2003

Regulating Babylon: Religion and Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina

Sarah E. King '03
Illinois Wesleyan University

Regulating Babylon

Religion and Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina

Sarah E. King
History 490
Illinois Wesleyan University

"Regulation is a name scarcely remembered,"[1] James Iredell insisted in a July 1771 letter to his father, Francis Iredell. The North Carolina Regulation movement had reached its crest that spring at the battle of Alamance. The Regulators had been soundly defeated by Governor William Tryon's soldiers, their leaders hanged. James Iredell and his eastern Whig cohorts could therefore proclaim with confidence that this alarming rebellion was decisively concluded. The disturbing religiosity of the settlers-turned-rebels would never again so greatly threaten the political hegemony of the eastern ruling class.

The Regulators, backcountry vigilantes bent on purging local government of perceived corruption, had sprung from fundamental grievances in North Carolina society. The North Carolina backcountry, haphazardly settled and loosely governed, had long been known for its embezzling sheriffs and arbitrary judges. The Regulators began as voluntary association to agitate, and if need be, fight for local reform. This name evoked a long history of Anglo-American dissent, as the term "Regulators" had been used since the English Civil War to denote citizen resistors to government corruption. These latter-day rebels consisted largely of evangelical devotees, grounded in an egalitarian, millennialist rhetoric that demanded their adherence to an "Inner Light." The Regulators' vigorous religious temperament moved them to react with great urgency to local issues and undertake strong measures in their conflict with the colonial government. Though deemed by the eastern elite as merely a bloodthirsty, anarchical mob, the Regulators were imbued with religious ideals, and not just agitated by petty, short-lived grievances. Backcountry settlers rejected a government divorced from religious principles, when their

[1] Don Higginbotham, ed. *The Papers of James Iredell* Vol. I (Raleigh: North Carolina Division of Archives and History, 1976), 73.

newfound, emotive religion demanded a proactive adherence to personal conscience and Christian ethics.

Past historians have situated the Regulator conflict in largely economic or social terms. James Whittenburg and others claim that at the time of the Regulation, a new and vast social division was present in backcountry society. The established backcountry settlers—the agrarian, yeoman farmers of Hermon Husbands' ilk—resented their recent displacement by mercantile and political interests. The Regulation, then, simply "crystallized widespread anxiety over the swift economic and political changes taking place in the piedmont."[2] The Regulators used fleeting issues of the moment to rectify their lessening influence in North Carolina. Rachel Klein similarly argues in *Unification of a Slave State* that the Regulators were trying to conserve their political clout and economic opportunities, and consequently were "something less than radical social critics."[3] The Regulator Rebellion, Whittenburg and Klein claim, was undertaken to ensure backcountry agrarian interests.

Little attention, until late, had been paid to the deeply religious temperament of the contemporaneous North Carolina backcountry, and the Regulation movement in particular. In her detailed study, *Breaking Loose Together*, Marjoleine Kars significantly addresses the religious motivations of the Regulation movement. Not only were Regulators objecting to recent political and social developments, but their radical Protestant ideology represented a new paradigm for colonial government and society. They "were critical of a world in which the quest for unlimited material gain overrode

---

[2] James P. Whittenburg, "Planters, Merchants, and Lawyers: Social Change and the Origins of the North Carolina Regulation," *William and Mary Quarterly* (April 1977): 238.
[3] Rachel N. Klein, *Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760-1808* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 67.

considerations of fairness,"[4] Kars explains. The Regulators were interested not only in rectifying political and economic ills, but also in creating ethical government. This essay seeks to expand upon Kar's depiction of the Regulators' religious motivations by placing those ethics more specifically within the bounds of Great Awakening evangelicalism. The Regulators' adherence to revivalist religion, which emphasized egalitarianism, pro-activity, and millenarian hopes, led them to actively resist a local government they deemed corrupt.

The settlement of the North Carolina backcountry was a drawn-out and fragmented affair. The eastern seaboard had been settled at the start of the eighteenth century, but further expansion west had been frustrated by the fierce resistance of the native Tuscarora Indians. By mid-century, the growing encroachment of European settlement had decimated the Tuscarora, and they were forced to merge with other Indian groups. North Carolina was now open for unbridled settlement. This occurred just as the rich farmlands of Pennsylvania and other mid-Atlantic colonies were becoming increasingly scarce and expensive. Consequently, settlers' eyes were turned to the comparatively inexpensive and sparsely settled land of North Carolina. The eastern portion of the colony, though more established, presented an undesirable option for many settlers. The seaboard was dominated by large plantations of gentry, and a slave workforce that was "very numerous...[perhaps] five to one White Person."[5] This did not provide much opportunity for a yeoman farmer, however industrious he might have been. The backcountry, then, with its recent, small-scale settlement, appeared a more attractive

---

[4] Marjoleine Kars, *Breaking Loose Together: The Regulator Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 218.
[5] William S. Powell, ed. *The Correspondence of William Tryon and Other Selected Papers* Vol. 1 (Raleigh: North Carolina Division of Archives and History, 1980), 139.

option. A contemporary observed, "Great numbers of Families keep daily crowding into the Back Parts of this Country...they come in Waggons by Land from Pennsylvania, a hardy and laborious Race of Men."[6] These simple farmers came to the backcountry in droves between 1730 and 1750.

The backcountry was "the Best poor mans Cuntry I ever heard of,"[7] proclaimed an early settler. Many came from northern colonies for a better life, but, as they quickly realized, it was a difficult one. Compared to its eastern counterpart, the frontier was decidedly barbaric. Land was hastily settled, and as Governor Tryon would complain, the settlers "have not more than a sufficiency to erect a Log House for their families and procure a few Tools to get a little Corn into the ground."[8] Families were unable to obtain many finished goods, and very few, if any, luxury items.[9] The land was rich, however, and was a suitable inducement for these struggling farmers to persevere. Backcountry farmers could make do by planting their crops, and letting their animals forage for food. Due to the richness of the land, little clearing was necessary, and consequently, farms existed symbiotically with wild, virgin forests. "Not a tree had been cut...," reminisced settler William Few, "and the state of society was in the first state of civilization."[10] Easterners often misinterpreted these minimal improvements as evidential of the settlers' lackadaisical attitude. "Surely there is no place in the world where the inhabitants live with less labor than in North Carolina,"[11] Virginia landowner William Byrd II

---

[6] Kars, *Breaking Loose Together*, 15.
[7] A. Roger Ekirch, *"Poor Carolina": Politics and Society in Colonial North Carolina, 1729-1776* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 29.
[8] Powell, *William Tryon*, 139.
[9] Ekirch, *"Poor Carolina,"* 29.
[10] Whittenburg, "Planters, Merchants, and Lawyers," 222.
[11] Kenneth A. Lockridge, *The Diary, and Life, of William Byrd II of Virginia, 1674-1744* (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 138.

