

NEW DEAL ON A NEW FRONTIER: EUROPEAN WOMEN COLONISTS AND TRUSTEE POLICY, 1733-1752

Lee Ann Caldwell
Augusta College

When Trust Secretary Benjamin Martyn analyzed demographic statistics for the Georgia colony for the last time in 1751, he found that, since 1733, 2127 people had been sent there at the expense of the Trust to begin new lives on the frontier of British North America. Of those, 864 (40.6%) were female, women and girls from Great Britain and the European mainland.¹ Other women had come with husbands and fathers who paid their families' expenses, a few as wives of recruits for the regiments, and fewer still at their own cost as independent women. This paper explores these European women who colonized as an integral part of Trustee Georgia, analyzing the effect of female settlement on the Trustees' policies and actions.² In the last two decades scholarship has increasingly sought to determine the role of European women in the settlement of England's colonies with the work of historians like Laurel Thatcher Ulrich on New England, Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh on the Chesapeake, Marylynn Salmon on South Carolina, and Johanna Miller Lewis on North Carolina. Colonial Georgia women must be integrated into the story of white women of the colonial era and this study seeks to contribute to that effort.

Georgia's founding in 1732 sought to fulfill three major goals. For the twenty-one men who sat as members of the "Trustees for the Establishing of the Colony of Georgia," the settlement was a philanthropic effort, offering a "new deal" to Britain's poor and unemployed and to Europe's persecuted Protestants. Their goal of a charitable colony set on the

New Deal on a New Frontier

southeastern mainland frontier corresponded nicely with the British government's mercantilistic desire for wine and silk and its defensive need to protect the exposed edges of its North American empire from the designs of Spanish Florida and French Louisiana.³ While these three objectives seemingly meshed well, they posed a gender dilemma for Trustee policymakers. To the eighteenth century mind, the poor men of Britain and persecuted males of Europe could plausibly both farm and fight, but women, an asset in agricultural communities, became a weakness in military ones.

The Trustees sought to reconcile their diverse goals and their gender problem by the establishment of regulations and policies that diminished the potential for women to become defense liabilities. While using gender to explain, at least in part, several regulations,⁴ the rules surrounding landgranting and tenure most clearly reflect the gender dilemma. The Trust wanted a male on every fifty acres of land. Therefore, they granted land in lots ranging from fifty to five hundred acres to freeholders, but those adventurers who came at their own expense and sought more than fifty acres had to have a manservant for each fifty acres. All grants were near towns which, according the Benjamin Martyn, "were to be regarded as Garrisons." In Savannah, for example, colonists received a town lot, a garden lot in the commons, and a forty-five acre farm lot just outside town. Land tenure was entailed to males and the land of men who died "without male issue" reverted to the Trust for regranting to a male citizen. Martyn explained this necessity:

For if the Grants were to have been made in Tail General. . .the strength of each Township would soon be diminished in as much as Every Female Heir in Tail, who was unmarried, would have been intitled to one Lot and consequently have taken from the Garison the Portion of one

New Deal on a New Frontier

Soldier; and by intermarriages several Lots might have been united into one.⁵

In both of these cases, the number of men on the land would be reduced supposedly hurting the defensive capabilities of the area. Martyn also pointed out that women had civil as well as military liabilities because they were "equally incapable to serve on juries" and perform other duties such as "watching and warding," which therefore would require more time of the fewer men and become "very burthensome."⁶

Reaction to the Trust land policy was swift. The first prospective colonists expressed immediate concern. Four settlers wanted their daughters to inherit and many wanted the widow's dower right of Britain upheld. Colonist Peter Gordon said he "could never enjoy any peace of mind, for the apprehension of dying there, and leaving his child, destitute and unprovided for, not having the right to inherit or possess any part of his real estate. . . ."⁷ Trustees granted that those on that embarkation without male heirs could name successors who would henceforth hold the land "in tail male," and guaranteed widows "their thirds."⁸ The issue did not end, however, with the first group and the Trustees found continuous requests to make exceptions to the policy. For example, in a March 1735 letter to James Oglethorpe, Joseph Hetherington wrote that his wife was "very big with child" and asked for a dispensation "in case we should have a female Child it may descend to her."⁹ The hardworking Salzburger also opposed the policy. In a January 1737 letter the Reverend Urlsperger in Augsburg asked that the policy be reconsidered "because the female as well as the Male Sex have left their country for the Sake of the Gospel, and certainly no Saltzburger would have undertaken so great a Voyage if they had known that so hard a Law should be proscribed for their Daughters."¹⁰

