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Inventory Unit Summary & Site Plan

Inventory Summary

The Cultural Landscapes Inventory Overview: CLI General Information:

Purpose and Goals of the CLI

As the National Park Service undertakes the comprehensive effort of inventorying all of its cultural landscapes, some common themes and narratives emerge. Previous CLIs have identified the underlying theoretical framework from which all current inventory and analysis occurs. As we began our work, we studied three prior CLIs to inform our field work and research—Fort Harrison: Richmond National Battlefield Park; Fort Bunker Hill: Fort Circle Parks; and Peace field: Adams National Historical Park. The following basic framework borrows from each of these reports as models for our work at Fort Rosalie, a unit of the Natchez National Historical Park.

The Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI) is an evaluated inventory of all significant landscapes in units of the national park system in which the National Park Service has, or plans to acquire, any enforceable legal interest. Landscapes documented through the CLI are those that individually meet criteria set forth in the National Register of Historic Places such as historic sites, historic designed landscapes, and historic vernacular landscapes or those that are contributing elements of properties that meet said criteria. In addition, landscapes that are managed as cultural resources because of law, policy, or decisions reached through the park planning process, even though they do not meet the National Register criteria, are also included in the CLI.

The CLI serves three major purposes. First, it provides the means to describe cultural landscapes on an individual or collective basis at the park, regional, or service-wide level. Secondly, it provides a platform to share information about cultural landscapes across programmatic areas and concerns and to integrate related data about these resources into park management. Thirdly, it provides an analytical tool to judge accomplishment and accountability.

The legislative, regulatory, and policy direction for conducting a CLI includes:

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 470h-2(a)(1)). Each Federal agency shall establish...a preservation program for the identification, evaluation, and nomination to the National Register of Historic Places...of historic properties...

Executive Order 13287: Preserve America, 2003. Sec. 3(a)...Each agency with real property management responsibilities shall prepare an assessment of the current status of its inventory of historic properties required by section 110(a)(2) of the NHPA...No later than September 30, 2004, each covered agency shall complete a report of the assessment and make it available to the Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Secretary of the Interior...(c) Each agency with real property management responsibilities shall, by September 30, 2005, and every third year thereafter, prepare a report on its progress in identifying...historic properties in its ownership and make the report available to the Council and the Secretary...

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Federal Agency Historic Preservation (Sec. 110 (a)(2). Programs Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act, 1998. Standard 2:
An agency provides for the timely identification and evaluation of historic properties under agency jurisdiction or control and/or subject to effect by agency actions. Management Policies 2006. 5.1.3.1 Inventories: The Park Service will (1) maintain and expand the following inventories...about cultural resources in units of the national park system... Cultural Landscapes Inventory of historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and historic sites...

Cultural Resource Management Guideline, 1997, Release No. 5, page 22 issued pursuant to Director’s Order #28. As cultural resources are identified and evaluated, they should also be listed in the appropriate Service-wide inventories of cultural resources.

Responding to the Cultural Resources Challenge:

The Cultural Resources Challenge (CRC) is an NPS strategic plan that identifies our most critical priorities. The primary objective is to “Achieve a standard of excellence for the stewardship of the resources that form the historical and cultural foundations of the nation, commit at all levels to a common set of goals, and articulate a common vision for the next century.” The CLI contributes to the fulfillment of all five goals of the CRC:

1) Provide leadership support and advocacy for the stewardship, protection, interpretation, and management of the nation’s heritage through scholarly research, science and effective management;
2) Recommit to the spirit and letter of the landmark legislation underpinning the NPS;
3) Connect all Americans to their heritage resources in a manner that resonates with their lives, legacies, and dreams, and tells the stories that make up America’s diverse national identity;
4) Integrate the values of heritage stewardship into major initiatives and issues such as renewable energy, climate change, community assistance and revitalization, and sustainability, while cultivating excellence in science and technical preservation as a foundation for resource protection, management, and rehabilitation; and
5) Attract, support, and retain a highly skilled and diverse workforce, and support the development of leadership and expertise within the National Park Service.

Scope of the CLI

CLI data is gathered from existing secondary sources found in park libraries, archives, and at NPS regional offices and centers, as well as through on-site reconnaissance. The baseline information describes the historical development and significance of the landscape, placing it in the context of the landscape’s overall significance. Documentation and analysis of the existing landscape identifies character-defining characteristics and features and allows for an evaluation of the landscape’s overall integrity and an assessment of the landscape’s overall condition. The CLI also provides an illustrative site plan that indicates major features within the inventory unit and generates spatial data for Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The CLI also identifies stabilization needs to prevent further deterioration of the landscape and provides data for the Facility Management Software System.
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Inventory Unit Description:

Fort Rosalie is a cultural landscape of the Natchez National Historical Park (NATC). The location is a 7-acre site in downtown Natchez atop a 200-foot bluff on the east bank of the Mississippi River. Established as a palisade fort in 1716, Fort Rosalie was constructed by the French on this prominent outlook in order to monitor and protect their interests in the lower Mississippi valley. While the seven acres owned by the NPS is the predominant landscape feature, the legislated boundary includes the bluff slope, the lower plateau now used a parking lot, and the waterfront along the Mississippi River.

The Fort Rosalie Unit of NATC is located approximately eight blocks from the middle of downtown Natchez and is associated with the very earliest defenses of France, Britain, Spain, and the United States. The original fort was burned in 1729 by the Natchez Tribe of American Indians and was rebuilt by the French as a set of pentagonal earthworks and structures using enslaved Africans. Each successive country that controlled the fort made changes and added to the built structure of the fort, but only a portion of the earthworks associated with some early version of the fort remain extant. The current NPS boundaries of the unit are D.A. Biglane St. on the north and northwest, the highest edge of the bluff on the west continuing south across Green St. to the southwest, returning east to Canal Street on the eastern border of the cultural landscape.

While the majority of the site’s history is associated with its use as a fort complex with associated buildings and landscape features, developments in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have heavily impacted the site. In the Antebellum era, the site became part of the grounds of Rosalie Mansion, named for the associated fort. When Rosalie Mansion changed ownership in the last quarter of the 1800s, portions of the south side of the property were subdivided, sold, and an adjoining neighborhood began to develop on the property.

Starting in the early twentieth century, Natchez made efforts to attract a box factory to the waterfront. A box factory manufactured wooden crates, boxes, and other containers used to transport agricultural goods and commodities to market. The Natchez Chamber of Commerce and city leaders went to great lengths to attract this enterprise, and it was located on the plateau to the south of the Fort Rosalie unit. The box factory was a major employer in Natchez, providing many jobs for middle-class workers, and those workers needed housing in close proximity to the box factory. The outlying areas of what had been the land associated with Fort Rosalie were utilized for this purpose, and a small community of approximately twenty-five houses was constructed on the site.

Shortly after the development of the neighborhood, a prominent developer and Natchez booster—Jefferson Davis Dickson—purchased the actual fort site and immediate surrounding lands and constructed an interpretive replica of the fort on the site as a tourist attraction. This replica garnered widespread attention and publicity, something that Dickson was known for. In addition to Dickson’s personal resources, he had recently married Philadelphia heiress Louise Mastbaum, whose father Jules Mastbaum in 1926 established the Rodin Institute in Philadelphia with a $1-million donation. With Dickson’s promoter sensibilities and personal and family financial backing, he created the replica fort during the same era that Colonial Williamsburg was being rebuilt under the aegis of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Greenfield Village was being assembled under the aegis of Henry Ford. Both of these internationally
recognized enterprises came to fruition in the 1930s. Interestingly, John D. Rockefeller III, visited Dickson’s rendition of Fort Rosalie the week after it opened in February of 1941.

With this knowledge, it is clear that the site has been impacted by five distinct periods of activity and development: its use as a Colonial Fort, its inclusion within the grounds of an Antebellum mansion, its development as a neighborhood associated with a major industry in Natchez, the construction of a replica fort on the actual footprint of the fort at a time when national fervor for places that portrayed the history of the country was at its height amid rising national patriotism and recovery from the Great Depression and the advent of an international World War, and finally as a unit of the Natchez National Historical Park, within the National Park Service.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Located on the outskirts of downtown Natchez, Fort Rosalie’s historic story began in 1716 when the first French palisade fort was constructed as an outpost of the Colonial empire of Louis the XIV. Regional government was handled from New Orleans, with local representatives and governors handling this trading, political, and military outpost.

In 1729, due to conflicts with the neighboring Natchez Tribe, the fort was attacked, destroyed, and most of the garrison residents were killed. The number of victims is estimated at 290 persons. Reaction was immediate and harsh, with a force of men arriving from New Orleans under the leadership of commanders Loubois and Le Sueur. This force then captured or executed most of the Natchez nation. Those who were captured alive were transported to Sainte Domingue, thus ending the Natchez Tribe as a separate nation (Cornelison and Hardy 39, 41).

A provisional fort was constructed on a lower small plateau southwest of the fort as seen in Figure 1. Within two years, a third permanent fort was rebuilt back at the top of the bluff on the footprint of the original fort. This location remained under French control until 1763, when the Treaty of Paris granted the Natchez lands to the British. They renovated the fort and renamed it Fort Panmure.
Figure 1: Carte des environs du fort Rosalie des Natchez et du fort provisionnelle fait depuis la destruction de ce poste arrivé le 28 novembre 1729 entre 8 et 9 heures du matin par les sauvages. Broutin’s 1730 drawing of the Provisional fort located southwest of the original fort on an extending plateau adjacent to the Mississippi River (Archives nationales d'outre-mer, 04DFC 35A).
With the second Treaty of Paris, Spain took control of the area in 1783. Under Spanish control, Governor Gayoso laid out the first street grid of Natchez, thus changing the landscape from an agricultural outpost to a true small town, with all of the amenities considered important to the development of an organized city. The Treaty of San Lorenzo, also called “Pinckney’s Treaty,” set the boundary between Spanish Florida and the United States at the 31st parallel. Since the Natchez District is north of the 31st parallel, this effectively separated Natchez from the Spanish Colony. The treaty was signed in 1795 and ratified in 1796 (Grant 45-47, 51).

As the newly formed United States of America gained economic, political, and military strength and also increased in population, the country looked west to expand its territorial ambitions. In 1797, under the direction of George Washington, U.S. representatives took tentative control of the fort as an American outpost. In 1803, with the Louisiana Purchase, President Thomas Jefferson took control of the Louisiana Territory, and the period of indecision and conflict ended. As early as 1806, parts of the fort were being dismantled and repurposed for other uses, when the blockhouse was moved from the fort proper and moved into town to establish a city jail.

One of the most important events in the site’s environmental history occurred in January of 1870, when the vast majority of the actual fort earthworks were lost during a collapse of the bluff. Some twenty acres fell onto the plateau below and is now partially covered by the asphalt parking lot of the Isle of Capri Casino. Multiple collapses or “slumps” have occurred along the Natchez bluff over the recorded era and this has been a recurring event along the entire bluff structure. Stabilization efforts and studies have been conducted at various locations along the bluff and are part of the management regime of the site.

After the arrival of the boll weevil in the Natchez area in 1907, what had been the core of the Natchez agricultural economy all but disappeared almost overnight. Throughout the South, towns and communities sought ways to encourage investment and create employment, and in an area which was heavily dependent on agriculture as a way of life, the leaders of Natchez tried to attract industries that would return money to their local residents and supply tax dollars into the city coffers.

In the 1910s Natchez sought out a Chicago firm, named the National Box Company, to locate a plant downslope and just adjacent and downriver from the Fort Rosalie site, and a community of early twentieth-century bungalow houses developed on the grounds of the adjoining acreage surrounding the fort. After a period of growth and construction, this community went into a period of decline, and many houses were torn down in the third and last quarters of the twentieth century.

At the same time that this community of factory workers was building homes in the neighborhood fronting Canal Street, an international developer, promoter, and Mississippi native named Jefferson Davis Dickson was forced from his holdings in Europe due to the German invasion of France and Paris, married a rich heiress from Philadelphia, and as many promoters and boosters do, he returned to his home state and looked for ways that he could give back to the community. Concurrent with Dickson’s promotional enterprises, designed to help the Natchez economy and return some of his fortune to the local residents, two other replica villages had been constructed in the United States—Colonial Williamsburg and Greenfield Village. The fervor for Natchez history had been kick-started in 1931 by the first tour of homes and the following year 1932, by the formal creation of the Natchez Pilgrimage.
It seems apparent that his idea of rebuilding a replica of Fort Rosalie was welcomed by city fathers and preservation leaders of the time. This would have added to their nascent enterprise in marketing the city’s history to a nation interested in Antebellum history and the origins of the South and the country. At the same time that Dickson was looking at Natchez as an area for development, the national success of the film *Gone With the Wind* had created further interest in the cotton-producing areas of the South and the plantation landscapes created by their owners.

With the untimely death of Dickson in 1943 in World War II, the future of the replica fort was now in question. With his history of boosterism, showmanship, and promotional abilities, it seems obvious that had Dickson survived, the development of the replica fort site would have continued for many, many years. After Dickson’s widow sold the property in 1949, it belonged to private owners until it was finally purchased by the NPS over a period of several years.

With NPS ownership, contractors have demolished dilapidated houses on the site, cleared some of the underbrush and non-native trees on the site in order to reveal the landscape to residents and visitors, and cleared areas along the bluff to allow visitors to catch glimpses of the Mississippi River in the distance.

**SIGNIFICANCE SUMMARY**

Fort Rosalie is significant under National Register Criteria A, B, C, D, and Criteria Consideration F. The property is nationally significant under Criterion A in the area of Military History for its association with the very earliest foundations of the country as an outpost of the French Colonial government, Spain, Britain, and finally, the United States. The property is regionally significant under Criterion A due to its association with the Natchez Tribe of American Indians and their attack on the fort complex in 1729. The site is locally significant under Criterion A due to its association with the early development of the city of Natchez, with the grounds of Rosalie Mansion, with the National Box Company neighborhood development, and as an early example of historic preservation when it was redeveloped through an interpretive reconstruction of the colonial fort.

This site is nationally significant under Criterion B due to the early Colonial leaders and artists who were at the site during its development and early American period: Bienville, LaSalle, Isaac Guion, Winthrop Sargent, and John James Audubon. The site is regionally significant under Criterion B due to its association with the Mississippi Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The site is locally significant due to its association antebellum merchant Peter Little and his home Rosalie and due to its association with Jefferson Dickson Davis and his preservation activities in Natchez.

Fort Rosalie is regionally significant under Criterion C due to the construction of the earthen military formations associated with the fort. It is nationally significant under Criterion D due to the material already recovered from the site through prior archeological investigation and the potential that it has to yield more information.

