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I. Introduction

This report details the LAMAR Institute’s search and discovery of Captain Robert Carr’s Georgia militia fort and the military engagement that happened there on February 10, 1779. This important historic place lay hidden in the forests of Wilkes County, Georgia for more than two centuries. This research project was a systematic hunt for the archeological vestiges of the fort and the battleground. Battlefield archeology, or conflict archeology, has grown increasingly popular as a research topic since the 1980s. The LAMAR Institute has led a number of battlefield studies in the southeastern United States since 2001. The successful search for Carr’s fort advances our understanding of the American Revolution in the southern colonies and it creates an important new historical landmark in northern Georgia.

Major funding for this research came from a 2012 Research Grant from the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program (Grant Number GA 2255-12-009). The National Park Service, particularly Matt Border, Paul Hawke, Greg Hindsley, and Kristen McMasters of its American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) were strong supporters of the Carr’s Fort Battlefield Survey project. A generous grant from the Kettle Creek Battlefield Association (KCBA) helped support these efforts. The KCBA and particularly several of its members including Joseph Harris, Tom Owens, and Larry Wilson, were robust advocates of the Carr’s fort project. The Plum Creek Foundation provided a generous grant to the LAMAR Institute to research primary documents pertaining to the American Revolution in Georgia. While the Plum Creek Foundation grant was not aimed specifically at the archeology portion of the Carr’s fort project, many of the documents that were examined at various archives in the United States and Great Britain helped to create a historical context for the battle. Plum Creek representative Jim Rundorff also was helpful in providing access to Plum Creek property in the study vicinity. Archeologists David C. Crass and Brian Tucker of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources were very supportive of the LAMAR Institute’s Revolutionary War research efforts. The Sons of the American Revolution advanced the effort, particularly Terry Manning, President of the Georgia Sons of the American Revolution and David Jenkins, head of the Washington-Wilkes Chapter. Additional support for the work also came from the LAMAR Institute and volunteer labor from the project crew members and other volunteers (Greg Beavers, P.T. Ashlock, II, Dawn Chapman Ashlock, Rita Folse Elliott, Michael Griffin, Joel Jones and Brett Osborn).

Project Environment

The archeological remains of Carr’s fort battlefield are located in western Wilkes County, Georgia (Figures 1 and 2). This location is rural and current land use is predominantly managed woodlands with lesser amounts of pasture and cultivated land. Houses are mostly scattered dwellings that are located along the major roads. Many of the dirt roads in the area contained some residences, including a number of small farms. The study area lies within the Piedmont physiographic province of Georgia, which is characterized by dissected uplands and gently rolling hills. The study area is located within the Beaverdam Creek watershed. Beaverdam Creek is a tributary of the Little River, which drains into the Savannah River and those waters wind their way to the Atlantic Ocean at Tybee Inlet. Robert Carr’s fort
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Project Environment

The archeological remains of Carr’s fort battlefield are located in western Wilkes County, Georgia (Figures 1 and 2). This location is rural and current land use is predominantly managed woodlands with lesser amounts of pasture and cultivated land. Houses are mostly scattered dwellings that are located along the major roads. Many of the dirt roads in the area contained some residences, including a number of small farms. The study area lies within the Piedmont physiographic province of Georgia, which is characterized by dissected uplands and gently rolling hills. The study area is located within the Beaverdam Creek watershed. Beaverdam Creek is a tributary of the Little River, which drains into the Savannah River and those waters wind their way to the Atlantic Ocean at Tybee Inlet. Robert Carr’s fort
was in built in what was then a remote section of Georgia. Robert Carr and his family settled in the Beaverdam Creek watershed soon after the 1773 treaty talks that established the “Ceded Lands” (Yonge 1773). When the State of Georgia was formed in 1777 this area became part of Wilkes County.

The geology of Wilkes County is composed of weathered igneous and metamorphic rocks (Long 1916, 1919; Cook 1967; Crawford 1968; Hall 1993; Hurst and Plemons 1990). Floodplains contain mostly Holocene sedimentary deposits that are derived from these weathered igneous and metamorphic soils. The mantle of saprolitic soils in the Georgia piedmont is derived from these underlying rocks, which have weathered in place. The area was found to contain small amounts of valuable rocks, as well. Geologist S. Jones (1909:256) described the Stone Ridge Mine in Wilkes County in a 1909 summary of gold mines of Georgia. His description is that of a minor, albeit promising, gold deposit that would cover portions of the present study area. Jones wrote,

This mine is situated about six miles southwest of Washington…and is near a road connecting the Greensboro and Skull Shoals highways. Gold was discovered here in 1879 and since that time a limited amount of mining has been conducted at intervals by different parties on an auriferous quartz vein occurring along the crest of a ridge. In 1881 Mr. C.E. Smith, of Washington, Ga., carried on mining operations for a short period on a portion of the ridge known as the Marlow property. This gentleman exhibited United States mint returns for gold he obtained showing an aggregate of $1,658.15. Some mining has also been conducted on the adjacent Smith and Crosby properties.

Considerable open cut work was done on the vein; shafts were also sunk and some drifts driven. At the time of visit no exposures of the ore body were noticed in the old works. It is stated that the trend
of the vein is along the crest of the ridge, the strike being about N. 15° E. Prospectors have reported the occurrence of gold along the ridge for several miles in either direction from the Stony Ridge mine (Jones 1909:256).

Gold is no longer mined in Wilkes County but vestiges of this important economic activity remain in the study vicinity, as evidenced by the road names, “Goldmine Road” and “Stoney Ridge Road”. These two roads are located within the Beaverdam Creek catchment basin. The location of the Stoney Ridge Mine is shown on several early twentieth century maps.

Figure 2. Carr's Fort Battlefield Survey Area.
II. Research Methods

Historical Research

Battlefield archeology on Georgia’s Revolutionary War battle sites is a relatively recent phenomenon. The National Park Service funded a study of 10 Revolutionary War and War of 1812 battlefields in Georgia, which was accomplished by Matthew McDaniel (2002). This was part of a nationwide study of America’s Revolutionary War and War of 1812 battlefield resources that was summarized in a report to the U.S. Congress by Gossett and Mitchell (2007). The battle at Carr’s fort was not considered in either of these two studies. Research by the LAMAR Institute, the Coastal Heritage Society, and the private cultural resources firm of Cypress Cultural Consultants, LLC has advanced Revolutionary War battlefield research since 2001 with surveys at Brier Creek, Ebenezer, Savannah and Sunbury (Elliott 2003, 2005, Elliott and Elliott 2009, 2011). Reports on all of these studies, except Brier Creek which is in progress, are available via the LAMAR Institute’s website (http://thelamarinstitute.org).

The Carr’s Fort Battlefield Survey project builds upon previous historical and archeological research by the LAMAR Institute at the Kettle Creek battlefield, located a few miles southwest of Carr’s fort (Elliott 2008). That battlefield survey project was funded by another branch of the National Park Service but the study followed ABPP survey protocol. The LAMAR Institute’s historical research team for the Carr’s fort battlefield survey included Robert Scott Davis, Jr., Daniel T. Elliott, Rita F. Elliott and Daniel E. Battle. Robert Scott Davis, Jr. (2014) provided the primary historical background report, many parts of which were adapted for the present document. Mr. Davis is intimately familiar with the history of Wilkes County, particularly its Revolutionary War history. He co-authored with historian Kenneth Thomas a seminal investigation of the Kettle Creek battlefield for the State of Georgia (Davis and Thomas 1975). He also compiled an inventory of frontier forts in Wilkes County and previously has written on the history of the engagement at Carr’s fort (Davis 2006e).

Many other scholars were contacted and provided input for this study. These included: Todd Braisted, webmaster at The On-Line Institute for Advanced Loyalist Studies; Ed Brumby; Dan Crumpton, veteran surveyor; Carol Faz; Louise B. Hammett; Phil McGinty, surveyor; James M. Preston, surveyor; Gordon B. Smith; Kenneth Thomas; Mary Bondurant Warren, and Will Graves and Charles Baxley, Southern Campaign of the American Revolution (SCAR). Of the above list, Dan Crumpton and Phil McGinty provided the lion’s share of the key land plat information that proved crucial in discovery of the battlefield site. Examples of their composite plat map reconstructions are illustrated in Figures 3-6. Others posthumously made significant contributions to the research effort on the American Revolution and early history in Wilkes County. These include important works by Davidson (1933), Green (1901), Hitz (1956), Knight (1970 [1920]), Slaton (1972) and Smith (1901).
Figure 3. Reconstruction of Original Land Grants Along Kettle Creek (McGinty 2007).

Figure 4. Working Reconstruction Map #1 of Land Grants on the Forks of Beaverdam Creek (McGinty 2008a).
Figure 5. Working Reconstruction Map #2 of Land Grants on the Forks of Beaverdam Creek (McGinty 2008b).

Figure 6. Plats North of Little River (McGinty 2006).
Historians conducted archival research at the following institutions in the United States: Georgia Department of Archives; Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division; South Carolina Department of Archives and History, North Carolina Department of Archives, and the Henry Clements Library, University of Michigan, Historical Society of Pennsylvania and the Wilkes County courthouse.

Several institutions in Great Britain provided important background information for the project. Funding for this research was provided by a grant from the Plum Creek Foundation and other private donations and was not derived from the ABPP portion of the grant. Institutions with relevant information included the British Library, London; National Archives, Kew; National Archives of Scotland and the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. Previous research at the National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, particularly the Ward Chipman papers and the Prevost family papers, provided important background information on the Loyalist regiments in Georgia.

Online research provided another important facet of primary and secondary historical information. This included digitized historical books (Google Books 2013, 2014a-b; Archives.org 2013; University of Michigan 2013; University of North Carolina 2013; University of Georgia 2013), military and related archival documents (Fold3.com 2013; Southern Campaign of the American Revolution 2013; Ancestry.com 2013; New York Public Library 2013), digitized early newspapers (Genealogybank.com 2013; Newspapers.com 2013; NewspaperArchive.com 2013); and early maps, plats and aerial photographs (Georgia Department of Archives 2013; University of Alabama 2013; University of Georgia 2013; University of Texas 2013; Campbell 1779a-b; Barker 1795; Barnett 1867; Davis 1986, 1986a-b; Elbert 1901; Ellis and Ellis 2012; Evans 1833; Gibbes 1779; Hinton 1779; Jackson 1821 [1793]; Nunis 1961; State Highway Department of Georgia 1953; U.S. Department of Agriculture 1938, 1942; U.S. Coast Survey 1865; U.S. Geological Survey 1906; Long 1916).

Researchers examined a great number of primary records pertaining to the American Revolution in Georgia (Carr 1773; Carr 1798; Clinton 1750-1838; Davies 1972-1978; Dooly 1779; Elbert 1901; Hamilton 1787; Moultrie 2008 [1802]; Shaw 1786; NARA various dates; Yonge 1773; Ward Chipman Papers 1776-1785; and Annual Register [1779, 1780, 1782, 1783, 1788, and 1821]). Federal pension records provided numerous unique descriptions of Carr’s fort and the people and military events in Wilkes County. Thanks to the advances in digitization of the records and their online availability, researchers identified many of these references (Fold3.com 2013; Southern Campaign of the American Revolution 2013).

Historic maps of the study vicinity provide a few clues to historic settlement and transportation routes over time (Yonge 1773; McLaughlin n.d. [ca. 1770]; Morse 1796; Lloyds 1864; U.S. Coast Survey 1865; Barnett 1868; Granade 1901; USGS 1906; Jones 1909; Long 1916). None of these maps identify the Carr’s settlement. Examples of these maps are shown in Figures 7-17. A 1942 aerial photograph of the battlefield vicinity is reproduced in Figure 18.

**Field Methods**

During the project’s planning proposal phase an extensive study area was defined from the known historical information about Carr’s fort and its battlefield (circa. 2009-2012). Understandably this study area, as defined in 2012, was very large and impractical for a complete survey. This area was divided into three zones (A, B and C) (Figure 19). Area A consisted of the northern portion, Area C was the central part and Area B comprised the southern portion. Area A was near the headwaters of Beaverdam Creek and Area B was at the confluence of Beaverdam Creek and the Little River. Areas A and B held the highest probability to contain Carr’s fort and the field survey focused on these two areas of Wilkes County.

What proved to be the most daunting task for the survey was the acquisition of written permission to survey on privately-owned land. This process began well before the actual fieldwork. It was, in fact, a process that had begun in 2009, several years before the ABPP Grant project award. The LAMAR Institute team acquired paper copies of tax maps from the Wilkes County Tax Assessor. In 2012 and 2013, however, these records were available in digital format through the Wilkes County government website and that resource was extensively explored for land owner information.

Once a short list of landowners was identified these persons or other relevant entities were contacted by letter from the LAMAR Institute. The letters’ contents introduced the proposed undertaking and requested written permission (Consent of Entry) to study the cultural resources on their respective properties. The response was decidedly underwhelming and a second series of letters was mailed, accompanied by emailed versions and, in some instances, personal telephone calls. By this process permission for survey was obtained from 13 private landowners in the study area. Plum Creek Timberlands and the Wilkes County government also granted access permission for their lands. Only five landowners rejected our request for access outright. After the vigorous letter, email and telephone campaign, the LAMAR Institute secured permission for survey on approximately 7,636 acres. Of this, 4,845 acres were not visited by the survey team.
Figure 7. A Map of the Lands Ceded to His Majesty (Yonge 1773).
Figure 8. Portion of Yonge's 1773 Map, Showing the Beaverdam Creek Vicinity.
Figure 9. Tracing of ca. 1770 “A Plan of a Part of the Province of Georgia”, Showing “Cers fort” on a tributary of Little River (McLaughlin n.d.).
Figure 10. Jones' "Map Showing the Distribution of the Gold Deposits of Georgia", Identifying Gold Deposits on Stoney Ridge in Beaverdam Creek Watershed, Southwest of Washington, Georgia (Jones 1909).
Figure 11. 1796 Map of Georgia, Showing Wilkes County Vicinity (Morse 1796).
Figure 12. 1864 Map of Georgia, Showing Wilkes County (Lloyds 1864).
Figure 13. 1865 Map of Georgia, Showing Wilkes County (U.S. Coast Survey 1865).
Figure 14. 1868 Map of Wilkes County (Barnett 1868).
Figure 15. Portion of 1901 Map of Wilkes County, Showing Beaverdam Creek Watershed (Granade 1901).
Figure 16. Portion of 1906 Topographic Map, Showing Beaverdam Creek Watershed (USGS [Crawfordville Sheet] 1906).
Figure 16. Portion of 1915 Soil Map of Wilkes County Showing Beaverdam Creek Watershed (U.S. Bureau of Soils 1915).
In early 2013, the LAMAR Institute field survey crew explored large portions of the Beaverdam Creek watershed for metal artifacts. This effort represents the most extensive undertaking of this type ever attempted in Georgia. The original survey area, as defined in 2012, was modified slightly. The survey crew systematically covered more than 4.36 square miles, or an estimated 2,791 acres (1,129.5 ha) with metal detectors and surface reconnaissance. This coverage was located mostly in Area A (northern part...
of the survey area) but a sizeable sample of Area B (southern part) was included and a small sample of Area C also was accomplished).

![Image of Project Study Area](image.png)

**Figure 18.** Project Study Area, as Defined in 2012.

**Metal Detection (MD) Survey**

Metal detectors (MD) served as the primary discovery tool for the Carr’s Fort Battlefield Survey. Surveyors worked alone or in teams of two and kept records of their finds in a field book. Each MD team was assigned a unique name (A, B, C, D, F, G, H, I, J, AA, BB, CC and AAA) and metal finds were recorded as consecutive numbers following the letter identifier for each team. Each team letter designation corresponded to GPS waypoints collected with a corresponding Garmin or Trimble handheld device.

Metal detector brands and types used by the surveyors are described in the following. Teams A, AA, AAA and G were composed of Rita Elliott and Greg Beavers using Garrett Crossfire II, Garrett 750 series, Minelab Xterra 305 and Nautilus 2BA machines. Team B was composed of Joel Jones assisted at various times by Brett Osborn, Lisa O’Steen and Mark Pollard using Nautilus and Fischer machines. Team C, I and
J was composed of P.T. Ashlock using a Minelab X-Terra 70 machine. Teams D, CC and F consisted of Dan Elliott using a Minelab X-Terra 70 machine. Team H was composed of Dan Elliott and Michael Griffin using a Minelab X-Terra 70 machine. Team B and BB consisted of P.T. Ashlock using a Minelab X-Terra 70 machine. In addition, surveyors often utilized small Garrett pinpointer detectors to isolate metal finds further within a metal detector hit. Recovery methods for the project were a mixture of collection and no collection. For most of the study area metal artifacts were located, identified and left in place. Artifacts that were clearly less than 50 years old were not assigned find numbers and were not collected. Finds were recorded by their UTM coordinates (Zone 17, WGS84 datum).

Survey coverage over most of the surveyed lands consisted of parallel transects 60 m apart. One smaller ridge formations, which were narrow, the sampling strategy was modified and ridges were covered by one or two transects with surveyors focusing on the more level ground that was available. Wetlands and steep side slopes of ridges were not surveyed. Other areas where the survey coverage was altered include areas near existing houses, fence lines, trash dumps and other areas containing high concentrations of modern metal on the landscape.