New Deal on a New Frontier

The policy potentially affected the growth of the colony by discouraging prospective colonists. In 1738 John Vanderplank expressed the concerns of many other potential settlers when he wrote, "after we have been at all the charge & labor to make it fruitfull. It does not descend to the family nor wife. . . so that if the Male of the Family Drops (which is Verry often the Case) all your Charge & Improvement is Lost. . . ."11 By 1738, in spite of defensive worries, the Trustees agreed to have "special regard to the Daughters of those who have made Improvements on their Lots not already provided for by having married." Widows acquired the right to lifetime use of "the Mansion House and one half the lands improved by their Husbands. . . ."12 In 1741 tenure was further enlarged to "Tail General" and finally in 1750 absolute inheritance became the rule "as a General Peace and Tranquility happily prevail."13 While it was male protest that ultimately brought these changes, those women who faced the possibility of being alone without visible means of support must have had misgivings as well. Indeed, there are examples of women who would not come to Georgia. Savannah's early minister Samuel Quincy eventually received permission to return to England because his wife adamantly refused to come.

The general attitudes of the Trustees, as well as male colonial officeholders, toward women as settlers reflected the attitudes of their day. While female "weakness" was problematic on a frontier, women had other characteristics that could be either burdensome or troublesome. Men were definitely seen as more valuable and the tension between the Trustee desire to have more able-bodied men and the need to have families is clear. In describing the June 1733 embarkation to Georgia, Benjamin Martyn wrote to James Oglethorpe, the Georgia Trustee founder who was at that time in Georgia, that the Trustees "have selected the most able Men, and the least incumber'd with Families. . . ."14

New Deal on a New Frontier

George Lewis Wentz, recruiting for colonists, had formal instructions from the Trust to bring single males between sixteen and thirty, although private instructions allowed him to bring twenty women and children if he could not find over one hundred men.¹⁵ These examples clearly demonstrate that the Georgia authorities, at least initially, did not believe women to be as valuable in their venture as males. That women were not seen as being as important in general as males is seen in a request from William Williamson to Trustee accountant Harman Verelst requesting him to send an enclosed letter to his sister "letters to women being frequently stopped at this Distance. . . I suppose not being Thought very material."¹⁶

Other stereotypical weaknesses of women that could potentially cause annoyances in the young colony included their alleged propensity to gossip and exaggeration, and their fearfulness. In a journal entry of August 1738, Georgia Secretary to the Trustees William Stephens wrote of news about an epidemic in Carolina: "But as this news came by a Woman, we hoped it might prove an old Woman's story only. . . ."¹⁷ One of the problems Stephens had with the protests of the "malcontents" against Trustee policy was that they frightened women "for Women will always have their Fears. . . ."¹⁸ In spite of all these weaknesses and foibles that they thought women brought with them, the Georgia authorities knew that women were absolutely necessary for colonial growth and stability. Their major roles included wives, mothers, and servants. The ideal woman, of course, was all three of these. The *South Carolina Gazette* eulogized Georgia colonist Lady Francis Bathurst as a "loving wife, an affectionate mother, and a true Housekeeper," while the Anglican minister in Georgia John Wesley approvingly wrote of the Salzburg women: "It appeared to be their delight as well as custom to be the servants of all."¹⁹ Benjamin Martyn summarized

New Deal on a New Frontier

the need for women as follows: "The Trustees were not so ignorant or absent as to forget how necessary a Part Women are in a Family. . . ." ²⁰ And the agricultural and philanthropic goals of Georgia required families.

