

THE
SOUTH CAROLINA
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

OCTOBER 1965

VOLUME 66

NUMBER 4



COPYRIGHT © 1965 BY

THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
CHARLESTON, S. C.

CONTENTS

Articles:	PAGE
<i>The First Pinckney Mission to France</i> , by Marvin R. Zahniser	205
<i>Federal Naturalization Oaths, Charleston, South Carolina</i> , list compiled by Marion R. Hemperley	218
<i>A Miles Genealogy</i> , by Rev. Robert E. H. Peebles	229
Reviews:	
Bonner, <i>A History of Georgia Agriculture, 1732-1860</i> , by Alfred G. Smith, Jr.	241
Sarles and Shedd, <i>Colonials and Patriots: Historical Places Commemorating Our Forebears, 1700-1783</i> , by Mary B. Prior	241
<i>Across the Cobblestones, A Charleston Guidebook</i> , by Selby Paul	242
Reynolds and Faunt, <i>Biographical Directory of the Senate of the State of South Carolina, 1776-1964</i> , by Louise Watson	243
Pogue, <i>South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, 1846-1964</i> , by George C. Rogers, Jr.	244
Notes	246
Archives News	249
Index	255

THE FIRST PINCKNEY MISSION TO FRANCE

MARVIN R. ZAHNISER *

The outbreak of war between France and England in February 1793 placed George Washington's administration in a dilemma. Its desire to maintain amicable relations with England was threatened by American obligations to France under the Treaty of Alliance of 1778. While Americans were grateful to France for her assistance during the Revolutionary War, and while many were thrilled with the constitutional and social developments in France since the outbreak of revolution in 1789, they also realized that England could ruin American commerce if their government chose to give France any significant assistance.

The Washington administration reacted to that situation by trying to chart a course that would offend neither of the two great powers. However, both France and her ardent partisans in America objected to this policy.¹ Washington's effort to appease France and the domestic opponents of his policy of neutrality is reflected in his selection of ministers to the French republic. The recall of Gouverneur Morris in 1794 because of his indiscreet conduct and well-known anti-republican convictions and his replacement by James Monroe, a Republican senator from Virginia, pleased the American "Jacobins"; but Federalists were as unhappy with Monroe as Republicans had been with Morris. An ardent speech by Monroe before the French National Convention in August 1794 extolling the ties of principle and interest between the two republics alarmed Federalists. And the fraternal embrace the president of the National Convention gave Monroe following the American's speech looked to Federalists more like a kiss of Judas than the salute of a genuine friend.²

While Federalists continued to find fault with Monroe, he felt himself to be the injured party, particularly after he had given false assur-

* Marvin R. Zahniser is assistant professor of history at The Ohio State University. He is at work on a biography of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney.

¹ For an analysis of foreign policy development in the Washington administration, see Alexander DeConde, *Entangling Alliance: Politics and Diplomacy Under George Washington*, Durham, 1958; Richard Van Alstyne, *The Rising American Empire*, New York, 1960, pp. 70-77; and Paul A. Varg, *Foreign Policies of the Founding Fathers*, East Lansing, 1963, pp. 70-114.

² Monroe's speech and the reply of the president of the convention can be found in *American State Papers: Class I, Foreign Relations* (hereinafter *ASP FR*), eds. Walter Lowrie and Matthew St. Clair Clarke, Washington, 1833, I, 673-674. See also William P. Cresson, *James Monroe*, Chapel Hill, 1946, pp. 130-131. Federalist reaction to this episode can be found in DeConde, *op. cit.*, pp. 350-352.

ances to France that the mission of Chief Justice John Jay to England would in no way injure French interests. The signing of the Jay Treaty, which the French government and its American devotees took as proof of the pro-English orientation of Washington and his advisers, ended Monroe's usefulness as minister. He no longer had the confidence of his own government, and the French distrusted him.

