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Memory, Manhood, and Military Service:

Gentlemen and Common Planters in the Battle of King’s Mountain

By Meghan Essington*

In early November 1822, Thomas Jefferson reflected on the significance of patriot victory over Patrick Ferguson’s army of British and Tories at the Battle of King’s Mountain on October 7, 1780. Jefferson explained, that the “turn of the tide success” at King’s Mountain “terminated the revolutionary war, with the seal of our independence.” It is impossible to study this battle without considering Jefferson’s analysis of the victory.

What caused President Jefferson to speak of King’s Mountain forty-two years after the action? Jefferson wrote these immortal words in a letter to John Campbell, a descendent of the battle’s commander-in-chief, Colonel William Campbell. On November 4, 1822, John Campbell wrote to Jefferson requesting documents related to the character of Colonel Campbell. John Campbell explained, “It is particularly the duty of the relatives [which] Genl. Campbell has left behind him to defend his memory from unfounded and unmerited assumptions.” The same obligation which motivated untrained backcountry men to meet Ferguson at King’s Mountain incited John Campbell’s protection of his deceased relative.

In fall 1780, frontiersmen from Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and present-day Tennessee assembled at Sycamore Shoals along

the Watauga River near the Watauga River
1,600 men marched to King’s Mountain. These British outnumbered them, but the patriots faced similar numbers of 45 and 60 minutes of fighting. The official record of the Battle of King’s Mountain states: “This patriot victory was a turning point in the theater of the war.”

This watershed event in South Carolina paused the conflict which overshadowed the results of the Battle of King’s Mountain in 1861. Few scholars have investigated the battle, especially the role of women. This article reviews how the memories of the Battle of King’s Mountain have been recorded through events of the Battle of King’s Mountain.

Conceptions of the Battle of King’s Mountain:
An accurate portrait of the battle cannot be drawn because it is unique for the time period. The white economy of the Revolution consisted of a landowning aristocracy, according to historian Gordon S. Wood, who argued that “most people on both sides were subject to some form of subordination to someone else through the vertical structure of society.”

Men of common origin who gained honor. A series of men from the frontier. Historian Lynan C. Draper, in Virginia, expressed that “the status of the gentry through architecture, prominent customers, and the Appalachian South.”
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the Watauga River near Elizabethton. On October 7, this gathering of about 
1,600 men marched to meet Colonel Patrick Ferguson’s army at King’s 
Mountain. These backwater soldiers, later dubbed the Overmountain Men, 
were outmatched by the well-trained and well-equipped British forces, but 
they faced similar numbers of approximately 1,200. The battle lasted between 
45 and 60 minutes. The patriots suffered less than the British in total 
losses. The official report claims a total British loss of 1,105 men at King’s 
Mountain. The patriots’ loss consisted of only 28 killed, and 62 wounded. 
This patriot victory represented an important turning point in the southern 
theater of the war.3

This watershed moment in the Revolutionary War occurred just a few 
weeks before the surrender of General Charles Cornwallis at Yorktown, 
which overshadowed the significance of the battle. In fact, the first history 
of the Battle of King’s Mountain appeared over one-hundred years later, 
in 1881. Few scholars have fully explored the importance of this battle, 
especially the role of perceptions of manhood in frontier communities. This 
article reviews how British threats to frontier manhood contributed to the 
events of the Battle of King’s Mountain and how later generations chose to 
remember the heroes and leaders of the battle.4

Conceptions of manhood in the Appalachian South differed from 
those in New England from the eve of the Revolution to early nationhood. 
An accurate portrait of frontier manhood must be constructed differently, 
because it is unique from other scholarly interpretations of manhood during 
this period. The white men living in frontier communities on the eve of the 
Revolution consisted of two classes: gentlemen and commoners. According 
to historian Gordon Wood, colonial society was “vertically organized.” Wood 
argued that “most people could locate themselves only in superiority or in 
subordination to someone else,” and a single, “great horizontal division,” cut 
through the vertical organization between, “gentlemen and commoners.”5