The significance of women to growth and stability, even for the southern garrison towns, became increasingly clear as time progressed and Trust recruiting instructions reflect their importance. In 1735, the Trust resolved to send forty Englishmen with their families to settle and gave Lieutenant Hugh Mackay instructions to recruit 110 freeman and servants to which "fifty women and children are allowed." ²¹ In May 1740 James Oglethorpe encouraged the Trustees to send wives with recruits as a "cheap" way to increase the colony and because "single men there are very great inconveniences." ²² By 1741 Oglethorpe strongly urged the Trustees to send over "married Recruits with industrious Wives." ²³ In fact, Oglethorpe wrote that, after religion, the best support and defense of the Georgia colony was "to encourage Marriage and the rearing up of Children." ²⁴ In 1742, according to Oglethorpe, there were seven hundred more men than women and most of those men would marry if they could, arguing that "Married soldiers live easiest, many of them have turned out very industrious planters." While realizing that sending single women without families to protect them "might be attended with Indecencys," Oglethorpe did recommend giving passage to wives, sisters, and daughters. ²⁵ But in spite of Oglethorpe's efforts, the garrison towns, according to historian Donna Marie Rabac, never achieved better than a 5:1 male to female ratio. ²⁶

Marriage for men and women in Trustee Georgia was for a lifetime, although that could be relatively brief. Divorce was not allowed, although desertions did occur. But most marriages ended in the death of one of the partners and in early Georgia that often made for short marriages. Widowhood could be equally transient,

New Deal on a New Frontier

especially for younger women. European women, always outnumbered in Trustee Georgia, were quite marriageable, more so if property was involved.²⁷ A woman in Ebenezer well illustrates this point. In 1739, Ebenezer leader the Reverend John Martin Bolzious reported that the town's new shoemaker had died after being in the colony only five weeks. Two weeks before his death (i.e., three weeks after his arrival in the colony) he had married Margaretha Egger, one of the single women that had been on the same voyage to America. Bolzious assured Trust accountant Harman Verelst that the young widow would be assisted with anything she needed, but pointed out that "she will have shortly the opportunity to marry again, when she is recovered from her Feaver." Indeed, in a June 1740 follow-up, Bolzious reported that she had married, "six months ago to an industrious, honest Salzburger."²⁸ Stories like this illustrate that marriage was much more an economic necessity than a romantic union, and each partner had specific functions to fulfill.

Having "fine" children was one of the most important functions of wives in the colony. Children provided important workers in an agricultural society and led to growth and stability in the colony. For women, childbirth was a blessed, but dangerous event as a 1735 letter from old Ebenezer illustrates:

It is very observable that hitherto all our childbearing Women are delivered of their Children before their full growth, and that most of the Women died. . .so that such of our Women as are now pregnant are in a deadly apprehension that ye Present Soil is pernicious both to the growth of Children & Seeds. "²⁹

The letter lists eight women deceased in childbirth from January to April 1735. Fortunately, the health of the Salzburger women

New Deal on a New Frontier

improved after their move to new Ebenezer later that year. The Frederica women seem to have had good health, for a 1738 letter said, "we have great increase of Children & Women bear, that in Europe were thought past their time."³⁰ No records tell us what middle-aged Frederica women thought about bearing children past their expected years of fertility.

Cognizant of the perils of childbirth, the Trust provided at their expense, first in Savannah, and later in both the Northern and Southern Divisions of the colony, a public midwife. This position was the only line-item, Trust-funded position for a female in the entire period. The midwives received £5 per year as salary plus 5 shillings per "laying." The Trust required midwives to attend to the poor as well as the Trust's indentured servants "on all occasions."³¹ In 1736, when the Savannah midwife Elizabeth Stanley became pregnant, she returned to England for her own "lying in." But before she left, she had delivered fifty-nine children with "non a miss," and felt that she had discharged her duty well. She was quite concerned, however, about "false pretenders" getting into the business, such as the gentlewoman whose second delivery resulted in a woman's death.³²