Washington searched for a new minister to France and finally chose General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney of South Carolina, a choice that was significant because the mission made Pinckney a confirmed Federalist and altered the political complexion of South Carolina. Pinckney's personal qualifications were well known to Washington, for Pinckney had served as his aide-de-camp for a short time during the Revolution. In fact, Washington had tried to bring Pinckney into his administration on three previous occasions. Pinckney, however, had refused to serve because his debts were so large that he could not afford to abandon his lucrative law practice.³

Political calculations, as well as appreciation of Pinckney's personal qualities, entered into Washington's decision to appoint Pinckney. Washington's administration had been under sharp attack in the South with many old friends opposing its measures, particularly the Jay Treaty. No state in the Union reacted more violently to the treaty than South Carolina, chiefly because no provision had been inserted in the treaty providing compensation for the slaves stolen by British soldiers during the Revolutionary War. Stormy protest meetings were held in Charleston. These were attended by representatives of the city's greatest families, including the politically influential and powerfully connected Rutledges. In one meeting John Rutledge delivered a heated oration against the treaty, one that received national attention.⁴ When the Senate, controlled by Federalists who wished to punish Rutledge for his stand on the treaty, refused to confirm Washington's nomination of the South Carolinian as chief justice of the United States, the Federalist interests

³ Washington had offered Pinckney the positions of associate justice of the Supreme Court in 1791, secretary of war in 1794, and secretary of state in 1795. Marvin R. Zahniser, "The Public Career of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney," unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 1963, pp. 151-153, 160-161, 173-174. See also Pinckney to Washington, February 24, 1794, Washington Papers, Library of Congress.

⁴ George C. Rogers, Jr., *Evolution of a Federalist: William Loughton Smith of Charleston, 1758-1812*, Columbia, 1962, pp. 276-277. John Rutledge's speech is abstracted in Henry Flanders, *The Lives and Times of the Chief Justices*, Philadelphia, 1858, I, 633-636. Also see *Aurora and General Advertiser*, June 29, 1795.

in South Carolina received another blow.⁵ South Carolina became a political question mark by the end of 1795.

Washington's selection of Pinckney as minister to France could not have been better calculated to calm the southern tempest. Pinckney, as Washington was aware, had connections "numerous, powerful and more influential than any other in the three Southern States."⁶ Through legislative and military service, as well as through an extensive legal practice, Pinckney was acquainted with nearly every important man in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. In South Carolina he was related or had close ties to the Middletons, Izards, Rutledges, Draytons, Mottes, and Manigaults, all very influential in the politics of the state. Pinckney, unlike John Rutledge, was also politically acceptable to the Federalists in Congress. Even though known as a friend to the French Revolution, Pinckney had given support to the Washington administration in its difficulties with France. During the weeks of protest over the Jay Treaty, Pinckney's support had been shaken severely, but he had remained neutral, speaking neither for nor against the treaty. Caught between the bitter opposition to the treaty by his best friend, brother-in-law, and law partner, Edward Rutledge, and the cautious endorsement given it by his brother Thomas Pinckney, the minister to England, Charles C. Pinckney had refused even to read the treaty. His resulting reputation as a political neutral made Pinckney an acceptable minister, both to Federalists who supported Washington's policy of neutrality and to Republicans who believed America should identify itself with the cause of revolutionary France.⁷

When he became minister to France, Pinckney thought of himself as a non-party man serving his country as a patriot. Yet he was a political appointee who had been recommended by Alexander Hamilton, doubtless with a view to strengthening the administration.⁸ Pinckney,

⁵ Oliver Ellsworth to Oliver Wolcott, August 15, 1795, in George Gibbs, *Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and John Adams, edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott*, New York, 1846, I, 225; Timothy Pickering to Washington, July 31, 1795, Pickering Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society. The rumors of Rutledge's mental instability were not without some foundation in fact. See William Read to Jacob Read, December 29, 1795, Jacob Read Papers, South Caroliniana Library (hereinafter SCL).

⁶ Washington to secretary of state, July 11, 1798, *The Writings of George Washington*, ed. John C. Fitzpatrick, Washington, 1940, XXXVI, 325.

⁷ C. C. Pinckney to Jacob Read, September 26, 1795, Emmet Collection, New York Public Library; James McHenry to Timothy Pickering, May 28, 1797, in Bernard C. Steiner, *The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry*, Cleveland, 1907, p. 225.

⁸ Hamilton to Washington, July 5, 1796, *The Works of Alexander Hamilton*, ed. Henry Cabot Lodge, New York, 1904, X, 181.

it would seem, was being used by Federalist strategists to strengthen their party in the South and in the nation for the impending presidential election. Certainly the appointment of the republican Pinckney could be cited by Federalists as evidence that the Washington administration wanted an honorable reconciliation with France.

