Georgia Southern University
Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Legacy ETDs

Summer 1984

The Quaker Experience at Wrightsborough

Martha Fay Franklin

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd_legacy

Part of the Political Science Commons

Recommended Citation
Franklin, Martha Fay, "The Quaker Experience at Wrightsborough" (1984). *Legacy ETDs*. 471.
https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd_legacy/471

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Legacy ETDs by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

THE QUAKER EXPERIENCE AT WRIGHTSBOROUGH

Martha Fay Franklin

Georgia Southern College
Library

THE QUAKER EXPERIENCE AT WRIGHTSBOROUGH

submitted by

Martha Fay Franklin

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

Georgia Southern College in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Statesboro, Georgia

1984

THE QUAKER EXPERIENCE AT WRIGHTSBOROUGH

By

MARTHA FAY FRANKLIN

A Thesis Written in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

JULY, 1984

DR. G. LANE VAN TASSELL
HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

DR. GEORGE H. COX, JR.
CHAIRMAN OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE

DR. R. FRANK SAUNDERS, JR.
THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DR. GEORGELLE THOMAS
ACTING DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. QUAKER SETTLEMENT IN GEORGIA..... 1

Issues Leading to the Migration to Georgia
The Actual Move to Georgia
The Early Wrightsborough Era
Pressures Against the Quakers
Indian Relations
Pacifism
Slavery
Loss of Community Control
The Migration from Wrightsborough

II. QUAKERS AS A PACIFIST MINORITY..... 21

The Psychology of Discrimination
Christian Tolerance
Anti-Semiticism as an Illustration
General Thesis Hypothesis
Measures of Political Tolerance
History of Persecution of Quakers
Pacifism as an Experiment
Quakers in the South
Quaker Separateness
The Militia Dilemma

III. PROJECT RESEARCH METHODS..... 43

Research and Validity
Secondary Works
Primary Sources
Significance of Monthly Meeting Minutes
Classification of Primary Sources
Personality Studies
Evaluation of Data

IV. EVIDENCE RELATING TO VARIANCES IN THE WRIGHTSBOROUGH QUAKERS' EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES..... 56

Quaker Organization
Monthly Meetings
Quarterly Meetings
Yearly Meetings

Reactions to Problems
Indian Attacks
The Militia Problem
Results of the War
Reactions to Slavery
The Two Migrations
The Move in 1785
The Exodus of 1800-1803
Personal Lives
General Conditions Surrounding the Friends
Effect and Reaction to Upheavals
Conclusions about Ostracism

V. CONCLUSION..... 88

APPENDIX..... 95

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 103

CHAPTER ONE

QUAKER SETTLEMENT IN GEORGIA

Most commonly, the Middle colonies of New Jersey and Pennsylvania are associated with the Quaker sect in colonial America. However, issues which surfaced in the southern colonies during the twenty years preceding the Revolutionary War had great influence on the developing pattern of migration of the American Quakers into and back out of the South. In the state of North Carolina, crucial events took place which inspired a large group of Friends to move southward to new lands in Georgia near Augusta. This new community created by the southern migration was "Wrightsborough" in honor of the Royal Governor of that time, Sir James Wright, who bestowed the large land grants upon the Quaker families who moved into the area.

Issues Leading to the Migration to Georgia

The influx of Friends into Georgia was primarily motivated by acts of repression which were taken by the British in Orange County, North Carolina in the 1750's and 1760's. The Royal government there began to collect taxes which local citizens felt were unfair and consequently refused to pay. The British authorities retaliated with widespread

property confiscation for failure to pay.[1]

An opposition group formed in and around Hillsborough, North Carolina whose members came to be known as the Regulators. Many of the Quakers who were living in Orange County were opposed to the British measures; one of the outstanding Friends being one Joseph Maddock who had arrived in North Carolina in 1754 from Newark, Pennsylvania. He had been part of an earlier migration southward that took place at mid-century partly because of the availability of new lands. There seems to have been a need to find more freedom of environment, a need which is conducive to the practice of the traditional Quaker lifestyle.

Maddock became associated with the Regulator group and became generally identified with the dissident element of the area. Throughout the Wrightsborough story, there is some indication that Joseph Maddock was a major influence in the life of the community, always involved in local issues and decision making.[2]

In the same year, 1754, when Maddock arrived in North Carolina, Edmund Grey traveled from Virginia with three other men to apply for land grants in St. Paul's Parish at Augusta. These Virginians represented themselves as Quakers to the Georgia Colonial government. The location of the place they claimed was known commonly as Brandon and is said to have been located approximately where Clark Hill Reservoir backwaters cover farm land today. This is approximately thirty miles above Augusta.

Grey and his companions were situated on the extreme Northwest frontier in Georgia; beyond was solidly Indian territory. The Colonial government of Georgia had recently surveyed this area. It would eventually be ceded to the Royal Government by the local Indians because of unpaid debts to traders.[3] Grey's efforts were unfruitful, and in 1755, fell out with Governor Reynolds, and he was forced to leave the Brandon area. He subsequently moved to the lower Altamaha.[4]

An even earlier attempt to establish a Quaker settlement had been made in 1751 by an unidentified group of Friends at a point about nine miles west of Augusta which was called Quaker Springs. A group of Carolinians had purchased Uchee Indian land and briefly settled briefly there. In 1754, Indian violence caused them to evacuate to Augusta. The farms were completely abandoned by 1758, but a settlement appears on some period maps of the region.[5]

Back in Orange County, the North Carolina Quakers were experiencing continued stress. Maddock was chosen for the North Carolina Assembly in 1756, but he refused to be seated. Maddock and his friend, Jonathan Sell, had been leaders at Cane Creek as early as 1764. He and Sell decided to travel to the Augusta area to investigate the new Georgia lands which were about to be opened for settlement. Their trip came shortly after the end of the French and Indian War and was indicative of the widespread hunger for land. It is true that these two Friends, Maddock and Sell, were

typical of many Quakers of that period who tended to become land speculators when moving into new areas where land grants were being made. A family head would apply for a large tract, divide it into three parcels, sell off two of these, keep one for himself and profit from the transaction.[6]

The Actual Move to Georgia

Upon returning to Hillsborough, Maddock and Sell recruited a group of families from the area who were interested in moving to Georgia. When Maddock applied to the Royal Governor for a twelve thousand acre tract on Little River for "about forty families," the approval was given. In reality, over seventy families were ready to move with the two leaders. Maddock received five hundred acres at Sweetwater Creek, ten miles south of Little River, and it was there that he built his first mill. His property was located directly on the Lower Creek Indian Trading Path. This location proved to be an inauspicious site and led to strained relations between the Creeks and the Quaker settlers because the trail was used in a controversial and unpopular Indian trade between Augusta and the Creeks. It was necessary to apply for land farther west and north, land which lay between the upper and lower Indian trails. Land was granted to the group in common for an area to be alloted for the grazing of cattle, known as the Cowpens Tract.

By 1772, about two hundred families were in the Wrightsborough area, some Quaker and some not. Maddock was

glad to have non-Quakers join the community if they were productive and cooperative people. At least twenty houses were built in the township which was formally granted and laid out in square tracts, numbered, and assigned to each family. Since some settlement occurred before the town was formally laid out, many of the owners of the tracts inside the township never actually built on them, but rather held them in ownership, later trading or selling them off to newcomers. They chose instead to live out nearer their crop lands. Maddock had moved his mill from Sweetwater Creek to a spot on another tributary which became known as Maddock's Creek. The mill itself is believed to have been built to closely resemble those which existed in the Orange County section of North Carolina.[7]

The Early Wrightsborough Era

Maddock encouraged non-Quakers to join the settlement, and many did; among these families were the Candlers, the Ansleys, the Fews, the Johnsons, the Grahams, and the Youngs. Thomas Ansley became an outstanding landholder with a sizable estate and a large home which stands today and is commonly known as the Rock House. The house itself is constructed of local stone and is believed to have been built by servants of the early settler William Manson of Friendsboro, another community which either did not survive or was never actually built.[8]

Because of occasional attacks on the settlers by Indians and raiders from across the Savannah River, a fort

was requested by the Quakers in a petition to the Royal Governor. Funds were also sought for the building of a wagon road to Augusta; this road was completed in May of 1769 and is still known as the "Quaker Road". Eventually, the road was developed all the way to Savannah.

Trade was enhanced after development of the transportation route which made it easy to move tobacco out of the Wrightsborough area to trading centers.[9] Mulberry seeds were sent to the Quakers at Wrightsborough, but as in so many other attempts the Georgia Trustees favored, silk making failed as an industry there. Some of what are locally believed to be the original mulberry trees still stand today in the area.[10]

The Friends were a hardy people; they cleared fields the first year and built cabins quickly. Until the first season's crop had come in, they lived off the land. Game, fish, berries, greens and turkeys were plentiful. Getting crops to market would have been a major problem had the Quaker Road not existed.

William Bartram, noted botanist and naturalist author of the period, visited Wrightsborough on his travels through Georgia. He included observations of the community in his published journal, mentioning several of the prominent residents such as Joseph Maddock and William Farmer, both of whom he visited while in Wrightsborough. He states that the people were typical of early backcountry settlers. Their homes were first built of logs, then of sawn lumber after

Maddock had built the sawmill.

The Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting was organized officially in 1773 along traditional church lines. This format called for broad consensus decision-making, rotating duties within the congregation, and a clerk selected by the membership. Maddock was named Clerk (leader) of the Meeting after moving his certificate of membership from the Cane Creek, North Carolina Monthly Meeting.[11]

During 1773, some lands contested by Creeks and Cherokees were ceded to the colonial government in payment for Indian debts to traders as previously mentioned. This area became known as the Ceded Lands. When more land became available, more and more settlers came into the area, and the Wrightsborough community became a bustling town known throughout the state.

Pressures Against the Quakers

From the beginning of their experience at Wrightsborough, the Quakers were always threatened by four major factors: the initial Indian threat of violence, their basic pacifist views, their anti-slavery testimony, and the competition from new settlers whose influence also threatened the Quaker group cohesion.[12]

Indian Relations

The Friends were becoming known for their attitude of peace toward Indians on a national and a local level. John Woolman's Journal had been written and appeared in print in

1774, and his teachings had widespread influence on changing the image of the "savages". He saw native Americans as a gentle people who were receptive to friendship and aid. The Friends became known for their efforts at easing the hardships which the Indians suffered as a result of colonization and the gradual move west by the white man. The troubles experienced by the people at Wrightsborough were not primarily Indian-related problems, although there were boundary dispute problems and the menace of theft near the trading paths. There are recorded occurrences of murders committed by Indians, but most of the trouble was related to livestock and property.[13]

An Indian Council was requested and held in Savannah, and a leading chief was killed by a white militiaman on his way to the meeting. This incident was typical of the many injustices done to the Indians in the mutual efforts at conciliation and peacemaking. The Cherokees to the north and west of Wrightsborough had been pushed back toward the Appalachian Mountains, and the Uchees along the Savannah River were absorbed by the Creeks as were so many other small groups in an effort at survival. The Creeks themselves began moving out of the area in gradually increasing numbers, moving east into lands dominated by their traditional enemies.

Pacifism

During 1774, the Revolutionary movement was afoot, particularly among the twelve more northerly colonies and along the Georgia coast in the Midway area. It was during this period that Wrightsborough reached its peak of growth. Stores, mills, farms, the schooling of children, meeting houses and private homes existed which were indicators of the status of Wrightsborough as a leading Georgia town. The affairs of the township were handled by the church's Elders who dealt with secular as well as clerical matters. Business, civic, and educational affairs were directed by the elders of the Meeting to the satisfaction of the community. Religious affairs were dealt with by the Monthly Meeting and by appointed Indulgence Committees of the Meeting which dealt with individual problems of morality and behavior among the people.

On the subject of war, the Friends were clear in their stand. They would not bear arms to aid the cause of war, nor would they even arm themselves to defend their community from violence. They supported the government in power, and in the case of revolution, the reigning power would be supported until overthrown, and then the new regime would be honored.[14]

The Revolutionary War was so different in the Georgia colony than in any of the others that it must be dealt with differently, particularly in respect to the view taken of those colonists who remained Loyalist. The Tidewater area

of Georgia was utterly different from the backcountry, and the War itself had an entirely different character in the two areas.

The settlers in the backcountry had generally migrated from the northern colonies, and many were from the lower classes. Those who located on the coast were often British-born and more educated and wealthy. Most of the backcountry farmers did their own work, and those few who depended on slaves were tobacco farmers. The trade issues which so greatly affected New England colonists were not of great importance to the people in backcountry Georgia. However, the Quakers were unalterably opposed to war on religious grounds and could take neither side, so they were doomed to rejection by both sides.

During and after the War, many of the Friends were expelled from the Monthly Meeting because of their participation in some way in the war effort. The War was a divisive factor among Quakers. As the American force was organized in Georgia, more and more problems began to surface for Friends, not only because they were perceived as loyalists.[15]

Maddock was the leader of the Wrightsborough group. He overextended himself financially and went bankrupt in 1775 after losing everything to James Habersham of Savannah. Joseph Williams became Clerk of the Meeting at that time. When the Second Georgia Provincial Congress met in 1775, Maddock, who had been elected, refused to serve and declined

the seat. More Indian fighting occurred, and general confusion reigned in Wrightsborough. Edward Barnard constructed a second fort for the people on Upton's Creek because of the unstable situation.[16]

The Monthly Meeting decided to send a letter to Governor Wright affirming the Friends' loyalty and "peaceable disposition". It should be remembered that all the Quaker dealings with the Royal government had been favorable. While the Declaration of Independence was being written and signed, life went on as usual in Wrightsborough except for occasional violent attacks by marauders.

In 1776, Charity Cook and Mary Pearson, traveling preachers, visited the Meeting House, as did Abel Thomas. The occasion of a visiting minister was a special event for the isolated group of Friends who yearned for news of other meetings. Usually, the visitor would preach at several of the small area meeting houses, and many Friends would attend. Other times, preaching would be held at a home, often at William Farmer's place.[17] Much of what we know about the Quakers' "Times of Troubles and Commotion" is from the journals kept by traveling ministers such as William Savery.[18]

Finally, the Revolution moved into the backcountry with full force. Fighting was carried on in a different manner than within the Tidewater area. Loyalties were undefined and often shifted with the presence of either Loyalist or Rebel troops. Much of the fighting was done guerrilla-style.

In addition to the regular military forces, groups of "banditti" ravaged the countryside spreading fear and ruin among the Friends who were condemned by both Rebel and Loyalist forces for their pacifism. The Quakers were committed to nonviolence in every respect; they were not allowed to even take up arms in self-defense, much less to join the army or to support a warring government. The British officially allowed the Friends to remain free of militia service.[19]

A colonel for the Wrightsborough militia (made up of non-Quakers) was selected by the Rebel Georgia Council of Safety in Savannah, and by 1777, the Rebel forces were in control of the Wrightsborough area. The Monthly Meeting requested more defense and protection from violence while expelling their own members, Thomas Johnson and John Mooney for warlike behavior.