Lastly, it is nationally significant under Criteria Consideration F due to the commemorative symbolic value that the site possesses due to the combination of criterion listed above and the level of significance that each possesses. Together, these elevate the commemorative value of the site to national status.
The overall period of significance for Fort Rosalie is 1716 to 1970, beginning with the establishment of Fort Rosalie by the French and ending with the demolition of the bungalow and Victorian housing stock associated with the National Box Factory enterprise neighborhood.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION SUMMARY AND CONDITION

The physical integrity of the Fort Rosalie site is evaluated by comparing landscape characteristics and features present during the period of significance (1716 to 1970) with current conditions. Many of the historic archaeological features directly associated with the original fort have been compromised. Only through additional research and testing can more be determined about existing integrity. The 1870 collapse of the bluff destroyed the majority of the actual fort earthworks, although many artifacts are probably buried and preserved at some depth in the bluff collapse soils below. How much remains on the lower plateau and how much fell further into the Mississippi River and eroded away is unknown. Twenty acres is a large area of loss, so it is difficult to know where the soils and bluff ended up at the point in time of the areal loss. Contributing characteristics identified for the Fort Rosalie unit are natural systems, topography, spatial organization and circulation, views and vistas, vegetation, buildings and structures, and small-scale features.

Extant landscape characteristics are the bluff itself and the fort rampart or embankment upon which the palisade was constructed. While the height of the fort ramparts is clearly visible, it is the aspect of the bluff looking west across the Mississippi River which is the most important view for the visitor. As a strategic military structure built atop the bluff, the fort’s location and relationship to the Mississippi River are important concepts to illustrate. Although the view from the landform towards the Mississippi River is mostly blocked by adjacent vegetation on non-NPS lands, if managed and selectively cleared, it has the potential to be one of the primary features of the park.

The systems of brick walkways constructed by Dickson to provide access within his replication is mostly still extant along the bluff edge within the wooded areas. The log cabin that was constructed as the visitor center is the only remaining architectural feature of the replication effort.

The one remaining residential structure and the large retaining wall and step structures along Canal Street clearly demonstrate that this was once a populated site and part of the suburban fabric of Natchez. All of these layers provide a multi-dimensional cultural landscape which provides abundant material for examination and interpretation.

Condition

The condition of the Fort Rosalie Unit landscape is “fair.” There is some evidence of negative disturbance and deterioration by natural and/or human forces. The cultural and natural values are as well preserved as can be expected given the local environmental conditions, especially those associated with the erodibility of the parent loess soil material and its depth. No immediate corrective action is recommended to maintain its current condition, but overall concerns related to the stability of the bluff will affect the recommendations included in that section of the report related to monitoring of any openings in the loess.
cap atop the bluff.

Additionally, the primary view towards the Mississippi River is blocked by trees and vegetation on the northwestern downslope facing the river. The trees and vegetation are located on land that is not owned by the NPS. Therefore, challenges relating to ownership and slope stabilization remain as regards the management of the view to the river using selective clearing and the use of tree services to maintain tree canopies and heights.
Site Plan

![Fort Rosalie Site Plan](image)

Figure 2: Fort Rosalie Site Plan generated from ArcMap 10.6 and Adobe Illustrator 2018.
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1 Property Level and CLI Numbers

2 Inventory Unit Name: Fort Rosalie

3 Property Level: Landscape

4 CLI Identification Number: 550174

5 Parent Landscape: 550174

6 Park Name and Alpha Code: Natchez National Historical Park – NATC

7 Park Organization Code: 5565

8 Park Administrative Unit: Natchez National Historical Park

CLI Hierarchy Description

Fort Rosalie is a cultural landscape within the parent landscape of the NATC, comprised of four separate sites in the Natchez area. In addition to Fort Rosalie, there are three other locations: Melrose, Forks of the Road slave market, and the William Johnson House—home of a free man of color living in urban Natchez.

Fort site:

The entire site was formerly the Colonial location of Fort Rosalie, and this is the over-arching organizing principle that determines the site boundaries. Various periods of activity have occurred at the site, which are overlays of the larger Fort Rosalie landscape. These are:

- Fort Rosalie
- Rosalie Mansion—the Antebellum mansion and its gardens
- Suburban development demonstrated by the Stietenroth House
- The Box Factory Neighborhood
- Fort Rosalie reconstruction
- National Park Service ownership and management
Concurrence Status

Inventory Status: In Progress

Completion Status Explanatory Narrative:

A Cultural Landscapes Inventory for Fort Rosalie was initiated by the National Park Service. An initial site visit to document the existing conditions of the Fort Rosalie cultural landscape was conducted in March 2017. John Welch, Nick Musso, Brian Goad, and Ashley Braquet, Landscape Architects with Suzanne Turner Associates, contributed to this project. The park contact from the Southeast Regional Office is David Hasty.
Fort Rosalie
Natchez National Historical Park

Geographic Information & Location Map

Inventory Unit Boundary Description:
The Fort Rosalie Unit is an irregular-shaped 7-acre parcel extending from the south side of Green St., north along Canal St. to D.A. Biglane St. on the north corner. The boundary then turns southwest along the top of the loess bluff and reconnects on the south side below Green St.

State and County:
State: MS
County: Adams County
Size (Acres): 7

Lot, Tract, and Parcel Numbers:
Lot 26: Tract: 102-03 Parcel 41-113C-26
Lot 25: Tract: 102-05 Parcel 41-113C-25
Lot 24: Tract: 102-06 Parcel 41-113C-24
Lot 23: Tract: 102-07 Parcel 41-113C-23
Lot 22: Tract: 102-08 Parcel 41-113C-22
Lot 21: Tract: 102-09 Parcel 41-113C-21
Lot 20: Tract: 102-28 Parcel 41-113C-20
Lot 19: Tract: 102-10 Parcel 41-113C-19
Lot 18: Tract: 102-11 Parcel 41-113C-18
Lot 17: Tract: 102-03 Parcel 41-113C-17
Lot 16: Tract: 102-12 Parcel 41-113C-16
Lot 15: Tract: 102-12 Parcel 41-113C-15
Lot 14: Tract: 102-13 Parcel 41-113C-14
Lot 13: Tract: 102-14 Parcel 41-113C-13
Lot 12: Tract: 102-15 Parcel 41-113C-12
Lot 11: Tract: 102-16 Parcel 41-113C-11
Lot 10: Tract: 102-17 Parcel 41-113C-10
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Tract:</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 9</td>
<td>102-18</td>
<td>41-113C-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>102-19</td>
<td>41-113C-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>102-20</td>
<td>41-113C-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>102-22</td>
<td>41-113C-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>102-23</td>
<td>41-113C-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2.1</td>
<td>102-25</td>
<td>41-113C-2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location Map:

**Figure 3**: Natchez National Historical Park is located in Adams County in the city of Natchez, Mississippi (Google Maps 2017).
Regional Context

Type of Context: Cultural

Description:
The area around Natchez has a high degree of significance and integrity, with a large collection of extant antebellum properties in their original settings. Urban development is largely absent in the core of Natchez. Highways 61 and 425 bisect the city but are not obtrusive, and their scale fits within the regional and local character of the area following the advent of automobile transport. The agricultural areas that once surrounded the city now exist as second-growth forests, but do not detract from the overall character of the surrounding landscape. However, it should be noted that the second-growth forests do not represent the character of the surrounding landscape as cotton and agricultural entities during the historic period.

Type of Context: Physiographic

Description:
Natchez is located on a loess bluff on the east bank of the Mississippi River. The legislative unit stretches from the area atop the loess bluff, down to a riverine plateau, to the edge of the Mississippi River. The bluffs that front the river on the east side begin south of St. Francisville, Louisiana, and run north to Vicksburg, Mississippi where they form the eastern boundary of the elliptical Mississippi Delta region before rejoining the Mississippi River near Memphis, Tennessee.
Figure 4: Regional Landscape Context. This Google map illustrates the regional location of Natchez, Mississippi. The Fort Rosalie site is located north of the bridge across the Mississippi River in Natchez, and south of downtown (Google Maps 2017).
Type of Context: Political

Description:
The Fort Rosalie Unit is located in the City of Natchez, county of Adams, state of Mississippi. Fort Rosalie is a cultural landscape within the Natchez National Historical Park, a unit of the National Park Service.

Management Unit: Fort Rosalie Unit

Tract Numbers: The Fort Rosalie unit is comprised of twenty-three tracts owned by the National Park Service and includes (102-03), (102-05), (102-06), (102-07), (102-08), (102-09), (102-28), (102-10), (102-11), (102-03), (102-12), (102-13), (102-14), (102-15), (102-16), (102-17), (102-18), (102-19), (102-20), (102-22), (102-23), and (102-25).
Management Information

General Management Information

Management Category: Must be Preserved and Maintained
Management Category Date: 1988
Management Category Explanatory Narrative:

The Fort Rosalie Unit meets the requirements of the management category, “Must be Preserved and Maintained” because the preservation of the property is specifically legislated.

NPS Legal Interest:

Type of Interest: Fee Simple
Type of Interest: Less Than Fee Simple
Other Agency or Organization: Private Owner
Explanatory Narrative:

The property is owned fee simple except for lands held by adjoining property owners. Plans and negotiations to purchase the remaining lands of the legislated boundaries continue.

Public Access:

Type of Access: Other Restrictions
Explanatory Narrative:

Access to the Fort Rosalie Unit is provided by the public Canal Street Road and Green Street. The park is open daily from dawn until dusk and only closed on the following days: Thanksgiving, December 25th, and January 1st. The Fort Rosalie site sits to the north of the Natchez Visitor Center, which serves as the primary visitor center for NATC and the southern terminus visitor center for NATR.

Adjacent Lands Information

Do Adjacent Lands Contribute: Yes
Adjacent Lands Description:

Adjacent lands are lands outside of the legislated boundaries of the park. Land adjacent to the Fort Rosalie Unit was originally part of the outlying fort landscape, and contained a bake
shop, well, and other features noted on maps in the 2017 archaeology report that contribute
to the overall “tout ensemble” of the fort complex. Much of the surrounding land has been
developed and continues to be developed. These intrusions are damaging the integrity of the
remaining viewsheds from the unit out to the adjacent lands and potentially endangering
important archaeological resources.
National Register Information

Existing National Register Status

National Register Landscape Documentation: Entered: Inadequately documented

National Register Explanatory Narrative:

The documentation history for and associated with Fort Rosalie includes the following reports: The General Management Plan for Natchez National Historical Park, the Fort Rosalie National Register of Historic Places Registration, the Natchez National Historical Park CLI documentation, as well as the Stietenroth and Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop Historic Structure Reports. Documentation also includes the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH) and the work conducted for them by Jack D. Elliott.

The General Management Plan for Natchez National Historical Park includes a copy of the enabling legislation creating Natchez National dated October 7, 1988. Within this document, the acquisition of Fort Rosalie and surrounding property was to be included within the park “only if the Secretary of the Interior determines that the historic resources of Fort Rosalie are of sufficient national significance and integrity to warrant inclusion in the National Park System.”

Prior research conducted by Jack D. Elliott, Jr. recommended that the Fort Rosalie site be purchased and included in NATC based on four major criteria. While lengthy, the four criteria that Elliott promulgated are an excellent explanation of the significance of the site to Natchez, the park service, and the region. Here below are the four criteria developed by Elliott:

1. Fort Natchez [Elliott’s preferred name for the fort] has a far longer and more continuous history than any other site in colonial Mississippi. Its occupation, excepting only a few interruptions, lasted through all three periods of European rule and into the beginning of the American territorial period. No other central place or point of attachment in Mississippi lasted for more than one period of European rule. From the French period, the Gulf Coast sites—Fort Biloxi/Maurepas (1699-1702), Vieux Biloxi (1719-1721), and Nouveaux Biloxi (1720-ca. 1722)—were each only briefly occupied and consequently had little long-term impact on the course of settlement in that area. Fort St. Pierre on the Yazoo River (1719-1729) was the center of a French agricultural settlement for a few years, but following the massacre of 1729, it was not reestablished. The British, conversely, neither established nor maintained any points of attachment other than Fort Natchez. In 1791, the Spanish established two new centers in the Natchez District: Los Nogales and Villa Gayoso, but both of these were abandoned soon after the beginning of the American occupation.

2. Fort Natchez effectively evolved into the town of Natchez; hence its importance as a central place continued after the fort itself was abandoned.

3. The fort and the Natchez District were closely interrelated during the early years of the District as is evidenced by the earlier settlers tending to cluster around the fort town and by the mere extension of the name Natchez to the district. Additionally, the two possessed the reciprocal relationship characteristic of central places and their hinterlands.
4. The Natchez District effectively evolved into the Mississippi Territory as exemplified by continuities of demography and spatial structure. The town of Natchez served as the primary central place of the territory much as the fort had served as the primary central place of the Natchez District prior to the birth of the town. If one follows the numerous boundary changes and demographic changes, a continuity can be observed from the beginnings of the Natchez District in the late 1760s to the establishment of the Mississippi Territory, through the changes in the territory, and on to the establishment of the State of Mississippi in 1817. (Elliott 38-39)

Clearly, Elliott saw the fort and eventual town as the center, first, of the Natchez District, then the political and social center of the region up through the time of statehood and beyond through the period of economic success and accumulated wealth during the Antebellum period. The fort and its location on the bluff overlooking the river and Louisiana to the west were the central reasons that settlement coalesced in and around Natchez.

The Fort Rosalie proposed nomination to the National Register of Historic Places Registration was completed in 2011, and encompasses the ruins of the fortification, the park landscape, a single extant dwelling house that was at one time used as park service headquarters, and a Dickson-era log building that was used as the entrance building to the Fort Rosalie site during the 1940s, the gift shop for the attraction, and later as a restaurant. While the proposed registration has not yet been accepted, it provides an extensive history of the site and the included documentation supports the importance of the resource to NATC and to the area.

Our analysis of the nomination recommends that Criterion A be expanded to include additional periods of significance related to Antebellum Natchez, the development of the surrounding neighborhood during the post-bellum and later periods, and then through the time when Natchez promoter and local booster Jefferson Davis Dickson developed a tourist-driven interpretation of the fort, along with his development of the site of White Apple Village and the viewing stands located on the perimeter of a site called the Devil’s Punchbowl, long associated with pirate and illegal activities and later associated with a surrounding encampment of freed slaves living in the area immediately after the Civil War and during Reconstruction. Furthermore, Criterion B should be added as an area of significance that would list the local, state, national, and international persons who were associated with the fort site. These people are listed in the subsequent material that follows. Criterion C should be added as relates to the method of construction used to develop the fort site. While there is limited integrity, the significance of the feature elevates it in the importance of the overall site. The nomination includes Criterion D, related to the archaeological resources at the site. An additional Criteria Consideration is F – the use of the site as a commemorative property. The site was chosen by the MSSDAR as the place where they installed a flagpole in 1916 to commemorate the placement of the American flag by Isaac Guion at the beginning of the American occupation of the Natchez District. The importance of the fort site was also the reason that Jefferson Davis Dickson chose the area for his interpretive fort, as a link between the Colonial origins of the United States and the European powers that discovered and settled the North American continent.

At the time this report was completed, Fort Rosalie was mentioned in the Natchez Bluffs and Under-the-Hill Historic District Nomination as a contributing resource within the Under-the-Hill District.
The nomination included the fort site, the bluff, and the waterfront associated with Under-the-Hill as
the three components that comprised the complete collection of features. While this is an important
connection, it does not represent the importance of the fort landscape to its surrounding context and
associated lands at the time when it was an active military garrison and complex.