Men of commoner status on the frontier breached this division by 
gaining honor. A sense of equality between classes of men did not exist on 
the frontier. Historian Rhys Isaac argued that southern colonies, especially 
Virginia, expressed class divisions between the common planters and 
gentry through architecture, dress, and decorum. The same held true in 
the Appalachian South, specifically the settlements located on the Holston, 
Watauga, and Nolichucky rivers, in present-day East Tennessee. Men of
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genteel status dressed and acted in ways which distinguished them from the rest of society. This does not mean, however, that common planters could not obtain genteel status. The easiest way to achieve this heightened recognition was through participation in successful military action. John Sevier provided such an example. Although his family traced a direct line to the French Huguenot family Xavier, in England and the British colonies, this name held no prestige until Sevier's participation in the Battle of King's Mountain. As a direct result of this battle, Sevier attained genteel status.6

Traditional aspects of the gentleman class included: kinship, wealth and costume, liberal arts education, and liberality. Kinship was the "most important measure" of a gentleman.7 What family a man was born into dictated his initial access to genteel society. Another important measure of a gentleman was his wealth—money, land, and slaves owned.8 Owning land in the Appalachian South was not uncommon; however, the majority of settlers did not own a single slave. In these frontier communities wealthy men owned the majority of slaves and land. Moreover, being a descendant of a prominent genteel family and possessing abundant wealth did not guarantee a man's acceptance into the class of gentlemen.

A frontier gentleman had to act and dress like his counterparts in England. The periwig, or powdered hair, and "lace-ruffled cuffs proclaimed freedom from manual work in field or workshop."9 This was especially difficult in the secluded regions of the frontier, where the settlers had limited access to Atlantic markets, and men of every status wore clothing purchased

---
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from Native Americans. Rhys Isaac stated that, “conscious adaptation to climate was opening a cultural rift between the colony and [British] society.”

The same can be said for the relationship between the frontier gentlemen and their parent colonies. Frontier conditions required men to alter British hierarchical norms.

Frontier gentlemen were generally less educated than their counterparts in Charles Town, for example, but they possessed more education than most men in their community. What differentiated the gentlemen of southwestern Appalachia from their comrades in the New England and Upper South colonies was the absence of a formal liberal arts education as a requirement for status. Schools on the frontier were few and formal educational programs were just as slim. The St. Martin’s Academy was the first school in the far western mountains of North Carolina. In 1783, Reverend Samuel Doak chartered the school in present-day Washington County, Tennessee. This school, which became Washington College, served the educational needs of the Watauga, Nolichucky, and Holston settlements. Sevier enrolled his children in Doak’s school in 1796, noting in his diary that he paid a six dollar monthly tuition for his sons, George Washington and Samuel, to attend. It was important for Sevier’s sons to receive an education so that they could obtain full genteel status.

The Reverend Samuel Witherspoon Doak was a pioneer preacher and teacher on the Tennessee frontier. His school in Washington County provided formal education to the children of frontiersmen in the gentlemen class. Doak House Museum, Tusculum College, Greeneville.

---
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Gentlemen received more formal education than common men, but it was not necessarily a prerequisite for genteel status on the frontier. Generally, gentlemen possessed a well-rounded education as well as the ability to fence, box, dance, and defend themselves in their community and on the battlefield. Gentlemen needed these lessons in order to converse with other men of genteel society. With knowledge of polite dances, gentlemen participated in the social trappings of their class and court women of equal or elevated stature. Gentlemen obtained a formal liberal arts education from a college or academy. However, for frontier gentlemen of the eighteenth century, the rugged terrain limited access to education. Rough and rocky topography combined with the absence of wagon-suitable roads made the transportation of books, maps, and other educational materials over the Appalachian Mountains both costly and time consuming. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, Native American hostilities made travel to and settlement in the frontier communities unattractive.  

Gentlemen modified all of the traditional tenets on the frontier, except kinship and liberality. According to Rhys Isaac, liberality “epitomized what was needed to make a gentleman.” Liberality indicated freedom. Gentlemen of all locales enjoyed freedom from poverty, from material want, from selfish interests, from manual labor, and from ignorance. “The gentry’s distinctiveness came from being independent in a world of dependencies, learned in a world only partially literate, and leisureed in a world of laborers.” Gentlemen of the frontier participated in formal balls, dinners, and ceremonies, while commoners held less formal celebrations and gatherings. 

