, to convene on January 4, 1764, concerning the murder of settlers in the Long Cane settlement by Creek Indians;

[**Note: Long Cane Creek** flows into the Savannah River northwest of today's McCormick, South Carolina. In 1760 a massacre of Cherokee Indians had occurred here during the Anglo-Cherokee War. Now it was the killing of white settlers by Creek Indians. And in 1780, a small military engagement occurred here during the Revolutionary War.]

followed by

January 4, 1764

Copy of proceedings of a meeting of Commons House, called by Boone's proclamation; including a message from the Governor, with additional evidence about the murders; including a response from Commons House; followed by

January 5, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 6, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, voting against a motion to "*Vacate & discharge*" the December 16, 1762 resolution against doing business with the Governor plus subsequent resolutions; followed by

January 7, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 9, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 10, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 11, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 12, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 13, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 14, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, concerning receipt of information in the included text of a Talk of an Indian named Tuqulkey [?] or Young Twin, which revealed the names of seven settlers murdered by the Creek Indians; followed by January 16, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 17, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 18, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 19, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 20, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 21, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 22, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 23, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 24, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by January 25, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by

April 16, 1764

Copy of proclamation from Boone, calling for a General Assembly meeting to convene on April 19, 1764 to discuss the matter of the King's approval for a certain number of French Protestants to settle in South Carolina; followed by April 19, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, which received the Governor's proclamation for a meeting, with no further business; followed by

April 20, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by April 21, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business; followed by April 23, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with receipt of a message from Boone, requesting a meeting with Commons House to discuss the situation with the French Protestant settlers; with receipt of a supporting document from Boone, text of a copy of a letter to Boone from the Board of Trade dated November 22, 1763, stating that the British government was supporting settlement of the French Protestants on lands along the Savannah River to be determined by the South Carolina government [transcript of this letter in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 41; see also transcript documents in Reel 11 document 42, 43]; Commons House then voting to receive these communications for future consideration, as soon as the matter of the previous resolutions of not doing business with the governor were resolved; followed by

April 24, 1764

Copy of proceedings of Commons House, with no further business [all these parts of BT number M.96.]

181. June 25, 1764 [364]  
Memorial from Charles Garth, Agent for South Carolina, at Inner Temple, to Board of Trade, describing the conflict between Commons House and the Governor over issues of authority and inclusion in that conflict of the issue of supporting the settlement of French Protestants in South Carolina [BT number M.97.]
182. June 26, 1764 [367]  
Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs to the Board of Trade, concerning petition of the South Carolina Commons House complaining about Governor Boone's actions refusing to accept a duly elected member of Commons House and his having dissolved Commons House when it proceeded to allow that member to serve; referring the petition to the Board of Trade for action consistent with royal approval of relief under the petition [apparently BT number M.98. although not so designated] [the Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs is also referred to as the Committee of Council for Plantation Affairs]

183. September 23, 1763 [368]  
Copy of petition to the King from Commons House of South Carolina, making the case for improper action by Governor Boone not to allow an elected member of Commons House to serve because that member had opinions contrary to Boone's policies and his subsequent action dissolving the House for recognizing that elected member [BT number M.99.]
184. July 2, 1764 [371]  
Memorial from Agent Charles Garth for South Carolina, at Inner Temple, to Board of Trade, pointing out the King's decision to grant relief for the South Carolina Commons House's petition regarding Governor Boone's improper actions regarding a duly elected member of Commons house; stating that Boone had arrived in England on June 28, 1764 to answer to the charges against him; stating his understanding that the petition had been referred for action to the Board of Trade; asking that the Board of Trade consider approving the requested relief to Commons House [BT number M.100.] [transcript of letter from John Pownall to Garth about this memorial and more is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 47]
185. February 14, 1763 [373]  
Printed document [78 printed pages] with cover title "*A Full State of the Dispute, &c*" and full title of "*A Full State of the Dispute betwixt the Governor and Commons House of Assembly of His Majesty's Province of South Carolina, in America, with the Proper Vouchers and Reasons in support of the Proceedings of the House of Assembly, as transmitted to their Agent in Great Britain; Printed in the Year MDCCLXIII*", including Commons House's statement of petition, signed by 14 members of Commons House, followed by supporting documentation, including:  
September 10 and 13, 1762, extracts from Commons House proceedings  
December 4, 1762 Remonstrance of Commons House to Governor Boone  
[no date] Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections of Commons House  
December 6, 1762 Boone speech replying to Remonstrance and Report  
December 6, 1762 Commons House message to Boone regarding ordnance-stores  
December 7, 1762 Boone's response to Commons House message  
December 7, 1762 Boone's speech responding to Commons House's Remonstrance and Report  
[no date] Commons House [lengthy] Reply to Boone's speech  
December 11, 1762 Boone's verbal answer to the reply of Commons House, referring them to his previous [December 7, 1762] response  
December 16, 1762 Extract from Commons House proceedings  
December 13, 1762 Copy of letter from William Wragg, printed in the *South-Carolina Weekly Gazette* of January 5, 1763, concerning elections in St. John Parish, Colleton County [southwest of Charleston]

- January 25, 1763 Published letter by Christopher Gadsden to "*Gentlemen Electors of the Parish of St. Paul*" [for more on Christopher Gadsden, see note after document 167]  
 November 24, 30, December 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 1762 Extracts from Commons House proceedings  
 April 16, 17, 1725, January 8, 1755 Extracts from Commons House proceedings  
 [no date] "*An ACT to ascertain the Manner and Form of electing Members*" for the South Carolina Commons House [signed by James Moore II, the first speaker of Commons House under royal rule, from 1721 to 1724]  
 [no date] "*Copy of the 35<sup>th</sup> Article of General Nicholson's Instructions for the Government of South Carolina*" [Sir Francis Nicholson was the first royal governor of South Carolina, from 1721 to 1725]  
 [BT number M.101.]
186. November 14, 1763 [415]  
 Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, acknowledging the King's "*Instructions for the establishing a temporary line of jurisdiction between this Province & No Carolina*"; stating his actions toward implementing this Instruction [BT number M.102.]
187. January 9, 1764 [417]  
 Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, assuring the Board that he was doing everything required by his Commission as governor, with details about his actions on a number of matters, including trade and the "*refractory behaviour of the Assembly*" [with enclosure, document 189] [BT number M.103.]
188. [about October 1763, "*one month after*" Long Cane murders] [423]  
 Copy of speech by Boone to Commons House, concerning the melancholy situation of fourteen [later apparently reduced to seven, based on better information] settlers at the Long Cane settlement murdered by Creek Indians; seeking cooperation from Commons House to deal with this situation; also concerning the need to cooperate with North Carolina in drawing a temporary boundary; followed by copy of South Carolina Council's sympathetic response and by copy of Boone's friendly response to the Council [enclosed with Boone's January 9, 1764 letter to Board of Trade, document 188] [BT number M.104.]
189. January 21, 1764 [427]  
 Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning an expedition into the frontier as a response to the murders by Creek Indians but reporting continuing difficulties with Commons House, which would hold up surveying the temporary boundary with North Carolina [BT number M.105.]
190. April 19, 1764 [429]  
 Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, requesting a leave of absence to return to England, beginning by the end of May 1764 [BT number M.106.]

191. May 4, 1764 [431]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing two lists of shipping [BT number M.107.]
192. May 16, 1764 [433]  
Letter from [Lieutenant Governor] William Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, informing the Board that Governor Boone had embarked for England on May 11, 1764; stating that he had convened the General Assembly and that no further information of note needed to be conveyed to the Board at this time [BT number M.108.]  
[Note: During Boone's term as South Carolina Governor, **William Bull II** had served loyally in his position as **Lieutenant Governor**, a position he held continuously from 1759 to 1775. While never leaving this position, he five times served as **acting governor** between terms of Governors. From April 4, 1760 to December 22, 1761, he had acted as Governor between Governors Lyttelton and Boone. Now, from May 11, 1764 to June 17, 1766, he once again acted as Governor between Governors Boone and Charles Greville Montagu (the period during which the constitutional crisis over the Stamp Act developed and began playing itself out). For more on Bull, see notes after documents 1, 39, 71.]
193. [no date] [435]  
Memorial of John Greg to the Board of Trade, seeking payment for work done [not explained] in relation to "*considerable demand upon the Publick occasioned by a transaction recent in your memories*"; followed by John Greg's account for services rendered In 1764 for moving a "charter party" [apparently reference to goods provided for the French Protestant settlement in South Carolina] totaling £4,403.9.3, partially paid [both are parts of BT number M.109.]  
[Note: John Greg was one of three principles in the London merchant company of **Forrans, Greg, and Poang**. They apparently dealt with public contracts, such as the one in which the British government provided emergency provisions for French Protestant refugees who settled with the King's approval and support in colonial South Carolina. See also transcript of John Pownall's August 15, 1764 letter to Bull concerning payment of the debt in Board of Trade, Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 52 and Bull's October 18, 1764 response to Pownall stating that the debt had been paid off, in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 4.]

## Reel 2 (Volumes 378, 379, 380)

### Volume 378—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), continue

August 20, 1764 to November 10, 1767      Documents 1 to 88      [Frames 1 to 275]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Board of Trade incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina continue in Volume 378 of the Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina.

**Note:** Archivists (probably in the Board of Trade Office) wrote descriptive notes for many of the manuscript documents. These are generally microfilmed with the documents. On these notes, archivists provided their own numbers by manuscript Bundle or Volume. Where found, this Finding Aid reports these numbers as "BT numbers." Volume 378 begins with N.1. and ends with N.62. For reasons unclear, three scattered BT numbers are not assigned to a microfilmed document (N.5., N.10., and N.39.). Also, three microfilmed documents are assigned no BT number (documents 83 to 85), apparently because they are not official Board of Trade correspondence but other documents received.

**Note:** In this Volume, none of the letters of official correspondence is numbered by the writer. Gaps in correspondence are thus more difficult to identify since they can be sequenced only by date.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

1. August 20, 1764 [1]  
Letter from William Bull II, Lieutenant Governor and, temporarily, acting governor of South Carolina, at Charleston, to the Board of Trade and Plantations, reporting the death of South Carolina Council member John Guerard, and having appointed John Burn to fill the vacancy; reporting that work surveying the temporary boundary line between South Carolina and North Carolina had begun; reporting on relations with the Cherokee and with the Creek Indians; reporting that the Assembly had given £500 Sterling to assist the colony of French Protestants in settling; reporting on returning trade with the Indians to normal since former Governor Boone's departure;

expressing support for the Board of Trade's position for the free trade of rice; reporting that the Assembly was functioning normally and that he would soon report bills passed in the current session; including other matters [BT number N.1.] [for more on **William Bull II**, see notes after Reel 1 documents 1, 39, 71; this was Bull's second time as acting governor; the first time was between Governors Lyttelton and Boone, from April 5, 1760 to December 22, 1761; this time, between Governors Boone and Montagu lasted from May 14, 1764 to June 17, 1766; see also note after Reel 1 document 193] [for more on Governor Thomas Boone, see note after Reel 1 document 108]

2. September 13, 1764 [3]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that the chief of the French party of the Creek Indians had apologized by a Talk to the English and sought to ally now with the English; laying before the Board a number of bills passed by the South Carolina Assembly [BT number N.2.]
3. October 8, 1764 [5]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade reporting that the temporary boundary line had been completed, running all the way to near the eastern boundaries of Catawba Lands; reporting on additional bills passed by the Assembly; reporting that James Moultrie had resigned as Attorney General upon being appointed Chief Justice of East Florida, and that Bull had appointed John Rutledge to be Attorney General of South Carolina [BT number N.3.]  
[Note: **John Rutledge** (1739-1800) was a native and member of a prominent family in Charleston. As an attorney, he served in a number of public positions, mostly on the American side of the conflict leading to the Revolution. So his tenure as Attorney General of colonial South Carolina was short, all within 1764. By 1765, he had become an early "rebel" leader, by British standards, by serving on the Stamp Act Congress. During much of the war, after the Declaration of Independence, he served as Governor of the new State of South Carolina. In 1795, he served briefly as the second Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. His younger brother **Edward Rutledge** was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.] [on the North-South Carolina boundary issue, see note after Reel 1 document 8.]
4. October 18, 1764 [7]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, stating that the recently passed tax bill in South Carolina had allowed payment to Mr. Greg of the company Forrans, Greg, & Poang, in London, for trade items sent to help the settlement of French Protestants [BT number N.4.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number N.5.] [see also John Greg's memorial in Reel 1 document 193, plus note after this document, and transcript of Pownall's August 18, 1764 letter to Bull in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 52]

5. [no date] [9]  
Memorial, written in French, of several French Protestants seeking to settle in South Carolina, and seeking relief from their distress as refugees, including a list of families by name and by number of family members settling, totaling 58 settlers [BT number N.6.]
6. December 21, 1765 [11]  
Letter from H[enry] S[eymour] Conway, [a gentleman commoner member of Parliament rather than a Lord, and Secretary of State for the Southern Department from July 12, 1765 to May 23, 1766] at St. James's, to Board of Trade, reporting that Lord Charles [Greville] Montagu had been appointed by the King to be Governor of South Carolina; instructing the Board to prepare a Commission and Instructions for him [BT number N.7.]
7. December 24, 1765 [13]  
Letter from Charles Lowndes, Secretary to the Treasury to Board of Trade, stating that payment of arrears salary for Thomas Boone as Governor of New Jersey had been approved and should be paid as requested by the Board of Trade [BT number N.8.] [Lowndes served as Junior Secretary from September 30, 1765 to August 18, 1766] [for more on Boone's efforts in 1765 and 1766 to receive unpaid salary from both New Jersey and South Carolina, see documents 8, 43, 44, Reel 3 documents 122 to 124, and Reel 5 documents 149, 150]
8. November 25, 1765 [15]  
Memorial to Board of Trade from Thomas Boone, requesting payment of unpaid salary for his governorship of New Jersey [BT number N.9.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number N.10.]
9. September 8, 1765 [18]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, conveying copies of bills passed by the South Carolina Assembly; reporting that records had been copied for South Carolina land grants through 1736 but that records of grants before 1692 were burned; reporting that the Assembly had approved £8,000 to complete construction of a state house for South Carolina; reporting on activities to run a boundary line with the Cherokee Indians; raising issues about the freedom of agricultural trade by the colony [BT number N.11.] [see different letter with same date by Bull to Secretary of State Halifax in Reel 5 document 137]
10. November 3, 1765 [22]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on "*very extraordinary & universal Commotion which has happened in this Town upon the arrival of the Stamp Papers*", similar to happenings in New England cities in August; stating that no colony was as loyal to the King as those in South Carolina, but that this occurrence in South Carolina was a matter of concern; with details;

asserting that “*This Contagion has spread thru this whole Country*”; wishing that there existed stamps that could be used without upsetting the populace, so that calm could return [BT number N.12.] [with enclosure, document 11]

[**Note:** Parliament saw the **Stamp Act** as a fair way for American colonists to help pay for the considerable military cost of the Seven Years War/French and Indian War that had successfully defended the Americans against French, Spanish, and Indian incursions between 1754 and 1763. Many Americans saw the same act as a precedent-setting direct tax, imposed only on Americans, without direct American representation in voting on the tax. The King **approved** Parliament’s Stamp Act on March 22, 1765, making it legally binding.

Yet actually collecting tax revenue on paper transactions could not begin until official “stamps” could be printed and governmental distributors could be deployed throughout the colonies, a process that took months, while American protest movements organized and grew bellicose. In the meantime, the only purely legal strategy for colonial governors and protestors was to attempt to shut down businesses, newspapers, seaports, and the like so that they would not engage in illegal, non-taxed paper transactions.

In South Carolina, the effect of having no stamps to distribute and no working process to enforce their use (see document 11) led, in effect, to an embargo on trade and other professional, legal, and commercial transactions that required stamps. This lasted until the practice in other colonies of allowing commerce to continue without the stamps, as long as the authorized officials did not or were not able to issue and enforce use of the stamps.

By March 18, 1766, Parliament, having learned the lesson that the costs of the Stamp Act were far greater than the revenues it generated, **repealed** the Act, while at the same time upholding, in the **Declaratory Act**, the official legality of Parliament to tax the colonists directly, regardless of their representation.]

11. October 29, 1765 [26]  
Copy of letter from George Saxby and Caleb Lloyd, Officers appointed to inspect (Saxby) and distribute (Lloyd) stamps for use in South Carolina, at Charleston, to Bull, reporting having been threatened by people of South Carolina because of their opposition to the stamps; further reporting on having felt they had no choice, for their safety, but to acquiesce with the demands not to distribute the stamps, and therefore, declaring their duties to be suspended until Parliament could decide the controversy and restore order [BT number N.13.] [enclosed with Bull’s November 3, 1765 letter to Board of Trade, document 10]
12. November 6, 1765 [28]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, stating his intention to do his duty to keep the Board informed, especially on the important matters of enforcing the Stamp Act [BT number N.14.]

**[Note:** Lieutenant Governor/acting governor Bull sought with little success to chart a complicated middle course between full official enforcement and total neglect of enforcement. When a supply of stamps arrived in Charleston, he had them locked up in Fort Johnson, arguing that if they were not accessible to be distributed properly, not using them was at least temporarily justifiable, given the ugly mood of the local citizens against the stamp tax. When faced with the issue of closing South Carolina's ports, he balked, seeking to find a justifiable way to maintain the colony's valuable trade while waiting for a time when the stamps might more safely be used (see documents 66 to 69). He was still waiting for that time when the Stamp Act was repealed. See also note after document 36.]

13. December 17, 1765 [30]  
 Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that the Assembly had declared what it saw as its rights regarding the stamp issue; stating that when and whether the Stamp Act would be enforced was unclear; reporting that confusion in land surveying remained on the frontier because the surveying of the temporary boundary line remained incomplete; reporting that an attempt to grow hemp in South Carolina for export appeared to be succeeding; observing that a three year prohibition of importing slaves "*has in great measure defeated the Salutary End proposed*" since nearly 8,000 slaves had been imported during the past year [BT number N.15.] [different letter with same date from Bull to Secretary of State Conway in Reel 5 document 138]
  
14. December 19, 1765 [33]  
 Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that the new Assembly in South Carolina had accomplished little business so far, but that "*their Proceedings relate to a Subject of very Extraordinary Nature & of great Expectation in America*" [BT number N.16.] [with enclosure, document 15]
  
15. November 29, 1765 [35]  
 Printed edition of proceedings of the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly, containing 13 resolutions declaring that colonial subjects had all the same rights as home subjects living in England, with details [BT number N.17.] [enclosed with Bull's December 19, 1765 letter to Board of Trade, document 14]  
**[Note:** As the Stamp Act crisis heated up, the conflict between Commons House and the Governor shifted gears from more internally oriented issues, especially those relating to financial and electoral control, to a broader scope articulated in terms of the **rights of South Carolinians** (and, by extension, British subjects living in the other American colonies) against abuse of those rights by British royal officials. See also note after Reel 1 document 32.  
 On the dispute over enforcement of the Stamp Act, see, all dated in 1766, documents 26, 27, 65 to 67, as well as documents 64 to 69 from Georgia Governor James Wright's correspondence to the Board of Trade in Reel 2 of the Georgia Colonial Papers, excerpted here from the DLAR's Finding Aid on those papers.

On a related issue in 1766-1767 over control of South Carolina's judicial system, which resulted in unpopular delays in operation of the judicial system directly related to Stamp Act enforcement, see documents 28 to 41, 45, 46, 49 to 51, 54, 55, 57, 60 to 63, 69, 84, 85. For an unrelated judicial issue in 1775; see documents 212, 215 to 220.

On ongoing controversy in 1769-1771 over colonial financial control, see documents 105, 106, 122 to 125, 130, 137, 145, 147 to 150, 158, 159, 163 to 165, 188, 189, 191, 194, 196, 210.]

16. February 22, 1766 [36]  
Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs to the Board of Trade, initiating the process of paying for Boone's back pay owed as Governor of New Jersey [BT number N.18.]
17. October 24, 1764 [38]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, explaining that the tax act money to be used to pay for the supplies for the French Protestants could not legally be used for that purpose, and that he had advised the Assembly that it must find alternative funding to support this necessity [BT number N.19.]
18. December 8, 1764 [40]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, acknowledging difficulties in communicating about the true situation in the colony; forwarding map with the survey of a temporary border between North and South Carolina [BT number N.20.]
19. December 10, 1764 [41]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing the final survey of temporary boundary between North and South Carolina, along with an explanation of the special circumstances of the Catawba boundaries, as negotiated in 1760; reporting that the Catawba lands had since become hemmed in by settlements on several sides, and the new, temporary border line would not resolve this situation; suggesting that a new conference be held with the Indians to continue the temporary line beyond where it was ended near Catawba lands [BT number N.21.]
20. December 21, 1764 [45]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning fees charged in South Carolina; concerning settlement of a group of German Protestants recently arrived in South Carolina [BT number N.22.]

21. March 15, 1765 [47]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, stating that the German Protestants had been settled in the uplands south of Ninety-Six [a frontier fort located west of present-day Columbia, South Carolina; stating that repairs to Fort Prince George (located in the South Carolina uplands south of the Appalachian Mountains] were progressing well; including other news as well on frontier expansion and colonial administration [BT number N.23.]
22. March 28, 1765 [50]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on news received about the Grenville Packet, which had been "*lost on a Shoal on the west side of the Cape of Florida about 30 leagues from Havanna*" [BT number N.24.] [similar letter with same date to Secretary of State Halifax in Reel 5 document 133]
23. June 5, 1765 [52]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on a plan to pay off the public debt of the province with a new tax on "*Land negroes Stock in Trade & monies at Interest*"; reporting on plans to build a fort of stone at Fort Charlotte [BT number N.25.]  
[**Note: Fort Charlotte** (named for the British queen at the time) was designed and constructed in 1765 as a defensive fort, not for purposes of Indian trade. It was located in what is still very rural territory, about 40 miles north of Augusta on the South Carolina side of the Savannah River. Constructed at great expense out of local granite blocks of stone, it was never effectively used, but it disintegrated only gradually. Today, its remains are located probably beneath the dammed-up waters of the Savannah River.]
24. January 25, 1766 [54]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on fort construction of Fort Charlotte and Fort Johnson; reporting that the Chickasaw Indians had settled near Fort Moore; reporting that fears of a Negro insurrection last December had proven unfounded, but believing that "*several large Parties of Runaways [are] still concealed in large Swamps*" [BT number N.26.]  
[**Note:** Unlike Forts Charlotte, Moore, and Prince George, **Fort Johnson** was built in the 1730s as part of Charleston's city defenses. In the early 1760s it was expanded and improved.]
25. November 20, 1765 [56]  
Report from Matthew Lamb at Lincoln's Inn to Board of Trade on his legal review and opinion on laws passed in August 1764 by South Carolina, including acts pertaining to the spreading of small pox; allowing the church vestry and wardens of St Andrew Parish to dispose of the church's pews; providing for an assistant rector for St. Michael Parish and a salary for the position; providing for the cleaning of Charleston's streets; ordinance appointing William Massey the country waiter for the port of Charleston [a country waiter was a customs official; see note after Reel 1 document 112];

act approving building a church in St. Paul Parish; amendment to the Act to Regulate Trade with the Cherokees, assigning further control by South Carolina; adding an additional duty on the sale of Negroes imported into South Carolina; declaring that he had found no legal objections to any of these [for more on Matthew Lamb, see note after Reel 1 document 102] [BT number N.27.]

---

**Insert:** The following six documents are found in Reel 2 of the microfilmed **Georgia Colonial Papers** (Board of Trade incoming correspondence) owned by the DLAR, documents 64 through 69. The summary entries reprinted here come from the DLAR's Finding Aid on the Georgia Colonial Papers (see DLAR blogsite to access this Finding Aid).

Governor **James Wright** of Georgia was a constitutionally conservative loyalist for whom enforcement of the Stamp Act was a patriotic mission. From his observation of how the South Carolina Lieutenant Governor William Bull II was handling enforcement of the Stamp Act in Wright's neighboring colony in spring 1766, Wright felt he was watching a sellout of constitutional principles, a contagion he feared was already being transmitted to subjects in his own colony.

As part of his patriotic mission, Wright spent much time and effort communicating with (at this time) the Board of Trade in London, informing them, in detailed letters accompanied with quantities of enclosed documentary evidence, about what he felt was "really going on," which he doubted South Carolina officials were doing. Thus, this short series of documents provides an interesting, otherwise missing perspective, in a short period of time during which no documents in the South Carolina Papers are dated. The document numbers and frame numbers retained here are those in DLAR's Finding Aid for the Georgia Colonial Papers.

64. February 10, 1766 [156]

Letter from Wright at Savannah to Board of Trade, "*relative to L<sup>t</sup> Gov<sup>r</sup> Bull's opening the Port in S<sup>o</sup> Carolina, under pretence that no stamped papers are to be had*" [BT number F.70.]

**[Note:** Lieutenant Governor **William Bull II** was at this time serving as acting governor while awaiting arrival of a new governor for South Carolina. The Stamp Act crisis happened to spring up during this transition period, leaving Bull with responsibility to respond. Bull sought with little success to chart a complicated middle course between full official enforcement and total neglect of enforcement. When a supply of stamps arrived in Charleston, he had them locked up in Fort Johnson, arguing that if they were not accessible to be distributed properly and that not using them was at least temporarily justifiable, given the ugly mood of the local citizens against the stamp tax. When faced with the issue of closing South Carolina's ports, he balked, seeking to find a justifiable way to maintain the colony's valuable trade while waiting for a time when the stamps might more safely be used (see documents 66 to 69). He was still waiting for that time when the Stamp Act was repealed and when the next governor arrived in June 1766.]

65. March 10, 1766 [158]  
Letter from Wright at Savannah to Board of Trade, "*relative to the difficulty with which he has kept the people quiet*" as he had attempted to enforce the Stamp Act [enclosing several documents concerning neighboring South Carolina's protests against the Stamp Act, documents 66 to 69 [BT number F.71.]
66. February 2, 3, 1766 [160]  
Printed excerpts from the proceedings of the South Carolina House of Assembly, relative to the opening of the ports in South Carolina while not enforcing the Stamp Act; including:  
February 2, 1766  
Letter from Colonel Peter Randolph, Surveyor General of Customs in South Carolina, to William Bull, Lieutenant [actually Acting] Governor of South Carolina, not willing to open the ports of South Carolina without Bull's political leadership; followed by  
[no date]  
Letter from Bull to Randolph, telling Randolph that he had no authority to intervene in the port-opening decision making; followed by  
February 2, 1766  
Letter from Randolph to Bull, continuing the disagreement; followed by  
February 3, 1766  
Letter from Bull to Randolph, declining to continue the disagreement by face-to-face meeting or in writing; followed by  
[no date]  
Excerpt from "*his majesty's 49<sup>th</sup> INSTRUCTION, to governor Boone*", including the authority of the Surveyor General to appoint certain officials in order to fill vacancies; followed by  
February 2, 1766  
Letter from Bull to Randolph responding to the Assembly's reminder of the Surveyor-General's appointment authority, stating that, since stamps were not available, the ports would be opened without the requirement that stamps be issued [enclosed with Wright's March 10, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 65] [BT number F.72.]
67. November 29, 1765 [164]  
Printed resolution of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, emphasizing the equal rights of Englishmen, both in England and in the Colonies, among which is the right against direct taxation without direct representation [enclosed with Wright's March 10, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 65] [BT number F.73.] [Bull had previously sent the same printed resolution to the Board of Trade, enclosed with a letter dated December 19, 1765 that contains his own statement of concern about the thinking among Commons House members.]

68. January 22 to 28, 1766 [165]  
Printed orders of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, and messages documenting the House's attempt to ascertain, from Lieutenant [actually Acting] Governor Bull, whether or not the new Stamp Act text had actually been received from the government in England by the South Carolina government; Bull not responding definitively to the House's messages, the House concluded that the Stamp Act had not been officially received in South Carolina [and thus could not be either enforced or not enforced]; Bull concluded that he had indeed received the valid text, though from different sources, and had no reason to believe the text was not accurate [and thus felt justified in taking steps to reopen the ports] [see note after document 64] [enclosed with Wright's March 10, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 65] [BT number F.74.]
69. March 1, 1766 [167a]  
Extract from minutes of a "*meeting of the FIRE Company in Charleston*," acting as "*Sons of Liberty*," adopting resolutions favoring free trade [thus anti Stamp Act] and specifically forbidding any trading with Georgia [which was seeking to enforce the Stamp Act] [enclosed with Wright's March 10, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 65] [BT number F.75.] [another copy in Georgia Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 215]  
[**Note:** Wright appears to have taken the beginnings of Sons of Liberty activity in South Carolina more seriously than Bull, who was more moderate but who also had to contend with an earlier and more widespread "rebel" movement. For Wright, the Fire Company rang a warning bell he found ominous.]
- 
26. May 3, 1766 [58]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, describing his actions to try to enforce the Stamp Act and in other administrative and legislative matters [BT number N.28.]
- Archivist's note:** An abstract of all grants of land from the first establishment of South Carolina to October 31, 1765 was separately bound as BT Bundle number N.29. [This abstract of land grants is microfilmed as the entire contents of Reel 9 Volume 398. See note at the beginning of Reel 9 of this Finding Aid explaining that Volume 398, although listed here as part of the South Carolina Colonial Papers, actually was microfilmed and physically is found in Reel 1 of the North Carolina Colonial Papers.]
27. May 8, 1766 [61]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning legal wrangling over enforcement of the Stamp Act, with itemized, numbered (1 to 10) notes about particular communications with South Carolina judges and actions he took; stating having heard, but not yet officially, of the repeal of the Stamp Act [Parliament repealed the Stamp Act on March 18, 1766;

official word may have reached South Carolina on June 17, 1766, when new Governor Montagu arrived in Charleston; see document 43 and note after it] [with enclosures, documents 28 to 38] [BT number N.30.]

28. April 3, 1766 [65]  
Copy of representation at Charleston by assistant judges [justices of the Common Pleas Court) of South Carolina to Bull, concerning action by Common Pleas Court Clerk Dougal Campbell, who had refused to enforce a particular court order because no stamp had been paid for and placed on a legal paper pertaining to the case (the usual practice having been to overlook the lack of a stamp, since they were not available); requesting that the rule of law be observed, that the court order be enforced despite the lack of a stamp, and that Campbell be suspended; signed by assistant judges Robert Pringle, Rawlins Lowndes, Benjamin Smith, and Daniel Doyley [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]
29. April 4, 1766 [67]  
Petition at Charleston of Court Clerk Dougal Campbell, justifying his having refused to enforce an order for which a stamp had not been properly obtained [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]
30. April 1, 1766 [69]  
Extract from proceedings of Commons House of South Carolina, concerning the representation by the assistant judges, declaring that Clerk Campbell should do his duty to enforce the court order or be suspended [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]
31. April 1, 1766 [71]  
Copy of statement "*Delivered in Open Court*" by Charles Skinner, Chief Justice of South Carolina [from 1761 to 1771], dissenting from the Commons House and assistant judges position, with legal details [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]
32. April 6, 1766 [73]  
Response by Bull to the petitioning assistant judges, pointing out the dilemma of his situation, between the legitimate authorities of the British Parliament on one side and the South Carolina court system on the other side; he therefore had referred the issue to the South Carolina Council; but in the meantime, Chief Justice Skinner had released his opinion, with which Bull concurs, therefore determining that Campbell did not deserve to be suspended; thus, declining to comply with the request of the petitioning assistant judges [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]

33. April 25, 1766 [75]  
Extract of Commons House proceedings, in which its members strongly suggest to Bull the strong reasons that should require him to suspend Campbell [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27] [see printed copy of Commons House proceedings, document 57]
34. April 26, 1766 [75]  
Memorial of Dougal Campbell to Bull, seeking not to be suspended and providing reasons for his request [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27]
35. April 28, 1766 [79]  
Response of Bull to the Commons House address to him requesting that Campbell be suspended, stating that he was required by the King not to "displace" any official unless sufficient reasons exist to do so; stating that in the case of Dougal Campbell, insufficient reasons existed, so Bull would not suspend him [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27] [see printed copy of Commons House proceedings, including Bull's April 28 response, document 57]
36. April 29, 1766 [81]  
Extract of Commons House proceedings, in which its members strongly disagreeing to Bull about his decision not to suspend Campbell; siding with the court judges against the governor and stating strong support for the British system of courts and rule of law; restating that Campbell's disobedience to the rule of law by the courts justifies his suspension and requesting that Bull issue the suspension promptly [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27] [see printed copy of Commons House proceedings, document 57]
37. May 1, 1766 [83]  
Response of Bull to the most recent Commons House address to him, disagreeing with Commons House logic and restating his position that Campbell will not be suspended [part of BT number N.31.] [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27] [see printed copy of Commons House proceedings, including Bull's May 1 response, document 57]
38. May 7, 1766 [85]  
Extract of Commons House proceedings, consisting of a resolution of the Assembly debated on May 2 and adopted on May 7, 1766; stating that since the Court of Common Pleas of South Carolina had sole power over its judicial matters and that Clerk Dougal Campbell was disobedient to that power, and that therefore, Lieutenant Governor Bull should have suspended Campbell, the Commons House thus felt compelled to petition the King for the removal of the Lieutenant Governor [part of BT number N.31.]

- [enclosed with Bull's May 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 27] [see printed copy of Commons House proceedings, document 57]
39. May 20, 1766 [87]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, informing them that Commons House had fined Campbell £100, but that Bull had suspended payment of the fine [with enclosures, documents 40, 41] [BT number N.32.]
40. May 16, 1766 [89]  
Copy of petition of Dougal Campbell to Bull, informing Bull of his having been fined; seeking relief from paying the unwarranted fine; followed by  
May 13, 1766  
Copy of extract of Court of Common Pleas proceedings concerning Campbell's petition, documenting the judges' position about Campbell's disobedience and imposing the £100 fine  
[Both are parts of BT number N.33.] [enclosed with Bull's May 20, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 39]
41. May 17, 1766 [91]  
Declaration by Bull to all judges in South Carolina's judicial system, stating that, since Dougal Campbell had been fined £100 by the judges for disobedience that was not an offense justifying the fine, Bull was using the King's authority to suspend payment of that fine [BT number N.34.] [enclosed with Bull's May 20, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 39]
42. June 9, 1766 [93]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, informing the Board that he had completed running a surveyed boundary line between the territories of the Cherokee and of South Carolina settlers; the North Carolina/South Carolina boundary still was not completed; experiments with importing only from neighboring colonies had not worked out well, nor had an attempt to greatly expand rice cultivation (which led to over-planting and excess supplies) [with probably an enclosure, document 47, which is identified as BT number N.36.] [BT number N.35.]
43. June 29, 1766 [95]  
Letter from newly arrived Governor of South Carolina Sir Charles Greville Montagu, at Charleston, to Board of Trade, informing them of his arrival on June 17, 1766; reporting his having sent a message to Commons House asking them to pay for former Governor Boone's unpaid salary; reporting widespread support and thanks for the Parliament's having repealed the Stamp Act [with enclosure, document 44] [BT number N.37.] [copy of this letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 149; on the issue of Boone's salary, see also Reel 2 documents 7, 8, 44, Reel 3 documents 122 to 124, and Reel 5 documents 149, 150]

[**Note:** Parliament repealed the Stamp Act on March 18, 1766. This letter, dated in late June, is the first indication in these microfilmed documents that South Carolina was aware of the repeal. Montagu may have brought the news to Charleston himself when he arrived at Charleston as South Carolina's new governor on June 17, 1766.]

[**Note:** **Sir Charles Greville Montagu** (1741-1784) served as South Carolina's colonial governor from 1766 until 1773 (with Lieutenant Governor William Bull II assuming the governor's duties as needed when Montagu was variously indisposed, in 1768 and again in 1769 to 1771).]

44. [no date] [97]  
Extract of proceedings [without a date] of a committee of the South Carolina Assembly, stating that Commons House had justifiably withheld Boone's salary because he "*had Arbitrarily and illegally Attacked a most essential Right of the Representatives of the people*" to validate their own election results; expressing thanks to the King, who had heeded Commons House's petition that Governor Boone be removed; supposing that some equitable amount would be found in the coming year's estimate toward payment of his back salary [second side of Frame 97 microfilmed twice] [BT number N.38.] [enclosed with Montagu's June 29, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 43] [copy of this report in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 150; on the issue of Boone's salary, see also Reel 2 documents 7, 8, 43, Reel 3 documents 122 to 124, and Reel 5 document 149, 150]
45. August 6, 1766 [99]  
Letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing an "*accurate account*" of the proceedings of judges and lawyers in relation to the Stamp Act; concluding that some "*very necessary...measures should be taken to Curb the growing powers of the assistant Judges, and to support those of the Chief Justice*" [with enclosures, documents 46, 48 to 63] [BT number N.40.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number N.39.]
46. May 7, 1766 [101]  
"*An Account of the Proceedings of the Chief Justice, Assistant Judges, and Lawyers of South Carolina on the Stamp Act*" [archivist's cover page]; followed by the account, written by South Carolina Chief Justice Charles Skinner [see also Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 documents 151 to 162; referencing copies of other documents, as follows:  
November 12, 1765  
Extract of proceedings of the judges convened by Skinner, recognizing that the Stamp Act had caused disruption of business in the court system; judges suggesting that, as long as stamps were not available and the Stamp Act could not be enforced, the business of the courts should continue without stamps, with which Skinner disagreed; followed by

November 13, 1765

Extract of proceedings of Commons House with Skinner and other judges present, pertaining to operations of the courts given the Stamp Act and the lack of stamps to enforce it; with further proceedings of December 3, 1765 and January 22, 1766; including information relating to the Court Clerk Dougal Campbell, who had refused to allow legal papers for a particular case to be processed because of the lack of a stamp; including the process of dealing with this matter, including the Lieutenant Governor, Commons House, and Chief Justice; followed by

March 3, 1766

Extract of proceedings of assembled judges convened by Skinner, who disagreed with the judges' desire to do court business without stamps, as long as the stamps were not available; followed by

March 4, 1766

Continuing Extract of proceedings of judges with Skinner, including text of petition to Skinner from a number of "*Merchants, Traders, Freeholders & other Inhabitants of*" South Carolina, seeking to end the "*refusal of Justice*" due to lack of enforcement of the Stamp Act and to require the court clerk to process court business; signed by 63 individuals; followed by

April 1, 1766

Continuing extract of proceedings of judges with Skinner, with the latter's opinion, delivered in court, concerning the petition from 63 individuals, stating that the colony's business could not be resumed until the Stamp Act was being enforced in that business, including legal arguments and observations on the actions of the assistant judges, who favored bypassing the stamp process and suspending the court clerk refusing to process papers without stamps [see copy of Skinner's opinion read in court in document 31]; followed by

April 3, 1766

Representation of the assistant judges of their position against strictly enforcing the Stamp Act and suspending the clerk who refused to process papers without stamps [see copy of the assistant judges' representation in document 28]; followed by

April 7, 1766

Extract of proceedings of South Carolina Council, which agreed with Bull and Skinner and not with Commons House and the assistant judges; followed by

April 4, 1766

Petition of Clerk of Court Dougal Campbell, stating his case for enforcing the Stamp Act strictly [see copy of this petition in document 29], with Skinner's account of additional actions relating to enforcement of the Stamp Act; followed by

April 17, 1766

Order by Skinner to Roger Pinckney, Deputy Provost Marshal of South Carolina, telling him to cease making arrests using writs that had not been signed by Skinner as Chief Justice, this being seen as another way to try to get around enforcing the Stamp Act by enforcing court business without stamps, including an additional court document dated April 18, 1766, concerning the particular case in which Francis Stokes had been arrested and jailed in his case against Robert Graham

**[Note: Roger Pinckney (1735-1776)** was, in the Pinckney family, a relative latecomer to South Carolina, migrating in 1764. His friend Richard Cumberland had previously been appointed Provost Marshal, but Cumberland did not intend to leave England, so he offered Roger the position of Deputy Provost Marshal, serving in South Carolina. Pinckney thus was Provost Marshal in practice but not in title.]; followed by

[no date]

Extract of proceedings of a Council meeting about the writ for making arrests; followed by

[no date]

Petition of trader James Brown to Bull, requesting help to open a special court, since the court of common pleas was not functioning, so that he could do business; followed by

April 10, 1766

Order of Bull to open a special court, with Skinner's comments and communication to Bull about this additional attempt to get around the Stamp Act; followed by

[no date]

Letter from Council President Othniel Beale to Skinner, concerning James Brown's petition and a special court; followed by

April 11, 1766

Letter to Skinner from [?] concerning what people at the Exchange were saying about Skinner's refusal to open the courts, as well as news received May 3, 1766 that the Stamp Act may have been repealed; followed by

Copy in a different hand of another letter by the same writer, here expressing surprise that Bull had approved the special court and fear that "*some Measures will be adopted that will increase the flame in America, and raise the Cry to Arms*" [Frame 121B] breaks the sequence of microfilmed pages in Skinner's account for one frame only]; followed by

May 5, 1766

Letter from Bull to Skinner concerning popular disturbances and keeping the public peace, to which Skinner responded with orders to tighten law enforcement; followed by

May 6, 1766

Evidence of public disturbances directed toward forcing Skinner to reopen the courts and disputes over whether the Court Clerk Dougal Campbell should be suspended as advocated by the assistant judges, but which Bull refused to do, so instead Commons House had fined him £100

[Skinner's account ends at Frame [125] [Frame 117 is microfilmed a second time, out of sequence, after Frame 125] [all part of BT number N.41.] [all enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]

47. June 2 to 9, 1766 [126]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, including Bull's May 31, 1766 proclamation requiring enforcement of the official boundary lines surveyed between settler and Indian territory in South Carolina; including news and comment on repeal of the Stamp Act plus other news and comment [BT number N.36., microfilmed out of order] [probably enclosed with Bull's June 9, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 42]
48. [no date] [128]  
Index of Skinner's legal account about the Stamp Act [document 46] [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
49. May 13, 1766 [133]  
Extract of proceedings of Court with representation of the legal case made by Rawlins Lowndes on behalf of himself and his fellow assistant judges Robert Pringle, Benjamin Smith, and Daniel Doyley, referring back to text of the April 1, 1766 representation by the same assistant judges [justices of the Commons Pleas Court] [see document 28] that argued against a strict enforcement of the Stamp Act, and for discipline of the court clerk who had disobeyed orders by refusing to process legal papers despite their not having the proper stamps, which had led to the clerk, Dougal Campbell being fined £100 for "*Contempt, Contumacy and Neglect of Duty*"; including references to documents and evidence [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
50. May 29, 1766 [145]  
Extract of proceedings of the Court, concerning various matters of court business; consideration of Dougal Campbell's petition, seeking relief from imposition of the £100 fine; responding to the petition by reducing the fine to £10; including further evidence about Skinner's accusation against the clerk for using the Chief Justice's name without permission [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]

51. July 1, 1766 [146]  
Extract of proceedings of the Court, including copy of Skinner's legal account about his possession and use (or not) of the seal of the court and related issues of court powers [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
52. May 13, 1766 [150]  
Index [probably] of Skinner's [May 7, 1766] legal account [document 46] [see also document 48] [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
53. January 13, 1766 [153]  
Petition of Robert Williams of Charleston and Thomas Hartley of St. Paul Parish, who were involved in a South Carolina court case, to Bull, seeking Bull's assistance because of delays in the court process [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
54. January 1, 1766 [156]  
Copy of "*Examination & Deposition of Robert Williams*" before Clerk Dougal Campbell concerning his court case; followed by  
January 1, 1766  
Copy of "*Information & Deposition of Thomas Hartley*" before Dougal Campbell in the same court case; with note, apparently by Skinner, "*I answered their Pet<sup>n</sup>. by my Let<sup>r</sup> to the Lieut<sup>t</sup> Gov<sup>r</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> Feby 1766*" [see document 55] [both part of BT number N.41.] [both enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
55. February 1, 1766 [162]  
Copy of "*The Ch. Justice's Answer*" [to Bull concerning the petition and depositions of Williams and Hartley, document 53], stating that Skinner himself had delayed the legal process in this case; providing details of the process and both Skinner's and Campbell's role in it; denying any wrongdoing of lax attention to enforcing the laws or of offering favoritism to particular people; concluding therefore that he was already complying with the request of the petition that the laws be duly executed and justice administered faithfully [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
56. April 3, 1766 [166]  
Bull's decision, speaking for the King, on the disposition of the court case involving Williams and Hartley, dismissing the felony charge against William Ward Crosthwaite for allegedly abducting by force Sarah Hartley [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]

57. April 28 to May 7, 1766 [168]  
Printed document of "*Votes of the Commons-House of Assembly of South-Carolina*", including text of a petition from "*the merchants, traders, freeholders, and other inhabitants*" of Charleston concerning disruption of commerce by enforcement of the requirement that all fees be paid for document stamps; signed by 114 individuals and businesses; including the April 23 to May 7, 1766 Commons-House proceedings [see documents 33, 35 to 38] concerning the petition, which include testimony of clerk Dougal Campbell, the April 24, 1766 vote that Campbell should be suspended, Bull's April 28, 1766 response declining to suspend Campbell [see document 35], Commons House's April 29, 1766 response to Bull opposing his declination to suspend [see document 36], Bull's May 1, 1766 response to Commons House refusing to change his decision not to suspend [see document 37], text of Bull's April 6 letter to the "assistant judges" [see document 31] who had supported suspension in a petition [April 3, 1766; see document 28], and Commons House's resolutions, as proposed May 2, 1766, that since Campbell had disobeyed his orders from the court, he was guilty of contempt, that were then debated on May 7, 1766, amended, and adopted [see document 38] [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
58. [no date], 1766 [176]  
Partially completed printed form, pre-signed by Justice Robert Pringle and Chief Justice Skinner, ordering the Provost Marshal to produce in court [name and other specifics blank] [microfilmed twice] [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
59. February 7, 1766 [178]  
Copy of Bull's Commission, on behalf of the King, of Rawlins Lowndes as an assistant judge [justice] of the Common Pleas Court in South Carolina; followed by  
March 3, 1766  
Copy of endorsement on back of the commission of Lowndes' having properly taken the oath to perform his duties as assistant judge; followed by  
February 28, 1766  
Copy of Bull's Commission, on behalf of the King, of Benjamin Smith as an assistant judge [justice] of the Common Pleas Court in South Carolina; followed by  
March 3, 1766  
Copy of endorsement on back of the commission of Smith's having properly taken the oath to perform his duties as assistant judge; followed by  
March 1, 1766  
Copy of Bull's Commission, on behalf of the King, of Daniel Doyley as an assistant judge [justice] of the Common Pleas Court in South Carolina; followed by

March 3, 1766

Copy of endorsement on back of the commission of Doyley's having properly taken the oath to perform his duties as assistant judge  
[all part of BT number N.41.] [all enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]

60. [no date] [181]  
Copy of legal and political "*Remarks on the Deductions made by the Assembly of South Carolina from the Fees of the Ch. Justice and Clerk of the Crown in the Court of General Sessions of the Peace, Oyer and Terminer* [hearing and decision, that is trial courts, for criminal offenses], *Assize & General Goal Delivery held*"; a report by an unidentified author objecting to a Commons House proposal to reduce fees [salaries] for two top court officers; note at the end indicates that Commons House had disagreed with the report and set the salaries "*as in the year 1759*"; a second note states that "*The Chief Justice obtained the above report from the Clerk of the Assembly the 22<sup>d</sup>. July Instant 1766*" [significance of the words "Delivery held" at the end of the document's title is unclear] [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
61. [no date] [186]  
Unsigned note stating that the Chief Justice, a few days before the new assistant judges took office on March 3, 1766, had happened to see and read part of the assistant judges' petition, in draft form, whereupon he had decided that, if they had proceeded with their petition he was determined to suspend them all and "*abide the Consequence*" [this presumably is the "representation" found in document 28] [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
62. [no date] [187]  
Copy of petition from "*practitioners of the Law, in the supreme Courts of Jurisdiction*" in South Carolina to Chief Justice Skinner, deploring the "*Suspension of every kind of business in civil cases*" resulting from the stamp tax situation, which had caused "*great injury, & oppression of the Inhabitants*"; requesting relief by fully reopening the operation of the courts as things were before the stamp tax was imposed [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]
63. [no date] [189]  
Unsigned note stating from a sympathetic perspective the situation with the Chief Justice against Commons House and the assistant judges [part of BT number N.41.] [enclosed with Montagu's August 6, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 45]

64. September 19, 1766 [191]  
Letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting three acts passed by the South Carolina Assembly, as well as papers from the Chief Justice [with enclosures, documents 65 to 67] [BT number N.42.] [copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 152]
65. [no date] [193A]  
Copy of Skinner's observations about the courts the sometimes nasty politics related to the stamp-tax issue in South Carolina, including the situation with Dougal Campbell, evidence against Provost Marshal Roger Pinckney, depositions of Bennet Oldham [elsewhere identified as William] and James O'Brien; relating happenings in August 1766 [BT number N.43.] [enclosed with Montagu's September 19, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 64]
66. September 15, 1766 [199]  
Copy of voluntary statement under oath of South Carolina justice James O'Brien, concerning his knowledge of some details of how South Carolina handled enforcement of the Stamp Act [BT number N.44.] [enclosed with Montagu's September 19, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 64] [another copy is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 154]
67. [no date] [201]  
*"M<sup>r</sup>. [William] Oldhams declaration, in support of what I [Chief Justice Skinner] had wrote same in regard for Mr. [Roger] Pinckney the [Deputy] Provost Marshal on the Affair of his arresting Stokes"* [see document 46, April 17, 1766] that had been discussed in the presence of Mr. Barons, whom Skinner thought was working secretly against him [BT number N.45.] [enclosed with Montagu's September 19, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 64] [copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 155]  
[Note: This Mr. Barons may be **Benjamin Barons**, who lived in Charleston in 1765 and 1766 as British Postmaster General for the Southern Department. He and his appointee as South Carolina Postmaster Peter Timothy had responsibilities during the Stamp Act period, apparently for both providing stamps for enforcing their use on mailing documents. Both Barons and Timothy apparently got a bad reputation among the people of Charleston for seeking to enforce the Stamp Act. Chief Justice Skinner appears to have developed an opposite feeling about Barons.]
68. September 13, 17, 1766 [203]  
Copy of South Carolina court document with accounting of fees for case of Ward & Leger v. John Campbell with dated notes of Justice Robert Pringle (September 13, 1766) and Chief Justice Skinner (September 17, 1766) concerning the "unanimous" disallowing of fee charges for swearing of a jury; followed by

August 4, 1760

Copy of court document with accounting of fees for case of Robertson & Baillie v. Tacitus Gaillard, signed by Pringle; followed by

December 11, 1764

*"List or Table of all Fees allowed"* in relation to a *"Requisition"* from Bull

[probably all part of BT number N.46.]

[another copy of Ward & Leger and of Robertson & Baillie court documents in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 documents 156, 157 respectively; copy of list of fees in Reel 5 document 158]

69. August 30, 1766 [evidently completed on] September 2, 1766 [206]  
Letter from Deputy Provost Marshal of South Carolina Roger Pinckney at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning his official actions in his position, stating his own knowledge of those actions, in light of a complaint against the assistant judges sent to the Board of Trade by Chief Justice Skinner [see document 46, especially the court order therein dated April 17, and document 67]; justifying his actions and questioning the accuracy of certain items in Skinner's complaint [BT number N.47.] [copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 159; original letter also in Reel 5 document 160]
70. November 14, 1766 [216]  
Letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting the *"last Quarterly Accounts of Entries & Clearances of Vessells from"* [the port of Charleston] [accounts not microfilmed here] [BT number N.48.]
71. December 8, 1766 [218]  
Letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting a *"List of the Exports from this Port from the Year 1747"* plus a return of the militia and regular troops in South Carolina [with enclosures, documents 72, 73] [BT number N.49.] [similar letter to Secretary of State Shelburne is in Reel 5 document 171]
72. [no date] [220]  
List of exports from the port of Charleston *"for 20 Years past"* [from March 1747 to March 1766], reported by categories of exports as follows: rice, naval stores, deer skins, indigo, slaves, lumber, corn & peas, tanned leather, beef & pork, silk, tallow, cotton, and hemp [enclosed with Montagu's December 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade [BT number N.50.] [same list sent to Secretary of State Shelburne in Reel 5 document 173]
73. [no date] [221]  
Return of militia and regular troops in South Carolina in 1766, reporting for regulars, 23 at Charleston, 45 at Fort Augusta, 19 at Fort Charlotte, and 30 at Fort Prince George, plus 10,000 militia [enclosed with Montagu's December 8, 1766 letter to Board of Trade [BT number N.51.] [same return sent to Secretary of State Shelburne in Reel 5 document 172]

74. February 13, 1767 [222]  
 Letter from [Secretary of State the Earl of] Shelburne to Board of Trade, informing the Board of the receipt from several North American colonies of petitions concerning the lack of sufficient "*Medium of Commerce*", especially gold and silver coin, and passing on their requests that the British government issue enough "*paper Currency as may be adequate to their Wants*" [with enclosures, all in document 75] [BT number N.52.]  
**[Note: William Petty, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Shelburne** (1737-1805) was active in the higher levels of British politics by the early 1760s. In 1763, he was serving as the First Lord of Trade, the leading member of the Board of Trade. Between July 30, 1766 and October 20, 1768, he served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department, a position from which he exercised considerable influence over British colonial policy in South Carolina. Later, in 1782, he served as Secretary of State for the Home Department before becoming Prime Minister.]
75. November 22, 1766 [224]  
 Copy of petition from the Council and Assembly of Nova Scotia to the King, concerning the availability of currency; followed by  
 December 11, 1766  
 Copy of petition from the Colony of New York to the Parliament, concerning the availability of currency; followed by  
 November 28, 1766  
 Copy of petition from the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina to the King, concerning the availability of currency; followed by  
 [no date]  
 Copy of petition from merchants of London trading with North America, concerning the availability of currency  
 [all enclosed in Shelburne's February 13, 1767 letter to Board of Trade, document 74] [none of these is identified with a BT number]
76. January 16, 1767 [235]  
 Letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting a list of entries and clearances of shipping at the port of Charleston for the preceding quarter; informing the Board that, pursuant to advice, he had issued a proclamation "*setting forth the Complaints of the Indians against the White People and his Majesty's Commands requiring strict obedience to be paid to the Royal ....*" [BT number N.53.] [similar letter with no date to Secretary of State Shelburne in Reel 5 document 175]
77. June 30, 1766 [235]  
 Statement of legal opinions from Matthew Lamb at Lincolns Inn, concerning 11 laws passed by South Carolina in October 1764 and during several months in 1765, including laws pertaining to: funding the colony in 1762-1763; continuation of several previous acts; implementation of a general tax; funding the colony in 1763-1764; selling a tract of land for use of the pastor on John's Island;

promoting incorporation of the Winyah Indigo Society, which already exists [for more on the Winyah Indigo Society of Georgetown, South Carolina, see Reel 1 document 15 and note after (1758), Reel 2 document 195 and note after (1772), and Reel 3 document 144 (1771) for more on the Winyah Indigo Society and the extended efforts to incorporate it; why incorporation was still an issue in 1766 and in the early 1770s is not clear from these documents alone]; appointing additional hemp inspectors; building a public road to the German settlements; establishing several ferries connecting several islands, along with connecting roads; encouraging John Cuthbert in his efforts to improve cultivation of rice and other grains; establishing a new St. Matthew Parish in Berkeley County [north of Charleston]; reporting no legal objections to any of these [BT number N.54.]

78. March 10, 1767 [239]  
Statement of legal opinions from Matthew Lamb at Lincolns Inn, concerning 5 acts passed by South Carolina in March and July 1766, including laws pertaining to: restraining export of Indian corn and peas for a certain time; extending time to pay taxes approved April 6, 1765; erecting a bridge over Salt Catcher River [location not determined] and approving two ferries; approving construction of a road and establishment of a ferry in the area of the Congaree and Catawba Rivers [location of ferry not clear since the two rivers are roughly parallel]; funding the colony in 1764-1765; reporting no legal objections to any of these [BT number N.55.]
79. April 14, 1767 [241]  
Letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, informing the Board that he had established new regulations on Indian traders and recalled all general licenses; transmitting these regulations and entries and clearances of vessels at Charleston for the previous quarter [the latter not microfilmed here] [with enclosure, document 80] [BT number N.56.] [similar letter with same date from Montagu to Secretary of State the Earl of Shelburne is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 180]
80. [no date] [243]  
Copy of "*Regulations for the better carrying on the Trade, with the Indian Tribes in the southern District*", containing 18 numbered regulations [Frame 243 microfilmed twice] [enclosed with Montagu's April 14, 1767 letter to Board of Trade, document 79] [BT number N.57.] [another copy of regulations in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 181]

81. May 12, 1767 [246]  
Letter from Montagu in South Carolina to Board of Trade, reporting having received an address from the South Carolina Assembly "*desiring I woud immediately suspend*" Chief Justice Skinner, having asked Skinner to comment on the address, having received Skinner's response defending himself against the allegations in the request; having consulted with the South Carolina Council, who unanimously agreed that Skinner did not understand South Carolina law and therefore should be suspended; and therefore having suspended Skinner effective on May 11, 1767 [with enclosures, documents 84, 85] [BT number N.58.] [copy of letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 177]
82. July 15, 1767 [248]  
Letter from Shelburne to Board of Trade, concerning a memorial from the people of South Carolina delivered by South Carolina Agent [Charles] Garth requesting that county sheriffs be appointed in lieu of a provost marshal for the colony, which Shelburne was referring to the Board of Trade to consider the request and report back to him with a recommendation [BT number N.59.] [for more on Garth, see notes after Reel 1 document 8, 127 and Reel 2 document 145, plus several Board of Trade documents in Reels 1 and 2 pertaining to other Garth petitions and memorials with dates in 1757, 1762, 1764, 1767, 1770, 1771; also, see especially Board of Trade response to Shelburne's 1767 letter in Reel 3 document 130]
83. July 11, 1767 [249]  
Copy of memorial of Garth at Wigmore Street, London, to Shelburne on behalf of the people of South Carolina concerning reasons they wish to change the South Carolina form of government to remove the position of provost marshal and substitute marshals or sheriffs appointed in each county [enclosed with Shelburne's July 15 letter to Board of Trade, document 82] [not identified with a BT number] [original memorial in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 182]
84. [no date] [254]  
Report of "*the Committee* [of Commons House, South Carolina Assembly] *appoint<sup>d</sup> to inquire into the State of the Courts of Justice*", containing particular evidence that the courts were not functioning properly; blaming especially the Chief Justice for having "*acted illegally, Arbitrarily, Partially, & Oppressively*"; therefore resolving to recommend to Commons House that it recommend to the Governor that the Chief Justice should be suspended [enclosed with Montagu's May 12, 1767 letter to Board of Trade, document 81] [not identified with a BT number] [copy of report in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 178]

85. May 2, 1767 [260]  
Memorial of Chief Justice Skinner to Montagu, responding to the committee report [document 84] with a detailed defense of how properly the courts had been functioning under Skinner's leadership [enclosed with Montagu's May 12, 1767 letter to Board of Trade, document 81] [not identified with a BT number] [copy of memorial in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 179]
86. June 26, 1767 [270]  
Order of the King disapproving a South Carolina act of August 1765 that created a new parish in Berkeley County [now in Charleston] in South Carolina had the effect of improperly increasing representation in the Commons House; instructing the Board of Trade to send new Instructions to South Carolina to ensure that it doesn't repeat this mistake [BT number N.60.]
87. June 26, 1767 [272]  
Copy of order of the King disapproving the South Carolina act that created a new parish, and thus increased representation in Commons House [BT number N.61.]
88. November 10, 1767 [274]  
Letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, describing some interior (frontier) insurrections [see document 102 for more details], which he hoped would now be dissipating [BT number N.62.]  
[**Note:** These insurrections are likely related to the ongoing hostility in the back country between poor farmers whose livelihood had been disrupted by the Anglo-Cherokee War and who were reverting to hunting, horse stealing, and banditry. Opposing them was a small group of propertied frontiersmen, who organized a vigilante group they called "Regulators" (differently motivated and unrelated to the North Carolina Regulators).]

## **Volume 379—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), continue**

May 30, 1768 to November 6, 1770      Documents 89 to 156      [Frames 1 to 157]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Board of Trade incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina continue in Volume 379 of the Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina.

**Note:** Archivists (probably in the Board of Trade Office) wrote descriptive notes for many of the manuscript documents. These are generally microfilmed with the documents. On these notes, archivists provided their own numbers by manuscript Bundle or Volume. Where found, this Finding Aid reports these numbers as "BT numbers."

Volume 379 begins with O.1. and ends with O.49. For 12 BT numbers, no document is microfilmed or perhaps not assigned, while for 22 microfilmed documents, no BT number is assigned.

Neither the unassigned BT numbers nor the documents not assigned BT numbers appear to be randomly distributed. For reasons not clear, BT numbers O.13., O.14., O.16. through O.21., O.30., O.31., O.46., and O.48. are assigned to no microfilmed document. Documents 129 through 151 are not assigned a BT number. The reason appears to be that these are copies, or more often duplicates, of letters from South Carolina Lieutenant Governor William Bull to Secretary of State for the Colonies the Earl of Hillsborough or enclosures with those letters, and thus apparently were not considered by the Board of Trade archivists to be Board of Trade documents.

**Note:** In the mid-1760s, top colonial officials, especially secretaries of state and colonial governors, began to establish practices of numbering their official letters to each other. For an overall analysis of letter numbering in the South Carolina Colonial Papers, see the section on this subject in the **Introduction**. Until about 1766, official correspondence between colonial governors in America and the Board of Trade and Secretary of State in London had not been organized by letter number (or carefully distinguished among original letters, copies, and duplicates). Secretary of State for the Southern Department the Earl of Shelburne apparently initiated the concept of numbered letters while working for the Board of Trade. The concept of numbering letters did not catch on with the Board of Trade. It fizzled soon after it was tried by Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina William Bull II in 1768.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

89. July 22, 1768 [1]  
Statement of legal opinions from Matthew Lamb at Lincolns Inn, concerning one act passed by South Carolina in April 1768, pertaining to establishment of courts, building jails and appointing sheriffs and other provincial officers; summarizing his detailed findings [which mostly raise questions] about the act's contents by stating "*I have Observed the Material things in this Act, and must Submitt the Confirming the same to your Lordships Judgment*" [BT number O.1.]  
[**Note:** For more on **Matthew Lamb**, see note after Reel 1 document 102]

90. July 18, 1768 [3]  
Copy of letter No. 2 from William Bull at Charleston to Secretary of State the Earl of Hillsborough, transmitting 17 acts by the South Carolina Assembly; commenting on just two of them which required “particular Notice”; first an act establishing courts, building jails, and appointing sheriffs and other officers, which Bull defends as needed; concerning a related matter of the temporary boundary between North and South Carolina from the sea to the Catawba River, pointing out that settlements had now surpassed the end of the line into territory west of the Catawba River, thus suggesting the need to extend the line; second, an act establishing a new St. Matthew Parish in Berkeley County, which had the right of representation in the Assembly, but that the current representative lived in another parish [BT number O.2.] [for original of same letter, addressed to the Board of Trade, see document 92] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 17] [for Bull’s letters to Hillsborough No. 3 to No. 8, dated between July 19 1768 and September 9, 1768, see Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 documents 18 to 20, 22, 23, and 26]  
[Note: The act to establish courts, build jails, and appoint sheriffs etc. was an attempt by Bull’s government to respond to the persistent violence in the back country. See the note after document 88.]  
[Note: Although Lord Charles Greville Montagu served as South Carolina’s colonial governor from 1766 until 1773, he twice took lengthy “leaves of absence”—from May 23 to October 30, 1768, and from July 30, 1769 to September 15, 1771. In 1768, Montagu traveled to Philadelphia and Boston to recover his health. A gap exists in the official correspondence from November 1767 to July 1768. During this period, apparently Montagu’s health declined (perhaps from a tropical disease such as malaria). Fortunately, Montagu had in William Bull a reliable and capable Lieutenant Governor, who always seemed present and prepared to take over. Although Bull was expected to maintain the administrative functions of the government, he in fact, in his cautious way, took on major policy issues, seeking middle ground to resolve them.]  
[Note: During the same gap in correspondence, a substantial change occurred in the British bureaucratic process of managing its colonies. **Secretary of State for the Southern Department** from 1766 to 1768 the **Earl of Shelburne** had begun the change when he left the Board of Trade, realizing that priorities in managing the North American colonies in particular were changing from economic (the policy realm of the Board of Trade) to political and military (the policy realm of the Secretary of State and, later, the War Office). In February 1768, the **Earl of Hillsborough**, also with experience in the Board of Trade, was appointed to a new, more robust secretary-of-state position, which combined responsibilities of the Secretaries of State for the Southern and Northern Departments. It also raised the status of the new **Secretary of State for the Colonies** (from February 27, 1768 to August 27, 1772) over that of the Board of Trade in managing colonial affairs, subsuming many of the Board of Trade’s responsibilities for policy and communications within the office of the Secretary of State.]

[**Note: William Petty, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Shelburne** (1737-1805) was active in the higher levels of British politics by the early 1760s. In 1763, he was serving as the First Lord of Trade, the leading member of the Board of Trade. Between July 30, 1766 and October 20, 1768, he served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department, a position from which he exercised considerable influence over British colonial policy in South Carolina. Later, in 1782, he served as Secretary of State for the Home Department before becoming Prime Minister.]

[**Note: Wills Hill, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Hillsborough** (1768 to 1772) had a long career in British politics and government: First Lord of the Board of Trade from 1763-1765; Secretary of State for the Colonies and First Lord of the Board of Trade from 1768-1772; Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1779-1782.]

[**Note:** The Earl of Hillsborough, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, made a practice, apparently continued from Shelburne, of numbering his outgoing letters and of having regular incoming correspondents such as colonial governors number their letters to him, as begun here in South Carolina Lieutenant Governor William Bull's letters to Hillsborough.]

91. May 30, 1768 [7]  
Duplicate letter No. 1 from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, informing the Board that Governor Montagu had "*embarked on Board his Majesty's Ship Fowey for Philadelphia for the recovery and re-establishment of his health in his Majesty's Northern Colonies, intending to return in the Fall*", leaving Bull in charge of the administration of the colony [BT number O.3.] [original letter is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 16]  
[**Note:** Letters from colonial governors were often sent multiple times on separate vessels, in hopes that one of the letters would get through or get through faster to England. Thus, an "**original**" letter would be sent plus perhaps several "**duplicate**" letters. A "**copy**" was usually the copy of a letter sent possibly at a later time and usually to another recipient. Use of these terminology conventions was usually but not always observed. Thus, a document identified as a "duplicate" might in fact be a "copy" or vice versa. Bull was unusual in numbering his letters to the Board of Trade. Governor Montagu, for whom Bull was standing in as acting governor while Montagu was on a leave of absence for health reasons between May 23 and October 30, 1768, did not number his letters to the Board of Trade, nor did the Board of Trade normally number its outgoing letters.]
92. July 18, 1768 [9]  
Letter No. 2 from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade [same as document 90, copy of letter to Secretary of State for the Southern Department, the Earl of Hillsborough] [BT number O.4.]

93. July 20, 1768 [13]  
Letter No. 3 from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, explaining that because the Assembly was currently prorogued, he planned to dissolve it and call for new elections when Governor Montagu returned [BT number O.5.]
94. August 15, 1768 [15]  
Letter No. 4 from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, stating that he would prepare and submit, as requested, "*a particular and exact account of the several Manufactures which have been set up & carried out in this Government from the year 1734*" [BT number O.6.] [Frame 15 microfilmed twice]
95. September 6, 1768 [17]  
Letter No. 5 from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting that "*Upon the most particular Inquiry I cannot learn that any Manufactures have been set up in this Province except three Rope Walks & two Houses for baking or refining Sugar*" and that records reveal no earlier manufactures in South Carolina, "*altho' in some of our Laws the Term Manufacture hath been applied, perhaps improperly, to the raising of Silk Hemp & Indico*"; adding details, including the observation that "*most of the Inhabitants being emigrants from the Northern Colonies have been accustomed to employ some part of their time in weaving coarse Cloths of Flax, Cotton & wool for their own Families*" with additional details [with enclosure, document 96] [BT number O.7.] [similar duplicate letter No. 8 to Hillsborough dated September 8, 1768 is in document 100, with Appendix document 101; original letter No. 8 dated September 8, 1768, is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 26 with Appendix document 27 [this is the last numbered letter Bull sent to Board of Trade]
96. [no date] [20]  
"Appendix" including "*Titles of all the Acts & Votes of the Assembly of South Carolina giving Encouragement to various Articles for the improvement of Agriculture since 1734*", including 11 entries with dates between May 29, 1736 and April 8, 1768 [BT number O.8.] [enclosed with Bull's September 6, 1768 letter to Board of Trade, document 95]
97. [no date] [22]  
Memorial to Hillsborough as First Commissioner of Trade of Plantations from Thomas Crowley on behalf of John Daniel Hammeret, seeking relief for Hammeret, who went to America in response to a public advertisement in 1765 in England from the Board of Trade stating that "*suitable Persons were wanted to go to America, in order to civilize and instruct the Indian Youth*", whom Hillsborough at the Board of Trade had assisted in being selected, who had done this work for several years in Cherokee territory, but had become destitute as a result and had no means of support [BT number O.9.]

[**Note:** When John Daniel Hammeret responded to the advertisement, Hillsborough was working in the Board of Trade. By the time of this memorial (apparently late 1768 or early 1769), Hillsborough had become Secretary of State for the Colonies. Nevertheless, he also retained his position in the Board of Trade, so he was approachable with a memorial.]

98. [no date] [24]  
Petition to Board of Trade from "*the Palatines* [Germans from the Palatinate region along the middle Rhine River] *settled in South Carolina*", seeking help in sending to their "*infant*" settlement a "*Clergyman to instruct them, to impart the Education to their Children, and to comfort the Sick and the Dying*", signed, in the name of the petitioners, by "*Gustavus Anthony Nachsel DD, Minister of the German Lutheran St George's Chapel in Goodman's Fields* [in London]" [BT number O.10.]
99. March 1, 1769 [26]  
Extract of letter from Montagu at Charleston [back on October 30, 1768 from his leave of absence] to Hillsborough as Secretary of State, explaining the depleted situation with membership on the South Carolina Council, recommending Rowland Rugeley and Bernard Elliot to fill vacancies on the Council [BT number O.11.] [original letter No. 8 in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 42]
100. September 8, 1768 [28]  
Duplicate letter No. 8 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, submitting his report on manufactures [with same wording as in Bull's letter No. 5, document 95 dated September 6, 1768] [with enclosure, document 101] [part of BT number O.12.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 26 with Appendix, document 27; similar letter dated September 6, 1768, with appendix, is in document 95]
101. [no date] [30]  
Appendix on improvement of agriculture since 1734 [with same wording as in document 96, enclosed with Bull's letter No. 5, document 95 dated September 6, 1768] [part of BT number O.12.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number O.13 or O.14.]
102. September 10, 1768 [32]  
Duplicate letter No. 9 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough as Secretary of State, reporting on plans for an election for the new Assembly and election irregularities in the residence of some candidates; reactions to a disturbing circular [about colonial rights] from Boston; violence in the colony's northwest, for which Bull blames partially "*a great number of horse-Stealers and House Robbers*" who live there, which Bull feels can be subdued and controlled only with the use of military force [see note after document 88] [BT number O.15.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number O.16. through O.21.]

[original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 29] [for Bull's letters to Hillsborough No. 10 to No. 13, dated from October 16, 1768 to August 12, 1769, see Secretary of State incoming correspondence, documents 31 to 33 and 51]

[**Note:** The **Boston Circular Letter** of 1767 was written by John Adams and James Otis. As adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives, it responded to the Townshend Act, new tax laws imposed by Parliament following repeal of the Stamp Act. Included was a tax on Tea. After Secretary of State Hillsborough's demand that Massachusetts repudiate its position on the Townshend Act was met by mob violence in Boston and rejection by the House of Representatives, Hillsborough ordering British troops to Boston to keep the peace, leading to more violence and in 1770 to the "Boston Massacre."]

103. August 28, 1769 [34]  
Letter No. 14 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough as Secretary of State, reporting on resolutions by the Assembly with claims of rights having questionable legality, influenced by similar resolutions in other colonies, including Virginia; but concluding that "*I make no Doubt but this province will chearfully return to its former plan, of raising produce from the Earth to be sent to Great Britain for her Manufacturing*" which was the true economic interest for all [with enclosure, document 104] [BT number O.22.] [duplicate letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 56]  
[**Note:** Virginia's House of Burgesses had adopted resolutions in 1765 against the taxation principles of the Stamp Act. In 1769 it followed the lead of Massachusetts, adopting new **Virginia Resolves** against the Townshend Acts.]
104. August 17, 1769 [36]  
Extract of proceedings of Commons House of South Carolina, concerning receipt of Resolutions from Virginia, which it agreed to consider; followed by August 19, 1769  
Extract of proceedings of Commons House, concerning consideration of the Virginia Resolutions, leading to consideration of similar resolutions for South Carolina, whose texts were included in the proceedings  
[both enclosed with Bull's August 28, 1769 letter to Hillsborough, dated August 28, 1769, document 103] [BT number O.23.]
105. August 29, 1769 [38]  
Letter No. 15 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning enforcement of the law requiring colonies to provide financially for the cost of "*Barrack necessities for the Kings Troops*" [the Mutiny Act or Quartering Act] [with enclosure, document 106] [BT number O.24.] [duplicate letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 58]

**Note:** A **Mutiny Act** was a British law designed to control British soldiers' and sailors' behavior when living among civilians. A Mutiny Act was in force for just one year and had to be renewed annual. The issue that upset the American colonies, including South Carolina, first emerged in the **Quartering Act** of 1765, which was an amendment to the Mutiny Act of that year. For that and subsequent years, it required civilians to provide and pay for "necessaries," including accommodations and housing, when British soldiers were stationed within a British colony. Many Americans felt this to be a financial imposition and an invasion of privacy.]

106. August 19, 1769 [40]  
Extract of proceedings of Commons House, concerning its response to Governor Montagu's letter seeking its approval of funding to support the cost of troops, objecting to the request because of the lack of prior consent by South Carolinians to be assessed for these costs [enclosed with Bull's August 29, 1769 letter to Hillsborough, document 105] [BT number O.25.]
  
107. September 7, 1769 [42]  
Letter No. 16 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, complimenting British troops now leaving Charleston for Cork [Ireland] for their good behavior while quartered in South Carolina [with apparent enclosure, document 108] [BT number O.26.] [for Bull's letters to Hillsborough No. 17 (September 25, 1769) and No. 18 (October 4, 1769), see Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 documents 60 and 62]
  
108. June 22, 1769 [44]  
Printed issue of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, including information about the South Carolina Assembly's resolutions and other news and comment [second sheet of Frame 44 microfilmed twice]; followed by  
August 26 to September 2, 1769 [45]  
Printed issue of *The South-Carolina and American General Gazette*, with news and comment  
[both apparently enclosed with Bull's September 7, 1769 letter to Hillsborough, document 107] [both are parts of BT number O.27.]
  
109. September 26, 1769 [48]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Bull to Board of Trade, transmitting 11 acts of South Carolina [with enclosure, document 110] [BT number O.28.]
  
110. [no date] [50]  
"*Titles of Laws passed 29<sup>th</sup> July & 23<sup>d</sup> August 1769*", including laws establishing courts, building jails, and appointing sheriffs and other offices; funding the colony's government for the calendar year 1768; paying for stamping and issuing stamps; encouraging discovery and apprehension of house breakers;

incorporating the Fellowship Society and establishing a fund for an infirmary; keeping and maintaining a watch company for good order and regulations in Charleston; appointing commissioners for certain bridge projects; ensuring preservation of deer; establishing a commission to keep Charleston's streets in good order; establishing a ferry crossing the Savannah River at [?] Bluff; laying out a new street in Ansonborough [now part of downtown Charleston] [enclosed with Bull's September 26, 1769 letter to Board of Trade, document 109] [BT number O.29.] [for more on the Fellowship Society's incorporation effort in 1769 and 1770, see documents 118, 126, 190, and Reel 3 document 136] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number O.30. or O.31.]

111. December 21, 1769 [52]  
Report of the Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs to Board of Trade, forwarding papers from North and South Carolina pertaining to the boundary between the two colonies for consideration by Board of Trade [with enclosures, documents 112 to 117] [part of BT number O.32.]
112. April 19, 1769 [53]  
Copy of letter from Montagu to Hillsborough, seeking action by the British government to settle the boundary between North and South Carolina [enclosed with December 21, 1769 Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs on extending the boundary between North and South Carolina, document 111] [part of BT number O.32.]
113. [no date] [52]  
Report of committee [of South Carolina Commons House or of the South Carolina Council?] rejecting a proposal submitted by Governor Tryon of North Carolina to Governor Montagu of South Carolina to extend beyond the Catawba River the boundary already agreed upon in 1764 from the seacoast to the Catawba River, but supporting a plan "*to delineate such a Line as would be reasonable and equitable between both provinces*"; with detailed information about and objections to Tryon's plan, which was perceived to divide lands already settled by white families that the committee believes should all become part of South Carolina; suggesting an alternative boundary line heading north from the end of the existing boundary, near the Catawba River, then northeast and around Catawba Indian territory, and then follow the Catawba River northward to Cherokee territory [enclosed with December 21, 1769 Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs on extending the boundary between North and South Carolina, document 111] [part of BT number O.32.]  
[Note: **William Tryon** (1728-1788), with a background in the military, served as governor of North Carolina, after the death of Arthur Dobbs, from 1765 to 1771. He is best known as governor for fighting the anti-taxation Regulators between 1768 and 1771, finally defeating them with a militia army at Alamance. Soon after this accomplishment, he left North Carolina to become Governor of New York, where he also returned to military duty during the Revolutionary War.]

114. March 15, 1765 [61]  
Extract of letter from Bull to Board of Trade, informing Board of Trade that he had informed the Cherokee of plans by North Carolina to extend the boundary between North and South Carolina in the direction of recent settlers near "*the foot of the Cherokee Mountains, which is the Chief Hunting Ground for the Lower Cherokees*" [enclosed with December 21, 1769 Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs on extending the boundary between North and South Carolina, document 111] [part of BT number O.32.]
115. December 12, 1768 [62]  
Letter from William Tryon at Brunswick, North Carolina, [on the Cape Fear River across from today's Wilmington; see note after Reel 1 document 130] to [Hillsborough], concerning papers he had received from Montagu relative to an extension of the boundary between North and South Carolina, and asking the Secretary of State to favor Tryon's own, different proposal for extension; including three detailed reasons against Montagu's and in favor of Tryon's proposed extension [enclosed with December 21, 1769 Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs on extending the boundary between North and South Carolina, document 111] [part of BT number O.32.]
116. November 29, 1768 [64]  
Extract of letter from Montagu at Charleston to Tryon, proposing an alternative boundary line to the one suggested by Tryon [enclosed with December 21, 1769 Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs on extending the boundary between North and South Carolina, document 111] [part of BT number O.32.]
117. December 11, 1768 [65]  
Letter from Tryon at Brunswick to [Hillsborough], contending that the boundary proposed by Hillsborough would be "*highly injurious to this Colony*"; including justifications [enclosed with December 21, 1769 Report of Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs on extending the boundary between North and South Carolina, document 111] [part of BT number O.32.]
118. [no date] [67]  
Memorial to Board of Trade of Gilbert Ross and James Mill, London merchants, concerning incorporation of the Fellowship Society, seeking Board of Trade approval for the act to accomplish this; signed by Charlton Palmer, "*agent for the memorialists*" [BT number O.33.]
119. December 5, 1769 [69]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing an annual report of exports and prices; concerning new, flourishing French and German settlements in South Carolina [with enclosure, document 120] [BT number O.34.] [see duplicate letter from Bull to Board of Trade with same date, document 128]

[**Note:** Between July 29, 1769 and September 15, 1771, Governor Montagu was once again away from Charleston on a leave of absence, again for his health but also, to some extent, to escape the pressures of the growing power struggle in South Carolina between the royally appointed governor and the locally elected Assembly. This time, as Lieutenant Governor Bull again filled in as acting governor, Montagu retreated all the way to England.

120. [no date] [71]  

*"Account of the Quantity and Value of Goods raised in, and exported from"* South Carolina from November 1, 1768 to November 1, 1769; including a lengthy list categorized into goods, quantity, prices, and money value, with a total cumulative value of goods of £404,056.0.3; followed by Quantities *"Of the preceding articles, [that] are sent to Europe"*, categorized by country, including goods sent to Great Britain (multiple goods) with a total value of £260,584.2.2; sent to Portugal (rice) with a total value of £54,594.0.0; sent to Spain (rice) with a total value of £11,353.10.0  
 [both enclosed with Bull's December 5, 1769 letter to Board of Trade, document 119] [BT number O.35.]
121. [ no date] [73]  

Memorial of South Carolina Agent Charles Garth to Board of Trade, seeking continuation of bounties for growing indigo in South Carolina *"for a further Term"* [BT number O.36.]
122. February 13, 1770 [75]  

Report of the Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs to Board of Trade, referring letter from Bull to Hillsborough concerning South Carolina Commons House vote of December 8, 1769 ordering the South Carolina Treasurer to advance £10,500 from the treasury to be delivered to certain members of Commons House to be sent *"to Great Britain, for the support of the just and constitutional Rights and Liberties of the people of Great Britain and America"*; seeking Board of Trade's opinion on the constitutionality of this transaction and of the colony's raising and issuing money [with enclosure, document 123] [part of BT number O.37.]  

[**Note:** During 1770, two significant conflicts highlighted the ongoing contest between Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly and the Governor and his Council for financial control over the colony's government. The first stemmed from the **December 8, 1769 order of Commons House** referenced in this document for the South Carolina Treasurer to **"advance" a large sum of paper money** to be used by representatives of Commons House in England to advance its cause with the British Government, outside the usual appropriation of expenses through the colony's annual estimate and approval by the Governor and Council. Although Commons House was unable to complete the intended advance and expenditures in London, it refused to submit to Governor/Council financial control.

In the Board of Trade incoming correspondence (Reel 2), see also other correspondence related to this conflict, dated between December 1769 and December 1770, include documents 123 to 125, 130, 137, and 191.

The second, directly related conflict followed from the **April 1770 “Additional Instruction” from the King to South Carolina’s Governor**, an attempt by royal imposition to help the Governor and Council enforce financial control. By imposing stringent restrictions on both issuing money and credit transactions in South Carolina, this ill-conceived imposition threatened the vitality of the colony’s economy, alienating both the Governor and Council and Commons House. An appeal by Bull and a petition from Garth led the King to rescind his Additional Instruction in June 1771. In Reel 2, see document 145 and following note plus 147 to 149, 158, 159 (Garth’s petition for reversal of the Additional Instruction, 188, 189, and 194 (King’s June 7, 1771 withdrawal of the Additional Instruction) and the following note.

The overall contest between Commons House and Governor/Council continued until revolution overcame South Carolina’s colonial government in 1775. See documents 196, 199, 201, 208, 216 to 220.

Some of the same documents plus additional ones are found in the Secretary of State incoming correspondence (Reel 6). See especially documents 79, 80 (text of the April 1770 Additional Instruction), 107 to 109, and 113 to 117.]

123. December 12, 1769 [76]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting the text of Commons House’s order for the Treasurer to advance £10,500 to be sent to Britain; pointing out that no mention was made of using the money to pay the colony’s expenses through its Agent in London; supposing it might be for use by “*the Supporters of the Bill of Rights in London*”; explaining that because of the Crown’s encouragements to increase settlement in America, “*the government in the Colonies has gradually inclined more to the democratical than legal Scale*”, and that this had resulted in an increase of independent authority for the Treasurer and Commons House, thus diminishing the governor’s authority; Bull therefore stating that he could not have prevented what the Treasurer and Commons House had done in this case; reporting that the imposition of new taxes [the Townshend Acts] “*had not the least Effect toward even relaxing the Resolutions for Non-importation of English Goods*” [enclosed with February 13, 1770 Report of the Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs to Board of Trade, document 122] [part of BT number O.37.] [similar letter No. 20 with same date from Bull to Hillsborough, document 130; duplicate letter No. 20 in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 71]

124. February 13, 1770 [81]  
Copy of "Case" to the Attorney General, summarizing the constitutional history of the Colony of Carolina from 1662 onward in relation to powers over currency and accounting for money and, in particular, the authority of the Treasurer and Commons House, leading up to Commons House's order for £10,500, which is partially quoted, followed by Bull's letter to Hillsborough, also partially quoted, about Commons House's procedures; statement of each legal question with the Attorney General's opinion, including first, the legality of Commons House's order, which was denied because it was not approved, as required in the South Carolina Constitution, by the Governor and Council; second that the transaction was also illegal because the money was to be taken from any monies available, without regard for their appropriation in the colony's annual estimate; third that because the order was illegal, the issuance of the money by the Treasurer was also illegal and without authority; signed by William de Grey, Attorney General [BT number O.38.]  
[Note: **William de Grey, 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Walsingham** (1719-1781) was a prominent lawyer, judge, and politician, who served as British Attorney General from 1766 to 1771.]
125. April 3, 1770 [91]  
Order of the Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs to Board of Trade, concerning South Carolina Commons House's order to transmit £10,500 to London, recommending that an Instruction be prepared to South Carolina officials "*to prevent the Assembly from ordering public Money to be issues in the illegal and unconstitutional manner* stated in the report to the Board of Trade [BT number O.39.]
126. June 5, 1770 [93]  
Legal opinion of Richard Jackson to Board of Trade, that South Carolina's act incorporating the Fellowship Society is "*proper in point of Law*" [BT number O.40.]  
[Note: **Richard Jackson** (c. 1721-1787) was an English attorney and politician. As a King's Counsel, he served as counsel for the Board of Trade, perhaps as an independent attorney. In the 1780s, he served as one of the Lords of Treasury. He succeeded Matthew Lamb as the Board of Trade counsel to review South Carolina's (and other colonies') recently adopted acts.]
127. January 6, 1770 [95]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting journals of the South Carolina Assembly and Council [not microfilmed here] [BT number O.41.]

128. December 5, 1769 [97]  
Duplicate letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on numbers employed, and employed as slaves, in South Carolina plus additional economic information, including the status of new French and German settlements [BT number O.42.] [see original letter from Bull to Board of Trade with same date, document 119] [for BT number O.43., look for document 152]
129. December 6, 1769 [99]  
Duplicate letter No. 19 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, providing economic information and numbers plus and update on relations with the Catawba Indians [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 68]  
[Note: No BT number is assigned to any document from document 129 to 151, which are letters from Bull to Secretary of State for the Colonies Hillsborough or enclosures with those letters.]
130. December 12, 1769 [101]  
Letter No. 20 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting Commons House's vote of December 8, 1769, ordering the Treasurer to advance £10,500 to be sent to London [similar letter with same date from Bull to Board of Trade, document 123; duplicate of this letter No. 20 in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 71]
131. December 16, 1769 [103]  
Letter No. 21 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, seeking assistance in receiving King's orders and other correspondence more regularly and reliably via vessels and packets, especially those pertaining to the tax laws [duplicate letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6, document 72]
132. January 8, 1770 [105]  
Duplicate letter No. 22 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, thanking Hillsborough for the King's approbation of his governing of South Carolina when no governor was present in Charleston [original letter is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 73]
133. March 6, 1770 [107]  
Duplicate letter No. 23 ["mistake"; thus in effect unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting on having sent on to John Stuart letters addressed to him just received in Charleston; stating that he would provide information as soon as he could assemble it on the situation of a person in jail sentenced to death, whom Montagu had reprieved; stating that the "*General Committee*" [of Commons House] continue "*in rigidly enforcing obedience to their Resolutions*"; stating that almost none of South Carolina's Council members or Bull's servants had subscribed to the Articles of Association; reporting on other news of the colony

[**Note:** In 1770, being an “**associator**” seems to have meant voluntarily joining a one of a number of “provincial” forces alternative to the militia and therefore potentially an expression of rebellion. By 1775, associators had become more organized and consciously rebellious. The term now meant a person (especially an enfranchised white adult male American person) who had declared his loyalty to one of the newly forming governments that began springing up during 1775 to supplant the British colonial governments now considered (by rebellious Americans) to be illegitimate. This declaration, generally made in writing, indicated that the person had chosen not only to side with the rebellious Americans but also to renounce loyalty to a British colonial government. In practice, the term “associator” came to mean a male adult who had not only sided with the rebellion but agreed to do active military duty to help ensure its success. They chose to do their military duty not in the colonial militia but in the various “provincial” forces that grew up in many colonies. While an associator might have renounced loyalty to a colonial government, he did not necessarily (yet) renounce the sovereignty of the King.]

[**Note:** Three letters in this microfilmed correspondence are identified as Letter No. 23 from Bull to Hillsborough, as follows:

- Reel 2 document 133: Duplicate letter No. 23, dated March 6, 1770
- Reel 6 document 75: Letter No. 23, dated January 12, 1770
- Reel 6 document 76: Letter No. 23, dated March 6, 1770

Reel 6 document 75 is the actual No. 23. This document and Reel 6 document 76, in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, have the same date and contents, which are different from those in Reel 6 document 75.]

134. March 7, 1770 [110]  
Duplicate letter No. 24 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, acknowledging happy receipt of news of the approval of the colony’s circuit court act; stating that he soon would be appointing judges to the circuit courts; lamenting that few capable men in South Carolina studied and practiced law, so the choices for judges were limited [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 78]
135. March 22, 1770 [112]  
Duplicate letter No. 25 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, providing details about the case of Matthew Turner, a mariner, who was convicted of murdering Captain Harris and sentenced to death; however the court record showed several circumstances in Turner’s favor, so Governor Montagu had “*reprieved*” his sentence, delaying its execution while awaiting possible clemency action by the King [with enclosure, document 136] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 81; undated copy in Reel 6 document 92]

136. May 5, 1769 [110]  
Copy of Montagu's reprieve of Matthew Turner in the case of his conviction for murder of Captain Harris [enclosed with Bull's March 22, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 135]
137. April 15, 1770 [115]  
Duplicate letter No. 26 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that 11 acts had been enacted by the Assembly in its recent session, but that others were not completed because Commons House refused to do further business with the Council after it had disapproved an item for £1,500 from the December 8, 1769 transaction reporting that he had prorogued the Assembly after it adopted a resolution requesting the British government to create another legislative body, separate from and independent of the Council, to share legislative duties with Commons House [no BT number assigned] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 84] [for Bull's original letters to Hillsborough No. 27 (April 29, 1770) and No. 28 (June 5, 1770), see Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 documents 88 and 94 respectively]
138. June 7, 1770 [117]  
Duplicate letter No. 29 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning progress toward agreeing on an extension of the North-South Carolina boundary; describing a journey he had taken through South Carolina's back country to assess the situation and meet with settlers and Indians; reporting on his observations of settlement, agricultural development, Indian relations, and military preparedness; stating his satisfaction with the overall prosperity of the colony [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 98]
139. June 13, 1770 [121]  
Duplicate letter No. 30 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, submitting names to be "*associate Judges*", Robert Pringle, Rawlins Lowndes, George Gabriel Powell, and John Murray [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 100]
140. July 16, 1770 [123]  
Duplicate letter No. 31 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, noting that the Assembly was prorogued, to be extended to August 6, when they would meet "*for the dispatch of business*"; reporting that South Carolina Treasurer Jacob Motte had died and that he had appointed Henry Peronneau in his place; reporting that the Council had expanded its legislative duties, thus bypassing the Assembly; stating that "*We are too apt to cast our eyes to the North Star of Boston in our Political Navigation, altho' the Commercial interests of this province differ much from that*" [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 102]

141. August 16, 1770 [125]  
Duplicate letter No. 32 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, describing the situation of Daniel Price, a white man, who had killed a Negro "*in a sudden heat of Passion*", for which the penalty was a fine, which he could not pay and so was imprisoned; Bull, thinking this a severe punishment, chose to "*suspend the Payment of his Fine*" until the King could decide on possible clemency; stating that he still needed to settle the matter of the Treasurer (who had since died) and Commons House withdrawing funds for questionable purposes [with enclosure, document 142] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 104]
142. June 16, 1770 [127]  
Proclamation of Bull at Charleston to all South Carolina judges and justices and to Treasurer Motte, concerning the case of Daniel Price; suspending payment of his fine, for reasons explained [enclosed with Bull's August 16, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 141]
143. August 17, 1770 [128]  
Duplicate letter No. 33 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting arrival of a Spanish vessel with credentials from the governor of the Spanish province of Yucatan, addressed to the governor of Carolina or Virginia, requesting protection and permission to purchase supplies; the apparent reason for Spanish request was that Yucatan was suffering from a severe drought; despite British policy to trade for goods imported in only British bottoms, Bull had granted permission for humanitarian reasons, and a merchant had privately accommodated the purchase; hoping that his technically unlawful act would not be held against him by the British government [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 106]
144. August 23, 1770 [130]  
Duplicate letter No. 34 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that the Commons House of the Assembly had met, had resumed discussion of the resolutions it had previously considered, softening most of them, except for one which was thereafter defeated; expecting that Commons House would be willing to do business in this session, except on the tax bill; making further observations about how the Assembly members were conducting themselves during this session; vowing to resolve the resolution situation by the end of the session [with enclosures, documents 145, 146] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 107]
145. August 22, 1770 [132]  
Copy of proceedings of Commons House, concerning receipt of additional Instruction about Commons House's duties, which led the House to inquire to the governor for information of any legislative matters that had been taken to the Council, and for guidance in how to construe the new Instruction

[enclosed with Bull's August 23, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]  
[another copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 108]

[**Note:** the King's April 1770 "**Additional Instruction**" to the South Carolina colonial government required the Governor to enforce stringent and across-the-board new restrictions on the issue and use of public money and credit, which in practice strangled the ability of the colony to borrow and to pay its obligations. This was not the intent of Lieutenant Governor Bull's request for the restrictions. Rather, he was hoping to quash an effort by Commons House to test its independent financial authority by issuing a large sum of money from the Treasury to be taken to England to be used for purposes not disclosed but clearly not for purposes specified in the colony's annual estimate. In this case, a petition from Commons House via South Carolina Agent Charles Garth successfully convinced the King that he had approved the Additional Instruction with incomplete information, so he rescinded it. See especially documents 122 and following note, 130, 137, 149 to 151, 158 to 160, and 194 on the conflict between Commons House and the Lieutenant Governor over financial control, on the King's reaction and response, and on Agent Garth's considerable role in negotiating the resolution.]

146. August 23, 1770 [133]  
Copy of Bull's response to Commons House's inquiry of August 22, 1770, stating that no legislative matters had yet been sent to the Council that he, Bull, was trying to adhere to the letter of the law as closely as possible, and that he could not legally provide further information [enclosed with Bull's August 23, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 144] [another copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 109]
147. September 8, 1770 [134]  
Duplicate letter No. 35 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting on new resolutions passed by Commons House relating to the Additional Instruction; expressing the convictions that these were "*the result not of precipitate warmth, but of three weeks deliberation*", and that the Commons House likely would not bend on the issue of financial control expressed by the removal of funds via the Treasurer for uses not approved in the provincial annual estimate; pointing out that Commons House had deliberately assumed rights "*in direct contradiction to the Kings Instruction*"; as a result of these actions, Bull had prorogued the Assembly until January 16, 1771 in anticipation of learning the King's desires; reporting seeking ways for Commons House to alter its position on issuing public money so that the journal of the House could be cleared up; summarizing with details historical trends in the division of authority between the Assembly and the Council and Governor, while seeking to demonstrate that Assembly power had increased significantly over time, but that he had done his best to preserve the King's rightful powers

[with enclosure, document 148] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 113] [for Bull's letters to Hillsborough No. 36 (October 20, 1770), No. 37 (November 25, 1770), and No. 38 (December 5, 1770), see Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 documents 123, 131, and 133 respectively]

148. August 30, 1770 [139]  
Copy of proceedings in Commons House, including the House's response to Bull's response [document 146], in which the House inquired about the authority Bull relied on in refusing to provide further information and suggested that Bull's duty should be to protest any unreasonable Instruction to the King [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 147] [another copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 114]
149. [no date] [141]  
Copy of report of the Commons House "*Committee to whom his Majesty's Additional Instruction...and his honor's Message relative thereto, were referred*", stating that "*the Lieu<sup>t</sup> Governor's answers are not so satisfactory as the House had a right to expect*"; including several resolutions; reiterating the "*undoubted*" right of Commons House to financial authority over the issuance of money; justifying its actions on December 8, 1769 requiring the Treasurer to advance money; insisting that the information used to inform creation of the new Instruction must be "*false, partial, and insidious*" [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 147] [another copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 117]
150. August 31, 1770 [144]  
Copy of response of Bull to Commons House's August 30, 1770 request for the authority that restrained him from providing information to the House; stating that the source of that authority was a letter he had received from Governor Montagu informing him of Secretary of State Hillsborough's order "*commanding the Governor not to communicate to the Council or Assembly any letter he may receive from the Secretary State without the Kings leave*" [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 147] [another copy in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 115]
151. [no date] [146]  
"*Precedents extracted from the Journals of the Assembly of monies issued (borrowed and to be replaced)*" and referred to in Bull's letter of September 8, 1770 to Hillsborough, document 147, listing 22 specific instances, by date and amount with description, with dates ranging from May 13, 1752 to December 8, 1769 [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 147] [another extract in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 118]

152. June 6, 1770 [148]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting copies of South Carolina laws passed; journals of the Assembly were to be forthcoming when copying was completed [BT number O.43.]
153. [no date] [150]  
Copy of list of acts enacted by South Carolina on April 7, 1770, including those pertaining to building a powder magazine, encouraging making flex linens and thread continuing a molasses duty, repealing an act to build a certain bridge, establishing a ferry across the Broad River, establishing a ferry across the Saluda River; appropriating money to build court houses and jails; establishing a fish market in Charleston, establishing a ferry over Sampit River at Georgetown leading toward Charleston, ordinance appointing Jacob Deveau country waiter at Port Royal [a country waiter was a customs official; see note after Reel 1 document 112], establishing a chapel of ease on Edisto Island and in St. John Parish, establishing a ferry at Charleston between two existing ferries, laying out and establishing several new streets in northwest Charleston and to build a parsonage in St. Philip Parish, and establishing a road between Orangeburg Bridge and Indian Head [enclosed with Bull's June 6, 1770 letter to Board of Trade] [BT number O.44.] [see document 162 for list of acts approved in England as legally acceptable and those not]  
**[Note: A chapel of ease** was a small chapel for Christian worship built on a plantation in colonial South Carolina whose (white) residents lived too far from a town with a church to attend services regularly. The public acts listed here indicate that building such "private" churches had become a publicly funded perk for at least some wealthy and well-connected planters.]
154. June 20, 1770 [152]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting journals of South Carolina Assembly [BT number O.45.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number O.46.]
155. September 8, 1770 [154]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, transmitting the "*half yearly return of the list of Grants*" of land in South Carolina from November 8, 1769 to May 2, 1770 [BT number O.47.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number O.48.]