Natchez National Historical Park CLI documentation consists of three distinct landscapes, including
Melrose Estate (2013), William Johnson House (2005), and Fort Rosalie. The Melrose CLI does not
mention Fort Rosalie; however, the William Johnson House CLI does describe the fort within the
regional context description, which reinforces the idea of the overall significance of the fort site and
its associated surrounding lands.

Historic Structure Reports exist for two structures at the Fort Rosalie Unit: the Stietenroth House
(2013) and the Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop (2006). The historical background and chronology for
both reports include a detailed history of the fort. The information contained in the Stietenroth HSR
underscores the importance of the neighborhood as it developed on the land formerly associated with
the fort landscape and subsequent periods of urban development connected to the growth of Natchez
and the increase in housing stock that occurred when the box factory was constructed on land below
the bluff. The Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop HSR connects the fort tourist attraction that was developed
at a time when Natchez was pivoting commercial concerns associated with its agricultural past to
what became the mainstay of the local economy when it capitalized on its antebellum history, due
largely to the concentration of significant structures in the area that retained and still do retain a large
degree of integrity.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH) site hosts a Historic Resources
Inventory Database (HRID). Associated properties listed in the Natchez Historic District in Adams
County as found on the site include: Stietenroth House and the Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop (log
cabin). The Fort Rosalie site is documented through a submission by Jack D. Elliott, Jr., submitted
sometime in the past (nd).

There is currently no comprehensive National Register Nomination for all of the Natchez National
Historical Park. When reviewing NPS-28: CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT GUIDELINE.
APPENDIX Q: Preparing National Register Forms, the NPS takes the position that an overall
nomination is preferable to individual piecemeal submissions. The existence of previous NR
nominations does not preclude the development of an overall nomination that considers all of the
park service properties in total.

Along those same lines, the resources in Natchez and vicinity are of such a level of significance,
retain a remarkable level of integrity, and the inventory of properties and landscapes is so extensive,
that it is reasonable to recommend that Natchez consider submission of the area to the NPS as a
federally recognized heritage area. The historic associations during the era of prehistory associated
with the Natchez Tribe of American Indians, the colonial era, territorial status, antebellum
development and wealth, the rise of the area during the nascent historic preservation movement, and
the continued interest and acknowledgement of Natchez as a national and international tourist
destination merit the consideration of this elevated status and recognition for the park service
properties, the architectural tout ensemble, the increasing acknowledgement and recognition of the
region as a focus of slave trading and ownership, and the connection to the Natchez Trace Parkway. These all exist together to provide a density of significant properties that could potentially constitute a heritage area when documented as a collection of historic resources. Ann Beha and Associates completed a Historic Resource Study in 1997, which provides an excellent framework for beginning this process.


Natchez is home to a variety of organizational resources that would be important in an undertaking such as submission to the NPS as a heritage area. The headquarters of the NATC are located in Natchez, the Historic Natchez Foundation, Pilgrimage Historical Association, Rosalie Mississippi State Daughters of the Revolution, the Friends of the Riverfront, the Natchez Chamber of Commerce, and a myriad of historians and experts in Natchez who could contribute to the process. While complicated in nature, this provides the kind of variety that interests more visitors and could potentially increase the degree of tourism in Natchez and surrounding environs.
Fort Rosalie
Natchez National Historical Park

National Register Eligibility:

National Register Concurrence: To be completed by NPS

Contributing/Individual: Contributing

National Register Classification: District: Natchez National Historical Park

Significance Level: National

Significance Criteria:

A – Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B – That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

C – Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

D – Property has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.

Criteria Consideration:

F – A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods of Significance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Context Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Context Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Context Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Context Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Context Theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Significance:

Fort Rosalie is significant in the following multiple ways: Colonial Frontier Military History, Historical Archaeology, Exploration and Settlement, Antebellum Natchez, Suburban Development, Regional Economic Trends, and Early Historic Preservation trends. The site is more generally significant for its strategic location at a crossroads between overland roads, the Natchez Trace trail system, and the Mississippi River. Early establishment of the site as a military post and river landing assured its premiere importance in the regional transportation network. Fort Rosalie became a node in the developing network of settlements in the Lower Mississippi Valley in the early eighteenth century and was the focal point of events significant in the development of the Mississippi Territory. From 1716 to ca.1806, the fort served as the nucleus of an evolving settlement that eventually became the heart of the Mississippi Territory, and then the State of Mississippi. Many of the events connected with the struggle for control of the Mississippi River valley were carried out here by France, England, Spain, and the United States. Fort Rosalie was so consistently associated with the events and personages that embodied the causal sequence leading to the creation of the Mississippi Territory for such a long period of time, that arguably, no other site can be considered as significant to the colonial history of Mississippi. Today, the site is owned by the National Park Service and will be developed as part of Natchez National Historical Park, for interpretation of the history of the Mississippi River Valley and the birth of the Mississippi Territory to the American public.

The archaeological potential of the fort site has been well documented. Originally constructed in 1716, the Fort Rosalie site was burned by the Natchez Tribe of American Indians in 1729, then was rebuilt by the French circa 1731-1732, and changes were made by the British when they renamed it Fort Panmure in 1763. The fort is associated with the earliest settlement and defense of locations along the Mississippi River, which was used as an entry point for French, Spanish, British, and American settlers and garrisons. Fort construction is a distinct category of earthworks associated with early American history. Most forts were designed and constructed by military engineers, and in the case of Fort Rosalie, French engineers designed and constructed the bulwarks, moats, and earthen parapets that created the shape of the fort.

After Fort Rosalie was abandoned as a military entity, Peter Little purchased the land in 1820 as part of the outlying grounds of his Antebellum home on the Natchez bluff. A survey of the entire Little property including the outlying gardens is owned by the MSSDAR and housed at Rosalie Mansion. The larger landscape was included in legal records with descriptions of fences, corn fields, and gardens. Antebellum and postbellum landscapes provide a unique opportunity to interpret the landed gentry. Peter Little’s business enterprises and his construction of Rosalie Mansion changed the architecture and the landscape of the city. The antebellum and postbellum landscape associated with Rosalie Mansion could yield important information about the gardens and extended landscape south of the house.

After Peter Little’s death, the Rosalie Mansion property was periodically subdivided, and lots were sold from the original tract that included the Mansion and Fort Rosalie site. As Natchez struggled through Reconstruction, families frequently sold off tracts of land, which at the time were associated with the larger agricultural landscape of Natchez. They used proceeds from these sales to pay taxes, maintain their lifestyle, perform maintenance on their homes, or provide for living expenses.
As the land surrounding Rosalie Mansion was sold, a neighborhood began to develop in the area between the bluff and Canal St. At the time the land was sold at sheriff’s sale, the Stietenroth family already occupied the overall site in a house at the edge of the Rosalie property. As Natchez struggled through the collapse of the cotton economy, city leaders sought ways to provide economic stimulus for the Nathez working class. In the 1910s, city leaders vigorously pursued proposals and investment from national companies, including the National Box Company out of Chicago, IL, encouraging them to choose Natchez as a new location for a manufacturing facility. With the advent of commercial development along the waterfront and the construction of the National Box Company factory, a larger neighborhood developed on the lands surrounding the fort site proper.

The nascent national historic preservation movement grew at an exponential rate during the 1930s. With the advent of places like Colonial Williamsburg and Greenfield Village, there was growing national interest in the origins of this country and the people and events which created cultural landscapes that animated historical trends. As Natchez became a famous site of heritage tourism, state leaders and the MSSDAR sought additional ways to promote the city and surrounding region. With the advent of the Spring Pilgrimage in 1932, interest grew in the architecture and history of Colonial and Antebellum Natchez. Along with the MSSDAR purchase of Rosalie Mansion, the Mississippi State government planned to “rebuild Fort Rosalie adjoining the property and overlooking the Mississippi River” (Lail). The interpretive reconstruction of Fort Rosalie as a tourist site was intended to generate additional visitor interest, along with Rosalie Mansion and other local properties that were open year-round or seasonally during Pilgrimage. Fort Rosalie site was restored by the Natchez Historical Association, which was founded by Dickson, who served as its director (Case). These community leaders felt that the two sites, Rosalie Mansion and Fort Rosalie, would provide attractions within close proximity to one another, associated through name and history, thus increasing the visitorship potential of both, a concept in economics called Central Place Theory.

With the purchase of Rosalie Mansion, the MSSDAR established state headquarters in Natchez. When Dickson arrived at the advent of WWII, he sought potential promotional locations, with the site of Fort Rosalie among those that he decided to develop. Widely recognized for his marketing and promotional skills, it is also clear that Jefferson Davis Dickson operated at the highest levels of business and social society during his life. In an era when personality was developing as a commodity, Dickson capitalized on the burgeoning form of media manipulation and advertising to promote the people, places, and ideas that appealed to the growing consumer class. The interpretive reconstruction of Fort Rosalie attempted to recreate a historic district that celebrated the roots of the country and the bravery of colonial settlers and pioneers. It also documented through materials and form, the type of construction methods used in early fort building, although there is no evidence that any of the buildings were based on documentary evidence. The following section takes the significance narrative above and categorizes it by each of the relevant criterion and criteria considerations. Fort Rosalie is significant under National Register of Historic Places Criteria A, B, C, D, and Criteria Consideration F.

**CRITERION A**

As this site was used as a military fort and garrison for nearly a century by the French, the British, as well as the United States, Fort Rosalie is nationally significant under Criterion A. It is also nationally significant under Criterion A as one of the primary trade outposts for France and Spain. Later, Natchez
was nationally significant as the southern terminus of the Natchez Trace Parkway, as it was an early trading route that was widened to enable wagon transport by the United States Army. The Trace served as an important transportation corridor and mail route.

Fort Rosalie is regionally significant due to its association with the Natchez Tribe of American Indians, who traded with the early settlers and attacked the fort in 1729, destroying the palisade and garrison buildings and murdering many of the residents. Fort Rosalie is regionally significant as the capital of the Mississippi Territory from 1798 to 1817, when the territory was divided into Alabama on the east and Mississippi on the west.

The site is locally significant as the place that then evolved into the town of Natchez. Elliott points out that “its importance as a central place continued after the fort itself was abandoned” (Elliott 38-39). The site is regionally significant as the capitol of the Natchez District and as the focus of trade between the surrounding hinterlands and the fort. The site is locally significant for several reasons: first, after the fort itself was dismantled, the site became part of the grounds of Rosalie Mansion; later, when it was subdivided (1850 to early 1900s) into a neighborhood abutting the original city plan of Natchez, and finally, when the National Box Company constructed a manufacturing facility between the fort site at the top of the bluff and the Mississippi River below. The site is locally significant as an early example of the historic preservation movement in America, when the site was re-developed and re-interpreted into a tourist attraction following the founding of the Natchez Pilgrimage in 1932 and the growth of the tourism industry in the city and local area.

CRITERION B
The site is nationally significant under Criterion B due to the early colonial leaders who commanded, settled, or visited the site. These include Bienville, LaSalle, Isaac Guion, Winthrop Sargent, and John James Audubon. The site is nationally significant due its association with persons like Isaac Guion, the first American ruling commandant of the fort. Following Guion, Winthrop Sargent arrived as the newly appointed territorial governor of the Mississippi Territory and utilized the fort as his original offices. Though not as closely associated with Natchez as he was with locations in Louisiana, John James Audubon visited Natchez and painted scenes of the city and fort landscape.

The site of the fort and its environs maintain regional significance for association with the Mississippi Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, who kept their headquarters at Rosalie Mansion.

Local significance is associated with Peter Little, an early Natchez merchant who inherited substantial wealth and purchased the site. He constructed his home, Rosalie Mansion, on the northern perimeter of the site on the edge of the City of Natchez. The last significant personage associated with Fort Rosalie is Jefferson Davis Dickson, the Natchez native who became an international boxing and event promoter in Europe. Dickson returned to Natchez at the advent of WWII, and using his considerable fortune, reinterpreted the fort site as a tourist attraction under the auspices of the Historic Natchez Foundation. He also opened for visitation the former center of Natchez culture at White Apple Village and The Devil’s Punchbowl.
CRITERION C

The creation of an earthen and palisade military fort, by its very nature, embodies a unique method of construction within the Natchez region. Fort Rosalie is regionally significant under Criterion C due to this remnant earthwork fort feature. The significance of the remaining earthen structure provides visible evidence of the early origins of the military outpost and the central location of the site to the later development of the City of Natchez. Throughout the development of New France, many of the initial structures began first as earthen and palisade structures because the materials were readily available, and construction could begin as soon as it was determined that there was the need for a military garrison or trading outpost. Brick was not available, and stone is not native to the area, so earthworks were the construction method of choice.

CRITERION D

Due to the fact that the site has provided information on the history of the development of America, it is Nationally Significant under Criterion D. Throughout its history, the site has yielded information important to the history of the nation. As early as 1840, Dr. Montroville Wilson Dickson visited Natchez and conducted archaeology as an “avocational archaeologist,” and extracted 59 artifacts that are now housed at the University of Pennsylvania (Cornelison and Hardy 59). Once the park service acquired the property, multiple investigations conducted over a ten-year period occurred at the site which yielded a vast collection of material. These findings were documented in the draft report conducted by SEAC in “Archeological Investigations of Fort Rosalie, Natchez National Historical Park.” The site has the potential to yield much further information as more archaeological research is conducted.

CRITERIA CONSIDERATION F

The site is significant in intent because of the age, tradition, and symbolic value. Serving as one of the first military outposts of the French hinterlands, the construction of Fort Rosalie in 1716 created the beginning of the symbolic importance of French Colonial empire. In later years it was significant because of use by the Spanish Colonial empire and the British Colonial empire, and it is a symbol of ties between France and America. The reinterpreted fort also held symbolic value for the MSSDAR when they installed a flag pole one top of the fort site in commemoration of the earliest American commandant of the fort – Isaac Guion.