Regardless of the limited access to formal education, frontier gentlemen were the most learned individuals in their communities. Indeed, liberality was a universal genteel quality; freedom was an attitude—an internal mind-set that projected itself upon the daily actions of gentlemen—supported by the benefits of extraordinary kinship. In all of the colonies, wealth equaled social status. A gentleman’s wealth in eighteenth-century Euro-American society originated from birth. Through the practice of primogeniture, the eldest son inherited the wealth of his family. In wealthy families, the eldest son and possibly younger brothers would become gentlemen and boast liberality.

Common men with little wealth or family status accessed genteel status through military service. In the colonies of Virginia and South Carolina, where the British aristocracy retained immense power and influence over society, men from the common class were less likely to cross the “horizontal divide” and join the ranks of the gentry. On the other hand, all men were militarily useful.

Men of consequence

Bertram Wyatt Thomas, The common plan of defense. On the other hand, men of equal status could be distinguished by their gentility. Common men were divided by education, by their social status in the local community, and by the dignity of their occupation. In Thomas’s view, gentility was an essential feature of the American national ethos. In Thomas’s view, gentility was an essential feature of the American national ethos. In Thomas’s view, gentility was an essential feature of the American national ethos. In Thomas’s view, gentility was an essential feature of the American national ethos.

In September 1772, Isaac Shelby arrived in the Watauga. A reluctant war refugee, he was a leader, a leader, a leader, a leader, and a leader. In late March, he formed the King’s Mountain Regulator Association to deliver the colony of South Carolina. Phillips at the age of fourteen, he knew the area well and the distant kinship.

What he brought was the “important watchword for the strength” of the movement—militarily, methodically, and morally. He was a leader in the battle against the British, burn their crops, kill their livestock, pull down their fences, and drive them from their homes.

divide” and join the genteel class. The conditions of the frontier, on the other hand, allowed men to make this conversion.

Men of common and genteel status possessed honor. According to Bertram Wyatt-Brown, “honor is not confined to any rank of society.” For common planters, any person could question one’s honor, demanding its defense. On the contrary, a gentleman’s honor could only be challenged by men of equal stature. Wood explained that gentlemen “could only be insulted by other gentlemen. A superior could ignore the affront of an inferior.” A common man’s actions defined his honor, who a gentleman was defined his honor. When a person from outside the community challenged the honor of that community’s men, the offended acted in defense of their manhood. Eighteenth century colonists believed society to be an extension of the household, and therefore it was every white man’s duty to provide discipline and protection for its members.19

****

In September 1780, Ferguson hoped to secure the southern theater and terminate the war. That month, Ferguson sent a message to Colonel Isaac Shelby by way of Samuel Phillips, warning that if the settlers along the Watagua, Nolichucky, and Holston rivers did not discontinue sheltering war refugees, he would “march his army over the mountains, hang their leaders, and lay their country waste with fire and sword.” Ferguson’s warning and method of delivery sparked the flame that led to the Battle of King’s Mountain. It is not a coincidence that Ferguson sent Samuel Phillips to deliver the written threat to Shelby. In August, British troops captured Phillips at the Battle of Musgrove’s Mill. Ferguson chose Phillips because he knew the area well and where to find Shelby and also because he was “a distant kinsman and near neighbor of [Shelby].”

What Ferguson probably believed to be a tactful move, backfired in two important ways. First, Phillips revealed what he knew about, “the locality and strength” of patriot forces. Second, the content of Ferguson’s warning and method in which he had it delivered threatened the manhood of every white male in the backwater communities. He threatened to hang their leaders and burn their communities.