condescendingly remarked. Charles Woodmason, Anglican itinerant, similarly noted that "the people [are] so very lazy."[12]

Besides the physical baseness, many feared the backcountry was a degraded state of human civilization. Reverend Woodmason sneered that North Carolinians were "compos'd of the Out Casts of all the other Colonies"[13] and were little above criminals. "It is dang'rous to live among, or near any of them,"[14] Woodmason declared. Personal possessions were always vulnerable to the grasping hands of the impoverished farmers. Encumbered by few societal restraints, the backcountry alarmed the elite, who considered the settlers "Vile and Corrupt...[in] a Stage of Debauchery Dissoluteness and Corruption."[15] While these comments were perhaps overly critical, civilization as known on the seaboard was remarkably absent in the frontier. The niceties of "civilized" life had not kept in time with the rapidity of backcountry settlement.

Similarly, North Carolina's government had not been able to expand at the same rate as the exponential growth of settlement. In some areas, Woodmason noted, the "Civil Police is hardly yet establish'd."[16] The settlers were mostly self-governing, as there were no real institutions to enforce the law. "In that country, at that time, there were no schools, no churches or parsons, or doctors, or lawyers; no stores, groceries or taverns, nor do I recollect to have seen during the first two years any officer, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, except a justice of the peace, a constable, and two or

---

[12] Richard J. Hooker, ed. *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953), 17.
[13] Ibid., 80.
[14] Ibid., 43.
[15] Ibid., 80.
[16] Ibid.

three itinerant preachers,"[17] recalled William Few, who himself settled in 1758. There was little organizational structure to backcountry society.

As there was little form to backcountry life, often there was a great deal of civil disorder. William Byrd stated that "the government there is so loose and the laws so feebly executed...[that] everyone does just what seems good in his own eyes."[18] What little order was maintained in the backcountry was the province of the carelessly managed and often-embezzling local government. Due to the rapid influx of immigration, many members of the colonial government were newcomers to the province, with little knowledge of local affairs and even less allegiance to their neighbors.[19] Many then, had no qualms using backcountry offices for economic gain. Many local government officials had no salary, but worked on a commission-basis. Many farmers would precipitously be called into court due to their debt, and judged guilty. Guilty parties, of course, were obliged to pay the government certain fees for their trouble. Sheriffs also had a habit of supplementing this income by overtaxing the backcountry citizens. Governor Tryon complained that "the Sheriffs have embezzled more than one half of the Publick Money ordered to be raised and collected by them."[20] Backcountry government often served the officials' incomes, not justice.

This flawed governance created much tension in backcountry affairs. A Massachusetts Spy editorial condemningly labeled backcountry officials as "the banditti of robbers, your judges, sheriffs, and pettifoggers."[21] The local authorities were

---

[17] Whittenburg, "Planters, Merchants, and Lawyers," 222.
[18] Lockridge, *William Byrd II*, 139.
[19] A. Roger Ekirch, *"Poor Carolina": Politics and Society in Colonial North Carolina, 1729-1776* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 83.
[20] Powell, *William Tryon*, 531.
[21] *Massachusetts Spy*, June 27, 1771.

perceived as intimately tied to the eastern locus of colonial power, and often had little in common with their constituents. Their comparatively affluent lifestyles, viewed in contrast to the public, were regarded with suspicion. A prominent backcountry lawyer and politician, Edmund Fanning, was popularly charged with civic thievery; a ballad accused that "by his civil robberies/He's laced his coat with gold."[22] The unregulated local government aroused bitterness and distrust, which later, combined with the ardent evangelicalism of the settlers, would flame into rebellion.

North Carolina's established religion, Anglicanism, also found difficulty maintaining authority in the backcountry. Rev. Charles Woodmason, an Anglican itinerant of South Carolina, complained that the state of religion in North Carolina was "greatly to be lamented—If it can be said, That there is any Religion, or a Religious Person in it."[23] There were only estimated to be eight Anglican clergymen residing in the colony of North Carolina as late as 1768.[24] The Anglican church of North Carolina, lagging unquestionably behind its neighboring colonies, was in such a state that Governor Tryon was in constant communication with the London-based Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, requesting Anglican clergymen to fill the perennially vacant county chapels. The present state of religion in the backcountry was deplorable, but, Tryon insisted, "when a sufficient Number of Clergy...persuade themselves to come into This Country, I doubt not but the larger Number of every Sect would come over to the

[22] Whittenburg, "Planters, Merchants, and Lawyers," 231.
[23] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 76.
[24] Robert W. Ramsey, *Carolina Cradle: Settlement of the Northwest Carolina Frontier, 1747-1762* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1964), 131.

Established Religion."[25] Despite this optimism, Anglicanism had yet to gain a significant foothold in the backcountry.

This lack of an Anglican establishment loosened social controls on the frontier. As Rhys Isaac explained in his study of contemporaneous Virginia, "churchgoing...had more to do with expressing the dominance of the gentry than with inculcating piety or forming devout personalities."[26] Institutional Anglicanism reinforced the hierarchy of the landowning class. It was a moderate religion, not subject to the alarming "humors" of enthusiastic religion, or the pervading authority of the pope. Anglican ministers, as spiritual guardians, were thought to restrain sinfulness and retain order for the masses, and therefore the lack of an adequate Anglican establishment was especially alarming. Charles Woodmason, for one, directly blamed this weakness for the prevalence of common-law marriages on the frontier: "For thro' want of Ministers to marry and thro' the licentiousness of the People, many hundreds live in Concubinage—swopping their Wives as Cattel, and living in a State of Nature, more irregularly and unchastely than the Indians."[27] William Byrd similarly noted that "the inhabitants of [this] province,...are not troubled with any religious fumes....What little devotion there may happen to be is much more private than their vices."[28] According to the eastern elites, backcountry society was rapidly falling into disarray and inching steadily closer towards damnation without a gentle Anglican shepherd to lead it.

---

[25] Powell, *William Tryon*, 144.
[26] Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 120.
[27] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 15.
[28] Lockridge, *William Byrd II*, 139.