The main Quaker Meeting was moved to Maddock's mill in 1779, and the Meeting received advices from the New Garden Quarterly Meeting in North Carolina forbidding participation in the War. William Benson was expelled for bearing arms in self-defense; and in 1780 James Benson, Joseph Jackson, John Jones and Ellis Cheek were removed for bearing arms. Several women were disowned for marrying non-Quakers without the permission of the Meeting.[20]

Thomas Brown, a fierce Tory, led the Loyalist troops on a path of destruction through the backcountry. It is said that the underlying motive here may have been to eradicate

the "Cracker" element from the backcountry forever by murdering, plundering and generally causing the inhabitants to flee the state. Wrightsborough was then raided by Rebel sympathizers and Joseph Maddock's house was burned, even though Maddock had always appeared to be very obviously Loyalist. He and ten others were forced to escape to Savannah for refuge where the British authorities were in control.[21]

The Rebels decisively secured Wrightsborough in 1781. Yet, more violence occurred among the civilian population: raids and burnings. In 1782, the Loyalist refugees returned to Wrightsborough from Savannah. The Meeting determined that families signing the Fidelity Test, an oath of loyalty to the United States government, would be disowned. Friends were not allowed to swear oaths. Therefore, it was impossible to take the loyalty pledge, and the conflict between political and religious requirements arose yet again. During this same year, the British deserted Savannah, and the Rebels again controlled the state. After the War ended, the economic sufferings were extreme throughout the state, and this was especially true for the Quakers. The war years had transformed prosperity into poverty, and the economy did not revive until the 1790's.[22]

Slavery

In 1776, the North Carolina Yearly Meeting decided to forbid slavery among members of the sect. This occurred nearly a century before the Civil War. In the early years,

the Friends in Wrightsborough had little cause to be concerned with the issue of slavery because, in the backcountry, there were few slaveholders or people whose livelihood depended on slavery. It was not until after 1793 and the invention of the cotton gin that slavery became an economic issue to the Quakers and their neighbors who farmed at Wrightsborough. Morally, they were strictly opposed to human bondage.[18]

Loss of Community Control

The structure of the closeknit Quaker community began to crumble during the late 1780's and 1790's. The Elders initiated more and more disciplinary measures against nonconforming members. From reading the Minutes of the Meeting at Wrightsborough, it is clear that the group was becoming fractured. Members began to leave the Meeting and the area. In 1785, Henry Jones led forty of the families to Ohio.

Job Scott, Zachariah Ferris and William Savery, traveling preachers, visited Wrightsborough. They brought with them word of Friends who were migrating to Ohio and the other Western Lands which had just opened for settlement.[23]

In 1792, Georgia issued an exemption from militia service to certificate-holding Friends of the Meeting, and a tax of twenty-five percent of produce was levied on those who refused to serve because of religious reasons.[24]

The old community leader, Joseph Maddock, was questioned by the Meeting about the London Friends' Relief Fund money which had been sent during the War to aid American Friends. Maddock could not explain the reason for a missing two hundred and fifty pounds which he had been responsible for distributing among Friends in distress. This scandal probably caused his final downfall. Even though he was eventually forgiven, he went bankrupt again and was forced to sell off his original property.[25]

The State of Georgia decided to take control of the Township away from the British styled Quaker Grant and set up a standard town commission in 1799. This final blow signaled the beginning of the main Quaker migration from Wrightsborough even though the town continued to grow.[26]

The leaders of the Meeting apparently had begun to lose control not only politically and economically (because of the slavery factor in cotton-growing) but with their own self-discipline system. The young people were influenced by the attitudes of those around them who were non-Quaker, and the Meeting lacked the ability to keep them in line. Joseph Cloud, a traveling preacher, visited the community and encouraged the Friends to migrate to slavefree lands in the west where greater separateness and "holiness" could be maintained.[27]

The Migration From Wrightsborough

In 1805, Zachariah Dicks, a traveling preacher who many Friends considered to be a prophet, visited Wrightsborough

and urged them to migrate to the new West where slavery was not a problem. He foresaw a rebellion among the slaves in the south which would be devastating to the whites. His influence, and that of other leaders among the Friends, was strong enough that there began a second migration to Ohio and Indiana. Some Friends remained, but they became integrated into the new mainstream of life in the area and lost their identity as Quakers. However, today many of the outstanding families of McDuffie County trace their roots to a Quaker heritage. It is interesting to note that Georgia populist Tom Watson's ancestors on both sides of his family were original Quaker settlers, Watsons and Maddocks.[28]

Even the quiet and influential leader, Jonathan Sell, decided to release his property for sale and move to Ohio. Maddock died during this period, probably prior to 1800. The last certificates of membership to be issued from Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting came west in 1805.[29] In 1806, Bush River Meeting in South Carolina issued a certificate for the loyal Wrightsborough citizen, William Farmer, to migrate to Miami, Ohio, and this seems to bring an end to the early Quaker chapter in Georgia history. Thomas Ansley, owner of the Rock House tract, died in 1809, and an era ended.[30]

What was left of Wrightsborough was non-Quaker, though a few Quaker families did remain and were incorporated into the mainstream of the population which would inhabit McDuffie County. The settlement continued for some time,

but eventually died out due to the railroad which passed through Thomson, rather than Wrightsborough. By the time of the Civil War, the town had declined and was no longer important in the state.[31]

Quakers had come and gone from Georgia in a mere thirty-five years, and they would not return until a Friends' group began meeting in Atlanta in 1943. In 1951, the Atlanta Monthly Meeting was organized; the Augusta Monthly Meeting began meeting in 1955; and the American Friends Service Committee moved its Southeastern office to Atlanta in 1980.[32] Quakers had returned to Georgia only after an absence of almost 150 years.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

[1]Annie Sutton Cameron, a booklet published in Orange County, North Carolina, Hillsborough and the Regulators; Charles F. McKiever, "Slavery and the Emigration of North Carolina Friends," a thesis, East Carolina College, Greenville, South Carolina (1962).

[2]Pearl Baker, "Joseph Maddock, Quaker Leader," on file at the Wrightsborough Foundation, Thomson, Georgia. Unpublished monograph, typewritten.

[3]Pearl Baker, "That Most Pestilential Fellow," Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation. Unpublished monograph, typewritten.

[4] Alex M. Hitz, "The Wrightsborough Quaker Town and Township in Georgia," Bulletin of Friends Historical Association (1957), pp. 10-11.

[5]Pearl Baker, "Some Quaker Footnotes," on file at the Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation, Thomson, Georgia. Unpublished monograph, typewritten.

[6]Algie Newlin, in an interview, at Guilford College, North Carolina (August, 1983).

[7]Interview with millowner, Greensboro, North Carolina (August, 1983). Pearl Baker Collection, an article "Joseph Maddock"; Kenneth H. Thomas, Jr., The Rock House, McDuffie County, Georgia: An Analysis of an Historic Site (Atlanta: Department of Natural Resources, Historical Preservation Section, 1977), p. 30.

[8]Allen D. Candler, The Colonial Records of Georgia 10 (Atlanta: Chase P. Byrd, State Printer, 1914): 690. *

[9]Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes, on microfilm, at Guilford College, Greensboro, North Carolina. In the Quaker Collection

[10]Ibid.

* See Robert S. Davis, Quaker Records of Georgia (1986)

[11] Ibid.

[12] C. Vann Woodward, Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel (Savannah: The Beehive Press, reprint, 1973), p. 20.

[13] The Georgia Gazette, 19 January, 1792.

[14] Edward Cashin and Heard Robertson, Augusta and the American Revolution: Events in the Georgia Backcountry (Darien, Georgia: the Ashantilly Press, 1975), pp. 4-5.

[15] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[16] Pearl Baker, A Handbook of History: McDuffie County, Georgia 1870-1970, among the Baker Papers, Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation, Thomson, Georgia.

[17] Algie I. Newlin, Charity Cook: A Liberated Woman (n. p., Friends United Press, 1981), p. 45; Betsy Corner and C. Christopher Booth, Letters to Dr. Fothergill (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 32.

[18] Stephen B. Weeks, Southern Quakers and Slavery (New York: Bergman Publishers, 1896), p. 2; Henry W. Cadbury, "Intercolonial Solidarity of American Quakerism," The Pennsylvania Magazine 60:4 (Oct. 1936):367-70; North Carolina Yearly Meeting Minutes; New Garden Quarterly Minutes, both in the Quaker Collection at Guilford College, Guilford, North Carolina.

[19] Edward Needles Wright, Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1961), p. 1-33.

[20] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[21] Merton E. Coulter, Georgia: A Short History (Athens: University of Georgia Press), p. 274; Robert Davis, "The Last Colony."

[22] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes; Howard Brinton, Friends for Three Hundred Years (Lebanon, Pennsylvania: Sowers Printing Company, 1976), pp. 200-300 passim.

[23] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[24] Horatio Marbury and William A. Crawford, A Digest of the Laws of the State of Georgia (Savannah: Seymour, Woolhopter and Stebbins, 1802), p. 440.

[25] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes; Kenneth Carroll, "Irish and British Quakers and Their American Relief Funds," Pennsylvania Magazine (October, 1978):437.

[26] Pearl Baker, A Handbook of History.

[27] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[28] Woodward, p. 20.

[29] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[30] William Wade Hinshaw, Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers Inc., 1936), p. 1042.

[31] Baker, Handbook of History.

CHAPTER TWO

QUAKERS AS A PACIFIST MINORITY

A study of the rights of minorities reveals that it is essential that a group have the right to preserve its culture and that this right is politically significant. The rights of any minority within a political system may be divided into six perspectives:

- self-government and political participation;
- language preference and mores;
- religious choice;
- education;
- movement, residence, and property;
- freedom of expression.[1]

The right of self-determination of a people within a state is a complex issue. The general conclusion is that any minority cultural group exists primarily as a segment of the population of a state, and therefore must support the good of the state. Even though it is possible to make certain concessions to the self-determination of groups within the pluralist society, the good of the whole is first considered.

Vernon Van Dyke notes that there are two conflicting

perspectives when a state begins to concern itself with the human rights issues. One is the doctrine which is important domestically and which focuses on the equal and nondiscrimiatory treatment of the individual. Generally, the idea of "one man, one vote" leads to majority rule and the permanent establishment of minority groups as politically ineffective. The second perspective is the international view that a state should do as it chooses concerning internal minority issues.[2]

Religion is an important cultural right, but it is often denied, particularly in cases in where there is an established state supported religion.[3] While freedom of religion is guaranteed in the American republic, the actuality of this freedom can be evaluated by the study of the plight of the various religious sects which have existed in this society, including the Quakers. While the states and the courts stand behind the principle, it is necessary to look at what the population actually "does" about religious tolerance, according to Shamir and Sullivan. It is often true that "who" someone is when initially encountered actually is equated with "what" that someone is. Persons are categorized by group membership rather than by personal history.[4]

Since a sect will often, because of language, way of life and rural living, become a closed society, any member of the sect will be viewed nonindividualistically; he will be seen only as a member of a particular group. Certain

variable behavior is associated with particular groups; since religious grouping today is seen as a purely voluntary category of minority, nontolerant attitudes toward certain religious minority members are usually viewed with less disdain than racial or sexual intolerance. However, as in the case of the Jews, birthright Quakers in the 1700's hardly ever felt free to leave the Society, and were not wholly "voluntary" members.

The Psychology of Discrimination

Discrimination means distinguishing between people on the basis of the group to which the person belongs or others perceive him/her as belonging rather than on individual characteristics. Non-legislative discrimination has always existed in America, and the overall pattern has been selective in nature with tokenism being a major solution.[5] This is evident in the case of the few Quakers who merged with the general population at Wrightsborough, according to the Monthly Meeting Minutes. After the major migration, there remained behind some of the more successful Quakers who chose to meld with the mainstream. Hostility toward groups is a phenomena which is based largely upon fantasies, personality needs and misinterpretations. Generally, if a person or a population bears hostility against one minority, there is a strong chance that they will be hostile toward a large number of other groups. Often when prejudice exists, there has been little or no contact with the minority in question, according to Shamir and Sullivan.

Important factors such as the economic climate and social mores are vital in the assessment of the likelihood that anti-tolerant attitudes will be present in a society. Fascism's success depended entirely upon mass acceptance. It succeeded in furthering anti-semiticism because it served an emotional need; it appealed to patterns of anxieties, fears and aspirations.[6]

Minorities might assimilate more completely if less prejudice existed, and there is a strong nationalistic objection to a group's "living apart" from society; segregation leads to more segregation.[7] Each ethnic group is perceived by prejudiced individuals as an homogeneous entity, and there is no attempt to determine or question how groups came to be as they are. The majority assumes that outgroups should change their character in order to make themselves more acceptable to the status quo.[8] It is true that the Quakers pulled in unto themselves at Wrightsborough and provoked this reaction among their neighbors.

Certain traits are present in individuals who display anti-semiticism: "stereotype, rigid adherence to middle-class values, the habit of seeing one's own group as morally pure, concern with dominance and power, fear of moral contamination, fear of being overwhelmed and victimized, the desire to build social barriers to separate one group from another and to maintain the morality and dominance of one's own group".[9] It is not evident that the Quakers encountered this kind of vehement resistance, but the fact remains that

they did meet with extremely harsh and hostile treatment. For some individuals, persecution was sudden and dangerous.

Political and economic conditions can change rapidly; political ideology is closely correlated to these changes. The 1700's was a period of rapid change for the American colonies; revolution and expansion were the primary factors which influenced the course of political action when the Quakers were living at Wrightsborough. The fact that they were a small sect in isolation in the backcountry of Georgia sets them apart from the other minorities and allows them to be studied in regard to the level of tolerance they experienced.