Pinckney was well qualified to act as the American minister to France. Through his legal practice and through wide reading he had become familiar with the field of international law and diplomatic custom. He had made his initial reputation as a Revolutionary soldier, a fact that might recommend him to the French people. Pinckney was a man of discretion and honor who was at the same time thoroughly acquainted with the everyday business of political compromise. A graduate of the Middle Temple in London, with a half year's additional study in France, Pinckney commanded "those various branches of science, w^{ch} please, instruct, & illumine society. . . ."⁹ Pinckney could be at home in the most exclusive salons of Paris.

Together with his wife and youngest daughter, Eliza, Pinckney sailed for Philadelphia on board the frigate *South Carolina* on September 1, reaching Philadelphia thirteen days later. Pinckney received his instructions from Secretary of State Timothy Pickering. They were designed not only for Pinckney's guidance, but also as an election campaign document as well, and were used as such once Pinckney had sailed.¹⁰ Neither Pinckney nor Pickering seems to have made a memorandum of the meeting or of his immediate impression of the other. Despite their marked contrasts—Pickering the self-made man, thin, hawk-nosed, narrow-eyed, and intense; Pinckney the man of family, stocky, frank, friendly, and easy—they appear to have established a good relationship.

After making final preparations, the Pinckneys sailed for Bordeaux late in September 1796 on board the *Liberty*. The trip was a terrifying experience. Driven by "violent storms," the ship pitched and rolled so much that the Pinckneys found it nearly impossible even to walk about in their cabin. The captain, a man with a "rough, violent, obstinate" temper, became so obnoxious that General Pinckney, known to be a strict military disciplinarian, all but authorized the mate to stage a mutiny by promising to testify in his behalf at a court of hearing.¹¹

⁹ Pinckney's learning and scholarly temperament were praised by Edward Rutledge who knew Pinckney perhaps as well as any man did. Edward Rutledge to his son [Henry Middleton Rutledge], August 2, 1796, this *Magazine*, LXIV (April 1963), 70.

¹⁰ Zahniser, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-186. Pickering's instructions to Pinckney were released to the press early in February 1797. See *Aurora*, February 3, 6, 1797.

¹¹ Mary Pinckney to Mrs. Gabriel Manigault, on board the *Liberty* at anchor [in Bordeaux harbor], November 14, 1796, Manigault Family Papers, SCL.

This nearly disastrous voyage could be taken as an omen of what awaited Pinckney in France. His mission of reconciliation had been undermined before it officially began. Pierre Auguste Adet, the French minister to the United States, had already written to the minister of foreign relations, Charles Delacroix, denouncing Pinckney and the forces behind his mission. Adet warned Delacroix not to be deceived by Pinckney's republican posture, declaring that Pinckney was "totally devoted" to the Washington administration and was its "deluded instrument." Adet hoped that the Directory, France's governing body, would not fall into the "trap" which the Hamiltonians had baited with the republican Pinckney, but would instead reject him as the tool of the Hamiltonians whose "protestations of friendship are false" and whose flattery is "treacherous."¹²

Pinckney's instructions to "remove jealousies and to obviate complaints by showing that they are groundless" and "to restore that mutual confidence which has been so unfortunately and injuriously impaired," were therefore seen by the Directory as the work of the crafty and "treacherous" Federalists. Nor was Pinckney's mission strengthened after his arrival in France by the claims of Republicans that his powers as minister were insufficient to negotiate outstanding differences with France; Republicans predicted that his rejection was all but certain.¹³

Even while Pinckney was at sea, Adet was issuing through the American press proclamations designed to influence the election of 1796. The government of France had determined to defeat the Federalist party and to have her supposed friend Thomas Jefferson elected to the presidency. Thus Pinckney was in the unenviable position of representing an administration which the French considered thoroughly discredited. In the view of the French government, Pinckney's identification with the Federalist party was probably proved conclusively when his brother Thomas virtually became John Adams' running mate in 1796. The fact that Thomas Pinckney was nearly maneuvered into the presidency by the Hamiltonian Federalists did nothing to support Charles Cotesworth

¹² Adet to minister of foreign relations, [October 3, 1796,] *Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1795*, ed. Frederick J. Turner, *American Historical Association Annual Report for 1903*, Washington, 1904, II, 951.

¹³ After Adet suspended his diplomatic functions in November 1796, the *Aurora* of January 27, 1797, asked: "But will Mr. Pinckney be received as our minister? It is reasonably to be supposed, that he will not. He left this country before the minister of the French Republic by order of his government suspended his functions here, he therefore cannot carry power to negotiate an accommodation of that break. . . . The Federal executive, if they sincerely wish an accommodation of grievances, will then, certainly be ultimately under the necessity of sending an envoy extraordinary, or of transmitting to Mr. Pinckney extraordinary powers."