Even though Rev. Woodmason bemoaned the lack of Anglicanism on the frontier, and concluded that "true Genuine Christianity is not to be found,"[29] the backcountry was not devoid of religion. On the contrary, the backcountry was remarkably religiously vibrant with varied sects abounding. While Woodmason complained that there was "not a Bible or Prayer Book—Not the least Rudiments of Religion, Learning, Manners or Knowledge (save of Vice) among them,"[30] he continually observed that large crowds frequented his sermons, though, he accused, "thro' Curiosity, and Itching Ears,"[31] not religious sentiment. Also, Woodmason's tirades revealed that much religious activity existed outside Anglicanism. On several occasions, he recounted that settlers independently did "employ themselves in Religious Exercises, and Works of Edification...In Singing of Hymns and Spiritual Songs."[32] This certainly is questionable behavior for a supposedly atheistic population.

Rather than being atheistic, religious sects proliferated in the backcountry. Loyal Anglicans, Woodmason reported, complained of "being eaten up by Itinerant Teachers, Preachers, and Imposters from New England and Pennsylvania—Baptists, New Lights, Presbyterians, Independents, and a hundred other Sects."[33] The southern backcountry in general was copiously supplied with itinerants, mostly products of the Great Awakening and followers of George Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent. These "enthusiastic" parsons alarmed the Southern elite, as they were thought to "make it their study to screw up the People to the heights of religious Phrenzy, and then leave them in that wild state."[34]

---

[29] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 43.
[30] Ibid., 23.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid., 97.
[33] Ibid., 13.
[34] Isaac, *Transformation of Virginia*, 150.

Evangelical itinerants acted to release adherents from the patriarchal overtones of elite religion, and consequently were regarded with skepticism.[35] "Africk [Africa] never more abounded with New Monsters," Charles Woodmason remarked, "than Pennsylvania does with New Sects, who are continually sending out their Emissaries around."[36] The backcountry was falling prey to dreaded "enthusiastic" religion.

The itinerants' questionable message stemmed from Great Awakening ideology, which had tremendously affected the Mid-Atlantic colonies, and was then working southward. The awakening was spurred in part by the sermons of Reverend Whitefield, an Anglican evangelist who toured the American colonies in the 1740's. Whitefield criticized the established Anglican clergy as having a dead faith and lacking a personal experience of God. He discouraged intellectualism, and instead promoted an emotional response to religion. In his sermons, he would dramatically depict the arrival of a sinner in hell. "Oh that I had taken up my cross and followed Christ," the sinner would cry, "[now] I must be miserable for ever." Whitefield would proceed to weep for the fate of the congregation, should they remain unrepentant.[37] These theatrics aroused the populace, and soon religious societies, such as Gilbert Tennent's Log College, were educating missionaries and sending them off to spread "the Word" in un-revived communities.

During the mid-eighteenth century, revivals flourished throughout the mid-Atlantic, and traveled down to the southern colonies. Often perpetuated by Presbyterians, revivals were similar to the time-honored Scottish holy fair. A charismatic speaker

---

[35] Ibid., 148.
[36] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 78.
[37] Frank Lambert, *Inventing the "Great Awakening"* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999), 98.

would raise the crowd to a height of religious fervor, encouraging them intimately to feel the workings of the Holy Spirit inside them. The Scottish poet Robert Burns described the spectacular stunts of the lay parson:

> Hear how he clears the points o' Faith
> Wi' rattlin' an' thumpin!
> Now meekly calm, now wild in wrath
> He's stampan, an' he's jumpan![38]

This captivating method of preaching appealed to backcountry settlers. Hermon Husband, the future leader of the Regulators, attended such a meeting and recalled, "I liked him [the preacher] much for thundering out against Sin and Sinners."[39] Soon backcountry residents flocked to see these charismatic ministers. Rev. Woodmason observed that "when some Itinerant Babler, or Vagrant Ignorant Bellweather comes to a Meeting House...then the Silly Herd run in Droves."[40] The Great Awakening had taken hold of the backcountry.

It was within this setting that the Regulator movement began. A backcountry settlement composed of subsistence farmers, scorned by the elite, devoid of customary governmental and societal controls, and brimming with enthusiastic religious ferment, presented a suitable locale for such a rebellion. When sheriffs and other local government officials increased their exploitations, the backcountry's evangelical religious ideology would exert its influence in full-force. By the formation of the Regulator movement in reaction to these developments, settlers would actuate their revivalist sentiments in a public forum.

---

[38] Leigh Eric Schmidt, *Holy Fairs: Scottish Communions and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989), 3-4.
[39] William K. Boyd, ed., *Some Eighteenth Century Tracts Concerning North Carolina* (Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton Company, 1927), 212.
[40] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 96.

While discord with local government had been an omnipresent fact of backcountry life, overt conflict did not begin until 1768. Corruption had always been a problem with local officials; backcountry settlers complained, "we labor under extreme hardships about our levies," as sheriffs extorted and embezzled tax money.[41] Now, however, a score of other complaints had joined this original one. Backcountry settlers received word that taxes would now only be collected in five designated areas, with a high penalty incurred for noncompliance. At the same time, Governor Tryon announced his plan to build a palatial mansion, to which much tax money was being diverted. Accordingly, backcountry settlers appealed to the colonial government for relief, but were ignored. In their frustration, members of the Sandy Creek Association formed the core of the Regulator movement in spring of 1768, circulating a pamphlet of resolutions which expressed the nucleus of their ideology.

Their immediate purpose was "regulating publick Grievances & abuses of Power,"[42] but the Regulators' aim had much larger scope. In the creation of such a document, the Regulators were asserting their ability and right to combat immorality in society. They resolved not to pay taxes until they were satisfied that "they are agreeable to Law and Applied to the purposes therein mentioned." The Regulators similarly agreed to "bear open testimony" to extortionate fees, a phrase reminiscent of a revivalist mission.[43] They also pledged community with one another, forming a mutual society to finance their campaign—this too is evocative of the evangelical vision of Christian

---

[41] Norris W. Preyer, *Hezekiah Alexander and the Revolution in the Backcountry* (Charlotte, North Carolina: Heritage Printers, 1987), 60.
[42] William S. Powell et al, eds., *The Regulators in North Carolina: A Documentary History, 1759-1776* (Raleigh: North Carolina State Department of Archives and History, 1971), 76.
[43] Ibid.

fellowship. Revealing the significant presence of radical Protestant groups, the Regulators resolved that, in place of oath-taking, those "being a Quaker or otherwise scrupulous in Conscience of the common Oath do solemnly affirm that We will stand true and faithful to this cause until We bring them to a true regulation."[44] The movement had begun.