156. November 6, 1770 [156]  
Report by Richard Jackson to Board of Trade of legal opinions regarding 13 South Carolina laws passed in 1767, 1768, and 1769, including establishing a new court system, establishing new St. Luke Parish and All Saints Parish and building a chapel of ease in Prince Frederick Parish, establishing new St. Matthew Parish and making a road to it public, establishing new St. David Parish and appointing commissioners for the high road, regulating rates for wharfage, merchandize, and storage at Charleston, issuing new paper money replacing old bills, encouraging discovery and apprehension of house breakers and those who buy and receive stolen goods, an added act for a watch company for safety in Charleston, appointing commissioners for certain bridges; encouraging preservation of deer and limiting hunting, continuing an act to keep Charleston streets clean, establishing a ferry at Two Sisters Bluff on the Savannah River, establishing a public street in Ansonborough; recommending that the act for issuing new money be disapproved because, in Jackson's opinion, it was not legal; finding the other acts to be legally constituted [see also document 191 and Reel 3 document 138] [Number O.49.]

## **Volume 380—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Trade Correspondence (incoming), end**

October 16, 1770 to November 10, 1775 Documents 157 to 222 [Frames 1 to 151]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Board of Trade incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina end in Volume 380 of the Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina.

**Note:** Archivists (probably in the Board of Trade Office) wrote descriptive notes for many of the manuscript documents. These are generally microfilmed with the documents. On these notes, archivists provided their own numbers by manuscript Bundle or Volume. Where found, this Finding Aid reports these numbers as "BT numbers." Volume 380 begins with P.1. and ends with P.61. In general, but inconsistently, enclosures to official correspondence were not given BT numbers. Some other kinds of documents, such as petitions that were not officially correspondence were inconsistently given or not given BT numbers. For 9 clearly official-correspondence documents (8 Bull-to-Hillsborough letters; 1 Montagu-to-Hillsborough letter), no BT number was assigned. For 6 BT numbers (P.5., P.8., P.16., P.55., P.56., and P.57.) no microfilmed document is identified. Otherwise BT numbers are assigned to all official correspondence and some other documents. No clear explanation is known for the inconsistencies in BT numbering.

**Note:** Numbering of official letters continued as in previous years. For an overall analysis of letter numbering in the South Carolina Colonial Papers, see the section on this subject in the **Introduction**. During the years of Volume 380's documents, the Board of Trade had completely discontinued numbering of letters. But most of the correspondence between the secretary of state and the governor or lieutenant/acting governor was by now via numbered letters.

Still, most governors/acting governor who wrote numbered letters also occasionally sent unnumbered letters to a secretary of state, containing less official contents.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

157. October 16, 1770 [1]  
Letter from William Bull II, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, at Charleston, to Board of Trade and Plantations, transmitting Assembly journals; since Council member Henry Middleton had resigned [having switched sides in the pre-revolutionary conflict; see note after Reel 3 document 4 for more on the Middleton family], transmitting three names as possible replacements, Gabriel Manigault, John Savage, and David Deas [merchant brother of John Deas]; declaring each to be "*Gentlemen of large Estates, undoubted loyalty, integrity and knowledge in the interest of this Province*" [BT number P.1.] [In this Volume, Bull's letters to Board of Trade continue to be unnumbered.]
158. December 9, 1770 [3]  
Order of the King, concerning a petition from Charles Garth, Agent for South Carolina in London, seeking reconsideration of the Additional Instruction adopted and sent to South Carolina for implementation; stating the King's agreement that this Instruction would not have been sent if the Assembly's representation of the situation had been received beforehand [for more on South Carolina Agent Charles Garth, see note after Reel 1 document 127] [BT number P.2.] [see also King's order on same subject dated June 7, 1771, document 194]
159. November 29, 1770 [5]  
Petition to the King of Charles Garth, Agent for the colony of South Carolina, pleading that the April 1770 Additional Instruction [see Reel 6 document 80] placed unnecessary financial restrictions on the South Carolina government because of inaccurate information that the Assembly was seeking to usurp powers beyond what was legally acceptable; arguing that various issues and policies require differing financial arrangements and that blanket restrictions impede effective financial management; stating that the actions of the South Carolina Assembly were not new and unique but were consistent with practice over many years and thus should not have been singled out as unlawful;

requesting that the King “*withdraw the said additional Instruction, which is now putting a full stop to the Payment of the public Debts and the necessary provision for the expences of Government*”; asking also that when other such situations were brought to the King’s attention, that he request and take into account a representation from the affected colonial assembly before adopting restrictions [no BT number assigned to this document] [besides King’s order, document 158, see King’s order on the same subject, dated June 7, 1771, document 194]

160. October 16, 1770 [9]  
Memorial of South Carolina Agent Charles Garth to Board of Trade, concerning settlement of the South Carolina-North Carolina boundary lines; seeking Board of Trade assistance in drawing the line fairly for South Carolina, contrary to the proposal from North Carolina, with details [BT number P.3.] [see note after Reel 1 document 8 for more on the North-South Carolina boundary issue.]  
[**Note:** Since 1762, efforts had been ongoing to establish, maintain, and update **boundaries between South and North Carolina** that would accommodate wishes in both colonies for settlement expansion, while minimizing frontier conflicts with Indians. Agent Garth submitted a petition on the subject to the Board of Trade sometime in 1762 (Reel 1 document 128). See other 1762 and 1763 documents on the subject in Reel 1. In 1764, work started on surveying a “temporary” boundary (Reel 1 document 189). Surveying was reported to be completed in December 1764 (Reel 2 document 19). See follow-up documents dated in 1766 and 1768 in Reel 2. By 1770, South Carolina was pushing for an extension of the boundary line around Catawba Indian territory. In this document, Garth was again petitioning the Board of Trade on the matter.]
161. March 4, 1771 [14]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, enclosing one-half year of land grant records; notifying Board of Trade of appointments of Henry Peronneau and Benjamin Dart joint treasurers of South Carolina [BT number P.4.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number P.5.] [similar letter, dated March 5, 1771, from Bull to Hillsborough, is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 155; duplicate of this document in Reel 2 document 166] [negative legal opinion on the concept of joint treasurers is found in document 162]  
[**Note:** Henry Peronneau had been appointed Treasurer in 1770, after the death of Treasurer Jacob Motte (Reel 2 document 140 and Reel 6 document 102]. In March 1771, Bull had the idea to appoint a second Treasurer, Benjamin Dart, making the two **joint treasurers**, apparently hoping to gain greater control over the South Carolina treasury (Reel 2 documents 161, 162, 167 and Reel 6 documents 155, 156). “Bonds” were prepared for signature of the two joint treasurers, designed to maintain the governor’s control over their actions. Although undated, Dart and Peronneau both apparently signed bonds in March 1771.

In June 1773, copies of these bonds were sent to Dartmouth as the conflict between the acting governor and Commons house over financial control continued to escalate (Reel 3 documents 202, 203; Reel 6 documents 155, 156; Reel 7 documents 13, 19, 20)

162. June 13, 1771 [16]  
Report of Richard Jackson [for more on Jackson, see note after document 126] to Board of Trade with positive legal opinions on acts passed by South Carolina's Lieutenant Governor, Council, and Assembly in 1770 and 1771, including acts to build a powder magazine at Hobcaw Point (on tidal Wando River north of Charleston), to increase making flax linens and thread, to continue a duty on molasses, concerning building a bridge across Four Hole Swamp and connecting road, to establish ferries across the Broad and Saluda Rivers, to establish another ferry across the Saluda River and one over the Savannah river at Augusta; establishing a fish market at Charleston, to vest a ferry over Sampit River from Georgetown toward Charleston, ordinance to appoint Jacob Deveaux country waiter at Port Royal, act to establish a chapel of ease on Edisto Island in St. John Parish, to vest a ferry from Charleston to Hobcaw and Scotts Ferries and to build a parsonage in St. Philip Parish, to establish several roads, ordinance to appoint Henry Peronneau and Benjamin Dart joint Public Treasurers of South Carolina [see note after document 161], to regulate inspection and export of tobacco and flour and to grant a bounty on flour; with negative legal opinions on an act of 1770 to stamp and issue £70,000 in paper money to pay to construct several court houses and jails, which is similar to a New York act previously disallowed by the King, and an act of 1771 empowering road commissioners in Prince George Parish to construct a new public road serving certain plantations but not others while also unvesting certain ferries without compensation to those losing service [compare this list with list of South Carolina acts enacted April 7, 1770 and sent to England (document 153); note after document 153 contains notes explaining chapel of ease and country waiter] [see also document 196 and Reel 3 document 143] [BT number P.6.]
163. December 13, 1770 [18]  
Duplicate letter No. 39 from Bull at Charleston to Secretary of State for the Colonies the Earl of Hillsborough, concerning a meeting of "*Planters, Merchants, and Mechanics*" concerning proposed discontinuation of a resolution for "*association against importing Goods from Great Britain*" [BT number P.7.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number P.8.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 138]
164. December 15, 1770 [20]  
Letter No. 40 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that court clerk Dougal Campbell, on leave for his health (including symptoms of insanity) at Lake George [New York] had disappeared and was presumed—but not confirmed to be—dead, which explained why Bull's had delayed in appointing a replacement;

now appointing James Johnston to fill the vacant position [no BT number was assigned to this letter] [for Bull's letters to Hillsborough No. 41 (January 17, 1771) and No. 42 (January 22, 1771), see Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 documents 140 and 141]

165. March 4, 1771 [22]  
Duplicate letter No. 43 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, explaining, in the context of the debate over the debate over the Commons House actions of December 8, 1769, Bull's understanding of the legality of "*exchanging*" bills of paper money, which were not new "*emissions*" of money but replacements under previous laws of 1731 and 1748; citing previous laws and precedents, including such an exchange in 1769; hoping that the matter had now been resolved; recounting having been informed that Governor Montagu would be sailing from England to return to South Carolina by Christmas 1770, but having been informed later that the date of his sailing would be in spring 1771; hoping that Montagu would arrive soon [no BT number is assigned to this letter] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 144]
166. March 5, 1771 [25]  
Duplicate letter No. 44 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, explaining why he had appointed joint treasurers; questioning the legal method in South Carolina for selecting treasurers, which includes nomination by ordinance of the General Assembly [with enclosure, document 167] [no BT number is assigned to this letter] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 155; similar letter dated March 4, 1771 from Bull to Board of Trade in document 161]
167. [no date] [27]  
Copy of document acknowledging General Assembly nomination and subsequent appointment of Benjamin Dart as a joint Treasurer of South Carolina; signed by Dart and 10 other individuals [see note after document 161] [enclosed with Bull's March 5, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 166]
168. April 2, 1771 [28]  
Duplicate letter No. 45 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting being in daily anticipation of Governor Montagu's return to Charleston; reporting that the colony's affairs were reasonably stable for Montagu to take over again, including adjournment of the Assembly in anticipation of Montagu's return; reporting appointment of James Simpson as Attorney General during the absence of Sir Egerton Leigh [see note after Reel 1 document 109; Leigh served as Attorney General from 1765 until 1774, so this absence was temporary. James Simpson succeeded Leigh as Attorney General from 1774 to 1775, he being the last colonial Attorney General] [no BT number was assigned to this letter] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 158]

169. May 7, 1771 [30]  
Duplicate letter No. 46 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, after receiving a circular from Hillsborough, congratulating the British government for successfully dissuading the King of Spain from attacking the British settlement in the Falkland Islands [BT document P.9.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 159]  
**[Note:** The congratulations in this letter refers to peaceful resolution of a diplomatic crisis that developed in 1770 when Spain threatened war against Britain for control of the Falkland Islands. Spain was counting on French support to make this threat credible. When France decided not to commit itself, Spain was forced in January 1771 to back down from its threat, disowning any intention of violence against the Falkland Islands. If this diplomatic resolution had not succeeded, Britain, France, and Spain might have been at war when the American Revolution broke out in 1775-1776. If France and Spain had been fighting Britain when the Revolution began, military history in North America might have evolved differently, with unpredictably different results for the United-States-to-be.]
170. May 7, 1771 [32]  
Duplicate letter No. 47 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, offering thanks for remitting the fine against Gilbert Campbell and for the appointment of [Thomas Knox] Gordon to be Chief Justice of South Carolina; reporting that the situation in South Carolina remains in the same state of anticipation of Montagu's return; reporting having officially prorogued the General Assembly to be ready for Montagu's return; thanking Hillsborough for supporting him during his acting governance of South Carolina [BT document P.10.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 160]
171. June 4, 1771 [34]  
Duplicate letter No. 48 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting having issued commissions for new Chief Justice Gordon and assistant judge, [Edward] Savage; offering further thanks to the King for his support of Bull as he acted in the place of Governor Montagu [BT number P.11.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, dated June 4, 1771, Reel 6 document 161]
172. July 9, 1771 [36]  
Duplicate letter No. 49 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting no change in the situation in South Carolina [BT number P.12.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 162]

173. July 9, 1771 [38]  
Duplicate letter No. 50 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, conveying to Hillsborough a memorial to Bull from George Milligan, surgeon to the King's garrisons in South Carolina, which requests an addition to Mulligan's pay; Bull, supporting the memorial, pleading for approval of this pay increase [BT number P.13.] [with enclosure, document 174] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 163]
174. August 7, 1771 [40]  
Memorial to Bull of George Milligan, "*Surgeon to all the Garrisons for his Majesty's forces in*" South Carolina, seeking a pay addition, based on his long service to the Crown [BT number P.14.] [enclosed with Bull's July 9, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 173] [copy of memorial in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 164]
175. August 19, 1771 [42]  
Letter No. 53 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting the death in a duel of Deputy Postmaster General for the Southern Department of North America and the Bahama Islands Peter Delaney, who lived and worked in Charleston; reporting having appointed William Henry Drayton to fill the position until the King can appoint a new Deputy Postmaster General [BT number P.15.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number P.16.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 168]  
[Note: This is Bull's last numbered letter to Hillsborough. On September 15, 1771 Governor Charles Greville Montagu returned from a lengthy leave of absence, and Bull returned to his "real" position of Lieutenant Governor. See note after document 199 concerning Montagu's final departure from Charleston as Governor of South Carolina and Bull's fourth interim assumption of the responsibilities of Governor in South Carolina in 1773.]
176. [no date] [44]  
Copy of memorial to the Treasury from Louis [de Mesnil] de Saint Pierre, justice of the peace and captain of the militia in the South Carolina settlement of French Protestants called New Bordeaux, currently at No. 15, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane, London, seeking support for his work, in "*growing and making of Silk, the Culture of Vines, and the making of Wine*" by approving a bounty on wine [BT number P.17.] [see also St. Pierre's memorial to Board of Trade, document 179]  
[Note: Efforts to grow vines and make wine in South Carolina began when Swiss Protestant **Jean-Pierre Purry**, from Neuchatel, settled in 1731 at what was called Purryville (or Purrysborough or Purrysburgh or Purrysburg) South Carolina (today's small town of Purrysburg on the Savannah River marks the spot, while today's rural village of Switzerland to the northeast lies near the center of the old township. Both lie north of today's slightly larger town of Hardeeville).

Purry and fellow Swiss and German settlers tried producing silk as well as wine, neither of which were successful, plus cotton, which soon was successful. For more on Purry's settlement, see 12 documents in Reel 3 between 24 and 63, dated between 1730 and 1734.]

In 1764, a more concerted colonizing effort was made by French Protestant **Jean Louis Gilbert**. His initial group of 112 settlers founded a town they named **New Bordeaux** (located in what is now rural country near McCormick, South Carolina, near the dammed up estuary that once was the Little River's confluence with the Savannah River). There, the settlers sought to specialize in wine production. (See Reel 1 documents 160, 181, 182, and 194 and Reel 2 documents 4 and 5 for more on the King's approval for, initial settlement of, and South Carolina's emergency assistance to keep the settlement from failing). This second effort also fell short of being economically viable.

In 1771 and 1772, **Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre** made a third major effort to establish wine as a productive agricultural venture in South Carolina, building on the earlier New Bordeaux effort. When the South Carolina government declined to help finance his grand plan, he wrote several pamphlets promoting it and lobbied in person in London, as this memorial and subsequent documents 177 to 181 attest. The King approved support for Saint Pierre's agricultural venture on February 28, 1772 (document 197), and progress aided by bounties was reported in May 1773 (document 201). Unfortunately this effort also faltered when Saint Pierre was killed in the mid-1770s on an expedition against Indians. See also Reel 3 document 145.]

177. February 27, 1772 [48]  
Extract of Treasury Minutes, "*Recd Memorial of Louis de St. Pierre &c &c*" "*My Lords cannot take this Memorial into Consideration unless it comes recommended by the Board of Trade*" [BT number P.18.]
178. [no date] [50]  
Copy of observations submitted by Louis de St. Pierre to Board of Trade concerning the desirability of a bounty to encourage vine growing and wine making in South Carolina, "*agreeable to his memorial now lying before your Lordships*", making eight numbered points [BT number P.19.] [date of March 16, 1772 appears to be date of copy, not of original observations]
179. [no date] [52]  
Memorial to Board of Trade from Louis de St. Pierre [similar to text of St. Pierre's memorial to Treasury, document 176] [BT number P.20., although not so identified] [date of April 9, 1772 appears to be date of copy, not of original memorial]

180. June 4, 1772 [54]  
Memorial to Board of Trade from Louis de St. Pierre concerning the spiritual health at the New Bordeaux settlement, seeking a grant of £50 per year to support a parish there; also requesting 150 muskets "*for the Defence of him and his settlers against the neighbouring Indians*" [see Note after document 176 and Reel 3 document 145] [BT number P.21.]
181. [no date] [56]  
Petition of merchant Robert Hankey of London, supporting St. Pierre's efforts in growing vines and making wine in South Carolina and seeking a land grant of 2,500 acres to settle in South Carolina and participate in the effort himself [BT number P.22.]
182. [no date] [58]  
Duplicate letter from Governor Charles Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning "*the case of Mr.[George] Roupell appointed Collector of the Customs at Charles Town by the commissioners of the Revenue at Boston*"; reporting that when Charleston Port Collector [John] Hughes had died, he had appointed [Roger Peter Handasyde] Hatley; however the Commissioners of the Customs at Boston had intervened in the Governor's power of appointment, appointing Roupell [previously a customs collector at Charleston]; the Chief Justice issued contradictory opinions, the second of which stated that Roupell could be suspended, but the Council had interpreted the second opinion as legally the same as the first; so the authority of the governor was confused on both appointment and suspension powers [with enclosures, documents 183 to 185] [BT number P.23.] [although undated, clearly the duplicate of original letter from Montagu to Hillsborough dated June 25, 1772 found in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 192]  
[Note: Lieutenant Governor Bull's latest numbered letter to Hillsborough as acting governor is dated August 19, 1771. On September 15, 1771, Governor Montagu returned to Charleston and resumed active control of colonial South Carolina government. Lieutenant Governor Bull returned to his secondary position once again. On Montagu's return to Charleston, he was immediately re-immersed in the roiling, ongoing political disputes between the elected Assembly and appointed Royal Governor that had been one reason he had taken a leave of absence in July 1769.]  
[Note: Montagu, unlike Bull, numbered his letters to Hillsborough only sporadically, nor did he maintain a regular "official" correspondence, at least among those microfilmed here. Montagu apparently began fairly soon to withdraw from his gubernatorial duties. By March 6, 1773, he had had enough of colonial conflict and sailed home to England, without even bothering to resign. He did formally resign once he returned to England. See also note after documents 186 and 199.]

183. June 16, 1772 [61]  
 "Duplicate" copy of letter from Montagu at [Charleston] South Carolina to [George Roupell] informing him that, because his commission was not valid, he was suspended from his position [enclosed with Montagu's undated letter to Hillsborough, document 182] [BT number P.24.] [copy of letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 195]
184. [no date] [63]  
 "Duplicate" copy of letter from South Carolina Chief Justice Thomas Knox Gordon to [Montagu], stating that Parliament had enacted law through which the King appointed Commissioners of Revenue in America and delegated to them appointment of customs collectors, but that the King's Instructions to the South Carolina Governor also delegated that authority to the governor, which was also a valid exercise of the governor's power, but which of these came first and second in time is not clear [enclosed with Montagu's undated letter to Hillsborough, document 182] [BT number P.25.] [copy of letter dated June 14, 1772 is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 194]
185. June 15, 1772 [65]  
 Extract of South Carolina Council meeting, concerning the Council's consideration of the situation of appointment of Roupell, after which the Council declared its view that Hatley had been legally appointed but Roupell did not have a commission clearly stating that authority for the Boston Commissioners' appointment came from the King [enclosed with Montagu's undated letter to Hillsborough, document 182] [BT number P.26.] [copy of same journal entry is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 6 document 193]
- Archivist's note that "*List of Grants of Land from Nov<sup>r</sup>. 1. 1771 to May 1. 1772 [are located] in a Bundle among the other Lists of Grants of Land.*" [BT number P.27.]
186. July 14, 1769 [68]  
 Copy of order of the King approving appointments of William Wragg and Rowland Rugeley to serve as members of the South Carolina Council [BT number P.28.]  
**[Note:** Documents 186 through 197 are copies of orders of the King pertaining to South Carolina. They are dated between July 14, 1769 and February 28, 1772 and were all received at the Board of Trade on December 12, 1772. Why they were archived in a set together here is not clear. The King's orders interrupted the flow of microfilmed correspondence in June 1772. This correspondence resumes with document 199, Bull's letter No. 54 to Secretary of State for the Colonies the Earl of Dartmouth, dated March 30, 1773. Governor Montagu's last microfilmed letter to Secretary of State Hillsborough (with no date) probably dates from about June 1772.

Although he remained physically “on duty” as Governor in Charleston until March 6, 1773, the gap in microfilmed correspondence filled by orders of the King corresponds with these last months of Montagu’s apparently dysfunctional governorship, during which no colonial correspondence is found. Bull’s letter No. 54 was his first after Montagu’s departure. It appears to be the first South Carolina official correspondence sent to the Earl of Dartmouth, although Dartmouth had replaced Hillsborough as Secretary of State for the Colonies in late August 1772. See also notes after documents 182 and 199.]

187. November 29, 1769 [70]  
Copy of order of the King confirming enactment of a South Carolina act “*establishing Courts, Building Goals, Appointing Sheriffs and other Officers* [BT number P.29.]
188. April 5, 1770 [72]  
Copy of order of the King concerning legality of the South Carolina Commons House’ enactment of an act on December 8, 1769 ordering the South Carolina Treasurer to convey certain funds to certain Commons House members for purposes not identified to be specified in South Carolina’s annual estimate of public expenses; quoting from a Board of Trade report containing extensive research on the history of South Carolina’s government and its powers granted by the King and concluding that the South Carolina act was not legally constituted; the report also recommending that “*in order the more effectually to put a stop to such irregular proceedings for the future, the Attorney General of the province should be ordered to prosecute the Treasurer*” for having executed the Commons House order; the King, having reviewed all the evidence, had agreed with the report, ordering, through an “*additional instruction*” to the South Carolina Governor, that the act be disallowed, the law applied as laid out in the report, and that the Attorney General prosecute the Treasurer [BT number P.30.] [see note after document 122 and references there to other documents about the conflicts between Commons House and the Governor and Council over financial control]
189. April 5, 1770 [78]  
Copy of order of the King, instructing Hillsborough to create the Additional Instruction to South Carolina’s government called for in the previous order [document 188] [BT number P.31.]
190. June 15, 1770 [80]  
Copy of order of the King, concerning incorporation of the Fellowship Society, confirming the South Carolina act to incorporate the Fellowship Society [BT number P.32.]

191. December 9, 1770 [82]  
Copy of order of the King, concerning legality of two South Carolina acts, the first "*for stamping and issuing the Sum of*" £106,500, the total amount of paper money in use in the colony, which the King disallowed; the second for establishing new parishes of St. Luke and All Saints and for building a chapel in St. Frederick Parish, which the King likewise disallowed [see also document 156 and Reel 3 document 138] [BT number P.33.]
192. February 24, 1771 [84]  
Copy of order of the King, confirming appointment of Thomas Knox Gordon and William Henry Drayton to the South Carolina Council [for more on Drayton, his family, and his decision to support the "rebel" cause in 1775, see documents 215 to 219, 192, 221 and Reel 3 document 140, plus notes after documents 192 and 218] [BT number P.34.]
193. May 1, 1771 [86]  
Copy of order of the King, confirming appointment of Barnard Elliot and David Deas to the South Carolina Council [BT number P.35.]
194. June 7, 1771 [88]  
Copy of order of the King, concerning the petition of Charles Garth, South Carolina Agent, on behalf of the inhabitants of the colony, pleading for withdrawal of the Additional Instruction to the Governor of South Carolina, which the King had approved without full knowledge of the situation, and which was causing difficulties in the South Carolina economy; to which petition the King agreed [BT number P.36.] [see Garth's petition, dated November 29, 1770, document 159; see also another King's order on this subject, dated December 9, 1770, document 158]
195. January 15, 1772 [90]  
Copy of order of the King, concerning a South Carolina act to encourage implementation of an act to incorporate the Winyah Indigo Society already operating in South Carolina; which the King supported [BT number P.37.]  
**[Note:** See Reel 1 document 15 for more on the Winyah Indigo Society. Why, when it was seeking incorporation in 1758 the Society was still or again seeking it is not clear in these microfilmed documents.]
196. January 15, 1772 [92]  
Copy of order of the King, disallowing two South Carolina acts, one for stamping and issuing paper money totaling £70,000, the other for encouraging the making of flax, linens, and thread [see also document 162 and Reel 3 document 143] [BT number P.38.]

197. February 28, 1772 [94]  
Copy of order of the King, concerning Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre's petition seeking royal support for agricultural development of vines and wine making as well as other agricultural products in South Carolina; ordering, consistent with a report from Board of Trade, ordering the Governor of South Carolina to make a land grant of 5,000 acres to support St. Pierre's agricultural venture [Frame 95 microfilmed twice] [BT number P.39.] [for more on Saint Pierre and his venture, see document 176 and note after it plus following documents]
198. December 13, 1773 [98]  
Memorial to Board of Trade from Agent of South Carolina Garth, praying to inspect certain papers [BT number P.40.]
199. March 30, 1773 [100]  
Duplicate letter No. 54 from William Bull II at Charleston to Secretary of State for the Colonies the Earl of Dartmouth, reporting that Governor Montagu had sailed from Charleston to Britain, "*whereby the Administration of this Government hath again devolved upon me*"; reporting having opened a new session of the Assembly; seeking to deal with moderation with the ongoing issue of the Common House's assertion of the power to withdraw money on its own; commenting on "their" [Common House's] agent Garth seeking to conduct South Carolina's affairs directly with London, bypassing the Governor and Council; describing details of the Assembly's attempts to operate independently [BT number P.41.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 9]  
[Note: Governor Charles Greville Montagu had sailed for England without resigning on March 6, 1773, leaving Lieutenant Governor William Bull II once again in charge of the British colonial government of South Carolina. Bull was now communicating with a new Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Earl of Dartmouth. **William Legge, 2nd Earl of Dartmouth** (1731-1801), replaced the Earl of Hillsborough as Secretary of State for the Colonies on August 27, 1772. He held the office until November 10, 1775. Governor-in-all-but-title Bull was by now used to these transitions and stepped again into familiar shoes with ease. He did not even bother to restart numbering his letters to the new Secretary of State. Instead, he resumed with the next letter number in the sequence of correspondence he had been using with the Earl of Hillsborough. See also notes after documents 182 and 186.]
200. April 9, 1773 [102]  
Duplicate letter No. 55 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting the death of Council member Othniel Beale; recommending three persons for the King's consideration to fill the vacancy, Thomas Smith, Miles Brewton, and John Deas [merchant brother of David Deas]; commenting on the potential difficulty of finding willing people to serve on the Council, given "*the unhappy Situation of this Colony in regard to our political disputes*" [BT number P.42.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 10]

201. May 15, 1773 [104]  
Duplicate letter No. 56 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, sending copies of "*the Bonds given by the two joint Public Treasurers of this Province*", part of the dispute with Commons House over financial control; describing the situation in venture to plant and grow vines in South Carolina, reporting that St. Pierre's efforts were progressing, aided by bounties; reporting that operations of the circuit court in the interior had helped reduce lawlessness and violence; reporting the ongoing need to establish schools and churches in addition to courts to bring "civility" to the interior; reporting that the mixed-crops economy of the interior, which had mostly white people and few Negroes, was doing well [BT number P.43.] [for more on Saint Pierre and his venture, see document 176, its note, documents 177 to 181, and document 197] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 19]
202. June 14, 1773 [107]  
Duplicate letter No. 57 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, informing Dartmouth that South Carolina was starting to implement the new requirements concerning surveying and preparation of land grants, although they were putting a damper on applications for land grants; describing the pent-up desire for land grants, while suggesting the negative consequences of the new requirements in South Carolina [with enclosure, document 203] [BT number P.44.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 21]
203. [no date] [109]  
Copy of South Carolina bond entered into by Treasurer Henry Peronneau [BT number P.45.] [probably the bond Peronneau had initially signed in March 1771 (see Reel 7 document 20 dated March 1, 1771), now being sent to Dartmouth, at his request, in June 1773] [Dart had similarly signed a bond in March 1771 (see Reel 2 document 167 and Reel 6 document 156), which also was sent to Dartmouth in June 1773 (see Reel 7 document 13); see also note after Reel 2 document 161] [enclosed with Bull's June 14, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 202]
204. August 26, 1773 [110]  
Duplicate letter No. 59 from Bull to Dartmouth, reporting on the situation in South Carolina during the interim until recently appointed William Campbell arrived, to be South Carolina's Governor to replace Montagu, who had resigned; reporting that he had called the Assembly into session, it had agreed to do business, but Bull did not expect them to do so; explaining the situation with the Treasurers and related matters of controlling use of public finances and confusion and distress resulting from its lack [probable enclosures, documents 205, 206] [BT number P.46.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 24]

205. August 13 to 20, 1773 [114]  
Printed edition of the *South-Carolina and American General Gazette*, with government documents, legislative proceedings, news, and comment [probably enclosed with Bull's August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 204] [part of BT number P.47.]
206. August 31, 1773 [116]  
Printed edition of the *South-Carolina Gazette and Country Journal*, with similar content to the Gazette in document 205 [probably enclosed with Bull's August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 204] [part of BT number P.47.]
207. July 24, 1773 [118]  
Duplicate letter No. 58 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting having prorogued the Assembly because it was not doing business, especially on the necessary tax bill; reporting publication in South Carolina of the Virginia resolutions of March 12, 1773, to which the Assembly had responded positively [BT number P.48.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 23]
208. September 18, 1773 [120]  
Duplicate letter No. 60 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting that "*Scenes of a very extraordinary nature have opened in our Legislative Theatre*", with descriptions of the Assembly and the Council engaged in legal conflict, of the Joint Treasurers engaged against the Assembly for allegedly overpaying judges, plus more [with enclosures, documents 209, 210] [BT number P.49.]
209. September 15, 1773 [124]  
Printed edition of "*Postscript to the South-Carolina Gazette*", with similar content to the *Gazette* in document 205 [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 208] [BT number P.50.] [copy or similar with same date in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 38]
210. [no date] [126]  
Copy of memorial to the King from the South Carolina Council concerning the "*critical and dangerous State of Our present Situation*"; describing the situation of printers of public publications having printed private political content without authority, how the Council had jailed two printers, and the resulting political and constitutional conflict; wishing for assistance in defending the British constitution [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 208] [BT number P.51.] [copy of memorial, dated September 11, 1773 in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 33]

211. September 19, 1773 [128]  
Duplicate letter No. 61 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, concerning a court case brought against Sir Egerton Leigh, South Carolina Attorney General and member of the Council "*for an Act done by him as President of the Council*", in which Leigh felt likely to lose [with enclosure, document 212] [BT number P.52.] [original letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 39]
212. September 18, 1773 [130]  
Copy of letter from Leigh at Charleston to Bull, informing Bull that he was expecting legal action to be taken against him "*for the Imprisonment of Thomas Powell*"; interpreting this action as an intentional insult to the Council [enclosed with Bull's September 19, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 211] [BT number P.53.] [copy of letter in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 document 40]
213. May 13, 1773 [132]  
Duplicate letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, congratulating the Queen through Dartmouth for her delivery of a prince [BT number P.54.] [no microfilmed document is identified as BT number P.55., P.56., or P.57.]
214. March 8, 1775 [134]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, cover letter for a report on the state of South Carolina [report not microfilmed here] [BT number P.58.]
215. March 8, 1775 [136]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, notifying the Board that he had suspended William Henry Drayton from the Council pending the King's pleasure concerning charges [unspecified in this letter] against him [with enclosures, documents 216 to 220] [BT number P.59.]
216. March 1, 1775 [138]  
Extract of South Carolina Council minutes, containing Bull's decision to suspend Drayton from the Council [enclosed with Bull's March 8, 1775 letter to Board of Trade, document 215]
217. February 11, 1775 [139]  
Copy of address by South Carolina Upper House of Assembly (also the Royal Council) to Bull, concerning charges by the General Assembly (Commons and Upper House of Assembly) against Drayton, which were declared to be serious enough for the Upper House (Council) to ask Bull to suspend him from the Council, followed by

February 13, 1775

Copy of Bull's response to Upper Houses of Assembly, stating that he would not suspend Drayton without learning more about the charges against him [both enclosed with Bull's March 8, 1775 letter to Board of Trade, document 215]

218. February 22, 1775 [140]

Extract of South Carolina Upper House of Assembly minutes, containing committee report on matter of William Henry Drayton's suspension, recommending that summaries of certain instances of Drayton's conduct be sent to Bull as justification for him to honor the Upper House's request for suspension; stating several instances in which Drayton had contentiously and in an obstructive way argued against the legitimacy of the Upper House as a legislative body of the people of South Carolina; in summary, accusing Drayton of acting "*to unhinge the Government and subvert the constitution*"; concurrence of the Upper House with the committee report and agreement to send it to Bull; signed by John Drayton [enclosed with Bull's March 8, 1775 letter to Board of Trade, document 215]

[**Note:** The South Carolina Royal Council to the Governor, whose members were appointed by the King, served also as the legislative Upper House of the South Carolina Assembly. See note after Reel 1 document 32.]

[**Note:** The Drayton family were early, wealthy settlers in South Carolina. **John Drayton** (1714-1779) first joined the South Carolina Council in 1761 (see Reel 1 document 103). He was still serving in 1775.

**William Henry Drayton** (1742-1779) was a son of John Drayton and married to a daughter of Lieutenant Governor (and currently acting governor) William Bull II (in February 1775, John and William Henry—and probably the latter's wife and Bull—must have had deep emotions not recorded here as they in essence faced off on opposite sides of the American-British conflict that was about to become a revolution). As a young man in the 1760s, William Henry supported the colonial government during the Stamp Act Crisis and afterwards. His reward was appointment to the South Carolina Council in 1771 (see document 192). But as he was joining the South Carolina loyal establishment, his political thinking was changing. Publication in late 1774 of his pamphlet on the American claim of rights quickly got him in trouble with the colonial government (in addition to this document, see document 215; for printed text of the pamphlet, see Reel 7 document 77). His "representation" justifying his actions to Governor Bull (document 219) was far from repentant (guaranteeing his suspension), and his evolving thinking soon propelled him toward becoming an active "rebel." During 1775, he served on the South Carolina Committee of Safety. In 1776, as Chief Justice under South Carolina's provisional "rebel" government, he helped give birth to the government that became the State of South Carolina. In 1778-1779, he represented South Carolina in the Continental Congress. While in Philadelphia, he contracted typhus and died, in the same year during which his loyalist father died in Charleston.

William Henry's son, **John Drayton** (1766-1822) followed in his father's footsteps, becoming a legal and political leader in the early years of the American republic. After studying law at the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University), he served in South Carolina's House of Representatives from 1792 to 1798. In 1800-1802 and again in 1808-1810 he was Governor of South Carolina. His career concluded with a U.S. District Judgeship in South Carolina from 1812 until his death in 1822.]

**[Note: South Carolina's transition from colonial to state government:**

Understandably, official correspondence in the British Colonial Papers does not describe and explain in detail the various committees that emerged between the late 1760s and early 1770s at the colony and local levels as extralegal engines of operations for the protest movements within 13 of the American colonies. These committees were by definition extralegal, decentralized, and diverse in their forms and practices. Their shared purposes were, however, to increase communications and coordination among the 13 colonies, so as to foster greater unanimity of mission and more effectiveness in collective action against the British establishment.

Various names were attached to these committees, including **Committees of Correspondence**, whose main purpose was to improve communications and coordinated actions among localities and colonies; **Committees of Inspection or Observation**, added after passage of the Intolerable/Coercive Acts to steer commerce around British boycotts, to enforce American boycotts, and to collect taxes for the benefit of the protest governments; and **Committees of Safety**, formed not only to facilitate functions of protection, such as controlling the militia, but to assume executive leadership over the evolving responsibilities of all these extra-governmental, increasingly governmental entities.

In practice, the colony-wide committees, whatever their names, shared governmental responsibilities in 13 unique ways, and local committees in many more various ways. Yet they shared common purposes—to organize governmental executive authority and responsibility to replace, or to fill the gap left by, disintegrating colonial governments, and to exercise executive authority in new ways, consistent with the protest movement's values, of democratizing the exercise of governmental power to many more people and especially to more "ordinary" people like farmers, artisans, and frontier settlers.

In South Carolina, the representative legislative institution of the **Commons House** was the first branch of colonial government to cease functioning, in January 1775. Before that, starting in July 1774, leaders of the colony who supported the protest movement met to begin designing an alternative government. In November 1774, a group of these leaders called for election of a legislative **Provincial Congress**, to convene in Charleston in January 1775. Thus, as the colonial government's Commons House was collapsing, the alternative, extralegal Provincial Congress stepped up to fill the void. When Governor Campbell arrived in June 1775, he refused to recognize the Provincial Congress and tried to convene an Assembly on August 28, but it was too late. His government no longer retained legislative authority, functionality, or legitimacy in the eyes of South Carolinians.

Meanwhile, by the early 1770s, various extralegal executive committees with various names began to spring up in various ways among the 13 colonies. Between 1772 and 1775 such committees began operating in South Carolina. By early 1775, a colony-wide **Committee of Safety** was recognized by the new Provincial Congress as the legitimate executive authority for a wide range of governmental functions, especially control of the militia, control over the public debt, issuing money, and related economic matters. By September 15, 1775, these extralegal governmental institutions had developed sufficient ability and authority that the remaining executive establishment of the British colonial government was overwhelmed and dissolved, its leaders leaving Charleston quickly for England.

Six weeks after the demise of South Carolina's colonial government and six months after Lexington and Concord, the King, speaking to Parliament on October 27, 1775, declared that Britain had a full-scale rebellion on its hands in 13 of its American colonies. This declaration both confirmed the obvious and spurred on American efforts to establish new governments, independent of Great Britain.

As of September 1775, South Carolina's ad-hoc, extralegal government had no competition within the boundaries of the old colony, but it still had to strengthen its institutions and to gear up to help fight a "continental" war against the British military, who were far from ready to concede loss of this valuable piece of the British Empire. In March 1776, South Carolina took on the next big steps of government building—creating a **state constitution**, closing down the institutions of extralegal government technically still under colonial rule, and replacing them with a new **state government**. Establishing a state government was one thing. Obtaining general popular acceptance for its exercise of governmental power was another. Until victory in the war was evident to all, South Carolina continued to be split between supporters of the new state government and large numbers of loyalists who dreamed and fought to return South Carolina to colonial status within the British Empire. By 1782 or 1783, the British and loyalists had indeed lost the war, and, finally, the era of British colonial government in South Carolina and 12 other former colonies ended.

**Reference:** Secondary references for this summary include numerous Internet sources, in particular, *The Provincial & State Government in SC During the American Revolution*, an on-line paper written by J. D. Lewis, at ([carolana.com/SC/Revolution/sc\\_revolution\\_provincial-government.html](http://carolana.com/SC/Revolution/sc_revolution_provincial-government.html)).]

219. February 27, 1775 [142]  
Copy of "*The humble Representation*" of William Henry Drayton, Council member, to Bull, maintaining his innocence of the charges as stated by questioning the legitimacy of the Upper House's functioning; further asserting that the Council "*have in this instance after mature deliberation precipitated themselves into a ludicrous situation*"; further arguing that the case brought against Thomas Powell by Egerton Leigh "*is contrary to Law and Justice*"

[Egerton Leigh had been Attorney General since 1765, but, sometime in perhaps late 1774, he fled the impending revolution, returning to England] [enclosed with Bull's March 8, 1775 letter to Board of Trade, document 215]

220. October 12, 1773 [145]  
Identified as Item A.; copy of Court of Common Pleas proceedings ordering “a *Bill against the Defendant*”; followed by  
October 13, 1773, containing the bill brought against Leigh for “*assault and false Imprisonment*” of Thomas Powell, who had been charged with “*Contempt and Breach of Privilege...against the said Upper House as a Branch of the Legislature*”; followed by  
October 16, 1773, containing the court's decision not to stay the action brought against Leigh  
[all enclosed with Bull's March 8, 1775 letter to Board of Trade, document 215]
221. December 19, 1774 [148]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting the status of the Council of South Carolina, listing names and offices held, including William Henry Drayton as a member and Egerton Leigh as Attorney General [Leigh left South Carolina for England sometime in apparently very late 1774 or early 1775, just ahead of the beginning of the Revolution] [BT number P.60.]
222. November 10, 1775 [150]  
Report from Richard Jackson to Board of Trade, with legal opinions on acts passed in South Carolina in March 1775, including an act to prevent counterfeiting paper money of other colonies, and an act to continue several acts pertaining to the General Assembly; finding no legal objection to either [BT number P.61.] [for more on Richard Jackson, see note after document 126]  
**[Note:** On November 10, 1775, Richard Jackson evidently was unaware of the September 15, 1775 demise of South Carolina's British colonial government. More generally, between March (document 215) and November (document 222) of 1775, two seminal events went unrecognized in the sparse correspondence during 1775 in the Board of Trade incoming correspondence. These events include not only the **September 15, 1775 collapse of South Carolina's British colonial government** but also the **first armed hostilities of the Revolutionary War on April 19, 1775 at Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts**. The Secretary of State incoming correspondence contains more detail in 1775, but it also lacks early recognition of Lexington and Concord and the significance for British colonial America of April 19, 1775.

**Note:** Microfilmed incoming Board of Trade correspondence ends here, in late 1775. Unrecorded in this correspondence is information on the final months of British colonial government in South Carolina, which collapsed on September 15, 1775. Although the politically besieged government limped along until September, its effective functioning was minimal after January 26, 1775, when Bull disbanded the Assembly, leaving the door open for the newly established but extralegal Provincial Congress to begin taking control over South Carolina's legislative governing process. This represented a direct challenge to British political authority and a major step toward establishing an alternative government. In June, Governor Campbell arrived to resume royal authority. In August, he tried but failed to convene a new "legitimate" Assembly. Meanwhile, an extralegal structure of committees under control of the South Carolina Committee of Safety was well along toward establishing alternative executive functions managed by leaders of the protest movement. By September 15, 1775 Campbell had given up, relinquishing political control to the "rebels" and ending the existence of the British colonial government of South Carolina.

## Reel 3 (Volumes 381, 382)

### Volume 381—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Board of Trade Correspondence (outgoing drafts)

August 16, 1720 to October 25, 1774

Documents 1 to 151

[Frames 1 to 393]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of drafts of Board of Trade outgoing correspondence for colonial South Carolina are contained in Volume 381 of the Colonial Office Papers for South Carolina. English settlement began in the Carolinas in the 1650s, and a single proprietary colony of "Carolina" was established before 1700. In 1712, South and North Carolina were separated politically, and by 1729, each had become a royal colony. During a transition period, especially from 1719 to 1724, institutions of royal colonial government were established provisionally and began functioning. Although the Board of Trade incoming correspondence, for which the DLAR's collection of microfilmed papers does not include documents dated before 1758, the draft outgoing correspondence in Volume 381 begins with documents dated in 1720. Microfilmed Board of Trade incoming correspondence ends in 1775. Microfilmed outgoing drafts end in 1774.

Yet a lengthy gap in draft outgoing correspondence exists between November 1738 and June 1764, during which no outgoing drafts are microfilmed. This gap does not represent selective acquisition by the DLAR, because the microfilmed frame numbers are continuous, without a break. Why draft letters between 1738 and 1764 are missing is not apparent from the microfilmed documents themselves or from the printed List and Index of CO5 Colonial Office Papers.

Especially in outgoing drafts, the number of documents microfilmed decreases substantially in the 1770s, reflecting partially the subsuming, beginning in 1768, of many Board of Trade's functions and communications responsibilities under the office of the new Secretary of State for the Colonies. The microfilmed outgoing draft correspondence includes 16 documents dated between 1720 and 1729, 100 documents dated between 1730 and 1738, and 35 documents dated between 1764 and 1774, 20 of which are dated between 1768 and 1774.

Besides the outgoing documents in Reel 3 Volume 381, another set of abstracts of Board of Trade documents, some of which are outgoing documents, are found in Reels 11 and 12, Volumes 400, 401, 404, and 405. These are described as being "Abstracts of Commissions, Instructions, Etc." By 1760 (Volume 404), these abstracts had evolved from being summaries to being full transcripts of the documents. Many of them pertain to the drafting and delivering of royal Commissions to new governors of South Carolina and of General Instructions and Additional Instructions to governors, which serve as their royal policy and procedure guides for colonial rule. The transcript documents also include a variety of related items, such as communications among governmental offices and individuals in London, including the King.

**Note:** Archivists (probably in the Board of Trade Office) wrote descriptive notes for many of the manuscript documents. These are generally microfilmed with the documents. While these descriptive notes often included Board of Trade archivist numbers (BT numbers), no such numbers are found in the descriptive notes microfilmed with the outgoing draft correspondence contained in Volume 381.

**Note:** In this Volume, none of the letters of official correspondence is numbered by the writer. Gaps in correspondence are thus more difficult to identify since they can be sequenced only by date.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

1. December 20, 1722 [1]  
Draft of letter from the Board of Trade and Plantations to Lord Carteret, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, concerning Carteret's request that the Board investigate and report on the situation of a complaint from the Spanish ambassador about construction of a fort authorized by the South Carolina governor "*at the Tamora and the Mouths of the Talage*" Rivers; hoping that the report would be helpful if the Spanish "*produce proofs*" for their claims; enclosing the report for Carteret to use in preparing a response to the ambassador [last page of this document is microfilmed after document 2]  
**[Note: John Carteret, 2<sup>nd</sup> Baron Carteret and later 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl Granville** (1690-1763) served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from March 4, 1721 to March 31, 1724. He returned to this position briefly between 1746 and 1748. In 1729, when both North and South Carolina became royal colonies, the King sought to buy out the proprietors. John Carteret had inherited one of the eight proprietorships of the original Carolina colony, and he elected not to sell but to keep and develop his one-eighth share. See note after document 20.]  
**[Note: Before Reel 1 in this Finding Aid, a list is provided of Lords of Trade who signed one or more of the draft letters** microfilmed in Reel 3 documents 1 to 151 (Volume 381). This list reveals something of the level of individual involvement exercised by certain of the Lords of Trade. The list and the microfilmed documents cover two periods of time—1720 to 1738 and 1764 to 1774—with a large gap between.]

[**Note:** From early in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century, the **Board of Trade and Plantations** evolved from being an advisory committee to the Privy Council on matters of colonial trade and agricultural production to becoming by 1700 a separate Board of Trade and Plantations with appointed Lords of Trade.

Between 1696 and 1782, it exercised considerable influence over trade and development in British colonies, especially those in America.

In 1768, as political and governance issues began to overshadow economic development issues in the colonies, a new Secretary of State for the Colonies, beginning with the Earl of Hillsborough, assumed dual leadership over both the Board of Trade and the Secretary of State's office. In essence, the Board was placed under control of the Secretary of State, who assumed full ministerial responsibility for foreign and colonial relations.

In 1783, following British defeat during the American Revolutionary War, this arrangement was substantially revised. The Board of Trade was abolished, and the Secretary of State office was transformed into the office of the Home Secretary, who assumed responsibility for the British Empire's foreign relations in a now somewhat altered world.

The microfilmed, draft, outgoing correspondence of the Board of Trade ends on October 25, 1774. The royal colony of South Carolina's government lasted until September 1775, although an extralegal Provincial Congress replaced the colonial Assembly in January 1775. The Board of Trade, of course, continued to function until it was abolished by the King in 1782.]

2. December 20, 1722 [2]

Draft of report from Board of Trade to the King, responding to Secretary of State Carteret's request, concerning the Spanish ambassador's complaint; suggesting that the ambassador really means the fort ordered by the King in 1720 to be constructed "*at the Embouchure of the Alatomaha*" River; arguing the necessity of this fort to protect the Carolinas' southern borderlands from encroachment and to maintain navigation on the Altamaha River; expressing surprise that the Spanish ambassador would be upset at construction of this fort, which was clearly within the territory of South Carolina

[**Note:** As with the Board of Trade, a modern map search was unable to identify rivers named Tamora and Talage (in document 1). The Altamaha River, by contrast, was well known in the broad boundary zone between Spanish Florida and British Carolina. Like the St. Marys River, St. Johns River, and Savannah River, the Altamaha flowed from the interior to the coast, offering both an avenue into the interior and a boundary between coastal territory to the northward and southward.]

[**Note:** In 1722, territory of the Carolinas extended southward toward Spanish territory, but no clearly defined boundary had been drawn between the two empire's colonies. This report makes clear that at this time Britain claimed territory at least some distance south of the Altamaha River. In 1712, the original colony of The Carolinas had been split into North Carolina and South Carolina, each of which became a royal colony by 1729.

When the proprietary colony of Georgia was founded in 1733, South Carolina's southern boundary was shifted northward to the Savannah River, where it remains today. The issue of the British border with Spanish Florida was therefore transferred to Georgia.

Regardless of the creation of Georgia, South Carolina continued to claim the right to establish settlements along the coast between the Altamaha and St. Johns Rivers. See notes after Reel 1 document 1 (1757) and document 160 (1763).]

3. August 30, 1720 [5]  
Draft from Board of Trade of "*Representation with a Draught of Instructions for a royal Governor of Carolina*", as requested by "*your Excellencys*", providing geopolitical context for Carolina, compared with Britain's other "*frontier*" colony in America, Nova Scotia, adjoining French territory in the north, as Carolina, adjoins Spanish territory to the south; including, information about needs for defense and security, construction of forts, and more against possible threats by the French against Nova Scotia; including the need for good relations with the Indians to counteract France's influence over them; including the need to deal with "*the great Disorder this province [Nova Scotia] at present labours under*"
4. September 23, 1720 [15]  
Draft report from Board of Trade to "*their Excellencies y Lrds. Justices*" on the need to build the fort quickly at the mouth of the Altamaha River to support and defend a settlement and town there, stating that 600 acres should be put aside for common pasture; that plots of 200 acres should be reserved to support a castle guard, that a small frigate should be maintained in the river to guard the town; making other recommendations for defense of the town that came from Crown Agent John Barnwell's plan, which General [and new royal governor of South Carolina] Nicholson supported; disagreeing with Nicholson's plans for expanding settlement and regulating the Indian trade [see Frame 393 for scrivener's summary of this document]  
[**Note:** John Barnwell and two other Crown Agents, **Joseph Boone** and **Richard Beresford**, shared common interests in developing the coastal areas of what became both South Carolina and Georgia—and of defending these coastal areas against the nearby colonial rival, Spain, in Florida. Barnwell's extensive plans included building six forts at points of strategic importance and promise for future colonial development. Only two were actually planned and constructed—**Fort King George**, at the mouth of the Altamaha River in what is now southern Georgia, and **Fort Moore** (named for James Moore II, the last proprietary governor of South Carolina, from 1719 to 1721) located on the Savannah River north of today's Augusta, Georgia. While both were (partly) built, neither was fully equipped, supplied, or manned, and neither became centers of settlement and development. For more on these two forts, see Reel 2 document 179 and note after (1764).]

For more on Barnwell, Boone, and Beresford's concerns about the threat of Spanish depredations along the southern Carolina coast during the same period, see documents dated in 1716 and 1720 not included in this Finding Aid, which are microfilmed in Reel 3 Volume 382, Frames 37, 40, and 68 to 74]

[**Note:** During the first two decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, **Spaniards** were not the only external enemies of South Carolina. **Indians** also were hostile and actively dangerous on the frontier. At different times, British, Spanish, and Indians each took their turns as aggressors in this violence. In 1702, South Carolina forces invaded Spanish Florida, unsuccessfully laying siege to St. Augustine. In 1706, Spaniards reciprocated, invading the coastal area of what is now Georgia, equally unsuccessfully. Meanwhile, Spanish pirates were actively engaged in the British coastal regions north of Spanish Florida and around the British colony of the Bahama Islands. Indian attacks on settlers in the South Carolina interior frontier were reported regularly. In 1711, these grew worse and were characterized as an "*Indian Warr.*" Although, interestingly, not mentioned in this microfilmed correspondence, South Carolina soon responded in the bloody Yamasee War of 1715 to 1717, in which Indians of several Nations fought and lost. A number of microfilmed documents, dated between 1702 and 1717, which pertain to either the Spanish or the Indian wars, are found in Reel 3 Volume 382, between Frames 14 and 56.]

[**Note:** **Governor Francis Nicholson** (1655-1728) was an army general, appointed at a time when concerns for military defense appeared paramount. In practice, the most important issue during his term as governor, from 1721 to 1725, was economic development. The plantation economy, based on slavery and staple crops, especially rice, benefited a relative few planters and traders but did not encourage frontier settlement by small, independent farmers. Nicholson sought to loosen money-credit opportunities to benefit a larger number of entrepreneurial agriculturalists. This "soft-money" policy was opposed by a "hard-money" contingent of planter/trader representatives in the Commons House, who wanted to keep credit tight and under control of the planter/merchant class.]

[**Note:** Nicholson was the first royally appointed governor of South Carolina. **Colonel Robert Johnson** had been the last governor appointed by proprietors, serving between 1717 and December 21, 1719. Johnson was followed by **James Moore II** (for whom the fort north of Savannah was named), an interim governor appointed by a convention. He served from December 21, 1719 until May 30, 1721, when Nicholson, newly appointed by the King, arrived in Charleston. Nicholson left Charleston in May 1725 but was not removed as governor until 1729, when the royal government was finally firmly established. Between May 1725 and December 1730, **Arthur Middleton** served as acting governor (establishing a pattern replicated several times in the royal government's history until 1775). **Robert Johnson** returned as royally appointed governor from May 1735 and November 1737, when he died. Acting governors filled in until **James Glen** was appointed, serving from 1743 until 1756. Glen was governor when the DLAR's microfilmed incoming correspondence of the Board of Trade (Reel 1) begins in 1758.]

[**Note:** The identity and status of judges or group of judges called in 1720 “***Their Excellencys the Lords Justices***” of Great Britain is not clear. During the 1720s to 1750s the Lords Justices seem to have been an organized governmental body to which important colonial issues were brought, in somewhat the same fashion South Carolina reported important issues for resolution to the Committee of the Privy Council on Plantations. Maybe the term refers to the **Judicial Committee of the Privy Council**, although no direct evidence of this has been found. The current government of the United Kingdom includes **Lords Justices of Appeal**, but these appear to be different justice officials. Thus, the status of Lords Justices in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> Century remains obscure.]

[**Note:** The Middleton family were wealthy South Carolina planters, staunch advocates for African slavery, and active public officials. In 1725, **Arthur Middleton** (1681-1737) was serving on the Council when he was thrust into the position of acting governor when Governor Nicholson left Charleston for England. He ruled the colony until the next duly appointed governor, Robert Johnson, arrived in December 1730. Arthur’s grandson, **Arthur Middleton** (1742-1787) joined the American cause early, serving on the Council of Safety and the Continental Congress. While serving in the war, he was captured when the British conquered Charleston.

**Henry Middleton** (1717 to 1784), son of the first Arthur Middleton and father of the second, served on the South Carolina Council during the 1760s. In 1770, however, he resigned in protest against British policies, joining the rebel cause. He joined his son Arthur as a member of the Continental Congress. The younger Arthur Middleton’s son, **Henry Middleton** (1770-1846) maintained the family tradition of public service in the new State of South Carolina and United States. From 1810 to 1812 he was Governor of South Carolina; from 1815 to 1819 he served in the U.S. Congress, and from 1820 to 1830 he was U.S. minister to Russia, dedicated to protecting rights of slaveholders in the Czarist state.]

5. November 17, 1720 [21]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Secretary Craggs, concerning “*Behaviour of the Spaniards at St. Augustine toward his Ma<sup>ty</sup>s. Subjects in those Parts*” and related matters

[**Note:** **James Craggs** the Younger was Secretary of State for the Southern Department from March 16, 1718 until February 16, 1721, when John Carteret replaced him. See note after document 1.]

6. August 16, 1720 [24]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Lords Justices, stating that the Commission for a new Carolina Governor had been prepared; pointing out that South and North Carolina now had different governments and governors

7. July 26, 1723 [26]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Lords Justices, concerning a dispute between the South Carolina government and merchants and planters over the government's refinancing bills of credit (loosening credit while increasing its costs), which had been expensive for merchants and planters, who had complained; commenting that the increases were consistent with the King's Instructions and therefore were acceptable
8. July 18, 1723 [28]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to General Francis Nicholson, royal governor of South Carolina, requesting that he comply more completely and punctually with requirements for submission of papers
9. June 19, 1723 [30]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Lords Justices, concerning an act passed in South Carolina "*for the good Gov<sup>t</sup>. of Charles Town*", with a unique procedure for incorporation; stating that such an act was "extraordinary" and should have been written contingent on the King's approval; stating that the act would have doubtful benefit for trade; suggesting repeal of the law
10. July 22, 1724 [32]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to the Duke of Newcastle, reporting the irregular confinement of a person in Charleston, apparently Benjamin de la Caseillere, who was a French Huguenot, member of the Council, and leader of the hard-money contingent of Commons House, which had been contesting Governor Nicholson's softer-money credit policies  
**[Note: Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Newcastle,** replaced John Carteret (2<sup>nd</sup> Baron Carteret) as Secretary of State for the Southern Department on April 6, 1724, serving until February 12, 1748 (except for a hiatus between February and April 1746 when John Carteret (now 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Granville) briefly replaced him). The Thomas Pelham serving on the Board of Trade might have been Thomas Pelham of Stanmer, who died in 1737, a relative, but not directly so, of Thomas Pelham-Holles.]
11. August 20, 1724 [34]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to the Right Rev. Bishop of London, responding to his letter concerning a new act advancing salaries to clergy in South Carolina, which the Board finds legally acceptable but financially unadvisable because of the manner in which was worded and the powers it delegated to the Church
12. November 17, 1727 [37]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Governor Nicholson of South Carolina, concerning Fort King George on the Altamaha River, asking for news from Nicholson on its status

13. November 29, 1728 [40]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, concerning articles of complaint from [Benjamin] Whitaker Attorney General of South Carolina [from 1721 to 1731], against [Arthur] Middleton, President of the South Carolina Council [and acting governor; see note after document 4], relating to procedures in the general accounts
14. December 9, 1729 [41]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Lord Viscount Townshend, submitting to Townshend a copy of a Commission for Robert Johnson to be Governor of South Carolina [see note after document 4]  
**[Note: Charles Townshend, 2<sup>nd</sup> Viscount Townshend (1674-1738)** held several high-level positions over many years in British government. Between 1714 and 1717 and again between 1721 and 1730 he was Secretary of State for the Northern Department. Between them, Secretaries of State for the Northern and Southern Departments held jurisdiction for foreign policy over much of the British Empire, divided geographically. At this time, jurisdiction of the Northern Department included European countries, while the Southern Department was responsible for the American colonies, including South Carolina. Townshend, closely allied with (and brother-in-law of) Prime Minister Robert Walpole, was a political rival of John Carteret, whom he successfully helped oust in 1724 from the position of Secretary of State for the Southern Department, to be replaced by Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Newcastle. Why the Board of Trade sent Townshend (in addition to Newcastle) a copy of Robert Johnson's Commission is not clear, except that it might have been related to communication among members of the Walpole-Townshend political cabal. See note after document 42.]
15. December 9, 1729 [42]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King conveying a Commission for Robert Johnson to be Governor of South Carolina
16. July 31, 1729 [45]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to the Privy Council Committee on Plantation Affairs, concerning complaints of South Carolina Council President [and acting governor] Middleton against the South Carolina Assembly in relation to the pending appointment of Robert Johnson to be Governor there  
**[Note:** Before 1696 and again after 1784, the Board of Trade and Plantations was itself a committee of the King's Privy Council. Between 1696 and 1768, it was a separate Board with appointed Lords with major responsibility for British colonial development and international trade. Apparently this Board communicated with the **Privy Council** through a **Committee on Plantation Affairs**, to which the Lords of Trade wrote a substantial number of letters, including those microfilmed here dated between July 1729 and April 1771.]

17. February 20, 1730 [47]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, concerning armaments for South Carolina
18. February 4, 1730 [48]  
Draft of letter from A[lured]. Popple [Secretary to the] Board of Trade to Col. Robert Johnson, conveying queries from the Board of Trade for the new governor to respond to concerning the following: Number and value of bills circulating in South Carolina; from what fund they were to be repaid; whether that fund had “*ever been broken into*”; for what “*Services*” they had been raised; to what purpose they had actually been used; how long it would be before the present bills were discharged; whether any necessity now existed for paper currency and if so, what the need was; and “*What Fund can be propos’d to prevent their being at Discount*”  
[Note: For several generations, members of the Popple family served as Secretary to the Board of Trade. **Alured Popple** (1699-1744) held the Secretary position, after a clerkship, from 1722 until 1737. In that year he left the Secretary position to his brother William, while he became Lieutenant Governor and then Governor of Bermuda from 1737 until he died in office of disease in 1744. Alured usually signed his name A. P.]
19. April 15, 1730 [50]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, conveying address received from South Carolina Council president and members, concerning the King having purchased the province of South Carolina [thus establishing a royal colony there]
20. May 23, 1730 [51]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition from John Carteret with claims to “*one full eighth undivided Part of Carolina, and also of the Arrears of Quit Rents*”, with details for settlement of the claim; requesting the King’s opinion about separating this one-eighth portion [from the King’s purchase of the eight proprietors’ shares of ownership of the original Carolina colony, one of which Carteret had inherited]  
[Note: Carteret’s petition was eventually approved. The land assigned to him was a 60-mile strip of what is now North Carolina, along the Virginia border. The land remained in the Carteret family until it was confiscated by North Carolina in 1776. For more on John Carteret, see note after document 1. For more on Carteret’s proprietor share of the Carolina colony, see documents 22, 26 to 28.]
21. June 10, 1730 [53]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, conveying draft Instructions for Governor Johnson concerning trade

22. June 15, 1730 [54]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying draft trade Instructions for Governor Johnson; including opinion that the new Governor should decide the issue of land ownership, including the one-eighth claimed by Carteret (which ended up being located in North Carolina); suggesting also that the King consider a statement of general conditions for quit rents, so that, if the South Carolina Assembly sought to intervene in the pricing of land and "*the Manner of recovering of Rents for Lands*", such intervention would not be possible; relating this issue to the issue of South Carolina's highly discounted paper money; suggesting a high priority to complete the fort on the Altamaha River; also including articles in the draft trade Instructions concerning the North Carolina-South Carolina boundary and the importation of Negroes, plus additional details [Frame 59 microfilmed twice]
23. July 30, 1730 [62]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, resubmitting General Instructions for Governor Johnson with requested alterations
24. July 23, 1730 [63]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, concerning settlement of 600 Swiss Protestants in South Carolina [for more on this settlement, see note after Reel 2 document 176 and 11 additional documents in Reel 3 between 25 and 63]
25. July 23, 1730 [64]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying letter of Jean-Pierre Purry of Neuchatel, Switzerland, concerning conditions for the anticipated settlement of Swiss Protestants in South Carolina; recommending approval of the settlement, with these conditions
26. August 4, 1730 [67]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Lord Carteret, concerning the value of his one-eighth proprietor's share of the Carolina colony
27. August 11, 1730 [68]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, informing them of Lord Carteret's response concerning the value of his one-eighth share of the Carolina colony, in which he stated that he had put no value on it because he did not intend to sell it but to retain it and improve it himself
28. August 20, 1730 [70]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, conveying the Board's committee report on Carteret's response concerning the value of his claim in South Carolina; pointing out treaty agreements with Indian nations that complicate land ownership issues [Frame 70 microfilmed twice]

29. September 30, 1730 [74]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, concerning Indian treaties and Carteret's land share; encouraging the King to continue supporting the "*small Expendence*" required for good relations with the Indians
30. October 1730 [76]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, conveying Instructions to South Carolina concerning a settlement of Swiss Protestants [most of letter was crossed out, and no day was included in the date, both suggesting that the letter was not sent]
31. [no date] [after 76]  
Draft of "*Additional Instructions*" to South Carolina Governor Johnson relating to the settlement of Swiss Protestants, with details of Purry's previous settlement attempt; granting Purry's new settlement 12,000 acres of land, "*free from Quit Rent*"; *enumerating several conditions of the land grant*
32. January 4, 1731 [79]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning establishment of civil governance in South Carolina under a royal government, based on the institutions of governance under the previous colonial government
33. April 2, 1731 [81]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Governor Johnson, congratulating him on his safe arrival in South Carolina; encouraging him to follow his Instructions and rule wisely; instructing him not to accept all of a South Carolina law modifying the court system, especially the proposal for giving security, which the Board wishes to be a general obligation rather than being tied to individuals; looking forward to receiving soon Johnson's first report to the Board as governor
34. November 18, 1731 [83]  
Draft of letter from "P." [probably a secretary to the Board of Trade] to Johnson, concerning Johnson's having allowed the Assembly to appoint its own Clerk temporarily; informing him of the Board's command that "*in this Kingdom his M<sup>ty</sup> always appoints the Clerks to the House of Commons*" and requiring Johnson to insist on the King's prerogative in this matter; stating that the Board requires Johnson to send copies of all colonial laws and Assembly proceedings to the Board for review
35. November 30, 1731 [85]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, informing them that Johnson had been empowered to grant lands under certain circumstances to Purry for his Swiss Protestant settlement

36. December 22, 1731 [87]  
 Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning the issue of establishment of the western and eastern boundaries of South Carolina, as raised by a petition from Lord Percival and others; suggesting that the authority on the subject remains “*ancient Patents*” granted by King Charles II to the proprietors of Carolina, which allowed the province “*to extend westward in a direct line as far as the S<sup>o</sup>. Seas*”; suggesting also that the eastern boundary under the new royal charter includes within South Carolina all the sea islands “*within Seventy Leagues of the Coast between the Rivers Savannah & Alatamaha*” not already settled “*by any authority derived from the Crown*”; expressing the opinion that “*the Proprietors should be restrained from granting above five hundred acres to any one Person*”
37. March 7, 1732 [89]  
 Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning an act passed by South Carolina called “*An Act for the better settling of the Courts of Justice*”, which altered the beginning of a civil action from a summons to a “*Capias*”, which led to many objections from South Carolina planters and the Provost Marshal; having asked Johnson to obtain passage of a more acceptable provision, he had responded to the Board stating that “*He is afraid the People of S<sup>o</sup> Carolina, will never again consent to pass a Law for instituting the Summons*”; requesting that the King consider allowing a reversion to the Summons so that civil process would be the same throughout the empire  
**[Note: A summons** was a legal notice issued by a judge for a person to appear in court. It was generally enforced by the Provost Marshal, an appointed colonial official. In civil cases, summons were usually administered with apparently some degree of discretion based on the gentlemanly code of honor. A **capias warrant**, used in criminal cases, was more than a notice. It was a writ of arrest issued by a judge. Applying an arrest process to civil cases clearly offended the honor of many Britishers on both sides of the Atlantic.]
38. May 26, 1732 [92]  
 Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of John Vat [London attorney and trustee of certain patents of South Carolina proprietors] on behalf of Purry and the Swiss Protestant families seeking to settle in South Carolina seeking a grant of 48,000 acres “*subject to the usual Quit Rents after the first Ten Years*”, located in the township to be called “*Purrysborough, on the great Yamasee Bluff on the Savanna River*”; informing the Privy Council about Purry’s previous attempt to settle 1,200 Swiss, for which South Carolina’s proprietors had pledged £2,400 to pay for transporting the settlers, but had not provided transport funding, so this attempt had failed; relating Purry’s second attempt, begun in 1730, for which Purry had initially sought a “*Barony of twelve thousand acres free of Quit-Rents*” for the settlement, which Board of Trade had approved; but again the issue of transport cost as well as sufficiency of acreage had intervened, and the new petition now requested 48,000 acres with quit rents after 10 years;

justifying approval of Purry's proposal as part of the British strategy, for security and defense of the British colonies in America, to settle as many "*white settlers*", as quickly as possible, along the British frontiers with Spanish and French colonies; proposing certain conditions for this approval, including that the settlers all take oaths of allegiance to Britain and that Purry not gain title to the land until he had fulfilled his promise to settle the Swiss [for more on Purry's efforts to establish a Swiss settlement in South Carolina, see Reel 2 document 176 and note after it, plus 12 documents in Reel 3 between 24 and 63]

39. June 16, 1732 [101]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, containing further condition for approval of the Purry request for 48,000, providing that if any of the land were not put into cultivation within 10 years, it would revert to royal ownership
40. June 21, 1732 [103]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, expressing concern about a report received from North Carolina Governor Captain [George] Barrington about the imminent possibility of an Indian war; stating that the Board had written to Barrington and to Johnson in South Carolina [see document 41] instructing them to take needed precautions  
**[Note: George Barrington (1682-1759) was proprietary governor in 1724 and 1725. Because of his controversial decisions and great unpopularity, the proprietors quickly removed him. Yet, when the King needed to appoint a royal governor, he could find no one else, so Barrington became the first royal governor of North Carolina in 1731. Once again his controversial and unpopular rule led to his being replaced in 1734.]**
41. June 21, 1732 [105]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Johnson concerning the possible threat of Indian war reported by Barrington in North Carolina; encouraging South Carolina to take necessary precautions
42. June 23, 1732 [107]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Sir Robert Walpole, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the rest of the Lords of the Treasury, quoting a memorial received from Richard Shelton "*late Secretary to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina and the Bahama Islands*", stating that he [Shelton] had suffered because of the royal takeover of the Carolina colony; seeking redress from the King via Board of Trade; Board recommending that Shelton's memorial be complied with

**[Note: Sir Robert Walpole, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Orford (1676-1745) was the dominant politician in English government during an extended period of more than two decades, from the early 1720s to the early 1740s. He was skillful at manipulating both people and issues in the ministerial and parliamentary governmental system of the time. Officially, he maintained power by holding two of the highest positions in the system, Prime Minister (1721 to 1742) and Chancellor of the Exchequer (1727 to 1740).**

43. September 6, 1732 [110]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning the need for South Carolina Governor Johnson to assist in drawing up a charter to establish a new royal colony in Georgia
44. September 6, 1732 [111]  
Draft of "*Additional Instruction*" from Board of Trade to Johnson, requesting that he announce, publicize and support in South Carolina the King's pleasure and plan to create a new royal colony in Georgia
45. November 1, 1732 [113]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning an act adopted by South Carolina on August 20, 1731, seeking remission of arrears of quit rents, for registering patents, grants, memorials relating to patents, grants, and title deeds, for regulating payment of quit rents in the future, clearing up "defects" in these documents, and for maintaining a separate "*Office of publick Register*" for South Carolina; also appropriating money to pay for duties on Negroes, liquors, and other goods; also repealing certain acts that set prices for certain goods; stating that because of its importance, Board of Trade had had it reviewed by the Treasury, which had responded that the act "*is not proper*" for the King to approve, with explanation; stating that, to be legal, the law must provide that South Carolina submit to the King all grants of land, including grants of land by former proprietors of South Carolina, and that quit rents must be paid on all such grants of land; concluding that "*this is a very partial act, calculated for the Interest of some particular Inhabitants of So. Carolina, to the Prejudice of your Majesty's just Rights & Claims in that Province*"; recommending that the King not approve this act and direct South Carolina to adopt an acceptable substitute
46. June 7, 1733 [121]  
Copy of letter from Board of Trade to Johnson, concerning the jailing by Commons House of South Carolina's Surveyor General [James] St. John for words he used in relation to the newly adopted act relaxing enforcement of quit rent payments; deploring that a royal public servant would be imprisoned for enforcing the royal quit rent laws; recommending that St. John be released

47. [no date] [123]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, stating that the attorney for Purry had proposed that a portion of Purry's land grant be approved, Purry having already settled 150 Swiss settlers and expecting to have settled 600 soon; Board of Trade recommending approval
48. June 19, 1733 [124]  
Draft of Additional Instructions from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Johnson, concerning conditions for the land grant to Purry for his Swiss settlement, allowing for proportionate grants of land for the 180 already settled and for the 600 expected to be settled soon
49. June 28, 1733 [127]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, enclosing a copy of a deposition [not microfilmed here] made by Nathaniel Coverley, master of the sloop *Bachelor*, reporting on an "*Expedition intended ag<sup>t</sup> Port Royal from Havanna*" [Port Royal is located among the tidal estuaries and sea islands of South Carolina, inland from St. Helena Island, nearer to Savannah than to Charleston]
50. July 19, 1733 [128]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of Robert Thorpe to the King stating his right to 9,000 acres of South Carolina land based on a grant by the proprietors; stating that questions had arisen about the legality of this land grant and the accompanying survey; explaining the discrepancies of these documents from the usual practices under the proprietors and suggesting that the land grant should not be recognized as legally binding
51. December 4, 1733 [131]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, enclosing copies of two affidavits [not microfilmed here] from South Carolina concerning "*the loss of the Spanish Flota in the Gulph of Florida in July last*"
52. January 22, 1734 [132]  
Draft of letter from Secretary A. P. [Alured Popple], writing on behalf of Board of Trade, to Johnson, concerning reports of ordnance sent to South Carolina that had not been used or stored properly but "*lye upon the Beach in Cha<sup>s</sup>. Town without Carriages, Exposed to the Weather and Sand*"; stating that Johnson had taken care of this situation; concerning petitions from merchants in London and Bristol, seeking redress of financial losses sustained because of two South Carolina laws, one of 1696 and the other 1731; including other matters

53. February 15, 1734 [134]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning review of petition from Thomas Cooper, James Greene, and Rowland Vaughan concerning a South Carolina act relating to suits and disturbances to judges and magistrates because of the habeas corpus act, which they seek to get repealed; stating the opinion that this act was “*extraordinary*” and should be disallowed by the King
54. February 15, 1734 [136]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning petition of Colonel Samuel Horsey to the King about a warrant by the South Carolina proprietors granting him Margrave status and “*four Baronies or Forty-eight Thousand acres of land*”, which was not exercised by the proprietors, and which he now wished to have transferred from the province to the King and for the King to honor the land grant; stating that Horsey had agreed to pay quit rents and the current royal rate, not the rate during the proprietary colony; recommending that the King approve surrendering the land to Horsey  
[Note: **Samuel Horsey** began his career in the Horse Guards of the British military, rising to the rank of colonel. As early as 1726, the South Carolina proprietors were promoting him as a potential governor, but in 1730, the King passed over him in favor of Robert Johnson. In early 1738, he actually was appointed and was being prepared to serve. However, he died on August 17, 1738. See documents 98, 99, 115, 116.]
55. February 6, 1734 [140]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petitions of London and Bristol merchants trading with South Carolina, who had complained about 1696 and 1731 acts of South Carolina; the second act seems to forbid prosecuting any inhabitant for debts owed, which was detrimental to economic relations needed for trade to thrive
56. March 22, 1734 [143]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of the London and Bristol merchants, stating that in 1723, South Carolina's entire paper currency was called in, debt regulated and limited, and economic intercourse upset, including the financing and functioning of the provincial government; the 1731 act was designed to reopen economic activity, using already approved duties on Negroes [and liquor] to be put into a sinking fund for use in encouraging settlement; however, in practice, the sinking fund had not been effective for that purpose

57. April 18, 1734 [150]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a 1723 act "*for settling the Estate of Richard Beresford, deceased*", about which several objections in point of law had been raised in relation to the financial methods used, as they apply to the larger economy; recommending that the King disallow the law
58. July 25, 1734 [152]  
Draft of letter from [Secretary of Board of Trade] A. P. [Alured Popple] to the [British] Attorney General and Solicitor General, concerning settlement of South Carolina through land grants within designated townships; in this context Purry sought land grants for his settlement, and regulation of ownership required a six-mile unsettled buffer between townships; reporting that the buffer had been violated by grants more recently made, which encroached on the Purry land grants; desiring to know, on behalf of Board of Trade, whether the encroaching grants were legal
59. August 22, 1734 [158]  
Draft of letter from [Board of Trade Secretary] A. P. [Alured Popple] to Johnson, instructing him to enforce the six-mile buffer between settlements in adjoining townships
60. September 5, 1734 [162]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning a petition from Purry concerning land grants for his settlement and encroaching settlements in adjacent areas; stating inability to determine the authority for encroaching settlements; suggesting that the South Carolina governor have a survey done to establish the six-mile buffer area and then not permit any settlement within that area; including additional rules for grant size; including Instructions for the South Carolina Governor to offer double lot grants in certain areas, as requested in Purry's petition
61. November 19, 1734 [169]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of Richard Shelton, late secretary to the South Carolina proprietors, seeking a 12,000 acre land grant; the Board concluding that the request for the land grant was justified and should be approved
62. December 19, 1734 [171]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, submitting draft Instructions [see document 63] for Johnson concerning his approving land grants for the Purry settlement
63. December 19, 1734 [172]  
Draft of Additional Instructions to Johnson pertaining to approving land grants for the Purry settlement, with conditions and restrictions on nearby settlements

64. December 19, 1734 [175]  
Draft of letter from [Secretary of Board of Trade] A. P. [Alured Popple] to John Scrope, [Senior] Secretary to the Treasury [from 1724 to 1752], concerning encroaching land grants in South Carolina and Board of Trade's position on the encroachment
65. December 19, 1734 [177]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a petition of South Carolina inhabitants claiming to be deterred from obtaining approved land grants for lands previously granted by the proprietors; containing allegations that Johnson and "*four or five other Persons*" sought to obtain "*exorbitant Tracts of Land & to enrich themselves by selling the same again in Parcels*" in the Granville County area; reporting that Johnson had neglected to establish a Court of Exchequer in South Carolina that might hear and resolve such allegations; suggesting that an Additional Instruction go to Johnson ordering him to resolve this situation; reporting that the Treasury believes the allegations to be true
66. February 28, 1735 [185]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning three acts passed by the Georgia Assembly, one to maintain peace with Indians in Georgia, one prohibiting "*the Importation & use of Black Slaves or Negroes into the same*", and one "*to prevent the Importation & use of Rum & Brandies in the Province of Georgia*"; conveying the Board's opinion that these were legal and recommending that the King approve them [apparently Georgia correspondence that was inaccurately recorded among South Carolina documents]
67. June 13, 1735 [187]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of Robert Wright, Chief Justice in South Carolina, complaining of not receiving a salary for up to three years and of no salary amount having yet been agreed on, and pointing out that the Chief Justice under the proprietary colony had been promptly paid £100 per year; suggesting that the royal colony's Chief Justice be made an independent official, paid not by the Assembly but directly by the Crown  
[Note: **Robert Wright** served as Chief Justice of South Carolina from 1730 to 1739, dying in office. His son James Wright, also an attorney, served as South Carolina Attorney General starting in 1747 and Crown Agent for South Carolina starting in 1757. In 1760, he was appointed Governor of Georgia, a position in which he served until 1782.]
68. June 25, 1735 [190]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to **Thomas Broughton**, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, acknowledging receipt of news from Broughton of Governor Johnson's death [Johnson died on May 5, 1735; Broughton served as Lieutenant or Acting Governor from that date until he also died, on November 22, 1737]

69. June 26, 1735 [191]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of Thomas Rutherford, wishing royal approval for the land grant of 12,000 acres he received in 1726; stating that no part of this requested grant was within six miles of any other township, including Purry's township; recommending approval of this grant
70. July 11, 1735 [193]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning the colonial government's handling of credit and paper money in South Carolina
71. July 11, 1735 [195]  
Draft of Additional Instruction to Broughton, concerning how to handle the situation of the Assembly having improperly passed an act to reissue the colony's paper money to refinance the colony's public debt and which the King had disallowed
72. August 14, 1735 [197]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning two 1731 acts of South Carolina complained of in petition of South Carolina Chief Justice Robert Wright, which delay filling court positions and regulate the South Carolina courts in ways Wright finds illegal; recommending that these acts be disallowed by the King and that the royal government be empowered to appoint assistant judges, two in each court jurisdiction, not subject to Assembly approval [last page of letter microfilmed after document 73]
73. August 14, 1735 [200]  
Draft of Additional Instruction to Broughton, concerning implementation of court appointments following the King's disallowance of court acts passed by the Assembly, including appointment of assistant judges
74. September 12, 1735 [203]  
Draft of letter from [Secretary of Board of Trade] Alured Popple to Broughton, conveying the Board of Trade's instruction that Broughton not take any action, despite the Assembly's passage of an act disallowing entry into South Carolina of servants of new settlers, that would in any way discourage new settlement, including restrictions on their bringing servants
75. November 26, 1735 [205]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of George Morley, Provost Marshal of South Carolina, in which he complained of difficulties setting up the practice of his office, including lack of a salary and of a jail;

requesting permission to obtain an allowance out of quit rents; recommending approval of the quit rent allowance for key expenses, but also recommending that the Lieutenant Governor do his best to convince the Assembly to approve the necessary funding of both salary and jail

76. November 28, 1735 [207]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of William Hodgson, Landgrave and Cassique of Carolina, stating having had a land grant from the proprietors, but that Governor Johnson had not permitted its development because he did not recognize the land grant as valid; seeking royal approval of his land grant; reporting having had the land grant examined and found to be too general to be recognized as a proper land grant; therefore recommending that the petition not be granted  
[Note: **Landgraves** and **Cassiques** were unique to the original Carolina colony's constitution. They were titles of letter nobility (between Lords and Commoners) given to members of Carolina's upper house of Assembly. Officially, the concept did not last much past 1700 and unofficially not much longer.
77. June 18, 1736 [209]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, informing the Council of the Board's having instructed the Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina to take strong measures to convince the Assembly to fund a jail
78. June 18, 1736 [210]  
Draft of Additional Instruction to Broughton, repeating a previous Instruction to Johnson to ensure that South Carolina provides for all needed public buildings especially a jail, as well as necessary staff for each building; specifically stating importance of convincing Assembly to provide for a jail or jails
79. October 22, 1736 [212]  
Draft of letter from [Board of Trade Secretary] A[lured]. Popple to James Oglethorpe, trustee of Georgia, conveying a complaint from the government of Spain against inhabitants of Georgia settling in Spanish territory in Florida and, specifically of establishing a Fort King George on the Altamaha River; requesting to know the truth of complaints and of the British understanding of the location of the boundary [note indicates this is a copy filed in South Carolina Papers]
80. October 22, 1736 [214]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Secretary of State Newcastle [for more on the Duke of Newcastle, see note after Volume 3 document 10], informing Newcastle that the Board had received several papers "*relating to Some Transactions between Mr. Oglethorpe & the Spanish Gov<sup>t</sup> of S<sup>t</sup>. Augustine*"; sharing additional information on negative relations with the Spanish in the past and present

81. November 9, 1736 [217]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, reporting on having received from Broughton information about the French having attacked the Chickasaw Indians, "*a Nation in Friendship with the English*", which appears to be a violation by the French of the Treaty of Utrecht  
[Note: The **Treaty of Utrecht** was signed by Spain and Britain after the War of Spanish Succession (1701 to 1714) in which Britain was the victor against Spain. How the French were violating this treaty is not made clear here.]
82. October 22, 1736 [219]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Broughton, requesting that he report the best information he had of the southern boundary of South Carolina, especially whether any settlements had been made south of the Altamaha River, whether the Indians between the Altamaha River and the St. Johns River held allegiance to Britain, and whether the Spanish had ever had a settlement north of the St. Johns River or anyplace except at St. Augustine
83. November 9, 1736 [221]  
Draft of letter from Secretary of Board of Trade A. Popple to Broughton, requesting on behalf of the Board of Trade more specific responses concerning transactions between the Spanish and Indians, and English treaties made with the Indians
84. November 24, 1736 [223]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petitions from Samuel and Joseph Wragg, former and current members respectively of South Carolina Council, seeking approval of a grant of 12,000 acres on the May River (inland from Daufuskie Island) in Granville County and another grant of 12,000 acres at Wyniaw [also spelled Winyaw] in Craven County, both formerly owned by the Duke of Beaufort; the Wragg brothers being willing to pay quit rents on the properties, Board of Trade had no objections; therefore recommending approval of both petitions  
[Note: Brothers **Samuel** (1690 to 1750) and **Joseph** (1698 to 1750) **Wragg** were wealthy merchants and planters. The main justification for their claim to 24,000 acres of land grants was based on their positive contribution to the colony from running a lucrative trade in African slaves. In 1718, Samuel and his son William were captured, robbed, and humiliated by the pirate known as Blackbeard.]  
[Note: **Counties** were not important organizationally in colonial South Carolina government. The proprietors named several, but none was surveyed and boundaries were unclear. What boundaries were recognized were the mouths of rivers at sea level. Initially, counties theoretically extended from the Atlantic coast all the way to the Pacific.

**Craven** County, one of the first three named, was originally considered the southern county, adjoining Spanish Florida. Carteret County, named in 1684, was renamed **Granville** County in 1708. Its coastal territory was north of the Savannah River. In 1706 a system of **townships** was established. These became the governmental entities around which settlement was organized.]

85. December 3, 1736 [227]  
Draft letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of trustees of Georgia colony who were apprehensive about any possible effort by South Carolina to grant lands for settlement south of the Altamaha River; stating that any such settlement efforts would invite war with the Indians in the area; asking that South Carolina be prohibited from occupying any land south of the Altamaha; stating that no such settlements should be attempted before the lands were formally purchased from the Indians, and that Indian hunting grounds should be protected from settlement
86. December 3, 1736 [229]  
Draft of Additional Instruction to Broughton, concerning reports that South Carolina would seek to start settlements south of the Altamaha River, stating that the British government would regard any such settlements as against royal wishes and should obtain prior royal approval; followed by another, more formal draft of the same Instruction
87. December 10, 1736 [232]  
Draft of letter from A. Popple to Broughton, informing him that Georgia had petitioned against allowing South Carolina to engage in any settlements south of the Altamaha River, and that the Board of Trade would soon be sending an Additional Instruction supporting the petition and warning South Carolina from any such settlement attempts; containing other matters relating to information received from customs collectors in the Bahamas
88. March 15, 1737 [235]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a South Carolina act "*ascertaining Publick Officers Fees*", stating that no apparent reason exists for complaints having been raised against South Carolina patent officers for extortion, so the act was unnecessary; explaining that no such law should have been enacted without consulting with the Governor; therefore recommending the law be disallowed

89. March 15, 1737 [237]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of George Morley, James Wedderburn, Thomas Gadsden, William Saxby, William Saxby Jr., and Samuel Wheatley, patent and warrant officers in South Carolina, complaining about a South Carolina act "*for ascertaining Publick Officers Fees*", asking that the king disallow this act, which, as they stated, was unwarranted, since they had not engaged in extortion; including legal arguments against the law
90. May 5, 1737 [240]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of [Sebastian] Zuberbuhler who had a contract with the South Carolina Council to settle at a place once called Savannah Town, later New Windsor, with 100 Protestant settlers, plus 200 more later; now seeking approval of 8,000 acres for this settlement, half within six miles of New Windsor; requesting that his settlement be given similar consideration to that of Purry; the Board reporting that he had also requested aid in obtaining cattle and tools and had requested other gratis services; however, he had been unable to afford to transport as many settlers as promised; the Board proposing limitations on land grants and assistance until sufficient settlers had arrived and been settled; otherwise, supporting approval eventually of the full 48,000 acres initially requested  
[Note: **Sebastian Zuberbuhler** (originally Zuberbühler) was probably Swiss and may have had a connection with Jean-Pierre Purry, who also was involved in developing Swiss Protestant settlements in South Carolina.]
91. June 14, 1737 [246]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petitions of two commissioners to settle and adjust the North Carolina-South Carolina boundary, who were seeking money to pay expenses for provisions and horses; the Board observing that in a similar situation in 1711, provision had been made to support boundary surveyors, recommending that the same arrangement be applied in this situation
92. September 1, 1737 [248]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning the Zuberbuhler petition, stating that their opinion had not changed on supporting the position
93. September 14, 1737 [250]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition from the Council and Assembly of South Carolina dated July 17, 1736 [not microfilmed here], complaining about obstructions of Indian trade by the government of the new colony of Georgia, plus a counter-petition of Georgia against South Carolina;

disagreeing over whether one colony can restrict trade with the Indians and whether the Savannah River should be open to commerce by both colonies, with Georgia insisting that its colonial government should control both Indian trade and commerce on the river, as a part of its colonial responsibility to maintain peace with the Indians; disagreeing also over a Georgia law seeking to prohibit sale of rum in that colony; the Board stating that such disputes between colonies could be dangerous to good relations with the Indians and give the Spanish and French opportunities to gain support from the Indians; concluding therefore, that the Georgia laws that inhibit trade with the Indians and commerce on the Savannah River were improper and dangerous

94. November 17, 1737 [256]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of John Hamilton, seeking a grant of 200,000 acres of land in South Carolina to establish a settlement; recommending that the petition not be granted because no detailed plan for the settlement had been presented
95. January 20, 1738 [258]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning the Zuberbuhler petition; recommending approval of 12,000 of 48,000 acres of land grant be approved
96. February 17, 1738 [260]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending approval of a South Carolina law concerning free trade with the Indians
97. February 10, 1738 [262]  
Draft of letter from [?] Hill [perhaps a secretary for the Board of Trade] to William Bull, President of South Carolina Council [and acting governor], responding to Bull's letter of December 10, 1737 announcing Broughton's death and the death of Council President [Arthur] Middleton [Sr.], and recommending Colonel Joseph Blake and Charles Pinckney to succeed them; stating that before receipt of Bull's letter, James Crocket and Edmund Atkins had already been recommended for these two seats [Pinckney died later in 1738]  
**[Note: William Bull Sr. (1683-1755) had been serving as King's Counsel for South Carolina when he was called on to fill the vacant position of acting governor after the existing Acting Governor, Thomas Broughton, died in office on November 22, 1737. Bull served in this capacity until the next official governor, James Glen, arrived on December 17, 1743. Bull continued to serve as Lieutenant Governor under Governor Glen until 1755, when he died. Lieutenant Governor Broughton had become Acting Governor when the previous Governor, Robert Johnson, had died on May 5, 1735.]**

98. April 11, 1738 [264]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, concerning preparation of a Commission for Samuel Horsey to be governor of South Carolina [see note after document 54]
99. April 11, 1738 [265]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, submitting a commission for Samuel Horsey to be governor of South Carolina [see note after document 54]
100. April 21, 1738 [267]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning approval of Zuberbuhler's petition, including its promise to settle 50 Protestant families in South Carolina
101. May 30, 1738 [269]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, concerning Instructions for new governor of South Carolina
102. June 6, 1738 [271]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, passing on correspondence from Bull in South Carolina to Newcastle
103. June 21, 1738 [273]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending steps to the King to end the conflict between South Carolina and Georgia over the Indian trade
104. June 21, 1738 [275]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning Instructions for the new South Carolina governor regarding mutual agreement between South Carolina and Georgia on the Indian trade
105. June 21, 1738 [276]  
Draft of several Instructions from Board of Trade to obtain mutual agreement on policies between South Carolina and Georgia on the Indian trade, being sent to the King for review
106. June 22, 1738 [278]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning petition of John Cartwright and others seeking a 200,000 acre land grant, in four parcels of 50,000 acres each, to start a settlement of Protestants, with all lands to be granted by the South Carolina governor, and with all old quit rents to be paid, and with the petitioners to pay for transport of 400 settlers; recommending that the King approve this

107. July 6, 1738 [282]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a South Carolina law about issuance of paper money, some of which was proper but certain sections of which were objectionable, including a provision allowing the Treasurer to discount amounts of duties, and a provision for an old debt of £100,000, for which no provision existed requiring repayment of its principal; suggesting that royal approval of this law be delayed until the new South Carolina governor could seek amendment of the original act to meet royal desires
108. July 13, 1738 [286]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, submitting drafts of Instructions for the new South Carolina governor for Newcastle's review
109. July 13, 1738 [287]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, submitting drafts of Instructions for the new South Carolina governor for the King's review, with details
110. July 13, 1738 [290]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning a petition from Bristol and London merchants complaining about a South Carolina law passed in May 1735 for issuing paper money to pay debts; seeking its disallowance the King; recommending that the law itself was agreeable to royal policy but that certain provisions in it were objectionable [see document 107]
111. July 25, 1738 [294]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning Bull's letter to Newcastle, which requests military assistance for defense of South Carolina; recommending that the request for supplies be approved
112. July 27, 1738 [298]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, informing him that the Board had received the same letter from Bull
113. August 10, 1738 [299]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a South Carolina law altering the court and juror system; raising objections to provisions in the law; recommending the King's disallowance of the act

114. October 5, 1738 [301]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, concerning letter from Bull stating contacts with the Choctaw Indians, who seem interested in friendship with Britain, after having been allied for some time with the French; sending copy of Bull's letter to Newcastle
115. November 9, 1738 [303]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Newcastle, conveying a draft Commission for newly appointed Governor of South Carolina James Glen [see note after document 54] [although appointed in 1738, Glen did not arrive in Charleston, officially becoming governor, until 1743, remaining in office until 1756; see note after Reel 1 document 1]
116. November 28 [?], 1738 [304]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying a draft Commission for James Glen as South Carolina governor, which is similar to that drawn up for Colonel Horsey [see note after document 54]

**Note:** No draft letters with dates after November 28, 1738 or before June 25, 1764 are found among these microfilmed documents. During this substantial gap, short-term Acting Governor Thomas Broughton had died in office on November 22, 1737, to be replaced by **William Bull Sr.** from that date until December 17, 1743, when the next official Governor, **James Glen**, arrived at Charleston. Glen served as Governor until 1756, when he was recalled, with the help of political rivals in London and General Braddock's loss trying to capture Fort Duquesne, and replaced by **William Henry Lyttelton**, who governed from 1756 to 1760. In the latter year, Lyttelton was appointed Governor of Jamaica, leaving Lieutenant Governor **William Bull II** (the son of William Bull Sr.) as acting governor of South Carolina, from April 5, 1760 until December 22, 1761, when South Carolina's next governor, **Thomas Boone**, arrived in Charleston. Boone was governor from 1761 to 1764, during which time he had alienated enough powerful interests to have to defend himself in London, from which he never returned to Charleston. Again, **William Bull II** filled in as acting governor from May 11, 1764 to June 17, 1766, when the next Governor, **Charles Greville Montagu** arrived in Charleston. For more on South Carolina Governors, see note after Reel 1 document 1. For more on William Bull II, see note after Reel 1 document 39. For more on Thomas Boone, see note after Reel 1 document 108.

