392/D-170

THE FIRST TWO FORT MOULTRIES

A STRUCTURAL HISTORY

FOSU 3
c.2

RETURN TO MUSEUM BRANCH

recd 1/22/69

June 30, 1968

Timmons
Beauss
8/15/95 / returned 8/18

FM 1+

THE FIRST TWO FORT MOULTRIES

A STRUCTURAL HISTORY

Fort Sumter National Monument

by

EDWIN C. BEARSS

FOSU 3
c.2



DIVISION OF HISTORY

Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation

June 30, 1968

National Park Service U.S. Department of the Interior

RETURN TO MUSEUM BRANCH

NATIONAL
PARK
SERVICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Table of Contents		i
List of Maps and Illustrations		ii
Foreword		iii
Introduction		v
Chapter I	Fort Moultrie, No. 1	1
Chapter II	Work is Started on Fort Moultrie, No. 2	22
Chapter III	Fort Moultrie, No. 2, is Completed and Wrecked	51
Chapter IV	Location of the First Two Fort Moultries	77
Appendix A		81
Bibliography		82

LIST OF MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

PLATE	Following Bibliography
I	Plan of Fort Moultrie and Map of the Battle of Sullivan's Island.
II	Plan of Platform in Sulivans [sic] Fort.
III	Plat of Part of Sullivan's Island, by J. Purcell.
IV	Plan of Fort--Moultrie on Sullivan's Island.
V	Diamond's Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 2.
VI	Macomb's Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 2.
VII	Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 1, Showing its Assumed Position in Relation to Fort Moultrie, No. 3.
VIII	Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 2, Showing its Position in Relation to Fort Moultrie, No. 3.

FOREWORD

This report was prepared to satisfy the research needs as enumerated in Historical Resource Study Proposal FOSU-H-4, The First Two Forts, 1776-1804, and so much of Historical Resource Study Proposal FOSU-H-1, Historical Base Maps, Fort Moultrie, as applies to the first two forts. This report documents the structural history of the Revolutionary Fort Moultrie and the 1794-1804 fort. In addition, I have endeavored to locate the first two forts in reference to today's fort. Archeological projects should be programmed to verify these locations and to secure additional data regarding the fabric of these two forts.

A number of people have assisted with the preparation of this report. Thanks are due Superintendent Paul Swartz and Historian John Dobrovolny of Fort Sumter National Monument for their assistance and cooperation at the site; to Mr. Elmer Parker and Mrs. Sara Jackson of the National Archives for suggesting sources and taking a keen interest in Fort Moultrie; to Dr. Ray Lewis of System Development Corporation, Falls Church, Virginia, for sharing his encyclopedic knowledge of American

Seacoast Fortifications; to Frank Sarles for proof-reading the final draft; and to Mrs. Sarah Smith for the many hours she spent typing the manuscript.

E. C. B.

Washington, D. C.
November 1968

INTRODUCTION

Fort Moultrie is well-known to students of American History. On two occasions actions centering on the fort had important and far reaching repercussions for our country. On June 28, 1776, American Patriots posted behind the palmetto and sand parapets of the fort repulsed, with heavy losses, a formidable British naval squadron. This victory came at an important time for the Americans. Until this moment, Gen. George Washington in 1776 had accomplished little beyond hurrying the British evacuation of Boston. The American army sent to overrun Canada had collapsed. Now word came of a victory in the South. News of the success reached Philadelphia shortly after the Declaration of Independence had been proclaimed. Now independence might become something beyond the bold statements set forth on parchment. Then in December 1860 Maj. Robert Anderson, when threatened by South Carolina Secessionists, evacuated Fort Moultrie and transferred its garrison to Fort Sumter. Three and one-half months later, South Carolina artillerists from Fort Moultrie participated in the bombardment of Fort Sumter, which sparked the Civil War.

There have been three Fort Moultries. The first of these was the palmetto and sand fort of the American Revolution, which the South Carolina assembly named in honor of Col. William Moultrie, following the repulse of the British fleet. Fort Moultrie, No. 1, disappeared in the post-Revolutionary years. Tradition has it swallowed by the sea. In 1794, when war with Great Britain appeared imminent, the Congress appropriated money for coastal defenses. Construction was started on Fort Moultrie, No. 2. With the easing of tensions following the Jay Treaty, work was suspended. The fort, a typical First System work, was completed in 1798 during the Quasi-War with France. Fort Moultrie, No. 2, was battered by high tides in 1803 and wrecked by the hurricane of 1804. Four years later, in 1808, when war again threatened with Great Britain, the construction of Fort Moultrie, No. 3, was commenced. A masonry work of the Second System, the fort was completed and garrisoned in December 1809. This is the Fort Moultrie of today, although it was greatly modified during the Civil War, the years 1872-1876, and between 1897 and 1903.

There are no surface remains of the first two Fort Moultries, and this study is designed to provide information as to the structural history of these two forts. The location of these two forts will be pinpointed in hopes that an archeological investigation will be undertaken and their foundations exposed.

CHAPTER I

Fort Moultrie, No. 1

In 1670 the settlement of Charleston began the colonization of South Carolina. For security reasons the town was begun on the west bank of the Ashley. At first, the lower part of the site of the present city was reserved for a port town. About 1672 this town was platted, and in 1680 Charleston was moved there.

Charleston was located at the point of the peninsula formed by the confluence of the Ashley and Cooper rivers. Two sea islands faced each other across the entrance to Charleston Harbor, Sullivan's Island to the northeast and Morris Island to the southwest. Sullivan's Island lay northeast and southwest, its western one-third curving in like a cupped hand toward Charleston. One and one-half miles southwest of the southernmost point of Sullivan's Island was the northernmost tip of Morris Island, Cummings Point. Fort Johnson, the work guarding the southern entrance to Charleston Harbor, was on James Island, two and one-eighth miles southwest of the western tip of Sullivan's Island. The anchorage between Fort Johnson and Sullivan's Island was known as Rebellion Road.

Because of a large shoal, the Lower Middle Ground (upon which Fort Sumter was to be located), ships entering Charleston Harbor had to navigate a course that skirted the southwestern shore of Sullivan's Island. The entrance to the harbor in turn was shielded by Charleston Bar, which was not abreast the mouth of the harbor, but some distance south of it. There were six passes through the bar.[1]

Sullivan's Island had been named for Capt. Florence O'Sullivan, one of the first settlers and a deputy of the Lords Proprietors. Its defense values were early recognized. In 1674 Captain O'Sullivan was placed in charge of a signal cannon on the island, and in subsequent years lookouts were stationed there to signal the approach of hostile ships. This signal aided in the defense of Charleston in 1706 against a French and Spanish attack.[2]

The South Carolina Patriots had been alerted early in 1776 to be on the lookout, as the British were planning an

---

1. "Map of the Clinton Collection, 302, Charleston, the British Attack of 1776"; "An Exact Plan of Charles-Town-Bar and Harbour, from an Actual Survey," Cartographic Branch, Library of Congress.

2. D. D. Wallace, History of South Carolina (New York, 1934) 2, 155.

attack on Charleston. It was recommended by the Continental Congress that preparations be made for a vigorous defense.

These words were hardly necessary for South Carolina. Charleston had a long Whig tradition, and from the first clash with Royal Governor Lord William Campbell, its leaders recognized its exposed position. The town had enjoyed its own tea party and the Whigs had spirited away public gunpowder and royal arms under cover of darkness. In June 1775 the province had raised two regiments, the 1st and 2d, of a thousand men each and a regiment (the 3d) of rangers for the frontier. It had taken possession of Fort Johnson, established a Rebel Government, and for President had elected John Rutledge, the influential dean of the Charleston bar.

Because of the extended absence from Charleston of Col. Christopher Gadsden of the 1st South Carolina Regiment, who was a member of the Second Continental Congress, the direction of the city's defense rested on the colonel of the 2d Regiment, William Moultrie.[3] Colonel Moultrie on March 2, 1776, had been ordered by President Rutledge to proceed to Sullivan's Island to take command of the force engaged in building a "large fort" designed by the engineers to be defended by 1,000 men. When he reached the island, Moultrie found a

---

3. George F. Scheer and Hugh F. Rankin, Rebels and Redcoats (New York, 1959), 148-150.

"great number of mechanics and negroe laborers" had been turned out to complete the works, as it was looked upon as the key to Charleston Harbor.[4]

Several officers had preceded Moultrie to the island, one of whom was Capt. Peter Horry. His company had been given the mission of preventing the British warships Tamar and Cherokee from putting ashore landing parties. Horry and his people had not been there very long before Moultrie and his regiment arrived. In the following weeks thousands of palmetto logs to be used in building the fort were rafted over from the mainland by Negro work gangs. Horry likened the fort to an "immense pen, 500 feet long, and 16 feet wide, filled with sand to stop the shot." For their platforms, the soldiers used two-inch plank, nailed down with spikes.[5]

Maj. Gen. Charles Lee, who reached Charleston on June 8 and took charge of the defenses, was unimpressed with the Sullivan's Island fort. At the time of his arrival, the parapet at the rear of the work was not more than "a few feet high," and the main gate was unfinished. The troops of the 2d South Carolina were camped behind the works," in huts and

---

4. William Moultrie, Memoirs of the American Revolution . . ., (New York, 1802), 1, 124.

5. Peter Horry and Mason L. Weems, The Life of General Francis Marion . . . (Philadelphia, 1866), pp. 36-37. Mr. Dewees had been ordered to supply palmetto logs not less than ten inches in diameter in the middle. One-third were to be 18 feet long; the rest 20 feet long. Henry Savage, Jr. Rivers of the Carolinas: The Santee (New York, 1956), 164-165.

booths covered with palmetto leaves." The only men posted in the fort were those assigned to the guard. "Mechanics and laborers were so numerous, in pressing on the work, and in lifting and fitting the heavy palmetto logs, which walled in the fort" that Moultrie feared that posting his regiment in the fort would "inconvenience the public service." [6]

Lee was disturbed to see that the Sullivan's Island fort was sited so that a bend in the island would permit an approach to its right flank by ships passing around the western tip of the island and into The Cove. Once the ships had anchored in The Cove, they would be able to enfilade the fort's front platform on which most of the heavy guns were mounted. To cope with this situation, he ordered Moultrie to have screens erected on the platform to shield the gun crews and a traverse thrown up to divide the fort. The traverse would enable the Americans to hold on in the forward portion of the fort, in case the British stormed the rear parapet, which had not been raised to its planned height, and secured a lodgment in the unfinished section of the work. When built, the traverse consisted

---

6. C. C. Jones, Sergeant William Jasper (Albany, 1876), 13; John Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2 vols. (Charleston, 1821), Vol. 2, 282, 283. Work on the rear parapet had been started on June 4.

of a breastwork of sand, behind which soldiers armed with pikes and muskets could take shelter.[7]

The successful passage of Charleston Bar by the British fleet and its occupation of Five-Fathom Hole, along with the landing of Maj. Gen. Henry Clinton's Redcoats on Long Island, caused Colonel Moultrie in the second week of June to break-up the camp of his 2d South Carolina Infantry Regiment. After striking their tents and razing their huts, the regiment moved bag and baggage into the works. Most of the mechanics and laborers now returned to the mainland. Capt. Ferdinand DeBraham, an engineer, was rushed over to Sullivan's Island to oversee the construction of some breastworks adjacent to the fort and at the "Advance Guard."[8]

On June 21 the American cannon mounted in the "Advance Guard" opened fire on two British ships making soundings in Hamlin Creek. British infantry posted on the Long Island side of The Breach replied with their small-arms. This skirmish focused General Lee's attention on Sullivan's Island. He was dismayed to learn at this time that the traverse he had ordered

---

7. Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2, 284-285; Jones, Sergeant Jasper, pp. 13-14.

8. Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2, 288.

Engineer DeBraham to throw up within the fort was so "illy executed as to threaten a speedy fall." He urged Moultrie to have it corrected before it was too late.[9] On the 22d Lee was disturbed to discover that the platform screens had not been erected, nor the traverse completed. Per-emptory orders were issued to push work on these projects. At the same time, Moultrie and DeBraham were to lay out an "advanced fleche" northwest of the fort, designed to cope with an attacking force approaching from The Cove.[10] Priority was given to the traverse, and accordingly work dragged on the Advanced Fleche and the screens for the platform. These two projects were far from completed on June 28--the day of the attack.

On the morning of June 28, 1776, when Sir Peter Parker's squadron left its anchorage in Five-Fathom Hole to force its way into Rebellion Road, the defenses of Sullivan's Island consisted of the "Advance Guard," armed with one 18-pounder and a 6-pounder, defended by Col. William Thomson's command--780-strong.[11] From the "Advance Guard," a range of barren

---

9. Lee to Moultrie, June 21, 1776, found in Moultrie's Memoirs, 1, 158-159.

10. Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2, 284-285; Lee to Moultrie, June 22, 1776, found in Moultrie's Memoirs, 1, 160-162.

11. Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2, 289; Joseph Johnson, Traditions and Reminiscences, Chiefly of

dunes fronted by a hard beach extended as far as Moultrie's fort. About one-fourth mile east of the fort, at the island's narrowest point, a breastwork, designated the "Quarter Guard," had been thrown up. A small force commanded by a lieutenant was posted at this point.[12]

Moultrie's fort (which had no official designation at this time) was a square, with a bastion at each angle, large enough to contain, when finished, 1,000 men. It was built of palmetto logs laid one upon the other, in two parallel rows at 16 feet apart, bound together at intervals with timber dove-tailed and bolted into the logs. The space between the two lines of logs was filled with sand. The merlons were walled entirely by palmetto logs, notched into one another at the angles, well bolted together, and strengthened with pieces of timber. They were 16 feet thick, filled in with sand, and ten feet above the platforms. The platforms were supported by brick pillars.

---

the American Revolution in the South(Charleston, 1851), pp. 90-91. The "Advance Guard" was constructed of palmetto logs, with merlons, on a brick foundation. The brick foundations were seen by Dr. Johnson shortly before 1850, when they were uncovered by shifting sand.

12. Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2, 289. In 1850 the Moultrie House was located on the site of the Quarter Guard.

The fort was finished only on the front or southeastern curtain and bastion, and on the southwest curtain and bastion; the northeastern curtain and the northwestern curtain and bastions were unfinished; being logged up to a height of about seven feet. Necessity, however, devised an expedient for making the unfinished parts tenable against an escalade by placing thick, long planks upright against the unfinished outside wall. These were inclined and projected over it, which increased the height by ten or 15 feet and through which loop-holes had been bored. The magazine was located in the northeast bastion. The platforms, as finished, only extended along the southeastern front of the fort, and its southwestern side. Upon these platforms the cannon were mounted. In the southeast bastion the flagstaff was raised, bearing a blue flag with a white crescent on which was emblazoned the word,"LIBERTY." Three 18- and two 9-pounders were mounted in this bastion. Along the southeast curtain six French 26-pounders and three English 18-pounders were placed. There were three French 26-pounders and two 9-pounders in the southwest bastion. In the southwest curtain there were six cannon: 12-and 9-pounders. Connected with the front angle of each rear-bastion of the fort were cavaliers extending a short distance to the right and left of the main work. Three 12-pounders were mounted in each of them. All

told there were emplaced in the fort and cavaliers 31 cannon; of which only 25, at any possible moment, could bear upon an enemy fleet anchored abreast the work. Even so, the four 9-pounders on the two inner sides of the front bastions could be scarcely used. Narrow banquettes were placed along the walls, where the plank was raised against them, for the soldiers to stand upon to fire through loopholes.[13]

The fort was garrisoned by 344 officers and men of the 2d South Carolina Infantry and 20 members of the 4th South Carolina Artillery Regiment. Colonel Moultrie, who was suffering from an acute attack of gout, was in overall command of the stronghold; Lt. Col. Isaac Motte was in charge on the right and Maj. Francis Marion on the left.[14]

There are two large scale maps of the fort prepared by contemporaries--one by Lt. Col. Thomas James of the Royal Regiment of Artillery and the other by an American draftsman to accompany John Drayton's Memoirs of the American Revolution.

---

13. Jones, Sergeant William Jasper, pp. 14-15.

14. Other officers posted in the fort on June 28 were: Adjutant Andrew Dellient; Capts. Peter Horry, Nicholas Eveleigh, James McDonald, Isaac Harleston, Charles Mott, Francis Huger, Richard Ashby, Richard Shubrick, William Oliphant, and John Blake; and Lts. William Charnock, Thomas Lessesne, Thomas Moultrie, Daniel Maryck, Jacob Shubrick, Thomas Dunbar, William Moultrie, Jr., Thomas Hall, Henry Gray, Isaac Dubose, Richard B. Baker, Adam Proveaux, Richard Mayson, Peter Gray, Basil Jackson, and Gad Marion. Moultrie, Memoirs, 1, 183; Horry & Weems, Life of Francis Marion, p. 41.

On both maps, the configuration of the fort is similar. The major difference is the position of the cavaliers. James shows them connecting with the rear angle of each front-bastion, while Drayton's map depicts them connecting with front angle of each rear-bastion. As Drayton was on the ground, while Colonel James was afloat and had to observe the fort at a distance, it is presumed that Drayton's map is correct on this point. (Copies of both maps accompany this report.)

Midway between the fort and the northwest point of Sullivan's Island was the Advance Fleche or "Rear Guard." Although this work had not been completed, it was manned by a small detachment.[15]

Sir Peter Parker's fleet had been repulsed with heavy losses, as it sought to beat down the fort with crashing broadsides. When Colonel Moultrie mustered his command on the 29th, he found that the defense of the fort had cost the Americans 38 casualties: 12 killed and 26 wounded. The fort itself had suffered little damage in the bombardment, although the merlons were riddled. The native palmetto had withstood the assault of foreign oak.[16]

---

15. In 1850 the Episcopal Church was located on the site of the Advance Fleche. Johnson, Traditions, p. 95.

16. South Carolina and American General Gazette, Aug. 2, 1776.

The British reported that the materials of which the fort was built "form no inconsiderable part of its strength. The Piemeto [sic] Tree, of a springy substance, is used in framing the Parapet & the interstaces filled with sand. We have found by experience that this construction will resist the heaviest fire." [17]

In addition, a morass located in the fort's interior had helped nullify the effectiveness of the high angle fire of the xiii-inch mortar mounted in the bomb-ketch Thunder. Although most of the bombs fired by the mortar fell within the work, they were "swallowed . . . up instantly" by the swamp.[18]

The South Carolina Assembly in July passed a resolution naming the fort on Sullivan's Island, Fort Moultrie, in honor of the officer who had commanded its defense on June 28.[19]

In the days following the repulse of Parker's squadron and before the British withdrew from the area in late July, the Americans strengthened the defenses of Fort Moultrie.

---

17. "Observations upon the Attack made by Sir Peter Parker upon Fort Sullivan," June 28, 1776, British Museum, MSS 25, 490, folio 31.

18. Moultrie, Memoirs, 1, 174-175; Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2, 297.

19. Moultrie, Memoirs, 1, 183.

Col. Isaac Huger's regiment on July 1 volunteered to go over to Sullivan's Island as a fatigue party and help strengthen the works. Lee would have preferred to send a corps of Negroes, but he was overruled by President Rutledge. Moultrie was to have these people throw up a redoubt on the beach designed to resist a landing, while a team of carpenters finished the gate to the fort.[20]

Following the withdrawal of the British, the fort and Sullivan's Island were garrisoned by the 1st South Carolina Regiment of the Continental Establishment. Charles C. Pinckney who had succeeded Col. Christopher Gadsden as regimental commander had his command post in December 1777 in Fort Moultrie.[21]

In that year an unidentified Frenchman visited Sullivans' Island. He reported that

> the palmetto,which is more plentiful in this vicinity than anything else, is a tree of great size and grandeur, without

---

20. Lee to Moultrie, July 1, 1776, found in Moultrie's Memoirs, 1, 171-172. As the gateway to the fort was unfinished at the time of the attack, it had been barricaded with timbers 8 - or 10-inch square, which required three or four men to remove. Ibid., 176.

21. "Records of the Regiments of the South Carolina Line, Continental Establishment," The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, 6, No. 1, pp. 13-14; 7, No. 2, pp. 75-80, 131-133.

> branches, very straight and very spongy. This latter quality renders it so elastic that when a bullet strikes it, it sinks in but does not go through. Thus a fort constructed of palmettoes can withstand a great fire of bullets and actually became stronger as more and more metal buries itself within its walls. This is so true that the Americans, instead of repairing the holes made by the fire from the British ship, merely plastered over them, leaving the bullets encased in the walls.
>
> These forts, built of palmetto timbers lying one above the other, are not raised very high, and their construction would seem to make an attack by a scaling party easy, but getting to the fort and making a landing under its guns is not only difficult, as the British found out, 22 but also very dangerous and impracticable.

Colonel Pinckney and his regiment were still at Fort Moultrie in May 1779. The 1st South Carolina (Pinckney's regiment)was known for its smart appearance and orderly conduct. Yet the Colonel was always dissatisfied, always fearful that the regiment might disgrace itself and him. When the 1st South Carolina was ordered into Charleston for a tour of duty after 18 months on Sullivan's Island, Pinckney lamented that his men might be "Infallibly Ruined," and that they would become a "Nucence and Burthen to the Country." He cautioned against the "Disappation and Seduction of the Town" and urged

---

22. "A Frenchman Visits Charleston in 1777," The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, 52, No. 2, p. 89.

his men for the "Love of Military Glory, which should Swell the soldiers breast and Lead him to Renown, to Exert every Endeavour to preserve and Increase the Discipline of the Regiment." Pinckney's orders for the day had two themes: (a) all violators of regulations could count on swift and certain punishment; and (b) soldiers should regulate their lives by the worthiest standards. While a strict disciplinarian, Pinckney always sought to see that his men were well provided with rations and clothing.[23]

In January 1780, the month before the British army led by Maj. Gen. Sir Henry Clinton landed on Johns Island, 30 miles south of Charleston, and Vice Adm. Marriot Arbuthnot's fleet appeared off Charleston Bar, the 6th South Carolina garrisoned Fort Moultrie.[24] With the city and harbor again threatened, Maj. Gen. Benjamin Lincoln, the American commander responsible for the area's defense, ordered Colonel Pinckney and his 1st South Carolina back to Sullivan's Island. After

---

23. "Orders by Col. Pinckney, Jan. 6, 1777, from An Order Book of the 1st Regt. S. C. Line, Continental Establishment," South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, 7, No. 2, p. 79.

24. The fort's commandant was Maj. Isaac Harleston of the 6th South Carolina. "Records of the Regiments of the South Carolina Line, Continental Establishment," The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, 6, No. 1, pp.13-14.

Arbuthnot's fleet had fought its way past Fort Moultrie on April 8 and had anchored in Rebellion Road, General Lincoln determined to reduce his force posted on Sullivan's Island. Colonel Pinckney with most of his command was ordered to Charleston, and Lt. Col. William Scott was left in charge of the troops garrisoning Fort Moultrie and holding Sullivan's Island.[25]

At daybreak on May 3, 1780, 200 sailors and marines led by Capt. Charles Hudson of His Majesty's frigate Richmond made an unopposed landing on Sullivan's Island at The Breach. Pushing forward, the British closed in on Fort Moultrie. On May 7 the garrison, 160-strong, was surrendered by Colonel Scott to Captain Hudson.[26]

The British were understandably jubilant. "Fort Moultrie the Great, has fallen!"a diarist wrote. When he landed and

---

25. Lincoln to President of Congress, April 9, 1780, Papers of the Continental Congress, CLVIII, pt. 2, pp. 369-370.

26. "A Journal of the Operations before Charleston, to the Day of the Surrender to the British Forces," pp. 127-128; Knowles to Clinton, May 10, 1780, Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Banastre Tarleton, A History of the Campaign of 1780 and 1781 in the Southern Provinces of North America (Dublin, 1786), pp. 55-56; Archibald Robertson, His Diaries and Sketches in America, 1762-1780 (New York, 1930), p. 227.

inspected the fort, Admiral Arbuthnot called it "the strongest fortress of its size I ever beheld." [27]

Maj. Patrick Ferguson on May 7 had received permission from General Clinton to attack Fort Moultrie. While effecting last minute preparations, word was received that the fort had surrendered to the navy. One of the soldiers was led by his curiosity to see "this Fort that has done us so much mischief, and which the Rebels boasted we could never take." Crossing over to Sullivan's Island he described it as

> the strongest Fort ever built by Hands. No labour has been spared to complete it. You can have no Idea of its strength without being Inside it; therefore it would be needless for me to describe it. They [the Rebels] have moved some of their Cannon to Town since we have invested their lines. Still there remains thirty-one Cannon mounted, a Number of shells, a 10 inch Brass Mortar, sixty Casks of Powder, three thousand Cannon cartridges, forty thousand Musket Cartridges, and a large Quantity of Provisions. It would be impossible to storm it; and none but cowardly Rascals would ever give up so strong a post.[28]

No detailed plans depicting Fort Moultrie as it appeared in 1780 have been located. We know, however, that Archibald Robertson made such a drawing of the fort as it appeared on

---

27. Arbuthnot to Germain, May 15, 1780, Germain Papers, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

28. "Journal of the Investment of Charleston on the Land Side" (Clinton Papers).

June 3, 1780, but his sketch has disappeared.[29] The descriptions left by soldiers and sailors, along with small-scale maps of the area prepared by Sir Henry Clinton's engineers, lead to the conclusion that in the period between June 28, 1776, and May 7, 1780, the Americans had completed the fort, as laid out by the American engineers early in 1776.

