

June 2016

Settlement of South Carolina's Colonial Backcountry: From Conflict to Prosperity

Steven C. Pruitt

Liberty University, spruitt2@liberty.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/ljh>



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pruitt, Steven C. (2016) "Settlement of South Carolina's Colonial Backcountry: From Conflict to Prosperity," *Bound Away: The Liberty Journal of History*. Vol. 1 : Iss. 2 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/ljh/vol1/iss2/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Crossing. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bound Away: The Liberty Journal of History by an authorized editor of Scholars Crossing. For more information, please contact scholarlycommunications@liberty.edu.

Settlement of South Carolina's Colonial Backcountry: From Conflict to Prosperity

Abstract

The Carolina Colony was the first foothold for the British in the lower south region of North America. Carolina developed in the tradition of Barbados, with its economy based on staple crops. These staple crops would become rice and indigo, both of which flourished in the areas near the coast. This lucrative agricultural development would assure that the seat of power in Carolina would remain near the sea for most of its early history. The coastal elites would face three major concerns: threat from the Native Americans in the west, treats from the Spanish in the south, and a fear of slave revolt in a colony that had an ever-increasing black majority. The solution that was initiated in the 1730's by the coastal government was to systematically settle a "new" backcountry that could provide a buffer between themselves and these growing physical threats. The settlement of this "new" backcountry would also help to add white residents to the colony to help dilute the growing black majority in the coastal regions. Due to this strategic positioning the backcountry settlers were exposed to extensive conflict and hardship, a circumstance that would have otherwise been thrust at the coastal settlements. In spite of these conditions the backcountry settlers grew from their yeoman roots to a prosperous society. Increased transportation networks, further access to slave labor, and the development of staple crops such as cotton, eventually allowed the backcountry to become involved with the staple based commercial economy of the coastal elites. This increase in commercial development would intimately intertwine the two regions of the state both economically and culturally by the turn of the nineteenth century.

Keywords

Colonial South Carolina, Backcountry

Introduction

The settlement of the backcountry of South Carolina was unlike the settlement of the frontier in other colonies. In this colony the “new” backcountry was a systematic, well-planned affair. The colonial elites gave away what they had to offer, free land, for the purpose of creating a human barrier of safety for themselves and their property. The planters on the coast feared attack from the Indians and the Spanish, as well as slave revolts. The plan by the coastal government of settling a “new” backcountry helped to alleviate some of these concerns. Backcountry settlements provided a buffer between the coastal planters, both from the Cherokee to the west and Spanish to the south and helped to add white residents to a colony that was becoming increasingly a black majority. Backcountry settlers were exposed to conflict and hardship, a circumstance that would have otherwise been thrust at the coastal settlements. Hardscrabble frontiersmen made it through years of conflict and political/legal neglect (from the coastal government) but whittled their way in the wilderness to create lives as yeoman farmers. As transportation networks increased throughout the eighteenth century the two regions came together due to ever increasing commercial agricultural economies based on staple crops. As a result, the backcountry and lowcountry would become vitally connected to one another by the mid-nineteenth century. The backcountry settlers would eventually, for all their risk and labor, become a prosperous people. This ever-increasing economic connection and consistent demand for recognition, as seen in the Regulator movement, further connected the two regions. After the Revolution the state eventually approved the creation of a new capital in the interior. Centrally located, Columbia, would govern the entire state as the two societies, backcountry and lowcountry, were becoming more and more connected.

Early English Settlement in North America and Carolina

After the failed attempt at settlement at Roanoke Island, the English finally got a foothold on the North American continent in the Chesapeake Bay at Jamestown in 1607.¹ The “empty” continent that made up the new world already had numerous people groups that dotted the landscape. Wherever the settlers established, whether in the Puritan northeast or the lower south, Indians were a force to be reckoned with. The east coast of the North American continent continued to entice settlement for the British (and other groups in smaller numbers). These areas included the Plymouth settlement of 1620, all the way through the formal colonization of Georgia in 1732.²

In 1663 Carolina became a proprietorship, granted to eight “influential and prominent men.”³ In 1669-1670, Settlers came in under the “Articles of Agreement between the Lords Proprietors,” signed in 1674.⁴ The proprietors’ success depended on them being able to attract more settlers. The colony’s founding document, The Fundamental Constitutions, written by one of the proprietors, Lord Shaftsbury and his secretary John Locke, created a unique atmosphere of religious toleration. The unique quality of Lockean tolerance in the colony from the beginning allowed for flexibility in thought and provided ground for South Carolina to become one of the most diverse North

¹ Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2001), 123.