In addition to providing midwives, the Trustees sought to ease the pain of women "brought to bed." In 1737, Trust Accountant Harman Verelst reminded the Trust Storekeeper Thomas Causton in Savannah that the recently purchased seventy pipes of "Madera wine were not designed for Daily Consumption. . . . But the Lying in women are to be Supplied with the usual allowance of wine. . . ." The next day a letter to the Frederica Storekeeper Richard White repeated the same instruction.³³

In addition to populating Georgia with wives and mothers, the Trustees also sought women for servants, and hundreds came to Georgia at Trust expense by agreeing to indentures for service. While women were not as desirable servants to colonial farmers as

New Deal on a New Frontier

men because of the physical strength required to fell trees, clear, and plant land, women servants did perform the many necessary domestic chores and could work in the Trust garden. The Trust provided female servants to its colonial officers including the secretary, bailiffs, gardener, as well as to some of the colony's widows like Mary Vanderplank, widow of a naval officer. Other colonists acquired servants sent by the Trust by paying their passage or having family or friends in England pay for them. The Trust also provided the industrious Salzburgers in Ebenezer with many of the German servants.³⁴

Of course, some indentured servant women were wives and mothers as well, and that was provided for in Trustee policy. While serving their time, no man and his wife were to be separated.³⁵ Initially girls under ten and boys under twelve, although later girls under twelve as well, stayed with their parents.³⁶ Males and females over twelve could be "put out," but were to remain in the same district as their parents as near as possible. Young girls remained in service to the age of eighteen, and young males to twenty-one.³⁷ Upon completion of service, females received a maintenance of 6 pence per day for a year. Males, of course, were eligible for land grants, got animals and tools, as well as 8 pence per day for the next year.³⁸ Wives of male German servants who were allotted one day per week to work on their own land, could also have that day to assist their husbands in its cultivation.³⁹

The records contain remarkably few complaints about female servants. Most that did occur involved female servants getting pregnant, which, of course, they did not do alone. In 1738, William Stephens complained of his newly-arrived Highland servant that "it appeared what She had been doing on her passage; for she is pregnant. . . ." Stephens further lamented, "See wt Luck I have with Wenches--I hope for better luck with the other Sex. . .

New Deal on a New Frontier

.⁴⁰ In a letter later that year he complained: "My two first Women Servts proved errant whores; & the one yt I got since to do the necessary offices of the house, being a mans wife soon proved so forward with Child. . . yt at present I am perfectly destitute of such help."⁴¹ Stephens, in addition to his problems with household help, became so concerned about men "making whores of their Female Servants; then cohabiting with them and their Bastards. . .," that he said the problem might need some "coercive power from the Civil Magistrate to restrain it. . . ."⁴² Other colonials made similar charges, sometimes with specific examples.

In addition to the wife/mother/servant roles for women in the Georgia colony, which had parallels in other colonies, the Trustees, as well as the mercantilistic British government, had a fourth function for Georgia women--to form the backbone of a new industry, the manufacture of silk. The Crown could thus acquire silk within its empire and the Georgia producers were assured a ready market in England. However, one of the great advantages of silk culture, as Benjamin Martyn wrote to the Reverend John Martin Bolzius, was that "The Women and Children (who are not of great use in other Works) are the Principal Persons to carry it on." In fact, "Women [would] be as serviceable in it as men, or more than they. . . ."⁴³ Wives, mothers, daughters, servants, widows could all participate.

From the beginning, one of the requirements of Georgia landgrants was that each grantee had to plant mulberry trees, one hundred trees within ten years for every fifty acre lot, to feed silkworms. The Trust made arrangements to bring knowledgeable Piedmontese Italian silk producers to teach the art of raising the worms and spinning the silk. For most of the Trustee period these arts rested in the Camuse family, with Mrs. Jane Mary Camuse as the experienced silk winder. Mrs. Camuse evidently possessed great talent. Martha Causton, wife of storekeeper Thomas, wrote

New Deal on a New Frontier

that Mrs. Camuse had "an exceeding fine Hand at working the Silk.