17 Bertram Wyatt-Brown, Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South (New York, 1982), xx.
18 Wood, Radicalism of the Revolution, 41.
20 Draper, King’s Mountain and its Heroes, 169.
21 Samuel C. Williams, Tennessee During the Revolutionary War (Nashville, 1944), 141.
22 Ibid., 141.
The part of Ferguson's warning, which ultimately united frontier gentlemen and common planters in battle, was the threat of fire. The communities on the Nolichucky, Holston, and Watauga rivers were tightly knit and represented a network of families. An attack on their property translated to an attack on their manhood. According to Wyant-Brown, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, "loyalty to family was transformed into duty to country." By threatening their communities under the heat of fire and blade of his sword, Ferguson challenged the manhood of the frontiersmen. Burning their land and homes prevented them from providing food and protection for their families, and stripped them of what made them men. The threat alone would have been enough to raise an army, but by sending a kinsman and neighbor to Shelby as a British prisoner of war, Ferguson challenged the honor of a gentleman. This was an unspoken threat; it implied that Ferguson could and would take his family and friends prisoner. It also insulted the honor of Shelby and his fellow gentlemen for their inability to protect their fellow men from becoming property of the enemy.

Upon receiving word of the attack on Ferguson's forces, 23 throughout the region, he went to Colonel William Campbell of Virginia, a prominent Virginian, and asked that he join in the army that he was raising. Campbell then asked that his men be put to work and be paid. Campbell raised more than 1,000 men of his own and immediately went to the ridge town of Kings Mountain and the Cherokee and agreed to join the army.

Having never been in a battle, Shelby regarded the battle as a necessary one. Until then, he had travelled with the largest regiment in the army. Colonel Charles Frederick, upon hearing such criticism of the army, brought in securing $12,700 for the men of the Kingdom of Carolina.

After hearing of the battle, Shelby responded. On the subject of North Carolina, Shelby's general proclamation to his men still loyal to the crown:

Gentlemen of the State: The barbarous Savage has insulted the aged, despoiled the rich, and made the earth a scene of carnage and murder: He has burnt the towns, killed the dogs and driven the people from the name of freedom. The parties who have already joined the British forces...

---


Upon receipt of the warning, Sevier and Shelby began planning a surprise attack on Ferguson's army. They communicated Ferguson's imminent threat throughout the frontier. With a frontier militia assembled, Shelby wrote to Colonel William Campbell in Virginia for assistance. Campbell was a prominent Virginian, serving in the House of Delegates and as a captain in the army during the attack on Point Pleasant in 1774. Shelby believed that his men were strong but not numerous enough to defeat Ferguson's forces. Campbell first declined to join because he was planning an attack of his own and could not afford to send his troops at that time. Shelby immediately wrote back explaining Ferguson's threat to their community and the Cherokee hostilities which complicated their situation. Campbell agreed to join Shelby and Sevier.  

Having no one man of superior rank to command the patriot forces in battle, Shelby requested General Horatio Gates send a general officer for this purpose. Until a commander could be sent, Shelby decided that William Campbell should serve as commander-in-chief of the patriot forces because he had travelled the farthest, was the only colonel from Virginia, and brought the largest regiment to the battle. In addition, Shelby did not want to appoint Colonel Charles McDowell to the position of overall commander, because of criticism of his leadership. Sevier assembled funds to outfit the militia, securing $12,735 from John Adair, the State Officer for the State of North Carolina.  

After hearing rumors of an attack from backwoods settlers, Ferguson responded. On October 1, 1780, he issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of North Carolina from his camp in Denard's Ford, North Carolina. In this general proclamation Ferguson used the language of manhood to challenge men still loyal to the English crown. Ferguson stated:

Gentlemen: Unless you wish to be eat up by an inquisition of barbarians, who have begun by murdering an unarmed son before the aged father and afterwards lopped off his arms, and who by their shocking cruelties and irregularities, give the best proof of their cowardice and want of discipline; I say, if you wish to be pinioned, robbed and murdered, and see your wives and daughters, in four days, abused by the dregs of mankind—in short if you wish or deserve to live, and bear the name of men grasp your arms in a moment and run to camp.

---


The Back Water men have crossed the mountains; McDowell, Hampton, Shelby and Cleveland are at their head, so that you know what you have to depend upon. If you choose to be p. d. upon by a set of mongrels so say so at once, and let your women turn their backs upon you and look out for real men to protect them.28

The purpose of Ferguson’s letter was clear: to gather more troops. In order to appeal to men not already bearing arms, he called their manhood into question.