People associated with the early colonial history of the Fort Rosalie site include the following:

Bienville
The Tribe of the Natchez
LaSalle
Guion (placed the first United States flag at the site)
Peter Little
MSSDAR The Mississippi Chapter of the DAR
Jefferson Davis Dickson
Chronology & Physical History

Cultural Landscape Type and Use

Cultural Landscape Type: Historic Site

Current and Historic Use/Function:

Primary Historic Function: Military Fort

Primary Historic Function: Antebellum and Postbellum garden

Primary Historic Function: Suburban neighborhood – Stietenroth and Box Factory Neighborhoods


Primary Current Use: Interpretive Landscape

Other Use/Function

Other Type of use or Function

Monument (Marker, Plaque) Both Current and Historic

Picnic Area Current

Current and Historic Names:

Name Type of Name
Fort Rosalie Both Current and Historic
Fort Panmure Historic
Fort Sargent Historic
Fort Natchez Historic
Rosalie Mansion Historic
Fort Rosalie Reconstruction Historic
Box Factory Neighborhood Historic
**Chronology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major Event</th>
<th>Major Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,000-8,000 BCE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Paleolithic Era. (Cornelison and Hardy 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000-1,000 BCE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Archaic. (Cornelison and Hardy 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-1,000 BCE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Poverty Point. (Cornelison and Hardy 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-100 BCE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Tchula/Tchefuncte (Woodland period inclusive). (Cornelison and Hardy 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 BCE to 300 CE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Marksville (Woodland period inclusive). (Cornelison and Hardy 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-700 CE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Baytown (Woodland period inclusive). (Cornelison and Hardy 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-1,200 CE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Coles Creek period. (Woodland period inclusive) (Cornelison and Hardy 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200-1,350 CE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Anna Phase (Plaquemine period inclusive) (Cornelison and Hardy 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,350-1,500 CE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Foster Phase (Plaquemine period inclusive) (Cornelison and Hardy 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500-1,650 CE</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Emerald Phase (Plaquemine period inclusive) (Cornelison and Hardy 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>Explored</td>
<td>Juan Ponce de Leon first began exploration of the North American mainland. (Cornelison and Hardy 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>Explored</td>
<td>Hernando de Soto began exploration in North America. (Cornelison and Hardy 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>Explored</td>
<td>Hernando de Soto “made the first recorded European contact with the Natchez.” (Cornelison and Hardy 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>Explored</td>
<td>“Expedition led by René Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle, made its way down the Mississippi from the Great Lakes.” Encounters the Natchez. (Cornelison and Hardy 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Natchez is the oldest continuously occupied European settlement on the Mississippi River and is the beginning or terminus of the Natchez Trace. It was first mentioned in written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>On March 26, 1682, by Henry Tonty, who was second-in-command to La Salle during the La Salle expedition descending the Mississippi River. (Cornelison and Hardy 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Colonized</td>
<td>“Louis XIV, King of France, appointed Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d’Iberville to establish a colony for France in the region previously explored by La Salle.” (Cornelison and Hardy 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699, Jan. 20</td>
<td>Colonized</td>
<td>“Iberville arrived in Pensacola … to find it occupied and controlled by Spain.” (Cornelison and Hardy 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Explored</td>
<td>Iberville sailed west until he encountered the Mississippi River. (Cornelison and Hardy 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Explored</td>
<td>Iberville “sailed north as far as present-day Baton Rouge and then returned to the Bay of Biloxi where he built Fort Maurepas in 1699. This was the first French settlement in Louisiana (Pénicault 1988:91-93, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Colonized</td>
<td>“Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville arrived in Biloxi with his brother, Iberville.” (Cornelison and Hardy 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Explored</td>
<td>“A Taensa informant for Iberville’s 1699 expedition up the Mississippi River reported that the Thecloel tribe, the people living in the Natchez area, lived in nine villages or settlement[s]: Flour, Grigra, Jenzenaque, White Apple, Tiou, Duck, the Grand Village itself (Natchez), and another located near Fairchilds and Coles Creeks.” (Cornelison and Hardy 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700, May 5</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>“Iberville met with several visiting Natchez chiefs in the village of Taensas, he accepted the calumet, or peace pipe, and promised to erect a fort and trading house in their country. Iberville was not able to fulfill his promise to the Natchez due to the War of Spanish Succession.” (Cornelison and Hardy NPS 31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1700 | Planned | “He [Iberville] was much pleased with the country of the Natchez, and considered it as the most suitable part of the province, for its principal establishment: he selected a high
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>“Crozat contracted with Marc-Antoine de la Loire des Ursins and Louis Auguste de la Loire Flaucourt … to establish a trading post at the landing below the bluff at Natchez.” (Cornelison and Hardy 32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1716 | Established | Bienville established Le Fort Rosalie des Natchez in 1716. (Phelps 1966:13, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 31)  
Completion date of the fort is 08/03/1716. (Barnett 71) |
| 1717 | Established | “The Company began in earnest to send colonists through a system of grants or concessions.” Small concessions were enough to support a single family – “but there were two that were quite large, with 29 European engages, 56 African slaves, four Indian slaves, and 40 habitant households.” (Usner 1992:66). Like du Pratz, many settlers purchased their land – already cleared for crops – from the Natchez (James 1968:71; Elliott 1989: 312-33, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 35-36) |
| 1722 | Neglected | “By 1722, there were only 18 men, and the fort was described in January of that year as consisting of badly decayed posts (Barnett 2007:86, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 35) |
| 1722, Oct 21 | Military Operation | “The inspector of St. Catherine concession, formerly Hubert’s concession, was shot and wounded by a Natchez man (du Pratz 1947:36-40 [1758]. The hostilities that followed over the next seven days, which included snipers taking shots at concessions, shooting of livestock, and burning of houses, came to be known as the Second Natchez War. (Barnett 2007:85-86, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 36) |
| 1723, Oct. | Military Operation | Bienville attempted to prevent an attack on the Natchez, but ultimately deferred to the “Council in New Orleans.” An armed force was sent north to destroy the Natchez, which was entitled the Third Natchez War. “A group of approximately 600 men, comprised of regular colonial troops, militia, and Indian auxiliaries … marched to the Village of the Apple and found it deserted. They burned the village and probably two or three more. Any Natchez who
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“In 1724, the area’s farms supported 25-30 cattle, seven to eight horses, and 30-40 hogs. Maps drawn during the period show the smaller farms scattered in the countryside inland from the fort and larger clusters of buildings representing the two large concessions.” (Cornelison and Hardy 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“In 1726 the Natchez colony was comprised of 259 people: 105 Europeans in 40 households, consisting of 49 men, 29 women, and 27 children, 65 Africans and nine Indian slaves, 45 engages (indentured servants) and 35 soldiers.” (Cornelison and Hardy 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726-1729</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“From 1726 to 1729 there were only roughly 30 men garrisoned at Natchez, most of who lived outside the confines of the fort.” (Barnett 2007:100, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“A census conducted in 1727 showed … the population of Natchez was 713: three officers, 200 men (including 20 soldiers), 80 women, 150 children, and 280 slaves.” (Phelps 1954:75, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“By 1729 there were roughly 200 enslaved Africans in the Natchez colony.” (Cornelison and Hardy 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“By 1729, the colony at Natchez was the most promising settlement in Louisiana. Tobacco had proved to be a stable crop and the French tobacco monopoly assured a steady market.” (Cornelison and Hardy 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729, Nov. 29</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>Natchez attacked Fort Rosalie. Massacre. (Cornelison and Hardy 28, 38-41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1730 | Military Operation | The remaining Natchez, approximately 500 persons, were arrested after several skirmishes and brought to New Orleans. “Not long after, the whole tribe was sent to St. Domingue and sold as slaves, in order that it might become extinct in the colony, and as the only mode of insuring tranquility and peace. ‘Thus,’ says du Pratz, ‘was extinguished a nation, apparently the most brilliant in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>“Provisional fort started by Loubois in 1730 and completed in 1731 during Perrier’s last year in office.” (Cornelison and Hardy 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Contract to erect a “regular permanent fortification to replace the provisional fort.” (Cornelison and Hardy 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
<td>“La Buissonniere, under Loubois’ authority, was appointed to supervise the construction of the new Fort Rosalie. The fort was constructed on its original site, this time as a more substantial terrace-fort [earthworks] rather than a stoccado [stockade] (Giraud 1991:425, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 41-42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733-1763</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“France maintained a garrison of about 50 men at the reconstructed fort which served as ‘an entrepot for the convoys ascending to the Illinois’ (Chambers 1942:14; Claiborne 1978:68; Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:142, 255, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733-1763</td>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>“During that time, large areas near Natchez reverted to wilderness (Pittman 1973:38 [1770].” (Cornelison and Hardy 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>“France surrendered Louisiana in order to maintain its European lands with the signing of the ‘Treaty of Paris’ in 1763. As part of the treaty, Louisiana was divided between Great Britain and Spain. All lands east of the Mississippi River, including Natchez, became English territory, while Spain held all lands to the west of the river and of the Isle of Orleans.” (Cornelison and Hardy 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>With the acquisition of West Florida, the British sent a garrison of 60 men to Natchez under the direction of Major Farmar. (Cornelison and Hardy 44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1766  | Reconstructed | “The fort was rebuilt by the British and renamed Fort Panmure. The area was reopened for settlement, 39 land grants were issued from 1766 through 1769 ranged from 140 to 20,000 acres, but many of the grantees never even went to Natchez and the British government made little effort to recruit colonists. Nevertheless, a small community
of European settlers developed near the fort, and farms grew along the major creeks.” (Cornelison and Hardy 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1766, Sept. 29</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“A detachment of the Scotch Fuziliers consisting of four officers and forty-four men came to occupy the fort. This force remained there almost two years until lack of support in England led to the removal of the troops in 1768.” (Cornelison and Hardy 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>The fort was “turned over to two British traders, John Bradley and Henry Fairchild, who used it for a trading post with the Indians.” (Cornelison and Hardy 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770, July</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“A group of pioneers, led by Samuel Wells and John McIntire, sailed down the Ohio and Mississippi rivers to settle at Natchez. They camped temporarily in the abandoned fort (Chambers 1942:15-16, 38, 46-48, 53).” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“Ten log houses and two frame houses had been built there. The population, including the neighboring countryside, was reported as 78 families, most arriving after 1772. It appears that settlement in the countryside, which was clustered along the larger streams (St. Catherine, Second, and Coles creeks), outpaced the landings.” (Cornelison and Hardy 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778, Feb. 19th</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“[Captain James] Willing landed at undefended Natchez, and the following morning he raised the American Flag over the fort, in what may conceivably have been the first occasion of an American glad to fly over what later became the State of Mississippi. … Willing continued to sail downriver on February 23 (Haynes 1976:58-67).” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“British rule of West Florida ended in 1779, a consequence of the American Revolution. Spain declared war against England and appointed its own governor, Bernardo de Gálvez. Gálvez promptly began attacks along the Mississippi River and Fort Panmure surrendered without a fight.” (Cornelison and Hardy 46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779, Oct. 5th</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“[Captain Juan de la] Villebeuvre arrived in Natchez to seize Fort Panmure.” (Cornelison and Hardy 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779-1795</td>
<td>Platted</td>
<td>“While Spain made no effort to send its own settlers to Natchez, the community prospered…. Spanish administrators can be credited with maintaining a stable government, establishing the town plan for Natchez on the Bluffs, and connecting it to the landing by a road.” (Cornelison and Hardy 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Military operation</td>
<td>“A force of 200 men from the surrounding area, including a few Indians, began a siege of the fort under the command of Captain John Blommart.” They captured the fort until Spanish control was re-established on June 22nd. (Cornelison and Hardy 49). Without an effort to send its own settlers to Natchez, the community nevertheless prospered and grew under its rule. The population of the district was still predominantly English in origin and sentiment. Spanish administrators can be credited with maintaining a stable government, establishing the town plan for Natchez on the Bluffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>“Spain officially acquired the territory in 1783 when the treaty ending the war was signed (James 1968:25, 27).” This was the second “Treaty of Paris.” (Cornelison and Hardy 46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Platted</td>
<td>“Prior to Gayoso’s arrival, Grand-Pre initiated the development of a town plat for Natchez. Streets and blocks were laid out around a central plaza, thus giving birth to the town. A broad esplanade or public park separated the town from the river with the fort being located at the southern end of the esplanade (Holmes 1965:40-43).” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Population of the Natchez district was 1,926. (Cornelison and Hardy 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Population in the Natchez district had grown to 4,345. “About one quarter of that number lived in town. But Natchez was still the frontier – backwoods residents came and went at will, and vagabonds, bandits, and cattle rustlers were reported in the district. A few mansions had been built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Type</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>“The fort was renamed Fort Natchez.” (Cornelison and Hardy 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797, Feb. 24th</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“Andrew Ellicott, a U.S. surveyor commissioned by President George Washington as the U.S. representative to survey the border between Spanish Florida and the United States, was sent to Natchez to persuade the Spanish to abandon the Natchez District. He arrived in Natchez on February 24, 1997 and encamped at the northern end of the esplanade. There he raised the American flag. He soon demanded Gayoso to withdraw, a demand that was ignored.” (Cornelison and Hardy 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797, April</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“American troops under Lieutenant ‘Crazy’ Percy Smith Pope arrived in April to re-enforce Ellicott (James 1968:62-66).” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797, June 14</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“A small band of rebels attempted to capture an elevation near the fort but were driven back by Spanish gunfire.” (Cornelison and Hardy 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797, Dec.</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“Additional American forces under Captain Isaac Guion arrived and peacefully took control of Natchez (James 1968:70, 74)” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798, Mar. 30</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>“The Spanish finally decided to withdraw from Natchez. Andrew Ellicott recorded in his journal that at four o’clock on the morning of March 30, 1798, he ‘walked to the fort, and found the last party, or rear guard just leaving it, and as the gate was left open, I went in, and enjoyed from the parapet, the pleasing prospect of the gallies and boats leaving the shore, and getting under way; they were out of sight of town before daylight. The same day our troops took possession of the works’ (Ellicott 1814:176)” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1798, Apr. 7th | Inhabited       | “The United States Congress created the Mississippi Territory with Natchez becoming its first capitol. Isaac Guion, whose troops apparently occupied the fort, served as ruling commandant for the territory until the appointed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1798, August</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Fort was named “Fort Sargent” in honor of the new territorial governor of the Mississippi Territory. (Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
<td>(Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>“Survey of the Nashville to Natchez route began in 1801, largely following ancient trails used by Native Americans, bison, and deer. (Clark and Guice 1989:84-87)” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 55)</td>
<td>(Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>President Thomas Jefferson executes the Louisiana Purchase from Napoleon Bonaparte, acting ruler of France. “With no foreign powers in the vicinity and with the creation of Fort Dearborn at the neighboring town of Washington, there was little use for the fort at Natchez.” (Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
<td>(Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>“The municipal government of Natchez moved the blockhouse from the fort into the town proper for use as a jail (James 1965).” (Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
<td>(Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>Altered</td>
<td>“John James Audubon observed that the town gallows was located in the middle of the site, and that slaves were being buried in the old moat of the fort (Peattie 1940).” (Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
<td>(Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td>“The original street grid of 34 blocks established by the Spanish regime had been expanded by another 15 blocks (James 1968:83). Presumably, the balance of the fort was dismantled at about this time because there is no further reference to its use.” (Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
<td>“The original street grid of 34 blocks established by the Spanish regime had been expanded by another 15 blocks (James 1968:83). Presumably, the balance of the fort was dismantled at about this time because there is no further reference to its use.” (Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Platted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Natchez population is 1,684, consisting of 459 slaves. Adams County population was 8,318.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810 – 1900</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>“Remains of the fort, presumably portions of the embankment, were noted throughout the nineteenth century.” (Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
<td>(Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>Peter Little purchased extensive landholdings in Natchez and across the river in Louisiana. It is not known if he purchased the site of Fort Rosalie, but is possible that even this early, he was buying the lands immediately surrounding</td>
<td>(Cornelison and Hardy 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Type</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>“By that time, the fort had reached an advanced state of disrepair. A contemporary of Little described it thus: ‘Fort Rosalie, a fine old ruin, overhanging the lower town, sunk growling away among the hills.’” (Vanderford 336)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Altered</td>
<td>Rosalie, the mansion, is completed and Peter Little and Eliza Lowe Little move into their new home, constructed on the Natchez bluff on lands that had once been the area surrounding the Fort Rosalie site. (rosaliemansion.com/rosalie-history, accessed 09/13/2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>“In the 1830s, J.H. Ingraham (1835:23) described seeing the romantic ruins of Fort Rosalie, now enameled with a rich coating of verdure.” (Cornelison and Hardy 54-55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838, Feb. 11</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>“A part of the Natchez Bluff near the light house on Saturday last, caved in and crushed a dwelling house below the Hill.” (“A CASUALTY”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>“Charles Lyell (1849:154) who visited Natchez in the 1840s mentioned the fort site in his writing.” (Cornelison and Hardy 55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Dr. Montroville Wilson Dickson visits the Natchez area and conducts archaeology as an “avocational archeologist,” locating 59 artifacts, which are now owned and housed at the University of Pennsylvania (Cornelison and Hardy 59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853, Mar. 06</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>“ANOTHER BREAK. The portion of the Natchez Promenade, known as ‘Parker’s Bluff,’ commenced giving away some days since, and yesterday morning about 15-feet front by 100 feet in length was precipitated into the thoroughfare below. We believe it is the first and only important land slide this winter.” (“ANOTHER BREAK.” 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>Rosalie was auctioned at public sale, and Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Wilson acquired the house and grounds (rosaliemansion.com/rosalie-history, accessed 09/13/2017). The Wilson’s adopted an orphan girl, Fannie McMurtry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Natchez population was 6,612, of which 2,131 were slaves. Adams County population was 13,553. (Cornelison and Hardy NPS AR:55). At the time, “Natchez was one of the South’s largest slave markets. (James 1968:162, 196-197. Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862, April 29</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>Union troops took over New Orleans. (Cornelison and Hardy 57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863, July</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“1,200 Union troops occupied the town. In addition to the camp, quarters, offices and messes were set up in a number of the mansions (Groh 1999:56-57. Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863, July</td>
<td>Military Operation</td>
<td>“Natchez slaves were freed in July 1863, when Union troops occupied the city.” (Parker 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866, Aug. 2</td>
<td>Inhabited</td>
<td>Fannie Wilson married Capt. Stephen Rumble at Rosalie. They go on to live in Rosalie for the rest of their lives, raising their six children there. (rosaliemansion.com/rosalie-history, accessed 09/13/2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869, May 18</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>“The people in the lower part of Under the Hill were considerably alarmed last Sunday night by the noise of a large land slide, which occurred on the property of Mrs. Culhane, below Fort Rosalie, precipitating a large body of land into the river. Some persons hearing the noise, and feeling the trembling of the earth, feared an earthquake. We learn that the rising of the river in the vicinity of the slide was considerable, and was observed as far as the wharf-boat.” (“The People” 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870, Jan. 29</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>“Says the Natchez Democrat of the 25th: We learn that during Wednesday night last, a tremendous land-slide occurred in the neighborhood of Fort Rosalie, precipitating some twenty acres of bluff down the abyss below. The shock was so very severe as to alarm many persons living in the vicinity.” (“Says the Natchez Democrat of the 25th p. 1.”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871, Feb. 15</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>“Also, the whole of the lots of land and their tenements, appurtenances, lately the residence of Peter Little, deceased, beginning at the southwest corner of the intersection of Canal and Orleans streets; and then along Canal street to the property of C. Stietenroth then following the inside or western boundary of Stietenroth, to the northwest corner of his property; then continuing in the same direction and along the Briel line, upon which are the remains of an old fence, to a point near the site of the old Fort, marked on the plat of the P. Little estate, site of Fort Rosalie…” (“Sheriff’s Sale” 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>“Steve Power (1984:7) noted that ‘the ruins of the old Fort Rosalie still stand…” (Cornelison and Hardy 55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1913, Aug 24 | Urbanized              | “There is good reason to believe that a permanent Truck Growers’ Association will necessitate the operation of a canning factory to assist in taking care of surplus produce. Then, too, it is probable the members of the Association will find they can manufacture the crates in Natchez, and a trade in this direction could be built up so that a box, crate and excelsior factory can be erected. If all this can be accomplished, truck growing will enhance its value to this city and county. Truck will bring ready money, so will the canning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914, Mar. 29</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td>“With the demand for crates that has been created by the organization of the truck growers in this county, it would seem as though there would be room for a box factory in Natchez. There is a constant demand for boxes and crates, and this demand could be filled by a home company. A box factory would ensure another pay roll for Natchez.” (“With the demand for crates” 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Spring Pilgrimage is founded in Natchez, as a result of the efforts of the Natchez Garden Club. (Parker, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Based on lobbying by the MSSDAR to protect the historic postal road between Natchez, MS and Nashville, TN, Congress passed legislation to begin surveying the Natchez Trace Parkway. On January 24th of 1934, Mississippi Congressman Jeff Busby introduced an appropriation bill in Congress for $50,000 for a survey of a road “to be known as the Natchez Trace Parkway.” Elliott 227.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937, Mar 5th</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>“DAR Swings Into Second Day of 31st Statewide Annual Conference In Natchez. The land on which it stands [Rosalie mansion] was included in the famous old Fort Rosalie. The titles proving this fact can be obtained. Rosalie, as you know, is the most historic site in the Mississippi Valley. Founded in 1716, it was first a French stronghold, then became British in 1763. Rosalie mansion stands on ground once reddened with French blood.” (“Purchase of Shrine.” Clarion-Ledger, Mar. 5, 1937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>The Rumble family, suffering under the hardships of the Great Depression sold Rosalie to the “Mississippi State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.” (rosaliemansion.com/rosalie-history, accessed 09/13/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>Legislation was passed to begin construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and the first land was purchased for its development. (1997 HRS Natchez National Historical Park, 145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939/1940</td>
<td>Built</td>
<td>The architectural folly named “Mammy” was constructed on Highway 61 south of Natchez, in a prominent location to serve tourists who arrived from the south towards Natchez. The 28-foot architectural folly and service station was constructed by Mr. and Mrs. Henry Gaudé in 1940 (“Mammy’s Cupboard”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1940</td>
<td>Exploited</td>
<td>The reconstruction of Fort Rosalie occurs under the development of promoter Jefferson Davis Dickson, Jr. (Cornelison and Hardy 57) Replica constructed, “complete with stockade, barracks, officers’ quarters, storehouse,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
powder magazine, and blacksmith shop that was built with little concern for historical accuracy.” This development occurred at the beginning of the nascent historic preservation movement in this country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Built</td>
<td>Constructed by the Public Works Administration, the original Natchez-Vidalia Bridge spanning the Mississippi River opened in 1940 with a toll plaza colonnade situated on the Natchez side just south of the Fort Rosalie ruins. A second span to accommodate eastbound traffic opened in 1988. (“Natchez-Vidalia Bridge”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941, Feb. 16th</td>
<td>Memorialized Built</td>
<td>Newspaper account of the opening of the tourist attraction at Ft. Rosalie under the aegis of Jefferson Davis Dickson. “Some years ago the Mississippi Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution erected a flagpole honoring Major Isaac Guion who raised the first American flag over Fort Rosalie and claimed all the Spanish territory in the name of the United States. Fort Rosalie, as restored by Dickson is situated between the ante-bellum mansion “Rosalie” now a state shrine of the D. A. R. and the approach to the Natchez-Vidalia Mississippi river bridge. It is within a stockade and the buildings include ‘the king’s store house’ barracks, officers’ quarters, general headquarters, kitchen and mess hall, stables and observation tower.” (Smith)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941, Feb. 23</td>
<td>Memorialized</td>
<td>“ROCKEFELLER III VISITS NATCHEZ. Natchez was honored this week with the presence of John D. Rockefeller III, of New York…. Assembling at Melrose and enjoying the splendor of this fine old mansion they proceeded to Conelly’s Tavern. The afternoon hours were spent at Ravenna, The Briers and Rosalie and at Fort Rosalie, recently opened to the public by Jefferesn (sic) Davis Dickson, jr., of Paris, London, New York and Natchez.” (“Rockefeller III Visits Natchez.” Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, MS: 1941, Feb. 23rd: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941, Mar 02</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>“In addition to the regular pilgrimage tours there will be side tours to the … recently restored Fort Rosalie, replica of the famous old French fort, built by Bienville in 1716. The fort in its entirety has been restored by the Natchez Historical Association with Jefferson Davis Dickson, Jr., the well-known European promoter as director.” (Case 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1949, Feb. 11th | Damaged                        | “Fort Rosalie Vandalized. NATCHEZ, Miss.,---Natchez police investigating vandalis (sic) at Fort Rosalie, which is now owned by D. A. Biglane, found youngsters had destroyed historical records which cannot be replaced. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949, Mar. 30th</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>Portions of Clifton Avenue experienced a bluff slide. (Corps of Engineers 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>Major slide occurs on Clifton Avenue, which “forced the closing of the street to all traffic.” This bluff slide was “possibly triggered by a leaking storm sewer. (Corps of Engineers 4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>Bluff stabilization structure northwest of Weymouth Hall collapsed, and portion of the bluff was lost. (Corps of Engineers 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980, Mar 29th</td>
<td>Eroded</td>
<td>“Major slide [of the bluff] which occurred on March 29, 1980, claimed the lives of two people and damaged two historically significant buildings.” (Corps of Engineers 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Land Transfer</td>
<td>The Stietenroth House and lot were purchased by the NPS and rehabilitated to provide office space for NATC staff. (Price 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005, Summer</td>
<td>Conserved</td>
<td>Joseph Frank conducted surface collections at the Fort Rosalie site. Frank collected creamware, faience, glass, and Native American pottery fragments. At the time, Frank believed that the elevated earthen area on the site was the remnant of a Native American mound structure. He submitted the location to the SHPO, and the site was assigned state site number 22AD1032. (Cornelison and Hardy 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016, Aug. 3rd</td>
<td>Memorialized</td>
<td>Natchez celebrates its Tricentennial, and Ft. Rosalie is opened to the public on the 300th anniversary of the fort’s completion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical History:

Narrative History

The history of Fort Rosalie as a military outpost of the Colonial era has been thoroughly documented in previous research reports, through its designation on the National Register and its current use as a unit of the NATC within the NPS. What is less understood and documented is the varying uses of the overall site after 1806, when its use as a military site ended.

What seems clear when looking at the timeline is that there have been five distinct major periods of use or intervention since the end of the military era and up to and including the NPS era:

- C. 1806 –1871. First is the ownership of the site by the owners of Rosalie mansion, from some time in the early to mid-1800s (approximately 1820) to 1871.
- 1871 – 1938. Second is the period from 1871 to 1938, during which transfers of portions of the property first to local residents and then to those building the neighborhood associated with the National Box Company.
- 1938 – 1958. Third is the period beginning in circa 1938, when the Daughters of the American Revolution and the City of Natchez purchased the land around the remnant fort with the idea of developing a tourist attraction associated with their recent purchase of Rosalie, the antebellum house. Shortly after their acquisition, Jefferson Davis Dickson purchased the actual fort site from the Mississippi State Society Daughters of the American Revolution and constructed his replica tourist attraction at a time when there were comparable developments occurring at Colonial Williamsburg and at Greenfield Village—among others.
- 1956 – 2005. Fourth is a period of private ownership, when the site included uses such as a small church, meeting place, and finally as a restaurant.
- 2005 – In the fifth period, the National Park Service acquired the property and began removing dilapidated structures and rehabilitating the two remaining buildings and the site for park use and interpretation.

While prior focus has been on the history of the site’s military use dating back to the early 1700s, the other five uses are central to the story of Natchez as an antebellum center, the economic development of the city of Natchez after the collapse of the cotton economy due to the boll weevil, early efforts in historic preservation and tourism beginning in the 1930s throughout the United States, the decline of historic preservation and tourism, and finally, a renewed understanding and effort to preserve significant historic landscapes. While the focus of this CLI will be on the first three of these periods, a cursory discussion of previous periods of significance and early mapping, as well as a cursory discussion of the more recent periods is useful in the overall understanding of the site and its context. The decision for the ending period of significance will be coordinated between NPS staff and the contractor taking into consideration an expanded interpretive view of the site.

Prehistory

During the Paleoindian Era, approximately 12,000 years ago, Paleoindian groups migrated south through
the Tennessee River Valley. Migratory clusters tended to accrete closer to rivers and associated streams. What would later be called the Natchez Bluffs are believed to be areas of population concentrations, due to varied topographic environments, high ground to avoid repetitive flooding, and the lower rich floodplains where seasonal agriculture could be practiced (Cornelison & Hardy 22).

The Archaic (8,000 – 1,000 BCE) period is characterized by increasing agricultural settlement and sedentism, along with an increase in the types of tools, variety in hunting points, and material cultural including stone bowls, effigies, pipes, and small ornaments (Williams and Brain 1983: 387-388, 395-396. Qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 23). Poverty Point Culture (2,000-1,000 B.C.), is widely considered one of the last periods of the Archaic Period. American Indians of the Poverty Point period saw an increase in earthworks, mounds, lapidary skills, and the use of artificial cooking methods as opposed to heating of stones.

After the close of the Archaic Period, the following period is the Woodland Period – Tchula/Tchefuncte (1,000 – 100 BCE). Primarily located in the Tensas and Yazoo river basins, there is one documented Tchefuncte site in the Natchez area; the culture associated with the site is called the Panther Phase. Projectile points were similar to previous periods, with an increase in the adoption of fiber-tempered pottery, and then later untampered ware and relatively few sand-tempered wares (Cornelison and Hardy 23-24).

The Woodland Period – Marksville (100 BCE – CE 300) again consists of population concentrations centered along the Yahaoo Basin, with little to no evidence of settlement in the Natchez area. The Woodland Period – Baytown, Coles Creek, and an early Mississippian culture developed further east and north, but there is little evidence supporting the idea that these cultures settled in the Natchez area.

The next significant period is the Mississippi Period – Emerald Phase (CE 1500 – 1650), characterized by the construction of Emerald Mound north of Natchez. This period is marked by the construction of elaborate ceremonial mounds and with the first contact between European explorers, which quickly caused the decimation of huge swaths of the native populations through disease introduction, and then with abandonment of their cities and villages.

The last and most important period in relation to site history is the Natchez. Contact with first the Spanish and then the French characterized the Natchez period, where population coalesced along St. Catherine’s Creek on the southern boundary to the Coles Creek area to the north. The Grand Village was the ceremonial center of Natchez culture, but mounds associated with this era are very small in comparison to those of the Emerald and other earlier periods. Because of the protohistoric nature of Natchez culture, more is known about the practices of this tribe and their material cultural artifacts. Early explorers recorded first-person accounts of meeting with tribal leaders and their subjects. In 1911, John Swanton authored Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley, which included an extensive account of the Natchez based on the earlier writings of Antonine Simon Le Page du Pratz and other writers. Swanton detailed the following aspects of Natchez culture:

- dress and personal ornamentation
- morals
- medicine
While the Great Sun of the Natchez was a hereditary title, he still answered to a council of village chiefs and a war chief. His power was not absolute. The primary economy of the Natchez was based on agriculture, where prevailing methods of agriculture were dominated by communal planting of maize, beans, pumpkins, watermelon, and tobacco. These were supplanted by seasonal foraging of fruits, nuts, and roots, and large and small game, including fish and birds. This system of tribal governance and economy were what existed when the French first determined the site where they would locate their trading outpost and later palisade fort for the protection of their interests on the Mississippi in the New World (Cornelison and Hardy 30-31).