**Figure 19. Greg Beavers Surveying on Former Carr Family Lands, 2013.**
Phase II Metal Detection (MD) Survey

Once the core area of the battlefield had been located, the MD survey methods were adjusted. Metal detector lanes were narrowed to cover the landform on a 30 m grid. Two separate battle loci were identified and were designated Locus A and B. Portions of the battlefield in these two areas then were MD survey sampled with a 10 m grid. This helped to refine the boundaries of the two loci. A sample zone on the eastern portion of the core battle area, Locus A, was partially cleared of the understory vegetation, raked of surface litter and then this grid was sampled with two-meter MD lanes. These lanes formed a 20 meter by 7 meter grid. Battle-related artifact finds at the two loci were mapped using a Trimble GeoExplorer 2008 Series XH device. The relative location of the close-interval MD survey at Locus A is shown in Figure 21.

Taken together, the additional metal detection survey of the two battlefield loci, Carr’s fort and the house up the hill, confirm the firefight that took place between the soldiers positioned in these two areas. Loyalist recruits in Carr’s fort were receiving incoming fire from the Georgia and South Carolina militiamen, who were outside of the fort. Patriot soldiers positioned within the building up the hill were receiving incoming small arms fire from the Loyalists in the fort.

Shovel Tests

Shovel tests are the standard survey tool for locating and sampling archeological sites in the Georgia piedmont (Elliott 2000; Georgia Council of Professional Archeologists 2014). Experience has shown, however, that this sampling technique is not particularly efficient or effective in the study of battlefields (Andrus 1999; Powis 2012). In 2014, metal detecting standards were established in Georgia to address this issue. These standards, which were developed with input from experience in the search for Carr’s fort and other recent battlefield survey projects in Georgia, were not in place at the time of the 2013 field survey. Shovel Testing was conducted at several areas in the study area. Shovel tests were recorded by GPS device and metric tape. Soil in each test was screened through 0.25 inch hardware cloth and tests were excavated until sterile subsoil was encountered. Soils and artifact depths were noted for each test. Fifteen shovel tests were excavated at Locus A in the Core Area of the Carr’s fort battlefield. Of these, four yielded historic artifacts associated with the fort.

Test Unit Excavation

Archeologists targeted the GPR anomaly and metal concentration within Locus A with a small test unit investigation. The unit, designated Test Unit 1, measured 3 meters by 50 centimeters. This test was excavated in two vertical levels. Level 1 was the plow-disturbed A-horizon and Level 2 was a thin interface between the plowzone and sterile subsoil. Artifacts recovered from this test included a limited assortment of eighteenth century items, including bottle glass, ceramics and metal.
Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR)
Ground penetrating radar (GPR) is a remote-sensing, non-destructive tool that has wonderful applications on America’s battlefields. Since 2002 the LAMAR Institute has incorporated GPR into its battlefield surveys, as well as in various other archeological projects. During this same period of time GPR imaging for archeology has vastly improved (Conyers and Goodman 1997; Conyers 2012).

GPR uses microwaves to acquire subsurface data with the aid of a transmitter and receiver mounted on a wheeled cart. A 500 MHz shielded antenna suspended just above the ground surface is pushed along a linear transect. Radar reflections are recorded in a computer monitor and saved for further analysis.
These two-dimensional images are constructed from a sequence of thousands of individual radar traces. A succession of radar traces bouncing off a large buried object will produce a hyperbola, when viewed graphically in profile. Multiple large objects that are in close proximity may produce multiple, overlapping hyperbolas, which are more difficult to interpret. Radargrams are essentially a vertical map of the radar reflection off objects and other soil anomalies. It is not an actual map of the objects. The radargram is produced in real time and is viewable on a computer monitor, mounted on the GPR cart.

The suspected area of Carr’s fort was sampled by Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey. GPR survey was hampered by the thick vegetation at the fort site, which limited access for the GPR equipment. The GPR sample that was completed covered a rectangular area measuring 20 m by 5.5 m, designated GPR Block A. Figure 22 shows the arrangement of the 12 radargrams within GPR Block A. Radar data was collected from south to north and progressed from west to east. It was located across an area where a slight increase in military artifacts was observed from MD survey.

The equipment used for the GPR survey at Carr’s fort consisted of a RAMAC/X3M Integrated Radar Control Unit, mounted on a wheeled-cart and linked to a RAMAC XV11 Monitor (Firmware, Version 3.2.36). A 500 megahertz (MHz) shielded antenna was used for the data gathering. MALÅ GeoScience’s Ground Vision software (Version 1.4.6) was used to acquire and record the radar data (MALÅ GeoScience USA 2006). The radar information was displayed as a series of radargrams. Output from the survey was first viewed using GroundVision. This provided immediate feedback about the suitability of GPR survey in the area and the effective operation of the equipment. Goodman’s GPR-Slice software (Version 7.0) was used in post-processing the data. This suite of hardware and imaging software has proven effective on previous LAMAR Institute GPR surveys. Upon arrival at the site the RAMAC X3M Radar Unit was set up for the operation and calibrated. Several trial runs were made on parts of the site to test the machine’s effectiveness in the site’s soils. Equipment settings and other pertinent logistical attributes included the following:

- Time Window: 77 ns
- Number of Stacks: 4
- Number of Samples: 584
- Sampling Frequency: 7,617 MHz
- Antenna: 500 MHz shielded
- Antenna Separation: 0.18 m
- Trigger: 0.04 m
- Radargram Spacing: 50 cm
- Radargram Collection: South to North
- Radargram Progress: West to East
- Total Radargrams: Block A- 12
Surface Reconnaissance
The study area for this project was predominantly wooded or pasture, which offered limited opportunities to observed artifacts on the ground. Surveyors did make observations of the landforms throughout the survey area. Traces of roads and trails were noted. Handmade bricks (generally pre-1875) also were widespread over the study area. Other identified cultural features included rock piles,
building foundation footers, chimney falls, well depressions and agricultural terraces. Archeologists recorded GPS waypoints for these surface finds and features.

**Laboratory Methods**
Artifacts, project paperwork and electronic data were taken to the LAMAR Institute’s laboratory in Rincon, Georgia. There the artifacts were cleaned, inventoried, analyzed and photographed. A wide range of artifact identification guides were used to identify artifacts recovered by the survey (Abbitt 1973; Nelson 1968; Neumann 1967; Neumann and Kravic 1989; Noël Hume 1983; Olsen 1963; Seaby and Purvey 1980; Stone 1974; South 1977; Tice 1998; and Troiani 2001). Lead balls/bullets were measured by weight (in grams) and diameter (in millimeters, where bullets were not distorted). Analysts noted evidence of impact, use or other modifications in the bullet assemblage. Buttons were classified using South’s button typology. (Types 7, 9 and 18 were represented). Two copper coins were weighed and measured. Examples of artifacts were selected for photography and report illustrations. Artifact data was entered into a computer spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel) and these data were use in the GIS analysis.

As noted in the field methods section, many of the metal artifacts that were located by the survey team were identified and left in situ. Many of these were photographed in the field. The field identification (and photographs) proved useful for integrating the two datasets (field and lab).

**Reporting and Curation**
Reporting is a vital part of this research since one purpose of the study is to inform the public of its cultural resources so that landowners, land managers, concerned citizens, and others can manage these resources responsibly. The technical report also is of interest to a scholarly audience, including historians, archeologists and others. The LAMAR Institute produced two reports and one video documentary for this project. The first report was a historical summary by Robert S. Davis, Jr. (2013). Davis’ background information was extracted for relevant sections of the second report. The second report is this volume, authored by Elliott and Davis, which is intended for wider distribution. A redacted version of this report, in which sensitive site location information has been deleted, will be made available to the general public via the LAMAR Institute’s website and possible other outlets. The video, entitled “In Search of Carr’s Fort” was produced by Michael Jordan and Dan Kurtz of Cosmos Mariner Productions (2014). Copies of these reports and the documentary video were deposited with the National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program in Washington, D.C. and the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division in Atlanta, Georgia. Artifacts, field notes, excavation forms, laboratory forms, maps, photographs, digital copies of the reports and video and other records generated by the project were permanently curated with the Department of Anthropology, Georgia Museum of Natural History in Athens, Georgia.
Historically archeologists have had a difficult time reaching a general audience with accurate stories about their work. Reports often twisted the information provided by the professional archeologists and debased the story by converting it into a treasure hunting tale. Often careful scientific inquiry was changed to more closely fit an “Indiana Jones” episode. Many times the facts are so distorted that the true story is completely lost to the reader. Realizing this tendency, professional archeologists in the United States have attempted to improve their public relations skills in reaching a target audience.

Increasing public awareness of the Revolutionary War battle at Robert Carr’s fort and the broader involvement of Wilkes County’s patriots in the American Revolution was an integral part of this research project. At the onset of the project public understanding of this military event was extremely limited. The LAMAR Institute hoped to provide information to the media that would stem the outrageous stories and offer instead, accurate facts about the project along with visual images of the work.

The public was informed of the LAMAR Institute project and its discoveries through a range of media outlets. The first of these consisted of the issuance of press releases by the ABPP and later by the LAMAR Institute. The project was placed on the agenda at the November 2012 meeting of the Wilkes County Board of Commissioners and Project Director Elliott described the upcoming work and answered questions from the attending public and the commissioners. The public was invited to participate in the effort and landowner’s support was encouraged. The LAMAR Institute issued a press release on April 30, 2013 announcing its discovery of the Carr’s fort battlefield (ABPP 2012; The LAMAR Institute 2013). The author created a Facebook community page named “Carr’s Fort Battlefield Project 1779” in October.
2012, which further exposed the project to the public (Facebook 2014). This page followed the project’s progress throughout the process with periodic text and photographic posts. Period posts informed the group about the planning, project schedule, disappointments, discoveries and other revelations. Photographs helped to underscore the project. News articles also were reposted at this website. During its peak popularity on Facebook (April 29, 2013), it reached 166 subscribers. The highest daily visits to the site took place on May 10, 2013, which it was viewed 29 times. This social media group page currently boasts 158 “likes”. These include 153 persons in the United States and one person each from Australia, United Kingdom, India, Finland and Spain. It has been more popular among men that women (54% versus 46%). Clearly, the Facebook page has declined from its mid-2013 levels and this is probably due to a reduction in posts that contained interesting content for potential readers (Figure 24). Compared to other “viral” Facebook posts, such as the proverbial cute cat video clips that receives millions of viewer “hits” within a few hours, the Carr’s fort story pales in comparison. Nevertheless, this social media reaches a small number of interested individuals who enjoy keeping up with the project’s progress.

Local newspapers were first to pick up the story. Washington, Georgia’s local newspaper, *The News-Reporter*, published multiple news articles about the project (Newsome 2012; Burke 2012, 2013a-d). That Wilkes County newspaper’s coverage followed the project from beginning to end and it reached a local audience via print media, as well as, an online audience through its weekly digital edition. Another article about the project appeared in an Augusta, Georgia newspaper (Johnson 2013). Self-promotion alone, however, reached only a small cadre of people. The story received a resounding boost with the release on May 3, 2013 of a news story by Russ Bynum, Savannah reporter for the Associated Press (AP) (Bynum 2013). On May 5th, Bynum’s news article was “The Big Story” at the AP website. With the AP coverage, the story spread like wildfire. The AP article was followed closely by a shorter article published on May 6th by United Press International (UPI) (Butler 2013). By May 7, 2013, Bynum’s story reached over 1,000 media outlets in the United States. The story also was reposted on many archeological, educational, genealogical, personal, military and Revolutionary War blogs on the internet. It was picked up by ABC News, Fox News, Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB), NBC News, Yahoo! News, and many hundreds of local televisions and newspaper services throughout the United States. Other examples of users of Bynum’s story include Bostonglob.com, Huffingtonpost.com, Salon.com, Thehawkeye.com, Treasurenet.com and Usmessageboard.com. The story remains readily available on the internet more than one year after its release. While the AP story was mostly published by media outlets in the United States, it did reach an international audience. A Google search on July 28, 2014 of Bynum’s headline resulted in 34,000 hits. It is difficult to determine the number of people actually reached by this media opportunity but it likely goes well beyond 1,000,000 persons.
Stories about the Carr’s fort project also appeared in several print magazines. These included *Archaeology*, published by the Archæological Institute of America (Toner 2013:1309); *American Archaeology*, published by Archaeological Conservancy (Neely 2013) and *Der Spiegel* (Franz 2013). These stories reached a worldwide audience through its subscriptions and its free digital versions that were offered online. The story also appeared in an online journal PastHorizons.com, published in England (PastHorizons.com 2013). Google’s English translation of Franz’s article in Germany’s *Der Spiegel* is reproduced in the following:

From 1775 to 1783, the 13 North American colonies fought for their independence from the English crown. A cell of resistance against the British Loyalists was in Georgia. Here the captain of Georgia Patriot Militia had housed some one hundred soldiers in his house. On 10 February 1779 succeeded about 80 loyalists to take Carr’s Fort - but not for long.

About 200 rebels were hot on their heels and intricate the England faithful in a fierce battle - no one won in the end. The rebels gave up the siege, but robbed the loyalists of their horses. After months of searching, archaeologists from the Lamar Institute report that Carr’s Fort has now been found.

On one of the arms of the Beaverdam Creek, they found musket balls and several hundred artifacts of iron and brass from the 18th century. "The search for Carr’s Fort was like looking for a needle in a haystack - only more difficult," says Daniel Elliott, president of the Institute in a press statement.

There were no contemporary maps of the area and only vague references to the location of the property from old documents. Finally, the excavators found the first traces at the end of the last day of the financed campaign. Crew members volunteered without pay in the following days in order to examine the site more closely. Even if his estate survived the siege, Captain Carr had not long to live after the battle. A few weeks later he was murdered in his home by a group of English-allied Indians (Franz 2013; Google 2014a).

In related public outreach, horseshoes recovered from the Carr’s Fort Battlefield Survey project were the subject of a professional presentation by members of the LAMAR Institute’s team at the 2014 meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology in Quebec City, Canada. That presentation focused on
the horseshoe assemblage and not the battle in particular. While a record-breaking blizzard termed the “polar vortex” dampened the attendance at this international conference, it was well received by the audience in attendance (Ashlock and Elliott 2014).

In addition to newspaper, magazine, television and internet media presentations, the Carr’s Fort Battlefield Survey project was the subject of a short video documentary, entitled, “In Search of Carr’s Fort” (The LAMAR Institute 2014). Versions of this film will be available to the public via Youtube.com. This film also will be shown at several local venues in the near future.

Figure 24. Videographers Michael Jordan and Dan Kurtz documenting the Carr's Fort Battlefield Survey Project, 2012.
III. Social, Historical and Geographical Context

The People

The Patriots
Colonel Andrew Pickens commanded the Patriot troops in the engagement at Carr’s fort (Pickens 1811; Pickens 1934; Ferguson 1960; Waring 1962). Colonel Pickens brought within him about 250 men, mostly from the 96 District of the South Carolina militia.

Colonel John Dooly commanded the Georgia militia in the engagement at Carr’s fort. After a discussion with Colonel Pickens, Dooly deferred to Pickens as the commander of the combined Georgia and South Carolina forces (Davis 2006d). Colonel John Dooly was killed by Loyalists, while he was on parole as a prisoner of war, in June, 1780. After Dooly’s death, many of the soldiers who were formerly under Dooly’s command then served with Elijah Clarke.

The people at Captain Robert Carr’s fort during its period of existence included some of the participants in the battle of Carr’s fort. It also consisted of numerous others who were not engaged in the battle. These included some of the soldiers in Captain Carr’s company, other Patriot soldiers who were posted at Carr’s fort before the battle, and the Robert Carr family. Carr’s fort began as a fortified farmstead. Robert Carr and his family arrived in the Beaverdam Creek valley shortly after 1773. Carr established a small cattle ranch. He was appointed a captain in Colonel John Dooly’s regiment of the Wilkes County militia after the American Revolution began. The primary threat at that time was from hostile Native Americans, including Creeks and Cherokees. Carr’s Company was garrisoned at his fortified farmstead.

Battle Participants
Andrew Pickens, Commander
Andrew Pickens’ regiment, South Carolina militia
Andrew Pickens, Colonel
John Anderson, Captain
James Baskins, Captain
William Baskins, Jr., Captain, [participant?, captured at Vann’s Creek, February 11, 1779]
Levi Casey, Captain
William Freeman, Captain
Andrew Hamilton, Sr., Captain
James Hays, Captain
James Jones, Captain [?]
John [Andrew?] Miller, Captain [participant?, captured at Vann’s Creek, February 11, 1779]
Captain Samuel Moore
Joseph Neal, Captain, Neal’s Company of Spies
Thomas Ramsey, Captain James Baskins’ Company, Lieutenant
George Reed, Captain
Samuel Reed, Lieutenant
James Gillison, Private, Baskins’ Company
Edward Doyle, Private, Casey’s Company
Stationed at Carr’s Fort

A review of pension claims identified five soldiers who stated, or had a family member or fellow veteran testify that they fought in the battle at Carr’s fort. These were Captain Andrew Hamilton, South Carolina militia; Private Jesse Gordon, Captain Gunnell’s Company, Dooly’s regiment; Private Lloyd Kelly, Captain Awtry’s Company, Dooly’s Regiment; Captain William Pulliam, Dooly’s regiment; Private Benjamin Pulliam, Captain Pulliam’s Company, Dooly’s regiment; Private Robert Tharpe, unspecified Georgia militia; Private Benjamin Thompson, Captain Awtry’s Company, Dooly’s regiment; William Manson, Captain Joseph Picken’s ranger company, South Carolina militia; and Private Hamilton Reynolds, Captain Awtry’s Company, Dooly’s Regiment. Captain William Baskins, Jr., South Carolina militia, left no pension record of his service but other sources indicate that he participated in the action at Carr’s fort and was captured (Moss 2006). Captain Baskins was captured in the engagement at Vann’s Creek on the Savannah River, which immediately followed the action at Carr’s fort (Davis 2008b).