The men who composed the newfound Regulation were overwhelmingly evangelical in their religious persuasions. Rev. Hugh McAden, a product of the revivalist Log College seminary, noted that in his travels in Hawfields, North Carolina, the crowd was "very desirous to hear the word...[it was] quite beyond expectation." This same area would later produce some of the most ardent Regulators.[45] The core members of the Regulation were founders of the Sandy Creek Association, an organization with its own credentials of radical Protestantism. The association had been formed by Quakers outcast from the Cane Creek Meeting due to their conflict with the church's discipline of an errant member. Hermon Husband, one of the leaders of this dissident group, lamented the estrangement but ultimately decided that one must "yield a strict Obedience to [your] own Conscience."[46] Husband and the dissidents who followed him to form the Sandy Creek Association presented a radically independent Protestant position that was essentially derivative of Great Awakening ideology.

The evangelical character of the Regulation was duly noted by the eastern elite. In Hermon Husband's *Impartial Relation*, he reported hearing that "he [Tryon] Represented us as a Faction of *Quakers* and *Baptists*, who aimed to overset the *Church* of

[44] Ibid.
[45] Kars, *Breaking Loose Together*, 85.
[46] Ibid., 117.

England."[47] While Husband denied any such aims, and maintained that the Regulation was simply composed of "every honest Man who was not deterred by Fear and Cowardice," he similarly recognized that the group did "consist Promiscuously of all Sects."[48] Tryon also used revivalist Presbyterian clergy to try to persuade Regulators to desist, thus suggesting that there was a significant portion who were Presbyterian Regulators.[49] Tryon, acknowledging the religious motivations of many Regulators, reprimanded their rebelliousness in an August 1768 letter that claimed their actions were shockingly "inconsistant with every Moral and Religious Duty."[50] Regulators were considered by their eastern opponents to be religious enthusiasts, and were negotiated with in such terms.

Religious concerns were never far from the Regulators' minds. There pervaded, as Hermon Husband would recall, "the Spirit of Enthusiasm...it catched every Man, good or bad, as *Saul* was catched among the Prophets."[51] The Regulators took action in this world, with their eyes set on the world to come. In a November 1766 letter from Frances Butler to her son, prominent Regulator William Butler, she relayed a funeral speech by revivalist minister Henry Patillo, and reminded her son to "observe and prepare for the next world...so as we may live in happiness to eternity." But, Mrs. Butler comforted herself, her son was already well aware of his "duty to take care for you and yours"[52] in religious matters. Though all knew of the dangers associated with opposition to colonial government, Regulators considered themselves fighting for a higher cause. They could

[47] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 280.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Powell, *The Regulators*, 162-165.
[50] Ibid., 159.
[51] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 268.
[52] Powell, *The Regulators*, 38.

then, with confidence, believe alongside Hermon Husband that the Regulation "was a Work of Providence, and therefore [they] feared no Evil."[53]

Religion was a powerful force in the Regulation because many Regulators had undergone dramatic spiritual transformations or conversions. Hermon Husband, considered to be both the ideological and political leader of the Regulation, was a prime example. Husband, though born Anglican, underwent a remarkable personal revival, as recounted in his pamphlet, *Some Remarks on Religion*. He was an adventurous young boy, and was consistently in trouble with his parents. Despite his youthful joviality, Husband recalled that "something in my own Breast [was] making me uneasy for my mischievous Tricks."[54] He remembered being told that he need only recite the Lord's Prayer and the creeds, and all would be forgiven. Husband found this a hollow belief, and knew that something more must be done. His deeds could not be absolved by mere perfunctory actions, but by a change of life. Husband repeatedly put off reform, rationalizing the delay as an earned enjoyment of his youth. But all the time, Husband "was reproved by Something within myself, and well remember at that Time, I thought it was God that spoke to me, and reproved me; and do verily believe I should always have thought so, had I never seen a Controversy to the Contrary."[55] Husband felt that he had always witnessed the Inner Light characteristic of evangelicalism, but his Anglican upbringing had prevented him from recognizing it.

Husband continued in this manner for some time, bargaining with God that one day he would reform, but not immediately. Finally, at the age of fifteen, Husband

---

[53] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 268.
[54] Ibid., 202.
[55] Ibid.

attended one of Reverend Whitefield's sermons, and this had a dramatic effect on his religious life. He decided that Whitefield was "One who bears a Testimony to the Truth."[56] Husband then investigated Whitefield's writings and became intimately involved with the New Light Presbyterians. "I was now a constant Adherent to the new Presbyterians or *Whitefieldians*,"[57] Husband recalled. He was enormously active in the opposition of the new Presbyterians to their older, conservative members. "I was according to my Age zealous against them," Husband remarked, "in contending for the Authority and Necessity of the inward and sensible Inspirations of the Holy Spirit, which was the grand Quarrel between us."[58] These sentiments that caused Husband to struggle against the old Presbyterians would similarly lead him to a break with the church entirely.

Despite Husband's new religious enthusiasm, or perhaps because of it, he found himself restless within the confines of the Presbyterian Church. Husband became increasingly familiar with revelation-guided Quaker theology, and found Presbyterianism ornate and sterile in comparison. "Where," Husband asked, "is St. *Paul's* Faith here?"[59] He decided that the Presbyterians had "disown'd" God, and found his present situation intolerable. Husband recalled, "my Soul longed for his Presence, nor could it be satisfied without him."[60] Husband found comfort in Quaker meetings, but he only marginally committed to this sect, his "Faith being not built on Man."[61] Husband's religion was very personal, and would eventually cause him to leave the Quakers as well. His goal was not adherence to a particular creed, but a personal relationship with God. Husband alleged:

---

[56] Ibid., 212.
[57] Ibid., 225.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid., 239.
[60] Ibid., 244.
[61] Ibid., 246.

> [I] have seen my Beloved at Times, who would touch the Handles of the Lock and withdraw, and peep as it were through the Lettice of the Window, or through the Roof of the House; sometimes appear on the Way, but withdraw as soon as I came in Sight of the City, or Assembly of the People.[62]

Husband's faith was a deeply-felt, personal religion, not one of church and creed. Conversion to this all-encompassing, individualized religion was the experience of many Regulators.

The ideology of this new faith would significantly impact the Regulators' relationship to the colonial government. Great Awakening thought presented a radically new paradigm by which adherents viewed their world. Foremost, this revivalist ideology espoused individualized devotion to God. Great Awakening rhetoric emphasized the importance of a "felt" God and an intimate relationship with the divine power. One could only become a Christian through personal conversion, not simply through acceptance of the creeds advocated by respected clergy. In Whitney R. Cross's examination of enthusiastic religion, *The Burned-Over District*, the author noted that in revivalist religion, "inspiration came to individuals, and each person charted his own course. Disregarding any established authority or institution...[they] concerned themselves with single souls, their own and others'."[63] Religion was individualized, and as such, an ordinary person could have as great a grasp of religious matters as a formally educated theologian, perhaps even more so.

