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“You must now close my afflicting Duty, by pronouncing upon you the awful Sentence of the Law; which is, that you Benjamin Merrill, be carried to the Place from whence you came, that you be drawn from thence to the Place of Execution, where you are to be hanged by the Neck; that you be cut down while yet alive, that your Bowels be taken out and burnt before your Face, that your Head be cut off, your Body divided into Four Quarters, and this to be at his Majesty's Disposal; and the Lord have Mercy on your Soul.”

Chief Justice of Hillsborough, North Carolina

Thus signifies the demise of the young, admired captain of the Regulators, Benjamin Merrill. That fateful, sweltering day of June 19, 1771, he and eleven of his compatriots were condemned to the gallows for high treason. But what heinous actions did these men commit? What reprehensible crime would constitute such a punishment? The answer lies in the failure of the Regulator Rebellion, a prolonged conflict in the North Carolina backcountry spanning from 1766 to 1771.

Introduction

Today, this unsuccessful revolution is best known as the War of Regulation, or more simply, the Regulation. The backcountry men of neighboring South Carolina, who protested the legislature’s inability to establish local government in the western settlements, first assumed the moniker of “Regulator.” The term was later adopted in the 1760s to denote persons of the North Carolina backcountry whose purpose was to “regularize” and reform the protocols and procedures of their local governments. These Regulators, a group consisting of seven thousand men, endeavored to obtain redress of their grievances from their colonial government. When their peaceful, legal measures were repeatedly blocked, primarily by Royal Governor William Tryon, the backcountry men reacted with open violence. Their hostilities culminated in the Battle of Alamance, which concluded the war with a Tryonian victory. In the aftermath of Alamance, the governor’s forces decimated Regulator strongholds, hanged a select number of the Regulator rebels, and required more
than 6,000 individuals to swear an oath of allegiance to the King. Though the larger portion of the insurrection had been subdued by 1771, the Regulator Movement persisted in the backcountry throughout much of the 1770s.

On the eve of the American Revolution, the Regulators would appear to be America’s first Patriots; however, such was not the case. Although the Regulators prefigured the larger American Revolution with their willingness to fight for fairer taxation and governance against their ruling body, they were not always the anti-British Patriots historians have assumed them to be. Thorough investigation of primary resources reveals that the Regulators were certainly not American Patriots: for the most part, they were loyal British subjects—reacting to and endeavoring to reform corruption in their local government through means of revolution.

**Historical Context**

The royal colony of North Carolina was established in 1729, though immigration to the region had begun nearly seven decades previous. By 1776, more than half of North Carolina’s population was located in the westernmost counties of the colony, such as Orange, Anson, Granville, Rowan, and Mecklenburg. In these areas, complaints pertaining to unfair representation, taxation, extortion, corruption of local officials, and subjugation of the poor soon flourished. Additionally, economic hardship, Easterner versus Westerner tension, dramatic population increases, religious unrest, and a spirit of individuality and independence were significant in the cultivation of conflict in the North Carolina Piedmont, or backcountry region.

Those who flocked to North Carolina were often independent farmers, usually of meager means. Having spent much of their limited funds to travel to the territory, many immigrants lacked the necessary finances to purchase the land on which they settled. Hoping for what later became known as preemption, the right to improve the land and make a profit sufficient to purchase it, families squatted on sections of the millions of acres owned by absentee speculators. Speculators, who often procured the territories through their participation in colonial government, initially promised to settle people in the Piedmont. Yet, when approached, speculators would only offer to sell their property at inflated costs, due to the “improvements” to the land. These “improvements” were the very toil of the settlers, such as cleared fields, cultivated crops, and newly constructed homes. The indignant squatters were backed into a corner: either they could desert the land on which they had sweat equity in search of cheaper land, or they could purchase the land at the higher price. Both were quite unattractive options, and such situations bred resentment amongst the poor farmers, who felt cheated by the wealthy of the province.