Several other soldiers served at Carr’s fort but were either not at the battle or made no mention of the engagement in their pension claims. These include: Private Charles Britt, Captain Burke’s or Baldwin’s Company, Lieutenant Colonel Clarke’s Regiment, Georgia militia (ca. 1777-1778); Private John Cloud, Clarke’s Regiment, Georgia militia; Private Joshua Dover, Captain Burke’s Company, Clarke’s Regiment, Georgia militia; Private William Evans, Captain Carr’s Company, Dooly’s regiment; and Private Britton Willis, Captain Burke’s Company, Clarke’s Regiment, Georgia militia (Britt 1837; Cloud 1833; Dover 1834; Evans 1833; Britton 1832).
Other soldiers, such as privates David Madden and Thomas Bankston, probably fought at Carr’s fort but did not mention it specifically in their pension claims. Private Madden was in Captain Alexander Awtry’s Company and fought in Dooly’s regiment at Kettle Creek on February 14th. Madden’s name also is listed in Captain Carr’s Company in 1778, so it is quite likely that Private Madden fought at Carr’s fort. Private Bankston joined Captain John Autry’s Company in 1778 and “served 10 months in guarding the frontiers in Wilkes County Georgia & being in several small fights with the Indians” (Madden 1832; Bankston 1835). Captain Joseph Collins joined Dooly’s regiment in 1777 and served for three years. Captain Collins was likely in command of his company at Carr’s fort but he did not mention it in his pension application, which he made when he was 94 years old (Collins 1833).

When Samuel Elbert reviewed the troops on Georgia’s western frontier in late August or early September, 1777 he listed six officer and 125 enlisted men (131 soldiers total) arranged in two battalions and garrisoned at five forts, including Carr’s fort. Elbert wrote that Carr’s fort contained one officer and 10 men. Elbert was holding John Dooly prisoner at that time (Elbert 1901:55). It is interesting to note that the size of Captain Carr’s regiment tripled between 1777 and 1778. If the same was true of the other companies under Colonel Dooly’s command, then that gives an estimate of just under 400 men. If divided in half, with one-half under Dooly and the other under Lieutenant Colonel Clarke, then Colonel Dooly may have had as many as 200 men in his regiment in February, 1779. Some unknown portion of this, including six injured and elderly men, may have kept garrison duty in the frontier forts. If soldiers at Carr’s fort are typical of the troops left at the forts, as McCall noted in 1816, Carr’s fort was garrisoned by six or eight men when it was invaded by the Loyalists, then an estimate of 100 men under Dooly’s command in the siege at Carr’s fort is plausible. That number may have even been slightly higher.

The troop strength of the South Carolina militia under Colonel Andrew Pickens was about 250 men (McCall 1811). This contrasts with the Georgia militia total of 100 men. Pension records provide an important source of information about the officers and enlisted men who fought at Carr’s fort under Colonel Pickens’ command. Soldiers who left written accounts that specifically mention the battle are discussed below. Other pension applicants mentioned their presence at Carr’s fort, but not at the time of the battle.

We are fortunate to have two surviving payrolls for Captain Robert Carr’s company. The first of these covers the period from August 15 to September 15, 1778. The second is dated January 9, 1779 and covering the period of service from September 15-October 15, 1778 (Ellis and Ellis 2012). These are reformatted and transcribed in Table 1. Table 2 is a composite list of all the soldiers in the two lists.

The composite list includes four officers and 47 enlisted men. The names of 30 men in the company, including all of its officers, are found on both lists.

Andrew Hamilton, an officer in the South Carolina militia, attested in 1832 that, “In 1779 -- he acted as Captain & as a Major part of this year under the authority & under direct command of Colonel Pickens, with whom, the deponent acted as Captain in the attack upon Carr’s fort in the State of Georgia, where
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Owry first Lieut.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 5/6</td>
<td>8 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Runnals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 5/6</td>
<td>8 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zackariah Henderson</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 2/6</td>
<td>3 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Hopkins</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 2/6</td>
<td>3 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Trapp</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders Walker</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Coats</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Sanger</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alix Owtry Sr.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Owtry</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Morgan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Hopkins</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunstall? Roan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Jackson</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Summerill</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Trapp</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke John Morgan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa Morgan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Fling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hammett Sr.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hammett Jr.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Philips</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Ellis</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedrick Runnals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwd. Hammett</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob? Wilkins</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Wilkins</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Maddin</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bagby</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Riggan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McNabb</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Norton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alix. Owtry Jr.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Philips Sr.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Philips</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Young</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Young</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>@ 1/8</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                    |      |
|                    | £ 124 0 0 |

From the 15th September to the 15th of October 1778 This Acct. Proved before me this 9 day of Jan. 1779.

Wm. Downs
Robert “R” Carr mark

I do certify the above Acct. John Dooly Col.
Table 1 (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Owry 1st Lieuten.</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@5/6</td>
<td>15 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Runnals Secs.Lieu.</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>5 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Wilkins</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos. Norton</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Owtry</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Morgan</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Maddon</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunstal Roan</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Trapp</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Wilkins</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedrick Runnals</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Philips Sr.</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Philips Jr.</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Philips</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Philips</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Jackson</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm Hamnett</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwd. Hamnett</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Hopkins</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Duggan</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ellis</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McNabb</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Smith</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Summerill</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Thompson</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Thompson, Sr.</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hamnett</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachariah Henderson</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Trap</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Trapp</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alix. Owtry Jr.</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa Morgan</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alix. Owtry Sr.</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norton</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Philips</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Maddin</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke John Morgan</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Lackey</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bagby</td>
<td>30 do</td>
<td>@1/8</td>
<td>10 £</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the 15th of Aug to the 15th of September 1778

(Ellis and Ellis 2012.)
Table 2. Composite List of Men Who Served in Captain Carr’s Company in 1778.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Carr’s Company</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Enlisted Men</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43 Total Enlisted Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47 TOTAL COMPANY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>8/15-9/15</th>
<th>9/15-10/15</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/15-9/15</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

he also bore a flag of truce, to the enemy in the Fort, which was abandoned by Pickens, to meet a Colonel Boyd” (Hamilton 1832).

Private William Black, a soldier in the Georgia militia, attested in 1833,

That he entered … the service in the summer of 1776 and served the whole of the war, drew pay during the whole of the time, served two years under Captain Neal and was in the Battle of Carr’s ford [sic, fort] and Kettle Creek in the State of Georgia. He served one year under Captain Daniel Gunnells and was at the siege of Savannah then went under the command of Captain Neal and rebuilt Neal’s Fort on Broad River Georgia which had been destroyed by the Indians. This was in the fall of the year. He remained in the fort until June following in consequence of the troops with which he then served refusing to accept the offered protection of the British (Black 1833).
Private Charles Britt, a soldier in the Georgia and South Carolina militia was a resident of New Bordeaux. By Britt’s timeline, he was stationed at Carr’s fort in late 1777 or early 1778. His reference to Burke’s and Baldwin’s companies assigned to that post is noteworthy, as it implies that Carr’s fort was a place of strategic military significance and not merely a fortified farmstead. Britt’s geographic description of its location, “about two miles from...Washington” agrees with the distance to the Beaverdam Creek watershed from Washington.

Private Charles Britt attested in 1837,

That on or about the 24th day of July in the year 1777, he was enlisted at French town in Abbeville District, in Captain Baldwin's Company of Georgia minute men, the officers of which Corps were John Stuart Colonel, Elijah Clarke Lieutenant Colonel and Caleb Howell Major. That he declarant and the other recruits were marched by George Walton's ferry on Savannah River to a place now called ___ in the State of Georgia. That he afterwards received a furlough for a month and on its expiration again joined his company at a place called Carr's Fort, about two miles from the place where Washington in the State of Georgia now stands. That there were two companies in the Fort, viz. Burke’s and Baldwin’s, and the declarant there did duty with them for the period of two months (Britt 1837).

Private Joshua Dover, a soldier in Captain John Burk’s Company, Elijah Clarke’s Regiment, served at Carr’s fort for part of the war and in 1834 he stated that he, “was marched to Carr’s Fort in the State of Georgia at which place he served most of his term, but at times for short periods at other places—the service of the force with which he served being in guarding the frontiers”, and that, “on one occasion [he] marched from Carr’s Fort in Georgia under the officers above named [General Clarke, Captain Burk, Lieutenant [___] Baldwin and Sergeant Benjamin Blake] ...” and later attested that he, “was in the Battle of ‘Briar Creek’ under Captain Drury Pace” where he, “received a slight gunshot wound in his right leg just above the ankle” (Dover 1836). If Dover was under command of Captain Pace at Briar Creek in early March 1779, then it is unlikely that he was at Carr’s fort during the February 10th battle.

Private Jesse Gordon, a seasoned veteran of the battle of Moore’s Mill, North Carolina and a soldier in Captain Joseph Gunnell’s Company, Dooly’s Regiment, Wilkes County militia, attested in 1833,

In a short time after his said last mentioned discharge not later than the first of September 1778 he enrolled himself in a Company of Militia in the County of Wilkes State of Georgia under the Command of Captain John Gunnels and joined the Regiment commanded by Colonel John Dooley and Lieutenant Colonel Elijah Clark and by this instrument subjected himself to be called into active service at any moment. Previous to this time this Deponent had become a Citizen of Wilkes County Georgia. This County soon after became the seat of an almost constant war (with either the British, Indians or Tories) and this deponent was for the most part of the time in actual service until peace was made with England and for some time after. This County was on the frontier. The Indians on two sides and the British and Tories on the other two so that the noted [?] Militia were almost constantly engaged in short expeditions and although occasionally at home a few days at a time it being subject to sudden calls had no time to attend to any business. After the British had taken Savannah and Augusta a party of them were sent to Wilkes County commanded by Colonel Hamilton. The Militia to which this Deponent was attached turned out under Colonel Clarke, drove Hamilton into Carr's Fort and there fought him some time until an express arrived that 700 Tories were at the Cherokee Ford of Savannah River intending to cross over into said County of
Wilkes. The militia took all the horses belonging to Hamilton's party that were alive with their equipment, raised a few more so as to make rank and file, 297, and marched to meet the Tories. They had however crossed over before we arrived and we pursued and overtook them at Kettle Creek, fought and Defeated them there (Gordon 1833).

Jesse Gordon further attested in 1839,

we then came back to Wilkes County in the State of Georgia where he had been previously married. In 1878 [sic, 1778] – enrolled himself as volunteer in the militia under Colonel John Duly, Lieutenant Colonel Elijah Clarke, his Captain was named Gunnells remained in that company until the end of the war – during which time he was on several expeditions against the Tories, Indians and British. At the time the British took possession of Savannah – they sent up the light horse commanded by Colonel John Hamilton to compel us to take the oath of allegiance in Wilkes County. The militia in which he was came up with them at Carr’s Fort and there engaged them and routed them, taking a number of the horses – At night an express came and informed them that there was a party of Tories at the Savannah River. The militia of which the deponent was one went to attack them – overtook them at Kettle Creek – attacked and defeated them – the fight lasted about three hours.

The officers who commanded, at Kettle Creek were Colonel Dooly, Elijah Clarke, Lieutenant Colonel and Major Burwell Smith and Captain Gunnells-- A Major Pickens [Andrew Pickens] from South Carolina was also there he afterwards was promoted to be a general (Gordon 1839).

Private Lloyd Kelley, a soldier in Captain Ottery’s [Awtry] Company, Wilkes County militia, fought in the engagement at Carr’s fort. Kelley attested in 1833 that he, “was in an engagement against the British and Tories in Wilkes County at Carr’s fort, the British were commanded by a Colonel or Major Hamilton--he fought under the command of General Pickens---there were in service at this engagement Colonel Dooly, Col. Clarke, Captain Gunnells, Stewart, George Dooly and Barker”, and that, “when he was not actively engaged in the field he was performing Garrison duty in Carr’s Fort in Wilkes County, Georgia. While Kelley’s memory was failing by the early 1830s, he attested that his service under Captain Ottery began, “toward the close of the year 1778 and ended about the month of August 1779” (Kelley 1833).

Private Robert Tharpe, a soldier in the Wilkes County militia, applied for a pension in 1842 at the age of 100. Although Tharpe’s chronology of events in 1779 is somewhat garbled, he provides unique information about Captain Carr and Carr’s fort:

I went to the State of Georgia and there I again entered the service of the United States and was under the command of Colonel Duley [sic, Dooly] and Captain John Clark [sic, Elijah Clark] these officers had full command of the frontier parts of the State of Georgia at that time and organized all the rules of spying against the Indians, and I Robert Tharp engaged with these officers and did serve a spying against the Indians whenever called on by either of these officers until Siege at Savannah when a Call was made for men to reinforce the Army at Savannah and these officers ordered out a portion of choice man of that purpose...after this defeat at Savannah I Robert Tharp then returned to Dooly and Clark and still [indecipherable word] my engagement with these officers, and again ordered out a spying of the frontiers for Indians and was Kept in actual service doing Duty of that kind according to the special orders of these officers until the death of Colonel Dooly and after the death of Dooly who had been promoted to General and after the death of this same General Dooly John Clark was then promoted and became General and I Robert Tharp was still continued in actual service a spying on the frontiers of Georgia and sheltered at Captain kars fort [sic, Carr or Kerr's
fort? near the line of the white settlement and while I Robert Tharp was at that Fort kept by Captain kar a party of British attacked the Fort when I Robert Tharp was made a prisoner of war with 8 other soldiers with me and all were taken off to the British Army at augustine [Saint Augustine] where I was kept a prisoner of war so that I never got back to my former place of service until after a final pacification of peace was made the term of time which I was in actual service under Colonel Dooly and Clark and after the death of General Dooly then under Clark alone until I was made a prisoner of war and the length of time which I was a prisoner of war was not less than 5 months in the whole of the time of my services on the frontiers of Georgia and the time I was a prisoner of war I do know is not less than 3 years and for the whole of this time last mentioned which I served I never received a Discharge nor pay neither and part nor in whole (Tharpe 1842).

In another deposition, also given in 1842, Tharpe stated,

I Robert Tharp then left North Carolina and went to Georgia where I this same Robert Tharp volunteered to serve a spying against the hostile Indians under General Dooly and Colonel Clark these officers at that time seemed to have full power to command all the forces on the frontiers of Georgia and by their orders I was stationed at Captain Robert McNabb's Fort and rendered services at Captain karrs Fort [sic, Carr's'] these forts were both on the [illegible] frontier parts of the State of Georgia the subaltern officers whose names I perfectly recollect at present were David Phelphs [sic, Phelps?] Lieutenant and William Hammett Lieutenant these officers were in actual service with me both in winter and summer the manner of way these soldiers were kept in service by orders of General Dooly himself were as follows from 6 to 12 men were ordered out from each Fort at one time the balance kept Garrison, general Dooly was killed at his own house by some unknown enemy and after General Dooly's death Colonel Clark took full command ordered out a party of choice men to take a rought [raft] along the Oconee River I Robert Tharp was one of the party and while on that expedition the British surrendered up to the Americans the town of Augusta and shortly after my return from my tour on the Oconee River General Clark ordered a party of choice men to a place called the White Bluff in South Carolina below Augusta on Savannah River where I was kept for 3 months guarding the River to keep the British from passing up or down the said River the British forces was then in possession of Savannah town at that time and after my return to my station at Captain McNabb's… after this Defeat I Robert Tharp returned to General Clark's command at Captain karrs Fort and Captain McNabb's Fort and some time after my return to my Station a British officer by the name of hammelton [sic, Hamilton?] With a party of soldiers far superior to the number of Captain karrs Fort there being but 9 in number on our part and consequence thereof we were all made prisoners of war and were taken on board of a watercraft and carried off to Saint Augustine and there kept a prisoner of war so that I Robert Tharp never got back to my station until final peace was made with old England, this being my unfortunate case near the end of the Revolutionary Struggle has finally deprived me from obtaining any part of my Monthly pay for the whole of my services which I rendered a private soldier after my engagement made voluntarily with General Dooly and Clark, the term of time was in actual service under the above mentioned officers I am sure is over 3 years (Tharpe 1842).

Davis (2014:11) considered the Carr's fort where Robert Tharpe was captured to be another fort, one operated by Captain Henry Karr. In light of Tharpe's description of his capture by the British officer named "hammelton", it is unclear if Tharpe is referring to the February 10, 1779 event at Captain Robert Carr's fort, or to a later event at another fort. Perhaps both are true, in that he participated in the engagement at Robert Carr's fort but was later captured at a different fort the following year. His story remains problematic.