² *Ibid.*, 241.

³ Lewis P. Jones, *South Carolina: One of the Fifty States* (Orangeburg: Sandlapper Publishing, 1985), 102.

⁴ Carolina Lords Proprietors, *Articles of Agreement between the Lords Proprietors* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1674).

American colonies, especially early on in its settlement.⁵ The requirement to enter the Carolina colony was a belief in God, and did not even exclude those of the Jewish faith. Religious tolerance, a voice in the government, and cheap land attracted settlers to the area from the beginning.

Charles Town was the first settlement in the Carolina Colony. The foundational underpinnings lay in the enormously prosperous British settlement of Barbados.⁶ This tiny island colony had almost solely devoted all of its acreage to sugar cane production. Due to this intense agricultural scheme, a scarcity of land for the island's residents was created. Many of these residents would look to Carolina to establish holdings on the mainland for themselves and their children in the lower south. Charles Town was strategically placed on a peninsula at the confluence of the Ashley and Cooper Rivers. By situating the settlement in this location, the English provided themselves with an excellent position for trade and defense. As a result, the city soon became the hub of the Carolina Colony. The early economy of Carolina consisted largely of naval stores, livestock, and the fur trade. Since the founding of Carolina, the use of African slaves in the colony had been a part of the culture. This was a tradition brought from Barbados by many of its early settlers. Unlike the harsh conditions in Barbados, early on in the history of Carolina, slaves were given a great deal of freedom because of the nature of their work (tending to livestock, etc.). These products that the early settlers produced were profitable, but they were still searching for a crop that would become the staple. By the late 1600s rice and indigo would become to Carolina, what tobacco was for Virginia and sugar was for Barbados.⁷ With these developments, a more organized and task oriented system of slavery began to take hold, as it was now more profitable to maintain tighter control. South Carolina would eventually become the densest region in terms of slaves, with a black majority for most of its history.⁸ The discovery of the staple crops that thrived in the coastal areas insured that the seat of power and economy would remain near the sea in Charles Town.

The “original” Carolina backcountry

The “original” backcountry that the early English of Carolina faced in the late seventeenth century was already settled by a diverse array of native peoples. These groups included the Kiawahs, Eutaws, Yamasees, and Santees.⁹ These groups were weaker than the inland tribes (Cherokee, etc.) and, for the most part, tended to cooperate with the English. The tribal life of these, like most in North America, changed forever after English settlement in 1670. The deerskin trade became a prevalent part of the Carolina economy and also a source of conflict, as overly ambitious traders cheated many Indians.¹⁰

These first Carolina residents lived in fear of Indian/Spanish attack, as well as slave rebellions. The largest Indian conflict in this coastal region was the Yemasee War

⁵ Samuel C. Smith, *A Cautious Enthusiasm: Mystical Piety and Evangelicalism in Colonial South Carolina* (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2013), 69-81.

⁶ Taylor, *American Colonies*, 224.

⁷ Jones, *South Carolina*, 146.

⁸ Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Major Problems in American Colonial History* (Boston: Wadsworth, 2013), 450.

⁹ Jones, *South Carolina*, 57.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 58.

in 1715-1717. The Yemasee War led the settlers to eventually pacify the Indians in the region and for the most part suppress all the natives in the immediate area. Most settlers in Carolina only saw conflict and threat from the natives, but some came for the purpose of evangelizing to them. Frances Rokeby wrote to Reverend Mr. Rose in 1707 describing the situation and the need for evangelism to the “savages.”¹¹ Ministers were sorely lacking in the colony, a reality that hampered Christianization efforts.