The gentry, though only five percent of the total population of the colony, dominated the political landscape. Public officials, including sheriffs and judges, were appointed on the recommendations of their fellow, affluent officials instead of a vote of the people. Thus, the infamous “courthouse rings” began, whereby the elite obtained legalized authority over the descending tiers of classes. Furthermore, sheriffs and clerks were not paid direct salaries; rather,
their commissions came from the fees that they collected. Therefore, the men holding these positions were encouraged to impose excessive fees on the farmers as a method of gaining additional income. While the backcountry farmers had little representation in their local governments, they exerted even less influence in the North Carolina General Assembly; those living in the eastern areas of the province often determined the decisions regarding taxation and other important matters. Additionally, embezzlement by members of this body was a recurring frustration for future Regulators.

Moreover, the backcountry men endured tremendous stress due to the droughts of 1758. By 1764, many areas were in desperate need of relief. Credit, as it is known today, was unavailable at that time, the only viable sources being the elite of the province. Yet, to accept credit from such persons would endanger the economic independence of the small farmers. It was not an uncommon occurrence for a creditor to claim that debts had not properly been paid then seize an amount greater than the original debt. When such cases were tried in local courts, judges consistently decided in favor of moneyed interests. As a result, the backcountry men could not rely upon the law as it would “terminate inevitably in the ruin” of their families. This fear of economic destruction at the hands of the elite fed the growing despair of the Piedmont farmers. The vulnerability of their position distinguished the people of the backcountry from those living farther east, and the disparities between the coastal populations and their western counterparts were further exacerbated by their differences in religious beliefs.

The tumultuous political, social, and economic climate of the Piedmont could not be indefinitely sustained. The fiscal burdens were often too great for many farmers to bear, and the direness of their predicament nourished a growing sense of helplessness. They drew strength from the central teachings of the First Great Awakening, incorporating the individualist character into their personas. Moreover, the unrest generated by the infringements on poor backcountry men’s rights, which ranged from inequitable representation in the general Assembly and local government to unjust taxation, would propel men to commit acts of revolution.

**Escalating Conflict**

As the abuses accumulated in the collective conscience of the Piedmont populace, the Regulator association was born. Beginning in 1766, these backcountry crusaders reacted with resolution to oppose fraudulent court proceedings and secure fair trials for all as mandated by the British constitution. To accomplish their lofty reform purposes, the Regulators prudently planned to petition their governor and the General Assembly, while also seeking to elect representatives who better represented “the judgment of the Majority.” They complained that their constitutional rights under Crown Law had been violated, considering that they were “Free-Men-British Subjects” who contributed their “Proportion in all Public Taxations.” They issued the warning that it was their “right to enquire into the nature of [their] Constitution” and their concerns that “by arbitrary proceedings” they would be “debarred of that right.”
end, they agreed upon the “Articles of Settlement and Oath,” which in essence was another appeal for their cause to their local government. Their objectives reflected, “a regular, plain, and uniform Method” of dealing with the public books of account, which would limit the abuses of officers and “do equal right and justice...according to Law.” Nevertheless, the legislature and the Governor speciously perceived the Regulators’ legal lobbying for reform in local government as an indicator of irreverence to the Crown.

Fearful that Governor Tryon would amass forces to hang their leaders, the backcountry men reassured him of their unwavering allegiance to his master, the King. They begged Tryon not to raise a militia against them, professing their “true faith and allegiance,” veneration of the British Constitution and determination to defend the King “to the last drop of blood.” Alas, their last hope for redress was undermined when he callously ignored their cries of injustice and professions of loyalty. Only when the Regulators, the “unhappy objects of oppression,” were left without the “most distant prospect or latent means of redress,” did they resort to the extra-legal measure of rebellion. The military-minded Tryon dealt with this occurrence as best as he knew how—by raising an army.

The Battle of Alamance

By nightfall of May 16, 1771, Tryon’s highly organized forces and those of the disheveled Regulators were both camped in the vicinity of the backcountry’s Great Alamance Creek. The previous day, the Regulators had entreated the governor with one final plea for arbitration, but the impetuous Tryon was in no mood for compromise, providing them with only one hour and ten minutes to relinquish their arms, “swear to be subjects of the laws of their country,” and surrender their outlawed leaders for execution, or if they should refuse, fight to the death.