Pinckney's view of himself as a political neutral and a friend of France. By November 15, 1796, when Pinckney landed at Bordeaux, Adet had made the French position clear: either the Federalists would be turned out of office and Pinckney replaced by a Jeffersonian, or France might force the United States into a war to protect her commerce.¹⁴

Unaware of the latest political developments in America, the Pinckneys remained ten days in Bordeaux. While there they attended the theater as guests of the city, but to Mrs. Pinckney's horror she was seated beside "two ladies of pleasure." She took some comfort when she learned that "there were but few others present. . . ." After the weather had cleared and their carriage alterations finished in preparation for the rough roads, the Pinckneys set out for Paris on November 25. They did not escape the lower elements of society by leaving Bordeaux. A band of *poissardes*—fishwomen—stopped Pinckney's carriage and forced the reluctant South Carolina aristocrat to descend, give them the fraternal embrace and, no doubt, the standard gift of money.¹⁵

After an exhausting trip of ten days, the Pinckneys reached Paris on the evening of December 5. It was cheering to find several of their friends there. Pinckney was especially happy to see his nephew, Henry Middleton Rutledge, the son of Edward Rutledge, who had come from England to be his secretary.¹⁶

Together Pinckney and young Rutledge began their duties the following morning when they handed James Monroe his letters of recall. Monroe told Pinckney of the Directory's hardening position toward America. Whether or not Monroe stressed the anger his recall had caused in France is uncertain, but, despite his personal bitterness over his abrupt recall by Washington, Monroe was friendly and helpful to Pinckney. Monroe was not certain that Pinckney would be received, but both men agreed that the attitude of the Directory toward America could be tested quickly by seeing how they treated the new American minister. On that same day, therefore, Monroe informed Delacroix by letter that Pinckney was ready to present his letters of credence to the Directory.¹⁷

¹⁴ Stephen G. Kurtz, *The Presidency of John Adams*, Philadelphia, 1957, pp. 125-132; DeConde, *op. cit.*, pp. 471-475.

¹⁵ Mary Pinckney to Mrs. Gabriel Manigault, November 16, 1796, Manigault Family Papers, SCL; Pinckney to secretary of state, [December 20, 1796,] *ASP FR*, II, 5; James Iredell to Mrs. Iredell, February 9, 1797, Griffith J. McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, New York, 1858, II, 492; *National Portrait Gallery of Distinguished Americans*, ed. James Herring, Philadelphia, 1865, I, 8.

¹⁶ C. C. Pinckney to Rufus King, September 25, 1796, King Papers, Henry Huntington Library.

¹⁷ Pinckney to secretary of state, [December 20, 1796,] *ASP FR*, II, 5-6; Monroe to minister of foreign affairs, December 6, 1796, *ASP FR*, I, 746. Mary Pinckney wrote

Shortly after the Pinckneys moved into their five-room apartment at the Hotel des Tuileries, Rue St. Honoré, an unexpected guest knocked on the door. Only Mrs. Pinckney was at home. It was "Mr. T. Payne," the controversial author of *Common Sense*. Paine asked Mrs. Pinckney if she had heard that the government of France had suspended the functions of its minister in America, Pierre Adet. Mrs. Pinckney replied that she had not, but she was aware that a certain "coolness" existed between the two governments. Coolness, Paine burst out, "no, it is indignation, & indignation well founded." Mary Pinckney, evidently fearful that Paine might be under the influence of liquor, wisely said nothing more and the mercurial Paine soon left. Paine, it seems, was working behind the scenes to prevent an open rupture between the United States and France and urged Delacroix to postpone action to reject Pinckney. Since Pinckney's appointment had not yet been confirmed by the Senate, Paine argued, the government of France could consider Pinckney as in "suspension."¹⁸

The Directory at first seemed unsure how to treat the "deluded instrument" of the Washington administration. On December 9, three days after receiving Monroe's note, Delacroix informed him that he would grant the two American ministers an audience that afternoon. Delacroix greeted Pinckney, Monroe, and Henry Rutledge with "great stiffness," but after a few minutes of conversation the atmosphere became more friendly. Delacroix not only accepted Pinckney's letters of credence, but also promised to send cards of hospitality immediately to Pinckney and Rutledge; no stranger in Paris was immune from arrest without these permits. Pinckney and Rutledge returned to their apartment encouraged.¹⁹

The first sign of trouble came the next day when Delacroix failed to forward the cards of hospitality. Two days later, on December 12, Pinckney learned why the permits had not been sent; the Directory had decided "that it will no longer recognize nor receive a minister plenipotentiary from the United States, until after a reparation of the grievances demanded of the American government, and which the French republic has a right to expect."²⁰

Mrs. Gabriel Manigault, December 18, 1796, that Pinckney thought the behaviour of Monroe to him "has been very candid." *Letter-book of Mary Stead Pinckney*, ed. Charles F. McCombs, New York, 1946, p. 34.