Fort Moultrie was reoccupied by the Americans following the evacuation of Charleston by the British on December 14, 1782. The fort was garrisoned by corporal's guard on October 6, 1783, when the wind picked up and commenced blowing out of the northeast. Toward evening it increased in violence, and by midnight it was a hurricane. The wind and accompanying rains did considerable damage to the wharves and shipping in the harbor, as well as the forts. Very few lives were lost, however, as most people had observed the high tides caused by the approaching storm and had fled from areas likely to be inundated. While the storm was at its height on Wednesday, the 8th, the winds veered from the northeast to the northwest, which caused lower tides than usually accompanied a hurricane. Had the winds shifted to the east or southeast

---

29. Robertson, Diaries, p. 227.

"Old Timers" were heard to remark, "the city would have experienced all the horrors and destruction of September 1752."[30]

His Majesty's government by the Treaty of Paris, formally proclaimed by the Congress on April 19, 1783, had recognized the independence of the United States. There was now no need to garrison Fort Moultrie, and no efforts were made to repair the damage suffered in the hurricane of 1783. People residing on Sullivan's Island, with the withdrawal of the garrison, began wrecking the fort to secure building materials. The assaults of man and nature on the fort had reduced the work to a wreck by the time of President George Washington's tour of the southern states in 1791. On May 5 the President visited Sullivan's Island. He was accompanied by General Moultrie and several other promanent Charlestonians. While on the island "he had the pleasure of viewing the remains of Fort Moultrie, so celebrated for its gallant defense against a powerful British fleet and army in the year 1776." On Sullivan's Island, he was "shown the greatest politeness and attention," and he was back in Charleston by 2 p.m.[31]

The South Carolina legislature in the same year passed "a resolution permitting people to build on Sullivan's Island

---

30. South Carolina Weekly Gazette, Oct. 11, 1783.

31. The City Gazette and Daily Advertizer, May 6, 1791.

on one-half acre lots, subject to the condition of their being removed, whenever demanded; by the governor or commander in chief." This led to the establishment of Moultrieville, and a rapid increase in population on the island. By 1802 most of the island had been platted, and before another five years had passed, a traveler reported:

> Almost every part of the island, which is nearly three miles long, is now occupied, and contains upwards of two hundred dwelling-houses besides kitchens and out offices. This place is little resorted to during the winter and spring; but in the summer and autumn numbers of people reside there, for pleasure or health; and packet boats are plying, at all hours, between it and Charleston. Along the hard beach of this island, its inhabitants enjoy the amusement of riding or walking; while the ocean incessantly breaks its waves at their feet, and vessels pass within two or three hundred yards of the shore.[32]

With no trees available for building materials, newcomers to the island in the period before work was started on Fort Moultrie, No. 2, in 1794, undoubtedly wreaked additional havoc on the remains President Washington had viewed in 1791. As

---

32. John Lambert, Travels Through Canada, and the United States of North America in the Years 1806, 1807 & 1808 . . . (London, 1816), 2, 158-159. According to John Drayton, Sullivan's Island until 1700 had been heavily wooded, but in that year the assembly passed an act "directing them to be cleared and cut down; except some remarkable trees, which were left standing as marks for pilots" entering and leaving the harbor. John Drayton, A View of South Carolina . . . (Charleston, 1802), pp. 206-207.

soon as the palmetto logs were removed, the sand parapets quickly became unrecognized sand hills. The brickwork was either salvaged for use in Fort Moultrie, No. 2, and for private homes, or covered by the shifting sands.

####
##
#

CHAPTER II

Work Is Started On Fort Moultrie, No. 2

The Treaty of Paris by which Great Britain in 1783 recognized the independence of the United States left many vexing problems, as there was no love lost between the two nations. Apart from a pro-British Federalist minority, recollections of the late conflict were sufficient to embitter American feeling against Great Britain far into the 19th Century. On the opposite side of the Atlantic, too, the traditions of the Revolution were of importance. The prevailing sentiment was one of dislike of the ex-colonists, though, as in the United States, there were minority groups that viewed the new nation across the ocean with friendliness.

The problems in Anglo-American relations after 1783 were, however, far more than a legacy of hostility—there were acute practical difficulties. Great Britain had retained Canada, and this would prove an irritant until well into the 19th Century. Aggressive British merchants intended to hold on to the fur trade in the region south and west of the Great Lakes. Charges were voiced that the British were backing the Miami Confederacy in the Northwest. British retention

of the Northwest posts, especially Detroit, met with vigorous American protests.

It was not on the frontier alone that American and British interests were in conflict. Until 1776 the 13 Colonies had been an integral part of the British colonial system, both as a market for British manufactures and as the chief source of provisions for the British West Indies. In 1783 the King's ministers faced the problem of formulating a new commercial relationship with the former colonists. There had been in 1784 a bitter dispute in England between groups favoring a liberal policy and the granting of commercial privileges, and groups which favored the maintenance of the British Navigation System and the exclusion of the United States. The liberals were defeated. Victory by the protagonists of Britain's established system in 1783-1784 meant that in the years immediately following the Treaty of Paris the United States was placed on a footing with other foreign nations. Instead of prospering within the same system, and achieving a sound basis of friendly commercial intercourse, the United States and Great Britain became commercial rivals in the years after 1783.

Despite these residual problems, America managed to remain at peace with her powerful neighbor across the Atlantic for the decade after independence. Additional strain to relations

between the two English-speaking nations was caused by the outbreak of war between Great Britain and France in 1793. The United States as a great commercial neutral could not avoid difficulties concerning neutral rights and trade. In her desire to reap benefits from the European war, and to engage, with as much freedom as possible, in trade with both belligerents, she discovered that war could produce huge profits for the enterprising neutral, but that there were also corresponding difficulties. The United States was to find in the years before 1812 that Great Britain had no desire to see France gain the benefits of an extensive neutral trade. France, recognizing the power of His Majesty's navy, opened the trade between the French West Indies and France to United States shipping soon after the outbreak of hostilities. Great Britain in turn invoked the so-called Rule of 1756, by which a trade closed to a neutral in time of peace could not be opened in time of war. America's answer was to inaugurate the system of the "broken voyage," whereby goods eventually destined for France were first shipped to the United States.[1]

As they pushed their blockade of France, the King's ministers in 1793 had declared breadstuffs contraband.

---

1. Reginald Horsman, The Causes of The War of 1812 (Philadelphia, 1962), 13-19.

In November they had forbidden all trade with the French West Indies. This hurt American shipping. The early months of 1794 found the newspapers filled with lists of American vessels captured in the West Indies and their masters haled before British prize courts and their ships condemned. Along the Atlantic and Caribbean shipping lanes, few escaped British or Spanish privateers. If the American captains tried to trade with the British instead, they became fair game for the French and fared no better.[2]

Many times, American ships were taken unjustly and condemned illegally by admiralty courts. When cargoes were not confiscated, they often rotted before inspection was completed and the masters were permitted to clear from the harbor. Crews were often treated worse. As a result of the British Orders in Council, few ships sailed from American ports. With the United States helpless, British men-of-war entered and left the young republic's ports unmolested. As if the British actions were not enough to galvanize the Americans into action, the Algerian pirates were. In the autumn of 1793, they had captured 11 vessels flying the American flag and imprisoned the crews. There was trouble in Charleston Harbor in

---

2. J. B. McMaster, A History of the People of the United States . . ., 8 vols. (New York, 1913), 2, 166-168; R. G. Albion and J. B. Pope, Sea Lanes in War Time (New York, 1942), 73-74.

December 1793. On the 20th the British sloop-of-war Goelan anchored in Rebellion Road. The next day she got under way and when opposite Fort Johnson, she came to. A party went ashore, and informed the gunner (Capt. Michael Kalteisen being absent in Charleston) that their vessel was a British warship and needed supplies. The gunner told the sailors that Goelan must come to anchor under the guns of the fort, and there await inspection by the port physician in conformity with a law enacted by the State of South Carolina, which precluded any vessel with more than 30 hands from going up to Charleston without submitting to an examination. Moreover, the gunner observed, the inspection was especially necessary, "as malignant disorders were prevelent in the West Indies."

The lieutenant in charge answered that there were not more than five or six hands on sick call, and that "His Majesty's ship could not be thus restricted."

"Those are my orders," the gunner retorted.

After employing "insolent, threatening language," the lieutenant and sailors returned to their ship.

Shortly thereafter, the lookout on Fort Johnson observed that Goelan was making sail. Whereupon the gunner had a shot fired from a musket, as a signal for the pilot to heave to. When the lieutenant again landed, he demanded a written

explanation of why the vessel could not proceed up to the town. The gunner was agreeable. Meanwhile, the sailors on Goelan had loaded one of their cannon with a blank charge, which they discharged. The gunner now called for his artillerists to load their cannon with shot. The lieutenant, seeing this, inquired,"Do you dare fire on His Majesty's ship?"

"Yes," and "on the Queen's ship too, if she does not comply with the laws of the state," was the answer.

Goelan now anchored, and the lieutenant prepared to reboard, after being informed that his captain might go up to Charleston in his small boat, if he thought proper.

Captain Woolly obliged himself of this opportunity. Disembarking at Charleston, he asked to see Captain Kalteisen. When they met, Kalteisen explained to Woolly the cause of the detention. Woolly announced that he was satisfied, as "all vessels were liable to be restricted by the law of the ports into which they entered." Woolly next explained to Kalteisen that he was "in want of necessaries, and wished to come up to the city to obtain them." Kalteisen was placed in a quandary by this request,as Governor William Moultrie was in Columbia. He would, however, permit Woolly to send for the "necessaries" in his small boat. Woolly said the craft was too small, so Kalteisen agreed to permit him to

bring Goelan up to Charleston. Kalteisen was subjected to considerable criticism by the Republican press of Charleston for this action.[3]

A mass-meeting was held at the Charleston Exchange on February 28, 1794, for the purpose of "taking into consideration the expediency of preparing and transmitting to Congress a spirited remonstrance on the late alarming depredations committed on the trade of the United States, and the total destruction of it contemplated in the additional instructions from the Court of St. James to the commanders of the British vessels, dated November 6, 1793." The remonstrance was duly drawn up and forwarded to Philadelphia.[4]

Congress was already moving to take corrective action. Spurred by President George Washington's words of December 3, 1793, regarding the dangers of a defenseless Atlantic coast, Congress was looking into the problem of providing defenses for the ports and harbors. On February 28, 1794, Secretary of War Henry Knox transmitted to the House of Representatives

---

3. The City Gazette & Daily Advertizer, April 28, 1794. William Moultrie had been elected to his second term as governor of South Carolina in 1792.

4. Ibid., March 1, 1794. The committee charged with drawing up the remonstrance included: T. Corbett, T. Morris, W. Crafts, S. Priouleau, N. Russell, Captain Jones, R. Hazelehurst, W. Pressman, J. Theus, W. Sumarfell, and D. Alexander.

a report on such "ports and harbors of the United States as require to be put in a state of defence, with an estimate of the expense thereof." Charleston was cited as one of the 16 ports and harbors that should be put "in a state of defence." It was recommended: (a) that the fortifications "ought to be of a nature to defend the several ports and harbors against surprise" by a hostile naval force, and "the parapets of the batteries and redoubts should be formed of earth, where" possible; and (b) that the points to be fortified be garrisoned by troops in the pay of the United States. To construct the necessary fortifications it was estimated would cost $76,053.52, while the necessary armament, 200 guns and their carriages, would add $96,645 to this figure. The annual expense of the troops to garrison these works was calculated at $90,349.25.[5]

The expense of erecting fortifications, "three sets of batteries and redoubts," for Charleston Harbor was estimated at $11,212.32. Seventy-two guns were to be emplaced in the Charleston defenses. In amount of money to be allotted and in number of guns proposed, Charleston, next to New York, would be the heaviest fortified city in the United States.

---

5. American State Papers, Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States, Military Affairs, (Washington, 1832), 1, 61-62; Emanuel Raymond Lewis, American Seacoast Fortifications: A Development History (Privately Printed, 1968), 19.

The Committee estimated that in peace time a force of three officers and 95 enlisted men would be sufficient to occupy, maintain, and police the projected Charleston fortifications.[6]

Based on the Knox Study, the 3d Congress passed an act, approved March 20, providing for seacoast defenses of key ports and harbors, from Maine to Georgia.[7]

To oversee the laying out and construction of the fortifications authorized by Congress, Secretary Knox engaged eight military engineers of French birth. One of these

---

6. American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 63-64.

7. James D. Richardson (compiler), A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1797 (Washington, 1896), 1, 104; Lewis, American Seacoast Fortifications, 19. The sections of the act of interest to South Carolinians read,

Section 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled, that the following ports and harbors be fortified under the direction of the President of the United States, and at such time or times as he may judge necessary to wit: Portland, Portsmouth, Gloucester, Salem, Marblehead, Boston, Newport, New London, New York, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, Norfolk, Alexandria, Cape Fear River and Ocracoke Inlet in the State of North Carolina; Charleston and George Town in the State of South Carolina, and Savannah and St. Mary's in the State of Georgia.

Section 2. That it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to employ, as garrison in the said fortifications, or any of them, such of the troops on the military establishment of the United States, as he may judge necessary; and to cause to be founded 100 cannon, of a caliber each to carry a ball of 32 pounds, and 100 other cannon of a caliber each to carry a ball of 24 pounds, together with the carriages and implements necessary for the same, and carriages with the necessary implements for 150 other cannon, with 250 tons of cannon shot.

individuals, Paul Hyacinthe Perrault on April 11, 1794, was named by Secretary Knox as the engineer charged with fortifying the port and harbor of Charleston. On reaching Charleston, Perrault was to contact Governor Moultrie and inform him that he had been detailed "to make necessary surveys and investigations" preparatory to beginning construction. Plans would be submitted to the Governor for approval, and when it had been received, Perrault was "to construct the works, and to execute them with all possible vigor and dispatch."

