THE WASHINGTON - ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, 1781 - 1783

An Historical and Architectural Survey

Project Historian:
ROBERT A. SELIG, Ph. D.

Sponsoring Organization

Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Inc.

Contributing Organizations

Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the Revolution and its Color Guard

Presidents	Color Guard Captain
Leroy Moody Lewis, III (2004)	Richard Dana Smith, Sr.
Harland Wetmore Johnson (2005)	
Ronald William Fenstermacher, Jr., Esq (2006)	

Pennsylvania Society, Sons of the American Revolution

Philadelphia-Continental Chapter	Washington Crossing Chapter
Presidents	**Presidents**
Frederick Remsen Rude, VMD (2004)	Edward Greenawald (2004)
William Hunt Epp (2005)	Douglas Oberrait (2005)
BG Richard D. Merion (2006)	Harry Hinkel (2006)

Project Director

Winchell S. Carroll
President, W3R - PA

2007

For additions/corrections/suggestions contact the author at

www.xenophongroup.com/vita/selig

For additional copies of this report contact W3R-PA at:

610-254-0340 **w3r-pa@comcast.net**

Potential collectors of artifacts at archaeological sites identified in this survey should be warned that collecting archaeological artifacts can be harmful to the historical record of the site. Also, there may be penalties for unauthorized collecting of archaeological artifacts from public land.

Further information my be obtained by contacting formally organized collector organizations. Listings of qualified archaeologist may be obtained by contacting formally organized archaeological associations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TIMELINE

1763 10 February. First Treaty of Paris ends the French and Indian War. France cedes Canada and territories east of the Mississippi to Great Britain.

1764 5 April. British Parliament passes the Sugar Act.

1765 22 March. British Parliament passes the Stamp Act.
24 March. British Parliament passes the Quartering Act.

1767 29 June. British Parliament passes the Townshend Act imposing duties on tea, paper, and other items imported into the colonies.

1770 5 March. British troops in Boston fire on rioters. The event becomes known as the Boston Massacre.
12 April. Repeal of most of the Townshend Act duties.

1773 16 December. Boston Tea Party.

1774 31 March. British Parliament shuts down Boston Harbor under what the British call the Coercive Acts and colonists call the Intolerable Acts.
20 May. British Parliament passes the Quebec Act, sharpening the divide between Canada and the lower 13 colonies.
5 September. First session of the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia. It adjourns in October.

1775 9 February. British Parliament declares Massachusetts to be in rebellion.
19 April. Battles of Lexington and Concord, the "shot heard 'round the world."
10 May. First session of the Second Continental Congress in Philadelphia.
14 June. Congress establishes the Continental Army and appoints George Washington its commander-in-chief the following day.

1776 April. Silas Deane sent to Paris to obtain military supplies and skilled military engineers for the Continental Army.
2 May. First shipment of arms and ammunition in support of the American rebels leaves France for the New World.
June. Hortalez & Cie. receives an initial one million livres from French Government, and another million from Spain, via the French Minister.
4 July. Congress ratifies the Declaration of Independence.

1777 February. Duportail, first of about 100 French volunteers, joins Continental Army. By September Hortalez & Cie (Beaumarchais) has already shipped 5 million livres worth of supplies to America.
31 July. Congress appoints the *marquis* de Lafayette a major-general.

12 October. British forces under General John Burgoyne are surrounded at Saratoga. They surrender within a week.

1778 6 February. French-American treaty of Amity and Friendship and a secret Treaty of Military Alliance signed.
4 May. French treaty recognizing American independence ratified by Continental Congress.
5 April. An *Acte Royal* sets 17 June 1778 as the starting date of hostilities with Britain.
17 June. First naval engagement of the war between French and British.
12 May. Charleston, South Carolina, falls to the British.
23 June. Spain declares war on Great Britain.
27 June. Naval battle off Ile d'Ouessant [Ushant] -- indecisive engagement between France and Great Britain (English Channel)
28 June. Following the Battle of Monmouth, Lafayette returns to France and requests more assistance from the king.
11 July -31 August. French Admiral D'Estaing's unsuccessful naval operations at New York and at Newport.
7 September. French capture Dominica (West Indies).
14 September. British capture St. Pierre-et-Miquelon Islands
1 October. British capture Pondichery (India).
9 October. Franco-American forces are defeated at Savannah, Georgia.
13 December. British capture St. Lucia (West Indies).
13 December. French under *duc* de Lauzun capture St. Louis (Senegal).

1779 1 May. Unsuccessful French raid on Jersey Islands. (English Channel)
18 June. French capture St. Vincent (West Indies).
4 July. French capture Grenada (West Indies).
23 September -20 October. D'Estaing and Americans conduct unsuccessful siege of Savannah (Georgia).
23 September. French troops at naval battle of Flambourgh Head (La Manche/English Channel) -- (*Bonhomme Richard* vs *HMS Serapis*)

1780 Winter. Lafayette returns from France to Morristown, New Jersey, with the promise of more support from the king.
21 February -12 May. French troops at failed defense of Charleston, SC.
17 April, 15 & 19 May. British and French forces engage in naval battles off Martinique (West Indies).
10 July. Commanded by Admiral de Ternay, a fleet carrying some 450 officers and 5,300 men under the *comte* de Rochambeau sails into Narragansett Bay in Newport.

21 September. Generals Washington and Rochambeau meet at the Hartford Conference.
25 September. Benedict Arnold’s attempt to hand West Point over to the British fails.

1781 5 January. Unsuccessful French raid on Jersey Island. (La Manche/ English Channel). British capture Dutch possessions in West Indies, South America, Ceylon and India.

16 March. British and French naval battle off the Chesapeake Bay (1st 'Battle off the Virginia Capes').

16 May. British and French naval battle of Porto Praya (Cape Verde)

10-12 May, French raid on St. Lucia (West Indies).

22-24 May. Washington and Rochambeau meet at Wethersfield, Connecticut, to discuss their strategy for the upcoming campaign.

26 May. Spanish and French capture Pensacola (Florida).

4 June. French forces capture Tobago (West Indies).

10 June. The French infantry leaves its winter quarters in Newport.

19 June. The Regiment Bourbonnais is the first French unit to cross into Connecticut from winter quarters in Rhode Island on its way to Philipsburg, New York.

21 June. Lauzun’s Legion leaves Lebanon, Connecticut, for Philipsburg, New York, on a route covering the left flank of the French infantry.

6 July. French forces join the Continental Army near Philipsburg, NY.

18 August. The Franco-American armies depart Philipsburg for Virginia.

19 August. Brigadier General Moses Hazen's Canadian Regiment (Congress' Own) and the combined New Jersey regiments cross the Hudson at Sneeden's Landing and march to Paramus.

21 August. The two regiments reach Springfield.

24 August. Major Sebastian Baumann's detachment encamps at Pompton.

25 August. Coming from Suffern, New York American forces under Generals Washington and Lincoln enter New Jersey.

26 August. The First Brigade of French forces enters New Jersey.

27-28 August. The Continental Army is encamped on the heights between Springfield and Chatham.

31 August. First elements of the Continental Army reach Trenton.

1 September. The first elements of the Continental Army embark in Trenton and/or cross the Delaware at Trenton for Philadelphia.

2 September. The Continental Army parades before Congress.

3 September. The First French Brigade parades before Congress.

4 September. The Second French Brigade parades before Congress.

4 September. The last elements of the Continental Army have crossed the Delaware River into Pennsylvania.

5 September. At Marcus Hook, Washington receives news of the arrival of Admiral de Grasse in the Chesapeake Bay.

5 September. British and French naval battle off the Chesapeake Bay (2nd 'Battle off the Virginia Capes').

9 September. The first elements of the Continental Army and parts of the French army embark at Elkton and sail two days later. The remainder begins its march to Baltimore.

12 September. The flotilla reaches Annapolis.

19-21 September. French army embarks in Annapolis.
26 September. The allied forces are re-united in Williamsburg.
28 September - 19 October. American and French siege of Yorktown, VA
19 October. Cornwallis' troops march out of Yorktown.
1 November. The first detachments of the Continental Army begin their march north to winter quarters. French forces will spend the winter of 1781-82 in and around Williamsburg.
4 November. Admiral de Grasse sails from Yorktown for Martinique.
26 November. French capture St. Eustatius (West Indies).
November- December. Continental Army troops march into and through Pennsylvania for their winter quarters 1781-1782 in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.
December. Lafayette sails back to France.

1782 6 January - 5 February. French and Spanish forces capture Fort St. Philip in Minorca.
25- 26 January French capture St. Kitts (West Indies).
18 February. British and French naval battle off Madras (India).
20 February. French capture island of Nevis (West Indies).
22 February. French capture Monserrat (West Indies).
12 April. British navy under Admiral Rodney destroys French naval squadron under Admiral de Grasse in Battle of the Saints, West Indies
1 July. Rochambeau's infantry begins its march north to Boston.
6 July. British and French naval battle off Negapatan (India).
July through March 1783. Unsuccessful Spanish and French blockade of Gibraltar.
14-24 July. Washington and Rochambeau meet in Philadelphia to discuss plans for the campaign of 1782.
17-20 July. French forces are encamped in Alexandria, Virginia.
24 July-23 August. French forces are encamped in Baltimore.
28 July. Rochambeau rejoins his forces in Baltimore.
8 - 31 August. French capture and destroy Fort Prince of Wales in Hudson Bay (Canada).
25-30 August. French besiege and capture Trincomalee (Ceylon).
23 August. Lauzun's Legion departs from Baltimore.
29 August. Coming from Wilmington, Lauzun's Legion is the first French unit to enter Pennsylvania and encamps in Chester
30 August. Lauzun's Legion camps in Philadelphia. The Bourbonnais Regiment camps in Chester.
31 August. With Rochambeau at its head, the Bourbonnais parades through Philadelphia before Congress and President Thomas McKean. Lauzun's Legion rests in Philadelphia.
1 September. The Bourbonnais rests in Philadelphia. The Royal Deux-Ponts parades through Philadelphia before Congress and McKean. The Soissonnais camps in Chester.
Lauzun's Legion leaves Philadelphia for Red Lion.

2 September. The Saintonge camps in Chester. The Soissonnais parades through Philadelphia before Congress and McKean. The Royal Deux Ponts rests in Philadelphia. Rochambeau and the Bourbonnais leave for Red Lion. Lauzun's Legion leaves Red Lion for Trenton.

3 September. The Saintonge parades through Philadelphia before Congress and McKean. The Soissonnais rests in Philadelphia. The Royal Deux Ponts leaves for Red Lion. The Bourbonnais leaves Red Lion for Trenton. Lauzun's Legion rests in Trenton.

6 September. The last French forces cross the Delaware into New Jersey

4-13 September. French forces cross New Jersey on the way to Boston

25 October - 22 December. Lauzun's Legion crosses New Jersey on its way to winter quarters in Wilmington.

30 November. Preliminaries of Peace between the United States and Great Britain signed in Paris.

9-11 December. Coming from Newburgh, New York, Rochambeau crosses New Jersey on his way to Philadelphia.

12 December. Rochambeau and his staff arrive in Philadelphia on their way to Baltimore. They stay until 2 January 1783.

21-23 December: Lauzun's Legion passes through Philadelphia on its way to winter quarters in Wilmington, Delaware.

25 December. French infantry sails from Boston for the Caribbean.

1783 20 January. Preliminaries of Peace are signed in Paris

10 February. Rochambeau arrives in Saint-Nazaire

March - July. French participate in capture of Voloze; siege of Mangalore (India).

3 April. Hostilities end in the territory of the United States.

16 April. Peace is proclaimed in Philadelphia.

11 May. Lauzun's Legion sails out of Philadelphia for France.

20 June. British and French naval battle off Cuddelore (India).

3 September. Second Peace of Paris signed. Britain acknowledges the independence of the United States of America.

5 October. A final transport of 85 soldiers under Captain François Xavier Christophe baron de Hell of Lauzun's Legion sails from Baltimore on the *Pintade* and enters Brest on 10 November

2 November. Congress disbands the Continental Army.

1784 14 January. Congress ratifies the Treaty of Paris.

1787 7 December. Delaware is the first state to ratify the Constitution.

1789 4 February. George Washington is elected first president of the United States of America.

30 April. George Washington is sworn in as first president of the United States of America.

INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose of the Project

In a 1999 interview with the historical magazine *American Heritage*, renowned author David McCullough claimed that "When you're working on the Revolutionary War, as I'm doing now, you realize what the French did for us. We wouldn't have a country if it weren't for them."[1] Few historians of the war on either side of the Atlantic would dispute that there is a large grain of truth in McCullough's statement. Still, the notion of Frenchmen fighting side by side with Continental soldiers for American independence comes as a surprise to many Americans: 225 years after Yorktown few Americans are aware of the critical importance of America's French allies during the Revolutionary War.

The support provided by French King Louis XVI toward the success of that war has been largely obliterated in the collective memory of the American people. Following the end of the war, the struggle between Federalists and Anti-Federalists over the future organization occupied the politically-minded while the vast majority of the population struggled to meet the challenges of life in the now independent United States. The struggle with England that culminated in the War of 1812, saw many a Revolutionary War veteran pick up his musket again, but the Revolutionary generation was already thinning out when on 14 August 1824, the *marquis* de Lafayette arrived in New York on the packet *Cadmus* at the invitation of President James Monroe and Congress for what would become a triumphal tour of the country he had helped gain its independence. Traveling south from New York, Lafayette arrived in Philadelphia on 29 September 1824, where he was greeted by a parade that included 160 Revolutionary War veterans. Lafayette's tour culminated in a celebration attended by thousands of veterans and spectators on the battlefield of Yorktown on 19 October 1824. Almost a year later, on 9 September 1825, Lafayette sailed out of the mouth of the Potomac on the frigate *Brandywine* for France.[2]

Lafayette's visit had been the Swan Song of a Revolutionary War generation that was quickly passing away, taking their memories with them.[3] As canals and railroads altered modes and patterns of transportation in the 1840s and 1850s, the memory of the "gallant" Frenchmen under General *comte* de Rochambeau, of

---

[1] "There Isn't Any Such Thing As The Past." *American Heritage* Vol. 50. No. 1, (February/March 1999), pp. 114-125, p. 124.

[2] See Edgar Ewing Brandon, *Lafayette. Guest of the Nation. A Contemporary Account of the Triumphal Tour of General Lafayette* 3 vols., (Oxford, OH, 1954), and J. Bennett Nolan, *Lafayette in America Day by Day* (Baltimore, 1934), pp. 14-17.

[3] See Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed with Blood. War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America.* (Philadelphia, 2002), Lafayette's journey here on pp. 171-209, and John Resch, *Suffering Soldiers. Revolutionary War Veterans, Moral Sentiment and Political Culture in the Early Republic* (Amherst, 1999).

their crucial contribution to American Independence and of the bond forged in the crucible of war, was covered by the mantle of Revolutionary War iconography. A prime example of this is given by Benson J. Lossing, who could write in 1852, that "a balance-sheet of favors connected with the alliance will show not the least preponderance of service in favor of the French, unless the result of the more vigorous action of the Americans, caused by the hopes of success from the alliance, shall be taken into the account."[4]

The tragedy of the Civil War and the turmoil of the Second Industrial Revolution brought massive economic and demographic dislocation in the 1860s and 1870s. As millions of immigrants from southern and east-central Europe settled mid-western and western America in the 1880s and 1890s, interest in the French alliance was increasingly confined to professional historians and Americans living in France. The celebrations of the centennials of the American and French Revolutions in 1876 and 1889 saw the publication of Thomas Balch's *Les Français en Amérique pendant la Guerre de l'Indépendance des États-Unis, 1777-1783,* published in Paris and Philadelphia in 1872.[5] In 1881, Henry P. Johnston published the still useful *The Yorktown Campaign and the Surrender of Cornwallis,* and Edwin M. Stone followed suit with *Our French Allies … in the Great War of the American Independence,* (Providence, Rhode Island, 1884).

In Paris, Henri Doniol published between 1886 and 1892 his ambitious *Histoire de la participation de la France à l'établissement des États-Unis d'Amérique. Correspondance diplomatique et documents* in five volumes.[6] In 1903, Amblard Marie *vicomte* de Noailles' *Marins et Soldats Français en Amérique Pendant la Guerre de l'Indépendance des États-Unis, 1778-1783* ran off the presses in Paris. Supported by the *Society in France, Sons of the American Revolution,* founded in Paris in September 1897, the French Foreign Ministry in 1903 published a partial list of names in *Les Combattants Français de la Guerre Américaine 1778-1783*.[7]

A few years later, the First World War brought the renewal of an alliance that had flourished some 140 years earlier. "Lafayette, we are here!" an American officer is said to have pronounced over the tomb of the *marquis* in Paris in 1917. With Armistice Day 1918, the "debt to Lafayette" was paid. But the war "over there" also brought renewed interest in the earlier military cooperation during the Revolutionary War. When Boston banker Allan Forbes retraced the route taken by Rochambeau's forces in the early 1920s, he concentrated on the New England

[4] Benson J. Lossing, *Pictorial Field Book of the Revolution* 2 vols. (New York, 1852), Vol. 2, p. 83, note 4.
[5] An English translation appeared in two volumes in Philadelphia in 1891-1895.
[6] A supplement volume bringing the history of events to the signing of the Peace Treaty of 1783 (the original volume 5 ends with the signing of the preliminaries of peace) was added in 1899.
[7] Published in the United States as United States. Congress. Senate. Miscellaneous Publications. 58th Congress, 2nd Session. Document No. 77. (Washington, D.C., 1903-1904). For the Royal Deux-Ponts and the Irish regiments Walsh and Dillon the document lists "officiers seulement".

states of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.[8] His research ended at the New York State line; the Mid-Atlantic States were covered in a single article.[9] Forbes' efforts and recommendations remained without a follow-up, and even though a few determined individuals tried over the course of the century to revive the memory of the role of France in the Revolutionary War, it has until recently been left to town historians and heritage-based organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Society of the Cincinnati or the *Souvenir Français*, to commemorate the Franco-American alliance.

All this changed in the late 1990s, when commemorative and preservation efforts that had begun in the State of Connecticut developed into a nation-wide effort to celebrate both the 225th anniversary of the American Revolution as well as the role of France in achieving American independence. In the Fall of 2000, both Houses of Congress passed "A Bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to complete a resource study of the 600 mile route through Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia, used by George Washington and General Rochambeau during the American Revolutionary War." The bill was presented to President Bill Clinton on 2 November and signed into law on 9 November 2000.[10] President Clinton's signature created Public Law No. 106-473, the *Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Heritage Act of 2000*. Similarly on 22 July 2002, the United States House of Representatives voted to make Lafayette an honorary citizen of the United States. This honor places Lafayette among only five others who were similarly honored.[11]

The present resource survey of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route (W3R) commemorating the 225th Anniversary of the American Revolution in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania contributes to the federally mandated nine-state plus the District of Columbia National Historic Trail study conducted by the National Park Service as authorized by Congress, and which is scheduled to be completed in the Spring of 2007.