This concept of individual conversion undermined hierarchies in many areas of life. With all people having equal access and revelation of the divine presence, those moved by "the Word" were encouraged to become lay preachers. Rev. Charles

---

[62] Ibid.
[63] Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850* (New York: Harper & Row, 1950), 206.

Woodmason recalled that in the backcountry, settlers "who can not write—Who never read ten pages in any Book, and can hardly read the Alphabett [were] discussing such Knotty Points for the Edification of their Auditors."[64] One's personal experience trumped any theological training. This usurpation of the province of the church hierarchy alarmed local authority. They believed that bishop and king went together; to deny one was to subvert the other as well. The local authorities were right—alongside their egalitarian religious ideals, many evangelicals maintained democratic political ideals as well. Revivalist minister Gilbert Tennent commented that "Civil Government [is] but the Union of Individuals for the more effectual Protection of Person and Property from Injustice and Violence."[65] It was consistent for people who believed in man's equality in the eyes of God to impose that ideal on worldly relations. Religious equality, then, was translated into civil equality.

Personal religious conversion, then, would be interpreted to mean egalitarianism in the public sphere. The aftereffects of this conversion, the presence of an "inner light," would supply a religious mandate that would invigorate the Regulators in their proceedings against local government. Once a person had experienced conversion, the Holy Spirit would descend to the person and guide them in their actions. As Whitney R. Cross explained, revivalism was centrally based on an "implicit, even occasionally an explicit, reliance upon the direct guidance of the Holy Ghost."[66] Since the Holy Spirit was an equal member of the Christian triune god, man was morally obligated to obey its commands. To suppress one's own spiritual revelation in favor of others', therefore, was

---

[64] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 103.
[65] James H. Smylie, ed. *Presbyterians and the American Revolution: A Documentary Account* Journal of Presbyterian History, Vol. 52, No.4. (Winter 1974), 322.
[66] Cross, *The Burned-Over District*, 198.

not only hierarchical, but sinful. The dictates of one's conscience were the dictates of God.

Their belief in personal divine guidance encouraged evangelical Christians to act out their religion in the world. George Whitefield preached that real faith "will not be dead, idle or inactive: for 'tis...continuously exciting the possessor of it to shew it forth by his works."[67] If man was divinely inspired, his conscience was of great worth to society. Man was charged to adjudicate for God's justice in the world. When people repressed their "inner lights" and blindly adhered to authority, the will of God was subverted. Gilbert Tennent also propounded the obligation of Christians to carry out their mission in the world. "*Brethren*," Tennent urged, "we were born not merely for ourselves, but the *Publick Good*! which, as Members of Society, we are obliged *pro virili* to promote!"[68] Evangelicalism directed Christians to actuate their faith in the outside world. Bringing inspirational Christianity into public life and government would create a better society, and inch nearer to God's vision of humanity.

The Regulation embodied this intrinsic connection between revivalism and egalitarianism, and heightened Regulator reaction to government encroachments. Regulators believed that God had made all men equal. Hermon Husband asked, "are not all men equally free; hath not God of one blood made all the kindreds of the earth?"[69] The Regulators believed that Christianity explicitly promoted egalitarianism. As men experienced God through personal conversion and revelation, all were equal in His sight. To the Regulators, the goal of true religion was to teach men "the rights of private

---

[67] Stuart C. Henry, *George Whitefield: Wayfaring Witness* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), 110.
[68] Smylie, *Presbyterians*, 323.
[69] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 316.

judgment and the liberty they have of judging for themselves in all things which respect the conscience."[70] No adherence to creed could replace this essential experience. Hermon Husband reflected this belief in his pamphlet, *An Impartial Relation.* "Do men think they can express themselves more intelligibly than the holy spirit," Husband questioned, "or commend the truth more clearly to other men's conscience?"[71] Every man must directly experience the "Truth," and therefore, no one was greater than another.

When this essential equality was denied, the floodgates were opened to a multitude of injustices. Men, convinced of their inability to participate in religion or government on the same level of others, were easily exploited. Husband accused the Anglican clergy of manipulating the people in this manner: "it is necessary to have the people well perswaded of the rights and importance of the clergy, and the divinity of creeds and canons of churches, before they will submit to be mounted and ridden like asses."[72] Deference was pure folly, as, Husband claimed, the "reason of all civil and religious impositions hath been the slothfulness of the people,—who act like great men who commit the care of their estates to stewards."[73] Men should not defer to their betters in civil and religious matters; it only led to corruption and manipulation.

In the Regulator's first advertisement, released before the outbreak of open hostility, they urged backcountry settlers to assert their god-given equality. Settlers should investigate the present workings of the often questionable local government. "Honest rulers in power will be glad to see us examine this matter freely," the Regulators hoped. This was not in an effort to undermine law and order, but rather preserve it. It

---

[70] Ibid., 330.
[71] Ibid., 321.
[72] Ibid., 328.
[73] Ibid.

was every man's "Duty as well as right to see & examine whether such rulers abuse such trust"[74] as men put in government. The situation had so degraded in North Carolina precisely *because* none took an active involvement in government. The advertisement implicated the common people in the continuance of government corruption, claiming that "when grievances of such public nature are not redressed the reason is everybody's business is no Bodys."[75] Hierarchy must not be allowed to rule; it permitted a multitude of vice.

That, Regulators believed, was exactly what had happened in North Carolina. The Regulator documents betray significant frustration at the high-handed, elitist attitude of a North Carolina government that denied the egalitarianism that was so crucial to the Regulators. Regulators often complained that government officials, mostly composed of eastern landowners, viewed themselves as above reproach by the lesser backcountry citizenry. They considered the rebellion to be simply "a lawless opposition to Government...an open defiance of Law and contempt of authority."[76] Backcountry settlers had been long acquiescent, so this uprising shocked the elite, who considered the rebels to be astonishingly ungrateful and insolent. A disappointed Edmund Fanning remarked, "I never could have suspected any people of [this,] much less the people of Orange."[77] Backcountry citizens, Regulators asserted, were only assuming their rightful position, one that had only been unfairly denied them. Further evidencing the inequities

[74] Powell, *The Regulators,* 35.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Ibid., 81.
[77] Ibid., 83.

in North Carolina government, Regulators joked that "no Masters of abject Slaves could be more exasperated"[78] than the hierarchical easterners.