He was cautioned that in view of the conservative estimates the parapets of the works "to be erected, are to be of earth, or, where that cannot easily be obtained of an adhesive quality, the parapets may be faced with strong timber, and filled in with such earth as can be had." If the earth were "tenacious and properly sloped, and sodded inside and out," knotgrass could be sown to bind the "sods and earth together." Where the batteries were not en barbette, the embrasures should be formed of "joist, and faced with" two-inch plank.

Section 3. That it shall be lawful for the President . . . to receive from any State (in behalf of the United States) a cession of the lands, on which any of the fortifications aforesaid, with the necessary buildings may be erected, or intended to be erected, or where such cessions shall be made to purchase such lands, on behalf of the United States, provided that no purchase shall be made, where such lands are the property of the State.

Where batteries were to be erected "on points of land, islands, or other places," at a distance from the port to be defended, they should be covered, by an enclosed work in which "the garrison should reside constantly, either in a barrack, or a strong block house," as judged most expedient. As the garrisons would be numerically weak, a blockhouse mounting one or two small cannon would be preferable as it provided greater security. No blockhouse would quarter more than 50 men.

The redoubts should be designed to be held by 500 men, capable of resisting a surprise attack. At present, it was not proposed to build timber casemates to shield the garrison from bombardment. The only casemate would be for the magazine, which must be constructed of massive timbers, "six feet thick on the roof, exclusive of the earth, and jointed and calked in such a manner as to be perfectly tight." Care would have to be exercised to insure that the magazines were properly ventilated and free from dampness. Magazines must be capable of holding 150 cartridges of powder for each piece serviced. The location of the magazine would require sound judgment on Perrault's part. His judgment would likewise dictate the parts of the work to be protected by fraizes and palisadoes, or whether the redoubts were to have their guns fire through embrasures or en barbette. A hot-shot furnace would be

erected for each battery. Nothing in Perrault's instructions was intended to "point out the particular manner in which the works should be erected." Outlines only had been given to guide him in "regulating the expense."

A person in whom he had confidence would be named to superintend the "actual execution of the works," in accordance with his directions. Arrangements would be made by this individual to secure the necessary workmen, implements, and materials. Everything, however, must by "previously calculated and estimated" by Perrault. As compensation for his services, Perrault would be paid four dollars per day. All reasonable extra expenses would be allowed, but for these he must "keep regular accounts and take receipts." Under his immediate supervision would be Jerome Merlie, as director of artillery artificers, and John J. Lairis, who would serve as sub-engineer and interpreter. Merlie was to oversee the emplacement of the heavy ordnance.[8]

Perrault reached Charleston on May 4, after a 14-day passage down from Philadelphia. Calling on Governor Moultrie, who was about to leave for Columbia, he learned that work had

---

8. Knox to Perrault, April 11, 1794, found in American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 101-102.

already commenced under the supervision of Lt. Col. J. Christian Senf, military engineer on the staff of the Governor.[9] Senf had located a battery at one of the Charleston wharves and a small work at Fort Johnson. Expenses for the first had been considerable, $803 having been disbursed for timber.

Mr. Merlie had contacted Daniel De Saussure, who had been designated the agent for erecting the Charleston fortifications, and had provided him with a list of materials, including oak, ash, and ironwork, required for constructing gun carriages. De Saussure shook his head and explained that it would be impossible at this season to secure seasoned oak or ash. At the same time he believed the expense would preclude the use of Acajou. As a way out of this impasse, Perrault suggested that Knox have shipped from Philadelphia the oak and ash needed for the large carriages, while Merlie put his people to work making the field carriages of Acajou.

From what he had observed, Perrault believed that with four fortifications, in addition to Colonel Senf's battery, Charleston harbor would be secure. It was apparent that the money budgeted for the Charleston works was insufficient,

---

9. Colonel Senf had been born in Sweden about 1754, and he had served at Charleston during the Revolution as an engineer. He held the office as Chief Engineer to the State of South Carolina. Charleston Courier, Sept. 3, 1806.

and he begged Secretary Knox "to give me some directions in order to make something useful."[10]

Perrault was a hard worker. By May 12 he was able to write Secretary Knox that he had "taken the plan of the whole of Fort Moultrie . . . and the plan of Fort Johnson." Provided there were no unforeseen delays, he hoped by the end of next week to submit his plans to Governor Moultrie.

So far, Merlie had not secured quarters in which to build his carriages. Perrault had located a site at the arsenal, but the keeper, a Mr. Lenox, had told him the Governor's consent must first be obtained. The necessary letter was drafted and forwarded to Governor Moultrie.[11]

While sounding the harbor, Perrault discovered a sand bank, 150 fathoms long and 60 wide, largely dry at ebb tide. This compelled him to alter his plans. Governor Moultrie was dumbfounded by Perrault's report and desired to examine the bank. Perrault accordingly took Moultrie out to the bank, which was located off the southeastern tip of Shute's Folley. If it were possible to locate one of the projected batteries on this bank, he explained, it in conjunction with

---

10. Perrault to Knox, May 4, 1794, found in American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 102.

11. Perrault to Knox, May 14, 1794, found in Ibid., 102.

the one to be positioned on Sullivan's Island could with hot-shot burn any unfriendly warship attempting to force her way into the harbor. Governor Moultrie agreed, but he had one reservation--could the foundations of a fort on the bank withstand the "vehement fury of the waves."[12]

By June 16 Governor Moultrie had designated the points to be fortified (Sullivan's Island, Fort Johnson, a battery on the wharf, and one on the sand bank opposite Shute's Folly) and the men to superintend the work. Although the Charlestonians had undertaken a campaign to raise additional funds for the defense of the harbor, as requested by Congress, the amount contributed would be too small for the nature of the work, where "nothing but sand can be found, and which necessitates us to make use of timber revetments both before and behind. Each 20 feet of parapet would call for an outlay of $500."[13]

Nine weeks before, on April 8, 1794, Governor Moultrie had received from Philadelphia a resolution passed by Congress on March 26 for a 30-day embargo on all ships currently in the ports of the United States, whether cleared or not. As

---

12. Perrault to Knox, May 31, 1794, found in ibid., 102-103. Moultrie, but for his ill-health, could have disembarked from the small boat and walked on the bank.

13. Perrault to Knox, June 16, 1794, found in ibid., 103.

soon as he received a copy of the order, the collector of revenue dispatched Captain Cockran, of the revenue service, to bring up to the city the brig Liberty, Captain Garrison, which had been cleared for Jamaica. When notified of the embargo, Garrison promised on his honor not to leave port. Satisfied with this assurance, Cockran agreed to permit Liberty to remain in Rebellion Road for the night. Shortly after daybreak the next morning, April 10, the brig was seen to be under sail and by 10 a.m., she had passed the bar. Upon being informed of the contempt shown for the law by Captain Garrison, Governor Moultrie ordered a detachment of the artillery battalion with two 6-pounders aboard the schooner President. They were to pursue the brig and compel her to return to port. By six o'clock both vessels were out of sight. During the night Liberty succeeded in eluding the schooner and continued on her way to Jamaica.[14]

The manner in which the unarmed brig had flaunted the authority of the state and nation rankled. Worse it drove home to the proud Charlestonians the impotence of their harbor defenses. What would happen they asked, if a British fleet appeared off Charleston Bar?

---

14. The City Gazette & Daily Advertizer, April 9 & 10, 1794.

On April 18 the Charleston papers announced that the good ship Charleston, Captain Garman, had sailed from Philadelphia with cannon to be mounted in the fortifications to be erected for defense of the harbor.[15] Because of the problems involved in securing timber for the gun carriages, it was mid-June before Merlie had turned his people to. In May De Saussure, on examining Merlie's requisitions for materials and workmen, had written Secretary Knox that the money budgeted for the carriages was insufficient. Work, however, had commenced as soon as a shop was established. By June 30 work to the value of $772.30 had been done. Unless additional funds were received, Merlie would have to discharge his craftsmen on July 31, by which time not over five or six carriages would be completed.

So far $3,497.97 had been expended on Forts Darrell (Mechanic) and Johnson. This figure included the materials and workmanship contracted for prior to Perrault's arrival. Perrault had seen fit to continue the construction begun by Colonel Senf. Fort Darrell (Mechanic) was far advanced, and for some time it had been no expense to the United States for "mechanical labor--that part being done gratis by the carpenters of the city." The labor of a large number of

---

15. Ibid., April 18, 1794.

Negroes had been donated by their owners, and they were employed to shift timber from place to place, and to fill in the earth as the revetments rose. Rations had to be provided the Negroes out of the fortification account. Subscriptions locally for military construction had been liberal--8,000 days' labor by Negroes, 4,000 feet of timber, and between seven and eight hundred pounds.[17]

De Saussure acknowledged the receipt of an additional $2,000 for artillery carriages on September 13. As of August 31, $2,343.34 had been charged against this account, which left a balance of $656.66. This sum would be obligated by the end of the current month in completing six carriages on the new plan. Governor Moultrie also had ordered Merlie to build 12 carriages for 24-pounders on the old plan. If work were to continue more money was required.

Up till August 31 there had been disbursed from the fortification account $7,185.34. Exclusive of this sum, timber valued at nearly $1,000 had been delivered at Fort Johnson and at Sullivan's Island for which he had not been billed. As these two works were large, they would require

---

17. De Saussure to Knox, July 7, 1794, found in American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 103. Two canoes had been purchased to transport timber and laborers.

"a considerable quantity of lumber and workmanship, which . . . will considerably exceed the sum appropriated" by the Congress and subscribed by the citizens.[18]

Unknown to De Saussure, the 3d Congress on June 9, 1794, had appropriated an additional $30,000 to be used for "fortifying certain ports and harbors in the United States." With the $76,000 heretofore appropriated by the acts passed on March 20 and May 9, it provided $106,000 for coastal defense. In accordance with a request by Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton, Secretary Knox on July 9 forwarded a list of the "sums apportioned to the different places." Charleston harbor was now slated to receive Federal expenditures of $16,212.32 for its defense.[19]

The Act of May 9, 1794, was also designed to expand the army and provide specialists to oversee the construction of the forts and to assist in their defense. A "Corps of Artillerists and Engineers" was organized to be incorporated with the artillery then in service, and was to consist of a lieutenant colonel commandant, with adjutant and surgeon,

---

18. De Saussure to Knox, Sept. 13, 1794, found in ibid., 103-104.

19. Hamilton to Knox, July 1794 and Knox to Hamilton, July 9, 1794, found in ibid., 105-106.

and of four battalions each commanded by a major, with an adjutant, paymaster, and surgeon's mate as battalion staff, and each battalion to consist of four companies. The total rank and file of the corps was to number 992.[20]

To encourage enlistments in all arms of the service, pay was never to be in arrears more than two month at a time, and the President was authorized to increase the beef, flour, whiskey, and salt components of the rations at certain times and places. The widow or children of an officer dying from wounds in battle were granted a maximum of a lieutenant colonel's half pay for five years. In spite of these added inducements to serve in the army, the organization of the "Corps of Artillerists and Engineers" was not soon completed.[21]

It would be sometime before personnel of the "Corps of Artillerists and Engineers" appeared in Charleston Harbor, and long before any did there were threats of trouble. The French privateer St. Joseph, Captain Sweet, of eight guns on the evening of May 13 encountered His Majesty's ship Flying Fish of 12 guns, off Charleston Bar. After an action lasting

---

20. William L. Haskin, The History of the First Regiment of Artillery From Its Organization in 1821, to January 1st, 1876 . . . (Portland (Me.), 1879), 4.

21. J. F. Callan, The Military Laws of the United States (Philadelphia, 1863), 105.

about 15 minutes, the British warship compelled St. Joseph to strike her colors. The crew of the privateer was detained until the 16th, when Flying Fish encountered the schooner Speedwell bound from St. Thomas to Charleston, and all but 15 of the privateer's crew were transferred to her.[22]

Charlestonians speculated on what would have been their response if St. Joseph had taken cover in Rebellion Road and His Majesty's ship had pursued. Fort Moultrie, No. 1, was in ruins and unarmed, so it would have been impossible to challenge Flying Fish. This action off Charleston Bar stimulated work on the inner harbor defenses--Forts Johnson and Darrell.

It was not until August 4 that the foundations for Fort Moultrie, No. 2, were laid. The fort was sited near and on the ruins of the revolutionary war work. A lady, "animated with republican zeal," asked the architect the honor of placing the cornerstone. The architect was agreeable. After performing

> the pleasing task, in presence of her children, she ardently expressed the hope, that the new fortress now about to be erected may, if ever attacked by the enemies of the equal rights

---

22. The City Gazette & Daily Advertizer, May 19, 1794. St. Joseph was sent to New Providence for adjudication by a prize court. In the meantime, the Congress had enacted legislation extending the embargo until May 25, 1794.