¹⁸ Mary Pinckney to Mrs. Gabriel Manigault, December 13, 1796, Manigault Family Papers, SCL; *The Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Moncure D. Conway, New York, 1895, III, 368n.

¹⁹ Delacroix to Monroe, [December 9, 1796,] *ASP FR*, I, 746; Pinckney to secretary of state, [December 20, 1796,] *ASP FR*, II, 6.

²⁰ Delacroix to Monroe, [December 11, 1796,] *ASP FR*, I, 746.

Pinckney was puzzled and did not know how to respond. Although the government of France claimed to have grievances against the United States, the Directory did not wish to negotiate them. Instead, it demanded capitulation on the outstanding issues before it would receive the American minister. Pinckney realized that he could do little to relieve the strained situation if the French maintained this policy. The decision of the Directory not to receive him, he informed Delacroix, "has filled me with real sorrow. . . ." Pinckney assured Delacroix that he had come to negotiate in good faith and felt certain that many points of difference could be resolved. Suspecting that the Directory was hostile because it believed him to be a stiff-necked Federalist, Pinckney added that "the freedom, happiness, and perfect establishment of the French republic have always been dear to me. . . ." ²¹

Pinckney did not realize how futile his efforts were. Even before Pinckney sailed for France, Adet had undated instructions in his hands to announce the suspension of normal diplomatic relations with the United States, a step he took on the very day the Pinckneys landed at Bordeaux. The Pinckneys were still in Bordeaux when Adet also announced the inauguration of a severe French naval policy toward American commerce.²²

Not knowing of the political furor Adet's activities were arousing in the United States, Pinckney continued to press for some clarification of his position. Henry Rutledge, upon delivering Pinckney's note of December 13 to Delacroix, was told that the minister of foreign affairs had no knowledge of an American minister to France since Monroe had presented his letters of recall. When Rutledge then asked if Pinckney would be allowed to remain in Paris, Delacroix replied that he would need to consult the Directory for instructions.

Two days later Rutledge's question was answered. Monsieur Giraudet, who identified himself as the chief secretary in the Department of Foreign Affairs, called on Pinckney and inquired if Pinckney were "acquainted with the laws of France, as they applied to strangers." Pinckney did not miss the point. He then asked Giraudet whether the Directory actually intended that he leave Paris, to which Giraudet replied he was not certain but would ask persons in authority.

That evening Giraudet returned to assure Pinckney that the Directory wished him not only to leave Paris but also France itself. Just when he must leave Giraudet did not know, but he assured Pinckney that an

²¹ Pinckney to minister of foreign affairs, December 13, 1796, *ASP FR*, II, 6-7.

²² Turner, *op. cit.*, II, 968-969; Kurtz, *op. cit.*, p. 128; DeConde, *op. cit.*, pp. 472-475.

extended stay would bring him into distasteful contact with the dreaded minister of the *police générale*. Pinckney, now angry as well as alarmed, protested that the police might throw him into jail as a stranger. He told Giraudet that he might remember that he, Pinckney, had been received by Delacroix who had promised him and Rutledge cards of hospitality. Pinckney correctly saw that the Directory was trying to force him to leave France on his own responsibility, something which no prudent minister would do. Therefore he insisted that any communication Delacroix had to make on the expulsion of his mission should be in writing.

In describing the events of his first days in Paris to Timothy Pickering, Pinckney expressed indignation about the apparent relationship between the probable rejection of his mission and the presidential election in the United States. He believed the Directory was temporizing "until the event of the election of President is known; thinking that, if one public character [Adams] is chosen, he will be attached to the interest of Great Britain; and that, if another [Jefferson] is elected, he will . . . be devoted to the interest of France." Pinckney lamented that many members of the French government entertained the "humiliating idea" that Americans "are a people divided by party, the mere creatures of foreign influence. . . ." Pinckney hoped that America "will never suffer any foreign nation to interfere in her concerns; and that an attempt to divide her citizens will be the 'signe de ralliement,' and render them more united."²³ Dispatches of this kind were a delight to Timothy Pickering; they were so readable, so publishable, and so irritating to Republicans.