Religious sects are often movements of religious protest. In the case of the Quakers, the protest was nonviolent but determined. Allegiance to the group was always voluntary, and membership was allowed only on the proof of conviction. Continuation of membership continued only through proof of loyalty to Quaker beliefs and practices. Faith came first; lives were then to be lived in accordance with an inward piety and outward conformity.[10]

Rufus Jones explains the Quaker inward attitude:

> The Quakers' supreme passion was the cultivation of inward religion and an outward life consistent with inward leadings. Experiments in government whether successful or unsuccessful, whether wise or unwise, were never their primary aim. Beneath these ventures, there was always a deeper purpose: to make a fresh experiment in spiritual religion. This Quaker aspiration led to a voluntary isolation of the Quaker community. These American Quakers of the period...Believed...that they had discovered, or rediscovered, a new spiritual Prin-

> ciple which they thought was destined to revolutionize life, society, civil government, and religion. The Principle...which they claimed to have discovered was the presence of a Divine Light in man, a radiance from the central Light of the spiritual universe, penetrating the deeps of every soul, which if responded to, obeyed, and accepted as a guiding star, would lead into all truth and into all kinds of truth. They thought that they had found a way to the direct discovery of the Will of God and that they could thereby put the Kingdom of God into actual operation here in the world. The whole momentous issue of life, they insisted, is settled by personal obedience or disobedience to the inward Divine revelation.... They risked everything they had on the truth of this Principle, and they must be judged by the way in which they worked out their experiment in religion.[11]

Christian Tolerance

Because of its strict organizational structure, Christianity is more intolerant of sects than other world religions. To its own members, traditional society seems to be the only choice of style; customs, mores and authority appear to be a continuation of a perfectly ordered society. When challenges arise, it is often from a minority seeking to achieve an important social change and therefore, appears threatening to society in general.[12]

Anti-Semiticism as an Illustration

Religious intolerance is a wider issue than mere doctrinal differences. For example, anti-semiticism is based on larger issues than the actual characteristics or beliefs of Jews. Anti-semiticism is not an isolated occurrence, but part of a larger ideology, and a person's susceptibility to this ideology depends on his own psychological needs.

Attitudes which allow prejudice are psychologically "on the surface", but the degree of openness with which a person displays these attitudes depends on the situation. There can be a big difference in what is actually felt and what a person says. The latter depends on the environment. If an anti-democratic climate arises, the likelihood of expression of anti-semitic views becomes much more likely to occur.

The link between ideology and action is important. To understand the occurrence of action and inaction when prejudice is present, it is necessary to refer to forces of personality and to the general climate. Forces of personality vary in individuals and societies and depend mainly on an organization of needs.

Anti-semiticism grew in the climate which was nurtured by Christian theology. In European political change, the question of alienness of the Jews became an issue. The American Revolution supposedly set the stage for Jews and other ethnic minorities to become equal citizens under law, but this did not take place.[13] In Western cultures, the very existence of the Jews, the Jewish community, Judaism and the Jewish identity as a people apart suggests that anti-semiticism is always a threat. "The hatred of the unlike is an all too human phenomenon."[14] The Nazi argument concerning natural biological traits would not have worked so well if biological explanations had not been generally accepted at that time by the German people. Personality structure allows a population to be receptive to

antidemocratic propaganda, and because of the nature of society, this type of propaganda can be assimilated.[15]

The supposed threat of a Jewish conspiracy grew from legends; from the Renaissance on, these legends were more politically than religiously oriented.[16] Well before the Nazi rise to power, the idea of the occult power of the Jews was accepted in German-Christian culture. The theory that Germany was defeated in World War I by the "stab in the back" from the Jews was propagated by the Nazis, and the idea was spread throughout the country.[17]

The experience of the original Quakers in England was not dissimiliar to that of the Jews who attempted to assimilate into Western society. In England, there were insurmountable legal obstacles which kept Quakers out of public service and out of the mainstream of life. In the early American colonial period, Friends in the Northeastern colonies were barred from officeholding and from voting, a condition which gradually changed, but not before the group began to move onward to the South and the West, seeking and finding more tolerant ground.[18]

General Thesis Hypothesis

If a true measure of a democratic society is how that democracy treats its minorities, then the two questions studied in the situation of the Quakers in Georgia should be: How did they fare as a minority there, and how might the larger community be expected to deal with the group and their differences?

The obvious hypothesis which could be drawn in the model is that ostracism occurred in the case of the Wrightsborough Quakers' decision to migrate from the area. This simple explanation would be supported by surface evidence. Evidence of hostilities directed toward the members of the group is plentiful. However, the simple ostracism case is too elementary in approach because the Wrightsborough story points to a much broader supposition concerning the overall air of tension surrounding the very nature of the Quakers' existence.

An alternate hypothesis concerning the Quakers' migration and the causes of the move west deals with this inward/-outward approach which they took to the external world and the conditions which they encountered. The Quakers' migration from Georgia was a result of the conflict between the two motivations which were present in the Quaker's social behavior: the need to pull inward to preserve the purity of the group's ideals and the need to turn outward to participate in the activities of the world about them. The inward/outward conflict prevented the possibility of the Friends' adjusting to the demands of being a part of a community which was mixed in religious and political elements.

Throughout the history of the sect, the same tension is present. There always existed the need to be secular while being forced to cleave to the core group for spiritual reasons. This phenomenon occurred during the Pennsylvania Experiment and on a much smaller scale wherever the Friends

settled.

The selection of this alternative premise still addresses the practical issue of political and social ostracism in America of certain groups who do not conform to expected codes of behavior. Purportedly vital issues -- the main one being the cause of national security -- are central to the vested interests of all nations as nation states. Since national survival is of prime importance to a population, and all nations are striving to protect their "physical, political, and cultural identity against encroachment", according to Hans Morgenthau, groups contrary to this goal are harshly viewed.[19]

In the case of the Quakers, the need to be accepted by their peers was subjugated by the need to maintain the requirements of the Meeting regarding the very issues which the community viewed as being national interest issues -- such as defense.

Measures of Political Tolerance

Political tolerance is simply a willingness to put up with ideas or groups which vary or are objectionable to the majority.[20] Intolerant political attitudes may be caused by socialization (anti-black feelings in the South), low individual self-esteem, or by a reality-based situation (lower middle class whites fearing job competition from blacks).[21] Groups or individuals who are insecure and feel threatened have anxiety which must be relieved -- often toward a target group -- some will perceive that they are more

directly threatened by a particular group than others do.[22]

Race and religion have always been the important issues regarding tolerance in the U. S. The most important sociodemographic factor related to ideology is religion. Ideology is directly reflected in levels of political tolerance.[23]

History of Persecution of Quakers

Considerable Quaker immigration to America took place in the 17th century and subsequent migration throughout the colonies occurred in the 18th century. The result was a widespread distribution of Quakers throughout the thirteen colonies. Through the institution of traveling ministers, unity among Friends was cemented, and common ideas and goals were easily spread from Meeting to Meeting.[24]

It is true that individual Quakers violated the strict rule of disassociation with the national interest in their code concerning pacifism and in their policy of supporting the government in word only. Their noninvolvement in political affairs and refusal to take oaths made them appear suspect in the eyes of their neighbors who were usually very nationalistic in attitude.[25]

The first instance of Quakers being persecuted for their pacifist stand occurred in Maryland in the 1650's. Fines in money or tobacco were levied on Friends for their refusal to train for the militia and refusal to take an oath of allegiance. Poor Quakers suffered extremely from this practice. In 1662, members of the Society were imprisoned

for refusal to pay fines.[26]

Pacifism as an Experiment

The Quaker experiment in Pennsylvania failed, and may have done so because there was a conflict between rigid principles within a group. In the case of Pennsylvania, the conflict occurred not from external pressures, but from within the group itself. The two divergent principles were the policy of non-violence and the principle of representative government.

When non-Quakers arrived in the colonies and sought militia protection, Quaker officeholders were faced with an impossible dilemma: could a chosen representative of the people refuse to grant the wishes of his constituency because of his own personal religious beliefs? As a solution, almost every elected Quaker in Pennsylvania eventually resigned his office.[27] The contradiction between the Pennsylvania law enforcement policy within the state and the pacifist stance on external threats seems to invalidate the entire experiment, but, actually, the state was never free of non-Quaker influence and never operated as a pure experiment.[28] Only if Pennsylvania could have remained truly self-governing in foreign affairs and pure of non-Quakers could it have been judged as to its success as a model for a pacifist society.[29]

Noninterference in political affairs became the policy of the Friends in Pennsylvania and the five other Yearly Meetings in America. Uniformity of conduct was enforced

through disciplinary measures exercised by the eighty Monthly Meetings.[30] Often, younger members of the Meeting broke with the group and joined the Rebel army, and this become a serious matter of discipline for the Friends. Holding control over the members was vital to the existence of the sect.[31]

Quakers in the South

The main southern concentration of Quakers was in North Carolina. There were nearly 5,000 there by the end of the colonial period. The first clash occurred over conscription in 1671: those who did not participate in militia drills were fined or imprisoned.[32]

Conscription policies continued in North Carolina through the French and Indian War and into the 1750's when the Regulator Movement sprung up there in protest to heavy taxation and property confiscation. Occasional demands were made by the Royal Government for use of provisions belonging to Quakers, and the Friends frequently did not comply. By 1771, the North Carolina legislature began to grant complete exemptions if Friends could supply Certificates of Membership in Good Standing from a recognized Meeting.[33]

Friends in Virginia suffered during the French and Indian War. The legislature imposed a fine of 100 pounds of tobacco for each militia drill missed by eligible men. The Quakers' anti-violent creed prohibited their participation in the protection of national security and caused the group untold problems during colonial days. The problem of dealing

with conscription was both an internal and an external problem. Internally, the problem was one of the discipline of the members of the group and the determination to resist conforming to the wider community norm in times of war.

During the Revolution throughout the colonies, Quakers were punished for offenses from vague accusations of Toryism to specific crimes such as refusal of military service, non-payment of taxes, refusal to take a loyalty oath, refusal to accept Continental money, and general "non-associating".

A graphic account of the treatment received by a conscientious objector during the Revolution is found in the manuscript minutes of the New Garden Monthly Meeting:

> Account of the suffering of Stephen Howel, a young man belonging to New Garden Monthly Meeting. He was taken on the 17th of the 4th month 1778 by several armed men who were by order of Andrew Boyd called Sublieutennant collecting fines said to be to hire substitutes to serve two months in the militia in the room of such as refused to go themselves or send others. On which account they demanded fifty two pounds ten shillings of Stephen (tho' he had not been called upon to go nor had any account of such demand before) which he refusing to pay they had him before said Boyd and he ordered him under guard to a magistrate and being taken to Lancaster he was had before several under that character one after another who used many persuasions for him to pay the demand and not go to prison which he steadily refusing (as being inconsistent with his religious principles) was at last took to the house of the under-burgess and kept at the door by one of the guards while the other went in and procured the following order Viz "To the Gaoler for the County of Lancaster. This is to command you in the name of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to receive the body of Stephen Howel into your custody and him safely keep until you receive further orders. Given under my hand and seal this 19th day of April 1778. Henry Dehuff."

> (Seal) And being conducted there when he entered the prison he felt such sweetness of mind as encouraged him to persevere on in suffering for the testimony of a good conscience. He was kept close prisoner upwards of three months and favoured to bear his confinement with a good degree of patience and resignation. Several Friends being then on a visit to men in office found the said Dehuff under some exercise of mind for his conduct in this case and being treated with he readily ordered Stephen's release without any demand for fees or otherwise.[34]

The effects of the War on the Friends were mixed. Some Quakers had claimed total support for the British; some had supported the rebels, and some had maintained the absolute prohibition of the sect against any connection with physical fighting. It is probably true that the majority did not support either side and that punishment received was unjust. The Revolution was not the first war in which Quakers had refused to participate.[35]

Quaker Separateness

In the study of a group such as the Quakers, it may be seen that the six measures of democracy[36] may be used too often in evaluation of experiences such as those of the Quakers of Georgia. It is too simple to blame a breakdown in the democratic system for the plight of the group rather than to look within the group for factors which led to eventual withdrawal from the community as well. When using the democratic code as a measure, the conditions of living in a frontier settlement of a mixed population seem to overwhelm the capacity of a closed group to function there. Consequently, the community may be blamed when the short-

comings actually existed also within the group which was experiencing setbacks on many fronts; violent attacks by Indians, marauders, rejection over the arms issue, and economic pressure from slaveholding farmers. Rather than look only outward, it is necessary also to search within the structure of the group for reasons for failure to co-exist.

The Quakers organized themselves to live apart from society itself. When outside influences caused a member to "deviate from" the accepted course set by the group, the member was disciplined by the group. He or she was caused to repent and was readmitted only in the case of self-condemnation of an act contrary to the chosen way. In the case of the Quakers, they were quick to show that they were willing to discipline a leader who deviated, as when Joseph Maddock encouraged the militia raising and when he misappropriated funds bound for the group as a whole. Yet, in fact, Maddock was probably typical of the membership as a whole as evidenced from the reading of the Monthly Minutes. He chose to leave North Carolina over an issue that bothered many Friends in the area, confiscation of property. He spoke for most Quakers when he supported the Royal Government which had been the benefactor of the Friends when they migrated to Georgia.[37]

The legitimacy of the authority of the Meeting came from its point of origin. The organization was formed as a protective or reactionary group; it set up its own power structure to protect the group from outside influences. The

interdisciplinary measures were created to maintain group cohesiveness and to preserve ideological purity for the community who chose to call themselves Quakers.

By functioning within themselves and by forsaking the outside world's affairs -- as exhibited by the refusal to involve themselves in government -- the Friends displayed the trait of living in a broader society but not being "of the world". The limitations of the practicality of this stance must be surveyed in respect to the conscription crisis faced by the Friends during the Revolutionary Period.

Common disasters linked the Quakers with their secular neighbors who were willing to fight to seek order. When the Friends were unable because of doctrine to participate in the common war effort and other activities thought to be necessary for surviving and succeeding on the frontier, what was the effect on their non-Quaker neighbors who questioned the right of these people to maintain their position as a viable and valid part of the settlement? When a group is questioned by its cohabitants as to the validity of its claim to existence in a peaceful and undisturbed state, the group must be able to justify its intentions. The Quakers had great difficulty with this, as evidenced by the fact that they were forced to appeal to the militia for protection repeatedly. By appealing, did they actually show approval of methods of force? The question could be answered positively. Does it matter whose hand delivers the blow, or who sanctions the blow?

The Militia Dilemma

Meeting Minutes reveal that the Friends realized that settlement required military protection because of the threat of Indian attack. A consensus was reached early in the colonial period that a conscripted militia was the most workable solution for non-Quaker settlements. Quakers in Pennsylvania kept a militia from being formed until 1747, but the Quaker colony was the exception. Non-Quaker settlers were particularly suspicious of a mercenary army of long term soldiers which could become a dangerous factor when used by a dictator. They felt that an army of citizens served best the interest of the nation. A citizen's army makes sense for a democracy; it also runs against the idea of free will and individual choice. Though at the time of the later Civil War, both the North and the South were forced to use conscription, the practice was tainted by substitutions and exemptions.