> of man, be as bravely and successfully defended as was the old one in the memorable battle of June 1776, when the American sons of freedom caused the ships of Britain shamefully to decline the contest, and leave our shores.[23]

Within less than two weeks, on August 15, a British fleet of seven sail appeared off Charleston Bar. The workmen on Sullivan's Island dropped their tools and watched as the frigate, Terpsichore, sent a boarding party on the brig Norfolk, which had just crossed the bar en route to Philadelphia, with a number of passengers. The boarding party impressed four of the sailors. On the morning of the 16th, the British intercepted and captured the French privateer Mountain, and chased two of her prizes(the brig Grand Sachem and the sloop Jamaica) ashore near the Edisto. The fleet remained off the South Carolina coast until the 28th, stopping and searching all vessels bound in or out of Charleston.[24]

Colonel De Saussure, in his capacity as agent for erecting fortifications at Charleston, determined, in view of the harassment by the British fleet, to step-up construction. On September 15 he advertised that he wished to hire 50 or

---

23. The City Gazette & Daily Advertizer, Aug. 11, 1794.

24. Ibid., Aug. 18 & 28, 1794.

60 Negroes to work on the fortifications under construction at Fort Johnson and on Sullivan's Island. Wages would be paid their owners in specie once a month.[25]

During the second week of November, the Charleston Battalion of Artillery mounted six carriage guns (three 18-pounders and three 12-pounders) and four 24-pounders _en barbette_ in Fort Darrell. On Saturday, the Mechanical Society, the group which had raised the money for the work, met there to delivery it to Governor Moultrie. Prior to the Governor's arrival, the Battalion of Artillery was formed within the fort, and as Moultrie approached, Captain Toomer, chairman of the Mechanical Society, received him at the gate. The Governor redesignated the work Fort Mechanic and turned it over to Major Rutledge of the Artillery Battalion. The battalion then gave three cheers, after which Moultrie "partook of a cold collation provided in the fort."[26]

When Congress convened in December 1794, the members were informed by President Washington that "in pursuance of the act of the last session, the fortifications of the different ports and harbors are in considerable forwardness,

---

25. Ibid., Sept. 15, 1794.

26. _The City Gazette & Daily Advertizer_, Nov. 18, 1794.

except only the port of Boston, and Wilmington, in the state of Delaware." Contracts had been made for the heavy ordnance to placed in these works. Because of changes in plans and a rising cost of labor and materials, a sum of not less than $225,000 would be needed "to complete the plan of defence contemplated, admitting the fortifications to be constructed of timber and earth; and if executed with stone, to a much greater sum."

The House Committee on Fortifications on December 4, accordingly resolved: (a) that "the necessary works for fortifying the ports and harbors of the United States ought to be continued, and constructed of the most durable materials, so as best to answer the purposes of defense and permanency;" (b) that a figure not to exceed $500,000 over and above the sum voted at the 1st Session of the 3d Congress be appropriated; and (c) that the President be authorized to assign priorities for the completion of the fortifications.[27]

Unknown to Congress, Chief Justice John Jay, who had been sent to Great Britain to negotiate a settlement of the crisis, had signed on November 19 a treaty with Lord Grenville, the British foreign minister. Jay's Treaty called for: (a) the evacuation of the Northwest posts by June 1, 1796;

---

27. American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 68.

(b) compensation for Britain's spoliations against American shipping; (c) American payment of pre-Revolution debts to British merchants; (d) for joint commissions to determine the boundaries between the United States and Canada in the northeast and northwest; (e) it declared the navigation of the Mississippi River open to both countries and prohibited the outfitting of privateers for Britain's enemies in United States waters; and (f) its commercial clauses granted the United States trading privileges in Great Britain and the British East Indies but offered only limited concessions in the British West Indies.

In the United States the treaty aroused a storm of protest. Republicans denounced it as a surrender to Great Britain by Alexander Hamilton and his Federalists. The Senate nevertheless on June 24, 1795, with not a vote to spare, approved the treaty by the necessary two-thirds majority, and President Washington ratified it on August 14.

The ratification of the Jay Treaty caused an uproar in Charleston. An observer recalled:

> I have often thought that the violent ebullition of popular hatred, exhibited on that occasion, was not without its benefit, in giving vent to rankling recollections of the injuries and oppressions sustained by every class of the community, during the revolutionary struggle .... The excitement was tremendous.

> On a gallows erected in front of the exchange on Broad Street were hanged six effigies representing the advocates of Washington's policy in dealing with Great Britain--John Jay, John Adams, Timothy Pickering, Jacob Read, William Laughton Smith, and the devil. The figures remained suspended throughout the day, "polluted by every mark of indignity, and in the evening, were carried off to Federal green, where they were burnt." A mob led by a popular leader, Michell, converged on General Read's house. To protect his property, the authorities were compelled to order out a company of militia.

The storm soon passed and the firmness of Washington prevailed.[28]

Relations with Great Britain having been normalized by the ratification of Jay's Treaty, Congress, as was to become customary, was unwilling to vote big sums for the completion of the port and harbor defenses. As for the fortifications at Charleston, Secretary of War Timothy Pickering on January 18, 1796, informed the Senate:

> The work planned for Sullivan's Island, of which the foundation only was laid in 1794, being on a scale supposed too extensive for the funds destined to this service, was directed to be left as it was. For the same reason, a new work, proposed by the engineer, on a point on the opposite side of the harbor from Fort Johnson, was not attempted. A battery had been erected in the town, by the mechanics.

---

28. Charles Fraser, Reminiscences of Charleston . . . (Charleston, 1854), 46-47.

> There remained only Fort Johnson, on which directions were given to make such repairs as would preserve the works already constructed, and render them serviceable. The engineer omitted the work.
>
> The officer in command at the fort has undertaken to make the necessary repairs of the works and barracks.[29]

At the time that work on Fort Moultrie, No. 2, was suspended, a tract of land 730 feet in width, bounded on one side by the channel and on the other by the back beach, had been reserved for the post. The reservation contained 18 9/10 acres. In addition to the foundation of the channel front of the fort, De Saussure's people had erected a bake house, a barracks, and an officers' quarters. (A copy of the plan of the Fort Moultrie Reservation prepared in August 1796 by J. Purcell is found in this report.)[30]

François Alexandre Frédéric La Rochefoucault-Liancourt, the noted French social reformer, visited Charleston at this time, and he found that a fort was scheduled to be

---

29. Pickering to Senate, Jan. 18, 1796, American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 111. Congress on March 3, 1795, had voted another $50,000 to help defray the cost of fortifying the harbors of the United States. Pickering had succeeded Knox as Secretary of War on January 2, 1795.

30. "A Plat of Part of Sullivan's Island, showing the lands laid out and reserved for the use of Fort Moultrie. By J. Purcell." The original is found in RG 77, Cartographic Branch, National Archives.

erected on Sullivan's Island. Authority had been granted by the South Carolina Assembly for persons to build on the island "on condition that they should hold themselves ready to remove whenever it might require." The more wealthy inhabitants of Charleston had taken advantage of this situation to build summer cottages to which they could escape "the summer heat."

He foresaw that the "people who now resort hither in such numbers, will be disposed to thwart the government, when it shall resolve, for the security of the harbour," to renew those fortifications which occasioned the loss of a great many lives by the English, "when they attacked in 1776."[31]

La Rochefoucault was unimpressed with Fort Mechanic. He reported that toward

> the side which is parallel with the river, the range of its guns cannot hinder the access of ships into the road. In that direction, too, its left side extends too far, so that the cannon cannot be levelled at

---

31. François Alexandre Frédéric La Rochefoucault-Liancourt, Travels Through the United States of North America . . ., 2 vols. (London, 1800), 2, 373-376. Charleston Bar, he reported, was composed of hard sand. There were four passes through the bar, the deepest was covered by 14 feet of water at high tide and 12 at ebb tide. At spring tides it was covered with water to a depth of 20 feet. This bar was never crossed at night. To facilitate the passage of ships, buoys had been placed in the water, and the pilots were likewise familiar with landmarks ashore. It was possible for ships to anchor outside the bar, but in the hurricane season this could be disastrous.

> any other object than the houses of the town. The battery is of wood, but there has not been enough wood used in its construction. The engineer [Colonel Senf] excuses himself, by complaining that he has not been sufficiently supplied with money for the expence. Why then did he undertake a work, which he was not fully to complete? For this he can offer no excuse, but that he was desirous to be employed; and with such an excuse it is not easy to be perfectly satisfied.[32]

---

32. Ibid.

####
###
#

CHAPTER III

Fort Moultrie, No. 2, Is Completed And Wrecked

While the Jay Treaty had eased tensions between the United States and Great Britain, it caused deep resentment in France. Embroiled as they were in a bitter commercial warfare upon the sea, both Great Britain and France had for several years prior to 1797 disregarded Washington's neutrality proclamation of 1793, repeatedly committing acts of aggression and spoliation upon American commerce and nationals. The French were doubly resentful of the United States because of its failure to give them open support, and on that score they considered the Jay Treaty of 1795 with England to be discriminatory against France.

At the height of this ill-feeling, Washington recalled the popular American minister to France, James Monroe, sending in his place, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, a prominent South Carolinian, who landed in France early in the autumn of 1796. Pinckney, of a distinguished line of southern aristocrats, and a delegate to the Constitutional Convention from South Carolina, had long played a leading role in

public affairs of his native state and was held in high esteem in Charleston. The disquieting news that the French Directory had refused to treat with Pinckney soon reached the United States, causing John Adams, who had been inaugurated as President in March 1797, to name a commission, of which Pinckney was to be a member and including John Marshall and Elridge Gerry, to proceed to Paris for the purpose of renewing negotiations, From October 1797 until March 1798, the commission waited in vain to be received formally by the Directory. Instead, the Americans were visited by mysterious emissaries, who suggested that the United States should pay tribute to the members of the Directory in order that peaceful negotiations with the French Governement might be opened. The American Commissioners refused these importunities, and their relations with the secret French agents ended. For months feeling had been growing in the United States against France, and in the spring of 1798 when President Adams laid the report of the commissioners in which the names of the French agents were replaced by the letters X, Y, and Z, before Congress, the excitement produced spread throughout the nation, which began preparations for war with France.[1]

---

1. Edward Channing, A History of the United States, 6 vols. (New York, 1920), 1, 116-147, 176-209.

In the period prior to the XYZ Affair, the only funds voted by Congress for the defenses of Charleston Harbor were for maintenance. Chairman William Lyman of the House Committee on Fortifications had informed the House on May 9, 1796, that a review of Secretary of War Pickering's report had induced his group to recommend that "some further expenditures will be expedient to perfect and secure the works already constructed; otherwise in some instances, they might be useless, and many would probably be exposed to very sudden decay, and destruction." The Committee had concluded that a "very considerable sum of the former appropriation" had not been allotted. It therefore recommended that additional funds be appropriated for "the purpose of completing and securing the fortifications in the harbor of New York."[2]

Lyman's committee informed the House on February 10, 1797, that in the year since Secretary Pickering had made his report on the condition of the coastal defenses that "the alterations in these forts" could be divided into two categories. At the ones not garrisoned they consisted of "depredations made by time," while at the others they consisted of "such repairs and additions as could be made" by

---

2. Committee on Fortifications to House, May 9, 1796, found in American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 115.

the troops. Among the works included in the latter classification was Fort Johnson. The garrisoned forts had been kept in repair, so far as the force stationed in them permitted, but, the committee warned, "it will require an additional grant of money to finish some necessary buildings, and complete certain works, indispensable to their defense and preservation." An appropriation of $23,394.55 was asked to carry out the Committee on Fortifications' recommendation.[3]

On June 3 Secretary of War James McHenry, who had succeeded Pickering, referred the Senate to his predecessor's report on the condition of the coastal fortifications. Since then (January 18, 1796) little had been done to the Charleston defenses beyond several construction projects of a minor nature undertaken by the Fort Johnson garrison. Pickering had estimated that another $46,000 was needed to complete the harbor fortifications. With the threat of a break with France, McHenry had increased this figure to $200,000. At the same time, he believed that "the ports from New York to St. Mary's (Georgia), are those which stand in most need of immediate attention," with those in the southern states deserving the highest priority.

---

3. Committee on Fortifications to House, Feb. 10, 1797, found in ibid., 116. As of February 17, 1797, $132,234.07 had been expended, leaving a balance of $23,877.56 to be obligated. $18,000 had been paid out on account of the Charleston fortifications.

It would be of scant benefit, he pointed out, for the forts to be strengthened, unless they were garrisoned.[4]

Three days later, on the 6th, McHenry advised the House Committee on Fortifications that the requested $200,000 should be budgeted as follows:

New York. To complete the works on Governor's Island, Bedloe's Island, and Oyster Island $90,000

Philadelphia. To complete a pier and battery on the sand bar opposite Mud Island, the works on Mud Island, and some auxiliary works $40,000

Virginia. To improve and complete the works at Norfolk $10,000

North Carolina. To erect works at Ocracoke . . $10,000

South Carolina. To complete and erect works on James Island, Shooter's Point, Sullivan's Island and Georgetown $40,000

Georgia. To complete the works at Savannah and St. Mary's $10,000

$200,000 [5]

---

4. McHenry to Senate, June 3, 1797, found in ibid., 118.

5. McHenry to House Committee on Fortifications, June 3, 1797, found in ibid., 118.

Congress on June 23 voted $115,000, $85,000 less than requested, to be expended on the maritime fortifications. This was in addition to the $22,065.58 that had not been obligated from previous appropriations.[6]

Work was accordingly resumed on the Charleston defenses. Although it cannot be documented it would appear in view of McHenry's statements regarding garrisons that the projects undertaken were all at Fort Johnson.