The proclamation identified how distinct the frontier common and genteel men were from their British counterparts in the late eighteenth century. It is significant that Ferguson addressed his call to arms with “Gentlemen.” He used this title because gentlemen possessed liberty. They could afford to leave their homes at a moment’s notice, and because most eighteenth century genteel families were loyal to the crown through kinship. Patriarchy existed as a process of ordering society and their allegiance. Englishmen on both sides of the Atlantic in the eighteenth century used, “the language of paternalism and filial obligation . . . to describe their hierarchical experiences.”29 Colonists in defending separation from the crown called the king of England a “tyrannical father” and “bad father.”

Similarly, the language of patriarchy was used in Ferguson’s proclamation to describe the frontiersmen. The proclamation opened with a description of these backwater men as barbarians who killed an “unarmed son” in front of his “aged father.” The unarmed son represented Tories and Loyalists (British subjects living in the colonies) and the “aged father” refers to an alleged atrocity by backwater residents. The “irregular” barbarian falls outside the language of patriarchy; the backwater men are not viewed by Ferguson as Englishmen. The text also suggested that the backwater men removed the hands of justice (“topped of his arm”) and, like dependents, needed discipline. Ferguson concluded the first portion of the proclamation by suggesting that if these gentlemen do not wish to be robbed of their manhood by the “dregs of mankind” then they should meet at British camp within four days to fight.

The second half of Ferguson’s proclamation abandoned the language of patriarchy and adopted the language of manhood. The text concluded with intelligence about the patriot forces, including its leaders. Ferguson listed four colonels who he believed were at the head of the party and suggested that they were incapable commanders. These accusations were not unfounded, at least in the case of McDowell who, after an earlier campaign in South Carolina, received criticism for sending his men to fight in the front lines while he stayed behind.28

28 Major Pat Ferguson to the Inhabitants of North Carolina, October 1, 1780, in Williams, Tennessee During the Revolutionary War, 151.
29 Wood, Radicalism of the American Revolution, 43.
30 Williams, Tennessee During the Revolutionary War, 148.
The final line of Ferguson's decree exploited the language of manhood. It gave the gentlemen of North Carolina two choices: eternal disgrace and the loss of their manhood; or the defense of their honor from a group of lawless barbarians. The censored word p_d upon by a set your women turn their backs to protect them. 

In order to gather more troops. In order to maintain his men, he called their manhood into question. 

To distinguish the frontier common and their counterparts in the late eighteenth century, he addressed his call to arms with the phrase "gentlemen possessed liberty." They were loyal to the crown through kinship, Marbury society and their allegiance. In the eighteenth century used, "the common man... to describe their hierarchical relationship from the crown called the "bad father."

The phrase used in Ferguson's proclamation opened with a description of an "unarmed son" in front of the line of soldiers and Loyalists (British soldiers). The phrase "unarmed father" refers to an alleged undisciplined barbarian that could not be viewed by Ferguson as a threat.

In the backwater men removed the line of dependence, needed discipline. Ferguson's proclamation by suggesting that the men of their manhood by the "dregs of British camp within four days to fight. Ferguson's constitution abandoned the language of manhood. The text concluded by including its leaders. Ferguson were at the head of the party and its leaders. These accusations were not well who, after an earlier campaign leading his men to fight in the front

---


29 Wyant-Brown, Southern Honor, 40.
legislation throughout the late eighteenth century, those still loyal to the crown called these patriots rebels and barbarians. Loyalists most often prefaced these terms with "lawless." Ferguson's proclamation to the gentlemen of North Carolina, for example, calls the backwater men "lawless barbarians." These metaphors were not unearned. For instance, frontier settlers continued to move across the Proclamation Line set in 1763 by the king of England. John Blair, the President of the Virginia House of Burgesses, responding to the continued encroachment of frontiersmen into Native American lands with a speech to the general assembly on March 31, 1768. In the talk he called these frontier settlers "banditti" and "abandoned Men." This terminology supports the idea that by the late eighteenth century, Englishmen believed these frontiersmen were separate from British society.