Big changes were coming for the Carolina colony in the early part of the eighteenth century. In 1712, the northern part of Carolina broke away to form North Carolina.¹² Then in 1719, a “revolution” took place in South Carolina and created a transition “from proprietary to royal government.”¹³ With royal government came new ideas of how to protect the colony, and some of these were going to create an even more heterogeneous environment than already existed. The bulk of the settlers in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century were English, followed by the French Huguenots, with smaller groups of other ethnic groups scattered amongst them. This was about to change as Governor Robert Johnson unveiled his plan to expand settlement inland in an organized and planned fashion. South Carolina would become “one of the more heterogeneous European populations in British North America...[and] by the time of the Revolution there [would be] nine European ethnic groups represented in measureable numbers.”¹⁴ Johnson’s “Township Plan” broke parts of the South Carolina frontier into eleven townships. These divisions would serve “as a defensive perimeter against both Indians and Spaniards” as well as “attract more white settlers to counteract the burgeoning black population” of the lowcountry.¹⁵ Townships helped alleviate the lowcountry planters’ greatest fears – attack from the Indians/Spanish and slave revolts (and to a lesser degree runaways). Thus the backcountry, conceived in conflict and at a distance from the center of legal authority, was predestined to be a region of unrest.

The “new” South Carolina backcountry – destined for conflict

The attempt by the “township plan” to settle the “new” backcountry of South Carolina was in direct conflict with the Cherokee. As George Hunter’s revised map of 1730 shows, the Carolina backcountry made up the main hunting, navigation, and trade routes of the Cherokee.¹⁶ A new treaty had to be coordinated to obtain the right to provide the land for the settlers and gain the indirect benefits for the lowcountry planters. A document was drafted and labeled “The Treaty with South Carolina,” which was signed in late 1755.¹⁷ “Nine of the townships...and one semi-township” was established by 1759 and “another three before the end of the colonial period.”¹⁸ With these settlements being located in the backcountry, navigation was of the utmost importance.

¹¹ Letter from Frances Rokeby to Reverend Mr. Rose (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1707).

¹² Taylor, *American Colonies*, 226.

¹³ David Ramsay, *The History of South Carolina from its First Settlement in 1670 to the year 1808* (Charleston: Longworth, 1809), 31.

¹⁴ Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 50.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 52-53.

¹⁶ Hunter, George, “Map of the Cherokee Country and the Path Thereto, 1730.” (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1730).

¹⁷ Ramsay, *The History of South Carolina*, 119.

¹⁸ Edgar, *South Carolina*, 54.

Charleston was the hub of the state for economic viability and trade. Charleston's dominance "was a result of the city's role in the formation of a cultural landscape that was shaped by a larger process of agricultural colonization."¹⁹ In the formation process it also "involved the region's settlement as well as its incorporation within a European world economy."²⁰ For this reason all nine of these original townships had access to navigable rivers. The location of natural resources determined how settlements would be spread out across the frontier. The divisions consisted of "Purrysburg and New Windsor on the Savannah, Saxe Gotha on the Congaree, Orangeburg on the North Edisto, Amelia near the juncture of the Congaree with the Santee, Fredricksburg on the Wateree, Williamsburg on the Black, Queensboro on the Great Pee Dee, and Kingston on the Waccamaw."²¹ The "semi-township" of the Welsh Tract was laid out near the township of Queensboro.

The new settlements in the backcountry of South Carolina were in a relative state of conflict from their creation up until the American Revolution. In the colonial American backcountry, "the Scotch-Irish [and other frontier settlers] found themselves on the frontier between European "civilization" and the "savage" Indians."²² Starting in 1760, the backcountry settlers of South Carolina were dealing with a new threat from the Cherokee at the hands of the French. This was the beginning of the Cherokee war of 1760-1761, in which South Carolina became one of the theatres of the French and Indian War. In early 1760 "war parties devastated the frontier which now extended from near present day Winnsboro westward to present Greenwood and McCormick."²³ In many cases, like most raids on the frontier, the "Settlements had a few days' or at least a few hours' warning...and quickly constructed community forts."²⁴ Activity included the massacre at the Long Canes where the Cherokee "killed or captured about fifty people, mostly women and children."²⁵ The Cherokee marched on Fort Loudon and staged a coordinated attack on Fort Prince George in the South Carolina upcountry near the tribal town of Keowee. The British and local militia eventually put down the Cherokee uprising and peace talks resulted in "Treaty of Peace and Friendship" in 1761.²⁶ As a result of the treaty even more of the Cherokee land became opened up and uncontested for settlement.²⁷ The treaty redrew the Cherokee boundary a mere forty miles south of Keowee, the capital of the lower Cherokee towns. Several other townships were established in the 1760's following the signing of this treaty. The three townships that were created during this time were "Boonesborough on Long Cane Creek, Hillsborough at the confluence of Little River and Long Cane Creek, and Londonborough on Hard Labor Creek"; all of these were tributaries of the upper Savannah.²⁸

¹⁹ Kenneth E. Lewis, "The Metropolis and the Backcountry: The Making of a Colonial Landscape on the South Carolina Frontier". *Historical Archaeology* 33 no. 3 (1999): 3.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Edgar, *South Carolina*, 54.