Private Benjamin Thompson, a soldier in Captain John Awtry's Company, Dooly's Regiment, Georgia militia, gave this account of his involvement in the battle at Carr's fort:
In 1779 he was called into service under the same commanders, attacked the British and Tories at Carr’s Fort in Wilkes [County] he was under the command of Colonel Dooly and General Pickens – after an engagement against the British and Tories for several hours General Pickens from intelligence received of a lady of the enemy crossing Savannah River retreated from the fort, he was a few days thereafter in a battle under General Pickens at Kettle Creek (Thompson 1833).

William Baskins, Jr. was a captain in the South Carolina militia. James T. Baskin wrote in 1914 about his ancestor: "William Jr commissioned Capt Apr 18, 1777 at Charleston under Col. Andrew Williamson; made prisoner at Carr’s fort 1779; released after battle of Kettle Creek Feb 1779". More likely, Captain Baskins was captured at Vann’s Creek, which immediately followed the action at Carr’s fort (Davis 2008b). Captain Baskinsand his company also may have been at Carr’s fort on February 10th.

William Manson was a soldier in the South Carolina militia. Manson recalled his service in Wilkes County, Georgia in his 1832 pension application,

Nine months after his discharge [in October 1777], he [William Manson] removed to Calhoun’s Creek -- where he was attached to Captain Joseph Pickens’ Company of mounted Rangers -- Alexander Lucky and Mathew Finley Lieutenants -- the name of the Ensign he is unable to recollect. In 1779 the Tory Captains Boyd and McCrary marched along the border settlements, coming out of North Carolina, plundering the Whig families -- intending to join the British forces on the Coast. Early in the summer of 1779 the Deponent was marched under Captain Pickens against the Tories Boyd & McCrary -- At the Savannah River above James Fort the Company divided, one part crossing the River under Captain Pickens in pursuit of Boyd -- the other part of which the deponent was one, pursued McCreery who had not yet crossed the River -- but did not overtake him -- but returned to Fort Charlotte. Captain Pickens overtook the Tory Boyd -- routed his Company and killed him, and returned with the prisoners to Fort Charlotte -- where the Deponent was employed as one of the guard over them. He was on service in this expedition one month (Manson 1832).

Manson makes no direct mention of Carr’s fort, although his attachment to Captain Pickens’ mounted rangers may place him at the battleground since Captain Joseph Pickens arrived there to inform his brother, Colonel Andrew Pickens, of the approach of Colonel Boyd’s Loyalists.

Hamilton Reynolds served as a volunteer soldier in the Wilkes County militia in 1779. He recalled in 1840 that he enlisted as a,

volunteer soldier sometime in the spring or summer of 1779 in Wilkes County State of Georgia under Captain John Clark. Our Company alone marched to the Creek nation of Indians and destroyed their crops &c when we marched back to Wilkes County. I served in this tour 15 days. So soon as I reached Wilkes County on my return from the Creek nation, Colonel Pickens was raising volunteers. I immediately entered the service again as a volunteer soldier under Captain John Autery. We immediately struck a march for Colonel Pickens Army which was then in Wilkes County. As soon as we joined him, the Army under Colonel Pickens marched against Captain Boyd, who commanded a Company of Tories. We overtook him at a place called Kettle Creek, here we had a Battle. We killed, captured or dispersed the whole, from here we marched to General Lincolns encampment on the Carolina side of the Savannah River at Black Swamp nearly opposite to Augusta, here we remained until the French fleet arrived (Reynolds 1840).
Private Reynolds made no mention of Carr’s fort in his pension application, although he was likely present at that engagement as a soldier in Captain John Autry’s company of Wilkes County militia.

Britton Willis served as a private in the Georgia (and possibly South Carolina) militia. Private Willis served at Carr’s fort, although the exact date of service he could not recollect when he applied for a pension in 1832 (Willis 1832). Willis stated that,

at the age of seventeen or eighteen years and while living at the Saluda South Carolina, Troops were raising to serve on the Frontiers of Georgia, called minute men, for a term of three years—that he enlisted and entered the service of the United States with those Troops for three years, under William Baldwin Captain his son Baldwin Junior Lieutenant, and John Emberson[?]Ensign, were first marched, together with another company under Captain John Burkes to Carr’s Fort, Wilkes County, Georgia, but the precise time of entering the service he does not recollect, went to Carrs Fort in the Summer, kept the Fort and guarded the Frontier until the following Spring—both Companies were then marched up on Broad River, where we built some defenses and continued guarding the country until next Spring—were then marched to Augusta, the rendezvous of the different Troops intended for and Expedition to Augustine [St Augustine].” Willis also stated, “For twelve months I served as a private militia man commanded by James Little Captain, [Burrell] Smith Major & Elijah Clarke General and was engaged in various scouting parties against Tories & Indians and guarding the frontier—it being then Wilkes County Georgia against the Indians, served also during this last term at the siege of Savannah under the last named Officers.

The Loyalists
Loyalist accounts of the engagement at Carr’s fort are lacking. The men who served with Colonel John Hamilton and Captain Dougal Campbell were new recruits and had not been formally enlisted in the military. It was not until several weeks after the battle that the “Royal Volunteers of North Carolina”, or the Royal North Carolina Regiment as it was later known, was formally organized. Presumably the men who were with Hamilton and Campbell at Carr’s fort (and that remained with him) were assigned to this regiment.

Colonel John Hamilton
The best known Loyalist in the engagement was its commanding officer, John Hamilton, also known as Jonathan Hamilton. His biography is closely intertwined with the Royal North Carolina Regiment (Sabine 1847:346; 1664; Lambert 2010:90, 163, 195, 196, 198; Coke 1915:216; Braisted 2014; Warren 2014). His biographers quibble over his military rank, ranging from Captain to Major to Lieutenant Colonel to Colonel. Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell wrote that he gave Hamilton the rank of Colonel, as noted below.

A letter of support written in November 1777 to Sir Henry Clinton from North Carolina Governor Tryon for John Hamilton demonstrates that Governor Tryon held John Hamilton in high esteem. The Governor wrote: “The Bearer Mr. [John] Hamilton late from Virginia, has proposals to make to your Excellency for raising a Body of Men for His Majesty’s Service. He was concerned in an extensive trade in Virginia before these troubles, and was known to me as a Gentleman much Esteemed in that Colony. I could not therefore decline giving him this introduction to your Excellency, as I also flatter myself his intelligence of the Southern Colonies (both as to their Interior Situation and Commercial proceedings) will be in your Excellency’s opinion interesting. He is perfectly well acquainted with our friends the Regulators. If his
Plan is practicable I trust you will honor it with a recommendation to Sr. Wm. Howe (Cole and Braisted 2014).

In 1777, John Hamilton fled the province of North Carolina with a number of others in a chartered vessel and joined the British at New York. Hamilton set sail with the force to take Georgia under Lt. Col. Archibald Campbell in late 1778. By January 1779, the British had secured Savannah. Hamilton was appointed to the rank of colonel by Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell on January 1, 1779 and subsequently given command of a soon-to-be-formed regiment of North Carolina Loyalist volunteers. Campbell noted in his letter to Hamilton that he was to “enroll as many men as you can for your Regiment and cooperate with the King’s Army in suppressing the present unnatural Rebellion, & in supporting the re-establishment of the legal Government, against all who shall dare to oppose it” (Campbell 1784:199). Colonel Hamilton served as commander of the Royal North Carolina Volunteer regiment until the unit was disbanded in Nova Scotia in 1783. Hamilton settled in New Brunswick (Coke 1915: 216).

**Captain Dougald Campbell**

Captain Dougald Campbell was a Scotsman who served in the 71st Regiment under Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell from the time of the regiment’s formation until October, 1779 when he was given a command in another regiment. Dougald was captured, along with Lieutenant Colonel Campbell, as they entered the port of Boston in 1777, held in Massachusetts as a prisoner of war, and released along with his superior in May, 1778. Lieutenant Dougald Campbell sailed with Archibald Campbell to Georgia. In Savannah Dougald, who by then served as Archibald’s aid de camp, was assigned to raise provincial corps. After the recruiting debacle that culminated in the battle of Carr’s fort, Captain Dougald Campbell returned to Savannah where he accompanied his superior on the vessel *Phoenix* to Great Britain with the intent of raising additional ranks of the 71st Regiment. In October, 1779 Dougald was given a command in the 87th Regiment and did not return to the United States. He died in India in 1792 (Brumby 2012:5, 52, 75, 95).

**The North Carolina Volunteers**

Cole and Braisted (2014) provide a brief history of John Hamilton’s Royal North Carolina Regiment and its service in the southern colonies. As noted earlier, Colonel John Hamilton and Captain Dougald Campbell were assigned the task of recruiting men for a North Carolina provincial regiment. Georgians in Wilkes County also were solicited for the new regiment. Those who chose not to swear their allegiance to the King were burned out by the recruiting party. They had nearly completed a circuit of Wilkes County’s militia forts when they were challenged by Colonel Andrew Pickens and his men at Carr’s fort. Precise numbers and names of the Loyalists who were with Hamilton and Campbell at the time were not recorded.

Daniel Manson, a ship builder from Charleston, South Carolina, served as a Major in the Royal North Carolina Volunteers. On January 20, 1779, Colonel John Hamilton gave Manson the following orders at Savannah, “By virtue of the power and authority given me by Brig. Gen. Prevost and Col. Archibald Campbell to be Col. Commandant of a Corps of Provincial to be raised under the title of the Royal North Carolina Volunteers, I do hereby authorize and appoint you to enlist men for the said Corps to serve for
three years or during the Rebellion and for doing so this shall be your Warrant”, and Colonel Hamilton further instructed, “You are to raise as your quota sixty men that is to say for your Lt. 18 Men, for your Ensign 12 men, the naming of them. Two. You will in that case be entitled to five dollars Bounty Money is allowed by Government for Levy Money, and you and inferior officers to receive pay agreeable to the Mode established by General Howe by Order the 24th of April 1777” (PRO AO 13/131:324; Warren 2014:210-223). John Martin, a Scotsman who settled in North Carolina, served as a Captain in the Royal North Carolina Volunteers. In his memorial, Martin stated that Colonel Hamilton had given him a warrant in 1779 to form a company for the regiment, which he did (PRO AO 12/34:145-147; Warren 2014:267-269). Researchers were unable to determine if either Major Daniel Manson or Captain John Martin were present at Carr’s fort.

On 22 February 1779 Lieutenant Colonel Campbell organized the Loyalist recruits into a corps of two companies, one of foot, and one of horse, by the name of “Royal Volunteers of North Carolina,” commanded by Lieutenant Colonel John Moore. At some point between February and October of 1779 the corps, by now known as the Royal North Carolina Regiment, consisted of two battalions. John Hamilton commanded one or both of them, but John Moore’s whereabouts is undetermined. The corps was consolidated into one battalion between the time of the Siege of Savannah (September-October 1779) and the Siege of Charleston (May 1780). Colonel Hamilton and his servant were taken prisoner by the Rebels scouting Charleston during the siege. The Royal North Carolina Regiment was a part of the army that advanced to the siege from Georgia under the command of General Paterson (Cole and Braisted 2014).

In 1781 the Royal North Carolina regiment formed a part of Cornwallis’ army that entered North Carolina, attracting more recruits to the unit. By this time the corps consisted of seven companies (including a light infantry company). An eighth company was raised later on the march to Virginia. When Cornwallis refitted his army at Wilmington, North Carolina, he left the Royal North Carolina Regiment there (with the exception of their light company), augmented by men from the battalion companies. The eighth company, commanded by Captain William Chandler of New Jersey, was raised along the march to Virginia. Two companies were at the Siege of Yorktown and were taken prisoner there.

The Royal North Carolina Regiment fought continuously with many diverse companies at the Siege of Savannah, Georgia and its aftermath (September 3 to October 18, 1779), and in South Carolina at the Siege of Charleston (March 29 to May 12, 1780) and the Battle of Camden (June 1780), as well as at Hanging Rock, North Carolina (August 1 to August 6, 1780 returning to Camden on August 16 with wounded), and in many other battles. On August 19, 1780 Cornwallis appointed new officers in the Royal North Carolina Regiment. The soldiers were: Captain John Leggitt, Daniel McLean, Lieutenant McCraw, Lieutenant Campbell, Ensigns John Shaw and Charles Atkins and Adjutant Roderick McLeod (Frederick Mackenzie Papers 1780).

In May, 1780, the North Carolina Volunteer Regiment received these arms:
- Musquets Short Land with Steel Rammers 24
- Bayonets with Scabbards 24
- Cartouch boxes with belts and Frogs 24
William Hayman served for four years as a soldier in Colonel Hamilton’s Royal North Carolina regiment. William Hayman was born in Argyllshire, Scotland about 1757. He may have been the sailor William Hyndman on the HMS Consent 1777 to America, listed in the Register of Testaments of Argyle, Scotland 1674-1800. William Hayman was discharged from the army at Country Harbour, Nova Scotia from the Royal North Carolina Regiment on dated Nov 3, 1783. William Hayman is listed in 1784, at Country Harbour, E., where he was granted 100 acres. He did not take up his grant but he moved on to settle at Waugh’s River near Tatamagouche, Nova Scotia (Lincoln 2008). While it is not documented that Hayman was present at Carr’s fort, his long association with Hamilton suggests that he was.

Nicholas Welsh served as an officer in Hamilton’s regiment from February, 1779 until 1780. Hamilton attested to the conduct of Nicholas Welsh, a soldier in his command in 1780, noting: the Conduct of Mr. [Nicholas] Welsh came under my immediate Cognizance from the Month of February 1779, until the period of Selling his Commission of Major in the Regiment which I had the honor to Command..., I do most humbly, & most earnestly Recommend him to the particular notice & favor of Government” (Hamilton 1780). While it is not documented if Welsh was present at Carr’s fort, he was with Hamilton by February 1779, which may indicate that he was with Hamilton on February 10th.

The Royal North Carolina Regiment was at Haw River, North Carolina (Feb to Apr 25, 1781), then in Hillsboro, North Carolina, with Cornwallis. Major John Hamilton requested that his Royal North Carolina Regiment be brought back together in May of 1781 and after a long march the regiment was at Wilmington, North Carolina on August 1, 1781. It continued fighting in the Southern Campaign until the end of the war.

With the evacuation of Yorktown, Virginia, all the companies of the Royal North Carolina Regiment were united at Charleston, South Carolina. On October 1, 1782 the regiment sailed from Charleston, South Carolina to St. Augustine, Florida. During the close of the war, Loyalists lost all claim to their land and possessions and started to leave the country. Hamilton wrote to Brigadier General McArthur on May 10, 1783 regarding the disposition of the troops under his command (Hamilton 1783). He requested that the men of his regiment be allowed to travel to British properties and be granted land. He also wrote to ask that he be allowed to go to a British province or England. In October 1783, the Royal North Carolina Regiment set sail from St. Augustine, Florida to Country Harbor, Nova Scotia in Canada, and in November the regiment was disbanded. Demond notes that three regiments arrived in Nova Scotia on December 3, 1783 from St. Augustine, Florida on the vessel DIANA. They were the South Carolina Regiment, King’s Carolina Regiment, and the Royal North Carolina Regiment (Demond 1940:192; UELAC.org 2012a-b; Murdoch 1867; Eaton 1918).

Later, Hamilton attested to the character of Archibald McDugald in a 1787 document. He noted, “I do hereby Certify that Archd. McDugald Join’d His Majestys Troops in Georgia in the Year 1779”, and that McDugald participated in the southern campaigns. He went on to write that McDugald, “behaved with
Great zeal and Firmness and on every occasion with uncommon Spirit and Gallantry he is therefore in my Opinion Justly intitled to the Notice and attention of Government” (Hamilton 1787).

While researchers have not identified any lists of the Loyalist participants in the engagement at Carr’s fort, better documentation for Colonel Hamilton’s North Carolina regiment exists for other periods of the American Revolution. Probably the best information for the regiment dates after the war, when the regiment settled in Nova Scotia, Canada. Some portion of these men may have served with Colonel Hamilton at Carr’s fort. A list of "Men, Women, Children and Servants Belonging to the late Royal North Carolina Regt. Settled and carrying Country Harbour 12th June1784." was transcribed for the Nova Scotia Genweb project (UELAC 2012a; Crowe 2002) and is reformatted in Table 3. We do not know which soldiers in the above list served with Colonel Hamilton on February 10, 1779, but it is reasonable to expect that some on the list were present.

The Loyalists who settled at Country Harbour, Guysborough County, Nova Scotia in 1783 included soldiers and their families who were part of the Royal North Carolina Regiment, the Royal South Carolina Regiment [South Carolina Royalists] and the Carolina [King’s] Rangers (Haliburton 1829:95). The settlement also included several hundred African-Americans who had provided service to the King. These settlers built a small town that they named Stormont (Harkness 1946). Haliburton (1829:95) noted, “Like most other towns attempted at that time it failed of success, the same difficulties having occurred to them all”. The failure of the Loyalists here seemed to echo their failure in colonial Georgia during the revolution.