---

[8] Forbes, Allan and Paul F. Cadman, *France and New England* 3 vols., (Boston, 1925-1929).

[9] Allan Forbes, "Marches and Camp Sites of the French Army beyond New England during the Revolutionary War" *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* Vol. 67 (1945), pp. 152-167. Forbes' research notes seem to be lost; they are not in his papers in the Massachusetts Historical Society.

[10] Concurrently First Lady and (then) Senator-elect Hilary Rodham Clinton designated the W3R a *Millennium Trail*, making properties along the route eligible for federal TEA-21 funds through each State's Department of Transportation.

[11] The Senate approved the Joint Resolution on 24 July 2002 and President George W. Bush signed it into law. The other honorees are Winston Churchill, Mother Teresa, Raoul Wallenberg, and William Penn and his wife Hannah. Since Lafayette was made a citizen of Maryland in 1785, historians such Louis Gottschalk have argued that Lafayette effectively became a US citizen when Maryland became one of the United States. See his *Lafayette Between the American and French Revolutions* (1950) Appendix III, and pages 145-147 of the text. Congress had already proclaimed Lafayette an honorary citizen in 1824.

The purpose of the W3R project in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is manifold:

1. To identify the land and river routes that General Washington's Continental Army and the *comte* de Rochambeau's French forces took through the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in September of 1781 on their way to Yorktown.

2. To identify the routes of the return marches of the American forces in November and December of 1781, into and through Pennsylvania. The primary focus lies on the winter quarters of Moses Hazen's Regiment at Camp Security and of that of the Rhode Island Regiment in Philadelphia, but it also includes the marches of the Second Continental Artillery and the Sappers and Miners to winter quarters in Burlington, the winter quarters of the 1st and 2nd New York Regiments near Pompton, and the winter quarters of the two New Jersey regiments near Morristown. Not included are the marches of the Continental Army through Pennsylvania to the Hudson Highlands in the Summer of 1782.

3. To identify the routes of the return march of the French forces in September 1782, including the route of the passengers of the l'*Aigle* and *la Gloire* from Delaware through the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to Yorktown Heights in New York State in late September 1782.

4. To trace the route of Lauzun's Legion in September 1782 through Pennsylvania to Stony Point.

5. To identify the return route of Lauzun's Legion from Crompond/Yorktown Heights, New York, back through Pennsylvania to winter quarters in Wilmington, Delaware, in November and December 1782, and the departure of the Legion from Philadelphia in May 1783.

6. To identify the route of Rochambeau's journey from West Point through Pennsylvania to Baltimore for departure to France in November 1782.

7. To identify sites and resources along these routes.

8. To research and write a historical narrative of the campaign of 1781 around these sites that focuses on the marches rather than the siege and victory at Yorktown.

9. To assist in developing a plan to interpret those sites within the context of the national W3R and the celebrations to commemorate the 225th anniversary of the march to the victory of Yorktown in 1781/2006, the return march in 1782/2007 and thereafter.

Identification of French routes except the routes taken by Lauzun's Legion, for which no eyewitness account exists, was greatly facilitated by contemporary French route descriptions and maps of campsites. For the Continental Army we often know only the names of the locations where these forces camped, but neither how they got there nor exactly where they camped. The identification of those routes and sites, though based on in-depth research, in many cases is only tentative. At the same time, the study is designed to allow for the implementation of statewide commemorative and historical and/or open space preservation projects in cooperation with other interested parties and organizations should Congress decide not to proceed with a federal designation for the W3R.

2.2 Scope of the Project

The current report undertakes a historical and architectural survey of resources for the W3R in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to develop recommendations for interpretation of these sites. In addition, it is intended as a tool to provide information to support potential archeological surveys and excavations of campsites, routes, and other physical evidence of the presence of the American and French armies in Pennsylvania from 1781 to 1783. This dual approach adheres to the template developed and followed by other states along the route such as Connecticut, New York, Delaware, Rhode Island or New Jersey.[12] Upon completion the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will have the basis for joining the W3R National Historic Trail if so designated by Congress. The W3R through the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be one element of the greater W3R project aimed at designating the entire nine-state route a National Historic Trail administered by the NPS. It will also have the foundation needed to begin the research for nominating identified sites to the National Register of Historic Places, including portions of the trail where still in existence, and for a more inclusive interpretation of existing sites within the state.

2.3 Goals of the Project

The project has set itself three goals:

1) To collect, interpret, and evaluate American, French, British, and German primary and secondary sources for information concerning the French role in the

[12] See for example Robert A. Selig, *Rochambeau in Connecticut: Tracing his Journey. Historic and Architectural Survey. Connecticut Historical Commission* (Hartford: State of Connecticut, 1999) and *Rochambeau's Cavalry: Lauzun's Legion in Connecticut 1780-1781. The Winter Quarters of Lauzun's Legion in Lebanon and its March Through the State in 1781. Rochambeau's Conferences in Hartford and Wethersfield. Historic and Architectural Survey. Connecticut Historical Commission* (Hartford: State of Connecticut, 2000), as well as Robert A. Selig, *The Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route in the State of New York, 1781-1782. An historical And Architectural Survey* (Albany: Hudson River Valley Greenway, 2001).

American Revolutionary War with a view toward explaining the reasons, goals, and results for and of that involvement.

2) To review these sources for information about the presence of French and American troops in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and their interaction with the inhabitants of the state in 1781, 1782, and 1783.

3) To identify historic buildings and/or sites as well as modern monuments and markers associated with the campaigns of 1781, 1782, and 1783. This identification of above-ground resources, including portions of the trail where still in existence, and of the campsites (as archeological sites) should (where possible, necessary, or feasible) be followed by the research necessary to bring about nomination of these resources for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or other appropriate state and/or national registers.

The routes as identified in the historical and architectural survey will be determined by aboveground resources and described in relationship to the currently existing road patterns within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It will by necessity vary at different locations from the actual eighteenth-century routes taken by the Franco-American armies.

Goals 1) and 2) were achieved by research in American and European libraries and archives with a special focus on unknown and/or unpublished materials relating to the French role in the American Revolutionary War. Local historical research was conducted in the State Historic Preservation Office, especially in the National Register of Historic Places files, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania State Archives, and in cooperation with individuals and libraries along the route during fieldwork in the Summer of 2005 and the Spring of 2006.

Within the parameters set in Goal 3) only structures and sites connected directly and through primary source materials (such as journals, diaries, letters, receipts, or maps) with the march of the infantry, artillery, and cavalry portion of Washington's and Rochambeau's armies in the Summer of 1781 and the Fall and Winter of 1782-1783, were included. Movements of French forces and/or of French officers or of American forces prior to the Summer of 1781, as well as sites connected with actions of Frenchmen in American service such as the *marquis* de Lafayette, are not covered in this report.

Fieldwork and photography were undertaken in the Summer of 2005 and Spring 2006. Copies of the final report are deposited in the offices of the Sons of the Revolution in Philadelphia. French and German words are in italics unless they are included as English words in *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, tenth edition. Unless otherwise noted, all photographs were taken by consultant. Unless also other wise noted, all translations are the author's.

2.4 Sources

The goal of this architectural and historical resource inventory and site survey of the march of the combined Franco-American armies to Virginia in the Summer of 1781 and back north again in the months thereafter is the identification of the routes of these forces and their location on the ground today.

On the American side there exists an extensive body of cartographic work for the marches of 1781, but it only covers the routes from Philadelphia to Yorktown and back. Once the decision to march to Virginia had been made, Washington ordered his cartographer Simeon DeWitt to draw up maps of the routes to be taken by the Continental Army to Yorktown. These maps are preserved as the Erskine-DeWitt Maps in the New-York Historical Society under the call numbers 124 A-U for the march from Philadelphia to Yorktown in August and September 1781, and 125 A-K plus half-sheet C 125 for the march from Yorktown to Elkridge Landing in November and December 1781. Unfortunately there are no maps for the routes of the Continental Army from Philipsburg, New York, through New Jersey to Philadelphia, but there are other contemporary maps drawn by DeWitt's predecessor Robert Erskine on which the routes can be traced with the help of Orderly Books, diaries, and other primary source materials. Unlike the French maps, these maps are drawn to scale, with mile markers indicated on the maps where available. They do not show the campsites, however, but point out landmarks such as inns, churches, fords, ironworks etc, which makes these, in their majority unpublished maps, important resources for the W3R project as well as for state and local history.

The by far single most important source on the American side for the reconstruction of the history around the march are the papers of George Washington, which have been used extensively for this study, and which are readily accessible via the internet.[13] Equally important are potentially the papers of Henry Knox,[14] and Benjamin Lincoln,[15] which are available on microfilm, but in their cases too the very speed of the journey across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the relatively short distance covered resulted in less than a half dozen letters by these two generals.

---

[13]Library of Congress holdings are at http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/gwhtml/gwhome.html; the Fitzpatrick edition can be searched at http://etext.virginia.edu/washington/fitzpatrick/; the 1781 campaign is covered in volumes 22 and 23.

[14] The Henry Knox papers are held in the Massachusetts Historical Society, #3883121. There is an index to the 55 reels of microfilm. *Index to the Henry Knox papers owned by the New England Historic Genealogical Society and deposited in the Massachusetts Historical Society.*

[15] The Benjamin Lincoln Papers are also held in the Massachusetts Historical Society. They are available on 13 reels of microfilm; an index is available as MHS Microfilm publication no. 3.

Reel 6, frame 191, contains a letter written from New Windsor on 15 June, frame 210 has the orders of the march to White Plains for 4 July 1781; frame 243 has a letter written from camp near King's Ferry, 21 August 1781. The next surviving letter was written at "Trentown, Sept 1st 1781 7 o'clock", the comes a letter from Baltimore, dated 16 September 1781 and then a letter from "camp before York, 1 October."

Another potentially valuable source are diaries and journals kept by enlisted men and NCOs, many of which are unpublished. A list based on years of research can be found at http://www.RevWar75.com, and a few of them contributed greatly to this project. First and foremost is the unpublished journal of Sergeant-Major Hawkins of the Canadian Regiment, located in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, which provides much of the necessary information for one of the routes of the Continental Army.[16] Another are the "Memoirs" of John Hudson, a 13-year-old boy-soldier in the 2nd New York Regiment, though written decades after the war, provide a valuable source for the march of the rear-guard of the Continental army.[17] Additional information can be gleaned from James Thacher's account and similar sources.[18] Of little value was the best-known memoir by an enlisted man, the account penned by Joseph Plumb Martin, *Private Yankee Doodle* (Hallowell, ME, 1830; repr. Boston, 1962). Martin's account contains much information on the campaigns of 1781-1782, but covers the march through Pennsylvania in three sentences on p. 222 in the 1962 edition.

A unique source on individual soldiers and the war that can be easily overlooked but which have been very useful in research and writing of this study are the pension applications of Revolutionary War veterans in the National Archives in Washington, DC. The autobiographies attached to these applications are lengthy at times and full of information not found anywhere else. Particularly informative for the reconstruction of the 1781/82 routes through Pennsylvania was an account entitled "Thomas Graton His Book", a journal kept by Thomas Graton of Massachusetts attached to his pension file. Graton joined the Company of Artificers for a five-month enlistment term on 2 August 1781 and marched to Yorktown and back with the Continental Army. Short as it is, Graton's "book" is valuable as the only known primary source for the route of the artificers.[19]

Reconstructing the logistics behind the American march through Pennsylvania is both more difficult as well as easier than for the French side. It is more difficult, because unlike in the case of the French army, no route maps or instructions to the troops which roads they were to take have survived.[20] This gap in our ability of reconstruct the march is filled in part by Orderly Books of

---

[16] *Journal of Sergeant-Major John H. Hawkins, 1779-1781.* Manuscript Guide 273, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Hawkins' journal is unpaginated.

Though relevant to the study of the Revolutionary war, this report does not include a discussion as to the reasons and motivations of individuals for keeping diaries or writing memoirs. The (limited) readership of this report is well aware of the fact that diaries, journals and memoirs often should not be taken at face value but should be compared with other primary sources.

[17] John Hudson's Memoirs were published, without title, in *Cist's Advertiser*, a weekly newspaper published by Charles Cist in Cincinnati, Ohio, in five installments beginning with Vol. 3, No. 3, 28 January 1846.

[18] James Thacher, *A Military Journal during the American Revolutionary War, from 1775 to 1783* (1823, repr. Stamford, 1994).

[19] Pension application of Thomas Graton, NARA W 14824, 34 pp., 1 August 1767-29 September 1790, roll 1110, frames 302-325.

[20] The exceptions to this rule are three letters by Washington to Colonel Philip Van Cortlandt who commanded the rear-guard of the Continental Army.

regiments marching through Pennsylvania. These Orderly Books provide an immediate if very uneven source for the reconstruction of the march. Orderly Books record the daily orders for each regiment, including the place where the regiment is at the time and where it was to march that day and set up camp. Most important for the reconstruction of the minutiae of the march is the Orderly Book of Colonel Lamb's 2nd Continental Artillery, which has survived in two versions (6/20 - 10/21/81 and 8/4 - 10/27/81) in the New-York Historical Society and is available on microfilm #143, reel 14, and NYHS microfilm #118.1, reel 12. Lamb's Orderly book is the only surviving source of its kind; of the five infantry regiments that made the march to Yorktown in 1781 -- 1st NJ, 2nd NJ, Canadian (Congress' Own), 1st RI, 1st NY, and 2nd NY -- one copy of the Orderly Book of the 2nd NY, covering the days from 24 September to 10 October 1781, has survived in the New York State Library under catalogue No. 10464, vol. 10, part 1. Another copy covering the days from 26 September to 30 October 1781 is at NYHS, microfilm #149, reel 15, but both versions are too late for this study.

Except for a small group of about 85 Delaware recruits, the same units - 1st New Jersey, 2nd New Jersey, 1st New York, 2nd New York, 1st Rhode Island, Hazen's Canadians, Lamb's Artillery, the Light Infantry as well as the Commander in Chief's Guard, Joseph Plumb Martin's Corps of Sappers and Miners, and the Corps of Artificers - made the return march in November and December 1781. Fortunately the diary of Samuel Tallmadge, also of the Second New York Regiment, has survived for the march from Yorktown.[21] In addition there is the Orderly Book for Colonel Lamb's Artillery Regiment as well. Having crossed from Philadelphia, Lamb wintered in Burlington, New Jersey, from 7 December 1781 to 4 February 1782, and marched to the Highlands in August 1782. It is in the NYHS, microfilm #152; reel 15. But while this Orderly Book provides some detail for the day-to-day affairs of the regiment, it does not provide any information on the routes taken by Lamb.

Another potential source for the reconstruction of the logistical aspects of the march of the American forces are the papers of Quarter-Master General (QMG) Timothy Pickering in the National Archives and Records Administration in Washington, DC. As QMG, Pickering and his Deputy-QMGs and their Assistant-QMGs were responsible for feeding, clothing and housing the Continental Army.[22] Yet just as in the case of the French Army, the speed of the march

[21] Almon W. Lauber, *Orderly Books of the Fourth New York Regiment, 1778-1780. The Second New York Regiment, 1780-1783 by Samuel Tallmadge and Others with Diaries of Samuel Tallmadge, 1780-1782 and John Barr, 1779-1782* (Albany, 1932), pp. 759-760. The Orderly Book unfortunately contains gaps from 17 June 1781 to 24 September 1781, and from 10 October 1781 to 19 August 1782, i.e. the times for the marches through Pennsylvania, but Tallmadge's diary fills that gap.

[22] Pickering became QMG in August 1780. See Erna Risch, *Supplying Washington's Army* (Washington, D.C., 1981), esp. pp. 58-63. See also E. Wayne Carp, *To Starve the Army at Pleasure. Continental Army Administration and American Political Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1984). Charles Pettit remained assistant quartermaster general, Jabez Hatch was appointed deputy quartermaster for Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire, and Donaldson Yeates was DQMG for Maryland and Delaware. John Neilson was appointed deputy quartermaster for New

through Pennsylvania left Pickering very little time for correspondence: only a handful of letters by him and to him have survived for the time the Continental Army marched through the state.[23] Pickering in fact did not even accompany the troops through the state; that task was left to DQMG Colonel Henry Emanual [sic] Lutterloh, but the papers of Lutterloh have not survived and neither has a single letter by Pickering to Lutterloh. The only pertinent letter by Washington to Lutterloh was not written until 7 September 1781, from Head of Elk. That was well after the Continental Army had left Pennsylvania. A second DQMG that accompanied the Continental Army through Pennsylvania was Colonel Henry Dearborn, but the Washington Papers do not contain a single letter to Dearborn relative to the Pennsylvania section of the campaign. No collection of Dearborn Papers relative to the Yorktown Campaign has survived, and Dearborn himself in his *Revolutionary War Journals* covers the campaign in all of two sentences.[24]

In some states, this gap is filled in part by the paper trail the Continental Army left behind in the form of interest-bearing Loan Certificates issued by the DQMGs along the way. These certificates, which cover everything from purchases of food and firewood to crossing the Delaware at Trenton to ship rent for the passage to Yorktown to tavern bills to bridge tolls and compensation for pasturage, are preserved in many public and private repositories and in numerous record groups. In NARA, records pertaining to this time period can be found among the 126-microfilm reel record group entitled *Miscellaneous Numbered Documents*. More can be found on the microfilms in Record Group M 926, *Letters, Accounts, and*

Jersey, Ralph Pomeroy for Connecticut, and Richard Claiborne for Virginia. Pickering retained Nicholas Long in North Carolina and Hugh Hughes in New York. For Pennsylvania he appointed Samuel Miles deputy quartermaster.

[23] The vast majority of the Timothy Pickering Papers, 29 linear feet, is located in the Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston and is available on 69 reels of microfilm. Frederick S. Allis, Jr., ed. Timothy Pickering Papers, 1758-1829 published a guide to these papers. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1966. Microfilm. 69 reels guide. Distributed by University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

One surviving letters relative to the campaign was written from Philadelphia on 31 August to Henry Dearborn, informing him that exclusive of the artillery teams, 85 ox teams would travel to the southward. Next is a letter to Robert Morris from Philadelphia on 6 September. In it he asked Morris for one months' pay for the "conductors of [two brigades, i.e., 80] ox teams: [since] the object of their march could not be announced, they came on not so well provided as they ought to have been." Pickering Papers Reel 26, Vol. 127: Letters sent by Pickering 10 May to 21 December 1781. Two letters were written on 8 September from Head of Elk to Pomeroy and Colonel Miles.