While Pinckney was waiting for a written order to leave France, Monroe had his final interview with the French government. Following Monroe's conciliatory speech, Paul Barras, president-general of the Directory, ungraciously responded that Americans should "never forget that they owe . . . [their liberty] to France." Barras warned Americans not to heed the advice of "perfidious men, who meditate to bring them under their former yoke," for if they did, they would soon find that an indignant and scorned France knew how to "cause its sovereignty to be respected."²⁴

Pinckney's temper must have risen as he read the speech of Barras. To one who had spent six years fighting the British, the claim of Barras that France had won the American Revolutionary War could only have been galling. Pinckney noted that while Barras professed friendship with

²³ Pinckney to secretary of state, [December 20, 1796,] *ASP FR*, II, 6-8. Pinckney stated in this dispatch that he would have sailed immediately for Philadelphia if he had not believed fresh instructions were on the way to him at Paris.

²⁴ Cresson, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-154. The speech by Barras is in *ASP FR*, I, 747.

America in one breath, in the next he made a thinly veiled threat against America if she did not capitulate to the demands of France.

Pinckney's receipt of a written order to leave France in the latter part of January 1797 confirmed that the anger of the Directory toward America remained unabated. In weighing the probable reasons for his expulsion, Pinckney suggested that the government of France "may have intercepted some [instructions] for me, the tone of which I hope was firm; or they may perhaps be so elated with Buonaparte's late success in Italy that they are determined to keep no measures with any Nation that will not be implicitly submissive to them. . . ." ²⁵ It is also possible that the Directory had learned John Adams would probably be elected president and had decided to take a drastic step to indicate its displeasure. Diplomatic intercourse on both sides of the Atlantic was now broken.

As he reflected upon the cause of his rejection, Pinckney began to believe that he would not have been expelled had there not been in America a Republican party to encourage French intransigence. The French, he felt, were simply trying to destroy the Federalist administration by exploiting the disloyalty of deluded Americans. The anti-French missives that he was receiving from Secretary Pickering, reinforced by his own experience, were beginning to have an effect upon Pinckney. "I most ardently wish that we would banish all party distinctions and foreign influence," Pinckney wrote Pickering when he learned of Adet's "disorganizing manoeuvres," and "think and act only as Americans. . . ." ²⁶

While Pinckney still seemed to favor neither political party, a new tone in his letters indicates that he was fast moving away from his earlier sympathy for France. The belligerent posture that France had assumed toward the United States was certainly the major reason for his change in attitude. There was no doubt a personal factor in this change also. Pinckney had come in good faith to negotiate and had found himself spurned as though he were an enemy of the French Republic. He had been officially ignored, socially ostracized,²⁷ and even threatened with arrest and imprisonment by a supposed friend, republican France. These were novel experiences for the proud Charlestonian. Although Pinckney tried to be patient, his temper, never far from the surface, began to rise. Scarcely realizing it perhaps, Pinckney was beginning to acquire the hostile attitude of the ardent Federalists toward France. This attitude

²⁵ Pinckney to Harriott Horry [his sister], January 26, 1797, Pinckney Papers, SCL.

²⁶ Pinckney to secretary of state, February 1, 1797, *ASP FR*, II, 18.

²⁷ Mrs. Pinckney lamented that "a minister non recu is a kind of scare-crow in this city." Written to Mrs. Gabriel Manigault, January 21, 1797, Manigault Family Papers, SCL.

gradually became more pronounced. By 1800 Pinckney was describing the French as "so volatile, unstable, & fickle a people" that to establish a republic to govern them was "one of the most absurd attempts that ever was made, and has greatly injured the cause of true republicanism & real liberty."²⁸

On February 5, 1797, after placing their goods aboard their carriage, the Pinckneys left Paris in an indignant mood, not to return until joined by John Marshall and Elbridge Gerry in the famous XYZ mission. Mary Pinckney sympathized with her "respectable husband, beloved & esteemed by his country," and yet "at this time of life driven from post to pillar!" Twelve days after their departure, the Pinckneys arrived in Amsterdam with little to do except to wait for new instructions from the American government and to watch political developments in France.²⁹