Table 3. Men, Women, Children and Servants Belonging to the late Royal North Carolina Regt. Settled and carrying Country Harbour 12th June1784.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Daniel McNeil</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Thomas Hamilton</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Henry Neel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>John Martin</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Audy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Alexander Campbell</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Timothy Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Dug McHethan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Daniel Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Thomas Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>Robert Hamilton</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Michael Dougherty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>Archibald McLeegats [Leggett?]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>Alexander McCaskill</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Peter Mayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quartermaster</td>
<td>Neill Currie</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>James Proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>John Simes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>David Johnston</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Patrick Connolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Norman Martin</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Cage Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Martin Mastin</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>John Reilly</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Henry Hetton/Ketton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>David Leggett</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Iruen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>James Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Annual Register* reported on the progress (or lack thereof) in winning the hearts and minds of the colonists in interior Georgia and the Carolinas. While the article was written in early 1779, it adeptly summarized the state of affairs in the southern colonies throughout the American Revolution, as reflected in the events surrounding the battle of Carr’s fort. The editors of the *Annual Register* surmised this regarding the southern Loyalists, “Their alertness and zeal were, however, stimulated into action by the accounts of General Prevost’s success. But their usual ill fortune still stuck by them; and before they were able to do anything of moment, they were attacked and entirely defeated by some of the nearest militia, having lost near half their number, in killed, wounded, or taken. About 300 of the remainder, however, found means to make their way good in a body to the back part of Georgia; from whence having proceeded to the nearest British posts, they by degrees joined the royal army. It appears that the loyal party, even in this quarter where it was strongest, (being in a great measure composed of emigrants from North Britain,) was infinitely inferior to the ill-affected; and that without the great and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>John Blivens</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Richard Molloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Malcolm Hack</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Benjamin Mayberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>John McPheran</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Robert Mayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Wm. Smithwick</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Richard Bradford</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>James Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>John McIntyre</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>James Lovely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Charles Tool</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Moses Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>John Newham</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Timothy Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>James Murray</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>John Cashel</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Gilbert McMillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Henry Wood</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Robert McMillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Davind Hinson</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>John Currie</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Daniel McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Murdock McLeod</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Duncan McLennon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Malcolm Mathewson</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>James Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Bevens</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Samuel Dyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Ira Tipser [sp?]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Daniel Fowler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Nathaniel Cooke</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Robert Dolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Matthew Cassady</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Richard Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Solomon Porter/Poster</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Samuel Pottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Proctor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Iliam Reeding or Ruding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Leech</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Rudman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John McAlister</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Clyton/Lyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Patrick O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Richard Donovan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed : Daniel McNeil, Captain
Signed : Thomas Hamilton, Captain late R. M. Regiment
Signed : Wm. Shaw, Mr.

Editors Note: Women, children & servants omitted
continual assistance of the royal army, the well-affected inhabitants, in no part of America, were in a condition to make head against the rebels” (*Annual Register* 1780:180). This reference to the 300 who made" their way good" to the British lines was composed of Hamilton’s recruits and the remnants of Boyd’s recruits.

**IV. Archeological Evidence from the Battlefield Landscape**

**Metal Detecting**
Metal detectors provided the most extensive dataset from the Carr’s Fort Battlefield Survey. Approximately 1,455 metal artifacts were located by MD survey. Of these, 746 were identified and left in situ, while 709 were collected and returned to the laboratory for analysis. Clearly modern objects, such as modern bullet casing and modern jacketed bullets, shotgun shell casings, tin cans, metallicized helium balloons, barbed wire, logging cables, wire nails, plow shares, mowing teeth, cattle tags, and a myriad of other relics of the modern world were not collected or recorded. At least 226 of the metal objects that were recorded were later determined to post-date the American Revolution.

Historical metal was widespread over the study area and few areas were completely devoid of metal. Architectural metal was most represented by the survey sample (n=616), followed by activity-related metal (n=605), kitchen metal (n=132), arms metal (n=45), clothing (n=26), personal (n=18), and furniture (n=10). Three locations in the study area yielded slag and at least one of these likely indicates the venue of a blacksmith operation. It was located several hundred meters northeast of the Carr’s fort battlefield.

Once the approximate battle location had been identified and a core area defined, archeologists implemented a Phase II Metal Detector survey over a portion of the battle site. This included closer-interval MD survey transects, beginning with transects spaced 10 meters apart. Once Locus A had been identified a small area (20 m by 7 m) was raked to remove leaf litter, small saplings, vines and other underbrush. Surveyors then covered this area with MD survey transects spaced two meters apart. This same area had already been explored by 60 m survey interval, 30 m coverage, and 10 m coverage. The sampled block yielded numerous battle artifacts from the two meter transects.

**Shovel Tests**
Shovel tests were used sparingly in this investigation. This method was not used for site discovery but was rather to ascertain the range and frequency of other artifacts at selected locations. Shovel testing also served to identify artifact classes, other than metal, that were present at the archeological sites. Shovel testing located 70 artifacts.

Fifteen shovel tests were placed within the suspected location of Captain Carr’s fort. These tests were spaced at five meter intervals in a 20 meter (northwest-southeast) by 10 meter (northeast-southwest) grid. These tests were aligned with the GPR grid.

As anticipated, the shovel testing effort produced very few battlefield artifacts. Four of the shovel tests yielded 13 historic artifacts and included one tiny undecorated delftware body sherd, one undecorated pearlware body sherd, one heavily patinated clear bottle or tableware glass and several small
brick/daub fragments. All the objects dated to circa 1770s, in keeping with the period of the battle. The Carr’s fort battlefield site soil is extremely shallow as a result of many decades of agriculture and erosion. The natural soil stratigraphy at the site is almost completely deflated--consisting of a thin, plow disturbed A-horizon above compact sandy clay subsoil. Artifacts were confined to the upper 10-12 cm of soil in these tests. Despite the lack of vertical integrity, the combined findings from the MD survey, limited shovel tests and the single test unit (discussed below) point to a single component, eighteenth-century occupation at Loci A and B.

Shovel tests also were excavated at two other locations in the study area. The first of these was a cruciform of tests excavated at a small eighteenth century artifact scatter on a knoll that was first defined by metal detecting. Shovel testing on a cruciform pattern with test spaced at 10 m intervals defined the area measuring 60 m east-west by 40 m north-south. This shovel test coverage encompassed the entire metal distribution area but all 11 shovel tests were devoid of any historic artifacts. Shovel tests did yield minor evidence of non-diagnostic aboriginal chipped stone debitage. Three pieces of quartz debitage were recovered from the upper 18 cm of soil (Appendix 1, C148).

The metal scatter on this knoll probably represents a single eighteenth century farmstead, possibly that of a member of the Jacob Awtry/Autry family. Jacob Autrys was a neighbors of the Carrs and several Awtrys, including Jacob, were soldiers in Captain Carr’s militia company during the American Revolution. This site was severely deflated from centuries of farming and erosion. The low frequency of any historic artifacts overall and the complete absence of any historic artifacts in the shovel test series attests to a brief occupation. Had shovel testing alone been used to search for the site, it probably would not have been found. Investigation of this location revealed no definitive arms group artifacts, although one small item was recovered that either represents a triangular file tip, or a bayonet tip.

The other location where a shovel test was located was near a suspected house ruin, north of the main area of the battlefield. A 50 cm by 50 cm test was placed in an area where the metal detector indicated a concentration of metal artifacts. Archeologists excavated this test in a single level to a depth of 16 cm below ground. It contained a variety of early to late nineteenth century artifacts (including ironstone, pearlware and C.C. ware ceramics, and solarized bottle glass) and confirmed this area as a former house location (Appendix 1, B295). This house was one of several that were distributed on this particular landform. It appears to be the most recent, dating to the nineteenth (and possibly early twentieth centuries). The predominant period of occupation on this plantation site was late eighteenth to very early nineteenth century. This area originally was granted to members of the Carr family in the 1780s, but by the early nineteenth century it formed part of the extensive Toombs plantation. Because of the abundance of hand wrought nails, this locale received considerable scrutiny by the survey team. Many metal artifacts were located by MD survey and mapped. Only a few arms group artifacts were included in this inventory and most of this plantation did not appear to be an area of armed conflict. More likely, the scattered lead bullets that were found were the product of regular plantation life.
Figure 25. Loci A and B, Carr's Fort Battlefield.
Ground Penetrating Radar Survey
GPR survey at Locus A on the Carrs fort battlefield produced some intriguing results. Field observations of the GPR data revealed a concentration of anomalies (possibly linear) in the northern part of the grid block, which was also the location of a cluster of impacted lead bullets. Preliminary GPR data analysis indicates that the radar anomalies related to structures or features within Carr’s fort. This portion of Locus A was then targeted with a small test unit to investigate it, which is discussed in following section.

Test Unit 1
A single 3 m northwest-southeast by 50 cm test unit northeast-southwest test unit, designated Test Unit 1, was excavated in the Core Area of the battlefield. This general area had yielded a cluster of fired lead flintlock rifle balls that were located during the MD survey. GPR survey in the same vicinity suggested that a linear feature was present. The test unit confirmed the existence of the linear feature, which was visible in the floor of the test unit as a dark reddish brown band that cut into the natural reddish clay.
subsoil. A plan view and profile view of Test Unit 1 is shown in Figure 28. The feature was very thin and subtle, but nonetheless present. The soil excavated from this test unit contained an assemblage of eighteenth century ceramic sherds (2 lead glazed coarse earthenware rims, 2 unglazed coarse earthenware body sherds, one black basalt body sherd, two undecorated creamware body sherds and one unrefined, gray salt-glazed stoneware sherd), two olive green bottle glass sherds, and two wrought nails. The unit also contained one metavolcanic thinning flake that is associated with an undated prehistoric occupation. With one single exception (1 wrought nail), these artifacts were confined to the upper soil zone, which consisted of a dark brown (7.5YR3/3 sandy clay loam with mottles of strong brown (7.5YR5/6) sandy clay. The subsoil matrix was red (2.5YR4/6) sandy clay.
Surface Evidence
Surface evidence provides additional clues concerning early historic settlement in the Beaverdam Creek watershed. Although ground surface visibility over most of study area was quite limited by trees and other ground cover, areas with exposed ground surface were carefully examined for artifacts. These exposed areas included dirt roads, trails, logging disturbances and timber yards, plowed game plots, and other recently denuded areas. Surface artifacts did not include any arms group artifacts. Visual surface survey did locate ceramics, glass, brick, and some metal items. Surface inspection also revealed many potential cultural features such as chimney pads, foundation stones and well depressions. Most, if not all of these, post-dated the American Revolution. Careful reading of the ground surface also resulted in the discovery of abandoned road traces and several segments of early roads, which the survey team mapped. Some of these transportation routes likely date to the American Revolution and contribute important information to that context.

Artifacts
The Carr’s Fort Battlefield Survey identified 1,729 historical artifacts on the Beaverdam Creek-Wilkes County landscape. Of these, 838 artifacts were identified in the field and left in place. The remaining 891 artifacts were returned to the LAMAR Institute laboratory for further study. Artifacts from the survey were grouped into functional categories following South (1977). Selected examples of artifacts recovered by the survey are illustrated in Figures 29-33.

Architecture Group
A total of 751 artifacts was assigned to the architecture group. These artifacts are associated with buildings and other farm improvements such as fences, animal troughs, or sheds. Nails were the most common architecture-related artifact.

Nails were fairly ubiquitous throughout the survey area and these were grouped into one of four categories: wrought, machine cut, unidentified square (cut or wrought) and wire. Hand wrought nails were generally manufactured in Georgia prior to 1790 (Nelson 1968; Elliott 2010). Hand wrought nails continued in use for several decades after the introduction of machine cut nails. A total of 273 wrought nails was observed during the survey, making it the most frequent nail type. Hand wrought nails were produced before, during and after the American Revolution. Thus, they may be indicative of a building dating to the war but not necessarily so. Researchers were surprised to learn that wrought nails outnumbered cut nails in the survey collection. In traditional archeological surveys the opposite is usually the case. The prevalence of wrought over cut nails suggests that most of the structures represented by the nails date prior to 1790.

Nails that were cut from sheet iron appear in Georgia after 1790. The inexpensive price of cut nails rapidly led to the waning popularity of wrought nails. Machine cut nails themselves suffered a decline in popularity after 1865 with the introduction of wire nails. Cut nails remained available for several decades later, however, and many houses from the late nineteenth century contain a mixture of cut and wire nail types. A total of 199 cut nails was observed by the survey making it the second most common
nail type. Since the technology for making cut nails did not exist prior to 1790 these nails are not diagnostic of the American Revolution time period. A small percentage of the cut nails observed by the survey team shared traits of wrought and cut nails. These date to the intermediate period when nail technology was improving.

The remaining two nail categories consisted of unidentified square nails and wire nails. The unidentified square nail category included cut or wrought nails that were poorly preserved and could not be distinguished between those two manufacturing techniques. Generally, wire nails were discarded in the field. Two specimens were retained, as they were already assigned a provenience designation.

Thirty-two spikes were located in the survey. Nearly all (n=29) were hand wrought. Nine spikes (28% of the sample) were recovered from Locus A on the Carr’s fort battlefield. The high incidence of spikes in this small area provides additional support for the interpretation of Locus A as the site of Carr’s fort. Spikes would have been useful and necessary in the construction of a structure such as a fort or fortified house.

Other building hardware located during the project survey consisted of six hinges (including one pintle hinge and one small brass hinge), six iron fireplace grate fragments and cast iron fireplace surround fragments. Most of these artifacts probably post-date the American Revolution. Their locations suggest the presence of later domestic sites in the study area. Surveyors also located one iron door hardware piece. It likely dates to the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. Four locations were recorded that contained large fragments of sheet metal. These likely represent roofing for buildings that post-date the American Revolution.

The MD survey identified several loci in the survey area where the density of iron was great and not suited to a 100 percent investigation. Those areas were designated “nail clouds” and they probably represent building locations. A very small sample of these nail clouds was studied, in order to estimate the building’s age.

Bricks were observed at 114 locations throughout the survey area. These included isolated bricks, brick clusters and intact chimney foundations made of brick and/or fieldstones. Window glass was poorly represented in the artifact inventory; only one window glass sherd was recovered. This is not entirely unexpected, since glass is not metallic and would not be expected in a MD survey.

**Clothing Group**

Archeologists identified 26 artifacts in the clothing group. These are summarized in Table 4. Brass buttons constitute most of this assemblage. Examples are shown in Figure 30. Three of South’s button types were noted in the collection. Most conformed to Type 7, one was Type 9 and one was a Type 18. The two former types were manufactured in the eighteenth century and may date to the battle period, while the Type 18 button was produced in the early nineteenth century. The collection also includes one “Bell Cord” overall button that was manufactured sometime during 1923-1936. The buttons were mostly undecorated or engraved with geometric or floral patterns. The collection includes no military buttons. The Patriot and Loyalist fighters at Carr’s fort did not have identifying marks on their buttons. Locus A yielded three metal buttons, including one Type 7 and one Type 9, while Locus B contained two
buttons, including one Type 7. Other clothing items recovered by the survey include one small brass thimble, an iron scissors handle, shoe parts (one brass shoe heel plate and one shoe heel composed of small wrought brass tacks and wood), and one small silver cuff link part (engraved floral motif).
Figure 28. Selected Iron Artifacts (A-C. Spikes, LN124, 334 and 557; D. Rosehead wrought nail, burned, LN711; E. Wrought hook, LN37; F. Padlock, LN371; G. Saw blade, LN293; H. Gimlet bit, LN373).
Figure 29. Selected Metal Buttons (A. Engraved tombac button, LN465; B. Undecorated brass button, LN98; C. Engraved starburst brass button, LN458; D. Undecorated domed brass button, LN709; E. Engraved silver cufflink, LN294; F and G. Undecorated brass buttons with thread, LN620 and 503).
Figure 30. Selected Brass Artifacts (A. Brass rosette, LN638; B. Brass lock plate, LN181; C. Brass buckle, LN582; D. Brass buckle fragments, LN302 and 291; F. Stamped floral brass strip, LN128; G. Brass pistol buttplate, LN288).
Figure 31. Selected Metal Artifacts (A. Iron flintlock butt plate, LN540; B. Lead glazed coarse earthenware sherd, LN307; C. Brass spoon handle, LN91; D. Brass powder flask, LN502; E. Copper coin planchet, LN554; F. Clipped British halfpenny (1770), LN283).
Figure 32. Selected Lead Artifacts (A-G, I-M, O-Q. Impacted rifle balls, LN275, 286, 299, 309, 310, 301, 568, 555, 567, 556, 297, 577, 311 and 578; H. and N. Dropped rifle balls, 558 and 661).
Furniture Group
The survey located 10 artifacts classed in the furniture group. A brass upholstery tack, door lock parts, kerosene lamp parts (n=6), a porcelain furniture castor, and a pump organ brass reed. Pump organs were common in small churches and private homes in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Gellerman 1996). The kerosene lamps that were recovered likely date after the eighteenth century and are not associated with the 1779 battle.

Kitchen Group
The survey team located 228 artifacts in the kitchen group. Most of these were fragments of cast iron cookware that were located by MD survey. Forms included kettles, pots, skillets, dutch ovens, and waffle irons. Test Unit 1 in Locus A of the battlefield core area contained an important collection of eighteenth century ceramics. This small assemblage confirms the mid-to-late eighteenth century age of artifacts from Locus A.