The Regulators took extreme exception to Fanning, a prominent backcountry lawyer and politician. Fanning had been working in close collusion with Governor Tryon to repress the Regulator rebellion. Regulators claimed that Fanning simply wanted to sustain the oligarchy of the elite, not maintain order and restrain "licentiousness" as he claimed. Husband particularly called attention to the plight of Fanning's district, Orange County: "No other County was bless'd with a FANNING, whose rigid Vice could not brook a Detection; and whose despotism would not suffer him to think the men that chose him their Representative *His Equals*, whose proud Heart would not bear the instruction of *His Constituents*."[79] The Regulators' foundation in Great Awakening egalitarianism caused them to view the inequalities perpetuated by government officials with even greater abhorrence. It was a subversion of the natural order.

The Regulator documents similarly betray a sense of religious mandate in their conflict with the local government. Every man not only had the absolute right to participate in government, but furthermore, he had a moral obligation to do so. In *Breaking Loose Together*, historian Marjoleine Kars characterized Hermon Husband's sense of religious mandate. "To him," Kars stated, "freedom of conscience was both a natural right and a divine command."[80] The Holy Spirit visited each and every man. To neglect the dictates of one's conscience was to deny the instruction of God. Regulator Hermon Husband intimately felt the pressure of divine mandate. In *Some Remarks on*

[78]Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 265.
[79] Ibid., 348.
[80] Kars, *Breaking Loose Together*, 124.

Religion, Husband articulated that he believed "this Grace that speaks in your Heart,...will not let you rest till you pay your just Debts."[81] He therefore determined that he would "never consent to any Evil, and if not trod down and rejected [he] will strive against it and every Tendency thereunto."[82] Evil, as recognized by one's inner light, had to be thwarted at every turn. Religious conviction required action.

The Regulators viewed their struggle with local government as actuating their religious faith in the public sphere. This political conflict, then, took on the appearances of a religious mission. Charles Woodmason characterized the Regulators as viewing their evangelical experiences as "binding on the consciences of all the Kirk, as the Gospel it Self, for it is a covenant enter'd into with God, from which they cannot recede."[83] Hermon Husband also ascribed to the Regulator cause a sense of religious obligation. Husband related that "God give[s] all men a knowledge of their privileges, and a true zeal to maintain them."[84] The backcountry could not remain compliant, for God supported and encouraged them to maintain their rights and ethics in government. A true Christian could not idly watch the destruction of virtue and the reign of "rogues" in government. Good government was ruled by morality. When people tolerate a politician who "neither fears God nor loves mankind,"[85] it was detrimental to society. For, Husband asked, "if the Almighty was not at the head of the administra[95]tion, it is hard to say where the end [of corruption] might be."[86] North Carolina government had sunk to its low state because

[81] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 238.
[82] Ibid., 230.
[83] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 55.
[84] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 317.
[85] Ibid., 322
[86] Ibid., 325.

it was not guided by religious principles, and it was the role of the Regulators to restore religious piety to government.

This is not to say that Regulators advocated a government-sanctioned church. Regulators unequivocally supported the separation of church and state. As each man relied on his own personal experience to form his religious attitudes, there would consequently naturally be a variety of religious persuasions. To impose an official religious view on the populace was dangerous—hence the Regulator's opposition to the proposed religious hegemony of the Anglican easterners. Hermon Husband fervently believed that "the estableshing a mantanance for the clergy by law opens a door for wiked designing men purely for the sake of such a maintenance to mostly crowd into those established benefices."[87] The sects that composed the backcountry, as Woodmason observed, might continually battle, but "as in England, they will unite together to injure the Church establish'd."[88] Religious freedom was too highly valued by the Regulators for them to advocate a theocracy.

What the Regulators did intend, however, was to enact their personal ethics in the social sphere. Unlike some radical Protestant groups, such as the Moravians, they did not advocate pacifism and withdrawal from the world. Their religious beliefs were exactly the opposite; if Christians abandoned the world through mistaken isolationism and thus neglected their divine duties, the world would surely sink further into inequity. "Christians," Husband argued, "is [sic] the light of the world—this is a most certain truth; and when the state is deprived of the light of so many Christians as is among dissenters,

[87] Kars, *Breaking Loose Together*, 107.
[88] Hooker, *The Carolina Backcountry*, 43.

her light becomes almost quite darkness."[89] To deny governance the benefit of enlightened Christianity was to do a grave injustice to the citizenry. One Regulator, James Few, believed that he was divinely charged in his participation in the Regulation, as he had been commanded "from heaven to relieve the world from oppression."[90] The Regulation movement would bring Christian ethics into the public sphere, and therefore benefit all North Carolinians. This infusion of Christian ethics was absolutely necessary, as the North Carolina government was, according to Regulators, rapidly degenerating. Civic life could not be divorced from private, religious life.

This sense of religious duty compelled Regulators to act in the civil world. However, this leaves the urgency of their mission unexplained. Great Awakening ideology had affected the Regulators in that they felt both worthy and obligated to involve themselves in religious and civil affairs. The ferocity of their involvement is largely due to the Great Awakening belief in the imminent millennium. The millennium was the thousand-year reign of Jesus as foretold in the Book of Revelations. Joseph Bellamy reflected this hope in his popular sermon, "The Millennium." The millennium was to be much desired, as "Babylon shall fall, satan be bound, and Christ will reign, and truth and righteousness universally prevail, [for] a thousand years."[91] The righteous would meet God and the unbelievers would be subject to his judgment. Hope of the millennium figured largely in the evangelical mindset.

The concept of the millennium, however, was not simply an intangible hope, but a pressing reality. Evangelicals believed they saw clear signs of the end times, and could

---

[89] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 322.
[90] Kars, *Breaking Loose Together*, 201.
[91] Alan Heimert, ed. *The Great Awakening: Documents Illustrating the Crisis and Its Consequences* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967), 626.

personally hasten the millennium. All events were interpreted as further documenting the advent of the millennium. As Ruth H. Bloch explained in *Visionary Republic*, "millennialism provided the main structure of meaning through which contemporary events were linked to an exalted image of an ideal world."[92] Foremost in this belief in the coming millennium was the idea that humans played a direct role in its arrival. Central then to revivalist Christianity was this "assumption that purposeful endeavor was instrumental in achieving millennial happiness."[93] Just as people individually experienced the divine presence, and therefore received the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they could also work to reform society in order to prepare it for the return of Christ. Anti-revivalist Charles Chauncy criticized that evangelicals were so captivated by this idea that they often preached that "the glorious Times they spake of, *would be manifest over the whole Earth, within the Term of THREE YEARS*"[94] if only humans would act accordingly.