... "144

The silk culture, however, proved a struggle in Georgia for three major reasons. Planters usually ignored the mulberry tree requirements, much to the Trustees' frustration; Jane Mary Camuse never taught other women to wind; and few Georgia women, Salzburgers being a notable exception, seemed so inclined anyway. The small number of mulberry trees planted was a problem with Georgia men. But the other two were problems with women. While Mrs. Camuse had indicated to Martha Causton in the mid 1730s that "the Girls of this place" should be trained to silk winding, she realized quickly when the trees began to produce, the lucrative potential of a monopoly of that art.⁴⁵ In November 1741 the Georgia President and Assistants found that her claim of £29.16.1 1/2 for silkwinding since September 1739 was unreasonable and beyond the Trustee budget; however, they paid it "for the sake of keeping her Quiet" until the Trustees could give direction.⁴⁶ At this time William Stephens complained that her "continual clammour is become vexatious," in spite of his efforts to behave courteously. Stephens feared that she meant to "make it on her own terms" and recommended trying to find another winder. Stephens even thought that perhaps she had been encouraged by the malcontents who "among their other deeds have taught this Woman to set a value on herself. . . ." ⁴⁷ Stephens and other men definitely saw this "putting a value on herself" as out of her proper feminine role and demeanor. Even more problematic than financial considerations was her continuing avoidance of sharing her knowledge. William Stephens said in 1743 that nothing in his work had given him "more Disquiet of mind than this unparalleled behavior of hers. . . ." ⁴⁸

Jane Mary Camuse was not, however, the only obstacle to silk-winding. By 1741, Stephens admitted that even if she had

New Deal on a New Frontier

agreed to teach, "would you believe it? We scarce know where to find 2 or 3 Girls willing to embrace the kind offer of learning the Art of winding the Silk."⁴⁹ The industrious Salzburger did work at the silk culture and even sent two Ebenezer young women to learn from Mrs. Camuse; but she used them for trivial work and did not teach them to wind. Disappointed but undaunted, the Reverend John Martin Bolzious tried to acquire another silk winder, the Widow Barricky, an Italian Piedmontese widow living in Carolina. But she proved, according to the good minister, "of the same principle as Mrs. Camuse, not inclined to teach her art."⁵⁰ In 1747, the two Salzburg young women who had watched Mrs. Camuse began to work from what they had observed, much to the delight of the frustrated Trustees who granted them each a £5 gratuity to encourage them and others. In 1749 the Trustees offered 40 shillings Sterling to every women in Georgia who learned to wind.⁵¹ By 1750 the widow Elizabeth Anderson was winding and instructing others. The Trustees sent her a £20 gratuity and instructed the Vice President and Assistants to "procure her a larger House (in which she is to live without Rent) and such Accommodations and Materials as shall be found necessary. . . ."⁵² The Trustees even rewarded one woman "tho' the Silk was not properly done. . . because she has set so good an Example to the other Inhabitants."⁵³ The Trust desperately hoped to fulfill at least one of their visionary ideas before surrendering their charter to the Crown. In 1752 silk production was taken in hand by a male member of the Assistants Pickering Robinson, and the next year by Joseph Ottolenghe who, it was said in 1753, had given "sufficient proof the last Season of his Capacity to carry on such an Undertaking."⁵⁴ Ottolenghe complained of Georgia's most industrious silk producers, the Ebenezer women, who he believed reeled inferior quality silk and did not seem to take his instruction well. He would, he said, "rather teach 10 of ye dullest English

New Deal on a New Frontier

women, then one of them." Mrs. Anderson, meanwhile, had gone to Carolina, blaming Ottolenghe for her loss of position. But, in spite of the increased hopes for silk culture with males in charge, the industry never became what the Trustees had hoped.