Why, during this period of multiple governors and acting governors, no outgoing draft correspondence from the Board of Trade concerning matters of colonial South Carolina was microfilmed is not clear from the documents themselves.

117. June 25, 1764 [305]  
Draft of letter from John Pownall, secretary for Board of Trade, to William Bull II, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina [and acting governor—see note after document 116], requesting that Bull receive with civility “*Monsieur l’Abbe, one of the French Protestants who lately went to South Carolina under the protection of government*” [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 45]
118. August 15, 1764 [307]  
Draft of letter from Pownall to Bull, concerning paying a balance owed to the French Protestant settlers
119. December 24, 1764 [309]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Bull, concerning the need for a “*uniform Plan*” to use in the dispute with the Indians; congratulating Bull on his efforts to support the French Protestant settlement and to establish a temporary boundary [between North Carolina and South Carolina]; offering advice on other policies, including reducing the numbers of Negroes imported and increasing imports of whites; approving the new line for the boundary of South Carolina southwest of Catawba Nation lands; approving of South Carolina’s response to an act of Parliament encouraging the export of more rice to England [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 53]
120. February 15, 1765 [311]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to governors of South Carolina, Georgia, East Florida, Leeward Islands, Barbados, Grenada, Bahamas, informing them that, since reports had been received of Spanish ships in distress being turned away from certain British colonial ports, the King’s policy was to welcome in all ships in distress, unless their real purpose was to seek to unload and sell foreign goods in the British ports [transcript of this letter to South Carolina acting governor Bull is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 54]
121. December 24, 1765 [313]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning Instructions for appointed Governor of South Carolina Charles Greville Montagu [see note after document 116; for more on Montagu, see notes after Reel 2 documents 43, 90, 119, 182, 186, 199], including new Instructions concerning a chief justice and court system, other public officials, a temporary boundary between North Carolina and South Carolina, and new legislation for trade encouragement and regulation [presumably the Stamp Act] [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 55]

122. January 24, 1766 [317]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning petition from former South Carolina Governor Thomas Boone, seeking payment of the Governor's past salary, which was being withheld by the South Carolina Assembly; stating that it was not a recognized privilege of the Assembly to withhold such salary, and that this set a dangerous precedent [for more on the issue of Boone's unpaid salary, see Reel 2 documents 7, 8, 43, 44, and Reel 5 documents 149, 150, plus documents 123 and 124 following] [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 57]
123. July 25, 1766 [319]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning Instructions for Montagu, instructing him to recommend that the South Carolina Assembly approve payment of Boone's past salary
124. July 25, 1766 [320]  
Draft of Additional Instructions to Montagu, instructing him to recommend that the South Carolina Assembly approve payment of Boone's past salary, since it is their duty and the King's pleasure
125. July 4, 1766 [323]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Montagu, sent to reach Montagu upon his arrival as Governor at Charleston [he actually assumed office on June 18, 1766], instructing him to manage closing out implementation of the Stamp Act, due to its repeal by Parliament; instructing him to take quick action to extend the temporary boundary between North Carolina and South Carolina beyond where it still ended to the newer frontier area where it was most needed, taking into account Bull's suggestions and working with North Carolina Governor [William] Tryon [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 61]  
**[Note: William Tryon (1728-1788), with a background in the military, served as governor of North Carolina, from 1765 to 1771. He is best known as governor for fighting the anti-taxation Regulators between 1768 and 1771, finally defeating them with a militia army at Alamance. Soon after this accomplishment, he left North Carolina to become Governor of New York, where he also returned to military duty during the Revolutionary War.]**
126. July 11, 1766 [325]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning Bull's refusal to approve recommendations of anti-Stamp-Act judges recommended by the Assembly to him; submitting for the King's review all the papers received from Bull [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 62]

127. January 6, 1767 [327]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, passing on a recommendation to appoint Daniel Moore to be a member of the South Carolina Council [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 63]
128. July 13, 1767 [329]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, sending draft documents to comply with a royal order, on documenting certain land grants and patents south of the Altamaha River, in an Additional Instruction to Montagu [transcript of draft letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 64]
129. July 13, 1767 [331]  
Draft of Additional Instructions from Board of Trade to Montagu, concerning sending transcripts of all patents and land grants for lands south of the Altamaha River, as well as sending copies of these to the Governor of Georgia [transcript of draft Additional Instructions is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 65]
130. July 22, 1767 [333]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Secretary of State the Earl of Shelburne, concerning a memorial from Charles Garth, royal agent for South Carolina, requesting that county sheriffs may be appointed in lieu of a provost marshal for certain duties; stating the Board's opinion that it would be bad policy to subdivide this aspect of law enforcement to counties rather than centralized in a single provost marshal; therefore recommending that the Governor be instructed to approve such a law from the South Carolina Assembly only if its implementation were to be deferred to learn the King's support or nonsupport for the law [see also Reel 2 documents 82, 83, Shelburne's letter to Board of Trade concerning Garth's petition and the text of Garth's petition, draft letter in Reel 5 document 183 and transcript of letter in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 66] [for more on South Carolina Agent Charles Garth and various of his petitions and memorials, see notes after Reel 1 document 8, 127 and Reel 2 document 145, plus various Board of Trade documents in Reels 1 and 2 pertaining to other Garth petitions and memorials with dates in 1757, 1762, 1764, 1767, 1770, 1771]  
**[Note: William Petty, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Shelburne (1737-1805) was active in the higher levels of British politics by the early 1760s. In 1763, he was serving as the First Lord of the Board of Trade. Between July 30, 1766 and October 20, 1768, he served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department, a position from which he exercised considerable influence over British colonial policy in South Carolina. Later, in 1782, he served as Secretary of State for the Home Department before becoming Prime Minister.]**

131. July 24, 1767 [335]  
Draft of Additional Instructions from Board of Trade to Montagu, instructing him not to approve any law that changes the composition or size of representation in the South Carolina Assembly [transcript of these Additional Instructions is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 68]
132. September 15, 1768 [337]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying a South Carolina act establishing courts, building jails, appointing sheriffs and other justice officials for the King's review; quoting from Matthew Lamb's report declaring most of the law to be useful but stating that certain provisions may prove to be objectionable, including, among other provisions, abolition of the position of provost marshal; concerning the memorial from South Carolina Agent [Charles] Garth requesting permission to substitute county sheriffs for the colonial provost marshal, and the Board's recommendation that the South Carolina Governor be instructed to approve no such law without a provision to delay implementation pending the King's approval; concerning Secretary of State Shelburne's, and therefore perhaps the King's, approval of such a law; therefore summarizing Lamb's objections to certain provisions and recommending that no General Instruction be issued supporting a law similar to that in South Carolina; raising, in addition, the issue of whether a colonial assembly can refuse to approve payment of a colonial official's salary; requesting that the King take all these objections into account and determine royal policy [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 69]  
[**Note: Sir Matthew Lamb** (1705-1768) was a distinguished barrister associated with the Lincoln's Inn, perhaps the most prestigious of the four private legal societies called the Inns of Court in London. He provided legal advice to the Board of Trade, as a private attorney from 1760 or before until his death in 1768, concerning laws passed by both South Carolina and Georgia.]  
[**Note:** Not recognized in this letter is the change, effective February 27, 1768, that gave the Earl of Hillsborough dual roles and effective control over British colonial policy. In this change, Hillsborough continued as 1<sup>st</sup> Lord of Trade while also assuming the new position of Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Earl of Shelburne continued as Secretary of State for the Southern Department, but his position was now subordinate to the new Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Board of Trade continued to function as it had, but its focus on economic development was reduced in status as Hillsborough focused more on colonial and foreign relations.]
133. July 6, 1769 [347]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending William Wragg and Rowland Rugeley to fill vacancies in the South Carolina Council [transcript of representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 71]

134. July 28, 1769 [349]  
Draft of letter from John Pownall, Secretary to the Board of Trade to Rev. Dr. Burton, Secretary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, conveying at the Board's command a petition "*on behalf of the protestant palatines* [settlers from the French-German area west of the Rhine River called the Palatinate] *in South Carolina*" expressing their distress at not having adequate means of practicing their religious beliefs; conveying the Board's sympathy with the petition and hoping the Society can respond to it [transcript of letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 70]
135. November 22, 1769 [351]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning the 1768 South Carolina law establishing a court system and more, which the King had supported in part but still rejected until it was passed again with certain changes; stating that a revised version of the law had been received, which appeared to be clear of the former objections, except for a provision establishing a separate clerk of common pleas in each circuit; suggesting that this deviation was not sufficient to warrant the King's rejecting the law a second time [Frame 351 microfilmed twice] [transcript of representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 72] [compare with earlier consideration and disallowable of this act in document 132, with transcript in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 69]
136. December 7, 1770 [354]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a 1769 law of South Carolina to incorporate the Fellowship Society; recommending the King's approval [for more on the Fellowship Society's incorporation efforts in 1769 and 1770, see Reel 2 documents 110, 118, 126, 190] [transcript of related document, dated June 7, 1770, is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 75]
137. November 21, 1770 [356]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning the August 1769 South Carolina law for stamping and issuing £106,500 in paper bills and for calling in and reissuing outstanding bills of credit, which the Board suggested contained many objectionable provisions [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 76]
138. November 21, 1770 [358]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a 1767 South Carolina law establishing St. Luke Township in Granville County and All Saints County in Craven County and for building a meeting chapel in St. Frederick Parish;

- stating that this law contains the same flaws as the similar law passed in 1765, establishing a new St. Matthews Parish in Berkeley County, which the King had disallowed [see also Reel 2 documents 156, 191] [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 77]
139. December 14, 1770 [360]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying draft of a Commission for Josiah Martin to be Governor of South Carolina
  140. February 13, 1771 [362]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending Thomas Knox Gordon and William Henry Drayton to become members of the South Carolina Council [for more about Drayton, his family, and his appointment to the Council, see Reel 2 documents 175, 192 and notes after; for more on Drayton's supporting the "rebel" cause in 1775 and being suspended from the Council, see Reel 2 documents 215 to 219 and note after 218]
  141. April 24, 1771 [364]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning a boundary line between North Carolina and South Carolina; making recommendations based on input from agents for both colonies for the upper end of the boundary line, in Catawba and Cherokee Indian territories
  142. April 26, 1771 [367]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending Barnard Eliot and David Deas to fill vacancies in membership of the South Carolina Council
  143. June 21, 1771 [369]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning April 1770 laws passed by South Carolina, including one stamping and issuing £70,000 in paper money to build courthouses and jails and another encouraging making flax, linens, and thread in South Carolina; stating objections to the first, which is similar in wording to a recent New York law that was disallowed by the King; supporting the purpose of the second, while finding it flawed by inclusion of a bounty for South-Carolina-made linen; therefore, recommending that each be disallowed by the King [see also Reel 2 documents 162, 196]
  144. December 18, 1771 [373]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a 1765 South Carolina act to incorporate the Winyah [Indigo] Society in the colony; recommending the King's support [see also Reel 1 document 15 and note after (1758), and Reel 2 documents 77 (1766) and 195 (1772) for more on the Winyah Indigo Society and the extended efforts to incorporate it.]

145. December 28, 1771 [375]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning memorial from Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre, a justice of the peace in Granville County, South Carolina and captain of militia for the French and German New Bordeaux settlement, which was faltering economically; the Board therefore recommending that he receive an additional 500 acre grant of land in South Carolina  
[Note: Organized settlement of Swiss Protestant (both French and German) immigrants designed especially to produce wine grapes and wine for export had been attempted in South Carolina starting in 1731. It soon languished economically. A second, French-organized attempt in 1764 created the settlement named **New Bordeaux**. Like the earlier attempt, this one quickly fell on hard economic times. Earlier in 1771, the Swiss Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre began trying to renew New Bordeaux with an influx of new settlers. This attempt also failed fairly quickly, and St. Pierre himself lost his life in the mid-1770s during an expedition against Indians. See note after Reel 2 document 176].
146. November 2, 1772 [377]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending that Charles Pinckney be appointed to replace John Burn, who was resigning as a member of the South Carolina Council to return to England [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 87; a question remains of which among several Charles Pinckneys who supported the American cause during the Revolution this might be]
147. June 10, 1773 [379]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying draft of Commission for newly appointed William Campbell to be governor of South Carolina, having added to the usual provisions a new one giving the Governor authority to “*issue Commissions for the Care and Custody of Idiots and Lunatics*” [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 88; transcript of the draft Commission text is in Reel 11 document 89]  
[Note: **William Campbell** was the last royal governor of South Carolina. By March 1773, the previous governor, **Charles Greville Montagu**, had basically become fed up with the ongoing political struggle between the Assembly and Governor over legitimate authority and rights. On March 6, without bothering to resign, he sailed from Charleston, returning to England never to return. Once back in London, he did resign, thus placing **William Bull II** back into the role of acting governor, from March 6, 1773 until June 18, 1775. Although Campbell was being prepared to be South Carolina Governor in June 1773, he did not arrive in Charleston to assume his duties as royal governor until June 1775. By then, royal rule was unraveling in South Carolina.

In January, acting governor Bull had dismissed yet another uncooperative Assembly in anticipation of electing a new Assembly hopefully more loyal than the last—a pattern practiced by royal governors going back to at least the early 1760s. Yet, this time, some members of the Assembly reconvened as an extralegal Provincial Congress, a direct challenge to royal authority and the first step toward creating an alternative government, which eventually evolved into the government of the State of South Carolina.

Upon arrival in Charleston, Governor Campbell sought to regain control with a newly elected Assembly. But his efforts were in vain as political control slipped from British into American hands. On September 15, 1775, Campbell gave up trying to run a colonial government, dismissed the last colonial Assembly, and sailed for England, relinquishing political control in South Carolina to the “rebels.” Britain would still seek to re-establish its colonial control through military action. Yet that effort eventually failed and in 1783, Britain officially surrendered all claim to 13 previous North American colonies, including South Carolina. See also the summary note after Reel 2 document 218.]

148. January 12, 1774 [381]  
Draft of letter from John Pownall, Secretary to the Board of Trade, to the Clerk in Waiting of the [Privy] Council, conveying extracts of South Carolina Assembly journals pertaining to the Privy Council’s consideration of a petition from the Council of South Carolina regarding proceedings of the Assembly
149. February 21, 1774 [383]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending Thomas Irving to be appointed to fill a vacancy in the South Carolina Council [transcript of this representation is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 91]
150. June 20, 1774 [385]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning preparation of Instructions for newly appointed South Carolina Governor William Campbell, mostly just slightly edited, but with new provisions disallowing use of attached assets of a non-inhabitant to cover debts within South Carolina and restricting the Assembly’s power to issue money and restructure debt; also omitting certain provisions that had grown obsolete
151. October 25, 1774 [391]  
Draft of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending William Gregory to be a member of the South Carolina Council

**Note:** Microfilmed, draft, outgoing Board of Trade correspondence ends here, in October 1774. The politically besieged government of the royal colony of South Carolina continued to exist until September 15, 1775 (see note after document 147).]

## **Volume 382—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), begin**

July 24, 1699 to August 22, 1724

Documents 152 to 211

[Frames 1 to 134]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. They continue in Reels 4 through 8. English settlement began in the Carolinas in the 1650s, and a single proprietary colony of "Carolina" was established in 1663. In 1712, South and North Carolina were separated politically, and by 1729, each had become a royal colony. During a transition period, especially from 1719 to 1724, institutions of royal colonial government were established provisionally in South Carolina and began functioning. Volume 382 contains early correspondence with dates beginning in 1699 and ending in 1724. The 211 individual documents in this Volume are not itemized in this Finding Aid because they pertain to the early period of the proprietary colony of South Carolina, while the DLAR's particular interest is with the period starting in 1750, after South Carolina had become a royal colony. The DLAR's microfilmed documents from the CO5 Colonial South Carolina Papers include Volume 382 primarily because it accompanies Volume 381 (Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence from 1720 to 1774) on the same reel. Consistent with its interests, the DLAR's microfilmed documents do not include Volumes 383 and 384 (Secretary of State incoming correspondence with dates from 1715 to 1743 or Volumes 387 and 388 ([perhaps outgoing] Secretary of State correspondence with dates from 1715 to 1746).

---

### **Table 13: Summary of Content and Organization of Microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence and related documents found in Reels 3 (Volume 382) through 8 (Volume 397)**

#### **Reel 3            Volume 382                            (1699 to 1724)**

Transition to and establishment of royal colony; entries not itemized in this Finding Aid

[Volumes 383, 384 (1715 to 1743): Not found in DLAR microfilmed papers]

#### **Reel 4            Volumes 385, 386                            (1743 to 1760)**

Early years of royal colony; concerns for economic development, settlement of frontier, relations with Spain, relations with Indians; documents poorly organized, with gaps (see "Archival Anomalies" in the **Introduction**)

[Volumes 387, 388 (1715 to 1746): Not found in DLAR microfilmed papers]

Archival restart from early transitioning to royal colony and its early years; beginning of long-term, well organized set of chronologically ordered official correspondence and related documents

**Reel 5            Volumes 389, 390            (1747 to 1767)**

Maturing of the royal colony, combined with the genesis of a protest movement against British colonial restrictions, which were interpreted as violations of the rights of British/Americans; continuation of better organized archiving; unexplained gap between Vols. 389, 390 of more than a decade in the archival record (1751 to 1762) (see “Archival Anomalies” in the **Introduction**)

**Reel 6            Volumes 391 to 394            (1767 to 1772)**

Continuation of historical trends of economic prosperity and an expanding protest movement; further improvements in the archiving system, introduced by Secretary of State Shelburne and institutionalized by his successor Hillsborough, including the numbering of official letters and other archived documents

**Reel 7            Volumes 395, 396            (1772 to 1777)**

Morphing of the protest movement into rebellion; fall of South Carolina’s colonial government under extreme pressure from rebel protesters on September 15, 1775; eventual takeover, after test by war, of both the colonial economy and colonial government by the planter/merchant elite class’s rebel leaders; split in the planter/merchant elite between loyalists and rebels; changing the contents in “colonial” correspondence from colonial to war and post-colonial concerns, beginning abruptly with a shift in subject matter between documents 157 and 158

**Reel 8            Volume 397            (1779 to 1784)**

Continuing shift from colonial issues to concerns about British military success and failure, including successful British capture of Charleston in May 1780, governance of Charleston under British military occupation, managing the subsequent British evacuation of Charleston in fall 1782, and the new presence of a South Carolina State government; lapse of organization in archiving, including filing correspondence unrelated to South Carolina (documents on the fall of West Florida to the Spanish and of negotiation for a general prisoner-of-war exchange in New York) plus reduced and irregular South Carolina official correspondence between the fall of the colonial government in September 1775 and British evacuation of Charleston in December 1782 (see “Archival Anomalies” in the **Introduction**)

---

**Summary of contents of Volume 382**—incoming Secretary of State correspondence dated from 1699 to 1724

Most of the correspondence in this volume pertains to matters of intergovernmental business. While the Board of Trade and Plantations was meant to guide economic development (and before 1768 related colonial governmental issues), the Secretary of State office was responsible for foreign relations, including those between colonies and foreign nations, as well as governing issues between the British government and its colonial governments and among colonies.

Most of the documents are direct correspondence between a South Carolina Governor and the Board of Trade or the Secretary of State in London. Many of the letters Governors wrote included multiple enclosures, many of which also appear among the microfilmed documents.

Within this context of issues and officials, a few particular themes dominated the correspondence between 1699 and 1724 in Volume 382. These themes include:

- Making the transition from a proprietary to a royal colonial government.
- Managing difficult and often hostile relations with the Spanish Empire and its Florida colony to the south of South Carolina.
- Managing difficult and often hostile relations with the Indian Nations occupying the frontier country to the north and west of the South Carolina colony—and the complex calculus of relations by individual or allied Indian Nations with individual rival European colonies of France, Spain, and Britain in North America.

- 

**Note: Volumes 383 and 384** in the CO5 Colonial Papers of South Carolina are not included in the DLAR's microfilmed collection. They contain Secretary of State incoming correspondence dated between 1715 and 1743, before the period of interest of the DLAR.

## Reel 4 (Volumes 385, 386)

### Volume 385—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue

August 26, 1719 to March 30, 1753

Documents 1 to 64

[Frames 1 to 227]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See the notes before Volume 382 for information about the coverage and context of the DLAR's microfilmed South Carolina incoming correspondence dated from 1699 to 1743 (Volumes 382 to 384). See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Reel 4 begins with Volume 385, whose earliest Secretary of State incoming correspondence is dated in 1743. For no known reason, the documents in this one Volume have uniquely been microfilmed in roughly reverse chronological order. (The chronology is fairly rough in any case, largely because of attachments to letters dated prior to, sometimes substantially prior to, the letter's date. The most prominent example of this in Volume 385 is a 1719 enclosure with a 1749 letter.) Oddly, the correspondence, in the order microfilmed, begins in November 1751. The dates thereafter retrogress, with some irregularity, to 1743, after which the dates jump to 1753 before retrogressing again and ending in 1750.

**Note:** Unlike the Board of Trade's incoming correspondence regarding South Carolina, archivists in the Secretary of State's office did not designate document numbers for its South Carolina incoming correspondence.

**Note:** Unlike the Board of Trade, Secretaries of State, beginning with the Earl of Shelburne in 1766, numbered their letters to colonial governors and acting governors. In return, governors and acting governors were expected to number their own letters to the secretary of state. None of the letters in Volume 385, dated between 1743 and 1753, was numbered by the writer.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

1. November 14, 1751 [1]  
Memorial of James Cohatt, Royal Agent for South Carolina, to secretary of State the Earl of Holdernessee, seeking [another] £3,000 in funding for purchase of presents to the Indians, seeking to reduce Indian violence against South Carolina inhabitants [see a copy of this memorial in document 45]  
[Note: John Darcy, 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Holdernessee served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from June 18, 1751 to March 23, 1754. He served again, briefly, in 1757.]  
[Note: Documents are found in various places in Reels 4 and 5 among the microfilmed Secretary of State incoming correspondence about specific efforts by the British government between 1748 and 1753 to finance and purchase goods to be distributed to Indians in South Carolina and Georgia. The purpose of this policy was, through “bribery,” to keep Creek, Cherokee, Choctaw, and Chickasaw Nations of Indians friendly to Britain and hopefully hostile toward Spain and France. In roughly chronological order, these documents are found as follows:
- August 25, 1748: Reel 5 document 2: Warrant for £3,000 to pay for presents to Indians in South Carolina and Georgia, designating London merchants Harman Verelst, Jermyn Wright, and John Hume, working separately or together, to purchase and ship goods for presents to Charleston and Savannah. (Although John Hume is listed in this warrant, no evidence exists in these microfilmed documents that he actively engaged in purchasing goods as did Verelst and Wright.)
  - Late 1748 to early 1749: Reel 5 documents 1 to 26: Accounts for purchase of goods for presents by Harman Verelst in London to be shipped on the *Francis and John*, under authority of the August 25, 1748 warrant.
  - Late 1748 to early 1749: Reel 5 documents 40 to 60: Accounts for purchase of goods for presents by Jermyn Verelst in London to be shipped on the *Francis and John*, under authority of the August 25, 1748 warrant.
  - October 9, 1749: Reel 4 document 11: Reference to new warrant with this date for £3,000 to purchase and deliver to South Carolina and Georgia additional presents for the Indians in 1750 and 1751.
  - October 1748 to December 1750: Information about presents and squabbles over payment for presents purchased and delivered, scattered in 16 documents found in Reel 5 between documents 65 and 105.
  - November 14, 1751: Reel 4 document 1: Letter from South Carolina Agent James Cohatt to Secretary of State for the Southern Department the Earl of Holdernessee, seeking another warrant for £3,000 for presents (which may have been at least partially approved).
  - 1749 to 1753: Reel 4 documents 2-4, 11: Accounts of purchases of presents, especially in 1751, by Verelst and Wright, to be shipped on the *Dolphin*, the *Charming Nancy*, and the *Live Oak*.]

2. April 4, 1751 [3]  
“*Invoices of Goods [provided] by Mr. Herman Verelst for His Majesty’s Service as Shipped on board the Dolphin the Charming Nancy, and Live Oak, for Presents for the Indians in South Carolina and Georgia*”, listing itemized goods and the cost of each, with a total cost of £1,067.4.6

**Note:** Documents 1 and 2 [Frames 1 to 5] are microfilmed twice, separated by the University Microfilms identification page for Volume 385. The second microfilming is more complete and identifies all of the Frames.

3. November 14, 1751 [8]  
“*The Accompt of Mr. Herman Verelst*” for £3,000 worth of goods to be distributed as presents to Indians in South Carolina and Georgia, with itemized charges dated from October 21, 1749 to November 9, 1753, with a total value of itemized transactions of £1,380.16.4¾

**[Note: A Harman Verelst (1641-1702) was an accomplished Dutch painter, born in Dordrecht and died in London. This Harman Verelst, a merchant in London, may be a descendant.]**

4. February 2, 1750 [15]  
Copy of letter from Jermyn Wright to Verelst, sending copy of Captain Glas’ receipt for presents shipped on the *Dolphin*

**[Note: James Wright** lived in South Carolina before 1760, when he began his long tenure, until 1782, although interrupted between 1776 and 1779, as colonial Governor of Georgia. His two brothers **Charles** and **Jermyn Wright** were less prominent in public but well off economically and socially as planters and merchants. In 1750, Jermyn was involved in at least trade and perhaps in the Indian trade, through which the governmental policy of giving presents to Indians was implemented.]

5. December 10, 1750 [17]  
Letter from the Board of Trade and Plantations at Whitehall to Secretary of State the Duke of Bedford, concerning a letter from Governor James Glen of South Carolina dated July 15, 1750, with plans to build forts and trading posts in Cherokee Indian territory; also concerning the Council’s “*pretence*” “*to exclude the Governor from being present when they sit in a legislative Capacity*” [for more on the Board of Trade, see note after Reel 1 document 1] [with enclosures, both in document 6]

**[Note: James Glen** was governor of South Carolina from December 1743 until he was recalled and replaced in 1756 by William Henry Lyttelton.]

**[Note: John Russell, 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Bedford** served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from February 12, 1748 until June 13, 1751, when he was succeeded by the Earl of Holderness. Bedford’s predecessor was Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Newcastle, who had served a lengthy term from April 6, 1724 until February 12, 1748, with a brief hiatus in 1746.]

6. July 15, 1750 [19]  
Extract of letter from Governor Glen to Board of Trade, describing how he had defeated and made peace with the Cherokee and Creek Indians, but also describing ongoing threats of Indians who were allied with the French; now seeking both forts, arms, and troops and with presents; with details of plans and costs for forts (£2,500) and troops (£1,860); also acknowledging with thanks the appropriation of £3,000 for presents; followed by  
Extract from another part of the same letter, concerning the South Carolina Council's desire to exclude the Governor from its legislative activities, which Glen felt were unnecessary "*Novelties and Innovations...and they appear to me Invasions of His Majesty's Just Prerogative*"; disagreeing with the Council's position that its legislative activities uniquely required absence of the Governor to preserve popular rule; offering contrary evidence of past practices and policies [similar letter with same date to Bedford in Reel 5 document 96]  
[both enclosed with Board of Trade's December 10, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 5]
7. November 19, 1750 [29]  
Copy of letter from Mr. Childer at Wilmington [presumably North Carolina] to Mr. Hume of South Carolina, concerning possible threats from Spain in Florida
8. November 5, 1750 [30]  
Letter from Board of Trade to Bedford, concerning Governor Glen's reports of "*great Disorders and Irregularities in the Secretary's Office*" of South Carolina [with enclosures, document 9, 10]
9. December 23, 1749 [33]  
Extract of letter from Glen to Board of Trade; reporting on his investigation of the Secretary's Office; stating that he had found that the law books in the office were "*in a worse condition and in great confusion*" [see another extract from this letter in document 16] [enclosed with Board of Trade's November 5, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 8]
10. August 12, 1749 [35]  
Extract of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, reporting having asked Deputy Secretary Freeman for copies of certain acts, but Freeman was not able to find them; stating that this was evidence of "*the miserable condition in which all our Original Laws, Records and other Publick papers are in that office*" [enclosed with Board of Trade's November 5, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 8]
11. [various dates] [39]  
"*Account of Indian Presents*" purchased under a warrant dated October 9, 1749 for distribution to Indians adjacent to South Carolina and Georgia, which were shipped by Jermyn Wright on the *Dolphin*; with entries dated in 1750; followed by Receipts for 11 specific transactions dated between November 1749 and April 1751; followed by

- April 14, 1751 [55]  
 Copy of printed form filled in, attesting to the good condition of the cargo of the *Live Oak*, sailing from London to Charleston; followed by  
 Additional receipts for 15 specific transactions dated between January 1750 and January 1751 [Frame 58 microfilmed twice]  
 [for more on purchase of goods as presents to the South Carolina and Georgia Indians by Harman Verelst and Jermyn Wright, see note after Reel 4 document 1]
12. May 4, 1750 [71]  
 Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Bedford, conveying letters from Glen expressing concerns that the Spanish at St. Augustine were encouraging slaves of English masters to desert and raising issues of French influence in southern frontier areas through their control in New Orleans [with enclosures, documents 13 to 18]
13. [no date] [73]  
 Copy of Instructions from Glen to Raymond Demere, whom Glen had deputized to sail to St Augustine to seek an agreement with the Spanish on a policy mutually to return escaped slave property to their proper owners; if unable to negotiate an agreement, Demere was to register a protest before leaving [document 14] [for more on Demere, see note after document 99 and documents 99 to 102; another copy of these instructions is in Reel 5 document 77]  
 [enclosed with Board of Trade's May 4, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 12]
14. [no date] [78]  
 Copy of Demere's protest, delivered to the Spanish governor before leaving St. Augustine, when no agreement was made on returning slaves [enclosed with Board of Trade's May 4, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 12] [another copy of this protest letter is in Reel 5 document 82]
15. [October 10, 1748] [80]  
 Copy of letter from Glen to Vaudrieul, Governor of Louisiana, concerning British relations with the French in New Orleans and relations by both French and British with the Indians, especially the Chickasaw and Choctaw Indians [another copy of this letter, dated October 10, 1748, is in Reel 5 document 75] [enclosed with Board of Trade's May 4, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 12]  
**[Note: Louisiana** was a colony of France, with Nouvelle Orleans as its capital, from 1682 until 1762, after which Spain acquired it as part of the 1763 settlement of the Seven Years War (French and Indian War). **Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil-Cavagnial** served as French colonial governor in Nouvelle Orleans from 1743 to 1753.]

16. December 23, 1749 [84]  
Extracts from letter by Glen to Board of Trade, including a warning that relying on copies and duplicates of documents may be dangerous and that one should rely as much as possible on only original documents; anticipating his later decision to send a deputy to St Augustine to negotiate exchanges of escaped slaves [see another extract from the same letter in document 9] [enclosed with Board of Trade's May 4, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 12]
17. December 23, 1749 [86]  
Extract of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, wishing for instructions on "*how to conduct myself with regard to the Chactaws*"; concerning what he should do with some French prisoners delivered to the British by Indians, illustrating the dangerous difficulties of trying to maintain friendly relations with the various Indian groups [enclosed with Board of Trade's May 4, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 12] [copy of this entire letter, without a date, is found, microfilmed in two parts, in Reel 5 documents 79 (second part) and 81 (first part)]
18. [no date] [88]  
Copy of letter from Glen to Spanish governor at St. Augustine, expecting that relations with Spain should be more friendly now, after the 1748 peace treaty, and trying to practice this optimistic process; but not yet achieving such friendship with Spanish officials [enclosed with Board of Trade's May 4, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 12]  
**[Note:** The **Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle** of 1748 ended the War of Austrian Succession. The victors, France and England, wrote the treaty, while the losers, including Austria and Spain, would now have been expected to be more friendly towards Britain.]
19. November 10, 1749 [91]  
Letter from Board of Trade to Bedford, concerning another letter from Glen, dated August 12, 1749, about relations with the Chickasaw Indians and with the French after delivery by the Chickasaw [with enclosures, documents 20 and perhaps 21]
20. August 12, 1749 [93]  
Extract of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, reporting on a warlike expedition by Chickasaw Indians on Britain's behalf against the French in the Mississippi River region, during which several prisoners were captured, some of them slaves; expressing uncertainty about future relations with the Choctaws and the Chickasaws [enclosed with Board of Trade's November 10, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 19]

21. August 26, 1719 [96]  
Extract of representation from Board of Trade to the Lords Justices [see note after Reel 3 document 4 for more on the Lords Justices], concerning whether Britain can in practice, especially against the French, enforce colonial charters in North America that claim territory from sea to sea [perhaps enclosed with Board of Trade's November 10, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 19]
22. November 2, 1749 [98]  
Letter from Board of Trade to Bedford, forwarding letter from Glen dated June 18, 1749 seeking approval of James Grame to succeed Benjamin Whitaker as Chief Justice in South Carolina, the latter being unable to continue duties because of physical infirmities [Whitaker was Chief Justice from 1739 until 1749, when paralysis made it impossible for him to function in the position; Grame was soon appointed Chief Justice and served until his death in 1752] [with enclosures, documents 23, 27]  
[**Note:** Microfilmed correspondence about the replacement of Benjamin Whitaker with James Grame is found in Secretary of State incoming correspondence in Reels 4 and 5. In chronological order, this correspondence, all in 1749, can be found as follows: Reel 5 document 66 (March 13); Reel 4 document 27 (May 31 to June 2, 1749; Reel 5 document 67 (June 15); Reel 4 document 23 (June 18); and Reel 4 document 22 (November 2). Grame served as Chief Justice until his death in late 1752. Correspondence in early 1753 about his replacement is found in Reel 4 documents 46, 47.]
23. June 18, 1749 [100]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade, concerning replacement of Benjamin Whitaker, Chief Justice of South Carolina, with James Grame [enclosed with Board of Trade's November 2, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 22]
24. [?] 1749 [103]  
Extracts of Glen's "*Answer to Queries sent to him by the Board of Trade, 1749*", stressing the strategic and economic importance of maintaining friendly relations with the Indians; stating that he had tried to learn about the Indians so as to relate to them effectively and to avoid war with them; describing the various Indian Nations, large and small, that inhabited areas around South Carolina; describing the relations of several tribes with the French or with the British; describing St. Augustine in time of war as a "*Nest of small Privateers*" and escaped slaves [enclosed with Board of Trade's November 1, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 25]
25. November 1, 1749 [107]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Bedford, forwarding Glen's 1749 answers to queries about Indian affairs in South Carolina [with enclosure, document 24]

26. June 2, 1749 [108]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Bedford, forwarding a “case” of one attempt to implement the King’s policy to encourage settlement of German and Swiss Protestants in South Carolina, pertaining specifically to a settlement organized by Hans Jacob Riemensperger of Switzerland, consisting of Lutheran settlers from the Duchy of Württemberg , which Glen had endorsed; reporting that about 600 potential settlers had become stranded in Holland, that they had submitted a petition for relief, and that some unhappy persons among them had sought to move to Pennsylvania; the Board of Trade suggesting support of royal relief for these potential settlers
27. May 31, 1749 [112]  
Copy of proceedings of South Carolina Council, concerning Benjamin Whitaker’s having abruptly left for England without giving any notice of vacating his responsibilities as Chief Justice of South Carolina, apparently because of poor health; Glen therefore wishing to appoint James Grame to fill the vacant position; reporting that, however, the Commons House had adopted the position that it should control appointment of assistant justices and the chief justice; followed by June 1, 1749  
Copy of proceedings of South Carolina Council, continuing consideration of filling the vacant position of chief justice; advising Glen that the position indeed appeared to be vacant, and that Glen had the authority to appoint Grame, subject to royal approval; however, that certain South Carolina laws seemed to contradict this authority, so the South Carolina Attorney General was asked to rule on the true legal situation; followed by  
June 2, 1749  
Copy of proceedings of South Carolina Council, continuing consideration of appointment authority for the South Carolina Chief Justice; Glen stating that he had the authority and sufficient reasons to fill the vacant position, which the Council again advised him to do [Grame was in fact appointed, serving until he died in 1752; see documents 46, 47]  
[all enclosed with Board of Trade’s June 2, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 22]
28. October 20, 1748 [118]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Bedford, forwarding letter from Glen dated July 26, 1748, pertaining to South Carolina’s relations with the Indians and a proposal to build forts in Indian territory for protection of frontier inhabitants [with enclosure, document 29]
29. July 26, 1748 [120]  
Copy of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, reporting that South Carolina’s relations with the Cherokee Indians were hostile and violent, with details; reporting also that the Catawba Indians had complained about the Cherokee for supporting the French;

- reporting also on organizing efforts by French agents among the Creek Indians to persuade them to support the French rather than Britain; but reporting that the Creeks and Chickasaw were still allied with Britain; arguing for the need to build one or more forts in Indian territories [enclosed with Board of Trade's October 20, 1748 letter to Bedford, document 28] [another copy of this letter in document 38]
30. October 26, 1748 [124]  
Report of Board of Trade to the Lords Justices [see note after Volume 3 document 4], supporting Glen's action disapproving a resisting Commons House efforts to issue paper currency that were referred to in Glen's letter of April 14, 1748 to Board of Trade [document 32]
  31. July 22, 1748 [127]  
Letter from Board of Trade to Bedford, forwarding Glen's April 14, 1748 letter to Board of Trade [similar to the Board's letter of the day before (document 33) forwarding a similar or the same letter (document 34)] [Frame 127 microfilmed twice]
  32. April 14, 1748 [129]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade, concerning Glen's feeling that South Carolina's trade was "*in great Distress*" from enemy depredations and in greater need for protection; concerning also Commons House's law to stamp and issue £40,000 in paper currency to pay for public expenses, an act which Glen had disallowed [similar to or the same letter as Glen's letter of same date, document 34] [enclosed with Glen's July 22, 1748 letter to Board of Trade, document 31]
  33. July 21, 1748 [132]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Bedford, forwarding Glen's April 14, 1748 letter to Board of Trade [similar to the Board's letter of the day after (document 31) forwarding a similar or the same letter (document 32)]
  34. April 14, 1748 [134]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade [similar to or the same letter as found in document 32] [enclosed with Glen's July 21, 1748 letter to Board of Trade, document 33] [identical copy found in document 37]
  35. December 6, 1748 [139]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Bedford, forwarding Glen's October 10, 1748 letter [document 39] concerning Indian relations with Britain and with France and Spain [with enclosures, documents 36 to 39]

36. February [?], 1748 [141]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade, relating a time when fear had gripped South Carolina that it might be attacked by some combination of Spanish, French, Indians, and Negroes; stating that he had successfully squelched each false rumor and that he had also responded with real measures to protect South Carolina's inhabitants; describing the Indian Nations and their allegiances; advocating for his plan of building forts in locations strategic to protection against and trade with the Indians; requesting £1,000 per year to buy presents for the Indians to keep them friendly; including additional details [enclosed with Board of Trade's December 6, 1748 letter to Bedford, document 35]
37. April 14, 1748 [147]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade [enclosed with Board of Trade's December 6, 1748 letter to Bedford, document 35] [identical copy found in document 34]
38. July 26, 1748 [150]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade [another copy of this letter in document 29] [enclosed with Board of Trade's December 6, 1748 letter to Bedford, document 35]
39. October 10, 1748 [156]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade, concerning Indian affairs in the north, where the Seneca Indians, allies of the French, were warlike and in contact with the Catawbas and Creeks in the south; relating news about these plus the Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Choctaw Indians, Indian traders being approached and bribed by French agents; with details [similar letter from Glen to Secretary of State Bedford in Reel 5 document 62] [enclosed with Board of Trade's December 6, 1748 letter to Bedford, document 35]
40. May 11, 1745 [160]  
Copy of petition of the Governor, Council, and Assembly of South Carolina, concerning the need for royal protection and defense in the South Carolina colony; with details of specific dangers and needs for additional protection and defense
41. May 2, 1746 [164]  
Duplicate letter from Glen at South Carolina to Secretary of State Newcastle, reminding him that Glen had done his best to "*cultivate a good understanding*" among all the Indian Nations; reporting on the status of current Indian relations, which in general were not positive and which included influence of the French among Indian Nations thought friendly to Britain

42. February 29, 1744 [166]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Newcastle, concerning a letter from the South Carolina Council President and acting governor [William] Bull [Sr.] about "*some Persons supplying his Majestys Enemies, with Negroes Provisions and Cloaths*" [For more on **William Bull Sr.** see note after Reel 3 document 97] [with enclosure, document 43]
43. November 22, 1743 [167]  
Extract of letter from Bull Sr. to Board of Trade, concerning those supplying the enemy, including some who were taking Negro slaves to St. Augustine to exchange; wishing that these matters be reported to the Secretary of State [enclosed in Board of Trade's February 29, 1744 letter to Newcastle, document 42]
44. March 2 and 22, 1745 [171]  
Address of South Carolina Council and Assembly to the King, concerning the need for "*relief and protection to this distant and defenceless Colony*"; signed by the Upper House on March 22 and the Commons House on March 2 [Frame 171 microfilmed twice]
45. November 14, 1751 [172]  
Memorial of James Cohatt, agent for South Carolina, to Secretary of State Holdernessee, concerning dangers in South Carolina from surrounding Indian Nations and from Spanish to the south and French to the north; requesting that the British Government approve £3,000 to be used for presents to the Indians [see a copy of this memorial in document 1; for more on the Earl of Holdernessee, see also note after document 1]
46. January 11, 1753 [174]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Holdernessee, concerning death of James Grame, Chief Justice of South Carolina, and recommendation of Peter Leigh to replace him [for more on the succession of Chief Justices in South Carolina, see Reel 1, notes after documents 36 and 40; Leigh served as Chief Justice from 1753 until he died in 1759] [with enclosure, document 47]  
[**Note:** Grame died in 1752 and was replaced for the short term by Charles Pinckney, who served until Peter Leigh replaced him in 1753. Leigh then served until his death in 1759.]
47. January 11, 1753 [176]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to the King, concerning death of James Grame, Chief Justice of South Carolina, and recommendation of Peter Leigh to replace him [enclosed with Board of Trade's January 11, 1753 letter to Hillsborough, document 46]

48. March 30, 1753 [177]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Holderness, conveying a letter from Glen to Board of Trade with enclosed petition from South Carolina Governor, Council, and Assembly to the King, seeking support to reconstruct fortifications around Charleston lost during a hurricane, along with plans for Charleston fortifications and other documents [with enclosures, documents 49 to 55]
49. October 7, 1752 [179]  
Petition from Governor, Council, and Assembly of South Carolina to the King, describing the recent hurricane, "*which has done inexpressible Damage to the Inhabitants, ruined the Forts and Fortifications of Charles Town, and of Fort Johnson at the Entrance of that Harbour*"; seeking relief through funding for rebuilding the fortifications [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 30, 1753 letter to Holderness, document 48]
50. December 16, 1752 [180]  
Extract of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, conveying his understanding that the South Carolina Assembly, after realizing how expensive rebuilding Charleston's fortifications would be, agreed to petition the King for the needed funding; a realization and agreement in which the Council concurred; conveying several documents in support of these realizations; with details; noting that the Assembly had been silent on funding for "*the Store houses on the outside of the Curtain line*"; Glen's interpreting this silence to reflect private traders' wishes for the public store houses not to be rebuilt so that privately owned store houses would need to be used for public stores, to the private benefit of their owners [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 30, 1753 letter to Holderness, document 48]
51. November 24, 1752 [187]  
Copy of report by William de Brahm to Glen concerning plans and costs for the defense and fortification of Charleston [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 30, 1753 letter to Holderness, document 48]  
**[Note: John William Gerrard de Brahm** (1718-c. 1799) was a talented German mapmaker and civil/military engineer. After serving as a "Captain Engineer" in the German military, he came to America in about 1750. Before moving to Georgia, he apparently lived and worked during the early 1750s in Charleston. In 1754, he was appointed Surveyor General of Georgia. By 1764, he had been appointed to the equivalent position in newly British East Florida, but his increasingly negative views about European imperialism caused him to be relieved of his position by Governor James Grant of East Florida in 1770. After spending the Revolutionary War years in Europe, he returned in 1791 to live his later years in Philadelphia.]

52. September 25, 1752 [193]  
Copy of "*Report of the Situation of Fort Johnson since the late violent Hurricane*" by Captain and Commander of Fort Johnson, John Lloyd, to [Glen] [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 30, 1753 letter to Holdernessee, document 48]  
[Note: **Fort Johnson** was named after Sir Nathaniel Johnson, who served as proprietary governor of South Carolina from 1703 to 1709. It was located on the Ashley River near Charleston.]
53. September 27, 1752 [195]  
Copy of report from William Boone to Glen on "*the State and Condition of Broughton's Battery since the late violent Hurricane*" [Broughton's Battery was located at the far southern tip of the Charleston peninsula] [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 30, 1753 letter to Holdernessee, document 48]
54. September 22, 1752 [197]  
Copy of "*The Report of George Hunter Master Gunner of Craven's Bastion*" [about hurricane damage to the bastion, which was located on the east side of the lower Charleston peninsula near present-day Bay Street] [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 30, 1753 letter to Holdernessee, document 48]
55. December 18, 1750 [199]  
Copy of testimonial [written in French] to the competency of de Brahm's work as a surveyor/fortifications designer; signed by Frederic Henry Marechal Comte de Seckendorff [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 30, 1753 letter to Holdernessee, document 48]  
[Note: This member of the large, powerful, and wealthy Franconian/German Seckendorff family, evidently **Friedrich Heinrich von Seckendorff** (1673-1763), was a professional soldier and field marshal in the armies of imperial Habsburg Austria and of Bavaria. De Brahm must have worked with him when each was involved in military design and construction in Germany during the 1740s or before. For more on de Brahm, see the note after document 51.]
56. March 19, 1752 [202]  
Report from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Holdernessee, concerning its consideration of petition from Captain Charles McNair of South Carolina, which seeks reimbursement for McNair's personal expenses while he was working at "*gaining over a considerable Body of Choctaw Indians to the British Interest*"; reporting that his services had been verified and that, from his total losses of £4,000, £1,000 could be considered reimbursable for losses incurred as a result of his services, and not a reward for his services
57. February 6, 1753 [205]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Holdernessee, enclosing warrant appointing Peter Leigh to be Chief Justice of South Carolina

58. [no date] [209]  
“*List of Ships and Vessels in the Port, and Harbour of Charles Town in South Carolina in the Hurricane on Fryday the 15 Sep<sup>br</sup> 1752*”, including vessel’s name, master’s name, and circumstances of the vessel following the hurricane, for 22 vessels; signed by Glen [enclosed with Board of Trade’s December 13, 1752 letter to Holdernessee, document 61]  
[**Note:** The great hurricane of 1752 was the most intense and destructive hurricane to hit South Carolina during the colonial period. It plowed head-on from the sea into Charleston, causing extreme damage and loss of life from both wind and tidal surge. According to historian Jonathan Mercantini, South Carolina’s contentious efforts to clean up and rebuild after this natural disaster demonstrate the constitutional hostility already engrained in the colony’s government and politics (which would only intensify in the 1760s, especially during the Stamp Act controversy, leading toward revolution in the 1770s). (**Reference:** Jonathan Mercantini, **The Great Carolina Hurricane of 1752**, *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 103, No. 4 (October 2002), pages 351-365)]
59. April 22, 1751 [211]  
Letter from Board of Trade to Bedford, conveying letter from Glen, dated October 2, 1750, concerning Indian affairs in South Carolina plus other matters, especially the McNair petition [with enclosure, document 60]
60. October 2, 1750 [213]  
Extract of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, stating the difficulty of obtaining and then maintaining the loyalty of Indian Nations, a situation made worse by the activities of French to weaken Indian loyalty toward Britain; commenting on Captain McNair petition, which he generally supported, contrary to the opinion of the Assembly, as interpreted by Glen, that McNair provided no public service and deserved no reimbursement for losses [similar letter with same date to Bedford in Reel 5 document 97 [enclosed with Board of Trade’s April 22, 1751 letter to Bedford, document 59]
61. December 13, 1752 [221]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Holdernessee, conveying Glen’s letter dated September 19, 1752, with accounts of the “*most dreadful Hurricane which happen’d there*” on September 15 [with enclosures, documents 58, 62]
62. September 19, 1752 [223]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade, describing in detail the hurricane and its severe damage to people and property [enclosed with Board of Trade’s December 13, 1752 letter to Holdernessee, document 61]

63. March 14, 1750 [226]  
*"Bill of Lading for 160 [?] Barrols on board the Live Oak, Captain James Rodgers"* [the cargo might have been publicly financed presents for Indians; see documents 1-4, 6, 11, 36, and 45; the timing seems unlikely for this cargo to have been lost in the hurricane of 1752, despite its juxtaposition in the microfilmed documents]
64. March 14, 1750 [227]  
*"Captain W<sup>m</sup>. White's Bill of Lading for Sundrys on board the Charming Nancy"* [the cargo might have been publicly financed presents for Indians; see documents 1-4, 6, 11, 36, and 45; the timing seems unlikely for this cargo to have been lost in the hurricane of 1752, despite its juxtaposition in the microfilmed documents]

## Volume 386—Itemized, Annotated Contents

### Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue

? 1721 to August 19, 1775 Documents 65 to 139 [Frames 1 to 209]

**Note:** See notes before Volume 382 (Reel 3) and Volume 385 (Reel 4) for information on the coverage and organization of the DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina prior to 1753. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Within Reel 4 Volume 386 (correspondence from 1753 to 1775 with enclosures back to about 1721 and mostly before 1760) continues the poorly organized pattern of Volume 385 (correspondence from 1743 to 1753 with enclosures back to 1719). As in Volume 385, the "sets" of correspondence in Volume 386 are organized very roughly in reverse chronological order. The entire Reel (Volumes 385 and 386) appears to be a miscellaneous collection of documents, with unexplained gaps and erratic chronological order. (See also "Archival Anomalies" in the **Introduction** and a version of this table in **Table 11**.)

---

**Table 14: Understanding the fractured chronology of Volume 386**

<u>Document numbers (in order)</u>	<u>Years of correspondence (out of order)</u>
65 to 71	1760 to 1761
72, 73, 83	1772 to 1775
74 to 82	[no date] with dates otherwise identified as between 1721 and 1736 plus one from about 1740, one from about 1760, and one (document 77) with no identified date
84 to 139	1753 to 1760 with gaps as follows:
between 102 and 103	gap from December 1756 to December 1757
between 104 and 105	gap from December 1757 to May 1759

---

**Note:** Some of the “sets” of documents loosely follow the dates of governors and acting governors of South Carolina. See the list of these governors and acting governors, with their dates of service in the **Introduction**. What appears to be the main body of Secretary of State incoming correspondence microfilmed by the DLAR is found in Reels 5 through 7. The documents microfilmed in these reels consist of a consistently organized, chronologically ordered set of documents with fairly continuous dates from 1748 to 1777, except for a sizeable and unexplained gap from 1751 to 1762 (see note at the beginning of Volume 390 in the middle of Reel 5). The existence of this set of microfilmed documents leaves unanswered why the documents in Reel 4 were apparently archived as well as microfilmed separately and so differently. The Board of Trade consistently assigned archival numbers by Volume to official correspondence from 1720 through 1775. The Secretary of State office did not begin this practice until 1767, used it for several years, and then abruptly discontinued it in July 1771. No archival numbers were assigned to any document in Volume 386. Secretaries of State, beginning with the Earl of Shelburne in 1766, numbered their letters to colonial governors and acting governors. In return, governors and acting governors were expected to number their own letters to the secretary of state. None of the letters in Volume 386, dated between 1721 and 1775, but mostly between 1753 and 1760, was numbered by the writer.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

65. February 11, 1761 [1]  
 Letter from the Board of Trade and Plantations at Whitehall to Secretary of State William Pitt (Elder), informing Pitt that William Bull II, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, had reported that the French “*have built a Fort on the Tennessee or Cherokee River, nearly in the midway between Fort Loudoun and Fort Assumption on the Ohio*” [for more on the geography of these rivers and forts, see note after Reel 1 document 101] [with enclosure, document 66]  
**[Note:** For more on the Board of Trade and Plantations, see note after Reel 1 document 1. **William Pitt (Elder)** served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1756 until October 1761. For more on **William Bull II** see notes after Reel 1 documents 1, 39. In February 1761, Bull was acting governor of South Carolina (in all but title). Five times during the years Bull served as Lieutenant Governor (from 1759 to 1775), he became acting governor either while a governor was on leave or during a hiatus between governors.

Governor William Henry Lyttelton had left Charleston on April 4, 1760, ending his service as governor. His replacement, Governor Thomas Boone, did not arrive in Charleston until December 22, 1761.] [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 4]

66. December 17, 1760 [4]  
Extract of letter from Bull to Board of Trade, forwarding information received from friendly Cherokee Indians that the French had built a fort on the Tennessee or the Cherokee River, about half way between Fort Loudoun [actually on what is now called the Little Tennessee River] and Fort Assumption on the Ohio River [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 11, 1761 letter to Pitt, document 65] [original of this letter from Bull to Board of Trade is in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 101]
67. February 17, 1761 [6]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Pitt, recommending that Joseph Stephenson be commissioned naval officer of South Carolina [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 5]
68. March 11, 1761 [9]  
Letter from Board of Trade to Pitt, recommending that Dougal Campbell be continued as Clerk of the Common Pleas in South Carolina [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 8]
69. December 11, 1761 [13]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to the Earl of Egremont, reporting receipt of a letter from Bull dated September 23, 1760, reporting that a "*preliminary Articles for a General pacification with the Cherokee Indians*" had been agreed on that day [Egremont served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from October 9, 1761 to August 21, 1763; for more on the Earl of Egremont, see note after Reel 1 document 174] [with enclosures, documents 70, 71] [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 29]
70. September 23, 1761 [15]  
Extract of letter from Bull to Board of Trade, reporting in detail on the agreement with the Cherokee Indians and of the circumstances leading to it [enclosed with Board of Trade's December 11, 1761 letter to Egremont, document 69] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 119]

71. September 23, 1761 [19]  
Copy of "*The Terms of Peace to be granted to the Cherokee Indians*", signed by Bull for South Carolina and the mark of Attakullakulla for the Cherokee Nation [at least one page of the microfilmed terms of peace is missing; the third page ends in the middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> Article; and the fourth page begins at the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> Article; the complete document consists of 12 Articles [for more on Indian chief Attakullakulla, whom the English called Little Carpenter, see note after Reel 1 document 19] [enclosed with Board of Trade's December 11, 1761 letter to Egremont, document 69] [complete, formal copy of Terms of Peace in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 120]
72. August 19, 1775 [23]  
Letter from George Roupell, Deputy Postmaster General for the Southern Department of North America at the General Post Office of Charleston to Anthony Todd at the General Post Office of London, reporting that "[revolutionary] *Persecution continues to go on against the Friends and Officers of Government without intermission*"; stating that many of these friends and officers, including himself, "*daily expect, and have prepared*" to seek protection on British warships or to leave Charleston completely; quoting an oath now being required, which, he stated, "*They all refused to take*"; begging that the postmaster general in England be apprised of the difficult situation postmasters like himself were in; indicating that moving the mail in Charleston may soon become impossible [second page of Frame 24 microfilmed twice]
73. [no date] [25]  
"*A List of Commercial & Revenue Bills passed* [evidently by the "rebel" government in South Carolina] *in September* [and later in] *1776/77*", including 22 acts, most identified by subject and by date, between November 1776 and June 1777
- [Note:** Documents 74 to 80 (except for document 77) are memorials and petitions with no date. Dates for six of them have been found in a listing of source documents about South Carolina history that are archived in what are called "*Papers in the State Paper Office, London*." **Reference:** These documents are listed in Volume 1 (1857), pages 250ff, of the *Collection of the South Carolina Historical Society*, published in 1857. The dates are either actual document dates or dates with which particular documents are associated. In these six entries, the dates found in this source (between 1721 and 1736) are shown in brackets immediately following "[no date]".
74. [no date] [1721] [27]  
Memorial from John Hammerton to [Secretary of State] Lord Viscount Townshend, "*praying to Succeed Mr. Rhett as Comptroller of the Customs of South Carolina*"

**[Note: Viscount Charles Townshend** served as Secretary of State for the Northern Department from 1721 until 1730. Early during this time, the Northern Department included South Carolina (the Southern Department consisted mostly of the West Indian colonies). By 1724, Townshend's political ally **Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Newcastle** had become Secretary of State for the Southern Department (now including South Carolina), a position he held until 1748. See note after Reel 3 document 10 for more on Newcastle.]

75. [no date] [1736] [29]  
 Memorial letter from James Abercrombie to [Secretary of State?], concerning possible resignation of the current Attorney General of South Carolina, possibly in favor of a friend [presumably Abercrombie]  
**[Note: James Abercrombie** moved to South Carolina in 1730. He held several public positions, including commissioner for redrawing the North Carolina/South Carolina boundary line in 1735-1736. He was royal agent for South Carolina from 1742 to 1757. In 1760, he elected to return permanently to England. In Parliament in 1766, he opposed repeal of the Stamp Act.]
  
76. [no date] [1736] [31]  
 Memorial of Charles Burley to Secretary of State Newcastle, wishing to return to South Carolina, where he previously had lived, and seeking to be appointed Clerk of Common Pleas; maintaining that if he filled this position, he would help resolve the current dispute between the South Carolina Governor and Chief Justice]
  
77. [no date] [32]  
 Memorial of Joseph Boone offering himself to be governor of South Carolina, signed by 12 individuals [clues not available to determine date]
  
78. [no date] [1728] [34]  
 Memorial of Lyder Muller "*an Orphan and Minor*" to the King, seeking permission to remain living in his house in South Carolina, although the law allows another adult to purchase it
  
79. [no date] [1728] [35]  
 Petition of Joseph Fox, late master in chancery [an official in chancery court] in South Carolina, to Newcastle, seeking relief from having lost his position to Theophilus Gregory, leaving him destitute by being appointed to another similar position
  
80. [no date] [1736] [37]  
 Petition of Thomas Lowndes to Newcastle, concerning a grant of land in South Carolina he believed was to be held by him until his death but which he had lost; seeking relief to regain his grant of land

81. [no date] [written probably in early 1740] [38]  
Draft of outgoing letter from [Newcastle?] at Whitehall to General Oglethorpe of Georgia, reminding him of the Instruction he had received the previous October [1739] from Newcastle “*to make an attempt upon the Spanish Settlement at Fort Augustine*” in conjunction with the Governor and Council of South Carolina; now instructing him to join forces with a larger expedition then approaching Jamaica, commanded by Lord Cathcart  
[Note: Only seven years after the official founding of the Colony of Georgia, this new colony’s General and Proprietor/Governor **James Oglethorpe** had followed his October 1739 Instructions, piecing together a motley armed force of Georgians, South Carolinians, and Chickasaw Indians. When they arrived in northern Florida in early 1740, they subdued several small peripheral forts, including Fort Picolata on the St. Johns River and Fort Mose near St. Augustine. They then **laid siege to St. Augustine**. The campaign ultimately failed, and the remains of Oglethorpe’s army retreated northward.  
For the Georgians and South Carolinians, a localized reason to support this war was protection of slavery. The Spanish in St. Augustine supported a policy, as an irritant to their English enemy to the north, of welcoming runaway slaves, freeing them from slavery, and settling them in Florida. Although the Spanish imposed segregation and second-class citizenship on the African American settlers, they offered them a separate home at Fort Mose, which doubled as a peripheral defensive fortification for the Spanish in St. Augustine.  
**Charles Cathcart, 8<sup>th</sup> Lord Cathcart**, was a career military leader, as were several generations in his family. Late in his career, he was placed in charge of an ambitious campaign to confront Spanish power in North America and the West Indies. This was part of Britain’s grand strategy to dominate its European rivals. This small piece of the grand strategy was called the **War of Jenkins’ Ear** (1739 to 1748). In January 1740, while Cathcart’s fleet and army were still in the West Indies, Cathcart died, and, with him, plans for Oglethorpe’s force to join with Cathcart’s in a grand invasion of Spanish Florida.]
82. [no date] [written probably about 1760] [40]  
Petition of James Sutherland, Captain and Commander at Fort Johnson, near Charleston, stating that he had served this fort for many years but that his salary had never kept up with the demands for operating this important fort, and that he therefore was requesting redress from the King to pay the excess costs he had paid personally, leaving him in financial difficulty  
[Note: **Fort Johnson** was built in the 1730s as part of Charleston’s city defenses. By the time this letter was written, probably around 1760, the fort had deteriorated over time, plus being decimated by the great hurricane of 1752. In the early 1760s, it was expanded and improved.]

83. January 2, 1772 [42]  
“*Substance of a Letter from Mr. Atkinson dated Charleston...to Mr. Henry Kendall in London*”; mentioning “*that a Spanish Frigate with Troops*” had arrived at Charleston “*under pretence of being in Distress*”, seeking provisions, although saying they had come only as far as from Havana; suspecting that they were really there to observe Charleston’s “*opulence*”
84. June 19, 1754 [44]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Secretary of State Sir Thomas Robinson, recommending that Dougal Campbell succeed George Wedderburn, who had died, as Clerk of the Crown and Common Pleas in South Carolina  
[**Note: Dougal Campbell** served in this clerk position probably until his death in December 1770 (see Reel 2 document 164). In 1766, he became embroiled, probably more as a pawn than a partisan, in the politics of enforcement of the Stamp Act (see about 20 documents, scattered in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2, between documents 28 and 65). His death in 1770 suggests suicide by a man whose mind had been deranged, perhaps by the stresses of the bit part he played in the Stamp Act controversy.]  
[**Note: Thomas Robinson, 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Grantham**, served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from March to October 1754.]
85. June 20, 1754 [48]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Robinson, concerning a report from Charles Pinckney “*that the French intend to build a Fort in the Upper Cherokee Country*” and, therefore, the importance of building British forts in the same area; pointing out that Governor Glen had warned of the same thing in 1747, that the British government had instructed him to buy land from the Cherokees for a fort, which he had done but was having difficulty in 1750 building a fort there, and no construction had begun on the fort since then [with enclosures, documents 86 to 88]
86. June 1, 1754 [52]  
Representation of Charles Pinckney to Board of trade, conveying his information from South Carolina about French plans to build a fort in Upper Cherokee country; stating his belief that this was a dangerous situation that deserved serious attention by the British government [enclosed with Board of Trade’s June 20, 1754 letter to Robinson, document 85]
87. July 28, 1753 [56]  
Copy of letter from South Carolina Governor James Glen to Charles Pinckney, thanking him for agreeing to convey information that could help the cause of South Carolina, during his stay in England [Glen served as Governor of South Carolina from 1743 to 1756; for more on him, see note after Reel 1 document 1] [enclosed with Board of Trade’s June 20, 1754 letter to Robinson, document 85]

88. April 9, 1754 [58]  
"Paragraph of a letter from Mr. William Pinckney" to [?] concerning information received from the Upper Cherokee that the French intended to build a fort in Upper Cherokee territory [enclosed with Board of Trade's June 20, 1754 letter to Robinson, document 85]
89. June 25, 1754 [60]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Robinson, informing him that the Board had prepared a warrant appointing Dougal Campbell to be Clerk of the Common Pleas
90. April 22, 1755 [63]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Robinson, recommending Joseph Stephenson to be naval officer for South Carolina, following the death of Apsley Bret
91. May 18, 1753 [65]  
Proclamation of Glen, calling on all South Carolina civil and military officers to allow a native of "Barbary" [northwest African Mediterranean coast], who had been enslaved by the Portuguese and imprisoned in South Carolina to be allowed to live peaceably in South Carolina
92. May 18, 1753 [67]  
Copy of Proclamation of Glen [document 91] [more readable copy]
93. March 9, 1757 [69]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to William Pitt (Elder), having received letters from South Carolina Governor William Henry Lyttelton dated December 25 and December 31, 1756, in which he reported information that South Carolina was about to be invaded and took steps against this possibility; also conveying news of Indian relations [William Pitt (Elder) served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from December 1756 to October 1761 except from April to June 1757] [Lyttelton served as Governor of South Carolina from 1756 to 1760; for more on him, see note after Reel 1 document 1] [second page of Frame 69 microfilmed twice] [with enclosures, documents 94 to 102]
94. December 25, 1756 [71]  
Copy of letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning a possible Spanish invasion of South Carolina and actions he took to protect the colony; concerning also Indian relations in the upper Cherokee country [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]

95. November 24, 1756 [76]  
Deposition of William Wilkins at Fort Frederica [located on Saint Simons Island, now in Georgia; for more on this fort and its history, see note after Reel 1 document 1] concerning the threat of war with the Creek Indians; signed by Lyttelton [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]
96. November 24, 1756 [78]  
Deposition of Joseph Blyth, concerning the threat of war with the Creek Indians [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]
97. November 20, 1756 [81]  
Copy of letter from William Gray, to the commanding officer at Fort Frederica, reporting on visiting a town "*up Setilly River*", where Creek Indians told him about movements of Spanish armed men, who were seeking to entice the Indians to support the Spanish over the British [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]  
**[Note:** The **Satilla River** is one of Georgia's many tidal rivers, emptying into the Atlantic between Sea Islands Cumberland and Jekyll. It winds slowly and circuitously across the coastal plain from rural central Georgia southeastward. For the Creek Indians, All of Georgia's coastal plain and more were once home territory for the Creek Indians.]
98. December 15, 1756 [83]  
Copy of "*narrative*" by William Birch, written in Charleston, reporting on a scare in Jamaica over a possible French fleet arriving on the island of Santo Domingo [Hispaniola]; but learning later from a British prisoner released by the French that the large and well armed and supplied fleet "*was certainly intended to make a Desert on Georgia and South Carolina the ensuing Spring*" [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]
99. November 25, 1756 [85]  
Copy of letter No. 1 from Captain Raymond Demere at English Camp [location not clear but somewhere in Cherokee territory] to Lyttelton, reporting that the "*Old Warrior of Tomathy*" [Tomatlay was an Over Hill Cherokee village], an Indian who "*is a true friend to us*", had given intelligence to Demere, saying that the Creek Indians and Cherokees at Tellico [a major "Over Hill" Cherokee village, along with Settico (or Citico)] [on the western slopes of the Appalachian Mountains in today's eastern Tennessee], who previously had been enemies, had met with the French on a friendly basis at the Alabama Fort [perhaps French Fort Toulouse on the Coosa River at the site of today's Wetumpka, Alabama, also known as Fort des Alibamons] and elsewhere; stating that it appeared that the Creeks were lost from friendship with the English [enclosed with Board of Trade's March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93] [see note about scrivener and archivist (or perhaps author) document numbering after Reel 1 document 141]

**[Note: Captain Raymond Demere** (1702-1766) was a British military man with a long history of service in Cherokee country. He had been responsible for reconstructing Fort Prince George (originally built in 1753) and for constructing Fort Loudoun in 1756-1757. For more on these two forts, each built near a major Cherokee town (Keowee in the lower towns and Chota in the “over hill” towns), and on the build-up to the 1758-1761 Cherokee War, see notes after Reel 1 documents 1, 7, 24). When this fort was completed, Raymond’s brother, **Captain Paul Demere** ( ? -1760), also a military man, assumed command of it, serving there until 1760, when he was killed in the Cherokee “massacre” of that date. The Demere brothers, originally D  m  re, came from a French Huguenot family about which little is known.]

100. December 2, 1756 [89]  
Copy of letter No. 2 from Demere at English Camp to [Lyttelton?], reporting having received the following intelligence from a Tellico runner just come from the Alabama Fort, that four Tellico people were on their way to New Orleans to travel to France; reporting also that Indians from throughout the Cherokee Nation were being called to meet at the Cold Springs [location not clear; a Cool Springs exists today at Franklin, TN, to the west of traditional Cherokee territory] to receive presents from the French [enclosed with Board of Trade’s March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]
101. December 31, 1756 [91]  
Copy of letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, informing them about his follow-up response to the perceived threats reported by Demere, including sending some troops from Augusta northward to Fort Prince George [near the “lower towns” of Cherokee territory on the eastern slopes of the Appalachian Mountains in South Carolina] [enclosed with Board of Trade’s March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]
102. December 13, 1756 [95]  
Copy of letter from Demere at English Camp to [Lyttelton], reporting on intelligence received from the Indian named “*Judges Friend*”, stating that he did not believe that the Creeks would end their friendship with the English but that the situation remained uncertain [enclosed with Board of Trade’s March 9, 1757 letter to Pitt, document 93]  
**[Note: Osteneco** (or perhaps Ocanostata), a great Cherokee warrior from the over-hill Tellico village, was known to the English as Judd’s Friend or Judge’s Friend (early in life, he apparently saved a man named Judd, maybe a judge, from being killed by the Cherokee). Initially a more belligerent rival of Little Carpenter, he was enticed into the English orbit by being selected to travel to England in 1762. Later in life, he was known as the Indian Thomas Jefferson knew best.]

103. December 8, 1757 [97]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Pitt, conveying a memorial to the Board from Childermas Crofts [member of a wealthy planter family with a plantation just north of Charleston], clerk of the General Assembly of South Carolina, seeking relief for his health by allowing him to return to England; the Board recommending approval of a leave of absence for this purpose
104. December 22, 1757 [99]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Pitt, conveying a memorial to the Board, from James Wright, Attorney General of South Carolina, having found it necessary to return to England for health reasons, seeking approval for an extended leave of absence for recovery; the Board recommending approval  
[Note: **James Wright** had served as South Carolina's Attorney General since 1747. In 1757, he parlayed his return to England for health reasons into appointment as the Crown Agent for South Carolina, living in London. He held this position until, in 1760, he was appointed Governor of Georgia, a position he held (not quite continuously) until 1782.]
105. May 22, 1759 [105]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Pitt, recommending that Richard Cumberland be appointed to the offices of Provost Marshal, Clerk of the Crown, and Clerk of the Peace in South Carolina, in the place of Hugh Watson, who had died
106. February 6, 1760 [108]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Pitt, conveying letters from Lyttelton in which he described actions he initiated personally to lead more than 1,000 troops into battle against the Cherokee Indians in response to Indian incursions into British territory and "*outrages*" against the British [with enclosures, documents 107 to 128]  
[Note: These actions are the first phase of the so-called **Anglo-Cherokee War** of 1758 to 1761 (for more on this war, see note after document 123). In this phase, Lyttelton personally led an armed force of militia he had ordered recruited. Although Cherokee leaders Old Hop and Little Carpenter sought to dissuade Lyttelton, they could not control their own younger warriors, who, like Lyttelton, were intent upon war. The Cherokee "emperor" or highest level chief was named **Kanagatoga** but the British called him Old Hop because of his venerable age and limp. The senior chief named **Attakullakulla** was called Little Carpenter by the British. These two tribal leaders tried unsuccessfully to maintain friendly relations between the Cherokee and British and to avert war. For more on Attakullakulla, see note after Reel 1 document 19. For more on Kanagatoga, see note after Reel 1 document 22.]

107. September 1, 1759 [110]  
Extract of letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, describing Cherokee Indian outrages against South Carolina inhabitants, efforts of friendly Cherokee chief Little Carpenter to reduce the violence, strengthening and re-provisioning Fort Loudoun, and other measures [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
108. May 22, 1759 [115]  
Copy of Talk by Lyttelton at Charleston to Cherokee Emperor Old Hop and Chief Little Carpenter, seeking to preserve "*a firm Peace and Friendship with the Cherokee Nation*" but stating having received reports of a gang of Cherokee Indians having killed 19 English subjects; requesting that the Cherokee provide legal satisfaction by apprehending and punishing the perpetrators [second sheet of Frame 115 microfilmed twice] [another copy of this Talk in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 41] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
109. June 27, 1759 [118]  
Copy of Talk by Old Hop and Little Carpenter at Fort Loudoun to Lyttelton, also wishing for peace and friendship and asking for forgiveness from the governors of both South Carolina and Virginia [another copy of this Talk in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 42] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
110. July 10, 1759 [121]  
Copy of letter from Captain Paul Demere, commander at Fort Loudoun, to Lyttelton, reporting that, as instructed, he had called Old Hop and Little Carpenter in to the fort and read to them and a large group of Indians Lyttelton's Talk, after which Old Hop and Little Carpenter had responded that they felt apprehending and punishing the gang members "*wou'd but make bad worse*" because the leader of the gang was a relation of the "*Great Warrior*" but that they would take steps to ensure that such violence against English subjects did not happen again in the future; after which Little Carpenter presented his Talk of continuing friendship; Old Hop and Little Carpenter also promised that the Cherokee warriors would actively support the British against the French [another copy of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 43] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
111. July 22, 1759 [125]  
Extract of letter from Paul Demere at Fort Loudoun to Lyttelton, stating that Little Carpenter had reported being pressed by his young warriors, especially at Settico and Tellico, to allow them to go to war against the French [another copy of this extract in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 44] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]

112. August 3, 1759 [127]  
Extract of letter from Lieutenant [Richard] Coytmore [commander] at Fort Prince George, to Lyttelton, reporting that the Cherokees who had gone to talk with the Creeks had returned with four Creek Indians, and that a large meeting was called at Keowee, which an informer had attended in secret; stating that the Creek purpose was to draw the Cherokee with them into a war against the English; reporting that the Cherokee were skeptical, but that the initial agreement would have to be the killing of all "*white people*" on their territories [another copy of this extract in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 45] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
113. May 1, 1758 [actually 1759] [133]  
Copy of letter from journal of trader to the Chickasaw John Bucknell, at the Chickasaw Nation, to Jerome Courtonne, also an Indian trader, containing entries from a journal documenting multiple occurrences of violence between the Chickasaw and the Choctaw Indians, indicating that the Chickasaw were being friendly to the British cause, against the French, with incidents dated May 12, June 5, June 16, July 28, August 2, September 6, September 14, November 20, December 2, and December 12, 1758 and January 8, January 16, March 8, April 3, 1759 [first sheet of Frame 135 microfilmed twice] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106] [another copy of letter is in Reel 1 document 46, also misdated 1758]  
**[Note: John Buckell and Jerome Courtonne** were both Indian traders, especially with the Chickasaw Nation. Both may have been in touch with Lyttelton, providing information to colonial officials. John was known by several similar last names, perhaps starting with Bucknell, going through maybe Bucknells and then Buckells, before morphed to Buckles. A transcript of a journal written by Courtonne was produced by the Genealogical Society of Utah in 1952. Called *Indian Book, 1754-1757*, it includes, besides some letters and other documents, a diary of a trip Courtonne took from Augusta to and with the Chickasaw people, between July 1755 and April 1756. Courtonne died in 1761.]
114. October 16, 1759 [141]  
Duplicate letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade, describing the actions he took, culminating in his command of a military force against the Cherokee [the first phase of the Anglo-Cherokee War] [original letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 53] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
115. September 26, 1759 [145]  
Letter from Coytmore at Fort Prince George to Lyttelton, describing Indian acts in response to their policy to kill all white people, which Coytmore describes as, in certain places, "*absolute open War*" [copy of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 56] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]

116. September 13, 1759 [146 second sheet]  
Letter from Paul Demere at Fort Loudoun to Lyttelton, describing the unrest of Indians at Fort Loudoun, especially after the Fort stopped providing ammunition to the Indians [copy of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 55] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
117. September 12, 1759 [148]  
Copy of letter from Maurice Anderson [apparently an informer] at Fort Loudoun to Richard Coytmore [at Fort Prince George], describing the unrest of Indians at Settico, which, along with Tellico, were the only towns that had "*broke out*" [another copy of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 54] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
118. September 26, 1759 [150]  
Letter from Captain John Stuart at Fort Prince George to Lyttelton, having learned about the violent actions of Cherokee Indians and their control over communications and transportation in the areas of Fort Prince George, Fort Loudoun, and elsewhere [copy of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 57] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]  
[**Note: John Stuart** was a long-time negotiator between Indian and British interests, cooperation, and hostilities. Although personally sympathetic toward the Indian Nations, he officially served the purposes of the King, in the position of Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department, from 1761 to 1779, when he died. In 1759, although Edmund Atkin was then Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Stuart was already actively involved. For more on Stuart, see notes after Reel 1 documents 18, 57.]
119. [no date] [152]  
Copy of address of Lyttelton to South Carolina Assembly, concerning the bad situation with the Cherokee Indians and the need for military action against them; expressing confidence that the Crown would generously support the effort [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
120. October 6, 1759 [154]  
Copy of order by Commons House to Lyttelton, stating its readiness to consider funding for military action the Cherokee Indians, as soon as Lyttelton submits estimated costs to them [another copy of this order in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 60] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]

121. [no date] [156]  
Copy of Lyttelton's response to Assembly's order [document 120] concerning funding for military action against the Cherokee Indians, estimating that the militia force needed would not exceed somewhere between 1,000 and 1,500 men [another copy in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 62] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
122. October 11, 1759 [158]  
Copy of address from South Carolina Commons House to Lyttelton, declaring that, although the dangerous situation with the Cherokee Indians requires a strong response, Commons House unanimously believes that declaring war on the Cherokee Nation "*at this Time, will be attended with the greatest Evils & Calamities, & be productive of the most dangerous & even fatal Consequences, as well to the Inhabitants of this, as of the neighbouring Province, [and thus] do most seriously advise & earnestly desire that your Excellency will not cause War to be declared against that Nation, until all hopes shall be lost of obtaining a reasonable & adequate satisfaction from them*" [another copy of this address in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 61] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
123. [no date] [160]  
Copy of Lyttelton's response to Commons House's address [document 122], stating that he had declared war on the Cherokee Indians and explaining his reasons, but delaying his decision until Commons House had approved the funding for the expedition, which he expected from them very soon [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]  
**[Note:** The **Anglo-Cherokee War** of 1759 to 1761 was fought in three phases, the first phase in late 1759, with Governor Lyttelton in personal command of a militia military force he himself recruited. Lyttelton's army marched from Charleston north to Cherokee territory where, in December, it was able to defeat the Indians and to incarcerate a group of chiefs come to negotiate, who were held as hostages for the capture and punishment of warriors identified as guilty of murdering certain South Carolina settlers (the proximate cause of the war). Declaring victory, and to negotiate the terms of British "satisfaction" for the murders of the settlers, Lyttelton imposed a treaty on the Cherokee in late December (in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, see Reel 1 documents 53 to 70; in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, see Reel 4 documents 106 to 130). Lyttelton soon learned that his treaty had not resolved anything and that his policy of insisting on British "satisfaction" for the murders had backfired. Violence intensified, leading the British, in March 1760, to massacre the hostage chiefs at Fort Loudoun.

During the second phase, in summer 1760, Lyttelton convinced the British military commander in North America, Jeffrey Amherst, to send regular British troops to put down the Indians (for more on Amherst, see note on Relations with Indians after Reel 1 document 1). Amherst sent Highlander Commander Colonel Archibald Montgomerie with a small military force of British Army regulars into Cherokee territory with instructions to kill Indians and destroy their property (for more on Montgomerie, see note on Relations with Indians after Reel 1 document 1). In June, Montgomerie made a half-hearted attempt at each but unexpectedly and irreversibly retreated, even in the face of criticism, all the way to Charleston, after which his little army embarked on ships and left South Carolina.

Montgomerie's ineffectiveness encouraged hostile Cherokee warriors to take the initiative. They successfully enforced a siege against Fort Loudoun, which was forced by imminent starvation to surrender in August (in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, see scattered documents in Reel 1 between documents 82 and 97; in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, see Reel 4 documents 131 to 134).

The third phase inevitably ensued in 1761, as the British sought revenge. In December 1760, Amherst assigned a larger British-regular army, to be commanded by Montgomerie's second in command, Colonel James Grant (for more on Grant, see note on Relations with Indians after Reel 1 document 1). Grant's assignment to finish the job at which Montgomerie had so feebly failed. Grant viciously applied violence against Indian people and property to the point that the Cherokee Nation was decimated and demoralized (in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, see scattered documents in Reel 1 documents 101 to 120); in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, see documents 65 to 71 (except document 67). The Anglo-Cherokee War was over, but British relations with the Indian Nations were worse than ever.]

124. [no date] [162]  
Copy of address from Lyttelton to General Assembly, stating that insufficient funding had been approved for the expedition against the Cherokee, time was pressing, as the militia recruits were assembling, and therefore Lyttelton had decided he must go ahead on his own with what had been approved; therefore, adjourning the General Assembly until March 26, 1761 [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
125. October 23, 1759 [164]  
Letter from Lyttelton at Charleston to Board of Trade submitting copies of minutes of conferences with Over Hill Town Cherokee Indian leaders; result being that the British decided the Indian assurances of accommodating British needs and wishes were "*insecure*" and deciding, therefore, that British policy would be to seek full satisfaction from the Cherokee for the "*many murders and outrages they have committed against His Majesty's Good subjects of this province*";

- also requiring that any treaty would be verifiably binding on all Cherokee before it was approved, because the Lower Town Cherokee appeared still to be hostile, while the Lower Town Cherokee were seeking to accommodate British needs; also requiring that full funding for additional militia duty if necessary after signing a would be approved in advance by the Assembly [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 64] [enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
126. October 18, 19, 22, 1759 [169]  
 Extracts of minutes from South Carolina Council meetings:  
 October 18, 1759  
 South Carolina Council meeting, during which great leaders from Chota [main village of Over Hill Towns of Cherokee Indians] met with the Council to engage in a collective Talk with Lyttelton about British relations with the Cherokee Indians and recent violence against South Carolina settlers [last sheet of these minutes microfilmed twice]; followed by  
 October 19, 1759  
 South Carolina Council meeting, with the Chota Cherokee leaders present, during which Lyttelton engaged in a discussion/Talk with Over Hill Town Cherokee leaders; followed by  
 [all enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]  
 October 22, 1759 [172]  
 South Carolina Council meeting, with the Chota Cherokee leaders and one Lower Towns Cherokee leader present to hear Lyttelton's Talk to the Cherokee, describing his understanding of relations between the Cherokee and British, including Cherokee actions hostile to Britain, suggesting that the time had come when the British must demand satisfaction for Indian violence against South Carolina settlers  
 [copy of all three extracts of minutes in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 65] [all enclosed with Board of Trade's February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]
127. Various dates in late 1759 [174]  
*"Extracts from Letters receiv'd from the Speaker of the House of Assembly in South Carolina"*, traveling with Lyttelton's military force; to [South Carolina Agent James Wright ], including  
 October 27, 1759  
 Stating that the Governor's military force had left for Cherokee territory, with hopes for a peaceful conclusion, not war, against the Cherokee, followed by  
 November 10, 1759  
 Still expressing hope for a peaceful resolution; followed by  
 December 1, 1759  
 Stating that the military force had reached 96 [for more on the frontier fort Ninety-Six or 96, see note after Reel 1 document 66], still hoping for an amicable resolution; followed by

December 5, 1759

Stating that the military force was marching from 96 to Fort Prince George  
“*where the Indians are to meet him*”; followed by

December 14, 1759

Stating that no further news had been received

[copy of each extract in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1  
document 66]

[all enclosed with Board of Trade’s February 6, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 106]

128. February 21, 1760 [176]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Pitt, concerning receipt of Lyttelton’s letter dated December 29, 1759 announcing that he had “*happily put an End to the War with the Cherokee Indians*”; stating that his force had captured 21 warriors, who were being held as hostages for delivery by the Cherokee to the British of 21 other warriors who were guilty of murdering British settlers, to be dealt with as the British saw fit; enclosing the resulting treaty [with enclosures, documents 129, 130]
129. December 29, 1759 [178]  
Copy of letter from Lyttelton at Fort Prince George to Board of Trade, explaining the conclusion of the war with the Cherokee Indians, the plan to punish Cherokee warriors guilty of settler murders, which he says actually number 24 [another copy of letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 67]  
[enclosed with Board of Trade’s February 20, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 128]
130. December 26, 1759 [180]  
Copy of treaty between Lyttelton as Governor of South Carolina and Attakullakulla (Little Carpenter) as deputy headman of the Cherokee Nation, containing 6 articles, signed at Fort Prince George by Lyttelton for the British and by Little Carpenter and five other Cherokee chiefs [enclosed with Board of Trade’s February 20, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 128] [another copy of treaty in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 68]
131. September 23, 1760 [185]  
Letter from Edward Sedgwick [apparently a clerk at Board of Trade] to Robert Wood [apparently a worker in Secretary of State office], in the absence of [Secretary for the Board of Trade John] Pownall, concerning letter from Bull to Board of Trade dated July 20, 1760, describing the arrival of Colonel Montgomerie with troops and their engagement against the Cherokee in June, followed by his decision to return to Charleston; asking that Bull’s letter be placed before Secretary of State Pitt [perhaps with enclosures, documents 132 to 134, but not so identified] [for more on Montgomerie’s “second phase” in the Anglo-Cherokee War of 1759 to 1761, see Board of Trade incoming correspondence, note after Reel 1 document 1 and note after document 123]

132. July 20, 1760 [187]  
Duplicate letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, providing information on the arrival of Colonel Montgomerie and his subsequent brief campaign against the Cherokee, with details; concluding that South Carolina had wanted Montgomery to stay and complete the task and now remained in danger from the Cherokee [original letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 83] [perhaps enclosed with Edward Sedgwick's September 23, 1760 letter to Robert Wood, document 131, but not so identified]
133. July 12, 1760 [189]  
Copy of letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, reporting on receipt of letter from Colonel [James] Grant with his own, different account of Montgomerie's brief campaign against the Cherokee in June 1760, with his own evidence that the campaign could have been pressed more strongly with greater success [another copy of letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 84] [perhaps enclosed with Edward Sedgwick's September 23, 1760 letter to Robert Wood, document 131, but not so identified]
134. [no date; evidently in summer 1760] [190]  
Copy of letter from Bull to Montgomerie [microfilmed letter is missing at least the first page and therefore a date], stressing to Montgomerie the dangers of not decimating the Cherokee who will, otherwise, ally with the French, offering them a prime opportunity to control the North American interior and diminish Britain's colonies; seeking to persuade Montgomerie, agreeing with Bull's analysis, to take appropriate military action against the Cherokee [perhaps enclosed with Edward Sedgwick's September 23, 1760 letter to Robert Wood, document 131, but not so identified]
135. "*Monday the 10<sup>th</sup> past 10' at night*" [perhaps July 10, 1760] [191]  
Note from a Board of Trade employee [Sedgwick?] to Wood, on Pownall's behalf, informing Wood that a letter had just been received from Bull with news that the garrison of surrendered Fort Loudoun had been "*massacred by the Savages*," with all officers killed except one
136. [no date] [193]  
[evidently soon after the death of King George II on October 25, 1760]  
Copy of memorial on behalf of the late Samuel Horsey to the King, seeking help in having the new King George III follow through on an earlier memorial from the late Samuel Horsey to King George II [may be following up on Samuel Horsey's petition of February 15, 1734 concerning ownership of land given by South Carolina's proprietors; in 1738, Horsey was appointed to be governor of South Carolina; however, he died later that year; thus, he never serving as governor, and his memorial appears to have been held up for many years; see Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 3 document 54 and note after it, along with documents 98, 99, 115, 116]

137. [no date] [perhaps in 1735] [195]  
Copy of petition of Colonel Robert Johnson to the King, whose father, Nathaniel Johnson, had been governor of South Carolina and who himself had been the last proprietor governor from 1717 to 1719, now petitioning to be considered to fill the vacant position of royal governor  
[**Note:** In 1735, the British government's first candidate to fill the vacant position of royal governor of South Carolina was **Samuel Horsey**; yet in the end, he was passed over, and **Robert Johnson** served as royal governor from 1735 to 1737. When Johnson died in office, Horsey again became the lead candidate, was appointed, but died before he could begin serving. For the Horsey family memorial, see document 136 For more on Robert Johnson's governorships, see note after Reel 3 document 4 in Board of Trade incoming correspondence. Why the Horsey memorial and Johnson petition appear microfilmed among documents dated in 1760 in the Secretary of State incoming correspondence is not clear. Because of their interconnections, perhaps the c. 1735 Johnson petition was submitted in 1760 in support of the new Horsey family memorial.]
138. December 19, 1760 [197]  
Letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Pitt, conveying letter from Bull to Board of Trade dated October 21, 1760, which explains the situation with the Cherokee Indians "*since their Breach of the Capitulation of Fort Loudoun, and of the present State of Affairs with respect to those Indians*" [with enclosure, document 139] [abstract of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 2]
139. October 21, 1760 [200]  
Copy of letter from Bull at Charleston to Board of Trade, hoping for military assistance from Britain against the threat from France; explaining in detail what had happened between the British and the Cherokee Indians since the massacre by the Indians of the captive British officer from Fort Loudoun; suggesting that Britain commit additional military power to the region, especially in efforts against Mobile, New Orleans, and Louisiana [enclosed with Board of Trade's December 19, 1760 letter to Pitt, document 138] [another copy is in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 98, with another copy in document 99]

**Note: Volumes 387 and 388** in the CO5 Colonial Papers of South Carolina are not included in the DLAR's microfilmed collection. They contain Secretary of State incoming correspondence dated between 1715 and 1746, before the period of interest of the DLAR. Organizationally, they appear to start the Secretary of State incoming correspondence (specifically the royal colonial correspondence) chronologically over again, in continuous, chronological order. This leaves hanging the question of the reason for the seemingly separate set of Secretary of State incoming correspondence from 1699 until 1760 with a few documents up to 1775 (Reels 3 and 4 Volumes 382 to 386.)

## Reel 5 (Volumes 389, 390)

### Volume 389—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue

January 30, 1747 to December 31, 1751      Documents 1 to 110      [Frames 1 to 264]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volume 382 (Reel 3) and Volumes 385 and 386 (Reel 4) for information on the coverage and organization of South Carolina incoming Secretary of State correspondence from 1699 to 1775 (actually about 1760 with outlier documents to 1775) in what appears to be a separate set of Secretary of State correspondence, originally covering the Proprietary Colony of South Carolina, but continued well beyond into the period of the Royal Colony. This set of correspondence is both poorly organized and replete with gaps. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Reel 5 appears to begin a new set of separately microfilmed South Carolina Secretary of State incoming correspondence, which runs in chronologically ordered, fairly complete fashion from 1715 to 1782, in Reels 5 through 8. Volumes 387 and 388 (correspondence dated from 1715 to 1746) are not microfilmed here because the DLAR's period of interest begins in about 1750. Volume 389 continues the new set of Secretary of State incoming correspondence, covering the years 1747 to 1751.

**Note:** Unlike the Board of Trade's incoming correspondence regarding South Carolina, archivists in the Secretary of State's office did not designate document numbers for its South Carolina incoming correspondence.

**Note:** Unlike the Board of Trade, Secretaries of State, beginning with the Earl of Shelburne in 1766, numbered their letters to colonial governors and acting governors. In return, governors and acting governors were expected to number their own letters to the secretary of state. None of the letters in Volume 389, dated between 1747 and 1751, was numbered by the writer.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

[no date]

[no frame numbers assigned]

Title page of the archivist for documents contained in this Volume 389, "South Carolina Letters from Governor Glen From 19 Jan<sup>ry</sup> 1748 To 31 Dec<sup>r</sup> 1751 N<sup>o</sup>. 18"; followed by

Table of contents by the archivist, including 78 documents, written on 202 manuscript pages [the document on page 57 is listed out of order, on a separate page; Volume 389 as microfilmed includes 110 documents on 264 Frames]

1. [no date] [second page of Frame 1]  
"The Accompt of Mr. Herman Verelst" to receive £3,000 to purchase goods to be given as presents to Indians in South Carolina, pursuant to a warrant dated August 25, 1748 [document 2], with itemization of goods charged for from September 9 to the end of 1748, with total reported expenses of £1,517.39 carried over to 1749

[Note: For more on **Harman Verelst**, see note after Reel 4 document 3. This purchase and shipment of Indian presents to South Carolina and Georgia was apparently his first but was followed by others through 1751 with additional funding and three vessels, the *Dolphin*, the *Charming Nancy*, and the *Live Oak*. See Reel 4 documents 2, 3. See also note after Reel 4 document 1.]

2. August 25, 1748 [7]  
Copy of warrant by Lords Justices Dorset P., Bedford, Montagu, and Harrington, conveyed by the Board of Trade and Plantations [for more on the Board of Trade, see note after Reel 1 document 1] to the Secretary of State for the Southern Department [John Russel, 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Bedford, at this time; he served from February 1748 to June 1751], verifying that Herman Verelst, John Hume, and Jermyn Wright [brother of James Wright, who in 1760 became Governor of colonial Georgia] were jointly or separately authorized to purchase goods for Indian presents for South Carolina and Georgia, under an approved government warrant for £3,000 annually [which was renewed at least once; see Reel 4 documents 2, 3]

[Note: Documents 1 through 26 all pertain to the accounts for Harman Verelst's purchase in London of large quantities of **goods to be shipped to South Carolina and Georgia to be distributed to Indians as "presents"** under a warrant (document 2) authorizing expenses of up to £3,000 for this purpose. All of the goods accounted for here were planned to be shipped on a merchant vessel named the *Francis and John*. Individual transactions differed considerably in cost, from one invoice and receipt worth £1.0.0 to another one worth £281.4.0. Most vendors were individuals but some were companies. Most invoices were paid off within a few days or weeks, but one quite small invoice went unpaid for several months. Invoice dates run from October 15 to December 30, 1748. Receipt dates run from December 7, 1748 to April 6, 1749 (all except two are between December 24 and January 20). Whether these documents represent all the goods purchased and shipped on the *Francis and John* is not clear from the documents alone.

According to Document 1, which lacks a date, only about half of the warranted amount had been spent by about the end of 1748. See documents 40 to 60 for a second large purchase, By Jermyn Wright also shipped on the *Francis and John* in December 1748, probably on the same voyage. See also note after Reel 4 document 1.]

[**Note:** Since documents 4 to 26 are all single-vendor invoices, most with receipts for payment, their contents are not itemized separately in this Finding Aid but are summarized here.]

3. January 5, 1749 [9]  
"Invoice" for [actually inventory of] itemized goods bought by Verelst as presents for the South Carolina and Georgia Indians, which were shipped on the *Francis and John* [which appears to have sailed on about January 5, 1749]  
[**Note:** The Verelst purchasing documented by the invoices and receipts (documents 4 to 26 except for document 7) was all accomplished between October 15, 1748 and April 6, 1749 in the modern calendar (which is used throughout in this Finding Aid). Among these invoices and receipts, all of the dates for early-year months were written as being in 1748, although most of these dates were receipts for payment that must have come after the corresponding invoice date. The answer appears to be that the accountants were operating on the **Julian calendar**, without using the convention of 1748/49 to represent dates after January 1 and before March 25, the Julian calendar's new year's day. Four years after the dates of these documents, England and its empire undertook two major calendar changes. To align the British new year's day with January 1, the year 1752 skipped Julian days January 1 through March 24 and renumbered March 24 to be January 1. In the same year, September 3 through September 13 were skipped to correct for the 11-day deviation of the Julian calendar from the Gregorian calendar with its more accurate use of leap years.]
4. to 26. except 7. [Various dates between October 15, 1748 [Frames 13 to 36] and April 6, 1749]  
Individual invoices and receipts for transactions by Harman Verelst to purchase goods up to the value of £3,000, per a warrant issued by the British Government on August 25, 1748 [document 2] to be shipped on the British merchant vessel *Francis and John* to South Carolina and Georgia and distributed as presents to the Indians [see summary of Verelst's purchasing activities in note after document 2; individual entries for these documents are not included in this Finding Aid]
7. January 4, 1749 [17]  
Bill of lading for goods shipped on the *Francis and John*, signed at London by the ship's master, Henry Boyton

[no date] [after document 13] [no frame number assigned]  
Scrivener's note stating that five vouchers [not included in the invoices and receipts of documents 4 to 26], listed by name and amount, had been delivered to "*Mr. Auditor Aislable's office*"

[no date] [after document 26] [no frame number assigned]  
Scrivener's note stating that one invoice [not included in the invoices and receipts of documents 4 to 26] had been delivered to Auditor Aislable's office

27. January 10, 1748 [38]  
Letter from South Carolina Governor James Glen to Secretary of State [the Duke of Newcastle], sending a description of trade in and protection of the colony of South Carolina; because the trade was becoming lucrative, Spanish privateers were beginning to present a danger, so steps were being taken to create a naval response against the privateers and protect British shipping; with details; asking that the British Navy send more naval protection [Frame 38 microfilmed twice]  
[**Note: James Glen** served as Governor of South Carolina between December 1743 and 1756. For more on Glen, see notes after Reel 1 documents 1, 125.]  
[**Note: Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Newcastle**, served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from April 1724 (with a brief hiatus from February to April 1746) until he was replaced in February 1748. For more on Newcastle, see note after Reel 3 document 10.]