The draft has become a controversial topic for over a century in this country. It is argued that post World War II inequities proved to be the undermining of the draft and led to its final abandonment.[38]

The militia dilemma faced by the Quakers of Wrightsborough was probably the most serious factor that caused the political intervention that did take place subsequently in the creation of the Commission which took control of the township from the Meeting in 1799. It is probably true that the nonparticipation in the Revolutionary action in the

backcountry area prompted a permanent loss of tolerance by the non-Quaker element of Wrightsborough.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER II

[1]G. Lane Van Tassell, Lecture Notes from Seminar, "Human Rights and Minority Politics", Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia (April, 1982).

[2]Vernon Van Dyke, "The Civil Rights of Peoples", Universal Human Rights 2:2 (April-June, 1980):1-21.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Hannah Arendt, The Human Condition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1958), p. 186.

[5]William Korey, "Discrimination", Anti-semiticism (Jerusalem: Ketter Books, 1974), p. 135.

[6]Ted Adorno, the Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950), p. 12.

[7]Ibid., p. 36.

[8]Ibid., p. 43.

[9]Ibid., p. 100.

[10]Bryan Wilson, Religious Sects (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 1.

[11]Rufus Jones, The Quakers in the American Colonies (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1962), p. xvii.

[12]Wilson, p. 19.

[13]Yizhak Heinemann and Joshua Gutmann, "Antisemiticism", Antisemiticism, p. 28.

[14]Ibid., p. 53.

[15]Adorno, pp. 2 - 10.

[16]Leon Poliakov, "Eleven Protocols of the Elders of Zion", Antisemiticism (Jerusalem: Ketter Books, 1974), p. 135.

[17]Ibid., 135.

[18]Jones, p. xiv.

[19]James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., Contending Theories of International Relations (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1981), p. 99.

[20]Michael Shamir and John Sullivan, "The Political Context of Tolerance", The American Political Science Review 77:44 (December, 1983):912.

[21]Ibid., p.914.

[22]Ibid., p. 912.

[23]Ibid., p. 925.

[24]Peter Brock, Pacifism in the United States (Princeton: University Press, 1968), p. 13.

[25]Ibid., p. 238.

[26]Ibid., p. 55.

[27]Daniel J. Boorstin, The Americans: The Colonial Experience (New York, n. p., 1964), p. 63.

[28]Brock, p. 157.

[29]Ibid., p. 158.

[30]Ibid., p. 186.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid., p. 66.

[33]Ibid., p. 251.

[34]Brock, p. 240.

[35]William Wade Hinshaw, The Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy 1 (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1936):1042.

[36]Van Tassell.

[37] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes. On microfilm, Guilford College Quaker Collection, Guilford, North Carolina.

[38] John O'Sullivan and Alan M. Meckler. The Draft and Its Enemies (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1974), p. 18.

CHAPTER THREE

PROJECT RESEARCH METHODS

The research to establish the nature of the events which occurred at Wrightsborough when the Quakers lived there for a short span of time in the late 1700's is mainly a task involving primary work. It is hardly possible to find a single source which outlines the experience of the group from start to finish. Therefore, reliance upon secondary sources is not possible. The hypothesis upon which the search is founded and which asserts that other factors were present in addition to the ostracism by the community is validated by evidence found mainly in primary sources which also help to establish a political tie to the relationship between group and community forces within the settlement at Wrightsborough.

Research and Validity

Research reveals an at least partial picture of the way things really were at Wrightsborough. The description of reality as it is perceived in hindsight is dangerous because prejudgement is involved. Research methods and the analysis of information should be objective in approach to avoid the shading of issue-oriented problems.[1]

The methods used in this project to evaluate the hypothesis were required to be chiefly historic in approach. Objective treatment of the hypothesis requires that the pure case for ostracism be presented and assessed through the process of inspection of collected data. After elimination of the pure ostracism hypothesis, a new, alternative hypothesis may be formed alleging that the Quakers were forced to migrate for other reasons than solely community pressure. The fit of this alternate hypothesis with the historical data can then be assessed.

A major threat encountered in the historical approach is the inferential factor; the possibility that the researcher's logic is wrong because of judgmental decisions is present. To assume that the Quakers were a persecuted group from the beginning of the settlement could cause major problems in analyzing their situation and in evaluating their eventual solution to their problems in Georgia. To make a judgment about the policy decisions of the Friends, it is necessary to test the assumptions about them. Did they encounter the same problems in other areas of America? Were their reactions similar in other instances? Does the final conclusion about the migration to the West exhibit reliability?

Secondary Works

The initial investigation is a search of library sources followed by a synthesis of available data from all

sources centering on the ostracism theme. The kinds of written records include biographies, genealogies, local histories and the many Quaker histories which exist that detail the general experiences of the group from its inception. Early reference to Hinshaw's description of the various Monthly Meetings in his Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy shows there was a general tide of settlement of Quakers moving southward from Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia through North and South Carolina into Georgia and then on to the Western lands which were opened in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. This documentation in secondary form gives root to the thesis that the Quakers at Wrightsborough were mainly following a set pattern of migration established after the failure of the Pennsylvania experiment.[2]

Cashin's local histories of the Augusta, Georgia area are important for gaining insight into the non-Quaker element of the backcountry in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The general economy is outlined, and the various military actions of the Revolution are chronicled there. The works of Pearl Baker on the Columbia-McDuffie County area serve as a medium of cohesiveness, tying the Quakers into the early development of the colony of Georgia. These local histories help to piece together the actual sequence of events and give insight into the views held by the non-Quakers toward the sect. The above related accounts portray an almost congenial climate between the Friends and the

community.

When looking into secondary source material concerning later conscription controversies during the Civil War period, it seems evident that attitudes concerning pacifist opinions became less tolerant after the early 1800's. Almost all sources pertaining to the Civil War and the Friends' refusal to fight described hardships and punishments encountered. This data is in sharp contrast to the information about tolerance of the anti-war position held by the Friends during the Revolution.[3]

The works of John Woolman and Rufus Jones are necessary to any project involving the analysis of important questions relating to Quakers in America -- the two authors represent very different time perspectives, and both reveal important insights into the overall Quaker philosophy which led to the formation of public opinion about them.

Primary Sources

A reference to the evidences of History shows that evidence exists in two forms: records and relics.[4] A complete study of records of the Wrightsborough Friends may be conducted in several locations: on site near Thomson, Georgia; at Augusta College in the Reese Library at Augusta, Georgia; at Guilford College, North Carolina, where there is a complete collection of Quaker records and works stored in the Quaker Collection. This latter collection includes Minutes from the Yearly, Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of the various groups of Friends who settled in the South. The

Georgia Historical Society in Savannah, Georgia holds microfilmed copies of the Georgia Gazette.

Original documentation found in Allen Candler's The Colonial Records of Georgia includes the letters to the Royal Governor at Savannah in reference to the issues of loyalty to the Crown prior to the outbreak of the Revolution, the appeal for military protection from the Indian thefts and attacks, requests for support, forts and new roads. The original land grant and a list of the first forty settlers is also found in Candler's work.

William Bartram's Travels Through North and South Carolina, East and West Florida is a contemporary work of the period which is important because the Wrightsborough area is described by Bartram in reference to the basic geography and the natural life of the area; he also refers to the general lifestyle and specific names of settlers of the town. Cross reference may be made between Bartram and the mention of names and places in the Minutes.

The county records of Columbia County, Georgia are readily accessible in the Reese Library at Augusta and include extensive references to land grants and land transactions among the Quakers at Wrightsborough. These records were compiled by Pearl Baker. A study of these transactions shows how important the acquisition of land was to the Elders and the members of the Meeting. To disregard the factor of the enticing land grant system in America during that period would be a serious exclusion in the effort to

gain perspective about motivation to migrate.

Significance of the Meeting Minutes

Written evidence is available in the form of manuscripts and printed material, some published and some unpublished.[5] The most obvious source are the original Meeting Minutes of the groups at Wrightsborough, Bush River and New Garden, South Carolina. These minutes recorded the monthly, quarterly and yearly meetings of the Friends in the area, and it is possible to read of the everyday happenings in the lives of the settlers in the minutes. The issues of war and slavery are widely dealt with in these papers, and discussion of the problems are quoted along with the official pronouncements of the Elders.

The minutes are available on microfilm from Guilford and are the most revealing sources used. The interaction within the group is evident in reading the minutes; the disciplinary measures are listed, and reactions are recorded. Nearing the end of the settlement period, the pressures within the group become evident, particularly those involving loss of control of the group. The reaction of the leaders to the war, non-Quaker settlers, Indians, slavery and the general economic depression is voiced in the Meeting Minutes. The weight placed upon the various external pressures is easily gauged from reading the Quaker records. The direction which the research takes is mainly influenced by the Minutes.

Classification of Primary Sources

The evidence which is available in the form of relics is of major importance to work on the project at Wrightsborough. It is surprisingly available on site. This is due to the fact that much of the original Quaker grant remains on private property. This land has remained undeveloped and in the same families for generations and has been protected by the local Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation at Thomson, Georgia. Relics include graves, letters, original minutes, literature, documents, business records and monuments. Also included in the relics category would be: language, customs, institutions, tools and other physical artifacts.

Relics found at Wrightsborough are in the form of the ruins of the actual settlement. The site study which was commissioned by the Quaker Foundation there is helpful in gaining a geographical bearing when walking over the former settlement lands. Maps of the area are readily available, and relationships between various ruins and original building foundations can easily be visualized by the use of these maps. One of the dangers in the use of the maps and early written accounts is the temptation to draw unproven conclusions about the location of early structures because of the convenience factor. Roads and streams in the area are easily traversed, making exploration inviting to the researcher. It may be necessary to stand at the original site of Maddock's mill at Sweetwater to gain the perspective

of the original settlers there.

The geographical factor became evident when studying maps of the Old Indian Trail which ran through the area and crossed Sweetwater Creek where Maddock decided to put the first mill, and, according to Edward Cashin, this got the settlement off to an unfortunate beginning. By locating directly in conflict with Indian passage, the Quakers could not relax their worry over Indian hostility and were forced to move further inland to the present site of Wrightsborough. The second Maddock Mill site is very much still in evidence archeologically. It is possible to visualize the entire operation from the remains which still exist onsite at the Stone Dam at the ford on Maddock's Creek. Comparing an existing mill in Guilford, North Carolina with the remains of Maddock's Mill makes it evident that the two operations were probably identical since the construction is similar. The mill at Guilford was built by a contemporary of Joseph Maddock, and it is logical to assume that Maddock would copy a successful mill for himself.

When confronted with the historical evidence needed for in depth study of the Wrightsborough experience, the element of common sense becomes major in importance. Verification is a leading concern when several accounts of the colony conflict. A point of contention in data is the actual Quaker population count of the township when it was in its prime. Historians have falsely placed the figure at twelve hundred which is probably a reflection of the total popula-

tion. both Quaker and non-Quaker. There were most likely between two and four hundred Quakers there.

Personality Studies

Personality also becomes important in studying the group; it is obvious that the leadership should be carefully analyzed in regard to the fate of the colony - the entrepreneur did exist among the Friends, and motives become extremely important in the accessment of the motivation to migrate from Wrightsborough.

It was necessary to do some study of group and leadership motivation to comprehend the implications of the cohesiveness factor of the Meeting and the role of powerful leadership of the elders.

Evaluation of Data

The main question in this project is to determine the effect of internal pressures on the group in Georgia as well as to assess the external pressures. Data regarding the influence of leadership, visiting preachers, edicts from quarterly and yearly meetings and historic records about the motives for the western move lead the researcher to point to some ingroup motivation for the move. It is necessary to look at the basic attitudes of the Friends and their contemporaries during the time period involved. The demographics of frontier life in a small, harsh settlement where survival is constantly threatened are important to consider. Did geography greatly influence the plight of Friends or was

leadership the important factor? How much effect did persecution over pacifism have? Was the inability to own slaves detrimental economically to the point that the Friends were forced to leave the community?[6]

The leadership within the group was an important factor in considering motivation. The elders determined most policy for both religious and community problems according to the Monthly Meeting Minutes. David Truman, a realist in his study of groups and group leadership, maintains that it is necessary to assume that the interest of the group is the same as the interest of the leader.[7] The biographical material available on both Maddock and Sell reveals that the two men had different roles in the Wrightsborough community, but that they both displayed the characteristics of the 18th century entrepreneur. Leaders want to maintain themselves in position, but this is not detrimental to the group -- they want more group cohesion, therefore, they are strengthening to group unity which was so important to the Quakers. Threats to the group come most often from internal conflict -- not external forces. It is obvious that one should look for internal conflict within the group of Friends. Not only do leaders represent their groups, but groups are usually reflective of the same qualities which their leaders possess. The popular will of the Friends was represented through the actions of the elders. Study of the Minutes reveals the relationship between the Friends and their response to the leadership during the crisis at Wrightsborough.

The Friends believed that their leaders were promoting the interest of the entire group; until discipline eroded over the bearing of arms, slavery and personal conduct, the group thrived at Wrightsborough. When the Minutes begin to reveal frequent causes for discipline, there is evidence of both the economic and political threat from outside elements such as harsh farming competition from non-Quakers using slave labor and the rising number of non-Quakers moving into the community which forced the Friends into a minority position in their own settlement.

Mancur Olson attacks the traditional group theory that small, primary groups and large associations function the same way and do not vary in character. He argues that in a small group, the greater the likelihood that the benefits will be more available to a member, therefore, the smaller the group, the greater the chance to share -- the larger the group, the greater the chance of collective benefits falling short.[8] He also says that it is not always true that individuals within a group really tend to act to achieve the common group interest.[9] If the members act to achieve their own interest, they will not be devoted to achieving group goals, and unless there is a strong coercion to force members to advance the common interest, fracture will occur. The discipline of the Meeting exerted a strong degree of coercion on the Quakers, and was effective in maintaining group cooperation until it

broke down with the conditions of war. When members were willing to accept being read out of the Meeting as a consequence of betraying doctrine, the act itself lost effectiveness.[10]

In summary, it may be said that sources of an historical nature and of general political theory[11] regarding groups are the two main kinds of data compiled in the project. The episode at Wrightsborough itself should become a fairly easily studied model of group and community conflict. The methods of analysis involve both the study of theory and fact.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER III

[1]Phillip Green and Sanford Levinson, Power and Community (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 26.

[2]William Wade Hinshaw, The Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1936), p. 1042.

[3]Margaret H. Bacon, The Quiet Rebels: The Story of the Quakers in America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969), pp. 102-121. Margaret E. Hirst, The Quakers in Peace and War (New York: George H. Doren Co., 1923), pp. 416-451. Edward Needles Wright, Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1961), pp. 1-33; Thomas E. Drake, Quakers and Slavery in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1050), pp. 150-151, 82-83, 198-199.

[4]Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, The Modern Researcher (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970), p.127.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., and Edward Cashin, Lecture, Augusta College, Augusta, Georgia, (November, 1983).