Trust policy was finally affected by the need to care for women whose usefulness to the colony was either temporarily or permanently ended. Some women required Trust support and in these plaintive pleas one finds the most offerings in the colonial records in women's own voices. Many of these women found themselves alone or with children, struggling to survive in a colony struggling to survive. These women clearly fit the paternalistic image of the "helpless," which the Trustees defined as "poor widows, orphans, and the sick."⁵⁵ In their annual budgets, the Trustees provided allotments for these purposes, although as money became tighter, these allowances grew smaller. They expected all women, including old women, to be productive if they were able. Stephens suggested in a 1739 letter that old women were useless "unless. . . employed. . . in the silk culture."⁵⁶ But some women were not able. For example, the Widow Hart, a servant to the Trustees, disabled in her limbs and impoverished by the loss of her cattle, petitioned in September 1742 that she was "reduced to great necessity by sickness." The Presidents and Assistants ordered 20 shillings for relief at that time and two months later ordered 2s/6d per week until further notice, "she appearing a real object of Charity."⁵⁷ The President and Assistants also favorably ruled on the petition of the Widow Gardener she "being well-known to be a laborious careful Woman, with two small Children, whom together with herself she has supported without any Subsistence. . . being now reduced to the last Extremity, & her children quite destitute of Cloathing."⁵⁸ The colonial government gave two widows, "to prevent their perishing," a small allowance of one shilling per week, "they being both very old, decrepit and

New Deal on a New Frontier

unable to support themselves and having no children or others able to Succour them."⁵⁹ The widow Cramp received 20 shillings, she "lying in lately and being in a Weak Condition with 3 or 4 Children and herself helpless."⁶⁰

Relief came in nonmonetary forms as well. In 1746, the widow Elizabeth Bowling told of the "great stress she was in by Reason of the House wherein she dwells being greatly exposed in the weather." Totally bedridden "by loosing the Use of all her Limbs. . .," she was not even protected from inclement weather. The President and Assistants instructed in July 1746 and again in October 1747 that the house be refitted.⁶¹ That same year, the widow Steinhavel, "in great need. . .having a Daughter that has been bedridden for. . .two Years. . ." received a barrel of rice. Often the relief was a one-time allotment to overcome sickness or "lying in," and sometimes it was a permanent allotment for the duration of a woman's life. In some cases, it simply involved forgiving a debt, often that of a deceased husband, so that a widow could start without that burden; in others, it meant providing a servant to help a woman help herself. Clearly, the Trustees felt an obligation to at least minimally aid those women who colonized their charitable venture.

In 1735, colonist Robert Parker, Jr., wrote, "Women in a New Colony are the Very Sinews of it. . ."⁶² In spite of the problems posed by having women in a frontier buffer colony, the Trustees' policies indicate that they agreed. Women were crucial to the stability of the colony in their roles as wives and mothers, important to the workings of the colony as housekeepers and servants, and necessary, the Trustees thought, to their hoped-for silk industry. The Trustees tried to formulate regulations that solved their dilemma of balancing the "liabilities" of women with their much-needed assets.

Georgia's first two decades had been difficult. The

New Deal on a New Frontier

Trustees did not accomplish their vision of diligent farm families working their own land without enslaved Africans, and silk spun by Georgia women worn by the nobility of England. One by one Trustee policies had been abandoned and by the 1750s the colony had begun to resemble its Carolina neighbor. But those years were not without successes. The colony had defended itself against Spanish and French encroachment and had maintained relatively good relations with native American Indians. The colony had survived, barely at times, but it had survived. Those women settlers who bore and then nursed the children, supported the men, worked in the fields and houses and huts and gardens, who served the meals and reeled the silk, were an integral part of this new beginning for the British on this new frontier.

NOTES

1. Allen D. Candler, comp., *The Colonial Records of Georgia* (hereinafter cited *CRG*), vol. 3, *The General Account of all Monies and Effects 1732-1751*. (Atlanta: Georgia Department of Archives and History, 1904-06), 353. Volumes 1-19 and 21-26 of the *CRG* were compiled by Candler from 1904-1916.