[**Note:** Although clearly dated in 1747, documents 28 to 33 all appear actually to be dated in February and March of 1748 in the modern calendar. See note after document 3 for more on British use of the Julian calendar until 1752.]

28. February 3, 1747 [42]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Newcastle, describing what appear to Glen to be increased intrigues from both Spaniards and French and possible new dangers, both on the seas and through foreign alliances with the Indians; with details on the various Indian tribes; describing plans for more land fortifications in South Carolina [see note after document 27 concerning the date of this document, which was 1748 in the modern calendar]  
[**Note:** Newcastle was replaced as Secretary of State for the Southern Department in February 1748. Presumably because of slow communications across the Atlantic Ocean, South Carolina did not learn that the Duke of Bedford had assumed this position until late July. Governor Glen congratulated Bedford on his appointment in a letter dated July 26, 1748, document 37.]

29. March 5, 1747 [48]  
Petition from inhabitants of two parishes in Granville County, South Carolina to Secretary of State Newcastle, asking that the British government send a regiment of soldiers to protect South Carolina inhabitants; signed by 67 individuals [see note after document 27 concerning the date of this document, which was 1748 in the modern calendar]

30. March 5, 1747 [50]  
Petition from London merchants doing business with South Carolina, commending to Newcastle and supporting the petition from South Carolina inhabitants [document 29]; signed by 24 individuals [see note after document 27 concerning the date of this document, which was 1748 in the modern calendar]
31. January 30, 1747 [52]  
Petition to the King from South Carolina's Governor, Council, and Assembly, requesting royal support for more security and protection from Britain, as adopted by Commons House and signed by William Bull, its Speaker  
[Note: **William Bull, Senior** (1683-1755) had served as acting governor before Governor Glen arrived in 1743. Since then, he had remained a leader in the South Carolina Assembly. His son, William Bull II, served as lieutenant governor from 1759 to 1775 and several times during these years as acting governor.]  
[see note after document 27 concerning the date of this document, which was 1748 in the modern calendar]
32. February 7, 1747 [53]  
Copy or duplicate letter from Glen to Newcastle, enumerating dangers to South Carolina from the French, the Spaniards, the Indians' various nations, and also from Negro slaves, based partly on letters from Colonel [Alexander] Vanderdusen [or Vanderdussen, commander of South Carolina militia in 1740 and after; declaring his intent to protect South Carolina from all these threats and enumerating the things he was doing to fulfill this intent, all within an environment he described as complex in its interactions [see note after document 27 concerning the date of this document, which was 1748 in the modern calendar]
33. [no date] [57]  
Petition from "*Gentlemen and Landholders*" of St. John Parish, South Carolina, to Newcastle, seeking additional protection by British troops against threats from French and Indians; signed by 39 individuals [scrivener's note: "*delivered by Gen<sup>l</sup> Oglethorpe March 7, 1747/48*"]
34. April 14, 1748 [58]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Newcastle, reporting further on Indian affairs, based in part on letters by Colonel Vanderdussen, with details
35. April 14, 1748 [60]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Newcastle, with additional information about British colonial ships being taken by foreign privateers; concerning his difficulties responding to the privateer threat because of the Assembly's unwillingness to pay the expenses, while the Assembly had passed a measure "*for Stamping and Issuing £10,000 Paper Currency in lieu of Money, for defraying the said Expense*", a provision Glen did not agree to; including his explanation of the reasons for not approving it

36. June 4, 1748 [62]  
Letter from Abraham Bosomworth at London to Secretary of State the Duke of Bedford, complaining of having been told that someone else had been selected to issue presents to the Indians, after he [Bosomworth] had been promised this responsibility  
[Note: **John Russell, 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Bedford**, served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from February 1748 to June 1751.]  
[Note: Abraham Bosomworth and his brothers Adam and Thomas all became involved with Indian affairs in South Carolina and Georgia, from at least 1742 until the mid-1760s. **Adam Bosomworth** served as an agent for Indian affairs in South Carolina. Judging from this letter, **Abraham Bosomworth** worked among the Indians in a number of ways, including, according to this letter, seeking a position distributing British government presents to the Indians after the government decided to spend heavily on “bribing” several Indian Nations to side with Britain against France and Spain in the late 1740s and early 1750s. **Rev. Thomas Bosomworth** married a Creek Indian, who inherited Creek territory on three of Georgia’s sea islands, which Bosomworth got legalized under English law, and then sought to become wealthy by selling parts of it to the Georgia government for settler development. For more on the Thomas Bosomworth story, see the DLAR Finding Aid for the Colonial Office Papers for Georgia and a number of documents in those papers.]
37. July 26, 1748 [64]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, congratulating Bedford as well deserving of having been appointed Secretary of State for the Southern Department; stating his high opinion of his own governorship of South Carolina and his hopes of continuing
38. July 27, 1748 [66]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, reporting on the capture and sale into slavery by “French Indians” of several British colonists, with details; advocating for pressing the Indians to administer justice themselves to their criminals; informing Bedford about the recent arrival among the Upper Creek Indians of Peter Shirley, a French-Indian half breed, who was working to persuade the Creeks to side with the French against Britain; suggesting strategies to strengthen British power over other Indian Nations (Choctaw, Cherokee, Catawba) especially by building a British fort among the Choctaw people
39. July 27, 1748 [70]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, reporting the further opposition of the Assembly to his governance, with details; reporting on the trade through Charleston, with details

[**Note:** Documents 40 through 60 pertain to the accounts for Jermyn Wright's purchase in London and Halifax of large quantities of **goods to be shipped to South Carolina and Georgia to be distributed to Indians as "presents"** under a warrant (document 2) authorizing expenses of up to £3,000 for this purpose. The warrant identified three individuals, Harman Verelst, John Hume, and Jermyn Wright [brother of James Wright, who in 1760 became Governor of colonial Georgia] as jointly or separately authorized to purchase goods for Indian presents for South Carolina and Georgia, under an approved government warrant for £3,000 annually [which was renewed at least once; see Reel 4 documents 2, 3]. All of the goods accounted for here purchased by Jermyn Wright to be shipped on a merchant vessel named the *Francis and John*. Individual transactions differed considerably in cost, from one invoice and receipt worth £5.10.3 to another one worth £461.11.0 (a November 1, 1748 purchase in Halifax). Most vendors were companies. Some invoices were paid off within a few days or weeks. Receipts for others record only the delivery of the goods. Invoice dates run from November 1 to December 23, 1748. Most were dated between November 23 and December 5. Receipt dates run from November 18, 1748 to January 20, 1750. Harman Verelst also purchased large quantities of goods, mostly in late fall 1748, also to be shipped on the *Francis and John* (see documents 1 to 26 and note after document 2). According to Document 1, which lacks a date, only about half of the warranted amount had been spent on the Verelst purchases. Perhaps Wright purchases, which totaled £1,509.9.7 (document 60) used the remainder of the £3,000 warrant amount. See also note after Reel 4 document 1.]

[**Note:** Since documents 40 to 60 (except for documents 41, 42, and 60) are single-vendor invoices, some with receipts for payment, their contents are not itemized separately in this Finding Aid but are summarized here.]

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 40. to 60. except for 41, 42, 60. [Various dates between November 1 and December 23, 1748]   | [Frames 72 to 94] |
| Individual invoices and receipts for transactions by Jermyn Wright to purchase goods up to the value of £3,000, per a warrant issued by the British Government on August 25, 1748 [document 2] to be shipped on the British merchant vessel <i>Francis and John</i> to South Carolina and Georgia and distributed as presents to the Indians [see summary of Verelst's similar purchasing activities in the same time period, also to be shipped on the <i>Francis and John</i> , in note after document 2; individual entries for these documents are not included in this Finding Aid] |                   |
| 41. December [?], 1748   | [74]              |
| Itemized bill of lading of goods for Indian presents shipped by Jermyn Wright on the <i>Francis and John</i> commanded by Henry Boyton   |                   |

42. [no date] [75]  
"Invoice of sundry Parcels of Goods" shipped by Jermyn Wright on the *Francis and John* for Charleston to be distributed to the Indians in South Carolina and Georgia [actually a shipping list or bill of lading]
60. December 5, 1748 [94]  
Shipping list of items sent to Charleston as presents to Indians in South Carolina and Georgia on the *Francis and John*, Henry Boyton, master; total value £1,509.9.7
61. [no date] [99]  
Letter from Glen to Bedford, concerning Indian affairs, with details [scrivener's note following document "*received September 26, 1748*"]
62. October 10, 1748 [103]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, concerning Indian affairs, with details [similar letter with same date from Glen to Board of Trade in Reel 4 document 39]
63. October 10, 1748 [107]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, concerning the case of a Dutch ship [thus an enemy ship], the *Vrouw Dorothea* [Wife Dorothea], which was hauled by a British Navy ship into Jamaica and its cargo sold, partly privately, after which it sailed homeward but was brought by a British privateer into Charleston, where it was prosecuted a second time as an enemy ship; requesting that, since Glen had some personal interest in the outcome of this prosecution, the government should decide the fair distribution of benefits from the Admiralty Court trial
64. October 10, 1748 [109]  
Letter from Glen to the secretaries of Bedford, stating that "*I must beg the favour of you to direct the under clerks that they may not permit any Person not belonging to the Office to read Glen's correspondence dated October 10, 1748*" [Frame 109 microfilmed twice]
65. October 10, 1748 [111]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, thanking him for sending independent military companies to defend South Carolina, for approving £1,500 to be spent on buying presents for the Indian Nations, and for the newly approved bounty on indigo; praising other qualities of South Carolina's economy and colonial government; claiming that his governing had been beneficial, with possibly a few exceptions, and blaming problems in the colony on the Assembly, which, he stated, had been misled "*into a belief that they are and to have the Sole direction of everything*"; illustrating the point with examples;

concluding that “*These things weaken the King’s Prerogative, they are hurtful to the people themselves, and it is easie to mention other matters prejudicial to the Mother Country*”; concluding further that “*Many of the above Evils may be corrected if a Council will Strengthen a Governor’s hands and give a due attendance*” but that many lived too far away to attend consistently; requesting that James Grame be approved to replace [John] Hammerton, who had been absent for five years; stating his opposition to the Upper House’s declaration before his arrival as Governor that it would not sit to do business with the Governor, a policy he had opposed as unconstitutional when he arrived; including other examples of friction between the Governor and the Assembly and of laws which he considered to infringe on the Governor’s and the King’s prerogatives

**[Note: John Hammerton** is a good example of a “placeman” in colonial government. He held a series of appointed positions over 30 years but actually lived in South Carolina for only 10 years. **(Reference: Henry D. Watson, Placemen in South Carolina: Receiver General of the Quitrents, *The South Carolina Historical Society Magazine*, Vol. 74, No. 1 (January 1973), pp 18-30)]**

66. March 13, 1749 [122]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, stating that Benjamin Whitaker, Chief Justice of South Carolina, was unwell, was unimproved since a two-year leave in Europe, and now had become unable to perform the duties of the office; recommending that James Grame be appointed to replace him [for additional documents on the replacement of Whitaker with Grame, see note after Reel 4 document 22]
67. June 15, 1749 [124]  
Letter from Glen to Bedford, explaining that the situation with Whitaker and Grame had changed, with Whitaker resisting resigning but instead had left suddenly for England, vowing not to return; Glen still wishing for James Grame to be appointed to succeed Whitaker as Chief Justice
68. [no date] [126]  
“*Some Remarks on the Scheme proposed by Mr. Crockett* [James Crockatt, a London merchant with a personal interest in the presents for Indians project; see documents 101 to 105] *for Altering the method of applying the money granted for Purchasing of Presents for the Indians*” from Jermyn Wright to Bedford, making four negative points in opposition to the scheme: that money would be diverted from gifts into other ways of maintaining the Indians, that maintaining the Indians would be very expensive, that the current goal of the presents policy was proper, adequate, and supported by the King, and that the Assembly was supporting the scheme because it would give it more opportunities to control colonial government spending; recommending that the current method of applying for and accounting for this money should remain the same

69. June 1, 1749 [128]  
Copy of abstract of minutes of meeting of South Carolina Commons House of Assembly, pertaining to a petition from Charles Wright and John Hume, representing Charleston merchants, who were "*copartners*" with Jermyn Wright in the business of receiving and distributing Indian presents in South Carolina which Jermyn Wright had purchased in England; stating that they had nothing to do with a similar purchase of presents by Harman Verelst, whom the Commons House had charged with having improperly profited privately from the purchases, money thus being wasted in the purchase process, which Commons House had voted to investigate  
[Note: London merchants **Harman Verelst**, **Jermyn Wright**, and **John Hume** were listed on the August 25, 1748 warrant for purchase of presents for South Carolina and Georgia Indians. **Charles Wright** and Jermyn Wright were brothers, both merchants, while their brother **James Wright** was at this time Attorney General of South Carolina. In 1760, he became Governor of Georgia, a position he held until 1782.]
70. August 12, 1749 [130]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, conveying an account of the state of the colony he had prepared for the Board of Trade, with answers to its questions, especially concerning Indian relations and their relations with the French, with details
71. November 6, 1749 [132]  
Letter from [Virginia Governor] Thomas Lee at Williamsburg to Bedford, concerning transactions of [former Virginia Lieutenant Governor William Gooch as a part of a large revision of the colony's laws  
[Note: **William Gooch** was Lieutenant Governor of Virginia from 1727 to 1749. Between 1737 and 1749, he served as administrative governor in Virginia, as Virginia's appointed governor remained in England. During his long tenure, he initiated many administrative and legal reforms. In August 1749, he resigned as Lieutenant Governor for reasons of poor health and returned to England, where he died in 1751. Before leaving, he helped to manage the transition by which **Thomas Lee** became Governor. In this letter, Lee evidently was seeking help to follow up on some of Gooch's last reforms.  
Why this correspondence was filed by the Secretary of State office under South Carolina rather than Virginia is not clear from these documents alone.]
72. December 23, 1749 [134]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade, informing them about the status of the colony and answering their questions, including issues of paper money and debt; enclosing several documents on other issues; concerning relations with the South Carolina Assembly; concerning other issues and details; concluding with mention of the problem St. Augustine is, as capital of Spanish Florida, a haven for British colonial runaway slaves [enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]

73. December 23, 1749 [142]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, responding to his request for information about the paper currency situation; doing so by enclosing copies of correspondence he had recently written to Board of Trade [with enclosures, document 72, 74-82]
74. [no date] [144]  
“*Account [to Board of Trade] of the number of Vessels that had Cleared Outwards at the Naval Office on Charles Town South Carolina with their Tonnage & Registers & Number of Men between the 1<sup>st</sup> November 1748 & the 1<sup>st</sup> Nov<sup>er</sup> 1749*”, reporting a total of 229 vessels, 13,525 tons, and 1,749 men; including shipping bound for Europe (74); West Indies (91); Northern Colonies, Georgia, and St. Augustine (62); and Africa (2) [enclosed with Glen’s December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]
75. October 10, 1748 [146]  
Copy of letter from Glen to [Governor of Louisiana] Vaudreuil [who was corresponding with Glen about violence by Indians], documenting the history of bad relations with Indian nations and how European nations, like France, contributed to the bad relations by encouraging certain Indian nations to perpetrate violence on British settlers [enclosed with Glen’s December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73] [another copy of this letter, without a date, is found in Reel 4 document 15]  
[**Note: Louisiana** was a colony of France, with Nouvelle Orleans as its capital, from 1682 until 1762, after which Spain acquired it as part of the 1763 settlement of the Seven Years War (French and Indian War). **Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil-Cavagnial** served as French colonial governor in Nouvelle Orleans from 1743 to 1753.]
76. [no date] [148]  
“*Account of Goods exported from Charles Town of the Produce of South Carolina from the 1<sup>st</sup> of Novem<sup>br</sup> 1748 to the 1<sup>st</sup> of November 1749*”, including names of the goods, quantity of goods, export duty rates, amount of duty paid, in Carolina currency, with total amount of duty paid £146,777.3.9, or 1,027,440.6.5 in Carolina currency [enclosed with Glen’s December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]
77. [no date] [150]  
Copy of instructions from Glen to Raymond Demere, who was being sent to St. Augustine to negotiate with the Governor of Spanish Florida [Manuel de Montaino] concerning trade relations ostensibly for mutual benefit, but which must include an agreement by the Spanish colonial government to return runaway slaves to their British masters, with implied and open threats if the St. Augustine government refused to comply [enclosed with Glen’s December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]

[see also copies of the letter of protest Demere wrote to the Spanish Governor before leaving St. Augustine, in Reel 4 document 14 and Reel 5 document 82; another copy of these instructions is in Reel 4 document 13; for more on Raymond Demere, see note after Reel 4 document 99 plus documents 99 to 102]

78. [no date] [152]  
Copy of letter from Glen to the Governor of Spanish Florida, stating that Demere was coming to St. Augustine to negotiate about the status of runaway slaves as well as soldiers and servants [enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]
79. [December 23, 1749] [154]  
Copy of second part of letter from Glen to Board of Trade concerning current Indian affairs; with a request to receive instructions for how to handle the Choctaws [the first part of this letter is in document 81; evidently the entire letter was enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, but the two parts got separated before they were microfilmed] [an extract from this letter, dated December 23, 1749, is found in Reel 4 document 17] [enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]
80. April 23, 1748 [158]  
Copy of letter from Glen at South Carolina to Board of Trade, providing an update on the situation with the Indian Nations adjacent to South Carolina territory; reporting making efforts to bring the Indians to talk at Charleston [enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]
81. [December 23, 1749] [160]  
Copy of first part of letter from [Glen] to [Board of Trade], referring to the "*miscarriage of the presents to the Chactaws in July*"; seeking to avoid blame for this mishap, with details [the second part of this letter is in document 79; evidently the entire letter was enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, but the two parts got separated before they were microfilmed] [an extract from this letter, dated December 23, 1749, is found in Reel 4 document 17] [evidently enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73]
82. [no date] [162]  
Copy of [probably extract from] letter from Captain Raymond Demere to [the Spanish governor of Florida], concerning the problem of Spanish Florida's having encouraged South Carolina slaves to escape southward [identified by scrivener as "*Copy of the Protest*"] [enclosed with Glen's December 23, 1749 letter to Bedford, document 73] [another copy of this protest letter is found in Reel 4 document 14]

83. March 10, 1750 [164]  
Notification by John Carruthers, at London, attorney for Benjamin Whitaker, Chief Justice of South Carolina, stating that since Whitaker's approved leave of absence for health reasons was expiring, and since Whitaker's health had not improved, Whitaker was resigning his commission as Chief Justice
84. December 14, 1749 [166, second side]  
Copy of itemized account of expenses for public services from the magazine at Fort Frederica, Georgia between June 25, 1747 and February 24, 1748, with a total value of £5,142.17.8¼; copy dated December 5, 1749; including certification that these expenses result from provisions made by Georgia's Trustees, at the establishment of this British colony, to repay debts; signed by six individuals [when a regiment stationed at Fort Frederica was discharged, the remaining provisions and other goods were sold to pay for the incurred debts]  
[Note: Documents 84 to 87 appear to relate to Georgia rather than South Carolina. However, they appear to relate to the British joint operation to provide presents to villages of several Indian Nations living adjacent to the frontier territory of both colonies and in particular to the settlement of debts for expenses to protect settlers on the frontier.]
85. March 8, 1749 [169, second side]  
Copy of itemized account of expenses for public services from the magazine at Fort Frederica, Georgia between February 25, 1748 and May 29, 1749, with a total value of £4,886.19.5¼; copy dated March 8, 1749
86. February 9, 1750 [171, second side]  
List of debts outstanding and due from the Fort Frederica magazine between February 26, 1748 to May 29, 1749, including 26 debts reported by name of the person owed, identity of the person explaining the debt, and the amount of the debt, with a total debt value of £189.19.12; signed by four individuals and attested to by three individuals
87. March 8, 1750 [172]  
Record of meeting of the Council established by the Trustees of the colony of Georgia, whose president was William Stephens, concerning payment for frontier expenses between June 25, 1747 and September 25, 1748 totaling £2,154.15.8½, including report on the authority for this payment; stating that the full cost for frontier expenses was larger than the reported amount; stating that the Council had sought to ascertain an accurate accounting of full expenses, including accounts of the Fort Frederica magazine money used to pay debts [documents 84 to 86]; concluding that some debts in the accounts had not been paid; concluding that missing information needed to be obtained by talking to certain people from Fort Frederica and South Carolina; copy dated April 5, 1750  
"In the Council Room"

**[Note: William Stephens** (1671-1753) came to Georgia in 1736 as a surveyor. Having become friends with James Oglethorpe, the Georgia Trustees (in England) named him Secretary of Georgia to keep them informed on progress in the colony. By 1742 he was named President of the Georgia colony, during the time when Oglethorpe was preoccupied with military hostilities with the Spanish in Florida. Stephens held the position of President until he resigned in 1750, evidently after March 8. He retired to a plantation on the Savannah River, where he died in 1753.]

88. [no date] [177]  
Account of distribution of presents to Indians contiguous to Georgia and South Carolina between August 17 and December 21, 1749 by agents William Stephens [for Georgia, who seems to have held multiple titles] and Abraham Bosomworth [for South Carolina], including separate itemized lists of presents to particular villages, most of them apparently of the Lower Creek Nation
89. [no date] [188]  
Account of distribution of presents to Indians contiguous to Georgia and South Carolina between May 27, 1749 and February 24, 1750 by commissary John Dart and agent Abraham Bosomworth, including separate itemized lists of presents to particular villages of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Creek Indian Nations, many of the presents delivered via Charleston
90. September 18, 1750 [193]  
Letter from Abraham Bosomworth at London to R. N. Aldworth, concerning a memorial he had submitted to the Secretary of State seeking a stipend for services he was providing to the government as an agent in South Carolina, services he describes  
**[Note: Richard Neville Aldworth** (1717-1793) was a political ally of the Duke of Bedford. In 1748 Bedford named him to be an Undersecretary of State for the Southern Department, under Bedford's direction. Aldworth served in this position until Bedford was replaced as Secretary of State in July 1751.]
91. [no date] [195]  
Memorial of Abraham Bosomworth to Secretary of State Bedford, describing his services delivering presents to Indian villages, claiming great "*Expenses and Trouble*", and seeking reimbursement and a stipend going forward
92. May 23, 1750 [197]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina certifying that Abraham Bosomworth was officially appointed agent for the province for distribution of presents to the Indians
93. [no date] [199]  
Instructions from Glen to Abraham Bosomworth for his assignment as agent for the distribution of presents to the Indians

94. May 21, 1750 [201]  
Letter from George Saxby at Charleston to Abraham Bosomworth announcing his intent to go to London, seeking a "salary" of £250, which he hopes can be paid out of quit rents
95. June 9, 1748 [203]  
Copy of letter from Bedford at Whitehall to Glen, stating his desire that Glen should appoint Bosomworth to be agent for the distribution of presents to the Indians
96. July 15, 1750 [205]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, taking credit for successfully negotiating peace between the Creek and Choctaw Indians, in which presents for the Indians played a major role; expressing ongoing concern for protection of settlers through forts in Indian territories and a regiment of troops, with details, including recommended pay for the various ranks of soldiers in the regiment, totaling £1,860 per year, but stating that Bedford should not worry about paying out money for the regiment because it can be supported with some of the money in the Indian presents account [extracts of similar letter with same date to Board of Trade in Reel 4 document 6]
97. October 2, 1750 [213]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, stating having learned of the approval of James Grame as Chief Justice of South Carolina; hoping that French influences around South Carolina had been rooted out, but still wary because of unrest among the Indians and lack of needed intelligence to understand their activities, with details of how he was seeking to deal with Indian relations [extract of similar letter with same date to Board of Trade in Reel 4 document 60]
98. November 10, 1750 [221]  
Letter from Abraham Bosomworth to Bedford, troubling him again with his memorial to cover his expenses as agent for South Carolina
99. [no date] [223]  
Memorial of Abraham Bosomworth to Bedford, asking for ongoing support for his work of delivering presents to the Indians
100. November 19, 1750 [225]  
Letter from Harman Verelst at Queen Square, Westminster, to Aldworth, seeking his help in obtaining approval for payment of expenses related to the purchase and distribution of presents to the Indians
101. December 11, 1750 [227]  
Letter from James Crockatt at College Hill [London] to Bedford, concerning his distress over money owed him totaling £1,338.7.7 [with enclosures, documents 102, 103]

102. [no date] [229]  
Petition from Crockatt, London merchant, seeking payment of money owed from the government for military salaries paid privately by Crockatt, due to be paid back by Thomas Marriott, but never paid [enclosed with Crockatt's December 11, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 101]
103. [no date] [230]  
Account of money owed by Thomas Marriott to Crockatt [enclosed with Crockatt's December 11, 1750 letter to Bedford, document 101]
104. December 14, 1750 [231]  
Letter from Harman Verelst and Jermyn Wright to Aldworth, informing him that they were "*adrift*" from doing anything productive for the Indian presents project because it would be contrary to the current warrant from the Treasury; hoping for some assistance from the Secretary of State but having heard nothing
105. December 17, 1750 [233]  
Letter from Crockatt at College Hill to Aldworth, complaining that Verelst and Wright had not seen fit to deal with him [Crockatt]; claiming that these difficulties were delaying the filling and sailing of two vessels with Indian presents for South Carolina and Georgia
106. [no date] [235]  
Copy to Bedford of Account from Glen to Board of Trade of the boundaries of South Carolina and of encroachment by "*subjects of foreign Princes*" within these boundaries [cover page only; account itself is in document 107]
107. February [?], 1751 [236]  
Copy of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, concerning Board's request for information about the boundaries of South Carolina and any encroachments on those boundaries; stating that he felt the request was impossible to document but that he was responding anyway, stating that the account "*will not be so perfect as I could wish*"; recounting history of the beginnings of settlement by French, Spanish, and English in North America, including early contention between the French and Spanish for what became Spanish Florida in the 1560s and French fur trading and "quasi" settlement; describing England's later arrival in the mid-1600s, occupying lands that may previously have been French or Spanish but had been abandoned by them; English settlement including, what became the royal colony of South Carolina by the early 1700s; claiming that the British had established friendly relations with the surrounding Indian Nations, although the French did not do so; suggesting that indeed places such as Mobile, Alabama, Tombee Bay [Mobile Bay, the confluence of the Tombigbee and Alabama Rivers] in the Choctaw Nation, and New Orleans, occupied by the French, properly belong within the British boundaries;

similarly, St. Marks and Pensacola in Florida, occupied by the Spanish, properly belong within British boundaries; suggesting that if all these places were under British control, keeping the friendship of the Indian Nations would be much easier; describing other places where French or Spanish settlement had been contrary to established treaties, going back to the 1600s and even late 1500s

108. [no date] [257]  
Copy of statement to Glen of services provided by Abraham Bosomworth to "*General Oglethorpe's late Regiment of Foot*", including being employed in 1743 at the magazine at Frederica and in helping entice the Indians to do violence against Indians friendly to the French; in 1747, he was involved in actions against Indians friendly to the French and other similar activities in both South Carolina and Georgia; now seeking compensation for his services
109. June 23, 1751 [259]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to Bedford, concerning Spanish privateering against British shipping, especially in North Carolina, with details [difficult to read because of writing with heavy ink on two sides] [Glen could not have known on June 23 in Charleston that five days earlier, Bedford had been replaced in London as Secretary of State for the Southern Department.]
110. December 31, 1751 [263]  
Letter from Glen at South Carolina to the Earl of Holderness, welcoming the new Secretary of State for the Southern Department  
[**Note: John Darcy, 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Holderness**, replaced the Duke of Bedford as Secretary of State for the Southern Department on June 18, 1751. He remained in office until March 23, 1754, and returned to serve in the same position briefly in 1757.]

**Note: A significant gap exists in microfilmed correspondence between Volume 389 and Volume 390 dates from December 31, 1751 to November 3, 1762.**

During this eleven-year period, the colony of South Carolina experienced much and went through numerous changes. For instance, several changes of governor occurred:

James Glen	December 1743 to June 1756
William Henry Lyttelton	June 1756 to April 1760
Thomas Pownall	(appointed in 1760 but never served)
William Bull II	April 1760 to December 1761 (acting)
Thomas Boone	December 1761 to May 1764

Several changes also occurred in Secretary of State for the Southern Department:	
John Russell, 4 <sup>th</sup> Duke of Bedford	February 1748 to June 1751
Robert Darcy, 4 <sup>th</sup> Earl of Holderness	June 1751 to March 1754
Thomas Robinson	March to October 1754
Henry Fox	November 1754 to November 1756
William Pitt (Elder)	December 1756 to April 1757
Robert Darcy, 4 <sup>th</sup> Earl of Holderness	April to June 1757
William Pitt (Elder)	June 1757 to October 1761
Charles Wyndham, 2nd Earl of Egremont	October 1761 to August 1763

Reel 4 contains some Secretary of State incoming correspondence from the gap years in Reel 5. Reel 4 is a rather unorganized collection of Secretary of State incoming correspondence, which itself contains gaps, suggesting that a complete set of incoming Secretary correspondence cannot be pieced together:

Gap documents found in Reel 4 Volume 385 are as follows:

- documents dated in 1751 (1 to 3, 45, 59)
- documents dated in 1753, 1752 (46 to 54, 57, 61)

Gap documents found in Reel 4 Volume 386 are as follows:

- documents dated in 1760, 1761 (65 to 71)
- documents dated from 1753 to 1760 (84 to 139)  
(with gaps from Dec. 1756 to Dec. 1757  
and from Dec. 1757 to May 1759)

Reel 1 contains a more even (but not necessarily full) array of correspondence incoming to the Board of Trade through the entire gap period in Reel 5's Secretary of State incoming correspondence. Reel 1's 194 documents in Volumes 376 and 377 are dated between 1756 and 1764. So, from a Board of Trade perspective, the portion of the gap between 1756 and 1762 may to some extent be filled. Volumes 372 through 375 of the Board of Trade incoming correspondence cover the years from 1748 to 1757, and thus the remainder of the Secretary of State gap. However, these Volumes are not included in the DLAR's collection of microfilmed documents from CO5, the British Colonial Office Papers of South Carolina.

Reels 10, 11, and 12 contain abstracts pertaining to Commissions, Instructions, Etc. for South Carolina governors and government with dates from 1720 to 1775. However the DLAR microfilm collection does not include Volumes 402 and 403, with documents dated from 1739 to 1760. So it does not help much to fill the 1751 to 1762 gap in the Secretary of State incoming correspondence, except in 1761.

Reel 12 contains abstracts of mostly official correspondence from the Board of Trade and to and from the Secretary of State. Volume 406 contains outgoing Board of Trade abstracts from 1721 to 1756. Volumes 407, 408 contain Secretary of State outgoing abstracted correspondence from 1766 to 1782, and Volumes 409, 410 incoming abstracted correspondence from 1766 to 1781.

These also do not help much to fill the 1751 to 1762 gap in Secretary of State incoming correspondence. Even if the dates were more helpful, these “abstracts” would not be of much help in filling the gap, because, until the mid-1760s, they consisted of summaries rather than transcripts.

## **Volume 390—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue**

November 3, 1762 to October 8, 1767      Documents 111 to 187      [Frames 1 to 231]

**Note:** The DLAR’s microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. For coverage and content in Reels 3 (Volume 382) and Reel 4 (Volumes 385 and 386) (a set of Secretary of State incoming correspondence from 1699 to 1760, with outlier documents to 1775, not well organized and with many gaps), see notes after each of the above Volumes. For the beginning of a new set of Secretary of State incoming correspondence beginning with Volume 389 in Reel 5, see note at the beginning of Volume 389. This new set is better organized chronologically and fairly free of gaps, with a notable exception. This set of correspondence begins in 1715 (although the DLAR’s microfilmed collection does not include Volumes 387 and 388 with correspondence from 1715 to 1746). Volume 389 (the earliest microfilmed documents in this new set) contains correspondence from January 1747 to December 1751. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Volume 390 follows with correspondence dated from 1762 to 1767, with a lengthy gap between the two Volumes. Possibly one or more archived Volumes were lost for some reason, creating this gap. (See note on this significant gap at the end of Volume 389.)

**Note:** During the years of Volume 390’s official correspondence, top colonial officials, especially secretaries of state and colonial governors, began to establish practices of numbering their official letters to each other. For an overall analysis of letter numbering in the South Carolina Colonial Papers, see the section on this subject in the **Introduction**. Until about 1766, official correspondence between colonial governors in America and the Board of Trade and Secretary of State in London had not been organized by letter number (or carefully distinguished among original letters, copies, and duplicates). Secretary of State for the Southern Department the Earl of Shelburne apparently initiated the concept of numbered letters. Near the end of Reel 5 and early in Reel 6 (Volumes 390 and 391), numbered letters first appear in the microfilmed Secretary of State incoming correspondence.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

111. November 11, 1762 [1]  
Letter from Governor of South Carolina Thomas Boone at Charleston to Secretary of State for the Southern Department the Earl of Egremont, reporting just having concluded a treaty with the Cherokee Indian Nation [with enclosure, document 112]  
[**Note: Charles Wyndham, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Egremont** (1710-1763), served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from October 9, 1761 to August 21, 1763.]
112. November 3, 1762 [3]  
Talk by Boone and Judd's Friend, headman of the Cherokee Nation, at Charleston, sharing friendship and talking about Judd's Friend's trip to England, during which the headman's interpreter had unfortunately died; agreeing that a great friendship now exists between the Cherokee and British; Boone reporting on only one instance of Indian violence against British people [enclosed with Boone's November 11, 1762 letter to Egremont, document 111]  
[**Note: Judd's Friend** (or Judge's Friend) was the English name given to a leading Cherokee warrior whose real name was written by the British as Osteneco or Oconostata. See note after Reel 4 document 102.]  
[**Note:** During the latter period of the gap in documents, between 1759 and 1761, South Carolina was heavily involved in a brutal war known as the **Anglo-Cherokee War**. Despite the Secretary of State gap, documentation of the war is found in the Board of Trade incoming correspondence in Reel 1. The war was fought in three phases, each concluding with a treaty:  
Phase 1: In late fall 1759, Governor William Henry Lyttelton of South Carolina personally led an "army" of militia against the Cherokee, doing considerable damage to the Cherokee and ending with a treaty imposed by the British signed on December 26, 1759. Lyttelton, declaring victory, departed for England in April 1760, leaving Lieutenant Governor William Bull II in charge of South Carolina. (see Reel 1 documents 40 through 71; copies of the treaty are in Reel 1 document 68 and Reel 4 document 130)  
Phase 2: The Cherokee resented the imposed treaty; the British complained that the Cherokee had broken the treaty, and the British Army sent in a regular army regiment under Colonel Archibald Montgomerie which attempted, in summer and fall 1760, to do the job right, but in fact did only an incomplete job before abruptly leaving South Carolina. Another treaty of sorts was signed in October 1760. (see Reel 1 documents 82 to 98)  
Phase 3: This time South Carolinians knew they had failed in their goal to reduce the Cherokees to submission. In January 1761, Colonel James Grant arrived with a larger force of regular army troops and a higher level of determination to be brutal. He carried out his intentions, crushing the Cherokee militarily and economically.]

By September, the desperate Cherokee sued for peace and accepted a humiliating and subduing treaty, which remained in force until 1776. (see Reel 1 documents 104 to 120; document 120 is a copy of the harsh preliminary treaty Grant imposed on the Cherokee, ending the war)

On December 22, 1761, after the fighting was over, newly arrived Governor Thomas Boone began the task of re-establishing peacetime relations with the Cherokee. Osteneco/Judd's Friend was a Cherokee leader, who, along with Attakullakulla/Little Carpenter, were willing to work in peaceful friendship with the British.]

113. November 27, 1762 [6]  
Letter from Peter Blake to Egremont, describing his traveling with the Cherokee Indians who went to visit England and back
114. March 8, 1763 [8]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Egremont, concerning the end of hostilities in Europe and signing of a preliminary treaty [signed in February 1763, signaling the end of the Seven Years War (in Europe) and French and Indian War (in America)]
115. April 21, 1763 [10]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Egremont, concerning a Frenchman, prisoner of the British, who sought to stir up disturbances against the British in Charleston
116. June 1, 1763 [12]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Egremont, stating his readiness to follow the King's order for the Governors of Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia plus the Superintendent of Indian Affairs should convene a meeting of headmen of the Catawba, Cherokee, Creek, Chickasaw, and Choctaw Indian tribes; stating his intent to call the meeting at Augusta or another "neutral" location
117. September 17, 1763 [14]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Egremont, concerning receipt of a royal proclamation [about signing of the peace treaty ending the Seven Years' War?] to be announced and observed in all the colonies  
[Note: Boone was not yet aware that Egremont had been replaced on September 9, 1763 by **George Montagu-Dunk, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Halifax** (1716-1771). Dunk Halifax, as he signed his name, had served as First Lord of the Board of Trade between 1748 and 1761; he served as Secretary of State for the Southern Department until July 10, 1765.]

118. November 23, 1763 [16]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to the Secretary of State concerning a new act of Parliament intended to raise revenue through customs duties and trade restrictions on coastal trading, to be enforced by laws in each colony; Boone raising points concerning what approach might work best, with details [with enclosure, document 119]
119. [no date] [20]  
Copy of title and preamble of "*An [South Carolina] Act to regulate the Coasting Trade*", authorizing the Governor to appoint officers to enforce the law and to prevent fraud; meant to be consistent with Parliament's act [enclosed with Boone's November 23, 1763 letter to the Secretary of State, document 118]
120. November 24, 1763 [22]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to the Secretary of State, stating that the South Carolina law Boone proposed and got passed would not allow direct trading with the Cherokee, although the Cherokee had specifically requested such trading; stating that he does not want to revoke or revise the act, which is working well to keep the peace with the Cherokee [with enclosure, document 121] [extract of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 176]
121. [no date] [24]  
"*A Rough Sketch of a Plan for the management of Indians in General & the Conducting of the necessary Commerce with them Upon the principles of Justice towards them and security for the Colonials*", beginning with the premise that "*neither the Indian traders nor Indians can be at all depended on*" and his observations of both as evidence; proposing a law, either by Parliament or the same in each colony, to regulate and control trade with the Indians through public policy and interaction with the Indians; including other specific recommendations for controlling trade and protecting settlers with garrisons in the frontier; recommending that both conferences [talks] with Indians and presents to them be abolished, because they were shams that did not change behaviors [enclosed with Boone's November 24, 1763 letter to Secretary of State, document 120] [copy of this sketch in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 document 175]
122. December 7, 1763 [29]  
Letter from Boone at Charleston to Secretary of State, conveying journals of the "*Congress*" with the Indians at Augusta; meanwhile, reporting new hostilities in the area of western Florida

123. February 11, 1764 [32]  
Copy of letter from Dunk Halifax, [new Secretary of State for the Southern Department] at St. James's [a residential neighborhood in central Westminster] to Boone, informing him that the journals of the Augusta Conference and Boone's plan to manage the Indians had been received, were being shared with the Board of Trade, and would be considered, as policy on Indian commerce was being developed by the British government; granting permission for two Cherokee Indians, Attakullakulla and Oconostata to visit England [see note after document 117 for more on the new Secretary of State, who, unknown to Boone in Charleston, had been in office since September 9, 1763 and continued in office until July 10, 1765]  
[Note: Dunk Halifax, or formally, **George Montagu-Dunk, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Halifax** (1716-1771), replaced the Earl of Egremont as Secretary of State for the Southern Department on September 9, 1763, serving until July 10, 1765.]  
[Note: Interestingly, Halifax chose to use the Indian version of these warrior/chiefs' names (transliterated into the Latin alphabet in various ways). More often, the colonial British invented and used English names for them and to their faces—Attakullakulla was known as Little Carpenter (see note after Reel 1 document 19). Oconostata was Judd's Friend (see note after Reel 5 document 112.)]  
[Note: Some unexplained anomalies appear between this document 123 dated in February 1764 and documents 112 and 113 dated in November 1762. The 1762 documents describe a visit by these two Cherokee Indians soon after the end of the Anglo-Cherokee War (see note after document 112), which seems to have been part of a strategy by Secretary of State Egremont and South Carolina Governor Boone to mend the tattered relationship between the Cherokee and British Nations. Document 123 describes an effort to organize another visit to London with the same two Cherokees, which new secretary of State for the Southern Department Halifax had just approved and Boone would have implemented except that in June he was recalled and replaced as Governor.]
124. June 9, 1764 [34]  
Copy of [outgoing] letter from Halifax at St. James's to Boone, ordering Boone home to England "*as soon as conveniently may be, to give an Account of the State of Your Government*" and stating that "*upon your departure from South Carolina, the Administration will devolve upon William Bull*", the Lieutenant Governor; requiring that Boone leave with Bull his Commission, royal Instructions, and other papers pertaining to the governorship
125. June 9, 1764 [36]  
Copy of [outgoing] letter from Halifax at St. James's to William Bull II, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, informing him that he would be governing South Carolina in Boone's absence with full powers of a governor [without the title]; directing Bull to make plans and seek funding from the South Carolina Assembly to repair and supply the forts in the colony with garrisons of British soldiers

[**Note:** During Boone's term as South Carolina Governor, **William Bull II** had served loyally in his position as **Lieutenant Governor**, a position he held continuously from 1759 to 1775. While never leaving this position, he five times served as **acting governor** between terms of Governors. From April 4, 1760 to December 22, 1761, he had acted as Governor between Governors Lyttelton and Boone. Now, from May 11, 1764 to June 17, 1766, he once again acted as Governor between Governors Boone and Charles Greville Montagu (the period during which the constitutional crisis over the Stamp Act developed and began playing itself out). For more on Bull, see notes after documents 1, 39, 71.]

126. July 5, 1764 [38]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Halifax, pressing the need for assistance from the British government for protection of settlers in South Carolina and stating the difficulties of trying to obtain [Commander of British Forces in North America General [Thomas] Gage's attention and support for such assistance; stating, nevertheless, that the currently stationed rangers and militia were providing as good protection as their numbers allowed [Gage served as commander in chief in North America from 1763 to 1775]
127. July 26, 1764 [40]  
Letter from Captain Gavin Cochrane of the "*Royal Americans*" [Regiment and Commander of British forces in South Carolina] to Halifax, reminding Halifax of Cochrane's having previously submitted to him a treatise on the Indians of North America; expressing his anxiety at not having heard from Halifax that he had received and was using the treatise; stating his conviction that the contents of this treatise were true and valuable
128. September 13, 1764 [42]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Halifax, responding to Halifax' letter appointing Bull to administer South Carolina's government, stating that he would immediately meet with the South Carolina Assembly about supporting efforts to repair and supply the forts; reporting that already he had gained Assembly support to repair Fort Prince George [on the South Carolina frontier near the Lower Towns of the Cherokee Nation] but not for Fort Moore (on the frontier 20 miles northeast of Augusta, Georgia), which had also been requested, with the Assembly claiming it was unnecessary; reporting that the Assembly had claimed it was not responsible for the costs of transporting supplies to the forts; stating he would continue to cooperate with Captain Cochrane on defense matters
129. November 14, 1764 [44]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Halifax, forwarding as requested "*a List of all Instruments made use of in Public transactions, Law proceedings, Grants, conveyances, Securities of Law or Money within this Province*" including explanations, since, they being "*peculiar to this Province cannot be generally understood so well as those which are of common Use in England*";

noting that “*several Articles which are Subject to the Stamp Duty in England are omitted here as not being included in your Lordships Description*” of what to include [scrivener’s note “*copy sent to the Treasury*”] [with enclosure, document 130]

130. November 14, 1764 [46]  
“*List of all Instruments made use of in Public Transactions, Law Proceedings Grants, Conveyances, & Securities of Land & Money in the Province of South Carolina*”. Organized alphabetically under 64 categories, many with more specific designations of particular instruments; signed by Bull [enclosed with Bull’s November 14, 1764 letter to Halifax, document 129]
131. November 28, 1764 [48]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Halifax, reporting at Halifax’ request that a thorough investigation revealed “*few Suspicions, & fewer Instances of Persons having carried on [fraudulent trade] here*”; with details of the kinds of fraud to a void customs duties that used to occur, but maintaining that little of that still occurred; stating his confidence in the honesty of the customs officers in South Carolina
132. December 1, 1764 [52]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Halifax, concerning a complaint from the Spanish Ambassador in London about violence against Spanish interests by English “*Pirates or Privateers in the West Indies*”; reporting that his inquiry was not able to identify any possible British pirates in this area
133. March 28, 1765 [54]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Halifax, reporting the loss of the Grenville Packet on shoals in the Florida Straits between Pensacola and Havana [similar letter with same date to Board of Trade in Reel 2 document 22]
134. June 20, 1765 [56]  
Draft of [outgoing] Letter from Halifax to Board of Trade, forwarding letters from General Gage and Lieutenant Governor Bull concerning a charge of £1,000 in Carolina Currency from Samuel Wyley for surveying a tract of land for the Catawba Indians, as ordered by the four colonial governors who attended the recent Congress at Augusta; requesting that the Board of Trade consider whether South Carolina should be responsible for paying this expense [identified by a scrivener or archivist as a Letter of Reference and assigned a No. 7; no other such numbering is found in these microfilmed documents, and no explanation has been found of its meaning.] [see note about scrivener and archivist (or perhaps author) document numbering after Reel 1 document 141]

135. March 1, 1765 [58]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Halifax, reporting that the South Carolina Assembly had deferred decisions on financing for bridges until the King's directions on this had been clarified; new post office regulations were also causing complaints
136. August 10, 1765 [60]  
Letter [outgoing] from [Secretary of State] H. S. Conway at St. James's to Bull, urging Bull "*to a continuance of Your Conduct in keeping things quiet in your Province, and attending to those objects which have been recommended to You*"  
[Note: **Henry Seymour Conway** replaced Dunk Halifax as Secretary of State for the Southern Department on July 12, 1765. He was a commoner member of Parliament, who served in this office for less than a year, until May 23, 1766.]
137. September 8, 1765 [62]  
Letter from Bull to Halifax, stating that he would implement the policy received, that British troops stationed in each colony would be commanded from that colony; reporting that Fort Prince George had been fully repaired to like new, that Fort Charlotte was now being constructed of stone, and that troops and cannon were being moved there from Fort Moore; reporting having found no illicit trade being practiced in South Carolina [Bull didn't learn that Halifax had been replaced by Conway as Secretary of State for the Southern Department until sometime before December 17, 1765] [see differing letter with same date by Bull to Board of Trade in Reel 2 document 9]
138. December 17, 1765 [64]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Conway, pledging to work with the new Secretary of State and reporting on what Bull assumed Conway already knew about, "*the general opposition with hath been shown in America against the operation of the Stamp Act all the Ports are shut up as no Vessel can be cleared without a Stampd Paper*", indicating that South Carolina was attempting to observe the law, but indicating also that if the ports were closed for long, British troops in the colonies of East and West Florida, Bermuda, and New Providence [Bahamas] would be subjected to "*the danger of Famine*"; reporting that Bull had ordered allowing certain vessels at Charleston shipping supplies to British naval vessels to be cleared as long as it was certified "*that no stamp papers are distributed here*" [different letter with same date from Bull to Board of Trade in Reel 2 document 13]
139. February 6, 1766 [66]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Conway, reporting having approved clearance of another vessel at Charleston carrying provisions to the new British colony at Pensacola [British West Florida] and was considering a request from St. Augustine [British East Florida] for similar clearance;

[the two British colonies of East and West Florida had been created from the colony of Spanish Florida after Britain won and Spain (and France) lost the Seven Years War, the French and Indian War in North America, in 1763]; reporting arrival at Charleston of Colonel Peter Randolph, Surveyor General of Customs in Virginia, who had been encouraging customs officers to clear vessels even if a port's customs officers had refused to issue Stamp Papers; reporting that this policy was being followed also in all the colonies northeast of Virginia; stating that because of all the pressure on him not to enforce the Stamp Act, *"I have been induced to grant a Certificate to such Captains of Ships as request it, that the Distributor of Stamps for this Province having signified to me by letter that He determined to adhere to his Public Declaration not to issue any, /until the sense of the Parliament is known on the American Petition/ & that accordingly He will not issue any, No Stamp Papers are now to be had in the Province"*; stating that he intended to collect [lesser] fees on the Certificates to raise some revenue for the King; stating his opinion that public opinion would not allow full enforcement of the Stamp Act

140. May 8, 1766 [68]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Conway, responding to the Treasury's admonition to the colonies [protesting the Stamp Act] to take all possible steps to enforce the King's trade policies, which Bull agreed to try to do
141. May 9, 1766 [70]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Conway, reporting joy in South Carolina following receipt of word that the Stamp Act had been repealed; reporting having announced and implemented the new policies, despite being daily in expectation of the arrival of a new governor for South Carolina, Charles Montagu [who actually arrived on June 17, 1766]  
**[Note:** Shortly after the date of this letter, Conway was replaced, as Secretary of State for the Southern Department on May 23, 1766, by **Charles Lennox, 3<sup>rd</sup> Duke of Richmond**. He didn't last long, though, being replaced on July 30, 1766 by **the Earl of Shelburne**.]
142. July 17, 1766 [72]  
Letter from Grey Cooper at Treasury Chambers to Richard Stonehewer [evidently employee in Secretary of State office] sending to Richmond a copy of a report from the Board of Trade concerning a memorial from former South Carolina Governor Glen relating to requested reimbursement for expenses incurred by him personally as a part of the Congress with the Cherokee Indians in 1755 [with enclosures, documents 143 to 148] [for more on Glen's efforts to be reimbursed for personal expenses related to his diplomacy with the Cherokee Indians, see Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 1 documents 124 to 126]  
**[Note:** Richmond served only briefly as Secretary of State for the Southern Department, from May 23 until July 29, 1766.]

[**Note:** In May and June 1755, Governor Glen had traveled to a place selected for conferences (or Congress) between the British and Cherokee Nation. The site, then called Saluda Old Town, was calculated to be more or less half way between Charleston and the Lower Cherokee Indian town of Keowee and was thought to be about 200 miles from Charleston. The conferences (Talks) took place in June, and the resulting treaty, signed on July 2, 1755, was called the Treaty of Saluda Old Town (or Treaty of Saluda). Glen apparently paid personally for many expenses, including travel costs, accommodations costs for 500 or more Indians, and the cost of presents for the Indians.]

143. May 27, 1762 [74]  
Copy of letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Commissioners of the Treasury, concerning Glen's request for reimbursement for £584 in expenses incurred personally by him during the Cherokee Indian Congress, explaining the details of the situation and Glen's repeated attempts to obtain reimbursement; how the amount requested was subsequently increased to £1,084 but was not approved and that now he was willing to settle for £584; the Board of Trade now concurring with the position of the South Carolina Assembly that the Crown should reimburse Glen for the £584 in expenses [enclosed with Cooper's July 17, 1766 letter to Stonehower, document 142] [transcript of this letter is in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 11 document 30]
144. April 14, 1756 [78]  
Extract of letter from Glen to Board of Trade, stating that he had sought to obtain South Carolina Assembly approval to reimburse him for his expenses at the Congress with Cherokee Indians; explaining the nature of these expenses in detail; seeking British government assistance in paying for these expenses [with enclosures, probably documents 145 to 148] [enclosed with Cooper's July 17, 1766 letter to Stonehower, document 142] [also found in Board of Trade abstracts of incoming documents, Reel 10 Volume 406 Frame 49]
145. May 20, 1755 [83]  
Copy of Address of Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly to the King, which was a tribute to the leadership of Governor Glen [enclosed with Glen's April 14, 1756 letter to Board of Trade [document 144] [enclosed also with Cooper's July 17, 1766 letter to Stonehower, document 142]
146. [no date] [84]  
Copy of statement by headmen of the Cherokee Nation, describing a series of conferences they had had with Governor Glen "*in the woods about 200 miles from Charles Town*" [at a place called Saluda]; quoting a talk by designated Cherokee spokesman, Cherlalk Herlalk [? identity not found], and describing other ceremonies during the conferences, during which the Cherokee gave certain lands to the South Carolina Governor; denouncing friendship with the French and pledging to support the British and to help fight their wars;

- Glen having responded with a speech of his own [probably enclosed with Glen's April 14, 1756 letter to Board of Trade, document 144] [enclosed with Cooper's July 17, 1766 letter to Stonehower, document 142]
147. March 20, 1756 [88]  
 [Extract of minutes of Commons House of South Carolina Assembly], containing message from Glen to Common House, written at Council Chambers on March 19, 1756, reminding them that before traveling to meet with the Cherokee Indians in 1755, he had told the House that he would incur certain expenses, which the Council and Assembly both supported; the message having been read, the matter, with additional documents, was referred to a committee of Commons House [probably enclosed with Glen's April 14, 1756 letter to Board of Trade, document 144] [enclosed with Cooper's July 17, 1766 letter to Stonehower, document 142]
148. March 22, 1757 [more logically 1756 but clearly dated 1757] [90]  
 [Extract of minutes of Commons House of South Carolina Assembly], containing report from committee which had considered Glen's message of March 19, 1756 and in particular his purchase from John McQueen of presents for the Cherokee; being of the opinion that previous obligations to pay for presents totaling over £2,000 should be honored, and, then, if funding remains, Commons House can do what it wishes with it [probably enclosed with Glen's / letter to Board of Trade, document 144] [enclosed with Cooper's July 17, 1766 letter to Stonehower, document 142]
149. June 29, 1766 [92]  
 Copy of letter from [newly arrived Governor] Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, concerning the issue of paying for the unpaid salary of South Carolina Governor Boone [with enclosure, document 150] [on Montagu's arrival, see note after document 141] [Identified as "*No. 16. in the Board of Trade's, of the 3<sup>d</sup> Sept<sup>r</sup> 1766.*"] [original letter in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 43; on the issue of Boone's salary, see also Reel 2 documents 7, 8, 44 and Reel 3 documents 122 to 124] [see note about scrivener and archivist (or perhaps author) document numbering after Reel 1 document 141]  
**[Note: William Petty, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Shelburne** (1737-1805) replaced short timer the Duke of Richmond as Secretary of State for the Southern Department on July 30, 1766, just a month after this letter and just six weeks after Governor Charles Greville Montagu had arrived in Charleston to begin serving his time as South Carolina's colonial Governor. During his time as Secretary of State, which lasted until October 20, 1768, Shelburne instituted both organizational and policy-oriented reforms. Administratively, he began a routine of numbering official outgoing correspondence and asked each colonial governor to number the official letters they sent to him. The numbers 16 and 17 assigned to documents 149 and 150 might be part of an early effort in the Board of Trade to number letters.

Before becoming Secretary of State, Shelburne had been First Lord of the Board of Trade since 1763. He also exerted considerable influence over British colonial policy during his time as Secretary of State, leading toward an organizational overhaul in 1768 in how British government dealt with colonial policy.]

150. [no date] [94]  
“*Copy of the Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Assembly in the Province of South Carolina on the late Governor Boone’s Salary*”, concluding that the Assembly had acted “*justly & wisely in withholding the Annual Allowance of Mr. Boone*”, whom they blamed for acting “*arbitrarily and illegally*” as Governor; yet recommending that that salary be paid up until the day Boone left South Carolina [May 11, 1764]; adding that Commons House would “*doubtless insert a proper sum*” for the current Governor and for contingencies in this year’s Estimate for South Carolina [enclosed with Montagu’s June 29, 1766 letter to Board of Trade, document 149] [Identified as “*No . 17. in the Lords of Trade’s, of the 3<sup>d</sup> Sept’ 1766*” [see note after document 149] [extract from this report is in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 44; on the issue of Boone’s salary, see also Reel 2 documents 7, 8, 43 and Reel 3 documents 122 to 124]
151. [no date] [96]  
Copy of “*Observations by Charles Skinner Esq<sup>r</sup>, Chief Justice of South Carolina*”, a document with three numbered sections, concerning the newly appointed Chief Justice of South Carolina’s request for information about the position’s powers to appoint other officers of the court, a matter that had been referred to John Pownall, Secretary to the Board of Trade, who had responded that all court officials except for the Provost Marshal were appointed by the Chief Justice; now, a new issue had arisen between Clerk of the South Carolina Court Dougal Campbell and the Chief Justice; the former claiming some independence but the latter denying it; expressing the belief that the Chief Justice needed a larger salary in order to defend himself and his position legally; stating also that more magistrates were needed, along with more funding to support them [identified as document No. 44]  
[**Note:** DLAR documents 151 to 159 (except for documents 156, 157) have been assigned numbers by a scrivener or archivist, beginning with “No. 44” for document 151 through “No. 50” for document 159. Five of these documents are also found in the Board of Trade correspondence, documents 65 to 69. The Board of Trade correspondence was numbered, but differently. Only certain official documents were numbered, and the numbering sequence began with a letter followed by a number—a separate letter for each Volume followed by a number in sequential order for each document (or set of documents) within the Volume. In Reel 2 Volume 378, documents were assigned the letter N. Within Reel 2, DLAR’s document 45 is the Board of Trade’s document N.40., a letter dated August 6, 1766 from South Carolina Governor Montagu to the Board of Trade. DLAR documents 46 to 63 are attachments to Montagu’s letter, all “packaged” as parts of Board of Trade’s document(s) N.41.]

In the Secretary of State incoming correspondence, DLAR's Reel 5 document 151 had been assigned "No. 44," which is "number 44," not the letter "N" followed by the number "44." Thus, besides the tantalizingly near-equivalency of numbers, the numbers assigned to Reel 5 documents 151 to 155, 158, 159 are not Board of Trade numbers, and therefore the reason for their sudden appearance, followed by their subsequent disappearance, remains unclear.]

**[Note:** In April and May 1766, **Chief Justice Charles Skinner** opposed a group of "**assistant justices**" in a major colonial power struggle, in which Skinner sought to maintain the integrity and authority of the position of Chief Justice to tightly control the colony's court system, while the assistant justices argued for a degree of local control and independence for the lower level judges in the system. This power struggle was intimately intertwined with a parallel power struggle between the Governor, South Carolina Council, the Chief Justice, and other top colonial officials against the Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly. Both of these were in turn intertwined with the dispute in South Carolina over adherence to and enforcement of the Stamp Act imposed by the British Parliament. Many documents in the microfilmed Board of Trade correspondence illuminate these struggles and dispute in some detail, especially in Reel 2 documents 26 to 32, 45, 46, 48 to 69. Copies and similar documents are found in the Secretary of State incoming correspondence. See especially documents 151 to 162.

Skinner, who served as Chief Justice from 1762 until 1771, was evidently a strongly minded individual and a dominating jurist. He wrote several strongly worded documents seeking to establish a legal basis for his concepts of control over the colonial court system and to provide a political defense for his actions to exercise that control. See especially Reel 2 documents 31, 46, 51, and 65. Some of these documents appear also in the Secretary of State incoming correspondence. See especially documents 151, 153, and 162. Skinner's struggle continued into 1767. See Reel 2 documents 81, 84, 85 and Reel 5 documents 177 to 179 and 182 to 184. See also note about scrivener and archivist (or perhaps author) document numbering after Reel 1 document 141.]

152. September 19, 1766 [99]  
Copy of letter from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, conveying three acts approved by the Assembly; concerning the Chief Justice's request concerning "*his proceedings and the Assistant Judges*" [identified as document No. 45; see note after document 151] [copy in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 64]

153. [no date] [101]  
 Copy of "*Some further observations of the Chief Justice upon Matters that occurred in this Province since the 7<sup>th</sup> of August last*", when he delivered [to Lord Halifax in England] *a Book containing a narrative of Things, relative to the courts of Law* [in South Carolina]", concerning the dispute over the position of Clerk of the Court and the Assistant Judges and [Deputy] Provost Marshal Roger Pinckney and the operation of court process in South Carolina, with daily details in August after the 7<sup>th</sup> of the month [identified as document No. 46; see note after document 151]  
**Note:** The year of these observations would appear to be 1767. In neither year was Halifax Secretary of State for the Southern Department, so Skinner's purpose in sending his book on South Carolina's courts to Halifax is not clear from the microfilmed documents alone.]
154. September 15, 1766 [110]  
 Copy of sworn statement of James O'Brien, one of the attorneys of South Carolina's Court of Pleas who also was "*one of the Domesticks*" of Chief Justice Skinner concerning the matter between [Deputy] Provost Marshal Pinckney and Skinner, Pinckney having stated that he would not execute any papers with stamps required by the Stamp Act on them [identified as document No. 47; see note after document 151] [another copy in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 66]
155. September 15, 1766 [112]  
 Copy of statement by W[illiam] Oldham concerning the increasing opposition in South Carolina's legal system against Skinner's defense and enforcement of the Stamp Act, while Oldham remained a supporter of Skinner and enforcement of the Stamp Act; also mention of Benjamin Barons, whom Skinner had once trusted but now opposed [identified as document No. 48; see note after document 151] [copy in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 67; see also note about Benjamin Barons after document 67]
156. September 13, 1766 [115]  
 Copy of account by Skinner concerning "*Fees charged upon a writ of Enquiry Execut<sup>d</sup>*" in the case of Ward & Leger v. John Campbell, with judge and clerk fees plus extra fees with a net total of £49.9.2, from which the fee for Chief Justice and Clerk had been removed [copy in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 part of document 68]
157. [no date] [116]  
 Copy of account by Skinner concerning "*Bill on Writ Inquiry Enquiry Executed*" in the case of Robertson & Baillie v. Tacitus Gaillard, with judge and clerk fees plus other fees with a net total of £52.6.8, on which a tax was paid; identified as occurring during the Court's "*August Term 1760*" [copy in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 part of document 68]

158. [no date] [117]  
Copy of "*A List or Table of all Fees allowed to or taken by the Clerk*" from a requisition of William Bull dated at Council Chamber on December 11, 1764, including 23 itemized services and fee for each, with notes on the legal authority for each fee (mostly acts of 1698, 1736, and 1743) [identified as document No. 49; see note after document 151] [copy in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 part of document 68]
159. August 30, 1766 [120]  
Copy of letter from South Carolina Deputy Provost Marshal Roger Pinckney at Charleston to Board of Trade, seeking to refute Chief Justice Skinner's accusations against him at length and in detail; dated at the close of the letter September 2, 1766 [see document 160 for original letter] [identified as document No. 50; see note after document 151] [another copy in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 69; the original is in document 160]
160. August 30, 1766 [130]  
Letter from Roger Pinckney at Charleston to Board of Trade, the original of which document 159 is a copy
161. October 5, 1767 [140]  
Affidavit of James Donovan, keeper of the public jail at Charleston, concerning a wagoner who had been incarcerated in the Charleston jail, having been committed there by Chief Justice Skinner
162. [no date] [142]  
Statement by Skinner defending himself against the allegations in Donovan's affidavit, presented in 28 numbered points [second side of Frame 143 microfilmed twice]
163. August 12, 1766 [146]  
Cover page of memorial of John Hume, Storekeeper of Ordnance at Charleston, as conveyed by Montagu to the Secretary of State by South Carolina Governor Montagu [cover page only, with enclosures, documents 164, 165]  
**[Note:** When this memorial was sent, The Earl of Shelburne had just become Secretary of State for the Southern Department, and South Carolinians were justifiably confused as to who filled this position. H. S. Conway had left office in late May 1766, had been replaced briefly by the Duke of Richmond from May until July. He himself had then been replaced by Shelburne on July 30, 1766. Not until sometime in fall 1766 did word of Shelburne's appointment reach Charleston.]
164. January 18, 1765 [148]  
Extract of Journals of South Carolina Commons House, concerning a petition from John Hume, Storekeeper of Ordnance, that was read that day and assigned to a committee; followed by

March 13, 1765

Extract of Journals of Commons House, containing committee report on John Hume's petition, which recommended a "*gratuity*" of £500 but no salary compensation; Commons House approved this recommendation [both enclosed with Montagu's August 12, 1766 conveyance of John Hume's memorial, document 163]

165. [no date] [150]  
Memorial of John Hume, Storekeeper of Ordnance for South Carolina, to Secretary of State Henry Seymour Conway, seeking relief from lack of payments for services performed in South Carolina since 1760 [enclosed with Montagu's August 12, 1766 conveyance of John Hume's memorial, document 163]  
[Conway served as Secretary of State from July 1765 until May 1766]
166. November 23, 1766 [153]  
Petition from South Carolina Commons House to the King, concerning its plans to issue large sums of paper currency, which they state they need to stimulate trade; requesting that the King secure the Parliament's repeal of a law forbidding the issue of paper currency in the colonies and that the King accept a South Carolina law allowing the issuance by the colony of £50,000 worth of paper currency
167. October 25, 1766 [156]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 2 from Secretary of State Shelburne to South Carolina Governor Montagu, conveying the King's approval of the patriotic support of South Carolina inhabitants for the King and Great Britain, of the conduct of Lieutenant Governor Bull while he was serving as acting governor, and for South Carolina's support for Court Clerk Dougal Campbell by remitting the fine imposed on him by Commons House when he upheld enforcement of the Stamp Act; and for exercising a strong policy against Indian violence; suggesting that the governor send separate letters to the Secretary of State on different issues and that he numbered each letter [transcribed copy in abstracts of Secretary of State outgoing correspondence in Reel 12 Volume 407 document 4)  
**[Note:** See note after document 149 for more on the Earl of Shelburne's initiatives and influence as Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1766 until 1768, including his system of numbering both incoming and outgoing "official" Secretary of State correspondence. Shelburne might have written to Governor Montagu letters No. 1 through at least No. 9. However, only letters No. 2, No. 6, and No. 9 are found in Reel 5. The abstract letter book for this period of Secretary of State outgoing correspondence in Reel 12 Volume 407 contains complete transcripts of letters No. 2, No. 5, No. 6, No. 8, and No. 9. Letters No. 5 and No. 8 are therefore microfilmed only as transcripts in Reel 12 Volume 407 documents 7 and 10 respectively.

Since letter numbers were determined at this time by where they appeared in the sequence of numbered documents in abstract letter books, it is possible that letters No. 1, No. 3, No. 4, and No. 7 were never written—or that they were written but are missing from both the archived actual letters and the abstract transcripts. A likely explanation is that the abstract letters in Reel 12 Volume 407 include items numbered No. 1, No. 3, No. 4, and No. 7, but these are not letters to individuals but “circular” letters outgoing from the Secretary of State to a number of colonial governors. Having used these letter numbers for circular letters, they were not available for Shelburne to use in letters to Montagu. Later on, circular letters were no longer numbered, simplifying the numbering system.]

168. November 16, 1766 [159]  
Memorandum or perhaps part of memorial from Charles Garth, crown agent for South Carolina, seemingly directed to [Egerton] Leigh, Attorney General of South Carolina, listing the titles of 13 leading officials [of colonial South Carolina], and stating [seemingly unrelated] that naval officer Robert Lazar (?) had been approved for 12 months leave of absence; [perhaps a part of the memorial in document 169 [Frame 159 microfilmed twice]
169. November 16, 1766 [161]  
Memorial [perhaps a draft, incomplete, beginning in the middle of a sentence] from Charles Garth to [?] concerning the authority of the Chief Justice to levy fines on other officials [probably reference to Court Clerk Dougal Campbell; with notation at end of document by the writer identifying this as “*New Bond Sheet*” [perhaps the list of officials in document 168]
170. [no date] [162]  
Memorial [perhaps a draft, incomplete, ending indistinctly perhaps in the middle of a sentence] from Garth to Shelburne, concerning the case of the Assistant Judges against the Chief Justice in South Carolina [perhaps a part of documents 169 and/or 170] [second page of Frame 162 microfilmed twice]
171. December 8, 1766 [163]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Shelburne, enclosing, as requested by the Board of Trade, a list of exports from Charleston since 1747 [document 173] reporting that hemp was being grown successfully in South Carolina; enclosing also a return of militia and regular soldiers in South Carolina [document 172] [similar letter to Board of Trade in Reel 2 document 71]
172. [no date] [165]  
Return of militia and regular troops in South Carolina in 1766, including numbers of regular troops stationed at Fort Prince George (30), Fort Charlotte (19), Fort Augusta (45), and Charleston (23), plus 10,000 militia, without geographic distribution, for a total of 10,000 effective troops [enclosed with Montagu’s December 8, 1766 letter to Shelburne, document 171] [same return sent to Board of Trade on same date, Reel 2 document 73]

173. [no date] [166]  
Table of exports from Charleston “*for 20 years past*”, including the value of annual exports from 1748 to 1766, by category, for rice, naval stores, deer skins, indigo, slaves, lumber, corn & peas, tanned leather, beef & pork, silk and silk products, tallow, cotton, hemp, with 20-year totals for each category, except for hemp production, reported first in 1765 [enclosed with Montagu’s December 8, 1766 letter to Shelburne, document 171] [same table sent to Board of Trade on same date, Reel 2 document 72]
174. February 19, 1767 [167]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 6 from Shelburne at Whitehall to Montagu, noting the positive report on South Carolina exports, with the added comment that “*but with proper Industry it must become one of the most flourishing of all His Majesty’s American Colonies*”; commenting on the importance of avoiding “*Disturbances or Incursions of the numerous Indian Nations which surround them*” and expressing royal displeasure with the new West Florida’s “*venturing to commence Hostilities against the Creeks without any authority so to do*”, which had led the King to recall the West Florida Governor [George Johnstone], leaving Lieutenant Governor [Montfort] Browne in charge at Pensacola [transcribed copy of this letter in abstracts of Secretary of State outgoing correspondence in Reel 12 Volume 407; Shelburne’s letters No. 5 and 8, which are microfilmed only among the abstracts (but with full transcript contents) in Reel 12 Volume 407 documents 7 and 10 respectively]
175. [no date] [170]  
Letter from Montagu to Shelburne, stating that he had complied with royal Instructions by making a public proclamation outlining the Indians’ complaints against British settlers and stating the government’s intent to enforce strictly the provisions of the Proclamation of 1763; enclosing a list of entries and clearances of vessels at Charleston harbor [not microfilmed here] [similar letter to Board of Trade dated January 16, 1767 in Reel 2 document 76] [for more on the Proclamation of 1763, see note after Reel 1 document 161]
176. March 5, 1767 [172]  
Letter No. 2 from Montagu at Charleston to Secretary of State for the Southern Department the Earl of Shelburne, stating that he was trying to reduce Indian disturbances by severely limiting the number of active Indian traders  
[Note: This is the first of Montagu’s letters to Shelburne that was numbered, in the fashion Shelburne desired for his own outgoing letters and for those he received from colonial governors. Montagu had been sending letters to Shelburne since June 1766 (document 149) but none was numbered before this letter No. 2.]

177. May 12, 1767 [174]  
Copy of letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Board of Trade, stating that the South Carolina Assembly had addressed him with charges, supported in a report [document 178], against Chief Justice Skinner and a request that the Governor remove him from office; stating that he had informed Skinner of the charges and asked him to write a defense against the charges; having received on May 3 Skinner's written defense, in the form of a memorial [document 179], stating that he met with the South Carolina Council on the matter, and that the result was a unanimous opinion that Skinner "was *unacquainted with Law, and entirely unfit for the Office of Chief Justice; and that they therefore advis'd me to suspend him*", which he did on May 11; enclosing the Assembly's report [document 178] and Skinner's memorial [document 179] [original letter to Board of Trade in Reel 2 document 81]
178. [no date] [176]  
Copy of report of committee "*appointed to enquire into the State of the Courts of Justice*", stating that almost all involved in the South Carolina courts believed that Skinner was "*a Person wholly unacquainted with, and ignorant of the Common Law, such Acts of Parliament as are of force here, and the Acts of Assembly of this Province, and that*"...the Chief Justice's "*conduct in that Station manifests such Ignorance, and shows him to be entirely unfit for a Place of so much Consequence*"; stating that other officials besides the Chief Justice also contributed to the inadequacies of the court system; providing case examples of the Chief Justice's having applied the law wrongly, including the texts of several pieces of correspondence written by Skinner; concluding with resolutions identifying the problem of Skinner's incompetent conduct and recommending that the Governor remove Skinner from office and replace him with someone "*fit and proper*" to administer justice knowledgeably [enclosed with Montagu's letter of May 12, 1767 to Board of Trade, document 176] [another copy of report in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 84]
179. May 2, 1767 [189]  
Copy of memorial to Montagu from Charles Skinner, Chief Justice of South Carolina, containing Skinner's defense against charges of lack of legal knowledge and of incompetent administration of the law; using defenses that sought both to demonstrate his own greater legal knowledge and abilities than allowed in the Assembly's complaint and to suggest the Assembly's lesser abilities and knowledge than it claimed for itself, with details; responding to and seeking to refute each of the case examples in the committee's report, with more details; summing up his case against the charges, Skinner's defense concluded that "*Thus, Sir, afflicted as I am to observe such a Torrent of unprovoked Malevolence, of inveterate Hatred, Malice and Revenge and of the most virulent setting in upon me*", he stated that he had done his best to respond properly on short notice [enclosed with Montagu's letter of May 12, 1767 to Board of Trade, document 176] [another copy of memorial in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 85]

**Note:** The last microfilmed manuscript page with a printed Frame Number is Frame 215. for the remaining documents in Volume 390, this Finding Aid includes, on the right margin of each entry, what the sequential Frame Number would be, in parenthesis ( ), had it been printed.

180. April 14, 1767 [(218)]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Shelburne, stating that he and the Council had developed a set of regulations [document 181] designed to control the Indian traders strictly [similar letter with same date from Montagu to Board of Trade is in Reel 2 document 79]
181. November 16, 1766 [(Frame 219)]  
“*Regulations for the better carrying on the Trade with the Indian Tribes in the Southern District*”, with 18 numbered, itemized regulations [copy of regulations in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 80]
182. July 11, 1767 [(Frame 221)]  
Memorial of Garth to Shelburne, concerning the positions of Provost Marshal and of Sheriffs in South Carolina, arguing the case that centralized control by the Provost Marshal reduced local governance, which the colony valued, and that the Sheriffs, also established with the Crown’s blessing were a better location for the overlapping functions of Provost Marshal and Sheriffs, closer to the people [copy of memorial in Board of Trade correspondence, Reel 2 document 83]
183. July 22, 1767 [(Frame 223)]  
Draft of letter from Board of Trade at Whitehall to Shelburne, advising positive consideration for the petition from South Carolina Agent Garth, stating that the colony had developed sufficiently economically to warrant subdivision into counties, each with an appointed sheriff [draft letter also in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 130]
184. October 8, 1767 [(Frame 224)]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 9 from Shelburne at Whitehall to Montagu, expressing strong displeasure with Montagu’s decision to suspend Chief Justice Skinner; believing Skinner’s statement that he had been denied proper process to defend himself; stating that Montagu should quickly remedy the situation with appropriate legislative action by the Assembly; informing Montagu that the colony’s plan, via Garth’s memorial to establish county sheriffs in place of a single provost marshal had been approved; expecting that South Carolina would be appropriately appreciative of the Royal largesse extended by this approval [what would be Frame 224 microfilmed twice]
185. August 14, 1767 [(Frame 228)]  
Letter No. 5 from Montagu at South Carolina to Shelburne stating that the Assembly had approved financing for stationing troops in South Carolina

186. October 5, 1767 [(Frame 229)]  
Letter No. 6 from Montagu at Charleston to Shelburne, reporting that Samuel Moore, Collector of Customs, was being obstructed in collecting the usual fees, while Mr. [George] Roupell, a searcher who had seized a schooner, was subjected to a suit for £5,000 damages for what was termed by the merchants an illegal seizure; including other similar details [by 1772 Roupell, who had earlier been a customs collector at Boston, was being supported by the Assembly to be appointed Commissioner of Revenue at Charleston but was opposed by the Governor and Council on the grounds that his commission from Boston was not valid in Charleston; see Reel 2 documents 182, 183, 185] [on numbered letters, see note after document 185] [no letter No. 7 from Montagu to Shelburne is found in these microfilmed documents]
187. October 8, 1767 [(Frame 231)]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Shelburne reporting having received reports of rioting in South Carolina, but had few details

## Reel 6 (Volumes 391, 392, 393, 394)

### Volume 391—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue

November 10, 1767 to December 10, 1768      Documents 1 to 37      [Frames 1 to 80]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volumes 382, 385, 386, 389, and 390 for information and content of the preceding microfilmed Volumes of this correspondence. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Volume 391 continues the fairly regular pattern of correspondence from Volume 390 with documents dated from November 1767 to December 1768. The correspondence reflects the change in the Secretary of State office as a new position was created, filled initially by the Earl of Hillsborough, of Secretary of State for the Colonies. This more powerful position put the Secretary of State more in charge of Britain's colonial policy, compared with the Board of Trade. Meanwhile, South Carolina's Governor Charles Greville Montague spent five months of 1768 on leave in Philadelphia and New York because of poor health. During his absence, the South Carolina Assembly was becoming increasingly rebellious, from the colonial government's perspective, so that when he returned at the end of October, he found his ability to govern as he wished severely compromised, a situation he took badly.

**Note:** Archivists in the Secretary of State's office had not previously designated consecutive document numbers in each Volume for official incoming correspondence. However, that office began this practice, based on the Board of Trade's prior practice, assigning official numbers to most of the documents microfilmed in Volumes 391 to 394 (late 1767 to mid-1771). The Board of Trade had numbered official documents for some time, assigning a single letter of the alphabet to each Volume and consecutive numbers for each separate official document within the Volume. For example, the BT (Board of Trade) numbers for documents in Reel 1 Volume 377 (South Carolina incoming Board of Trade correspondence) run from M.1. through M.109. In Volume 391, SS (Secretary of State) numbers run from A.1. to A.37. Documents in the subsequent three Volumes were numbered as follows: Volume 392 B.1. to B.13.; Volume 393 C.1. to C.20.; Volume 394 D.1. to D.18. The document numbering ended abruptly at D.18. and was not resumed for subsequent Volumes of Secretary of State documents. As in the Board of Trade, only what were considered "official" incoming letters and related documents received SS document numbers.

**Note:** By 1766, numbering of letters in series, to or from the Secretary of State or the Board of Trade, had begun, especially for official letters between secretaries of state and colonial governors/acting governors. See the section on this subject in the **Introduction**. After some early experimentation, the Board of Trade did not continue a process of letter numbering. It did continue to number official documents within Volumes as described in the previous note.

In Volume 391, the secretary of state and South Carolina governor had just begun to use numbered letters and also were beginning to number official documents by Volume. The two systems appear not to have been linked in their numbering. Meanwhile, a third numbering system had been used for some time in both the Board of Trade and the Secretary of State office to archive important official documents by writing summaries or transcripts of them into “abstract” letter books. These letter books, with abstracted documents dated from 1720 to 1782, are microfilmed in Reel 10 (Volumes 400, 401); Reel 11 (Volume 404), and Reel 12 (Volumes 405 to 410). See the **Introduction** for a section on actual documents and abstract documents and of locations in these microfilmed documents of each, for incoming or outgoing correspondence or both. Most of these summarized or transcribed documents are found as actual documents elsewhere among the microfilmed documents. A few, however, are found only as transcripts in the abstract letter books, as documented in each Volume. An early problem emerged in the late 1760s when letter numbering began. The letter books numbered each document consecutively in the order entered. Thus, if a numbered letter was entered, it was likely to have two numbers, causing confusion. Initially, these letters were given their entry numbers, but that left the impression that some official letters were missing. The solution that eventually emerged was to number, in the letter books, only the official numbered letters, using the letter number assigned by the author. This Finding Aid includes notes that seek to explain these numbering complications within the Volume where they occur. For more on letter numbering see especially the section on the subject in the **Introduction** and the notes at the beginning of Volume 379 (Board of Trade), and of Volume 390 (Secretary of State). See also the note after document 7 below on how abstract documents of outgoing correspondence help find and sort out numbered letters from and to Secretaries of State.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

1. December 4, 1767 [1]  
 Bill from William Reynolds to Charles Montagu for a debt of £210.10 “*for the Demurage of the Ship Lonthill [?] lying at Portsmouth waiting on his Lordship*”; addressed to “*Mess<sup>rs</sup> Bishop & Ridgell Vine Street Piccadilly*” [may be SS number A.1. although not so identified]

**[Note: Charles Greville Montagu** was Royal Governor of South Carolina. Sometime, perhaps as early as late 1767, he had requested a leave of absence to regain his health. Demurrage was a fee paid if a vessel was delayed beyond a date previously agreed to for the vessel to be loaded and underway. This bill indicates that Montague owed such a fee for a ship he had delayed, which was located at Portsmouth, England. Only by improbable association could it be inferred that this ship's delay was related to Montagu's plans for a leave of absence. First, the vessel was on the wrong side of the Atlantic. Second, when Montagu finally did depart for his leave of absence, he sailed up the coast to Philadelphia for a shorter R&R trip, not to England. An alternative explanation for this demurrage fee and Montagu's request that it be paid for out of public funds (document 2) is not found in these microfilmed documents.]

2. [no date] [3]  
Memorial of Montagu to Lord Shelburne, seeking relief to pay for the government-caused delay which had cost Montagu £210.10 for demurrage of the ship [SS number A.2.]
3. December 14, 1767 [5]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Lord Shelburne, sending a record of all the land grants issued in South Carolina "*since May*"; reporting that hostilities with the Indians had diminished and both troop and police security had increased on the frontier [SS number A.3.]
4. December 14, 1767 [7]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Lord Shelburne, acknowledging receipt of a new seal for South Carolina and that he would return the old one [SS number A.4.]
5. November 10, 1767 [9]  
Letter No. 8 from Montagu at South Carolina to Shelburne, reporting having sent to Shelburne proceedings of the South Carolina Assembly plus copies of the laws they had adopted; reporting some settler violence in the interior, due partly to the lack of courts in this area, being addressed by people's petitions for better government services and protection; expecting that the threat of riots would quickly diminish [SS number A.5.]
6. November 14, 1767 [11]  
Letter No. 9 from Montagu at Charleston to Shelburne, concerning conviction of two men for murder in the back country, but with circumstances warranting mercy, so a request was being made to the Crown for clemency [SS number A.6.] [no letters No. 10 or No. 11 from Montagu to Shelburne are found in the microfilmed documents. A probable No. 12 is found in document 9 below]

7. February 20, 1768 [13]

Draft [outgoing] letter No. 3 from the Earl of Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, expressing approval for the Assembly's having voting funds to pay for quartering troops in South Carolina; reporting having referred Montagu's matters concerning the behavior of customs officials and quit rents to the Treasury; expressing the King's great satisfaction that violence on the frontier had been contained and that settling matters through courts rather than violence was a great improvement; reporting that the King had granted full pardons to the two accused murderers [see document 6]

**[Note: Wills Hill, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Hillsborough** (1768 to 1772) had a long career in British politics and government: First Lord of the Board of Trade from 1763-1765; Secretary of State for the Colonies and First Lord of the Board of Trade from 1768-1772; Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1779-1782.] He assumed his expanded duties as the first Secretary of State for the Colonies on February 27, 1768 and held this influential position until August 27, 1772. See note after Reel 2 document 90 for more on why Hillsborough's Secretary of State duties under the new title were expanded at this time.]

**[Note: Secretary of state outgoing numbered letters to colonial governors were susceptible to confusion,** leaving uncertainty for researchers about whether or not full sets of numbered letters were or were not available for study. **Secretary of State Hillsborough** wrote numbered letters, at different times, to both Governor Montagu and acting governor Bull. A number of these letters appear, on the surface, to be missing in the microfilmed actual documents. Only two are actually missing but both of these are found as transcripts in Reel 12 Volume 408, an abstract letter book of outgoing Secretary of State correspondence, dated between February 20, 1768 and February 6, 1782. In general, the only transcript documents with separate Finding Aid entries from the abstract letter books are those that do not appear among the microfilmed actual documents, as follows in Hillsborough's numbered letters:

- **Numbered letters to Montagu:** Letter No. 20 is missing from the actual documents but is found as a transcript in Reel 12 Volume 408 document 21. The unnumbered letter in document 10 below is the same, with the same date, as the No. 8 letter abstracted in Reel 12 Volume 408 document 8. No. 4 to No. 7, No. 9, No. 11 to No. 15, No. 17, No. 24, No. 25, and No. 27 are numbers assigned to circular letters (when they were entered into the abstracts letter book. They differed from other official correspondence by periodically delivering generalized information to multiple colonial governors. Once assigned, a number on a circular letters could not also be assigned to a letter written by a Secretary to a particular governor
- **Numbered letters to Bull:** Letter No. 32 is missing from the actual documents but is found as a transcription in the abstracts of Reel 12 Volume 408 document 36. No. 38 is a circular letter, so that number was skipped in the numbered letters to Bull.

**Secretary of State Dartmouth** wrote numbered letters to Montagu, to Bull, and to Governor William Campbell. All of his 5 numbered letters to **Montagu** (dated between September 27, 1772 and January 6, 1773) are found in the microfilmed actual letters. All of his 12 numbered letters to **Bull** (dated between June 10, 1773 and December 10, 1774) are also found in the microfilmed actual letters. **Campbell's** short term as governor came and went as Dartmouth was also leaving office. The timing was such that Dartmouth wrote only two numbered letters to Campbell before Germain replaced him. He numbered these as an add-on to the series he had started writing to Montagu in 1772. Both are found as actual documents among those microfilmed.

**Secretary of State Germain** wrote numbered letters to Bull, and to William Campbell, the last royal governor of South Carolina. All of his three numbered letters to **Campbell** (dated between December 23, 1775 and January 14, 1777) are found in the microfilmed actual letters. None of Germain's numbered letters to **Bull** (dated between April 4, 1781 and February 6, 1782) are found in the microfilmed actual letters but several (plus two unnumbered letters dated January 8 and March 29, 1781) are found in the transcribed abstracts in Reel 12 Volume 408 documents 98 to 100 and 102 to 104.

All of these letters were written after the fall of South Carolina's colonial government on September 15, 1775. Those written between mid-1776 and early 1777 to Campbell presumed that he remained Governor of South Carolina. Those written in 1781 to Bull presumed him still to be Lieutenant Governor of a colonial government which the Secretary of State still hoped, after the successful recapture of Charleston in May 1780, Bull might find the means to re-establish.]

8. March 9, 1768 [15]  
Letter from Thomas Bradshaw at Treasury Chambers to Richard Phelps at the Treasury, commenting on the South Carolina matters Hillsborough had referred to the Treasury [SS number A.7.]
9. March 25, 1768 [17]  
Letter No. 12 from Montagu at Charleston to Secretary of State [Shelburne or Hillsborough], reporting the death of Chief Justice Charles Skinner, which had prevented Montagu from following the King's orders to reinstate Skinner because he had not received this royal order until too late to act on it; stating his opinion that justice had been done because Skinner had no more defense of his conduct except what was in the memorial he had written to Montagu [SS number A.8.]  
[Note: On this date, Hillsborough was Secretary of State for the Colonies (as of February) and Shelburne was Secretary of State for the Southern Department (until October). Whether or not Montagu was yet aware of the creation of Hillsborough's new position and the resulting shift in power to him is not clear from this letter. Two hints suggest he was not. That Montagu numbered this letter No. 12 suggests that he was directing it to Shelburne. Furthermore, on May 13, 1768, Montagu wrote a letter No. 1 to Hillsborough (document 12).]

10. May 5, 1768 [19]  
Draft [outgoing] letter [unnumbered, however, transcript in Reel 12 Volume 408 document 9 assigns it No. 8; see note after document 7] from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, responding to Montagu's request for leave of absence "*for a short time for the Recovery of your Health*", which the King had approved; giving instructions for turning the South Carolina government over to Lieutenant Governor William Bull II, including Montagu's royal Instructions and other official papers]  
[Note: Montagu left Charleston on May 23, 1768 (see note after document 16), traveling to Philadelphia, where he spent time on medical leave. He did not return until October 30, 1768. During the interim, Lieutenant Governor William Bull II acted as Governor, without the title. Since becoming Lieutenant Governor in 1759, this was the third of five times during which Bull assumed administrative control over South Carolina's colonial government for an extended period while a governor was on leave or the colony was between governors.]
11. May 12, 1768 [21]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 10 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, instructing that the Chief Justice position be filled quickly with a "*fit and able Person*" [see note after document 7 for more on seemingly missing numbered draft letters from Hillsborough, including No. 11 to No. 15]
12. May 13, 1768 [23]  
Letter No. 1 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting having received Hillsborough's letter No. 1; suggesting that communications would be simplified if a packet were to be sent directly between London and Charleston rather than via numerous other ports; also conveying journals of the South Carolina Council and bills for costs of the judiciary [SS number A.9.] [although Hillsborough became Secretary of State for the Colonies in February 1768, it took until mid-May for the letter numbering by both Hillsborough and Montagu to be restarted with No. 1]
13. May 13, 1768 [25]  
Letter No. 2 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting having received Hillsborough's letter No. 2; responding to Hillsborough's request that he send copies of all South Carolina Laws, stating that if a complete set could have been assembled, he would have sent it, but that obtaining a full set would be difficult [SS number A.10.]
14. May 13, 1768 [27]  
Letter No. 3 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing Hillsborough that Montagu's doctors had advised him he needed very soon to take a leave of absence to regain his health in a northern colony; stating, since his Instructions allowed such leave, he intended to travel before the end of May to New York for this purpose [SS number A.11.]

[no letter No. 4 is found in this Montagu to Hillsborough series; however, two consecutive letters No. 5 follow this letter, the first (document 24) dated September 9, 1768 in New York, the second (document 35) dated November 21, 1768 in Charleston; it seems likely that Montagu lost track of his letter numbers while on leave and subsequently got back on track after he returned to Charleston; he was on leave from May 23 to October 30, 1768]

15. July 12, 1768 [29]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 16 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, reporting having recommended a direct packet between London and Charleston, which he stated would be established; expressing sorrow at Montagu's ill health but relief that operation of the government would devolve to the able and faithful Lieutenant Governor Bull [see note after document 7 for more on seemingly missing numbered draft letters from Hillsborough, including No. 17]
16. May 30, 1768 [31]  
Letter No. 1 from Lieutenant Governor Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, stating that Montagu had embarked this day on the British naval ship *Fowey* for Philadelphia, expecting to return in the fall after regaining his health; promising that he would attend well to the needs of the government during this period [SS number A.12.]  
[**Note:** The usual date reported for Montagu's departure date is May 23. This letter suggests it was a week later, for a reason that is not clear from these documents alone.]
17. July 18, 1768 [33]  
Letter No. 2 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, conveying copies of 17 laws passed by the Assembly of South Carolina and assented to by Montagu, including act establishing courts and jails and appointing Sheriffs (in lieu of a provost marshal) and other officers; arguing for the need for this law; arguing as well the need to redraw the temporary boundary between North and South Carolina, a line established in 1764, running from the sea to the Catawba River, because new settlements of South Carolinians had grown up beyond the end of the line; suggesting extending the line to take in territory recently organized, by one of the new laws, into a part of Berkley County to be called St. Matthew Parish; this act would include representation of this area in the General Assembly of South Carolina [SS number A.13.] [copy in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 90]
18. July 19, 1768 [37]  
Letter No. 3 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing Hillsborough that no complete copy of South Carolina laws existed, so it could not be copied and delivered to Hillsborough as he had requested; suggesting that Hillsborough might be better served by receipt of an analysis of the laws rather than the voluminous original manuscripts, which could be produced [SS number A.14.]

19. July 20, 1768 [39]  
Letter No. 4 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting having sent to Hillsborough journals of the last Assembly term; stating his intent to dissolve the Assembly (prorogued at the time) and call elections for a new Assembly; also transmitting copies of all land grants approved during the previous half-year [SS number A.15.]
20. July 20, 1768 [41]  
Letter No. 5 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting having forwarded, as requested by Hillsborough, a packet of correspondence intended for Governor James Wright of Georgia; reporting receipt of other correspondence from Hillsborough [SS number A.16.]
21. September 15, 1768 [43]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 18 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, responding to Bull's letters No. 1 through No. 5; supporting the idea of redrawing the boundary line between North and South Carolina [Hillsborough's draft letter No 16 (July 12, 1768) was sent to Governor Montagu and his letter No. 20 (November 15, 1768) was again sent to Montagu. In between, Hillsborough communicated in letters and No. 18 and No. 19 without changing the sequence of numbers, with Lieutenant Governor William Bull II as acting governor during Montagu's leave of absence for reasons of poor health; Hillsborough wrote no letter No. 17 because the number was used for a circular letter in the abstract letter book [see Reel 12 Volume 407 and note after document 7 above]
22. August 15, 1768 [45]  
Letter No. 6 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting the loss of the Packet Maria Theresa, near the Florida Straits while sailing from Pensacola; also reporting arrival of rescued mail at Charleston, the content of which is itemized [SS number A.17.]
23. August 16, 1768 [47]  
Letter No. 7 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that he had received a letter from General [Thomas] Gage [commander of British forces in North America], announcing Gage's decision "*to abandon the Forts garrisoned by His Majesty's Troops [in South Carolina] and to embark them for New York*"; stating the opinion that this decision might be dangerous for South Carolina's relations with the Indians, so that he had immediately taken precautions to secure provincial arms and property at Fort Prince George in Cherokee territory and to speak with the Cherokee leaders about how to handle this situation [SS number A.18.]

24. September 9, 1768 [49]  
Letter No. 5 [probably really No. 4] from Montagu at New York to Hillsborough, stating his intent "*next week*" of returning to South Carolina; thanking Hillsborough for having approved a potential future "*short*" leave of absence for Montagu, also for health reasons, this time to England, but promising not to use it "*unless I find it absolutely necessary*" [SS number A.19.] [no letter is identified as No. 4 in this series; this letter may in fact be No. 4, misnumbered while Montagu was on leave of absence in New York; the real letter No. 5 is in document 35, dated November 21, 1768]]
25. October 12, 1768 [51]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 19 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, informing Bull that the King had rejected the bill passed by the Assembly in the last session that established a court system with county sheriffs and no provost marshal; enclosing the King's order and the Board of Trade's report, with justifications for the rejection; stating that he had conveyed Bull's comments about this act to the Board of Trade; instructing Bull not to approve a similar bill unless it omits reference to judges' commissions and provides for royal appointment of sheriffs; with explanation of the reasoning behind these two prohibitions [Hillsborough's draft letter No. 20 to Governor Montagu is not found in this reel. However, a transcript of it is found in the abstracts of Secretary of State outgoing correspondence in Reel 12 Volume 408 document 21]
26. September 8, 1768 [54]  
Letter No. 8 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting having fulfilled the request to seek information on manufacturing in South Carolina since 1734, with the result of discovering no such manufacturing in South Carolina; stating that South Carolina's laws refer to only the raising of silk, hemp and indigo as examples of "manufacturing", with additional details about these; stating that South Carolina's economic efforts had been "*confined to Staple Commodities for exportation to Great-Britain*" [with enclosures, documents 27, 28] [part of SS number A.20.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 100, with Appendix, document 101; similar letter dated September 6, 1768, letter No. 5 to Board of Trade, is in Reel 2 document 95 with Appendix, document 96]
27. September 8, 1768 [58]  
Appendix containing the titles of actions by the South Carolina Assembly since 1734 in support of an agricultural economy; listing 10 acts or votes, with dates as follows: 1736, 1738, 1743, 1744, 1755, 1756 (2), 1762, and 1768 (2) [part of SS number A.20.] [appendix is dated after the letter in which it was enclosed] [enclosed with Bull's September 2, 1768 letter to Hillsborough, document 26]

28. September 2, 1768 [60]  
Printed edition of *The South Carolina and American General Gazette*, including timely news and comment [perhaps part of SS number A.20.] [enclosed with Bull's September 2, 1768 letter to Hillsborough, document 26]
29. September 10, 1768 [61]  
Letter No. 9 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting having dissolved the Assembly and called new elections in October; reporting the arrival in the southern colonies of the Circular Boston Letter; anticipating a more difficult time, even than before now, in being able to work productively with the South Carolina Assembly; including explanations of these difficulties; commenting on the other ongoing unstable situation in South Carolina—relations with the Indians; followed by a thoughtful consideration of the entire complex situation [with enclosure, document 30] [no SS document number assigned; this would be SS number A.21.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 102]
30. September 6, 1768 [65]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette and Country Journal*, including timely news and comment, especially news from Boston and the "*Circular Letter*" that Bull reported was now stirring up the southern colonies [enclosed with Bull's September 10, 1768 letter to Hillsborough, document 29]
31. October 16, 1768 [66]  
Letter No. 10 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that no customs officer at Charleston had been subjected to "*opposition, interruption or insult*" "*since what happened in June 1767*" [in opposition to the Stamp Act]; expressing willingness to hope that South Carolina would continue to maintain a state of compliance with the customs laws and other acts of Parliament; describing the situation now in Charleston, as being Boston-style opposition to the customs laws that was being pressed on South Carolinians by outsiders from the northern colonies [SS number A.22.]
32. October 18, 1768 [68]  
Letter No. 11 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, describing the nature of the Boston approach to opposition against the customs laws and limits on American trade, and how the northern activists were seeking to impose it on South Carolina merchants [SS number A.22., the same SS number as document 31]
33. October 23, 1768 [70]  
Letter No. 12 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, stating his intention to prorogue [temporarily discontinue] the newly elected Assembly; hoping to get its members to function normally and productively, which had not yet occurred; realizing the danger of the situation now in Charleston [SS number A.23.]