[7]Green, pp. 112-113.

[8]Mancur Olson, The Logic of Collective Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 34.

[9]Ibid., p. 2

[10]Robert T. Golembiewski, The Small Group in Political Science (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1978), passim. A collection of essays.

[11]Ibid.

CHAPTER FOUR

EVIDENCE RELATING TO VARIANCES IN THE WRIGHTSBOROUGH QUAKERS' EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES

In the original Georgia Charter granted by King George II, June 9, 1732, it was provided that "there shall be liberty of conscience allowed in the worship of God to all persons; all persons except papists shall have a free exercise of religion, so they will be contented with the quiet and peaceable enjoyment of the same."[1] In general, the Trustees endeavored to establish Religious tolerance in the colony as official policy. They did not exhibit personal prejudice, and freedom of worship was stressed as an attribute of the colony.[2] The religious policy of the colonial administration actually promoted such reforms as the education of the ordinary colonists and the distribution of charity as poor relief.[3] Overall, the climate in Georgia was one which was favorable to the migration of the Friends in North Carolina who were seeking new land and refuge from the confiscations and unusual fees for the support of the military protection in the colony of North Carolina.[4] The Quakers were welcomed to Georgia when they applied for grants.

When Joseph Stubbs appealed to the Governor on behalf of "sundry families, at present resident in Orange County in the Province of North Carolina but lately from Pennsylvania, setting forth that they were desirous to remove into and become settlers in this Province, and praying that a reserve of land for that purpose might be made for a certain time,"[5] the answer read, "It is ordered that a reserve be made for the petitioners until the first day of February 1768, of 12,000 acres of land adjoining the Indian line from Little River; and in case ten families of them by that time, come in, apply for and settle upon the said lands, then a further reserve shall be made of the residue of the said 12,000 acres until the 1st day of January 1769."[6]

Joseph Maddock received the first individual tract, and he and Jonathan Sell received a grant for 500 acres in trust for the group of Quakers who would be moving to Georgia.[7] He brought with him many more families than the required number.

Quaker Organization

The Friends maintained their unity through various moves, migrations and troubles by adhering to the strict organizational structure which they had devised.

Monthly Meetings

The system began on a local level with the Monthly Meeting. Friends in a community began a regular meeting and built a meeting house which was centrally

located; more than one meeting house could be located in an area. The business of worship and community affairs was handled at least once a month at the Monthly Meeting which really became the community or town meeting for the Friends who discussed church matters as well as local business at the Meeting. It was a device which they had devised which helped maintain control of the town's affairs.

Quarterly Meetings

Since settlements of Friends tended to be in concentrated areas and were separated by distances of twenty, thirty or forty miles, it was necessary to have area meetings to maintain contact with other meetings. Therefore, the Quarterly Meeting evolved. At least four times a year, representatives of the area Monthly Meetings would come together at a central location for a Quarterly Meeting. There they would conduct important business and share experiences as well as hear traveling Friends who ministered to the widespread members of the Society.

The Yearly Meeting

These Monthly and Quarterly Meetings would have representatives report to a Yearly Meeting which met once a year to transact important Quaker business and to set new policy.[8] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting belonged to New Garden Quarterof North Carolina Yearly Meeting once the community was firmly established.

Meetings were usually named for townships, waterways or some other natural feature of the town or countryside.[9] Wrightsborough was named in honor of Governor James Wright who granted the petition allowing the Quakers to settle the colony.[10] This example of loyalty and gratitude to the Crown is typical of the Quakers' attitude toward the Royal authorities in Savannah.

A Traveling Letter was granted by the Meetings to various ministers who had the right to apply to different groups to whom they wished to preach. The Meeting had the right to accept or to reject the offer. This accounts for the "traveling minister" phenomenon referred to so often. The Quakers had no paid ministers.

Reactions to Problems

From the time of settlement until 1774, the Quakers appealed to the Governor and Council at Savannah on many occasions. The most important matters were the complaints against the Indians and the appeals for physical needs such as a road and a fort.

Indian Attack

The Quakers are known for their peaceable disposition, and their basic attitude toward the American Indians was one of compatibility and coexistence. In the Wrightsborough area, there were both Creeks and Cherokees. The Lower Indian Trading Path was traveled frequently and bordered the southern edge of the Quaker grant; to the south and east,

the Indians were primarily Creeks. To the north were the Cherokees who had been pushed further and further West by the encroachments in Georgia and South Carolina. Actually, the settlement was enclosed on three sides by Indians who moved freely around the area. The initial assumption was an unrealistic one of assuming that the land could be formally received by treaty without problems from the former inhabitants. Edward Cashin recounts the unfortunate chain of events as a poor choice of location for the Friends. He relates that white settlers were encouraged by the Royal Government to come into the area while allowing and urging the Indian population to engage in a trade which took them along the Indian Trail on the southern edge of the Wrightsborough township.[11] Trouble was inevitable.

Problems with the Indians mostly arose from thefts; the Indians simply took what they found available of the settlers' property. Fear of Indian attacks escalated, and in 1773, a skirmish occurred between twenty-five whites and one hundred and fifty Indians. Five men were killed with one dying at Wrightsborough.

Several private forts and dwellings were burned by the Lower Creeks, and this incident caused great alarm among the Friends.[12] In 1769, there had been such a complete loss of stock that planting was nearly impossible, and twenty-five families left the area in 1771. Thirteen of these returned, but the situation deteriorated to the point that some of the Friends themselves suggested forming a militia of their own

to protect their property. In the first five years of settlement, the government contributed one hundred pounds for the protection of Wrightsborough, plus fifty pounds for a fort.[13]

The Colonial Records state:

> His excellency laid before the board a letter this day, received from Edward Barnard, Esq.:...acquainting his Excellency, in the fact that a party of Creeks, Creek Indians, had taken a number of horses from the Quaker settlement, had been pursued and come up with; and instead of the people getting their horses again, the Indians had treated them very ill, expressing the fear that nothing less than severe treatment would be sufficient to curb the insolence of such renegade villains; unless their insolence was soon curbed, that promising settlement would soon be left completely destroyed and further setting forth that the disagreeable situation of the people as by the loss of the horses, being deprived of raising provisions for a season.[14]

On January 14, 1774, there was an attack by the Coweta Creeks on Sherrill's Fort to the west of Wrightsborough. Settlers were surprised while building a stockade, and William Sherrill and two others were killed immediately. The remainder of the group took refuge in a barn and held off their assailants all day until help arrived. Seven of the twenty settlers at the fort were killed and five were wounded while only five Creeks died. Near panic resulted from this incident. In January, 1774, a relief force was ambushed by a Lower Creek war party.[16]

During 1774, continuing Indian raids threatened to disrupt the settlement. The following two letters found by Pearl Baker attest to this problem, this time probably

involving Cherokees:

> My sisters and their families journeyed about 300 miles to Mr. Maddock's settlement in Georgia. They lived in peaceable possession of their homes, undisturbed by the natives, until there was a new purchase of land made by the government, with which the Indians were dissatisfied. (Mrs. Price refers to the 1773 Ceded Lands Treaty.) My brothers-in-law bought land in it. It was considered very good land, so they cleared it, and sowed it with grain, but due to Indian raids, they decided not to reside on it. They left it, but when the grain ripened, they went to gather it. The distance not being far from their home in Wrightsborough, Sister Tamar (Kirk-Menmdenhall), her husband, Phineas, and three sons went to reap, leaving their daughters at home.
>
> Early one morning, Tamar went to milk a cow they had taken wirth them, and while she was so engaged, the Indians attacked, killing her and her eldest son, taking her youngest son captive. The father and other son escaped. The Indians were good to the boy, adopted him, and kept him for two years. When some traders ransomed him, he had become so fond of Indian life, he did not want to return home. (letter by Rachel Kirk)

A letter was also written from Wrightsborough in 1777 from Daniel Williams,

> I got liberty to move into an empty cabin.... While there I dealt with a man for 100 acres of land in the old purchase....There were about seven acres cleared, a nice house just built, and about forty bearing peach trees. I grubbed and cleared five acres ready to plant in corn, and now have ten acres planted. The country is very fertile, our one discouragement is the raids by the savages who, every year, cause some part of the settlement to break, although it is hard for them to penetrate above two or three miles within the English boundaries. Yet, it is astonishing to see how rapidly the country is settled and inhabited, which was eleven years ago, a wild uninhabited wilderness. We have generally good water, and clear, wholesome air in the middle of summer....[16]

The Quakers had early established a reputation for charitable attitudes toward the local Indians, and they managed somehow to maintain this attitude in spite of the occasional conflict with the Creeks and Cherokees. An analysis of the 1793 Book of Discipline requests that "Friends should not purchase or remove to settle such lands as have not been fairly and openly first purchased from the Indians". In 1795, the Baltimore Yearly Meeting set up the Permanent Committee for Indian Affairs which would help displaced and harassed tribes.[17] Great cause for tension was the Trading Path location in the area relative to the town of Wrightsborough. The personal fear experienced by the local population at Wrightsborough was intermittent and did not serve as the main deterrent to further settlement.

The Militia Problem

Wrightsborough reached its peak about 1775, just before the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. The political turmoil was gathering and would have devastating effects on the backcountry settlers. Before the War ended, there would be massive poverty, disruption of the economy, and many people would move out of the area permanently. Churches were destroyed, and congregations split; schools were shut down, and businesses went broke. The ill will created over the militia issue in Wrightsborough was probably the most damaging factor to the future of the Meeting.

According to George Fox, the "answering that of God in everyone" is the principle of the whole Quaker theory of

social behavior. The "God in everyone" cannot be answered by any form of violence, physical or psychological, because violence taints not only flesh, but the inner spirit. The "God" in every man can be appealed to in order to discourage violence (war).[18] Learning to heed the Christ Within had taken away the causes of war.

The devotion of the Friends to the Peace Testimony was severely tested by the war, and the New Garden Meeting issued the following declaration in 1780:

> We of the Yearly Meeting standing Committee met at New Garden the 11th day of the Eighth Month 1780.
>
> To the Quarterly and several Monthly Meetings which Constitute the same.
>
> Dear Friends and Brethren under an humbling sense of the many Calamities that now abound in our Land, and the prevailing difficulties which we as a people are likely to be surrounded with; are drawn forth in Brotherly sympathy to salute you with desires that we may all be preserved in an humble Resignation of Mind to the divine Will we have apprehended our minds have been at this time favoured in a degree with the calming influence of Truth in deliberating on some weighty and important subjects wherein our spirits have been nearly united. Therefore we do give this forth as our solid Advice and Judgment, that we believe all Friends ought to be faithfully engaged for the support and maintaining of our Peaceable Testimony by an honest refusal to act or willingly comply with any Regulations or Demands made by men in supporting or carrying on Wars or the Shedding of Blood; for we are fully persuaded that those that as actively comply in the least degree therein have manifestly deviated from our Principles and will suffer loss thereby.[19]

Some of the Quakers held loyalist sympathies, but most of them remained quiet on the issue.[19] The Meeting decided it was necessary to send a message to the Governor affirming

the loyalty of the group to the government in power. In a letter to the Governor at Savannah, Maddock and forty other important citizens stated their opposition to the move for liberation from England.

> We, the inhabitants of the town of Wrightsborough and places adjacent, understanding that fourteen persons have drawn up several resolutions respecting the disputes between Great Britain and the town of Boston, concerning the destroying of a quantity of tea, the property of the East India Company, and have published them as the act of the Province, and which we look upon as a great imposition, having no knowledge of them 'till after they were passed: Therefore we do, in this public manner, deny passing any concerning them, and disapprove them altogether, such as a few acting without their knowledge, we apprehend being contrary to the rights and privileges of every British subject.[20]

The Quakers remembered that the British in Savannah had gladly granted land to their sect. When they had appealed for a road, the Quaker Road had been built. It seemed unthinkable that the Friends would have any reason to violate their Peace Testimony.

Joseph Maddock was the most prominent Loyalist. When a British agent arrived in Wrightsborough in 1779, he was aided by Maddock in procuring volunteers for the British militia. When Augusta was occupied by Loyalists, Maddock was one of a group of Friends sent to meet with the commanding officer. He was eventually arrested by the Rebels and imprisoned for these activities. Maddock was released in 1780 and returned to Wrightsborough to see the British regain and again lose control of the area. The

Rebels who finally took over were led by a former Wrightsborough Quaker, Josiah Dunn.[21]

Edward Cashin quotes The Royal Gazette in its description of Dunn:

> A set of the most barbarous wretches that ever infested any community, amounting, some say, to 200, others 250, lately crossed the Savannah from the Northward, surprised and murdered several Loyalists at Wrightsborough and on the Ceded Lands, stripping their families of the necessities of life....One Dunn, a notorious horse thief, a a Major Williamson and Samuel Stirk are said to be the leaders of these miscreants....(This reference actually refers to the men of Ellijah Clarke, leader of Rebel troops in the area. Clarke was ill with smallpox at the time of this raid, and command was lax.)[22]

The two men, Maddock and Dunn, represent the political divergence within the group of Friends itself.

In 1779, the Minutes begin to show individual opinion within the community shifting to support for the militia service among Friends. In April, 1779, William Benson was cited for "carrying arms in a warlike manner", as was James Barnes. John Carson was removed in the following way on January 6, 1782:

> Whereas John Carson Junior having a Right in Membership amongst friends but have deviated so far from the Principles of Truth in his own breast as to be guilty of bearing arms in a warlike manner; therefore for the Clearing of Truth and the Society from this Reproach this meeting Doth Testify against him and decleave him. This John Carson to be no longer a Member of our Religious Society until through Repentence and Amendment of Life he be Enabled to Condemn his Misconduct to the satisfaction of friends which our desire he may.[23]

There appears in the Minutes in April, 1780, complaints about illegal acts of the local militia which included thefts. Many of the conscripted militia were undisciplined and were prone to pilfering and violence. The Friends were in a position of not knowing who to trust and who would be in control in the near future. For some family heads, it was impossible to resist the need to supply self-protection to the community.

The group suffered from food shortages, severe weather and disease. The nature of the war in the backcountry was vicious. Marauders and "banditti" swept through the community burning and stealing. Tories murdered Whigs, and general chaos prevailed.[24]

The difficulties of maintaining the Peace Testimony were multiple. Pressure from the community to fight and disobedience from within the Meeting weakened the position of the Friends who wanted to maintain the pacifist position.

Results of the War

Many Quaker families and friends were divided by the Revolution. Among those disowned at Wrightsborough during the War were: John Jones, Amos Stuart, Evan Haines, Thomas Sell, Hollowell Sanders, James Moore, Jesse Embre, Nathan Stubbs and Isaac Stubbs. These individuals are named in the Minutes.