Relations with France having continued to deteriorate, Secretary McHenry on February 27, 1798, informed Congress that of the $137,065.58 available to spend on coastal fortifications on June 23, 1797, $39,381.65 had been disbursed. This amount had been allotted:

At Mud Island (Fort Mifflin)	$23,640.87
Baltimore	188.93
Charleston	9,978.00
Portsmouth	488.46
Newbern	800.00
Norfolk	266.50
St. Mary's	4,018.89
	$39,381.65

6. McHenry to Sewall, Feb. 27, 1798, found in ibid., 119-120. Samuel Sewall had replaced Lyman as chairman of the House Committee on Fortifications.

Most of this sum, as the members could see, had been used at Fort Mifflin. The reasons cited by McHenry for this were: (a) the land on which the fort stood had been ceded by Pennsylvania to the United States; (b) the works were "composed of good materials", and were so put together as "to promise long duration and utility"; and (c) a study had shown that supporting works were necessary to make Fort Mifflin secure and thus afford protection to Philadelphia, the capital city.

Once again, McHenry urged Congress to provide for an expension of the army to garrison the coastal defenses, as it could not be done satifactorily by the militia. At the same time troops of the regular establishment deployed on the Western frontier could not be recalled without "endangering the peace of the Union."

In building the forts, McHenry suggested that in the interest of economy those works deemed vital "to the general defence should be constructed, like Fort Mifflin, of the most durable materials." As yet, he continued, few of the states had ceded to the United States the land on which the fortifications were being erected.[7]

Samuel Sewall and his committee, after reviewing McHenry's report and President John Adams' State of the Union Message, reported that while a considerable sum of that previously

---

7. McHenry to Sewall, Feb. 27, 1798, found in ibid., 119-120.

voted was unexpended, it appeared that "a further appropriation, and a more vigorous" effort to push construction of the coastal fortifications was needed.[8]

The War Department on April 9 recommended five steps be taken to oppose French aggression on the high seas and to protect the trade of the United States. Among these measures were: (a) To increase the present military establishment by the constitution of one regiment each of artillery, cavalry, and infantry. The artillery was deemed indispensable, while the cavalry would be useful in the Southern States. The cost of this increase to the armed forces was estimated at $517,998. (b) A "more complete defence" of the principal ports by fortifications. One million dollars, might be allotted for this undertaking, but "should the naval force be rendered respectable, much of this sum" could be saved. (c) Thirteen hundred cannon, including 32-, 18-, 12-, 9-, and 6-pounders, were needed. The cost of these cannon was estimated by the Secretary at $308,000. At the same time $200,000 would be budgeted for "powder, saltpetre, copper for sheathing, &."[9]

---

8. Committee for Protection of Commerce and Defence of the Country to House, March 8, 1798, found in ibid, 119.

9. McHenry to Sewall, April 9, 1798, found in ibid., 120-123.

Congress moved promptly to provide the War Department with the means to counter French aggression. On April 27 legislation was enacted authorizing the addition to the regular establishment of an additional regiment of "Artillerists and Engineers," to have a lieutenant colonel commandant and 12 companies organized into three battalions. In the following year this unit was increased to 16 companies. Three months later, an act was passed providing for a further addition to the army of twelve regiments of infantry and one of light dragoons.[10]

On May 3, 1798, President Adams signed a bill appropriating "a sum not to exceed $250,000, in addition to sums heretofore appropriated and remaining unexpended to make and complete, at the discretion" of the President "the fortifications heretofore directed for certain ports and harbors, and to erect fortifications in any other place or places as the public safety shall require."

The next day, a law was enacted appropriating $800,000 to purchase "a sufficient number of cannon," small-arms, ammunition, and military stores. President Adams was authorized by another piece of legislation passed the same day, "to

---

10. Haskin, History of the 1st Artillery, 4.

cause a number of small boats, not exceeding ten to be built or purchased and to be fitted out, manned, armed, and equipped as galleys." Thus the Congress had given the Executive Department all that it had asked to cope with the crisis that had developed as a result of the XYZ Affair.[11]

In just four years public opinion in Charleston had shifted from Anglophobia to Francophobia. There was a mass-meeting at St. Michaels on May 5. At this assembly a resolution was introduced by the intendant of Charleston taking cognizance of the sudden and great demands which may be made on the government of the United States, for "the purposes of national defense, [which] may oblige a too limited provision for the fortifications essential for the security of the sea ports." It was accordingly determined that a campaign be instituted to raise funds by public subscription to supplement those voted by Congress for the "fortification and defence of the city and harbour of Charles Town." The committee to collect the subscription and superintend the spending of the funds would consist of: William Washington,

---

11. Annals of The Congress of the United States, Fifth Congress (Washington, 1851), 3724-3727. Congress on April 30 had enacted legislation establishing in the Executive Department a Department of the Navy.

E. Rutledge, A. Vanderhorst, H. W. De Saussure, Thomas Lee, James Simons, and Nathaniel Russell.[12] All funds collected were to be left at the homes of the committee, at the office of the Insurance Company, or with the cashiers of the banks.[13]

James Simons had already made a thorough reconnaissance of the harbor and its partially completed defenses. On doing so, he expressed the view that the engineers had underestimated the importance of Hog Island Channel. He argued that the channel could be commanded by a battery opposite its entrance into Cooper River. Another battery should be thrown up in Charleston opposite the work to be erected on Shute's Folly, as it would occupy a position from which the city could be defended. While Sullivan's Island and Fort Johnson were "very important for the annoyance of an enemy on his approach," Shute's Folly and the southeast point of Charleston were the most important situations . . . for the actual defence of the city." Fort Mechanic could not be compared to these two sites. The battery to be erected on Sullivan's Island, Simons wrote, should be "built in form

---

12. The City Gazette and Daily Advertizer, May 7, 1998; Fraser, Reminiscences of Charleston, 46-47.

13. Ibid., May 12, 1798.

of a Horse Shoe," and much larger than Lt. George Izard had proposed.[14]

Lieutenant Izard of the United States Artillery and Engineers did not agree with Simons, and he ordered that the highest priority be given to completing Fort Moultrie on Sullivan's Island and beginning construction of the work to be located on Shute's Folly. Large working parties were recruited and turned to. Funds collected by the committee for the Fortification of Charleston Harbor were utilized for this construction, as well as almost $15,000 in Federal money. By August 30 Thomas Pinckney was able to report we have nearly "finished a small fort on Sullivan's Island and laid out considerable sums, in other defensive arrangements."[15]

By September 17 construction had progressed far enough on the work being erected on Shute's Folly to enable it to receive its battery. The work would be designated Fort Pinckney, as a tribute of respect to General C. C. Pinckney. As soon as the guns were mounted a salute was fired, which

---

14. Simons to Izard, April 11, 1798 (files, South Carolina Historical Society).

15. Pinckney to Burrows, Aug. 30, 1798 found in Naval Documents Related to the Quasi-War Between the United States and France, Naval Operations from February 1797 to October 1798 (Washington, 1935), 355-356.

was returned by the cannon mounted in Forts Johnson and Mechanic, the armed brig Unanimity, and the British ship Bellona.[16]

Fort Moultrie, No. 2, was completed in early November 1798. The fort was an enclosed five-sided work, surrounded by a ditch and glacis. The glacis had a width of 50 feet, while the ditch's depth was eight feet. It was 17 feet from the bottom of the ditch to the top of the parapet; the interior height of the parapet above the terreplein was six-foot. Positioned in the ditch, which was dry, were a hot-shot furnace, a well, and five blinds or curtains. The furnace and well were in opposite angles. On the terreplein were located "The Place of Arms" and the "Cazerne." "The Place of Arms" was enclosed by seven-foot ramparts, while the interior height of the Cazerne was 13 feet and its exterior 10 feet. At the east end of the Cazerne was a well, and at its west end was the magazine. Four structures were sited between the fort and the back beach. One of these housed the bake oven and the others served as officers'

---

16. The City Gazette and Daily Advertizer, Sept. 18, 1798.

quarters and barracks. (For plans and maps of Fort Moultrie, No. 2, turn to appropriate plates).[17]

The committee named to raise funds for the fortification of Charleston Harbor on November 9, 1798, made an accounting of funds disbursed for completing Fort Moultrie. It reported:

July 21, 1798	Hire of manager, mechanics and laborers	$512.50
July 28, 1798	" " " "	345.50
Aug. 4, 1798	" " " "	379.50
Aug. 11, 1798	" " " "	472.00
Aug. 18, 1798	" " " "	475.00
Aug. 25, 1798	" " " "	499.00
Sept. 1, 1798	" " " "	516.00
Sept. 8, 1798	" " " "	555.25
Sept. 15, 1798	" " " "	531.50
Sept. 22, 1798	" " " "	522.00
Sept. 29, 1798	" " " "	506.25
Oct. 6, 1798	" " "	460.50
Oct. 13, 1798	" " " "	483.50
Oct. 20, 1798	" " " "	340.00
Oct. 27, 1798	" " " "	334.00
Nov. 3, 1798	" " " "	317.50

[Supplies etc. In Dollars & £ Sterling]

		£ (Sterling)	$ (Dollars)
July 2, 1798, pd.	Thomas Nicholls, palmetto logs		$328.50
July 2, 1798	Hugh Swinton, lime		108.30

17. " A Map of the Harbour of Charleston, Surveyed by Order of The Honorable H. Dearborn, Secy. of the U. S. for the Dept. of War, by Alexander Macomb, Capt. of Engineers;" "Plan of Fort Moultrie on Sullivan's Island, South Carolina" (National Archives, Cartographic Division, RG 77).

		£ (Sterling)	$ (Dollars)
July 2, 1798	Thomas Cockran, timber		$ 36.20
July 2, 1798	William Prichard & Co. a flatboat		80.00
July 2, 1798	Thomas Morris, 13,000 flates		605.89
July 2, 1798	J. & S. Parker, palmetto logs		260.81
July 2, 1798	J. & S. Parker, line		495.50
July 2, 1798	Samuel Beckman, 2 pumps		20.50
July 14, 1798	John L. Poyas, palmetto logs	82.14	
July 17, 1798	Ed Tash, pick axes . . .	2.9	
July 20, 1798	W. Blacklock, spades and axes	6.11	
July 20, 1798	G. Greenland, firewood .	5.20	
Aug. 7, 1798	Pepper & Graddock, . .	6 16 9	
Aug. 11, 1798	T. Nicholls, palmetto .	139 17 4	
Aug. 11, 1798	Robt. Maxwell, sundries	38 2	
Aug. 11, 1798	W. Gunn, pickaxes . . .	1 15 -	
Aug. 14, 1798	S. Braund, plank and boards	3 18 9	
Aug. 16, 1798	Joseph Dulles, posts, spades and hatchets	8 15	
Aug. 27, 1798	Pepper and Graddock, fresh beef	11 9 10	
Aug. 30, 1798	Daniel Cannon, 7 rafts, timber	124 6 10	
Aug. 31, 1798	James Wallace, rafting	12 17 6	
Sept. 3, 1798	David Cruger, lime . .	18 8 8	
Oct. 1, 1798	G. Greenland, schooner-hire.	14 8	
Oct. 3, 1798	Pepper & Graddock, fresh beef	15 14 3	
Oct. 11, 1798	J. L. Poyas, palmetto logs.	84 15 3	
Oct. 24, 1798	Pepper & Graddock, fresh beef	4 15 4	
Oct. 30, 1798	Cantey, Henry & Co., 18 barrels pork . . .	67 59	

		£ (Sterling)			$ (Dollars)
Nov. 6, 1798	W. Green, transporting . .	5	-	-	
Nov. 6, 1798	Ripley Singleton, drayage	2	11	-	
Nov. 6, 1798	W. McCormick, a barrel of salt	-	19	-	
Nov. 7, 1798	Joseph Lewis & Co., cordage	5	9	7	
Nov. 7, 1798	Waring & Smith, storage rice, & c	5	2	8	
Nov. 7, 1798	Freneau & Paine, printing account	5	6	-	
Nov. 7, 1798	Benjamin F. Timothy, printing account	5	6	-	
Nov. 7, 1798	32 barrels of rice & 5 barrels of beef		85	-	
	(pounds) £	765	5	10	$3,279.81
	(Dollars)				$12,487.26 [18]

18. The City Gazette and Daily Advertizer, Nov. 9, 1798.

Most of the 16 guns (ten French 24-pounders and six English 12-pounders) emplaced in Fort Moultrie came from Canada. Secretary of State Pickering in October had succeeded in locating 25 cannon, French 24-pounders, and 1,800 shot at Halifax, Nova Scotia. These cannon had originally been taken in the French ship Foudroyant and had been given to the Province of South Carolina by George II. When Charleston had surrendered in 1780, these guns and their shot had fallen into the hands of the British, and when they evacuated the city in 1782 they had taken them with them. Prince Edward and Sir John Wentworth, the Governor of the Province, had agreed on the application of the British Minister, Mr. Liston, to loan these guns and ammunition to South Carolina. The condition of the loan was that "they should be relanded, when required, and without expence, in any part of His Britannic Majesty's American Dominions."[19]

Two vessels, Herald and Pickering, were ordered to Halifax by the Secretary of the Navy to convey the French 24-pounders and shot to Charleston. The first of these made the run to Nova Scotia, picked up the guns, and anchored off Sullivan's Island on December 11. A large working party was turned out, and ten of the French 24-pounders were landed and mounted in Fort Moultrie, No. 2.[20]

---

19. Pickering to Stoddert, October 6, 1798, found in Naval Documents Related to the Quasi-War, 1, 499-501. Benjamin Stoddert was Secretary of the Navy in President John Adams' cabinet.