See also Reel 26, Vol. 82: Letters sent by Pickering 29 June 1781 to 2 January 1782. The reel contains one letter written at King's Ferry on 26 August;. then comes a letter to Col. Hughes from Philadelphia of 3 September 1781, informing him that "besides the corn at Trenton there are 5000 bushels of Oats in Bucks County purchased for our army."
the there is a gap until 10 September, when we find a letter written from Baltimore. On 14 September he writes a letter from Fredericksburg, and on 18 September there is a letter from Williamsburg. On 23 September he wrote to Donaldson that he is waiting for 7,000 pairs of horseshoes from Lancaster, at least 3,000 pairs had to come as quickly as possible via Head of Elk since the French needed some as well.

[24] *Revolutionary War Journals of Henry Dearborn, 1775-1783.* Edited from the original manuscripts by Lloyd A. Brown and Howard H. Peckham. With a biographical essay by Hermon Dunlap Smith. (Chicago, 1939. Reprint, New York: Da Capo Press, 1971), p. 215.

Estimates of the Quartermaster General's Department 1776-1783, which occasionally covers French purchases as well, and in the well over 100 microfilm reels of Record Group 93, Revolutionary War Rolls.

While in the case of New Jersey, the papers of DQMG John Neilson provide a window into some of the logistical challenges the QMG Department faced in the Summer of 1781, no such treasure drove of materials seems to have survived for Pennsylvania. During the less than two years that John Neilson served as DQMG in New Jersey, he handed out over 10,000 such certificates which help in reconstructing the routes taken by the Continental Army.[25] A potentially similarly large contributions was made by State authorities in the form of contributions in kind. They were collected by contractors hired by the State to procure its share to the maintenance of the Continental Army.[26] Once again, however, consultant has been unable to locate an equivalent body of sources for Pennsylvania.[27]

On the French side, the indispensable collection of primary source materials is the compilation of maps and route descriptions published by Howard C. Rice, Jr. and Anne S. K. Brown in their *The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army 1780, 1781, 1782, 1782*. 2 volumes, (Princeton and Providence, 1972). Volume 2 re-produces maps of the routes and campsites as well as the road descriptions that are located in the Rochambeau Papers, the Rochambeau Family Cartographic Archive (GEN MSS 146) at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University and in other repositories world-wide. These maps were drawn mostly by Louis Alexandre de Berthier and, though not always to scale, provide the exact location of the campsites. These superbly edited volumes are indispensable for anyone interested in the march of Rochambeau's troops from Newport to Yorktown in 1781 and back to Boston in 1782. There are a very few sites and routes such as the route of Lauzun's Legion through Connecticut in June

[25] Neilson, John. "Papers … kept as DQM for NJ, 1780-1782, Box 1" call no. Ac 589, Special Collections, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Neilson took over as DQMG from Moore Furman in September 1780. In almost all cases only the signed receipt that payment had been made, i.e., a small strip on left hand of the certificate, has survived.

The Delaware Public Archives in Dover hold a Record Group (RG) *Delaware Archives*, which together with materials in RG 1315.6 Auditor of Accounts, Wastebook A, 1784-1796, and RG 1315.7, Journal A, 1784-1800, allow a reconstruction of the logistics of the American march.

[26] See New Jersey State Archives, Record Group: Dept. of the Treasury. Sub-group: State Treasurer's Office, Series: Revolutionary War-Era Accounts of Taxes received in kind, 1781-1782. There are also thousands of receipts for payment of taxes in kind in the different counties in RG: Department of Defense, SG: Revolutionary War, Series: Numbered Manuscripts, 2 vols.

[27] The autobiography of Samuel Miles, DQMG for Pennsylvania entitled "Life of Col. Samuel Miles written by himself beginning on 4 February 1802," focuses primarily on his service in the French and Indian War. It is in Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Am 1042. His role in the summer of 1781 is covered in a single sentence: "I was nominated by the Quarter Master General of the Army Deputy Quarter Master for the State of Pennsylvania, which office I served until the year 1782; when a new arrangem(en)t took place." Whole autobiography is 14 hand-written pages long. Items in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania are quoted at the proper place in the text.

A search in RG-27, Records of Pennsylvania's Revolutionary Governments, Accounts and Reports, 1777-1790 (2 boxes), series #27.18 in the Pennsylvania State Archives yielded no pertinent information.

1781, or the 1782-1783 winter quarters of Lauzun's Legion in Wilmington, that Rice and Brown either could not locate or that lay outside their immediate research interest, but for the march of French forces through Pennsylvania the itineraries and maps are complete. Unfortunately, the itineraries that are missing concern Pennsylvania only marginally: the flanking march of Lauzun's Legion from Philadelphia to Stony Point in the Fall of 1782, and the return march of the Legion from Crompond/Yorktown Heights to Burlington and Wilmington in November and December 1781.

On the French side, orders and arrangements for the marches as well as supply issues are addressed in itineraries and official orders for the march published in Volume 2 of Rice and Brown's *American Campaigns*. Berthier, an assistant quartermaster-general, provides a very detailed description of the order and organization of each column of the march until August 1781, but just as French forces enter New Jersey on 27 August, his account ends abruptly in mid-sentence. The same is true for another invaluable source for French troop movements, the *Livre d'ordre* of Rochambeau's little army, which allows a minute reconstruction of the daily life of the soldiers in America as well as the order and organization of the march to White Plains. The *livre*, the equivalent of an Orderly Book in the Continental Army, is preserved in the Archives Générales du Département de Meurthe-et-Moselle in Nancy, France, under the call number E 235. But it ends on 17 August 1781, the day before the troops got ready to break camp and set out for the march to Yorktown. A second volume for the siege of Yorktown and/or the march north in 1782 has not been found yet.

A continuation of sorts of the *Livre d'Ordre* is the "Journal des operations du corps Français, Depuis le 15 Aôut", a brief 14-page manuscript narrative of the march of the French army to Virginia, the siege of Yorktown, and the surrender of Cornwallis. From the appearance of the handwriting throughout this volume, it seems that it is the original day-to-day record dictated by Rochambeau. For the return march of 1782, there exists a 19 1/2 page manuscript, partly autograph, with heading on first page, "1782", and heading on page 16", 1783", giving Rochambeau's narrative of events of 1782 and early 1783. Both of these manuscripts are in the Rochambeau Papers at Yale University, but neither of them covers the marches through Pennsylvania in more than a sentence or two.

An important source for French army logistics are the Jeremiah Wadsworth Papers in the Connecticut Historical Society. Wadsworth was the chief supplier for the French forces in America, and his agents supplied Rochambeau's troops throughout their stay on the American mainland. But here too, the very short time Wadsworth and his agents had to prepare for the march in August 1781, and the speed with which French forces crossed Pennsylvania and Philadelphia, combined with Wadsworth's ability to pay for his purchases in cash, has resulted in relatively few primary sources compared to the march to across other states.[28]

[28] The vast majority of the Wadsworth Papers are preserved in the collections of the Connecticut Historical Society in Hartford; a few manuscripts are in the New-York Historical Society.

If sources such as the Orderly Books or the *Livre d'ordre* have hardly, if ever, been used in historical analyses of the 1781-1782 campaigns, personal accounts, letters, diaries, and memoirs by American and French military personnel have always formed one of the backbones of the historiography of the war. But here too a lot of new ground remains to be broken as historians have all too often focused their attention on only a few well-known and easily accessible sources rather than mine the treasure-trove of the many lesser-known materials available in out-of-the-way places. In an appendix to Volume 1 (pp. 285-348), of their *American Campaigns*, Rice and Brown provide a list of journals, diaries, memoirs, letters, and other primary sources available at the time of publication of their book. Since then, almost two dozen primary sources have appeared in European and American archives that can be added the 45 sources, i.e., accounts of events in America written by officers in Rochambeau's army listed by Rice and Brown. Most surprising is the fact that three journals/diaries/memoirs of enlisted men have come to light since 1972. The most important of these three is the journal of Georg Daniel Flohr, an enlisted man in the Royal Deux-Ponts, located in the Bibliothèque Municipale of Strasbourg, France.[29] Among the Milton S. Latham Papers in the Library of Congress can be found the *Journal Militaire* of an unidentified grenadier in the Bourbonnais regiment.[30] Finally there is the *Histoire des campagnes de l'Armée de Rochambaud (sic) en Amérique* written by André Amblard of the Soissonnais infantry.[31]

Also added can now be a most valuable new source, the papers of Antoine Charles du Houx, *baron* de Vioménil, Rochambeau's second in command. Some 300 items and about 1,000 pages long, the Fonds Vioménil is preserved in the Académie François Bourdon in Le Creusot, France. This material has never before been used and sheds much new light on the decision-making process at the top of the French military hierarchy. For Lauzun's Legion, long the only component of Rochambeau's army without a contemporary eyewitness account, a manuscript journal kept by its Lieutenant-Colonel Etienne Hugau entitled *Détails intéressants sur les événements arrivés dans la guerre d'Amérique. Hyver 1781 à 1782. Hampton, Charlotte et suitte* has come to light in the Bibliothèque municipale in the town of Evreux, France. Unfortunately for the same reasons given for the American participants, the Papers of Rochambeau in the Library of

---

[29] *Reisen Beschreibung von America welche das Hochlöbliche Regiment von Zweybrücken hat gemacht zu Wasser und zu Land vom Jahr 1780 bis 84*. I am currently preparing an English translation and edition.

[30] Library of Congress, Milton Latham Papers MMC 1907.

[31] Amblard, who enlisted at age 19 in 1773, was discharged as a captain in 1793. His manuscript is located in the Archives Départementales de l'Ardèche in Privas, France. I am at a loss to explain why numerous passages from this journal can be found verbatim in the journal of unidentified officer of the Soissonnais regiment preserved in the Huntington Library in California and which also contains maps of all French campsites that may have been copied from Berthier. For the return march his journal only contains a list of the towns the army marched through. See my "A New View of Old Williamsburg. A Huntington Library Manuscript provides another glimpse of the city in 1781." *Colonial Williamsburg. The Journal of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation* Vol. 22 No. 1, (Spring 2000), pp. 30-34.

Congress[32] or in the Beinecke Library at Yale University[33], the Vioménil Papers or Hugau's *Details* do not contain much information on the marches through Pennsylvania. Fortunately a brief account of the return march from Virginia to Yorktown Heights, dated "Camp de Pines Bridge, sur le Croton, l2 27 7bre 1782", Hugau provide the stopping points for the Legion to Stony Point.[34]

Among new sources not listed in Rice and Brown are the correspondence of Captain Charles Malo François *comte* de Lameth, aide-de-camp to Rochambeau and *aide-maréchal général des logis* (May 1781), and of his brother Captain Alexandre Théodor Victor *chevalier* de Lameth, who replaced Charles Malo François in the Summer of 1782.[35] Also unavailable in 1972 was the *Journal de l'Armée aux ordres de Monsieur le Comte de Rochambeau pendant les campagnes de 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783 dans l'Amérique septentrionale* kept by *comte* de Rochambeau's 21-year-old nephew Louis François Bertrand Dupont d'Aubevoye, *comte* de Lauberdière, a captain in the Saintonge infantry and one of his aides-de-camp.[36]

The largest body of materials not listed in Rice and Brown concern the Royal Deux-Ponts regiment of infantry. One is a letter written by Jean-François de Thuillière, a captain in the Royal Deux-Ponts preserved in the Archives Nationales.[37] Another are two letters by Louis Eberhard von Esebeck, lieutenant-colonel in the Royal Deux-Ponts, dated Jamestown Island, 12 and 16 December 1781,[38] and the papers and letters by Colonel Christian de Deux Ponts, which have been in part deposited in and in part acquired by German archives.[39] Through the good offices of Ms Nancy Bayer I have also gained access to four letters written by her ancestor William de Deux-Ponts from America.[40] Sources

[32] This collection of about 1,800 items was used in its microfilm edition.
[33] The Rochambeau Papers are catalogued as GEN MSS 308, Beinecke Library, Yale University.
[34] Published by Gérard-Antoine Massoni, *Détails intéressants sur les événements arrivés dans la guerre d'Amérique. Hyver 1781 à 1782. Hampton, Charlotte et suitte. Manuscrit de Claude Hugau, lieutenant-colonel de la Légion des Volontaires Etrangers de Lauzun* (Besançon: Université de Franche-Comté, 1996). Hugau's account can be found on pp. 219-227.
[35] Archives du Département Val d'Oise in Cergy-Pontoise, No. 1J 191 and 1J 337-338.
[36] Lauberdière's *Journal* is in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, France. See my "America the Ungrateful: The Not-So-Fond Remembrances of Louis François Dupont d'Aubevoye, Comte de Lauberdière" *American Heritage* Vol. 48, No. 1, (February 1997), pp. 101-106, and "Lauberdière's Journal. The Revolutionary War Journal of Louis François Bertrand d'Aubevoye, *comte* de Lauberdière" *Colonial Williamsburg. The Journal of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation* Vol. 18, No. 1, (Autumn 1995), pp. 33-37.
[37] The letter is catalogued under B4 172, Marine.
[38] John M. Lenhart, "Letter of an Officer of the Zweibrücken Regiment", *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, Vol. 28, (January 1936), pp. 321-322, and Vol. 28, (February 1936), pp. 350-360.
[39] The papers of Christian von Zweibrücken deposited in the Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv - Geheimes Hausarchiv - in Munich are owned by Marian Freiherr von Gravenreuth; those deposited in the Pfälzische Landesbibliothek in Speyer were acquired by the library at auction.
[40] The writer is grateful to Ms Bayer of New York, for providing copies of the correspondence of her ancestor in the possession of her cousin Anton Freiherr von Cetto in Germany.

that I have not yet seen are a journal kept by Dupleix De Cadignan of the Agenois and the journal of Xavier De Bertrand, a lieutenant in the Royal Deux-Ponts.[41]

These discoveries bring the total of known French sources to over 60, but their value for the Pennsylvania project varies greatly. For one, the location of the journals by Ollonne, Saint-Cyr, Menonville or Rosel listed in Rice and Brown is unknown. Three items listed by them are collections of maps drawn by engineers for the march and/or for the siege of Yorktown. Other primary sources such as the letters by the Armand de la Croix *comte* de Charlus[42] or Gabriel-Gaspard *baron* de Gallatin, a *sous-lieutenant* in the Royal Deux-Ponts,[43] are often only collections of letters written during different stages of the campaign. Though valuable for the information they contain, most of them say little or nothing about the march through Pennsylvania, viz. the journals kept by Brisout de Barneville (ends on 5 December 1781),[44] Cromot du Bourg,[45] William de Deux-Ponts,[46] Amblard or the anonymous grenadier in the Bourbonnais record not much more than a tabulation of miles marched and the names of locations passed. Many more end with the siege of Yorktown, e.g., William de Deux-Ponts and Cromot du Bourg, while others again, i.e., those of Ségur[47] or Broglie[48] begin only in 1782 when their authors arrived in America, though they contain detailed accounts of their encounter with British naval forces in the Delaware Bay. Of those officers who participated in the marches some, such as Blanchard, either marched ahead of the main army to check on campsites[49] or, as in the case of

---

[41] The journal is quoted in Régis d'Oléon, "L'Esprit de Corps dans l'Ancienne Armée" *Carnet de la Sabretache* 5th series (1958), pp. 488-496. Régis d'Oléon is a descendant of Bertrand.

[42] 24-year-old Armand de la Croix *comte* de Charlus was second in command of the Saintonge. The last known letter he wrote from America is dated 16 August 1781. The eight letters written by Charlus to his father are preserved in the collections of the Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre in Vincennes, series A13732, Nos. 59, 65,66,68,72,73,81,82.

[43] Warrington Dawson, "Un Garde suisse de Louis XVI au service de l'Amérique" *Le correspondant* Vol. 324, Nr. 1655, (September 10, 1931), pp. 672-692, pp. 683-688.

[44] "Journal de Guerre de Brissout de Barneville. Mai 1780-Octobre 1781" *The French-American Review* Vol. 3, No. 4, (October 1950), pp. 217-278. It only contains a list of the towns visited on the march.

[45] Marie-François Baron Cromot du Bourg, "Diary of a French Officer, 1781" *Magazine of American History* Vol. 4, (June 1880), pp. 205-214, p. 214.

[46] William de Deux-Ponts, *My Campaigns in America* Samuel Abbot Green, ed., (Boston, 1868).

[47] Louis-Philippe *comte* de Ségur, "Extraits de Lettres écrites d'Amérique par le comte de Ségur colonel en second du Régiment de Soissonnais a la comtesse de Ségur, Dame de Madame Victoire 1782-1783" in*: Mélanges publiés par la Société des Bibliophiles François (Deuxième Partie)* (Paris, 1903), pp. 159-205.

[48] Prince de Broglie, "Journal du Voyage du Prince de Broglie colonel-en-second du Régiment de Saintonge aux États-Unis d'Amérique et dans l'Amérique du Sud 1782-1783" in*: Mélanges publiés par la Société des Bibliophiles François (Deuxième Partie)* (Paris, 1903), pp. 15-148.

[49] *The Journal of Claude Blanchard, Commissary of the French Auxiliary Army sent to the United States during the American Revolution* Thomas Balch, ed., (Albany, 1876). Blanchard was sick during the return march and "rested and kept quiet. Thus, my journal was almost laid aside. I will only say that we were not far from New York. We marched in military manner as far as the banks of the North river, where we arrived on the 15th [of September 1782]. I had some good lodging places, and especially in [New] Jersey, where there are many Dutch families. I lived alone there and was happy." Ibid., p. 174.

Lauberdière, followed behind the main army. The *chevalier* de Chastellux did not write a single word about the march,[50] neither did the *duc* de Lauzun,[51] and the *Détails interéssants* of lieutenant-colonel Hugau do not begin until after the siege of Yorktown. Desandrouins had the misfortune of losing his journal in the wreck of the *duc de Bourgogne* in the Spring of 1783, and his surviving description of the march to Yorktown consists of 10 lines; those of the return march are four pages long.[52] That leaves the journals of Clermont-Crèvecœur[53] and Baron Closen[54] as the two single most important primary sources for the 1781 march of French forces through Pennsylvania.

The usefulness of the majority of journals is further impacted by the fact that virtually all officers who made the march to Yorktown kept their comments on the return march very short: Clermont-Crèvecœur's journal, an excellent source for 1781, devotes all of 20 lines to the return march a year later. Verger, who had sailed with the siege artillery to Yorktown in August 1780, partly fills that void.[55]

Indispensable for biographical research on the 1,034 French officers serving in d'Estaing's, Rochambeau's, and St. Simon's forces as well as on the French officers in the Continental Army is Gilbert Bodinier, *Dictionnaire des officiers de l'armée royale qui ont combattu aux États-Unis pendant la guerre d'Indépendance 1776-1783* 3rd edition, (Chailland, 2001). Enlistment records or c*ontrôles* of enlisted personnel in Rochambeau's corps, indispensable for statistical data on his troops are preserved by the Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre in the Château de Vincennes;[56] only those of Lauzun's Legion are in the Archives Nationales in Paris.[57] On the American side Francis B. Heitman's,

---

[50] Chastellux did not become a *marquis* until the death of his eldest surviving brother in early 1784. See the introductory essay to Marquis de Chastellux, *Travels in North America in the Years 1780, 1781, and 1782.* Howard C. Rice, Jr., ed., 2 vols. (Chapel Hill, 1963).