Colonial Era

Written history related to the Natchez area is first recorded on March 26, 1682, when Henry Tonty, second-in-command to La Salle during his expedition, noted the location during the expedition’s descent down the Mississippi River from the Great Lakes (Cornelison and Hardy 31). A decade-and-a-half later, Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d’Iberville was appointed by Louis XIV, King of France, to establish a colony in the region that La Salle had previously explored.

Iberville arrived in Pensacola to find that it was already occupied and controlled by Spain. He then sailed further west until he encountered the Mississippi River. He “sailed north as far as present-day Baton Rouge and then returned to the Bay of Biloxi where he built Fort Maurepas in 1699. This was the first French settlement in Louisiana” (Pénicault 1988: 91-93, qtd. In Cornelison and Hardy 31). Iberville was joined by his brother Bienville shortly thereafter.

The following year, Iberville sailed up the river and met with the Natchez chiefs as an introductory meeting to make plans to “erect a fort and trading house in their country” (Cornelison and Hardy 31). These plans were delayed due to the War of Spanish Succession, which lasted from 1701 to 1714. Even though plans were delayed, Iberville chose the high bluff along the river, laid out a preliminary city grid, and named the area Rosalie, in honor of the countess of Pontchartrain (Martin 152).

Meanwhile, Iberville and his brother Bienville were appointed to political positions in Louisiana, with
Bienville acting as Governor off and on for thirty years. During early planning efforts in 1708, the first enslaved laborers were brought to Louisiana (Cornelison and Hardy 31, 38). Development of the colony was slow. Realizing that there had been little success in establishing the colony in Louisiana, the colonial authorities in Paris granted a fifteen-year charter to Antoine Crozat, giving him almost unlimited powers in order to promote development and rewarded him with extensive land holdings for his efforts (Cornelison and Hardy 32).

Crozat in 1714 “contracted with Marc-Antoine de la Loire des Ursins and Louis Auguste de la Loire Flaucourt … to establish a trading post at the landing below the bluff at Natchez” (Cornelison and Hardy 32). The fort site was chosen because of the elevation of the natural loess bluff and Mississippi River access, which made it both easy to defend and bring in goods. Two years later, on August 3, 1716, Le Fort Rosalie des Natchez was completed on the bluff overlooking the Mississippi River (Barnett 71).

Phillip, duc d’Orleans, acting regent of France, was approached by John Law, who was able to convince the prince that Law could make much more rapid progress in developing the colony of Louisiana. The regent revoked Crozat’s charter and transferred the rights to Law, thus beginning an era of rapid growth and colonization within the territory (Usner 1992: 32, qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 35). Law, founder of the Company of the West, began creating multiple grants and concessions, some small ones organized for families, and some larger concessions designed to operate as larger entities to create commodity crops that could be shipped back to France to enrich the royal coffers. Other settlers purchased land directly from the Natchez, much of it already cleared for crops (James 1968: 71; Elliott 1989: 312-33, qtd. In Cornelison and Hardy 35-36).

The year 1720 would become a pivotal year in the development of French Louisiana. In 1720, there were sixty soldiers garrisoned at the fort. That same year, John Law’s Company of the West collapsed, and the financial support of the company ended. Settlers increasingly turned to their American Indian neighbors for trading of food supplies and to obtain additional lands for agricultural purposes. Disagreements over land ownership increased, and this created friction between the colonists and their Natchez neighbors. There were periodic arguments, violence, and even deaths that occurred between both parties.

In 1723, a French cartographer by the name of Ignace-Francois Broutin mapped the Fort Rosalie site, the Natchez bluffs, and the surrounding areas as seen in Figure 5. This map is considered an authoritative record of the area at that point in time (Cornelison and Hardy 72). This was also the year that the Company of the West “was merged by the French Crown with other enterprises into the East India Company, which then became known as the Mississippi Company of the Indies (Barnett 2007, 82).
Figure 5: Close-up of Fort Rosalie. Carte des environs du fort Rosalie aux Natchez, Ignace-François Broutin, 1723, showing the Fort Rosalie site, the Natchez bluffs, and the surrounding areas. (Source gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque Nationale de France).
Figure 6: Plan du Fort Rozalie des Natchez avec ses Environs, circa 1728, was published in Dumont de Montigny’s Memoires Historique sur la Louisiane (From Dumont's Mémoires historiques sur la Louisiane, contenant ce qui est y est arrivé de plus mémorable depuis l'année 1687, Paris, C.J.B. Bauche, 1753, vol. 2, facing p. 94 / University of Pittsburg Library System, urn:oclc:record:1049658319). This map includes the fort, the Concessions of St. Catherine and White Earth, and the Natchez villages on the Mississippi River (Fleuve Saint Louis).

Tensions between the Natchez and the colonial settlers increased, and the territorial government in New Orleans in 1723 sent a contingent of soldiers north to suppress the Natchez in what was called the Third Natchez War (Figure 6). They burned the Village of the Apple, which was deserted, and placed any Natchez they did encounter under Bienville’s control (Cornelison and Hardy 36).

The map drawn by Jean Baptiste Michel Le Bouteux, Les Natchez, (Figure 7) demarcates the original fort and the nine villages of the Natchez area that were inhabited by the Thecloel tribe—although they are different than what is sighted by Cornelison and Hardy—Flour, Grigra, Jenzenaque, White Apple, Tiou,
Duck, the Grand Village (Natchez), and one other village located near Coles and Fairchilds Creeks (Barnett 2007; Brown 1985; Lorenz 1997; qtd. in Cornelison and Hardy 28). The Bouteux map also shows the Grand Village, the Village du Serpent piqué (Village of Tattooed Serpent), the Village de la grande dent (Village of Big Teeth), the Village de la Pome (Village of Apple), the Village du Renard (Village of the Fox), Village abandonné (Abandoned Village), La Terre blanche (White Earth), Concession de S.Reine (Concessions of the Queen), and Village Francois (French Village).

The Natchez war chief known as the Tattooed Serpent was more of a diplomat and peacemaker than a war chief (Barnett 86), and he had been an ally of the French for nearly ten years, mediating disputes between the Natchez and the French settlers before his death in 1725 (Barnett 95). Between 1726 and 1729, the population of the colony doubled, and by 1726, there were 259 people in the Natchez colony (Cornelison and Hardy 36, 38).
Figure 7: Les Natchez, by Jean Baptiste Michel Le Bouteux, 1728 (MDAH and Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal / http://purl.pt/1604)). The fort is visible in the bottom of the image, just above is the Village of Apple that was burned in 1723. On the center right is the Grand Village, home of the ceremonial center of the Thecloel, and to the northeast is the Village du Serpent pique which translates to Village of the Tattooed Serpent.

The Colonial population continued to grow, which created increasing tension between the settlers and their Natchez neighbors. Disputes over land ownership escalated, and finally erupted in a massacre on November 29, 1729, when the Natchez attacked the fort and killed approximately 290 people. The French
reaction was decisive and harsh. Over the next few months, they rounded up the remaining 500 native people of the Natchez Tribe, transferred them to New Orleans, and then sent them to St. Domingue to be sold as slaves. This brought an end to the Natchez nation as a separate tribe in the Louisiana territory (Cornelison and Hardy 28, 38-41).

At first, a provisional fort was established closer to the river on a point of land just to the south of the city. This was soon replaced by a third and final fort, when a contract was let on July 31, 1731 to build the new “regular permanent fortification to replace the provisional fort” (Cornelison and Hardy 41).

The new fort was constructed on its original site, but with a more substantial earthworks and rampart, instead of the palisade stockade of the original fort (Cornelison and Hardy 41-42). A section plan of a portion of the reconstructed fort is shown in **Figure 8**. The small rectangle on the bottom left of the image shows the Cellar Plan or “Plan de La Cave”, directly above that is the earthen rampart fronted by an entrenchment and palisade to the left. Structures, such as barracks, would have been located behind the rampart and a similar entrenchment and palisade is located on the right of the image moving toward the bluff and the Mississippi River.

**Figure 8:** Coup et profil de la redoute de Rosalie au Natchez prise sur la ligne A.B. aus lieu le 11 may 1732, Alexandre de Batz. This map shows a cut and profile of Fort Rosalie (Library of Congress).
Figure 9: Plan du fort auquel on travaille dans le poste des Natchez. Anonymous, ca. 1732 (Library of Congress).

The overall plan of the reconstructed fort as designed by French engineers is shown in Figure 9. Frequent political change, the French and Indian War, and chaos in Europe between the France, Spain, and England caused a decline in the Natchez settlement. Between 1733 and 1763, “large areas near Natchez reverted to wilderness” (Cornelison and Hardy 44). With the Treaty of Paris, “all lands east of the Mississippi River, including Natchez, became English territory.”
In 1766, the British sent a garrison of sixty men to Natchez under the direction of Major Farmar, where Captain Philip Pittman, an engineer, mapped the fort and the surrounding area. He notes that the Mississippi River had fallen 36 feet and that the fort stood 180 feet above the surface of the water. He also demarcates barracks, a storehouse, and an officer’s house.

When the English rebuilt the fort, they named it Fort Panmure. “The area was reopened for settlement, 39 land grants were issued from 1766 through 1769,” ranging in size from 140 to 20,000 acres (Cornelison and Hardy 44-45). Figures 10 and 11 show the fort with outlying structures and gardens. Typical of the mercantilist system of ownership, many of the grantees never came to Natchez, instead renting their lands through factors to locals, who worked the lands for their distant owners. “Nevertheless, a small community of European settlers developed near the fort, and farms grew along the major creeks” (Cornelison and Hardy 45).
Figure 10: Plan of Fort Rosalia, Pittman, 1765 (1766). Reproduced in Hulbert (1907-17), ser. III, pl. 82. University of North Carolina. This map was drawn after the British acquired West Florida at the end of the French and Indian War, before it became Fort Panmure, therefore, it may have been completed in 1766. (The National Archives Kew, CO 700/Florida26).
The importance of Fort Rosalie as a military garrison diminished, and in 1768, the fort was turned over to two British traders. Population tended to concentrate along the surrounding larger streams of St. Catherine, Second, and Coles creeks. The landings on the river served commercial purposes, but residential development occurred inland around small yeoman farms (Cornelison and Hardy 45).

The American Revolution brought about a brief period of United States rule, after which the area was returned to Spanish control between 1779 and 1798. In the spring of 1797, Andrew Ellicott, along with a military force commanded by Lieutenant Percy Smith Pope, attempted to drive the Spanish from the fort. Repeated efforts finally succeeded when the Spanish withdrew from the fort on Mar. 30th, of 1798 (Cornelison and Hardy 53). Congress created the Mississippi Territory and designated Natchez as its first capitol. The fort name was changed to Fort Sargent, after Winthrop Sargent, the new territorial governor of the territory.

At the end of Spanish rule over the territory, a painting (Figure 12) was executed by Georges Henri Victor Collot. The caption translates as “Travel in North America, or Description of the Watered Countries by Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri.” The legibility of the fort structure is not clear. A palisade fence is apparent at the peak of the bluff, with a large flagpole, a large block structure, and various outbuildings.

Figure 12: "View of the Fort of the Natchez", from Georges Henri Victor Collot's Voyage dans l'Amérique Septentionale, ou Description des pays arrosés par le Mississippi, l'Ohio, le Missouri. Jan. 2, 1796 (MDAH).
The above 1796 Collot map (Figure 13) shows the Natchez town grid, the fort in its entirety to the southwest, and the surrounding environs both toward and away from the river. The bluff structure between the fort and the river appears to be much more extensive than at present, with wide plateaus along the river. The circulation back east and to the north and below to under the hill are also shown.
The reference states that this map (Figure 14) is possibly a copy of the two-year earlier Collot map of 1796, with minor revisions, including the location of the town plaza. The bluff structure, the plateaus along the river, and north-south circulation system, are clearly shown along with roads leading east into the interior away from the river.
Figure 15: Barthélémy Lafon, 1814. The map illustrates the plan of the old fort that was built by the Spanish. From Lafon's manuscript Atlas of the 7th Military District Exhibiting the General map of the States of Tennessee, Louisiana & Mississippi Territory with the Fortifications formerly built, projected, or built since the Beginning of the War. (Historic New Orleans Collection, 1970.2.23).

The 1814 map shown in Figure 15 by Lafon above states that the fort shown is a presentation of the fort complex as updated by the Spanish in 1794. The town of Natchez is shown without the street grid, as is the town of Vidalia across the river. The preceding maps were executed at the point in time when the importance of the fort was at its end. The era of colonial rule and European influence was over. The invention of the cotton gin and the influx of Americans into the territory and city of Natchez exploded. Once the Louisiana Purchase was completed in 1803, even the lands across the river were under American control, and the need for the fort as a military outpost to protect the area declined and finally ended. Over the next decade, architectural elements of the fort landscape were moved, demolished, or dismantled for reuse in the burst of growth brought on by Americanization of the territory (Cornelison and Hardy 54).
Antebellum Natchez

In 1798, Peter Little arrived in Natchez as a young soldier with the American garrison that was sent to the fort. He quickly settled in the area and began to build his fortune as a merchant and agriculturist in the Mississippi Territory and across the Mississippi River in Louisiana. By 1810, the population of Natchez had grown to 1,684 and the Adams County population grew to 8,318. The waterfront along the river became the center of commerce as steamboats carrying passengers and cotton “replaced the flatboats and keelboats that formerly hauled Natchez cotton” (James 1968: 193-194; Ann Beha Associates 1996: 27. Qtd. In Cornelison and Hardy 55).

At the very time that Fort Rosalie was decommissioned in 1806, two of Peter’s friends, Jacob Lowe and his wife, both contracted yellow fever and died. They left behind a fourteen-year-old daughter, Eliza, whom they left in Little’s care. Little promptly married Eliza, eleven years his junior, solidifying his legal rights to the Lowe property and the resources that Eliza had inherited. At that time, Eliza Lowe Little had not completed her formal education, and Peter sent her to Baltimore to finish her coursework on the East Coast. It is not clear exactly when Little purchased the land on which he built Rosalie Mansion (Figure 16), however the Rosalie Mansion website states that he was in possession of the land by 1820, when it appears that Eliza completed her education and returned to Natchez to take her place by his side.

Figure 16: Survey of Little property, where Rosalie Mansion was sited on the bluff overlooking the Mississippi River, 1826 completed by Levin Waily. The map has been rotated so that the Mississippi River is visible on bottom right, the blue outline is the property boundary, and the fort site is shaded in blue in the top of the map (NPS, 11070).
By 1823, the house was complete, and Peter and Eliza moved into the mansion on the bluff overlooking the river. There they lived, taking in various orphan children and using their wealth for the public good. Surely, Eliza’s early childhood, being an orphan at fourteen, must have influenced her desire to help those who were most in need. Sadly, Eliza suffered the same fate as her parents and was struck down by yellow fever in 1853 at the age of 61.

The year that Peter and Eliza Little moved into their new home was also the year that John James Audubon visited Natchez. As seen in Figure 17, Audubon painted the city from a location on the outskirts of town. The remnant earthwork of Fort Rosalie are clearly visible in the foreground.