20. Excerpts from Herald's Log, found in ibid, 2, 83.

It has been impossible to determine the date on which Fort Moultrie, No. 2, was first garrisoned by troops from the United States Army. The first regular unit to be posted at the fort was Captain Francis Huger's Company of the 2nd Regiment of Artillery and Engineers. Incomplete Muster Rolls and Returns for Huger's Company indicate that it was stationed at Fort Moultrie as early as May 1799. The company was still at the fort in December of that year.[21] (See Appendix A for a list of the personnel in Captain Huger's Company.)

The frigate United States, Commodore John Barry commanding, arrived off Charleston Bar from Philadelphia on July 23, 1799, with 50 soldiers. These troops were to reinforce the garrisons posted in the harbor forts. On going ashore the troops landed at Fort Johnson.[22]

In March 1800 Huger's Company was transferred from Fort Moultrie to Fort Jay, New York. Prior to leaving Charleston Harbor, a number of the enlisted men were detached and remained at Fort Moultrie under the command of Major Constant Freeman.[23]

---

21. "Muster Rolls and Returns for Captain Huger's Company, 2nd Regiment of Artillery and Engineers, May 31-December 31, 1799," National Archives, Old Military Records Division.

22. The City Gazette & Daily Advertiser, July 24, 1799.

23. "Muster Rolls and Returns for Captain Huger's Company of Artillery and Engineers, January 1-May 31, 1800,"National Archives, Old Military Records Division.

Fort Moultrie continued to be garrisoned by units of the 2nd Regiment of Artillery and Engineers until some time in 1804. On December 31, 1803, there were posted at the Sullivan's Island fort two officers and 43 enlisted men,[24] but by December 31, 1804, the garrison had been withdrawn, having been transferred to Fort Johnson.[25]

Meanwhile, the Quasi-War with France which had erupted because of the XYZ Affair, and had resulted in heavy military expenditures by the United States, had been settled by diplomacy. Elbridge Gerry, who had remained in France after his fellow commissioners departed, landed at Boston in the fall of 1798 with word that the French wished to renew negotiations. President John Adams did not exclude the possibility of a peaceful solution if the American envoys were accorded proper treatment. Alexander Hamilton, however, urged war with France, an attack on Spanish America, and the creation of a large standing army of 40,000 officers and men.[26] On his own initiative, Adams appointed W. Vans Murray as minister to the French Republic and proposed the choice of a special peace commission. Congress was outraged,

---

24. "Return of the United States Army for 1803," found in American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 175.

25. "Return for the United States Army for 1804," found in ibid., 176. As of December 31, 1804, there were at Fort Johnson two officers, one surgeon's mate, and 46 enlisted men.

26. In March 1799 the legislation was passed authorizing a further increase of the army by one battalion of "Artillerists and

but his bold act was acclaimed by much of the press, and neither Hamilton nor Congress could thwart it. Adams' disloyal cabinet, believing a Bourbon restoration was at hand, opposed the President's policy and frustrated it at first. Adams, however, completed instructions for the mission and authorized its departure by November 1, 1799. In France, Napoleon Bonaparte, on his return from Egypt, by his coup d' etat of November 9 had disposed of the Directory and established the Consulate. Adams' peace commissioners found Napoleon willing to normalize relations, and a peace which never should have been broken was restored at Morfontaine on September 30, 1800.

The war itself never went beyond a few Naval actions, in which the newly constituted United States Navy did itself credit. As the legislation creating the 40,000-man standing army was contingent on certain conditions that failed to materialize the units authorized by the Act of March 1799 were never organized. Even the regiments authorized by the Act of July 16, 1798, were only partially filled and in 1800 were mustered out. As reduced, the army consisted of two regiments of artillerists and engineers, two troops of dragoons, and four regiments of infantry.[27]

Engineers," three regiments of cavalry, 24 regiments of infantry and one regiment and a battalion of riflemen. Haskin, History of the First Regiment of Artillery, 4.

27. Ibid., 4-5.

An Act of March 16, 1802, still further reduced the regular establishment. As now constituted it consisted of an Engineer Corps, one regiment of artillery (with a colonel, lieutenant colonel, four majors, and twenty companies organized into five battalions), and of two regiments of infantry of ten companies each. This reduction, to an army of slightly more than 3,000, marked the low point to which the strength of the Regular Army was destined to fall since it was increased in December 1792.[28]

The end of the Quasi-War with France found the War Department with $107,618.10 of the $620,000 appropriated by the Congress for coastal defenses unobligated.[29] In the years from 1794 through 1799, $24,882.43 of War Department funds had been disbursed for the defenses of Charleston Harbor, while another $30,359.98 of Federal funds had been disbursed by Colonel De Saussure for "the purchase of materials, tools, provisions, and the wages of laborers and mechanics." During the period, 1799-1805, Federal expenditures on the Charleston

---

28. Ibid.

29. Dearborn to House, February 13, 1806; Department of War, Accountant's Office, Nov. 16, 1801, American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 153, 197. The amounts spent annually for the defenses of Charleston Harbor were: 1794-$3,850; 1795-$4,625.45; 1796-$1,149; 1797-$912; 1798-$4,205.98; and 1799-$11,500. Ibid.

Harbor fortifications were almost non-existent, totaling $48.68 for the three forts--Moultrie, Johnson, and Pinckney.[30]

In 1803, the year before the garrison was withdrawn from Fort Moultrie, there were high tides on October 1 and 2 along the Sea Island Coast. As these tides were higher than any experienced since the hurricane of 1783, fears were voiced for the rice crops. At the same time, on Sullivan's Island the flood tides had damaged the Fort Moultrie glacis fronting the harbor, ruined the counter-scarp in that area, and injured one of the brick walls of the magazine.[31]

The October 1803 high tides should have been a warning that Fort Moultrie, No. 2, was endangered by the elements. No one seemed unduly alarmed, however, and no steps were taken to protect the fort by constructing breakwaters or sinking grillages. The area was therefore unprepared when a hurricane roared up the coast and struck Charleston Harbor on Friday evening, September 7, 1804. At first, the winds were out of the northeast, but on Saturday morning they veered around to the east, and in the afternoon to the southeast. At ebb tide

---

30. Dearborn to House, Feb. 13, 1806, found in ibid., 195

31. City Gazette & Daily Advertizer, Oct. 4, 1803; "Plan of Fort Moultrie on Sullivan's Island, South Carolina," National Archives, Cartographic Division, RG 77.

on Saturday, the tide was higher than to be expected at spring tide. It appeared that during the preceeding ebb tide that but little water had left the Cooper and Ashley. By noon the tide was several feet higher than it had been for a number of years. It rolled over the wharves and drove a number of vessels aground.

The howling winds, accompanied by high tides, continued through Sunday morning.

Damage from this tropical storm, which many Charlestonians said was the worse they could remember, was great. All homes from Gadsden's on Cooper River to South Bay were wrecked. Of the numerous vessels in the harbor, only three or four escaped damage.[32]

On Gen. Christopher Gadsden's wharf several warehouses were wrecked or washed into the river, and the rice and cotton stored within "much damaged and some lost," On South Bay, the "bulwark" erected to cut down erosion was in ruins, while William Veitch's home, built on a recent fill, had collapsed,

---

32. Charleston Courier, Sept. 10, and 11, 1804. Among the vessels damaged in the blow were: the ship Halcyon and the brig Thomas; vessels sunk included the ships Columbus and Christopher, the brig Concord, and the schooner Mary; vessels wrecked were the brig Tartar, and the schooner Theoda; vessels driven aground were the brigs Nancy, Vensu, Norfolk, and Unanimity, and the schooners Lydia, Rising Sun, and Middleton; and one vessel, the schooner Ann Eliza, was capsized.

killing a Negro. The street recently opened to link East Bay and White Point had suffered heavy damage, as the sea had breached it in a number of places. On Blake's Wharf, a brick building and a country house had been wrecked by the bowsprit of Lydia as she came ashore.

Almost every house in Charleston roofed with slate had lost some of the roofing, many trees had been uprooted, and fences blown down.

While the storm was at its height, fears were expressed for the families summering on Sullivan's Island. The first boat from Sullivan's Island reached Charleston on the 10th, and from the crew it was learned that there had been only one death on the island--a Negro boy. From 15 to 20 houses had been washed away by the sea tide as it swept across the island, the inhabitants of which lost everything. A visitor to the island reported that if "the water had continued to rise for half an hour longer, scarcely a home would have escaped, and many people must have perished."

When they compared notes with "old timers," the Charlestonians concluded that the storm was "much longer" than the one that had visited the area in 1783, but not as great as the hurricane of 1752.[33]

---

33. Ibid., Sept. 11, 1804.

The hurricane reduced Fort Moultrie, No. 2, as well as Forts Johnson and Pinckney, to ruins.[34] Chief Engineer Jonathan Williams visited Sullivan's Island in April 1807 and he found that the counter-scarp and glacis of the fort had been obliterated, while the revetment of "the rampart which was of brick" was "in most part gone, and some of the guns have pitched forward; and bearing their broken carriages behind them, lie on the brick." The part of the hot-shot furnace not buried in the sand was swept by the surf.

Williams continued:

> There is nothing in the whole of this work that can be considered in any other view, than as heaps of rubbish, of no other value than the brick which might come in use again, except the barracks, in the rear and without the fort, which might be put in good repair, by restoring the interior wood part. There is . . . a long building within the fort called a bomb-proof, [cazerne] but the roof which is timber covered with a mass of brick work, and stakes is in a decayed state, & it is besides in the way of the future work . . . for the new front must be brought so far behind the rubbish, as to occupy the ground . . . this building stands on.[35]

---

34. Dearborn to House of Representatives, Feb. 13, 1806, found in American State Papers, Military Affairs, 1, 195.

35. Williams' Report on Sites of Old Works, Charleston, S. C., April 23, 1807, National Archives, Brill Collection, RG 77.

In the 1830's, when the Corps of Engineers spent large sums of money to erect grillages to protect Fort Moultrie from the sea, they encountered the remains of Fort Moultrie, No. 2. On his plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 3, prepared in September 1830 Lt. Joseph K. F. Mansfield locates the "remains of a former fort." [36] In his report supplementing the map, Mansfield wrote," at the SW angle [of the work] it will be observed . . . that nothing but the old rubbish of a former fort prevented the sea from coming quite in contact with the wall at that point." [37]

---

36. Map of Fort Moultrie, "Surveyed and Drawn by Lieut. Mansfield of the Corps of Engineers, 25th Sept. 1830," National Archives, Cartographic Branch, RG 77.

37. Mansfield to Gratiot, Sept. 25, 1830, National Archives, RG 77, Engineers L. R., 712-M-1830.

####
##
#

CHAPTER IV

Location of The First Two Fort Moultries

I. Fort Moultrie, No. 1

All maps locating Fort Moultrie, No. 1, in reference to other man-made or physical features on Sullivan's Island pinpoint a canal. The Drayton Map shows the canal extending from The Cove toward the fort's gate, at a point several yards east of the angle connecting the north curtain with the northwest bastian. This would be logical, as logs for the fort's construction were rafted over from the mainland. The location of the canal and gateway, as indicated, would facilitate supplying the garrison. Maps prepared by the British likewise show a canal leading from The Cove to the fort's north curtain.

Maps drawn by Captain Alexander Macomb and John Diamond in 1807 of Fort Moultrie, No. 2, show the canal. The canal terminates at a point about 60 yards northeast of the northeast corner of Fort Moultrie, No. 2. The map drawn by J. Purcell in 1796 shows a ravine that had been canalized leading from The Cove toward the sea beach. This ravine is

to the east and northeast of Fort Moultrie, No. 2. As these maps are in agreement it indicates that the north curtain of Fort Moultrie, No. 3, is located on or near the north curtain of Fort Moultrie, No. 1.

According to Colonel James' map, the distance between the salient angles of the fort was 550 feet. The distance between the northwest salient angle and the northeast salient angle of Fort Moultrie, No. 3, is 404 feet, while the distance from the northeast salient angle to the southeast angle is 323 feet. Thus if we accept Colonel James' estimates, Fort Moultrie, No. 1, occupied considerable more ground than Fort Moultrie, No. 3. It should be pointed out, however, that Col. William L. Trenton in Fort Moultrie Centennial, An Illustrated Account of the Doings at Fort Moultrie (Charleston, 1876) makes the point that Fort Moultrie, No. 1, had a "sea front east & west of 200 feet." This would greatly reduce the size of the Revolutionary War fort. As Colonel James was a trained artillerists and engineer, greater credence has been given his figures. A map has been prepared, utilizing documentary evidence to locate Fort Moultrie, No. 1, in relation to Fort Moultrie, No. 3. This map supplements this report.

II. Fort Moultrie, No. 2

Fort Moultrie, No. 2, was located a short distance southwest of Fort Moultrie, No. 3. Its position in reference to Fort Moultrie, No. 3, is indicated on the map titled, "Fort Moultrie, 1794-1804," which supplements this report.