²² Albert H. Tillson, "The Southern Backcountry: A Survey of Current Research". *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 98 no. 3 (1990): 393.

²³ Larry E. Iver, *Colonial Forts of South Carolina: 1670-1775* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 17.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ "A Treaty of Peace and Friendship...", 18 December 1761.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Edgar, *South Carolina*, 54.

During the period after the French and Indian War, settlers poured into the backcountry. Many of these new settlers did not have good intentions and were drifters and outlaws. Backcountry settlers in South Carolina had complained for years about the lack of representation in the assembly, as well as the lack of law and order. Early in 1766, a petition was sent to the assembly with a variety of grievances. These grievances argued that “they were unrepresented in the assembly, Indians and lawless whites caused [them] hardship, their produce could reach market by ‘land carriage’ only, they had neither churches nor schools, and they were annoyed by ‘itinerant and vagabond strollers’...[and the backcountry settlers] existence...[is] in the coastal planters [best] interest.”²⁹ As the coastal elites saw the Stamp Act as a more pressing matter, the petition fell on deaf ears.

In the late 1760's the frontier settlers took the law into their own hands and formed bands called “Regulators.” These “leading men in the backcountry” were “intent upon establishing a lawful and orderly environment within which they could prosper as planters.”³⁰ The main goal of their movement was to establish courts that could be used effectively to maintain law and order in the increasingly lawless backcountry.³¹ The work started out in defense of their homes and families, but then turned into something that was more questionable. The Regulators initially were formed to provide protection against bands of outlaws, rogue hunters, and other new segments of the population that threatened the “moral, social, and economic order” of the region.³² The families that were impacted the most from the lawlessness in the backcountry were the ones that had the most to lose, the region's emerging elite class of prosperous planters.³³ Wealthier planters had gained large holdings of land and goods and found these outlaw bands especially threatening to their lifestyle.³⁴

In addition to physical threat, a large number of renegade hunters roaming the countryside threatened the agricultural interests of the area. Vagrant hunters often drew wolves into settled areas by leaving animal carcasses uncovered, and sometimes preyed on livestock as well as wild animals. Their use of Indian hunting grounds increased the danger of frontier attack on backcountry settlements.³⁵ The backcountry settlers felt that they had no other choice but to enforce order in the region themselves. The officials in Charleston sent the militia in to counter this threat to their authority. In 1767, the assembly established two ranger companies to deal with the problem of the backcountry. The power struggle between the two groups went back and forth until it ended with the Regulators flat out denial of assembly power. The coastal leaders only had one option at this point, and that was to concede and work to remedy some of the grievances. This activity eventually “resulted in the Assembly of Circuit Court Act” (1769).³⁶ With this legislation the backcountry gained seven courthouses where traveling judges could hold court. It also provided that sheriffs and jails would be located in each. Lastly, lawyers

²⁹ Charles Woodmason, *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution*. Edited by Richard J. Hooker (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953), 168.

³⁰ Robert E. Shalhope, “South Carolina in the Founding Era: A Localist Perspective”. *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 89 no. 2. (1988): 103-104.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Tillson, “The Southern Backcountry”, 400.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid., 406.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Jones, *South Carolina*, 276.

from Charles Town served clients through the colony in circuits.³⁷ The Assembly of Circuit Court Act helped to alleviate some of the tension that had been building between the two regions since the backcountry's creation. The backcountry settlers felt better represented after this act and had gained at least a minimal amount of law and order in their region. Coastal officials were equally glad for resolution with their backcountry neighbors, as tensions with Great Britain were starting to escalate.