[51] *Mémoires de Armand-Louis de Gontaut, duc de Lauzun,* Edmond Pilon, ed., (Paris, 1928).

[52] Fragments of his diary which survived his shipwreck in February 1783 are published in Charles Nicholas, *Le Maréchal de Camp Desandrouins* (Verdun, 1887), pp. 341-368.

[53] Jean François Louis *comte* de Clermont-Crèvecœur had entered the Auxonne Artillery in 1769. His account of the American campaigns is published in *The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783* Howard C. Rice, Jr. and Anne S. K. Brown, eds. 2 vols., (Princeton and Providence, 1972), Vol. 1, pp. 15-100.

[54] Acomb, Evelyn, ed., *The Revolutionary Journal of Baron Ludwig von Closen, 1780-1783* (Chapel Hill, 1958).

[55] Jean Baptiste Antoine de Verger, a Swiss officer, had entered the Royal Deux-Ponts as a 17-year-old *cadet-gentilhomme* in February 1780. His journal of the American campaigns is published in *The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783* Howard C. Rice, Jr. and Anne S. K. Brown, eds. 2 vols., (Princeton and Providence, 1972), Vol. 1, pp. 117-188.

[56] The Bourbonnais *contrôles* are catalogued under 1 Yc 188 (1776-1783 and 4 February 1784 to 1786), Soissonnais *contrôles* have the number 1 Yc 966 (1776-1783 and 4 February 1784 to 1786), the Saintonge *contrôles* are 1 Yc 932 (1776-1783 and 4 February 1784 to 1786), the Royal Deux-Ponts *contrôles* are 1 Yc 869 (1776-1783 and 4 February 1784 to 1786). The *contrôles* of the Auxonne Artillery are listed as 10 Yc 1 (1776-1783 and 4 February 1784 to 1786).

[57] The Lauzun *contrôles* in the Archives Nationales have the catalogue number D 2c 32 (March 1780-1783) and 8 Yc 17 (beginning on 4 February 1784 to 1786).

Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army during the War of the Revolution (Washington, 1893; many reprints) is still indispensable.

While the correspondence of officers such as Washington and Rochambeau is of the greatest importance for the identification of the route and the grand strategy behind the campaign, it is in the papers, letters, and accounts of its participants that one finds the details, the personal encounters, and the stories that bring the route to life. The same, of course, holds true for the American side, but the body of resources is infinitely larger. In his *Revolutionary America 1763-1789. A Bibliography* (2 vols., Washington DC, 1984), the last major bibliography published on the Revolutionary War, Ronald M. Gephart lists more than 20,000 items just in the holdings of the Library of Congress. Since then, thousands of titles have been added to those listed in Gephart's bibliography. Other valuable resources include Stetson Conn and Robert W. Coakley, *An Army Chronology of the American Revolution* (revised) (Washington, D.C., 1974); Joyce L. Eakin, *Colonial America and the War for Independence* Special Bibliography 14. (Carlisle Barracks, 1976); Terry M. Mays, *Historical Dictionary of the American Revolution* (Lanham, 1999); J. Todd White and Charles H. Lesser, eds. *Fighters For Independence: A Guide to Sources of Geographical Information on Soldiers and Sailors of the American Revolution* (Chicago, 1977); Robert K.Wright, Jr., *Continental Army. Army Lineage Series* (Washington, D.C., 1983); Charles H. Lesser, ed. *Sinews of Independence: Monthly Strength Reports of the Continental Army* (Chicago, 1976); and Howard H. Peckham, ed., *Toll of Independence: Engagements & Battle Casualties of the American Revolution* (Chicago, 1974).

Taken all together, the historiographical situation in Pennsylvania therefore presents the situation characterized by a relative paucity of primary sources that can be used to tell the story around the marches. On the one hand, this is caused by the brevity of the stay of French forces. Extended stays produce a longer and larger body of sources, but French, and American, forces cross Pennsylvania very quickly. For Rhode Island we have a large body of correspondence between Jeremiah Wadsworth and his agents in Newport as well as Rochambeau's Orderly Book, which allows us to construct a detailed picture of French presence in the state. In Connecticut we again have hundreds of letters and sources in the Wadsworth Papers and a seven-month stay of Lauzun's Legion in Lebanon. For the stay in White Plains, there is the singular source of more than 1,000 hand-written pages of oral history interviews conducted by John MacLean McDonald in the 1840s among Revolutionary war veterans. The Delaware archives contain a separate record group for claims dating to the Revolutionary War that were collected and organized for submission to Congress during the 1790s already.

During his research in Pennsylvania, consultant has found no equivalent to any of these sources, which means, that based on our current state of knowledge we know less than what we would like to know about the human aspects of the march to victory through Pennsylvania.

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Criteria for Selection: How Sites Were Chosen for Inclusion

Since this survey is conducted with a view toward the study currently conducted by the National Park Service regarding the eligibility of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route to be designated a National Historic Trail, the criteria applied to this resource inventory in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are those of the National Trails System Act [(Public Law 90-543) (16 U.S.C. 1241-1251) as amended through P. L. 106-509, November 13, 2000]. Of particular importance is Section 3. [16USC1242] (a) (3), NTSA, which states that "National historic trails shall have as their purpose the identification and protection of the historic route and its historic remnants and artifacts for public use and enjoyment." Point (4) includes "Connecting or side trails, established as provided in section 6 of this Act, which will provide additional points of public access to national recreation, national scenic or national historic trails or which will provide connections between such trails" as potential components of a NHT.

This survey was conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Identification and Evaluation* (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1983). A discussion of the general methodology can be found in *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning. National Register Bulletin 24* (Derry, Jandl, Shull, and Thorman, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1977; Parker, rev. 1985).

The criteria used for the evaluation of properties were based on those of the National Register of Historic Places, administered by the National Park Service under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. Properties listed in the NHR include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture.

The National Register's criteria for evaluating the significance of properties, which were developed to recognize the accomplishments of all peoples who made a contribution to the country's history and heritage, state the following:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity in location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, association and:

that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

Prior studies conducted in other states along the W3R as well as for the NPS resulted in the establishment of these categories for resources along the route:

Campsites and Bivouacs
Buildings and Building Sites
Plaques, tablets, and markers placed by federal, state and local authorities, by patriotic organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Society of the Cincinnati, or by historical societies
Tombstones and/or Grave Markers and other emblems
Archeological Sites: terrestrial and underwater
Natural Landscape Features
Paintings and Murals
Water Routes and River Crossings
Historic Road Segments
National Parks
State Parks
Historic Preservation/Education/Tourism Areas

Using the criteria developed in 2.3, consultant inspected and inventoried on site all resources listed in this report and identified **85** individual resources on 12 separate routes taken by various components and individuals belonging to the two armies through Pennsylvania. These major routes are as follows:

Route 1: The Land Route of Generals George Washington and the *comte* de Rochambeau to Philadelphia in September 1781
Route 2: The Land Route of Continental Army Troops from Trenton, New Jersey to Claymont, Delaware in September 1781
Route 3: The Water Route of Continental Army Troops from Trenton, New Jersey to Christiana, Delaware in September 1781
Route 4: The Land Route of *commissaire de guerre* de Granville from Boston to Philadelphia in September 1781
Route 5: The Land Route of the French Army Troops from Trenton, New Jersey to Claymont, Delaware in September 1781
Route 6: The Water Route of *comte* de Rochambeau from Philadelphia to Chester on 5 September 1781, and the continuation of the route on land with Washington to Wilmington

Route 7: The Return Marches of the Continental Army in December 1781
Route 8: The Return March of the French Army in September 1782
Route 9: The Philadelphia Conference and the Celebrations for the Birth of the *dauphin*, 14 to 24 July 1782
Route 10: The March of the Passengers of the l'*Aigle* and *la Gloire* from Dover, Delaware to Yorktown Heights, New York in September 1782
Route 11: The March of Lauzun's Legion from Yorktown Heights, New York to Winter Quarters in Wilmington, Delaware in December 1782
Route 12: Route of Rochambeau to Baltimore via Newton, Hackettstown, Baptistown and Philadelphia in December 1782

The resources identified on these routes fall into nine different categories and groups:

Campsites and bivouacs
Buildings and building sites
Plaques, tablets, and markers
Monuments
Historic Districts
State Parks
Historic Preservation Area
Water Routes and River Crossings

Within each category, the resources are divided according to their importance for the route. One group consists of "contributing sites", i.e., sites for which primary-source evidence in the form of a mention in a primary text or an American or French map exists that ties the resource to the W3R. The other group consists of "witness sites", i.e., resources that exists in 1781-1782 along the route but for which no specific mention in a primary contemporary source could be found.

3.2 The Form

Inventory Number. Each inventoried property is assigned an inventory number, which appears on the form. Site profiles and inventoried properties are arranged chronologically according to the marching sequence. Street names and street numbers are recorded as they appear in town records.

Historic Name. The historic name serves as shorthand for indicating the site's significance. In the case of commercial buildings, churches, and public buildings, the historic name is straightforward and represents the buildings earliest known use. With houses, the historic name is usually the name of the family that built it or who lived there for many years.

Date. Dates of construction are based on architectural evidence, information from primary and secondary sources (see bibliography), research files maintained by the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Office, original research in primary sources, and other historical documentation. The forms generally indicate the reason for ascribing a specific date to a building or site.

Materials. In cases where cement or other types of facing were applied to underpinnings it was not possible to determine, without access to cellars or scraping away the cement from the foundation of a monument, what the actual foundation materials were. "Asbestos siding" was checked off for houses with any type of rigid composition shingles; however, many of these are wood-pulp products containing no asbestos.

Dimensions. Building and monument dimensions are either taken from Tax Assessor's street cards or were determined by measuring the object itself in the field. The dimension of the elevation facing the street is given first.

Condition. Without extensive analysis, it was not possible to assess professionally the structural condition of any building.

Threats to Buildings and Sites. Unless the survey personnel had direct knowledge of a specific threat, "None known" was checked.

Wherever possible National Register of Historic Places or National Historic Landmark registration forms addressing these issues were attached to the site form.

3.3 Other Parts of the Survey Report

In addition to the inventory forms and site profiles, which form the core of the survey, the project report includes an overview of the French army of the *ancien régime,* and of French forces in America before their march with the Continental Army through Pennsylvania in 1781 and 1782. It also includes a discussion of primary resources still standing in the field as well as mention of resources listed in earlier sources that have since disappeared.

Parts of this report can be found in different form in previous reports for the States of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Delaware. Though the basic facts of history have not changed, historical research and writing is always "work in progress". As new sources come to light, details will change and so will the interpretation of events. The reader is therefore encouraged to contact the writer to add whatever he or she can to contribute toward the task of making the WASHINGTON - ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE a reality. The advancement of historical knowledge depends as much on sharing of information as it does on individual research.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE WASHINGTON-ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE

When Forbes and Cadman published their *France and New England* in 1925, they indicated that an "effort has been made to get the State Park Commission of Connecticut to mark all the nineteen camp sites in that State and it is hoped that some time this will be done."[58] Thirty years later, the sites were still not marked and it was only in response to the establishment of an Interstate Rochambeau Commission that the General Assembly took up the issue again in 1956.

That commission was the brainchild of Charles Parmer, who took it upon himself to resurrect the memory of French participation, and to identify the route taken by French troops. In the Spring of 1951, Parmer began prodding state governments and patriotic societies for funds.[59] In 1952, the Colonial Dames of Virginia endorsed his proposal for a uniform marking of the route and on 16 January 1953, Virginia Governor John S. Battle appointed Parmer to head a *Rochambeau Commission*. Its purpose was "to arrange with other States for the uniform marking of the route taken in 1781 by General Rochambeau and his French forces (… and) to arrange for a joint celebration of the anniversary of the Rochambeau Victory March."[60]

On 16 April 1953, Parmer called for a meeting of interested parties at Mount Vernon. The event was widely reported in the press; even President Dwight D. Eisenhower and French Foreign minister Georges Bidault sent congratulatory telegrams. Parmer was elected *General Chairman of the Interstate Rochambeau Commission of the United States* and by the Fall of 1953, "Rhode Island, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut had appointed Commissions or Representatives to work with Virginia." New York, New Jersey and Maryland had "leaders of patriotic groups making plans to do the marking with State permission".[61] But interest in the project seems to have waned as fast as it had arisen. Parmer's Commission was continued until 1958, but only Connecticut seems to have carried out the task of identifying and marking the route. In its January 1957 session, the Connecticut General Assembly passed House Bill No. 2005, "An Act concerning erecting Markers to designate the Sites of Camps occupied by the French troops under Rochambeau." Approved on 4 June 1957, it appropriated $ 1,500 and instructed the State Highway Commissioner to "erect roadside signs" in cooperation with Parmer's "Interstate Rochambeau

[58] Allan Forbes and Paul F. Cadman, *France and New England* 3 vols., (Boston, 1925) Vol. 1, p. 131.

[59] The writer is very grateful to Albert D. McJoynt of Alexandria, Virginia, for providing copies of correspondence and newspaper clippings he had acquired from Parmer's widow.

[60] The origins of Parmer's activities are outlined in his *Report of the Rochambeau Commission to the Governor and the general Assembly of Virginia* Senate Document No. 19 (Richmond, 1953).

[61] Parmer apparently never contacted Massachusetts for cooperation. The list of states involved is taken from his *Report of the Rochambeau Commission*, p. 10.

Commission" and "local historical societies or fraternal community groups". Pursuant to this legislation, the State Highway Commission placed 27 signs at or near known campsites of Rochambeau's army across the state.[62]

Parmer died in 1958 shortly after the dedication of the Fourteenth Street Bridge (I-395 between the Jefferson Memorial and the Pentagon) over the Potomac in Washington, DC, as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge in October 1958.[63] With him the project also died.[64]

In his report to the General Assembly of Virginia of 1953, Parmer listed Pennsylvania as one of the states where "leaders of patriotic groups [were] making plans to do the marking with State permission". We have no reason to doubt Parmer's word, but if indeed any such plans were made or committees formed in the early 1950s, this writer has been unable to locate any trace of their existence or activities during his research.

Nineteen years later, in 1972, Anne S. K. Brown and Howard C. Rice, Jr., published the authoritative and groundbreaking study *The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783.* Volume 2 of the work contains 204 pages of itineraries and texts followed by 177 contemporary maps, charts, and views of the routes taken by Rochambeau's army on the American mainland as well as in the Caribbean. These maps identified and definitely established the route of the main body of the French forces.

During preparations for the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, Representative Hamilton Fish of New York introduced on 16 April 1975, House of Representatives Concurrent Resolution 225. It called upon federal, state, county, and local governments to recognize the route taken by Rochambeau's forces as identified in the Brown and Rice work as "The Washington-Rochambeau National Historic Route". On 14 November 1975, the United States Department of the Interior as the supervisory body of the NPS informed Representative James A. Haley, Chair of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that the department had no objections to the resolution. It recommended, however, that the word "National" not be used since the route was neither part of the NPS nor met the criteria of integrity required by the NPS.

The Sub-Committee on National Parks and Recreation held hearings on the resolution and the correspondence from the Department of the Interior dated 17 November 1975, and sent a favorable report to Haley, whose committee took up

---

[62] See Robert A. Selig, *Rochambeau in Connecticut: Tracing his Journey. Historic and Architectural Survey. Connecticut Historical Commission* (Hartford: State of Connecticut, 1999), 1957), p. 17.

[63] United States 85th Congress, 1st Session, House Resolution H.R. 572, 3 January 1957, and Senate Bill S. 768, 22 January (legislative day 3 January) 1957.

[64] In September 1973, Mrs. Parmer was still asking French government officials to forward her the insignia of *Chevalier de la Legion d'Honneur,* which her husband had been awarded posthumously in May 1959.

the resolution on 27 January 1976. In its report to the full House, Haley's committee recommended passage of the resolution creating the "Washington-Rochambeau Historic Route" albeit outside the National Park System. On 17 February 1976, the resolution declaring the recognition of the route "as one of the more useful and enduring educational patriotic accomplishments to come from the bicentennial of the American War for Independence" passed without objection as amended, and was referred to the United States Senate the following day.

More than five months later, on 21 July 1976, the Department of the Interior informed Senator Henry M. Jackson, chair of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that it had no objection to House Concurrent Resolution 225. Following a hearing by the Senate's Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation on 2 August 1976, Jackson's committee recommended on 5 August that the Senate pass the resolution as well.[65] The Senate passed the resolution on 25 August 1976.

Joint House-Senate Resolution 225 had asked that the states "through appropriate signing, call attention to the route," but failed to appropriate funds to pay for signs beyond the boundaries of Colonial National Historical Park in Yorktown, Virginia. Due to this lack of federal funds, a private "Washington-Rochambeau National Historic Route Committee" established itself in Yorktown, New York, and set up its own signs. Few of these signs seem to have survived.[66] But even without federal funds or markers, however, hundreds of re-enactors traced the route from Newport to Yorktown from 9-16 October 1981, to commemorate the bicentennial of the siege.[67]

Concurrently a "Committee of the Bicentennial 1776-1976" was established by the French government. One of its tasks was the erection of markers along the "Washington-Rochambeau Route" in the State of Virginia (?) between Mount Vernon and Yorktown where this writer has seen them at three locations.[68] At the current stage of research it is unknown whether the French government in other states erected markers as well; there are none in Pennsylvania.

---

[65] See United States. Congress. House. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. 94th Congress, 2nd Session, Report No. 94-799, *Recognizing the Washington-Rochambeau National Historic Route*, and United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 94th Congress, 2nd Session, Report No. 94-1145, *The Washington-Rochambeau Historic Route* (Washington, DC, 1976).

[66] The author has been unable to identify or make contact with any member of that committee, which seems to have disbanded at an unknown date though its markers in Connecticut are still maintained.

[67] The "Rochambeau. A Reenactment of His Historic March from Newport to Yorktown" project was sponsored by the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation and directed by the Office of the Adjutant General of the state. The writer is grateful to Roy P. Najecki for sharing his folder of press releases and marching orders relative to that march. There also seems to have been some support in France for such a project: see the attached page from the *Revue economique française* Vol. 104, No. 2, (1982).