Peter died intestate in 1856, three years after the death of Eliza. The property was then auctioned at public sale and purchased in 1857 by Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Wilson. Like the Littles, the Williams also shared a concern for underprivileged and orphaned youth and adopted a young lady named Fannie McMurtry. A decade later, Fannie married Capt. Stephen Rumble at Rosalie, and the Rumble family continued occupation of the house through Reconstruction, the end of the 1800s, and the beginning of the 1900s. After the property was sold to the Mississippi State Society Daughters of the American Revolution in 1938, the Rumble heirs retained a life estate as occupants and tour guides in their ancestral home. A deed...
recorded in *The Weekly Democrat*, the local Natchez newspaper, recorded a property transfer in February of 1871 that noted the Peter Little plat contained “a point near the site of the old Fort, marked on the plat of the P. Little estate, site of Fort Rosalie.”

During the Civil War, both the Americans and the Confederate States of America conducted extensive mapping exercises as part of planning efforts for naval, equipment, and troop movements. *Figure 18* shows the Natchez waterfront on the Mississippi River and significant features are portrayed and one important feature is labeled. Portions of the city are visible, Rosalie Mansion, Fort Rosalie, and two rows of “Contraband barracks” that were used to house the formerly enslaved just north of downtown at the base of the bluff adjacent to the river.
Figure 18: 1864 occupation map of Natchez, depicting the Rosalie Mansion and gardens on left center extending along the bluff, and Mississippi River on bottom (NATC).
Figure 19: Survey of the Mississippi River, 1882 (Historical Map & Chart Collection, Office of Coast Survey/National Ocean Service/NOAA).

A plane table map is depicted in Figure 19 which was conducted as part of a comprehensive survey of the Mississippi River and surrounding lands. The map shows the fort location on the bluff above the river, south of the city of Natchez. Also shown is the city of Vidalia across the river in Louisiana. Number notations within the borders of the river are depth soundings that show the river depth from bank to bank.
This 1907 photograph of the remnant earthworks of the fort (Figure 20) shows the condition of one of the remaining pentagonal points shortly after the turn of the century. There are some volunteer trees growing on the earthwork, but the photographer considered the site important enough to document the site and reproduce it as a postcard with accompanying text.
Suburban Development

The National Box Company Neighborhood

In the early years of the twentieth century, the boll weevil arrived in the United States from Mexico, and cotton agriculture was decimated. Throughout the South, local economies and farms collapsed, and Natchez’s dependence on a single crop caused severe financial hardship in the region. City leaders were continually seeking ways to provide employment, and it is clear through the preponderance of newspaper articles that their solution was to attract an industry that could utilize the agricultural commodity that was plentiful in the area, the Southern pine, along with the revitalization of a more varied agricultural suite of products that could be grown, packed into wood boxes, and shipped to urban centers.

During this period, agricultural produce was shipped in crates and “boxes,” which were slats of wood fastened by nail or wire, strong enough to hold heavy foodstuffs, and that could be stacked for shipping. Over the course of many years, Natchez leaders sought the construction of a manufacturing facility to produce these boxes, and sometime in the late 1910s, they convinced the National Box Company, based in Chicago, IL, to locate a box factory on the waterfront bluff in Natchez, just south of downtown.

At some point, the Rumble heirs either sold off parcels of land individually or sold a large tract of their Rosalie estate to a developer, who then laid out a community of late Victorian and early bungalow houses to the west of S. Canal St. on the outlying grounds of Fort Rosalie. It is unclear whether this was due to financial pressures or due to the increasing demand for housing stock for the box factory. In the years preceding the construction and operation of the box factory, there were already homes constructed on lots on the northern edge of the site. One of the earliest of those houses was that of the Stietenroth family.

The Stietenroth House was constructed approximately 1871-1874 and is a vernacular mix of architectural styles, with an Anglo floor plan, but French Creole openings and an undercut gallery. Later additions to the structure yielded an irregular floor plan, probably as a result of a growing family, additional resources, or both. The property was purchased from the estate of Peter Little by the Stietenroths, who had been in Natchez for several decades by the time of the purchase. Throughout 1870 and 1871, the family purchased lumber from the Andrew Brown Lumber Company, which operated as a commercial enterprise in Natchez for many years. The presumption from the Historic Structures Report is that these lumber purchases were for the construction of the home where they would then reside. Various family members were involved in a variety of businesses and occupation. These included printing, the construction business, and architectural design. Members of the family immigrated from Germany as early as 1838, and probably first arrived at the port in New Orleans before settling upriver in Natchez.¹

Over the decades, the Rumble family continued to sell off the outlying lots surrounding Rosalie Mansion. This process provided the land that then developed into the neighborhood surrounding the Fort Rosalie site. In 1938, under financial duress, the Rumble family sold Rosalie mansion to the Mississippi State Society Daughters of the American Revolution (MSSDAR), who allowed the remaining Rumble family to continue living in the house. Also known is that the MSSDAR quickly sold the site of Fort Rosalie to

¹ Jaeger/Quinn Evans 10.
Jefferson Davis Dickson. Dickson also purchased land from the Rosenthal family that consisted of the point where Dickson constructed the ticket office and gift shop. It is not clear if the Rosenthals and Stietenroths were related, but they are listed in the city directory of 1922-23 cohabitating in the same residence (Price 9).
Figure 21: This image was taken some time after the MSSDAR installed the flagpole atop the remnant fort earthwork in 1916. Their recognition of the importance of the site reinforced the commemorative nature of the earthwork remains of Fort Rosalie (Estes Collection).
The MSSDAR, the City of Natchez, and Jefferson Davis Dickson and the Fort Rosalie Interpretive
Replica Reproduction

At the same time that the MSSDAR purchased Rosalie, the City of Natchez donated “$1,800.00 to purchase an adjoining lot to give more spacious grounds, and the government will rebuild Fort Rosalie adjoining the property and overlooking the Mississippi River” (Lail 3). Evidently, Dickson did not originate the idea of recreating the replica fort. It seems that the city and the ladies of the MSSDAR determined that a replica fort would be the prime location to apply the economic principle of “central place theory,” and that building an adjoining attraction that would provide self-reinforcing numbers of tourists to both sites would support the financial survival of both. A flagpole was installed during their ownership, as is visible in Figure 21. Then, upon the scene arrived Jefferson Davis Dickson, fresh from his multiple European endeavors.

Jefferson Davis Dickson was a Mississippi native who left to serve as a photographer in World War I, and then remained in Europe to begin his promotional career (“Jeff Dickson”). Dickson became the most successful boxing promoter of the time. Dickson constructed the Palais des Sportes in Paris, basing it on the design of Madison Square Garden, and fostered the boxing careers of the most famous fighters of the time. He was an early sponsor of Joe Louis, bringing him to Europe to travel around the continent and to appear in boxing exhibitions in various cities. Dickson also sponsored Primo Carnera, another famous fighter of the time who was a heavyweight champion.

Dickson traveled to all the larger cities of Europe, “including London, Berlin, Brussels, Rome and Barcelona” (“Jeff Dickson”). Dickson did not limit his promotional talents to boxing, as he also “promoted other sporting events, including figure skating, bike races, hockey, bullfighting and wrestling” (“Jeff Dickson”). It is probable that while promoting figure skating, he met his future fiancé (Figure 22), who was the most famous ice figure-skater of the time—Sonja Henie. Henie, sixteen years his junior, “was a three-time Olympic Champion (1928, 1932, 1936) in Ladies’ Singles, a ten-time World Champion (1927-1936) and a six-time European Champion (1931-1936) (‘Sonja Henie”). Henie later appeared in several Hollywood movies. While Henie had nothing to do with Natchez or Fort Rosalie, her inclusion in this narrative is to point out the kinds of international celebrities that Dickson traveled with. Sometime during the height of her career, Henie became Dickson’s fiancé.
Figure 22: Jefferson Davis Dickson with Sonja Henie and her mother, Madame Henie in 1934 (Original Polaroid photo in the personal collection of John Welch, Suzanne Turner Associates).

Their engagement lasted several years, but at some point, their relationship ended. On July 9th, 1939, Dickson married Louise Wedell Mastbaum, heiress to the Mastbaum department store fortune of Philadelphia. Louise Mastbaum was the daughter of Jules E. Mastbaum, who had married another Philadelphia heiress and expanded their fortune through department stores and the construction and operation of movie theaters. In 1926, Mastbaum donated $1 million for the construction of the Rodin Institute, now a branch of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, which houses the largest collection of Rodin sculpture, prints, drawings, and paintings outside of Paris. The equivalent amount of money in 2018 dollars would be $14,381,189.85. (https://westegg.com/inflation/infl.cgi).

With this marriage, Dickson combined his widely recognized promotional skills and record, probably along with his own personal reserves, with the extensive resources of one of the richest heiresses in the country. By this point, Dickson had left Europe due to the advent of World War II and was looking for
opportunities to contribute back where he was born in his native Mississippi. Possibly inspired by the
successes of the Rockefeller family at Colonial Williamsburg and the Ford family at Greenfield Village,
Dickson arrived in Natchez, and promptly purchased the site of Fort Rosalie from the MSSDAR.

While there was documentation related to the construction of the replica fort that was destroyed in a
vandalism incident in the late 1940s, most researchers believe that the extensive replica fort complex that
Dickson developed and promoted (Figure 23) bore very little resemblance to what existed on the ground
during its Colonial and early American history. Looking at the early efforts at Williamsburg and
Greenfield Village provides an interesting snapshot into preservation trends of the time. It seems that
Dickson was on the cutting edge of the types of large, all-encompassing developments that were designed
to attract students and fans of American history, with a level of boosterism that was part of the marketing
program for these types of large-scale efforts.

Figure 23: Flyer advertising two local Natchez sites: Fort Rosalie and White Apple Village, circa
1941. Photographs show the reconstructed Fort Rosalie, Natchez Indian ceremonial mound, and the
museum of White Apple Village, which contained artifacts of the Natchez Indians (NATC, 19678). Both
of these sites were developed by Jefferson Davis Dickson, along with a site on the northern edge of the
city called The Devil’s Punchbowl.
Figure 24: View from river back toward interpretive fort complex constructed by Jefferson Davis Dickson. The recreation was built right up to the edge of the bluff. Stabilization structures are visible to the left in the image (Historic Natchez Foundation).

Interestingly, the week after Dickson opened his interpretive recreation of Fort Rosalie in 1941 (Figure 24), John D. Rockefeller III visited Natchez and toured the recently opened fort and exhibits that Dickson had just completed (“Rockefeller III Visits Natchez”). Rockefeller also visited Melrose, Ravenna, The Briers, and Rosalie Mansion. So, Dickson had the social connections, the promotional skills and know-how, and the personal wealth to create a tourist attraction promoting early American history at a time in the country when most regions were still suffering financially under the weight of the Great Depression. City, state, and national leaders were constantly seeking ways to promote economic development, and Dickson’s enterprise at the Fort Rosalie site occurred at a time when state, local, and D.A.R. leaders were interested in creating complimentary attractions with Rosalie Mansion.

Ever the patriot, Dickson, at age 47, an age when he was not required to serve the United States in a military capacity, volunteered as a photographer in the Air Force in World War II. In July of 1943, Dickson’s wife received word at her New York City penthouse at the Waldorf Astoria that the plane he had been flying in over Germany had disappeared. Neither the plane nor his remains were ever found. It seems obvious, had Dickson survived the war, he would have continued his enterprise in Natchez, maintained the extensive work he had already completed at his tourist attractions, and probably ventured...
into other areas promoting the history of the area, the state, and the country. His own words to Ned Smith of the Associated Press underscore his promotional bent and his ability to spin historic legends into marketing clichés that appealed to the general public:

Thus we see a veritable pageant of the nations has been enacted here—the Lily of France; the Cross of St. George, the Red and Gold of Spain, the red, White and Blue and the Stars and Bars. No more sacred spot exists in all the southland. It is holy ground where the blood of Martyrs was spilled that men might know the living God. What nobler shrine could a people ask.

The fort is rebuilt and it is my earnest hope that it will become not merely a state shrine, but an international shrine where students of American progress may visualize [CLI author’s emphasis] our glorious past. (Smith 9)

So, Dickson’s skills at boosterism did not necessarily include the claim that the rebuilt fort was a historical recreation. He acknowledged that the public had to “visualize” the fort as a representation of what had been there. Certainly, without adequate documentation, this was the result on the ground.

The only structure that remains from the Fort Rosalie interpretive reconstruction is the log building that served as the ticket office and gift shop. When the gift shop was purchased by the NPS from the Biglane Family in 2005, Fat Mama’s Tamales was located in the structure. The GMP recommended the removal of the building from the site as the Preferred Alternative. At the time of the purchase, the NPS performed a Historic Structures Report. With After the HSR was complete, the park service revisited that decision and building has been repaired and preserved. The most important recommendations in the HSR related to the cultural landscape were to,

- Remove chinaberry trees, stumps, and yucca from around front and southern end of building
- Remove earth from against rear of building and eliminate all wood-to-ground contact
- Clear crawl space of debris and construct new piers as needed
- Establish drainage system that will move rainwater quickly away from the building.
- Establish handicapped access from parking lot to the rear doors; preserve front steps.

The Mississippi SHPO’s office “determined the building to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, with local significance.
**Figure 25**: 1941 aerial of downtown Natchez, the Fort Rosalie Site, and the newly constructed bridge across the Mississippi between the southern end of Natchez and Vidalia (LSU Cartographic Information Center).

This 1941 aerial (Figure 25) is a recently located USDA image focused on the Louisiana side of the Mississippi River, but which includes downtown Natchez within the edge of the image. When blown up, the image loses legibility, but portions of the Dickson interpreted fort complex are visible yet extremely blurry. What is apparent in the aerial image is that the development followed a linear northeast/southwest axis along the bluff. This image warrants further study using photographic analytical tools to better discern elements on the ground at the time that the interpretive fort complex was in place.
The Later Eras

With the death of Dickson, the interpretive replica fort at Fort Rosalie began to fall into disrepair. In the following years, residents and children visited and played among the ruins, until finally the structures were no longer deemed safe. At some point, the remaining structures were removed. The gift shop/visitor’s center located on the corner of S. Canal St, and D. A. Biglane St. was the only building associated with the interpretive replica fort that remained.

Along with the removal of the interpretive replica fort structures, the surrounding neighborhood fell into a period of decline. The types of homes constructed in the area were not the types that appealed to the broader tourism instincts of local Natchez boosters. As time passed, demolition by neglect and finally totally demolition became the norm within the surrounding neighborhood. The only remaining neighborhood structure that survived is the Stietenroth House.

Figure 26: 1959 aerial image of downtown Natchez and vicinity (LSU Cartographic Information Center).

In this 1959 aerial image (Figure 26), the former site of Dickson’s interpretive fort complex has already been engulfed in a canopy of native and invasive plants and little can be discerned from the image.
The tree canopy on the site has further developed and obscured the ground plane at the Fort Rosalie site, as is visible in Figure 27. The development on the plateau below the fort has expanded and the parking lot associated with the development has also expanded.
Figure 28: 1969 aerial image of downtown Natchez and environs (LSU Cartographic Information Center).