The belief that society could initiate the millennium through human agency leant a sense of urgency to reform. Revivalism, Whitney Cross explained, "was also radical in the sense of haste to accomplish great changes, because it was the harbinger of the millennium."[95] No longer were religious adherents content to organize gradual change, but rather, they demanded an immediate rectification of moral misconduct. Christians, Joseph Bellamy urged, should "exert themselves to the utmost, in the use of all proper means, to suppress error and vice of every kind."[96] The sooner human society could be

---

[92] Ruth H. Bloch, *Visionary Republic: Millennial themes in American thought, 1756-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), xiii.
[93] Ibid., 18.
[94] Heimert, *The Great Awakening*, 303-304.
[95] Cross, *The Burned-Over District*, 201.
[96] Heimert, *The Great Awakening*, 632.

corrected, the sooner the long-wished millennium would commence. Pro-activity was absolutely required. This new religious attitude gave reformers a sense of haste in their endeavors.

It was therefore evident to many evangelicals that immediate pro-activity was needed in government. Bellamy deemed adherents a de facto army of Christ, trying to secure his kingdom for his return:

> Although many a valiant soldier may be slain the field; yet the army shall drive all before them at last. And satan being conquered, and all the powers of darkness driven out of the field, and confined to the bottomless pit, ye shall reign with Christ a thousand years.[97]

Likewise, those who opposed the reformist actions of these zealous Christians were grouped into the camp of the Anti-Christ. Evil opposition was not necessarily foreign and unknown, but rather Christians needed to realize that "domestic foes are the most dangerous."[98] Opposition did not daunt these religious crusaders—the Bible foretold a battle for the soul of the earth. Such opposition, placed in these dire terms, had to be met with drastic measures. Revivalist ideology did not reject the idea that violence may have to be employed in order to conquer evil in the world. With this dedication, revivalist minister Jonathan Edwards hoped, "Satan's visible kingdom on earth shall be utterly overthrown."[99]

Regulator ideology displays these latent millenarian underpinnings. Herman Husband, for instance, became convinced in the 1740's of the imminent millennium, and constantly shared those views with others.[100] He imposed this millenarian ideology on

---

[97] Ibid, 633.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid., 25.
[100] Bloch, *Visionary Republic*, 72.

the Regulators' struggle with local government officials, and consequently he viewed the movement as part of a larger battle between the forces of the elect and those of the Anti-Christ. Should the Regulators be successful, it would usher in great progress, culminating in the much desired thousand-year reign of Christ. Hermon Husband clearly articulated these sentiments as he explained his push to reorganize backcountry government: "Methinks when a Reformation can be brought about in our Constitution by a legal and constitutional manner, then will commence that Thousand Years Reign with Christ, and utter downfall of Mystery Babylon."[101] Millenarian expectations were clearly present in Herman Husband's ideology.

It is impossible to determine whether rank-and-file Regulators shared Husband's millenarian views. There are few documents to investigate, as Husband was the only Regulator that wrote political or religious treatises, and most other Regulator documentation is in the form of public announcements. However, the Regulators were overwhelmingly composed of evangelical Christians, and this millenarian rhetoric was an essential component of that movement. Also, it is significant that such a popular leader as Husband, who was almost unanimously considered to be both the political and ideological leader of the Regulation, was such a strong adherent to this philosophy. His rhetoric and efforts to shape the movement alone would have helped to imbue a millenarian spirit on the Regulation movement.

This millenarian thread in Regulation ideology strengthened the Regulator's dedication to their cause. Because they cherished such religiously-motivated goals, the Regulators were able to endure more duress and expressed greater opposition than would

[101] Ibid., 73.

have been possible otherwise. Husband remarked that the Regulator belief in their ability to enact positive, millennial reform fortified the movement. He recalled a particular instance in which the Regulators roused the countryside to protest an innocent man's arrest. The outnumbered backcountry settlers confronted the colonial soldiers without fear. "A man Under the Opperation of this Spirit," Husband insisted, "can do and undergo double what he can at another Time."[102] The Regulators' millennial expectations endowed their cause with great urgency and intensity.

Due to this thread of millenarian thought in the Regulation, the Regulators tended to view their conflict in terms of this religious expectation. The colonial government did not take the Christian ethics of virtue and fairness into consideration during their procedures, a move that was essentially at odds with the Regulators' evangelical Protestantism. Consequently, Regulators viewed the government's opposition to what they considered, a Christian-based public policy, as opposition to Christianity itself. As with many millenarian groups, Regulators crouched their conflict in terms of the forces of Christ and the Anti-Christ. The Regulator cause represented Christianity, virtue, and morality. They were an oft-wronged people, who, after years of abuse, finally decided to amend the wrongdoings of their oppressors. A popular Regulator pamphlet, *A Fan for Fanning*, insisted that dissidents were entrapped; they were constantly bombarded with morally-corrupt government officials who extorted money and abused their constituents. Regulators saw no way to escape from the colonial government's un-Christian avarice, hierarchy, and corruption.[103] Their only resort was rebellion. The Regulators were an honest, moral, and Christian force that had only been driven to action by the oppression

[102] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 268.
[103] Ibid, 360.

of evil-intentioned men. They were, Hermon Husband believed, "God's peculiar and chosen people."[104]

In Regulator ideology, this godly force was counterbalanced by the malevolence of their opponents. Their opposition, the colonial government, was not only a political adversary, but a religious one as well. In *An Impartial Relation*, Husband related the Regulation conflict to the Biblical affliction of the Jews by heathen peoples, endowing backcountry settlers with chosen people status, while their colonial opposition was deemed godless adversaries.[105] North Carolina government officials were not seen merely as having political agendas, or possessing different ideologies. They were un-Christian, and entirely morally-corrupt sinners. One Regulator advertisement labeled officials "Monsters in iniquity."[106] Officials were sinful and fundamentally opposed to Christ. Their crimes were symbolic of the distresses of the end times. They were a debased people, and were dragging society down with them in, what Husband pronounced, a time akin to the "mighty degenerate Age."[107] Due to their evangelical religious persuasions, Regulators took their objections to colonial opposition to a further level, and questioned their morality as human beings, not just their judgments as public officials.