Other kitchen-related metal items included forks, spoons, knives and stove parts. Non-metallic kitchen related artifacts included minor amounts of ceramics and bottle glass identified from the surface or from subsurface test excavations. Ceramics that dated to the battle period included black basalt, creamware, delftware, lead glazed coarse earthenware, pearlware and salt-glazed stoneware. Bottle glass possibly dating to the battle period included olive green spirit bottles and clear bottle or tableware glass.

Table 1. Clothing Group Artifacts.
The abundance of cast iron cookware sherds throughout the survey area is noteworthy. Cast iron was not readily recycled once these vessels were broken. Consequently, the sherds often were discarded near their area of use. They were frequently discovered at, or on the periphery of, domestic residences. This class of kitchen artifacts is easily located with MD survey and their discovery in future surveys should provide important clues to the location of early residences. While they are not military artifacts, a wide variety of metal cookware was used by the military in the American Revolution and these items are often found on military campsites. Private Joseph Plumb Martin discussed his regiment’s use of iron kettles in 1776 and 1777 in his autobiography of his service as a patriot (Martin 1962). He described a kettle that he was charged with carrying while his regiment was on the march in New Jersey and New York. Martin (1962:51-52) wrote of one event near White Plains, New York, “We had our cooking utensils (at that time the most useless thing in the army,) to carry in our hands. They were made of cast iron and consequently heavy. I was so beat out before morning with hunger and fatigue that I could hardly move one foot in front of the other. I told my messmates that I could not carry our kettle any further. They said they would not carry it any further; of what use was it? They had nothing to cook and did not want anything to cook with. We were sitting down on the ascent of a hill when this discourse happened. We got up to proceed when I took up the kettle, which held nearly a common pail full. I could not carry it. My arms were nearly dislocated. I sat it down in the road and one of the others gave it a shove with his foot and it rolled down against the fence, and that was the last I ever saw of it.”

James Swank (1892:279) wrote in his history of iron manufacture that, “Georgia has no colonial iron history” and that the “first iron enterprises in this State established probably after 1790”. More recently, Mulholland (1981) demonstrated that numerous iron foundries existed in the eastern North America by the mid-eighteenth century in spite of British policy that prohibited the establishment of this industry in America. Mulholland’s study did not address the prospects for an early iron industry in Georgia. By 1792, iron furnaces existed in north Georgia. Elholm visited fortified Hillhouse furnace, on a tributary of the Broad River near present-day Danielsville, Georgia (Elholm 1793). Wilson (1913:193) described an early iron foundry on the upper Oconee River at Hurricane Shoals near present-day Commerce, Georgia. Wilson noted, “Fragments of pots, ovens and skillets were thick around the old site until 1840, when the great Harrison flood, as the big rain was called, swept away almost every vestige of its former life. Then work had to start anew. The old furnace was kept in operation as late as the sixties, during the civil war.”

**Personal Group**

Twenty-one artifacts from the survey were assigned to the personal group. Seven of these came from the core area of the battlefield. They included clasp knives, two coins, jewelry, and a key. One coin was a clipped British half cent. This specimen was highly worn and barely legible and no date was visible. Based on its other stylistic features, the age of the coin could be bracketed between 1770 and 1773 and it appears to bear the date 1770 (Seaby and Purvey 1980). This coin was located by metal detector within the suspected Carr’s fort portion of the Core Area of the battlefield.

**Tobacco Group**

The survey yielded no artifacts in the tobacco group. This finding was not unexpected since the primary search technique was MD survey and typical tobacco-related items generally are not metallic.
Arms Group
Forty-two artifacts from the survey were assigned to the arms group. The battle-related artifacts include lead rifle balls and brass and iron flintlock hardware. These items are summarized in Table 4. Arms artifacts were all metal artifacts that were, with a single exception, located by MD survey. The exception was a percussion gun part that was located in a 50 cm by 50 cm test excavation. This type of weapon was invented in the early nineteenth century, so it was not considered a battlefield relic. Archeologists recovered most of the arms objects from the area later defined as the core area of Carr’s fort battlefield (Figure 37). Only 11 arms group artifacts (<26%) came from surveyed locations outside of the core area. This is an important statistic in light of the extensive survey coverage in the areas beyond the core area. Figure 38 shows the spatial distribution of arms group artifacts within the core area. Arms artifacts were most concentrated at two locations within the core area. These areas were designated Loci A and B and are discussed later in the report.

Figure 33. Brass butt plate photographed in-situ on the battlefield, 2013.
Table 2. Arms Group Artifacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Core Area</th>
<th>Locl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Brass butt plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Brass gun part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gun hardware, brass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lead ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Leadball, impacted</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Leadball, impacted</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Leadball, impacted</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Butt plate or escutcheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Iron side plate with rivet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Lead ball, dropped</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Lead ball, flattened</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Lead, flattened</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Leadball, dropped</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Leadball, impacted (melted)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted (chewed?)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Butt plate, pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>Butt plate, pistol, brass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Frizzen, iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Gun barrel, wrought iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Iron, buttplate</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>Lead ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Lead ball, impacted</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Lead ball, possibly dropped</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Lead ball, small, impacted (melted)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Lead, flattened</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Leadball, impacted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Possible gun part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>Triangular iron fragment, bayonet or file</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities Group
Six hundred and four artifacts from the survey were assigned to the Activities Group. This category reflects a wide range of rural activities and they cover several centuries of life in the area. Items include animal tack, barrel hoops, blacksmithing debris, buckles, chains, hooks, knives, plow parts (clevis, hames
hardware, trace chains), tools (axes, chisels, hoes, gimlet, saws, shovel, wrench), wagon hardware and
other scrap metal objects. Many are related to the operation of farms. Plow shares and plow share
fragments were quite common throughout the study area. Only a few examples of these were recorded
by the survey team. Others activities group artifacts pertain to timbering activity. Most of this artifact
group cannot be directly linked to the Revolutionary War battle. Many items, however, were fashioned
by hand and pertain to frontier period life in the area. Many were also functional items that continued
to be used for many decades thereafter.

Horseshoes were a notable component of the activities group artifacts identified by the survey.
Horseshoes and other animal shoes were found throughout the survey area. These span the eighteenth
through early nineteenth centuries. Many of the horseshoes displayed traits characteristic of early
historic horseshoes. While the horseshoes could not be specifically linked to the military engagement at
Carr’s fort, they did provide information on the roadways, paths and historic settlements in the study
vicinity. This artifact category also provides information on other land use, such as farming and logging,
where the shoes were deposited away from the roadways. A total of 115 horseshoes was included in the
dataset. Of these, 66 were collected and analyzed and another 49 horseshoes were located and left in
the field after being recorded with GPS. The horseshoe collection differentiated between horse and
mule-shoes, although these results were tentative. The core area of Carr’s fort battlefield yielded 21
animal shoes, or slightly more than 18 percent of the overall survey assemblage.

Prehistoric Artifacts
Forty-two stone artifacts were associated with the prehistoric era. These included chipped projectile
points (PPK), biface fragments, one crude chipped axe and chert and quartz debitage. None of these
artifacts was found in any great concentration. The projectile points included stemmed PPKs dating to
the Middle and Late Archaic period and one small triangular PPK dating between the Late Woodland and
Middle Mississippian periods. The chipped stone axe likely dates between the Middle Archaic and Early
Woodland periods. None of these artifacts is associated with the Revolutionary War event at Carr’s fort.
It should be noted, however, that this part of Wilkes County was heavily collected for Native American
relics in the twentieth century. One prominent collector, E.B. Mell, accumulated many such relics. The
locations of some of his finds are recorded in the Georgia Archaeological Site File in Athens, Georgia. If
E.B. Mell collected any historic relics related to the eighteenth century, these are not curated by the
University of Georgia.

Battlefield Analysis and KOCOA

Battle Description
Our present understanding of the Carr’s fort battlefield is not complete. Historical records provide some
information about the place and the present archeological search located the site and recorded a small
artifact sample of battle artifacts. This assemblage was sufficient to confirm the location of the battle
but it falls short of defining all pertinent areas within the battleground. Had the battlefield been located
early in the survey the research team could have allocated more time and resources to its study. As it
was found at the very end of the project, however, archeologists obtained only a rudimentary definition
of the site.
Other than the scattered references to the battle found in pension applications, only a few descriptions of battle events are known. These include brief accounts by Jonathan Hamilton in Charles Stedman’s history of the war, Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell’s journal entry (possibly written in 1783 or 1784), Surgeon Robert Jackson’s brief discussions of Loyalists wounds (1791), an 1811 recollection by Andrew Pickens, an 1812 deposition by Samuel Beckham, and an 1811 secondary historical account by Hugh McCall.

Davis’ Synthesis of Historical Accounts

Davis (2014:38) summarizes the known accounts of the engagement at Carr’s fort on February 10, 1779:

Colonel Andrew Pickens with men from his Upper Ninety Six South Carolina Regiment and Colonel John Dooly with his Georgia militia, some 200 men in total, crossed the Savannah River into Wilkes County and set out to pursue the Loyalist horsemen under Captains Dougald Campbell and [Colonel] John Hamilton. Records have not survived for the Robert Carr’s fort-Kettle Creek Campaign but vouchers for the passage of troops at that time at John Cowan’s ferry on the Savannah River show almost all of the militiamen mounted. Large numbers of troops, such as Pickens’ and Dooly’s combined commands also had wagons. For example, on April 3, 1779, Pickens led three hundred thirty-four soldiers, all mounted, in crossing there with six wagons and teams.

Realizing that the Loyalists had set out southwest on the interior road towards Robert Carr fort, Pickens sent ahead a messenger to tell the people in the fort to close its gates. He would claim many years later that he positioned the militiamen to attack from the rear as soon as he heard a signal gun. In one account, the messenger forgot to deliver the warning until the Loyalists had already dismounted and entered the fort. The old men, women, and children might have not understood the message in time or they otherwise chose not to close the gates.

Pickens ordered the horses not killed in the firefight seized (the Loyalists were unable to take the horses into the fort with them) and, in the process, acquired a set of pistols that belonged to John Hamilton from the baggage. He ordered his Captain William Freeman of South Carolina to lead an assault upon the house that stood above the fort. Some of the militiamen fell but, in taking the house, the South Carolinians cut off access from the fort to its water supply and allowed Freeman’s men to fire upon the interior of the fort and the roofs of the huts.

Pickens now demanded the surrender of Robert Carr’s fort or at least the release of the civilians. Campbell and Hamilton refused. Pickens later wrote that he determined to set the very dry fort on fire by rolling flaming wagon wheels onto the gate and walls. The colonel could have given up on his idea only because he needed his wagons fully functional. In McCall’s version of the battle at Carr’s fort, the officers determined not to burn the fort out of concern for the civilians held captive inside.

Word then reached Andrew Pickens from his brother Lieutenant John Pickens of the march of Boyd and his hundreds, or even thousands, of Loyalists moving along the Cherokee border with South Carolina towards the Savannah River. Colonel John Dooly knew that Boyd had sought guides in nearby Wrightsborough in January and that the enemy would likely take the southwestern route as a roundabout way through Wilkes County to the British army in Augusta. That interior road passed near Robert Carr’s fort before turning southwest to cross Kettle Creek proceeded onto Wrightsborough. Even if Dooly and Pickens had failed to connect the Boyd in Wrightsborough to the torrent of Loyalists on the march across the frontier, Wilkes County and close proximity to Robert Carr’s fort seemed the only route the Loyalists might follow as any approach to Augusta from the South Carolina would have to pass through Brig. Gen. Andrew Williamson’s brigade across the river from the British army. Boyd could have followed one of two roads along the river through Wilkes County (he chose the most western route as he continued along the edge of the
Indian frontier) but scouts could have guarded each road and allowed time to concentrate the militia on stopping the Loyalists approach.

Dooly must have also known that, by waiting and preparing, the two state militias had the time to take the Hamilton’s and Campbell’s horsemen then ‘forted up’ at Robert Carr’s fort before dealing with the other Loyalist threat. With the additional weapons thus captured, Pickens and Dooly could then set a trap that would guarantee to block Boyd and his following from reaching Augusta. Dooly with only his some 100 men could not have taken Carr’s fort and Pickens, with hardly any greater number, could hardly have stopped Boyd with just the men he commanded.

The decision lay with Andrew Pickens. He had insisted on commanding all of the militiamen in this expedition as the price of his cooperation. Dooly had proven an unreliable ally when the South Carolina militia had come to the aid of Wilkes County during the Indian raids of the previous summer. Pickens took a gamble and decided to abandon the siege of Robert Carr’s fort to try to stop Boyd in South Carolina, what he would try to excuse for the rest of his life as necessary for the most significant defeat of the approaching Loyalists. John Hamilton would later give his version of the withdrawal of him and his men: ‘At last, having nearly completed his circuit, he [Hamilton] was attacked by a colonel Picksens, with five hundred militia, who had marched against him from the district of Ninety-six, in the province of South Carolina: but the militia were soon repulsed and obliged to fly. The bodies of nine or ten who had been killed in action were afterwards found in the woods covered with leaves; their wounded they carried off’.

**British and Loyalist Accounts**

Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell wrote this brief summary of the battle at Carr’s fort (although he does not identify it by name) in his journal:

Captain Hamilton had settled all Matters with the Frontier Forts, excepting one, which stood out on hearing that 300 Rebel Horse were one their Way to his Neighborhood. Hamilton and Campbell who were apprized of their Approach, took a Resolution that was prompt and judicious: They stormed the Fort before the Enemy came up, and the Rebels found them too determined, and too securely posted, to practice the same Efforts to regain it. The Enemy sent for two small Guns to cannonade the Fort; of which I received early Notice, and dispatched the Light Infantry and One hundred Florida Rangers on Horseback to Middleton Ferry, by a forced March; in Consequence of which, they retreated with precipitation, and Hamilton was at Liberty to prosecute his orders (Campbell 1981:59-60).

Colonel Hamilton’s account to Charles Stedman was brief, stating: “At last, having nearly completed his circuit, he [Hamilton] was attacked by a colonel Pickens, with five hundred militia, who had marched against him from the district of Ninety-six, in the province of South Carolina; but the militia were soon repulsed and obliged to fly. The bodies of nine or ten who had been killed in action were afterwards found in the woods covered with leaves; their wounded they carried off” (Stedman 1794, volume 2:120).

Samuel Beckham gave this brief account of events on June 1, 1812:

Coln. [Colonel John] Hamilton the present British consul in Norfolk was then Detached with a large party to pay Wilkes County a visit. But Colons Pickens, Dooly & Clark were soon in pursuit of him [with] their veteran Militia[.] Coln H thought is most Expedient to take shelter in [a] Stock aid fort on the frontiers of Wilks called Carrs fort; here he was so closely pressed that the rear man was shot down as he entered the Fort gate supposing him to be one of the enemy. In the course of the night
Colons Pickens Dooly & Clark received an express that Coln Boyd from Yadkin N Carolina with 700 Tories were Crossing Savannah River at Cherokee ford which compelled them to leave Coln H in his fort to his great joy. The next morning the Coln left his cage for Agusta reaching Rightsborough that night where he cooled himself in a stock aid fort again. There he remained that night & fortunately for him he arrived in Agusta the next day (Davis 1979a:167-168).

Surgeon Robert Jackson, attached to the 71st Regiment in the Georgia campaign, later wrote of the medical situation in Georgia in 1779. At least some of the wounds described by Jackson were suffered in the battle at Carr’s fort (Jackson 1793:64). Jackson wrote,

In the year 1779 a party of the Loyal American militia who attacked a post of the enemy in the back parts of Georgia, were obliged to retire without affecting their purpose. A considerable number of them were wounded; and as their distance from the army precluded them from surgical assistance, their wounds were only bound over with a bit of rag. Such was the fact: the consequence was not what might have been expected; for among the wounds which I afterwards saw there were several wounds which we should have expected to be troublesome and tedious in cure, if treated according to the common rules of surgery, but in reality they healed speedily and well.