The Governor’s troops fired the first shot prior to the termination of the allotted time. The battle was finished within an hour, as all the Regulators who were not killed, wounded, or captured had retreated. The 1,500 Regulator troops had utilized guerrilla tactics, for like the British regulars in coming revolution, Tryon’s militia marched in the conventional European formation of the day. This made them exceedingly vulnerable to Regulator sharpshooters, who exploited the cover of the surrounding woods and structures (a successful strategy that would be remembered and executed by future Patriot commanders). However, the backcountry men lacked the necessary leadership and ammunition to sustain them for the duration of the battle. As the Regulators fled the field, their dreams of victory were left with their fallen comrades: dying.

With his enemy’s forces in shambles, Tryon’s militia embarked on a vengeful reprisal “made necessary by the laws of war.” Six Regulators were sentenced for their so-called “crimes of high treason.” On the hot morning of June 19, 1771, onlookers jeered as these men trudged to gallows. Captain Benjamin Merrill was executed, his body buried in a grave along with those of his five comrades.
government—a lesson that would not soon be forgotten by the settlers of the backcountry.

Legacy of the Regulation

On the surface, the Regulators, with their grievances and protest against the government, appear to foreshadow the later Patriots of the American Revolution. Thus, historians have erroneously dubbed the War of Regulation as the “catalyst” of the American Revolution. William Fitch was among the numerous 19th- and 20th-century scholars who went so far as to claim that Alamance was the first battle of the War of Independence. Author Joseph Seawell believed it “reasonable to regard the Regulators in the Province of North Carolina as the vanguard of the American Revolution” and the War of Regulation as “the very inception of the American Revolution, seven years before the battle of Concord.” However, these conclusions are quite simply false. The Regulators opposed corruption in state and local government rather than Crown Rule. Though their ideals appear to be reflected in the maxims of the Patriots, such as “no taxation without representation,” the Regulators learned the consequences of being labeled traitors to the King’s authority. As a result, they were often Loyalists during the War of Independence, a trend that becomes evident by tracing the major actors in the Regulation through the 1770s and 1780s. They doggedly fought alongside the British, prolonging combat in the Southern theater. Meanwhile, staunch anti-Regulators, such as William Hooper, Alexander Martin, and Francis Nash, became fervent Patriots, integrating their military experiences during the Regulation into their battlefield tactics.

After the disaster at Alamance, many Regulators fled the Piedmont to escape persecution. As many as 1,500 families departed; some in the quest for independence; some in the pursuit of freedom from the oppression of the elite. These men explored and conquered the vast frontier, forming the first enduring communities in the Appalachians and developing societies such as the Watauga Association. In Tennessee, former Regulators established the revolutionary independent state of Franklin. Additionally, the spirit of the Regulation was reflected in Shay’s Rebellion, the Whiskey Rebellion, and the Populist Movement. These events similarly epitomize the clash between the haves and have-nots, as well as the pursuit of a more representative democracy; thus, the War of Regulation serves as a predecessor for the class conflict and reform movements that have occurred throughout our nation’s history. Former Regulator leader Herman Husband was a principal force in the Whiskey Rebellion, as he urged men to revolt against what was viewed by the common man as inequitable taxation and exploitative government. The Populists endeavored to obtain fairer treatment under the law and sought freedom from the corruption of the elite and agrarian debt, yet their efforts initially proved unsuccessful. However, like the Regulators, Populist goals were later incorporated into state constitutions and eventually, into the national Constitution.

At a North Carolina convention in 1776, a Declaration of Human Rights was appended to the state constitution. Article II ensured that, “the People of
this State ought to have the sole and exclusive Right of regulating the internal Government and Police thereof.” Article X decreed, “excessive Bail should not be required, nor excessive Fines imposed, nor cruel or unusual Punishments inflicted.” Finally, Article XVII asserted, “the People have a Right to assemble together, to consult for their common Good, to instruct their Representatives, and to apply to the Legislature for Redress of Grievances.”