2. Both Native American women and African-American women were significant in the Georgia colony, but are not analyzed in the scope of this work. One of the most important women in Trustee Georgia was Mary Musgrove, daughter of a Native American woman and English father. Her relationship to Georgia is discussed in Doris Fisher, "Mary Musgrove: Creek Englishwoman," (Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 1990). While Trustee regulation prohibited slavery until 1750, a debate raged for most of the period between those who wanted to maintain the policy and those who argued that

New Deal on a New Frontier

slavery should be allowed. Slavery undoubtedly existed in the Augusta area as early as the 1730s and by the late 1740s South Carolinians began to colonize in Georgia with slaves, even before the regulation had been changed. The definitive treatment can be found in Betty Wood, *Slavery in Colonial Georgia, 1730-1755*, (Athens, Georgia, 1984).

3. Scholars have agreed that these were the three major goals of the colony, but disagreed about which were paramount to whom. E. Merton Coulter, *Georgia: A Short History*, (Chapel Hill, 1960) sees philanthropy as the guiding force of the Trustees. Others have argued that economic and military concerns were more important to the Trust. A good discussion of this historiography is in Donna Marie Rabac, "Economy and Society in Early Georgia: A Functional Analysis of the Colony's Origins and Evolution," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1978). After reading all of the records of the Trustees, this author remains convinced that Trustee economic and defensive concerns related to the growth and survival of their charitable effort.

4. For example, the need to protect women and children was one of the defenses for the regulation that prohibited African slavery.

5. *CRG* vol. 3, 373.

6. *Ibid.*, 374. The most thorough study of land policy can be found in Robert G. Lipscomb, "Landgranting in Colonial Georgia," (M.A. thesis, Univ. of Georgia, 1970).

7. Peter Gordon, *Journal of Peter Gordon*, E. Merton Coulter, ed. (Athens, 1963), 26.

8. *CRG* vol. 3, 378.

New Deal on a New Frontier

9. Kenneth Coleman and Milton Ready, eds. *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*, vol. 27, *Original papers, Correspondence to the Trustees, James Oglethorpe, and Others, 1732-1735* (Athens, 1982), 276-278.
10. CRG vol. 21, *Original Papers, Correspondence, Trustees, General Oglethorpe, and Others, 1735-1737*, 302.
11. CRG vol. 22, part 1, *Original Papers, Correspondence, Trustees, General Oglethorpe, and Others, 1737-1739*, 256.
12. Lands improved meant land with a six foot high fence. CRG vol. 29, *Trustees' Letter Book, 1732-1738*, 259.
13. CRG vol. 1, *The Georgia Charter: List of Trustees; By-Laws and Laws; Journals of Trustees*, 544.
14. CRG 29, 16.
15. CRG vol. 32, *Entry Book of Commissions, Powers, Instructions, Leases, Grants of Land, Etc, by the Trustees 1732-38*, 124.
16. CRG 21, 465.
17. William Stephens, *A Journal of the Proceedings in Georgia*, vol. 2 (London, 1742), reprinted by Readex Microprint Corporation, 1966, 272. Stephens' Journal also appears as vol. 4 and vol. 4 supplement of CRG.
18. *Stephen's Journal*, vol. 2, 458.

New Deal on a New Frontier

19. *South Carolina Gazette*, May 8-15, 1736, and John Wesley, *The Journal of the Reverend John Wesley*, A.M., ed. Nehemiah Curnock, Standard Edition I (London, 1909), 375. Quoted in Harold Davis, *The Fledgling Province: Social and Cultural Life in Colonial Georgia, 1733-1776* (Chapel Hill, 1976), 159.

20. *CRG* 29, 28.

21. *CRG* vol.2, *Minutes of the Common Council of Trustees, 1732-1752*, 110-111.

22. *CRG* vol. 22, part I, 301.

23. *CRG*, vol. 23, *Original Papers, Correspondence, Trustees, General Oglethorpe, and Others, 1741-42*, 24. He again urges the Trustees for married recruits and for German families, p 59.

24. *CRG* vol. 23, 488.