![Figure 34. Surgeon Robert Jackson's Illustrations of Battlefield Wounds in Georgia in 1779 (The Annual Register 1821: Plates 2 and 3).](image)
Patriot Accounts

Colonel Andrew Pickens wrote a brief description of the engagement at Carr’s fort in a letter to Henry Lee, dated August 28, 1811. Despite the passage of 32 years since the battle the memories of it were embedded in Pickens’ mind. He wrote:

Coln Campbell detached [Lt Coln] John Hamilton, now Consul in Virginia, with 200 mounted, mostly irregulars, up Savannah River on the Georgia side – The Whigs of Wilkes County fled to the Carolina Side of the River & gave me immediate notice – I immediately went down with what men I could hastily collect & at the River Colonels [John] Dooley & [Elijah] Clark from Georgia with about 100 men – Hamilton appeared the next morning & showed an intention to cross the river; but we had secured all the flats [flatboats or rafts] on the Carolina side – I had not men enough to cross & guard the other places which were necessary. We maneuvered opposite each other for two days up & down the River for ten miles – On the evening of the second day he disappeared – I immediately sent two men to reconnoitre to know whether it was a feint or whether he was gone some distance – They returned & informed me that he had taken the road to a small fort about ten miles from the River, where there were some old men with women & children – I immediately commenced crossing the River & as we had but one flat at the Place & all horsemens, it was nearly break of day before we got all over – When we all had gotten over, I had the men paraded, for as Dooley was a full Colonel in Georgia & I in Carolina he then had the Command – Clark was then Lieut Coln under Dooley – I then spoke to Dooley & told him that unless he gave up the sole command to me I would not proceed further to which he readily consented – I then spoke to the men & told them I was determined to pursue the enemy & attack him wherever I found him & that if any wished they might return; but further that I was determined to be obeyed, to which they all heartily agreed. As soon as it was clear light we proceeded with all the rapidity possible & when we came to the fort where they had stayed that night, they had just left it and said they were going to Kerr’s Fort which was about twelve miles further – I then dispatched two men on good horses who were well acquainted with the country, to get to the fort before them, desire those in the fort to shut their gates and keep them out, for that I would certainly be there in a short time after them – They got into the fort, but were so negligent or stupid as not to mention their business until Hamilton stepped in after them – They took to the fort, a smart firing commenced & I had several men wounded – We got a few men into a small house near the fort which annoyed them much – At length I sent in a flag desiring them to surrender & save the effusion of blood – Hamilton refused – I then sent desiring him to let the woemen and children come out which he also refused – It was an old Stockade fort, full of little old cabbins & very dry – As soon as it was dark I intended to set it on fire, & had prepared lightwood for the purpose upon waggon wheels which cold have been easily rolled down the descent of a hill against the gate along a smooth road which led to it – Just as it was growing dark I received a particular account of Coln Boyd & his tories, advancing along the frontier of South Carolina, & was expected to reach Savannah River that night to the number of seven hundred men – There was not time then to be lost –I ordered the wounded men to be taken off, called the principal officers together & communicated to them the intelligence – It was immediately agreed to recross Savannah River & try to intercept them if possible – We immediatelykindled a long line of fire just over the top of a ridge which ran parallel with the fort about 150 yards from it, so that they could see the light of the fires from the fort – their horses saddles and bridles were all taken, many were tied to the stockades – We got to Savannah River early the next morning, got over that day & ten or twelve miles on the Carolina side (Pickens 1811).

Historian Hugh McCall’s (1816) version of the battle goes as follows,

About the 1st of February, [British] lieutenant-colonel [Archibald] Campbell spread his military posts over the most populous parts of Georgia, and all opposition to the British arms ceased for a
few days; the oath of allegiance was administered to the inhabitants who remained, and the torch to
the habitations of those who had fled into Carolina.

When the families of Georgia were placed in security, the men assembled under their leader, colonel
John Dooley, and took a position on the Carolina shore of the Savannah river, about thirty miles
above Augusta. M’Girth, with three hundred loyalists, had taken a position at Kioka creek, twenty-
five miles above Augusta, on the Georgia side of the Savannah river, with orders to watch the ferries
and passes, and to take possession of all of the boats; colonel Dooley had parties similarly employed
on the opposite shore. Dooley returned into Georgia with a part of his troops, but was obliged to
retire before one of M’Girth’s detachments, commanded by major Hamilton, which pressed him
closely and fired upon his rear as he recrossed the Savannah, a short distance below the mouth of
the Broad River. Hamilton having driven the Americans from the western part of the state, encamped
at Waters’ plantation three miles below Petersburgh, with one hundred men. Dooley took a position
opposite to him in Carolina, where he was joined by colonel Andrew Pickens with two hundred and
fifty men of his regiment: their number thus united, was about three hundred and fifty. Though
colonel Dooley was the senior officer, there appears to have been a private understanding between
him and colonel Pickens that the latter was to command. Dooley appears to have yielded to this
measure, from the circumstances of three-fourths of the command belonging to Pickens’ regiment.

With this united force, it was determined to attack Hamilton’s detachment. On the night of the 10th
of February, they passed over at Cowen’s ferry, about three miles above Hamilton’s encampment,
and marched to attack him early in the ensuing morning, but Hamilton had marched, unappreciative
of danger, on an excursion through the country, to visit the forts and administer the oath of allegiance
to such inhabitants as fell in his way. The Americans pursued the enemy, and imagining that Carr’s
fort would be their first object, Capt. A. Hamilton [Major Andrew Hamilton? iv], of South Carolina,
was directed to take a guide, proceed to that fort and defend it with such men as might be found
there, and that the main body would move up quickly and attack the enemy in the rear. Intelligence
was given at the fort in due time for defense, but there were only seven or eight aged and infirm
men in it, who directed to the consequences which would attend a failure of the attack, refused to
comply with the order. The Americans were close in the enemy’s rear when they reached the fort,
and anxiously listened for the signal gun, but they had the mortification to observe that the fort gate
was opened, and the attack was necessarily commenced, without any of the contemplated
advantages. The enemy left their horses and baggage, took possession of the fort and defended it. A
brisk fire was supported by both parties, but with little effect on either. The enemy’s fire commanded
the spring, and as a siege was determined on, to cut off the supply of water from the besieged, was
no longer to be neglected by the assailants. The possession of a new log building near the spring
would accomplish this object, as it commanded the spring. The building could be approached only
through an open exposure to the enemy’s fire; which was suddenly accomplished by captain William
Freeman, with about forty men of his company. Early in the evening, the enemy’s horses,
accoutrements, and baggage were brought off, and all the avenues for their escape, secured. In the
afternoon the enemy had been summoned to surrender, which was refused. A request succeeded,
that the women and children might be permitted to leave the fort, which was also refused. The
possession of the new building, which then gave the assailants the command of the water; also gave
them the command of the tops of the huts within the fort, from whence the most injurious fire
proceeded. The enemy was without food and water, and it was confidently believed that they could
not hold out twenty-four hours. The sanguine expectation of a surrender, and thereby recovering the
western district of Georgia, was marked with pleasure in the enlivened countenances of the
besiegers; but disappointment awaited them. About ten o’clock at night, colonel Pickens received a
letter by captain Ottery from his brother, captain Joseph Pickens, by which he was informed, that
colonel Boyd was passing through Ninety-six district with eight hundred loyalists, toward Georgia;
spreading destruction of property and of lives, by fire and the sword, wherever he passed. A
proposition was made by some volunteers to set fire to the fort at different places, at the same time,
which would compel an immediate surrender; but the distress of the unfortunate families in the fort,
consequent on such a measure, induced colonels Pickens and Dooley to decline the proposal. The
siege was raised, the wounded carried off, and major Hamilton left in quiet possession of the fort,
dismounted and without baggage. Hamilton retreated to Wrightsborough, when tenanted a small
stockade fort for a few days, and thence marched to Augusta, and joined lieutenant-colonel Campbell. In Hamilton’s report, he states his loss at nine killed and three wounded; and the American loss at five killed and seven wounded.

**Davis’ Synthesis of Historical Accounts**

Davis (2014:38) summarizes the known accounts of the engagement at Carr’s fort on February 10, 1779:

Colonel Andrew Pickens with men from his Upper Ninety Six South Carolina Regiment and Colonel John Dooly with his Georgia militia, some 200 men in total, crossed the Savannah River into Wilkes County and set out to pursue the Loyalist horsemen under Captains Dougald Campbell and [Colonel] John Hamilton. Records have not survived for the Robert Carr’s fort-Kettle Creek Campaign but vouchers for the passage of troops at that time at John Cowan’s ferry on the Savannah River show almost all of the militiamen mounted. Large numbers of troops, such as Pickens’ and Dooly’s combined commands also had wagons. For example, on April 3, 1779, Pickens led three hundred thirty-four soldiers, all mounted, in crossing there with six wagons and teams.

Realizing that the Loyalists had set out southwest on the interior road towards Robert Carr fort, Pickens sent ahead a messenger to tell the people in the fort to close its gates. He would claim many years later that he positioned the militiamen to attack from the rear as soon as he heard a signal gun. In one account, the messenger forgot to deliver the warning until the Loyalists had already dismounted and entered the fort. The old men, women, and children might have not understood the message in time or they otherwise chose not to close the gates.

Pickens ordered the horses not killed in the firefight seized (the Loyalists were unable to take the horses into the fort with them) and, in the process, acquired a set of pistols that belonged to John Hamilton from the baggage. He ordered his Captain William Freeman of South Carolina to lead an assault upon the house that stood above the fort. Some of the militiamen fell but, in taking the house, the South Carolinians cut off access from the fort to its water supply and allowed Freeman’s men to fire upon the interior of the fort and the roofs of the huts.

Pickens now demanded the surrender of Robert Carr’s fort or at least the release of the civilians. Campbell and Hamilton refused. Pickens later wrote that he determined to set the very dry fort on fire by rolling flaming wagon wheels onto the gate and walls. The colonel could have given up on his idea only because he needed his wagons fully functional. In McCall’s version of the battle at Carr’s fort, the officers determined not to burn the fort out of concern for the civilians held captive inside.

Word then reached Andrew Pickens from his brother Lieutenant John Pickens of the march of Boyd and his hundreds, or even thousands, of Loyalists moving along the Cherokee border with South Carolina towards the Savannah River. Colonel John Dooly knew that Boyd had sought guides in nearby Wightsborough in January and that the enemy would likely take the southwestern route as a roundabout way through Wilkes County to the British army in Augusta. That interior road passed near Robert Carr’s fort before turning southwest to cross Kettle Creek proceeded onto Wightsborough. Even if Dooly and Pickens had failed to connect the Boyd in Wightsborough to the torrent of Loyalists on the march across the frontier, Wilkes County and close proximity to Robert Carr’s fort seemed the only route the Loyalists might follow as any approach to Augusta from the South Carolina would have to pass through Brig. Gen. Andrew Williamson’s brigade across the river from the British army. Boyd could have followed one of two roads along the river through Wilkes County (he chose the most western route as he continued along the edge of the Indian frontier) but scouts could have guarded each road and allowed time to concentrate the militia on stopping the Loyalists approach.

Dooly must have also known that, by waiting and preparing, the two state militias had the time to take the Hamilton’s and Campbell’s horsemen then ‘forted up’ at Robert Carr’s fort before dealing with the other Loyalist threat. With the additional weapons thus captured, Pickens and Dooly
could then set a trap that would guarantee to block Boyd and his following from reaching Augusta. Dooly with only his some 100 men could not have taken Carr’s fort and Pickens, with hardly any greater number, could hardly have stopped Boyd with just the men he commanded.

The decision lay with Andrew Pickens. He had insisted on commanding all of the militiamen in this expedition as the price of his cooperation. Dooly had proven an unreliable ally when the South Carolina militia had come to the aid of Wilkes County during the Indian raids of the previous summer. Pickens took a gamble and decided to abandon the siege of Robert Carr’s fort to try to stop Boyd in South Carolina, what he would try to excuse for the rest of his life as necessary for the most significant defeat of the approaching Loyalists. John Hamilton would later give his version of the withdrawal of him and his men: ‘At last, having nearly completed his circuit, he [Hamilton] was attacked by a colonel Pickens, with five hundred militia, who had marched against him from the district of Ninety-six, in the province of South Carolina; but the militia were soon repulsed and obliged to fly. The bodies of nine or ten who had been killed in action were afterwards found in the woods covered with leaves; their wounded they carried off’.

**Archeological Definition of the Battlefield**

The name Carr was synonymous with military service in early Georgia. Captain Mark Carr commanded a company of Marine Rangers in coastal Georgia during the Trustee period. Captain Patrick Carr, who commanded a company of rangers in the Burke County militia, was active in the American Revolution and in the years immediately following (Carr 1798:1-4; Charlton 1809:21-22). To confound the issue, Wilkes County likely contains more than one fortified place by the name of Carr’s fort. Historian Otis Ashmore (1926) placed one such fort at the mouth of Long Creek on the Broad river. A Captain Henry Karr may have had a fort, which was located south of Robert Carr’s fort and near the Quaker Springs Road (Davis 2014:11). It is unclear as to what, if any, family relationships existed between Robert Carr of Beaverdam Creek and the other Carr/Kerr officers. Recognizing that many questions remain unanswered and many more have now been created, let us consider the tangible remains of Carr’s fort where the battle happened on February 10, 1779.

Archeologists defined many aspects of the Carr’s fort battlefield in 2013. The broader survey coverage provides a glimpse of the backdrop of the Wilkes County frontier settlements with its farmsteads, a blacksmith shop, roads and trails. Battle action was not identified over most of the survey area. Archeologists defined the core area of the battlefield --based on the spatial distribution of battle-related relics. Archeologists examined the distributions of various artifact groups within Locus A and B. Distribution maps are shown in Figures 35-39. A schematic diagram of the Core Area is shown in Figure 40. Researchers used these data to define the two loci where these materials were concentrated, (Figure 41). The loci are approximately 75 m apart. Each of these is summarized below. Artifact summaries for the loci are provided in Table 5.

Locus A probably represents the site of Robert Carr’s fort and the Loyalist troop position in the battle. It was defined by MD survey, limited systematic shovel testing, one test unit (3 m by 1 m) and one GPR survey sample (20 m by 5 m). This locus covers an area approximately 106 m east-west by 71 m north-south. The two most common artifact groups represented in Locus A were architecture and kitchen artifacts. Their distribution helps define the residential footprint of the fort. Large wrought iron spikes and nails best reflect the building’s location. Cast iron cookware sherds help to define the debris field
surrounding the fort. Brick fragments were uncommon in Locus A, although researchers observed only several small fragments. This would be in keeping, however, with a hinterland frontier house and fort and the lack of accessibility to brick.

Most telling were the arms group artifacts at Locus A. These included 10 lead balls and two fragments of gun hardware. The lead balls were mostly impacted and eight bullets formed a tight cluster approximately 10 meters in diameter. Locus B probably represents the location of an isolated building that served as a Patriot troop position during the battle and its immediate surroundings. This locus was explored by MD survey. No other excavations were attempted. This locus measures approximately 113 m north-south by 83 m east-west. The length of occupation of this dwelling is unknown, although the scarcity of metal artifacts at this locus suggests that it was very brief.

In contrast to Locus A, the 11 lead balls from this area of the battlefield were not tightly clustered. Instead they appear form a crude line extending 75 m in length and oriented northwest-southeast. Lead balls covered an area 35 m northeast-southwest. Lead balls in Locus B were mostly impacted but also included dropped examples. This area yielded three pieces of flintlock gun hardware.

Locus A, the fort, yielded nine wrought iron spikes. These were distributed over an area approximately 30 m in diameter. Four of these spikes were contained within the wrought nail cluster described above. Another grouping of spikes was located 15 m east of the western group. The isolated dwelling of Locus B contained no spikes.

Locus A yielded 70 wrought iron nails. The nails covered an area 83 m east-west by 60 m north-south. A nail concentration m in the center of Locus A measured approximately 21 m east-west by 18 m north-south. Locus B produced only seven wrought iron nails. These were dispersed over the locus.

Locus A yielded 25 pieces of kitchen metal, whereas Locus B produced only three examples. This attests to the longer occupation at Locus A compared to Locus B. Another interpretation is that the building at Locus B represents some outbuilding where cooking tasks were not performed.

Locus A contained three clothing artifacts and Locus B contained two clothing group artifacts. South’s Type 7 and 9 were identified and these are diagnostic eighteenth century button types.

Locus A yielded one coin. This was a clipped British half penny manufactured between 1770-1773 (Seaby and Purvey 1980:231). Locus B yielded one blank copper planchet, which probably represents an extremely worn half penny.
Figure 35. Distribution of Wrought Nails and Spikes, Loci A and B, Carr's Fort Battlefield.
Figure 36. Distribution of Clothing Artifacts, Loci A and B, Carr's Fort Battlefield.
Figure 37. Cast Iron Cookware, Loci A and B, Carr's Fort Battlefield.
Figure 38. Spatial Distribution of Arms Group Artifacts in the Core Area of Carr's Fort Battlefield.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LN</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Wt (g)</th>
<th>Diam (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brick, small fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nail, cut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail, wrought</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sheet metal</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail, wrought</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nail, cut or wrought</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Nail, wrought</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nail, wrought, rosehead</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nail, wrought, small</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nail, wrought, T-head</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spike, iron, wrought</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail, cut or wrought</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hinge, iron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail cloud</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail, wrought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail, wrought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nail, wrought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spike, iron, wrought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spike, iron, wrought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spike, iron, wrought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spike, iron, wrought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spike, iron, wrought</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spike, iron, wrought</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Button, brass, plain, Type 7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buckle, brass, large, fragment</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Button, Tombac, engraved, Type 9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pearlware, undecorated body</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delftware, plain, body</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creamware, plain</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black Basalt, body</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creamware, plain, body</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lead glazed coarse eartheware rim</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stoneware, gray, salt glazed, body</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unglazed coarse earthenware body</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clear glass, bottle or tableware</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Olive green bottle glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Olive green bottle glass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cast iron cookware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cast iron, kettle fragment</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Iron fork</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cast iron, kettle</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utensil handle, wrought iron</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cast iron, kettle</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cast iron, kettle leg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217 Locus A Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Locus A Artifact Summary.**
The space between Loci A and B was remarkably devoid of metal artifacts. This “dead zone” lends credence to our interpretation of the battle implications for these locations. As Colonel Pickens had described the Patriot riflemen firing from a building outside of the fort at the Loyalists he implies that...
the intermediate area was dangerous ground not held by either side. Interestingly, the distance between the two loci (75 m) conforms to the accepted distance for the effective fire of flintlock guns.