[68] Images of some of these markers are at http://xenophongroup.com/mcjoynt/vawrrmrk.htm

Almost twenty years passed before another effort to identify, mark and protect the route began in Connecticut. In 1995, the Inter-Community Historic Resources Committee began its work of identifying and classifying known campsites according to their state of preservation and the danger of potentially destructive development. The Committee set itself the goal in October 1995 of having Rochambeau's route, already recognized as the "Washington-Rochambeau Historic Route" by the United States Congress, listed in the National Register of Historic Places as the "Revolutionary Road". Concurrently it asked State Representative Pamela Z. Sawyer to introduce legislation in the General Assembly to allocate the funds for the historical, archeological, and architectural research required for that registration. After three years, and with the help of 26 co-signers, the state legislature in the Spring of 1998 appropriated $ 30,000 for the first of three annual phases to document the route through Connecticut as the first step toward having the entire route from Newport to Yorktown listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Concurrently in June 1998, a commemorative initiative of the National Park Service began as an effort of Revolutionary War-related parks in its Northeast and Southeast regions to use the 225th anniversary of the American Revolution to enhance public understanding of events from 1775 to 1783. In collaboration with, but organizationally separate from this initiative, almost 50 local and regional historians and historically interested individuals from New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut met at Washington's Headquarters in Newburgh, New York, on 16 December 1999, to organize a Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route committee. Chaired by Dr. Jacques Bossière, the W3R functions as a working committee that is part of a broader initiative to commemorate the 225th Anniversary of the American Revolution. Its goals were, and are, the identification and preservation of the route itself and of historic sites along the route on a state level, and the creation of a National Historic Trail to promote inter-state heritage preservation.

The W3R Committee was soon successful in its lobbying efforts for funding for the national effort. On 3 July 2000, on the doorsteps of the Dean-Webb-Stevens Museum in Wethersfield, CT, site of the historic May 1781 meeting between Washington and Rochambeau, Representative John B. Larson announced that he had introduced on 29 June 2000, what has become the *Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Heritage Act of 2000*. That same day, his bill, entitled "A Bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to complete a resource study of the 600 mile route through Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia, used by George Washington and General Rochambeau during the American Revolutionary War," was referred to the House Committee on Resources. Referred to the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands on 14 August with an executive comment requested from the Department of the Interior, the bill, which by now had attracted 42 co-sponsors, was back on the floor of the House on 23 October where it passed by voice vote at 3:17 p.m.

Received in the Senate on 24 October 2000, where Senators Joseph Liebermann, Christopher Dodd, and eight co-sponsors had introduced an almost identical Senate Resolution 3209 on 17 October 2000, and read twice, it passed without amendment and by Unanimous Consent on 27 October 2000. A message on this Senate action was sent to the House the following day; the bill was presented to President Bill Clinton on 2 November, who signed it on 9 November 2000.[69] President Clinton's signature created Public Law No. 106-473, an "Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to complete a resource study of the 600-mile route through Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia, used by George Washington and General Rochambeau during the American Revolutionary War." Unlike previous legislation, this bill allocated federal funds to the NPS to carry out a feasibility study that began in late 2001.

That study was completed and became available to the public on the internet at http://www.nps.gov/boso/w-r/ on 18 October 2006, just in time for the 225th anniversary of the victory at Yorktown. At the time of this writing (December 2006) printed copies of the study are scheduled to be available in mid-January 2007, when the 30-day public comment period required by law will begin as well.

Preceding the completion of the federally mandated resource study by nearly three months, Representative Maurice D. Hinchey of New York and seven co-sponsors, incl. Rep. Curt Weldon of Pennsylvania, on 26 July 2006, introduced H. R. 5895 "To amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail." Concurrently Senator Joseph I. Lieberman and six co-sponsors (Warner, Biden, Reed, Menendez, Dodd, and Chafee) introduced companion bill S 3737 in the U.S. Senate. The 109th Congress expired in December 2006 without taking action on those bills, but it is hoped that similar bills will be re-introduced when the 110th Congress convenes in January 2007.

Though much remains to be done, Pennsylvania is the sixth of nine states to have completed a resource inventory, furthering the goal of the W3R of gaining national recognition and designation as a National Historic Trail of the routes taken by the Franco-American armies on their march to victory in Yorktown.

[69] Concurrently First Lady and Senator-elect Hilary Rodham Clinton designated the W3R a *Millennium Trail*, making properties along the route eligible for federal TEA-21 funds through each state's Department of Transportation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

From Yorktown's ruins, ranked and still,
Two lines stretch far o'er vale and hill:
Who curbs his steed at head of one?
Hark! The low murmur: WASHINGTON!
Who bends his keen approving glance
Where down the gorgeous line of France
Shine knightly star and plume of snow?
Thou too art victor, ROCHAMBEAU!
John Greenleaf Whittier

5.1 France and Great Britain on the Eve of American Independence

On 6 February 1778, His Most Christian Majesty Louis XVI, By the Grace of God, King of France and Navarre, absolutist ruler *par excellence*, whose right to rule rested on his position as representative of God on earth and whose theory of government knew but subjects, not citizens, entered into an alliance with the self-proclaimed United States of America, an entity that was in a state of rebellion against fellow monarch George III, By the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland. Absolutist France backed and bankrolled a government that justified its existence by claiming to "derive[d] its just powers from the consent of the governed," which proclaimed the seditious idea that "all men are created equal," and which endeavored to turn subjects into citizens by endowing them with "certain unalienable rights" such as "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In retrospect it is hard to imagine two allies more diverse than France and the United States in 1778. What formed the basis of their alliance, and what held it together, were not shared ideologies and ideals, nor common territorial or financial interests. France came to the assistance of a bankrupt, reluctant ally, and in the very treaty creating the alliance renounced all territorial gain in the New World. This decision had little to do with any sympathies for the ideology of the revolutionaries. In March 1776, the King told Vergennes how much he "disliked the precedent of one monarchy giving support to a republican insurrection against a legitimate monarchy".[70] A 1783 Memorandum "Motifs de la Guerre" in the Rochambeau papers[71] with annotations in the hand of Naval Minister de Castries

[70] Quoted in General Fonteneau, "La période française de la guerre d'Indépendance (1776-1780)" *Revue historique des armées* Vol. 3, No. 4, (1976), pp. 47-77, p. 48.

[71] Rochambeau Papers, GEN MSS 308, Box 1, folder 39, Beinecke Library, Yale University.

A book published by the *Association des Amis du Musée de la Marine* on the occasion of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution even carries one of these goals in its title. See Jacques Vichot, *La guerre pour la liberté des mers, 1778-1783* (Paris, 1976).

lists these three reasons for French involvement in the war. "L'Amérique, en prenant les armes, a voulu acquerir l'indépendence: la france a fait la guerre pour l'assurer cette indépendance pour assurer la Liberté des mers, et pour parvenir affaiblier la puissance angloise - taking up arms, America wanted to achieve independence: France fought the war to assure that independence, to assure the liberty of the seas, and to attain the weakening of English power." French policy, in other words, was guided by that long-standing principle of international relations, which postulated that peace in Europe and the world was best preserved by a more or less equitable balance of the great powers.

The Peace of Paris of 1763 had altered that balance of powers in favor of Britain and France's chief minister determined that the most effective way to restore the equilibrium was to confront Britain in her American colonies. For such a foreign policy France could count on the benevolent neutrality if not tacit support of her European neighbors. They too wanted to see British influence diminished though they would never consent to the equally undesirable prospect of crippling Britain to a degree where she would no longer be able to play her part in the European concert. It was for this goal that France spent over 1 billion livres between 1775 and 1783, it was for this goal that the *fleurs-de-lis* flew on the ramparts of Yorktown, and it was for this goal that His Most Christian Majesty threw all ideological considerations overboard, and provided the United States with the military and financial support she needed to win her independence.

The American Revolutionary War was both the last traditional war of cabinets as well as the first modern popular conflict in a century characterized by almost continuous warfare. From the War of the League of Augsburg, known as King William's War in the colonies in 1689 to the French Revolutionary Wars in the 1790s, Europe witnessed barely a dozen years of peace. In all of these wars, Great Britain and France fought on opposite sides. During the first half of the century, the Bourbon kings in Versailles were able to hold their ground against the Hanoverian kings in London, but the Seven Year's War from 1756 to 1763, appropriately known as the *French and Indian War* on this side of the Atlantic, ended in disaster. In the (First) Peace of Paris, France lost virtually all her possessions in India and in the New World, where Canada became British and Louisiana was given to Spain. All that was left of France's erstwhile globe-circling empire were the sugar islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe and the fever-infested swamps of Cayenne and French Guyana.

But there was some posturing behind France's ostentatious anger as well. Much as it may have hurt French pride, Étienne François, *duc* de Choiseul-Stainville, her chief minister during negotiations in 1762, had almost insisted that Canada be given to Britain. Despite the misgivings of many of his colleagues and popular opinion at home, which clamored for the retention of Canada, Choiseul realized that giving up the colony would free his foreign policy in the New World. His adversary Lord Bedford, the chief British negotiator, anticipated Choiseul's fondest dreams when he saw an alarming mirage emerge across the Atlantic. He

wondered "whether the neighborhood of the French to our North American colonies was not the greatest security for their dependence on the mother country, which I feel will be slighted by them when their apprehension of the French is removed."[72] Bedford's worst fears soon became reality.

The loss of Canada had freed France's hands in the New World, and in the years after 1763 she kept a close watch on developments on America's Eastern seashore, where British policies created just the political climate she hoped for. French foreign policy after 1763, set itself three goals. First she had to try and isolate Great Britain on the continent. This task was made easier by Russia's war with the Sultan in Constantinople from 1768 to 1774, by Austria's continued attempts throughout the 1770s to trade Bavaria from the Wittelsbachs for the Netherlands, and by Prussia's considerable animosity with Great Britain for abandoning her continental ally in 1761, once Britain had achieved her war aims overseas. The second task had to be the strengthening of King Carlos III on the throne of Spain and of the Bourbon Family Pact of 1761, between the ruling houses in Paris and Madrid. As collateral, Paris needed to keep colonial tensions between Madrid and London simmering, especially over Florida, which had been given to Great Britain in 1763. Lastly she had to avoid all continental entanglements that could infringe upon her ability to wage war against Great Britain whenever and wherever the opportunity arose.

In February 1762, a full year before the (First) Treaty of Paris was signed, Choiseul declared that after the end of that war, he would pursue "only one foreign policy, a fraternal union with Spain; only one policy for war, and that is England."[73] Versailles was convinced that the most effective way to hurt Great Britain and her trade, which was the foundation of her wealth, was through the separation of her American colonies. This would severely weaken British trade and sea power and to a corresponding increase in the relative strength of France. British policy versus her colonies, combined with the free hand France had gained with the cession of Canada, would give her the opportunity to achieve these goals.[74]

The Seven Years' War had not only brought huge territorial gains for Great Britain; it had also resulted in some £137 million of debt. Interest on the debt amounted to £5 million annually, more than half the governmental revenues of some £8 million. Parliament in London wanted the colonies to help pay for these

---

[72] In W. J. Eccles, "The French Alliance and the American Victory" in: *The World Turned Upside Down. The American Victory in the War of Independence* John Ferling, ed., (Westport, 1976), pp. 147-163, p. 148.

[73] Ibid. See also the article by John Singh, "Plans de Guerre français 1763-1770". *Revue historique des Armées* vol. 3 No. 4 (1976), pp. 7-22. In a 1765 *Mémoire sur les forces de mer et de terre de la France et l'usage qu'en pouvait en faire en cas d'une guerre avec l'Angleterre* for Louis XV, Choiseul described the purpose of the war as "de se venger de l'Angleterre." Quoted ibid., p. 15.

[74] The best introduction into this issue can be found in W.J. Eccles, *France in America* (New York, 1972).

debts and asked them to defray one third of the cost of maintaining 10,000 redcoats in the New World. In 1764, Prime Minister Sir George Grenville received the House of Common's approval to place import duties on lumber, foodstuffs, molasses, and rum in the colonies. The Sugar Act of 1764 was immensely unpopular in the New World and hostility increased even more when the Quartering Act of 1765 required colonists to provide food and quarters for British troops. Hard on its heels came the 1765 Stamp Act, probably the most infamous law concerning the colonies ever passed by a British Parliament. Vehement opposition forced the Commons to repeal the act in March 1766. To make up for the lost revenue, the Townshend Acts of 1767 levied new taxes on glass, painter's lead, paper, and tea.

Relations with the motherland had barely been smoothed over when long-standing military-civilian tensions in Boston erupted on 5 March 1770, when British troops fired into a mob.[75] The infamous *Boston Massacre* killed five people, including Crispus Attucks. In the Fall of 1773, tensions flared up again in Boston and all along the coast when East India Company tea ships were turned back at Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. A cargo ship was burned at Annapolis on 14 October and another ship had its cargo thrown overboard, once again, in Boston at the *Boston Tea Party* on 16 December 1773, to protest the new tax on tea. Parliament responded with what the colonists called the "Intolerable Acts" of 1774, which curtailed Massachusetts' self-rule and barred the use of Boston harbor until the tea was paid for.

Of equal, if not greater importance for the rapid deterioration of British-Colonial relations was the Quebec Act of 1774. This act not only granted Roman Catholics in Canada the freedom to practice their religion, more importantly, it placed all lands between the Great Lakes and the Ohio River under the administration of the governor of formerly French Quebec. With that decision, the House of Commons seemed to have closed off forever all chances of continued westward expansion. Until ten years earlier, the French had stood in the way of land-hungry colonists, now Parliament in London had assumed that role. When the First Continental Congress convened, after ten years of conflict with the crown, in Carpenters' Hall in Philadelphia on 5 September 1774, Great Britain had become the antagonist for expansion-minded colonists, who in ever larger numbers saw independence as a potentially viable option.

5.2 French Aid Prior to the Alliance of 1778

The war Choiseul had foreseen was about to break out. France was prepared militarily and politically. Ever since the Peace of Paris, Choiseul and his successor Charles Gravier, the *comte* de Vergennes, who replaced Choiseul as

[75] See Douglas Edward Leach, *Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763* (Chapel Hill, 1986). For the period following see John Shy, *Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution* (Princeton, 1965).

foreign minister in 1774, had embarked on an ambitious naval build-up. It called for a fleet of 80 ships of the line and 47 frigates, almost twice the 47 ships of the line in French service in 1763. Helped by an enthusiastic response from provincial estates and the generosity of municipalities such as Paris, the French navy grew to 64 ships of the line, mostly of 74 guns, plus 50 frigates in 1770.[76] In 1765, Choiseul issued the first major new navy regulations since 1689, retired numerous incompetent officers, emphasized training, and the following year re-established the navy as an independent service within France's armed forces. Gabriel de Sartines, Choiseul's successor as navy minister (1774-1780), continued these programs. When France entered the war in 1778, her order of battle listed 52 ships of the line of at least 50 guns (plus 60 frigates) with total crew strength of about 1,250 officers and 75,000 men. They were arrayed against Britain's 66 ships of the line, and there was hope that Spain would join in the fight, adding another 58 fighting ships to the French side of the equation. Parity with Great Britain had been achieved; since she had to keep some 20 ships of the line close to home to counter the threat of French raids, naval superiority in select theatres of war such as the Caribbean had become a possibility.[77]

The defeats of the Seven Years' War, particularly at Rossbach in 1757, had also laid painfully bare the inefficiency of the French army, which was "still basically functioning as in the days of Louis XIV."[78] Beginning in 1762, Choiseul's ministry carried out long-overdue reforms. At long last all infantry regiments were organized in a single pattern, equipment and training were standardized and recruiting was centralized. The *Maréchal* de Saxe's dream of the 1740s that some day the French army would march in step was coming true. The artillery was re-organized along the ideas of General Jean Baptiste de Gribeauval, and the cavalry got its first riding school.

Reforms were pushed further in 1774, when Louis XVI succeeded to the throne of France. The *comte* de Saint-Germain, Louis XVI's Minister of War, forbade the sale of officers' commissions, retired some 865 of over 900 colonels

---

[76] On Vergennes' foreign policy, which closely followed Choiseul's goal of trying to fight the war against England overseas rather than on the European continent, see Jean-François Labourdette, "Vergennes et la Cour." *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* vol. 101 Nos. 3-4 (1987), pp. 289-321; Orville T. Murphy, "The View From Versailles. Charles Gravier Comte de Vergennes' Perceptions of the American Revolution". In: Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert, eds. *Diplomacy and Revolution. The Franco-American Alliance of 1778.* (Charlottesville, 1978), pp. 107-149, and the still useful article by René Pinon, "Louis XVI, Vergennes et la Grande Lutte contre l'Angleterre". *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* vol. 43 (1929), pp. 37-64.

[77] By far the best account of the French navy is Jonathan R. Dull, *The French Navy and American Independence: A Study of Arms and Diplomacy, 1774-1787* (Princeton, 1975); annual lists of capital ships on pp. 351-378. At Yorktown in 1781, France enjoyed that temporary superiority that Choiseul had hoped for long enough to decide the outcome of the war.

[78] A good introduction with superb illustrations is René Chartrand and Francis Back, *The French Army in the American War of Independence* (London, 1991), pp. 6-14; the quote is taken from page 6, the regimental organization from p. 9. Additional information is in Samuel F. Scott, *The Response of the Royal Army to the French Revolution. The Role and Development of the Line Army 1787-93* (Oxford, 1978).

in the army and eventually abolished the King's Guards, including the Horse Grenadiers and the famous Musketeers, as too expensive. In March/April of 1776, all but a handful of regiments were reduced to two battalions; regiments with four battalions saw their 2nd and 4th battalions transformed into new regiments. The most famous of these newly created units is undoubtedly the *Gâtinais*, created from the *Auvergne*, whose grenadiers and chasseurs stormed Redoubt No. 9 before Yorktown in 1781. Concurrently St. Germain also reduced the number of companies per battalion from nine to six and used the savings in officers' salaries to add personnel to each company.