After finally being able to gain some recognition from the assembly, Indian troubles soon flared back up again for the backcountry settlers in the mid-1770's. These troubles with the Indians were due in large part to the instigation of the British, in a coordinated effort with its assault on the coast. As is clear from Cook's 1773 map, the whole northwestern part of the South Carolina frontier was exposed and bordering Cherokee land.³⁸ Through the "machinations of the British emissaries, the Indians commenced their marauding expeditions in 1776 in western North Carolina and along the frontier settlements of South Carolina."³⁹ In this summer offensive, the Cherokees joined with northern tribes to raid frontier settlements in North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia in an effort to push settlers from their lands. Several massacres occurred on the frontier in South Carolina including both the Hampton and Hannon Massacres near the Upper Tyger watershed of the Spartan District.⁴⁰ The settlers fought back by sending Colonel Andrew Williamson and a large force of South Carolina militia and Continental troops against the Indians. They destroyed most of the Cherokee towns east of the mountains, and then joined with the North Carolina militia to do the same in that state and Georgia. After these defeats and their towns in shambles, the Cherokees were looking for peace. In May of 1777, Colonel Andrew Williamson led a South Carolina delegation to Dewitt's Corner, near present day Due West, in Abbeville County, to settle peace terms.⁴¹ Then on May 20, 1777, all parties signed the Treaty of Dewitt's Corner.⁴² In this Treaty the Cherokee gave "up all their lands in South Carolina (most of present-day Anderson, Greenville, Oconee, and Pickens Counties)."⁴³ With this cession of land, the last of the major land disputes between backcountry settlers in South Carolina and Indians came to a close.

From conflict to economic prosperity

Despite all of the conflict that the backcountry of South Carolina was destined to endure from its inception, the resilient German, Ulster Scots, and various other groups made the most of their opportunity. Despite being placed strategically in harms way from the beginning by the lowcountry planters, this relationship between the two regions would slowly heal and "throughout the late eighteenth century, [the] growing economic

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ James Cook, "A Map of the Province of South Carolina, 1773." (South Carolina Collection. The University of South Carolina, S. C.).

³⁹ J.B.O. Landrum, *Colonial and Revolutionary History of Upper South Carolina* (Greenville, SC: Shannon, 1897), 86.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 98.

⁴¹ Jones, *South Carolina*, 311.

⁴² "Treaty of Dewitt's Corner, 1777." (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History).

⁴³ Edgar, *South Carolina*, 229.

ties between the coastal and frontier elite improved relations between the two sections of the state.”⁴⁴

These early settlements in the Backcountry were small, usually arranged in a close kin connection network,⁴⁵ and functioned largely as their own economic centers. For most of the eighteenth century, the backcountry remained largely self-sufficient and consisted of tiny settlements in a sparsely settled region. The larger settlements that emerged were essential components to the initial regional economy. These settlements also found themselves “taking on the activities necessary for the economic and political integration of the region.”⁴⁶ Out of necessity, main settlements were usually centrally placed among further scattered communities. The economy and the transportation networks of these settlements that supported them were initially based on local trade and mainly structured around the production of grain. A gradual change would occur in the latter half of the eighteenth century that would soon facilitate the development of commercial production in the area.⁴⁷ The backcountry would continue to grow and it would further expand and develop its infrastructure in the years leading up to the Revolution. The ability for increased transportation and trade further promoted the region's eventual change to a commercial agricultural region after the conflict.⁴⁸ The developing transportation networks became the basis of external trade, and the self-sufficient yeoman farmers of the backcountry subsequently became intertwined with the larger commercial economic market of the state. The commercial shift in the backcountry created an environment in which during “the late eighteenth century, growing economic ties between the coastal and frontier elite improved relations between the two sections of the state.”⁴⁹ Thus “gradually economic, demographic, social, and political forces brought about marked changes in South Carolina society,” with this being most pronounced in the backcountry. Eventually by the turn of the nineteenth century, rice was overtaken by cotton as the state's staple crop and many of the backcountry yeoman farmers switched to slave labor to produce this new staple in a growing statewide market economy.⁵⁰ An eventual shift took place in the backcountry from the yeoman farming communities that had previously existed to a more lucrative staple producing economy using slave labor by the 1800's.⁵¹ Thus, eventually in the nineteenth century a continued coalescing of the state came about by an intersection of opportunities between the two regions. The entrance of “commodity markets, affordable slave labor, available western lands” with the yeoman's entrepreneurial spirit and eagerness to improve, left the backcountry settlers in a position to be “willing to exploit land and people to get it.”⁵² As this commercial agricultural economy continued to develop in the state there was a subsequent coming

⁴⁴ Tillson, “The Southern Backcountry”, 400.

⁴⁵ Peter N. Moore, *World of Toil and Strife: Community Transformation in Backcountry South Carolina, 1750-1805* (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2007)

⁴⁶ Kenneth E. Lewis, “The Metropolis and the Backcountry: The Making of a Colonial Landscape on the South Carolina Frontier”. *Historical Archaeology* 33 no. 3 (1999): 8.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁴⁸ George Lloyd Johnson Jr., *The Frontier in The Colonial South: South Carolina Backcountry, 1736-1800* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1997), 165.

⁴⁹ Tillson, “The Southern Backcountry”, 400.

⁵⁰ Shalhope, “South Carolina – founding era”, 111.

⁵¹ Moore, *World of Toil and Strife*, 3.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 110.

together of the backcountry and lowcountry societies and the development of a distinct “indigenous elite.”⁵³

The South Carolina backcountry became like most other parts of the colonies in the period before the Revolution, especially in terms of trending toward a more “consumer society.”⁵⁴ This created, across the colonies and regions, an Anglicization of the colonial marketplace with a rapid increase in consumer choice and a standardization of consumer behavior.⁵⁵ Even in nearby rural North Carolina, “One English traveller discovered to her surprise that... women seldom bothered to produce soap” even though good raw materials could be found.⁵⁶ The growing trend of Anglicization and shifting markets further connected the entirety of the state. The backcountry settlers, “by adopting certain aspects of gentility, [these] yeoman farmers and their families tried to create a familiar world on the edge of an imperial system that was itself undergoing rapid and irreversible change.”⁵⁷ Settlers of the South Carolina backcountry used elements of refinement to structure their lives to offset some of the societal tensions that were inherent to frontier life.⁵⁸ Recent archaeological and archival data from the “New Windsor [township] indicates that many colonists actively participated in and understood both the material and behavioral aspects of gentility.”⁵⁹ Thus, as this archeological evidence suggests, that settlers in the backcountry had high-status goods that demonstrated refinement and gentility and also knew the behavioral patterns they represented.⁶⁰ Based on this new information it “suggests that gentility often associated with 19th-century antebellum cotton planters actually had roots in the early colonial history of the frontier” and that “more importantly, gentility contained and directed relationships in the backcountry in ways reminiscent of lowcountry society.”⁶¹

Conclusion

The “new” backcountry of South Carolina was destined for conflict from its inception by the lowcountry elites. Governor Johnson’s “township plan” worked well to deflect, for the lowcountry planter’s benefit, the attacks by the Indians and Spanish against the new settlers of the backcountry. Townships added to the white population to combat another problem, a growing black majority in the colony, creating an environment of white solidarity late in the eighteenth century.

Through rugged individualism the yeoman farmers of the backcountry built lives, raised families, and created settlements out of the wilderness. They suffered through constant fear of attacks during this colonial era from Indians and did so with very little help from the coastal governments. They forged through with self-sufficiency to build enough of an economy that they and their children would soon reap the benefits as commercial agriculture and prosperity crept into their fertile inland communities. Peter

⁵³ Tillson, “The Southern Backcountry”, 405.

⁵⁴ Kupperman, *Major Problems*, 456.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 457.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 456.

⁵⁷ David Colin Crass, et al., “Gentility and Material Culture on the Carolina Frontier”. *Historical Archaeology* 33 no. 3 (1999): 27-28.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ Crass, et al., “Gentility and Material Culture”, 3.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 14.

Moore insightfully wrote that opportunities such as “commodity markets, affordable slave labor, available western lands” combined “with the yeomanry’s drive to exploit them...[and] eagerness to ride the wave of the capitalist business cycle” facilitated much of this prospering. These backcountry settlers were “looking for [this] main chance and [were] willing to exploit [the] land and people to get it.”⁶² This was the dream, before there was an American dream, at least in agriculturally based South Carolina. It was a dream to have land, build up a business (unfortunately at the time this involved slave labor), and reap the benefits financially for them and their children. Many of the backcountry settlers made their dreams come true, and the once dissident “frontier people,” became intimately intertwined both economically and culturally with the lowcountry.

⁶² Moore. *World of Toil and Strife*, 110.