[**Note:** It was into this situation that Governor Montagu returned to Charleston from New York on October 30, 1768, following his health-related leave of absence.]

34. December 10, 1768 [72]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 21 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, informing him of Hillsborough's assessment that Bulls reports on the Circular Letter and attempts by Boston merchants to convince Charleston merchants to join the northern colonies' stronger opposition to the customs laws and other limits on American trading had been met mostly with "silent neglect"; yet expressing awareness of the potential danger; asking Montagu to suggest three individuals to be appointed to the South Carolina Council
35. November 21, 1768 [74]  
Copy of letter No. 5 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that the Assembly had met on November 15, but their journal and address to him revealed resolutions not acceptable to the colonial government, so Montagu had dissolved the Assembly [SS number A.24.] [Although also numbered No. 5, Montagu's previous numbered letter to Hillsborough (document 24 sent from New York on September 9, 1768 while Montagu was on leave), was probably actually No. 4]
36. November 21, 1768 [76]  
Copy of letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, [the content being the same as the letter misnumbered No. 5 but actually No. 6, document 35] [assigned SS number A.25., which was subsequently crossed out with a scrivener's or archivist's note that "*This is a copy of the preceding Letter*" with enclosure, document 37]
37. November 19, 1768 [78]  
Copy of resolutions adopted by the Commons House on that date after consideration of two letters, one from Thomas Cushing, Speaker of the "late" Massachusetts Bay Assembly and the other from Peyton Randolph, Speaker of the House of Burgesses in Virginia; having unanimously adopted several resolutions supporting the content of the letters, and establishing a Committee of Correspondence to communicate instructions to South Carolina's Royal Agent to work with these other colonies to accomplish repeal of several Parliamentary laws that lay duties on American colonies and to prevent insertion in the Mutiny Act of the clause requiring colonial billeting of British soldiers in America [SS number A.25.]

## Volume 392—Itemized, Annotated Contents

### Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue

November 8, 1768 to December 9, 1769      Documents 38 to 65      [Frames 1 to 59]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volumes 382, 385, 386, 389, 390, and 391 for information and content of the preceding microfilmed Volumes of this correspondence. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**.

Volume 392 continues the fairly regular pattern of correspondence from Volume 391, with documents dated from November 1768 to December 1769. During this period, Governor Charles Greville Montagu left South Carolina on a second leave of absence because of bad health. This time, he traveled to England, only nine months after he had returned from a previous such leave to Philadelphia and New York, which had lasted five months.

**Note:** In Volume 392, archivists in the Secretary of State's office continued the practice, started in Volume 391, having been borrowed from the Board of Trade, of numbering official incoming documents with numbers consisting of a letter for each Volume and consecutive numbers for the documents. Volume 392 begins with SS number B.1. and runs to SS number B.13.

**Note:** In Volume 392 the secretary of state and South Carolina governor continued corresponding mostly with numbered letters. For more on letter numbering, see especially the section on the subject in the **Introduction** and the notes at the beginning of Volume 379 (Board of Trade) and of Volume 390 (Secretary of State).

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

38.      January 4, 1769 [1]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 22 from Secretary of State for the Colonies the Earl of Hillsborough at Whitehall to Governor of South Carolina Charles Greville Montagu, stating that the King was concerned that Montagu had thought it necessary to dissolve the Assembly, especially since Montagu had not sent to London the resolutions that made him feel dissolution was necessary

[**Note:** The Earl of Hillsborough had assumed the new position of Secretary of State for the Colonies on February 27, 1768, and served in this position until August 27, 1772. Governor Montagu served as Governor of South Carolina from June 1766 to March 6, 1773, except during two leaves of absence, from May to October 1768 and from July 1769 to September 1771.]

39. November 8, 1768 [3]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, stating that he had returned to Charleston from his leave of absence on October 30, to find that Lieutenant Governor Bull had prorogued the Assembly until November 15; with nothing further to report, yet [SS number B.1.]
40. January 17, 1769 [5]  
Letter No. 7 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, enclosing Proceedings of the South Carolina Assembly during its past session, as well as journals of the Council from December 31, 1767 to January 1, 1769, and a list of land grants from May 15 to October 22, 1768; stating he would not call a new Assembly until receiving instructions from London [SS number B.2.]
41. March 23, 1769 [7]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 23 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, conveying the King's command that Montagu call an election and convene an Assembly "*whenever the publick Affairs of the Colony shall appear to you to require it*"; announcing that William Wragg had been approved to serve as Chief Justice of South Carolina, succeeding Charles Skinner, who had died [no letters No. 24 and No. 25 from Hillsborough to Montagu are found because they are listed in Reel 12 Volume 408 as circular letters, so their numbers were not used for personalized letters]
42. March 1, 1769 [9]  
Letter No. 8 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting on several vacancies and absences of South Carolina Council members, including Charles Skinner's death, [Henry] Laurens "*having declin'd acting*", [?] Moore living in England, [probably John, 4<sup>th</sup> Baronet] Colleton living on his plantation and not coming to Charleston, and Attorney General [Egerton] Leigh not attending because of the load of his other work; suggesting two names to fill the vacancies, Rowland Rugeley and Bernard Elliott [SS number B.3.] [extract of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 99]
43. June 7, 1769 [11]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 26 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, reporting having referred to the Board of Trade Montagu's suggestions of Rugeley and Elliot to be appointed to the South Carolina Council [no letter No. 27 from Hillsborough to Montagu is found because it is listed in Reel 12 Volume 408 as a circular letter, so its number was not used for a personalized letter]

44. April 19, 1769 [13]  
Letter No. 9 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, complaining that Governor [William] Tryon of North Carolina had determined to draw the unsettled boundary between South and North Carolina in a fashion that “*would be a great injury to this Province*”; requesting that the King authorize a proper survey to settle the matter [with enclosure, document 45] [SS number B.4.] [document 46, dated May 25, 1769, was also numbered No. 9, but is actually No. 10]
45. April 10, 1769 [15]  
Report of a committee of the Council appointed by Montagu to review the situation with the North Carolina/South Carolina boundary; responding to and refuting each of Governor Tryon’s objections to the previously negotiated boundary of 1764; arguing for South Carolina ownership of Catawba land that would, under Tryon’s proposal, become part of North Carolina; making other arguments for boundary choices more to South Carolina’s benefit; recommending a continuation of the boundary to the north and west of the end of the currently recognized land, so as to wrap around the Catawba territory, rather than continuing straight west, as proposed by Tryon; enclosing in the report extract of letter from Lieutenant Governor Bull dated March 15, 1765 concerning the boundary line in relation to Cherokee territory and the location of Fort Prince George [enclosed with Montagu’s April 19, 1769 letter to Hillsborough, document 44]
- [Archivist’s note: “*Folio 21 is a map and is unsuitable for photographing*”]
46. May 25, 1769 [22]  
Letter No. 9 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that, because of the importance of the position for the economy, having assigned James Simpson to be Judge of the Admiralty, subject to royal appointment [SS number B.5.] [document 44 dated April 19, 1769 is actually No. 9, and this is actually No. 10]
47. July 15, 1769 [24]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 28 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, notifying Montagu that warrants had been approved for Wragg and Rugeley to fill the two vacant seats on the South Carolina Council; reporting that the boundary issue between North and South Carolina would receive prompt attention by the government; stating that the King was rethinking the boundaries of areas for Judges of the Admiralty; recommending for Montagu’s consideration Daniel Hammerer, a German immigrant who, on his own, had been successfully operating education opportunities for Cherokee youth but who could not continue without public financial support

48. June 30, 1769 [26]  
Letter No. 11 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that he had called an election, that an Assembly had thereafter been convened, but that “*I have no expectation of their providing for his Majesty’s Troops*”; reporting on having held an Admiralty trial for the murder of a captain [SS number B.6.]
49. June 30, 1769 [28]  
Letter No. 12 from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting that his health had worsened again and that his doctor had told him he needed to go to England to recover his health; stating that he was seeking an opportunity in early summer to take a leave of absence for this purpose; leaving Lieutenant Governor William Bull II [again] in charge of South Carolina’s colonial government [with enclosure, document 50] [SS number B.7.]
50. June 28, 1769 [30]  
Printed statement by “*inhabitants*” of South Carolina, recognizing the “*abject and wretched Condition to which the British Colonies are reduced, by several Acts of Parliament*” which impinge on colonial rights to free trade and deny freedom from taxation by Parliament, listing four resolutions of noncompliance with the offending laws and of a boycott of British manufactured goods
51. August 12, 1769 [31]  
Letter No. 13 from Lieutenant Governor Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, noting that on July 30, 1769, Montagu had left for England on his second leave of absence to improve his health; stating that he had suspended a £15 fine on each of “*four poor Germans*” who had been convicted of trying to “*rescue*” several “*persons that were in custody of the Law*”; reporting that the four had already served a three-month imprisonment and had petitioned Bull for some consideration about paying the fine because they could not afford to pay it [with enclosures, documents 52, 53] [SS number B.8.] [similar letter with same date to Lords of Treasury in document 70]  
**[Note: The logic of letter numbering is unclear here but inconsequentially so. Montagu’s last numbered letter to Hillsborough before he left Charleston on extended leave of absence on July 30, 1769, (document 49) was No 12. Bull’s first letter to Hillsborough after assuming acting control (again) over South Carolina government was dated August 12, 1769 (document 51) and was numbered No. 13. It might be that Bull decided to continue Montagu’s letter numbering from where the Governor had left off. However, given Bull’s previous practice, it may be that he decided to continue his own numbering sequence of correspondence with Hillsborough. When Montagu returned from his first leave of absence on October 30, 1768, Bull had to decide where to restart his letter numbering. He chose to start with No. 13. By coincidence, his last numbered letter to Shelburne in March 1768 had been No. 12, as had been his last numbered letter to Hillsborough in June 1769.**

52. [no date] [33]  
Copy of petition to Bull of John Falmer, Bartholomew Gartman, Christopher Smith, and Thomas Trapp, seeking relief from paying a fine of £15 each [enclosed with Bull's August 12, 1769 letter to Hillsborough, document 51]
53. August 9, 1769 [35]  
Official declaration of Bull's suspension of the fines against Falmer, Gartman, Smith, and Trapp [enclosed with Bull's August 12, 1769 letter to Hillsborough, document 51]
54. November 4, 1769 [36]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 29 from Hillsborough to Bull, commending Bull for an "*act of humanity*" in suspending the fines of the four "*poor Germans*"; stating his opinion that the King would probably remit the fines completely
55. November 4, 1769 [38]  
Draft [outgoing] letter from Hillsborough to Lords of the Treasury, explaining the situation of Bull's suspension of four fines of £15 each; stating that unless the Lords of the Treasury object, the King would probably remit the fines
56. August 28, 1769 [40]  
Duplicate letter No. 14 from Bull to Hillsborough, stating that the South Carolina Assembly had adopted resolutions of rights claimed by Americans similar to those claimed in Virginia; stating that 10 bills had been passed by the Assembly and approved after Montagu's departure by Bull; reporting having thereafter prorogued the Assembly [SS number B.9.] [original letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 103]  
**[Note:** These Virginia resolutions, known since as the **Virginia Resolves**, were adopted by the Virginia House of Burgesses in May 1769, asserted the absolute right of the colony of Virginia only to lay taxes upon its citizens.]
57. August 17, 1769 [42]  
Extract of minutes of Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly, concerning resolutions received from Peyton Randolph, late speaker of the Virginia House of Burgesses; followed by  
August 19, 1769  
Extract of Commons House minutes, including quotation of resolutions discussed and approved by Commons House similar to those adopted in Virginia [both enclosed with Bull's August 28, 1769 letter to Hillsborough, document 56]
58. August 29, 1769 [44]  
Duplicate letter No. 15 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, forwarding to Hillsborough the action of Commons House against approving funding for barracks housing for British troops stationed in South Carolina [with enclosure, document 59] [SS number B.10.]

[original letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 105] [for Bull's letter No. 16 to Hillsborough, dated September 7, 1769, see Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 107]

59. August 23, 1769 [46]  
Extract of minutes of Commons House meeting, Commons House having declined the request of the Governor to approve funding for barracks house to house British troops stationed in South Carolina; including reasons for having not concurred with the request [enclosed with Bull's letter of August 29, 1769 to Hillsborough, document 58]
60. September 25, 1769 [48]  
Letter No. 17 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting on the signing by South Carolina's Commons House of a resolution for the nonimportation of English goods; reporting on news received of the arrival of Spanish troops on the Mississippi River [as part of Spanish takeover of New Orleans from the French, as negotiated in the 1763 Treaty at the end of the Seven Years War/French and Indian War] [with enclosure, document 61] [SS number B.11.]
61. September 18 to 25, 1769 [50]  
Printed edition of *The South Carolina and American General Gazette*, with news and commentary on current issues especially in the colonial government [enclosed with Bull's letter of September 25, 1769 to Hillsborough, document 60]
62. October 4, 1769 [52]  
Letter No. 18 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, supporting Hillsborough's sentiments in favor of educating the Indians to civilize them; anticipating calling the Assembly back into session, partly to deal with Indian affairs; stating that resurveying the South Carolina-North Carolina boundary was almost complete; describing the difficulties of a British transport ship with 150 troops of the 21<sup>st</sup> Regiment under Colonel Maxwell's command that had suffered from severe weather and had returned to Charleston after about three weeks, and that Bull's government had taken the troops in when they arrived [SS number B.12.]
63. November 29, 1769 [54]  
Letter from Thomas Bradshaw at Treasury Chambers to John Pownall, conveying the concurrence of the Lords of Treasury that the small fines suspended by Bull should be permanently remitted [SS number B.13.] [see also document 69]  
[Note: At this time, John Pownall held two important and related positions—**secretary to the Commissioners of the Board of Trade** (since 1758) and **Undersecretary of State** (since 1768). In which capacity he received this letter from the Treasury is not clear, but it may make little difference, because upon receipt, he presumably would have shared its contents with both the Board of Trade and the Secretary of State.]

64. November 30, 1769 [56]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 30 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, conveying the King's approval to remit the fines that Bull had suspended; expressing support for Bull's attempts to work productively with the Assembly
65. December 9, 1769 [58]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 31 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, stating that the King had concurred with South Carolina's most recent law establishing courts for the colony [no letter No. 32 from Hillsborough to Bull is found here; a transcript of this letter is found in the abstracts of Secretary of State outgoing correspondence in Reel 12 Volume 408 documents 36]

### **Volume 393—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

#### **Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue**

May 6, 1769 to December 24, 1770 Documents 66 to 129 [Frames 1 to 131]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volumes 382, 385, 386, and 389 to 392 for information and content of the preceding microfilmed Volumes of this correspondence. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Volume 393 continues the fairly regular pattern of correspondence from Volume 392 with documents dated between May 1769 and December 1770. During this period, colonial leadership was fairly stable. Lord Hillsborough remained as Secretary of State for the Colonies; William Bull II remained Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina and was acting as governor during the extended leave for health reasons of South Carolina Governor Charles Greville Montagu.

**Note:** Archivists in the Secretary of State's office continued the practice in Volume 393 of numbering official incoming documents. This Volume begins with SS document C.1. and ends with SS document C.27. In Volume 393 the secretary of state and South Carolina governor continued corresponding mostly with numbered letters. For more on letter numbering, see especially the section on the subject in the **Introduction** and the notes at the beginning of Volume 379 (Board of Trade) and of Volume 390 (Secretary of State).

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

66. December 5, 1769 [1]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Lieutenant Governor [acting as Governor] William Bull II at Charleston to Secretary of State [for the Colonies the Earl of] Hillsborough, sending to Hillsborough a *Gazette* article that was part of a large debate on matters of colonial rights, especially in relation to the current nonimportation agreements [with enclosure, document 67] [SS number C.1.]  
**[Note: Nonimportation agreements]** were collective agreements among merchants and other economic leaders, in particular cities or colonies, not to import or export English goods, as a means of protesting British revenue policies on the colonies, beginning with the Stamp Act of 1765. As in other such “unconstitutional” activities (from the British perspective), Boston’s merchants led the way in August 1769 with a well organized boycott of English trade. By later in 1769, the debate about nonimportation, if not direct action by merchants, had reached South Carolina.]
67. November 16, 1769 [3]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, with current news and commentary especially on colonial government and the nonimportation issue [enclosed with Bull’s December 5, 1760 letter to Hillsborough, document 66]
68. December 6, 1769 [5]  
Letter No. 19 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting on issues of the economy, finance, and money, and of Indian affairs, plus more [SS number C.2.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 129]
69. January 17, 1770 [7]  
Letter from Bradshaw at Treasury to [Undersecretary of State] John Pownall, conveying to the Secretary of State the King’s approval of remitting the small fines suspended by Bull [with enclosure, document 70] [SS number C.3.] [see also document 63 and note after it concerning Pownall’s position(s)]
70. August 12, 1769 [9]  
Copy of letter from Bull at Charleston to Lords of Treasury concerning his suspension of four fines [enclosed with Bradshaw’s letter of January 17, 1770 to Pownall, document 69]
71. December 12, 1769 [11]  
Duplicate letter No. 20 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, describing with consternation the Assembly’s “secret” passage of a plan to withdraw £10,500 of South Carolina public money, from any source, to be taken to England by Assembly leaders, to be used to further the cause of colonial rights, including passage of a bill of colonial rights, with comments about the larger implications of this act [SS number C.4.]

[similar letter from Bull to Board of Trade in its incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 123; original of this letter No. 20 from Bull to Hillsborough in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 130]

72. December 16, 1769 [14]  
Duplicate letter No. 21 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing Hillsborough that Common House consideration of finances for the colony was so bogged down in the debate on colonial rights that no tax bill could be expected before May [SS number C.5.] [original letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 131]
73. January 8, 1770 [16]  
Letter No. 22 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, expressing appreciation for the approbation Hillsborough had communicated to Bull for his actions as acting governor [SS number C.6.] [duplicate letter is in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 132]
74. February 17, 1770 [18]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 33 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, including further approbation, plus sympathy for what must be frustrating to Bull in trying to deal with the Assembly, with news of shifting top leadership in the British government
75. January 12, 1770 [20]  
Letter No. 23 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting good news in the economy of the colony, especially with the shipment of a sizable export of raw silk [SS number C.7.] [This is one of three letters to Hillsborough to which Bull assigned No. 23. See document 76, and Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 133 and note after. This letter is the real No. 23]
76. March 6, 1770 [22]  
Letter No. 23 ["mistake"; thus in effect unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, thanking Hillsborough for his work in London on behalf of the four poor Germans; suggesting that some of Governor Montagu's efforts "*unfortunately miscarried*"; stating his (Bull's) confidence in his governing ability and support from the "*firmness*" of the Council; conceding that he had had little luck dealing with the "*Clouds of discontent & jealousy which spread a gloom over this Country*"; stating that he was still trying to develop the economy positively and advance education opportunities [with enclosure, document 77] [SS number C.8.] [This is one of three letters to Hillsborough to which Bull assigned No. 23. See note after Reel 2 document 133. Document 75 is the actual No. 23. This document and Reel 2 document 133 were identified as letter No. 23 and dated March 6, 1770, but archivists noted that this number was assigned "by mistake", so these two documents are, in effect, unnumbered. They also share the same date and contents, which differ from those in document 75.]

77. [no date] [24]  
Report of a committee created to investigate how to support “free” [public] schools and a college in South Carolina [enclosed with Bull’s March 6, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 76]
78. March 7, 1770 [26]  
Letter No. 24 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning the King’s acceptance of South Carolina’s rewritten courts act [SS number C.9.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 134]
79. April 14, 1770 [28]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 34 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, concurring with Bull’s wish that associate judges for South Carolina could be “*Persons of Ability and Reputation in the Profession of the Law of England*” but recognizing the “*Difficulties and Disappointments*” Bull had experienced in this regard; wishing to put the “*extraordinary Proceeding of the Commons House of Assembly on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of Dec*” before the King, but waiting for additional evidence; forwarding an Additional Instruction [with enclosure, document 80]
80. April 14, 1770 [30]  
Copy of “*additional instructions*” concerning the actions of Commons House on December 8, especially adoption of a scheme for a large sum of money to be withdrawn from public funds held in South Carolina to be used for purposes not approved in the annual estimate of colonial government expenses [enclosed with Hillsborough’s April 14, 1770 draft letter to Bull, document 79]
81. March 22, 1770 [34]  
Letter No. 25 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning the trial of Matthew Turner taking place in Charleston regarding the murder of Captain Harris in the Bay of Honduras and stating that, under the King’s law, using the gubernatorial authority of Governor Montagu, he had suspended Turner’s death sentence [SS number C.10.] [unnumbered copy in document 92; duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 135]
82. May 6, 1769 [36]  
Copy of proclamation of Governor Montagu of South Carolina [executed by Bull], under legal authority from the King, stating that the sentence of convicted murderer Matthew Turner for the murder of Captain Harris should be suspended [see copy or similar proclamation dated May 5, 1769, document 91]
83. April 6, 1770 [37]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, sending on mail from other colonies that had been delayed coming through Charleston [SS number C.11.]

84. April 15, 1770 [39]  
Letter No. 26 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning Commons House's actions on December 8, 1769 outside of the bounds of the colony's annual estimate, and Bull's subsequent action to prorogue the Assembly; followed by a postscript dated April 16, 1770 about enclosure [document 85] of the recent Gazette with relevant information [SS number C.12.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 137]
85. April 5, 1770 [41]  
Printed edition of *Supplement to The South-Carolina Gazette*, containing news and commentary on the South Carolina governments
86. June 12, 1770 [43]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 35 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, concerning difficulties, in the case of Matthew Turner in implementation of existing law allowing Admiralty Courts to convict for murder on the high seas with sentences of execution; expressing sorrow for the improper actions of the South Carolina Assembly on December 8, 1769; advising Bull to enforce the King's orders concerning the laws of financial controls
87. June 12, 1770 [45]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 36 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, reporting nothing new since his last letter except to report having received Bull's letter No. 26
88. April 29, 1770 [47]  
Letter No 27 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, telling Hillsborough of his plans to take a tour around many of the settlements of South Carolina [letter looking incomplete, ending in the middle of a page without the usual "obedient servant" language and signature at the end; nevertheless, it was received in London [occasioning a scrivener's note stating that the letter was from Bull "*but his name omitted to be subscribed*"] [SS number C.13.]
89. June 14, 1770 [49]  
Letter from Hillsborough to the Advocate Attorney & Solicitor General, conveying to them Bull's letter about the Admiralty Court murder trial of Matthew Turner [document 81] for their legal consideration
90. [?] 1770 [received September 21, 1770] [51]  
Response to Hillsborough from the Advocate Attorney and Solicitor General, stating that difficulties exist in the current law that make it difficult to enforce it as desired; signed by James Marriott, William de Grey, and E. Thurslow [see their report to Hillsborough, document 93]

91. May 5, 1770 [53]  
Copy, under Governor Montagu's authority and King's order [executed by Bull], of proclamation that Turner be reprieved and the sentence suspended [copy or similar proclamation dated May 6, 1769, document 82]
92. March 22, 1770 [55]  
Copy of letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, stating that, under the King's law, using the gubernatorial authority of Governor Montagu, he had suspended Turner's death sentence for murder [see numbered original letter, document 81 and duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 135]
93. [no date] [57]  
Report of the Advocate Attorney and Solicitor General in answer to legal questions about whether laws from the past can still be used to allow trials by colonies in cases of murders committed on the high seas, including several references: A November 5, 1761 letter in which the Governor of New York explained a situation in which crew a privateer allegedly caused the deaths of several crew of a British ship; stating that the legal authority that New York colony had used had expired, leaving no legal jurisdiction for courts to try murders on the high seas; also, a March 4, 1762 Board of Trade document [signed as secretary of the Board of Trade by John Pownall and by three Lords of Trade] whose opinion was that all older laws were still enforceable, including legal trial jurisdiction over murders committed on the high seas; the Report clearly siding with the Board of Trade's position taken in 1762
94. June 5, 1770 [59]  
Letter No. 28 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, seeking approval for suspensions of sentences for two additional murderers, William Juste and Christopher Davis, plus suspension of a fine of Robert Bussard, including details of the circumstances in each case [SS number C.14.] [with enclosures, documents 95 to 97]
95. April 28, 1770 [61]  
Copy of official document from Lieutenant Governor William Bull suspending execution of death sentence for Christopher Davis [enclosed with Bull's June 5, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 94]
96. April 28, 1770 [62]  
Copy of official document from Bull suspending execution of death sentence for William Juste [enclosed with Bull's June 5, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 94]
97. May 3, 1770 [63]  
Copy of official document from Bull suspending a fine for Robert Bussard [enclosed with Bull's June 5, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 94]

98. June 7, 1770 [64]  
Letter No. 29 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, stating the urgency of settling the North Carolina-South Carolina boundary line; supporting his sense of urgency with information from his recent tour of new settlement areas; also recognizing the need to train the militia better for duty on the frontier; also expressing pride over economic development in the colony; with a PS concerning proroguing the General Assembly and hoping that it would be willing to do colonial business successfully [SS number C.15.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 138]
99. July 31, 1770 [68]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 37 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, informing Bull that the King had pardoned [two murderers] William Juste and Christopher Davis, thanking him for the description of his tour of the settlements and for his concerns for the boundary, militia, and settlements [no letter No. 38 from Hillsborough to Bull is found because in Reel 12 Volume 408, this number is assigned to a circular letter and not used for a personalized letter]
100. June 13, 1770 [70]  
Letter No. 30 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, submitting recommendations for assistant judges in South Carolina, including Robert Pringle, Rawlins Lowndes, George Gabriel Powell, and John Murray [SS number C.16.] [duplicate of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 139]
101. August 15, 1770 [72]  
Letter from Grey Cooper at Treasury Chambers to Undersecretary of State John Pownall, stating that the Lords of Treasury had no objection to remitting the fine of Robert Bussard [SS number C.17.]
102. July 16, 1770 [74]  
Letter No. 31 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, stating that he intends to convene the General Assembly in August to do business; informing Hillsborough of the death of South Carolina's Treasurer, [Jacob] Motte, and appointment of Henry Peronneau to replace him; stating that he interpreted the December 8, 1769 action of Commons House to assume control over certain colonial funds not to be valid legislation; wishing that the southern colonies would not so often "*cast our Eyes to the North Star of Boston, in our Political navigation, altho' the Commercial interests of this Province differ very widely form that.*" [SS number C.18] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 140]

103. June 7, 1770 [76]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 39 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, seeking further information that Bull's nominees for associate judges were "*free from fractious connections & unconstitutional Prejudices*" hoping to hear soon of productive results from the convening of the Assembly; sending a copy of the King's pardon of Matthew Turner
104. August 16, 1770 [78]  
Letter No. 32 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, describing the case of Daniel Price, convicted of killing a "*negroe*" "in a sudden heat of passion, who had been sentenced to a fine of £350 and imprisonment until the fine was paid, but he could afford to pay only part of the sum, and who had petitioned that if he had killed a white man, he would have been treated better, and that he deserved to be released from prison under presumption that between money and time spent in prison, he had fully paid the penalty; Bull being willing to suspend the remaining fine and seeking Royal concurrence in resolving this situation [with enclosure, document 105] [SS number C.19.] [duplicate of this letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 141]
105. June 15, 1770 [80]  
Copy of Bull's warrant concerning the Daniel Price case, stating his willingness to suspend the remaining fine, as long as the King concurred [enclosed with Bull's August 16, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 104]
106. August 17, 1770 [81]  
Letter No. 33 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, relating the appearance of a Spanish ship in South Carolina waters, with a request from the Spanish Governor of Yucatan to purchase survival supplies at regular commercial prices to be delivered to the inhabitants of Yucatan, who were stricken with famine; relating Bull's attempt to discern the best policy in this case, taking into account both legal considerations between Spain and Britain, as well as humanitarian considerations, plus Britain's customs duty laws; having decided to allow the supplies to be purchased and exported, while ensuring that the appropriate customs duties were paid; hoping for the King's approbation of this "*extraordinary*" solution to an "*extraordinary*" situation [SS number C.20.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 143]
107. August 23, 1770 [83]  
Letter No. 34 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, describing the Assembly's convening, of returning to consideration of the resolutions from Virginia, and, in the tax bill, enforcing its financial plan adopted the previous December 8, despite the King's Additional Instruction declaring this legislation to be unconstitutional; hoping that his dealing with these issues would be approved by the King [with enclosures, documents 108, 109] [identified as a second SS number C.20.; sequentially actually SS number C.21.]

[for text of the Additional Instruction, see document 80] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 144]

108. August 22, 1770 [85]  
Copy of Commons House communication to Bull concerning the King's Additional Instruction regarding the December 8 financial enactments of the Assembly, which Commons House questions out of fear that the King had been misinformed by colonial officials to oppose the Assembly's just enactments [for more on this Additional Instruction, see note after Reel 2 document 145] [enclosed with Bull's August 23, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 107] [another copy in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 145]
109. August 23, 1770 [87]  
Copy of Bull's response to Commons House' August 22 communication to Bull [document 108], stating that he knew of no representations from South Carolina government that could be construed to have misinformed the King about Commons House's enactments; insisting that he regularly followed all the rules of lawmaking in the British colonial system [enclosed with Bull's August 23, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 107] [another copy in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 146]
110. October 19, 1770 [89]  
Draft [outgoing] of Letter No. 40 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, expressing the King's approval of suspending the portion of Daniel Price's fine that he could not pay; without agreeing to Common House's position, also acknowledging the efficacy of Bull's actions in relation to the Spanish ship seeking to purchase supplies; reminding Bull that he cannot disobey a direct order of the King through the Secretary of State, but surmising that the King would graciously consider individual situations
111. October 25, 1770 [91]  
Letter from John Robinson at Treasury Chambers to Undersecretary of State John Pownall, stating the Lords of Treasury concurrence with Bull's suspension of Daniel Price's unpaid balance on a fine for killing a Negro [with enclosure, document 112] [SS number C.22.]
112. August 10, 1770 [93]  
Copy of letter from Bull at Charleston to the Lords of Treasury, explaining the Daniel Price case and his actions to suspend the unpaid remainder of the fine [enclosed with John Robinson's October 25, 1770 letter to John Pownall]

113. September 8, 1770 [95]  
Letter No. 35 from Bull to Hillsborough, explaining the Commons House's logic in assuming certain direct financial powers on December 8, 1769, and the colonial government's understanding and practice of royal policies, including financial policies and powers, with details and historical context [with enclosures, documents 114-118] [identified as a second SS number C.22; sequentially actually SS number C.23.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 147]
114. August 30, 1770 [100]  
Copy of communication of Commons House to Bull, requesting information of any Additional Instructions the South Carolina colonial government might have received instructing the governor to withhold information from the Assembly or to communicate in privacy rather than through official correspondence channels [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 113] [another copy in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 148]
115. August 31, 1770 [102]  
Copy of Bull's response to Commons House, providing information on what correspondence he had had with the Secretary of State [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 113] [another copy in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 150]
116. September 5, 1770 [104]  
Copy of communication of Commons House to Bull, delivering the report of the Commons House committee which had reviewed Bull's August 15, 1770 letter and the attached the King's Additional Instruction dated in April 1770 [enclosed with the Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 113]
117. [no date] [106]  
Copy of report by a committee of Commons House to review and comment on the King's Additional Instruction to the South Carolina colonial governor concerning the Commons House's enactment of a law assigning certain financial powers to Commons House rather than to the Governor; listing resolutions taken by the committee for Commons House reaction and response to the "charges" in the Additional Instruction; maintaining that Commons House did have independent authority and jurisdiction over certain financial powers, that having the treasurer advance money under certain circumstances was included in those powers, that the Commons House's order for a line of credit from the Treasurer was therefore proper, that the action by Commons House did not issue money from the treasury already designated for other purposes;

concluding therefore that the Additional Instruction's requirements and restrictions on Common House legitimate powers were falsely based on misinformation, stating also that the provisions in the Common House's actions of December 8, 1769 were necessary to protect the public monies, concluding that whoever designed the Additional Instruction, based as it was on "*false, partial and insidious representation...are guilty of high Misdemeanors and are Enemies to his Majesty's Province*" [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 113] [for text of the Additional Instruction see document 80] [another copy of report in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 149]

118. [no date] [109]  
Extract from proceedings of the South Carolina Assembly, listing past instances in which the Assembly borrowed public monies, some instances with approval of the Governor and Council and some through direct transactions with the Treasurer; including items with dates from 1752 to 1760, 1764, 1765, and lastly, December 8, 1769 [enclosed with Bull's September 8, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 113] [another extract is in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 151]
119. November 15, 1770 [111]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 41 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, agreeing with Bull that the recent resolutions of the Assembly concerning the April 1770 Additional Instruction were "ill-founded"; reminding Bull to "*strictly adhere to the Directions you have received in respect to the Exercise of your Negative in the passing of Money Bills*"
120. November 15, 1770 [113]  
Draft [outgoing] letter [unnumbered] from Hillsborough to Montagu [in England], informing him that the King expected him to "*immediately repair to your Government*" [see follow-up correspondence in documents 121, 122, and 136, dated November 17, November 21, and December 8, 1770, respectively, in which Montagu replied to Hillsborough that he would leave "*as soon as possible*" but that his health was still poor; to which Hillsborough responded, stressing that it was "*of importance to go as soon as [he] can embark*"; to which Montagu responded that he would embark as soon as he could find a British warship "*ready to carry him.*" Montagu clearly was in no rush to leave, despite Hillsborough's unmistakably strong directives to leave quickly. Montagu finally left England on July 29, 1771 on board a suitable (for him) warship and arrived in Charleston on September 15, 1771.]

121. November 17, 1770 [115]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Bath, England, to Hillsborough, acknowledging receipt of Hillsborough's November 15 1770 letter expressing the King's desire that the Governor return to South Carolina, responding that he would comply "*as soon as possible*"; stating that his health was "*greatly better*" but was "*still far from being established*" [SS number C.24.]
122. November 21, 1770 [117]  
Draft [outgoing] letter [unnumbered] from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, responding to Montagu's November 17, 1770 letter that "*His Majesty thinks that, in the present Situation of Affairs in the Province of S. Carolina, it is of Importance that His Governor should be upon the Spot*"; requesting that Montagu inform him, as information for the King, of "*how soon you will be ready to embark*"
123. October 20, 1770 [119]  
Letter No. 36 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, enclosing a *Gazette* [document 124] with information about proceedings of the Assembly concerning control over money; otherwise informing Hillsborough about the Assembly's effort to enforce their [nonimportation] resolutions and about other activities of American committees; stating the current weakness of the Council for lack of members, and related matters [SS number C.25.]
124. September 23 to October 3, 1770 [121]  
Printed issue of *The South-Carolina and American General Gazette*, including, along with other news and opinion, information about actions of the South Carolina Assembly [enclosed with Bull's October 20, 1770 letter to Hillsborough, document 123]
125. December 11, 1770 [123]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 42 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, expressing regret that "*discontents*" were still being agitated by Associators in South Carolina; informing Bull that South Carolina's Agent [Charles Garth], representing the wishes of his constituents [meaning especially merchants] had petitioned the King for revocation of the Additional Instruction of April 1770; telling Bull the King had approved of Bull's consistent support of royal policy; informing Bull of the King's direction that should Montagu return quite soon to rule in South Carolina; informing Bull the King had disallowed two acts of the Assembly in South Carolina
126. September 13, 1770 [125]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Bull in Charleston to Hillsborough; enclosing a *Gazette* [document 127] with news of the Assembly's actions relative to the dispute over money control between it and the Council [and governor] [SS number C.26.]

127. September 3 to 10, 1770 [127]  
Printed issue of *The South-Carolina and American General Gazette*, including, along with other news and opinion, news of the Assembly's actions concerning the dispute between the Council and Assembly over money control [enclosed with Bull's September 13 letter to Hillsborough, document 126]
128. December 24, 1770 [129]  
Letter [unnumbered] from three Lords of the Admiralty, at the Admiralty Office, to Hillsborough, conveying a petition [document 129] received by them from merchants of South Carolina and Georgia concerning their fears that their colonies might be taken over by Spain if a war breaks out between the Spaniards and the British [SS number C.27.]
129. December 18, 1770 [131]  
Petition of merchants in South Carolina and Georgia in London, concerning the threat of war between Britain and Spain and the resulting danger that these two colonies could be taken over by Spain, and that such an eventuality would bring negative results for the importation to Britain of valuable goods as well as the property and livelihoods of British subjects in these colonies; requesting that Britain organize a convoy to convey ships from the colonies to Britain safely, no later than March 21, 1771; signed by 14 individuals

## **Volume 394—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Secretary of State Correspondence, (incoming), continue**

January 21, 1761 to December 14, 1772    Documents 130 to 208    [Frames 1 to 182]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volumes 382, 385, 386, and 389 to 393 for information and content of the preceding microfilmed Volumes of this correspondence. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Volume 394 continues the fairly regular pattern of correspondence from Volume 393 with documents dated between November 1771 and December 14, 1772 (with two letter enclosures dating from 1761). During much of this period, leadership was fairly stable. Lord Hillsborough remained as Secretary of State for the Colonies; William Bull II remained Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina and was acting as governor during the extended leave for health reasons of South Carolina Governor Charles Greville Montagu. However, in September 1771, Montagu had returned to duty in Charleston, and in August 1772, Hillsborough had left office to be replaced by Lord Dartmouth.

**Note:** Archivists in the Secretary of State's office continued the practice in Volume 393 of numbering official incoming documents. This Volume begins with SS number D.1. and ends abruptly, with no explanation, with D.18, in the middle of the Volume. No documents are identified with SS numbers after July 1771.

In Volume 394, Hillsborough and Bull continued the practice of numbering their letters to each other. Bull's numbered letters to Hillsborough are all microfilmed, from No. 37 to No. 53 (the last numbered letter he sent before Montagu's return in September 1771). Hillsborough's draft outgoing correspondence to Bull and then to Governor Montagu continued to be included among the incoming correspondence, with numbers in this Volume from No. 43 (January 2, 1771) to No. 53 (July 1, 1771). When Montagu continued his official correspondence with Hillsborough in September 1771 after his extended leave of absence in England, and later, as he corresponded with Lord Dartmouth in 1772, he numbered his letters only irregularly.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

130. January 2, 1771 [1]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 43 from Secretary of State for the Colonies the Earl of Hillsborough at Whitehall to South Carolina Lieutenant Governor William Bull II [acting as governor in the absence on extended health-related leave of Governor Charles Greville Montagu], acknowledging receipt of a Gazette dated September 10 with news of the conflict between the South Carolina Assembly and its Council; commending the Council for its actions in response to the Assembly  
[**Note:** For more on **Wills Hill, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Hillsborough**, see note after Reel 2 document 137. He had a long career in British politics and government: First Lord of the Board of Trade from 1763-1765; Secretary of State for the Colonies and First Lord of the Board of Trade from 1768-1772; Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1779-1782.  
**William Bull II** (1710-1791) served as Lieutenant Governor between 1759 and 1775. While officially remaining Lieutenant Governor throughout the period, Bull was called on five separate times to serve as acting governor of South Carolina. Between July 1769 to September 1771, Bull acted as the South Carolina Governor Montagu was on an extended, health-related leave of absence in England.  
**Sir Charles Greville Montagu** (1741-1784) served as South Carolina's colonial governor from 1766 until 1773 (with Lieutenant Governor William Bull II assuming the governor's duties as needed when Montagu was variously indisposed, in 1768 and again in 1769 to 1771).]

131. November 25, 1770 [3]  
Letter No. 37 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing him that Gilbert Campbell had suffered the penalty of 350 lashes for killing a Negro in a fit of passion; reporting that, on recommendation of mercy by the judges, he had suspended imposition of the accompanying fine until the King's pleasure is known; with explanation for a recommendation of mercy [SS number D.1.]
132. November 30, 1770 [5]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, conveying to him a report on "*the present state of Religion, Polity, Agriculture, & Commerce*" in South Carolina; the report, with details, is contained in the body of the letter [30 manuscript pages] [SS number D.2.]
133. December 5, 1770 [21]  
Letter No. 38, marked "*Private*", from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, responding to his request for more information about the individuals Bull had recommended as associate judges, including Robert Pringle, Rawlins Lowndes, George Gabriel Powell, and John Murray [see related letters in documents 79, 100, and 103] [SS number D.3.]
134. January 24, 1771 [26]  
Letter from John Robinson at Treasury Chambers to Undersecretary of State John Pownall, concerning Bull's suspension of Gilbert Campbell's fine of £350, stating that the Lords of Treasury approve of the fine being remitted [SS number D.4.]
135. November 25, 1770 [28]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to the Lords of Treasury, informing them about the penalty of 350 lashes and a £350 fine against Gilbert Campbell, convicted of killing a Negro in a fit of passion; the lashes had been administered, but Bull had requested mercy concerning the fine, suspending it, subject to the pleasure of the King; seeking approbation for his action
136. December 8, 1770 [30]  
Letter from Montagu at Bath, England, to Hillsborough, stating that he was following Hillsborough's suggestion to apply for a "*King's Ship*" that would carry Montagu back to South Carolina, so, he would be ready to return to his governorship as soon he finds a ship ready to carry him [SS number D.5.]
137. February 11, 1771 [32]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 44 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, informing Bull that the King had remitted the fine on Gilbert Campbell; reporting that the King had also approved appointment of Thomas Knox Gordon to be Chief Justice of South Carolina and of Edward Savage to be associate judge; hoping to appoint additional associate judges soon;

reporting that Gordon had also been appointed to the South Carolina Council, along with "*your relation Mr. William Grayton*"; stating that receipt of the report on Religion, Polity, Agriculture, and Commerce in South Carolina was pleasing to the King

138. December 13, 1770 [34]  
Letter No. 39 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, describing some of the "*Theatrical Tears*" shed in the Assembly over issues of lost rights; predicting that eventually, after people cool off, most would be ashamed of their behavior in protesting against the British colonial system [SS number D.6.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 163]
139. December 15, 1770 [36]  
Duplicate Letter No. 40 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing him of the presumed death of court clerk Dougal Campbell, who had gone to Lake George in New York to recover his health, went out by himself, apparently got lost, and, despite a search, was not found; no action had yet been taken to fill his position because of the uncertainty of his death; now recommending James Johnston to be appointed court clerk [SS number D.7.] [duplicate in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 164]
140. January 17, 1771 [38]  
Letter No. 41 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning relations with the Spaniards, especially in the case of a British ship commanded by a Captain Robinson, in the context of recent fears of British war with Spain [SS number D.8.]
141. January 22, 1771 [40]  
Letter No. 42 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, reporting opening the Assembly session with a speech [document 142] on January 16, 1771; reporting on the unsettled situation with Spanish ships and privateers in the West Indies [SS number D.9.]
142. January 16, 1771 [42]  
Copy of Bull's speech to the opening of the Council and Assembly session, invoking the generous protection of the British Crown, which the Assembly and colony must earn by loyalty, obedience, and financial support; asking that both the Assembly and Council do their respective duties in the governance of South Carolina [enclosed with Bull's January 22, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 141]
143. April 1, 1771 [44]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 45 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, expressing his warm satisfaction with how Bull had governed in Governor Montagu's absence; stating that Montagu would be returning soon to Charleston;

congratulating Bull on his success in “*the return of so considerable a part of the Inhabitants of South Carolina to a just sense of their duty, and a due submission to legal authority, during your Administration, which is a peculiar honour to it*”; announcing more judicial appointments for South Carolina, including Charles Matthew Coslett and John Murray; a remaining vacancy to be filled soon; concerning the petition from Agent Garth, stating that it was under consideration and that certain suggestions had already been made against withdrawing the Additional Instruction

144. March 4, 1771 [46]  
Letter No. 43 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, explaining why he had signed a bill for exchanging £106,500; stating that it was not a concession but consistent with earlier South Carolina laws of 1731 and 1748; including historical details; expressing anticipation and hope of positive results from the return of Governor Montagu [SS number D.10.] [with enclosures, documents 145 to 154] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 165; similar letter with same date to Board of Trade in Reel 2 document 161]  
[**Note:** The 10 enclosures that follow this letter are a historian’s delight: a microcosmic summary in a completely preserved conversation/debate in January and February 1771 between South Carolina’s acting royal governor and the lower, Commons House of its Assembly. The acting governor sought to uphold the non-negotiable demands of all British subjects and their governments to obey royal policy. The Commons House sought to uphold the non-negotiable imperatives of British subjects’ inherent rights and privileges, exercised through their locally controlled governments. Since both sides insisted on a non-negotiable premise, the result was less a conversation or debate than two sides of an argument passing each other by, failing to engage one another. With hindsight, we know that these were ingredients for imminent revolution. At the time, each side claimed to base its premise on the solid rock of British institutions, traditions, and beliefs—especially loyalty to the Crown.]
145. January 25, 1771 [49]  
Copy of address by Commons House to Bull, responding to his January 16, 1771 address to them by Bull, expressing loyalty and appreciation for the Crown’s protection during the recent “*dangers*” [hostilities with the Spaniards]; stating that the Assembly had done its job to support defense and similar expenses; stating that the Additional Instruction concerning financial decisions by Commons House had been an unnecessary deterrent to the colony’s response to its protection needs; suggesting that the King’s high-placed ministers may be more subject to error than the colonial Assembly [enclosed with Bull’s March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]

146. January 25, 1771 [51]  
Copy of Bull's response to the Commons House address [document 145], accusing Commons House of exercising "*an appearance of Slight and disrespect*" in delaying response to Bull's address, with details [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
147. January 25, 1771 [53]  
Copy of Commons House response to Bull's response [document 146], denying any intent toward slight or disrespect in its previous communications to Bull or in their timing [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
148. January 31, 1771 [55]  
Copy of Commons House address to Bull, informing him that the House had made a decision to release, through the Treasurer, to Bull, a sum sufficient for him to pay £7 to each person in a distressed group of Irish Protestant settlers who had petitioned for assistance to start their settlement, under condition that the recipients "*make provision to reimburse the Public Treasurer the said sum*" [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
149. February 7, 1771 [57]  
Copy of Bull's reply to Commons House's January 31, 1771 address (document 148), stating that he cannot comply with the House's action calling for him to distribute funds to the group of Irish Protestant settlers, stating that the funds involved were already designated for other, more needy people, and that Bull could not act against the legal requirements for expenditure of these funds; stating also that the Crown's Additional Instruction, ordering that the Assembly could not take financial actions such as this, was still in force; stating further that another matter of three men who had been convicted of "*feloniously carrying away Colonel Glover's Schooner and Negroes last Spring*", rewards were to be paid for "*apprehending and bringing into the Province*" the three men, and notice had been given of the opportunity for those with claims to submit them for settlement [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
150. February 13, 1771 [59]  
Copy of Commons House's response to Bull's reply of February 7, 1771 [document 149], arguing that Bull should have had no difficulty in understanding the House's familiarly worded order or of complying with it; stating that Bull had made an unnecessarily large fuss over a very small amount of money; dismissing the significance of the Additional Instruction in this situation, since that Instruction violated the rights and privileges of the Assembly, and that the Assembly's compliance with Bull's demands would also violate those rights and privileges [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]

151. February 15, 1771 [61]  
Copy of Bull's response to Commons House's response of February 13, 1771 [document 150], pointing out that Bull could not now legally follow an order once accepted under South Carolina law but now prohibited by an Instruction from the King; stating that it was not within his nor the Assembly's power to decide whether an Instruction from the King was acceptable or not [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
152. February 27, 1771 [63]  
Copy of Commons House's response to Bull's response of February 15, 1771 [document 151], reiterating that the House meant no offense but only sought to defend the House's rights and privileges, with additional justifications [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
153. January 21, 1761 [65]  
Copy of a message by Lieutenant Governor Bull "*relative to his drawing money out of the Treasury*", informing Commons House that insufficient money was available in the treasury, asking the Assembly to approve additional sums for defense [sent by Bull in 1771 to Commons House in support of his position on Commons House's role in financial decision making] [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
154. January 24, 1761 [67]  
Copy of Commons House's 1761 response to Bull's message [document 153], agreeing to make available additional money for defense expenses [sent by Bull in 1771 to Commons House in support of his position on Commons House's role in financial decision making] [enclosed with Bull's March 4, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 144]
155. March 5, 1771 [69]  
Letter No. 44 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing him that Bull had appointed joint treasurers for South Carolina, Henry Peronneau and Benjamin Dart, as a means of countering the Assembly's implementing independent financial decisions through a single Treasurer it can control; including a legal precedent for this approach, in 1721 South Carolina law [SS document D.11.] [with enclosure, document 156] [similar letter, dated March 4, 1771, from Bull to Board of Trade, in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 161] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 166] [negative legal opinion on the concept of joint treasurers in Reel 2 document 162] [see note after Reel 2 document 161]
156. [no date] [71]  
"*Bond*" of Benjamin Dart to perform the responsibilities of Joint Treasurer totally within the bounds of the law; signed by 10 individuals [one of whom was Speaker of Commons House] [enclosed with Bull's March 5, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 155]

[in June 1773, a copy of Dart's bond, probably this one, was sent to Secretary of State Dartmouth (see Reel 7 document 13)] [similar bond for Henry Peronneau is found in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 203, of which a copy was apparently sent also to Dartmouth (see Reel 7 document 20); see also note after Reel 2 document 161]

157. May 4, 1771 [72]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 46 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Bull, notifying him that Montagu's ship still had not left England for Charleston
158. April 2, 1771 [74]  
Letter No 45 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing Hillsborough of Bull's assent to several ordinances and to appointment of George Sheed to be Commissary General of South Carolina; stating that he had tried to get the Assembly to stay in session until Governor Montagu returned, but that he had had to approve its adjournment on May 7, 1771; reporting that Attorney General [Egerton] Leigh had left on a leave of absence and that Bull had appointed James Simpson [who was then Vice Admiralty Judge in South Carolina, from which he soon resigned; see document 167] in his place [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 168; see also note after it for more on both Leigh and Simpson] [SS number D.12.]
159. May 7, 1771 [76]  
Letter No. 46 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, expressing satisfaction at the Spanish King's disavowal of involvement with or support for a recent invasion of the Falkland Islands; advocating a strong stand by British leaders against any such incursions or dangers from abroad [SS number D.13.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 169]
160. May 7, 1771 [78]  
Letter No. 47 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, updating him on several matters, including the unchanged conflict situation with Commons House [SS number D.14.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 170]
161. June 4, 1771 [80]  
Letter No. 48 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, expressing pleasure at the British government's happiness over the results of Bull's governing of South Carolina during Montagu's absence [SS number D.15.] [copy of letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 171]
162. July 9, 1771 [82]  
Letter No. 49 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, concerning the economic-development situation in South Carolina and of manufacturing tar as made in Sweden in particular [SS number D.16.] [copy of letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 172]

163. July 9, 1771 [84]  
Letter No. 50 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, conveying a memorial [document 164] from South Carolina surgeon of garrisons [George] Milligan, which contains allegations that deserve serious attention [SS number D.17.] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 173]
164. July 9, 1771 [86]  
Memorial to Bull of George Milligan, explaining his circumstances and hoping for a salary sufficient for his sustenance [enclosed with Bull's July 9, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 163] [copy of memorial in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 174]
165. July 10, 1771 [88]  
Letter from Bull at Charleston to Undersecretary of State John Pownall, acknowledging receipt of information on the making of tar in Sweden; Bull had distributed copies of this information to those in South Carolina who can best use it for the colony's economic development [Frame 88 microfilmed twice] [SS number D.18.]  
**[Note:** No document in Volume 394 was assigned an SS number after document 165 (July 10, 1771). The reason SS numbers were discontinued here is not clear from the microfilmed documents alone. It does not appear to have had anything to do with the numbering of official letters.]
166. August 7, 1771 [90]  
Letter No. 51 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, acknowledging with joy the birth of a prince to the Queen and King
167. August 7, 1771 [92]  
Letter No. 52 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing him that Bull had filled the position of Judge of the Vice Admiralty Court in South Carolina, following James Simpson's resignation, with Edward Savage
168. August 19, 1771 [94]  
Duplicate letter No. 53 from Bull at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing him that Peter Delaney, Deputy Post Master General for North America and the Bahamas, had been shot and killed in a duel, leaving a vacancy in that position; reporting having appointed William Henry Drayton to the position subject to royal approval [copy of letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 175]

169. September 26, 1771 [96]  
Letter [unnumbered; actually No. 1] from Governor Charles Greville Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing Hillsborough he had arrived September 16 at Charleston; stating that he was hopeful the Assembly would do business with him; offering initial impressions of the situation in South Carolina [with enclosures, documents 170, 171]
170. September 19, 1771 [98]  
Copy of address from South Carolina Council to Governor Montagu, congratulating him on his safe return; stating the importance of resolving the location of the boundary with North Carolina; stating that the “*dissentions that have of late unhappily subsisted in this Province have given us great concern*”; stating their intent to focus on the business of the colony [enclosed with Montagu’s September 26, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 169]
171. September 19, 1771 [100]  
Copy of address from South Carolina’s Commons House of Assembly to Governor Montagu, thanking him for his speech upon his return; mentioning the importance of resolving the North Carolina boundary; stating the opinion that the “dissentions” can be resolved through “*Candid, impartial, unprejudiced examination and enquiry into the Original Cause*”; promising to work with the Governor to conduct the business of the colony [enclosed with Montagu’s September 26, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 169]
172. December 4, 1771 [102]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 47 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, expressing hope that “*your Lordship’s Administration will not be entangled with those Difficulties which the former Violence and Prejudice of the Assembly had created*”; stating further that the sole purpose of Montagu’s administration should be “*to restore to the Constitution of the Colony those barriers against the like Attempts for the future*”; stating that he had forwarded to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury the petition for salary relief from surgeon George Milligan
173. October 24, 1771 [104]  
Letter No. 2 from Montagu at South Carolina to Hillsborough, acknowledging, despite his hopes, that disputes were again dominating relations with Commons House, now over the “*Tax Bill*”; expressing frustration that he had not been able to acquire a proper governor’s house in Charleston
174. November 13, 1771 [106]  
Letter No. 3 from Montagu at South Carolina to Hillsborough, notifying him with sorrow that Montagu had had to dissolve the Assembly because Commons House sought to order the Treasurer to give to the Commissioners of Silk Manufacture £3,000 to use to send raw silk produced in South Carolina to Great Britain;

stating that the Upper House had added an amendment making the transfer of the money a loan to be paid back, but that this amendment had been omitted in the final bill; reporting that when the [joint] treasurers refused to pay out the money, they were both placed In jail; they were released only after Montagu dissolved the Assembly [Frame 106 microfilmed twice] [with enclosures, documents 175 to 177]

175. November 5, 1771 [109]  
Copy of warrant from Commons House that the two joint Treasurers be jailed for "a *Violation and Contempt of the Authority and Privileges*" of Commons House regarding its order to release £3,000 to the Commissioners of Silk Manufacture [enclosed with Montagu's November 13, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 174]
176. November 7, 1771 [110]  
Certification of authenticity of the warrant dated November 5, 1771 [document 175], signed by Provost Marshall Roger Pinckney [enclosed with Montagu's November 13, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 174]
177. November 4, 1771 [111]  
Extract from journal of Commons House, containing the text of a message from the South Carolina Council to Commons House, expressing concern over the "*Difference of Sentiments*" between Commons House and the Council; hoping that Commons House would consider adopting "*Sentiments upon this Subject more agreeable to the nature of our Constitution, & to the Laws & Customs of Parliament*"; stating that the financial transactions in the Commons House bill were not itemized in the annual tax bill, and therefore could not be allowed; with additional details; Commons House responding with its own message, quoted in the extract, informing the Council that Commons House "*never shall regard any Ministerial Instruction in the framing of a Money Bill, nor alter any part of the Schedule upon your Requisition, And we are firmly persuaded that these will be the Sentiments of every future Commons House of Assembly. We therefore return you the Tax Bill without any Alteration*"; Commons House following up with a resolution reaffirming the initial items in the Tax Bill to which the Council objected; followed by  
November 5, 1771  
Extract of journal of Commons House, containing a resolution ordering that the two joint Treasurers be jailed because they had violated the authority and privileges of Commons House and containing the text of Governor Montagu's November 5, 1771 proclamation dissolving the General Assembly of South Carolina because of this dispute  
[both enclosed with Montagu's November 13, 1771 letter to Hillsborough, document 174]

178. January 11, 1772 [115]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 48 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, informing him that, Montagu's recent letters and enclosures having been "*so contrary to the expectations which the King had entertained of a more moderate and respectful conduct, have given His Majesty great concern & cannot fail of having consequences equally prejudicial to His Majesty's Service & to the Affairs of the Colony*"; Hillsborough also dismayed that the Assembly had not provided a decent governor's house for Montagu; holding out hope that the "*violent Measures and unwarrantable pretensions of the Assembly will be disapproved by all real Friends of the Constitution*" especially by supporting the two public treasurers; making clear that the King supports Montagu's dissolution of the Assembly and encouraging Montagu to continue observing the provisions of the Additional Instruction of April 14, 1770; finally, instructing Montagu to do all this with the appearance of moderation
179. February 5, 1772 [118]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 49 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, informing him that the Treasury had looked favorably on the petition from surgeon Milligan
180. February 5, 1772 [120]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 50 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, sending the King's disallowance of two South Carolina laws [not identified here] passed in April 1770 [the King's disallowance order (dated January 15, 1772, Reel 2 document 196) identified the two bills as first, encouraging the making of flax, linens, and thread, and second, ordering the stamping and issuing of £70,000 worth of paper money]
181. January 25, 1772 [122]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at South Carolina to Hillsborough, concerning receipt of a complaint letter from several assistant judges; reporting little additional news; reporting that a Spanish ship in distress was now in Charleston harbor; reporting his effort to gain Assembly approval for expenses for work on surveying the new boundary between North and South Carolina [with enclosure, document 182] [Frame 122 microfilmed twice]  
**[Note: Assistant judges** appear infrequently in the Board of Trade and Secretary of State incoming correspondence. They appear from time to time to have become involved collectively in public policy debates relating to the judicial system. In particular, in 1766, they weighed in on enforcement of the Stamp Act, leading Governor Montague to warn about their increasing power (Reel 2 document 45, August 6, 1766). The assistant judges became directly involved in a legal case against Chief Justice Charles Skinner, who inflexibly supported enforcement of the Stamp Act (see selected documents dated between April and August 1766 in Reel 2 (Board of Trade) between documents 28 and 69 and, later in 1766, in Reel 6 (Secretary of State) documents 152, 153, and 170.]

182. January 23, 1772 [124]  
Letter from assistant judges in South Carolina to Hillsborough, complaining that "*the Leading Men here take every method to gratify their spleen by distressing the Servants of the Crown*", with details; signed by three individuals, Edward Savage, John Murray, and John Newtzell [enclosed with Montagu's January 25, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 181] [it would make more sense for this letter to have been sent to Montagu, who then forwarded it to Hillsborough; however the evidence suggests that the assistant judges sent it directly to Hillsborough]
183. April 1, 1772 [126]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No 51 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, responding to Montagu's communications about the three assistant judges and other matters
184. June 1, 1772 [128]  
Memorial to Hillsborough of Charles Garth, royal agent of South Carolina, at Queen Street, London, requesting his assistance to intercede, on behalf of the inhabitants of South Carolina, with the King to curb Governor Montagu's illegal actions [earlier in 1772] against the legally elected Commons House of the South Carolina
185. June 6, 1772 [130]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 52 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, expressing surprise at not having received a letter from Montagu in response to Hillsborough's last letter to Montagu
186. April 27, 1772 [132]  
Letter No. 4 from Montagu at South Carolina to Hillsborough, offering bit of news of a new election in anticipation of a new Assembly, and other matters [with enclosures, documents 187 to 190]
187. April 3, 1772 [135]  
Copy of speech by Montagu to Commons House at opening of its new session following an election, informing them of his displeasure that his initial hopes to work well with Commons House had been dashed during the previous Commons House session by its unsupportable positions on spending the colony's public money through direct transactions with the Treasurers [enclosed with Montagu's April 27, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 186]
188. April 4, 1772 [137]  
Copy of address from Commons House to Montagu, responding to his speech [document 187], defending its decision to jail the two treasurers because of their illegal behavior; therefore expressing its own disappointment with the actions of the Governor [enclosed with Montagu's April 27, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 186]

189. April 9, 1772 [139]  
Copy of response by Montagu to Commons House address [document 188], informing Commons House that it should not expect any change in the Additional Instruction of April 1770, considering its conduct [enclosed with Montagu's April 27, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 186]
190. [no date; likely in April 1772] [141]  
Copy of address by Montagu to Commons House, announcing that, because of the disrespectful behavior of Commons House, the Governor was dissolving the Assembly [enclosed with Montagu's April 27, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 186]
191. July 1, 1772 [143]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 53 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to Montagu, expressing sorrow that Montagu had not been able to moderate the positions of Commons House and had to resort, again, to dissolving the Assembly; offering bits of advice, despite his distance from the events and disputes; urging Montagu to resist looking at all timid or irresolute; offering additional advice
192. June 25, 1772 [146]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu to Hillsborough, reporting the death of [John] Hughes, collector of customs at Charleston and Montagu's appointment of [Roger Peter Handasyde] Hatley to the position; who did a good job, until Royal Commissioners of Customs in Boston sought to replace him with their own choice, [George] Roupell; reporting that he [Montagu] had asked Chief Justice Thomas Knox Gordon for a legal opinion, but that in two opinions, he had contradicted himself, suggesting he was not a reliable source of legal advice; concluding that Roupell now had undue power as customs collector, deputy postmaster general, and a "searcher" of the customs [an investigator who searched ships for contraband goods] [with enclosures, documents 193 to 195] [undated duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 182] [for more on George Roupell and his politics in 1772, see also, in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 documents 183, 185; for background information, see Reel 5 document 186 (October 1767)]
193. June 15, 1772 [150]  
Copy of journal of the South Carolina Council meeting, concerning death of Hughes as customs collector at Charleston, appointment by Montagu of Hatley in his place, but also appointment by Commissioners of Customs in Boston of George Roupell to fill this position, which, according to the South Carolina Chief Justice Thomas Knox Gordon was contrary to law [see document 194] [extract of this journal entry is in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 185]  
followed by

June 16, 1772

Copy of journal of the Council, continuing consideration of the Roupell appointment, on which the Chief Justice had reversed himself, now stating that this appointment was legal and should be "*acquiesced in*"; however, the Council persisting in its original position that Roupell had not been lawfully commissioned and therefore that Montagu should suspend him; followed by

June 18, 1772

Copy of journal of the Council, containing Montagu's announcement to the Council that he had suspended Roupell [see document 195]; seeking Council support to enforce compliance from the rest of the customs officials in South Carolina, who were refusing to recognize Roupell's suspension [all enclosed with Montagu's June 25, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 192]

194. June 14, 1772 [152]

Copy of letter from Thomas Knox Gordon, South Carolina's Chief Justice, offering the opinion that the appointment power over the customs collector position ultimately rests with the colonial governors, although the King had also created a Commission of Customs, which could, at the King's command, assume this appointment power [enclosed with Montagu's June 25, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 192] [duplicate but undated letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 184]

195. June 16, 1772 [150]

Copy of letter from Montagu to Roupell, stating that, because the Commission in Boston did not have authority to appoint Roupell to be Customs Collector at Charleston, Montagu was suspending Roupell from that position [enclosed with Montagu's June 25, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 192] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 183]

196. July 27, 1772 [156]

Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, reminding Hillsborough that he had expected to go to the "*Northern Provinces*" during the summer for his health, but that no vessel had yet arrived that could carry him there; stating that he had made appointments to carry on the work of settling the boundary line with North Carolina; stating that some of the areas where the boundary was not yet established had thriving settlements from South Carolina, and that the boundary line should observe this reality

**[Public Record Office note** placed here, dated October 8, 1929, references a map of "*Part of the Counties of Mecklenburg and Tryon, lately added to the Province of South Carolina*" and states that the map was enclosed with Montagu's July 27, 1772 letter to Hillsborough (but which is not microfilmed here)]

197. August 2, 1772 [158]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at South Carolina to Hillsborough, listing 11 current South Carolina Council members by name or title with their attendance records, pointing that only two of them could reliably be expected to attend meetings; recommending that John Drayton be removed for nonattendance; recommending four individuals from whom to fill this vacancy, Charles Pinckney Sr., Thomas Loughton Smith, Benjamin Huger, Charles [Matthew] Coslett, and Edward Savage
198. September 27, 1772 [160]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 1 from new Secretary of State for the Colonies Lord Dartmouth, at Whitehall, to Governor Montagu of South Carolina, continuing consideration of the South Carolina situation over appointment of the Customs Collector and of subordinate customs officials [who had refused to accept the suspension of George Roupell as Customs Collector]; rather the question was whether Montagu was going to follow the dictates of his Instructions from London, a matter on which Dartmouth was requesting clarification from the Treasury; expressing a lack of certainty on the propriety of several of Montagu's actions  
**[Note: William Legge, 2nd Earl of Dartmouth** (1731-1801), replaced the Earl of Hillsborough as Secretary of State for the Colonies on August 27, 1772, and served until November 10, 1775. Hillsborough's last numbered letter microfilmed here is No. 53, dated July 1, 1772. References appear in Montagu's later letters to Hillsborough to the latter's displeasure with Montagu, and Montagu's defensive responses.  
Dartmouth served as Secretary of State until November 10, 1775. He did not hesitate to inject himself directly into the colonial government's issues of governance under royal aegis. He also decided to follow Hillsborough's practice of numbering his outgoing letters, starting over at No. 1 for his letters. He did not succeed (if he tried) to hold Governor Montagu to the same standard. Montagu's letters to Hillsborough after he returned from his extended leave of absence in England in September 1771, at least those microfilmed here, were infrequent and only irregularly numbered (11 letters between September 1771 and October 1772, only three of them numbered, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4., dated between October 1771 and August 1772.) Montagu's first letter to Dartmouth, dated was likewise un-numbered.]
199. August 22, 1772 [162]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at South Carolina to Hillsborough, informing Hillsborough that Montagu hoped his "*letters in regard to the Assembly*" had arrived in London, and warning that his speech to the Assembly [which he had dissolved soon after it met] attached to that letter, might, via passengers on another vessel to London, have reached the English newspapers before his letter to Hillsborough

**[Note:** Because of delays in communications back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean, colonial governors often learned only months later when political circumstances in London had brought about changes in key governmental positions, such as Secretary of State. In this case, Hillsborough had been replaced by Dartmouth as Secretary of State for the Colonies on August 27, 1772. Yet, Montagu, oblivious to this change, kept writing letters to Hillsborough through late October 1772 (document 201). On November 4, 1772, Montagu first wrote to Dartmouth, congratulating him on his appointment. Meanwhile, Dartmouth wrote first to Montagu in his letter No. 1 of September 27, 1772 (document 198).]

**[Note:** It is interesting that, during this period of political transition in England, both outgoing Hillsborough and incoming Dartmouth found themselves disenchanted with Montagu's approach to colonial governing, in the face of considerable challenges from the Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly. The slow-motion series of communications from document 198 to 206 (dated between September 27 and December 4, 1772) reveal the fragility of both Montagu's governorship and South Carolina's colonial government, two and a half years before revolutionary military hostilities began in April 1775 and three and a half years before thirteen colonies, including South Carolina, declared their independence from England.]

200. November 4, 1772 [164]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 2 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Montagu, responding to Montagu's letter to Hillsborough concerning nonattendance by some South Carolina Council members; stating that attendance at Council meetings was an important duty and that Montagu should represent such to both Othniel Beale and John Drayton and, then, if they failed to attend, the governor's duty was to replace them on the Council; stating that [David] Deas would shortly be appointed [to the Council] and [Barnard] Elliot shortly thereafter
201. September 24, 1772 [167]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Fort Johnston, South Carolina, to Hillsborough, expressing uneasiness over Hillsborough's letter expressing disapprobation over Montagu's speech to the Assembly and his dissolution (rather than proroguing) the South Carolina Assembly; defending his approach and the wording of his speech; explaining that his next move would be to convene the Assembly, after an election, at "*Beaufort, Port Royal*" rather than in Charleston, with the hopes that the change of location would help the Assembly to adopt the Tax Bill; otherwise, Montagu felt governing was at an impasse; listing his reasons for this assertion
- [Note:** Today, Beaufort and Port Royal, South Carolina remain separate towns, located about nine miles apart by water on one among many sea islands surrounded by the snaky meanders of numerous tidal creeks and rivers, about 50 miles as the crow flies—but many more as traveled by land or by water—southwest of Charleston.]

202. October 20, 1772 [171]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Hillsborough, informing him that Montagu had followed Hillsborough's suggestion to try being conciliatory by proroguing the Assembly on its first day meeting at Beaufort, to reconvene soon after in Charleston; enclosing a copy of his speech to the Assembly [document 203]
203. October 10, 1772 [173]  
Copy of Montagu's speech to the South Carolina Assembly, convened at Beaufort; in a spirit of working in cooperation with the Assembly, invoking the King's and the British constitution's authority over colonial government, and concluding by proroguing the Assembly to reconvene in Charleston on October 22 [enclosed with Montagu's October 20, 1772 letter to Hillsborough, document 202]
204. December 9, 1772 [175]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 3 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Montagu, disagreeing with Montagu's tactic of convening the Assembly at Beaufort but happy to learn that Montagu had quickly prorogued the Assembly to reconvene at Charleston; commenting that Montagu's speech was so dominated by his views on the dispute between the Assembly and Governor that it "*appears to me more likely to protract than accelerate that happy Issue of this disagreeable business, which is so earnestly desired by all who wish well to the Peace and Prosperity of the Province*"
205. December 14, 1772 [177]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 4 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Montagu, concerning an issue raised by the Postmaster General, of "*frequent & unnecessary Detentions in the American Ports*" of packet boats; stating that in all the colonies, standards should be enforced so that "*the Departure the Packets should be at fixed periods, generally known, and from which no deviation should be made but in Cases of the most urgent Necessity*"; ordering Montagu to observe this standard in South Carolina
206. November 4, 1772 [179]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Charleston to Dartmouth, congratulating him on his appointment as Secretary of State for the Colonies, of which he had just learned; enclosing resolutions of Commons House had adopted October 30, 1772, plus "*some strictures*" from the Governor "*published with a view to counteract the ill impressions those Resolves, might perhaps make here...*"; stating that Commons House had refused to give him copies of its deliberations while they were debating these resolutions; that Commons House had rejected his command to meet with him immediately; that he thereafter had prorogued the Assembly; strongly denouncing the resolutions for denying the King's prerogatives [with enclosure, document 207]

207. October 30, 1772 [181]  
Copy of Journal of Commons House, containing text of the Committee on Grievances Report, which reported the House's displeasure at how the Governor had treated them by convening them at Beaufort and then back at Charleston, creating delays and inconveniencing the members' attending to their businesses; therefore reporting four resolves, each a grievance against the Governor; Commons House receiving a command from the Governor to convene immediately with him, they continued their business, amending and adopting altered resolutions, which were then sent to South Carolina's royal agent, Charles Garth, to be used to raise the people's grievances with the government in London; the House then went to meet with the Governor, who prorogued the Assembly until November 9, 1772 [Frames 181, 182 microfilmed twice]
208. [no visible date] [no visible Frame Number]  
Printed newspaper page [barely visible; not clearly part of Volume 394 but not clearly not part of it]

## Reel 7 (Volumes 395, 396)

### Volume 395—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue

January 15, 1771 to November 22, 1773

Documents 1 to 46

[Frames 1 to 98]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volumes 382, 385, 386, and 389 to 394 for information and content of the preceding microfilmed Volumes of this correspondence. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Volume 395 continues the fairly regular pattern of correspondence from Volume 394 with documents dated between January 1773 and November 1773 (with a few attachments dated in 1771). During this period, Governor Montagu left Charleston abruptly in March 1773, resigning only after he had returned to England. A new governor, William Campbell, was appointed in March 1773 but did not actually arrive in Charleston to begin governing until June 1775. During the interim, Lieutenant Governor William Bull II again filled in as acting governor in all but title.

**Note:** In the midst of Volume 394, archivists in the Secretary of State's office had discontinued the practice of numbering official incoming documents. Volume 395 also has no SS numbers. In this Volume, Governor Montagu's few letters to Dartmouth before he sailed for England on March 6, 1773 are all unnumbered. When Bull again assumed the role of acting governor on the day Montagu left, he continued the practice. For more on letter numbering, see especially the section on the subject in the **Introduction** and the notes at the beginning of Volume 379 (Board of Trade) and of Volume 390 (Secretary of State).

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

1. January 6, 1773 [1]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 5 from [Secretary of State for the Colonies] the Earl of Dartmouth at Whitehall to [Governor of South Carolina] Charles Greville Montagu, expressing dissatisfaction at the results of Montagu's strategy of moving the Assembly's convening location from Charleston to Beaufort, which apparently made the situation worse rather than better

[**Note: William Legge, 2nd Earl of Dartmouth** (1731-1801), replaced the Earl of Hillsborough as Secretary of State for the Colonies on August 27, 1772. He held the office until November 10, 1775. His prior draft letters No. 1 to No. 4 are found near the end of Reel 6, dated between September 27 and December 14, 1772. **Charles Greville Montagu** was officially Governor for almost 7 years, from June 1766 to March 1773. However, he ruled actively in Charleston for only about 3.5 years, with two leaves of absence for health reasons, from May to October 1768 and from July 1769 to September 1771.]

2. January 23, 1773 [3]  
 "Observations" by Charles Garth, agent for South Carolina, in London, [to Dartmouth?], concerning the dispute between the Assembly and Governor in South Carolina, during which the Governor moved the Assembly to meet at Beaufort, thus causing an "*irreparable Breach between the Governor and His people*"; arguing that the Governor was at fault and that charges made against the Speaker of Commons House were ignorant of the facts [unnumbered Frame 2 and numbered Frame 3 are microfilms of the same manuscript page; also, Frame 4 is microfilmed twice]
3. January 23, 1773 [5]  
 Petition of Garth to the King concerning the difficulties of the Commons House of Assembly in South Carolina, which were blamed on the Governor, with details; seeking removal of Montagu by the King
4. [no date] [7]  
 Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette* [masthead, and thus the date, are missing]; with news and comment pertinent to Garth's petition; followed by November 12, 1772  
 Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette* with news and comment [both possibly enclosed with Garth's petition to the King, document 3]
5. January 4, 1773 [9]  
 Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at South Carolina to Dartmouth, expressing displeasure at Dartmouth's displeasure with Montagu's dispute with Commons House; stating that he had done what he felt was necessary, and hoped still to take steps to obtain an Assembly he could work with
6. January 21, 1773 [11]  
 Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at South Carolina to Dartmouth, informing him that the Commons House had convened on January 6, had elected the same Speaker as in the previous session, and had acted in ways that required him to prorogue the Assembly [again]; hoping for the King's approbation for his actions

7. [no date; received at Secretary of State office March 18, 1773] [13]  
Petition of Edward Wilkinson of South Carolina to Dartmouth, concerning Wilkinson's past employment as a trader with the Cherokee Indians, resulting in considerable debts owed to him by Cherokees for land that had been ceded to the British, which he calculated at £8,436.9.9 and did not believe he could recover from the Indians; seeking royal assistance in recovering the amounts owed him through the King's assistance
8. April 10, 1773 [15]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Montagu at Falmouth Harbour [most western sizeable English harbor on Cornwall's south coast facing the English Channel] to Dartmouth, reminding Dartmouth that he had previously suggested he would need, again, to take a leave from his duties at South Carolina to recover his own health and the health of his family; stating that, at the immediate time when the dispute with Commons House had become most impossible to deal with, he had left South Carolina for England, but that if he had felt that the Assembly could be moved to conduct public business, he would not have left; stating his intention of "*waiting upon your Lordship in London, as soon as possibly I can*"
9. March 30, 1773 [17]  
Letter No. 54 from William Bull II at Charleston to Dartmouth, informing Dartmouth that Montagu had left Charleston on March 6, and that the governing of South Carolina had again devolved to Bull; stating that, the prorogation of the Assembly having expired, he had met with its members, seeking a conciliatory approach, hoping that the issue of the Assembly's withdrawing money from the treasury unilaterally was constitutionally resolved; hoping to move the colony beyond the recent disputes toward functioning as a loyal British colony [duplicate of letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 199]  
**Note: William Bull II** (1710-1791) served as Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina from 1759 to 1775. Between 1760 and 1775, while officially remaining Lieutenant Governor throughout the period, Bull was called on five separate times to serve as acting governor of South Carolina. This was his fifth and last time to serve as acting governor, officially from, March 6, 1773 when Montagu sailed out of Charleston, without bothering to resign, until **Lord William Campbell** arrived to replace Montagu on June 18, 1775, to serve as Britain's last royal governor of colonial South Carolina until September 15, 1775, when the colonial government functionally expired. For more on Governor Campbell and the last months of South Carolina's British colonial government, see note after Reel 3 document 147. Bull remained in his Lieutenant Governor position until the colonial government collapsed in September 1775. Although he had been in many ways the glue that kept colonial South Carolina together and functioning, he too ultimately failed to resurrect the British colony in the face of revolution. For more on Bull, see note after Reel 1 document 108.]

10. April 9, 1773 [19]  
Letter No. 55 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, noting that Council member Othniel Beale had died, recommending a choice between Thomas Smith, Miles Brewton, and John Deas as possible replacement. [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 200]
11. June 10, 1773 [21]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 6 from Dartmouth to Bull, expressing the King's pleasure that Bull had convened the Assembly with a conciliatory speech; hoping that now the South Carolina colony would move on toward better government; stating that Lord William Campbell had been appointed to replace Montagu as Governor of South Carolina [appointed in June 1773, but did not arrive at Charleston until June 1775, too late to save the South Carolina government from collapsing, three months later, under long-building revolutionary pressures, on September 15, 1775.] [Dartmouth continued his sequence of numbered letters when Lieutenant Governor William Bull II again became acting governor after Governor Montagu sailed to England and only when he arrived there announced his resignation]
12. June 16, [1773] [23]  
Letter from Charles Garth at Devizes [a small town east of Stratford-on-Avon, in Wiltshire, England] to Dartmouth, concerning the bond required to be signed by South Carolina's joint treasurers [with enclosure, document 13]
13. [no date] [25]  
Copy of bond signed by South Carolina "*Joint Public Treasurer*" Benjamin Dart [probably in March 1771 (see Reel 2 document 167, Reel 6 document 156); in June 1773, Garth sent a copy of apparently this bond to Secretary of State Dartmouth (document 12)] [a separate bond was signed by Henry Peronneau, the other joint Treasurer, also in March 1771 (see Reel 2 document 203, Reel 7 document 20); see also note after Reel 2 document 161] [enclosed with Garth's June 16, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 12]
14. June 17, 1773 [27]  
Letter from Garth at Devizes to Undersecretary of State John Pownall, sending certain papers for the Secretary of State; concerning funds for a governor's house in Charleston [with enclosures, documents 15 to 17]
15. October 9, 1771 [29]  
Extract from Journal of Commons House, concerning funding for a governor's house in Charleston; establishing a committee on the subject; followed by October 11, 1771  
Extract from Journal of Commons House, containing the committee's report that a search had been done of the town, and no house could be found none could be found that "*is agreeable to the Governor*"; recommending that the Governor's annual house rental allowance be doubled to £200 Sterling; followed by

October 18, 1771

Extract from Journal of Commons House, with consideration of the committee report, including an amendment changing the revised rental allowance sum from “£200 Sterling” to “£1,200 Currency”, after which the committee report was approved; followed by

January 15, 1771

Extract of speech by Bull, stating that the first priority for defense spending was for a battery at Fort Lyttelton; followed by

January 24, 1771

Extract of response to Bull’s speech by Commons House, stating that it had already committed to necessary funding for a battery at Fort Lyttelton

[all enclosed with Garth’s June 17, 1773 letter to John Pownall, document 14]

16. May 3, 1773 [31]  
Sworn statement by Clerk James Johnston of the accuracy of the copied documents in document 15 [enclosed with Garth’s June 17, 1773 letter to John Pownall, document 14]
17. May 5, 1773 [33]  
Account of public gun powder “*expended*” to various fortifications under an order of Governor Montagu, with transactions dated from October 1, 1771 to February 4, 1773, with a total weight of 12,200 pounds [enclosed with Garth’s June 17, 1773 letter to John Pownall, document 14]
18. May 12, 1773 [35]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, conveying congratulations for the Queen’s safe delivery of a young Prince
19. May 15, 1773 [37]  
Letter No. 56 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, hoping that legislative matters would settle down; conveying copies of the two bonds signed by the joint Treasurers for South Carolina; updating Dartmouth on efforts being made to grow grape vines in South Carolina, plus other domestic economic and social matters [with enclosure, document 20] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 201]
20. March 1, 1771 [39]  
Copy of bond signed by Henry Peronneau as one of two joint Treasurers [he had served previously as the sole Treasurer since mid-1770 (see Reel 2 documents 140, 203, Reel 6 document 102)] [In May 1773, Bull sent to Dartmouth a copy of apparently this bond (document 19)] [similar bond signed in March 1771 by Dart, the other joint treasurer (see Reel 2 document 167, Reel 6 document 156, Reel 7 document 13] [enclosed with Bull’s May 15, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 19]

21. June 14, 1773 [41]  
Letter No. 57 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, promising to enforce a new law of Parliament, to be enforced by a royal order dated April 7, 1773 concerning land surveying for land grants and other purposes but finding potential difficulties with them [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 202]  
[Note: The law is known as the **Enclosure Act of 1773**. It established procedures for land surveying, purchasing, possessing, owning, and enclosing for private use, which encouraged land ownership and speculation by the wealthy and powerful. It also abolished the old English common law concept of “commons” land owned in common by common people. Although wealthy South Carolina plantation owners had long subscribed to this way of thinking, because the source of this law was the British government in London, it was distrusted as being potentially dangerous for American self-government.]
22. August 4, 1773 [43]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 7 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, encouraging South Carolina’s attempts to develop vineyards; concerning support for efforts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in South Carolina; supporting Bull’s initial steps to enforce the royal order concerning surveying
23. July 24, 1773 [45]  
Letter No. 58 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, stating that he had prorogued the Assembly on July 9, 1773 because it was not conducting business; not expecting productive legislative work from this Assembly; stating, however, that not all inhabitants supported the Assembly’s March 1773 resolutions [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 207]
24. August 26, 1773 [47]  
Letter No. 59 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, explaining his actions regarding the Assembly when it met (briefly) on July 9; explaining a new financial issue involving the joint treasurers and public funds and private merchant debts plus other issues between the acting governor and Assembly [with enclosures, documents 25 to 30] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 204]
25. August 11, 1773 [51]  
Copy of Bull’s address to Commons House, stating that, under the circumstances, he would not be opening the session with a speech; stating that he thinks the Assembly should move rapidly to provide for paying the public debts [enclosed with Bull’s August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 24]

26. August 13, 1773 [53]  
Copy of Commons House's response to Bull's address, stating that Commons House was ready to do business, whether on matters suggested by the acting governor or on its own accord; pointing out the stress of dealing with the public debt and annual tax bill at the same time; [enclosed with Bull's August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth. document 24]
27. August 16, 1773 [55]  
Pages of a printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, without the front page with masthead and date, with news and commentary in South Carolina, including actions of the acting governor and Assembly; followed by  
August 16, 1773  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, without the front page with masthead and date, with news and commentary in South Carolina, including actions of the acting governor and Assembly; followed by  
August 23, 1773  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, without the front page with masthead and date, with news and commentary in South Carolina, including actions of the acting governor and Assembly  
[all enclosed with Bull's August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 24]
28. August 23, 1773 [59]  
Copy of address from Upper House of the South Carolina Assembly [which was also the South Carolina Council] to Bull, expressing amazement that Commons House had represented the Council as having tried to deceive the acting governor; commenting on the middle position the joint Treasurers hold, answering to Commons House and to the acting governor, with details on the financial condition of the colony [enclosed with Bull's August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 24]
29. August 23, 1773 [61]  
Copy of resolutions by the Council, estimating that the Treasury held no more than about £10,000, but that £127,674.6.11 was owed on the public debt, and that amount could not be said to be in the Treasury; stating that the lack of attention by Commons House to the colony's finances had put in jeopardy public confidence in the South Carolina's finances and economy; stating that Commons House's communication had been "*unparliamentary*" and insulting; expecting Commons House to communicate "*in all deliberations for the public good*"; signed by Egerton Leigh, leader in the Council/Upper House [enclosed with Bull's August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 24]
30. August 11, 1773 [63]  
Extract of journals of the Upper House of Assembly in relation to the financial condition of the Treasury, including testimony from Joint Treasurer Peronneau that the money in the Treasury, under normal expenditures, would last until the beginning of October; followed by

August 13, 1773

Extract of journals of the Upper House, still in relation to the financial condition of the Treasury, Peronneau reporting that £158,476 had been spent since the previous year's tax bill was adopted; followed by

August 20, 1773

Extract of journals of the Upper House, with Peronneau reporting that bonds issued to pay the previously existing debt had become due on June 1, 1773; followed by

August 21, 1773

Extract of journals of the Upper House, including report of a committee consisting of Chief Justice [Thomas Knox Gordon] and [Council member William Henry] Drayton, who had inspected the Treasury accounts to determine South Carolina's public financial condition and that the Treasury had only something approaching £10,000 in it; passage of a motion to report their findings to the acting governor

[all enclosed with Bull's August 26, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 24]

31. October 28, 1773 [65]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 8 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, judging the evidence Bull had sent concerning the colony's finances was "*fresh Evidence of the ill effects of the Assembly's obstinacy in refusing to comply with the just and equitable expectations of the Crown*"
32. September 18, 1773 [67]  
Letter No. 60 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, describing "*extraordinary*" happenings "*in our Legislative Theatre*", that the Upper House had had a printer jailed for having printed in *The South Carolina Gazette* journals of the Council without an order, but that justices of the peace who heard the printer's habeas corpus plea, who happened to be the speaker and a member of Commons House, had released the printer; describing conflict between Commons House and the acting governor on the issue of Commons House's using the power to issue money to finance paying off the public debts of merchants; including Bull's thoughts, both historically and given the current situation, about proper governing [with enclosures, documents 33 to 38] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 208]
33. September 11, 1773 [72]  
Copy of memorial from South Carolina Council to the King, laying "*at your Royal feet the critical and dangerous State of Our present situation*"; describing the conflict between Commons House and the acting governor and Council over the jailing of a printer, as an example of a larger problem in the American colonies; seeking to convince the King of the severity of the situation and of the need for royal assistance to return the colonies to proper governing [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 32] [copy of memorial, with no date, in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 210]

34. September 4, 1773 [75]  
Certification by Roger Pinckney, sheriff of Charleston, identifying a copy of Council journal that had been printed in *The South Carolina Gazette* without authorization by Thomas Powell, printer, and concerning the legal proceeding that followed [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 32]
35. August 31, 1773 [76]  
Extract of journal of Upper House of Assembly of South Carolina, containing the decision to jail Thomas Powell, printer [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 32]
36. September 1, 1773 [part of 77]  
Copy of document by which Justices of the Peace Rawlins Lowndes and George Gabriel Powell released Thomas Powell [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 32]
37. September 2, 1773 [part of 77]  
Certification by Roger Pinckney, sheriff of Charleston, of the authenticity of the Justices of the Peace document [document 36]; followed by  
September 3, 1773  
Certification by Justices of the Peace Lowndes and G. G. Powell of their action concerning Thomas Powell [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 32]
38. September 15, 1773 [78]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, with news and comment plus public documents, including documents related to the Thomas Powell legal situation [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 32] [copy or similar with same date in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 209]
39. September 19, 1773 [80]  
Letter No. 61 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, forwarding a letter from Egerton Leigh, who was the nucleus of communications back and forth about the Thomas Powell situation [with enclosure, document 40] [duplicate letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 211]
40. September 18, 1773 [82]  
Copy of letter from Egerton Leigh at Charleston to Bull, informing Bull of having received a letter from Edward Rutledge that he had been asked to represent Thomas Powell in a case against Leigh for bringing legal difficulties upon Powell [enclosed with Bull's September 18, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 39] [copy of letter in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 212]

[**Note:** In 1773, the leading men of South Carolina were already beginning to take sides and square off against one another. **Egerton Leigh** remained a staunch loyalist, who fled to England in 1775 to escape from what he saw as “rebel” persecution in South Carolina. **Edward Rutledge**, who considered himself a “patriot” rather than a rebel and was a signer of the Declaration of Independence in 1776.]

41. November 22, 1773 [84]  
Letter from William Campbell at Portsmouth [England] to Dartmouth, announcing his having just arrived at Portsmouth and intending to wait upon the Secretary of State shortly [although appointed Governor of South Carolina in June 1773, Campbell proved to be in no hurry, having just arrived in England, to undertake the voyage to Charleston to take over his responsibilities as Governor]
42. November 29, 1773 [86]  
Letter from Charles Garth at Devizes to Dartmouth, concerning the case against Attorney General Egerton Leigh in relation to Thomas Powell
43. October 20, 1773 [88]  
Letter No. 62 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, concerning a bill in Commons House against Attorney General Egerton Leigh for his actions in relation to the printer Thomas Powell [with attachment, document 44]
44. October 16, 1773 [90]  
Duplicate letter from Egerton Leigh at Charleston to Bull, reporting on the situation of the charges against him in the Powell case, with details [enclosed with Bull’s October 20, 1773 letter to Dartmouth, document 43]
45. October 21, 1773 [92]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, enclosing journals of the Council/Upper House of the Assembly of South Carolina [not microfilmed here]
46. December 15, 1773 [94]  
Copy of petition from Garth at London to the King concerning the charges against Leigh in the Powell situation; presenting the side of Powell and Commons House against Attorney General Leigh [with scrivener’s note that original petition had been sent to the Privy Council]

## Volume 396—Itemized, Annotated Contents

### Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), continue

December 24, 1773 to November 26, 1777 Documents 47 to 172 [Frames 1 to 319]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volumes 382, 385, 386, and 389 to 395 for information and content of the preceding microfilmed Volumes of this correspondence. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Volume 396 continues the fairly regular pattern of correspondence from Volume 395 with documents dated between the end of 1773 and the end of 1777. Lieutenant Governor William Bull II continued as acting governor as this period began. On June 18, 1775, new Governor William Campbell finally arrived (after having been appointed in June 1773). By this time the protest movement against the colonial government in South Carolina had escalated into establishment of an alternative government with Provincial Assembly and Council of Safety, and relations between the two "governments" had deteriorated and become violent. In this situation, Campbell had little or no chance to pull the colonial government back from collapse on September 15, 1775, resulting from the pressure exerted by the "rebels". A rebellion had begun, and Britain's policy quickly changed from managing unruly colonies to punishing and defeating rebellious colonies—using military violence. Governor Campbell tried to exercise some measure of control in his colony, but he was forced to live on a British Navy vessel for protection and had no real authority in South Carolina. By the end of this period, he was still trying to re-establish some colonial governmental authority, with little success.

**Note:** In the midst of Volume 394, archivists in the Secretary of State's office had discontinued the practice of numbering official incoming documents. Volume 396 also has no SS numbers. In this Volume, acting governor Bull's ongoing correspondence with Secretary of State Lord Dartmouth is numbered continuously without break from No. 54 through No. 90. Thus ended the longest series of consecutively numbered letters in the system of official, numbered correspondence between secretaries of state and South Carolina governors (acting governor in this case). Multiple political events in 1775 led to greater instability and fragmentation, which shows up even in letter numbering. On June 18, Governor Campbell finally arrived in Charleston. He started a new series of official letters to Secretary of State Dartmouth. Bull was out (again) as acting governor, so his series of letters was discontinued. By September 15, South Carolina's colonial government collapsed under intense pressure of rebellious protesters in Charleston. Yet ironically, no letter-numbering series was affected. Since Britain had not given up the war, the apparent loss of South Carolina was considered temporary and contingent. In London, on November 10, Dartmouth was replaced by Germain as Secretary of State. Thus Germain started a new series of letters to Campbell, but Campbell chose to continue the series he had started in January 1775 with Dartmouth. Campbell's last numbered letter to Germain was dated November 29, 1776. Soon after, he returned to England, having played the role of governor without a government for more than a year. Germain continued his official correspondence with Campbell until January 14, 1777.

With Campbell back in England “without a job” as governor and with little chance of a southern military campaign any time soon to recapture Charleston, little point remained in corresponding.

Yet, four years later, the numbered letters reappeared (see transcripts of Germain and Bull letters dated in 1781 in Reel 12 Volumes 408 and 410. This time Germain was communicating with (whom else?) William Bull II. Still recognized as Lieutenant Governor, Bull (along with other colonial government leaders) was being encouraged to return to Charleston after its capture in May 1780, to re-establish colonial South Carolina. Bull went, early in 1781, and served as Intendant General of Charleston’s quasi-civil municipal government, the Board of Police, during the city’s British military occupation. When the British troops evacuated Charleston in December 1782, Bull went with them. And thus finally ended the British South Carolina colony, which had held out (a least in British minds and official correspondence) for over seven years.

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

47. January 8, 1774 [1]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 9 from [Secretary of State for the Colonies] the Earl of Dartmouth at Whitehall to [William] Bull [II, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina and acting governor between governors], expressing hope that he would receive some of the credit if his advice to Bull concerning Commons House had improved the situation; unhappy about the charges against South Carolina Attorney General Egerton Leigh regarding Leigh’s actions against printer Thomas Powell for printing journals of the Council without an order to do so
48. December 24, 1773 [3]  
Letter No. 63 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting that Captain Curling had arrived at Charleston with 257 chests of tea “*sent by the East India Company with the same instructions to agents appointed here as at Boston, New York & Philadelphia*”; reporting that Curling had kept the tea on board his vessel because he was aware of threats violence, as had occurred at the northern ports; describing threats from some Charleston merchants; describing how the customs collectors at the port had sought to seize the ship and its cargo, not to collect the tea duties but to obtain and sell the tea; describing how the government had instead seized the ship to protect it; describing the various reactions Charlestonians had to the situation and how they should respond personally

49. February 5, 1774 [5]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 10 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, stating that the actions to obtain the tea without the tea duty being paid, as described in Bull's letter of December 24, 1773 were "*unwarrantable*", and that Bull's protecting the East India Company ship from seizure by the custom collectors was "*much approved by the King*"  
[Note: The famous **Boston Tea Party** occurred on December 16, 1773. Around the same time, less violent but similarly motivated actions took place in the harbors of New York, Philadelphia—and **Charleston**, as reported in document 48 by acting governor Bull and responded to in document 49 by Secretary of State Dartmouth. For the protesting colonies, the dispute over a duty on tea escalated the conflict with Britain another notch, moving it from protests, pamphlets, and committee organizing toward political maneuvering and civil disobedience—and violence against property. In New England, such violence was not new at the Boston Tea Party. In June 1772, merchant leaders in Rhode Island had instigated the burning of the British revenue schooner HMS *Gaspée*. For the southern colonies, such violence was slower to be used, although by early 1775, South Carolinians, along with other colonies, had gone beyond violence against property to violence against loyalists and their property. Britain recognized this as rebellion and responded with military violence to force colonial obedience, but the colonies chose to define it as a war of revolution. See note after document 95.]
50. February 11, 1774 [7]  
Letter No. 64 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, concerning a "*murderous*" attack by Creek Indians in Georgia's interior and actions he had taken since for protection in the interior of South Carolina; reporting having appointed William Henry Drayton to a judge position, replacing Justice [John] Murray, who had died; describing the controversy with Commons House over qualifications for judges, which appointment of Drayton had helped resolve; concerning the need to support a petition to assist Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre's effort to redevelop the failed settlement of New Bordeaux [with enclosure, document 51; see also note after this document]
51. [no date] [9]  
Petition of Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre to the King, seeking his approval for South Carolina to grant additional lands to help re-establish New Bordeaux settlement more prosperous [enclosed with Bull's February 11, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 50]  
[Note: For more on St. Pierre's effort to re-establish a faltering French immigrant colony in South Carolina, see Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 documents 176 to 178, 180 to 181, 197 and Reel 3 document 145, all dated probably in 1771 and 1772, plus notes after Reel 2 document 176 and Reel 3 document 145. Unfortunately this effort in 1774 also faltered when Saint Pierre was killed sometime in the mid-1770s on an expedition against Indians.]