The concept of a regiment consisting of two battalions of five companies each, as set up in the *ordonnance* of 25 March 1776 was further clarified on 1 June 1776. It set the strength of an infantry regiment at two battalions of five companies each and an auxiliary company of variable strength. Each regiment had one grenadier company consisting of 6 officers, 14 non-commissioned officers, 1 *cadet gentilhomme*, 1 surgeon's assistant, 84 grenadiers and 2 drummers for a total of 6 officers and 102 men. Besides the grenadiers stood one of the newly created *chasseur* or light infantry companies and four companies of fusiliers. The authorized strength of those companies stood at 6 officers, 17 NCOs, 1 *cadet gentilhomme*, 1 surgeon's assistant, 116 *chasseurs* (or fusiliers) and 2 drummers for a total of 6 officers and 137 men. A regimental staff of twelve, i.e. the Colonel, the Second Colonel, 1 Lieutenant Colonel, 1 Major, 1 Quarter-Master Treasurer, 2 Ensigns, 1 Adjutant, 1 Surgeon-Major, 1 Chaplain, 1 Drum-Major, and 1 Armourer. By the Spring of 1780, subsequent *ordonnances* had set the authorized strength of a regiment at 67 officers and 1,148 men (excluding the auxiliary company), which for bookkeeping purposes was fixed at 1,003 men for French, and 1,004 men for foreign, infantry. [79]

When France decided to provide aid to the American colonies in 1775, the paper strength of her land forces amounted to some 140,000 men, though the actual strength was probably 8,000-10,000 men below that number.[80] Of these, some 77,500 served in one of the 79 French line regiments, about 12,000 in one of the eight German, three Irish, the *Royal Corse* and the *Royal Italien* regiments, and 12,000 served in one of the eleven regiments of Swiss infantry.[81] The royal household troops, including one regiment each of French and Swiss Guards, were authorized at almost 9,000 men. Almost 6,000 served in the artillery; the cavalry added about 22,000 men and the Light Troops about 3,500. The Ministry of the Navy had its own establishment of about 100 companies of Marines, six regiments of Colonial infantry, and several battalions of Sepoys in India. About

[79] Including the two *portes-drapeaux* (flag-bearers) and the *quartier-maître trésorier* (pay/quarter master). The strength of a regiment is that given by Kennett, *French forces*, p. 22.
[80] Scott, *Response*, pp. 217-222. The British army worldwide numbered 45,000 officers and men in 1775, 8,500 of whom were stationed in North America. See Dull, *French navy*, p. 346.
[81] Michel Pétard, "Les Étrangers au service de la France (1786)" *Tradition* Vol. 32, (September 1989), pp. 21-29.

50,000 militia and another 41,000 men in the Coast Guard provided a reserve that could be mobilized for the defense of the kingdom in France proper.[82]

During these same years, the army budget increased from 91.9 million livers in 1766, to 93.5 million in 1775. The relatively small increase in expenditures hides the real significance of the changes that took place within the French army during those years. The armed forces of 1775 had been thoroughly streamlined, and the funds available were spent much more efficiently. Through the reduction in strength of unreliable, but costly, elements such as the militia, detached companies, and separate recruit units, the paper strength of the armed forces had declined from roughly 290,000 to 240,000 men. Within the regular army, the guards had remained virtually unchanged and the foot contingent declined by 5,000 through the abolition of units such as the *Grenadiers de France* in 1771. A decrease in the number of foreign infantry, which cost the crown 368 livres per year as opposed to 230 livres for a French soldier, freed additional funds which were used to increase the number of French infantry, of mounted units from 25,000 to nearly 46,000, and of light troops.[83] The introduction of the Model 1777 *Charleville* musket, a .69 caliber weapon that was lighter, stronger and more reliable than the .75 caliber Land Pattern muskets known as "Brown Bess" used by the British, completed these reforms.[84]

The same holds true for the artillery. After 1765, it consisted of seven regiments named after the community in which they were stationed. In November 1776, each regiment was divided into two battalions of ten companies each: fourteen of gunners, four bombardiers, and two sappers. Each company consisted of four officers and 71 other ranks. Unattached were nine companies of sappers and six companies of miners for a total of 909 officers and 11,805 men authorized strength in the Royal Artillery, well above its actual strength of almost 6,000 men. However, though technically most advanced branch of the French military, the artillery always had problems keeping its ranks filled. But what it lacked in numbers it made up in quality: contemporaries considered the French artillery second to none, a well-deserved reputation as Cornwallis discovered at Yorktown.

These reforms, necessary as they were, brought St. Germain numerous and powerful enemies in the officer corps, but it was the introduction of a new and universally hated Prussian-style uniform in 1776, that caused his downfall in

[82] Claude C. Sturgill, "Money for the Bourbon Army in the Eighteenth Century: The State within the State" *War and Society* Vol. 4, No. 2, (September 1986), pp. 17-30, p. 29, sets the total budgeted strength of the French army at 239,473 officers and men in 1775. This number does not include naval troops.

[83] Ibid., p. 22. In the 1740s a French soldier had cost 122 livres per year to maintain, a soldier in one of the Foreign regiments between 160 and 170 livres.

[84] On French arms manufacture see the excellent article by Jean Langlet, "Les Ingénieurs de l'École Royale du Génie de Mézières et les Armes de la Manufacture de Charleville dans la Guerre d'Indépendance Américaine". *Revue historique Ardennaise* vol. 34 (1999-2000), pp. 197-217.

1777, and replacement by the Prince de Montbarey (minister until 1780).[85] By then, the French navy, infantry, cavalry, and artillery had been transformed into well-trained, efficient, and well-equipped organizations ready to take on the British foe once again. The fleet that Admiral de Grasse arrayed at the mouth of the York River in September 1781, and the troops that General Rochambeau would take to America and to victory at Yorktown, had little in common with the French army that had suffered defeat after defeat at the hands of Frederick the Great and the British between 1756 and 1763.

While politicians and administrators in Versailles were preparing for the impending war, they also kept a close watch on American developments. As early as 1767, Choiseul had dispatched the German-born self-styled Baron Major-General Jean de Kalb on a secret fact-finding mission to the British colonies and his successor Vergennes followed this policy. Throughout the late 1760s and early 1770s, the French crown repeatedly sent agents to British America in order to keep informed of developments in the lower thirteen colonies.[86]

Vergennes was well aware of the tense situation along America's eastern seashore when the First Continental Congress adjourned in October 1774, with an appeal to King George III to help restore harmony between Britain and the colonies. They also knew that the Congress had called on the colonies to boycott trade with Britain. As the tense winter months of 1774-1775, turned to spring, it became only a question of time until civil disobedience would erupt into open violence. That moment arrived in mid-April 1775, when patriots alerted by Paul Revere, William Dawes, and Samuel Prescott attacked British troops at Lexington and Concord on 19 April. On 10 May, the day the Second Continental Congress opened its debates, Colonels Ethan Allen and Benedict Arnold captured Fort Ticonderoga in upstate New York. Next colonials headed for Bunker Hill near Boston, where they repulsed British redcoats under General William Howe twice before retreating on 17 June 1775. Two days earlier Congress had appointed General George Washington Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army.

The colonies were at war, and France stepped in to aid the rebellious colonies against the British motherland. America reached out, and France responded. From mid-March to early April 1775, a secret plan to aid the Americans was

[85] The Prussian-style uniform of 1776 was not officially replaced until February 1779. Since uniforms were replaced in three-years cycles with one third of a regiment receiving new uniforms each year, and since many units ignored the changes and kept using non-regulation equipment, Rochambeau's troops, even within individual regiments, wore a mix of at least two, if not three, different uniform patterns -- not to mentioned non-regulation uniform pieces. The *ordonnance* of 1776 had abolished the beloved bear-skin miters of the grenadiers but the order was widely ignored: in 1781, the grenadiers of the Saintonge are reported to have worn their mitres as they marched through Philadelphia.

[86] See Jonathan R. Dull, *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution* (New Haven, 1985), pp. 63. On the German-born Kalb see A. E. Sucker, *General de Kale, Lafayette's Mentor* (Chapel Hill, 1966), pp. 59-79. Some of his reports are published *in Collection de Manuscrits contenant Lettres, Mémoires, et Autres Documents historiques relatifs a la Nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1885), vol. 4, pp. 315-334.

drawn up in Versailles. When news of Lexington and Concord reached Paris, the government of His Most Christian Majesty, despite all ideological differences, became the first foreign power to provide aid and support to the fledgling United States. In September 1775, Vergennes' emissary Julien-Alexandre Achard de Bonvouloir arrived in Philadelphia to establish semi-official relations and to encourage the Americans in their rebellion. Concurrently Silas Deane arrived in Paris as Congress' commercial agent and covert representative. Deane had been instructed to buy clothes, arms, and ammunition for 25,000 men, and to negotiate treaties of alliance and commerce with the French.

To supplement Deane's efforts, Vergennes co-opted the playwright Pierre Augustin Caron de Beaumarchais, author of *The Barber of Seville*, into his service.[87] As early as the Fall of 1775, Beaumarchais had approached Vergennes with a plan to support the American rebels. In January 1776, Vergennes submitted the proposal to King Louis XVI, informing him that the plan was "not so much to terminate the war between America and England, as to sustain and keep it alive to the detriment of the English, our natural and pronounce enemies."[88] After some hesitation - in March Louis XVI told Vergennes that he "disliked the precedent of one monarchy giving support to a republican insurrection against a legitimate monarchy" -- the king eventually agreed to let Beaumarchais act as the secret agent of the crown.[89] In April 1776, substantial military supplies were made available to Beaumarchais, who set up the trading company of Roderigue Hortalez & Co. as a front to channel aid to the Americans. In June, Louis XVI granted Beaumarchais, i.e., the American rebels, a loan of 1 million livres.[90] Spain added another million in August.[91] With this covert backing and financial support of the Spanish and French governments, Beaumarchais' ships carried much-needed supplies to the Americans, frequently via the tiny Dutch island of St. Eustatius in the Caribbean.[92]

When news of the disaster at Long Island and the occupation of New York by troops under Sir William Howe in September reached Europe in late 1776,

---

[87] Claude Van Tyne, "French Aid before the Alliance of 1778" *American Historical Review* Vol. 31, (1925), pp. 20-40.

[88] Quoted in "Beaumarchais, Pierre-Augustin Caron de (1732-1799)" in: *The American Revolution 1775-1783. An Encyclopedia* Richard L. Blanco, ed., 2 vols., (New York, 1993), Vol. 1, p. 107.

[89] Quoted in General Fonteneau, "La période française de la guerre d'Indépendance (1776-1780)" *Revue historique des armées* Vol. 3, No. 4, (1976), pp. 47-77, p. 48.

[90] On French expenditures see Robert D. Harris, "French Finances and the American War, 1777-1783" *Journal of Modern History* Vol. 48, (June 1976), pp. 233-258, and Claude C. Sturgill, "Observations of the French War Budget 1781-1790" *Military Affairs* Vol. 48, (October 1984), pp. 180-187.

[91] The best books on the subject are Buchanan Parker Thomson, *Spain: Forgotten Ally of the American Revolution* (North Quincy, 1976) with an overview of Spanish expenditures in support of the American rebels during the war on pp. 241-248, and Thomas A. Chávez, *Spain and the Independence of the United States. An Intrinsic Gift* (Albuquerque, 2002).

[92] See J. Franklin Jameson, "St. Eustatius in the American Revolution" *American Historical Review* Vol. 8, No. 3, (July 1903), pp. 683-708. For more recent literature see Robert A. Selig, "The French Capture of St. Eustatius, 26 November 1781" *The Journal of Caribbean History* Vol. 27, No. 2, (1993), pp. 129-143.

Versailles feared that Britain might succeed in snuffing out the rebellion. France and Spain stepped up their support. A royal order forwarded by Jose de Galvez, Minister of the Indies, to Luis de Unzaga, Spanish Governor of Louisiana, of 24 December 1776,[93] informed Unzaga that he would soon "be receiving through the Havana and other means that may be possible, the weapons, munitions, clothes and quinine which the English colonists (i.e., Americans) ask and the most sagacious and secretive means will be established by you in order that you may supply these secretly with the appearance of selling them to private merchants." Concurrently Galvez informed Diego Jose Navarro, governor of Cuba, that he would soon "receive various items, weapons and other supplies" which he was to forward to Unzaga together with "the surplus powder available" in Havana and "whatever muskets might be in that same Plaza in the certainty that they will be quickly replaced."

When Congress compiled its instructions to Arthur Lee and Benjamin Franklin, who were about to join Deane in France, in September 1776, it stated its needs in quite unusual candor. "As the Scarcity of Arms, Artillery and other military Stores is so considerable in the United States, you will solicit the Court of France for on immediate Supply of twenty or thirty thousand Muskets and Bayonets, and a large Supply of Ammunition and brass Field Pieces, to be sent under Convoy by France. The United States will engage for the Payment of the Arms, Artillery and Ammunition, and to indemnify France for the Expense of the Convoy." If possible, they were to "Engage a few good Engineers in the Service of the United States".[94] France met America's requests and by September of 1777, had dispatched clothing for 30,000 men, 4,000 tents, 30,000 muskets with bayonets, over 100 tons of gunpowder, 216 (mostly 4-pound) cannons and gun carriages, 27 mortars, almost 13,000 shells and 50,000+ round shot.[95]

The last sentence in Lee's and Franklin's 1776 instructions points to another deficiency in the American military establishment: the Continental Army was desperately short of experts to work some of the sophisticated material provided by France, though there was no lack of applicants from all over Europe! As soon as Benjamin Franklin arrived in Paris in late December 1776, he soon found himself flooded with requests for employment in the Continental Army.[96] Deane had already entered into contracts with some twenty-seven (mostly French)

---

[93] Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid, Estado Legajo 4224.

[94] Congress' instructions for Franklin of 24 September 1776, are published in William B. Willcox, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Volume 22 March 23,1775, through October 27, 1776* (New Haven and London, 1982), pp. 625-630, the quote is on pages 627-628.

[95] Langlet, "Charleville", p. 200, estimates that over 100,000 muskets and pistols were sent to America.

[96] Before the war was over, Franklin received 415 applications for employment in the Continental Army; 312 applicants were French, the remainder came from all across Europe. See Catherine M. Prelinger, "Less Lucky than LaFayette: A Note on the French Applicants to Benjamin Franklin for Commissions in the American Army, 1776-1785" *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* Vol. 4, (1976), pp. 263-270, p. 263. Deane's tendency to mix personal and public business for personal gain while serving as Congress' agent only added to the confusion and led to his recall in 1778.

officers, among them the *marquis* de LaFayette and fourteen additional officers, including the Baron de Kalb, who accompanied LaFayette to America on the *Victoire*. But he had also granted to Philippe Jean-Baptiste Tronson du Coudray, gifted, but exceedingly vain artillery major, permission to recruit forty more officers on his own. The pressing need for experts, inexperience, and difficulties of communication led to numerous embarrassments. Deane had promised Coudray a commission as major general and command of artillery and engineers in the Continental Army: Henry Knox' and Presle du Portail's positions! Coudray's death by drowning at the Schuylkill Ferry in September 1777, saved Congress from this embarrassment, and caused Lafayette to comment that "the loss of this quarrelsome spirit was probably a fortunate accident."[97]

Congress had a lot to learn, but it learned quickly. Once those start-up problems were overcome, Franco-American relations proceeded considerably more smoothly. Of the ten ships dispatched by Beaumarchais and that reached American shores between March and November 1777, only one ran into trouble with the British and had to be blown up with its thousands of pounds of gunpowder by the captain. The vast majority of the almost 100 foreign volunteers either hired by Deane, Lee, or Franklin with the tacit consent of the French crown for the express purpose of serving in America, whether they traveled on ships owned by Beaumarchais or whether they came on their own, whether they were French like the *marquis* de Lafayette, Presle du Portail or Pierre l'Enfant, Polish like Taduesz Kosciuszko or Casimir Pulaski or German-speaking like Barons Steuben or de Kalb all brought much-needed expertise to the Continental Army, served faithfully and sometimes even laid down their lives for America's freedom.

The Continental Army put Beaumarchais' supplies to good use. The defeat of General Johnny Burgoyne and his army on 17 October 1777, by General Horatio Gates at Saratoga, was a major turning point in the American Revolutionary War. It was won by American soldiers, even if 90 per cent of the gunpowder used had been supplied by and paid for by France, and was used in the French model of 1763-1766 pattern muskets, which had become standard in the Continental Army. The victory at Saratoga proved to the French that the American rebellion could be sustained with a possibility of success. News of Burgoyne's capitulation reached Paris in the evening of 4 December 1777; on 17 December 1777, Vergennes promised to recognize the independence of the Thirteen Colonies, with or without Spanish support. On 30 January 1778, the king authorized the *Secrétaire du Conseil d'Etat* Conrad Alexandre Gérard to sign the Treaty of Amity and Commerce and a secret Treaty of Alliance on his behalf. On 6 February 1778, Gérard carried out the order and Deane, Franklin, and Lee signed for the United States. By these treaties, France offered "to maintain … the liberty, sovereignty, and independence" of the United States in case of war between her and Great Britain. France promised to fight on until the independence of the United States

[97] Gilbert Bodinier, *Dictionnaire des officiers de l'armée royale qui ont combattu aux Etats-Unis pendant la guerre d'Indépendance* (Château de Vincennes, 1982); the Lafayette quote on p. 464. Biographies can also be found in Blanco, *Encyclopedia*, passim; Coudray in vol. 1, pp. 405-406.

was guaranteed in a peace treaty. The United States promised not to "conclude either truce or peace with Great Britain without the formal consent of the other first obtained".[98]

On 13 March 1778, His Most Christian Majesty officially informed the Court of St. James of this decision. A week later, the three Americans were introduced to the king as *Ambassadors of the Thirteen United Provinces*, while Gérard in turn was appointed French resident at Congress in Philadelphia. Copies of the treaties reached Congress in early May, which ratified them unanimously and without debate and ordered them published without waiting for the French government to ratify the treaties as well.[99]

A treaty of military alliance is not a declaration of war: but both sides understood it as such. Upon hearing the news, the Court of St. James on 15 March 1778 recalled its ambassador from France, which in turn expelled the British commissioners at Dunquerque. In early June, British ships chased the French frigate *Belle Poule* off the coast of Normandy. The *Belle Poule* held her ground and limped, badly damaged and with half of her crew dead or wounded, into Brest. Louis XVI responded by ordering his navy on 10 July 1778 to give chase to Royal Navy vessels.

5.3 The Failed Invasion of 1779 and the Decision to send Troops to America

The war France had expected since 1763 was on.[100] Choiseul had always wanted to fight it overseas, and Vergennes continued this policy. Even before the *Belle-Poule* affair, Vergennes had sent Admiral d'Estaing with 17 ships of the line, 6,200 naval personnel and 4,000 infantry to the Caribbean, where they arrived in July 1778. But the first two years of military cooperation did not go well. The siege of Newport in August 1778 ended in failure. So did the siege of Savannah in September and October 1779, which had been taken by British troops under Henry Clinton in December 1778. Once d'Estaing had raised the siege, British troops began the invasion of South Carolina where Charleston fell in May 1780.

---

[98] Ruth Strong Hudson, "The French Treaty of Alliance, Signed on February 6, 1778" *The American Society Legion of Honor Magazine* Vol. 49, No. 2, (1978), pp. 121-136. For the text of these treaties see the *Documents* section attached to this report.

[99] Alexander DeConde, "The French Alliance in Historical Speculation" in: *Diplomacy and Revolution. The Franco-American Alliance of 1778* Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert, eds., (Charlottesville, 1981), pp. 1-38. Accompanied by Deane, Gerard reached Philadelphia in July 1778. From Rehoboth, William Vernon of Newport enthusiastically welcome the alliance and wrote to Samuel Vernon on 21 May 1778, "The News from France is grand, more then we cou'd expect, beyond our most sanguine expectations and hope we shall improve the present moment." Newport Historical Society, Vernon Papers, Box 49, folder 5.

[100] Spain hesitated until April 1779 to enter the war against Great Britain in the Convention of Aranjuez, while Great Britain herself declared war on the Netherlands in November 1780. An *Acte Royale* of 5 April 1779, set 17 June 1778, as the official date for the beginning of hostilities between France and Britain.

The apparent inability of French forces "to make a difference" in the war severely strained the alliance. But the criticism was quite undeserved: without massive French aid the Continental Army would probably not have continued to exist. France had been active in Europe as well. In February 1778, already, she had begun to concentrate troops on the Channel coast for a possible invasion of the British Isles. By 30 June, 28 battalions of infantry, some 14,000 officers and men, 10 escadrons of cavalry and 25 companies of artillery were concentrated in the Le Havre, Cherbourg, Brest and coastal areas. By the end of the year, the numbers had almost tripled to 71 battalions, and more troops were arriving daily. By late Spring 1779, 2,608 officers, 31,963 men, 4,918 *domestiques*, 1,818 horses plus large amounts of artillery, one quarter of France's armed might, was waiting near Le Havre to board almost 500 transports to take them to the Isle of Wight.[101]

The interests of Spain, which had entered the war in April 1779, and whose interests lay in fighting Britain in Europe, Gibraltar, Minorca, and Portugal, not overseas, had largely dictated this policy. But Spain was not ready for war against Britain. French naval forces under 69-year-old Admiral d'Orvilliers spent valuable weeks in June and July cruising at the southern entrance of the British Channel, waiting for the Spanish fleet to arrive. The rendezvous for the two fleets had been set for 15 May. When the French and Spanish fleets finally joined up in the last days of July, smallpox was sweeping through the French fleet. D'Orvilliers had already lost 140 sailors, some 600 were in Spanish hospitals, and another 1,800 sick were on board his ships. On 15 August the combined fleets turned into the Channel only to be driven out by a violent storm. The next day d'Orvilliers received instructions that the place of attack for French land forces had been changed to the coast of Cornwall. First, however, he had to find and defeat the Royal Navy to gain control of the channel. On 25 August his lookouts reported the British fleet: 34 ships of the line, 8 frigates, and 20 smaller vessels carrying 26,000 sailors and 3,260 cannon commanded by Admiral Sir Thomas Hardy. The combined Franco-Spanish fleet consisted of 66 ships of the line, 12 frigates, and 16 smaller vessels. D'Orvilliers wanted to give battle out on the Atlantic, but Hardy stayed close to his homeports. Dangerously low on supplies, d'Orvilliers in the first days of September received with relief the order to return to Brest where he disembarked some 8,000 sick sailors. The campaign of 1779 was over. It had cost France the lives of hundreds of sailors and millions of livres with nothing to show for it. In October Montbarey called off the campaign. In November the army moved into winter quarters.[102]

Though they believed that there was a possibility of success, neither Louis XVI nor Vergennes had placed all their hopes on the successful invasion of Britain. The project went against decades of planning that had always assumed

[101] See also Marcus de la Poer Beresford, "Ireland in French Strategy during the American War of Independence 1776-1783" *The Irish Sword* Vol. 12, (1976), pp. 285-297 and Vol. 13, (1977), pp. 20-29.
[102] All numbers from Fonteneau, "La période française", pp. 79-85.

that the war would be fought in America. Now that the project had failed, the voices in favor of fighting England in her colonies grew stronger again. The first suggestions of such an operation had surfaced in late 1777 as France was contemplating the recognition of the United States. That proposal had not been pursued, but now a most important voice was clamoring for just such an expedition: that of the Marquis de Lafayette, who had returned to France in the Spring of 1779. It may well have been at Lafayette's urging that Franklin addressed his memorandum to Vergennes in February 1779, suggesting the dispatch of a corps of 4,000 soldiers to America.[103] In July, Vergennes asked Lafayette for a detailed memorandum on the feasibility of such an expedition, and ordered an internal study. When Admiral d'Estaing limped into Brest with his battered flagship the *Languedoc* in early December, the matter took on additional urgency. Louis XVI and his chief ministers feared that unless the new year would bring at least one case of successful Franco-American cooperation, the colonists might make peace with Britain, leaving France to continue the war by herself.

5.4 Rochambeau and the Troops of the *expédition particulière*

The decisive shift in favor of sending troops to America came in January 1780. The possibility of sending ground forces across the Atlantic for stationing on the American mainland had been discussed and rejected as impracticable even before these treaties were signed. Both sides were all too well aware of the historical and cultural obstacles that had grown up during decades of hostilities to assume an unqualified welcoming of French forces in the United States. France had hoped for a short war, but Sir Henry Clinton's successful foray into Georgia and South Carolina, combined with the failed sieges of Newport and Savannah in 1778 and 1779, had dashed all hopes of a quick victory for the Franco-American alliance. In the Fall of 1779, France and America needed a new strategy. The decision in January 1780 to dispatch ground forces formed the core of the new strategy.[104]

Once again Britain's success had worked against her. Up until the Summer of 1779, even Washington had had reservations about French ground forces in America. But on 16 September 1779, French minister the *chevalier* de la Luzerne met with Washington at West Point to discuss strategy for 1780. With an eye toward the deteriorating military situation in the South he wondered "whether in case The Court of France should find it convenient to send directly from France a Squadron and a few Regiments attached to it, to act in conjunction with us in this quarter, it would be agreeable to The United States." Washington's reply as recorded by Alexander Hamilton indicated that "The General thought it would be very advancive of the common Cause."[105] Washington repeated his views in a

[103] See Lee Kennett, *The French Forces in America, 1780-1783* (Westport, 1977), pp. 3-17.
[104] A brief but concise analysis of the context of the decision to send Rochambeau to America is Jonathan R. Dull, "Lafayette, Franklin, And the Coming of Rochambeau's Army". This lecture which Dull presented to the Washington Association in Morristown in 1980 is available electronically at http://njreporter.org.
[105] The letter is on the web at http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/gwhtml/gwhome.html.

letter to the *marquis* de Lafayette of 30 September 1779. In it he informed the *marquis* of his hopes that Lafayette would soon return to America either in his capacity of Major General in the Continental Army or as "an Officer at the head of a Corps of gallant French (if circumstances should require this)".[106] Based on Luzerne's report of the 16 September meeting, and an excerpt of Washington's letter, which Lafayette had sent him on 25 January 1780, Vergennes decided that the time had come when French ground forces were welcome in the New World.

Following Vergennes' recommendation, the king on 2 February approved the plan code-named *expédition particulière*, the transportation across the ocean of a force large enough to decide the outcome of the rebellion in America. Naval forces in the Caribbean would be strengthened and put in a position to support the expeditionary force. In Europe, military action would be confined to diversionary actions, such as the siege of Gibraltar, aimed at binding British forces.

Once the decision to send troops was made, the next questions were 1) who would go, and 2) who would command? Vergennes and his colleagues agreed that the command did not call for brilliance, but for level-headedness, an ability to compromise, and a willingness to cooperate. Harmonious relations with the American ally as well as within the French force were of paramount importance. If the former pointed toward the appointment of the 23-year-old Lafayette, the latter all but ruled it out.[107] Lafayette's recent promotion to colonel in the French army had already ruffled quite a few feathers, and numerous officers made it very clear that they would not serve under the young marquis. In early February, the cabinet appointed Charles Louis d'Arsac chevalier de Ternay, a *chef d'escadre* with 40 years experience, to command the naval forces. For the land forces the choice fell on 55-year-old Jean Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur, *comte* de Rochambeau, a professional soldier with 37 years of experience who was more comfortable in an army camp than in the ballrooms of Versailles, and who had already been selected to command the advance guard in the cancelled invasion of Britain. On 1 March 1780, Louis XVI promoted Rochambeau to lieutenant general and placed him at the head of the expedition.

Both men wasted little time to get ready for the expedition. Ternay had been ordered to find shipping for 6,000 men. Rochambeau spent much of March at Versailles trying to have his force increased, but only succeeded in adding the 2nd battalion of the Auxonne artillery, some 500 men, a few dozen engineers and mineurs,[108] and 600 men from the *Légion de Lauzun* as a light force to the four

[106] The letter is on the web at http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/gwhtml/gwhome.html.

[107] Lafayette never actively sought the command. He returned to the US shortly after the appointment of Rochambeau in March with Commissary Dominique Louis Ethis de Corny who was to make arrangements for the arrival of Rochambeau's troops. Congress made him a lieutenant colonel on 5 June 1780.

[108] The engineers were commanded by Colonel Jean Nicolas Desandrouins. Fragments of his diary which survived his shipwreck in February 1783 are published in Charles Nicholas, *Le Maréchal de Camp Desandrouins* (Verdun, 1887), pp. 341-368. The *mineurs* stood under Joseph

regiments of infantry, some 4,000 men, he would be able to take. A Quartermaster staff under Pierre François de Béville, a medical department of about 100 under Jean-François Coste,[109] a commissary department under Claude Blanchard,[110] a provost department headed by Pierre Barthélémy Revoux de Ronchamp with a hangman and two *schlagueurs,* i.e., corporals tasked with meting out corporal punishment,[111] not to mention the dozens of *domestiques*, i.e., servants for the officers, brought what was supposed to be the first division of the *expédition particulière* to about 6,000 officers and men. Everyone else would form part of a second division that Rochambeau hoped would join him in 1781.

5.4.1 The Officer Corps

These were only some of Rochambeau's problems. Once the numbers had been agreed upon, the decision as to which units to take was to be Rochambeau's. He chose them from among the forces quartered along the coast for the aborted invasion of England. Lee Kennett's description of Rochambeau's decision-making process, i.e., that the regiments selected "were neither the oldest nor the most prestigious regiments, in the army, but (Rochambeau) judged them to be well-officered and disciplined … and at full strength" is only part of the story.[112] Outside considerations may have played a role in their selection as well. The upper echelons of the officer corps belonged to the top of aristocratic society whom Rochambeau could not afford to alienate. For the members of the *noblesse de race,* the wealthy and influential court nobility, promotion to high rank and participation in prestigious enterprises at an early age was a birthright. They alone had the influence and the money, 25,000 to 75,000 livres, needed to purchase a line regiment. Nobles such as François Jean, *chevalier* de Beauvoir de Chastellux, a member of the *Académie Française* since 1775, were too influential to be ignored once they expressed interest in the expedition.[113] Humble as ever,

---

Dieudonné de Chazelles. See Ambassade de France, *French Engineers and the American War of Independence* (New York, 1975).

[109] See Louis Trenard, "Un défenseur des hôpitaux militaires: Jean-François Coste" *Revue du Nord* Vol. 75, Nr. 299, (January 1993), pp. 149-180, and Raymond Bolzinger, "A propos du bicentenaire de la guerre de l'Indépendance des États-Unis 1775-1783: Le service de santé de l'armée Rochambeau et ses participants messins" *Mémoires de l'Académie Nationale de Metz* Vol. 4/5, (1979), pp. 259-284.

[110] See *The Journal of Claude Blanchard, Commissary of the French Auxiliary Army sent to the United States during the American Revolution* Thomas Balch, ed., (Albany, 1876). See also Jean des Cilleuls, "Le service de l'intendance à l'armée de Rochambeau" *Revue historique de l'Armée* No. 2, (1957), pp. 43-61.

[111] Unlike in the Prussian army, corporal punishment was not the norm in the French military: the term used in the original documents, *schlagueurs*, is derived from the German word *schlagen*, to hit someone.

[112] Kennett, *French forces*, p. 22.

[113] His *Travels in North America in the years 1780, 1781, and 1782* 2 vols., (Paris, 1786; English: London, 1787) form an invaluable source on revolutionary America but provide little information on the campaigns. A modern edition was published by Howard C. Rice, Jr., Travels in North America in the Years 1780, 1781

the *duc* de Lauzun recorded that he was simply "too much in fashion not to be employed in some brilliant manner".[114]

From among the French regiments Rochambeau picked the Bourbonnais, commanded by Anne Alexandre, *marquis* de Montmorency-Laval, who had become colonel of the Toraine regiment at age 23. He was all of 28 when he took over the Bourbonnais in 1775. The fact that Rochambeau's son, 25-year-old Donatien Marie was *mestre-de-camp-en-second*, i.e., second in command of the regiment, may well have influenced this decision. When Donatien became colonel of the Saintonge in November 1782, Charles Louis De Secondat, *baron* de Montesquieu, a grandson of the famous philosopher, took his place. Soissonnais' *mestre de camp* Jean-Baptiste Félix d'Ollière, *comte* de Saint Maisme was all of 19 1/2 years old when he took over that unit in June 1775. St. Maisme's second in command, 24-year-old Louis Marie, *vicomte* de Noailles, a son of the *duc* de Mouchy, was not only a member of the highest nobility, but also Lafayette's brother-in-law. He received his new position on 8 March 1780. When Noailles became colonel of the *Roi-Dragons* in January 1782, he was replaced by Louis Philippe *comte* de Ségur, the 29-year-old son of the minister of war. Though he had started his military career at the age of 5 (!) and become colonel of the Custine Dragoons at age 22, Adam Philippe, *comte* de Custine, the 38-year-old colonel of the Saintonge, was by far the oldest (and most difficult) of these regimental commanders. Since his second in command, 24-year-old Armand de la Croix *comte* de Charlus, appointed to the position in March 1780, was the son of the Navy minister, the decision of whether to take the regiment or not may not have been Rochambeau's alone.[115]

One stipulation imposed upon Rochambeau by the *marquis* de Jaucourt, who was in charge of the operational planning of the *expédition*, was that one third of the force consist of German-speaking soldiers. Jaucourt argued, overly optimistic as it turned out, that recruiting deserters from Britain's German auxiliaries could make up losses in such units.[116] Politics may very well have decided the selection of the Royal Deux-Ponts. The Royal Deux-Ponts was 'suggested' to Rochambeau by Marie Camasse, Countess Forbach, a former dancer and morganatic wife of its

---

[114] *Mémoires de Armand-Louis de Gontaut, duc de Lauzun,* Edmond Pilon, ed., (Paris, 1928), p. 242.

[115] A scathing analysis by an anonymous subordinate of some these officers in Bernard Faÿ, "L'Armée de Rochambeau jugée par un Français." *Franco-American Review* Vol. 2, (Fall 1937), pp. 114-120.

[116] Kennett, *French forces*, p. 23. On 25 July 1780, only two weeks after Rochambeau's arrival, Joseph Reed, President of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania, informed the chevalier de la Luzerne in response to his letter of the same date inquiring about the possibility of recruiting Hessian deserters, that there was no legal obstacle to French recruitment of these men. The next day, 26 July, Luzerne informed Rochambeau of the availability of these men and of their desire to serve either in Lauzun's Legion or in the Royal Deux-Ponts regiment and suggested that he send recruiting officers to Philadelphia. Luzerne to Rochambeau with insert of Reed's letter is located in Rochambeau Family Papers, Gen Mss 146, Box 2, No. 123, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

founder and first *colonel propriétaire* Duke Christian IV of Zweibrücken.[117] Their eldest son Christian de Deux-Ponts, who had been two months short of his 20th birthday when he was given the Royal Deux-Ponts in 1772, had income from estates in Germany and France amounting to over 7,200 livres annually. He also enjoyed an annuity of 14,400 livres, 9,000 livres pay as colonel of his regiment, doubled to 18,000 livres for the American campaign, plus financial support from his mother, which brought his annual income for the American campaign to well over 40,000 livres![118] Second in command was his younger brother William, who distinguished himself during the storming of Redoubt No. 9 before Yorktown, and received his own regiment, the Deux-Ponts Dragoons, in January 1782.

The ships that left Brest in May 1780 were not necessarily carrying the "flower of the French nobility," but Rochambeau's staff was certainly rather heavily laced with court nobility. Competition for these positions was fierce. The slow pace of peacetime advancement in an army where promotion was strictly based on seniority left many officers hoping for an opportunity to "make a name for themselves" as the only way for faster advancement. War alone gave that opportunity. With Europe at peace and the fever-infested Caribbean an undesirable destination, the American campaign seemed to hold out hope for both distinction and survival. Rochambeau had been given blank commissions to fill these positions and subsequently spend much of his time trying to refuse sons, nephews, and favorites pressed upon him by members of the court.

The most famous among these is probably 26-year-old Axel von Fersen, son of the former Swedish ambassador to France and favorite of Queen Marie Antoinette. Men such as Fersen belonged to a group just below the very rich. In a letter to his father of January 1780, Fersen stated his fixed monthly expenses for, among others, room and board, three domestics, three horses, and a dog at 1,102 livres, though he promised he would try and economize in the future.[119] Fersen became an aide-de-camp to Rochambeau. Antoine Charles du Houx *baron* de Vioménil, Rochambeau's second in command, not only secured appointments for about a dozen of his friends from the Polish campaigns, he also brought along

---

[117] His brother Charles II August in 1776 succeeded Christian to the throne. Yet the regiment was qualified to participate for the campaign. On 27 March 1780, Rochambeau characterized it "comme aussi solide par sa composition qu'aucun régiment français et dans le meilleur état." J. Henry Doniol, *Histoire de la participation de la France a l'Établissement des États-Unis d'Amérique* 5 vols. (Paris, 1886-1892), Vol. 1, # 3733. Camasse presented Franklin a walking cane upon his departure from France; Franklin in turn willed the cane to George Washington; today it can be seen in the Smithsonian Institution.

[118] These figures are based on the *Nachlass Christian Graf von Forbach, Freiherr von Zweibrücken* (Signatur N 73) in the Pfälzische Landesbibliothek Speyer, Germany.