25. *Ibid.*, vol.23, 488-489.

26. Rabac, 174.

27. Some Indian traders married native American Indian women, but their numbers are not included, as their communities were separate.

28. *CRG*, vol. 22, part I, 219, 371. Letters and writings between and about spouses indicate a genuine and respect in most cases, even in the era when marriage was based more on necessity and economic considerations than on romance. Colonist Elisha Dobree wrote about his wife still in England: "I can freely Say in truth that my wife has been a

New Deal on a New Frontier

Vertuous Woman and the greater desire I have therefore to have her company." *CRG*, vol. 21, 286. Francis Piercy believed that marriage and his wife had changed his life: "For now I am marry'd instead of drinking Rum in the morning, I drink tea with my wife, and by the advice of my wife. . . I have left drinking quite, and I thank God live very happy and loving with my wife." *CRG*, vol. 20, 368. William Stephens reported that when rumors flew of Spanish attacks on Oglethorpe's camp outside Augustine, "wives bewailed the loss of their Husbands with Tears; and I found it no easy Matter to undeceive them." *Stephen's Journal*, vol. 2, 387.

29. *CRG*, vol. 20, 361.

30. *CRG*, vol. 22, part 1, 143.

31. *CRG*, vol. 2, 275.

32. *CRG*, vol. 20, 167. The concern of men to provide midwives seems quite genuine. In 1736, William Bradley, his son, and a John Robinson appeared at the Trust office, having been left behind by their ship to Georgia when they went ashore at Portsmouth to "engage a midwife to go to Georgia for the sake of Women Passengers near their time. . . ." *CRG*, vol., 143. One of the women was Bradley's wife who delivered on board the ship. *CRG*, vol. 21, 137.

33. *CRG*, vol. 29, 213, 226.

34. *CRG*, vol. 2, 249-251. *CRG*, vol 1, 535.

35. *CRG*, vol. 29, 63.

36. *CRG*, vol. 1, 535.

New Deal on a New Frontier

37. CRG, vol. 31, *Trustees' Letter Book*, 1745-52, 14.
38. CRG, vol. 2, 408.
39. CRG, vol. 31, 45.
40. CRG, vol. 22, part 1, 101.
41. *Ibid.*, 173.
42. *Ibid.*, 203.
43. CRG, vol. 30, *Trustees' Letter Book*, 1738-45,
276.
44. CRG, vol. 22, part 1, 64-65.
45. *Ibid.* 64-65.
46. CRG, vol. 6, *Minutes of the Presidents &
Assistants*, 7.
47. CRG, vol. 23, 146, 199.
48. CRG, vol. 24, *Original Papers, Correspondence,
Trustees, General Oglethorpe, and Others, 1742-1745*, 187.
Stephens wrote this before his major encounters with British-
native American Mary Musgrove Matthews Bosomworth in the
late 1740s who claimed rights to major tracts of land including
three islands off Georgia's coast.
49. *Ibid.*, 227.
50. *Ibid.*, 343.

New Deal on a New Frontier

51. *CRG*, vol. 31, 165.

52. *CRG*, vol. 1, 547-548. By this time the Trustees were encouraging teaching orphan girls as well. Slavery had begun in Georgia by 1750 and the Trust began to urge that young Female slaves be taught to wind also. A 1751 Trustee proposal urged planters to send "daughters, as well as their Young Slaves, to acquire the Art of reeling. They may by this means make every Branch of their Families highly useful." *CRG*, vol. 32, 246. There are few other references to female slaves in the records this early.

53. *CRG*, vol. 31, 226.

54. *CRG*, vol. 26, *Original Papers, Correspondence, Trustees, General Oglethorpe, and Other, 1750-52*, 418.

55. *CRG*, vol 22, part 1, 74.

56. *Ibid.*, 7.

57. *CRG*, vol. 6, 46, 52.

58. *Ibid.*, 60.

59. *Ibid.*, 314.

60. *Ibid.*, 29.

61. *Ibid.*, 159, 194.

62. *CRG*, vol. 20, 208.