52. March 10, 1774 [11]  
Letter No. 65 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting on the ongoing conflict between him and Commons House, especially over treasury issues; concerning raising troops for frontier defense [with enclosure, document 53]
53. March 3, 1774 [13]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, with news and commentary on the conflict between the acting governor and Commons House and more [enclosed with Bull's March 10, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 52]
54. March 24, 1774 [14]  
Letter No. 66 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, describing a "*new expedient contrivance by the Assembly*" concerning Egerton Leigh and a sum of £1,500 and other matters in the conflict between Bull and Commons House [with enclosures, documents 55 to 57]
55. March 10, 1774 [16]  
Extract from journal of the South Carolina Commons House, containing report of a committee considering a response to several commands of Lieutenant Governor Bull; supporting Bull's call for troops to defend the frontier [enclosed with Bull's March 24, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 54]
56. March 11, 1774 [18]  
Extract from journal of Commons House, containing report of a committee concerning a letter by Attorney General Egerton Leigh about enforcing the law in relation to Commons House's resolution of September 10, 1773 to use money from the £10,500 withdrawn by Commons House from the Treasury on December 8, 1769, and for the money to be made available under authority of the bonds of the joint treasurers [enclosed with Bull's March 24, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 54]
57. March 11 to March 18, 1774 [20]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, containing news, commentary, and public documents, including some related to the dispute between Commons House and the acting governor [enclosed with Bull's March 24, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 54]
58. May 4, 1774 [22]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 11 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, concerning a claim by a German Baron Alvensleben on land for settlement in South Carolina, with orders that Bull was to report to Dartmouth on all the land transactions in which this baron was involved [with enclosure, document 59]

59. March 30, 1774 [24]  
Letter, written in French, from Baron Alvensleben at London to Dartmouth, delivered to Secretary of State office with letter from Margrave of Anspach, concerning Alvensleben's land claim [enclosed with Dartmouth's May 4, 1774 letter to Bull, document 58 (a draft outgoing letter)]
60. May 4, 1774 [26]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No 12 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, reiterating the policy that no public funding can be authorized by the lower legislative house along; concerning the frontier violence in South Carolina, clearly blaming the Creek Indians, without concern for the details presented by Bull; hoping that this incident of violence was an isolated event by a few "*disorderly young warriors*", that could probably be contained
61. April 26, 1774 [28]  
Letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, congratulating the Queen and King for delivering a healthy prince
62. May 3, 1774 [30]  
Letter No. 67 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, concerning Commons House's continuing to involve itself with financial matters on its own, combined with intervening in financial matters pertaining to the public debt
63. May 3, 1774 [32]  
Letter No. 68 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, stating that he would follow new Instructions about how to handle land transactions
64. July 6, 1774 [34]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 13 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, stating that Campbell would soon be embarking for his voyage to Charleston to begin governing South Carolina and that affairs should be prepared for his arrival and assumption of the governorship
65. May 25, 1774 [36]  
Letter No. 69 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, expressing skeptical hope that Georgia's stoppage of the Indian trade would work out for the best; stating that what had happened in relation to tea in Boston would not be allowed in South Carolina;
66. June 4, 1774 [38]  
Letter No. 70 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, concerning one Israel Baxter who was convicted of harboring robbers and was jailed because he could not pay his way out; requesting the King's favor to remit the man's fine

67. August 3, 1774 [40]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 14 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, reporting that he had referred the case of Israel Baxter to the King
68. July 31, 1774 [42]  
Letter No. 71 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, expressing hope that Parliamentary action in the Boston Port Act would help the colonial situation in America; stating that activities of resolutions and correspondence from certain colonies “*have raised an universal Spirit of Jealousy against Great Britain, and of unanimity towards each other*”, including South Carolina, where a large crowd turned out in Charleston to hear about the initiative from Boston to establish a “*Congress of Committees*” [also called the “*High Court of Congress*” (see document 72) and later the First Continental Congress, which convened at Philadelphia on September 5, 1774]; fearing that “*this spirit of opposition to taxation and its consequences is so violent and so universal throughout America, that I am apprehensive it will not be soon or easily appeased*”; stating that the South Carolina Assembly was currently prorogued but would convene August 2, and Bull did not expect positive results from it; expecting Governor Campbell to arrive in September [having been appointed governor in June 1773, Campbell actually arrived in Charleston, after many delays, on June 18, 1775] [with enclosure, document 69]
69. July 11, 1774 [44]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, with news and commentary [enclosed with Bull’s July 31, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 68]
70. August 1 1774 [46]  
Letter No. 72 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting that Attorney General Egerton Leigh had requested a leave of absence to return to England for health reasons, and that he would be replaced temporarily by [James] Simpson [in fact, Simpson served as the last Attorney General of colonial South Carolina]
71. August 1, 1774 [48]  
Letter No. 73 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, stating that he was taking steps to encourage closure of the affairs of [Hector de Berenger de Beaufain] the Baron de Beaufain.  
[**Note: Baron de Beaufain**, a wealthy plantation owner in South Carolina, was clearly well connected in London as well as Paris. Secretary of State Dartmouth made a point in 1774 of encouraging Bull to expedite settlement of Beaufain’s estate. Later, in 1787, correspondence in Thomas Jefferson’s papers indicates that the estate was still unsettled, and that now it was US interests rather than British interests seeking to expedite the settlement. See also documents 75 and 80.]

72. August 3, 1774 [50]  
 Letter No. 74 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting that the Assembly met but immediately conducted itself improperly, so Bull had prorogued it until September 6, but not before the Assembly approving five individuals to attend the upcoming Congress in Philadelphia and approved a request to the Governor to provide arms for inhabitants against such dangers as Indian War; the latter was left incomplete when the Assembly was prorogued [with enclosure, document 73]
73. August 2, 1774 [52]  
 Abstract of minutes of Commons House of South Carolina Assembly, containing the House's action appointing Henry Middleton, John Rutledge, Thomas Lynch, Christopher Gadsden, and Edward Rutledge deputies of South Carolina to the "*general Congress*" scheduled in early September in Philadelphia; recording the intent to request that arms be provided as needed in the colony for protection of inhabitants [enclosed with Bull's August 3, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 72]
74. October 5, 1774 [54]  
 Draft [outgoing] letter No. 15 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, requiring Bull to write as often as needed to keep the Crown fully informed on affairs in South Carolina and the other colonies, "*during the present state of affairs*"; fearing that the South Carolina deputies to the Congress in Philadelphia would add a negative viewpoint to the mix from this colony
75. August 30, 1774 [56]  
 Letter No. 75 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, explaining details behind the effort to close out the affairs of Baron de Beaufain, with a memorial from the Baron, an executor in place, but the "*universal heir*", a nephew, had died and a series of competing claims were pending; including additional details and difficulties; seeking to meet the desires of the Crown to settle these affairs positively from the Baron's perspective
76. August 30, 1774 [59]  
 Letter No. 76 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, thanking Dartmouth for his approbation of Bull's timely correspondence and actions as acting governor
77. August 31, 1774 [61]  
 Letter No. 77 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, enclosing a copy of a "*notable production*" which he describes as applying to both the pamphlet and its author, who was William Henry Drayton, a member of the South Carolina Council, as "*replete with sentiments so derogatory to the Royal Prerogatives, & the Authority of Parliament & the long established Constitution of Government in America that it cannot fail to excite indignation, while the futility tautology & triteness of arguments raise contempt*" [with enclosures, documents 78, 79]

**[Note: William Henry Drayton** had been a member of the South Carolina Council since February 1771 (Reel 2 document 192, Reel 3 document 140) and was a trusted member of South Carolina's loyal British colonial leadership until as late as February 1774, when he was appointed to a vacant judge position (Reel 7 document 50). When he delivered to Bull his pamphlet, written under the name "Freeman", in August 1774, his change of sides was both sudden and permanent. He went on to become a "rebel" leader in South Carolina, including a South Carolina delegate to the First Continental Congress, until his death of typhus in Philadelphia in 1779. For more on this member of the large, wealthy, and publicly active South Carolina Drayton family, see notes after Reel 2 document 218. For more on his change of sides see Reel 2 documents 215 to 220 and documents 77 to 80 in this Reel.]

78. August 10, 1774 [63]  
Printed copy of "*A Letter from Freeman of South-Carolina to the Deputies of North-America, Assembled in the High Court of Congress at Philadelphia*" published by Peter Timothy at Charleston; consisting of a cover, first unnumbered page, and pages numbered 4 through 47; containing arguments against Britain's taxation policies imposed on the American colonies [Frame 66 microfilmed twice] [the Congress at Philadelphia to which Dayton refers is the Continental Congress, which convened in September 1774, soon after this pamphlet was printed; Drayton was there, as a delegate from South Carolina] [enclosed with Bull's August 31, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 77]
79. August 30, 1774 [88]  
Letter from William Henry Drayton at Charleston to Bull, acknowledging to Bull that he was the author "Freeman" of the letter to the South Carolina Deputies to the Philadelphia Congress, and that he wrote it, and hereby presented it to Bull, in the interest of bringing some sense into the debate over what would be best for South Carolina and the other colonies in this crisis situation [enclosed with Bull's August 31, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 77]
80. November 2, 1774 [90]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 16 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Bull, expressing the King's approbation for Bull's efforts on behalf of the affairs of Baron de Beaufain; stating that he had received Drayton's pamphlet from the author; agreeing with Bull that it was "*a very extraordinary performance*" but that its impact was still to be determined
81. October 12, 1774 [92]  
Letter No. 78 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, informing Dartmouth that a large group of Creek Indians would soon be meeting with Georgia authorities in Savannah to settle the dispute over Indian murders that had led Georgia to close the Indian trade; stating that there was no new news about "*the general disposition of the people in relation to the grand American Disputes*"; still expecting Governor Campbell's arrival soon

82. December 10, 1774 [94]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 17 from Dartmouth to Bull, stating that the King was pleased to hear that relations with the Creek Indians may be improving soon; stating that “*Lord William Campbell is still here having been detained on account of some private Affairs of importance to his family, but as I understand those affairs are now brought to a Conclusion*”; expecting Campbell to depart “*as speedily as possible*” [although appointed governor in June 1773, Campbell kept delaying his departure for Charleston to the point where Dartmouth was becoming irritated; Campbell further increased Dartmouth’s irritation and Bull’s anticipation until he finally arrived in Charleston on June 18, 1775; see also document 41]
83. November 23, 1774 [96]  
Letter No. 79 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting on a murder by Joel Mosely Sr., for which he had been convicted, but for which circumstances suggested the propriety of exercising Royal Mercy; stating that the mood in South Carolina had not changed and that deputies were expected to represent South Carolina when the Philadelphia Congress reconvened on January 24, 1775
84. December 19, 1774 [98]  
Letter No. 80 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, still reporting nothing new on the “*American discontents*” and not expecting anything until the Congress reconvenes in January; reporting a robust economy in South Carolina and lamenting that it was accompanied by the discontents [with enclosure, document 85]
85. December 12, 1774 [100]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, with news and commentary [enclosed with Bull’s December 19, 1774 letter to Dartmouth, document 84]
86. December 19, 1774 [102]  
Letter No. 81 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, explaining his difficulties in filling a court judge position, which was causing a delay in court activities
87. December 19, 1774 [104]  
Letter No. 82 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, stating his intent to try to control the import of gunpowder and ammunition into South Carolina, during these dangerous times, despite the large amount of private smuggling
88. January 4, 1775 [106]  
Letter No. 83 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, stating that nothing had changed in the discontent, neither the instances of outrages nor any diminution of mutual hostilities.

89. January 20, 1775 [108]  
Letter No. 84 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting on ways South Carolina was dealing with prosperous agriculture but restrictions in commerce and debt financing, which were stubborn problems British governments probably could not resolve; it had been some time since the Assembly met successfully and legislated helpfully [with enclosures, document 90]
90. January 17, 1775 [110]  
Copy of address of members of the [recently established, extralegal] South Carolina Provincial Congress to acting governor Bull, seeking redress at the colonial level for political and economic grievances; signed by Charles Pinckney, President of the Provincial Congress; followed by  
January 17, 1775  
Copy of response by Bull, making clear that the only legitimate representative of the people of South Carolina was the Commons House of the Assembly, not the provincial congress, and that the Assembly was currently prorogued and would reconvene on January 24, only a few days away  
[both enclosed with Bull's January 20, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 89]  
[Note: **Charles Pinckney** (1757-1824) sided with the Americans, fought in the Revolutionary War, served in the Continental Congress and later the U.S. House of Representatives, signed the U.S. Constitution with his cousin Charles Cotesworth, and was governor of the State of South Carolina from 1806 to 1808. For more on the Pinckney family of South Carolina, see note after Reel 1 document 31.]  
[Note: By establishing a **Provincial Congress**, South Carolina's protest movement was taking a step toward disassociation with the British colonial government, consistent with steps being taken in other colonies. Loosely speaking, the new provincial congresses were colony-level analogues to the Continental Congress that had convened in September 1774, including delegates from South Carolina. The timing of the emergence of a provincial congress in South Carolina coincided with Bull's convening the colonial government's Assembly (in reality its lower Commons House) on January 24, 1775, and its quick demise, never to convene again.]
91. January 28, 1775 [112]  
Letter No. 85 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, enclosing communications between the Assembly and acting governor during the convening of the Assembly on January 24, 1775; stating that the Assembly had not legislated usefully but that Bull was keeping it in session so no accusations could be made that the acting governor had shut down the representative process prematurely [with enclosures, documents 92 to 94 (actually one copy of Bull's speech to Commons House, two copies of Commons House's address in response to Bull's speech, and two copies of Bull's response to Commons House's address)]

[**Note:** Despite trying to cover himself politically, Bull on January 24, 1775 was in fact initiating the shut-down the British Colonial Assembly and specifically its lower Commons House. By January 26, the deadlock between the Assembly and the acting governor had begun to rip the government apart. The Assembly was never reconvened, the colonial government limped along without a legislative body, and the direction of South Carolina's protest movement shifted from trying to take control over and alter the existing South Carolina government toward replacing that government, with yet unpredictable consequences.]

92. January 26, 1775 [114]  
Copy of address of Commons House to Bull, thanking him for his speech to them on the opening of the Assembly session; complaining that Bull presented no information on Instructions from the King, because these were being held secret until arrival of the new Governor; assuring that Commons House would always do its duty, as representatives of the people, to carry out policies in the best interest of the colony; followed by  
January 26, 1775  
Copy of Bull's response to Commons House address, explaining that royal orders kept him from releasing the Instructions to the new governor  
[both enclosed with Bull's January 28, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 89]
93. January 24, 1775 [116]  
Copy of Bull's speech to Commons House and Council of South Carolina at opening of the Assembly session, reporting that he had no new Instructions to share with the Assembly but that matters of concern, such as the threat of war with the Creek Indians, were being handled and resolved; offering to work productively with the Assembly if it was willing to work with him; followed by  
January 26, 1775  
Copy of Commons House address to Bull [another copy in document 92]  
[both enclosed with Bull's January 18, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 89]
94. January 26, 1775 [117]  
Copy of Bull's response to Commons House address, stating that he must follow the Instructions received from the King [another copy in document 92] [enclosed with Bull's January 28, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 89]
95. February 22, 1775 [118]  
Letter No. 86 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting that on February 17, a day of general fasting throughout the colony, [former] members of the Assembly and other people had assembled at St. Philips Church for a special gathering and sermon—an intended humiliation to the King and his government; pointing out that several of the Church of England's clergy had sided with the Assembly on this day; in general, the Church, whose titular head was the King, had grown independent of the colonial government and, in some ways, no longer recognized the King's authority;

informing Dartmouth that the South Carolina Council had advised Bull to suspend William Henry Drayton from the Council, that Drayton had objected, and Bull had taken the position that Drayton must answer for his behavior to the King; asking the King's support for Bull's objecting to the Assembly's practice, last year and probably for this year, of issuing certificates as payment on public debts; concluding that "*Boston seems to be still the North Star by which our Political Courses are Shaped*" [with enclosure, document 96]

[**Note:** A month after the South Carolina Assembly had been effectively shut down by Bull, it continued to exist in the minds and political calculations of South Carolinians, but more in the minds of British "loyalists" than of the American "rebels." In the meantime, the American "disturbances" had been moving gradually from political and economic protest toward civil disobedience and then rebellion, a trajectory accompanied by increases in the use of violent tactics. Massachusetts responded to the **British Tea Act** of May 1773 (a new British attempt to impose new taxes on the colonies) with the **Boston Tea Party** in December, an example of civil disobedience with intentional violence against property. As the British East India Company's tea was arriving in Boston, other shiploads of tea were sailing into New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston (see documents 48 and 49). What was noticed in London was what had happened at Boston, not Charleston. The British Parliament responded quickly in early 1774 with four punitive laws, which, among other things, strangled Boston's (legal) commerce with a boycott and abolished self-government in Massachusetts. Collectively called by Americans the "**Intolerable Acts**" or "**Coercive Acts**," these vindictive responses had the opposite affect than what was intended. They led in September 1774 to the convening of a **Continental Congress** in Philadelphia, a political escalation designed to coordinate protest movements across colonies and to achieve greater unanimity among diverse protesters from New England to the Southern colonies. South Carolina sent delegates at the first opportunity to the Continental Congress.

(Meanwhile, Georgia sought to remain somehow uncommitted and neutral until it succumbed to becoming the 13<sup>th</sup> rebellious colony by July 1776, but still hung on with a tattered colonial government until 1782. East Florida and West Florida never seriously connected with the protest movements from Savannah northward, did not attend the Continental Congresses, remained solidly loyalist throughout the Revolutionary War, and were extracted from the British Empire only by terms of the 1783 Treaty of Paris, which returned them to the Spanish empire, after only 20 years of British rule.)]

96. February 13, 1775 [120]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, containing news and commentary on recent aspects of the ongoing disputes between the Assembly and the acting governor [enclosed with Bulls February 22, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 95]

97. March 13, 1775 [122]  
Letter No. 87 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting having suspended William Henry Drayton from the Council, based on the Council's charges and Drayton's response, which was a further statement of protest; reporting having signed two bills and not agreed to others passed by the South Carolina Assembly; stating his belief that no arms and ammunition had been illegally smuggled into South Carolina, in violation of the King's order [scrivener's note that Bull had not signed this letter]  
[Note: As the American colonies of Britain were separating in starts and stops from British rule between 1773 and 1776 (with earlier roots), American families also were separating, often wrenchingly, and often along generational lines. The splitting apart of the Drayton family in South Carolina provides a visible example in one of South Carolina's wealthiest, most prominent, and most powerful families. Overall, estimates suggest that the South Carolina colony was split nearly 50/50, loyalist and patriot/rebel, with a very generalized geographic/class split between lowland/urban planters and commercial interests v. upland/rural farmers, artisans, and frontier settlers. Despite the more or less equal divide of the population, those who rebelled acted more decisively, seeking major change, while the colonial government, consistent with its doctrine of maintaining the imperial status quo of royal authority and established institutions, gradually collapsed inward from the external pressure. For more on the William Henry Drayton and the Drayton family, see note after document 99.]
98. March 28, 1775 [124]  
Letter No. 88 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting little likelihood that the situation in America would change much; that popular opinion was strongly against the British government, and that unless something changed in Boston or in London, that situation probably would not change; reporting also, however, some dispute within the Assembly "*between demagogues*", somewhat influenced by class, as with the mechanics against the planters and merchants; expecting soon the arrival of the new Governor Campbell [who actually finally arrived on June 18, 1775]
99. March 15, 1775 [126]  
Letter from William Henry Drayton to Dartmouth, informing Dartmouth of his having been suspended from the Council but insisting that this did not mean that he had acted against the interests of the South Carolina colony; offering evidence that he—stating that he was the only Carolinian on the Council—had perhaps been more loyal than the others to the true interests of South Carolina; insisting, therefore, that his protests were more than "*captious and frivolous*"; claiming that he had unjustifiably endured "*ill will*" from the Chief Justice; including additional claims justifying his protests in detail; stating his respect for his uncle, acting governor William Bull II, and his feeling that Bull's actions in relation to his nephew must come from a sincere but misguided conviction that he was upholding the King's desires and orders;

stating also his disinclination to dispute his suspension and his inability to conceive of continuing in the “*Royal service*” but wanting to offer to the British government and to the King an honest accounting of the true situation in South Carolina [with enclosures, document 100]

[**Note:** For more on Drayton’s public life and his remarkable public change of horses during the midst of South Carolina’s contest between British colonial power and American democratic power, see, in the Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 documents 215 to 220 plus notes (document 219 is Drayton’s representation of his principled position to Bull in August 1774) and, in the Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 7 documents 77 to 80 and 95 to 99 plus notes (document 78 is Drayton’s August 1774 printed pamphlet of his principled positions; this document 99 is Drayton’s justification of his principled positions to Dartmouth in March 1775, after he had been suspended from the South Carolina Council)]

100. March 6, 1775 [130]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, containing news and commentary; followed by  
January 23, 1775  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette*, containing news and commentary [both enclosed with Drayton’s March 15, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 99]
101. May 1, 1775 [133]  
Letter No. 89 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, lamenting that, despite the unflagging efforts of the King to preserve the glory of the British Empire and its American colonies, Bull’s own efforts in South Carolina to support the King “*have been in vain*”; stating that no one he had spoken with in South Carolina had retained any hope of reconciling the two sides in the dispute, or of the colonial government in South Carolina continuing to receive support from its inhabitants; predicting that the popular movement “*will not dissolve or weaken, but strengthen in their unanimity*”; reporting that armories at Charleston had been broken into and arms and powder stolen, that other illegal and violent actions had occurred, and that the acting governor and council had met but felt helpless to respond; reporting that the militia continued to muster frequently to maintain discipline, but that rumors abounded that the militia in Virginia were preparing to move into other colonies to support the popular cause [Frame 133 microfilmed twice] [with enclosure, document 102]  
[**Note:** Between March (document 100) and May (document 101) of 1775, the first armed hostilities of the Revolutionary War broke out on April 19, 1775 in **Lexington and Concord**, Massachusetts, between British soldiers and Massachusetts militia loyal to that colony’s rebellious protest movement. This event was not specifically recognized at the time in the South Carolina official colonial correspondence of the Board of Trade or Secretary of State, but was indirectly reflected in correspondence like this letter from a pessimistic Bull to Dartmouth.]

102. April 27, 1775 [135]  
Copy of cover letter from Commons House to Bull, acknowledging receipt of a message from Bull dated April 24, 1775 [pertaining to the theft of arms and powder from public armories]; followed by  
Copy of Commons House's response, enclosed with the cover letter, stating that members of the House "*are not able to obtain any certain Intelligence relative to the removal of the Public Arms & Gun Powder, as mentioned in His Honor's Message, but think there is reason to suppose that some of the Inhabitants of this Colony may have been induced to take so extraordinary and uncommon a step in Consequence of the late alarming Accounts from Great Britain*" [enclosed with Bull's May 1, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 101]
103. May 1, 1775 [137]  
Letter from Alexander Innes to Dartmouth, informing Dartmouth that he had arrived at Charleston [evidently at Dartmouth's request or at least to observe and report to him] on April 19, 1775 and was sorry to report that "*this Province hardly falls short of the Massachusets in sorry Indecency, Violence, & Contempt to Government*"; stating that "*Lord North's conciliatory Motion*" had failed to conciliate but rather "*added fuel to the flame*"; describing the theft of arms from the arsenal; describing the "*Provincial Congress*" [see note after document 90] as consisting of "*many people of the best fortunes in Town, & Country, several of them Members of the Assembly, particularly the Speaker*"; stating that support for the protests and violence was not unanimous, but it was "*faint*"; stating also that the leaders in the popular movement disagreed greatly and fought among themselves; describing the unseemly proceedings of the Commons House; stating that Bull was looking forward to the time when he could retire to the country; remarking about his surprise to find that even wealthy people like [Henry] Laurens were strongly on the side of the popular movement [with enclosure, document 104]  
[**Note:** **Alexander Innes** had been sent to South Carolina to serve as Governor Campbell's secretary, but he carried with him, in addition, secret orders to observe and report personally to Dartmouth on colonial politics in South Carolina. Arriving on April 19, 1775, two months before the Governor did, he got busy first with his secret agenda, sending this letter to Dartmouth less than two weeks after his arrival. **Reference:** B. D. Barger, "Charles Town Loyalism in 1775: The Secret Reports of Alexander Innes," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 83, No. 3 (July 1962), pp. 125-136.]
104. [no date] [141]  
Clipping from printed edition of [probably] *The South-Carolina Gazette* [not including the masthead or date], containing news and comment on the popular movement against the colonial government, in about April 1775 [enclosed with Alexander Innes' May 1, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 103]

105. May 15, 1775 [142]  
Letter No. 90 from Bull at Charleston to Dartmouth, enclosing a petition to the King from South Carolina Receiver General of quit rents, Mr. [Thomas] Irving, and other inhabitants now living in South Carolina, seeking relief for them after their lands were changed from North Carolina (from which they had land patents) to South Carolina, when the boundary between them was redrawn at the King's orders in 1764 [with enclosure, document 106]
106. [no date] [144]  
Petition to the King from "*sundry*" British subjects who had settled in North Carolina on lands that in 1764 were transferred to South Carolina, when the boundary was redrawn; concerned that these settlers' "old" land grants might not be honored; therefore, seeking "new" grants confirming the authenticity of the "old" ones, and hoping that the quit rents would not be increased if new grants were issued; signed by 150 individuals [enclosed with Bull's May 15, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 105]  
**[Note:** In this correspondence, **William Bull II**'s long rule as Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, which began in 1759 and was interspersed five times with periods as acting governor, came to an inconclusive end in 1775. His long period of colonial public service ended with a whimper, not a British imperial roar. And, it ended with ultimate failure, on his watch so to speak, as his government gradually sank into dispute, then dysfunction, and finally disintegration, between 1759 and 1775. Yet during his almost 17 years of active rule in South Carolina, Bull's record of moderate policies and competent management looks, with hindsight, more successful from year to year than the collective rule of the several Governors who came and went during his tenure as Lieutenant Governor.  
When Governor William Campbell arrived in Charleston on June 18, 1775, he reported (in document 108) that Bull was not present to greet him. Apparently, Bull never did formally greet and turn over colonial governmental power to newly arrived Governor Campbell. Instead, he left Charleston and retired to the privacy of his plantation, sometime soon after having written his last official letter as acting governor to Dartmouth, on May 15, 1775 (No. 90; document 105). While this last numbered letter dealt with relatively mundane administrative matters, the previous letter (No. 89; document 101) contained Bull's last thoughtful summary of the constitutional and political situation in South Carolina. This letter was pessimistic about the future of the colony but did not suggest that he would himself be forced into exile, which occurred in May 1777, after he had refused to sign an oath of allegiance to the new State of South Carolina, and it had responded by confiscating his estate and banishing him. After the British Army captured Charleston in May 1780, Bull returned in February 1781, soon becoming active in the British occupation government for the city. However, when the British Army evacuated Charleston as the war waned in December 1782, Bull was forced again into exile, this time permanently. For more on Bull's life after 1775, see note after Reel 8 document 180.]

107. July 5, 1775 [147]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 18 from Dartmouth to Governor William Campbell of South Carolina, hoping that, when Campbell had arrived in Charleston, he would find that the situation there was better than Bull's letters suggested, but expecting that would not be the case, that the "*flame of Rebellion*" had reached almost every American colony, and that the only remaining question was of "*the means by which it may be the most effectively suppressed*"; stating the King's firm resolution to use any [military] means, by land or sea, to suppress the rebellion and re-establish obedience of the colonial inhabitants; detailing plans for suppression, initially by sea power to cut off colonial commerce, but if Britain's Navy were confronted with violence, a full military response was planned [Note: By the date of this draft letter, three months after the first military engagement of what became the Revolutionary War, Secretary of State Dartmouth had no remaining uncertainties about the existence of a **full-scale rebellion** and of the British government's necessary response to it—**full-scale military action** to suppress it.]
108. July 2, 1775 [151]  
Letter No. 1 from Governor William Campbell at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting having arrived late on June 17, 1775 at Charleston and the following morning had begun his rule as Governor of South Carolina; his first assessment of the situation was that "*the people of the best Sense, & greatest property, as well as the Rabble, have been gradually led step, by Step, into the most violent measures, by a set of desperate, & designing men*"; acknowledging having received useful information from Alexander Innes; stating that, so far, Lieutenant Governor William Bull II had ignored him and his arrival, which Campbell interpreted as disrespect; stating his difficulty in finding sufficient members of the Council to convene a meeting; stating that three days after his arrival, Campbell had received an address from the Provincial Congress, which he deemed "*of an extraordinary, & criminal nature*", to which he responded; although the "*violent faction*" had pushed the colony almost into open rebellion, Campbell still hoped to follow a policy of clemency; expecting support in re-establishing obedience from what he considered to be a large number of moderates; anticipating efforts to reduce communications among the colonies by increasing British military presence; explaining having delayed calling the Assembly into session; including other news [with enclosures, documents 109 to 112]
109. June 20, 1775 [155]  
Copy of address from Provincial Congress of South Carolina to Governor Campbell, explaining why loyal British-American colonists were taking extraordinary actions in the face of injustices within the British system, as the normal process of grievances had failed; followed by

[no date]

Copy of Campbell's response, stating that constitutionally he could answer only to the Assembly of the Colony, not to another "*extraordinary*" body; stating that he had not yet been in South Carolina long enough to understand all the issues and disputes, so he could not respond to the request of the Provincial Congress to know his positions as Governor on these issues and disputes

[both enclosed with Campbell's July 2, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 108]

110. [no date] [157]  
List of "*Members of the Council of Safety*" [extralegal body with executive powers, analogous to the legislative powers of the Provincial Congress, in South Carolina's "rebel" shadow government; formerly the Committee of Safety; see note after Reel 2 document 218], including as members, Henry Laurens, President of the Council, four delegates to the Continental Congress, and 12 other individuals, of whom 10 were identified to be also members of the South Carolina Assembly [enclosed with Campbell's July 2, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 108]
111. June [?], 1775 [159]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette for 1775*, with news and commentary plus public documents of the Provincial Congress [Frame 159 microfilmed twice] [enclosed with Campbell's July 2, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 108]
112. [no date] [160]  
Printed list of members of the Provincial Congress held on January 11, 1775 [and, handwritten in, January 1, 1775] at Charleston, including 183 member names arranged by the Parish each group of members represented, [with handwritten notations of 39 who were also members of the Assembly] [enclosed with Campbell's July 2, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 108]
113. July 2, 1775 [162]  
Note written by Jervais Henry Stevens [deputy postmaster at Charleston] stating that at 8 o'clock in the evening William Henry Drayton, Thomas Corbett, and John Neufville had come to the Post Office and demanded entry, threatening to tear down the door if their order was not complied with. After entering, they had "*taken away with them 26 Packets directed on Government Service to L<sup>t</sup> Gov<sup>r</sup> [William] Bull [II of South Carolina] Gov<sup>r</sup> [Patrick] Tonyn [of East Florida] Gov<sup>r</sup> [Josiah] Martin [of North Carolina] Sir James Wright [Governor of Georgia] & L<sup>t</sup> Gov<sup>r</sup> [John] Moultrie [of East Florida]*"
114. June 9 to 16, 1775 [166]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, with news and commentary of the week; followed by

June 16 to 23, 1775

Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, with news and commentary of the week

115. July 19, 1775 [168]  
Copy of letter No. 2 from Campbell at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting at length on the situation he found when upon arriving in South Carolina; reporting on the Post Office incident [see document 113] stating that William Bull II and other officials in the colonial government were still not complying with the expectation of visiting and communicating with the new Governor; reporting that [William] Wragg, a real gentleman, had declined to accept appointment as Chief Justice of South Carolina; commenting on the bad situation also in Georgia; reporting that reliable communications were difficult and that correspondence was easily intercepted and stolen by rebels [letter not signed but initialed, with handwritten note that original letter had been mislaid] [with enclosures, documents 116 to 124]
116. July 18, 1775 [172]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina Gazette and Country Journal*, with news and commentary of the day [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
117. July 10, 11, 1775 [174]  
Copies of two circular letters with separate dates from the [Provincial Congress'] "*Committee of Intelligence, to the COMMITTEES in the several Districts and Parishes of South-Carolina*", including news with various dates about rebellious activities [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
118. June 23 to 30, 1775 [175]  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, containing news and commentary of the day; followed by  
July 7 to 14, 1775  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, containing news and commentary of the week [both enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
119. July 17, 1775 [180]  
Copy of sworn statement by Jervais Henry Stevens, Deputy Postmaster at Charleston, before Chief Justice Thomas Knox Gordon concerning the incident at the Post Office on July 2, 1775 [see Stevens' own note, document 113] [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]

120. July 12, 1775 [181]  
Copy of sworn statement by George Roupell, Deputy Postmaster General for the Southern District of North America, before Chief Justice Thomas Knox Gordon, concerning safety of the mails in general and the incident at the Post Office on July 2, 1775 in particular [see Stevens' own note, document 113] [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
121. July 19, 1775 [183]  
Statement made to Governor Campbell about incident of stolen mail on July 11, 1775, during which four selected letters were opened, signed by George Roupell [Frame 183 microfilmed twice] [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
122. [no date] [185]  
Petition to Governor Campbell from Joel Moseley Sr., convicted of murder, but having had his sentence delayed by Lieutenant Governor Bull; seeking an extension of this delay beyond the current deadline of the third Wednesday in July, hoping for clemency because he did not mean to kill the person [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
123. July 12, 1775 [187]  
Printed edition of the *Georgia Gazette*, with news and commentary from Georgia [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
124. July 12, 1775 [189]  
Extract from journal of Commons House of South Carolina Assembly, authorizing the issue of money to pay for troops needed to secure the colony from safety dangers from both slave insurrections and Indian violence [enclosed with Campbell's July 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 115]
125. July 23, 1775 [191]  
Letter No. 3 from Campbell to Dartmouth, informing Dartmouth that "*the* [General] *Committee*" [of the Provincial Assembly] had been summoning officials working for the colonial government to appear for interrogation by the Committee, partly seeking to force them to sign "*the association*" [supporting the shadow government over the colonial government]; Campbell stating his displeasure over all this and his determination to re-establish British colonial authority; commenting that "*It is hardly possible to conceive a situation more irksome than mine is at present, scarce a shadow of authority left, but I am resolved to keep my ground as long as possible*" [with enclosures, documents 126 to 128]

126. July 20, 1775 [193]  
 Copy of printed form of the Provincial Congress, concerning those who had refused to sign the "*Association entered into by the Congress*", who were being summoned "*to appear before the General Committee, to give reasons in Justification of their refusal*"; this form having been completed in handwriting, addressed to "*Captain Alexander Innes*"; followed by [no date]  
 "*Capt Innes's Answer, to the Committee*", stating that he would not have expected to have to respond to such a summons if it had properly been delivered through the Governor; however expressing his willingness to respond in any case, as follows: "*I could not sign the Association consistently with that Allegiance I owe my King or that Duty I owe my Country*"  
 [both enclosed with Campbell's July 23, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 125]
127. July 21, 1775 [196]  
 Copy of letter from Commons House to Governor Campbell, informing him that, with the current situation in the American colonies, it would be fruitless for Commons House to stay in session and expect it to be able to accomplish anything of benefit to its constituents; requesting therefore that the House be adjourned until November 1, 1775 [enclosed with Campbell's July 23, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 125]
128. July 24, 1775 [198]  
 Copy of Campbell's response to Commons House, stating that, considering the "*alarming, & distress<sup>d</sup> situation*" in the American Colonies, "*I cannot consistently with my duty deprive myself of your assistance at so dangerous, & critical a juncture*"; therefore refusing to grant Commons House's request to adjourn until November; pointing out that he had made several years of South Carolina accounts available the House, hoping they would serve their constituents by crafting a constitutional policy for the public debt for South Carolina; not doubting that Commons House would always be willing to postpone private affairs to the needs of the public, their constituents [enclosed with Campbell's July 23, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 125]
129. July 20, 1775 [200]  
 Letter from Alexander Innes at Charleston to Dartmouth, enclosing duplicate of a previous letter; informing him that Innes' "*situation in the present state of this Province is very particular, & not a little distressing*"; hoping that he would continue to be capable of performing his service well for Dartmouth
130. July 30, 1778 [note "*should be 1775 (see No. 5.)*"] [202]  
 Copy [note "*original mislaid*"] of Letter No. 4 from Campbell at Charleston to Dartmouth, reporting on a new proposal approved by the Council of Safety to fortify Charleston and Charlestonians from the armory; commenting further on the situation in South Carolina

131. August 19, 1775 [204]  
Copy [note: "*original mislaid*"] of Letter No. 5 from Campbell at Charleston to Dartmouth, worrying that he had received no assistance from General Gage or the Admiral, and that he had not been able to raise as many troops as he had heard were assembling in the cause of rebellion in the northern colonies; stating that North Carolina and Georgia were "*equally neglected, equally abandoned*" with South Carolina; reporting with displeasure the hanging and burning of a well-to-do free Negro on suspicion that he had instigated a slave rebellion; expressing distress that the conflict was rapidly moving toward more violence, as with a recent tar-and-feathering of a man for expressing loyalty to the Crown; feeling bad that he and his government were no longer able to protect those loyal to the King in South Carolina; among these loyalists being Quakers and those sympathetic to Quakers living in the back country, whom he could not protect; reporting other instances of what was happening to the royal colony, including capture by a "rebel" vessel of a large quantity of gunpowder from a British vessel; reporting that the other side was actively arming and recruiting troops, while he could not do so [with possible enclosure, perhaps the first item in document 132]
132. June 4, 1775 [208]  
Statement of Association, subscribed to by members of the South Carolina Congress, identifying injustices by the British which justify "*resisting Force by Force*", as well as supporting the Continental and Provincial Congresses, including an "*Obligation to continue in full Force until a Reconciliation shall take place between Great Britain & America upon Constitutional Principles*"; Subscribed by all members [of apparently the South Carolina Provincial Congress and Council of Safety] and certified by Henry Laurens, President [of the Council] [apparently enclosed with Campbell's August 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 131]; followed by "*At sea, on board the Eagle Packet 15 Sept. 1775*"  
Statement, signed by George Milligan, Surgeon to the garrison of British forces in South Carolina, of his personal opposition to the principles of the Statement of Association; stating that the Congress had about 170 members; that its principles were not based on monarchy but on republicanism and therefore were opposed to the British government and its colonial governments; describing in detail the unconstitutional nature of the Congress governments in the colonies and the rebellious actions of those loyal to these governments; including text of a statement he had made to the [General] Committee, stating that he had received a form to sign supporting the Association, which he refused to sign; providing justification; stating he had subsequently been told by a member of the Committee "*that these reasons gave great offence, but this I disregarded*";

describing with details how later, he was surrounded by a hostile crowd in the streets and “*abused*,” having to carry his wife in his arms through the “*mob*” to his house; describing how, later, a small delegation led by [President of the Provincial Congress, Charles] Pinckney came from the Statehouse to Milligan’s home, urging him to sign an oath that he would not, by deed or word, “*attempt to Counteract or oppose the proceedings of the People in North America and particularly in this Province*”, which he refused to do; describing how, having already “*taken leave of my Wife and Family*”, he immediately escaped from his home and sailed from Charleston on the Packet *Eagle* [chronologically, this statement could not have been enclosed with Campbell’s August 19, 1775 letter; how it reached the Secretary of State office is not clear]

[**Note:** This statement is as intriguing for what it does say as for what it does not say. As Surgeon of British forces in South Carolina, Milligan had been a recognized leader in the colony’s governing inner circle. Why he, among prominent loyalists who were at this time receiving similarly violent treatment, decided to write such a full and direct statement of his political beliefs, the treatment he received from the rebel “mob,” and his escape with his wife and family is not clear. Nor is it clear why his particular statement was received and archived in the Secretary of State office. Other documents reveal that Governor Campbell suffered much less, and did not escape to England but only to the (relative) safety of a British warship in Charleston harbor.]

133. October 4, 1775 [217]

Draft [outgoing, unnumbered] letter from [Undersecretary of State] John Pownall at Whitehall, in the absence of Dartmouth, to Campbell, commending him on his conduct, that, “*in a very difficult & dangerous situation, has given great Satisfaction*”, with details about the government’s determination to “*repel Force by Force*” and about the military plans already made to put down the rebellion; with hopes that the planned military action would include a “*Diversion to the Southward*” during the winter

[**Note:** This outgoing draft letter was addressed by Pownall to Campbell apparently in Charleston, so the commendation assumed Campbell was still actively ruling over a colonial government of South Carolina, when that government had actually collapsed over two weeks before. Nevertheless, the general assumption at this early time, on the British side, appears to have been optimism that the rebellion could be broken fairly quickly, if enough British military might were committed to the effort.]

134. November 7, 1775 [221]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 19 from Dartmouth at Whitehall to Campbell, informing Campbell of British commitments of armed forces to the southern colonies, with details on strategy for the campaign; giving Governor Campbell his own tasks, to send "*Emissaries among the Inhabitants of the well disposed Counties, with authority and commission to the principal persons of trust & confidence, for raising and embodying as many men as can be procured, & informing them of His Majesty's Intentions of supplying them with Arms, & giving them the same pay as the Regular Troops as soon as they come down, which they should be encouraged to do, as soon as they hear of the arrival of the Troops upon the Coast*"; itemizing a few limitations on the American recruits, mostly related to quit rents  
[Note: Where Dartmouth thought Campbell would receive this draft of an outgoing letter is not clear. Clearly, however, he was writing to Campbell as Governor of South Carolina, who could play an active role in rallying the loyalist population within what was still a British colony.]
135. August 31, 1775 [225]  
Letter No. 6 from Campbell at Charleston to Dartmouth, describing "*diabolical*" activities by the rebellious South Carolinians, especially the leaders and press, which had stirred up the people and spread misinformation; recounting many rumors and much second hand information, including threats of slave insurrections and attacks from Indians, with details of specific instances; describing also the "*poignancy of my agony, & distress*" in these situations [with enclosures, documents 136 to 139]
136. August 17, 1775 [231]  
"*Report of the Judges and Attorney General on the case of Jerry a Free Negroe, now under Sentence of Death in an Attempt to raise an Insurrection*", stating their collective legal opinion (with one dissension) that, given the facts of the situation, those who sentenced this free Negro to death did so illegally; signed by Thomas Knox Gordon, Edward Savage, William Gregory, and James Simpson [enclosed with Campbell's August 31, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 135]
137. [no date] [233]  
Statement of a differing opinion on the case of Jerry, a free Negro, concerning questionable testimony by Justice of the Peace John Coram, signed by Justice Charles Matthew Coslett [enclosed with Campbell's August 31, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 135]
138. August 19, 1775 [235]  
Letter from Justice John Fewtrell, suggesting that the process used to review the case of Jerry, a free Negro, was faulty. Instead of review by justices, the matter should have been sent back to the court of the first trial for a more democratic resolution [enclosed with Campbell's August 31, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 135]

139. June 16, 1775 [237]  
Sworn statement by Justice of the Peace John Coram in case of Jerry a free Negro; followed by  
Statement of what "Sambo" said was said by Jerry, which could be interpreted as predicting a slave insurrection [enclosed with Campbell's August 31, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 135]
140. September 1, 1775 [239]  
Copy of a declaration from loyal inhabitants of South Carolina [all colonial government officers, mostly judges] to Governor Campbell, stating their view of the current situation, that the "*popular committee*" had become "*violently agitated and [against] which the executive power of Government have been altogether impotent*", and reporting on actions by the General Committee against them which have threatened their loyalty to Britain, including: reporting on the Congress's effort, approved by a resolution dated June 4, 1775, and quoted in full, to require colonial government officials, among others, to sign the "Association" document of allegiance to the new South Carolina "government" of Provincial Congress and Council of Safety; reporting that, when these South Carolinians had refused to sign, they received a written summons dated July 10, 1775, also quoted, to appear before the General Committee; reporting that they and other "*crown officers*", abiding by the summons on July 22, were requested to sign or to explain their reasons for refusing to sign, the latter of which they did; reporting that, on August 11 and 12, they were visited by members of the General Committee, read an oath of allegiance to the new "government", also quoted, and were subsequently repeatedly asked to sign it, but all refused; quoting also the August 23 order of the General Committee to seek signatures on this oath; expressing their collective opinions that this effort had disrupted their lives and threatened their loyalty, but that they had remained steadfast in their allegiance to Britain; signed by Thomas Knox Gordon, Edward Savage, Charles Matthews Coslett, John Fewtrell, William Gregory, James Simpson, and James Trail [a similar original declaration is found in document 142]
141. September 19, 1775 [241]  
Letter No. 7 from Governor Campbell, "*On Board His Maj<sup>ty</sup>s Ship Tamar in Rebellion Road*" [a protected docking area in the narrows of Wappoo Creek, a tidal estuary running between the Ashley and Stono Rivers west of the City of Charleston, above Charleston harbor], to Dartmouth, stating that he had remained in Charleston as long as physically safe and then had retired to the protection of this British navy ship; reporting ongoing violence by the rebels and defiance that it must be subdued by "*the most spirited, & vigorous measures*"; reporting that [William] Wragg had been treated "*with greater inhumanity, by banishing him in this sickly season to his Plantation, cutting him off from all society with his family & friends, & to add to his distress he left Mr<sup>s</sup> Wragge big with Child*"; reporting on efforts by other loyalists in the colonial government to resist being forced to disarm, to lose their homes, and other actions by the rebels;

reporting that [Alexander] Innes had been forced to leave South Carolina on short notice; reporting on other actions and occurrences in detail; stating that he was having to spend time and money on personal matters, under these circumstances, which he would pay for himself, including portions of his salary; adding a last minute statement, that the captain of the ship he was on had been ordered to discontinue provisioning the ship; adding again, pointing out that the packets were unarmed and defenseless in this situation, so delivery of the mail was in jeopardy, and reporting that both Fort Johnson and Fort Charlotte were in rebel hands [with enclosures, documents 142 to 144]

**[Note: William Wragg (1714-1777)** was an attorney, politician, and plantation owner, who served in public offices off and on from the 1750s. Although not always appreciated and once suspended from the Council, when the Revolution came, he remained a loyalist—and paid a heavy price, as described in this letter. See also Reel 1 documents 13, 31, 36, Reel 2 document 186, Reel 6 document 41, and Reel 7 document 115. Two years after his humiliation in South Carolina, he died at sea at the age of 63.]

**[Note: Alexander Innes** had come to South Carolina in May 1775 ostensibly to be Campbell's secretary but secretly also to provide intelligence to Dartmouth on the situation in South Carolina. Only two months later, in July 1775, when he was caught in the General Committee's dragnet requiring colonial government officials to sign an oath to the "Association" of rebels, Innes staunchly defended his loyalty to the British Crown—and paid a price by being forced out of South Carolina on short notice, as recognized by Campbell in this letter. However, unrecorded in this correspondence, When Campbell was forced to seek protection on a British Navy vessel, he took Innes with him to continue acting as his secretary. See also documents 103, 108, 126, and 129.]

142. September 1, 1775 [245]  
Declaration from loyal inhabitants of South Carolina [and colonial government officers, mostly judges] to Governor Campbell [the same or similar statement as in document 140 (which see for details), signed—here with original signatures—by the same seven individuals] [enclosed with Campbell's September 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 140]
143. September 4, 1775 [249]  
Copy of letter from Campbell to the loyalist colonial officers [mostly judges] who had sent him a declaration of their loyalty [document 140 and document 142], expressing his approbation of their conduct and stating that he would forward their statement to the King; stating that it is in these kinds of situations that one discovers one's true friends; expressing hope that after government had perhaps been destroyed, it would reemerge, and then, "*I trust we shall soon see happier days, when you Gentlemen will be enabled to resume, & execute your offices with proper deputy, & then this unhappy Province will be deliver<sup>d</sup> from the most unbelievable of all Tyrannies, that of a Lawless, & Vindictive Mob, led by artful, wicked, & Designing men*" [enclosed with Campbell's September 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 141]

144. August 14, 1775 [251]  
Extract of journal of South Carolina Council meeting, containing a statement of the Governor's sorrow and apprehension concerning the menacing rebellion underway and the increasing personal danger to government officials and their families; stating that only action by Commons House could avert this rebellion and this danger; proposing that he send a message seeking to persuade Commons House to take action to curtail the rebellion; followed by  
September 2, 1775  
Extract of journal of South Carolina Council meeting, containing information from the Governor that a group of judges had informed him of threats to their loyalty and of their having remained steadfast in their loyalty and that [William] Wragg had been treated more harshly; reporting that the judges were thinking of shutting down their offices, thus leaving the colony without a legal system, an idea that might be broadened to the remaining colonial government; the Council advising that this proposed action deserved time "*to reflect and deliberate*" before acting; followed by:  
September 4, 1775  
Extract of journal of South Carolina Council meeting, with Campbell informing the Council of how Alexander Innes had been treated by the General Committee; Council members responding to the idea of intentionally shutting down the colonial government, with one Council member supporting a shut-down because continuing it in this situation was itself a travesty of British royal authority, and four Council members opposing this approach as premature; followed by  
September 15, 1775  
Extract of journal of South Carolina Council meeting, in which Campbell described having been met the previous day [September 14] by officials of the Central Committee, including Charles Pinckney, who asked about whether troops were being sent to South Carolina to put down a rebellion; to which Campbell had responded that he had indeed heard that, and that he had come to the conclusion that no other alternative remained to put down the violent rebellion already underway; describing how, following that encounter, he had decided he must seek protection on a British man-of-war and remain there "*until some Event should happen which might render it expedient for him to return again to Charles Town*" [Campbell did not take these Council members or other government officials with him when he escaped to the HMS *Tamar*; apparently his sole companions in this exile were his wife and family and his secretary Alexander Innes; initially at least, he may have hoped that the rebellion would be put down quickly and he would be able to return to ruling colonial South Carolina]  
[all enclosed with Campbell's September 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 141]

145. October 19, 1775 [253]  
Letter No. 8 from Campbell on board the armed ship *Cherokee* in Rebellion Road [Charleston] to Dartmouth, explaining that he had moved from the *Tamar* to the *Cherokee* because the latter was “*more commodious & roomy vessel*”; stating that rebel plans to fortify Charleston against the King’s navy were “*madness*” and that the more “*respectable*” inhabitants were protesting; sharing other information he had received of the situation in Charleston; stating that rebel efforts to enlist the Catawba Indians to fight against the British led to no more than the Catawbas declaring their neutrality; including other related information [with enclosures, documents 146, 147]
146. September 27, 1775 [257]  
Printed edition of *The Georgia Gazette*, with news of the colonial government and the rebel movement in Georgia; followed by  
September 29 to October 6, 1775  
Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, with news and commentary on events in Charleston [both enclosed with Campbell’s October 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 145]
147. [no date] [261]  
Note in Campbell’s handwriting about arrival at Charleston of a Spanish ship in distress on September 26, 1775, after having been damaged in a storm; with related information [enclosed with Campbell’s October 19, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 145]
148. October 22, 1775 [263]  
Letter No. 9 from Campbell, on board the *Cherokee* at Rebellion Road [Charleston], to Dartmouth, offering additional intelligence of rebel efforts to arm and fortify areas around Charleston in South Carolina [with enclosures, documents 149, 150]
149. October 18, 1775 [265]  
Copy of report by Thomas Brown to Governor Campbell, informing Campbell about loyalist organizing and arming on the frontier to confront rebels that were doing the same [enclosed with Campbell’s October 22, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 148]  
**[Note: Thomas Brown’s Report** provides much detailed information at a moment in time, with little context. It gives a glimpse into what appears to have been “the only game in the colony,” a contest on the South Carolina frontier when Charleston and the low country were more quiet and under rebel control. See the note below for more information to help clarify the contents of the report. Governor Campbell must have welcomed Brown’s report and the loyalist action on which it reported, since it proved that “his” colony was not completely moribund and rebel-controlled.]

[**Note:** Campbell appears to have been indirectly involved in these matters, thus effectively **redefining the responsibilities of a colonial governor—one without a colony**. Of course, neither he nor British policy conceded at the time that South Carolina was no longer a British colony with a colonial government (although the truth of this is evident with the benefit of hindsight). So, unable to govern, Governor Campbell assumed a new responsibility—to do all he could to aid and abet loyalist efforts in South Carolina, as well as the adjacent southern colonies of Georgia and North Carolina, with the goal of helping to defeat the rebellious insurgency and return his and the other colonies to tranquil, obedient status as loyal royal colonies of the British Empire.

Toward this end, Campbell had to work cooperatively with others—in particular the governors of North Carolina (Josiah Martin), Georgia (James Wright), and East Florida (Patrick Tonyn), as well as military leaders in the British armed forces stationed along the southern Atlantic coast and in command of North American operations.

Documents 152 to 171 in the remainder of this Reel provide bits of information about Campbell's efforts to work with the following between late 1775 and early 1777: North Carolina Governor Josiah Martin; British Navy Captain Edward Thornburgh; British Army General Thomas Gage; British Navy Vice Admiral Samuel Graves, British Navy Captain Tobias Furneaux, and British Army General William Howe. Working with these leaders was always difficult, and Campbell's efforts were often thwarted. By fall 1776, he had been transported to New York (see below for details), where he sought assistance and recognition of his authority as governor, with a duty to his colony and the King, to help defeat the rebellion. Making contacts and influencing events was a difficult task for a governor forced to live on board an armed vessel and having to beg the British Navy for transport.]

[**Note: British invasion and Georgia/South Carolina frontier conflict between loyalists and rebels in 1775-1776:** Before getting to New York, in August 1776, he had been present for the first British military effort to recapture Charleston. The anticipated British fleet had arrived off of Charleston in early June 1776. It consisted of 20 warships commanded by Admiral Peter Parker, carrying about 2,500 soldiers commanded by General Henry Clinton. A battle was fought on June 28, 1776. Superior numbers of British invaders were turned back by rebel defenders under the command of General Charles Lee. Lee sought to follow up his advantage with a rebel invasion of East Florida. This failed, partly because of Brown's intelligent use of his Florida Rangers and the Creek Indian threat. Campbell, on deck on Admiral Parker's flagship HMS *Bristol* during the battle, sustained a significant wound from a flying splinter of timber. Following the battle, Campbell was taken, on the *Bristol*, to New York, both to recover from his wound and to try to influence the top British military officials to organize a second, larger southern campaign. He was not successful with the military leaders, nor did his wound heal well, and sometime in 1777 he returned to England, never to return. In September 1778, his unhealed wound led to his early death at the age of 48.

Meanwhile, **Thomas Brown**, Campbell's key contact for influencing frontier loyalist effort, was making his own way as a creative and active frontier loyalist leader. He combined an adventurous bent, affinity for the Creek Indians, passion for the British Crown, willingness to fight for his principles, ability to energize and organize men to work and fight, and a penchant to live on the edge of trouble, all mixed into one complex character.

Brown had emigrated as a young man from England in 1774, with the goal of becoming a "country gentleman." Settling in the Georgia/South Carolina frontier, near Augusta, Georgia by early 1775, he was actively involved in recruiting and organizing loyalists into militia-like Ranger troops to oppose similar militia troops being organized by rebels under the leadership of South Carolinians Rev. William Tennant and William Henry Drayton, along with Colonel Thomas Fletchall. Fellow leaders with Brown on the loyalist side were Captain Robert Cunningham and Moses Kirkland.

Brown was abruptly initiated into the violent culture of the frontier, leavened by the boiling-over passions of the loyalist-rebel conflict, by being tarred and feathered by a mob at New Richmond, South Carolina when he refused to sign the loyalty oath to the new provincial government [New Richmond was a small settlement about 30 miles upstream from Augusta on the Savannah River; the site is now under the dammed-up river. This experience instantly radicalized Brown toward the greater glory of Loyalism to the British Crown.

The motley forces of Loyalism and Rebellion confronted each other in August 1775 near **Ninety-Six**, South Carolina (located west of present-day Columbia, South Carolina; calculated [inaccurately], when settled as a fort and way station on the so-called Cherokee Trail running from Charleston to the Lower Cherokee Villages, to be 96 miles from the main Cherokee village named Keowee). The confrontation occurred at Ninety-Six because Kirkland was already there with an encampment of loyalist militiamen. Each side had sought to recruit an Indian Nation to fight on its side, but the Indians resisted commitments. Nevertheless, when treaties were negotiated, they were at the table. After apparently minimal fighting, William Henry Drayton (former leader in colonial South Carolina's government and member of one of the colony's most powerful and wealthy families), negotiated a pro-rebel treaty, which did not please anyone. A second treaty was negotiated on November 22, 1775, this one dictated by loyalist Cunningham. Neither treaty was observed much in practice. Soon after this inconclusive affair, both Cunningham and Kirkland were imprisoned by the rebels (and Cunningham soon changed sides, joining the rebellion), leaving Brown alone but vulnerable.

Early in 1776, Brown was invited to St. Augustine, capital of the much safer, solidly loyalist British colony of East Florida, where he met Patrick Tonyn, Governor of East Florida and John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the Southern British colonies. Tonyn and Stuart were interested in plans Brown was developing for military action by British troops supported by loyalist rangers (militia) on the frontier. They persuaded Secretary of State Lord George Germain and British General Henry Clinton to support the plan, incorporating it into their own plans for an invasion of the southern colonies.

Brown strengthened his roles as commander of the Rangers and author of the invasion plans, by applying his knowledge of the territory around Augusta and his understanding of how to work successfully with the Creek Indians (he had married an Indian wife and lived with the Creek Nation some of the time). Governor Tonyn, urged on by Campbell, lent his support by giving Brown, commissioned as a Lieutenant Colonel commanding the East Florida Militia, the opportunity to mold this body of citizen-soldiers into a well-trained military unit called the Florida Rangers. The Rangers went on, under their commander Thomas Brown, to perform well in 1777-1778 defending East Florida successfully from weak rebel invasions from Georgia and in 1778-1779, alongside British troops, in British invasions from East Florida into Georgia, during which Savannah was captured for the duration of the war, and Augusta was captured twice but only briefly before being lost again. Brown stayed in East Florida, both because it was safer territory and because he had been given responsibility and authority to contribute toward the loyalist cause. Besides being commander of the Florida Rangers, in 1779, following John Stuart's death, he also became British Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the southern colonies. Brown performed effectively in both positions and retained both until the end of British rule in June 1784. Thereafter, he remained in St. Augustine, assisting with the orderly evacuation of British inhabitants from East Florida, finally leaving East Florida with Governor Tonyn and a few other remaining British officials in August 1785, when the evacuation was completed and both British Florida colonies were returned to Spanish occupation and rule. **(Reference:** Edward T. Cashin, *The King's Ranger: Thomas Brown and the American Revolution on the Southern Frontier*. Fordham University Press, 1999; previously published by University of Georgia Press, 1989.)]

150. [various dates] [270]  
 October 6 to 13, 1775  
 Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, with news and commentary on the rebellion; followed by  
 October 13 to 16, 1775 [272]  
 Printed edition of *A General Gazette Extraordinary* with information about the South Carolina Provincial Congress and Council of Safety [Frame 272 microfilmed twice] followed by  
 October 16 to 20, 1775  
 Printed edition of *The South-Carolina General and American Gazette*, with news and commentary on the rebellion  
 [all enclosed with Campbell's October 22, 1775 letter to Dartmouth, document 148]

151. December 23, 1775 [275]  
Draft [outgoing] Letter No. 1 from George Germain at Whitehall to Campbell, informing him that the expedition for a southern campaign to put down the rebellion in America was almost ready to sail; wishing to make sure that Campbell was making all possible preparations to support this campaign in South Carolina; commending Campbell on providing valuable information about Spanish shipping and of preparations for armed conflict by both sides in South Carolina; expressing sensitivity to the distress Campbell had and was still experiencing as he sought to do his duty as Governor  
**[Note: Lord George Germain, 1<sup>st</sup> Viscount Sackville** (1716-1785) replaced the Earl of Dartmouth as Secretary of State for the Colonies on November 10, 1775. He served during the wartime Lord North administration, until February 1782.]
152. January 1, 1776 [277]  
Letter No. 10 from Campbell, on board the *Cherokee* at Rebellion Road [Charleston], to Dartmouth, expressing disappointment that no military assistance had come to South Carolina's aid, and now it seemed to be too late; saying that he would have to abandon Charleston harbor [because he and the British Navy could not stay there indefinitely; reporting that the rebels had made some progress toward fortifying the city and harbor, although the two British ships [*Tamar* and *Cherokee*] had come close enough to cannonade some of the work, causing some damage; describing actions he was taking to try to get the Navy ships to act more aggressively, but Captain [Edward] Thornburgh of the small British fleet that included the *Cherokee*, hinting that the Navy might be moving out of Charleston harbor; reporting on activities among mobilized loyalists on the frontier, including capture of a substantial amount of rebel powder and ammunition; reporting that Governor [Josiah Martin] of North Carolina had arrived, also living on a Navy ship; expressing displeasure that Thornburgh allowed several ships at Charleston to leave for Cape Fear, feeling that the British forces should have been consolidated at Charleston harbor rather than scattered; Martin and Campbell now on board the HMS *Scorpion*, still in Charleston harbor; reporting that "*a set of Ruffians beset my house in Charlestown*", which was later occupied by the rebels; meanwhile, Campbell's wife and children, who had been living with him, were secreted away to another Navy ship at Cape Fear; describing bad news he had heard about a Rebel-Loyalist armed conflict near Ninety-Six, about involvement with the Creek and Cherokee Indians, and about a Rebel-Loyalist treaty that had gone bad [see note after document 149] [with enclosures, documents 153 to 159]  
**[Note: Lord George Germain** replaced the Earl of Dartmouth as Secretary of State for the Colonies on November 10, 1775. On the date of this letter, Campbell hadn't written to Dartmouth since October 22, 1775, when Dartmouth was still in office. When Campbell did learn that Germain was the new Secretary of State is not evident because of gaps between letters. Letter No. 11, dated January 1, 1776 (document 160), was sent to Dartmouth. Letter No. 12, dated July 8, 1776 (document 166), was sent to Germain.

Probably because of the turmoil connected with the rebellion, Germain did not write frequently to Campbell either. Dates of his letters No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 were December 23, 1775, June 14, 1776, and January 14, 1777 respectively.]

153. August 9, 1775 [282]  
Copy of letter from General Thomas Gage at Boston to Campbell, offering a pessimistic prediction of the future, including a long, bloody war, and, before it was over, the “*not unlikely*” outcome that “*some of the maritime Powers may have possession of some of the Provinces*” and stating in closing that “*I wish your Lordship may not at length fall a prey to the negroes*”, and offering no assistance to South Carolina [enclosed with Campbell’s January 1, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 152]  
[Note: **General Thomas Gage** (1718-1787) served in the British Army as commander in chief in North America from 1763 to 1775. In the latter year, fully engaged against the rebels in Boston with a large British army, he was held responsible for not decisively winning the first armed conflicts of what became the Revolutionary War—the skirmishes at Lexington and Concord in April and then the bloody battle at Bunker Hill on June 17. By October 10, 1775, Gage had been replaced by **General William Howe**. On General William Howe and his brother Admiral Richard Howe, see note after document 157]
154. September 20, 1775 [283]  
Copy of letter from Campbell on the *Tamar* at Rebellion Road [Charleston], to Gage, expressing the unfulfilled hope that Gage’s command “*would have permitted some little attention to have been paid to his Southern Provinces*”; stating that this letter was being delivered by [Moses] Kirkland, a loyalist who had plans for local loyalist action aimed at re-establishing British authority [enclosed with Campbell’s January 1, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 152]
155. July 1, 1775 [284]  
Letter from Campbell at Charleston harbor to Gage, announcing his arrival as Governor of South Carolina; describing the dangerous situation in the colony; making a case that South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina all were in immediate need of military assistance to counter the violence of the rebels; suggesting what military aid might be most useful [enclosed with Campbell’s January 1, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 152]
156. July 1, 1775 [286]  
Copy of letter from Campbell at Charleston harbor to Vice Admiral Samuel Graves at Boston, announcing his arrival as Governor of South Carolina; stating that he had written to Gage seeking military assistance for Georgia and North Carolina as well as South Carolina; seeking naval assistance [enclosed with Campbell’s January 1, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 152]

157. August 22, 1775 [287]  
 Letter from Graves [on board HMS] *Preston* at Boston, responding to Campbell's situation with sympathy but no assistance; stating that his orders would not allow him to send any ships to the southern colonies, and that he was having to move the *Tamar* northward; offering no hope of any assistance any time soon [enclosed with Campbell's January 1, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 152]  
**[Note: Vice Admiral Samuel Graves** (1713-1787) held the North American command of the British Navy from July 1774 until January 27, 1776, when he was replaced by **Vice Admiral Richard Howe**, brother of **General William Howe**, who had replaced General Thomas Gage as Commander in Chief of British forces in North America in October 1775. The Howe brothers commanded the land and sea war in the American colonies until mid-1778, when William was replaced by General Henry Clinton, and Richard left his command because of perceived lack of support from Prime Minister Lord North.]  
**[Note:** Between the writing of document 157 and 158, the colonial government of South Carolina was overwhelmed by rebel protest and violence, collapsed on September 15, 1775, and was never resurrected.  
 The chronological remainder of this microfilmed Secretary of State incoming correspondence for South Carolina (from Reel 7 document 158 through Reel 8 document 205) is actually **post-colonial** in content. Put another way, this correspondence is **transitional**, as South Carolina began making the considerable leap from being a British colony to being a State in the United States of America. See **Introduction** and note at beginning of Reel 8 for a summary of these content changes.]
158. December 1, 1775 [289]  
 Copy of letter from Campbell, on board the *Cherokee* in Rebellion Road [Charleston], to Josiah Martin, Governor of North Carolina, expressing pleasure at having met Martin, who had come by ship to Charleston harbor, where Campbell was residing on board another ship; expressing the hope of working with Martin in their mutual effort to serve the King and to suppress the rebellion; followed by  
 December 1, 1775  
 Copy of letter from Martin, on board the sloop of war *Scorpion* at Rebellion Road [Charleston] to Campbell, stating that he had been happy to have the opportunity to leave his former on-board accommodation [having also been forced to leave his home for protection on a British Navy vessel] which was neither pleasant or safe, to reside in the *Scorpion* and to be transferred to Charleston [so that the *Tamar* could be transferred northward]; expressing pleasure that, as a result, he would be able to share location and duties with Campbell; agreeing that a "*fatal contagion*" of rebellion had spread throughout the colonies and specifically in both North Carolina and South Carolina; declaring his zeal for re-establishing British control and obedience in both colonies;

stating, however, his feeling that he could not serve the King's wishes by remaining on the *Scorpion* at Charleston, and his having requested that Captain Thornburgh make necessary repairs to the *Scorpion* as soon as possible, and then that Martin be transported back to North Carolina, where he needs to be on duty [both enclosed with Campbell's January 1, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 152]

159. December 3, 1775 [293]  
Copy of letter from Campbell on board the *Cherokee* to Captain Thornburgh, suggesting that if the *Scorpion* leaves again for Cape Fear, Charleston harbor would once again be dangerously vulnerable for rebel attack and occupation; suggesting strongly that if the *Scorpion* does leave, Thornburgh's intent would probably be to abandon the harbor to the rebels; followed by  
[no date]  
[Apparently notes by Campbell to himself] Listing questions apparently in connection with this letter, expressing his concerns of the extremely negative consequences if Charleston harbor were to be abandoned by the British Navy; followed by  
December 4, 1775  
Copy of letter from Thornburgh on the *Tamar* at Rebellion Road [Charleston] to Campbell, informing Campbell that among all the considerations of the decisions Thornburgh must take, he had felt that the best course would be to meet Governor Martin's request to return to North Carolina so that he could do his duty in North Carolina, and by transporting him there on the *Scorpion*; stating that he was also committed to maintaining control over Charleston harbor as long as Governor Campbell was present and seeking to do his duty as Governor of South Carolina; pointing out that he was relying on Campbell to provide better information than Thornburgh had on the rebellion in Charleston, so that it was Campbell who must inform Thornburgh on how to maintain control in the harbor, while leaving Thornburgh to do his job of commanding the fleet [all enclosed with Campbell's January 1, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 152]
160. January 23, 1776 [295]  
Letter No. 11 from Campbell on board the *Cherokee* in the Savannah River, Georgia, to Dartmouth, reporting events since January 1 at Charleston harbor, including movements of vessels and loading and unloading supplies until January 6, when the *Cherokee* sailed to the Savannah River [evidently to deliver Campbell there], where it found other British Navy vessels and where he received Dartmouth's letter of November 7, 1775 with news of plans for a southern-colony military expedition; reiterating his view that Charleston harbor was a place of top priority for the British to defend, and Charleston city was of prime concern to return to British rule as soon as possible; reporting that he had not yet seen Georgia Governor James Wright, who appeared to be imprisoned in Savannah with a few of his Council members and friends of government;

reporting knowing nothing about the situations of families of Georgia's government officials; reporting that [James] Hume, Attorney General of Georgia [and James Wright's nephew], having been banished by the rebels, would shortly be sailing for England and would be bearing news; requesting that Campbell's personal situation, including loss of his home and estate, be placed before the King with Campbell's request for relief; stating that he would be leaving the *Cherokee* shortly [with enclosures, documents 161 to 163] [Campbell's last numbered letter written to Dartmouth, even though Germain had become Secretary of State on November 10, 1775; Campbell's first letter written to Germain (No. 12 but identified as No. 13) was dated July 8, 1776 (document 166)]

161. January 18, 1776 [298]  
Copy of letter from Campbell, on board the *Cherokee* [after its arrival in the Savannah River] to [Captain] Tobias Furneaux, requesting that Furneaux would help arrange for Campbell's wife and family to be transported to safety at St. Augustine; explaining that he, as governor, and his secretary, Alexander Innes, felt obliged to return to their colony, to either Charleston or Beaufort [enclosed with Campbell's January 23, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 160]  
[Note: **Tobias Furneaux** (1735-1781) had an extraordinary career as a naval officer and explorer. After early entry into the British Navy and successful advancement through the ranks, his claim to fame came through his experiences as an explorer. He may have been the first human to circumnavigate the globe in both directions. In 1766-1768, he served in a Royal Navy exploratory voyage on the HMS *Dolphin*, under the command of Samuel Wallis, which sailed westward, around Cape Horn, to explore in the vast Pacific Ocean, including Tahiti and New Zealand, before returning via the Cape of Good Hope. Then, in 1771-1775, he commanded the HMS *Adventure*, the companion ship that sailed with Captain James Cook's HMS *Resolution* during Cook's second exploratory voyage. Cook and Furneaux sailed eastward via the Cape of Good Hope and New Zealand to the Pacific Ocean, where they also explored, and finally around Cape Horn and up the Atlantic Ocean to England. Now, in 1776, less than a year after having returned home with Cook, Furneaux was commanding the HMS *Syren*, on duty at Savannah with other British Navy vessels. Perhaps it was Furneaux' notoriety that attracted Campbell to him with his requests for transport. By late June, the *Syren*, with 19 other warships and a quantity of British troops, converged on Charleston to attack both the harbor and city—both of which, to the great surprise of the British, refused to be defeated.]
162. January 20, 1776 [part of 299]  
Letter from Captain Furneaux [on board the] *Syren*, to Campbell, informing Campbell that he had no power to order ships and their passengers, including for Campbell's family, and that his opinion was that the British ships were in place for the time being, until the expected fleet arrived from England [enclosed with Campbell's January 23, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 160]

163. January 21, 1776 [part of 299]  
Copy of letter from Campbell, on board the *Cherokee*, to Furneaux, stating that, given the situation he and Innes were in, they must either be transported to a place where he could make his case to the Commander in Chief, or he would be forced to take a packet, along with his family, straight to England; insisting that his orders from the King's ministers required him to do his duty without further difficulties [enclosed with Campbell's January 23, 1776 letter to Dartmouth, document 160]
164. [no date] [300]  
Information received from Captain Smith "*Master of a Vessel arrived in the Downes from S<sup>o</sup> Carolina*", [note written by (John) Pownall, Undersecretary of State, dated April 17, 1776], Smith reporting having experienced distress at sea on a commercial voyage from Jamaica to England and put into Stono Inlet [mouth of the Stono River, near Charleston], South Carolina; was detained there by the Committee of Safety from January 3 until February 24, 1776, after which he was released to continue his voyage; noting that in Charleston harbor, the *Tamar* and the *Cherokee* had sailed away, that the rebels now had several warships in the harbor, and that the rebels were expecting a British fleet and were preparing defenses  
[**Note:** After Captain Smith and his vessel were released by the rebels, he successfully sailed back to England, where he floated for a while in the sheltered roadstead off the Kent coast called **The Downs**, probably waiting his turn to deliver his cargo up the Thames River.]
165. June 14, 1776 [302]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 2 from Germain at Whitehall to Campbell, stating that certain of Campbell's letters to the Secretary of State had been lost on the packet Cumberland on its return from America, encouraging Campbell and other colonial governors to take advantage of opportunities of "*transmitting an account of such Occurrences as you shall judge it of importance to communicate to me for His Majesty's Information*" [all of Campbell's numbered letters to Germain appear to have been delivered with none lost to the sea]
166. July 8, 1776 [304]  
Letter No. 13 [actually No. 12] from Campbell on board HMS *Bristol* "*in five Fathom Hole near Charles Town*" to Germain, reporting that the *Bristol* had met General Henry Clinton at sea and gone with him to Cape Fear, where they met Admiral Peter Parker and Major General Charles Cornwallis [the commanders with their vessels and troops for the planned invasion of the southern colonies]; reporting that they had jointly decided against a move against North Carolina but instead to move toward Charleston with its new fortifications, and that, if successful there, the campaign would move northward from there; reporting on their attack on Fort Sullivan on June 28; praising the British effort, with details, even though it was not directly successful;

reminding Germain that he had requested a contingency account to pay for numerous expenses he was responsible for during this unusual time of rebellion; asking that it now be approved; reporting on relations with the Indian Nations and about having removed a South Carolina schooner to St. Augustine, out of danger from the rebels [although numbered No. 13, this letter actually is No. 12 consecutively among Campbell's letters to Secretaries of States, first Dartmouth and then Germain] [Campbell's first numbered letter sent to Germain, although he had become Secretary of State on November 10, 1775; Campbell's last letter sent to Dartmouth was dated January 1, 1776 (document 160)]

**[Note: Five Fathom Hole**, located south of Charleston harbor between the bar and Morris Island, was an area of sea where the British warships could safely wait before approaching the harbor or lay over. The *Bristol* was the flagship of Admiral Peter Parker's fleet that, with troops commanded by General Henry Clinton, had on June 28, 1776 fought an inconclusive battle against fewer rebel defenders in Britain's first attempt to subdue the rebellious southern colonies.]

167. August 15, 1776 [308]  
Letter No. 13 from Campbell on board the *Bristol* at New York harbor to Germain, reporting that the invasion fleet and troops had sailed from Charleston, following their indecisive engagement there, to New York; reporting that he had not conferred with either Admiral Parker or General Clinton, so he did not know what next actions were being planned [this second letter numbered No. 13 by Campbell is, consecutively, No. 13]
168. November 29, 1776 [310]  
Letter No. 14 from Campbell at New York to Germain, informing him of a letter he had intercepted [but had since been lost with other mail on a packet that foundered] from John Laurens, son of Henry Laurens, "*Vice President of [rebel] South Carolina*", who was in London and was collecting and sending detailed information about British anti-rebellion actions; reporting that, since he had been unable to acquire useful information on British plans in New York, he wished permission to return to England "*for a few months*", although he was sensitive to being perceived by the King as a "*refugee*"; hoping for follow-up very soon on the military campaign in the southern colonies [with enclosures, documents 169, 170]
169. September 22, 1776 [312]  
Copy of letter from Campbell at Jamaica on Long Island to General William Howe [Commander of British Forces in North America, having replaced General Gage on October 10, 1775], containing an extract of a letter Campbell had written to Germain [possibly Letter No. 13 dated August 15, 1776, document 166], stating that General Howe had told him that plans for the "*reduction of America*" would not include a southern invasion any time soon, which had strengthened his desire to sail for England; seeking Germain's assistance in obtaining approval for this trip to England;

after recounting the suffering of “*Friends of Government*” in South Carolina, expressing hope that the British government would not forget these people and would act as quickly as possible to restore British rule in South Carolina, which would relieve their suffering; suggesting in the meantime that his personal secretary, Alexander Innes, be sent to the South Carolina interior to maintain support for the loyalist cause [enclosed with Campbell’s November 29, 1776 letter to Germain, document 168] [for more on General William Howe and his brother Admiral Richard Howe, see note after document 157]

170. September 17, 1776 [314]  
Copy of letter from General Howe at headquarters on Long Island, New York, to Campbell, stating that, “*seeing no immediate Prospect of your Lordship’s return to your Government in the present State of Affairs*”, he sees no objection to Campbell’s taking time now to return to England; approving of Campbell’s idea of sending Innes to the South Carolina frontier; suggesting that loyalist inhabitants of that area who feel insecure should consider moving to St. Augustine [enclosed with Campbell’s November 29, 1776 letter to Germain, document 168]
171. January 14, 1777 [316]  
Draft [outgoing] letter No. 3 from Germain at Whitehall to Campbell, agreeing with Howe’s assessment that British forces would not in the near future be able to be sent to the southern colonies; thus sending the King’s approval for Campbell to return to England; stating that Campbell’s financial requests had been forwarded to the Treasury and that he was confident they would be approved  
**Note:** The chronological sequence of Secretary of State incoming correspondence that began in Reel 3 ends here at the end of Reel 7. Yet there is no real ending here. Governor Campbell was still officially governor, but his government no longer existed, he had been ousted from “his” colony, the British military’s July 28, 1776 attempt to recapture Charleston had failed, Campbell had been wounded in that battle, and the Secretary of State was now telling him not to hope soon for another “southern campaign.” Campbell had run out of options, both in Charleston and in New York, so, in early 1777, he sailed home to England. See the **Introduction** for a summary of Campbell’s “post-colonial” activities from September 1775 until his death in 1778.]
172. November 26, 1777 [318]  
Letter from Thomas Knox Gordon [former Chief Justice of colonial South Carolina] at Belfast [Ireland] to [perhaps Germain], thanking him for expediting financial support for Gordon following his return to England; stating that before becoming South Carolina’s Chief Justice, he had successfully practiced law in Ireland; aspiring now to become a judge in Ireland; seeking assistance in applying for and being considered for such a position

## Reel 8 (Volume 397)

### Volume 397—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Secretary of State Correspondence (incoming), end

May 1, 1779 to March 1, 1784

Documents 1 to 205

[Frames 1 to 458]

**Note:** The DLAR's microfilmed papers of Secretary of State incoming correspondence for colonial South Carolina begin in Reel 3 Volume 382. See notes before Volumes 382, 385, 386, and 389 to 396 for information and content of the preceding microfilmed Volumes of this correspondence. See also the overall summary of the microfilmed Secretary of State correspondence, from 1719 to 1784, in **Table 13**. Volume 397, with dates leading up to and following September 15, 1775, when the South Carolina colonial government collapsed under pressure from South Carolina rebels, contains a mixture of contents, some of it not directly related to South Carolina as a royal colony. Documents 69 through 171 plus 184 and 185, dated between May 1, 1780 and January 31, 1781, pertain to the successful British military conquest of Charleston under General Henry Clinton, concluded on May 12, 1780, and subsequent unsuccessful military operations in South Carolina and northeastward under General Charles Cornwallis seeking to regain control of interior South and North Carolina, which concluded with Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown in October 1781. Documents 1 to 7, dated between January 3, 1781 and March 1, 1784, and documents 172 to 205, except for 184 and 185, dated between August 31, 1781 and mid-October 1782, pertain to post-colonial concerns, largely economic, of South Carolinians and London merchants during British military occupation of Charleston (from May 1780 to December 1782) and after British evacuation, concluded on December 14, 1782. An anomaly in this microfilmed Secretary of State incoming correspondence for South Carolina is contained in documents 8 to 68. These consist of two letters (each with numerous enclosures and each letter plus enclosures received and microfilmed twice) from General Clinton to Secretary of State Germain. One is a report on British loss by force of its West Florida colony to the Spanish. The other reports on unsuccessful negotiation by designees of General Clinton and General Washington concerning a possible general exchange of prisoners of war. Neither pertains directly to South Carolina but both were mailed by Clinton from Charleston so, apparently all these documents were filed by the Secretary of State office under "South Carolina."

**Note:** In the midst of Volume 394, archivists in the Secretary of State's office had discontinued the practice of numbering official incoming documents. Volume 397 also has no SS numbers. In this Volume, no correspondence is found written by or written to Governor William Campbell, whether numbered or unnumbered. By contrast, much numbered correspondence is found from General Henry Clinton to Secretary of State Germain. Evidently, this correspondence had been going on for some time, as it begins abruptly on May 13, 1780 with letter No. 86 and ends as abruptly on June 5, 1780 with letter No. 95. Clinton was away from his headquarters at New York as commander in chief of British forces in North America from February until early June 1780.

During that time, he led a British army to Charleston, besieged the city and its 5,000 some rebel defenders plus additional inhabitants, and captured the city, accepting surrender of the rebel army on May 12, 1780. Although he had been in South Carolina for over three months, no letters he sent from there were archived in the South Carolina Secretary of State incoming correspondence—until the day after Clinton’s victory at Charleston. With dates between May 13 and June 5, 1780, he sent 10 numbered letters (No. 86 to No. 95) to Germain. Two were the report letters mentioned in the previous note containing information about the loss of West Florida (No. 86) and unsuccessful negotiation for a general prisoner-of-war exchange (No. 87)—matters of concern to the commander in chief of British forces in North America, not directly related to South Carolina, but filed under South Carolina in the Secretary of State archives apparently because Clinton mailed them from Charleston. The other letters do pertain to South Carolina. This sequence of numbered letters ends as abruptly as it started, on the day Clinton sailed from Charleston, returning to New York. No additional numbered or unnumbered letters from Clinton to Germain are found in these microfilmed papers, and no letters from Germain to Clinton are included here.

**Note: The changing content in Secretary of State incoming correspondence** between the beginning of Reel 4 to Reel 7 document 157 compared with that in Reel 7 document 158 to Reel 8 document 205 (the end of this microfilmed correspondence), Note that **Table 15** is a more extended and differently focused version of **Table 12** in the **Introduction**, which pertains to the content of Reel 8 alone.

---

**Table 15: Changing content in Secretary of State incoming correspondence**

- Documents from the **beginning of Reel 4 to Reel 7 document 157**  
 From November 22, 1743, as James Glen was about to be appointed royal governor of South Carolina, to August 22, 1775, just before the royal colonial government of South Carolina collapsed on September 15, 1775  
 This set of documents contains official correspondence, primarily between South Carolina’s colonial governor and pertinent Secretary of State (first Secretary for the Southern Department; later Secretary of State for the Colonies). The contents of this correspondence covers issues of colonial governance and economic development plus the gradually developing American protest movement against what its proponents saw as abuses of the rights of British subjects by Parliament and the colonial government.
- Documents from **Reel 7 document 158 to the end of Reel 8**  
 From December 1, 1775, as the post-colonial-government period began, until the end of the microfilmed Secretary of State incoming correspondence in mid-October 1782.  
 This set of documents contains much more diversity of contents, as the colonial world had changed for South Carolina from running a colony to dealing with the fallout of the colonial government’s collapse, as well as archiving documents on a variety of other matters, some seemingly unrelated to South Carolina.

**Summary of changing content** of documents in the second set, dated from December 1, 1775 to mid-October 1782 (Reel 7 document 158 to 172 and Reel 8 document 1 to 205):

- **Reel 7 documents 158 to 171** **December 1, 1775 to January 14, 1777**  
Correspondence of Colonial Governor William Campbell, dealing with the aftermath of the collapse of his government and of British authority in South Carolina; living on British warships in Charleston Harbor, then Savannah, then on flagship during failed battle on June 28, 1776 to retake Charleston (wounded), then to New York to recover and promote southern campaign (Campbell still in New York in early 1777 but returned to England where no longer active governor; died in September 1778 from having never recovered from his Charleston war wound)
- **Reel 7 document 172** **November 26, 1777**  
Post-colonial government petition from former South Carolina Chief Justice seeking a judgeship in England
- **Reel 8 documents 1 to 7** **January 3, 1781 to March 1, 1784**  
Miscellaneous, time-scattered post-colonial government documents pertaining to individual situations, grievance, and claims (see note after document 1)
- **Reel 8 documents 8 to 56** **March 2, 1779 to March 24, 1780**  
General Henry Clinton correspondence to Germain with detailed description of Spanish successful conquest of West Florida against Britain (letter with numerous enclosures, dated May 13, 1780; content not pertaining directly to South Carolina but part of Clinton's larger responsibilities as Commander in Chief of British forces in North America, and dated at Charleston, one day after General Benjamin Lincoln's surrender of his American army to Clinton at Charleston) (see notes after document 8 and document 30)
- **Reel 8 documents 57 to 68** **September 30, 1779 to March 30, 1780**  
Clinton correspondence to Germain with documents pertaining to an effort by British and American military leaders to negotiate a general exchange of prisoners of war (which failed); including correspondence by General George Washington; (letter with numerous enclosures, dated May 13, 1780, not pertaining directly to South Carolina but part of Clinton's larger responsibilities as Commander in Chief of British forces in North America, and dated at Charleston, one day after General Benjamin Lincoln's surrender of his American army to Clinton at Charleston) (see note after document 58)
- **Reel 8 documents 69 to 132** **May 1 to May 14, 1780**  
Clinton's correspondence to Germain with documents pertaining to the final stages of his army's and Admiral Arbuthnot's naval forces' successful efforts to besiege Charleston and force it to surrender (see note after document 70)

- **Reel 8 documents 133 to 163** **May 14, 1780 to June 5, 1780**  
 Clinton correspondence pertaining to wrapping up his responsibilities in Charleston, implementing, through Major General Charles Cornwallis and other British commanders, his offensive war strategy for the south following the capture of Charleston, and encouraging his plan to reinstitute colonial civil government, relying on supposedly numerous loyalists and his generous “amnesty” proclamation for Charleston prisoners of war. Document 163 is an unreadable printed edition of a *Gazette* from Charleston with undermined date. On June 5, Clinton left Charleston, returning to New York and leaving the southern command to Cornwallis. (see note after document 142)
- **Reel 8 documents 164 to 171, 184, 185** **July 28, 1780 to January 31, 1781**  
 Correspondence and other documents pertaining to the conduct and results of Clinton’s offensive military strategy, as implemented by Cornwallis and other British military commanders, initially mostly in South Carolina. It began with British military successes but bogged down as rebel resistance took its toll, and the British armies needed to resupply, which forced them toward the coast. In October 1781, Cornwallis got trapped along the coast at Yorktown, Virginia and was forced to surrender to an American army and French Navy, thus ending the southern strategy and, actually, the entire war
- **Reel 8 documents 172 to 205** **August 31, 1781 to mid-October 1782**  
 (except for documents 184, 185) Correspondence relating to preparation for British evacuation from Charleston, including British occupation and rule, relations with the State of South Carolina government, and transition issues, mostly economic, concerning debts and trade plus the ownership and status of slaves

**Note:** The British Public Records Office archivists who microfilmed the original manuscript documents placed stamped numbers in the upper right corner of the manuscript(s) included on each microfilmed frame. A frame may include one or more manuscript sides. Or, some manuscript sides were microfilmed on more than one frame. In addition, frames either blank or with archivist notes were inconsistently given or not given a frame number.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers run from Volume to Volume through a complete microfilm Reel. Frame Numbers start over with each Volume.

1. January 3, 1781 [1]  
 Note taken apparently in Secretary of State office, stating that “*Mr. Laurens, in a Conversation with Mr. Oswald, said he wish’d that he would let any of the Secretaries of State know, that, if he was permitted to go to South Carolina on his Parole, he believes he could satisfy them that he could do considerable Service to this Nation*”

**[Note: Henry Laurens** was a wealthy South Carolina planter who became wealthier yet by running an extensive slave-trade operation. For him, the British Empire's imposition of commercial restrictions was anathema to the rights of Englishmen. He became a "rebel" as a prominent leader in South Carolina's "shadow" government of Provincial Congress and Council of Safety in late 1774 and 1775. By title, he was South Carolina's first "president." The Continental Congress sent him off to be the rebellious states' first diplomat to the Netherlands. In 1779, he was unfortunate to be captured on the high seas by a British warship, which carried him to London, where he had the unique experience for an American of being locked in the Tower of London, after having been charged with treason. His well-placed South Carolina business partner and friend Richard Oswald argued in the British courts that Laurens was unconstitutionally being held in British prison as a criminal rather than as a prisoner of war with greater rights. The British apparently conceded the point, because Laurens was finally released through a prisoner-of-war exchange in 1781 for British Major General Cornwallis, who had been captured at Yorktown. Not long after his release from British incarceration, he was appointed by the Continental Congress to serve as one of the representatives of the new United States who negotiated the Treaty of Paris between victorious America and defeated Britain. Whether this could be construed as a "*considerable service to this [British] nation*" is open to question.]

2. December 29, 1781 [3]  
Memorial, to Secretary of State for the Colonies Lord George Germain, of Thomas Fletchall of Ninety Six in South Carolina, at Charleston, stating that he had commanded a regiment of South Carolina colonial militia and had loyally led them at Ninety-Six against rebels on November 22, 1775, that after the battle, he had been captured, jailed, and his property destroyed by the rebels; that since then, he had been unable to support his family of sixteen; therefore, requesting relief from the British government; with note added that a copy had been sent to Fletchall's attorney on March 6, 1782 [see note after Reel 7 document 149 for the context of Fletchall's loyalist involvement at Ninety-Six in 1775, as well as the location and name of Ninety-Six]
3. [no date] [5]  
Copy of statement by Henry Yonge to [possibly General Henry Clinton?] reporting the arrest of Dr. William Wells at Charleston, which Yonge contends was illegal because it occurred under a flag of truce, under which Wells had been granted protection  
**[Note:** This appears to be **Henry Yonge Jr.**, Attorney General of East Florida. Like his father, Henry Yonge Sr., who had been official surveyor of Georgia in the 1760s, he remained a staunch loyalist. The precise situation here, why Yonge was involved in the Wells case in Charleston, and to whom he was actually directing his legal opinion are not clear from this correspondence.]

**[Note: Dr. William Wells (1753-1817)** was a practitioner and scholar of medicine as well as a printer. Born in Charleston but educated in Europe, he returned to Charleston in 1771, only to leave again under duress in 1775 when he refused to sign the oath of allegiance to the rebel shadow government. Returning to Charleston in 1781 when it was under British control, Dr. Wells, an American loyalist, was unlucky to be arrested, as Henry Yonge described it, “*under a flag of truce.*” When Charleston returned to American control in December 1782, Wells moved to St. Augustine, where he founded and published the *East Florida Gazette*. When the Treaty of Paris returned East Florida to Spanish control, Wells moved back to England in 1784, where he practiced medicine and conducted highly regarded medical research.]

4. March 1, 1784 [7]  
Copy of letter from Patrick Tonyn, Royal Governor of British East Florida, at St. Augustine, to [Germain], concerning “*the severe treatment of Mr. James McDonald at Charles Town one of His Majesty’s faithful Subjects*”; forwarding McDonald’s petition seeking relief
5. June 10, 1782 [9]  
Letter from James Simpson, former Attorney General of colonial South Carolina, who had received a commission from General Henry Clinton “*to the Peace Commission in North America*”; describing his qualifications for the position relating to his public service to the colony of South Carolina [with enclosure, document 6]
6. May 24, 1782 [10]  
Memorial of James Simpson at London to Lords of the Treasury, describing his having stayed in Charleston after the colonial government was ousted but refused to take an oath to the new government, for which he was fined and his property later seized, that he had left Charleston for New York in 1779 but was ordered by the Crown to return to Charleston in March 1779; and that all the moving, property loss, and lack of his salary as Attorney General had been very costly to him; seeking relief
7. [no date] [13]  
List [prepared by Secretary of State office staff?] of “*Crown Officers in South Carolina*” whose arrears salaries had been ordered by Commissioners of the Treasury to be paid, and their salaries had been paid; listing five positions held by five named individuals

8. May 13, 1780 [14]  
Duplicate letter No. 86 from General Henry Clinton at Charleston to Germain, [written three days after Clinton's army had successfully captured and occupied Charleston, but reporting not on that major victory but on the "*Critical State of West Florida*", including news of the loss of Baton Rouge and Mobile and an expected attack on Pensacola, with extensive documentation [including enclosures, documents 9 to 30]  
[**Note: Documents 8 to 30** (Frames 14 to 69) ( first set) include a duplicate of letter No. 86 from General Clinton to Secretary of State Germain, dated May 13, 1780, plus a table of contents for 21 enclosures that follow, plus the enclosed documents in 21 separate documents.  
**Documents 31 to 56** (Frames 70 to 128) (second set) contain a triplicate of Clinton's Letter No. 86, plus the same table of contents, plus the same 21 enclosures, with the addition of two more documents, placed between documents 22 and 23 in the first set, both Dated March 1, 1780.  
The subject matter of the letter and set of enclosures is the **Spanish invasion and partial conquest of the British colony of West Florida during 1779 and 1780**, including the surrender of Baton Rouge and Natchez on the Mississippi River and of Fort Charlotte [not to be confused with Fort Charlotte on the South Carolina side of the Savannah River, 40 miles north of Augusta, Georgia] and Mobile on the Gulf Coast. The conquest was completed the following year, with the siege and surrender of Pensacola in May 1781.  
The only connection these documents have with South Carolina is that General Clinton sent the documents to London from Charleston, dated, perhaps coincidentally, just one day after the end of his army's successful siege and capture of South Carolina's capital city. Why they were filed under South Carolina rather than West Florida in the CO5 Colonial Office Papers is not clear.]  
[**Note:** Spain entered the American Revolutionary War in June 1779. One of its goals in America was to **return Florida to Spanish rule**, reversing the 1763 Treaty of Paris, which had given Florida to Britain. The British had decided for administrative reasons to split the Spanish colony in half, creating two separate colonies of East Florida (capital at St. Augustine) and West Florida (capital at Pensacola). Between 1779 and 1781, the Spaniards pursued their goal against West Florida, the weaker of the two British colonies, led politically by Don Bernardo de Gálvez, the Spanish Governor at New Orleans, and militarily from both New Orleans and Havana. Defeating the weak defenses of West Florida in stages was a fairly easy task for the Spanish military. Baton Rouge fell in September 1779, (see documents 12 to 17) leaving Natchez, farther up the Mississippi River, exposed and defenseless. Fort Charlotte at the head of Mobile Bay and Mobile itself fell in March 1780 (see documents 22 to 26). The conquest was completed the following year, with the siege and surrender of Pensacola in May 1781 (see document 25 and the note after it). See also the note after document 10.]