For the initial group of Regulators, this document would have produced mixed sense of bitterness and accomplishment; it encompassed the very rights for which they had so determinedly fought but had not been realized until nearly five years after the conclusion of the Regulation. Nonetheless, their achievement was considerable, as state constitutions served as models for the writers of the U.S. Constitution. The deprivation of due process rights for men such as Merrill was now condemned; the Regulators’ revolution had indeed produced reform.

The Regulators were not reacting against the King’s authority, but rather against corrupt local officials and an unsympathetic governor. They had not originally intended to become the revolutionary rebels that they were labeled; rather, the misconceptions regarding their intent blinded the public from seeing their true dispositions—those who desired reform and above all else, the rule of law, not the rule of avaricious men.
Appendix I

Engraving of Edmund Fanning, an anti-Regulator who sought to vilify the backcountry men as “traitorous dogs.”\textsuperscript{lxviii} As a corrupt judge, clerk, and rich inhabitant of Hillsborough, he incited anger in the public with his excesses, such as his purchase of the gold-laced jacket featured in this portrait.\textsuperscript{lxix} From the \textit{North Carolina Colonial Archives}. 
Appendix II

Tryon and the Regulators in Hillsborough, “The Capital of the Backcountry.” The courthouses in Hillsborough served for the majority of the Piedmont region. Many principal figures of the War of Regulation settled in the area, including the “unscrupulous and libertine” anti-Regulator Edmund Fanning, who constructed a magnificent Masonic mansion there, much to the aggravation of his Piedmont neighbors. The constant activity and presence of so many diverse individuals in such close proximity to one another would inevitably make this town the breeding ground for revolution.
Appendix III

1771 Map of the Alamance Battleground. On the 13th of May, the Council of War was held in Tryon’s encampment. Based on intelligence ascertained, it was concluded that the army would change its course, foregoing its original plan and instead travel the road from Hillsborough to Salisbury. They would advance with “all possible expedition” past the little and Great Alamance Rivers. This crucial decision would mark the beginning of the end for the Regulators.
Present-day marker at the Alamance.
Monument in memory of the Regulators’ struggles and sacrifices.
Appendix IV

Close-up of the plaque on the previously shown monument. This depicts the hanging of James Pugh, who was executed with Benjamin Merrill. This memorial testifies to the heroic nature of the Regulators’ revolution.
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a claim with I verified through my other sources. The “Historical Review of the Colonial and State Records of North Carolina” proved useful in penning “Historical Context.”


White, Julia S. *A Church Quarrel and What Resulted*. Guilford College, N.C.: s.n., 19--?. This dissertation focuses on the conflict between Regulator leader Herman Husband and his Quaker brethren, though White does digress to discuss the ineptness of the army man William Tryon.

Zinn, Howard. *A People’s History of the United States: 1492–Present*. New York: Harper-Perennial, 1995. Zinn’s section on the Regulators points to the element of class conflict as essential to the development of the Regulator Movement. Though Zinn undoubtedly exhibits liberal tendencies in his writing, the information he provided on the Regulators was verified in other sources that I subsequently obtained.
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**NATIONAL HISTORY CLUB**


**Why join NHC?**

When you join the National History Club (NHC), you join students and teachers from around the country in discovering, learning, reading, writing, teaching, and living history.

NHC brings students and teachers with a real passion for history together, helping them learn from the ideas and activities that are exchanged through our eNewsletter, eUpdates, and other communication methods.

We do not limit the scope of activities that a chapter may participate in—each club is allowed to navigate its own course. Schools are free to decide whether their chapter will be a regular History Club (open to all) or a History Honor Society (with specific requirements for induction). The NHC also co-sponsors multiple award programs to recognize outstanding student members, Advisors, and chapters.

For more information about the NHC and to find out how to start a chapter at your school, please visit: