THE WASHINGTON - ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, 1780 - 1783

An Architectural and Historical Site Survey and Resource Inventory

Project Historian:

ROBERT A. SELIG, Ph. D.

Project Sponsor:

Rhode Island Rochambeau Historic Highway Commission
Rep. Nicholas Gorham, Chair

Project Director:

Roseanna Gorham
Chairman, Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route – Rhode Island (W3R-RI)

2006 (updated 2015)

This report is in the public domain

For additions/corrections/suggestions contact either the

Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route Association of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations c/o Ms Roseanna Gorham at roseannagorham@verizon.net

and/or the author at

www.xenophongroup.com/vita/selig

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 may 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

Any series of national WASHINGTON - ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL resource inventories and site surveys should begin in Rhode Island, the state where French forces under the *comte* de Rochambeau landed in July 1780. Instead it began almost 20 years ago in neighboring Connecticut and from there wound its way on the land and water routes of the allied armies to Yorktown. And yet it is more than fitting that it should find its completion in Rhode Island in the year 2015, the year of the return of the reconstructed French frigate *l'Hermione* to the United States and to Rhode Island, the very vessel that had carried the *marquis* de Lafayette across the Atlantic in the spring of 1780 with the news of the impending arrival in the New World. It is therefore my great pleasure to thank the many supporters who have assisted me over the years in the completion in this "Architectural and Historical Site Survey and Resource Inventory" for the State of Rhode Island.

First and foremost I would like to express my gratitude to the Project Director Ms Roseanna Gorham. Together with her husband Nicholas Gorham Esq. who as chair of the Rhode Island Historic Highway Commission in the legislature initiated the project they were was instrumental in procuring the necessary funding through the office and with the support of then Rhode Island Governor Donald L. Carcieri.

It is my great pleasure to thank the staff of the Newport Historical Society in Newport, Rhode Island, the Historical Society of Rhode Island in Providence, the Connecticut Historical Society in Hartford, Ms Kathie Ludwig, Librarian of the David Library in New Hope, Pennsylvania, Ms Ellen Clark, Director of the Library of the Society of the Cincinnati in Washington, DC and Ms Michelle Yost of the Interlibrary Loan Department at Hope College for their assistance in researching the presence of French forces in Rhode Island. Among the many contributors within and outside the State of Rhode Island Lydia Rapoza, Diana Reisman, Norman Desmarais, John Rees, Todd Braisted, Don Hagist, Prof. John Hattendorf and my good friend and colleague Sam Scott all deserve a big Thank You! I would also like to thank the Brigade of the American Revolution for permission to include two articles that were first published in *The Brigade Dispatch*. Lastly I also thank the anonymous readers of the ms for their comments and critiques. The report is much the better for it. Any errors are of course mine.

Holland, MI, March 2015

TIMELINE
France and the American War of Independence

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

1772 9 June. The British revenue schooner *Gaspée* runs aground off Warwick and is looted and burned to the waterline the following day

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.
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.
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.
17 June. First naval engagement of the war between French and British.
12 May. Charleston, South Carolina, falls to the British.
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 5 April. An *Acte Royal* sets 17 June 1778 as starting date of hostilities with Great Britain.
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 (English Channel) -- (*Bonhomme Richard* vs *HMS Serapis*)

1780 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).
27 April. Lafayette returns from France with the promise of more support.
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. (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 Bourbonnois 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 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
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).
25-28 August. French besiege and capture Trincomalee (Ceylon).
28 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 Bourbonnois Regiment camps in Chester.
31 August. With Rochambeau at its head, the Bourbonnois parades through Philadelphia before Congress and President Thomas McKean. Lauzun's Legion rests in Philadelphia.
1 September. The Bourbonnois rests in Philadelphia. The Royal Deux-Ponts parades through Philadelphia before Congress and McKean.
The Soissonnois camps in Chester.

Lauzun's Legion leaves Philadelphia for Red Lion.

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

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

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.

TIMELINE

Rhode Island in the American War of Independence 1763-1790

(Courtesy Newport Bicentennial Commission, 1976; adapted)

Dec. 1763: Arrival of frigate *Squirrel* to enforce anti-smuggling laws.

1764: Rhode Island angered by Sugar Act, Paper Money Act, Stamp Act.

25 Jun 1764: Delegates chosen for the Stamp Act Congress at Albany.

3 Mar 1764: Rhode Island College (now Brown University) chartered.

1764: Robert Melville reports to Admiralty about Newport Harbor.

9 Jul 1764: Customs schooner *St. John* fired on by order of Legislature.

31 Jul 1764: Legislature appoints Stamp Act Committee of Correspondence

Dec 1764: Stephen Hopkins publishes *Rights of the Colonies Examined.*

4 Jun 1765: Tender to frigate *Maidstone* burned by Newport mob.

27 Aug 1765: Stamp Act Riots begin, including hanging in effigy, destruction of houses; stamps kept aboard frigate *Cygnet.*

16 Sep 1765: Legislature votes resolution against Stamp Act.

31 Oct 1765: Governor Ward refuses to take Stamp Act Oath, alone of all American governors.

14 Feb 1766: Liberty Tree dedicated at Newport.

4 Mar 1766: Daughters of Liberty established at Newport, first such women's group in America.

11 Jul 1767: Thomas Sabin starts weekly stagecoach service Newport to Boston.

3 May 1766: Newport Massacre; Henry Sparker killed by British officer.

25 July 1768: Silas Downer calls for Independence at dedication of Providence Liberty Tree.

16 May 1769: Jessie Sackville & other Customs officials tarred & feathered in Providence.

19 July 1769: Customs schooner *Liberty* destroyed & burned at Newport.

7 Sep 1769: First commencement of Rhode Island College (now Brown University).

Feb 1772: HMS *Gaspee* arrives in Newport to enforce maritime trade regulations

10 Jun 1772: British Schooner *Gaspee* burned off Pawtuxet

20 Aug 1772: British establish Royal Commission to investigate *Gaspee* incident; extraordinary powers granted to Commission.

Mar 1773: RI and Virginia establish permanent Committees of Correspondence to report on outcome of *Gaspee* inquiry and look into suspension of Charter rights by *Gaspee* Commission.

Dec 1773: A non-event: no Newport Tea Party occurs because tea officials in London think Newport is too dangerous to send tea.

1774: Legislature outlaws importation of slaves as result of movement started by the Rev. Dr. Samuel Hopkins of Newport.

12 Jan 1774: Tea boycott imposed in Newport.

17 May 1774: Providence Town Meeting issues call for Continental Congress.

14 Jun 1774: Legislature selects delegates Stephen Hopkins and Samuel Ward to send to Continental Congress; first to do so.

3 Dec 1774: Legislature orders removal of cannons and powder from Fort George, Newport; orders carried out 9 December. First such move in America.

12 Dec 1774: Arrival of frigate *Rose* at Newport to curb smuggling under command of James Wallace.

4 Jan 1775: 60 cannons cast at Hope Furnace, first in America.

2 Mar 1775: 300 pounds of tea burned at Providence.

22 Apr 1775: 1,500 troops ordered raised in RI to assist Massachusetts after Lexington.

3 May 1775: Governor Wanton suspended by Legislature.

3 Jun 1775: RI troops encamp at Boston under command of Nathanael Greene.

Jun 1775: Flour Riot. Newport, caused by George Rome.

12 Jun 1775: Legislature creates RI Navy, first in America.

15 Jun 1775: RI Navy sloop *Katy* captures Royal Navy tender *Dianna*, off Jamestown, first naval battle of Revolution.

17 Jun 1775: RI troops assist at Battle of Bunker Hill.

22 Jun 1775: Nathanael Greene made brigadier general of RI troops.

20 Jul 1775: Frigate *Rose* threatens to bombard Newport if rebel activists are not thrown out of city.

9 Aug. 1775: Sloop *Katy* removes rest of cannons from Fort George, Newport.

26 Aug 1775: Legislature sends instructions to Stephen Hopkins to make Congress establish a Continental Navy "to protect us from the *Rose*".

30 Aug 1775: Frigate *Rose* conducts raids on Block Island, and Stonington, CT

11 Sep 1775: RI troops depart on Arnold's Expedition to Quebec.

4 Oct 1775: Esek Hopkins made brigadier general of troops stationed around Newport

7 Oct 1775: Frigate *Rose* makes night-time raid on Bristol to divert American troops who had orders to burn Newport.

13 Oct 1775: Continental Congress passed RI resolution to create Continental Navy.

5 Nov 1775: Esek Hopkins made commander-in-chief of Continental Navy.

7 Nov 1775: Governor Wanton officially deposed by Legislature.

3 Dec 1775: RI Navy sloop Katy sold to Continental Navy and renamed *Providence*.

10 Dec 1775: Frigate *Rose* raids Jamestown in retaliation for snipers.

2 Jan 1776: Sloop *Providence* on short cruise in Delaware becomes first vessel of Continental Navy to set sail.

3-4 Mar 1776: Continental fleet captures Nassau; *Providence* is first vessel ever to land US Marines.

5-7 Mar 1778: George Washington visits Providence.

26 Mar 1778: Death of Samuel Ward of smallpox at Philadelphia. He was replaced by William Ellery of Newport.

4 Apr 1776: Continental fleet captures British warships *Bolton* and *Hawke* off Newport, first captures made by Continental Navy.

6 Apr 1776: Continental fleet attacks but fails to capture British frigate *Glasgow* off Newport. Frigate *Rose* departs from Newport for repairs at the Halifax Dockyard.

4 May 1776: RI Legislature renounces allegiance to George III in session at Colony House at Newport; first declaration of independence in America.

12 May 1776: John Paul Jones made captain of sloop *Providence*, his first command.

15 May 1776: Launching of Continental frigates at Providence: 32 gun *Warren* and 28 gun *Providence*.

4 Jul 1776: Congress declares independence from Great Britain

9 Aug 1776: Congress makes Nathanael Greene major general

Aug 1776: General Greene reprimands RI troops on Long Island for streaking

8 Dec 1776: A large British army arrives to occupy Newport.

10 Jan 1777: Action at Fogland Ferry.

12 Mar 1777: Nathanael Greene appointed quartermaster general by Congress.

13 Mar 1777: RI Galley *Spitfire*, run aground, captured and burned by British.

19 Apr 1777: William Vernon appointed secretary of the Eastern Navy Board, equivalent to modern post of Secretary of the Navy.

9 Jul 1777: British General Prescott captured by Colonel Barton, at Overing Farm.

2 Aug 1777: Action at Dutch Island.

5 Aug 1777: While British are raiding Narragansett, RI, troops from Tiverton raid British positions in Portsmouth.

27 Jan 1778: Sloop *Providence* captures Nassau again, this time single-handedly.

9 Feb 1778: Legislature authorizes raising a regiment of black troops.

16 Feb 1778: Continental frigate *Warren* escapes British blockade to the open sea, commanded by John B. Hopkins.

27 Feb 1778: Continental ship *Columbus* wrecked and burned at Point Judith while attempting to escape British blockade.

30 Apr 1778: Continental frigate *Providence* escapes to open sea commanded by Abraham Whipple

18 May 1778: RI 16-gun privateer Oliver Cromwell (originally Y*e Terrible Creture*) captured by British frigate *Beaver* and is renamed *Beaver's Prize*.

25 May 1778: British forces raid Bristol and Warren.

31 May 1778: British forces raid Tiverton and Fall River.

28 Jun 1778: Generals Greene and Varnum save American Army at Monmouth, NJ.

29 Jul 1778: Large French army and navy force under D'Estaing arrive at Newport; British dig in for siege.

5 Aug 1778: British frigates sunk around Newport as French fleet advances.

10-12 Aug 1778: French fleet defeated by Lord Howe's smaller British fleet off Newport, then both fleets smashed by hurricane.

29 Aug 1778: During Battle of Rhode Island Americans under General Sullivan retreat from Newport under fire; Black regiment distinguishes itself.

28 Oct 1778: RI Navy vessel *Hawk* (Silas Talbot) captures British warship *Pigot* off Newport.

17 Dec 1778: British guardship off Newport captured by Lt. Chapin and six men in a whaleboat.

May 1779: John Brown builds 20 gun privateer *General Washington* at Providence.

21 May 1779: British raid North Kingstown.

6 Jun 1779: British raid Point Judith.

7 Jul 1779: RI sloop *Argo*, commanded by Silas Talbot, captures RI Loyalist (Tory) brig *King George*, captain Hazard, and other British vessels.

14 Aug 1779: Frigate *Warren* and sloop *Providence* blown up in Penobscot River, Maine, to avoid capture.

16 Oct 1779: British burn Beavertail Lighthouse, Jamestown, preparatory to leaving Rhode Island.

25 Oct 1779: Contrary to all advice from naval experts, British garrison evacuates Newport to consolidate their position in New York.

12 May 1780: Frigate *Providence* commanded by Abraham Whipple captured by British at the fall of Charlestown, SC

22 Jun 1780: Col. Israel Angell and RI troops win battle at Springfield, NJ.

10 Jul 1780: Large French army under Gen. Rochambeau arrives in Newport.

Sep 1780: The *General Washington*, commanded by Silas Talbot, captured by 74-gun British ship *Culloden* off Newport, and renamed *General Monk*.

11 Oct 1780: British ship *Beaver's Prize* (former RI privateer *Oliver Cromwell*) wrecked at St. Lucia, West Indies.

14 Oct 1780: Nathanael Greene made commander-in-chief of American forces in the South.

17 Jan 1781: Nathanael Greene fights battle at Cowpens, SC

6-14 Mar 1781: George Washington visits Newport to plan the final campaign of the War with Rochambeau and Lafayette.

15 Mar 1781: Nathanael Greene fights battle at Guilford Courthouse, NC.

19 Apr 1781: Nathanael Greene fights battle at Camden, SC.

25 Apr 1781: Nathanael Greene fights battle at Hobkirk's Hill, SC.

14 May 1781: Col. Christopher Greene killed in battle near Fishkill, NY.

5 Jun 1781: Nathanael Greene captures Augusta, GA

10 Jun 1781: French army evacuates Newport.

8 Sep 1781: Nathanael Greene fights battle of Eutaw Springs, SC

14 Oct 1781: Stephen Olney of Providence leads American charge at Redoubt No. 10 before Yorktown

8 Apr 1782: British frigate *General Monk* (former Rhode Island privateer) recaptured by Hyder Ali (or Ally) in Delaware; sold to Continental Navy and renamed *General Washington* (again).

1 Nov 1782: RI Legislature refuses to accept the authority of Congress to levy customs duties.

25 Apr 1783: News of cessation of hostilities arrives and great celebrations are held.

3 Sep 1783: Final peace treaty signed at Paris.

Sep 1783: Frigate *General Washington* visits Plymouth, England, first vessel of Continental Navy to do so on good-will visit.

23 Feb 1784: RI Legislature passes Negro Emancipation Act, first law forbidding slavery in America.

11 Mar 1784: Royal Navy sells frigate *Providence* at auction.

1784: Continental Navy sells frigate *General Washington* back to John Brown, her original owner. She is next to last vessel owned by Continental Navy.

13 Jul 1785: RI Signer of the Declaration of Independence, Stephen Hopkins, dies.

19 Jun 1786: Nathanael Greene dies of heatstroke.

1787: The *General Washington* is first RI vessel to visit China.

29 May 1790: Rhode Island ratifies United States Constitution, last of 13 original States to do so.

TIMELINE
The Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations

NOTE: Unlike the preceding timelines this timeline is arranged by month, not by year

January

February

March

1781, March 2: Washington departs from New Windsor with Major General Robert Howe and his aides Tench Tilghman and David Humphries to meet with Rochambeau in Newport.

1781, March 3: Washington spends the night at the home of Col. Andrew Morehouse of Dutchess County on the Fishkill-Hopewell road, near the Connecticut State line.

1781, March 4: Washington and his entourage arrive in Hartford were they meet up with Governor Jonathan Trumbull and his son Jonathan Jr. Washington and the younger Trumbull continue on to Lebanon where they spend the night.

1781, March 5: Washington reviews Lauzun's Legion and continues on to spend the night in Kingston, RI.

1781, March 6: Washington and his military family take the Narragansett Ferry to Jamestown and arrive in Newport around 02:00 p.m.. Here they board a barge sent by Admiral Charles René Dominique Gochet, *chevalier* Destouches that takes them to Destouches' flagship the *duc de Bourgogne.*

1781, March 6-12: Washington visits with Rochambeau in Newport.

1781, March 8: Departure of a French fleet under Admiral Charles René Dominique Sochet, *chevalier* Destouches, Destouches with 1,500 troops under the *baron* de Vioménil for the Chesapeake. Their aim is to capture Benedict Arnold.

1781, March 13: Travelling from Newport via Bristol Ferry and Warren, Washington reaches Providence where he spent the nights of 13/14 and 14/15 March.

1781, March 15: Washington and his military family leave Providence and ride to Lebanon in Connecticut via Canterbury, Scotland and Windham, traveling more than 60 miles on horseback that day.

1781, March 16: Washington spends the night in Hartford.
1781, March 17: Washington spends the night in Hartford.

1781, March 18-21: The itinerary for these days is unknown.

1781, March 22: Washington and his military family are back in New Windsor.

1781, March 27: Destouches returns from Virginia after having engaged a Royal Navy fleet under Admiral Mariot Arbuthnot off the Chesapeake Bay.

1782, March 28: The frigate *Emeraude* arrives in Newport with 4.8 million *livres*. She had left Brest on 14 February.

The funds are escorted overland by Major DePrez of the Royal Deux-Ponts to Philadelphia, where they arrive in the second week of May. With the departure of DePrez all French forces have left Rhode Island.

April

May

1781, May 18: Washington leaves New Windsor and spends the night at "Morgans Tavern 43 miles from Fishkill Landing".

1781, May 19: Washington arrives in Wethersfield accompanied by Generals Henry Knox and Louis Lebègue Duportail and lodges in the home of Joseph Webb.

Rochambeau and Chastellux set out from Newport for Wethersfield in Connecticut. They spend the night most likely with Lieutenant Governor Jabez Bowen in Providence.

1781, May 20: Rochambeau and Chastellux spend the night at Daniel "White's Tavern at the Sign of the Black Horse" in Andover.

1781, May 21: Rochambeau and Chastellux arrive in Wethersfield and lodge at Stillmann's Tavern.

1781, May 22: Washington and Rochambeau meet at Wethersfield to discuss strategy. They decide to focus on New York City.

1781, May 23: Rochambeau and Chastellux spend the night in Wethersfield.

1781, May 24: Rochambeau and Chastellux spend the night at Daniel "White's Tavern at the Sign of the Black Horse" in Andover.

1781, May 25: Rochambeau and Chastellux spend the night in Providence.

1781, May 26: Rochambeau and Chastellux return to Newport.

June

1781, June 5: The town council of Newport votes "to draw up an address of thanks, to His Excell[enc]y General Rochambeau, for his particular Attention for the Welfare of this Town during his command here."

The infantry and artillery of Lauzun's Legion receive orders to embark at 6:00 a.m. the next day to cross over to Providence.

1781, June 6: Lauzun's men spend the night in the barracks at Poppasquash.

1781, June 7: A convoy of eight vessels accompanied by the 50-gun ship of the line Le Sagittaire carrying 592 infantry replacements and two companies, 68 men, of artillery, arrives in Boston from France. The replacements had been drawn from the Regiments of Auvergne (71 healthy and 7 sick soldiers) and Neustrie (19 plus 28) for the Bourbonnois; Languedoc (80 plus 6) for the Soissonnois; Boulonnois (112 plus 36) for Saintonge; Anhalt (46 plus 4) and La Marck (39 plus 36) for the Royal Deux-Ponts; and Barrois (31 plus 17) for Lauzun's Legion.

Upon arrival in Providence on 13 June the 398 men fit for duty Will join their units, the 262 sick will continue on to Newport.

Lauzun's Infantry and artillery reach Providence from Newport.

1781, June 10: Around 5:00 a.m. in the morning of 10 June 1781, the First Brigade of French forces begins to embark on vessels waiting for them in the harbor of Newport to take them to Providence.

Rochambeau leaves behind in Newport an infantry detachment of half a dozen officers, 100 NCOs and enlisted men from each of the four infantry regiments and 30 men artillery under the command of Brigadier Gabriel de Choisy.

He also leaves behind his siege artillery consisting of twelve 24-lb guns, eight 16-lb guns, four 8-inch and seven 12-inch mortars and two 8-inch howitzers.

1781, June 11: The First Brigade of French forces arrives in Providence around 9:00 p.m., too late to set up camp.

Those who reach Providence spend the night in the Market House, others in the Old Work House on the west bank of the Moshassuk River just north of Smith Street.

The Second Brigade embarks.

The replacements leave Boston and march to camp in Dedham.

The exact march route is unknown; the stops in Dedham and Wrentham are based on the route of Rochambeau's infantry to Boston in December 1782.

1781, June 12: The Second Brigade of French forces disembarks in Providence and joins the First Brigade in camp on either side of Cranston Street between Westminster Avenue and Broad Street.

The replacements leave Dedham march to Wrentham.

The exact march route is unknown.

1781, June 13: Lieutenant-Colonel Hugau of Lauzun's Legion receives orders to march from Providence to Lebanon on Saturday, 16 June, with the 31 healthy replacements for the Legion from the Royal Barrois due to arrive that day from Boston.

1781, June 14: The infantry and artillery of Lauzun's Legion leave Providence and spend the nights of 14/15 June in Plainfield, and of 16/17 June in Windham. They arrive in Lebanon on 17 June.

1781, June 16: Lt.-Col. Hugau of Lauzun's Legion departs from Providence with the replacements for Lauzun's Legion for Lebanon where they arrive on 19 June.

1781, June 18: For the march to New York Rochambeau organized his forces into four divisions of one infantry regiment each plus its artillery complement and wagon train. Lauzun's Legion took a route separate from the infantry that took it along the coast..

The Regiment Bourbonnois as the first French division leaves its camp in Providence for its next camp at Waterman's Tavern. The remaining three Regiments Royal Deux-Ponts, Soissonnnois and Saintonge follow over the next three days.

1781, June 19: The Regiment Bourbonnois leaves its camp at Waterman's Tavern on its way to its camp in Plainfield, CT. The remaining three regiments, Royal Deux-Ponts, Soissonnnois and Saintonge follow over the next three days.

1781, June 20: The frigate *Concorde* leaves Newport for the Caribbean with a report about the Wethersfield Conference and a request that de Grasse borrow 1.2 million *livres* in Martinique or St. Domingue. Eventually de Grasse will borrow the funds in Cuba.

De Grasse receives Rochambeau's letter of 28 May (with post-scripts) on 16 July; his response informing Rochambeau that he would sail to the Chesapeake , leaves St. Domingue on the Concorde on 28 July, reaches Newport on 11 August, and White Plains on 14 August 1781.

July

1781, July 10: A small French fleet under Captain de La Villebrune sails out of Newport for Long Island.

1781, July 12: The *Romulus* and three French frigates from Newport enter the Sound between Long Island and the mainland in an attempt to capture Fort Lloyd (or Fort Franklin near Huntington, Long Island). The enterprise fails.

1780, July 11: Around 10:30 a.m. a fleet commanded by Admiral Charles-Henri-Louis d'Arsac de Ternay carrying some 450 officers and 5,300 men under the *comte* de Rochambeau, sails into Narragansett Bay and anchors between Conanicut, Rose and Goat Islands.

1780, July 12: "The town (Newport) was beautifully illuminated this evening."

1781, July 14: The small French fleet under Captain de La Villebrune returns from Rhode Island to Newport.

1780, July 18: News of safe arrival in Boston of the *Ile de France* with 350 men of the Bourbonnois Regiment reaches Newport. The would indicate an arrival date of 14/15 July 1780.

1780, July 20 (?): The Bourbonnois soldiers set out for Providence and Newport. Presumably they spend the night in Dedham (?). The departure date is probably 20 July since it is a three day's march to Providence where the unit arrives on 22 July.

The exact march route is unknown; the stops in Dedham and Wrentham are based on the route of Rochambeau's infantry to Boston in December 1782.

1780, July 21 (?): The Bourbonnois soldiers spend the night in Wrentham (?).

1780, July 22: The *Providence Gazette* reports that "a Transport with 350 troops on board and a large quantity of Military Stores which had been separated from the fleet is safe arrived in Boston. The Troops are on their march for this Town on their way to Newport and are expected to arrive here To-day."

1780, July 22: Navy Lieutenant de Valernais of the frigate *Hermione* is buried in the cemetery at Trinity Church.

1780, July 23: The Bourbonnois detachment marches from Providence to Newport and rejoins the regiment on 24 July.

August

1781, August 11: The *Concorde* arrives in Newport with a letter for Rochambeau from Admiral de Grasse in Haiti dated 28 July 1781 stating that he would sail for the Chesapeake on 13 August but that he would only stay until 15 October.

The letter reaches Rochambeau in the Odell House in Westchester County, NY on 14 August 1781.

De Grasse in fact departed eight days earlier on 5 August with 28 ships of the line, supporting frigates and around 3,300 officers and men from the Gâtinois, Agenois, Tourraine and the Metz artillery.

1781, August 23: Admiral Barras slips out of Newport with nine ships, incl. seven ships of the line carrying 480 men infantry and 130 men artillery as well as the siege artillery. They arrive in the James River in Virginia on 10 September.

The remaining garrison of Newport, 104 men under Major Louis Aimable de Prez de Crassier of the Royal Deux-Ponts, march to Providence, where they arrive on 23 August.

1780, August 29: A delegation of Oneida Indians from upstate New York visits General Rochambeau at Newport.

September

1780, September 18: Rochambeau and Admiral de Ternay set out from Newport at around 9:00 a.m. to meet Washington in Hartford, CT. They spend the night with Lt.-Gov. Jabez Bowen in Providence.

1780, September 19: A broken wheel forces Rochambeau and de Ternay to spend the night in an unknown Tavern in Scotland.

1780, September 20: Rochambeau and Ternay take lodgings in the home of Jeremiah Wadsworth in Hartford.

1780, September 21: Hartford Conference between Rochambeau and Washington.

1780, September 22: Another broken wheel at the same spot as on 19 September forces Rochambeau and de Ternay to again spend the night in an unknown Tavern in Scotland.

1780, September 23: Rochambeau and Admiral de Ternay spend the night with Lt.-Gov. Jabez Bowen in Providence.

1780, September 25: Rochambeau and Admiral de Ternay return to Newport at around 7:00 p.m.

October

1780, October 19: State of Connecticut offers winter quarters to Lauzun's hussars after Providence refused to provide quarters

1781, October 26: News of the surrender of Cornwallis reaches Newport

1780, October 28 : French frigate *Amazone* under Jean-François de Galaup, *comte* de Lapérouse leaves Newport for Brest with Rochambeau's son, the *vicomte* de Rochambeau. The *Amazone* is accompanied by the *Hermione* and the *Surveillante*. He arrives in L'Orient on 15 November 1780 and is back in Paris on 23 November 1780.

November

1780, November 1: French infantry enters winter quarters in Newport.

1780, November 9: Hussars of Lauzun's Legion ride from Newport to Providence.

1782, November 9: In preparation for the march to the northward Rochambeau had divided his forces into five divisions of one regiment each which are to march one day apart. Lauzun's Legion forms the first division, the Bourbonnois Regiment the second, Royal Deux-Ponts the third, Soissonnois the fourth and Saintonge the fifth division.

That structure was maintained until the arrival of the Second Division, i.e., the Bourbonnois Regiment, in Trenton on 3 September 1782, when Rochambeau re-organized his units into two-regiment brigades for the march to Massachusetts.

Lauzun's Legion does not join the infantry regiments on their march to Boston. It marches instead from New York to winter quarters in Wilmington, Delaware.

Coming from Dorrance Tavern in Connecticut the French First Brigade consisting of the Regiments Bourbonnois and the Royal Deux- Ponts camp near Waterman's Tavern in Rhode Island.

1782, November 10: Coming from Waterman's Tavern the French First Brigade consisting of the Regiments Bourbonnois and the Royal Deux-Ponts camp in Providence.

The Second Brigade consisting of the Regiments Soissonnnois and Saintonge arrives in Providence

1780, November 12: Lauzun's hussars leave Providence for Windham, Connecticut.

1782, November 13: The French camp is moved to the property of Jeremiah Dexter. French forces will remain here until 4 December.

1782, November 16: The campaign artillery leaves Providence for Wrentham.

1782, November 19: French artillery arrives in Boston and is quartered in vacant houses in the harbor.

1780, November 20: Hussars enter winter quarters in Lebanon.

December

1782, December 1: Rochambeau, accompanied by his son, by the *comte* de Vauban and the *comte* de Lauberdière, says farewell to his troops in Providence and in a heavy snowfall sets out for Newburgh, NY. They spend the night at Dorrance' Tavern in Connecticut.

1782, December 4: The French First Brigade consisting of the Regiments Bourbonnois and the Royal Deux- Ponts leaves Providence for a camp in Wrentham, Massachusetts.

The Second Brigade consisting of the Regiments Soissonnnois and Saintonge camps in Providence.

1782, December 5: The Second Brigade consisting of the Regiments Soissonnnois and Saintonge leaves Providence for a camp in Wrentham.

INTRODUCTION

5.1 Purpose of the Project

In a 1999 interview with the historical magazine *American Heritage*, Pulitzer Prize-winning 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 very 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: almost 235 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 of the United States occupied the politically-minded while the vast majority of the population struggled to meet the challenges of life in the now independent country. 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 a triumphal tour across the country he had helped gain its independence. Traveling south from New York City, 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 siegefield 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. As the men of 1776 passed away in the 1820s and 1830s, and canals and railroads altered modes and

---

[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.

patterns of transportation in the 1840s and 1850s, the memory of the "gallant" Frenchmen under General *comte* de Rochambeau, of their crucial contributions to American Independence, and of the bond forged in the crucible of war, was covered by the mantle of Revolutionary War iconography. [3] 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.[5] 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.[6] 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.*

---

[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). The last Revolutionary War veterans died in the 1860s. For some examples see Rev. Elias Hillard, *The last men of the Revolution. A Photograph of each from Life ... Accompanied by brief Biographical Sketches of the Men* (Hartford, 1864).

[4] Benson J. Lossing, *Pictorial Field Book of the Revolution* 2 vols. (New York, 1852), vol. 2, p. 83, note 4. A few years later, *Harper's* would characterize Rochambeau's officers as "Frenchmen of talent and capacity [who] weary of intrigue, or worsted by it, threw themselves into any career that promised sidtraction and excitement. To these exhausted votaries of of an effete civilization the wilds of America were fascinating" as they compared "the modest eye of maiden purity" with the "gay record of [their] licentious lives at home." "Newport Historical and Social" *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* vol. 9 no. 51 (August 1854), pp. 289-317; French visit on pp. 304 -310, p. 304.

[5] See David McCullough, *The Greater Journey: Americans in Paris* (New York, 2011).

[6] An English translation appeared in two volumes in Philadelphia in 1891/95.

Correspondance diplomatique et documents in five volumes.[7] 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*.[8]

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!" Lt.-Col. Charles Stanton declared at the tomb of the *marquis* in Paris on 4 July 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 in the early 1920s Boston banker Allan Forbes retraced the route taken by Rochambeau's forces, he concentrated on the New England states of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.[9] His research ended at the New York State line; the mid-Atlantic states received a single article.[10] 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 had until recently been left to town historians and private organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Sons of the Revolution, Society of the Cincinnati and/or the *Souvenir Français*, to commemorate the Franco-American alliance.

During the celebrations for the Bi-centennial of the American Revolution in the 1970s Rhode Island paid considerable attention to the important role played by France in the struggle for independence as well as to the almost year-long stay of French forces in the state. The compilation of maps and route descriptions published in a superb edition by Howard C. Rice, Jr. and Anne S. K. Brown in *The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army 1780, 1781, 1782, 1782*. 2 volumes,

---

[7] A supplement volume bringing the history of events to the signing of the Peace Treaty of 1783 (the original vol. 5 ends with the Preliminaries of Peace) was published in 1899.

[8] Published in the United States as: United States. Congress. Senate. Miscellaneous Publications. 58th Congress, 2nd Session. Document no. 77. (Washington, D.C., 1903/4). For the German-speaking regiment Royal Deux-Ponts and the Irish regiments Walsh and Dillon the document lists "officiers seulement."

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

[10] 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 among his papers in the Massachusetts Historical Society.

(Princeton and Providence, 1972) caused Representative Hamilton Fish of New York to introduce 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." Though that effort did not result in the creation of a National Historic Trail, the current effort to create such a trail rests to a large degree on the work done in Rhode Island the 1970s. Supplementing the work done by Mrs Brown and Dr. Rice, the Franco-American Sub-Committee of the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission staged numerous programs to commemorate the role of France, while the Office of the Adjutant General of Rhode Island under the leadership of BG Gilbert A. Hempel (RIM) organized a re-enactment of the march to Yorktown.

These celebrations of the 1980s were followed by an almost inevitable hiatus which lasted until 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 War of Independence as well as the role of France in achieving that 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.[11] 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.[12]

---

[11] 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.

[12] 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 145-47 of the main text. Congress already proclaimed Lafayette an honorary citizen in 1824.

The present resource survey of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail (W3R-NHT) in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations contributes to the federally mandated nine-state plus the District of Columbia study authorized by Congress and completed in 2006.

The purpose of this architectural and historical site survey and resource inventory in and for the State of Rhode Island is six-fold:

1. To identify the land and river routes that the *comte* de Rochambeau's French forces took through Rhode Island between July 1780 and June 1781 during their almost one-year long stay in the state. Side trips by officers such as the travels of the *chevalier* de Chastellux are not included in this report.

2. To identify the routes of the marches of French forces from Newport to Providence and on to Connecticut in June 1781 on the way to Yorktown.

3. To identify the routes of the return march of the French forces in November and December 1782.

4. To identify sites and resources along these routes.

5. To research and write a historical survey of the winter quarters of 1780/81 and of the campaign of 1781 around these sites that focuses on the marches rather than the siege and victory at Yorktown.

6. To assist in developing a plan to interpret those sites within the context of the national W3R commemorating the march to Yorktown in 1781 and the return marches north in 1781 and 1782.

5.2 Scope of the Project

The current report undertakes a historical and architectural survey of resources for the W3R in the State of Rhode Island. As such its goal is to touch on as many aspects of the French presence in Rhode Island as possible and to point out further areas and topics of research rather than to write an in-depth and exhaustive study of each and every domestic and foreign aspect related to France and the United States during these momentuous months in Newport and Rhode Island history. In addition it is intended as a tool to provide start-up information to support potential archeological surveys and excavations of the campsites, routes, and other physical evidence of the presence of the French army in Rhode Island from 1780 to 1783.

This dual approach adheres to the template developed by consultant and followed by states such as Connecticut, New York, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Upon completion Rhode Island will have the historical basis for joining the W3R National Historic Trail. The W3R through the State of Rhode Island will be one element of the greater W3R project aimed at bringing to life the entire nine-state route as a National Historic Trail administered by the NPS. It will also have the foundation needed to begin the research for nominating to the NHR newly identified sites such as eighteenth-century sections of the trail and for a more inclusive interpretation of existing sites within the state.

5.3 Goals of the Project

Following the pattern established in similar surveys in other states along the route, the project has set itself three goals:

1) to collect and provide information out of American, French, British, and German primary and secondary sources for information concerning the French role in the 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 troops in Rhode Island and their interaction with the inhabitants of the state in 1780, 1781, 1782, and 1783.

3) to identify historic buildings and/or sites as well as modern monuments and markers associated with the campaigns of 1780, 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 route as identified in the historical and architectural survey will be determined by above-ground resources and described in relationship to the currently existing road patterns within the State of Rhode Island. It will by necessity vary at different locations from the actual eighteenth-century routes taken by the French army.

Goals 1) and 2) were achieved by research in American and European libraries and archives with a special focus on little-known and/or unpublished materials

relating to the French role in the American Revolutionary War. Local historical research was conducted in the Rhode Island State Historic Preservation Office, the Rhode Island Public Archives, the Historical Society of Rhode Island, the Historical Society of Newport and in cooperation with individuals and libraries along the route during fieldwork in the Fall of 2004, the Summer of 2005, and on subsequent research visits since then.

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 presence of the infantry, artillery, and cavalry portions of Rochambeau's armies between the summer of 1780 and 1781 and the fall and winter of 1782/83, were included. Movements of French forces and/or of French officers in American service such as the *marquis* de Lafayette are not covered here.

In its style, its detailed comparative footnoting, its discussion of sources, and its repeated references to the need for additional research of particular subject areas this survey betrays the fact that it is meant more as a research tool than for the general reader. 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 translations are the author's.

5.4 Sources

The primary goal of this architectural and historical resource inventory and site survey from the arrival of French forces in Rhode Island in June 1780, their winter quarters 1780/81 to their departure for Virginia in the summer of 1781 as well as its brief return to Rhode Island in November 1782, is the identification of the routes of these forces and their location on the ground today.

The indispensable collection of primary source materials to reconstruct the French presence in Rhode Island 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 camp-sites 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 camp sites. 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 1781, or the 1782/83 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 Rhode Island the itineraries and maps are complete.

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, when 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. Unfortunately it too 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. Though about two-thirds of the book cover mundane items such as sign/counter-sign, which regiment provides guards when and where, it is a source that deserves closer research for any in-depth study of Rochambeau's forces in Rhode Island and the march to White Plains.

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 very brief narrative of events of 1782 and early 1783. Both of these manuscripts are located in the Rochambeau Papers at Yale University, but neither of them covers the marches through Rhode Island in more than a sentence. The Rochambeau Papers in the Library of Congress and the Beinecke Library at Yale University,[13] however, should form the basis of any future in-depth study of the French presence in Rhode Island.

[13] The Rochambeau Papers are catalogued as GEN MSS 308, Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

If sources such as the *Livre d'ordre* have hardly, if ever, been used in historical analyses of the 1781/82 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 to 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.[14] The Milton S. Latham Papers in the Library of Congress are home to the *Journal Militaire* of an unidentified grenadier in the Bourbonnois regiment.[15] Finally there is the *Histoire des campagnes de l'Armée de Rochambaud (sic) en Amérique* written by André Amblard of the Soissonnois infantry.[16]

Also added can be 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 never-before used material sheds much new light on the decision-making process at the top of the French military hierarchy. They are especially valuable for the time periods when Rochambeau was absent from the troops and

---

[14] *Reisen Beschreibung von America welche das Hochlöbliche Regiment von Zweybrücken hat gemacht zu Wasser und zu Land vom Jahr 1780 bis 84*.

[15] Milton S. Latham Journal MMC 1907, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

[16] Amblard enlisted at age 19 in 1773 and was discharged as a captain in 1793. His manuscript is located in the Archives Départementales de l'Ardèche in Privas, France. Excerpts were published in four installments by Francis Barbe, "De Lussas vers l'aventure . . . dans l'Histoire de France," *Revue de la Société des Enfants et Amis de Villeneuve-de-Berg*, new ser., vol. 57 (2001), pp. 183-198, vol. 58 (2002), pp. 239–56, vol. 59 (2003) and vol. 60 (2004). I am at a loss to explain why numerous passages from this journal are repeated verbatim in a ms by an unidentified officer of the Soissonnois regiment in the Huntington Library in California and which also contains maps of all French campsites that may have been copied from Berthier. 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.

Vioménil was in charge, but they contain little for the stay in Rhode Island. For Lauzun's Legion, long the only component of Rochambeau's army without a contemporary eye-witness 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. But these *Détails* begin only after the siege of Yorktown while Lauzun's Legion never entered Rhode Island in 1782 but returned to Delaware from Crompond/Yorktown Heights, New York.[17]

Among new sources not listed in Rice and Brown are also the correspondence of Rochambeau's aide-de-camp Captain Charles Malo François *comte* de Lameth, *aide-maréchal général des logis* (in May 1781), and that of his brother Captain Alexandre Théodor Victor *chevalier* de Lameth, who replaced Charles Malo François in the summer of 1782.[18] Also unavailable in 1972 was the *Journal de l'Armée aux ordres de Monsieur de 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 Regiment of Infantry and one of his aides-de-camp.[19] The largest body of materials not listed in Rice and Brown concerns the Royal Deux-Ponts regiment of infantry. Through the good offices of Ms Nancy Bayer I gained access to four letters written by her ancestor Wilhelm de Deux-Ponts from America[20] while the papers of Colonel Christian de Deux Ponts, which have been in part deposited in and in part acquired by German archives.[21] Also new are a letter written by Jean-François de

---

[17] 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.

[18] The letters are in the Archives du Département Val d'Oise in Cergy-Pontoise, no. 1J 191 and 1J 337/338. For the stay in Newport they contain mostly strength reports.

[19] Lauberdière's *Journal* is in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, Nouvelle Acquisitations Françaises, 17691. 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.

[20] The letters are owned by Anton Freiherr von Cetto in Oberlauterbach, Germany. They deal mostly with family affairs in France and Germany; the correspondence ends with William's departure for France after the victory at Yorktown.

[21] 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 at auction and are owned by the library.

Thuillière, a captain in the Royal Deux-Ponts preserved in the Archives Nationales[22] and two letters by Louis Eberhard von Esebeck, lieutenant-colonel in the Royal Deux-Ponts, dated Jamestown Island, Virginia, 12 and 16 December 1781.[23]

In 2008, the Society of the Cincinnati acquired at auction the papers of Captain François-Ignace Ervoil d'Oyré, an engineer with Rochambeau's army. The papers consist of a group of journals gathered in four parts entitled *Notes relatives aux mouvemens de l'armee françoise en Amerique* and cover the period of 1780 to 1782. In February 2009, the library also acquired one additional journal that fits into this series along with a collection of 37 letters of Captain Oyré written to a family member back in France, which cover his experiences in America.[24] Aditionally, I have been able to locate the journal kept by Antoine de Bellemare de Saint-Cyr, a *capitaine* in the Saintonge Regiment of Infantry, in the Warrington Dawson Collection, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University[25] and the Journal of Captain Charles Joseph de Losse de Bayac of the Bourbonnois Regiment of Infantry, whose two volumes begin with a brief history of the American troubles and end in 1783.[26] Though it only covers the months between 1 July 1782 to 20 September 1782 when French forces marched from Georgetown to Hunt's Tavern in New York and thus ends before they entered Rhode Island, the "Suite de journal des campagnes 1780. 1781. 1782 : Dans l'Amerique Septentrionale, 1782" purchased at auction by Princeton University in 2007 needs to be added to the list of newly discovered manuscripts since it contains valuable information on the regimental organization and logistics of the marches.[27]

---

[22] The letter is catalogued in Marine B4 172, Archives Nationales, Paris.

[23] John M. Lenhart, "Letter of an Officer of the Zweibrücken Regiment," *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, vol. 28, (January 1936), pp. 321-322, and (February 1936), pp. 350-360.

[24] d'Oyré (1739-1798) was one of nine engineers to serve with Rochambeau's army in North America. His *Notes relatives aux mouvemens de l'armee françoise en Amerique* have the call number MSS L2008F163 M; his 37 letters are catalogued under MSS L2009F30 M.

[25] *Extrait des Mémoires du chevalier de Bellemare de Saint-Cyr, lieutenant-colonel d'infanterie [Régt. de Saintonge] régié par lui-même en 1815*. The version at Duke University is a typed copy of a transcript made in 1856 by his great-nephew L.A. de Captot. The Warrington Collection consists of 7,846 items in 69 vols. Collection no. 1424. Transcripts and copies of mss by French officers are primarily in Boxes 38 to 42.

[26] Special Collections Department, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, VA, Accession no. 4976.

[27] General Manuscripts Bound, 2nd Series. Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library, call no. C0938 (no. 469). This 25-page ms is identified on the cover as "19ieme liasse", i.e. the 19th installment; none of the other notebooks have (yet) been found.

Sources that I have not been able to use for this study are the complete "Journal de la campagne de l'armée française... 1783" by Jean-Baptiste-Elzéar, *chevalier* de Coriolis (1754-1811), a lieutenant in the Bourbonnois Regiment in Rochambeau's army. This 153-page long journal is held by the Bibliothèque centrale des musées nationaux in the Louvre in Paris under the call no. LA 38 145.[28] Also unavailable were the journal of Xavier de Bertrand, a lieutenant in the Royal Deux-Ponts,[29] and the journal kept by Jean-Baptiste Dupleix de Cadignan of the Agenois Regiment.[30] Still unknown is unknown are the locations of the journals by officers such as Miollis, Ollonne, Menonville or the brothers Rosel, some of which Warrington Dawson had seen and/or excerpted in the 1930s.[31]

These discoveries bring the total of known French sources to over 70, many of which have never been used before, but their value for the project varies greatly. 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[32] or Gabriel-Gaspard baron de Gallatin, a *sous-lieutenant* in the Royal Deux-Ponts,[33] 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, viz. the

---

[28] The library also holds the "Manuscrit en partie autographe. Histoire de l'origine, de la source et des progrès de la guerre d'Amérique entre la Grande-Bretagne et ses colonies ... 1776, 1777." 11 cahiers, 285 pages. Extracts of the journal covering the shipwreck of La Bourgogne off the coast of Venezuela on 3 February 1783 were published by Maurice La Chesnais, "Un Officier français au Vénézuéla, par le Chevalier de Coriolis" *La Revue du Mois* vol. 7, (January-June 1909) and "Lettres d'un officier de l'Armée de Rochambeau: le chevalier de Coriolis" *Le correspondant* no. 326, (March 25, 1932), pp. 807-828.

[29] 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. Its current location is unknown.

[30] The Agenois Regiment formed part of the infantry that sailed on Admiral de Grasse' fleet to the Chesapeake. His manuscript *Journal des differentes campagnes que j'aÿ fait soit par terre ou par mer, depuis que je suis entré au service, ainsi que des principaux evenements qui se sont passés dans les differents climats que j'aÿ parcouru..., 1784-1785*; 2 volumes of 285 and 141 pages resp., is therefore only of limited value for this study. It was sold at auction in Paris in November 2009. I have been unable to identify and/or locate the buyer.

[31] See the list in Warrington Dawson, « Les 2112 français morts aux Etats-Unis de 1777 à 1783. » *Journal de la Société des américanistes* New Series vol. 28 (1936), pp. 1-12, pp. 9-11.

[32] 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 la Defense in Vincennes, series A13732, Nos. 59, 65,66,68,72,73,81,82.

[33] 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.

journals kept by Brisout de Barneville (ends on 5 December 1781),[34] Cromot du Bourg,[35] William de Deux-Ponts,[36] Amblard or the anonymous grenadier in the Bourbonnois 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[37] or Broglie[38] 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 hospitals or campsites[39] or, as in the case of Lauberdière, followed behind. Others such as the *chevalier* de Chastellux did not write a single word about the march,[40] neither did the *duc* de Lauzun,[41] while the *Détails* of 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. His description of the march to Yorktown consists of 10 lines; those of the return march are four pages long.[42] The usefulness of the majority of journals for the return march to Boston is 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 but 20 lines to the return march a year later. Only Verger, who had sailed with the siege artillery to Yorktown in August 1780, fills some of that void.[43]

---

[34] "Journal de Guerre de Brissout de Barneville. Mai 1780-Octobre 1781" *The French-American Review* vol. 3 , no. 4, (October 1950), pp. 217-278.

[35] 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.

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

[37] Louis-Philippe *comte* de Ségur, "Extraits de Lettres écrites d'Amérique par le *comte* de Ségur colonel en second du Régiment de Soissonnois à 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.

[38] "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.

[39] *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).

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

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

[42] 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.

[43] 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 is published in *The American*

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). Indispensable is also Bodinier's magisterial *Les officiers de l'armée royale combattants de la guerre d'Indépendance des États-Unis de Yorktown à l'an II* (Château de Vincennes, 1983). 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; only those of Lauzun's Legion are in the Archives Nationales in Paris.[44] Here Samuel F. Scott in his *From Yorktown to Valmy: The Transformation of the French Army in an Age of Revolution* (Niwot, CO, 1998) has produced an equally superb parallel volume to Bodinier's research on French andnon-French officers. Detailed research into the more than 6,000 names recorded in these files goes beyond the scope of this study. Such research would provide information as to which and how many French soldiers died and where they were buried.

On the American side, the single most important private source is 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.[45] Besides these papers another important source which has only lately become easily accessible on fold3.com are the pension application records of Revolutionary War veterans compiled in the 1830s. The vast majority of these thousands of applications were submitted by Continental Army or militia veterans, but there are also a handful of

---

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.

[44] The Bourbonnois *contrôles* are catalogued under 1 Yc 188 (1776-1783 and 4 Feb 1784 to 1786), Soissonnois *contrôles* have the number 1 Yc 966 (1776-1783 and 4 Feb 1784 to 1786), the Saintonge *contrôles* are 1 Yc 932 (1776-1783 and 4 Feb 1784 to 1786), the Royal Deux-Ponts *côntrôles* are 1 Yc 869 (1776-1783 and 4 Feb 1784 to 1786). The *contrôles* of the Auxonne Artillery are listed as 10 Yc 1 (1776-1783 and 4 Feb 1784 to 1786). The Lauzun *contrôles* in the Archives Nationales have the catalogue number D 2c 32 (March 1780-1783) and 8 Yc 17 (beginning on 4 Feb 1784 to 1786).

[45] The vast majority of the papers of Jeremiah Wadsworth are preserved in the collections of the Connecticut Historical Society in Hartford, Connecticut (CTHS), but some manuscripts can also be found in collections of the New-York Historical Society and other repositories such as the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) in Washington, DC where the Revolutionary War Pension and Bounty Land Warrant Application files, Film 27, Reel 2670 contain the Wadsworth and Carter Day Book 27 April 1781 to 13 November 1782. Since the beginning of this project the mss in CTHS have been re-catalogued, e.g. Box 155 is now Box 42 &c. Both cataloguing systems are used in this report.

applications by waggoners from Rhode Island and Connecticut which provide insights into this vital but frequently ignored aspect of the march to victory.[46]

Taken all together, the historiographical situation in Rhode Island can be summed up thus: we have a large body of primary French sources, many of which remain unpublished, as well as the equally virtually untapped voluminous correspondence between Wadsworth and his purchasing agents which allows the reconstruction of the economic side of the French presence in the state. There is no single major body of materials in Rhode Island, no "French War Papers" file or the papers of one or a few important men that tell the story of the French presence. Though every effort was made to look at all pertinent files in these archives, the many treasures deposited in the archives of the Newport Historical Society, the Rhode Island Historical Society in Providence and the Rhode Island State Archives also in Providence, especially account books and day ledgers, still contain much untapped material for the business relationships on the micro-economic level in a yet to be written book-length study of the French presence in Rhode Island. These sources form the basis for this survey, which is not meant as the place to retell in a different format once again the story of the balls and dances in Newport, of the infatuations of French officers with the beautiful Wanton daughters of Newport, or the grand funeral of Admiral de Ternay. Their translated and published stories are readily available to the interested reader in the journals of Baron Closen,[47] of Clermont-Crèvecœur,[48] of the *vicomte* de Rochambeau, and other titles listed in the bibliography. Desirable as such a project might be, this architectural and historical site survey and resource inventory is not a history of "Rochambeau in Newport." It is focused on troop movements within the state rather than those of naval vessels off Rhode Island's coast, which only recently have been treated expertly by noted Naval historian John B. Hattendorf.[49] Following the pattern established in the surveys for other states along the route in view of Goals 1) and 2), it is intended to give suggestions for future research. It focuses on unknown and unpublished primary sources rather than what is already readily available elswhere in print, and places these events within the historical context of the Yorktown campaign of 1781.

---

[46] The pension applications in NARA are accessible on-line as part of the fold3 collection of primary sources. They are searchable by name and keyword.

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

[48] 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.

[49] *Newport, the French Navy, and American Independence* (Newport, 2005).

METHODOLOGY

6.1 Criteria for Selection: How Sites Were Chosen for Inclusion

Since this survey is conducted with a view toward the study currently conducted by the NPS regarding the eligibility of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route to be designated a National Historic Trail, the criteria for selection in this Rhode Island resource inventory 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 for the Rhode Island inventory 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 historical and architectural survey was also conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Identification and Evaluation* (NPS, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1983). A discussion of the general methodology to be utilized 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 National Register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. Recognition of these resources is intended to contribute to an understanding of the historical and cultural foundations of the nation.

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.

Previous studies conducted along the W3R as well as for the NPS identified resources along the route in the following categories:

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 American Revolution, the Society of the Cincinnati, or local 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
State and National Parks

Using these criteria the writer inspected and inventoried on site all resources listed in this report. These resources fall into five different categories and groups:

Campsites and bivouacs
Buildings and building sites
Plaques, tablets, and markers
Monuments
Water Routes and River Crossings

6.2 The Form

Inventory Number. Each inventoried property is assigned an inventory number, which appears on the form. Site profiles and inventoried properties within the city of Newport are arranged based on the LIST OF QUARTERS OCCUPIED IN THE TOWN OF NEWPORT BY THE ARMY UNDER THE COMMAND OF THE COMTE DE ROCHAMBEAU, DURING THE WINTER QUARTERS OF 1780-81, published by Alan and Mary M. Simpson in "A New Look at How Rochambeau quartered his Army in Newport (1780-1781)." *Newport History* (Spring 1983), pp. 30-67.

Resources outside Newport are first listed geographically within a given area in the sequence in which they were visited rather than in a strictly chronological sequence which would have necessitated beginning the inventory with University Hall in Providence rather than the landing sites in Newport.

Historic Name. The historic name serves as a 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 Rhode Island State 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. Where possible a primary source mentioning the resource is listed with each site.

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

6.3 Other Parts of the Survey Report

In addition to the inventory forms and site profiles this report includes an overview of the French army of the *ancien régime,* of Franco-American conceptions and misconceptions, and of the winter quarters of French forces in Rhode Island America before their marches through Rhode Island to the southward in June 1781 and their return in November 1782.

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."[50] 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.[51] 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."[52]

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."[53] 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

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

[51] 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.

[52] 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).

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

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 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.[54]

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.[55] With him the project also died.[56]

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 National Park Service (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.

---

[54] 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.

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

[56] 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 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 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.[57] 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.[58] 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.[59]

---

[57] 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).

[58] 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.

[59] 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

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.[60] At the current stage of research it is unknown whether markers were erected by the French government in other states as well; there are none in Rhode Island.

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.

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 retired Yale University Professor Dr. Jacques Bossiere, the organization, whose title was shortened to W3R at the suggestion of Christian Bickert, was to function as a working committee that was 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

---

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).

[60] Images are available at http://xenophongroup.com/mcjoynt/vawrrmrk.htm

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 under suspended rules 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.[61] 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. Preceding the completion of the federally mandated resource study by nearly three months, Representative Maurice D.

[61] 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.

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.

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

April 27, 2006

The Honorable Frances P. Mainella
Director
National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW
Room 3200
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Director Mainella,

We are writing to request that the National Park Service help our offices draft a bill to authorize the establishment of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route (W3R) National Historic Trail. The W3R National Historic Trail would trace the 650-mile route that French troops under the command of General Jean-Baptiste de Rochambeau took from Newport, Rhode Island to Yorktown, Virginia in 1781. American troops under the command of Commander-in-Chief George Washington joined the French force outside New York City. On October 17 of that year, the combined armies defeated the British army with the help of a French fleet commanded by Admiral de Grasse. General Cornwallis' surrender that day at Yorktown ended major hostilities in the American Revolutionary War.

Given that the 225th anniversary of Cornwallis will occur in October 2006, we would very much appreciate it if the draft legislation could be provided to our offices by no later than May 22, 2006. If you have questions, please contact Kit Batten (Senator Lieberman's staff) at 202-228-3093 or Conrad Schatz (Senator Warner's staff) at 202-224-8130. Your attention to this matter is appreciated, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Senator Joseph Lieberman

Senator John Warner

On 26 February 2007, Senator Joseph Liebermann with Senator John Warner as a co-sponsor introduced Senate Resolution 686, "To amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Washington - Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail". On 1 March 2007, Representative Maurice Hinchey with Rep. James P. Moran as a co-sponsor introduced an identical bill as House Resolution 1286. Since only the Senate Resolution emerged from committee and was placed on the legislative calendar no other legislative action was taken on the legislation by the 110th Congress.

Following Congressional hearings, the United States House of Representatives on 25 March 2009 passed H.R. 146, "[T]o designate certain land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes." Following minor changes in the text, the United States Senate on 26 March 2009, "At 1:03 p.m.," received" a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, [which] announced that the House agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 146) entitled ``An Act to establish a battlefield acquisition grant program for the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes." House Speaker Representative Nancy Pelosi signed the bill on Monday, 30 March 2009. Later that day President Barack Obama signed HR 146, the "Omnibus Public Land Management Act" into Public Law No. 111-11. Section 5204 of this law establishes the "Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail" as the 29th National Historic Trail within the National Park System:

SEC. 5204. WASHINGTON-ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.
Section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)) (as amended by section 5202(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(29) WASHINGTON-ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL-

(A) IN GENERAL - The Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail, a corridor of approximately 600 miles following the route taken by the armies of General George Washington and Count Rochambeau between Newport, Rhode Island, and Yorktown, Virginia, in 1781 and 1782, as generally depicted on the map entitled `WASHINGTON-ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL', numbered T01/80,001, and dated June 2007.

(B) MAP- The map referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(C) ADMINISTRATION- The trail shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with--
(i) other Federal, State, tribal, regional, and local agencies; and
(ii) the private sector.

(D) LAND ACQUISITION- The United States shall not acquire for the trail any land or interest in land outside the exterior boundary of any federally-managed area without the consent of the owner of the land or interest in land.'.

The appointment of Joseph DiBello as Superintendent of the W3R-NHT, WaRo in NPS parlance, in the summer of 2009 concluded this phase of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail project. The next phase will focus on developing national criteria for inclusion in the actual trail system, i.e. is every land and water section traveled by Washington and/or Rochambeau by definition part of the W3R-NHT, how many troops have to have used a certain trail &c and the development of a management plan based on these criteria.

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

8.1 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 and endow 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 when 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. What formed the basis of their alliance, and what held it together, were not shared ideologies and ideals, nor common territorial or financial interests. The decision had little to do with any sympathies for the ideology of the revolutionaries.[62] In March 1776, the King told Vergennes how much he "disliked the precedent of one monarchy giving support to a republican insurrection against a

[62] American elites were under no illusion as to why France and Spain entered war. In a letter to Silas Deane of November 1781, Jeremiah Wadsworth told Deane "You seem to have supposed that France and Spain shou'd have entered into the War from no motives but to obtain justice for America—I had never such an Idea, Nations have other motives for making War than releveing the oppressed; and when France & Spain engaged in the present War, they intended to humble a haughty insolent and envious Neighour, to do this effectually they will, if wise, continue the War so as to keep America interested in every event to its close." Jeremiah Wadsworth Papers, Box 132, CTHS.

legitimate monarchy".[63] Only after Vergennes had convinced him that the goal was "not so much to terminate the war between America and England" and to create a republic in America "as to sustain and keep it [i.e., the war] alive to the detriment of the English, our natural and pronounced enemies" did he agree to release funds. Then why did France enter into that war? A 1783 Memorandum "Motifs de la Guerre" in the Rochambeau papers with annotations in the hand of Naval Minister the *duc* de Castries lists three reasons for French involvement in the war.[64] "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." The "weakening of English power" and a concurrent increase of power of other European nations, particularly of France, a balancing of powers, was not an end in itself but at the core of the centuries-old principles underlying French foreign policy.

French foreign policy was guided by a set of long-standing principles of international relations. One of them postulated that peace in Europe, and around the world, was best preserved by a more or less equitable balance of the great (European) powers both in Europe as well as around the globe. The eighteenth-century world was a European-centric, multi-polar world, based on the principle of the balance of powers. The Peace of Paris in 1763 had altered that balance of powers in favor of Britain which emerged as the world's sole super power. Due to her colonial empire as well as her geographic position as an island and her sea-faring history and traditions, she was less interested in Continental Europe than any other European power. That posed a problem for France as well as for most other European powers, whose diplomatic system depended on Britain playing a vital role in the balance of powers on the continent, a role she seemed to have abrogated.

In order to restore the balance of powers and to refocus Britain eastward onto the continent French foreign policy after 1763 set itself four goals. First she had to isolate Great Britain on the continent: that would allow France to focus her war on Britain. 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

---

[63] 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.

[64] 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).

Bavaria from the Wittelsbachs for the Netherlands, and by Prussia's considerable animosity with Great Britain for abandoning her in 1761, after 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 1761 Bourbon Family Pact 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 Britain had acquired in 1763. 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."[65] Thirdly she had to avoid all continental entanglements that could infringe upon her ability to wage war against the House of Hanover whenever and wherever the opportunity arose. And lastly she had to detach Britain from her North American colonies. British policy versus European powers as well as versus these colonies, combined with the free hand in the New World that France had gained with the cession of Canada, provided France the opportunity to achieve her goals.[66]

France's chief ministers from César Gabriel de Choiseul-Chevigny, *duc* de Praslin (Foreign Minister 1761 to 1766) to Charles Gravier *comte* de Vergennes, who became foreign minister in July 1774, were convinced that the most effective way to re-focus Britain onto the Continent was to confront Britain in her American colonies. Choiseul as well as his successor Vergennes were members of the *secret du roi*, the "Secret of the King", a group of primarily east-ward looking foreign policy advisors (including Vergennes since 1755) established by King Louis XV in 1745, which saw an expansive Russia as Europe's greatest threat. Vergennes, who had served as French ambassador to Constantinople from 1755 to 1768, argued that once Britain was detached from her colonies she would focus her attention again on Europe and assist France in her policy of containment of Russia through the strengthening the Baltic States, Poland, Hungary and the Ottoman Empire: make Britain a “European” power looking “East” rather than “West”. After 1763, France could count on the benevolent neutrality if not tacit support of her European neighbors for such a foreign policy. They too wanted to see British preponderance diminished even if 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-centered concert of states. It was for this goal that France spent over 1 billion livres

[65] Ibid. See also 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." Ibid., p. 15.
[66] The best introduction can be found in W.J. Eccles, *France in America* (New York, 1972).

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.

Being involved on the Continent was of vital importance to Britain too, but in the aftermath of the victory of 1763 she had forgotten that maxim. Britain had forgotten that involvement in Continental European affairs had been crucial for success around the world and paid a huge price for it in 1783 when she lost her American colonies. In 1775/76, Britain realized too late that she needed a "sword on the continent" such as Prussia during the Seven Years' War to keep France occupied on the Old Continent if she wanted to be successful in the rest of the world. In 1775/76, Britain found herself isolated in Europe, partly intentionally and partly by default, but certainly not due to French policies, even if Vergennes had taken full advantage of the foreign policy opportunities available to him. With France not having to worry about Prussia breathing down her neck and none of the other states willing to assist Britain, France could focus on the war in North America, the Caribbean and in India. This was a unique foreign-policy constellation during the eighteenth century: it is worth remembering that under any other configuration the victory at Saratoga would have made little difference for the future activities of France!

In other words: there was posturing behind France's ostentatious anger at the First Peace of Paris when 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. 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." [67]

[67] Quoted 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.

Bedford's worst fears and Choiseul's fondest hopes soon became reality. When London reminded the colonists once too often of their obligations to, and depence on, the mother country they responded with a *Declaration of Independence* on 4 July 1776 that stressed the differences with Britain rather than the commonalties.

Detaching themselves from their dependence on Britain, becoming an independent nation, was also the goal of hundreds of thousands of Americans represented in Congress in Philadelphia and it was at that point that French and American war aims met and coalesced. Britain on the other hand did not want to be detached from her colonies which is why American and French and later Spanish forces fought Great Britain in the four corners of the universe between 1775 and 1783. Only that this time Britain stood alone as France watched as British policies created just the political climate on America's Eastern seashore she hoped for.

In the years after 1763 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 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 Commons'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 hated law concerning the colonies ever passed by a British Parliament. Vehement opposition forced the repeal of 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.[68] The infamous *Boston Massacre* killed five people, including Crispus Attucks. On 9 June 1772, the British revenue schooner *Gaspée* ran aground off Warwick in the shallow waters on the northwestern side of Narraganesett Bay while chasing the packet boat *Hannah*. That night members of the Providence "chapter" of the Sons of Liberty under the leadership of Joseph Bucklin rowed out to

[68] 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).

the Gaspée and burned her to the waterline the next day.[69] The threat of charging the Sons with treason and sending them to England for trial galvanized opposition to British rule not only in New England but all over the colonies. In the fall of 1773 tensions flared up again in Boston and 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 1773, while at least one of the three ships bringing tea to Boston was vandalized and had its cargo thrown overboard 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.

When it came on 4 July 1776, that Declaration of Independence was addressed not so much to the American people – South Carolina's constitution establishing an Independent Government was signed on 26 March 1776, Rhode Island declared her independence on 4 May, North Carolina voted for independence on 12 April, Virginia on 15 May &c - or to King George III, who did not need to be informed of the fact that his colonies wanted to break away, but rather was "submitted to a candid world" in general and to France (and to a lesser degree to Spain) in particular. The colonists had started their fight with Britain penniless, without arms or many of the supplies and equipment needed to sustain that fight. Rebel leaders were well aware of both their need for outside assistance and of the only place where that assistance could come from: the two Bourbon kings Louis XVI of France and Carlos III of Spain.

[69] This was not the first run-in Rhode Islanders had had with the Royal Navy: in 1764 they attacked HMS St. John and in 1769 they burned the customs ship HMS Liberty on Goat Island in the harbor of Newport.

A Declaration of Independence was a first indispensable step toward acquiring that support – the rebels could only obtain the aid of France and Spain if they succeeded in portraying themselves as an independent nation fighting a common foe, by turning their civil war into a war between independent nations. In January 1776, Thomas Paine had written in *Common Sense* that "Every thing that is right or natural pleads for separation. 'TIS TIME TO PART", and added that "Nothing can settle our affairs so expeditiously as an open and determined declaration for independence…. [neither] France or Spain will give us any kind of assistance, while we profess ourselves the subjects of Britain. The custom of all courts is against us, and will be so, until, by an independence, we take rank with other nations.[70]

A few months later on 2 June 1776, Richard Henry Lee wrote to his fellow Virginian Landon Carter that "our enemies are determined upon the absolute conquest and subduction of N. America. It is not choice then, but necessity that calls for Independence, as the only means by which foreign Alliance can be obtained".[71] Even John Adams, who was privately convinced that Catholics, esp. the French kind, had horns and cloven feet, admitted the need for outside assistance.[72] In his autobiography he wrote of his fear – or hope? - following the departure of Richard Penn from Philadelphia in July 1775 to London with what is known as the Olive Branch Petition "That We should be driven to the Necessity of Declaring ourselves independent States, and that We ought now to be employed in preparing a Plan of Conferation (sic) for the Colonies, and Treaties to be proposed to foreign Powers particularly to France and Spain, that all these Measures ought to be maturely considered, and carefully prepared, together with a declaration of Independence. That these three Measures, Independence, Confederation and Negotiations with foreign Powers, particularly France, ought to go hand in hand, and be adopted all together." Why? Mostly because "we are distressed for want of artillery, arms, ammunition, clothing".[73] On 8 May 1776, fellow Bostonian James Warren wrote to Adams in a similar vein: "I am not fond of English or French tyranny, tho' if I must have one, I should prefer the last. I don't want a French army here, but I want to

---

[70] Thomas Paine, *Common Sense: Addressed to the Inhabitants of America* (Philadelphia, 1776), p. 24.

[71] James C. Ballagh, ed., *The Letters of Richard Henry Lee* (New York, 1911), vol. 1, p. 198.

[72] John Adams took a more benevolent approach toward American Catholics. "[L]ed by curiosity," Adams accompanied by Washington on 9 October 1774, attended a Catholic service at St. Mary's Church in Philadelphia. In a letter to his wife, Abigail, he described the service as "most awful and affecting; the poor wretches fingering their beads, chanting Latin, not a word of which they understood . . . everything [designed] to charm and bewitch the simple and ignorant." Charles Francis Adams, Familiar Letters of John Adams and His Wife Abigail, during the Revolution (New York, 1876), p. 46.

[73] John Adams autobiography, part 1, "John Adams," through 1776, sheet 22 of 53 [electr. edition]. *Adams Family Papers* at http://www.masshist.org/digitaladams/

have one employed against Britain, and I doubt whether that will be done, till you make a more explicit declaration of independence than is in your privateering resolves, or those for opening the ports. You will never be thought in earnest, and fully determined yourselves, and to be depended on by others, till you go further." [74]

8.2 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 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.[75] In 1765, Choiseul issued the first major new navy regulations since 1689, retired numerous incompetent officers, emphasized training, and in 1766 re-established the navy as an independent service in 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, viz at Yorktown in 1781, had become a possibility.[76]

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

---

[74] *Warren-Adams Letters, Being chiefly a correspondence among John Adams, Samuel Adams, and James Warren* vol. 1: 1743-1777 (Boston, 1917), p. 241.

[75] On Vergennes' goal of fighting the war against England overseas 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.

[76] 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.

functioning as in the days of Louis XIV."[77] 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 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 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 *Gâtinois,* created from the *Auvergne*, whose grenadiers and chasseurs stormed Redoubt No. 9 before Yorktown in 1781. Concurrently St. Germain 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 each 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

[77] 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).

and 1,148 men (excl. the auxiliary company), which for book-keeping purposes was set at 1,003 men for French, and 1,004 men for foreign, infantry. [78]

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. 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.[79] 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 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.[80]

During these same years, the army budget increased from 91.9 million livres 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

---

[78] Including the two *portes-drapeaux* (flag-bearers) and the *quartier-maître trésorier* (pay/ quarter master). The strength of a regiment is given by Kennett, *French forces*, p. 22.

[79] 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. Michel Pétard, "Les Étrangers au service de la France (1786)" *Tradition* vol. 32, (September 1989), pp. 21-29.

[80] 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.

of light troops.[81] The introduction of the Model 1777 *Charleville* musket, a .69 caliber weapon lighter, stronger and more reliable than the .75 caliber Land Pattern muskets known as "Brown Bess" used by the British, completed these reforms.[82]

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 of the system introduced by Lieutenant General Jean Baptiste Vaquette de Gribeauval (1715-1789) second to none, a well-deserved reputation as Lord 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 1777, and replacement by the Prince de Montbarey (minister until 1780).[83] 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.

---

[81] 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.

[82] 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.

[83] 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, wore a mix of at least two, if not three, different uniform patterns, e.g. 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 miters as they marched through Philadelphia.

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 and 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.

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.[84] 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 on 19 April 1775, when patriots alerted by Paul Revere, William Dawes, and Samuel Prescott attacked British troops at Lexington and Concord. 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 where they repulsed British redcoats under Sir William Howe twice before retreating on 17 June 1775. Two days earlier Congress had appointed 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. From mid-March to early April 1775, a secret plan to aid the Americans was drawn up in Versailles. When news of Lexington and Concord reached Paris the government of His Most Christian Majesty became the first foreign power to provide aid and support to the fledgling United States. In December 1775, Vergennes' emissary Julien-Alexandre Achard de Bonvouloir arrived in Philadelphia carrying instructions to establish semi-official relations and to sound out the mood in the colonies and of Congress. His report of 28 December 1775 detailing his conversations with the Secret Committee of Correspondence

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

reached Vergennes on 27 February 1776.[85] In it Bonvouloir assured the French minister in the most glowing terms that "Their affairs are in a good state ... their ardor and determination are incredible ... Everybody here is a soldier" and that "They are more powerful than is supposed. You can not imagine it, and it would surprise you. They are afraid of nothing - depend on that." Through Bonvouloir the Committee posed three questions to Vergennes:

1. Can he inform us what the disposition of the Court of France is toward the Colonies of North America; whether it is favorable, and in what way we can be reliably assured of this?

2. Can we obtain from France two skillful, faithful, well-recommended engineers, and what steps must be taken to procure them?

3. Can we have arms and other war supplies direct from France in exchange for the products of our country, and be allowed free entrance and exit to French harbors?

Bonvouloir's report brought a major shift in French policy which became obvious in a Council of State meeting on 12 March 1776, when Vergennes argued for providing arms to the Americans. Over Turgot's opposition he had outlined in a memorandum of 6 April 1776, the king decided on 22 April 1776, to provide funding to the Americans and to increase the naval budget as well to enable the navy to counter any hostile reaction to France's support for the rebels.

To supplement Deane's work but also in an effort to hide France's involvement in the American rebellion, Vergennes co-opted the playwright Pierre Augustin Caron de Beaumarchais, author of *The Barber of Seville*, into his service.[86] 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."[87] After some hesitation the king eventually

[85] The text of Bonvouloir's correspondence is printed in *New Materials for the History of the American Revolution*. John Durand, transl. and ed., (New York, 1889), pp. 1-16.
[86] Claude Van Tyne, "French Aid before the Alliance of 1778" *American Historical Review* vol. 31, (1925), pp. 20-40.
[87] 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.

agreed to let Beaumarchais act as the secret agent of the crown.[88] Following the Council meeting of 22 April 1776, 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.[89] On 2 May 1776, the crown released 1,000,000 livres to Beaumarchais to purchase supplies for the rebels and Spain matched the amount.[90] 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 Dutch island of St. Eustatius in the Caribbean.[91]

---

[88] 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.

[89] 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.

[90] Dull, *French Navy*, p. 52-53. See also Buchanan Parker Thomson, *Spain: Forgotten Ally of the American Revolution* (North Quincy, 1976) with an overview of Spanish expenditures on pp. 241-248, and Thomas A. Chávez, *Spain and the Independence of the United States. An Intrinsic Gift* (Albuquerque, 2002).

[91] See J. Franklin Jameson, "St. Eustatius in the American Revolution" *American Historical Review* vol. 8, no. 3, (July 1903), pp. 683-708. All warring parties benefitted from the status of the Netherlands as a neutral power, be that whether in Europe, where access to the capital market in Amsterdam was important for France, or in the Caribbean, where the island of St. Eustatius, which had become the first free port/free trade zone in the world in 1754, supplied crucial war materials, naval stores, and food supplies to all sides. At the height of the American war in 1779, 3,551 vessels entered (and presumably also cleared) St. Eustatius for a total of 7,102; in London in 1777, only 627 entered and 342 cleared the port for a total of 969; in Providence, Rhode Island, the total was 1,661 vessels in 1773. Even if the numbers for St. Eustatius were inflated by the war, they were still multiples of any other harbor in the Western world. R. G. Gilmore, “St. Eustatius: The Nexus for Colonial Caribbean Capitalism,” in: *The Archaeology of Interdependence: European Involvement in the Development of a Sovereign United States*, Douglas Comer, ed., (New York, 2013), pp. 41–60, p. 44. It was only when Britain felt she it had no other choice that she it declared war on the Netherlands in December 1780. When Admiral Sir George Brydges Rodney (1718–1792) captured the island on 3 February 1781, the total known value of loot was over £7 million.

To put this into perspective: the British budget for 1780 was £22 million. The prize was enough to cover Britain’s whole non-military budget for the year, at over 170 million livres, it was three and a half times the 48 million livres pricetag for the almost three-year-long stay of Rochambeau’s army in the New World. On the re-capture of the island see my "The French Capture of St. Eustatius, 26 November 1781" *The Journal of Caribbean History* vol. 27, no. 2, (1993), pp. 129-143.

An excellent recent discussion of the pivotal role of the “Golden Rock” in the survival of the Caribbean slave economies is Andrew Jackson O’Shaugnessy, *The Men Who Lost America: British Leadership, the American Revolution, and the Fate of Empire* (New Haven, CT, 2013), pp. 297–308.

By that time Britain's American Colonies were in open revolt and preparing to declare independence. Congress, aware of the need for military supplies and counting on France's willingness to provide them, drew up a list of what it needed. In its conversations with Bonvouloir the Committee had wondered whether they could "have arms and other war supplies direct from France"? Its 3 March 1776 instructions for Silas Deane, about to depart for France, were much more precise: "That the supply we at present want, is clothing and arms for twenty-five thousand men with a suitable quantity of ammunition and one hundred field pieces."[92] Having landed in Bordeaux in mid-June, Deane arrived in Paris on Saturday, 6 July 1776.[93] By the time he arrived in Paris and met foreign minister Vergennes on 11 July, France had already acted in support of the American rebels. Aware of the 1,000,000 livres loan, Dr. Jacques Barbeau-Dubourg, a close friend of Benjamin Franklin and one of the three men Deane had been instructed to meet with, had gone to see Gribeauval in the morning of 19 June 1776, i.e., before Deane arrived in Paris, to discuss ways in which France could assist the American rebels.[94] Later that day Barbeau-Dubourg informed *Vergennes* that Gribeauval had told him "[qu'] il avait dans les arsenaux du roi en canons du calibre 4, qui étaient les plus nécessaires dans leur position, plus de 3 a 400 pieces de nul usage actuel pour le service de l'Etat ... there are in the arsenals of the King 4-lb canons which are most necessary in their position, more than 3 or 400 pieces of no use in the service of the State." Gribeauval suggested that the fleurs-de-lis and other identifying marks could be erased and the guns sold to Spain which could ship them to Havana where the Americans could pick them up. France had enough officers to service these cannon and Gribeauval was already authorized to grant leave to those officers who requested it.[95]

France had correctly anticipated Congress' needs well before Deane arrived in Paris with his requests for "one hundred Field Pieces". Still, it could not have come at a better time for Inspector General of Artillery Jean Baptiste Vaquette de Gribeauval who at once sent inquiries to France's 18 military districts and the arsenals and fortresses in them requesting a report of the number of 4-lb guns, gun carriages and limbers stored there. The reports came back during late August and

---

[92] Congress' instructions to Deane of 3 March 1776 are at http://franklinpapers.org/, vol. 22, 23 March 1775 to 27 October 1776.

[93] Jared Sparks, *The Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution* vol. 1, (Boston, 1829), pp. 9-10. Deane described his travels in a letter to the Committee of Secret Correspondence from Paris dated 18 August 1776.

[94] The other two were the British spy Dr. Edward Bancroft and Jean-Baptiste Le Roy.

[95] The letter is printed in Henri Doniol, *Histoire de la participation de la France à l'établissement des États-Unis d'Amérique. Correspondance diplomatique et documents* 5 vols., (Paris, 1886-1892), vol. 1, p. 507.

early September and showed that Gribeauval had indeed hundreds of 4-lb guns of the type Vallière -- 27 M1732 long and 173 M1740, M1755 and M1759 *à la suédoise* cannon - in his arsenals. He did not have the 300 to 400 cannon that Barbeau-Dubourg had reported (he was, after all trying to convince Vergennes as well as War Minister St. Germain that France had more than enough cannon and could easily spare a few), but 173 Light 4-lb cannon *à la suédoise* and 27 Long M1732 4-lb cannon still added up to 200 guns, twice the number the Americans requested. Gribeauval was determined to dispose of them all - tubes, carriages and limbers.

By 14 September 1776, St. Germain had provided Philippe Jean-Baptiste Tronson du Coudray, with a list of the arsenals, forts and depots and the cannon, carriages and limbers available there and orders to inspect them. The order was briefly rescinded on 20 September but a few days later Du Coudray was on his way.[96] Following inspection, he was to send these "vieilles armes réformées sept ou huit ans plus tôt par Bellegards et pas encore livrées à Montieu ... these old weapons decommissioned seven or eight years ago by Bellegarde but not yet delivered to Montieu" to Dunkerque, Havre, Nantes and Bordeaux for shipment to the American rebels.[97] Between 20 April and 1 December 1777, eight of the nine vessels sent out by Beaumarchais arrived safely in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.[98]

Congress repeated the request in its instructions to Arthur Lee and Benjamin Franklin in September 1776, who were about to join Deane in France. "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

---

[96] Doniol, *Histoire*, p. 56.

[97] Nardin, *Gribeauval*, p. 291. Deane had promised Du Coudray, a gifted, but by all accounts exceedingly vain artillery major, 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." Bodinier, *Dictionnaire*; the Lafayette quote on p. 464.

[98] On her way from Martinique to Portsmouth the *Seine* became "the only ship of Beaumarchais's to be seized, and even then much of her military cargo was saved", i.e., because she had been unloaded in Martinique. Brian N. Morton and Donald C. Spinelli, *Beaumarchais and the American Revolution* (Lexington Books, 2003), p. 127.

the Service of the United States".[99] France met America's requests and by December 1777, had dispatched clothing for 30,000 men, 4,000 tents, 30,000 muskets with bayonets, over 100 tons of gunpowder, 194 4-pound cannons and gun carriages, 27 mortars, almost 13,000 shells and 50,000 round shot.[100]

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.[101] Deane had already entered into contracts with some twenty-seven (mostly French) 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."[102]

---

[99] Franklin left Philadelphia on 26 October and arrived in Quiberon after a 30-day journey on 29 November. He arrived in Paris on 21 December 1776. 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.

[100] Du Coudray rejected six of the 27 Long 4-lb guns as unserviceable. See Neil L. York, "Clandestine Aid and the American Revolutionary War Effort: A Re-Examination." *Military Affairs* vol. 43 no. 1 (February 1979), pp. 26-30. Jean Langlet, "Les ingenieurs de l'Ecole Royale de Génie de Mezières et les armes de la Manufacture de Charleville dans la guerre d'Indépendance américaine." *Revue historique Ardennais* vol. 34 (1999-2000), pp. 197-218, p. 200, estimates that over 100,000 muskets and pistols were sent to America.

[101] 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.

[102] Biographies in Blanco*, Encyclopedia*, passim; Coudray in vol. 1, pp. 405-406.

Congress had a lot to learn, but it learned quickly. Once those start-up problems were overcome, Franco-American relations proceeded considerably more smoothly. 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.

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 shortly after the arrival of Benjamin Franklin, 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, 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."

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. Vergennes decision reflects the two sides of the American victory at Saratoga: Burgoyne's surrender worried Vergennes as much as it pleased him. The rebellion was alive, French material support had not been wasted, but France was

not quite ready to openly enter the war - he would have liked some more time to prepare the navy and to convince Spain to openly join France in an alliance against Britain. He quickly found out, however, that he would neither get the open support of Spain nor the time to finish his preparations. Why? Upon hearing news of the surrender at Saratoga Lord North asked the House of Commons to repeal the Tea Act and the Massachusetts Government Act, the last of the Coercive Acts, and announced the dispatch of a Peace Commission, the so-called the Carlisle Commission, to America to offer the colonies/United States a large degree of self-rule. That was exactly what Vergennes had feared - what if the colonists would accept the proposal? In that case France would have to face the wrath of Britain alone and without allies. Convinced that he needed to be pro-active, Louis XVI on 30 January 1778 (more than eight weeks after the news of Saratoga had reached Versailles on 4 December 1777) instructed Conrad Alexandre Gerard to sign a Treaty of Amity and Commerce and a secret Treaty of Military Alliance with Deane, Franklin and Lee. The signing took place on 6 February, on 15 March the Court of St. James recalled its ambassador from Versailles. The rest is history, as they say. Yes, Saratoga sent an important message to Americans and to France, but the decision to acknowledge the independence of the US had as much or more to do with the British reaction to Saratoga as with the American victory as such.

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 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".[103] 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.[104]

---

[103] 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.

[104] 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.,

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.

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

The war France had expected since 1763 was on.[105] 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.

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

---

(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.

[105] Spain entered the war against Great Britain in April 1779 in the Convention of Aranjuez, while Great Britain declared war on the Netherlands in November 1780. An *Acte Royale* of 5 April 1779 set 17 June 1778 the official date for the beginning of Franco-British hostilities.

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.[106]

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.[107]

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 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 an important voice was clamoring for just such an expedition: that of the marquis de Lafayette,

---

[106] 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.

[107] All numbers from Fonteneau, "La période française", pp. 79-85.

who had returned to France in the Spring of 1779. It may well have been at Lafayette's urging that Franklin addressed a memorandum to Vergennes in February 1779, suggesting the dispatch of a corps of 4,000 soldiers to America.[108] In July, Vergennes asked Lafayette for a detailed study 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 ministers feared that unless the year 1780 brought at least one case of successful Franco-American cooperation, the colonists might make peace with Britain, leaving France to continue the war by herself.

8.4 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.[109]

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, the *chevalier* de la Luzerne, French minister to the United States, 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

---

[108] See Lee Kennett, *The French Forces in America, 1780-1783* (Westport, 1977), pp. 3-17.

[109] 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://xenophongroup.com/mcjoynt/dulltlk.htm

very advancive of the common Cause."[110] Washington repeated his views in a 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)".[111] 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 would be 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 question was 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, the ability to compromise and 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.[112] Lafayette's recent promotion to colonel in the French army had already ruffled some few feathers, and numerous officers made it 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 invasion of Britain. On 1 March 1780, Louis XVI promoted Rochambeau to lieutenant general and put him in charge of the expedition.[113]

---

[110] The letter is on the web at http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/gwhtml/gwhome.html.
[111] The letter is on the web at http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/gwhtml/gwhome.html.
[112] Lafayette 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 commissioned Corny a lieutenant colonel in the Continental Army on 5 June 1780.
[113] A new and very readable biography of Rochambeau is Jini Jones Vail, *Rochambeau: Washington's Ideal Lieutenant* (Tarentum, 2011).

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,[114] and 600 men from the *Légion de Lauzun* as a light force to the four 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,[115] a commissary department under Claude Blanchard,[116] 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,[117] 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.

8.5 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.[118] Outside considerations may have played a role in their selection as well. The upper echelons

---

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

[115] 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.

[116] Besides the *Journal of Claude Blanchard* 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.

[117] 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.

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

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. Lastly, the *duc* de Lauzun opined that he was "too much in fashion not to be employed in some brilliant manner".[119]

From among the French regiments Rochambeau picked the Bourbonnois, 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 Bourbonnois 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. Soissonnois' *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 *comte* de Charlus, appointed to the position in March 1780, was the son of the Navy minister, the decision to take the regiment not have been Rochambeau's alone.[120]

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

---

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

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

up losses in such units.[121] 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 founder and first *colonel propriétaire* Duke Christian IV of Zweibrücken.[122] 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![123] 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.

---

[121] 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 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.

[122] 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." Doniol, *Histoire*, 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.

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

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 of January 1780 to his father, 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.[124] 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 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 Bourbonnois 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.[125] 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.[126] When Claude Gabriel *marquis* de Choisy appeared in Brest on 17 April 1780, with five officers who

---

[124] *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.

[125] 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.

[126] 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.

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".[127] 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.[128] Men such as Fleury belonged to the lower nobility who provided about 90 per cent of the company-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.[129] 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.[130]

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-

---

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

[128] 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.

[129] Four hundred fifty-nine 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.

[130] 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).

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.[131] 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 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

---

[131] 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. See John Rothensteiner, "Paul de Saint Pierre. The First German-American Priest of the West." *Catholic Historical Review* vol. 5 (1920), pp. 195-222, and John M. Lenhart, "Notes on the biography of Paul de Saint Pierre." Ibid., vol. 21 (1935-1936), pp. 322-329, and Franz-Bernard Lickteig, "Paul of St. Peter O.C.D., Revolutionary War Chaplain and Mississippi River Missionary (1746-1826)." *The Sword* vol. 36 no. 2 (1976), pp. 17- 25 and pp. 35-37.

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.[132]

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 to 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.[133] 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 totaled 5,571 livres, the equivalent of nine annual peacetime incomes![134]

---

[132] Schwerin's original correspondence was sold to an American collector in the early 1960s; it is now (winter 2014/15) owned by Dr. Cliff J. Scheiner of Brooklyn, New York.

All quotes are from copies made for the Library of Congress in 1930. See my "'*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.

[133] Brisout de Barneville, aide to *baron* de 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.

[134] I am 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, or 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.

8.6 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 under Rochambeau. 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.

Below them was the rank and file. The French army was a *young* army. [135] In 1789, almost exactly 50 per cent of all enlisted men were between 18 and 25 years old, another 5 per cent were even younger. [136] 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, 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 %) 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 %) 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%) 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 Bourbonnois 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.[137]

The biggest difference between the Royal Deux-Ponts and French units was in the religious affiliation of the soldiers.[138] The French regiments were almost 100 % Catholic while the Royal Deux-Ponts was almost 40 % Protestant.

---

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

[136] Rochambeau's corps had at least one black soldier in its ranks: Jean Pandoua, "un fils d'amour" according to his enlistment record, who had joined the Bourbonnois regiment as a musician in 1777; after five years of service he deserted on 27 October 1782 in Connecticut.

[137] 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.

[138] Of twelve soldiers the religion is unknown.

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. Research on the French army and the troops of Rochambeau has proved this wrong. 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![139] 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 %) of its 1,146 men were peasants and "autres travailleurs de la campagne." The next largest group, 59 men (5 %), were tailors, 48 gave shoemaker as their profession, and 46 were masons. The rest were carpenters (24), butchers (22), wheelwrights (21) and a variety 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 Bourbonnois, which focuses almost exclusively on military events and contains little for the purposes of this study.[140] Neither does the journal of André Amblard of the Soissonnois, 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*.[141] The only child of Johann Paul Flohr, a butcher and small farmer, and

---

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

[140] Milton S. Latham Journal MMC 1907, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

[141] All personal data are taken from his enlistment record 1 Yc 869 (1776-1783) in the Service historique de l'armée de Terre, Château de Vincennes, France.

His *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. I am 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

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, just before his twentieth birthday, Flohr volunteered for an eight-year-term in the Royal Deux-Ponts. Flohr was not asked was not asked whether he wanted to fight in the American War and 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". Nevertheless, Flohr liked this “beautiful country” well enough to return to the United States in circa 1798, where he ended his days as a Lutheran minister in Wytheville, VA, in 1826.

---

it in a newly discovered Memoir" *American Heritage* vol. 43, no. 8, (December 1992), pp. 64-71; "A German Soldier in New England During the Revolutionary War: The Account of Georg Daniel Flohr" *Newport History* vol. 65, Part 2, no. 223, (Fall 1993), pp. 48-65; "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, "Georg Daniel Flohr's Journal: A New Perspective" *Colonial Williamsburg. The Journal of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation* vol. 15, no. 4, (Summer 1993), pp. 47-53. "Private Flohr's Other Life: The young German fought for American Independence, went home, and returned as a man of peace" *American Heritage* vol. 45, no. 6, (October 1994), pp. 94-95.