9. [no date] [16]  
“*Schedule of Copies and Extracts of Letters*” enclosed in Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter to Germain [document 8], including 21 enclosures microfilmed following this schedule [documents 10 to 30] [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
10. September 11, 1779 [18]  
Extract of letter from Major General John Campbell at Pensacola to General Henry Clinton, stating that West Florida was poorly defended, with details [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]  
**[Note: John Campbell of Strachur (1728-1806)** Scottish clan leader and British Army career officer, was no direct relation to South Carolina Governor William Campbell. He had commanded the troops that attacked but failed to capture Fort Sullivan at Charleston in May 1776. In October 1778, promoted to Brigadier General and soon after to Major General, he was ordered to Pensacola, West Florida, to defend that colony from expected Spanish attack. Arriving at Pensacola in January 1779, he discovered how poorly defended West Florida really was, and sought to strengthen its defenses. In June 1779, Spain entered the war against Britain. By the date of this letter nine months later, Campbell reported that the situation had not improved much. By now, however, Spanish attack was imminent. Baton Rouge fell in September 1779, leaving the Mississippi River in Spanish control. Fort Charlotte and Mobile fell in March 1780, and Pensacola surrendered in May 1781. Campbell spent the rest of the war as a prisoner of war, paroled to New York. When returned to active duty, he was rewarded by being given command of North American British forces from 1783 to 1787—after the war was over.]
11. December 15, 1779 [21]  
Extract of letter from Campbell at Pensacola to Clinton, describing the capitulation of Baton Rouge on September 21, 1779; describing the lack of supply support to British forces in West Florida; suspecting that the Spanish Governor at New Orleans and commander of Spanish forces there, Don Bernardo de Gálvez, was aware of this weakness and had, judging from the size of the force he commanded against Baton Rouge, a force that could successfully attack other West Florida port towns [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
12. September 21, 1779 [24]  
Copy of Articles of Capitulation [written in French] of British Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Dickson at Baton Rouge to Spanish Governor Gálvez [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]

13. September 21, 1779 [29]  
Copy of address by Harry Alexander, representing inhabitants of Baton Rouge, to Dickson after British capitulation to the Spanish, sorrowful at the British loss, but understanding that they had fought well but were too weak to resist the Spanish forces [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
14. September 22, 1779 [31]  
Copy of statement by Dickson, at the Baton Rouge Redoubt, giving reasons for his having to capitulate at Baton Rouge, with details; followed by Certification of Dickson's statement by Assistant Engineer Graham [both enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
15. October 4, 1779 [33]  
Copy of address from inhabitants of Natchez to Dickson, sad at the British defeat but supportive of the British troops' effort to defeat the Spanish; signed by 59 inhabitants [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
16. October 20, 1779 [35]  
Copy of letter from Dickson to Campbell concerning "*the Behaviour of the Troops in the Defense of Baton Rouge*" [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
17. October 19, 1779 [37]  
Copy of "*Return of Prisoners with the Spaniards & the killed & wounded at Baton Rouge &c*", including a total of 419 prisoners held at New Orleans, captured at various places and times, listed by military unit and rank for the Royal Artillery, 16<sup>th</sup> Regiment, 60<sup>th</sup> Regiment, Waldeck Regiment, Independent Company, Staff of the Garrison, and All Sergeants and Rank & File; including also numbers of British soldiers killed and wounded, as well as prisoners who had died in captivity [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
18. February 5, 1780 [39]  
Extract of letter from East Florida Governor Tonyn to General Clinton, reporting having appropriated ordnance stores from a ship carrying them to Jamaica because of great shortages in East Florida; followed by  
March 20, 1780  
Extract of letter from Tonyn to Clinton, reporting on intelligence from some Indians suggesting that Gálvez might be losing a battle against British defenders somewhere in West Florida [with enclosure, document 19]  
[both enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]

19. February 18, 1780 [41]  
Extract of letter from Governor [Peter] Chester [of West Florida] to Tonyn, hoping that news was accurate that Admiral Parker had captured seven Spanish warships and transports; but reporting as well that Spanish vessels had been busy crossing the bar into Mobile Bay and heading northward toward Mobile [enclosed with Tonyn's March 20, 1780 letter to Clinton, part of document 18; also enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
20. February 10, 1780 [43]  
Extract of letter from Campbell at headquarters [at Pensacola] to Clinton, informing him that Campbell had sought to raise two troops of light dragoons among West Floridians to help protect frontier inhabitants from hostile Choctaw Indians; seeking ways to obtain returns of British prisoners at New Orleans and to provide some of their salary pay to the Spanish to provide for the needs of the prisoners; providing additional information about the status of Indian affairs, which he stated were in disarray; reporting weak conditions of remaining British forces in West Florida [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
21. February 12, 1780 [47]  
Copy of letter from Campbell at headquarters at Pensacola, to Clinton, reporting what appeared to be a Spanish attack on Mobile [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
22. March 24, 1780 [49]  
Extract of letter from Campbell to Clinton, reporting the loss of Fort Charlotte at the mouth of Mobile Bay [not to be confused with Fort Charlotte located near Augusta in South Carolina], which had surrendered March 14, 1780; enclosing intelligence received about this loss; reporting that the Spanish had subsequently besieged and captured Mobile; predicting that Pensacola would soon also be besieged and captured, unless his attempts to fortify it were successful or unless Admiral Parker would send a warship to defend it; reporting also that one of the two new light dragoon troops had been surprised and several prisoners of war taken to Mobile [with enclosures, documents 23, 24] [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]  
**[Note:** The second set of Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, No. 86 (triplicate) contains two additional enclosures, located between documents 22 and 23. Both are dated March 1, 1780. See note after document 8 and documents 47 and 48.]
23. March 2, 1780 [53]  
Copy of letter from West Florida Lieutenant Governor Elias Durnford at Mobile to Campbell, reporting details of the Spanish attack on Mobile [enclosed with Campbell's March 24, 1780 letter to Clinton, document 22; also enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]

24. March 14, 1780 [55]  
Copy of letter from Durnford at Fort Charlotte to Campbell, reporting the surrender of the remaining, small garrison at Mobile to the Spanish, all of them prisoners of war, resulting from the Spanish having had far superior arms [enclosed with Campbell's March 24, 1780 letter to Clinton, document 22; also enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
25. March 28, 29, 1780 [57]  
Copy of letter from Campbell at Pensacola headquarters to Clinton, reporting having seen a large Spanish fleet of 29 vessels draw up outside the Pensacola bar; reporting that Durnford was being paroled to Pensacola; expecting to receive information from him on numbers killed, wounded, etc. at Mobile; reporting a day later that the Spanish fleet was still deployed in front of Pensacola Bay, as if waiting for instructions from Gálvez [with enclosure, document 26] [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]  
**[Note:** The fleet observed may have been the Spanish fleet commanded by Governor Gálvez out of New Orleans. Plans to conquer Pensacola included a second fleet with additional troops sailing from Havana. It may have been planning to join the New Orleans fleet along the Gulf Coast before jointly attacking Pensacola sometime in March 1780. In that year, the two fleets never joined, apparently because a large storm (hurricane?) decimated the Havana fleet. But that occurred in October 1780, after the time of this correspondence. The following spring, the two fleets successfully merged, converged on Pensacola, besieged it, and forced its surrender in May 1781, reducing the number of British American colonies by one, without any colonial protest movement, rebellion, or revolution.]
26. March 13, 1780 [59]  
Copy of capitulation document for Fort Charlotte, with articles Gálvez rejected accepted, or wrote, signed by Durnford and Gálvez [enclosed with Campbell's March 28, 29, 1780 letter to Clinton, document 25; also enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8] [Fort Charlotte, located at the mouth of Mobile Bay, defended the British town of Mobile, located at the Bay's head]
27. April 24, 1780 [62]  
Extract of letter from [Florida Rangers commander and Superintendent of Indian Affairs] Colonel Thomas Brown to Clinton, passing on intelligence from Indians of cannonading at Pensacola; reporting on positive relations with the Creek Indians and uncertain relations with the Choctaw [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]

28. May 1, 1779 [64]  
Copy of letter from Clinton at New York to Admiral John Byron [commander of British forces in North America, following Admiral Richard Howe's departure in mid-1778], conveying Major General Campbell's representation of the weakness of Pensacola fortifications, especially after a hurricane in October 1779, requesting that Byron consider sending a frigate to Pensacola to provide some protection for the harbor [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
29. October 26, 1779 [66]  
Copy of letter from Clinton at New York to Admiral Peter Parker, sending a copy of the letter Clinton wrote to Byron, endorsing his request, and adding his plea that food and other supplies also be sent from Jamaica to Pensacola [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Germain, document 8]
30. February 5, 1780 [68]  
Copy of letter from Admiral Parker at sea on the HMS *Ruby* to Clinton, remarking that so little news was being reached from West Florida that doubts existed as to whether it was "*still in our Hands*"; stating that when he returned to Jamaica, he would inquire into the needs of Pensacola and what might be sent to help [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 "duplicate" letter to Germain, document 8]  
**[Note: Documents 31 to 56 (Frames 70 to 128) (second set) contain the same 23 documents that are contained in documents 8 to 30, with a few notable differences. These include General Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter to Secretary of State Germain (document 31), plus a table of contents for 21 enclosures that follow (document 32), plus the enclosed documents in 21 separate documents (documents 33 to 46, 49 to 56). These documents are not itemized here for a second time.**  
The second set of these documents differs from the first set as follows: Clinton's letter is identified as "triplicate," instead of "duplicate. The table of contents is identical in both sets, although two additional enclosed documents are included in the second set (documents 47, 48, which are itemized below).  
The subject matter of the letter and set of enclosures is the **Spanish invasion and partial conquest of the British colony of West Florida during 1779 and 1780**, including the surrender of Baton Rouge and Natchez on the Mississippi River and of Fort Charlotte and Mobile on the Gulf Coast. The conquest was completed the following year, with the siege and surrender of Pensacola in May 1781 (see document 25 and the note after it)  
The only connection these documents have with South Carolina is that General Clinton sent the documents to London from Charleston, dated, perhaps coincidentally, just one day after the end of his army's successful siege and capture of South Carolina's capital city. Why they were filed under South Carolina rather than West Florida in the CO5 Colonial Office Papers is not clear.]

47. March 1, 1780 [110]  
Copy of letter, written in French, from Gálvez at "*Pointe de la Chatolo*" [near Baton Rouge?] to Durnford, offering him the opportunity to surrender his inferior force to avoid fighting  
[**Note:** Documents 47 and 48 were included as two additional enclosures in the second set of documents enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 triplicate letter No. 86 to Germain but were not included in the first set enclosed with Clinton's same but duplicate letter; the remaining enclosures, plus the triplicate letter and table of contents (which does not include these two additional documents) are not itemized here.]
48. March 1, 1780 [112]  
Copy of letter from Durnford, responding to Gálvez, refusing his offer to surrender without a fight  
[**Note:** The second set of Clinton's Letter No. 86 with table of contents and enclosures ends at document 56 and Frame 128.]
57. May 13, 1780 [129]  
Duplicate letter No. 87 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain, enclosing a report of negotiations at Amboy that have established a process for cartels for the general exchange of prisoners of war; observing that already, "*I am sorry to observe [that it] has proved as ineffectual as the other Negotiations entered into with the Rebels on this business*"  
[**Note:** **Amboy**, now Perth Amboy and South Amboy lies on both sides of the mouth of the Raritan River, New Jersey, near the south end of Staten Island. It was apparently a convenient, protected location for negotiations between American and British officers. During much of the war, Elizabeth City, now Elizabeth), up a protected series of channels at the north end of Staten Island, served as a way station for the exchange of British and German prisoners of war from Philadelphia, Lancaster, and other places in Pennsylvania for American prisoners held by the British in New York.]
58. [no date] [131]  
"*Schedule of Papers relating to the Commission for a General Exchange of Prisoners*", including 10 documents, dated from September 30, 1779 to March 30, 1780  
[**Note:** **Documents 59 to 68** do not pertain specifically to South Carolina and apparently were filed in the South Carolina Colonial Papers only because Clinton sent this letter with enclosures from Charleston to Germain.]  
[**Note:** Document 60 (Frame 135) is copy of letter dated September 30, 1779 from George Washington at headquarters at West Point to Major General Phillips, the lead negotiator for the British on the issue of general prisoner-of-war exchanges.]

Document 63 (Frame 143) is copy of proclamation dated March 7, 1780 by General George Washington naming Major General [Arthur] St. Clair and Lieutenant Colonels [Edward] Carrington and [Alexander] Hamilton as commissioners to negotiate with the British concerning a possible general prisoner-of-war exchange. St. Clair and Hamilton were at this time aides de camp to General Washington. Carrington was a Virginian, a capable artillery officer with a distinguished career in battles throughout the war, and a personal friend of Washington. Soon after Carrington completed his assignment as commissioner to negotiate a possible general exchange of prisoners of war, General Nathanael Greene appointed him to serve as quartermaster general during Greene's 1781 southern campaign, a task Carrington handled while still leading artillery during battles.

Documents 64 to 68 (Frames 146 to 162) are copies of minutes of commissioner meetings, a resulting British proposal and response, and plans for exchange of two divisions of Convention Army prisoners of war. The unique invention of the **Convention Army** of British prisoners of war was created after the battles of Saratoga in October 1777 by the winning and losing generals respectively, Horatio Gates and John Burgoyne. Burgoyne's entire army surrendered to the American army. Rather than negotiate the usual surrender terms to be ratified later by higher ups and implemented through channels, Gates and Burgoyne negotiated on the battlefield a complete arrangement, including special disposition for the defeated British prisoners of war. Congress did not look kindly on Gates' expansive concept of his role and authority and never approved the Gates-Burgoyne Convention. As a result the whole body of these thousands of prisoners of war was maintained through most of the war off the land of rural America, marched from one place to another to be kept far from active combat zones.]

69. May 1, 1780 [163]  
"Memorandum of the State of the Army" under Clinton's command, including "Return of Prisoners with the Spaniards of the Troops in West Florida, included in the State, as Prisoners with the Rebels", reported as British, German (Waldeck), or Provincial (Loyal Pennsylvania), by rank, totaling 377 troops; also, return of British troops in detachments separated from the main British forces in North America, including 782 in South Carolina, 99 in Nova Scotia, 10 in East Florida, 42 in West Florida, and 9 in Georgia; signed by Clinton
70. May 13, 1780 [165]  
Duplicate letter No. 88 from Clinton at headquarters at Charleston to Germain, describing with details the "*Delays and Difficulties which prevented serious Operation until the 29<sup>th</sup> of March on which day the Landing on Charles town Neck was effected*" referring to the early stages of Clinton's military effort against Charleston that concluded with surrender of the rebel army at Charleston and British occupation [with enclosures, documents 71 to 100;

documents 101 to 132 contain a triplicate copy of this letter No. 88 along with the same enclosures plus two additional enclosures; among these, only the letter (document 101) and the two additional enclosures (documents 121, 126) are itemized here; see also the note below on Clinton's Letter No. 88]

[**Note:** Like Clinton's letters No. 86 (on West Florida) and No. 87 (on a general prisoner-of-war exchange process), letter No. 88 (on capitulation of General Lincoln's rebel army at Charleston) contains detailed information on a particular subject presented with a cover letter from Clinton to Germain, followed by a schedule of numerous enclosures, followed by extracts or copies of the enclosures. Each of these three letters with enclosures was dated May 13, 1780, the day after General Lincoln's army had surrendered Charleston to the British. The reason for this juxtaposition of letters, subjects, and a date is not certain. Unlike No. 86 and No. 87, the subject of No. 88 relates directly to South Carolina and Charleston during the war period, after the British colonial government of South Carolina had collapsed on September 15, 1776.]

[**Note: Clinton's letter No. 88** is microfilmed twice, along with lengthy sets of abstract and copy enclosures. The **first set (documents 70 to 100)** contains a duplicate of Clinton's letter No. 88 to Germain (document 70), followed by a "schedule" of 29 enclosures (document 71) plus the 29 enclosures, (documents 72 to 100). The **second set (documents 101 to 132)** is microfilmed immediately after the first set. It contains a triplicate of Clinton's letter No. 88 to Germain (document 101), followed by no schedule of enclosures, but with 31 enclosures, which include the 29 enclosures in the first set plus two additional ones (documents 102 to 132; Frames 237 to 299), which are microfilmed in a slightly different order. The two additional enclosures are itemized in this Finding Aid where they were microfilmed, as documents 121 and 126. The 29 enclosures that are microfilmed in both sets are itemized only once, where they were microfilmed in the first set (documents 72 to 100).]

71. [no date [171]  
"Schedule of Inclosures in N<sup>o</sup> 88", including 29 items [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70]

72. April 10, 1780 [173]  
Copy of summons from General Clinton and Admiral Arbuthnot to Major General [Benjamin] Lincoln, commander of American forces at Charleston, declaring their intent to capture the city by force unless Lincoln were to surrender [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 102, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]

[**Note: Mariot Arbuthnot** had been named commander of the British fleet in North America late in 1779, replacing John Byron. He personally commanded the fleet that had conveyed Clinton's army to South Carolina and occupied Charleston harbor during the siege of the city.]

[**Note:** By this time, Clinton's intent, along with Admiral Arbuthnot's, had long been clear to all. The campaign against Charleston had begun in February 1780 and the land-and-water siege in earnest in March. The purpose by April was to force a conclusion to the punishing siege which General Lincoln and his beleaguered troops and remaining Charleston population could not withstand much longer. Clinton knew it, and he knew Lincoln knew it as well. I didn't take long for General Lincoln to open negotiations for capitulation, but these dragged on until May 12, 1780, when Lincoln signed **Articles of Capitulation** and surrendered his army and the city of Charleston, returning the capital of colonial South Carolina back to British control until near the end of the war. However, military occupation of Charleston alone could not resurrect the colony and its government.]

[**Note:** **Benjamin Lincoln** of Massachusetts served as a high-ranking general under General George Washington throughout the war. He was directly involved in three major surrenders during the war. At Saratoga in 1777 and at Yorktown in 1781, he was on the winning side. However, At Charleston in 1780, he sought to salvage what he could from the greatest American surrender of the Revolutionary War. He had tried unsuccessfully to obtain sufficient numbers of troops to stave off defeat at Charleston, but in the end he surrendered an army of 5,000 that had been besieged into submission by Clinton's much larger army of 13,500. After capitulation became inevitable, Lincoln stalled the negotiations long enough to allow (rebel) South Carolina militia to escape, along with some Continental Army soldiers. As is clear in the correspondence, General Clinton realized what General Lincoln was doing and did his best to counteract it.]

73. April 10, 1780 [175]  
Copy of response from Lincoln to General Clinton and Vice Admiral Arbuthnot, acknowledging having known Clinton's hostile intent for some time and refusing to negotiate but expressing determination to defend Charleston, which was his duty [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 103, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
74. April 21, 1780 [177]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln at Charleston to Clinton, stating that "*I am willing to enter into the consideration of Terms of Capitulation*"; proposing a cessation of hostilities for six hours "*for the Purpose of digesting such Articles*" [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 104, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
75. April 21, 1780 [179]  
Copy of Clinton's reply to Lincoln's letter seeking terms of capitulation, informing him that he should have sent his letter to Arbuthnot as well as Clinton; stating that he would consult with Arbuthnot and would set up the cessation of hostilities;

- requesting that the battery on James Island “*may desist firing*” [James Island is a large sea island between Morris Island and Charleston City, from which batteries could have fired on vessels in the harbor or on the city itself] [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 105, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
76. April 21, 1780 [181]  
Copy of articles of capitulation proposed by Lincoln to Clinton [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 106, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
77. April 21, 1780, “8 O’Clock at Night” [183]  
Copy of Clinton’s response to Lincoln’s proposed Articles of Capitulation, disagreeing with several articles as proposed; maintaining that the articles should reflect Clinton’s and Arbuthnot’s “*former offer*”; insisting that all rebel combatants [including militia and others] should surrender and become hostages, not just Continental troops [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 107, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
78. May 8, 1780 [185]  
Copy of letter from Clinton to Lincoln, offering a new summons, observing that the rebel situation in Charleston had further deteriorated, and that no hope remained for Charleston to escape imminent British capture [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 108, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
79. May 8, 1780 [187]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln to Clinton, stating that he was considering Clinton’s latest summons and that because “*there are so many different Interests to be consulted*”, requesting that hostilities “*not again commence till Twelve*” [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 109, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
80. May 8, 1780 [189]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln at Charleston to Clinton, requesting that, because consulting with the different interests had taken more time than expected, “*the Truce may be continued until 4 o’Clock*” [enclosed with Clinton’s May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 111, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]

81. May 8, 1780 [191]  
Copy of letter from Clinton before Charleston to Lincoln, consenting to Lincoln's request to further continue the truce until 4 o'clock, but indicating that this would be the last acceptable delay [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 112, not itemized here; see document 101 and note after it]
82. May 8, 1780 [193]  
Copy of letter from Clinton to Lincoln, stating that "*I consent that Hostilities shall not again Commence before the hour of twelve as you desire*" [responding to document 79] [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 110, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
83. May 8, 1780 [195]  
Copy of proposed terms of capitulation, containing changes required by Clinton and agreed to by Lincoln [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 113, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
84. May 8, 1780 [197]  
Copy of letter from Clinton before Charleston to Lincoln, stating his need to confer with Admiral Arbuthnot about the content of Lincoln's last letter [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 114, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
85. May 8, 1780 "6 P.M." [199]  
Copy of letter from Clinton to Lincoln, suggesting that, to allow time for consideration of revised Articles of Capitulation, the cessation of hostilities "*shall continue until the morrow Morning at Eight o'Clock, and that in the mean time every Thing shall continue in its present Situation*" [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 115, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
86. May 8, 1780 [201]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln at Charleston to Clinton, acceding to Clinton's suggestion that "*hostilities shall cease untill tomorrow Morn<sup>g</sup>. Eight o'Clock, and that in the mean time all works shall continue in their present State*" [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 116, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]

87. May 8, 1780 *"Eight o'Clock P.M."* [203]  
Copy of letter from Clinton before Charleston to Lincoln, stating that Lincoln's accession to Clinton's suggestion included only cessation of hostilities, not that *"everything should continue in its present Situation; and my Meaning was, that there should not be any Attempt made to remove any of the Troops, or remove or destroy any of the Ships, Stores or other Effects whatever, now in the Town or Harbour"*; seeking clarification of Lincoln's meaning [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 117, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
88. May 8, 1780 [205]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln at Charleston to Clinton, stating that his meaning was to accede to Clinton's meaning, which he reiterated [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 118, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
89. May 9, 1780 [207]  
Copy of Articles of Capitulation as proposed by Major General Lincoln and answered by General Clinton and Admiral Arbuthnot, with acceptance of certain articles and rewriting of certain others [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 112, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
90. May 9, 1780 [209]  
Copy of alterations, proposed by Lincoln to Articles 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 in the Articles of Capitulation as revised by Clinton and Arbuthnot, designed to maintain the dignity of those surrendering, including changes such as seeking to prevent militia from being made prisoners of war, allowing officers to keep their horses, ensuring that citizens living in Charleston [including officers of Charleston's civil government] would not be made prisoners of war, etc. [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 120, not itemized here; and also in document 126; see also document 101 and note after it] [an additional enclosure to Clinton's letter No. 88 is found in document 121, enclosed with the triplicate copy of this letter in document 101; it is the cover letter from American General Lincoln to General Clinton dated May 9, 1780 which delivered Lincoln's alterations to the proposed Articles of Capitulation, as found in this document plus documents 120, 126]

91. May 9, 1780 [211]  
Copy of letter from Clinton and Arbuthnot before Charleston to Lincoln, stating that "*The Alterations you propose are all utterly inadmissible. Hostilities will in consequence commence afresh at 8 o'Clock*" [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 122, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
92. May 11, 1780 [213]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln at Charleston to Clinton, while continuing to protest that Clinton's proposed treatment of surrendering militia and citizens was inhumane, having learned that these people themselves were willing to comply with that treatment in order to end the siege, he had been led "*now to offer you my Acceptance of them*" [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 122, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
93. May 11, 1780 [215]  
Copy of letter from Clinton, before Charleston, to Lincoln, informing Lincoln that the terms Clinton and Arbuthnot had previously proposed, having been acceded to by Lincoln, were still acceptable to Clinton and Arbuthnot; stating that therefore, they were agreed to, that a copy would be drawn for Lincoln's certification, and that then, a detachment of grenadiers would be sent into the city to take possession of it [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 124, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
94. May 12, 1780 [217]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln at Charleston to Clinton, stating that he was sending Colonel [Jean Baptiste Charles de] Ternant [a French volunteer officer] "*as Commissioner on my Part*" to explain some matters about the situation and to "*execute this Business, and agree upon the place to which our Troops shall be conducted*" [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 125, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it; [an additional enclosure to Clinton's letter No. 88 is found in document 126, enclosed with the triplicate copy of this letter in document 101; it is another copy of the alternative terms of capitulation that General Lincoln proposed to General Clinton, copies of which are also found in documents 90 and 120]
95. May 12, 1780 [219]  
Copy of Articles of Capitulation "*as finally agreed upon and ratified*", with two columns, Lincoln's original proposal and Clinton's and Arbuthnot's revision, which was agreed to on May 11 [document 93] and signed and dated the next day

[enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 127, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]

96. May 14, 1780 [221]  
"Return of Ordnance, Arms, and Ammunition in Charleston" at the time of surrender [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 128, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
97. May 12, 1780 [223]  
"Return of the Killed and Wounded" in Clinton's British army from the date of its disembarkation at Charleston on February 11, 1780 until the surrender of Charleston on May 12, 1780, including total killed 75 plus total wounded 180 [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 129, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
98. April 12, 1780 [225]  
Copy of instructions from Clinton to Lieutenant Colonel [James] Webster, containing detailed orders and contingent orders for his corps' movement on April 13 and 14 along two lines of rural lowlands with rivers, ferries, bluffs, [each line of march roughly paralleling a transportation route toward Charleston]  
[Note: Intentionally not made clear in the instructions was their intent, to find and engage rebel troops guarding the transportation routes and to destroy their usefulness to resupply Charleston as part of General Clinton's siege of Charleston and its harbor. The remembered action during this operation was the **Battle of Monck's Corner**, fought on April 14, 1780. The **Loyalist British Legion** commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Banastre Tarleton caught by surprise the rebel troops assigned to protect the transport route running through this town toward Charleston (which roughly follows modern U.S. Route 17A). British success here closed one of the few remaining supply lines into Charleston, helping to ensure the success of the British siege and the surrender of the rebel army in Charleston on May 12, 1780 [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 130, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]  
[Note: **Lieutenant Colonel Sir Banastre Tarleton, 1<sup>st</sup> Baronet** (1754-1833) was a British officer in his 20s during the Revolutionary War. An effective if brutal military leader, he led loyalist troops during the siege of Charleston, including the successful raid at **Monck's Corner** in April 1780. After Charleston fell, he organized Tarleton's Raiders, a special loyalist corps of cavalry and light infantry. Under the command of **Major General Charles Cornwallis, 1<sup>st</sup> Marquess Cornwallis** (1738-1805), among the more capable of the top generals on the British side, Tarleton operated on offence in the North Carolina-South Carolina frontier. His troops won again in the bloody battle (or massacre) at **Waxhaw** south of Charlotte (see note after document 145) in May 1780.]

In August, as Cornwallis was winning decisively at Camden, Tarleton's troops also won a subsequent, smaller victory against Brigadier General Thomas Sumter of the South Carolina Militia, at a place variously known as Fishing Creek or **Catawba Fords**. Soon after, however, Tarleton's troops were decisively defeated at the **Battle of Cowpens** in January 1781. He went on to play a defensive role at Yorktown, surrendered with the rest of Cornwallis' army, and returned to England under parole. For more on Brigadier General Thomas Sumter, see note after document 185.]

99. April 23, 1780 [227]  
Copy of letter from Clinton at headquarters at the Neck of Charleston to Webster, adding to the previous instructions some "hints" about Webster's situation, to be interpreted as hints of orders concerning the siege, now well underway [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 131, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]
100. April 25, 1780 [229]  
Copy of letter from Clinton to Lieutenant General [Charles] Cornwallis, asking that he and his troops move toward controlling the Cooper River as part of the tightening siege around Charleston [enclosed with Clinton's May 13, 1780 letter No. 88 to Germain, document 70; another copy of this enclosure is found in document 132, not itemized here; see also document 101 and note after it]  
[Note: **Major General Charles Cornwallis, 1<sup>st</sup> Marquess Cornwallis** (1738-1805) was among the more capable of the top generals on the British side of the Revolutionary War. He and his troops were involved in many of the major engagements with American forces from 1776 onward. He is perhaps most remembered for his surrender at **Yorktown**, Virginia in October 1781. Prior to that, however, he led his troops with considerable success, under General Henry Clinton's overall command, during the British southern campaign of 1780 and 1781. During the siege of **Charleston** he played a leading military role. Following that, Clinton sent him and his troops into South Carolina's interior to protect the British gains at Charleston and to go on the offense against rebels in the south. He had significant early successes at **Waxhaw** (led by Cornwallis' subordinate Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton) and **Camden** in May and August 1780, respectively. By late 1780, however, loyalist forces lost at **Kings Mountain** in October 1780, stalling Cornwallis' offensive strategy into North Carolina, Tarleton's troops lost badly at **Cowpens** in upland South Carolina in January 1781, and Cornwallis's troops suffered a bloody standoff at **Guilford Courthouse** in north central North Carolina in March 1781, before Cornwallis chose to retreat to Virginia via Wilmington, North Carolina.]

101. May 13, 1780 [231]  
Triplicate letter No. 88 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain [for summary, see a duplicate of this letter, document 70; see also note after document 70] [with enclosures, documents 102 to 132, which are not listed here but are identified by number in the entry for the same enclosures (documents 72 to 100) with the duplicate of Clinton's same letter No. 88, (document 70); the exceptions are documents 121 and 126, which are entries for two enclosures to the document 101 letter, which are not microfilmed with document 70]
121. May 9, 1780 [275]  
Copy of letter from Lincoln at Charleston to Clinton, the cover letter for Lincoln's proposed alterations [document 120], stating, in relation to Clinton's and Arbuthnot's proposed alternative Articles of Capitulation [document 119], that "*they are inadmissible*" and making his proposals for admissible alterations in certain articles [this cover letter was not included among the enclosures with Clinton's duplicate letter No. 88, document 70]
126. May 9, 1780 [285]  
Copy of Articles of Capitulation alterations proposed by Lincoln [this document was not included among the enclosures with Clinton's duplicate letter No. 88, document 70, although another copy of it was enclosed in document 90, and another copy is also found in the enclosures with this triplicate letter No. 88 in document 120]
133. May 14, 1780 [300]  
Duplicate letter No. 89 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain, acknowledging receipt of a secret letter and a very secret letter, both dated March 15, 1780, both to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty [with an enclosure, not microfilmed]
134. May 15, 1780 [302]  
Duplicate letter No. 90 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain, concerning a matter of required resignation of officers with commissions in both the British Army and Provincial Militia, from one or the other, which was being enforced except for two officers, Lieutenant Colonels [John Graves] Simcoe and [Banastre] Tarleton, pending consideration of "*how much the Kings Service would suffer from it*"; requesting that similar exemption be allowed for Captain Robertson [among several Robertsons in the British Army at the time, the identity of this person has not been found]
135. May 15, 1780 [304]  
Duplicate letter No. 90 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain [another duplicate letter No. 90, the same as in document 134]

136. May 15, 1780 [306]  
Duplicate letter No. 91 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain, stating his difficulty of having insufficient numbers of generals, so that he was promoting certain colonels
137. May 15, 1780 [308]  
Duplicate letter No. 91 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain [another duplicate letter No. 91, the same as in document 136]
138. May 16, 1780 [310]  
Duplicate of "Separate" [unnumbered] letter from Clinton to Germain, concerning his support for [James] Simpson who was "*endeavouring to collect every Information with respect to the present Temper and disposition of the Inhabitants*", which Clinton hoped would lead to a decision of readiness to re-establish a colonial British government in South Carolina [with enclosure, document 139]  
[**Note:** Clinton's plan was to arouse loyalist enthusiasm and action to create an indigenous movement toward **re-establishment of British colonial rule in South Carolina**, following the fall Charleston to the British after Clinton's siege of the city. During the campaign to conquer Charleston, Clinton's secretary had been former South Carolina Attorney General **James Simpson**. Clinton delegated implementation of his loyalist plan to loyalist leader Simpson. Simpson was appointed to this responsibility on May 3, 1780, just days before Benjamin Lincoln's rebel army in Charleston surrendered on May 12. Only three days after that capitulation, Simpson wrote a report to Clinton (document 139). Simpson was, however, more than an individual intelligence gatherer and reporter. Another loyalist named **Richard Pearis**, living in upland South Carolina, working apparently under Simpson's direction, had some success in a related effort to organize a group of loyalist militia. In the end, none of these efforts succeeded in re-establishing colonial rule in South Carolina.]
139. May 15, 1780 [311]  
Copy of letter from Simpson at Charleston to Clinton, reporting that some inhabitants seemed to be reasoning that a return to the King's authority would be the most logical alternative, while others seemed intransigent in their "*error*" of rebellion, and others reportedly felt in other ways; suspecting that the number of more consequential people who favored return to British rule outnumbered those still opposed to that rule; stating that the number of loyalists who had always supported the King's authority were not so numerous as he had expected; stating that additional loyalists were forced to leave Charleston to "*settle in the country*"; believing that some of these loyalists may be "*deservedly so obnoxious, that whatever Measures may be adopted by Government, it will be Impossible for them to Escape the Effects of private resentment*"; believing that the "*Lower class of People*" would "*without trouble Submit quietly to the Government that Supports itself*";

stating that, as a result of his inquiries into public opinion, he believed “*it will be very practicable to Establish the King’s Government in South Carolina*”, although it would take some time and effort to accomplish [enclosed with Clinton’s May 15, 1780 “*separate*” unnumbered letter to Germain, document 139]

140. June 3, 1780 [314]  
Triplicate letter No. 92 from Clinton at Charleston headquarters to Germain, informing Germain that Lord Rawdon had resigned his commission as Lieutenant Colonel in the British Army and had chosen to continue as Colonel of Provincials, but that having to make this choice was “*mortifying*” for him; suggesting that this requirement was doing harm to the British military  
[**Note: Francis Rawdon-Hastings, 1<sup>st</sup> Marquess of Hastings** (1754-1826) was a career army officer actively involved in the British response to the American Revolution from Lexington and Concord to Yorktown and beyond. During the southern campaign, he served under Clinton at Charleston. When Cornwallis’ army began moving northward after the August 16, 1780 Battle of Camden, Rawdon became the de-facto commander of British troops remaining in the deep south. Yet, his army was gradually forced by rebel military pressure back to Charleston, where, in July 1781, he gave up his command and returned to England, reportedly because of poor health. How this situation squares with his having decided in 1780 to keep a provincial over a British military position is not clear from these documents alone. Rawdon’s military and colonial career continued after the American war elsewhere in the British Empire. From 1813 until 1823 he served as Governor General of India.]
141. June 3, 1780 [316]  
Duplicate letter No. 92 from Clinton at Charleston headquarters to Germain [the same as triplicate letter No. 92 in document 140]
142. June 4, 1780 [318]  
Triplicate letter No. 93 from Clinton at Charleston headquarters to Germain, reporting the capture of 5,618 prisoners of war through the surrender of the rebel army at Charleston; reporting that Cornwallis and other British troops were now marching inland in South Carolina to expand British-held territory beyond Charleston, with some success [with enclosure, document 143] [an apparent partial draft of this letter is found in document 144; a duplicate of the same letter is in document 145 with its last (fifth) page microfilmed separately in document 152]  
[**Note:** Just before the date of this letter, on May 29, 1780, Banastre Tarleton’s loyalist troops (under Cornwallis’ overall command) had brutally defeated Abraham Buford’s Continental Army troops at a place called **Waxhaw**, on the South Carolina-North Carolina border. Shortly thereafter, on August 16, 1780, Tarleton’s troops reinforced with other British troops clashed with and routed Horatio Gates’ rebel army at **Camden**, South Carolina.]

Despite this initial victory, and several more indecisive encounters with the rebels, the British army eventually became bogged down and moved northward, seeking access to needed supplies. When Cornwallis reached **Yorktown**, Virginia, where he expected to be resupplied, circumstances had turned this coastal area into a trap rather than an opportunity to resupply. French naval support along with a large rebel army turned the tables, bottling Cornwallis' army up in September and October 1781, until it was forced to surrender. This more than nullified the British victory at Camden, leading eventually toward final American victory in its Revolutionary War against the British in 1783. Earlier in the war, in 1777, General Gates had succeeded grandly by defeating General John Burgoyne's British army at Saratoga, New York. He was not so successful at Camden. For more on Lieutenant Colonel Banastre Tarleton, see note after document 98.]

143. [no date] [320]  
Return of prisoners captured by British forces at Charleston on May 12, 1780, including, 17 corps, each reporting numbers by rank for commissioned officers, staff officers, noncommissioned officers, and rank and file plus numbers by position in civil government, general hospital, commissary general's department, quarter master general's department, and militia hospital, with various totals and a grand total of 5,618 prisoners, plus a few in unique categories, leading to a grand, grand total of 5,704 [enclosed with Clinton's June 4, 1780 letter to Germain, document 142]
144. [no date] [321]  
Evidently an incomplete draft of parts of letter No. 93 from Clinton to Germain, dated June 4, 1780, referring to efforts to certify the allegiance of Charlestonians captured at the surrender of the rebel army and to seek to keep them in South Carolina as loyal inhabitants; stating that "*I may venture to assert, that there are few Men in South Carolina, who are not either our Prisoners or in arms with us*"; reporting that "*the loyalists in the back parts of North Carolina are arming*"; hoping that "*within the Provinces*" Cornwallis and his army "*will call back its Inhabitants from their State of Error and Disobedience*"; proposing to send "*a small Expedition into Cape Fear River*" to support the upland loyalists; stating that he was leaving Charleston harbor with as many troops as possible, going to New York [this draft begins in the middle of a sentence and consists of the last two pages of the complete letter, whose date is written at the top of the second microfilmed page in an archivist's different handwriting; for complete copies of this letter see triplicate letter (document 142) and duplicate letter (document 145 with the last, fifth page microfilmed in document 152)]

145. June 4, 1780 [322]  
Duplicate letter No. 93 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain, describing the movement of Cornwallis' corps northward and the engagement of Lieutenant Colonel [Banastre] Tarleton with the rebels at [the Battle of Waxhaw]; making positive assertions about possibilities for re-establishing British rule in South Carolina, with the help of a perceived many willing loyalists, especially in the interior, where Cornwallis and Tarleton were then finding military success [the last (fifth) page of this letter is microfilmed separately in document 152] [see evident partial draft copy of this letter in document 144 and triplicate letter (complete) in document 142]  
[**Note: Waxhaw** is now a small rural town not far south of Charlotte, North Carolina, near the border with South Carolina. In the early 1760s this area was home to a small band of Waxhaw Indians, apparently affiliated with the Catawba Nation. During that time, the Indians and frontier settlers from both North Carolina and South Carolina contended for this territory. A major concern of both colonies for some time was negotiation of a firm boundary line between the two Carolinas that would also move the Indians farther away on the frontier. See note after Reel 1 document 165. In 1780, Waxhaw was a logistical meeting point of two armies, not a destination. Nor were the Indians any longer major contenders for power in the area, leaving hostilities to loyalists v. rebels, in the British terminology.  
The **Battle of Waxhaw** was a bloody affair. Tarleton's rebels faced Continental troops from Virginia commanded by Colonel Abraham Buford. Tarleton had, as usual, charged up his troops for a hard fight. They were sufficiently effective that Buford apparently sought to surrender. Meanwhile, during a charge, Tarleton's horse had been killed and Tarleton had been pinned under the horse's body. His hyped-up troops, furious at the thought he had perhaps been killed, violated the surrender truce and turned the battle into a massacre.]
146. June 3, 1780 [324]  
Duplicate letter No. 94 from Clinton at Charleston to Germain, enclosing copies of proclamation and a handbill he had circulated seeking to encourage loyalist leanings among prisoners and inhabitants [with enclosures, documents 147, 148] [another duplicate of the same letter is found in document 149, dated June 4, 1780]
147. May 22, 1780 [325]  
Copy of printed handbill containing a proclamation from Clinton to the inhabitants of South Carolina, warning against any new armed violence against British authority and expressing he intent to reinstate civil government in South Carolina loyal to the King; encouraging all inhabitants to disavow the rebellion and overcome its "*Disorder, Violence and Oppression*"; stating that "*the helping Hand of every Man is wanted to re-establish Peace and good Government*" and "*to secure to them Peace, Liberty, and Prosperity*";

calling for creation of a new [loyal] militia, in which young men would be expected to serve "*as his Debt to his Country*" [another copy of this printed handbill in document 151] [enclosed with Clinton's June 3, 1780 letter to Germain, document 146]

148. June 3, 1780 [328]  
Copy of proclamation from Clinton stating his order that, to help repopulate South Carolina with willing, loyal inhabitants, the paroles of prisoners of war who surrendered at Charleston in May 1780 were to be ended because the paroles were no longer needed for security purposes, and the men were needed to fulfill the goal of re-establishing "*peace and good government*" in South Carolina; declaring that those who were prisoners of war and on parole, after June 20, 1780 "*are freed and exempted from all such Paroles and may hold themselves as restored to all the rights and Duties belonging to Citizens and Inhabitants*"; and that any who "*afterwards neglect to return to their Allegiance and to His Majesty's Government will be considered as Enemies and Rebels to the same and treated accordingly*" [same as document 150] [enclosed with Clinton's June 3, 1780 letter to Germain, document 146]
149. June 4, 1780 [330]  
Duplicate letter No. 94 from Clinton to Germain [another duplicate of the same letter as in document 146, dated June 3, 1780] [with enclosures, documents 150, 151]
150. June 3, 1780 [331]  
Copy of proclamation from Clinton calling on inhabitants of South Carolina to be loyal to the King and to aid the task of re-establishing "*peace and good government*" in the colony [same as document 148] [enclosed with Clinton's June 4, 1780 letter to Germain, document 149]
151. May 22, 1780 [333]  
Copy of printed handbill with proclamation encouraging all South Carolina inhabitants to be loyal to the King and to help out in re-establishing "*Peace, Liberty, and Prosperity*" in the colony [same as document 147] [enclosed with Clinton's June 4, 1780 letter to Germain, document 149]
152. [June 4, 1780] [336]  
Copy of last page of duplicate letter No. 93 from Clinton to Germain [the previous four pages of this letter are microfilmed in document 145; an evident draft of the last part of the letter is found in document 144, and a complete triplicate letter is in document 142]

153. June 5, 1780 [338]  
Duplicate letter No. 95 from Clinton on board the Man of War *Romulus* off of Charleston bar to Germain, enclosing a more detailed description from Cornwallis of the battle at Waxhaw [with enclosures, documents 154 to 157] [same as duplicate letter No. 95 in document 158]  
**[Note:** General Clinton had decided soon after Charleston's surrender on May 12, 1780 that he would return with some of his troops to New York, to attend to ongoing northern conflicts which he felt needed his attention. When he wrote this letter on June 5, 1780, his troops were already on board transports and he was ready to sail from outside the Charleston bar. He left Cornwallis behind, in command of all British troops remaining in the south, with instructions to continue the offensive strategy he had devised.  
The military side of this strategy was to roll up victories throughout the south as loyalists poured out to support re-establishment of the South Carolina colony. The political side of the strategy was to engage loyalists quickly to reconstitute British civil government in the colony.  
Unfortunately for Clinton, and more directly for Cornwallis, the assumption of widespread loyalist support in South Carolina missed the mark of reality by a wide margin. The military strategy got bogged down. Cornwallis marched eastward toward the coast, seeking reinforcements and supplies, and ended up trapped at Yorktown. The political strategy was stillborn. In Charleston the British had control through military rule but little support. In the rest of the colony, despite Cornwallis' military success in certain battles, the British never even regained control. Tenacious military harassment by the American southern army under General Nathanael Greene's overall command and some capable leadership beneath him also had something to do with Clinton's and Cornwallis' miscalculation.  
Yet, the fatal blind spot belonged to the British—their unrealistic assumption that the British system was superior and ultimately invincible, and that the trouble in the American colonies was a mere rebellion caused by an insolent minority of malcontents who would eventually fail if sufficient British force was applied, whereupon the essentially loyal population would return from its misguided ways to its natural loyalty and obedience to the King. In these microfilmed official South Carolina Colonial Papers, this assumption became a persistent refrain after the early 1760s, seemingly impervious to change based on clear evidence. Between 1780 and 1782, the evidence in South Carolina against the faulty British assumption became more and more clear, as the British strategy yielded neither cumulative military victories nor a flowering of civil government.]
154. June 2, 1780 [339]  
Copy of letter from Cornwallis at Camden, South Carolina to Clinton, enclosing a more detailed report of the battle at Waxhaw from Tarleton along with return of those killed and wounded on both sides in the battle [same as document 159] [see enclosures, documents 155 to 157] [enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 153]

**[Note:** The interior frontier country of South Carolina verging into North Carolina that briefly became the center of operations for the British southern campaign after the surrender of Charleston on May 12, 1780 remains today largely rural. Locations in this area are most easily described today in relation to two larger modern cities on the fringes of this area—Charlotte, North Carolina and Columbia, South Carolina. Waxhaw, now in North Carolina, lies just a few miles south of Charlotte. From Columbia, Camden is about 35 miles northeast and Waxhaw is another 60 miles straight north from Camden.]

155. May 30, 1780 [341]  
Copy of letter from Tarleton at Waxhaw to Cornwallis, containing details of the British success at the battle there [same as document 160] [enclosed with Cornwallis' June 2, 1780 letter to Clinton, document 154, which was enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 153]
156. [no date] [343]  
"Return of Rebel killed, wounded, and taken in the Affair at Wacsaw [Waxhaw] the 29<sup>th</sup> May 1780", reporting 113 killed, 150 wounded, and 53 captured for a total of 316; reporting also the capture of cannons, wagons with ammunition, gunpowder, clothing, arms, musket cartridges, new cartridge boxes, flints, and camp equipage [see note about this battle-turned-massacre after document 145 [same as document 161] [enclosed with Cornwallis' June 2, 1780 letter to Clinton, document 154, which was enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 153]
157. [no date] [344]  
"Return of British Killed and Wounded in the Affair at Wacsaw [Waxhaw] the 29<sup>th</sup> May 1780", reporting 3 killed and 14 wounded [same as document 162] [enclosed with Cornwallis' June 2, 1780 letter to Clinton, document 154, which was enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 153]
158. June 5, 1780 [346]  
Duplicate letter No. 95 from Clinton on board the HMS *Romulus* off Charleston bar to Germain, [with enclosures, documents 159 to 162] [same as duplicate letter No. 95 in document 153]
159. June 2, 1780 [347]  
Copy of letter from Cornwallis at Camden to Clinton with enclosures about Battle of Waxhaw [same as document 154] [enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 158]
160. May 30, 1780 [349]  
Copy of letter from Tarleton at Waxhaw to Cornwallis with details of results of the battle there [same as document 155] [enclosed with Cornwallis' June 2, 1780 letter to Germain, document 159, which was enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 158]

161. [no date] [351]  
Copy of return of rebels killed, wounded and taken at the Battle of Waxhaw [same as document 156] [enclosed with Cornwallis' June 2, 1780 letter to Germain, document 159, which was enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 158]
162. [no date] [353]  
Copy of return of British killed and wounded at the Battle of Waxhaw [same as document 157] [same as document 157] [enclosed with Cornwallis' June 2, 1780 letter to Germain, document 159, which was enclosed with Clinton's June 5, 1780 letter to Germain, document 158]
163. June 22, 1780 [?] [356]  
Printed edition of *The South Carolina Royal Gazette* [microfilmed too darkly to be readable] [Frame 356 microfilmed twice]
164. July 28, 1780 [357]  
Petition to the King of merchants at London trading to South Carolina, upon learning that General Clinton had "*given Orders to stop and Detain Indico and other Property*" in order to keep them from being used to pay foreign debts, and that British naval and army personnel were taking "*Books of Accounts, Papers, Indico, and other Property*", pleading that the King would overrule these Orders, would ensure that all property taken with no evidence of use for foreign debts was restored to the rightful owners, and to encourage the continuation of using such property to pay British debts
165. [no date] [359]  
"*A Sketch [Map] of the Environs of Charlestown in South Carolina*", with printed information about places and the locations of military forces, during the siege of Charleston in March to May 1780, identified in a printed legend
166. December 4, 1780 [360]  
Copy of letter from Cornwallis in South Carolina to Clinton, complaining about various ways in which the rebels were "insolent", and related matters
167. January 6, 1781 [362]  
Extract of letter from Cornwallis at Wynnsborough [South Carolina] to Clinton [today's Winnsboro lies about 40 miles north of Columbia near the Catawba River]; complaining about how rebel militia keep the back country in an uproar; planning to march his troops, [who seem to have come from Ninety-Six], from Winnsboro northeastward across the Catawba and Yadkin Rivers [in South Carolina and North Carolina respectively]; reporting having asked the Navy to put some protection into the mouth of Cape Fear [evidently making plans to head toward the coast, seeking to resupply, perhaps at Cape Fear]

168. January 28, 1781 [365]  
Copy of letter from Cornwallis at Turkey Creek and the Broad River [evidently in the upper reaches of the Broad River not far south of the mountains and North Carolina] to Clinton, reporting that he was about to begin his march to North Carolina; reporting on Tarleton's bloody losses against an American army on January 17, 1781 [referring to what became known as the **Battle of Cowpens**, fought northeast of today's Spartanburg, South Carolina, in which Brigadier General Daniel Morgan's American troops soundly defeated Tarleton's loyalist troops]; expressing concern that about 400 British troops may have been killed or wounded in that battle]
169. January 8, 1781 [368]  
Extract of letter from Major General [Alexander] Leslie to Clinton, reporting having arrived at Wynnsborough and having seen Cornwallis, who was planning to leave the next day; reporting healthy troops and good weather  
[Note: **Major General Alexander Leslie** (1731-1794) had served in the British Army in both the north and the south since early in the Revolutionary War. Now, his and Cornwallis' armies apparently had separate missions under General Clinton. After Cornwallis surrendered his army at Yorktown in October 1781, Leslie replaced him by early 1782 as commander in chief of British troops in the south. Beginning in May 1782, Leslie reported to General Guy Carleton, who had replaced Clinton as commander of British forces in North America. Leslie commanded from Charleston, so he also was responsible for governing that city under martial law during the British occupation, until the British evacuated Charleston in December 1782.]  
[Note: General **Guy Carleton, 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Dorchester** (1724-1808) served many years in the British Army. In 1775-1776 he defended Quebec from invasion by the rebellious colonies to the south. After Sir Henry Clinton was recalled to London as Commander of British Forces in North America, following the British defeat at Yorktown, Carleton was appointed to replace Clinton. He held this position from May 1782 until December 1783.]
170. January 25, 1781 [370]  
Extract of letter from Lieutenant Colonel Balfour at Charleston to Clinton, reporting that on January 21, 1781, a naval expedition had left to occupy and protect Cape Fear, without erecting any major new fortifications; seeking to react to Tarleton's "*unfortunate affair*" [the **Battle of Cowpens**] by sending additional troops into the area because of the need to "*keep that Country in awe*"; reporting having no information about the expedition under General [Benedict] Arnold  
[Note: **Lieutenant Colonel Nisbet Balfour** was involved in the northern war before coming south with Clinton's army to Charleston. After that city surrendered to the British, he was sent to command the military way station and crossroads at Ninety-Six, South Carolina (west of today's Columbia). Ninety-Six was a key piece in the puzzle of subduing South Carolina's interior.]

By the time of this letter, Balfour had returned to Charleston and was the British commander there for a time. In this capacity, he would appear to have reported to General Cornwallis, but, here he was keeping Cornwallis' boss, General Clinton, informed.]

171. January 31, 1781 [372]  
Extract of letter from, Balfour at Charleston to Clinton, reporting a raid at Georgetown, South Carolina by rebel troops under command of Lieutenant Colonel ["Light Horse" Henry] Lee and [Brigadier General Francis] Marion; although it failed, it embarrassed the British as three of their officers, including the local commander, Lieutenant Colonel George Campbell were captured [a classic example of Marion's "swamp fox" method, executed expertly by Lee and others under Marion's command, of appearing by surprise from the swamps, conducting a quick, effective raid, and disappearing again into the swamp]; reporting also the destruction of wagons and supplies at Monck's Corner [apparently another rebel raid against a British military outpost] [**Georgetown** is strategically located, about half way between Charlestown and present-day Myrtle Beach, near the estuary of several rivers combined, including especially the Great Pee Dee River]
172. August 31, 1781 [374]  
Memorial to Germain of "*Merchants and Others Interested in the Commerce and Prosperity of the Province of S<sup>o</sup>. Carolina*" at London, expressing satisfaction with the positive prospects for restoring civil government and obedience to the King; requesting that the King appoint a new governor for South Carolina; signed by 24 individuals  
[**Note:** See note with **Table 16** at end of Reel 8 about the **abrupt change of contents** in these documents of incoming Secretary of State correspondence—beginning with document 172 (August 31, 1781) and running through document 205 (mid-October 1782), which is at the end of the Secretary of State microfilmed incoming correspondence and the end of Reel 8.]
173. March 2, 1782 [376]  
Memorial to Secretary of State Welbore Ellis of William Blake of Charleston, executor for the will of his brother Daniel Blake, deceased, seeking resolution of debts and other matters pertaining to South Carolina  
[**Note:** **Welbore Ellis**, (later) **1<sup>st</sup> Baron Mendip**, (1713-1802) served briefly as **Secretary of State for the Colonies** in February-March 1782, after Germain left office when Prime Minister Lord North's government fell, as political support collapsed for the British war effort in America. Ellis served as Secretary of State for a little over one month until March 8, 1782, when the office of Secretary of State for the Colonies was abolished, in recognition of the failure of Britain's effort to re-establish its American colonies. The new name for the equivalent office was **Secretary of State for the Home Department** or, more briefly, Home Secretary. The name change reflected shifting British attitudes toward at least one part of the world that had once been part of the British Empire.]

[**Note:** Between October 1781 and March 1782 (i.e. during the period between document 172 and 173) “**the world turned upside down.**” In October 1781, General **Cornwallis surrendered** his entire army to combined American and French forces at Yorktown. In February 1782, the “**war government**” of **Prime Minister Lord North (Frederick (Lord) North, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Guilford (1732-1792)** **fell** as direct fallout from Cornwallis’ surrender. Public opinion and a Parliamentary majority turned against the war. General Henry Clinton, Prime Minister Lord North, Secretary of State Lord Germain, and others lost their jobs as a **new government** led by the **Earle of Shelburne as Prime Minister** and **Thomas Townshend as Secretary of State for the Home Department** took over the British government in July 1782 (see note after document 186). Besides replacing individuals, this government changed the structure of the government in certain ways, especially in the Secretary of State office, which under Lord Germain had played such a prominent war policy role. Now it was “domesticated,” renamed the Home Department, and its leaders renamed (for short) Home Secretaries. In March 1782, Parliament led the way to **end the war**, voting to limit military orders in America first to defensive actions and then to no actions, i.e. declaring a cessation of hostilities. In December 1782, following the logic of their new orders, the British military evacuated Charleston, which they had occupied as enemies by force since May 1780.]

174. March 6, 1782 [identified as Frame 376, a second time; actually between Frames 376 and 377]  
Extract of letter from Thomas Farr to [?] concerning the supply of beef and pork to British troops [enclosed with Ellis’ March 6, 1782 letter to Clinton, a letter apparently not microfilmed] [may relate to General Clinton’s overall responsibility to ensure that British troops throughout North America were fed; in May 1782, Clinton was replaced as commander in chief of British military forces in North America]
175. August 10, 1782 [378]  
Copy of petition to General Leslie [at Charleston] of a group of inhabitants of Charleston, written along with Leslie’s responses to the petition’s requests, at British military headquarters at Charleston, requesting relief from difficulties in obtaining justice under the jurisdiction of the Board of Police; including Leslie’s concluding opinion that he “*does not think it advisable at present to make any alterations in the mode of distributing Justice by the board of Police*”
176. August 10, 1782 [380]  
Copy of petition of merchants and inhabitants of Charleston to John Mathews, Governor of the State of South Carolina and to members of the State’s Privy Council, seeking clarification on how they may operate as merchants with “*commercial engagements*” they had made since May 12, 1780; signed by 10 individuals, members of the General Committee representing the larger group of merchant and inhabitant petitioners [the South Carolina Privy Council advised the Governor]

177. August 13, 1782 [382]  
Copy of letter from Governor Mathews to merchant and inhabitant petitioners promising to convene the Privy Council about the petitioners' concerns and to convey their answer as soon as possible; followed by  
August 13, 1782  
Copy of letter from Nathaniel Green [perhaps a British military in Charleston; clearly not related to Nathanael Greene of the Continental Army] responding on behalf of Governor Mathews to the petitioners, stating that "*whatever Conditions are Agreed to by the Civil authority, will Strictly be adher'd to by the military*"; followed by  
August 14, 1782  
Copy of letter from Governor Mathews to the committee representing the petitioners, enclosing his answer after "*the most mature deliberation*"; followed by  
August 14, 1782  
Copy of "*Answer to the memorial and petition*", indicating that petitioners could legally engage in commerce and in obtaining loans to finance their commerce except for commerce with the enemy [Britain] and that they could not do anything averse to the interest of the state; specifically denying a request that certain of the petitioners be reimbursed by the State of South Carolina for expenses related to their homes having been used by British military leaders while Charleston was under British control
178. August 20, 1782 [384]  
Copy of letter from [the Privy Council] at Charleston to Governor Mathews, apparently the Privy Council's response to Mathews to guide the Governor's response to the merchant and inhabitant petitioners
179. August 23, 1782 [back side of 384]  
Copy of letter from Mathews to M. I. Harris [perhaps in the Privy Council], indicating that his original response stands as written, after receipt of a response to it from the petitioners and a "*recommendation*" [perhaps from the Privy Council]; followed by  
August 23, 1782  
Copy of letter from Mathews to the committee representing the petitioners, clarifying but not changing his previous responses for three of the requests in the petition
180. August 15, 16, 1782 [386]  
Copy of "*Resolutions of the Board of Police*" pertaining to request from Intendant General William Bull II concerning the status of suits pending when Charleston is evacuated [by the British], suggesting rules for differing procedures depending on whether the defendant or plaintiff would be evacuating

**[Note:** Following on the footsteps of his father, William Bull Sr., **William Bull II** (1710-1791) had a long history of public service in the colonial government of South Carolina. He was a representative in the Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly from 1736 until 1749. From 1749 until 1775, he served on the South Carolina Council. From 1759 until 1775, he was also Lieutenant Governor under several governors and during five lengthy interim periods between governors, during which he served as acting governor (without the title). When the colonial government collapsed in September 1775, he resigned from the Council and retired to his plantation. He remained a loyalist, refusing in 1777 to sign the oath of allegiance to the State of South Carolina. As a result, his property was confiscated, and he was banished, going into exile in England in May 1777.

After General Henry Clinton's victory over a besieged American army at Charleston in May 1780, the British government in London encouraged Bull and other leaders of the former colonial government to return to Charleston, with the expectation of re-establishing British colonial rule in South Carolina. Bull, still with his Lieutenant Governor title, returned in February 1781. Governor Campbell would probably have returned as well, but he had died in 1778 and no new governor had been appointed.

Bull and the others did not return to civilian government in Charleston. Instead, the army had retained control, ruling through a military occupation and martial law, with an overlay of civilian government called a Board of Police. Bull served as Intendant General (top leader) of the Board of Police, replacing James Simpson, former Attorney General of the former South Carolina colonial government.

On December 14, 1782, the British Army evacuated Charleston, as a part of Parliament's post-war policy to disengage from the American conflict. This action sealed the fate of the British Colony of South Carolina. British colonial officials, including Bull, and other loyalists in Charleston, decided then either to remain in South Carolina as citizens of the new State and United States or to return to Britain as subjects of the British Crown. Bull returned to England, finally ending his long career as a leader in British colonial government. He never returned to America, although he did manage to recover his estate in South Carolina and to have his banishment reversed. He died in London on July 4, 1791]

181. August 13, 1782 [back side of 386]  
Copy of petition to General Alexander Leslie, Commander in Chief of British forces in the Southern Department of North America, of "*the Committee of Merchants trading to Great Britain*", regretting the announced policy of the Board of Police [probably actually the Council] concerning a limitation on the recovery of debts owed to those soon to evacuate Charleston; stating that this policy would be detrimental to traders who did not plan to evacuate and to the country [the United States]; therefore requesting that provision should be made to treat all traders with Great Britain equally in their ability to recover debts in trade with Great Britain

182. [no date] [388]  
Copy of letter from J. L. "*in behalf of the Merchants*" to Colonel Allen [probably Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen, commander of the loyalist New Jersey Volunteers] having been offered some hope from the field officers and from General Leslie now learning that the Board of Police [probably actually the Council] had passed resolutions that would preclude these merchants from equal treatment concerning outstanding trade debts; seeking his understanding of the merchants' distress and the potential negative results for ongoing trade with Great Britain, requesting that justice be done; stating that they had submitted a petition to General Leslie concerning this matter
183. [no date] [390]  
"*Abstract of Pay due the Officers of the Charlestown Regiment & Royal Militia, Commanded by Colonel Robert William Powell*", for 23 named officers, including their ranks, dates of commission, dates of service, number of days, rate of pay, and total amount due, with a total amount of pay due of £2,370.8.2
184. August 20, 1780 [392]  
Copy of letter No. 1 from Cornwallis at Camden to Germain, stating that General Clinton had left Charleston for New York on June 5, leaving Cornwallis in command of "*His Majesty's Forces in the Southern Provinces*"; reporting that, because his troops were very short on provisions, he had decided not to move toward North Carolina immediately but to set up a series of posts "*to awe the disaffected & encourage the loyal Inhabitants*", while also seeking to recruit some provincial Corps and to "*establish a militia, as well for the Defense as for the internal Government of South Carolina*"; with details, including extra efforts in the more populated area around Ninety-Six; reporting having heard about the movement of Continental troops under Major General Baron de Kalb into North Carolina, along with other rebel forces, and judging that they were too far away for Cornwallis' army to march to engage them in battle this late in the season; stating also that "*I had much Business to do at Charlestown in regulating the Civil and Commercial Affairs of the Town and Country*"; reporting that in much of the countryside, inhabitants were greatly disaffected [not loyalists]; reporting hostilities in various places on the frontier, especially in the area north of Ninety-Six; recounting details of how these hostilities coalesced into a battle in August as British forces led by General Rawdon and American forces under General Gates met at Camden for a major battle; promising to inform "*your Lordship of the Consequences in my next Dispatch, which will be written to morrow*"
185. August 21, 1780 [398]  
Copy of letter No. 2 from Cornwallis at Camden to Germain, conveying the happy news of a major British victory at the Battle of Camden on August 16, 1780; describing how he had left Charleston on the 10<sup>th</sup> to join the army and take command of it he led the British in the battle against rebel Generals Thomas Sumter and Horatio Gates;

arguing that he might have decided to retreat to Charleston, but that this strategy would have lost the entire upland to the rebels, so, despite the strength of the enemy, he had decided to stand and fight, as described in detail; describing also the great losses of the enemy; describing Tarleton's follow-up operation two days later, which was "*executed...with his usual activity & military address*"; describing other follow-up efforts, seeking to take advantage of the inland victory in South Carolina to increase loyalist support in North Carolina

[**Note:** Although **Major General Baron Johann de Kalb** was mentioned in the first of these dual letters describing the British victory in the Battle of Camden, not mentioned is that de Kalb was mortally wounded in the battle. He had come to America as a patriotic professional soldier in the French army—and as the mentor of the Marquis de Lafayette.]

[**Note:** **Brigadier General Thomas Sumter** (1734-1832), a Virginian planter and politician who rose through the ranks of Virginia's and then South Carolina's Militia, had been a thorn in the side of Cornwallis' southern army. Besides leading rebel troops in the Battle of Camden, he had been harassing the British Army with hit-and-run raids to the extent that Tarleton referred to him as a "gamecock." After the war, Sumter returned to politics, representing South Carolina subsequently in both the US House of Representatives and the Senate. Years later, Sumter's military contribution was recognized when the strategically significant, water-surrounded fort in Charleston harbor was famously named Fort Sumter. Later yet, the University of South Carolina's football team chose the name "Fighting Gamecocks.]

186. August 22, 1782 [406]

Copy of memorial to [Secretary of State for the Home Department] Thomas Townshend from the Committee of Merchants at London, expressing their great distress, having learned that the British army had withdrawn from Georgia and that the British commander at Charleston was taking negative actions from the perspective of English merchants and loyalist South Carolina merchants wishing to maintain trade between the two; hoping that the government in London would ensure against any more negative actions; signed by William Greenwood, John Nutt, and John Clark

[**Note:** **Lord George Germain**, the last Secretary of State for the Colonies, had been dismissed as part fall of Lord North's government in February 1782. In March 1782, the **Earl of Shelburne** became the first Secretary of State for the Home Office, a position reflecting a shift in the Secretary of State's responsibilities from an outward view toward colonies to a more internalized view toward the welfare of the people of Britain as well as the remaining British Empire. When Shelburne became prime minister and formed his own government in July 1782, **Thomas Townshend**, became Secretary of State for the Home Department, serving, except for a brief hiatus in 1783, from July 1782 until 1789.]

187. September 16, 1782 [408]  
 Printed proclamation by General Cornwallis at Charleston, ordering the sequestration of estates of traitorous persons still refusing to return to their duties and loyalty to the King; appointing John Cruden to be Commissioner to oversee the sequestration process, which will include seizure of accounts and other papers to verify the content and values of estates; requiring that all inhabitants give information to the Commissioner, with additional details
188. October 3, 1782 [409]  
 Copy of memorial to Townshend from the Committee of Merchants, dismayed at additional news of injurious policies against those doing trade with South Carolina; seeking an unequivocal statement of British government that the rights of debt resolution should be equally justified and allowed for all debts in South Carolina since 1776; signed by Greenwood, Nutt, and Clark
189. October 9, 1782 [411]  
 Copy of order by Lieutenant General Leslie to Alexander Wright and James Johnson, concurring with South Carolina Governor John Mathew's appointing them [and subsequently others as well] as Commissioners to enforce a policy requested by South Carolina inhabitants, ensuring *"that all the slaves, the Property of American Subjects in South Carolina, now in my Power, shall be left here and restored to their former owners as far as it is practicable, except such slaves as have rendered themselves particularly obnoxious by their attachment and service to the British Troops, and such as have had specific promises of freedom, and that those shall be valued by indifferent Persons and Certificates given by one of their masters"* including further details for enforcement  
**[Note:** General Leslie and Governor Mathews negotiated a **"compact"** or **"treaty"** between their **"enemy"** entities for the purpose of **managing the ownership, status, and movement of slaves during the planned evacuation** of Charleston by the British military at the end of 1782. Leslie's goal was to allow some Negroes to evacuate with the English, at least some of whom would be freed from slavery. He understood that slaves taken would have to be paid for to their South Carolinian owners. Mathews wanted to maintain the legality of slave property ownership and the control of slavery to be in the hands of South Carolina slave owners. He apparently agreed to Leslie's compact to make the process as controlled as possible so that neither side could easily abuse the rules. The compact created a Commission to manage the controlled process. At least four commissioners are mentioned in this correspondence. See document 190 for the text of the compact and the names of the four commissioners, who were appointed by Leslie. See documents 189, 191, 192, 194, 195, 203, 204.]

190. October 10, 1782 [413]  
Copy of agreement or "*compact*" by the Commissioners appointed by Leslie and Mathews to enforce the policy on leaving slaves in place when British forces depart; stating the purpose of the policy "*to prevent the great loss of Property and probably the ruin of many families, which might be occasioned by the removal of such slaves as are within the British Lines when the Troops shall be withdrawn from Charlestown*"; stating the rules that would be enforced; signed by [Commissioners] Edward Rutledge, Benjamin Guerard, Alexander Wright, and James Johnson; with addendum signed by Wright and Johnson that "*We agree that not only slaves, but any other Property of the Citizens of South Carolina is, by us, considered and included in the foregoing Treaty as far as it is practicable to restore it*" [same as document 204]
191. [no date] [417]  
Copy of "*The objects of the Compact of the 10<sup>th</sup> October 1782*" [not clear who the author is or authors are], including a list of what "*The Carolina Revolted [are] to have*", including their slaves, the value of "*obnoxious*" slaves, public deeds, records and papers, and property restored; another list of what, "*To the loyalists it is promised*", that debts to British merchants would not be seized or withheld, property would be secured now and in the future, only property of citizens to be taxed, prohibiting violence against family members, possible allowance from the state to assist those choosing to leave South Carolina; including also observations [by whom?] that the compact guaranteed immediate results for rebels but only promises to loyalists; that uncertainty existed between revolvers and loyalists on the status of debts and estates covered "*by Family Settlements*", which was an "equivocal expression"; that other provisions should be included, such as no limits on claims of creditors; that actions taken by British or French officials did not apply to properties designated as "*Family Settlements*"; that only houses were included in the definition of estates abandoned by loyalists who had moved away, and that other buildings and improvements should perhaps be included
192. No date] [419]  
Copy of unattributed opinions [from the perspective of what the British would consider an unreconstructed and unforgiving rebel] making suggestions for how the agreements being made prior to British evacuation of South Carolina should be altered, stating that the evacuation would "*leave the usurpation and Sovereignty over the Persons and Property in their power*"; hoping that General Leslie would "*find means to lessen the distress*" [apparently of "patriot" South Carolinians] by managing property so that it remained attached to those who now owned it rather than allowing the "*unrelenting spirit to the Loyalists*", whose estates otherwise would be confiscated, to prevail; considering that the October 10 agreement may lead to *unconditional restitution*; stating that those trading with Great Britain, who were more loyalists than English merchants, should not be allowed to sweeten the bargain to collect on debts or to own property; wishing not to favor "*Loyalists—British Creditors or others, Resident or absent*"

193. October 14, 1782 [421]  
Copy of letter from Edward Blake and Roger Parker Saunders at Charleston to Governor Mathews, stating that they were following instructions of the governor to seek to enforce the rules of the new commission on the status of slaves, for which they recruited several others to assist; stating their purpose to be to take from outgoing vessels any Negroes who might be about to be taken from South Carolina, when according to the commission, they should not be taken from the state; asking the governor's assistance in their efforts; followed by  
October 19, 1782  
Copy of letter from Edward Blake at Charleston to Governor Mathews, reporting having searched a "*fleet*" bound for St. Augustine and had "*taken out of it 136 Negroes which we supposed belongs to the citizens of this State*"; seeking assistance in searching additional vessels; having been told by one British officer that if Negroes were in British vessels, they would generally be considered to be part of the fleet and would not be removed; still awaiting an official reply from British headquarters about full enforcement of the policy  
[Note: Having agreed to the compact concerning how to handle slavery issues during the evacuations, Governor Mathews apparently set up an enforcement group to make sure the British didn't "steal" additional slaves than agreed to by the commissioners. Four men are identified in this correspondence as having been a part of this enforcement effort. Some of the activities of two of them, Edward Blake and Roger Parker Saunders, are documented in the correspondence (documents 193, 196). The activities of two others, Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Waring, are not documented. Partly because Mathews had little trust in Leslie or the British military, he quickly discovered what he thought was a plot by Leslie, using Blake and Saunders to steal slaves to benefit British interests rather than South Carolina planter interests. He quickly disassociated himself from Blake, Saunders, and their activities, and accused Leslie of subverting the Commissioners and the Compact (documents 197, 200, 202). Without explanation in writing, he also warned Ferguson and Waring to disappear immediately because they were in grave danger (document 201). This failure at attempted cooperation would not be resolved by completion of the evacuation. Although the British military was leaving, many loyalists were choosing to stay and already were petitioning for their rights in a relatively hostile environment.
194. October 18, 1782 [425]  
Copy of letter from General Leslie, Commander at Charleston to **General Guy Carleton**, Commander in Chief of British forces in North America [having replaced Clinton in May 1782], sending a petition from loyalists in Charleston concerning the status of Negroes and other rebel property sequestered within Charleston; expecting to resolve this situation satisfactorily; seeking advice on how to handle situations of Negroes who have been particularly helpful to the British; noting that the current policy was that they should be kept but paid for to their former owners;

stating that he was working on several fleets of evacuation, one already gone to St Augustine and two others to sail soon to New York and Halifax respectively

195. September 9, 1782 [428]  
Copy of memorial to Leslie from loyalists at Charleston, stating that although loyal, they were disturbed by the policies negotiated between the State of South Carolina and the British Army concerning the status of debts, Negroes, and other property; making the case for slavery as property and owners as both legally owning slaves and also offering them a better life in bondage than they would get outside of it; therefore, wishing for relief to that their loss of property would not be any greater than it already had been; signed by 44 individuals, joined by 59 others who did not sign
196. October 19, 1782 [432]  
Copy of letter from Edward Blake and Roger Parker Saunders to [Governor Mathews] concerning General Leslie's British Army approach to resolving issues of slave ownership and movement in South Carolina, as agreed to in the "Compact" or "Treaty with the state government; seeking to ensure full enforcement of owners' rights
197. October 19, 1782 [434]  
Copy of letter from Mathews to [Blake and Saunders] instructing them not to contact him further or to take possession of any Negroes [apparently wishing the compact to be enforced as agreed between Leslie and Mathews]; followed by October 19, 1782  
Copy of letter from Mathews to Blake and Saunders later the same day, confirming his previous decision, having been convinced that these two were trying to subvert the compact as part of a larger "*insidious Manouvering*" of those aligned with the "*Enemy*" [i.e. the British]; ordering their commissions [with the state] to be "*done away*" with and forbidding them to take any actions to obtain Negroes
198. October 26, 1782 [436]  
Memorial to the King from merchants of London trading with South Carolina and Georgia and representing other persons in this trade living in these provinces; concerning dangers to their property and money "*in consequence of the measures, lately adopted by your Majestys Ministers, in the Sudden, and unexpected Evacuation thereof*"; seeking relief, with details; signed by 15 individuals
199. October 27, 1782 [438]  
Letter from Grey Elliot [apparently a merchant] at Knights Bridge [London] to [Townshend?], suggesting that, as reflected by the October 26, 1782 memorial from London (and American) merchants [document 198], more should probably be done to accommodate the memorialists' wishes; using an act pertaining to Granada to justify this suggestion; with details



200. October 19, 1782 [440]  
Copy of letter from Mathews to Leslie, laying out evidence that certain individuals were subverting the compact by taking Negroes off of vessels, including those bound for St. Augustine, but seeking to abscond with them without going through the commissioners of the compact; Mathews threatening to withdraw from the compact
201. October 19, 1782 [442]  
Copy of letter from Mathews to [?] Ferguson and [?] Waring, expressing “*serious alarm for your present Safety*”, based on information he had received regarding actions by General Leslie; declining to explain [in this letter] the reasons for his warning; stating that he had “*apprized Gen<sup>l</sup> Greene of the matter, & dare say he will do what is necessary to render your return safe*”
202. October 19, 1782 [444]  
Copy of letter from Mathews to [Leslie] expressing concern and anger that he and the British seem to have been conspiring to violate the compact in a scheme to take Negroes away from Charleston without the knowledge or approval of the commissioners; stating his intention to withdraw from the compact and his and General Greene’s refusal to be threatened by the British efforts
203. October 31, 1782 [447]  
Copy of letter from A[lexander] Wright and James Johnson, commissioners to enforce the compact, to [Mathews?], stating that they wished for the compact to be enforced as agreed to, and that General Leslie was supporting their efforts; stating that Leslie had agreed to take steps to ensure that Negroes were not being carried away; stating their confidence that Leslie would follow through
204. October 10, 1782 [449]  
Copy of the original compact, containing the original permission for Blake and Saunders to assist the commissioners [same as document 190]
205. [no date] [455]  
“*Observations of the Merchants Trading to South Carolina & Georgia*” to Townshend, referencing two previous laws concerning trade with Granada and with St. Christopher’s, Nevis, and Monserrat, respectively, stating that “*it would seem Expedient to exempt from Capture for six months all ships & their Cargoes*”, seeking to return trading rules to their prior situation while making the transition from British colonial rule, with details; followed by  
[no date]  
Legal opinions of “*Mr Shorthead*” [?] to [Townshend?] relating the Granada and St. Christopher’s laws to the America situation; approving the concept of allowing delivery of cargoes in “*neutral bottoms*” to ease the situation of traders between Britain and the southern former American colonies

**Note: Shift in thinking about public issues** after August 1781 from wartime/colonial rule to post-war/post-colonial South Carolina possibilities, Charleston from August 1781 to September/October 1782 (Reel 8, documents 172 to 205)

**Table 16** illustrates the shift of important issues in Reel 8 documents 172 to 205, between August 1781 and mid-1782 in official Secretary of State incoming correspondence. In January 1781 and before, official correspondence focused more narrowly on issues of British allegiance and loyalty, colonial obedience, and military progress. After August 1781, a shift refocused thinking on issues of economic prosperity, including the status of slavery.

In August 1781, most of South Carolina territory was nominally under rebel control, except for Charleston, which was under British military occupation and martial law. The war was winding down with little combat occurring in South Carolina. British General Cornwallis had moved away from the deep south toward coastal areas of North Carolina and then Virginia. By October 1781, his army surrendered at Yorktown, causing Lord North's government in London to fall in February 1782, after which Parliament ordered military operations first curtailed and then discontinued. The British military responded to new orders by staging a strategic retreat from the former colonies, including evacuation of Charleston, accomplished on December 14, 1782. British evacuation left the State of South Carolina free to pursue its statehood but the City of Charleston without a civil government. It left loyalist and rebel planters, still full of mutual hostility, to work out their differences—and to resolve the slavery issue on their own, mutual terms.

**Table 16: Shift of important issues in Secretary of State incoming correspondence (Reel 8 documents 172 to 205, August 1781 to mid-1782) from British allegiance and loyalty, colonial obedience, and military progress to economic prosperity, including the status of slavery**

	<u>August 1781</u>	<u>March 1782</u>	<u>August 1782</u>	<u>Sep/Oct 1782</u>
Economic issues (debt, bottoms, etc.)	172	173	176, 177, 178 179, 181, 182 186	188, 198, 199 205
Economic issues (slavery)				189, 190, 191 193, 194, 195 196, 197, 198 200, 202, 203 204
Loyalist issues	172		175, 186, 187	187, 192, 194 195
British military issues			175, 181, 182 186	187, 189, 190 191, 194, 195 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204
State govt. issues			176, 177, 178 179, 180,	189, 190, 191 193, 194, 196 197, 200, 201 202, 203, 204

## Reel 9 (Volume 398)

### Volume 398—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Abstract of Land Grants, begin

February 9, 1674 to October 31, 1765

1 Document

[Frames 2 to 142]

**Note:** A summary table of contents (**Table 10**) for the South Carolina Colonial Papers is found in the **Introduction** which differentiates locations of “actual documents” and “abstract documents” for incoming and outgoing correspondence separately. Also found there is a note on definitions and differences between abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts.

**Note:** Volume 398 consists of a single document, an abstract of grants of land by South Carolina between 1674 and 1765 (280 manuscript pages microfilmed on 141 frames). See archivist’s note referencing this bound abstract, which is found after Reel 2 document 26 (dated May 3, 1766) in the Board of Trade incoming correspondence, where it is identified as Board of Trade document N. 29. Yet, Volume 398 is not microfilmed in either Reel 2 or Reel 9 of the South Carolina Colonial Papers (DLAR Microfilm Set 550b), but as a part of Reel 1 of the North Carolina Colonial Papers, (DLAR Microfilm Set 550a) along with Volume 295 of the North Carolina Papers. Thus actually no physical Reel 9 of the South Carolina Papers exists. A companion to the abstract of grants in Volume 398 (covering the period 1674 to 1765) is found in Volume 399 (covering the period 1767 to 1773). It is microfilmed in the South Carolina Papers, at the beginning of Reel 10.

## Reel 10 (Volumes 399, 400, 401)

### Volume 399—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### Abstract of Land Grants, end

May 7, 1767 to May 18, 1773

11 Documents

[Frames 1 to 71]

**Note:** Volume 399 consists of a single document abstracting, in single-line entries in chronological order, land-grant transactions in South Carolina between 1767 and 1773 (about 140 manuscript pages microfilmed in 71 Frames). Because land grants were reported by governors in periodic batches, and these batches seem to have been entered less frequently into bound abstract letter books that were periodically certified, the single chronological document looks like 11 run-on documents, both because the batches of abstracts were not microfilmed in chronological order and the abstract pages are occasionally interrupted with a separate certification statement. The details of the 11 documents and their numbering by Frame are not explained in more detail in this Finding Aid. Also, the Finding Aid does not contain detailed information about this abstract's contents.

**Note:** Reel 9 Volume 398 contains a companion bound abstract of land grants that covers the period 1674 to 1765. See notes at the beginning of Reel 9 Volume 398 for more detail about the content and microfilm location of that Volume, and about the related but different terms Abstract, Extract, Summary, and Transcript.

### Volume 400—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### [Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc. (incoming and outgoing) Part A

August 15, 1720 to August 20 1730 Numerous Documents [Pages/Frames 1 to 395]

**Note:** A summary table of contents (**Table 10**) for the South Carolina Colonial Papers is found in the **Introduction** which differentiates locations of “actual documents” and “abstract documents” for incoming and outgoing correspondence separately. Also found there is a note on definitions and differences between abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts.

**Note:** Volume 400 and Volume 401, both in Reel 10, when combined, include a large number of summaries and abstracts of documents pertaining to South Carolina Commissions and Instructions, Etc. dated between 1720 and 1739. Both because these documents date from before the DLAR's period of primary interest (1750 to 1800) and because few of these documents are full transcripts but instead are some sort of summary or abstract, few of these documents have separate entries in this Finding Aid. The microfilmed South Carolina Colonial Papers include only Parts A and B (Volumes 400 and 401 with dates from 1720 to 1730) and Parts E and F (Volumes 404 and 405 with dates from 1760 to 1775). Parts C and D (Volumes 402 and 403 with dates from 1739 to 1760) are not included in these microfilmed documents.

**Note:** Volume 400 is the first (Part A) of six Volumes of Board of Trade documents identified as “Commissions, Instructions, Etc.” These documents, both outgoing and incoming, were summarized or transcribed into letter books at the time the actual documents were written and delivered. See note at the beginning of Reel 9 Volume 398 for more information on the differing terms extracts, abstracts, summaries, and transcripts.

The six parts and Volumes of South Carolina Commissions, Instructions, Etc. are as follows:

Part A:	Volume 400 (1720 to 1730)	in Reel 10
Part B:	Volume 401 (1730 to 1739)	in Reel 10
[Part C:	Volume 402 (1739 to 1755)	not included in the DLAR]
[		microfilmed documents]
[Part D:	Volume 403 (1755 to 1760)	not included in the DLAR]
[		microfilmed documents]
Part E:	Volume 404 (1760 to 1774)	in Reel 11
Part F:	Volume 405 (1774 to 1775)	in Reel 12

The documents consist of Commissions and Instructions for royal governors of South Carolina, plus additional orders, correspondence, and other documents relating to Commissions, Instructions, appointments, and additional subjects.

**Note: Historical context of Volume 400/Part A's documents:** Part A contains documents from the time of the establishment of South Carolina as a Royal Colony of Great Britain (after having been a proprietary colony since its founding in 1663) and of the rule of South Carolina's first royal governor, Francis Nicholson (May 1721 to May 1725), followed by acting governor Arthur Middleton (May 1725 to December 1730). The kinds of documents found in this Volume range from founding documents from when South Carolina was being re-established as a royal colony, during the late 1710s and 1720s, to later documents, during which South Carolina settled into operating as a royal colony.

**Note:** The documents in Volume 400 were written into a bound letter book. Many are summaries of the contents of documents pertaining to “Commissions, Instructions, Etc.” A few larger, more important documents are transcribed. This Finding Aid itemizes only a sampling of more important documents in Volume 400, which were fully transcribed. Those selected are among the South Carolina royal colony's major founding and governing documents.

**Note:** In this Volume's letter book, each side of paper written on was assigned a handwritten page number in the upper right or left outer corners of facing pairs of pages. In effect, these page numbers are also frame numbers for the microfilmed documents. For Volume 400, this Finding Aid has assigned no DLAR Document Numbers. Instead, documents can be found using their Frame Numbers, which appear in brackets at the right margin.

- August 15, 1720 [1]  
Transcript of order to prepare a Commission for a royal governor for the royal colony of Carolina
  - August 16, 1720 [4 to 24]  
Transcript of draft text of royal governor Commission from Lords Justices, as part of establishment of the royal colony of (originally) Carolina
  - Aug 23, 1720 [28 to 29]  
Transcript of "*Complaints against the Lords Directors of Carolina*", containing list of 24 complaints dated from April 15, 1705 to August 16, 1720; such complaints were the basis for the King's decision to discontinue the investor-based colony and establish a royal colony
  - August 30, 1720 [31 to 40]  
Transcript of Board of Trade letter to Lords Justices justifying a royal governor and offering draft Instructions for the first royal governor
  - August 30, 1720 [41 to 91]  
Transcript of text of draft Instructions for the first royal governor of South Carolina, Francis Nicholson, containing 96 individual instructions
  - August 30, 1720 [92 to 123]  
Transcript of draft Instructions from Lords Justices for the King's approval for incoming Governor Nicholson, containing 24 individual instructions
- [Nicholson served as governor until May 1725, when he was recalled, but he did not resign until 1729. Arthur Middleton served as acting governor until December 1730. Various documents on Frame Numbers 134 to 243 pertain to South Carolina's rule under these two.]
- December 9, 1729 [244 to 269]  
Transcripts of several items of correspondence pertaining to appointment of Robert Johnson to be Governor of South Carolina, including a draft letter of appointment and draft text of a Commission for him
  - June 10, 1730 [283 to 376]  
Transcripts of Board of Trade consideration of ideas for and a draft of General Instructions for Governor Johnson
  - August 20 to September 9, 1730 [384 to 395]  
Transcripts of Board of Trade representations seeking the King's pleasure regarding a treaty negotiated with the Cherokee Nation in South Carolina, including text of the agreement

## **Volume 401—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **[Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc.**

#### **(incoming and outgoing) Part B** (Parts C and D not microfilmed here)

October 21, 1730 to July 19, 1739

Numerous Documents

[Frames 1 to 418]

**Note:** See note at the beginning of Volume 400 for the combined view of Volumes 400 and 401.]

**Note:** Volume 401 is the second (Part B) of six Volumes of Board of Trade documents identified as “Commissions, Instructions, Etc.” These documents, both incoming and outgoing, were summarized or transcribed into letter books at the time the actual documents were written and delivered.

See note at the beginning of Reel 9 Volume 398 for more information on the differing terms extracts, abstracts, summaries, and transcripts.

See note at the beginning of Volume 400 for more on the six parts and Volumes of Board of Trade abstracts of South Carolina documents pertaining to Commissions, Instructions, Etc.

**Note: Historical context of Volume 401/Part B’s documents:** Part B contains documents during the governorship of Robert Johnson (December 1730 to May 1735, when he died), during the acting governorship of Thomas Broughton (May 1735 to November 1737, when he died) and then during the acting governorship of William Bull Sr. (November 1737 to December 1743).

The contents of these documents pertain to ongoing issues of running a royal colony. These included economic-development issues, including projects to settle particular groups from “mostly Protestant” ethnic populations (e.g. Jean-Pierre Pully’s settlement of Swiss people started in 1731) and others with idealistic, altruistic intent (e.g. a speculative, unsuccessful scheme to settle indigent people from London and Westminster in South Carolina). Economic issues of migration and settlement led to political issues of settling a frontier already occupied by multiple groups of Native Americans (whom the British called Indians).

**Note:** The documents in Volume 401 were written into a bound letter book. Many are summaries of the contents of documents pertaining to “Commissions, Instructions, Etc.” Some are full transcripts of actual documents. Because none of the documents in this Reel has a uniquely high level of importance in relation to South Carolina’s colonial economic development or political issues, this Finding Aid itemizes no documents in Volume 401.

**Note:** Volumes 402 and 403, which contain Part C and Part D respectively of Commissions, Instructions, Etc. (with documents dated between 1739 and 1760) are not included in these microfilmed South Carolina Colonial Papers.

## Reel 11 (Volume 404)

### Volume 404—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### [Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc.

#### (incoming and outgoing) Part E (Parts C and D not microfilmed here)

November 11, 1760 to October 25, 1774      92 Documents      [Frame 1 to 498  
plus unnumbered 500 to 513]

**Note:** A summary table of contents (**Table 10**) for the South Carolina Colonial Papers is found in the **Introduction** which differentiates locations of “actual documents” and “abstract documents” for incoming and outgoing correspondence separately. Also found there is a note on definitions and differences between abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts.

**Note:** Volume 404 (in Reel 11) and Volume 405 (in Reel 12), when combined, include 99 documents pertaining to South Carolina Commissions, Instructions, Etc. dated between 1760 and 1775. All of these documents are abstracts in the form of transcripts. This Finding Aid includes a separate entry for each document in Volume 404.

**Note:** Volume 404 is the fifth (Part E) of six Volumes of Board of Trade documents identified as “Commissions, Instructions, Etc.” These documents, both incoming and outgoing, were transcribed into letter books at the time the actual documents were written and delivered.

See note at the beginning of Reel 9 Volume 398 for more information on the differing terms extracts, abstracts, summaries, and transcripts.

See note at the beginning of Volume 400 for more on the six parts and Volumes of Board of Trade abstracts of South Carolina documents pertaining to Commissions, Instructions, Etc.

**Note: Historical context of Volume 404/Part E's documents:** The period between 1760 and 1775 turned out to be a crucible in which the integrity of the British empire and its system of colonies was severely tested, and during which fledgling ideas of colonial protest were heated and agitated toward rebellion and beyond that to American revolution. During this period, the British political system was responding through organizational change. Especially important from the American perspective, Secretaries of State were going through an organizational shift. Before 1768, Secretaries of State for the Southern District had been lesser equals with the Board of Trade in a partnership to promote colonial (primarily economic) development. In 1768, the realities of imperial diplomacy and hostility brought a new political official to the fore, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The incumbent in this new position quickly gained superior recognition and power over the previous Secretaries of State for the Southern Department and the Board of Trade.

His responsibilities included relations with foreign imperial/colonial competitors (especially France and Spain, relations with the unpredictably friendly or hostile Indian Nations in America's colonial interior, and the increasingly confrontational politics of the emerging protest movement of British/American colonists, which, between 1765 and 1776, evolved from protest to rebellion to revolution.

In 1760, William Pitt (Elder) was Secretary of State for the Southern Department. He was replaced consecutively by a series of five short-term incumbents between 1761 and 1766. The last of these was the Earl of Shelburne, who took office in July 1766. In February 1768, the organizational change went into effect, as the Earl of Hillsborough was appointed the first Secretary of State for the Colonies. Shelburne remained in his position during a transition period until October 1768, but his significant powers were soon transferred to Hillsborough.

After the reorganization, the Secretary of State position stabilized considerably. Hillsborough served until August 1772. He was replaced by the Earl of Dartmouth until November 1775, who was then replaced by Lord George Germain, who served in Lord North's "war government" until it fell in March 1782.

Meanwhile, during this period, South Carolina was experiencing an unpredictable turnover of multiple governors, interspersed with multiple stints by the stabilizing Lieutenant Governor, serving without the title as on-call acting governor. In 1760, Governor William Henry Lyttelton was in the process of leaving South Carolina, having in April 1760 been promoted to become governor of Jamaica. Lieutenant Governor William Bull II was available (not for the first time) to take over as acting governor until a new governor, Thomas Boone, arrived in December 1761. Boone governed until May 1764, when he was recalled, at which time Bull again took over as acting governor, until June 1766, when yet another new governor arrived—Charles Greville Montagu.

Montagu served as governor until March 1773, but he suffered from poor health and twice took extended leaves of absence, each time leaving William Bull II to run the government, from May to October 1768, and again from July 1869 to September 1771. When Montagu resigned in March 1733, Bull once again stepped forward, ruling until the arrival of South Carolina's last royal governor, William Campbell, in June 1775. Campbell ruled until September 1775, when the South Carolina colonial government collapsed under pressure from South Carolinian rebel protestors.

**Note:** The documents in Volume 404 were written into a bound letter book. Its pages were numbered in large, clear handwriting at the top outer corner of each facing side of paper. In the Index (document 92) found at the end of the letter book, these page numbers are identified as "Folio" numbers. In effect, they also are frame numbers for the microfilmed documents. DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin.