Because they viewed their enemies as opposed to true, Christian-based policies, Regulators did not flinch from undertaking drastic measures. For instance, Regulators often employed physical intimidation to coerce officials into adopting a more equitable policy in the backcountry. Lawyer Edmund Fanning, well-known for his extortions of

[104] Ibid., 325.
[105] Ibid., 310-311.
[106] Powell, *The Regulators*, 115.
[107] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 311.

backcountry taxpayers, was the target of such "righteous" violence. During a Regulator riot in Hillsborough, North Carolina, the Boston *Evening Post* reported that the Regulators

> seized him [Fanning] by the heels, dragged him down the steps, his head striking violently on every step, carried him to the door, and forcing him out, dragged him on the ground over stones & brickbats, struck him with their whips and clubs, kicked him, spit and spurned at him, and treated him with every possible mark of contempt and cruelty.[108]

Fanning escaped, but the crowd proceeded to attack his house the next day. After destroying nearly all of his personal possessions, the mob "pulled down & laid his house in ruins."[109] Regulators were determined to teach Fanning, however roughly, that governance without Christian ethics was not acceptable. To Regulators, their goal of perfecting society through the perpetuation of Christian ethics was so important that even violence was justified.

After escalating Regulator resistance, resulting in the destructive public riots in Hillsborough, Governor Tryon decided he was through negotiating with the backcountry insurgents. He mounted a provincial army, mainly composed of conscripted settlers, to repress the Regulators. Fortified by their evangelical convictions, the Regulators would meet this violence head-on. James Hunter insisted that the backcountry people were "wholly deprived of justice,"[110] and this sentiment provided the moral backing to an outright Regulator rebellion. Violence was necessary in this battle for the soul of North Carolina, and would lead Regulators to eradicate what they saw as a glaring lack of Christian ethics in the public sphere. Regulators felt morally bound to regulate the

---

[108] Powell, *The Regulators*, 254.
[109] Ibid., 255.
[110] *Massachusetts Spy*, June 27, 1771.

behavior of their local government. Theirs was a public-minded religion, as Husband himself vowed to bring every person out "from under the Bondage and Slavery of Sin" and therefore would not tolerate evil being perpetuated in society.[111] It is not surprising then, that Regulators felt little qualms when presented with opposition by the colonial government. They were backed by Christian ethics that they felt obligated them to act in colonial government.

Despite their religious belief in the justifiability of their case, the Regulators would not be successful in their rebellion. The movement would meet its end in April of 1771, as ragtag Regulator fighters were outmatched by a trained British army and local militia. Governor Tryon then embarked on a ruthless suppression of all those affiliated with the rebellion. Several prominent Regulators were hanged without trial. The backcountry turmoil finally began to subside when Tryon offered pardon to all those who would take a new oath of allegiance, thereby hoping to prevent further uprisings. Eventually 6,400 backcountry men would take the oath, thus evidencing the widespread appeal of the religiously-inspired uprising.[112] The force of this backcountry movement to inculcate Christian ethics in government policies was only subdued by the machinations of a colonial army. The Regulator movement had ended, but the momentum it generated in the years before its demise lends remarkable credit to the power evangelical religion maintained in the North Carolina backcountry.

The North Carolina Regulation was heavily influenced by evangelical religion. Beleaguered by what they viewed as an increasingly oppressive political and economic environment, they took action. They were bound by their newfound evangelical faith to

[111] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 230.
[112] Kars, *Breaking Loose Together*, 204.

follow the dictates of their own consciences, and were sent forth in their endeavors with great urgency due to their millenarian expectations. Regulators, Hermon Husband insisted, heard "Carolina cry and utter her voice, and say, That she will have her publick accounts settled,"[113] and this is just what these dissidents attempted to do. The Regulation was an attempt to bring evangelical, personal ethics into the public realm of government, from which, they believed, religious principles were becoming increasingly divorced.

[113] Boyd, *Eighteenth Century Tracts*, 324.

Bibliography

Azbug, Robert H. *Cosmos Crumbling: American Reform and the Religious Imagination.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Baldwin, Alice M. "Powers of Sedition: The Political Theories of Some of the New Light Presbyterian Clergy of Virginia and North Carolina." In *William and Mary Quarterly* 5 (January 1948): 52-76.

Bloch, Ruth H. *Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought, 1756-1800.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Boyd, William K., ed. *Some Eighteenth Century Tracts Concerning North Carolina.* Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton Company, 1927.

Cross, Whitney R. *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850.* New York: Harper & Row, 1950.

Ekirch, A. Roger. *"Poor Carolina": Politics and Society in Colonial North Carolina, 1729-1776.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981.

_____. "'A New Government of Liberty': Hermon Husband's Vision of Backcountry North Carolina, 1755." In *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, Volume 34, Issue 4 (October 1977) 632-646.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Heimert, Alan, and Perry Miller, ed. *The Great Awakening: Documents Illustrating the Crisis and Its Consequences.* Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.

Henry, Stuart C. *George Whitefield: Wayfaring Witness.* New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.

Higginbotham, Don, ed. *The Papers of James Iredell.* Raleigh: North Carolina Division of Archives and History, 1976.

Hoffman, Ronald, et al. eds. *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry during the American Revolution.* Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1985.

Hooker, Richard J., ed. *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Isaac, Rhys. *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Kars, Marjoleine. *Breaking Loose Together: The Regulator Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Klein, Rachel N. *Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760-1808.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Lambert, Frank. *Inventing the "Great Awakening".* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999.

_____. *"Pedlar in Divinity": George Whitefield and the Transatlantic Revivals, 1737-1770.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Landsman, Ned C. *Scotland and Its First American Colony, 1683-1765.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Lockridge, Kenneth A, ed. *The Diary, and Life, of William Byrd II of Virginia, 1674-1744.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Massachusetts Spy. June 27, 1771.

Nobles, Gregory H. "Breaking into the Backcountry: New Approaches to the Early American Frontier, 1750-1800." In *William and Mary Quarterly* 46 (October 1989): 641-670.

Powell, William S., ed. *The Correspondence of William Tyron and Other Selected Papers.* Vol. I 1758-1767. Raleigh: North Carolina Division of Archives and History, 1980.

Powell, William S., et al, eds. *The Regulators in North Carolina: A Documentary History; 1759-1776.* Raleigh: The North Carolina State Department of Archives and History, 1971.

Preyer, Norris W. *Hezekiah Alexander and the Revolution in the Backcountry.* Charlotte, North Carolina: Heritage Printers, 1987.

Ramsay, Robert W. *Carolina Cradle: Settlement of the Northwest Carolina Frontier, 1747-1762.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1964.

Schmidt, Leigh Eric. *Holy Fairs: Scottish Communions and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Smylie, James H., ed. *Presbyterians and the American Revolution: A Documentary Account.* In Journal of Presbyterian History, Vol. 52, No.4. Winter 1974.

Westerkamp, Marilyn J. *Triumph of the Laity: Scots-Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Whittenburg, James P. "Planters, Merchants, and Lawyers: Social Change and the Origins of the North Carolina Regulation." *William and Mary Quarterly* 34 (April 1977): 215-238.