[119] *Lettres d'Axel de Fersen a son père pendant la guerre de l'Indépendance d'amérique* F. U.Wrangel, ed., (Paris, 1929), p. 46. English translations of some letters were published in "Letters of Axel de Fersen, Aide-de-Camp to Rochambeau written to his Father in Sweden 1780-1782" *Magazine of American History* Vol. 3, No. 5, (May 1879), pp. 300-309, No. 6, (June 1879), pp. 369-376, and No. 7, (July 1879), pp. 437-448. Eight letters from America to his sister were published in *The Letters of Marie Antoinette, Fersen and Barnave* O.-G. de Heidenstam, ed., (New York, 1929), pp. 6-13.

his brother, a cousin, a son-in-law, and two nephews, as well as his eldest son, 13-year-old Charles Gabriel, who served as aide-de-camp to his father. Rochambeau took his son, *mestre de camp en second* of the Bourbonnais Regiment, as his *aide-major général de logis.* Custine's kinsman Jean Robert Gaspar de Custine became a *sous-lieutenant* in the Royal Deux-Ponts on 4 April 1780, three days after his 16th birthday. Quarter-Master General de Béville took his two sons as members of his staff as well. It was not just Frenchmen who wanted to see America with Rochambeau. Friedrich Reinhard Burkard Graf von Rechteren, a Dutch nobleman with 15 years service in the Dutch military, used his descent from Charlotte de Bourbon, his great-great-great-great-great-grandmother who had married William of Orange in 1574, to get himself appointed *cadet-gentilhomme* in the Royal Deux-Ponts on 11 March 1780.[120] One of Rochambeau's nephews, the *comte* de Lauberdière, served as one of six aides-de-camp, another, George Henry Collot, as aide for quartermaster-general affairs.[121] When Claude Gabriel *marquis* de Choisy appeared in Brest on 17 April 1780, with five officers who wanted to sail to America, Rochambeau refused to take them. Choisy and his entourage, which by now had grown to ten officers, left Brest on the *Sybille* for Santo Domingo on 25 June 1780. There they found passage on *La Gentille* and sailed into Newport on 29 September 1780.

Rochambeau was also under siege by numerous French volunteers who had returned to Europe upon news of the treaties of 1778. They assumed that it would be better for their careers to serve out the war in the French rather than the American Army. Rochambeau realized that he needed not only their expertise, but since neither he nor many of his officers spoke English, their language skills as well. These appointments were much resented. When Rochambeau chose Du Bouchet as an aide, Charlus wrote scathingly in his diary that du Bouchet was but "a brave man who has been to America, [and] who has no other talent than to get himself killed with more grace than most other people".[122] Another beneficiary of Rochambeau's need for "American" experts was the much-decorated de Fleury, who volunteered to serve as a common soldier when he could not find a position as an officer. Rochambeau appointed him major in Saintonge, which caused considerable grumbling among Fleury's new comrades. [123] Men such as Fleury belonged to the lower nobility who provided about 90 per cent of the company-

[120] Rochambeau made Rechteren a captain *à la suite,* lending credence to Ternay's claim that the army contained "too many useless mouths". Kennett, *French forces,* p. 21. By 14 August 1780, Rechteren was sightseeing in Philadelphia; he returned to Europe as soon as Yorktown had fallen. His personnel file is in Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre, Vincennes, France, Yb 346.

[121] Kennett, *French forces,* p. 21. See also Robert A. Selig, "America the Ungrateful: The Not-So-Fond Remembrances of Louis François Dupont d'Aubevoye, Comte de Lauberdière" *American Heritage* Vol. 48, No. 1, (February 1997), pp. 101-106, and "Lauberdière's Journal. The Revolutionary War Journal of Louis François Bertrand d'Aubevoye, Comte de Lauberdière" *Colonial Williamsburg. The Journal of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation* Vol. 18, No. 1, (Autumn 1995), pp. 33-37.

[122] Quoted in Vicomte de Noailles, *Marins et Soldats Français en Amérique pendant la guerre de l'Indépendance des États-Unis* (Paris, 1903), p. 161.

[123] Gilbert Bodinier, "Les officiers du corps expéditionnaire de Rochambeau et la Revolution française" *Revue historique des armées* Vol. 3, No. 4, (1976) pp. 139-164, p. 140.

grade officers. They could hardly aspire to retiring as more than a major, and formed the vast majority of the officers in Rochambeau's army.[124] Though well paid in comparison to common soldiers, a *capitaine en seconde* in the French infantry earned 2,400 livres per year in America, they were caught between their limited financial resources and the obligations required by rank and status.[125]

These statistics do not tell us much about the lives of these men. A series of ten letters written by Count Wilhelm von Schwerin, a twenty-six-year-old sub-lieutenant of grenadiers of the Royal Deux-Ponts, partly in German, partly in French, between August 1780 and December 1781, to his uncle Graf Reingard zu Wied, fills some of this void. They provide a rare glimpse into the life -- and the precarious finances -- of a company-grade officer in America. In a letter of 16 March 1780, Schwerin laid bare his finances. His base salary was 60 livres per month; stoppages included 8 livres for his uniform and 2 livres to help pay the debts of a retired officer. His share to pay the salary of Georg Friedrich Dentzel, the Lutheran minister of the regiment, amounted to 9 sols per month.[126] That left him 49 livres 11 sols per month or 594 livres 12 sols annually. Anticipating the high cost of living in the New World, officer's salaries were doubled in March of 1780, raising Schwerin's net annual income to 1,309 livres 4 sols. His uncle added 48 livres per month, 576 livres per year, for a total of 1,885 livres 4 sols or 157 livres 2 sols per month.

In preparation for the expedition, the king had ordered that the officers be paid three months in advance plus 50 livres to buy tents, hammocks, shirts etc. For

---

[124] 459 officers accompanied Rochambeau from Brest, 20 joined him between July 1780 and November 1783. Samuel F. Scott, "The Army of the Comte de Rochambeau between the American and French Revolutions" *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* Vol. 15, (1988), pp. 143-153, p. 144. Twelve non-commissioned officers were promoted to officer rank during the campaign. Samuel F. Scott, "Rochambeau's Veterans: A Case Study in the Transformation of the French Army." *Proceedings, the Consortium on Revolutionary Europe 1750-1850* (Athens, 1979), pp. 155-163, p. 157. Captain Jean François de Thuillière of the Royal Deux-Ponts joined his regiment in Newport in October 1780. Thuillière, recommended to Franklin by Camasse left Europe in early 1777. Captured twice by the British, he arrived in America just as his leave was about to expire. He returned to France only to find out that there was no place for him Ternay's ships and he had to sail with Choisy's group to Newport.

[125] All pay information is taken from *Ordonnance du Roi, Pour régler le traitement des Troupes destinées à une expédition particulière. Du 20 Mars 1780* (Paris, 1780).

[126] The minister had a remarkable career made possible by the French Revolution. Georg Friedrich Dentzel was born on July 16, 1755, in Bad Dürkheim as the son of a baker. From 1774 to 1786 he served as the Lutheran preacher in Royal Deux-Ponts. As senior of the Protestant clergy in Landau from 1786-1794, he was the founder and first president of the local Jacobin Club. In 1792, he was elected a member of *Assemblé Nationale* in Paris and commanded the defense of Landau in the Fall of 1793. Arrested and imprisoned in Paris he was released after the fall of Robespierre. By 1813 he was a brigadier in Napoleon's army and *Baron de l'Empire*. Retired as full general in 1824, he died in Versailles in 1828. He is the grandfather of Prefect Hausmann, the architect responsible for the reconstruction of Paris in the 1850s and 1860s.

Paul de St. Pierre, the Catholic priest of the Royal Deux-Ponts, lived an exciting life as well. Born Michael Joseph Plattner in 1746 in Dettelbach near Würzburg, he was back in the United States by late 1784 and living in Baltimore. St. Pierre became a missionary to the Indians and died in 1826 in Iberville, Louisiana.

Schwerin that meant an additional 200 livres, but not much of it was spent on travel preparations. Some older officers retired rather than accompany the regiment to the New World. That meant that Schwerin had to pay the expenses arising from the *concordat* among the officers of the Royal Deux-Ponts. The *concordat* was an agreement stipulating that every time an officer left the regiment, each officer below him in rank, who would thereby advance in seniority, if not in rank, was to pay that officer the equivalent of two months of his own wages if that officer retired without pension, one month if he retired with a pension. Count Wilhelm's *concordat* in the Spring of 1780 amounted to at least 288 livres, the equivalent of 6 months wages. To make up for the four officers who could not pay their share of the *concordat* since they "already sit in prison because of other debts," each lieutenant of the regiment had to pay an additional 24 livres 11 sols 6 deniers.[127]

Upon arrival in America, Schwerin had additional expenses that put a severe drain on his budget as well. The servant, whom he was required to keep, cost him 15 livres in cash wages and 35 livres for food each month plus 3 livres clothing allowance. His lunch alone cost him 80 livres per month in Newport, which left him with maybe 24 livres per month from his 157 livres income. In the evenings he ate "but a piece of bread" and lots of potatoes, as he ruefully informed his uncle, but at 22 sols for a pound of bread or 4-6 sols for a pound of potatoes even that was an expensive meal. Shoemakers in Newport charged 40 livres for a pair of boots, and just the material for a shirt was 9 florin or 18 livres 15 sols. A good horse, estimated by Fersen to cost about 50 louis d'or, or 1,200 livres in Newport, was simply out of reach for two thirds of the officers in Rochambeau's army. Schwerin was always borrowing money: in the Spring of 1781, he borrowed 1,200 livres from his colonel to equip himself for the campaign, which included hiring a second servant and purchasing a horse for 300 livres.[128] No wonder he concluded one of his letters by telling his uncle that those who had remained in Europe "would not believe how everyone is fed up with waging war in this country here. The reason is quite simple in that one is obliged to buy one's forage with one's own money, and no one gives you your ration that is your due in times of war." After Schwerin had returned to France, a compilation of his debts on 25 September 1783 showed them to be at 5,571 livres, the equivalent of nine annual peacetime incomes![129]

---

[127] Schwerin's original correspondence was sold to an American collector in the early 1960s, its current whereabouts are unknown; all quotes are from copies made for the Library of Congress in 1930. See Robert A. Selig, "'*Mon très cher oncle':* Count William de Schwerin reports from Virginia." in the *Colonial Williamsburg. The Journal of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation* Vol. 22 No. 2 (Summer 2000), pp. 48-54, and "Eyewitness to Yorktown." *Military History* vol. 19 No. 6 (February 2003), pp. 58-64. Actual expenses may have been over 500 livres. The concordat of 23 July 1784 is in Régis d'Oléon, "L'Esprit de Corps dans l'Ancienne Armée" *Carnet de la Sabretache* 5th series (1958), pp. 488-496, pp. 493-495.

[128] *Sous-lieutenant* Nicolas François Denis Brisout de Barneville, aide to Baron Vioménil, largely confirms Schwerin's prices. "Journal de Guerre de Brissout de Barneville. Mai 1780-Octobre 1781" *The French-American Review* Vol. 3, No. 4, (October 1950), pp. 217-278, p. 245-46.

[129] The writer is grateful to Dr. Hans-Jürgen Krüger of the Fürstlich Wiedische Rentkammer for this information taken from an entry in the *Korrespondenz Findbuch* of the archives in Neuwied.

A final question to be asked here is: How much did the French officers reflect upon the reasons for fighting in this war? Did they know, or care, about the causes, and consequences, of their involvement in the American Revolution? To put it briefly: very few of them knew or cared. The war, wrote young *comte* de Lauberdière, had been caused by the "violent means employed by the ministry in England" to raise taxes "in violation of the natural and civil rights of her colonies". France came to the aid of the colonies, though one usually looks in vain for an explanation as to what these "rights" consisted of. In their journals individual officers more often talked of glory, honor, the opportunity to make a name for oneself, a chance to escape boredom, creditors, girlfriends as the recurrent theme for their joining the fight in America rather than the restoration of the balance of powers as the impetus for Franco-American co-operation.

5.4.2 The Rank and File

Unlike their officers, the rank and file of the *expédition particulière*, the non-commissioned officers and enlisted men, have remained largely a faceless mass of people. Thanks to the meticulous research of Samuel F. Scott, we know at least how many there were: Rochambeau took with him almost 5,300 soldiers. In June 1781, 660 re-enforcements were sent from France, 160 men were recruited in the US (all but one European-born) for a total of 6,038 men who served with Rochambeau's forces.

Non-commissioned officers promoted to their ranks after long years of service formed the backbone of the French army. Following the army reforms of 1776, a fusilier or chasseur company had 15 NCOs, five sergeants and ten corporals, while the smaller grenadier company had four sergeants and eight corporals. The sergeants formed the elite of a company's non-commissioned officers. Based on an analysis of the careers of over 20,000 men, Samuel F. Scott found that in 1789 more than half of all sergeants were under 35 years of age despite the often ten or more years of service it took to reach that rank. Every one of the eight to ten corporals too had reached his rank based on seniority after long years of service. According to Scott, "[c]orporals fell into three general categories: a minority of apparently talented soldiers who were promoted after four to six years' service, soldiers who followed a more common career pattern and were promoted around the time of their completion of their first eight-year-enlistment (sometimes as an inducement to re-enlist); and soldiers with long service, over ten years, who were promoted on this basis." More than three fourths of these men were under 35 years old.[130]

Below them was the rank and file, and, unlike the Prussian military at the time, where Frederick the Great preferred older soldiers, the French army was a *young* army. In 1789, almost exactly 50 per cent of all enlisted men were between 18

[130] Scott, *Response*, p. 8.

and 25 years old, another 5 per cent were even younger. About 12 per cent had less than one year of service, but 60 per cent had been with the colors between four and ten years, another 20 per cent had served for over ten years. These data are confirmed in the troops of the *expédition particulière.* In the Royal Deux-Ponts we find that the regiment sailed from Brest in April 1780, with 1,013 men. The regiments La Marck and Anhalt provided 113 reinforcements in June 1781, another 67 men were recruited in America between August 1780 and November 1782, for a total of 1,193 men who served with the Regiment.

If well over 90 per cent of all soldiers in the French regiments were French-speaking subjects of the King of France,[131] the treaty of March 1776 between Duke Charles and Louis XVI had stipulated that of the 150 recruits needed each year to maintain the strength of the unit, 112 (75 per cent) were to come from the Duchy of Deux-Ponts and surrounding areas. The remainder was to be drawn from German-speaking subjects of the King of France in Alsace and Lorraine, since the language of command in the regiment would remain German. A look at the age of the soldiers shows that 584 men (48.9 per cent) of the rank and file had been born between 1753 and 1759. Almost half of the men were between 21 and 27 years old by the time the regiment left for the United States. Some 736 soldiers (61.7 per cent) of the rank and file had signed up between 1773 and 1779, had up to eight years of service. Enlisted men could join at a very young age: the *enfants de troupe*, sons of soldiers or officers, were usually admitted at half pay at the age of six and served as drummers until the age of 16, when they could enlist as regular soldiers. The youngest drummer-boys in the regiment were but nine years old. Comparative data for the Bourbonnais confirm these findings. Most of its men were in their early 20s, the average age being 27; the youngest soldier was 12, the oldest 64.[132]

The biggest difference between the Royal Deux-Ponts and French units was in the religious affiliation of the soldiers.[133] The French regiments were almost 100 per cent Catholic, while the Royal Deux-Ponts was almost 40 per cent Protestant.

Catholic:	732	62.0%
Lutheran:	269	22.8%
Reformed:	180	15.2%

	1181	100.0%

There is a general conception that the soldiers in the armies of the eighteenth century were the dregs of society, released from prison if not from the gallows in exchange for military service. In the case of the French army and the troops of

[131] Rochambeau's corps had at least one black soldier in its ranks: Jean Pandua, "un fils d'amour" according his enlistment record, who had joined the Bourbonnais regiment as a musician in 1777; after five years of service he deserted in October 1782 near Breakneck in Connecticut.

[132] Kennett, *French forces,* p. 23. The Touraine regiment of infantry, which Admiral de Grasse brought to Yorktown, kept an 80-year-old on its payroll.

[133] Of twelve soldiers the religion is unknown.

Rochambeau, research has shown that this is clearly not the case. As a rule, these men did not come from well-established middle-class families, but rather from the un- and under-employed lower classes. Of over 17,000 people holding a city-issued license to beg within the city limits of Paris between 1764 and 1773, only 88 entered the army![134] The most detailed report on any regiment, that on the Royal Deux-Ponts compiled on 1 October 1788, a few years after its return from America, shows, not surprisingly for a pre-industrial society, that 875 (76.4 per cent) of its 1,146 men were peasants and "autres travailleurs de la campagne." The next largest group, 59 men (5 per cent) were tailors, 48 gave shoemaker as their profession, and 46 were masons. The rest were carpenters (24), butchers (22), wheelwrights (21) and an assortment of other trades.

If officers in Rochambeau's corps did not reflect much upon the causes of the war and the reasons for France's involvement, our knowledge of how enlisted men felt is even sketchier. It was only a few years ago, that three journals of enlisted men came to light. One is the *Journal militaire* of an anonymous grenadier in the Bourbonnais, which focuses almost exclusively on military events and contains little for the purposes of this study.[135] Neither does the journal of André Amblard of the Soissonnais, even though it does contain more observations about America and the Americans he met with than the grenadier *journal*. Only Georg Daniel Flohr of the Royal Deux-Ponts, expressed his views, unreflective as they were, about the American war in his *Account of the travels in America undertaken by the praiseworthy regiment von Zweibrücken on water and on land from the year 1780 until 1784.*[136] But even he says very little about the American cause or the reasons for his being in America. If he had heard about the ideas of independence, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, he neither mentions them nor does he apply them to himself, at least not during this phase of his life. Flohr and the French troops had come to America to put an end to the British "wreaking havoc on this beautiful country".[137]

---

[134] Quoted in Scott, *Response*, p. 19.

[135] Library of Congress, Milton S. Latham Journal-Miscellaneous Manuscripts Collection # 1902.

[136] Flohr's *Reisen Beschreibung von America welche das Hochlöbliche Regiment von Zweybrücken hat gemacht zu Wasser und zu Land vom Jahr 1780 bis 84* is located in the Bibliothèque Municipale, Strasbourg, France. The writer is currently preparing an English language edition of the journal. See my "Private Flohr's America. From Newport to Yorktown and the Battle that won the War: A German Foot Soldier who fought for American Independence tells all about it in a newly discovered Memoir" *American Heritage* Vol. 43, No. 8, (December 1992), pp. 64-71 and "A German Soldier in America, 1780-1783: The Journal of Georg Daniel Flohr" *William and Mary Quarterly* Vol. 50, No. 3, (July 1993), pp. 575-590. Flohr returned to the United States in circa 1798, and ended his days as a Lutheran minister in Wytheville, VA, in 1826.

[137] The only child of Johann Paul Flohr, a butcher and small farmer, and his second wife, Susanne, Georg Daniel was born on 27 August 1756, and baptized on 31 August 1756, in Sarnstall, a community of some twenty families, and a suburb of Annweiler in the duchy of Pfalz-Zweibrücken. Orphaned at the age of five by the death of his father, Georg Daniel and the five children from his father's first marriage were raised in the German Reformed Church by their mother. Nothing is known about his schooling or the trade he learned. On 7 June 1776, shortly before his twentieth birthday, Flohr volunteered for an eight-year-term in the Company von Bode, of the Deux-Ponts. Regimental records describe him as 1.71 meter (5 feet 8 inches) tall, with black hair, black eyes, a long face, regularly shaped mouth, and a small nose.