1. November 11, 1760 [1]  
Transcript of Board of Trade [and Plantations] letter to [Secretary of State for the Southern Department] William Pitt (Elder), conveying papers pertaining to the capitulation of Fort Loudoun to the Cherokee Indians and subsequent murder by Indians of captured British officers on their march as prisoners to Fort Prince George

**[Note:** For more on the capitulation of Fort Loudoun and massacre of its prisoner officers, as well as their context as part of the Anglo-Cherokee War of 1759 to 1760, see: in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, documents and notes after Reel 1 documents 1, 24, 82, 85, 96, 98 and: in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, documents and notes after Reel 4 documents 123, 138, 139]

2. December 19, 1760 [3]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Pitt, transmitting letter from [South Carolina Lieutenant Governor] William Bull II with information on the capitulation and murder [original letter is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 138]
3. January 8, 1761 [4]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Pitt, transmitting letter from Bull with information on state of affairs with Cherokee and Choctaw Indians
4. February 11, 1761 [5]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Pitt, transmitting letter from Bull reporting having learned that the French were building a fort on the Tennessee or Cherokee River midway between Fort Loudoun and Fort Assumption on the Ohio River [original letter is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 65]
5. February 17, 1761 [6]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Pitt, recommending that the [new] King [George III] (re)appoint Joseph Stephenson to be Naval Officer of South Carolina; he having been previously appointed by King George II, who had died [this letter is in Reel 4 document 67]
6. February 17, 1761 [8]  
Transcript of draft order of King George III (re)appointing Stephenson to be Naval Officer of South Carolina
7. March 11, 1761 [12]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King recommending reappointing officers appointed by the late king George II, William Bull II as Lieutenant Governor and David Graeme as Attorney General
8. March 11, 1761 [13]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Pitt, recommending reappointment of Dougal Campbell as Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas in South Carolina [original letter is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 4 document 68]

9. March 11, 1761 [14]  
Transcript of draft order of the King appointing Dougal Campbell as Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas
10. March 17, 1761 [16]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending accepting resignation of Thomas Pownall as governor of South Carolina and appointment of Thomas Boone in his stead [for personal reasons, Pownall never served although appointed; Boone served as Governor from December 1761 to May 1764]
11. March 17, 1761 [18]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending Charles Skinner to become Chief Justice of South Carolina following the death of Peter Leigh
12. April 1, 1761 [19]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying draft Commission for Thomas Boone as Governor of South Carolina
13. April 1, 1761 [20]  
Transcript of draft text of Commission for Thomas Boone to be royal governor of South Carolina
14. April 1, 1761 [46]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending reappointment of William Bull II as Lieutenant Governor
15. April 1, 1761 [47]  
Transcript of draft order of the King reappointing Bull to be Lieutenant Governor
16. April 1, 1761 [49]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending appointment of David Graeme to be Attorney General of South Carolina
17. April 1, 1761 [50]  
Transcript of draft order of the King appointing David Graeme to be Attorney General of South Carolina
18. April 1, 1761 [52]  
Transcript of representation of Board of Trade to the King, recommending appointment of Charles Skinner to be Chief Justice of South Carolina
19. April 1, 1761 [53]  
Transcript of draft order of the King appointing Charles Skinner to be Chief Justice of South Carolina

20. April 21, 1761 [55]  
Transcript of representation to the King, seeking the King's permission, as requested by Thomas Boone, for him to return to England for 12 months to settle private affairs before traveling to South Carolina to begin serving as governor
21. May 6, 1761 [56]  
Transcript of representation to the King, recommending Charles Skinner, John Drayton, and John Battray to become members of the Council of South Carolina, replacing George Saxby and Edward Fenwick, who wished to resign, and John Cleland, who had died
22. May 6, 1761 [57]  
Transcript of representation to the King, preparing a warrant approving 12 months leave for Thomas Boone to return to England to settle private affairs before traveling to South Carolina to begin serving as governor
23. May 6, 1761 [58]  
Transcript of King's order permitting Boone to take a leave of absence as requested
24. May 29, 1761 [59]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending repeal of two South Carolina laws passed in April 1759, one for correction of wills and the other on election procedures
25. September 7, 1761 [64]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Boone ordering repeal of two South Carolina laws passed in April 1759
26. September 21, 1761 [66]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying suggested changes in draft of General Instructions for Governor Boone, for the King's approval
27. September 21, 1761 [70]  
Transcript of revised draft of General Instructions for Governor Boone
28. November 13, 1761 [161]  
Transcript of representation to the King recommending Daniel Blake to be a Council member in South Carolina

29. December 11, 1761 [162]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Secretary of State [for the Southern Department the Earl of] Egremont, enclosing abstract of letter from Bull with copy of articles for a "*General Pacification with the Cherokee Indians*" [this letter, the abstract of Bull's letter, and a copy of the proposed articles of "*General Pacification with the Cherokee Indians*" are in Reel 4 documents 69, 70, 71 respectively] [The Earl of Egremont replaced William Pitt (Elder) as Secretary of State for the Southern Department in October 1761, serving until replaced by the Earl of Halifax in August 1763]
30. May 27, 1762 [163]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Lords of Treasury regarding memorial of former South Carolina Governor Glen, seeking reimbursement for personal expenses during a conference and treaty negotiation with the Cherokee Indians in 1756-1757, including summary of facts in the case and other documentation [enclosures not microfilmed here] [copy of this letter is in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 143]
31. June 3, 1762 [171]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Boone, congratulating him on his safe arrival in South Carolina; hoping for success from the Indian treaty; recommending new law to regulate the Indian trade
32. December 3, 1762 [173]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Boone, concurring with Boone's reported action, when the South Carolina Assembly engaged in proceedings "*so irregular & improper, as to require an immediate Dissolution*"
33. December 22, 1762 [175]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King concerning boundary dispute between North Carolina and South Carolina, recommending "*that the most speedy end be put to the bad consequences of the Transactions set forth by Gov' Boone*" and that all such future disputes be prevented; including historical background information  
[Note: Governor Boone appears to have had a knack for alienating others. See note after Reel 1 document 108 and also document 35 below and note after it. Although he clearly had alienated officials in London by 1762, he was not officially recalled until May 1764.]
34. March 29, 1763 [185]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, suggesting that the Privy Council put before the King an order that, if he approved it, would order a temporary boundary line to be drawn immediately between North Carolina and South Carolina; followed by  
Draft text of Instruction to Boone

35. May 30, 1763 [190]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Boone, concerning report received that Boone's government had approved warrants to survey large tracts of land south of the Altamaha River for the purpose of making land grants there; expressing the King's "*Surprise and Concern*" that Boone had approved such an improper action; informing him of the limitations of his proper jurisdiction in making land grants  
[**Note:** The issue of South Carolina's actively encouraging settlement south of the Altamaha River, which flows into the Atlantic Ocean about half way between Savannah Georgia and the St. Johns River in northern Florida—thus not contiguous with other South Carolina territory—was unusual in practice for a British colony and considered by Georgia to be a direct threat by fellow colony Georgia. See the DLAR's Finding Aid for Georgia's CO5 Colonial Papers for that colony's hostile reaction. South Carolina's colonization efforts went back to the late 1750s and were a matter of concern in London by the early 1760s (see Reel 1 documents 1 and 160 and notes after each). The issue reached the top levels of British government by 1767 (see Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 documents 128, 129 and transcripts of these documents in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 1 documents 64, 65 respectively.)]
36. August 4, 1763 [194]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending John Burn to replace John Rattray, who had died, as a member of the South Carolina Council [see also document 87 below]
37. August 5, 1763 [195]  
Transcript of letter to John Stuart [Superintendent for Indian Affairs for the Southern District of America], stating the King's desire that more efforts be made to improve communications about and regulation of trade with the Indians
38. October 13, 1763 [199]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending Thomas Skottowe to be a member of the South Carolina Council
39. November 18, 1763 [200]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning his order to support a settlement of French Protestants in South Carolina; stating that actions already taken by Boone were sufficient, advantageous, and beneficial

40. November 18, 1763 [203]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Charles Jenkinson, secretary to Lords of Treasury, suggesting that the current verbal agreement with [Alexander] McNutt, agent for the French Protestant group wishing to settle in South Carolina, be put in writing with conditions suggested by the Board of Trade [see related document dated August 3, 1763 in Reel 1 document 159, and also Reel 1 document 180 and documents 41, 42 below]
41. November 22, 1763 [206]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Boone, informing Boone that a large number of French Protestants from southern France would be settling in South Carolina; advising Boone that he should support these settlers and suggesting actions he should take in providing that support [see reference to this letter in Reel 1 document 180; see also documents 40, 42 below]
42. November 22, 1763 [212]  
Transcript of "*Liste des Protestants Refuges actuellement a Plymouth pour se rendre en Amerique*" including names, ages, and occupations for a total of 112 males and 61 females [see related documents in this Reel, documents 41, 42 and reference to document 41 in Reel 1 document 180]
43. November 22, 1763 [215]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Boone, recommending an individual and his family for settlement in South Carolina
44. March 15, 1764 [217]  
Transcript of letter from [Secretary to the Board of Trade] John Pownall to Boone, conveying the Board of Trade's recommendation that Boone seek approval from the Assembly for a memorial from a particular individual whose settlement in South Carolina would be "*essential to the public Security and the decency of Government*"
45. June 25, 1764 [219]  
Transcript of letter from Pownall to Bull, instructing him to treat well Monsieur l'Abbe, one of the French Protestants settling in South Carolina [draft letter is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 117]
46. July 2, 1764 [220]  
Transcript of letter from Pownall to Jenkinson, requesting advice from Treasury to Board of Trade concerning a doubt about implementing the quit rent laws in North and South Carolina

47. July 3, 1764 [221]  
Transcript of letter from Pownall to Charles Garth, concerning Garth's reported support for a petition from the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina "*complaining of the Conduct of Governor Boone*": reporting that Board of Trade would consider the petition shortly [see Garth's memorial in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 184]
48. July 3, 1764 [222]  
Transcript of letter from Pownall to Boone, informing him about the petition complaining that Boone had refused to administer the "state oaths" to a person duly elected to Commons House, and that Boone had improperly dissolved Commons House; informing him that the Board of Trade would be meeting soon to consider the petition, and that the Board of Trade "*will also be ready to hear what you may have further to offer in support of your Conduct*"
49. July 10, 1764 [224]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King recommending John Colleton and Henry Laurens to be members of the South Carolina Council
50. July 13, 1764 [225]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Bull, acknowledging receipt of Bull's letter with information that John Guerard, a South Carolina Council member, had died, and, there being two vacancies, stating that Board of Trade had recommended to the King John Colleton and Henry Laurens to fill the vacancies
51. July 16, 1764 [226]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, reporting the results of Board of Trade's consideration of the petition against Governor Boone; finding that Boone had allowed personal "*Passion and Resentment*" to interfere with his policy judgment; finding also that Commons House had allowed itself to be overly provoked by the Governor, to the detriment of its constituents; suggesting that steps be approved by the King to alleviate the situation in the case of both the governor and Commons House
52. August 15, 1764 [230]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Bull, forwarding a memorial from John Greg, merchant at London, requesting payment of money owed him for expenses helping the French Protestants [John Greg's undated memorial is in Reel 1 document 193, including note; Bull's October 18, 1764 reply to Board of Trade is in Reel 2 document 4, stating that the debt had been paid off]

53. December 24, 1764 [231]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Bull, awaiting receipt from Bull of a plan to manage Indian affairs; offering ideas for positive steps, such as control over public debt and approval of laws to reduce importation of Negroes, and to encourage settlement of more white people; expressing hope for early completion of the temporary boundary [draft of this letter is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 119]
54. February 15, 1765 [234]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Bull, instructing that foreign commercial vessels from countries hostile to Great Britain that were in distress should be allowed to use the ports at Charleston and elsewhere in South Carolina to receive emergency assistance [draft of this letter, to several colonial governors, is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 120]
55. December 24, 1765 [235]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, that according to his command, a Commission and General Instructions had been drafted for incoming governor of South Carolina Charles Greville Montagu; explaining a few particular provisions [draft Commission is not microfilmed here but draft General Instructions are] [Montagu began serving as governor in June 1766; during a relatively lengthy period of service, he took two health-related leaves of absence, from May to October 1768 and from July 1769 to September 1771] [draft representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 121]
56. December 24, 1765 [239]  
Transcript of draft text of General Instructions for Montagu, consisting of 99 separate instructions
57. January 24, 1766 [360]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King regarding memorial of Thomas Boone to Lords of Treasury, seeking payment of unpaid salary [draft Instructions are in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 122]
58. February 10, 1766 [363]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade secretary John Pownall to Charles Lowndes, secretary to Lords of the Treasury, forwarding Boone's memorial requesting payment of his salary

59. February 25, 1766 [364]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee on Plantation Affairs, conveying draft of Additional Instructions for Montagu instructing him to recommend to the South Carolina Assembly to “make good” on the salary debt owed to Boone
60. February 25, 1766 [365]  
Transcript of text of Additional Instruction to Montagu concerning payment of back salary owed to former Governor Thomas Boone
61. July 4, 1766 [367]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Montagu, welcoming him to South Carolina as governor [he had actually arrived on June 17, 1766]; acknowledging the early challenge Montagu would have to contend with, resulting from colonial opposition to the Stamp Act; stating that the temporary boundary line between the Carolinas still had not been completed [draft of this letter is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 125]
62. July 11, 1766 [370]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, stating that Bull had informed Board of Trade that four of the assistant justices had requested that Bull suspend Clerk of the Court Dougal Campbell for refusing to enter cases brought seeking to enforce the Stamp Act; detailing the results of his decision not to comply with their request, whereupon Commons House had fined Campbell £100, on which Bull then suspended payment; seeking the King’s pleasure in this situation [draft of representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 126]
63. January 6, 1767 [372]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending that Daniel Moore be a member of the South Carolina Council, filling the Council at 12 members [draft representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 127]
64. July 13, 1767 [373]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, conveying drafts of Additional Instructions to governors of South Carolina and Georgia about settlements south of the Altamaha River [draft letter is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 128]
65. July 13, 1767 [374]  
Transcript of text of Additional Instructions to Montagu to resolve the situation of South Carolina having issued land grants for territory located south of the Altamaha River by transferring the South Carolina grants to Georgia inhabitants [draft text is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 129]

66. July 22, 1767 [376]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to the Earl of Shelburne, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, regarding memorial from Charles Garth, Agent for South Carolina, petitioning that sheriffs in counties be appointed in lieu of a Provost Marshal; Board of Trade expressing the opinion that decentralization of the Provost Marshal's duties to county sheriffs was a good idea; recommending that the King inform South Carolina that it favored adopting a law instituting county sheriffs in lieu of a Provost Marshal [draft letter is in Board of Trade outgoing draft correspondence, Reel 3 document 130 and in Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 183] [Garth's memorial is in Board of Trade incoming correspondence, Reel 2 document 83 and Secretary of State incoming correspondence, Reel 5 document 182] [The Earl of Shelburne became Secretary of State for the Southern Department in July 1766, serving until October 1768 (although he was superseded by appointment of the Earl of Hillsborough as Secretary of State for the Colonies in February 1768)]
67. July 24, 1767 [379]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, offering to draft an Additional Instruction concerning South Carolina's law that illegally created a new county and changed the number of representatives in Commons House
68. July 24, 1767 [380]  
Transcript from Board of Trade to the King of draft text for Additional Instruction to Montagu, declaring South Carolina's law creating a new county and changing the representation in the Assembly to be unconstitutional and therefore disallowed [draft text is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 131]
69. September 15, 1768 [383]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending disallowable of a South Carolina act to establish courts, build jails, and appoint sheriffs and other justice officials, based on advice of Matthew Lamb, one of the King's Counsels at Law, with details draft [representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 132] [compare with transcript dated November 22, 1769, document 72, and with Reel 3 document 135, for a change of position and approval of this law, despite remaining defects]
70. July 28, 1769 [399]  
Transcript of letter from John Pownall, Secretary to the Board of Trade, to Rev. Dr. Burton, Secretary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, regarding a petition from Protestant Palatines in South Carolina, who were seeking to find a minister for their settlement [draft letter is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 134]

71. July 6, 1769 [400]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending William Wagg, Chief Justice of South Carolina, and Rowland Rugeley to be appointed to the South Carolina Council [draft representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 133]
72. November 22, 1769 [403]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, reconsidering the South Carolina act to establish courts after revisions; recommending it now be approved although still imperfect. [compare this with the earlier representation in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 132, dated September 15, 1768, and its transcript in this Reel document 69, with a negative recommendation] [this representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 135]
73. February 23, 1770 [406]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, regarding the December 8, 1769 vote of the South Carolina Assembly to order the Treasurer to make available £10,500 for several of the leaders of the Assembly to take to London to use for purposes supporting the "*Constitutional Rights and Liberties of the People of Great Britain, and America*"; citing the 1669 *Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina* as the true source of the colonists' rights and liberties; reciting the historical record since then verifying the logic of the constitutional position taken; with details; thus, supporting the position that the Assembly's vote on December 8, 1769 was unconstitutional [financial and political fallout from this vote of the South Carolina Assembly reverberated through 1770 and, less frequently, into 1774, as documented in the Board of Trade correspondence, scattered in Reel 2, especially between documents 122 and 188, and in the Secretary of State correspondence, scattered in Reel 6, especially between documents 86 and 117 and in Reel 7 document 56.]
74. April 4, 1770 [425]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, conveying draft Additional Instructions to Governor Montagu designed to enforce control of public monies without unconstitutional interventions by the Assembly
75. June 7, 1770 [432]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a South Carolina act "*to incorporate the Society commonly called & known by the name of the Fellowship Society*", which had been found to be constitutional; therefore recommending that the King approve it [see additional documents relating to the Fellowship Society in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 135, dated December 7, 1770 and in references there to other documents]

76. November 21, 1770 [434]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, regarding an August 1769 act of the South Carolina Assembly authorizing stamping of £106,500 in paper, equal to the currently lawful paper bills of credit; suggesting that the King disallow it [this representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 137]
77. November 21, 1770 [436]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, regarding a 1767 South Carolina act establishing several new parishes, which would increase the number of representatives in the Assembly, which was not constitutional; pointing out that the King had already disallowed a similar act; proposing that the King disallow this act [this representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 138]
78. February 13, 1771 [438]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, proposing approval of Chief Justice Robert Knox Gordon and William Henry Drayton to be appointed to fill vacancies in the South Carolina Council
79. March 27, 1771 [439]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning a petition from Charles Garth, conveying the "*grief and concern*" at having incurred royal displeasure resulting in receipt of a recent Additional Instruction of April 14 1770, which South Carolinians hoped would be withdrawn; advising the King against withdrawing this Additional Instruction
80. April 24, 1771 [443]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, concerning drawing a proper boundary line between North Carolina and South Carolina, suggesting that the King instruct each governor to appoint members to a commission to draw a "*final*" boundary line between the two colonies
81. April 26, 1771 [447]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King regarding vacancies in the South Carolina Council, recommending that Barnard Elliot and David Sears be appointed to fill these vacancies
82. May 29, 1771 [448]  
Transcript of Report from Board of Trade to Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs, conveying draft Additional Instructions for Governors of North Carolina and South Carolina to settle on a final boundary between the colonies

83. [probably about May 29] 1771 [449]  
Transcript of Additional Instructions from Board of Trade to Montagu for him and the North Carolina governor to take steps to settle on a final boundary line between the two colonies
84. June 21, 1771 [452]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, regarding several acts of the South Carolina Assembly, including an act to issue £70,000 to cover the cost of constructing courthouses and another act to encourage making of flax, linen and thread, recommending that both be disallowed, the first because it violated the financial controls required for a colonial government, and the second because the bounties offered were improper because they were applied to manufacturing, not agricultural enterprises
85. December 18, 1771 [455]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning incorporation of "*the Winyaw Society*", recommending its approval
86. December 18, 1771 [457]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning a memorial from Louis de Mesnil de Saint Pierre, who had worked to settle a large number of French people at New Bordeaux in South Carolina, seeking a grant of £2,000 to support bringing to America additional French and German people who had settled unsuccessfully in Nova Scotia; recommending that the King should consider supporting the request in a location in either South Carolina or Georgia; suggesting making 5,000 acres of a land grant available to support this settlement
87. November 2, 1772 [461]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending that Charles Pinckney be appointed to the South Carolina Council in place of John Burn, who had left South Carolina for England, without intention to return [draft representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 146; a question remains of which among several Charles Pinckneys who supported the American side in the Revolution this might have been; see also document 36 above]
88. June 10, 1773 [462]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, conveying, as requested, a draft Commission appointing William Campbell to be governor of South Carolina [draft representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 147]
89. June 10, 1773 [464]  
Transcript of draft text from Board of Trade to the King of Commission for William Campbell to be governor of South Carolina

90. January 12, 1774 [496]  
Transcript of letter from [Board of Trade secretary] John Pownall to the "*Clerk of the Council in waiting*", concerning a petition from the South Carolina Council "*respecting some proceedings of the House of Assembly there, which they conceive injurious to their Rights and Constitution of that Board*" which was being considered by the Privy Council and King, enclosing abstracts of Commons House journals
91. February 21, 1774 [497]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending Thomas Irving to become a member of the South Carolina Council [draft representation is in Board of Trade draft outgoing correspondence, Reel 3 document 149]
92. [no date] [unnumbered but would be 500 to 513]  
Index  
[**Note:** This index lists the transcribed documents written into the letter book identified as Volume 404, evidently written by contemporary scribes. No page numbers were assigned to the index pages. The index was organized by page number in the same order that the documents were written into the letter book.]  
[**Note:** The Index references one more document than was written into this letter book. The referenced document is not included among the transcribed documents in Volume 404, and the entry was X'ed out by hand. The Index entry reads as follows:

October 25, 1774

Transcript of "*Representation [from Board of Trade] to His Majesty recommending W<sup>m</sup> Gregory Esq<sup>r</sup> to be of the Council*" F 145

This entry is found in place in Reel 12 Volume 405, which is the subsequent Part F of Commissions, Instructions, Etc. And it is located right where the crossed-out entry at the end of the Part E Index indicates it should be, at Frame Number 145, in correct chronological order.]

## Reel 12 (Volumes 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410)

### Volume 405—Itemized, Annotated Contents

#### [Board of Trade Abstracts of] Commissions, Instructions, Etc.

#### (incoming and outgoing) Part F

June 20, 1774 to June 1, 1775

7 Documents

[Frame 1 to 148]

**Note:** See note at the beginning of Reel 11 Volume 404 for the combined view of Volumes 404 and 405.

**Note:** Volume 405 is the sixth (Part F) of six Volumes of Board of Trade documents identified as “Commissions, Instructions, Etc.” These documents, both incoming and outgoing, were summarized or transcribed into letter books at the time the actual documents were written and delivered.

See note at the beginning of Reel 9 Volume 398 for more information on the differing terms extracts, abstracts, summaries, and transcripts.

See note at the beginning of Volume 400 for more on the six parts and Volumes of Board of Trade abstracts of South Carolina documents pertaining to Commissions, Instructions, Etc.

**Note: Historical context of Volume 405/Part F’s documents:** The two-year period of this Volume’s documents is the tail end of the pre-war era of British colonial development and rule in 13 of its colonies in North America. Likewise, it was the last two years in the existence of the British Colony of South Carolina. See the note at the beginning of Reel 11 Volume 404 for a summary description of the period of Part E of Commissions, Instructions, Etc. documents (1760 to 1774), leading up to the beginning of the American Revolutionary War. By June 1774 agitation by South Carolina’s “rebel” protest movement had become strident and sometimes violent. Lieutenant Governor William Bull II had been serving as acting governor of South Carolina following the abrupt resignation of Governor Charles Greville Montagu in March 1773.

The next—and last—colonial governor of South Carolina, William Campbell, arrived after considerable delay on June 18, 1775. By then, the situation had become so inflammatory that Bull had left Charleston for the relative safety of his plantation. He didn’t bother to return to Charleston when the new governor arrived, although he was still officially South Carolina’s lieutenant governor. Campbell was miffed. He also soon learned that the quickly deteriorating situation in Charleston was beyond his control. On September 15, 1775, just shy of three months later, Campbell was forced to flee for his safety to a British Navy warship in Charleston harbor, taking with him the legitimacy of British colonial rule in South Carolina, which thereupon collapsed. Microfilmed documents in Volume 405 pertaining to Commissions, Instructions, Etc. for colonial South Carolina totaled only seven during this period and petered out completely on June 1, 1775.

As South Carolina's colonial government collapsed, the British government was gearing up for war to teach its wayward colonies a lesson by force about—from London's perspective--the necessity and inevitability of loyalty and obedience to the Crown. In November 1775 Lord North formed a "war government" that included Secretary of State for the Colonies Lord George Germain. This parliamentary government ruled England and prosecuted war against the 13 American colonies until the British army commanded by General Charles Cornwallis surrendered to American and French forces at Yorktown in October 1781, signaling the failure of the war policy and resulted in the fall of Lord North's government.

**Note:** All of the documents in this Volume are transcribed, not summarized or extracted. All 7 documents are itemized in this Finding Aid. The documents were written into a bound letter book with page numbers handwritten in the upper right or left outer corner of facing pages. These page numbers also amount to frame numbers for the microfilmed pages. DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Handwritten Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin.

1. June 20, 1774 [1]  
Transcript of General Instructions from the King to Governor William Campbell, including 94 items of Instructions
2. June 20, 1774 [100]  
Transcript of Additional Instructions from the King to Governor William Campbell, including 26 items of Instructions
3. [no date] [143]  
Template form for reporting lists of ships and vessels entering ports in South Carolina
4. [no date] [144]  
Template form for reporting lists of ships and vessels clearing ports in South Carolina
5. October 25, 1774 [145]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, recommending that William Gregory be appointed a member of the South Carolina Council
6. May 16, 1775 [146]  
Transcript of letter from Board of Trade secretary John Pownall to Egerton Leigh, Council member in South Carolina, instructing him to return to Charleston "*in a reasonable time*" to resume his responsibilities on the Council

7. June 1, 1775 [147]  
Transcript of representation from Board of Trade to the King, concerning Bull's March 8, 1775 letter regarding his suspension of William Henry Drayton as a Council member, recommending also suspending Bernard Elliot, because of their joint anti-government activities

## **Volume 406—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Abstracts of letters to the Board of Trade (incoming)**

July 13, 1721 to December 6, 1756      163 Documents      [Frames 1 to 55]

**Note:** A summary table of contents (**Table 10**) for the South Carolina Colonial Papers is found in the **Introduction** which differentiates locations of “actual documents” and “abstract documents” for incoming and outgoing correspondence separately. Also found there is a note on definitions and differences between abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts.

**Note:** Volume 406 contains summaries and abstracts of incoming correspondence to the Board of Trade, almost all of it from royal governors of the colony of South Carolina. See note at the beginning of Reel 9 Volume 398 for more on the definitions of and distinctions between abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts.

**Note:** This correspondence is dated between July 13, 1721 (soon after Francis Nicholson had been appointed South Carolina's first royal governor in May 1721) and December 6, 1756, (soon after William Henry Lyttelton had replaced Robert Johnson as governor in June 1756). These microfilmed documents do not include abstracts of incoming Board of Trade documents dated after December 1756, although numerous documents of Board of Trade incoming correspondence are found in Reels 1 and 2, with dates between February 3, 1756 and November 10, 1775, with no major gaps. See notes at beginning of Reel 1 and beginning of Reel 3 on dates of and gaps in Board of Trade incoming and outgoing correspondence and other documents respectively in these microfilmed South Carolina Colonial Papers.

**Note:** Summaries and abstracts were entered chronologically into a letter book, written on both sides of the paper. Each two-sided sheet of paper in the bound book has been assigned a consecutive page number (not always readable on microfilm but consistent), either handwritten or printed or both. Although each side of a page has been microfilmed in a separate frame, only every other microfilm frame has a number. In this Volume of this Finding Aid, the written and/or printed page numbers are referred to as “Frame Numbers.”

**Note:** Because none of the summaries and abstracts of Board of Trade incoming correspondence in this Volume is a transcript of a full document, no documents in Volume 406 have separate entries in this Finding Aid.

**A Summary of Volume 406's Contents** follows:

- Letters from Governor Francis Nicholson: 47 documents dated from July 23, 1721 to April 30, 1725, in Frames 1 to 14 (including two letters from the South Carolina Council and Assembly Speaker dated October 8 and November 15, 1723 respectively, in Frame 7) [Nicholson served as governor from May 1721 to May 1725, when he was recalled].
- Letters during transition between governors: 3 documents dated between May 6, 1727 and January 28, 1729 from Council President Arthur Middleton and 1 undated document from the South Carolina Council, all in Frame 14 [Middleton served as acting governor from May 1725 to December 1730].
- Letters from Governor Robert Johnson: 24 documents dated between December 27, 1730 and August 7, 1734, in Frames 14 to 18 [Johnson served as governor from December 1730 to May 1735, when he died].
- Letters during transition between governors: 7 documents dated between May 6, 1735 and July 15, 1737 from Council President, then Lieutenant Governor Thomas Broughton, in Frames 18 to 21 [Broughton served as acting governor from May 1735 to November 1737, when he died].
- Letters during transition between governors: 23 documents dated between December 10, 1737 and November 22, 1743 from Council President, then Lieutenant Governor William Bull Sr., in Frames 21 to 27 [Bull Sr. served as acting governor from November 1737 to December 1743].
- Letters from Governor James Glen: 51 documents dated between December 26, 1743 and April 14, 1756, in Frames 27 to 49 [Glen served as governor from December 1743 to June 1756, when he was recalled]. [an extract of Glen's April 14, 1766 letter to Board of Trade is in Secretary of State incoming codependence, Reel 5 document 144]
- Letters from Governor William Henry Lyttelton: 7 documents dated between June 3, 1756 and December 6, 1756, in Frames 51 to 55 [Lyttelton served as governor from June 1756 until April 1760; thus, only the beginning of his term as governor is reflected in these documents].

## Volume 407—Itemized, Annotated Contents

### Abstracts of letters from Secretary of State (outgoing), begin

August 8, 1766 to October 8, 1767

11 Documents

[Frames 1 to 10]

**Note:** A summary table of contents (**Table 10**) for the South Carolina Colonial Papers is found in the **Introduction** which differentiates locations of “actual documents” and “abstract documents” for incoming and outgoing correspondence separately. Also found there is a note on definitions and differences between abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts.

**Note:** Summaries and abstracts of outgoing correspondence from the Secretary of State in Volumes 407 and 408 contain: references to circular letters not summarized or found elsewhere in these microfilmed documents; summaries of letters whose contents are described generally, sometimes in the third person (but not organized with lettered subsections as in the Board of Trade abstracts and summaries in Volume 406.)]

**Note:** The 11 documents in Volume 407 were written as “abstracts” into a letter book. Among these documents, only 2 are full transcripts of letters that do not appear as actual documents in these microfilmed documents. Therefore, only 2 documents in this Volume have separate entries in this Finding Aid.]

Transcribing “abstracted” documents (rather than summarizing them) became prevalent only after an inconsistent transition period between sometime in 1766 and sometime in 1768. For most researchers, actual documents are preferable to transcripts, and transcripts are better than summaries. Since documents in Volume 407 date from the transition period, some are summaries and others are transcripts.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers in Reel 12 start over again in each Volume. Frame Numbers in Volume 407 include two sets of numbers, one set handwritten and the other stamped. Handwritten numbers were assigned consecutively for each microfilmed frame (one side of a page) but were written in the upper left hand corner of every other frame, for odd numbered frames only. Stamped numbers were assigned consecutively to pairs of frames, a left side followed by a right side of facing pages, with the number on the second, right side.

7. February 3, 1767 [handwritten Frame 3]  
Transcript of letter No. 5 from Secretary of State the Earl of Shelburne to Governor of South Carolina Charles Greville Montagu, informing Montagu that Robert Raper, Deputy Naval Officer at Charleston was to take a leave of absence of one year to settle personal affairs; seeking Montagu’s approval for him to leave his duties at Charleston for that purpose for that time

10. August 7, 1767 [stamped Frame 3]  
Transcript of letter No. 8 from Shelburne to Montagu, sending him the King's order "*repealing and Annulling*" South Carolina's 1765 act "*establishing a Parish in Berkeley County by the Name of S. Matthew & for declaring the Road therein mentioned to be a Publick Road*"

## **Volume 408—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Abstracts of letters from Secretary of State (outgoing), end**

February 20, 1768 to February 6, 1782      106 Documents      [Frames 1 to 158]

**Note:** Volume 408 follows Volume 407 as the second of two Volumes containing "abstracts" of outgoing Secretary of State correspondence. Volume 408's correspondence covers the period from February 1768 to February 1772. . During this period, three Secretaries of State, the Earl of Hillsborough (February 1768 to August 1772), the Earl of Dartmouth, (August 1772 to November 1775), and Lord Germain (November 1775 to March 1782) corresponded with two royal governors of South Carolina, Charles Greville Montagu (June 1766 to March 1773 with two leaves of absence) and William Campbell (June 1775 to September 1775) plus Lieutenant Governor William Bull II multiple times as acting governor during the absence or lack of a governor in Charleston (May 1768 to October 1768, July 1769 to September 1771, and March 1773 to June 1775).

When the South Carolina colonial government collapsed on September 15, 1775, Britain did not recognize the end of its colonial rule and did not terminate Campbell's service as governor. When the unemployed Governor Campbell died in 1778, no new South Carolina governor was appointed. Yet, when the British military successfully recaptured Charleston in May 1780, the government in London ordered the top colonial officials to return to Charleston from "exile" in England to re-establish civil rule there. That civil government was never successfully recreated, and Charleston was ruled by military force, martial law, and a "Board of Police" created by the military to simulate a civil government. For a final time, William Bull II was called on, still as Lieutenant Governor, to lead the Board of Police as its "Intendant General," from sometime in 1781 until the British evacuation of Charleston in December 1772 (see Reel 8 document 180 and note after it).

**Note:** The 109 documents in Volume 408 were written into a letter book as "abstracts" of mostly outgoing Secretary of State correspondence. They consist mostly of numbered letters from Secretaries of State to Governors of South Carolina. Also included are several unnumbered letters from Secretaries of State to Governors, a few letters from other Secretary of State office officials, and a number of documents relating to the correspondence. During a transition period from sometime in 1766 to sometime in 1768, the practice of entering summaries into abstract letter books shifted toward writing out full transcripts as "abstracts" of documents. Most of the "abstract" documents in Volume 408 are full transcripts.

Since for most researchers, original documents are better sources than transcripts (which in turn are better than summaries), this Finding Aid includes separate entries for only those “abstract” transcript documents for which no actual document is found in the microfilmed documents. This Finding-Aid contains separate entries for only 17 documents in Volume 408, all of which are documents found only here and only as transcripts, among the microfilmed documents.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame Numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers in Reel 12 start over again in each Volume. Frame Numbers in Volume 408 are complex. The letter book of abstract documents is microfilmed with a separate frame for each side of paper. If the separate framed sides of paper are viewed as pairs of left and right facing sides with odd numbered pages on the left and even numbered pages on the right. The pagination is as follows: For pages numbered 1 to 74, all numbers are handwritten. Page 75 has both a handwritten and a stamped number. Pages 76 to 78 have all stamped numbers. Pages 79 to 150 have handwritten even numbers and stamped even numbers. Pages 151 to 158 have only stamped numbers.

21. November 15, 1768 [13]  
Transcript of letter No. 20 from the Earl of Hillsborough [Secretary of State for the Colonies] to [South Carolina Governor] Charles Greville Montagu, conveying a speech by the King in which, Hillsborough says, the King extolls “*this happy unanimity, and the resolution to preserve entire and inviolate the supreme Authority of the Legislature of Great Britain over every part of the British Empire*”; announcing that the Queen had birthed a princess [this transcript letter is the only version of this numbered letter from Hillsborough to Montagu found in these microfilmed papers]
36. January 18, 1770 [29]  
Transcript of letter No. 32 from Hillsborough at Whitehall to [Lieutenant Governor and acting governor] William Bull II, conveying a speech by the King to Parliament [this transcript letter is the only version of this numbered letter from Hillsborough to Bull found in these microfilmed papers]
46. July 25, 1770 [44]  
Transcript of letter from Hillsborough to Lords of Treasury concerning suspending the fine of £100 against Robert Bussard, a German; suggesting that, unless Treasury objects, the King will offer remission of the fine
55. December 9, 1770 [55]  
Transcript of journal of Privy Council meeting with the King, expressing their opposition to a South Carolina law approving the stamping of £106,500 in paper bills, basing its opinion on recommendations against it by both Board of Trade and Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs followed by

December 9, 1770

Transcript of journal of Privy Council meeting with the King, expressing their opposition to a South Carolina law establishing new parishes that illegally increase representation in the South Carolina assembly

67. January 16, 1772 [78]  
Transcript of journal of a Privy Council meeting with the King, representing their disapproval of two South Carolina acts, one approving stamping of £70,000 of paper bills to finance a courthouse and jail and approving two new Assembly districts, and the other encouraging flax, linen, and thread manufacture
77. [no date; likely between June and August 1773, dates of surrounding documents among the chronological entries] [100]  
Transcript of draft by [Secretary of State for the Colonies] the Earl of Dartmouth of a Commission for William Campbell to become Governor of South Carolina
86. July 6, 1774 [128]  
Transcript of "Circular" letter from Dartmouth to Bull, concerning murders of settlers by Creek Indians, ordering efforts to discontinue trading with the Creek Indians until "*Public Tranquility is restored and that Commerce may be again carried on with safety to the King's Subjects*"
97. January 19, 1779 [probably actually 1780] [146]  
Transcript of letter from [Secretary of State for the Colonies] Lord George Germain to [James] Simpson, [attorney general of colonial South Carolina] telling him and John Stuart, [Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department] to travel to South Carolina to resume their colonial governmental duties [Charleston was besieged by British forces early in 1780 but American forces there held out until May before surrendering and actually making it possible for South Carolina officials to return to try to re-establish colonial rule]
98. July 6, 1780 [147]  
Transcript of letter from [Undersecretary for the Colonies] William Knox to Bull, informing him that that "*The Province of South Carolina being recovered to the King's Obedience it is judged proper that all Persons holding Civil Offices therein and all others to whom Allowances have been made by Government for their Support should immediately return to that Province*"  
[Note: Knox exaggerated somewhat by suggesting that South Carolina had been "*recovered to the King's Obedience.*" More accurately, Charleston had been captured by force in May 1780 and was under British military occupation. The hinterland was controlled by neither British nor American military power, and the frontier population may have been more partial to the rebels than the loyalists. Nevertheless, British political and military leaders were optimistic at this time about re-establishing British rule in colonial South Carolina.]

99. August 7, 1780 [148]  
Transcript of letter from Knox to Bull telling him not to instruct [South Carolina Council member William] Gregory to return to South Carolina with other colonial officials because “*Mr. [William] Gregory’s private Conduct, during his Residence in South Carolina, as one of the judges and one of his Majesty’s Council, was scandalous*”
100. January 8, 1781 [148]  
Transcript of letter [unnumbered] from Germain to Bull, introducing and recommending Charles Goodwin to be welcomed to practice law in South Carolina, as was his wish
101. March 29, 1781 [149]  
Transcript of letter [unnumbered] from Germain to Bull, introducing and recommending [?] Bayly, an Irish Gentleman who intended to travel to South Carolina to reclaim his family’s estate; requesting that Bull provide whatever assistance he could
102. April 4, 1781 [150]  
Transcript of letter No. 1 from Germain to Bull [at Charleston], expressing satisfaction that Bull had safely made the journey back to South Carolina; optimistic that Charleston would now be much better off since a civil government had been returned there; hoping that North Carolina and Georgia would enjoy similar successes [this transcript letter is the only version of this numbered letter from Germain to Bull found in these microfilmed papers]
103. April 4, 1781 [152]  
Transcript of letter from Germain to Egerton Leigh thanking him for useful information about the situation in Charleston and for accepting a position on the Charleston Board of Police [for more on the Board of Police during the British occupation of Charleston, see Reel 13, Volumes 513 to 526 and note at the beginning of Volume 519]]
104. June 4, 1781 [152]  
Transcript of letter No. 2 from Germain to Bull, rejoicing at the British victory at the Battle of Guilford [Courthouse, in interior North Carolina; actually the military result was a bloody standoff, which British forces could ill afford as their offensive campaign had stalled and the remaining troops were low on supplies]; expecting that “*all the Country to the South of James River is by this Time recovered to His Majesty*”, and hoping that this means a return of peace to South Carolina [in reality, recovering the country south of the James River backfired as the British army got cornered on the Yorktown peninsula while waiting for British supply ships to arrive but instead finding themselves surrounded by an American army on land and a French fleet on the water.] [this transcript letter is the only version of this numbered letter from Germain to Bull found in these microfilmed papers]

105. September 1, 1781 [154]  
 Transcript of letter No. 3 from Germain to Bull, hoping for a “*speedy Restoration of the Province of South Carolina to the Blessings of Civil Government*”, with Bull’s assistance and leadership; expressing sorrow that Bull had suffered so much “*in your private Fortune by the late insurrection*”; hoping that Bull would soon regain his losses [this transcript letter is the only version of this numbered letter from Germain to Bull found in these microfilmed papers]
106. February 6, 1782 [156]  
 Transcript of letter No. 4 from Germain to Bull, referring to the “*great and calamitous Change of Circumstances in South Carolina*”; despite these setbacks, expressing optimism still for the final outcome [this transcript letter is the only version of this numbered letter from Germain to Bull found in these microfilmed papers]  
**[Note:** The real dual calamities for the British cause at this time were Cornwallis’ surrender at Yorktown, Virginia in October 1781 and the February-March 1782 fall in London of the British “war government,” in which Germain had been a major leader. The first signaled the coming end of the military conflict, while the second signaled the crumbling of British political support for the war effort.]

## **Volume 409—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Abstracts of letters to Secretary of State (incoming), begin**

December 8, 1766 to June 1, 1772                      101 Documents                      [Frames 1 to 254]

**Note:** A summary table of contents (**Table 10**) for the South Carolina Colonial Papers is found in the **Introduction** which differentiates locations of “actual documents” and “abstract documents” for incoming and outgoing correspondence separately. Also found there is a note on definitions and differences between abstracts, extracts, summaries, and transcripts.

**Note:** Volume 409 begins a two-Volume set of abstracts of incoming official Secretary of State correspondence, including summaries but mostly full transcripts of documents dated between December 8, 1766 and December 28, 1781. During this period, one Governor of South Carolina, Charles Greville Montagu (June 1766 to March 1773 with two leaves of absence) and Lieutenant Governor William Bull II (acting governor during Montagu’s absences from May 1768 to October 1768 and from July 1769 to September 1771) corresponded with two Secretaries of State, the Earl of Shelburne (July 1766 to February 1768) and the Earl of Hillsborough (February 1768 to August 1772). The 101 documents in this Volume were written into a letter book. They consist mostly of numbered letters from Governors of South Carolina, and acting governor William Bull II during absences of or transitions between governors, to Secretaries of State for the Colonies. Also included are several unnumbered letters from a governor or acting governor to a Secretary of State, plus a few letters from Treasury officials and from South Carolina’s royal agent in London, Charles Garth.

**Note:** Between sometime in 1766 and sometime in 1768, the Secretary of State office's abstracting process went through a transition from entering summaries to writing out full transcripts of actual documents. For most researchers, transcripts are better than summaries, and actual documents are better than transcripts. In this Finding Aid, only documents that are full transcripts and that are not found among the actual documents among these microfilmed documents have separate entries. Since all of the transcript documents are found also as actual documents, no documents in Volume 409 have separate entries in this Finding Aid.

## **Volume 410—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Abstracts of letters to Secretary of State (incoming), end**

April 27, 1772 to December 28, 1781    79 Documents    [Handwritten Frames 1 to 313  
Stamped Frames 1 to 158]

**Note:** Volume 410 follows Volume 409 as the second of two Volumes containing “abstracts” of incoming Secretary of State correspondence. Volume 410's correspondence covers the period from April 1772 to December 1781. During this period, two royal governors of South Carolina, Charles Greville Montagu (June 1766 to March 1773 with two leaves of absence) and William Campbell (June 1775 to September 1775, when the South Carolina colonial government collapsed under rebel pressure), plus Lieutenant Governor William Bull II (acting governor between governors from March 1773 to June 1775 and as a leader to re-establish South Carolina colonial rule in 1781) corresponded with three Secretaries of State, the Earl of Hillsborough (February 1768 to August 1772), the Earl of Dartmouth (August 1772 to November 1775), and Lord Germain (November 1775 to March 1782).

When the South Carolina colonial government collapsed on September 15, 1775, Britain did not recognize the end of its colonial rule and did not terminate Campbell's service as governor. When the unemployed Governor Campbell died in 1778, no new South Carolina governor was appointed. Yet, when the British military successfully recaptured Charleston in May 1780, the government in London ordered the top colonial officials to return to Charleston from “exile” in England to re-establish civil rule there. That civil government was never successfully recreated, and Charleston was ruled by military force, martial law, and a “Board of Police” created by the military to simulate a civil government. For a final time, William Bull II was called on, still as Lieutenant Governor, to heed the call of duty as a governmental leader. Arriving in Charleston early in 1781, he sought out and soon found his niche, replacing his good friend James Simpson, once Attorney General of South Carolina and now Intendant General of the Board of Police. Simpson was leaving for New York, and Bull took his place. Bull always seemed a willing public servant, and he probably was in this situation too. However, after so many years of executive efforts, this job in occupied Charleston must have felt small to him, and probably depressing on most days. After Lord North's war government fell in February 1782 and Parliament declared that the conflict would end, Bull's mission changed from seeking to rebuild a royal colony, one step at a time, to working with the British military to achieve a full military and civilian evacuation from Charleston and South Carolina—symbolically an indicator of British civilization's failure and defeat. See Reel 8 document 180, and note after for more on Bull's contribution.

**Note:** The 79 abstract documents in this Volume were written as full transcripts into a letter book. They consist mostly of numbered letters from one of the governors or the lieutenant governor to one of the Secretaries of State. Also included are several unnumbered letters from a governor or acting governor to a Secretary of State, and a very few letters from other individuals, especially South Carolina's royal agent in London, Charles Garth.

Most of these transcribed abstract documents are also found as actual documents, but a few are not. This Finding-Aid contains separate entries for 8 documents in Volume 410, all of which are transcripts of documents that do not appear among the microfilmed documents

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers appear at the left margin. Frame numbers appear in brackets at the right margin. Document numbers in Reel 12 start over again in each Volume. Page numbers in Volume 410 are stamped archivist numbers. Documents are microfilmed with a separate frame for each side of paper. Viewed as a pair of facing pages as bound in the letter book, stamped numbers appear on the left upper corner of the left side of paper, meaning that only odd-numbered pages have stamped numbers. The only exception is page 113. Due probably to a stamping error, this page has a handwritten number, in sequence with the others.

72. February 16, 1781 [141]

Transcript of letter [unnumbered] from [Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina] William Bull II at [Charleston] to [Secretary of State for the Colonies] Lord George Germain, announcing his arrival after a 66-day passage from England at Charleston, which he found a "melancholy scene" with ruined and burned buildings, however, there was shipping in the harbor; having been greeted by Colonel Balfour, the British commander at Charleston; reporting that James Simpson had just sailed to new York, leaving the office of Intendant General of the Police Board vacant; stating that the people here had expectations that Bull would establish a civil government, and expressing the prior need to enroll the population as loyal subjects [probably letter No. 1 although not recognized as such]

**[Note:** Germain still addressed Bull by his colonial South Carolina governmental title, **Lieutenant Governor**, although the government he had helped lead had been displaced by a new State of South Carolina government in September 1775. Germain in London, Bull back in Charleston, and additional top officials in the defunct colonial South Carolina government, who also returned to Charleston, harbored a hope and a conviction that they would be able to re-establish British colonial rule to South Carolina and others among the "provinces" which they still thought of as rebellious colonies within the British Empire. The reality was somewhat different, as would become starkly evident eight months in the future, when General Cornwallis' army surrendered to American and French forces at Yorktown, Virginia. The British never regained control of South Carolina's interior, and colonial civil government was never successfully reinstated at Charleston.

Instead, the British military, under the command of Major General Alexander Leslie, established a hybrid civil-military “municipal” government for Charleston. Called a **Board of Police**, this administrative/judicial government (without a legislative branch) was operated by loyalists and led by former colonial government officials. It functioned under the oversight of the occupying British Army and its martial law. The Board of Police provided administrative leadership over a few, public services, especially a civilian judicial system. Most of the remaining documents microfilmed in Reel 13 are court records from this judicial process. Reel 14 contains documentation of oaths of allegiance obtained by British authorities from loyalist inhabitants now living in Charleston, whose loyal allegiance would be the basis for establishing a new civil colonial government in South Carolina.]

73. February 25, 1781 [143]

Transcript of letter from Egerton Leigh to Germain, reporting having just arrived at Charleston; stating that “*There is a hostile Force within the Province...to reconquer this Country*”; making the case for establishing civil government as quickly as possible; partly to end military rule, which was not necessarily good government; reporting having accepted a seat on the military [Police] Board as a place to start; hoping for an allowance to cover his personal expenses of public service in Charleston; making other similar observations

[**Note: Egerton Leigh** served in the colonial government of South Carolina from 1759 until 1774 as a member of the Council and as Attorney General from 1762 to 1774. In that year, he left South Carolina, fleeing the unrest and violence leading up to the fall of the colonial government in September 1775. In May 1775, John Pownall, Undersecretary of State John Pownall wrote ordering him to return from England to his governmental posts in South Carolina (transcript of letter in Board of Trade Commissions, Instructions, Etc., Reel 12 Volume 405 document 6 dated June 1, 1775). The microfilmed documents do not reveal whether he did so or not. However, in 1781, he did heed a similar call as Charleston was surrendering to General Clinton’s siege and becoming British occupied territory In this transcript of a letter dated February 25, 1781, Leigh reported to Germain after arrival at Charleston. Germain responded with a letter of thanks and encouragement to Leigh (transcript of outgoing Secretary of State correspondence in Reel 12 Volume 408 document 103 dated June 4, 1781)]

74. March 22, 1781 [146]

Transcript of letter No. 2 from Bull at Charleston to Germain, expecting that Simpson would have informed Germain about establishment of the Board of Police, which, so far, had focused on re-establishing a financial market and process to manage debts; complaining about how the British military had been taking away by ship Negroes who were slaves owned by loyal colonial South Carolinians; complaining about how the old British law in the colony better protected the property rights of slave owners; stating that small parties of rebels were making incursions, carrying off horses, etc., indicating that the rebellion had not yet actually been put down

75. March 26, 1781 [148]  
Transcript of letter No. 3 from Bull at Charleston to Germain, expressing hopes that a more complete victory may be won by British military forces by the spring of 1782
76. June 28, 1781 [149]  
Transcript of letter No. 4 from Bull at Charleston to Germain, updating Germain on military engagements that had occurred in South Carolina recently; stating that the jurisdiction and effectiveness of the Board of Police were being curtailed by the persistence of hostile parties of rebels
77. July 2, 1781 [151]  
Transcript of letter No. 5 from Bull at Charleston to Germain, reporting slow progress and great difficulties; looking forward to a future time when tranquility and prosperity would return; expressing his pleasure at having been appointed to a position "*in the administration of Justice at the Board of Police*"
78. November 11, 1781 [152]  
Transcript of letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Germain, mentioning "*The great event which hath happened at York in Virginia*" [surrender of General Charles Cornwallis' British army to an American army and French fleet at Yorktown on October 19, 1781] without going into detail or assessing the results; commenting then on the status of the British military force in South Carolina, for which he remained optimistic, supported by positive results from General Clinton's promise of a pardon for prisoners of war who would again pledge allegiance to Britain; stating also that members of the former colonial government were now gaining positions in the Board of Police, which was a good sign for future civil government; commenting on the scarce availability of money in South Carolina to rebuild the economy; including other observations of the current situation, which was difficult but supported by hope for the future
79. December 28, 1781 [155]  
Transcript of letter [unnumbered] from Bull at Charleston to Germain, passing on more military news which seemed optimistic for the fortunes of Britain; expressing mixed feelings of wanting to be optimistic for the future but feeling a great threat possible from "*the important Event in Virginia*"

**Note:** Volumes 411 through 511 are not microfilmed here.

Their contents are as follows:

Volume 411 through 424	Acts of the South Carolina Assembly	1663 to 1770
Volume 425 through 507	Sessions of the South Carolina Assembly, Council, and Council in Assembly	1721 to 1773
Volume 508 to 511	Shipping Returns for South Carolina harbors	1716 to 1765

## Reel 13 (Volumes 512 through 526)

**Note on “Post-Colonial” Papers:** The South Carolina Colonial Papers indeed contain many colonial papers, but they also contain what might be called “post-colonial” papers. These perhaps more accurately are papers from a transition period as Britain’s war to destroy the rebellion of the American colonies faltered and was abandoned. In South Carolina, it was the time of British occupation of Charleston from May 1780 to December 1782. The British military and loyalists entertained optimistic notions of driving the rebels northward, kindling a latent spirit of loyalism throughout the former colony and, hopefully, re-establishing the royal colony of South Carolina. But this potential trend took a sharp pessimistic turn when Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown in October 1781 and Lord North’s war government was turned out in London in February 1782.

---

**Table 17: South Carolina Microfilmed Papers as Organized into Two Distinct Categories—“Royal Colony” (1720 to 1775) and “Post-Colony” (1775 to 1782)**

### Royal Colony

Most of the CO5 South Carolina Colonial Papers were written during and reflect the period when South Carolina was a **royal colony—from roughly 1720 to 1775**. The microfilmed papers in the DLAR collection include:

#### Board of Trade

Incoming correspondence	1756 to 1775	Reels 1, 2
Outgoing (draft) correspondence	1722 to 1774	Reel 3 Vol. 381
Outgoing (draft) correspondence (abstracts)	1721 to 1756	Reel 12 Vol. 406
Outgoing/incoming:		
Commissions, Instructions Etc., begin	1720 to 1739	Reel 10 Vols. 400, 401
	[not have microfilmed documents for 1739 to 1760]	
Commissions, Instructions Etc., end	1760 to 1775	Reel 11, Reel 12 Vol. 405

#### Secretary of State

Incoming correspondence (begin)	1699 to 1724	Reel 3 Vol. 382
	[not have microfilmed documents for 1724 to 1744]	
Incoming correspondence (continue, end)	1744 to 1777	Reels 4, 5, 6, 7
Incoming correspondence (abstracts)	1767 to 1775	Reel 12 Vols. 409, 410 (begin)
Outgoing correspondence (abstracts)	1766 to 1775	Reel 12 Vols. 407, 408 (begin)

#### Other

Abstracts of land grants	1674 to 1773	Reel 9, Reel 10 Vol. 399
Treasurer’s Accounts	1759 to 1763	Reel 13 Vol. 512

## **Post colony**

### Board of Trade

[no documents; colonial economic development was at an end in South Carolina and twelve other former British colonies]

### Secretary of State

Incoming correspondence	1780 to 1784	Reel 8
incoming correspondence (abstracts)	1776 to 1781	Reel 12, Vol. 410 (end)
Outgoing correspondence (abstracts)	1776 to 1782	Reel 12, Vol. 408 (end)

### Board of Police

Depreciation study of paper currency	1780	Reel 1 Vol. 513
Judicial documents	1781 to 1782	Reel 13 Vols. 514 to 518
Proceedings of the Board and Council	1780 to 1782	Reel 13 Vols. 519 to 526
Declarations of Allegiance to the King	1781 to 1782	Reel 14 Vols. 527 to 534

### Other

Demands against sequestered estates	1781	Reel 14 Vol. 535
-------------------------------------	------	------------------

---

While some of the “post-colony” papers in these microfilmed papers shared the hope of re-establishing colonial South Carolina, more of them were focused on the nearer term, specifically in Charleston, and especially toward trying to manage public and private affairs in a city without a proper city government but with a military occupational force and a civilian governing institution authorized by the military called the Board of Police. This governing arrangement was certainly transitional. The occupation itself was expected to be temporary, and the Board of Police was a stopgap attempt at governing until more normal times were re-established. Of course they were not, under British rule at least. So, the South Carolinian transition lurched back toward an American future, a story that is truly post-colonial and beyond the scope of the British Colonial Papers.

But microfilmed documents from fall 1782, as Charleston was preparing for British evacuation, reveal a strong preoccupation among loyalists of means and influence, whether planning to leave or determined to stay, to focus on the issue of slavery, on which they shared similar self-interests. Both sides were seeking to protect their own absolute right to own, work, and sell slaves—while ironically, the British military was taking a more liberal and flexible approach, allowing some South Carolina slaves to be transported away during the evacuation, and for some of them to be freed from slavery. The issues of the Colonial period might reappear in various forms, but THE intransigent issue of the American future had already made its appearance in South Carolina.

**Note:** The archivists identified the microfilmed papers in Reels 13 and 14 as “Miscellaneous Papers.” In **Reel 13**, these include:

---

**Table 18: Contents of “Miscellaneous Papers” in Reel 13**

Volume 512	Treasurer’s Accounts	1758 to 1763
Volume 513	Board of Police: Evidence on the Depreciation in Paper Currency	November 5, 1780
Volume 514	Judicial Orders	October 20 to Dec. 15, 1781
Volume 515	Dockets of Causes for Trial	April 1781 to August 1782
Volume 516	List of Judicial Causes	May 29, 1781 to Aug. 5, 1782
Volume 517	Judicial Rules	For February 1782 Term and to October 24, 1782
Volume 518	Receipts for Court Papers	May 22 to November 25, 1782
Volume 519 to Volume 526	Proceedings of Board & Council	June 23, 1780 to Oct 29, 1782

---

## Volume 512—Itemized, Annotated Contents Treasurer’s Accounts

1758 to 1763

Documents 1 to 6

[Frames 1 to 95]

**Note:** Volume 512 contains selected colonial **Treasurer’s accounts for South Carolina for fiscal years 1758-1759, 1761-1762, and 1762-1763.** A full listing of South Carolina’s colonial accounts would be much more inclusive in content and would cover a much longer period—for the royal colony alone from about 1720 to 1775. Why this selective and brief 1758-to-1763 excerpt alone is archived in the CO5 South Carolina accounts is not clear. Perhaps public financial issues were of special interest or concern in South Carolina during this time. However, no such “spike” in interest or concern is evident in the microfilmed documents.

During this time, Commons House of the South Carolina Assembly was beginning its campaign against the colony’s governor and Council to assume greater control over the flow of money and credit and over public financial decision making. This reflected the political/economic dynamics of Commons House, whose members were representatively elected, but which nevertheless was strongly dominated by South Carolina’s wealthy planter class. Their economic interests depended on colonial governmental policies that supported plantation agriculture, slave labor, open and available financial credit, and extensive open trade, especially with England. Rather than being distinct to this period, South Carolina’s planter-class domination, both economically and politically, was a longer-term phenomenon.

The other primary colonial concern of this period was hostile relations with the Cherokee Nation in South Carolina's interior, highlighted by the so-called Anglo-Cherokee War of 1758 to 1761. Responding to this threat required heavy public spending by South Carolina's colonial government on fortifications, arms, and military forces. Yet such concerns and such public spending was by no means unique to this short period and, thus, also cannot readily explain the archiving of these particular accounts.

**Note:** The accounts microfilmed in Volume 512 consist of tables of detailed financial information. Only overall totals found in these tables are reported here.

**Note:** DLAR Document Numbers generally appear at the left margin. In Volumes with only one document, it is indicated by a "•" rather than a number. The "miscellaneous" documents archived in Reel 13 (Volumes 512 to 526) and Reel 14 (Volumes 527 to 535) tend to differ in content from Volume to Volume, or the documents do not lend themselves to continuous document numbering. Therefore, for several of these Volumes, no document numbers are assigned in this Finding Aid. If they are found, they are not continuous through the Reel but start over in each Volume.

In Reel 13's Volumes, archivists have stamped page numbers on each side of paper or each pair of facing pages in a bound letter book. In this Finding Aid, these numbers are called "Frame Numbers." For Volume 512, DLAR document numbers are placed on the left margin, and Frame Numbers are placed in brackets at the right margin.

1. 1759 [1]  
*"Account of the General Tax Raised by Virtue of A Law Ratified the 7<sup>th</sup> day of April 1759 for the Charges of the Year 1758 and as follows"* listed by the following categories of expenditures:

- |  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| • <i>Allowances to Public Officers</i>     | • <i>Lookouts</i>              |
| • <i>House Rent for the Public Service</i> | • <i>Public Arms</i>           |
| • <i>Writing for the Public Service</i>    | • <i>Parochial Charges</i>     |
| • <i>Barracks Contract</i>                 | • <i>Coroner Inquests</i>      |
| • <i>Forts</i>                             | • <i>Criminals [justice]</i>   |
| • <i>Garrisons at Fort Prince George</i>   | • <i>Criminal Slaves</i>       |
| • <i>and Fort Loudoun</i>                  | • <i>Prisoners of War</i>      |
| • <i>[Armed] Forces</i>                    | • <i>Indian Expenses</i>       |
| • <i>Scout Boats</i>                       | • <i>French Acadians</i>       |
|  | • <i>Extraordinary Charges</i> |
|  | • <i>Contingencies;</i>        |

These expenditures totaled £118,743.14.11; the archived copy of this table was certified accurate later, on January 20, 1764

2. 1759 [11]  
*"Collected in 1760 for the Charges of the Year 1758"*  
 By Cash from quit rents £110,590.0.6; from other sources £18,153.13.; for a total of £118,743.14.11
3. 1761 [12]  
 Itemized income accounts by sources of revenue, from March 25 (or for a few categories, June 2) to September 29, 1761, including the following revenue sources:
- *Cash to General Duty on Sundry Goods and Merchandise Imported*, totaling £22,661.8.10
  - *Cash to Additional Duty on Sundry Merchandise Imported*, totaling £5,208.6.2
  - *General Duty on Merchandise Imported To Cash paid the following Debentures*, totaling £1,392.13.5
  - *Additional Duty on Merchandise Imported To Cash paid the following Debentures*, totaling £207.16.9
  - *Cash to Duty on Deer Skins Exported*, totaling £812.9.6
  - *Cash to Duty on Tanned Leather Exported*, totaling £410.1.6
  - *Cash to Acco<sup>t</sup> on Goods Imported by Transient Persons*, totaling £216.3.5
  - *Cash to Acco<sup>t</sup> Tax on Negroes Imported for the first time*, totaling £7,615.0.0
  - *Acco<sup>t</sup> Duty on Negroes Imported To Cash, paid the following Debentures*, totaling £360.0.0
  - *General Duty on Merchandise Imported to Cash paid the following*, totaling £6163.0.0
  - *Fund Appropriated for Building & Repairing Fortifications D<sup>r</sup> to Cash paid*, totaling £3,059.2.5
  - *General Account of [Duties on the above taxes], D<sup>r</sup>, Contra...C<sup>r</sup>*, dated September 29, 1761
  - *Fund appropriated for Building a Post House and Erecting a Beacon, D<sup>r</sup>; balance applied for use in 1761*, totaling £8,071.5.7
  - *Fund appropriated for the use of New Settlers, D<sup>r</sup>; [same amount as for post house and beacon fund]*
- ending with an additional page of *Contra...C<sup>r</sup>* entries; archived copy certified accurate on January 20, 1764
4. 1761 [34]  
 Accounts of George Saxby, Receiver General for South Carolina, for quit rents collected, reported the county of the land and the name of payer, for four separate payments due for the fiscal year 1761, with a total amount collected for quit rents, after expenses, of £2,537.2.3, plus £3,664.13.21 received from other sources, for a total collected of £6,201.12.5; archived copy certified accurate on January 14, 1764; followed by  
 [no date]  
 One page of notes of expense payments; followed by  
 March 17, 1763  
 Letter of account audit for the fiscal year from March 26, 1761 to March 25, 1762

5. 1762 [64]  
Accounts of George Saxby for quit rents collected during the fiscal year 1762-1763, reporting the same categories of information as for 1761-1762 (document 4) with a total amount collected after expenses of £2,358.13; followed by One page of notes of expense payments, followed by November 18, 1763  
Letter of account audit for the 1762-1763 fiscal year
6. 1762 [95]  
Accounts of George Saxby for “*His Majesty’s Fines*” and other “*Casual Revenue*” collected by him during the fiscal year 1762-1763, with a total amount collected of £289.0.0; including audit letter dated November 18, 1763; archived copy certified accurate on January 14, 1764

## Volume 513—Itemized, Annotated Contents

### Board of Police: Evidence Laid before the Commissioners for Ascertaining the Depreciation in Paper Currency

November 5, 1780

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 24]

**Note:** Volumes 513 to 526 in Reel 13 contain documents from the Charleston **Board of Police** dated during the British occupation of Charleston by British military forces between May 1780 and December 1782 (when the British evacuated the city, and soon thereafter, South Carolina). For more on Charleston’s Board of Police governing entity during the British occupation, see note at the beginning of Volume 519 (the first of eight Volumes of Proceedings of the Board of Police). The Board of Police played a number of roles, including administering certain public services, managing public complaints, regulating the economy to some extent, and running the city’s civilian judicial system. Working with a commission, it also delved, in Volume 513, into the issue of currency depreciation,

**Note:** Because of rampant economic uncertainty during the Revolutionary War period, **depreciation in local currency** was an endemic problem for the economies of the revolting American colonies. After the British military captured Charleston in May 1780, its occupation government had particular reason to be concerned about depreciation as it sought to prop up what remained of colonial South Carolina for future colonial viability. In late 1780, the Board of Police, as Charleston’s civilian government under military occupation, was given the task of documenting depreciation at Charleston from 1777 to 1780, to be reported to a special Commission investigating the trends in depreciation. Two measures of depreciation in the value of local paper currency were reported:

- Changes over time in the relative market value of **specie** (money) between paper currency and **gold/silver, and**
- Changes over time in the relative market value of a market basket of “**country produce**” between paper currency and **Pounds Sterling.**]

**Note:** An overall **summary of the results** of the evidence in the microfilmed tables, reported on November 5, 1780, indicated the following trends in depreciation between April 1777 and June 1780. The change in relative values was measured as the cumulative percentage change from a baseline for each of the two measures. The microfilmed tables report a total of 26 periodic measurements of specie value and 27 periodic measurements of the country-produce price.

---

**Table 19: Summary of results for Ascertaining the Depreciation in Paper Currency, November 1780**

### **Specie Value**

<u>Date of measurement</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Baseline value (Jan. 1, 1777)	100%
(Value of money = paper currency relative to gold/silver)	
July 1, 1777 (first measurement)	127 $\frac{1}{4}$ %
May 1, 1780 (highest depreciation)	14,000%
June 1, 1780 (last measurement)	11,000%

### **Country Produce Price**

<u>Date of measurement</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Baseline value (1773)	100%
(Price of country produce = market basket of selected goods purchased in baseline year = £54.18.3)	
April 1777 (first measurement)	157 $\frac{8}{13}$ %
June 1780 (last measurement)	5,229 $\frac{6}{13}$ %

---

**Note:** See note at beginning of Volume 512 for how DLAR Document Numbers and Frame numbers are used in Reels 13 and 14. In Reel 13's Volumes, archivists have stamped page numbers on each side of paper or each pair of facing pages in a bound letter book. In this Finding Aid, these numbers are called "Frame Numbers." For Volume 513, since only one document is found, no DLAR Document Numbers have been assigned. Frame Numbers are found in brackets at the right margin only to indicate the length of the document.

- November 5, 1780 [Frames 1 to 24]  
 Tables of "*Evidence Laid before the Commissioners for Ascertaining the Depreciation in Paper Currency*", including:  
 Cover letter "*By James Simpson Esqr Intendant General of the Police of His Majestys said Province [of South Carolina]*"; followed by  
 Cover page for the document, entitled "*A Correct Register of the Proofs and Evidences said before the Commission for ascertaining the progressive depreciation of the Paper Currency*" in South Carolina; followed by

Tables of the document, in two parts:

- **Specie:** Tables of depreciation percentages of South Carolina paper currency against gold and silver, calculated at various intervals of time, with each measurement reported for the first of a month; the baseline for calculations is January 1, 1777; 26 reported measurements are dated from July 1, 1777 to June 1, 1780.
- **Country Produce:** Tables of depreciation percentages for the total price for a set “market basket” of 12 items, including produce, dairy, meat, and firewood; calculated at various intervals of time, with each measurement reported for the first of a month; the baseline for calculations is 1773; 27 reported measurements are dated from April 1, 1777 to June 1, 1780.
- 

## **Volume 514—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: Judicial Orders**

October 20 to December 15, 1781

1 Document

[Frame 1 to 3]

**Note:** For more on Charleston’s **Board of Police** governing entity during the British occupation from May 1780 to December 1782, see note at the beginning of Volume 519, Proceedings of the Board of Police. The Board of Police played a number of roles, including administering certain public services, managing public complaints, petitions, and memorials, regulating the city economy to some extent, and running the city’s civilian judicial system. Reel 514 is one of several that focus on the Board of Police’s judicial function.

**Note:** See note at beginning of Volume 512 for how DLAR Document Numbers and Frame numbers are used in Reels 13 and 14. In Reel 13’s Volumes, archivists have stamped page numbers on each side of paper or each pair of facing pages in a bound letter book. In this Finding Aid, these numbers are called “Frame Numbers.” In Volume 514, only one, brief document is found, and it appears to be a fragment of a larger document or documents. It may have been more a working paper than a document meant for archiving. Possibly earlier pages of similar orders were discarded after use, and possibly this one survived only because it was packed in a box during the evacuation process, was shipped to London, and found its way into the archived Colonial Papers of South Carolina. Since only a single, short document is found in Volume 514, neither Document numbers nor Frame Numbers have been assigned.

- October 20 to December 15, 1781  
Judicial orders issued as an individual court case opens; fragment of a larger document

## Volume 515—Itemized, Annotated Contents

### Board of Police: Docket of Causes for Trial

April 1781 to October 1782

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 29]

**Note:** For more on Charleston's **Board of Police** governing entity during the British occupation from May 1780 to December 1782, see note at the beginning of Volume 519, Proceedings of the Board of Police. The Board of Police played a number of roles, including administering certain public services, managing public complaints, petitions, and memorials, regulating the city economy to some extent, and running the city's civilian judicial system. Reel 515 is one of several that focus on the Board of Police's judicial function.

**Note:** See note at beginning of Volume 512 for how DLAR Document Numbers and Frame Numbers are used in Reels 13 and 14. In Reel 13's Volumes, archivists have stamped page numbers on each side of paper or each pair of facing pages in a bound letter book. In this Finding Aid, these numbers are called "Frame Numbers." In Volume 515, only one document is found, containing lists in tabular form of court "causes" (what today are called cases). The cases are dated between April 1781 and September 1782 which may cover most of the time during which this court functioned. So this may not be a fragment but a fairly complete record of the court's activity. Because it is a single document, no DLAR Document Numbers have been assigned. Frame Numbers appear at the left margin to indicate the length of the single document.

- April 1781 to October 1782 [Frames 1 to 29]  
Table of dockets for trial cases before the Board of Police in Charleston, reported periodically for a period of a month or several months from April 1781 to September 1782; information reported included:

- names of the parties in the case
- cause of the court action
- plea of the defendant
- claim for money
- prosecuting attorney
- defense attorney;
- [disposition, evidently added]

Tables were reported for court terms as follows (reported in reverse chronological order; unnumbered additional cases might be carryovers):

Numbered		Additional	Numbered	
<u>Court Term</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Court Term</u>	<u>Cases</u>
<u>October 1782</u>	27		<u>October 1781</u>	239
September 1782	56	7	July 1781	163
August 1782	162	9	June 1781	176
May 1782	122		May 1781	281
November 1781	131		April 1781	128

## **Volume 516—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: List of Judicial Causes**

May 29, 1781 to August 5, 1782

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 10]

**Note:** For more on Charleston's **Board of Police** governing entity during the British occupation from May 1780 to December 1782, see note at the beginning of Volume 519, Proceedings of the Board of Police. The Board of Police played a number of roles, including administering certain public services, managing public complaints, petitions, and memorials, regulating the city economy to some extent, and running the city's civilian judicial system. Reel 516 is one of several that focus on the Board of Police's judicial function.

**Note:** See note at beginning of Volume 512 for how DLAR Document Numbers and Frame numbers are used in Reels 13 and 14. In Reel 13's Volumes, archivists have stamped page numbers on each side of paper or each pair of facing pages in a bound letter book. In this Finding Aid, these numbers are called "Frame Numbers." In Volume 516, one, brief document contains lists and notes about individual cases during a relatively short period of time. This might be a fragment of a larger document or documents. More likely, it may be a working paper, not meant for archiving. Possibly additional pages of similar lists were discarded after use, and possibly this one survived only because it was packed in a box during the evacuation process, was shipped to London, and found its way into the archived Colonial Papers of South Carolina. Since only this one document is found in Volume 516, no DLAR Document Numbers have been assigned. Frame Numbers, found at the right margin, are used only to indicate the length of the single document.

- May 29, 1781 to August 5, 1782 [Frames 1 to 10]  
Lists of and notes about individual cases, not numbered or organized

## **Volume 517—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: Judicial Rules**

February to October 24, 1782

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 6]

**Note:** For more on Charleston's **Board of Police** governing entity during the British occupation from May 1780 to December 1782, see note at the beginning of Volume 519, Proceedings of the Board of Police. The Board of Police played a number of roles, including administering certain public services, managing public complaints, petitions, and memorials, regulating the city economy to some extent, and running the city's civilian judicial system. Reel 517 is one of several that focus on the Board of Police's judicial function.

**Note:** See note at beginning of Volume 512 for how DLAR Document Numbers and Frame Numbers are used in Reels 13 and 14. In Reel 13's Volumes, archivists have stamped page numbers on each side of paper or each pair of facing pages in a bound letter book. In this Finding Aid, these numbers are called "Frame Numbers."

In Volume 517, the one, brief, apparent fragment of a larger document or documents found in Volume 517 may have been more a working paper than a document meant for archiving. Possibly earlier pages of similar rules for previous court terms were discarded after use, and possibly this one survived only because it was packed in a box during the evacuation process, was shipped to London, and found its way into the archived Colonial Papers of South Carolina. Since only one, brief document is found in Volume 517, neither Document Numbers nor Frame Numbers have been used.

- February to October 24, 1782  
“*Rules etc. for February Term 1782*”, including rules for process during a court term and for use in individually designated cases; the latest one recorded is dated October 24, 1782, just two months before the British evacuation of Charleston

## **Volume 518—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: Receipts for Court Papers**

May 22 to November 25, 1782

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 3]

**Note:** For more on Charleston's **Board of Police** governing entity during the British occupation from May 1780 to December 1782, see note at the beginning of Volume 519, Proceedings of the Board of Police. The Board of Police played a number of roles, including administering certain public services, managing public complaints, petitions, and memorials, regulating the city's economy to some extent, and running the city's civilian judicial system. Reel 518 is one of several that focus on the Board of Police's judicial function.

**Note:** See note at beginning of Volume 512 for how DLAR Document Numbers and Frame Numbers are used in Reels 13 and 14. In Reel 13's Volumes, archivists have stamped page numbers on each side of paper or each pair of facing pages in a bound letter book. In this Finding Aid, these numbers are called “Frame Numbers.” In Volume 518, the one, brief, apparent fragment of a larger document or documents may have been more a working paper than a document meant for archiving. Possibly earlier pages of similar receipts were discarded after use, and possibly this one survived only because it was packed in a box during the evacuation process, was shipped to London, and found its way into the archived Colonial Papers of South Carolina. Since only one, brief document is found in Volume 518, neither Document Numbers nor Frame Numbers have been used.

- May 22 to November 25, 1782  
Receipts for court papers, including mostly rough notes and irregular fragments appearing to be for internal office use

## Volume 519—Itemized, Annotated Contents

### Board of Police: Board Proceedings, begin

June 23 to October 24, 1780

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 43]

**Note:** The previous Volumes (513 to 518) of Board of Police papers contain miscellaneous documents reflecting the Board's responsibility to operate a civilian judicial system in Charleston. The succeeding Volumes (519 to 526) contain **Proceedings** of meetings of the Board of Police and of a related Council during the British military occupation of Charleston.

**Note: Proceedings of the Board of Police** (Volumes 519 and 521 to 526 with meeting dates from June 23, 1780 to October 29, 1782) report on the Board's judicial function. Meeting by meeting, they list information about motions, decisions, etc. on specifically identified civil cases. They also report lists of potential jurors. Initial members of the Board of Police were Intendant General James Simpson (former Attorney General of colonial South Carolina, Colonel Alexander Wright and Robert William Powell.

As second son of James Wright, governor of Georgia, Alexander Wright was a staunch loyalist. He was also one of the commissioners to enforce the "Compact" negotiated between military commander Leslie and State Governor Mathews designed to minimize the number of slaves that would be taken out of South Carolina through the evacuation of Charleston (see Reel 8 document 189, note after it, and following documents).

Robert William Powell was a merchant who had supported the rebellion earlier but had changed sides and, as a loyalist, had had his property confiscated.

Volume 520 differs from 519 and subsequent Volumes of Board of Police *Proceedings*. It contains in one letter book **Proceedings of The Council**, with meetings dated from June 13, 1780 to November 27, 1781. The Council was the members of the Board of Police meeting with a different purpose and a different name. This governmental entity seems similar in ways to the Council of colonial South Carolina. Its meetings included discussions of significant governance issues leading to advice for the governor (the Intendant General in this case). Unlike the colonial Council, this Council lacked real governing authority and had no legislative responsibilities. Consistent with Governor Campbell's and General Clinton's policy wishes to re-establish South Carolina's colonial government, the Council did have a specific responsibility to approve petitions from Charleston prisoners of war seeking release of their parole after having declared their allegiance to the King.

James Simpson's last Council meeting is dated February 2, 1781. He left Charleston for New York, where he served (again) as General Henry Clinton's personal secretary. Meanwhile, colonial South Carolina's Lieutenant Governor William Bull II had returned from England and soon was named to replace his former colonial-government colleague James Simpson. Bull's first Council meeting was on February 27, 1781. Two more of Bull's colonial-government colleagues were soon appointed to the Board of Police under Bull's leadership, Thomas Knox Gordon, former Chief Justice, and Edward Savage, an assistant judge.

For a reason not clear, the last microfilmed Council meeting is dated November 27, 1781, although the British occupation lasted a little over a year longer.

---

**Table 20: Chronology of Meeting Summaries of Proceedings in Volumes 519 and 521 to 526 for the Board of Police and Volume 520 for the Council, 1780 to 1782**

---

Volume 519	the Board	June 23, 1780	to	October 24, 1780	
Volume 520	the Council	June 13, 1780	to	November 27, 1781	
Volume 521	the Board	November 6, 1780	to	May 8, 1781	(from Volume 519)
Volume 522	the Board	May 9, 1781	to	October 19, 1781	
Volume 523	the Board	October 23, 1781	to	February 4, 1782	(overlap)
Volume 524	the Board	November 9, 1781	to	March 25, 1782	(overlap)
Volume 525	the Board	March 19, 1782	to	May 24, 1782	(gap)
Volume 526	the Board	September 5, 1782	to	October 29, 1782	

---

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 519, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- June 23 to October 24, 1780 [Frames 1 to 43]  
Summaries of Proceedings of Board of Police for British occupied Charleston written into a letter book

## **Volume 520—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: Council Proceedings**

June 13 to October 22, 1781 1 Document [Frames 1 to 37]

**Note:** For more on the Proceedings of the Board of Police and the Council, see notes at beginning of Volume 519.

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 520, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- June 13, 1780 to October 22, 1781 [Frames 1 to 37]  
Summaries of Proceedings of the Council of the Board of Police for British occupied Charleston, written into a letter book

## **Volume 521—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: Board Proceedings, continue (from Volume 519)**

November 6, 1780 to May 8, 1781

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 65]

**Note:** For more on the Proceedings of the Board of Police and the Council, see notes at beginning of Volume 519.

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 521, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- November 6, 1780 to May 8, 1781 [Frames 1 to 65]  
Summaries of Proceedings of Board of Police for British occupied Charleston, written into a letter book

## **Volume 522—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: Board Proceedings, continue**

May 9 to October 19, 1781

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 44]

**Note:** For more on the Proceedings of the Board of Police and the Council, see notes at beginning of Volume 519.

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 522, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- May 9 to October 19, 1781 [Frames 1 to 44]  
Summaries of Proceedings of Board of Police for British occupied Charleston, written into a letter book

## **Volume 523—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Board of Police: Board Proceedings, continue**

October 23, 1781 to February 4, 1782

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 37]

**Note:** For more on the Proceedings of the Board of Police and the Council, see notes at beginning of Volume 519.

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 523, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- October 23, 1781 to February 4, 1782 [Frames 1 to 37]  
Summaries of Proceedings of Board of Police for British occupied Charleston,  
written into a letter book

### **Volume 524—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

#### **Board of Police: Board Proceedings, continue**

November 9, 1781 to March 25, 1782 1 Document [Frames 1 to 4]

**Note:** For more on the Proceedings of the Board of Police and the Council, see notes at beginning of Volume 519.

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 524, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- November 9, 1781 to March 25, 1782 [Frames 1 to 4]  
Summaries of Proceedings of Board of Police for British occupied Charleston,  
written into a letter book

### **Volume 525—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

#### **Board of Police: Board Proceedings, continue**

March 19 to May 24, 1782 1 Document [Frames 1 to 6]

**Note:** For more on the Proceedings of the Board of Police and the Council, see notes at beginning of Volume 519.

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 525, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- March 19 to May 24, 1782 [Frames 1 to 6]  
Summaries of Proceedings of Board of Police for British occupied Charleston,  
written into a letter book

**Volume 526—Itemized, Annotated Contents**  
**Board of Police: Board Proceedings, end**

September 5 to October 29, 1782

1 Document

[Frames 1 to 19]

**Note:** For more on the Proceedings of the Board of Police and the Council, see notes at beginning of Volume 519.

**Note:** Each Volume of Proceedings contains a separate letter book, so each is identified as a single document. The summaries were entered more or less chronologically into the letter books without page breaks, making Frame Numbers less useful. For these reasons, Document Numbers are not assigned for Volume 526, and Frame Numbers, found in brackets at the right margin, are useful only to indicate the size of the single document.

- September 5 to October 29, 1782 [Frames 1 to 19]  
Summaries of Proceedings of Board of Police for British occupied Charleston,  
written into a letter book

## Reel 14 (Volumes 527 through 535)

**Note:** Beginning in 1780, the British military, under the overall command of General Henry Clinton, initiated a Southern Campaign, intended to break the American rebellion by conquering the supposedly softer underbelly of the southern colonies and then roll northeastward, defeating rebels and governments one by one, all the way up to the hardest nut, Massachusetts. Clinton began with Charleston and South Carolina. His army's siege of Charleston led to surrender of General Benjamin Lincoln's defending American army on May 12, 1780, followed by British military occupation of Charleston for two and a half years until changed war policy in London, after Cornwallis' Yorktown surrender, led to British evacuation of Charleston on December 14, 1782.

British occupation of Charleston reignited desires and efforts toward re-establishing a civil colonial government for South Carolina. That did not occur, so Charleston was governed during the occupation by a combination of military rule under martial law plus a civilian quasi-governmental entity called the Board of Police, which acted under military control as a city government for Charleston (see notes on the Board of Police especially at the beginning of Volumes 513 and 519 in Reel 13).

An important element in recreating a British colonial government in South Carolina was to **enroll sufficient numbers of south Carolinians as loyal subjects of the King, to help bolster the colony's chance for economic prosperity and political survival.**

Before Clinton left New York with his massive army, he invoked a policy he had espoused before (in 1779 in what became known as the Philipsburg Proclamation). It entailed applying positive, peaceful incentives to reduce the will of the adversary to fight, thus possibly reducing the brutality and violence of warfare in general but, if that didn't work, for his own forces to be strengthened relative to the adversary, making victory more likely. Beyond that, leniency to prisoners of war would provide a springboard to rebuild a British loyalist colony. See Reel 8 documents 146 to 148 in General Clinton's 1780 correspondence with Secretary of State Germain about the capture of Charleston and Clinton's optimism that his victory would be a springboard to re-establish the South Carolina colony.)

By announcing his policy intent at the beginning of his campaign, early in 1780, Clinton sought moral leverage, before the fighting began, to negotiate for more humane terms of military engagement, as well as a stronger position from which to negotiate post-war settlement. Whether or not this policy produced a weaker American defense of Charleston or a quicker capitulation is uncertain. However, reissuing his proclamation after General Lincoln's troops and Charleston civilians had surrendered created a whole new post-battle situation. Prisoners of war had certain rights, including limited options for parole and release, usually through an exchange of prisoners from both sides. Clinton's proclamation offered the prisoners of war much more—essentially their freedom (call it amnesty or pardon, the legal differences didn't matter much, except that what Clinton was offering was much more than simple parole).

Why would Clinton make this offer? Because he was focusing on the post-war period of re-establishing civilian institutions of public governance. And his concept of these institutions was that they would emulate the British colonial model. And to accomplish this, he was convinced he needed to build a large citizenry of willing and capable individuals of a strongly loyalist persuasion. Clinton's logic was persuasive. However, it relied on a necessary but uncertain premise, that, after the fighting had ended, the inhabitants of the southern colonies would flock to the opportunity to declare their loyalty to the King, forming the basis for a new civil society and civil government, starting in South Carolina.

Although Clinton's logic was roundly opposed by the British government in London—and by the colonial governor of adjacent Georgia, James Wright—the optimism of Clinton's assumption prevailed in British-occupied Charleston.

One visible result was the extensive campaign by British authorities to promote massive declarations of allegiance to the King. Volumes 527 to 534 in Reel 14 consist of almost 2,000 printed declaration forms, almost all filled out and signed in Charleston between June 1780 and May 1782. The campaign was tangibly successful. Yet, in the end it made little difference. After Cornwallis and his army surrendered at Yorktown in October 1781 and the British Parliament followed up by, essentially, discontinuing the war in February 1782, the game plan changed considerably, in a hurry, in British occupied Charleston. The military command announced a complete evacuation, with a timetable. Suddenly British loyalty, even for devoted loyalists, became a lesser concern than each individual's and each family's plans to stay or leave in South Carolina, based largely on the feasibility for each to stay safely vs being forced out, plus the status of their property—and most especially the status of their slave property.

South Carolinians agreed on few things, but one thing all planters and most others agreed on—regardless of their patriot or loyalist proclivities—was the absolute right of white residents to buy, work, and sell Africans as slaves, at will, without restriction. As Charleston prepared for evacuation, documents at the end of Reel 8 (documents 172 to 205 (except for documents 184 and 185) reveal a preoccupation with ensuring that all South Carolina slaves would be kept in their home territory, under the control of their “rightful” owners.

Part of the problem for slave owners was General Clinton. His 1779 proclamation and later military orders institutionalized a military practice of granting freedom to all slaves who escaped to within military lines and agreed to be recruited to work for the military. General Alexander Leslie, commander in Charleston during the evacuation, also allowed slaves who had been helpful to the military during the occupation to be granted freedom and a ride away from Charleston on a British transport. In addition, some slave owners who chose to leave South Carolina were allowed by the military to transport their slaves with them. Apparently some 5,000 slaves left Charleston with the evacuating British in December 1782, while some 25,000 or more slaves who might have wished to leave were detained forcibly and otherwise from going.

South Carolinians were among both loyalists and rebels in many former colonies who complicated the settlement of grievances after the war by insisting on repayment for losses of property, whether confiscated or destroyed real property or “stolen” slaves. Besides the documents referenced above at the end of Reel 8, see the accounting ledger in Volume 535 at the end of this Reel that documents the British effort to confiscate and use the production of rebel-owned plantations to feed British troops—and to pay off outstanding debts of loyalists against the itemized rebel plantation owners.

**Note:** Reels 13 and 14 of the microfilmed CO5 South Carolina Colonial Papers contain “Miscellaneous Papers,” as follows:

---

**Table 21: Contents of Miscellaneous papers in Reel 14**

Volume 527	Declarations of Allegiance to the King, begin	mid-June to late August 1780
Volume 528	Declarations, continue	late August to mid-Sept. 1780
Volume 529	Declarations, continue	mid-Sept. to early Nov. 1780
Volume 530	Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the King, begin	May 1780 to June 1781
Volume 531	Certificates of Declarations, end	May 1780 to June 1781
Volume 532	Declarations, continue (from Volume 529)	early Nov. 1780 to late Apr. 1781
Volume 533	Declarations, continue	early May to mid-June 1781
Volume 534	Declarations, end	late May to late July 1781
Volume 535	Demands Brought Against Sequestered Estates	January 5, 1781

---

### **Volume 527—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

#### **Declarations of Allegiance to the King, begin**

Mid-June to late August 1780	205 Declarations	[Frames 1 to 69]
------------------------------	------------------	------------------

**Note:** During the British occupation of Charleston between May 1780 and December 1782, British officials, working through the Board of Police acting as the Council (see note at beginning of Reel 13 Volume 519), made a concerted effort to attract loyal inhabitants to sign declarations of allegiance to the King. Having a large number of loyal inhabitants was a prerequisite for the main goal, which was to re-establish civil colonial government in South Carolina. The documented result of this effort is the archived collection of printed declaration of allegiance forms completed and signed in Charleston between June 1780 and May 1782. These are contained in Volumes 527 to 534 in the CO5 South Carolina Colonial Papers, all in microfilm Reel 14.

**Note:** The **Declaration of Allegiance form** was printed with fill-in spaces for the name and signature of the person declaring allegiance, the date of signature at Charleston, and signature of a witnessing, approving official. The forms were printed three to a page, suggesting that they were not to be distributed to and completed by individuals on their own, but that the declaration had to be made in an official public space under the eye of public officials.

The content of the form was as follows: "*I [name] do hereby acknowledge and declare myself to be a true and faithful Subject to His Majesty, King of Great-Britain*"; promising to be obedient to his government [*within this Province*] and promising always to be "*ready to maintain and defend the same against all Persons whatever*." The phrase in brackets [ ] was marked out by hand on the first batch of printed forms and eliminated from the form in later printings. It was quickly recognized as unnecessarily restrictive and never was actually included in it.

The signature dates on the forms are only approximately chronological, suggesting that several pages of forms (each with three forms) could have been in simultaneous use over a period of time until three signed declarations were completed on each page. Especially in the last half of 1780, large numbers of declarations were signed on a few particular dates, suggesting a strategy of advertising special opportunities for people to come in and declare their allegiance. Only occasionally was a form with a name inserted X'ed out and left incomplete on a page with one or two other forms completed. The declaration process must, in most cases, have been relatively smooth and easy. In a few cases, pages of blank forms were microfilmed, but notes inserted between documents indicate where additional blank-form pages were not microfilmed.

**Note:** The completed **Declaration Forms** microfilmed in Volumes 527 to 529 and 532 to 534 are a continuous set, more or less chronological, running from May 1780 to July 1781. In contrast, a separate set of **Certificates of Declaration Forms** is found in Reels 530 and 531 (see note on the Certificates of Declarations and the difference between them and Declarations at the beginning of Volume 530). The completed Certificate forms were not chronologically ordered, but they did require allegiance to the King using identical wording as that in the Declaration. In addition, both forms were printed three-to-a page for office use, not individual use elsewhere.

Yet the two had differing formats. The Certificate form required signing a certificate of declaration rather than simply a declaration of allegiance. Was this a distinction without a difference? Did signers receive a certificate as well as the rights and obligations of a British subject? Did the same individuals sign both a Certificate and a Declaration on the same date? Why were the Declarations dated chronologically on the forms, while the Certificates were dated almost at random? These questions beg answers unavailable from the documents themselves.

**Note:** Signed Declarations and signed Certificates of Declaration are found in Volumes 527 through 534 as follows:

**Table 22: Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance, Charleston, mid-June 1780 to July 1781**

**Declarations**

<u>Volume</u>	<u>Total Declarations</u>	<u>Approximate Dates</u>	<u>Frames</u>
527	205	mid-June to late August 1780	69
528	282	late August to mid-Sept. 1780	94
529	291	mid-Sept. to early Nov. 1780	97
[see below for Volumes 530 and 531]			
532	297	early Nov. 1780 to late April 1781	99
533	147	early May to mid-June 1781	49
534	87	late May to late July 1781	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,309</b>	<b>mid-June 1780 to late July 1781</b>	<b>437</b>

**Certificates**

<u>Volume</u>	<u>Total Declarations</u>	<u>Approximate Dates</u>	<u>Frames</u>
530	297	May 1780 to June 1781	100
531	303	May 1780 to June 1781	101
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>May 1890 to June 1781</b>	<b>201</b>

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, signed Declaration and Certificate forms were batched together for archiving in Volumes, apparently unbound, and later microfilmed by page (three forms per page). In an important sense, each form is a historical document. Alternatively, a whole Volume of signed forms might be considered a single document. Yet the pages of forms were not bound together, and the pages themselves are not, themselves, historical documents. So, separate documents have not been identified in these Volumes except in a few special cases. Frame Numbers have only limited usefulness for these batches of forms, mostly for identifying the number of Declarations or Certificates.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of each Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- Mid-June to late August 1780 [Frames 1 to 69]  
205 individually signed and dated Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived in approximately chronological order; part of a series of declarations found in six Volumes (527 to 529 and 532 to 534)

- [no date] [would be Frames 70 to 77]  
Alphabetical name index. without Frame Numbers; presumably names of those who signed Declarations archived in this Volume. Since the total of names in the index is 157 and the total number of signed Declarations in this Volume is 205, either the index is incomplete, or it lists another set of individuals not identified

## **Volume 528—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue**

Late August to mid-September 1781                      282 Declarations                      [Frames 1 to 94]

**Note:** See notes at the beginning of Volume 527 for more on Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of the Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- Late August to mid-September 1780 [Frames 1 to 94]  
282 individually signed and dated Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived in approximately chronological order; part of a series of declarations found in six Volumes (527 to 529 and 532 to 534)

## **Volume 529—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue**

Mid-September to early November 1780                      291 Declarations                      [Frames 1 to 98]

**Note:** See notes at the beginning of Volume 527 for more on Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of the Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- Mid-September to Early November 1780 [Frames 1 to 98]  
291 individually signed and dated Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived in approximately chronological order; part of a series of declarations found in six Volumes (527 to 529 and 532 to 534)

## **Volume 530—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the King, begin**

May 1780 to June 1781                      297 Certificates of Declaration                      [Frames 1 to 100]

**Note:** Volume 530 begins a two-Volume separate set of Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the King. See notes at the beginning of 527 for more on Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance, and of the differences between the two.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of the Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- May 1780 to June 1781 [Frames 1 to 100]  
297 individually signed and dated Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived, apparently in the order in which they were filled out but not at all chronologically; part of a separate series of certificates of declarations found in Volumes 530 and 531

## **Volume 531—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the King, end**

May 1780 to June 1781                      303 Certificates of Declaration                      [Frames 1 to 101]

**Note:** Volume 531 concludes the two-Volume separate set of Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the King. See notes at the beginning of 527 for more on Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance, and of the differences between the two.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of the Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- May 1780 to June 1781 [Frames 1 to 101]  
303 individually signed and dated Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived, apparently in the order in which they were filled out but not at all chronologically; part of a separate series of certificates of declarations found in Volumes 530 and 531

## **Volume 532—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue** (from Volume 529)

Early November 1780 to late April 1781

297 Declarations

[Frames 1 to 98 plus 1A and 14A]

**Note:** See notes at the beginning of Volume 527 for more on Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance. Volume 532 continues this set of Declarations of Allegiance from Volume 29.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of the Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- Early November 1780 to late April 1781 [Frames 1 to 98 plus 1A and 14A]  
297 individually signed and dated Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived in approximately chronological order; part of a series of declarations found in six Volumes (527 to 529 and 532 to 534)
- February 24, 1781 [Frame 80]  
Declaration of John Pamor, handwritten completely on a separate piece of plain paper without the printed form; see declaration for same person on special form created by Lieutenant Nisbet Balfour [next document, Frame 81]
- February 24, 1781 [Frame 81]  
Different, full-page printed declaration form [filled in for John Pamor; see previous handwritten declaration, Frame 80]; identified as having been ordered by Lieutenant Nisbet Balfour, Commander at Charleston [under the command of General Cornwallis]; quoting the usual declaration word for word but adding an additional phrase "*therefore restored to the free exercise of his trade or profession, and the full privileges enjoyed by the local inhabitants of Charles Town*"; this form is found nowhere else in the microfilmed documents

## **Volume 533—Itemized, Annotated Contents**

### **Declarations of Allegiance to the King, continue**

Early May to mid-June 1781

147 Declarations

[Frames 1 to 50]

**Note:** See notes at the beginning of Volume 527 for more on Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of the Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- Early May to mid-June 1781 [Frames 1 to 50]  
147 individually signed and dated Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived in approximately chronological order; part of a series of declarations found in six Volumes (527 to 529 and 532 to 534)

### **Volume 534—Itemized, Annotated Contents** **Declarations of Allegiance to the King, end**

Late May to late July 1781                      87 Declarations                      [Frames 1 to 29]

**Note:** See notes at the beginning of Volume 527 for more on Declarations of Allegiance and Certificates of Declarations of Allegiance. Volume 534 concludes this set of Declarations of Allegiance.

**Note:** In Volumes 527 through 534, a single general entry identifies the contents of the Volume, including approximate dates and numbers of forms. In some Volumes, certain individual pages of forms are identified separately because of an unusual feature. Each Volume contains at least a few blank form pages or form pages with one or two forms crossed out or blank. These are not recognized here.

- Late May to Late July 1781 [Frames 1 to 29]  
87 individually signed and dated Declarations of Allegiance to the British King; signed in Charleston during its occupation by the British military from May 1780 to 1782; consisting of unbound batches of printed forms with three declarations per page, completed, signed, and archived in approximately chronological order; the concluding Volume in the series of declarations found in six Volumes (527 to 529 and 532 to 534)

### **Volume 535—Itemized, Annotated Contents** **Demands brought against Sequestered Estates**

January 5, 1781                      2 documents                      [Frames 1 to 79]

**Note:** Volume 535 is the last Volume in the “Miscellaneous” category of archived documents in the CO5 South Carolina Colonial Office Papers and the final Volume in the entire collection of microfilmed documents. Its contents are unique among all the Volumes, focusing as they do on an issue in the crack between the war and the post-war resolution of hostilities and property claims. The overall issue is the status and disposition of estates/plantations/slaves “confiscated” by one side or the other from owners who had supported the opposite side.

In this case, it is the British occupation military and its Commissioner of Sequestered Estates who are “confiscating” estates from “rebel” owners. In the twilight of the Revolutionary War, the sequestered plantations and their slaves were set to work either to produce food for the British armies still occupying Charleston or engaged in the field in South Carolina or other southern former colonies, or perhaps to pay off claims by (in this case) loyalists against “rebel” plantation owners.

**Note:** For Volume 535, DLAR Document Numbers are found at the left margin. Frame Numbers are found in brackets at the right margin.

1. January 5, 1781 [1]  
Title page for the ledger of “*Demands brought against the Sequestered Estates, in consequence of the Notification given by order of the Commandant and Council*”  
**[Note: Estate Sequestration—British version of rebel plantation confiscation:** When the “rebels” won territory and its economic resources, American authorities practiced a policy of **confiscating loyalist property** (largely plantations and slaves) and disposed of it for the benefit of the revolutionary cause and “patriot” Americans. In 1781, the British engaged in a similar scheme during its Southern Campaign, especially in South Carolina. On both sides, a strong motivator was revenge. For the British military, a second practical motive also was at play—solving the problem of how **to feed British occupying and campaigning armies**. To give a legal patina to British confiscation of rebel plantations, British military authorities called it **sequestration of [rebel] estates**. Sequestration is a term in the law defining legal takeover of property from miscreants under the law, whose property is then operated for the benefit of the public.  
In this case, General Cornwallis appointed one **John Cruden** of North Carolina to be **Commissioner of Sequestered Estates**. His job was to use the means of production (including slaves) available on a series of plantations in South Carolina, to produce food for British troops in the south. General Alexander Leslie, British commander in Charleston, supported the scheme to help reduce his dependence on food arriving by ship. The theory of this scheme never panned out in practice, but before it had time to mature, Britain’s policy changed after Cornwallis’ Yorktown surrender, and efforts in South Carolina refocused on managing an evacuation of Charleston.]  
**[Note on Ledger of Demands:** Judging from the microfilmed ledger (document 2) brought against sequestered estates, more than just hungry soldiers wanted benefits from the Commissioner of Sequestered Estates’ efforts to make a profit on rebel plantations. **Loyalist South Carolinians wanted some of the benefits to pay off bad debts owed by rebels or otherwise attributable to the rebellion.**

2. January 5, 1781 [2]  
 Ledger of "*Demands brought against the sequestered Estates*"  
 [Note: For the owner of each identified "sequestered estate," the ledger contains the following information: A numbered list of debts owed, the nature of each debt, the date of the bond note on account for each debt, the date when the bond note is payable, the amount of the debt in local currency, the amount in Pounds Sterling, and any interest due and on what date.  
 The ledger is written on 78 ledger pages, all of which are microfilmed. The total number of estate owners from whom debts are demanded is 74. A full list of the estate owners follows in **Table 23**. It is in the same almost alphabetic order in which the ledger pages are arranged.]

---

**Table 23: Demands Brought Against the Sequestered Estates, January 1781**

---

The number in parenthesis ( ) after each name is the number of debts itemized in the ledger against each estate owner.

Joseph Bee	(2)	Thomas Heyward	(6)
Peter Bocquet	(8)	Robert Hicks	(1)
Barnard Beckman	(7)	Peter Horry	(5)
Simon & John Berwick	(2)	Hugh Horry	(4)
Anthony Bourdeaux	(1)	Henry Hughs	(3)
Adam Fowler Brisbane	(12)	Richard Hutson	(15)
Alexander Broughton		Edmund Kyrne	(6)
& Isaac Motte	(1)	Ralph Izard	(12)
Stephen Bull	(31)	Michael Kalteison	(2)
Pierce Butler	(29)	John Kinnerly	(1)
Benjamin Cattell	(35)	Henry Laurens	(13)
William Cattell	(18)	Joseph Legare	(5)
Samuel Clegg	(1)	Abraham Livingston	(3)
Isaac Dacosta	(1)	Francis Marion	(4)
Stephen Drayton	(17)	Hawkins Martin	(9)
James Dunwiddy	(3)	John Mathews	(13)
Nicholas Eveleigh	(16)	Arthur Middleton	(21)
John Edwards	(4)	Isaac Motte	(7)
Thomas Ferguson	(44)	Edward Mitchell	(1)
William Flood	(11)	John Mouatt	(2)
Isaac Ford	(3)	William Moultrie Sr.	(27)
Christopher Gadsden	(5)	Charles Middleton	(11)
Charles Gee	(1)	Jacob Myers	(2)
John Lewis Gerais	(8)	James Neilson	(13)
William Gibbes	(11)	William Parker	(6)
Alexander Gillon	(2)	Christopher Peters	(2)
Francis Goodwyn	(3)	Charles Cotesworth	
John Harleston Jr.	(22)	Pinckney	(15)
John Harleston	(12)	Thomas Pinckney	(1)

William Reeves	(6)	Joseph Slann	(5)
John Rutledge	(34)	Philip Smith	(2)
Hugh Rutledge	(6)	Rev. Robert Smith	(12)
Edward Rutledge	(3)	William Clay Snipes	(14)
William Sanders	(7)	Richard Strother	(1)
John Sanders	(4)	Joseph Towner	(2)
Thomas Savage	(31)	Arnoldus Vanderhorst	(13)
William Scott	(2)	Richard Wethers	(8)
Thomas Shubrick	(15)	Joseph Wragg	(1)
Samuel Sleigh	(1)		

Followed by

*“Demands against the Usurped Power of South Carolina including all Persons whose Estates are Sequestered”*, list of four “demands” from four individuals that appear not to be the responsibility of a particular plantation owner but remain the responsibility of South Carolina, which still is not recognized as a State but as “usurped power” against the power of the King (4)

--End of Document--