Ferguson's proclamation was intended to be a threat of

---

8 Major Pat Ferguson to the Inhabitants of North Carolina, October 1, 1780, in Williams, Tennessee During the Revolutionary War, 131.

Decades after the Battle of King's Mountain, William Campbell's contributions to the battle were called into question by Isaac Shelby and John Sevier. "William Campbell," by Robert W. Wilson, 1979, National Park Service, King's Mountain Military Park, Blackburg, South Carolina.

British invasion or further attacks of the backcountry settlements, and not a direct attack on the honor or manhood of the leaders of these communities. Because these men had separated themselves from the crown, they were not British subjects; therefore, in the eyes of Ferguson, these backwater men were capable of neither common nor genteel status. In Ferguson's opinion, they were human waste. 33  

In contrast, Shelby and Sevier interpreted the declaration as a threat to their honor and manhood, because they saw themselves as members of genteel society.

Ironically, Sevier sent a similar warning to the Cherokees in 1793. Sevier addressed this letter to "the Cherokees and their warriors if they have any." In Sevier's opinion, the Cherokee men were savage barbarians who he expected to "fight like men." He wrote that he pitied their women and children because "they must suffer and live like dogs" due to their men's cowardice. 34 Similar to Ferguson's judgment of the backwater men thirteen years earlier, Sevier did not believe that the Cherokees were men. Sevier's letter came long after the Battle of King's Mountain, but the text demonstrated the importance of the language of manhood during this period.

A direct challenge to manhood was a second reason for the success of unskilled backwater soldiers against the well-trained British army at King's Mountain. The frontiersmen's determination to win, or die trying, illustrated manhood's prevailing influence. Shelby expressed to his father that his countrymen, "being determined to conquer or die ... finally got
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possession, of the enemy camp. As historian Anne Lombard explained,
one challenged, “manhood had to be defended.” The same motivation
accounts for John Campbell’s determination to defend the name of his
ancestor William Campbell in 1822.

John Campbell claimed that Shelby challenged the honorable memory
of Colonel William Campbell in a letter to Thomas Jefferson on November
4, 1822, declaring it to be a “most extraordinary charge.” In response,
Jefferson, cautioned Campbell, stating that the memory of old men
sometimes fails them. Moreover, he stated that this was the first time he
had ever heard of someone calling into question, “the laurels which Col.
Campbell so honorably won in the battle of King’s Mountain.” In fact, so
ubiquitous was this sentiment among Virginians that on November 10, 1780,
the House of Delegates in Senate decided “that a good horse... and sword
be purchased at the publick expense, and presented to Col. Campbell, as a
further testimony of the high sense the General Assembly entertain of his
late important Service to his country.” The horse was presented to Colonel
Campbell before his death, but for reasons unknown, the sword was not.
Issac Shelby’s “extraordinary charge” against Colonel Campbell began twelve
years earlier after Virginia’s General Assembly voted to pay fifteen hundred
crowns for “the most elegant sword that could be procured in France.”

Outraged by this, Shelby wrote to John Sevier.

In his book on Sevier, Oliver P. Temple wrote that, “history [had]
done this battle and its heroes, and especially Sevier and Shelby, tardy and
niggardly justice.” Correspondence between Sevier and Shelby in January
1810 shows they shared this attitude. Shelby asked Sevier, “What did Colonel
Campbell merit more than you or [I] did?” Saying it to be a well known
fact that Campbell was not present at the surrender, and although he did
not want to “detract from the honor of the dead,” Shelby believed that the
legislature of North Carolina owed him and Sevier equal gifts of gratitude.

Shelby’s frustration was warranted. Ferguson sent Shelby the warning, and
Shelby yielded the “command of enterprise which [he] had originated, and
had the right to claim for [himself].” Sevier agreed that there were other
officers in that battle who “merited as much notice from their Country
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as [Colonel Campbell]." In this exchange of letters, the public's failure to observe the equal merits of Shelby and Sevier threatened their genteel status because "at the heart of honor . . . lies the evaluation of the public." Without the public's recognition of their merits, Sevier's and Shelby's contributions were null and void.