A typical reading out declaration was issued to William Benson:

> Whereas William Benson was educated in the way

> of Truth held forth by the people called Quakers, but for want of giving due heed to the attitude therein his own Breast have erred so far as to be guilty of carrying arms for the defense of his Person, gaming and playing with cards and officiating as a clerk of a Lottery, for which this Meeting disowns him from being any longer a member of our religious Society until he shall see his Errors and condemn this outgoings to the satisfaction of this Meeting.[25]

The general complaint of the community over the situation created by the War is voiced in a letter to the London Meeting for Sufferings in February of 1782:

> ...In the beginning of the present Commotions and Troubles in America, We seemed to be remarkable favoured for a considerable time, for although there were divers exercising authority, that Endeavoured to have Laws Enacted against us, to compel us to bear arms, and to fine us for not Mustering, Scouting, or going on Expedition (so called) with them, yet these fines were never Executed or Levied on us, there generally happening something in a remarkable way to stop the same.[26]

The war came at a disastrous time for the Friends in Wrightsborough. They had just established a community which was prospering in spite of obstacles created by the primitiveness of the country and the Indian threat. The economic despair caused by the war as well as the social censure created by pacifism were traumatic to the group. The decline of the town may be dated from the end of the War; the Tory leanings of the Friends would not be forgotten following the close of hostilities. Moreover, there were clear instances of the Quakers taking the British side and not remaining neutral. The policy of nonparticipation was voided by members of the group on many occasions. It cannot

be said that they truly remained out of the War while at Wrightsborough.

The old leader, Maddock, was accused of misappropriating funds intended for the persecuted Quakers. The Loyalist leaders at Wrightsborough had been forced to evacuate to Savannah after the Rebels took over, and London Friends donated 240 pounds for their relief. Maddock accepted the money on behalf of the group. Meanwhile, the North Carolina Yearly Meeting had sent funds for the same purpose to Wrightsborough and advised the group not to accept the money from London. Most of the Wrightsborough Quakers had been able to keep their homes, surviving the worst onslaughts of the War. The meeting still functioned, and it began an investigation of the dispersal of the funds received by Maddock in June, 1783. When he refused self-condemnation, there was a plan to appeal to the Quarterly Meeting. Before this happened, Maddock modified the letter of condemnation, and it was accepted by the Meeting. Maddock's role as a leader ended with this sad episode. He died at Wrightsborough just before the turn of the century.[27]

Reactions to Slavery

Among Quakers, John Woolman was the leading opponent to slavery. He maintained that it was contrary to the spirit of Christianity and that there could be no compromise on the issue.[28] Woolman was a very important influence on Friends of that period and still serves today as a notable writer

on Quaker thought concerning pacifism and charity.

Following the Revolution, tobacco was the major crop. using free labor, but with the cotton gin in 1793, slavery came to the backcountry. Friends did not allow the holding of slaves. In 1772, the Standing Committee of the Yearly Meeting declared that Slavery should be totally abolished:

> Being fully convinced in our minds and judgments beyond a doubt or scruple, of the great evil and abomination of the importation of Negroes from Africa...we are impressed with abhorrence and detestation against such a practice in a Christian community...Morality and true piety are much wounded where slave-keeping abounds, to the great grief of true Christian minds.[29]

It may have been a great temptation to use slave labor to compete with other area farmers, but this was expressly forbidden by the Meeting. In 1881, Amos Stuart was accused of trying to buy a Negro slave girl and was ordered to set her free at age 18. When Stuart was not agreeable, papers were prepared against him by the Meeting, and he was read out.[30]

There appear false hints of a conflict between religious declarations and the actual daily practice of slaveowning, but slaveholding was simply not tolerated in the Meeting. Naturally, the coastal sections of Georgia had sanctioned and benefited from the institution earlier than the frontier section. Yet with the spread of the cotton culture, slavery became a practical necessity to some farmers in the Wrightsborough area. Slavery had both an

economic and a social implication.[31] Economically, it proved to be profitable in the South.[32] The groups which could not sanction it, such as the Quakers, were in the position of being forced to compete economically at an unfair disadvantage. It is not really evident that this was true of the Quakers at Wrightsborough. Although some locals eventually owned slaves, the majority refused to disavow the ruling of the Yearly Meeting and refused to use slave labor. William Savery, traveling minister, went with Friends to Savannah and Augusta in 1791 on a mission to preach and council the Friends against advocation of slavery.[33]

People who held slaves were disowned by the group. It was also forbidden to hire another man's slave, so that form of labor was simply not available to the Quaker farmer. Friends were kept informed on the issue by traveling preachers such as Savery who came to Wrightsborough.[34]

Some Quaker historians have determined that the major cause for the move West was slavery. They trace the growth of opposition by Quakers and show the sequence of events which led them to the new lands. The major Meetings requested that the government implement a program of manumission, abolition and legal protection of freed slaves.[35] The Quakers at Wrightsborough were not directly involved in the national Quaker movement, but they were bound by the ruling of the Society and were forbidden from participation in the institution. The slavery issue simply served to put one more barrier between the Friends and their neighbors.

The Two Migrations

The Move in 1785

There were really two moves West; the first occurred in 1785 when Henry Jones led a group of forty families to Ohio. The motivation was prompted by the difficulties which had been encountered with the Indians and the War. It is easy to see that the temptation would have been great to move on to lands where grants were being distributed to those willing to travel there. The farmland was known to be cheap and fertile, and the first group from Wrightsborough joined the masses going into the Northwest. In the winter of 1780-81, at Wrightsborough, fifty people were killed by the raiders, and homes and barns (including Maddock's) were burned. This incident prompted a large number of the Friends to agree to leave with Henry Jones for Ohio. This large decrease in population caused by the departure of forty families had a weakening effect on the town.[36]

The Exodus of 1800-1803

The traveling preachers were the an influence promoting the move West. Zacharias Dicks was a prominent Quaker visionary between 1800 and 1804 and traveled throughout the South between 1800 and 1804 preaching prophecy of slave rebellion. John Belton O'Neal says of Dicks:

> The massacres of San Domingo were also fresh (in their minds). He warned the Friends to come out from slavery. He told them if they did not their fate would be that of the slaughtered islanders. This produced in a short time a panic and removals to Ohio

commenced.[37]

It is evident that the preaching did not actually cause the move because it had started before Dicks became known.[38] However, the kind of message that he carried could have influenced those who were already hostile to slavery and curious about the West.[39]

In the fall of 1802, a group of Quakers reached Ohio and settled near the Stillwater River, a branch of the Little Miami, and the settlement became known as West Branch Monthly Meeting. The settlers were primarily from Deep River in North Carolina, Bush River in South Carolina, and Wrightsborough. Bush River and Wrightsborough were almost void of any Quaker element after 1809 because so many of the towns' inhabitants left at once.[40]

Joshua Evans, visiting the Georgia meeting in 1797, remarked:

> I believe that the Lord hath a little remnant in these parts, who testify against slavery an are favored to keep themselves clear....Having visited near fifty families within the limits of the Monthly Meeting.[41]

Among the Carolina settlers who traveled to the Ohio river was a certain Borden Stanton who wrote to Friends at Wrightsborough on the proposal that they move to the Northwestern Territory. The letter, dated May 25, 1803 reads:

> Dear friends, Having understood by William Patten and William Hogan from your parts, that a number among you have had some thoughts and turnings of mind respecting a removal to this country; and, as I Make no doubt, you have had much struggling and many reasonings about the propriety of it; and also, considering the undertaking as a very

> arduous one, that you have been almost ready at times to be discouraged and faint in your minds; under a sense of which, I have felt a near sympathy with you. As it has been the lot of a number of us to undertake the work a little before you, I thought a true statement (for your information) of some of our strugglings and reasonings concerning the propriety of our moving; also of our progress on the way, and the extension of heavenly regard to usward; together with the progress of Friends, both temporally and encouragement to you in the arduous task you have in prospect.
>
> I may begin thus, and say that for several years Friends had some distant view of moving out of that oppressive part of the land, but did not know where until the year 1799; when we had an acceptable visit from some traveling friends of the western part of Pennsylvania. They thought proper to propose to friends for consideration, whether it would not be agreeable to best wisdom for us unitedly to remove north west of the Ohio river, to a place where there were not slaves held, being a free country. This proposal made a deep impression on our minds; and it seemed as if they were messengers sent to call us out, as it were from the Egyptian darkness (for indeed it seemed as if the land groaned under oppression) into the marvelous light of the glory of God...[42]

The effects of the conflicting influences on the Friends produced a extreme stress in the sect. The Quaker charities to the Indians were in direct contrast to the violence suffered at the hands of the natives. The violent demands of the War were contrary to the basic doctrine of pacifism. The temptation to compete agriculturally with slave labor was forbidden by the Yearly Meeting's advices against slaveholding. Pressures to stay pulled against the desire to move West for the acquisition of favorable new lands.

Personal Lives

Unpopularity is hard to bear, and the Friends built an excellent system of defense against the pressures of community to conform. Members were socialized to adhere to heavy discipline within the group, forcing out the influence of the outside world. "Truth...came to be a definite static thing....Not only did the ideas of the Society crystallize into static concepts of truth, the form of worship...became fixed and well-nigh unalterable."[43] The objective of living in simplicity required a strict set of rules which would eliminate choices in the life of a Quaker. In actuality, the Member became as stereotyped as any of the early Church institutions which Friends had originally opposed. They acquired and maintained a fixed form of dress and speech; they expressed a set attitude toward music and art; and marriage out of the faith was almost forbidden. The Quaker became a "type" and perhaps lost some of the sense of Truth which had been the original goal in establishing the denomination.[44]

Setting oneself apart purposely is what the Wrightsborough Meeting did in conformity with the Friends throughout the South. In so doing, they established their status as a minority both as a group and individually. A most extreme case of the requirement to self-discipline and to the rules about bearing arms occurred in Wrightsborough when a Member was disciplined when he had taken up a gun in the middle of the night to protect his homesite from raiders who

were burning his barn.[45] This would seem to serve as the ultimate example of binding oneself to the discipline of the church and subjugating personal interest in favor of the group's demands for purity of Christian practice.

General Conditions Surrounding the Friends

Life in the backcountry of Georgia was typical of the experiences encountered by all westward migrants. Settlements tended to be small towns like Wrightsborough which had a small artisan class and a group of small farmers who owned their own land. A large middle class dominated life in these settlements. Blacks were present as slaves, but by the end of the Revolution, Indians had removed further west in the state. The old colonial aristocracy declined after the war, and a great population change occurred when Tories left the area. There was an influx of people into the backcountry following 1790. The common man's lot was improved, and after the advent of the cotton culture in the backcountry, a new aristocracy was formed from the original small farmer element.[46] Upward social mobility was possible to any any Friend who would forsake the church and take up the ways of the world outside. The times were full of change and fluctuation; what had begun as a small, self-contained religious colony became a town with multiple elements and influences.

There was a great religious change in the state during the 1780`s which was constituted by the growth of the number of Baptists and Methodists in the backcountry. The Baptists

had a great following because of their emotional appeal, and they were able to gain many members from other denominations. Quakers left the sect to become Baptists or Methodists in many instances.[47] The setting was not conducive to the kind of life that the Friends wanted to secure for themselves, and the confusion that life in Wrightsborough near the end of the Revolutionary period created for them was too much to bear. When the group chose to set themselves apart and leave the area, they were not induced by their neighbors to stay.

General Effect and Reaction to Upheavals

The clash of events and populations at Wrightsborough can be drawn in terms of the inward/outward analysis. As early as 1757, John Woolman began the work which spread the peaceful attitude among Friends toward the American Indians. This was hard to maintain by the Friends at Wrightsborough when they were repeatedly attacked and had goods stolen from them by Indians. Even earlier settlers at Quaker Springs in 1754 had been forced to evacuate because of the violence with the Indians. The group had purchased its land from the Uchees, but could not hold it because of the territorial uprooting which the Creeks had undergone. Even though they attempted to gain the land legally, the Friends were driven from it in a violent manner. The intent to settle honorably failed, at least in terms of the long-term success of the community.

"Pretending" Quakers such as Edmund Grey harmed the name of the sect by using false pretenses to gain land grants in Georgia and failing to act in good faith in the settlement called Brandon. Clear identity as an honorable people living apart was threatened by such duplicity.

During the 1750's, Woolman began agitating for the prohibition of slaveholding by persuading the Philadelphia Meeting to condemn slavery. The stage was set for another future conflict for the Friends in Georgia. The choice of settling further south was an unfortunate one, for the Friends from Orange County would have to face the issue more there than they would have if they had moved more westward.

The practice of the Royal Government of allowing settlement by a defenseless group who had no knowledge of the Indian Trading Path situation set up an automatic setback for the initial Wrightsborough settlement at Sweetwater Creek. The difficulties of moving were prolonged as the group moved further west, seeking to escape conflict with the Indians traveling the Path. In spite of efforts to coexist, the Indian attacks in 1771 horrified the Friends, making self-defense a major question among the group. The move to request defense from the colonial government caused the query concerning the right or wrong of asking for militia protection. When the English fort was built, it is highly probable that Quakers aided in the construction which was against all church doctrine.

Another Indian attack in 1773 followed the Ceded Lands

Treaty with the Indians. This caused more contention between the Friends and the Indians.

Non-Quakers were given and sold land within the grant. This led to the eventual erosion of group unity by the effect of outside influences.

When Maddock was elected Clerk, the Friends actually put into power the man who would later forsake the principles of pacifism and honesty. This may have made the group appear weak in their neighbor's eyes.

After Wrightsborough managed against all obstacles of hostility and the trauma of settlement on the frontier to become a successful and thriving town, the Revolutionary War tore it apart. After the Declaration of Independence, the membership began to split over the bearing of arms issue. Members were disowned on a regular basis from 1775 until the end of the War because the Meeting would not tolerate warlike behavior, and the various offenders could not resist joining the fight. Every member who participated in the War helped to void the veracity of the Meeting and to destroy the Truth of the principle of non-violent intention as viewed by the rest of the community.

The letter to Governor Wright disclaiming sympathy with the Boston Tea Party set off a wave of suspicion toward the well-intentioned Quakers. Better to have remained silently neutral.

The traveling preachers came often to the town to oversee the condition of the Friends spiritually. After

they were gone, life was hard to bear on a day to day basis minding the edicts which were passed from meeting to meeting.

In 1777, Wrightsborough was forced to request more defense because the level of local war-related violence had increased. The shift of week to week control passed from Rebel to Loyalist forces at such a rate that it was impossible to determine the fate of the town for even one month. The "Time of Commotion and Trouble" was a truly difficult time of upset and upheaval, both in the community and within the Quaker group itself. It occasioned the initial trend of the young to question the church elders and set the stage for disobedience to occur. While the Meeting tried to maintain Unity, the community was torn apart by outside forces.

The burning of houses and barns, the stealing of livestock and destruction of property was undue punishment for the majority of group who had abided by the neutrality rule. When Wrightsborough was plundered in 1780, the Friends had no one to whom they might appeal. The local Rebel militia often persecuted the Quakers for their non-participation and blamed the whole group for the Tory support given by a few Friends. The Meeting did not take a strong lead when influential citizens expressed Loyalist sympathies openly, a mistake which led to the accusation of hypocrisy. It is not surprising that Henry Jones was able to successfully gather a large number of families together

who were anxious to leave in 1785 for the Northwest.

The incoming traveling ministers brought word after the War of the attractive western lands, while at the same time, they condemned the practice of slaveholding in the South. The influences of Charity Cook, Job Scott, Zachariah Ferris, Henry Hull, Joseph Cloud and William Savery cannot be minimized. Cloud was especially strong in this denunciation of the practice of slavery in the South, advocating a move West.

When taking stock of their entire situation, it is clear that the Quakers found the alternative of migration to Ohio more advantageous than rebuilding in Georgia. It was probably with characteristic Quaker eagerness and optimism that they set off on the journey in the early 1800's to leave the catastrophe of their settlement at Wrightsborough behind to gradually disappear.

Conclusions about Ostracism

It is indeed possible to assume that the Quakers migration from Georgia was a result of the conflict between the inward demands of the sect and the conditions of the outward world in which they were forced to live.

This alternate hypothesis is correct in stating that other factors caused Quaker migration rather than the ostracism conclusion alone. The very inward structure of the group suggests that fear existed that community rejection and competition would be forthcoming in most areas of the country. The sect was perpetually locked in to a continual

pattern of striving, rejection, and removal.[48] When reading the Minutes of the Monthly Meeting, it is obvious that the struggle was as much within the group as with the forces without. When control of the membership began to wane, the Elders apparently reacted with a decision to follow the migration solution.[49]

Though it is true that they received undeserved persecution as a sect from many quarters, it cannot be proven that this was the case in Georgia in the late 1700's, for it is a fact that the Quakers received particular favor in Georgia when it was a Royal colony. Many suffered during the Revolution, but many left the various Meetings to fight against the British.[50] The numbers of Members of the Meetings were reduced by the controversy.

The Quakers of colonial times were astonishingly resilient and were willing to gather their belongings and search on for the perfect setting for their way of life in another place. They exhibited little fear of the wild and proved to be excellent settlers for the frontier because of their good relations with the Indians.[51] Much attention is given to their pacifist views; perhaps this is due to the most recent trend toward arms control, and it is true that they are the best known "peace" group. However, their chief attribute remains their deep religious commitment to peace within the individual. Much is said in Meeting Minutes about members' self-realization and confession of sin by members in the company of their peers. Little mention is given to secular

affairs in these Minutes. It appears that the migration was a contemplated choice made under the influence of other Friends rather than a forced expulsion by the community. There is ever present this constant push/pull of the secular against the philosophical within the Quaker world.

It is important to note that during the Twentieth Century, the Quakers have again regained their reputations as important pacifists. They have become more assertive in their anti-war stance and have made pacifism more than just a matter of doctrine; they have taken up the arms protest and have become a most vocal minority on the issue of peace.[52]

It remains that self-determination must achieve a balance with national interest at some point if a group is to survive within a national system. It is unlikely that the right of the Quakers to preserve their culture was truly guaranteed in colonial America anywhere. All perspectives of freedom were not achieved in the Georgia backcountry nor at any time by the Quakers due to the conflict factor involved in any holiness cause.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER IV

[1]Alex M. Hitz, "The Wrightsborough Quaker Town and Township in Georgia" The Bulletin of Friends Historical Association 46 (1957):10.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Linley S. Butler, North Carolina and the Coming of the Revolution, a Booklet published at Rockingham Junior College, on file at Guilford College Library, Guilford, North Carolina, p. 6.

[5]Allen D. Candler, The Colonial Records of Georgia, XXVII (Atlanta: Chase P. Byrd, State Printer, 1914):126.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., pp. 553, 694.

[8]Seth B. Hinshaw, Carolina Quakers (Greensboro, North Carolina: North Carolina Yearly Meeting, 1971), p.27.

[9]Algie Newlin, in an interview, Guilford College, Guilford, North Carolina (August, 1983).

[10]William Wade Hinshaw, Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy Volume 1 (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1936), p. 1042.

[11]Edward J., Jr. Lecture, Augusta College, Augusta, Georgia (November, 1983).

[12]Charles Colcock Jones and Salem Dutcher, Memorial History of Augusta, Georgia (Syracuse, New York: D. Mason and Co., Publishers, 1890), p. 53.

[13]Hitz, p. 15.

[14]Allen D. Candler, The Colonial Records of Georgia 10 (Atlanta: The Franklin-Turner Company, 1908): 749.

[15]Edward J. Cashin, Jr. and Heard Robertson, Augusta and the American Revolution: Events in the Georgia Backcountry, 1773-1783 (Darien, Georgia: the Ashantilly Press, 1975), pp. 4-5.

[16]Pearl Baker, "Some Quaker Footnotes", an article on file at the Wrightsborough Foundation, Thomson, Georgia.

[17]Jay Worrall, "The Adventure of the Quakers, 1793-1983", Friends Journal 29:5 (March 15, 1938):10.

[18]Howard Brinton, Friends for Three Hundred Years (Lebanon, Pennsylvania: Sowers Printing Co., 1976), pp. 29-30

[19]Hitz, p. 16.

[20]Allen D. Candler, ed., The Revolutionary Records of the State of Georgia (Atlanta: The Franklin-Turner Company, 1908), p. 27.

[21]Robert S. Davis, "The Wrightsborough Quakers and the American Revolution", The Southern Friend Journal of North Carolina Friends' Historical Society (Autumn, 1982), p.4.

[22]Cashin, Augusta, p. 55.

[23]Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes (Janua y, 1782).

[24]Kenneth Coleman, ed.,A History of Georgia (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1982), p. 85.

[25]Ibid., (August, 1780).

[26]Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[27]Davis, p. 5.

[28]Stephen Weeks, Southern Quakers and Slavery (New York: Bergman Publishers, 1968), p. 203.

[29]North Carolina Yearly Meeting Minutes (1772).

[30]Ibid.

[31]Charles F. McKiever, "Slavery and the Emigration of North Carolina Friends", a thesis, East Carolina College, Greenville, North Carolina (1962).

[32]Robert Wm. Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, Time on the Cross vol. 1 (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1974), passim

[33]Jonathan Evans, William Savery (Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore, 1837), quoted in Travels in the Old South, p. 144.

[34]Weeks, same, quoted in a review in Pennsylvania Magazine 20:426.

[35]Ibid., p. 122.

[36]Vinnie Williams, "The Rock House", The Atlanta Journal and Constitution Magazine (September 20, 1965).

[37]McKiever, p. 44.

[38]Algie Newlin, Charity Cook: A Liberated Woman (Friends United Press, 1981), p. 106.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Opal Thornburg, "Cultural Resources of Quaker Pioneers in Ohio", Bulletin of Friends Historical Association 61-65 (Haverford, Pennsylvania: Friends Historical Association, 1957):94.

[41]Weeks, p. 123.

[42]John and Isaac Comly, eds., Friends' Miscellany: Being a Collection of Essays and Fragments (Philadelphia: J. Richards, 1839), pp. 216-17.

[43]Weeks, p. 218.

[44]Rufus M. Jones, The Quakers in the American Colonies (New York: Russell Inc., 1962), p. xxiv.

[45]Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[46]Coleman, pp. 80-85.

[47]Pearl Baker, The Story of Wrightsborough (Thomson, Georgia: Wrightsborough Restoration Foundation. 1965).

[48]Newlin, interview.

[49]Weeks, p. 133.

[50] Joseph R. Conlin, American Anti-War Movements (Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press, 1968), p. 4.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Self-determination of a group of citizens within a state is a complex issue. A religious group champions the cultural right to exist and to pursue the lifestyle it chooses, but in reality, this right is often denied and impossible to obtain when the basic requirements of the religion demand that certain practices be allowed which are perceived to be contrary to the accepted standards of the majority.

The rules for living drawn up by the Quaker Meeting were beyond the limits of acceptability to some inhabitants of the Wrightsborough area, but not to the degree where there was a conscious effort at removal of the Friends by non-Quakers. Whether the reaction of the settlers toward the Friends can be termed as generally intolerant is debatable. The settlement was originally Quaker; outsiders were allowed in by the elders who maintained control of the Meeting and the town until 1799 when a Commission was set up by the state of Georgia to govern the town's affairs. The elders allowed the initial outside influences to enter when land was divided and sold, and non-Quakers were allowed to share in the enterprises of the town. When control was

lost, it was mainly a result of a general fracture of authority within the group, not competition from others.[1]

It has been assumed that the Quakers were forcefully driven from their homes by their neighbors, but it has become apparent during work on the project that other factors were deeply involved.

The number and type of causes which have influenced any given event are always infinite, and there is little in the nature of each specific cause to give it the merit of standing alone as the one and only reason. "We pick among causes depending on value implication," says Barzun.[2] It would be inaccurate to even initially assume that the Wrightsborough Quakers were discriminated against in Georgia simply because Friends had suffered in other parts of the country.

Group control was strong at the start of the colony; members were frequently warned about adopting the "ways of the world" while their stand on the issues of slavery and physical violence drew contempt from some elements of society. The Meeting itself allowed outsiders, such as Thomas Ansley, to become a part of their community power structure. They went about destroying the purity of the purpose of isolation which would have existed if the original settlement could have contained only Quakers. The same errors were made on a small scale which had been made in Pennsylvania, therefore, it is impossible to speculate about what would have become of the town if it had remained all-

Quaker. By allowing the varied influences into their environment, the elders set up the mechanics for the destruction of the the stability of the Friends' position at Wrightsborough.

The Meeting was forced to remove members because of participation in the War, while outstanding members openly supported the Crown. This caused a loss of respect for the group both without and within. Externally, both Loyalists and Tories came to doubt the principles of the Friends, and from 1780 on, they were recorded as complaining of being oppressed by the various elements of the harsh life in the Revolutionary backcountry. Their time in Georgia ended unhappily, and after 1805, the last of the Friends were gone. The town was, in the end, in the hands of an entirely non-Quaker population.

The group at Wrightsborough was a small part of the larger pattern of migration which the Quakers engaged in from 1750 until the mid-1880's; this trek took them from the Middle States southward and then westward to new lands. It may be assumed that land grants were the obvious reward for the traumatic and strenuous moves.

It is helpful to refer again to David Truman's theory about the formation of common interest groups which asserts that groups will naturally form when a number of persons experience some form of deprivation or frustration. He states that political or economic changes will alter the pattern of life of the group members and that they will seek

to reinforce themselves by interacting and organizing. However, he says, the new group may in turn become a social disturbance that has influence on the interests of other groups, and a competition arises.[3]

The tension to which Truman refers in the case of the group at Wrightsborough was set up by the Revolution. The urge to reject those who do not "do their part" was very great for the settlers who had taken the risks involved in self-defense against the Tories. One can only speculate about what may have happened had the Quakers remained truly neutral during the conflict rather than to have had some of their outstanding Members take the side of the Crown so vocally.

Mancur Olson argues that Truman's theory is too simple:

> ...individuals cannot be expected to organize spontaneously once they become aware of a threat to their common interest. As long as individuals are likely to receive the collective goods that interest groups are working to obtain, regardless of whether or not they make a contribution toward the effort, it will be exceedingly difficult, as a practical matter, to spur many of them into action.... the marginal costs of political participation differ greatly among social groups and explain why individual incentives for political action are generally so weak.[4]

Both arguments about group behavior can be applied to the Quaker model. While it served the purpose of the Friends to unite to preserve their traditions and to achieve goals which could only be achieved by uniting, it did not serve the non-Quaker group to formally oppose the Friends. While individual acts occurred which were indeed anti-Quaker,

there was not enough motivation to form a concentrated effort at removing the group from the community. The incentives for extreme intolerance were just not great enough to provide a need for the non-Quakers to unite in any real effort at ostracism as it is specifically defined. True ostracism requires the ultimate expulsion of an agent by general consent from society or from privileges of the community. No such situation existed in fact in Wrightsborough at any time during the period when it was a viable town.

The primary reasons for the migration were: the loss of control within the group; competition from incoming settlers (not a form of ostracism); loss of political control of the township when the state put the commission in charge, and Quakers found that they could not be elected popularly to the board; and the general yearning for new lands which was common in the period. A combined set of circumstances along with the basic framework and attitudes of the Quakers which set up a perpetual conflict caused the withdrawal from Georgia.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER V

[1] Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes.

[2] Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, The Modern Researcher (New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970), p. 127.

[3] Jack L. Walker, "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America", The American Political Science Review 77:2 (June, 1983):390-91.

[4] Ibid.