The news of Pinckney's expulsion arrived in Philadelphia a few days after John Adams had taken his oath as president, presenting his administration with its first great crisis in foreign affairs.³⁰ Ardent Federalists were quick to stress that Pinckney's rejection was clear evidence that France intended to make America her satellite, while Republicans reminded their followers that Pinckney's rejection was due to his lack of adequate power to negotiate the outstanding differences.³¹ Why France should threaten and then summarily expel Pinckney was not so easily explained by Republicans. Adams reacted to this crisis sensibly and appointed a three-man commission to negotiate with France, hoping that patience and new circumstances would moderate the bellicose attitude of France. And by naming ministers from three different areas, Pinckney of South Carolina, Marshall of Virginia, and Gerry of Massachusetts, Adams hoped to unite the country behind his foreign policy.

The political repercussions of Pinckney's dismissal were greater in his own state of South Carolina than in the nation at large. South Carolinians knew Pinckney to be a friend of France, had seen him march arm in arm through the streets of Charleston with French comrades, and were aware that he had been hospitable to Citizen Genêt, a tempestuous

²⁸ Pinckney to Jacob Read, February 7, 1800, Emmet Collection, New York Public Library.

²⁹ Mary Pinckney to Mrs. Gabriel Manigault, February 13, 1797, Manigault Family Papers, SCL; C. C. Pinckney to Harriott Horry, February 18, 1797, Pinckney Family Papers, Library of Congress.

³⁰ The *Aurora* of March 13, 1797, announced: "It can . . . no longer be doubted that Mr. PINCKNEY has not been acknowledged; but we are far from believing, that he has been ordered to quit that country, or that he has taken it upon himself to depart."

³¹ William Smith to Rufus King, April 3, 1797, as quoted in Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 297. Also see *Aurora*, March 30, 1797.

French diplomat of an earlier day.³² Now their trusted and steady fellow citizen was writing to his brother Thomas and to Edward Rutledge telling of his own and his country's humiliation. Pinckney's friends, as a consequence, began to have second thoughts about France and the French Revolution.

Under the impact of Pinckney's analysis of events in France, his complaints, and then his insulting expulsion, the politics of South Carolina began to take on a new look. The state which had been overwhelmingly Jeffersonian in the election of 1796 now found reason to doubt its former confidence in the Virginian. Could the Virginia philosopher and his followers, some asked, be mistaken in their attitude toward republican France? What one sees in South Carolina as a result of the first Pinckney mission to France, and the subsequent XYZ mission, is the movement of many great Charleston families into the Federalist camp, led by the Pinckney brothers, Charles Cotesworth and Thomas, and their close friends and political allies, Edward Rutledge and John Rutledge, Jr.³³ It was this powerful group of Pinckney's relatives and friends, no

³² Pinckney to Thomas Pinckney, April 16, 1793, Pinckney Family Papers, Library of Congress; Ralph Izard to ———, April 17, 1793, Izard Papers, SCL; Ebenezer S. Thomas, *Reminiscences of the Last Sixty-Five Years*, Hartford, 1840, II, 132; Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

³³ Pierre Adet reported late in March 1797 that former friends of France in the South were enraged over the treatment of Pinckney and would "gladly fight us." Adet to minister of foreign relations, [March 31, 1797,] Turner, *op. cit.*, II, 1004. It has not always been clear to historians what political position Edward Rutledge took following the Pinckney mission. Rutledge's friendship with Jefferson and opposition to the Alien and Sedition Acts have obscured the support that Rutledge gave to the Adams administration. Rutledge, when elected governor of S. C. in 1798, warmly approved Congressional military measures and worked to keep the tone of the S. C. legislature "perfectly federal." See Edward Rutledge to John Rutledge, Jr., January 23, 1798, John Rutledge, Jr., Papers, Duke University Library; Edward Rutledge to Phineas Miller, January 1, 1799, Rutledge Papers, SCL. The support Edward Rutledge gave to the Adams administration following the Pinckney mission is substantiated by the comment of Congressman Theodore Sedgwick shortly after Governor Rutledge's death: "The loss of Governor Rutledge, at the present time, is very great. The renovated character of S. Carolina seemed to have been created by, and its continuance to depend upon him." Sedgwick to Henry Van Schaack, February 9, 1800, Sedgwick Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society. Sedgwick, a staunch Federalist, was close to Congressman John Rutledge, Jr., and presumably Sedgwick's information was based on conversations he had had with young Rutledge. Edward Rutledge had formerly been a Jeffersonian, and had, in fact, headed the successful state Jeffersonian electoral ticket in 1796, according to the *Charleston City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, December 10, 1796. John Rutledge, Jr., also a Jeffersonian presidential elector in 1796, became a Federalist because "of the indignities which have been shewn to Genl. Pinckney [by France]." Theodore Sedgwick to Ephraim Williams, May 20, 1797, Sedgwick Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