Figure 39. Loci A and B, Carr's Fort Battlefield.
Number of Participants and Battlefield Casualties
The number of troops on each side of the engagement at Carr’s fort remains tentative. No muster lists or other official military documents have been identified for either side recording their actions on February 10, 1779. The Patriot forces consisted of Colonel Andrew Pickens’ South Carolina militia and Colonel John Dooly’s Georgia (Wilkes County) militia. Lieutenant Colonel Elijah Clarke’s soldiers, who served under Dooly’s command, were not involved in the conflict, although they later joined forces and defeated the Loyalists at Kettle Creek on February 14. Patriot troop strength is estimated at about 350 soldiers. These included about 100 men under Colonel Dooley and 250 militia men from South Carolina (McCall 1816:193-194; Candler and Evans 1906:322; Davis 2014). Colonel Hamilton, from his besieged position with Carr’s fort, placed that number considerably higher at 500 Patriots. McCall noted that Carr’s fort contained, “only seven or eight aged and infirmed men in it”, when the Loyalists entered it.
The latter were probably noncombatants during the battle. If any women or children were present in the fort at the time of the battle, their presence is not detailed. The regular garrison of the fort, Captain Carr’s company, served with Colonel Dooly’s forces when the company was commanded by Captain Awtry. The Loyalist troop strength at Carr’s fort is even less well known than that of the Patriots, ranging from 80 to 200 persons (McCall 1816; Candler and Evans 1906:322; Davis 2013; PRO AO 13/10:77; PRO AO 12/72:159 in Warren 2014).

Colonel Thomas Waters, who lived along the Savannah River in present-day Elbert County, wrote in his memorial for Loyalist claims in 1786, “that he resided in the Ceded lands in Georgia in 1779 when Col. John Hamilton was detached by order of Col. Arch’d Campbell commanding the King’s Troops in that Province with a Body of Horses about two Hundred. That they remained two Days, in which time he supplied them with Provisions & a Horse worth £30, including which, he demands the real value £61.13.7” (PRO AO 12/72; PRO AO 13/10:78 in Warren 2014). In 1789, Hamilton testified in support of Water’s claim,

That he marched to the Frontiers of Georgia in Feb. 1779 by order of Col. Archibald Campbell Commanding at Augusta, in order to scout the country, and tender the Oaths of Allegiance to the Inhabitants and reduce such Forts as he found erected in opposition to Government. In the course of this service he was at the plantation of Col. Waters, and remained there one night with about 200 Horsemen, that he got from Col. Waters some supplies of forage and provisions but can’t now say how much of either [lost] certain that he gave a receipt for the quantity at the time as he was directed to do by Col. Campbell for all Loyalists from whom he should receive either forage or provisions, in order that Payment might be made by the King’s Commissary upon the said Receipt being produced. This he knows to have been the usual practice of officers commanding detachments and that payments were duly made it being always supposed that receipts to Loyalists only. He remembers the taking of the horse perfectly – a Stone Horse designed for the use of Major Simon Frazer, acting Quarter Master Gen. at Augusta. That the party under his command was attacked by a superior force, on which occasion many horses were lost and this Stone Horse he is almost certain, tho he cannot declare as a positive fact, was of the number. The said horse was valued at the time at as he thinks £40, and a receipt given accordingly he cannot say that the horse was worth that sum (PRO AO 13/10:160-170 in Warren 2014).

The numbers of killed and wounded in the engagement at Carr’s fort is difficult to ascertain. By Hamilton’s own account the Patriot losses was 9-10 killed and an unknown number of wounded. Historian Hugh McCall listed to Patriot losses at five killed and seven wounded. McCall, citing a report by Hamilton, listed the Loyalist losses in the battle at nine killed and three wounded. By these varying estimates the total battle losses at Carr’s fort numbered fewer than 20 killed and at least 10 wounded. Compared to other battles in the war, Carr’s fort was a skirmish if judged by casualties alone.

Historians disagree as to whether any soldiers were captured in the engagement. Some documents indicate several Patriots, including Captains William Baskins, Jr. and John Miller, South Carolina militia and Private Robert Tharpe, Georgia militia, were captured at Carr’s fort and were taken to St. Augustine, Florida (Heitman 1914:392; Moss 2006; Tharpe 1842). Davis (2014) earlier suggested that these men were captured at a different Carr’s fort, that of Captain Henry Kerr, and in 1780, rather than 1779. This topic remains fertile ground for future research. Additional research shows that Captain Baskins and
Miller were captured in the action at Vann’s Creek on the Savannah River, immediately following the action at Carr’s fort (Davis 2008b).

**Military Terrain Analysis**

The National Park Service encourages the KOCOA approach for battlefield terrain analysis (American Battlefield Protection Program 2008; McMasters 2009). The defining features of a battlefield in this approach include Key Terrain (K), Observations of Fields of Fire (O), Cover and Concealment (C), Obstacles (O) and Avenues of Approach (A). Table 5 provides a list of defining battlefield features.

**Key Terrain**

One would expect that the occupants of a fort held an advantage over their opponent in terms of terrain. This assumes that the fort was built at the optimal location (high ground, close to fresh water) relative to the lands surrounding the fort.

The engagement at Carr’s fort was a rifle exchange. Some smaller caliber smoothbore weapons (< 0.60 caliber), such as pistols, tradeguns or carbines, also may have been fired. None of the primary accounts refer to the use of any artillery. While the fort may have contained some small ordnance, none of the battle participants mention its deployment. Colonel Pickens also may have had access to small cannon but, according to his recollection, it was never deployed in the siege of Carr’s fort. Consequently, the effective range of rifle fire into the fort was probably less than 300 meters. For more accurate fire, that range was likely reduced to about 100 meters. If Carr’s fort was located on the highest landform within that 300 meter radius, then it held the key terrain. Colonel Pickens’ recollection of the battle suggests that an unfinished building situated outside of the fort actually held a better advantage, as it was located uphill from the fort. From that position Colonel Pickens’ riflemen were able to fire into Carr’s fort without suffering equal return fire. Despite the fact that the Loyalists were in a fortified post, the Patriots held the advantage by occupying the key battlefield terrain.

Another aspect of the terrain at Carr’s fort included a spring that would have provided drinking water. Colonel Pickens references a spring that was located outside of Carr’s fort. His men were directed to cover that position so that the Loyalists in the fort were blocked of any access to fresh water.

The survey team identified one prolific spring at the eastern edge of the battlefield. This spring may represent the spring described by Colonel Pickens. This area is highly eroded and the 1779 land surface may no longer remain intact. Nevertheless, its approximate location was documented. Another more distant spring is located northwest of the battlefield. By controlling the spring and access to fresh drinking water, the Patriots further advanced their control of the key battlefield terrain.
Observation and Fields of Fire
Observation and Fields of Fire include areas of high ground, sloping approaches, and the building located southwest of Carr’s fort. These areas allowed observations of movement of the enemy. Carr’s fort is flanked by higher ground to the west. Many areas of the ridge in that direction would afford an observation post towards the fort. This would be particularly true in February, when the battle was fought, since deciduous trees would have lost their foliage and visibility through the woods was likely greatly improved. The Patriots also used these upland positions to their advantage to create campfires at several locations to fool the Loyalists into believing that they remained in the area. This guise apparently worked and gave the Patriots the opportunity to retreat from the engagement unopposed. The Patriots had the advantage over the Loyalists in terms of their ability to observe and control the fields of fire.
Cover and concealment was provided by walls, structures, forests and ravines. These landforms or landscape elements and cultural materials provide protection from enemy fire and opportunities for troop concealment. The Loyalists within Carr’s fort were offered protection from enemy fire by the log walls of the fort and other wooden buildings within the fort. The disadvantage of the Loyalists’ position was that they were trapped in siege conditions and unable to move from the surrounding enemy fire.

Researchers were unable to locate any detailed description or drawing of Robert Carr’s fort. Colonel Andrew Pickens remembered the fort several decades after the battle as, “an old Stockade fort, full of little old cabbins [sic] & very dry”. In reality the fort was no more than five years old at the time that Pickens observed it. His reference to being “full” of “little old cabins” surrounded by a “Stockade fort” provides important clues to the configuration of the fort (Pickens 1811).

One example of a Wilkes County farmstead was that of Benjamin Elsberry’s place, which was destroyed by fire sometime between January 1787 and August 1788. Elsberry stated that his farm, “had four Houses burnt Viz: one Hewed log dwelling House twenty by twenty five feet planked below, one, Kitchen, one stable & corn crib. the Kitchen Logs hewed down” (Moore 1788; Indian Depredations p.338).

Two examples of 1790s wooden fortifications survive in Georgia. These are Fort Yargo in Barrow County and Fort Hollingsworth in Banks County, Georgia. The former has been altered from its original form and has likely been moved from its original setting. Fort Hollingsworth continued in use as a residence through the late twentieth century, so the original “fort fabric” at that fort site also has been altered. Recent GPR mapping of Fort Hollingsworth by the LAMAR Institute provides tantalizing evidence of subsurface remains (Elliott 2012a). No archeological confirmation of these potential features has been undertaken. Archeological survey in search of Fort Mathews, a 1790s fort in Oconee County, Georgia provides another analog for the Robert Carr’s fort (O’Steen 2012). GPR mapping there by the LAMAR Institute also suggests that the site has subsurface potential (Elliott 2012b). Work done at Fort Mathews has been limited to shovel testing and the GPR anomalies have not been verified.

Archeological excavations at Fort Independence in Abbeville County, South Carolina provide a glimpse of a small Revolutionary War fortification (Bastian 1984). Bastian’s interpretation of the configuration of Fort Independence is based on archeological excavation. Her illustration of Fort Independence shows a central blockhouse surrounded by a rectangular stockade with simple corner bastions on three sides.
Fort Charlotte is another important military fortification from the American Revolution that is located in the central Savannah River region. It was a large enclosure that held a garrison of troops and was considerably larger than a fortified farmstead. Caldwell conducted archeological excavations at Fort Charlotte prior to the construction of Lake Strom Thurmond (Davis 1941; Caldwell 1952). Fort Charlotte was described by Caldwell (1952:47-50) as, “a square masonry with bastions at the four corners and measuring altogether 170 feet on each side” with standing walls, “two feet thick”, and an interior stone building, “exactly 14 feet long by 10 feet wide”. The masonry consisted of granite and schist rocks that were quarried locally. The fort was constructed in 1765 and was occupied in the American Revolution by Patriot forces. Because of its large size and extensive use of local stone in its construction, Fort Charlotte is likely not a useful analog for Carr’s fort.

Captain Robert Carr raised cattle and his farm complex undoubtedly included pens or other enclosures for domestic animals. The exterior of the fort likely included animals within pens as well as free-ranging animals. Because of the hasty entry of the Loyalists into Carr’s fort, the soldiers were unable to bring their horses and pack animals into the fort enclosure. The Loyalists’ supplies and personal effects hauled by these animals, as well as the animals themselves, were taken as booty by Colonel Pickens’ men upon their departure from the battlefield. The animals also served as obstacles to the field of fire during the battle.
The Patriots had less protection than the Loyalists. Patriots used the building southwest of the fort as one means of cover. This was likely the unfinished dwelling that Colonel Picken’s refers to that was located near Carr’s fort. The dimensions of this building were not described. Pickens had some of his men position themselves at this structure. From that position they were able to fire effectively into Carr’s fort. The Patriots also took advantage of the ravines, the entrenched road located west of the fort, and the trees in the forest for concealment.

Other opportunities for concealment in the Carr farmstead may have included wagons, hay bales or other temporary landscape features. The eastern flank of Carr’s fort was marked by a ravine. This ravine would have provided protection and concealment for soldiers attacking the fort. Loyalist riflemen at an elevated position within Carr’s fort may have been able to fire into the ravine, but not without exposing themselves to Patriot fire. The Patriots and Loyalists were nearly equally matched in terms of their cover and concealment. Had the battle and siege continued, the Loyalists would have lacked drinking water and likely surrendered. Colonel Pickens’ early retreat, however, gave the Loyalists the opportunity to escape the confines of Carr’s fort and retreat to friendly ground.

Artist Shauna Fannin created her rendition of the Carr’s fort battlefield, which is reproduced in Figure 44. This perspective view is based on the limited information gleaned from primary documents about Carr’s fort, the archeology there, and the descriptions/drawings of similar period forts. This rendering considers the known KOCOA factors for the site. This image helps to convey the story Carr’s fort to the general public. While some of the above-ground features are speculative, the general facts are conveyed in a way that provides a visual representation to what is otherwise invisible today.

Figure 43. The Battle of Carr's Fort, February 10, 1779.
Obstacles
Obstacles were presented by fortification walls, fences, ravines and natural vegetation. These landscape elements served to hinder movement and potentially affect the battle. The walls and fortifications of Carr’s fort were obstacles for the attacking Patriots. The ravines and vegetation were minor obstacles that may have slowed the advance of the Patriots somewhat, but not enough to affect the outcome of the engagement.

Avenues of Approach
Avenues of approach and retreat include features such as roads, paths, and creek beds. These provide corridors used by troops for movement into and away from the core battle area. The landscape surrounding Carr’s fort contained all three of these features.

Colonel Pickens wrote to Henry Lee of his intentions to roll a flaming wagon down the slope leading to Carr’s fort. From this one may assume that the path to the fort was downslope from Colonel Pickens’ position and that the path was suitable for wagon traffic.

Archeological survey identified sections of an early road that leads past Carr’s fort (Figures 45-46). That road is deeply incised at several locations, which attests to its antiquity. This early road followed the course of Beaverdam Creek and it would have connected the Patriot forts and farmsteads at the Little River with Elijah Clarke’s settlement to the north. At the Little River this road connected with other roads that led to Wrightsborough and Augusta. A sketch map of the area, formerly in possession of Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell shows a dotted line (leading from “Cers fort” crossing the Little River downstream from Phillips fort (McLaughlin n.d.). The main road running north-south was the route likely taken by the Loyalists and Patriots upon their entry and exit from the battlefield. The road identified archeologically does not lead directly to Carr’s fort, however, and the field survey team observed no clear road trace leading directly to the fort. The secondary road, or driveway, that leads to the fort proper probably branched off of the main road and led northward to the fort--a distance of approximately 150 meters.

The primary avenue of approach to Carr’s fort and the route of retreat was likely the main road that paralleled Beaverdam Creek. This road followed the high ridge between the two forks of Beaverdam Creek. The Loyalists used this road in their journey from Heard’s fort, located northeast of Carr’s fort. The precise route taken by the Patriots was not described but it is reasonable to conclude that they arrived the same way, since the Patriots were traveling from the east. This road continues southward, crossing the Little River, and running to Wrightsborough. Augusta and Savannah also were accessed via that route. When the Patriots retreated from the battlefield their route was not described by anyone, but they were headed eastward for South Carolina. The Loyalist exodus from the battlefield was probably south on the road to Wrightsborough. This road was likely a narrow wagon road at the time and not the main route down the Savannah River valley. Both sides of the engagement arrived at Carr’s fort by horse. The Patriots also left by horse but the British were on foot because the Patriots had taken their animals that had been left outside of the fort enclosure.
Figure 44. Deeply Incised Road Leading to Battlefield.

Figure 45. Road Trace at Carr's Fort Battlefield, Facing South.
Table 5. Battlefield Features Defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Captain Robert Carr’s Fort</td>
<td>Located, tentatively defined</td>
<td>More work needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Building outside of fortified compound</td>
<td>Located tentatively defined</td>
<td>More work needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Spring outside of Carr's Fort</td>
<td>Located</td>
<td>East of fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Road near Fort, leading to Littler River</td>
<td>Located, portions identified</td>
<td>More work needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Road near Fort, leading to Kettle Creek</td>
<td>Located, portions identified</td>
<td>More work needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Forks of Beaverdam Creek</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>Location of Carr's land and fort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Summary

The LAMAR Institute’s search for Captain Robert Carr’s lost militia fort and its affiliated battleground was successful. A multi-disciplinary survey approach that included archeologists, historians, and geographers resulted in the identification of the likely battlefield site. An added benefit was the delineation of many areas of the surrounding cultural landscape. This included the identification of cultural resources over an area more than four square miles in extent, which provides an impressive context for Carr’s fort and the battle. This additional information was a secondary benefit created by the delay in discovering the actual battle site. It was not until the last days of the field survey project that permission was granted by one landowner to access the property that contained most of the battlefield. Once this area could be accessed the survey team spent approximately one week searching that property. On the final hours of the last day of survey archeologists found the battlefield. In “extra innings” the survey team returned for several more days of fieldwork at the site to conduct a more thorough examination.

The Core Area of the battlefield was relatively small. The suspected fort site and the surround field of fire covered an area smaller than a football field. Given that the survey began with the feeblest of clues to the fort’s location in an area of more than four square miles the discovery was quite significant. During the American Revolution Wilkes County hosted more than 30 small fortified sites, not unlike Carr’s fort. To date, Captain Robert Carr’s fort is the only example to be located on the modern landscape.
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