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY

GEORGIA QUAKER HISTORY	QUAKER AND GENERAL AMERICAN HISTORY
	1652 George Fox sees a vision of people to be called Quakers
	1656 First Quakers in North America
	1661 Establishment of New England Yearly Meeting
	1662 The Quaker Act (Quakers forbidden to meet) in England
	1671 George Fox advises slaves be freed
	1689 Toleration Act in Parliament
	1696 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting opposes slavery
	1704 First written book of discipline
	1715 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting declares slavery a disowning offenses
	1732 Georgia Trustees provide for Quaker settlement by allowing affirmation
	1733 Founding of Georgia
1750 Edmund Grey appears before Council in Savannah	

1751	Quakers from Carolina purchase Uchee land Quaker Springs		
1754	Early Quakers evacuate Quaker Springs	1754	French and Indian War begins
	Grey goes to Brandon with three other settlers		Maddock arrives in Orange County, North Carolina
1755	Samuel Fothergill travels through the South		
	Edmund Grey feuds with Governor Reynolds		
		1756	Maddock refuses North Carolina Legislature seat
		1757	Woolman writes of personsonal conscience and salvation
1758	Quaker Springs deserted	1758	Woolman persuades Philadephia Yearly Meeting to condemn slaveholding
1759	Royal agents meet Grey at New Hanover settlement on Altamaha		
		1762	Meetings for Negroes continued throughout U. S.
		1763	End of French and Indian War
1764	Maddock and Sell first go to Wrightsborough area to examine lands		
1765	Map shows Brandon between Savannah River and mouth of Williams Creek on Little Creek	1755	Stamp Act
1767	Orange County, N. C. settlers petition for land in Georgia		

1768	Maddock leads Quakers to Georgia		
	Second land petitions Quaker Road authorized		
	Meeting denounces trading in Negroes		
	Indian land cession		
1769	Quaker Road completed		
1770	Sell, Farmer, Maddock grants received; Cowpen organized	1770	Correspondence with Dr. Fothergill and Bartram
	Wrightsborough settled officially		
1771	Indian scare; twenty-five familes leave	1771	Little River Meeting sends letter to Governor of N. C. in gratitude of exemption laws
1772	Two hundred Quaker families in area of Wrightsborough	1772	New England Yearly disowns for slaveholding
	English Fort built		
	Raiders kill 100		
	Mulberry seeds received at Wrightsborough		
1773	Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting organized	1773	Boston Tea Party
	Indian land cession-Ceded Lands Treaty		
	Indian skirmish; many evacuate area		
	Bartram visits		
	Maddock appointed clerk		
	Maddock receives certificate from Cane Creek		

1774	Continued Indian violence in area	1774	American patriots protest at Tondee's Tavern in Savannah
	Head Turkey killed by militia		
	Indian Council held in Savannah		
	Ansley receives grants in Quaker township		
	Governor Wright contributes money for new Meeting House		
1775	Wrightsborough reaches peak of growth and development	1775	American Revolution begins
	Maddock bankrupt		Army organized in Georgia
	Joseph Williams becomes Clerk		
	Second Georgia Provincial Congress; Maddock declines seat		
	Creek Indian troubles		
	Edward Barnards fort		
	Letter to Governor Wright affirming Loyalty		
	Elias Hollingsworth owned for bearing arms		
	Enoch Pearson condemned for joining army		
1776	Charity Cook and Mary Pearson preach at Wrightsborough	1776	Declaration of Independenc North Carolina Yearly forbids slavery
	Abel Thomas preaches at Wrightsborough		
	Nehemiah Dunn dismissed for warlike behavior		
	Colonel for Wrightsborough Militia selected		

1777	Rebels control area Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting requests more defense		
	Thomas Johnson and John Mooney removed for war-like behavior		
1778	Rebel occupation continues	1778	Friends prohibited from complying with loyalty oath in N. C.
1779	Quaker Meeting moved to Maddock's Mill		
	Appeal to militia in Augusta for protection during "Time of Commotion and Trouble"		
1780	William Benson expelled for bearing in self-defense	1780	New Garden issues condemnation for war participation
	Amos Stuart expelled for owning Negroe girl		
	British again in control of Wrightsborough		
	James Benson, Joseph Jackson, John Jones, Ellis Cheek removed for bearing arms in war		
	Complaints of thefts by members of local militia		
	Women's Meeting recommends expulsion for women who deviate		
1781	Wrightsborough Loyalist group seeks refuge in Savannah		
	American Revolutionary forces regain control in Wrightsborough		
	Loyalists murdered by raiders at Wrightsborough		

	Jessie Embrie removed for warlike behavior		
	Joseph Mooney eldered for shooting a robber		
		1781	Hiring of Negro slaves forbidden by N. C. Yearly
1782	Refugees return from Savannah	1782	English abandon Savannah
	The Meeting determines that families signing Fidelity Test be disowned		
	John Carson, Jr. dismissed for warlike behavior, but restored		
1785	Henry Jones leads 40 families to Ohio; is aided by Cherokees		
1786	Charity Cook, Lydia Haskett, Henry Milhouse preach at Wrightsborough		
		1787	Slavery condemned by Bush River
			Constitutional Convention
1789	Job Scott, traveling preacher, at Wrightsborough		
1790	Zachariah Ferris visits Maddock, preaches at Wrightsborough		
1791	William Savery preaches against slavery	1791	Newspaper attacks on Quakers nationally
1792	Georgia exempts Quakers from militia		

1793	Wrightsborough Quakers give 9000 bushels of corn to starving Indians	1793	Invention of Cotton Gin
	Thomas Scattergood preaches at Wrightsborough		
1796	Maddock Relief Fund Money scandal		
1797	Maddock sells Sweetwater property		
		1798	Zachariah Dicks preaches all over South against slavery
1799	Henry Hull preaches at Wrightsborough	1799	Beginning of major Quaker migration to Northwest
	State of Georgia sets up Board of Commissioners to run town		
1800	Joseph Cloud visits; encourages migration		
		1801	Georgia's Manumission Law drawn up, restricting Black rights
1804	Jonathan Sell leaves area permanently		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T. W. The Authoritarian Personality. New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950.

Arendt, Hannah. The Human Condition. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Bacon, Margaret H. The Quiet Rebels: The Story of the Quakers in America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969.

Baker, Pearl. A Handbook of History. A booklet published by the Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation, Thomson, Georgia.

Baker, Pearl. "That Most Pestilential Fellow", Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation, Thomson, Georgia. Unpublished monograph, typewritten.

Baker, Pearl. "Some Quaker Footnotes". Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation, Thomson, Georgia. Unpublished monograph, typewritten.

Baker, Pearl. "Joseph Maddock, Quaker Leader," Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation, Thomson, Georgia. Unpublished monograph, typewritten.

Bartram William. "Travels in Georgia and Florida" in Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. Ed., Frances Harper, 1942. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, reprint 1972.
Specific information gained by Bartram on the Wrightsborough area.

Bartram, William . Travels Through North and South Carolina, East and West Florida. Savannah, Georgia: the Beehive Press, 1973.
The original description by Bartram of the Wrightsborough area, including mention of individual Quaker families.

Barzun, Jacques and Henry F. Graff. The Modern Researcher. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970.

Boorstin, Daniel J. The Americans: The Colonial Experience. New York: 1964. This traditional work covers the entire scope of life during the 1700's in the eastern colonies.

Brinton, Howard. Friends for Three Hundred Years. Lebanon, Pennsylvania: Sowers Printing Company, 1976. General history and definition of the Quaker movement through North America.

Brock, Peter. Pacifism in the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968. Brock devotes much space in his book on basic pacifism to the Quaker history during wartime in the United States.

Butler, Linley S. North Carolina and the Coming of the Revolution. Booklet, at Rockingham Junior College. Deals with the Regulator protests in the Hillsborough area.

Cadbury, Henry W. "Intercolonial Solidarity of American Quakerism," The Pennsylvania Magazine, 60:4, (October, 1936). Very important point made about the similarity in Quaker opposition to slavery being the same as typical north-south view conflict.

Cameron, Annie Sutton. Hillsborough and the Regulators. The Orange County Historical Museum, 1964.

Candler, Allen D. The Revolutionary Records of the State of Georgia. Atlanta: The Franklin-Turner Company, 1908.

Candler, Allen D. The Colonial Records of Georgia. Volume 28. Atlanta: Chase P. Byrd, State Printer, 1914.

Carroll, Kenneth L. "Irish and British Quakers and their American Relief Funds," in The Pennsylvania Magazine. Philadelphia, The Winchell Company, October, 1978.
Deals with the Maddock scandal concerning misappropriation of relief funds.

Cashin, Edward J., Jr. and Heard Robertson. Augusta and the American Revolution: Events in the Georgia Backcountry, 1773-1783. Darien, Georgia, the Ashantilly Press, 1975.

Cashin, Edward J.,Jr. Cashin's Augusta Chronicle Notes. Augusta, Georgia, Augusta College, 1979. Collection contains an invaluable listing of events as recorded in the Augusta Chronicle which are pertinent to the development of the area historically.

Cashin, Edward. Lecture, Augusta College, Augusta, Georgia. November, 1983.

Coleman, Kenneth. A History of Georgia. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1982.

Columbia County Then and Now. The Martinez-Evans Jaycees. Martinez, Georgia.
A brief history of the county which includes interesting episodes about Quakers in the area.

Comly, John, and Isaac, eds. Friends' Miscellany: Being a Collection of Essays and Fragments. Philadelphia: J. Richards, 1839.

Conlin, Joseph R. American Anti-War Movements. Beverly Hills, the Glencoe Press, 1968. This is a short survey of the by various groups to eradicate warfare.

Corner, Betsy and C. Christopher Booth. Chain of Friendship: Letters of Dr. Fothergill. Cambridge: Howard University Press, 1971.
Letter to John Bartram, March 19, 1770 is directly quoted.

Coulter, Merton E. Georgia: A Short History. Athens, University of Georgia Press.

Davis, Robert S. "The Wrightsborough Quakers and the American Revolution", The Southern Friend Journal of North Carolina Friends' Historical Society. (Autumn, 1982).

Davis, Robert. "The Last Colony". An article. Submitted for review.

Dougherty, James E. and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr. Contending Theories of International Relations. New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1981.

Drake, Thomas E. Quakers and Slavery in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Dunn, Verna T. "Wrightsborough, Georgia: That Used to Be," an article published in Orange County, North Carolina. (November 11, 1933).
Filed at Guilford College Library in the Quaker Collection
Concerns the Regulator Movement, tax protest, number of families leaving the area with Sell and Maddock, Maddock's certification from Cane Creek, population of Wrightsborough, Revolutionary data and traveling preachers.

Evans, Jonathan. William Savery. Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore, 1837.

Fogel, Robert Wm. and Stanley L. Engerman. Time on the Cross. Volume 1. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1974.

Frost, J. William. The Quaker Family in Colonial America. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1973.
Wide coverage of the Quaker family structure.

Golembiewski, Robert T. The Small Group in Political Science. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1978.

Green, Phillip and Sanford Levinson. Power and Community. New York: Random House, 1970.

Heinemann, Yizhak and Joshua Gutmann. Anti-Semiticism. Jerusalem, Ketter Books, 1974.

Hinshaw, William Wade. The Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1936.

Hinshaw, Seth B. Carolina Quakers. Greensboro, North Carolina: North Carolina Yearly Meeting, 1971.

Hirst, Margaret E. The Quakers in Peace and War. New York: George Doran Co., 1923.

Hitz, Alex M. "The Wrightsborough Quaker Town and Township in Georgia", The Bulletin of Friends Historical Association. Volume 46, 1936.

Jones, Charles Colcock, and Salem Dutcher. Memorial History of Augusta, Georgia. Syracuse: D. Mason and Co., Publishers, 1890.

Jones, Rufus M. The Quakers in the American Colonies. New York, Russell and Russell, Inc., 1962.

Jones, Dorothy M., ed. Wrightsborough 1768, Wrightsboro 1799, McDuffie County, Georgia 1870.. Thomson, Georgia: Wrightsborough Quaker Community Foundation, 1982.
Contains maps and documentation of the general Wrightsborough area.

Korey, William. "Discrimination", Anti-Semiticism. Jerusalem: Ketter Books, 1974.

Linley, Harlow. "A Century of Indiana Yearly Meetings," Bulletin of Friends Historical Society of Philadelphia. 12:1 (Spring, 1925).
Catalogs various meetings, attendance and proceedings; contains family names, etc.

Marbury, Horatio and William A. Crawford. A Digest of the Laws of the State of Georgia. Savannah: Seymour, Woolhopter and Stebbins, 1802.
Copies of specific laws of the period.

McKiever, Charles F. "Slavery and the Emigration of North Carolina Friends," a thesis submitted at East Carolina College, Greenville, South Carolina, 1962.
Concerns many good points on the issue - Woolman, economic factors, Rufus Jones' analysis, etc.

New Garden Quarterly Meeting Minutes. Meeting Minutes of New Garden, 1772-1783 and 1783-1794. Stored on Microfilm at Guilford College, Guilford, North Carolina. In the Quaker Collection.

Newlin, Algie I. Charity Cook: A Liberated Woman. Friends United Press, 1981.
Biography of woman preacher.

Newlin, Algie. Interview. Guilford College, Guilford, North Carolina. August, 1983.

North Carolina Yearly Meeting Minutes, 1772. On Microfilm, Guilford College, Guilford, North Carolina. In the Quaker Collection.

Olsen, Mancur. The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

OSullivan, John. and Alen M. Meckler. The Draft and Its Enemies. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1974.
A current work which gives background history to present opposition to the draft.

Penn, William. No Cross, No Crown. Philadelphia: Benjamin and Jacob Johnson, 1797.
Impressions in interview form on subject of Quaker doctrine.

Poliakov, Leon. "Protocols of the Elders", Anti-Semiticism. Jerusalem, Ketter Books, 1974.

Scattergood, Thomas. Journal of the Life and Religious Labors of Thomas Scattergood, A Minister of the Gospel in the Society of Friends. Philadelphia: The Friends' bookstore.
Account of a visit by the author to the Monthly Meeting at Wrightsborough; mentions William Farmer.

Shamir, Michael and John Sullivan. "The Political Context of Tolerance", The American Political Science Review. 7:44 (December, 1983).
This article was done on a study conducted in the United States and in Israel measuring tolerance levels among the population. Describes the basic features of intolerance.

Stanley, Phern. Papers. Quaker House Archives, Atlanta, Georgia. Excerpts over various years, drawn with permission, 1976.

Thomas, Kenneth H., Jr. The Rock House: McDuffie County, Georgia. Atlanta: Department of Natural Resources (Historic Preservation Section), 1977.
Chronological Account of the development of events which led to the establishment of Wrightsborough.

Thornburg, Opal. "Cultural Resources of Quaker Pioneers in Ohio", Bulletin of Friends Historical Association. Volumes 61-65. Compiled by Lyman W. Riley. Haverford, Pennsylvania: Friends'Historical Association, 1957.

The Georgia Gazette. Savannah, Georgia, 1765-1805. On Microfilm, stored at the Georgia Historical Society, Savannah.

U. S. Geological Survey, Map of Wrightsboro, Ga., N3330-W8230/7.5. Reston, Virginia, U. S. Geological Survey, 1972. This topographical survey map is helpful in locating ruins in the Wrightsborough area., 1972%

Van Tassell G. Lane. Lecture, Georgia Southern College. 1982.

Van Dyke, Vernon. "The Cultural Rights of Peoples", Universal Human Rights. 2:2 (April-June, 1980): 1-21.

Walker, Jack L. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America." The American Political Science Review 77:2 (June, 1983):390-91.

Weeks, Stephen. Southern Quakers and Slavery. New York, Bergman Publishers, 1896. This work is a standby in study of the Quakers - it especially covers well the wartime period.

Williams, Vinnie. "The Rock House", Atlanta Journal and Constitution. (September 20, 1965).

Wilson, Bryan. Religious Sects. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970. Short descriptive tract on main world sects.

Woodward, C. Vann. Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel. Savannah: The Beehive Press, 1973,

Worrall, Jay. "The Adventure of the Quakers, 1793-1983", Friends Journal. 29:5 (March 15, 1983):10.

Wright, Edward Needles. Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War. New York: A. S. Barnes, 1961. Specific descriptions of several religious groups' problems which were encountered as a result of pacifism.

Wrightsborough Monthly Meeting Minutes. On microfilm. Guilford College, Guilford, North Carolina. In the Quaker Collection.