doubt joined by the Charleston British interest,³⁴ who struggled, although unsuccessfully, to give Charles Cotesworth Pinckney South Carolina's presidential electoral votes in 1800 and who formed the hard core of the Federalist party in the state through the elections of 1804 and 1808 when Pinckney was the Federalist candidate for president. Thus the strategy of Federalists in having Pinckney appointed minister to France was in a sense successful, for part of the South, temporarily at least, resumed its support of the Federalist administration.

The first Pinckney mission would seem to indicate that a diplomat need not always succeed in his mission in order to be useful to the administration which appoints him. Certainly Pinckney rallied political support for the Washington and Adams administrations even though his mission failed. Pinckney's evolution to a staunch Federalist position also supports the thesis that disagreement over the conduct of foreign policy was often decisive in determining the party allegiance of many Americans in the early national period. It seems doubtful that Pinckney and his friends would have become firm Federalists had they not felt Republicans were naïve in their attitude toward France. Because Pinckney favored a firm foreign policy toward France, he found himself moving into the Federalist camp, bringing with him his connections "numerous, powerful and more influential than any in the three Southern States."

³⁴ Identified by Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

FEDERAL NATURALIZATION OATHS
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA
1790-1860

List compiled by MARION R. HEMPERLEY

(Continued from July)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Date of Oath</i>	<i>Source Book and Page</i>
Niehuhu, John P.	September 17, 1849.....	6-2
Niel, Julius	June 27, 1807.....	10-48
Nimitz, Charles Henry	January 7, 1850	6-21
Noel, Alphonse	April 2, 1835	4-18
Nolan, John	March 12, 1824	9-331
Nolan, John M.	May 20, 1822.....	9-233
Norvell, Thomas S.	August 27, 1813	10-20
Notta, Lewis I.	August 12, 1824	9-354
Nugent, Richard	February 14, 1843.....	4-162
Nunan, John C.	August 6, 1821.....	9-172
Oates, Edward H.	March 15, 1847	4-287
Oates, George	March 15, 1847	4-287
Oates, George A.	March 15, 1847	4-287
Oates, Henry T.	March 15, 1847	4-287
Oates, John	September 6, 1813.....	10-26
O'Brien, Ellen	July 14, 1851	6-77
O'Brien, James	March 11, 1822	9-223
O'Brien, James	October 6, 1824	9-359
O'Brien, John	September 24, 1849.....	6-3
O'Brien, Matthew	May 19, 1821.....	9-167
O'Brien, Stephen	July 29, 1830	8-75
O'Callaghan, Denis	January 13, 1847	4-282
O'Callaghan, Patrick	August 27, 1821.....	9-176
Ochman, Frederick William	March 21, 1860	11-374
O'Connor, James	January 7, 1841	8-353
O'Connor, Patrick	June 16, 1823.....	9-298
O'Callaher, Simon F. (Rev.)	September 20, 1802.....	3-266
Ogilvie, James	July 27, 1846	12-98
O'Hanlon, Charles	October 1, 1834	2-411
Ohlendorf, William	April 8, 1843	12-16
O'Hlueiller, Michael	October 14, 1806	7-87
Ohring, Magnus	July 2, 1812	10-89
Ojemann, Johann C.	December 13, 1847	4-308
Ojemann, John C.	July 15, 1851	6-77
O'Malley, John	July 3, 1843	4-179
O'Meara, Cornelus	October 27, 1858	11-209
O'Neale, Charles	September 3, 1802.....	3-262
O'Neill, Edward	December 3, 1824	9-367
O'Neill, Hugh	August 6, 1847	4-301
O'Neill, James	August 6, 1847	4-301
O'Neill, Jeremiah F. (Rev.)	May 24, 1830	2-332
O'Neill, John	April 12, 1825.....	2-162
O'Neill, John	May 7, 1830	8-70
O'Neill, Patrick	April 21, 1827.....	2-243
O'Neill, T. F.	March 2, 1826	9-415
Oland, Catharine	April 20, 1849.....	4-357
Oland, Diederick	July 17, 1828	8-49