In 1812, Shelby wrote Sevier asking for a statement placing him in the heat of the battle, saying he had been accused of not being, "in the action at King's Mountain," and that he was, "only a lieutenant or some inferior officer." Sevier responded saying, "it is very well known that your [were] in the heat of that action." The defense of a gentleman's honor, like the questioning of it, can only come from another gentleman. In the same year, The Reporter, a Lexington, Kentucky newspaper, published an article downplaying the contributions of both Sevier and Shelby at the Battle of King's Mountain. This led Shelby to believe that there was a conspiracy against his and Sevier's manhood. The question of Shelby's honor coincided with his campaign for a second term as governor of Kentucky in 1812. If his adversaries could prove to, or at least convince, the public that Shelby did not earn honor in battle, like Campbell, then they could make him an illegitimate leader.

In the 1820s, debates about Campbell's legacy at the Battle of King's Mountain resumed. In July 1822, George Washington Sevier, the son of John Sevier, published the correspondence between Shelby and his father regarding William Campbell's contributions at King's Mountain. In November, descendants of William Campbell published articles in several newspapers defending their ancestor and their family's name. At the same time John Campbell wrote to Thomas Jefferson for his opinion. The debates about what Campbell did or did not do at the Battle of King's Mountain largely ended the next year when Shelby published a small pamphlet on the matter.

The fact that this debate over honor continued for many decades after the actual events, showed the importance of manhood and honor during the early nineteenth century. Furthermore, it demonstrates how imperative it was for descendants to defend the honor of their relatives. In the case of John Campbell, the battle at King's Mountain, the attack on the mountain by the Americans, the whole battle of King's Mountain is not fully appreciated, but their names are not tarnished.

The definition of gentility was necessary in the backwater mountains of the Southern Colonies in 1780, and it still is for the descendants of those great men. When someone has offended them or their ancestors, they must defend their honor and their status, and the family's honor.

Because the public was quick to forget the blood of their ancestors who had fought and died in battle, the gentility of the Southern Colonies needed to be redefined. The public needed to agree that the battle of King's Mountain was a battle for the honor of the genteel men and women of the Southern Colonies.

In the American Revolution, the definition of gentility needed to be redefined according to the needs of the time. The American colonies needed to be protected from the British, and they needed to defend their independence. The men who served in the military service of the American colonies, the battle of King's Mountain, was the battle for the honor of the genteel men and women of the Southern Colonies.
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of John Campbell, if Shelby's attack on the memory of William Campbell was successful, the entire Campbell family would have suffered. The family might not have lost their genteel status, but their name would have been tarnished.

The defense of manhood necessitated the actions of the backwater frontiersman in 1780, and it also motivated their descendants in the early 1800s. When someone questioned a gentleman's honor, the offended fought valiantly to defend themselves, their social status, and their family's name. Because the public assigned men their manhood and gentleman their elevated status, it became necessary when challenged to publicly confront their accusers. Eighteenth century frontier genteel manhood should not be confused with constructions of genteel manhood in New England. Religion and a formal liberal arts education were important components of New England genteel manhood in the eighteenth century.

In the Appalachian South, formal education was limited. As a result, the definition of elite manhood was different than in New England. However, this different definition of manhood did not mean greater equality among gentlemen and common planters on the frontier. A system of hierarchy, enforced through a language of patriarchy, existed on the frontier. The American Revolution offered common frontier planters the opportunity to defend their manhood, claim honor, and obtain elevated status through military service. The Battle at King's Mountain is such an example. This battle united gentlemen and commoners with a shared goal: the defense of manhood as part of creating a new nation. The memory of that battle and its participants changed over time, but the significance of victory at King's Mountain to American independence remained clear to all. Shelby agreed with Jefferson that, "it was the very first perceivable event that gave a favorable turn to the American Revolution."50

---

50 Shelby to Sevier, August 12, 1810, in Sevier and Mackeen, Sevier Family History, 175.