III. Recommendations

It is recommended that archeological projects be programmed for the first two Fort Moultries. Heretofore, it has been assumed that the sea had claimed the site of Fort Moultrie, No. 1. A study of contemporary accounts and maps has led the author of this report to conclude that the present fort is located on and near the site of Fort Moultrie, No. 1. As the Revolutionary War fort had a larger perimeter than today's work, a trained archeologists might pinpoint some of its remains and thus verify the location of this fort. With the approach of the Bicentennial of the battle of Sullivan's Island, the nation's attention will again be focused on the site.

During the week of October 28-November 1, 1968, while Archeologist John Griffin was excavating the Osceola grave-site, in front of Fort Moultrie, No. 3, he encountered at a depth of about 32 inches a mass of mortar that had supported a brick foundation. Near this mass was found a pewter button that had belonged to a member of the 2d South Carolina Continental

Establishment, the regiment posted in the Revolutionary War fort in 1776. Archeological, architectual, and historical evidence found in the pit leads to the conclusion that the masonry mass encountered is either a part of Fort Moultrie, No. 1, or the foundation of a building erected to support the construction of Fort Moultrie, No. 3, in the period 1807-1809.[35]

In the 1830's, when the Corps of Engineers spent large sums of money to erect grillages to protect Fort Moultrie from the sea, they encountered the remains of Fort Moultrie, No. 2. On his plan of Fort Moultrie,No. 3, prepared in September 1830 Lt. Joseph K. F. Mansfield locates the "remains of a former fort."[36] In his report supplementing the map, Mansfield wrote, "at the SW angle [of the work] it will be observed . . . that nothing but the old rubbish of a former fort prevented the sea from coming quite in contact with the wall at that point."[37]

---

35. Williams' Report on Sites of Old Works, Charleston, S. C., April 23, 1807, National Archives, Brill Collection, RG 77.

36. Map of Fort Moultrie, "Surveyed and Drawn by Lieut. Mansfield of the Corps of Engineers, 25th Sept. 1830," National Archives, Cartographic Branch, RG 77.

37. Mansfield to Gratiot, Sept. 25, 1830, National Archives, RG 77, Engineers,L.R., 712-M-1830.

######
#####
####

APPENDIX A

Muster Roll for Captain Huger's Company of Artillery and Engineers for the Period May 31-December 31, 1799.

Officers

Francis Huger, Captain.
James B. Maney, Lieutenant.

Non-commissioned Officers

Sergeants - Job Lawles and George Lewis.

Corporals - John Penny, John Rickey, and Samuel Burchard.

Artificers - Mackey McCarty and James Garland.

Privates

Thomas W. Lammons, Thomas Sherwood, Francis Curtis, Job Gossle, Benjamin Steel, James Lawlis, John Crawford, Solomon Fleming, North Whitely, Levin Cavender, William Shelley, Thomas Wilson, James Allen, John Hicks, James Duncan, Isaac Cohee, L. C. Dean, George Jenkins, John Kelley, John Lewellyn, Perry Emory, Samuel Parker, Daniel Hill, James Moony, Peter Kiernan, Jonathan Smith, James W. Knight, Samuel Moore, John Littleton, Isaac Thistlewood, Joseph Mahon, Thomas Divan, John Ashley, John Lindall, Christopher Kley, John Blackhorn, John Dugan, Charles Butler, Philip Carroll, John Wallace, John Jessup, William Couzins, and Kirley Rotherts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources

Manuscript Materials

"A Journal of the Operations before Charleston, to the Day of the Surrender to the British Forces," Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Germain Papers, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Mich.

"Muster Rolls and Returns for Capt. Huger's Company, 2nd Regiment of Artillery and Engineers," National Archives, Old Military Records Division.

"Observations upon the Attack made by Sir Peter Parker upon Fort Sullivan," June 28, 1776, British Museum, London, Great Britain.

Simons to Izard, April 11, 1798, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, South Carolina.

Public Documents

Richardson, James D., compiler, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1797, Washington, 1896.

American State Papers, Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States, Military Affairs, Vol. 1, Washington, 1832.

Annals of The Congress of the United States, Fifth Congress, Washington, 1851.

Callan, J. F., The Military Laws of the United States, Philadelphia, 1863.

Documents Related to the Quasi-War Between the United States and France, Naval Operations from February 1797 to October 1798, Washington, 1935.

Manuscript Maps

"A Map of the Harbour of Charleston, Surveyed by Order of the Honorable H. Dearborn, Secy. of the U. S. for the Dept. of War, by Alexander Macomb, Capt. of Engineers," National Archives, Cartographic Branch, RG 77.

"Map of the Clinton Collection, 302, Charleston, The British Attack of 1776," William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Mich.

"An Exact Plan of Charles-Town--Bar and Harbour, from an Actual Survey," Cartographic Branch, Library of Congress.

Map of Fort Moultrie, "Surveyed and Drawn by Lieut. Mansfield of the Corps of Engineers, 25th Sept. 1830," National Archives, Cartographic Branch, RG 77.

"Plan of Fort Moultrie on Sullivan's Island, South Carolina," National Archives, Cartographic Branch, RG 77.

"Plat of Part of Sullivan's Island, showing the lands laid out and reserved for the use of Fort Moultrie. By J. Purcell," National Archives, Cartographic Branch, RG 77.

Books

Drayton, John, A View of South Carolina . . ., Charleston, 1802.

Drayton, John, Memoirs of the American Revolution, 2 Vols., Charleston, 1821.

Fraser, Charles, Reminiscences of Charleston . . ., Charleston, 1854.

Johnson, Joseph, Traditions and Reminiscence, Chiefly of the Revolution in the South, Charleston, 1851.

Lambert, John, Travels Through Canada, and the United States of North America in the Years 1806 & 1808 . . ., 2 Vols.,London, 1816.

La Rochefoucault-Liancout, François A. F., Travels Through the United States of North America . . ., 2 Vols, London, 1800.

Moultrie, William, Memoirs of the American Revolution . . ., 2 Vols, New York, 1802.

Robertson, Archibald, His Diaries and Sketches in America, 1762-1780, New York, 1830.

Tarleton, Banastre, A History of the Campaign of 1780 and 1781 in the Southern Provinces of North America, Dublin, 1786.

Articles in Periodicals

"A Frenchman Visits Charleston in 1777," South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, Vol. 52.

"Records of the Regiments of the South Carolina Line, Continental Establishment," The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, Vols., 6 and 7.

"Orders by Col. Pinckney, Jan. 6, 1777, from An Order Book of the 1st Regt. S. C. Line, Continental Establishment," South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, Vol. 7.

II. Secondary Sources

Biographies

Jones, C. C., Sergeant William Jasper, Albany, 1876.

Horry, Peter, and Weems, Mason L., The Life of General Francis Marion . . ., Philadelphia, 1866.

General Histories

Channing, Edward, A History of the United States, 6 Vols., New York, 1920.

McMaster, J. B., A History of the People of the United States . . ., 8 Vols.,New York, 1913.

Revolutionary War and Local Histories

Savage, Henry, Jr., Rivers of the Carolina: The Santee, New York, 1956.

Scheer, George F. and Rankin, Hugh F., Rebels and Redcoats, New York, 1959

Trenton, William L., Fort Moultrie Centennial, An Illustrated Account of the Doings at Fort Moultrie, Charleston, 1876.

Wallace, D. D., History of South Carolina, 2 Vols., New York, 1934.

Technical Studies

Albin, R. G. and Pope, J. B., Sea Lanes in War Time, New York, 1942.

Haskin, William L., The History of the First Regiment of Artillery from Its Organization in 1821, to January 1st 1876 . . ., Portland (Me.) 1879.

Horsman, Reginald, The Causes of the War of 1812, Philadelphia, 1962.

Lewis, Emanuel R., American Seacoast Fortifications: A Development History, San Francisco, 1968.

Newspapers

Charleston Courier.

(Charleston) South Carolina and American General Gazette

(Charleston) South Carolina Weekly Gazette

(Charleston) The City Gazette and Daily Advertizer

PLATE I

Plan of Fort Moultrie and Map of the Battle of Sullivan's Island, taken from Drayton, Memoirs of the American Revolution, Vol. 2, Charleston, 1821.


No. 1. FORT SULLIVAN afterwards called FORT MOULTRIE in the unfinished State it was on the 28th June 1776. the numbers opposite each cannon shew the weight of ball they carried. Only the part of the Fort which is shaded was finished.
No. 2. Sketch of a part of Sullivan's Island, the Fort, the Main, and the Shipping, during the Attack of the 28th June 1776.
No. 1.
Cavalier
Cavalier
Gate
Powder Magazine
Land Pounders
Traverse ordered by Genl Lee.
No. 2.
Huddell's Point
MAINLAND
THE COVE
Floating Bridge
SULLIVANS
Where the Frigates were to have been Stationed
Active
Bristol
Experiment
Solebay
Lower Middle Ground
Sphinx
Friendship
Syren
retiring. Thunder Bomb.

PLATE I

PLATE II

"Plan of the Platform in Sulivans [sic] Fort, by Lt. Colonel Thos. James of the Royal Regiment of Artillery," London, engraved & Published according to Act of Parliment, Aug, 10, 1776. From National Archives, Record Group 77.


PLAN
of the
PLATFORM
in
SULIVANS FORT,
by
L.t Colonel Tho.s James
of the R.l R.t of. Artillery.
Retired Battery
of 3 Pieces of Cannon & 1 Mortar
Western
Bastion
Eastern
Bastion
Retired Line before the Myrtle Grove
550 Feet
The Pieces of Cannon on the Platform
are 32 and 26 Pounders.

PLATE II

PLATE III

"A plat of part of Sullivan's Island showing the lands laid out and reserved for the use of Fort Moultrie. From a survey taken under the direction of His Excellency the Governor in August 1796, by J. Purcell, D. S." From National Archives, RG 77.

Explanation

A. The Land laid out and reserved for the use of Fort Moultrie & Garrison. Contains 18. acres. 9. tenths. the public Buildings with it are

a. The Barracks for Officers and Privates.

b. Bake house.

c. The foundation of the new Fort lately laid, and nine Private houses erected by divers persons.

Drawer 65.
Sheet 1.



Showing the land laid out and reserved for the use of Fort Moultrie.
From a survey taken under the direction of His Excellency the Governor in August 1796.
By S. Purcell O.S.

Engd Depot Aug 13 1842
Lefton Chief Officer in Mr C. B. White
Surveyor

PLATE III

Scale 300 feet to the inch.

65-1

PLATE IV

"Plan of Fort-Moultrie on Sullivan's Island, South Carolina." From National Archives, RG 77.

PLAN Drawer 65. Sheet 2.

Of Fort-Moultrie

on

Sullivan's Island South-Carolina.

Remarks.

The Glacis 30 feet — Ditch 8 feet deep. — Parapet above the ditch 17 feet. Interior hight of the Parapet 6 feet. — Rampart above the place of Arms 7 feet. — Interior hight of the Cazerne 13 feet. Exterior hight 10 feet. —

To fill the frame with tabby, it would require 15.280 Cubic feet of that composition: It is 9 feet deep, and 4 to 6 feet wide.

The high tides, on the 1st and 2nd October 1803, have destroyed the glacis fronting the harbor and ruined the counter scarp. And injured the wall of the Magazine. —

From this Fort, to Fort Johnson on James Island S. 74° W, 4312 Yards



65-2

PLATE IV

PLATE V

Diamond's Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 2, from" The plan of four Sites for the erection of Forts, as Ceded by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to the United States by the Act Passed the nineteenth day of December . . . one thousand eight hundred & five . . . done at the request of the Commissioners appointed by the said Act in August 1807 by John Diamond, Surv." From National Archives, RG 77.



PLATE

PLATE VI

Macomb's Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 2, from "A Plan of the Harbour of Charleston, Surveyed by Order of The Honorable. H. Dearborn, Secy. of the U. S. for the Dept. of War by Alex. Macomb, Capt. of Engineers, 1806."
From National Archives, Record Group No. 77.



PLATE VI

PLATE VII

"Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 1, Showing its Assumed Position in Relation to Fort Moultrie, No. 3." By Edwin C. Bearss.


MYRTLE GROVE
CANAL
CAVALIER
12 12 12
GATE
POWDER MAGAZINE
CAVALIER
12 12 12
ASSUMED POSITION OF FORT MOULTRIE, NO 3 IN RELATION TO FORT MOULTRIE, NO 1.
12- and 9-POUNDERS
TRAVERSE THROW UP IN MID-JUNE
26 26 26 18 18 18 26 26 26
9 9 9 26 26 26
6 6 6 18 18 18
550 FEET
SEA BEACH
FORT MOULTRIE, NO 1
1776-1783
CONVENTIONAL SYMBOLS
PARAPET COMPLETED AT TIME OF BATTLE
CANAL
CANAL
ROADS
CANNON
WOODS
TREES
SURF

PLATE VII

PLATE VIII

"Plan of Fort Moultrie, No. 2, Showings its Position in Relation to Fort Moultrie, No. 3." By Edwin C. Bearsss

GPO 868-320



PLATE VIII

DRAWN BY:	NAME AND LOCATION OF STRUCTURE	SURVEY NO.	HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY SHEET OF SHEETS	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS INDEX NUMBER
UNDER DIRECTION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				