In 1969, the vegetative canopy at Fort Rosalie (Figure 28), along the bluff, and on the plateau below has further developed, which prevents extensive analysis of features on the ground plane. The building and associated parking lot visible in previous aerials on the lower plateau have been removed and there appears to be a low vegetative cover of volunteer plant materials or grass.
In Figure 29, the main change between 1969 and 1982 is the amount of canopy cover in the Box Factory neighborhood and the number of houses that have been removed over time. At this point, the casinos have not been placed along the river and the large parking lot associated with the casino has not been constructed.

In 1980, Walter Biglane contracted Jack D. Elliott, historical architect, through the MDAH to conduct a limited exploration and assessment of the Fort Rosalie site. Elliott recovered various items, including contemporary artifacts, French faience ceramics, and several fragments of Native American pottery (Cornelison and Hardy). The following year, Elliott submitted his report to Biglane “noting his determination that the remnant earthen elevation was actually an edge of Fort Rosalie. (Cornelison and Hardy 64).

When the park service decided to locate their headquarters at 504 Canal Street, a new era began. First the rehabilitation of the Stietenroth House occurred in order to convert the house into offices.
for NPS staff. Later, the NPS purchased the surrounding land associated with Fort Rosalie in order to preserve and protect the earliest evidence of European exploration and repeated military ventures in the Mississippi Territory.

What does remain at the Fort Rosalie site is a multi-layered and multi-dimensional landscape. It includes vestiges of the earthworks and archaeological remains of the early Colonial and American fort; the antebellum home and grounds of a prominent Natchez citizen; the urban domestic layer of a worker’s neighborhood; and the infrastructure and building associated with the era of American history where wealthy residents sought to highlight and underscore the celebrated stories of our past. Each of these layers are still extant on the site. How that mix of Natchez and American history is portrayed to the general public and to the visitor of the site will be a challenge. The juxtaposition of Colonial military history, southern economic development, and the early framework of the U.S. historic preservation movement provides a fascinating interplay of ideas. There is much to be celebrated at the site in its final role as a commemorative center of Natchez history.
Analysis & Evaluation of Integrity

Analysis and Evaluation of Integrity Narrative Summary:

Landscape characteristics identified for Fort Rosalie include topography, spatial organization, natural systems and features, land use, circulation, vegetation, buildings and structures, views and vistas, and small-scale features. Of these, topography, spatial organization, circulation, and views and vistas are the most important characteristics and include features that contribute to the site’s overall historic character. The features that contribute were present during the period of significance.

The physical integrity of the Fort Rosalie landscape is evaluated by comparing landscape characteristics and features present during the period of significance (1716-1970) with current conditions. This date might be adjusted to a later time if NPS staff deems an expanded period of significance appropriate. Few historic characteristics and features remain today, as the majority of the site has been drastically changed over the preceding three centuries; however, the remnant earthwork remains in its original location. The spatial organization of the landscape has been restored in areas close to the earthwork, although it has been diminished by adjacent suburban development, infill housing remnants on the site, as well as an adjacent bluff that is not part of the Fort Rosalie site. The Fort Rosalie site is accessed by roadway and is within close proximity to the City of Natchez. Nearby suburban development has encroached on historic views and vistas, obscuring views to the Mississippi River, as well as the historically open views inland.

INTEGRITY

According to the National Register of Historic Places, integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance through physical resources. The National Register program identifies seven aspects of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Retention of these qualities is necessary for a property to convey its significance; however, not all seven aspects must be present for a property to retain integrity. A basic test of integrity is to judge whether a participant in the historic period would recognize the property as it exists today. For example, if a soldier from the battle of Chaffin’s Farm or a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Company 1375 were to return today, would he easily recognize the property in question?

Location:

Location is defined by the National Register as the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. The earthwork upon which Fort Rosalie was built was the foundation for the original fort built in 1716; likewise, the re-constructed fort of the first British period in 1766 remains in its original constructed location. The site’s proximity to the Mississippi River played a major role in the development. Its location and vantage point on the bluff made it an
ideal location for protection. Proximity to settlements of the Natchez Tribe is also a key to the fort’s location.

Design:

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. The Fort Rosalie site features vague remnants of the original design. The remaining form of the remnant earthwork is difficult to read as a fort site due to erosion, infill development, and the loss of portions of the earthwork due to unstable bluff conditions. The NPS has brought legibility back to the site by reclaiming and demolishing nearby homes to return the surrounding landscape to its former conditions as a ruin.

Setting:

Setting is the physical environment of a property and the general character of the place. The Fort Rosalie landscape was set in an undeveloped site near the Natchez settlements along the Mississippi River. The site had views both north and south along the Mississippi River with the Natchez villages to the East. The landscape would have been cleared of vegetation and used for construction of fortifications and to improve sight lines. Beginning in the twentieth century, the construction of residential housing and roads within proximity of the remnant earthwork altered the historic character. Today, much of the site has been cleared of homes, however many features from the past can still be seen throughout the landscape. The current viewshed consists primarily of the river and the battures on either side, punctuated by industrial and shipping concerns at the City of Vidalia on the west bank, and the urban development of Natchez on the east bank.

Materials:

Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during the period of significance in a particular pattern or configuration to give form to the property. The remnant earthwork upon which Fort Rosalie once stood is the most significant material representation of remains of the original fort landscape. Archaeological investigations on the site have also yielded materials associated with the fort complex and possibly earlier periods. Later periods when the site was an antebellum garden and then small neighborhood are also still represented by remnant materials, especially some of the infrastructure associated with urban development.

Workmanship:

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts and methods of construction used during the specified historic period of significance. The Fort Rosalie landscape demonstrates the unique
workmanship of three varying periods. The earthwork remains of the fort showcase the efforts of the early developers of the land. The log cabin structure serves as an example of craftsmanship during the 1930s. There are also several examples of workmanship left behind from the neighborhood layer, including the Stietenroth house as well as the associated retaining wall and staircases.

Feeling:
Feeling is the expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular time resulting from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey a property’s historic character. The Fort Rosalie landscape is revealed as a defensive fort only when the visitor stands at the top of the earthwork. This is currently not allowed because of safety concerns with the unstabilized loess bluff and the possibility of accelerating erosion if the grass cover is degraded. Standing at the top allows the visitor to understand the vantage point and practicality of this site, and one can easily understand its significance at this particular juncture. The remaining landscape elements seem disjointed; however, they serve as a reminder for how development transpires over time and add to the interpretive potential of the site.

Association:
Association is the direct link between the property and an important historic event or person. Fort Rosalie continues to be directly associated with the history of the Natchez Tribe, early Colonial origins of the area, the establishment of the city of Natchez, early preservation efforts in the United States, the commemoration of American history, and with various early military, political, developers, and preservationists.

Landscape Characteristics
This section presents an analysis of landscape characteristics and their associated features and corresponding List of Classified Structures names and numbers. It also includes an evaluation of whether the feature contributes to the property’s National Register eligibility for the historic period (1862-1970), contributes to the property’s historic character, or if it is noncontributing, undetermined, or managed as a cultural resource.
Character-defining Features:

Natural Systems and Features

General: The Fort Rosalie site is located on the eastern loess bluffs of the lower Mississippi River in Adams County, Mississippi. The parent soils are windblown loess at depths approaching 200 feet in height above the level of the river. Currently, seventy-five percent of Adams County is commercial forested lands. This resource provides the majority of employment in the area through raw product extraction, processing into lumber for construction, and chemical processing for paper production. Twenty-five percent of surrounding land is used for farming, pasture lands, and commercial or residential purposes (Morris 20-27, qtd in Cornelison and Hardy 9).

Physiography: The undulating bluff and plain loess system of the eastern side of the Mississippi River is known as the Loess Hills. The larger physiographic region that the area lies in is the Gulf Coastal Plain. The ecoregion is the Mississippi Valley Loess Plain Ecoregion. Due to the highly erodible nature of the region’s soils, creeks and drainage areas are deeply incised with steep banks. The bluff at Fort Rosalie consists of Loess soils and is highly erodible. At Rosalie and other sites along the Natchez waterfront, bluff collapses have historically been a recurring issue. The original site of the fort has been adversely affected by bluff collapses to a significant degree. The most famous bluff collapse occurred in 1870, when the majority of the fort earthworks fell to the plateau below. The integrity of the site currently relates to the later periods of significance beginning with neighborhood development, the fort interpretive reconstruction, and the use of the site for commemoration.

Vegetation: Prior to European contact, the ecoregion was comprised of an oak-hickory and oak-hickory-pine canopy. During the antebellum era, the region became a center of cotton culture, and the majority of lands were cleared for agricultural production. After the boll weevil and the decline of cotton, the region was developed into commercial forest land, which is the present usage of the majority of Adams and surrounding counties (Cornelison and Hardy 9). The most recent glaciation epoch had minimal effect on the flora of the Natchez region. The botanical communities in the Mississippi Valley Loess Plain Ecoregion are comprised of southern red oak (Quercus falcata), white oak (Quercus alba), southern magnolia (Magnolia grandiflora), and water oak (Quercus nigra). Plant communities currently on the site consist of volunteer indigenous trees and understory plants, ornamentals planted at relict house sites, and a large number of invasive volunteer mulberry, which have become endemic in abandoned landscapes throughout the Gulf South. The exotic vine kudzu (Pueraria lobate) covers portions of the slope below the bluff between the site and Biglane Avenue and frequently grows up over the edge of the bluff.

Fauna: Prior to the arrival of Europeans, faunal representation in the area consisted of buffalo (Bison bison), black bear (Ursus americanus), deer (Odocoileus virginianus), raccoon (Procyon lotor), opossum (Didelphis marsupialis), rabbit (Sylvilagus sp.) and gray and fox squirrels (Sciurus carolinensis and Sciurus niger). Many of the larger species in their historic range are no longer present, but the smaller opossum, raccoon, and rabbit have all adapted to urban settings and are frequently seen in local communities. The proximity of the site to the Mississippi River places it within the Mississippi Flyway, “a major migratory route for nearly 40 percent of all of
North America’s migrating waterfowl and shorebirds” (Cornelison and Hardy 13).

Climate: Natchez is listed in the Koppen-Geiger classification as a Cfa climate, which is “humid subtropical.” The majority of the year is characterized by prevailing winds from the south, off the warm, moist waters of the Gulf of Mexico. During winter months, there are occasional intrusions of continental air and infrequent snowfall, but these are rare and do not occur on an annual basis. Climate change forecasts are calling for an increase in rainfall intensity and duration. Increases of rainfall amounts and intensity will impact runoff and sediment yields (Wu, Peng, et al.).

Geomorphology and Soils: Parent soils in Adams County are comprised primarily of windblown loess soils, along with pockets of alluvium and marine deposits (Morris 1970:45, qtd in Cornelison and Hardy, 11-12). Concentrations of loess deposits are typically thicker in closer proximity to the Mississippi River and thinner as distance away from the river increases. The eastern border of Adams County has a much thinner layer of loess soils.
**Character Defining Features:**

1. Feature: Mississippi River  
   Feature Identification Number:  
   Feature Contribution: Contributing  
   IDLCS Number:  

2. Feature: Natural Loess Bluff  
   Feature Identification Number:  
   Feature Contribution: Contributing  
   IDLCS Number:  

**Landscape Characteristic Graphics:**

*Figure 30: View from on top of bluff looking out to the Mississippi River. Vegetative growth is on adjoining property (STA).*
Figure 31: Loess bluff along D. A. Biglane with vegetative cover.
Figure 32: View looking north towards the National Box Factory neighborhood upper terrace from South Canal Street, east of Fort Rosalie.
Topography

During the Colonial period, the natural underlying topographic advantages offered by the loess bluff (Figures 30 and 31) and hills east of the Mississippi River made the location of the defenses belonging to the Fort Rosalie landscape an obvious choice for development. The earthwork berms associated with the remains of Fort Rosalie are located on the highest point of the bluff, providing the vantage point for locating enemy troops and observing maritime vessels in the river. While there is little evidence that the earliest fort used earthworks, following the 1729 massacre, existing plans called for a moat-like structure surrounding the perimeter of the reinforced palisades, elevated on a raised berm platform. It is not known whether later permutations of the fort under the English, Spanish, and Americans changed these elevations or structural elements, as no documentation has been located for those periods.

From the high bluff aspect, the land slopes gently down away from the bluff to Canal St. Since only two “points” of the original fort pentagon remain after the 1870 collapse of the bluff, it is not entirely clear how the rest of the topography was utilized when the fort was originally replaced in 1731.

Construction of the National Box Factory neighborhood:
With the advent of the National Box Factory, the neighborhood that developed on the site of the grounds of Fort Rosalie was graded to allow for driveways, intersecting neighborhood roads, and more level terraces for house construction, as seen in Figure 32. While the remaining terraces and retaining wall are contributing features of this period of development, their construction likely impacted the historic features of the surrounding fort landscape, due to the amount of cut and fill that was required during the construction of the neighborhood.

Fort Rosalie Interpretive Replica:
The construction of the Fort Rosalie interpretive replica fort and associated buildings probably impacted the historic site even further. Whereas, the neighborhood had been constructed on outlying lands, the interpretive replica fort was constructed directly on the footprint of the fort’s earthworks and surrounding areas. While the overall general configuration of the 1730s earthworks still exists, the construction of foundations and infrastructure would have particularly impacted the archaeological record as it pertained to the working military fort and garrison.

NPS Ownership
Recent clearing of the site (2015-2016) to make it more legible has been conducted in a sensitive fashion, with trees removed at ground level but with stumps left in the ground in order to retain remaining archaeological integrity and to minimize the potential for erosion. Many Natchez residents had not been able to see the remnant earthworks nor known of their existence for decades prior to this selective clearing of the site. This clearing of undergrowth and trees has opened up the site for visibility purposes and aided greatly in the ability of the NPS to interpret the colonial history of the fort complex.
Character-defining Features:

Feature: Box Factory Neighborhood Terraces
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Fort Rosalie Earthwork
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Landscape Characteristic Graphics:

Figure 33: Terraces are visible in the distance. It is assumed that they are associated with the late 1800s and early 1900s neighborhood formerly located on the site.
Figure 34: Remnant earthwork of Fort Rosalie with mulch from tree removal operations visible on the slope.
Spatial Organization

Historic Conditions:

Military Era.

Spatial organization during this era will be described based on information available from the maps depicting the period. The fort depicted on Broutin’s 1723 map (Figure 5) is drawn in the shape of a square, with each point extending outward in the shape of an arrowhead. The fort and related paths shape space within the fort’s immediate area. In the Le Bouteux map (Figure 7), much more detail is shown of the original fort and surroundings. The area immediately surrounding the fort comprises the magazine, the government and commandant residences, and the parish, each of which have associated gardens. A large tobacco plantation is evident as are two areas referred to as “Desert Sauvage,” which may be translated as infertile lands that were once farmed by the Natchez. This plan also shows areas of cypress swamp, scrub, and prairie. In Broutin’s 1730 map (Figure 1), the provisional fort, which was the second temporary fort, is depicted on the lower plateau southwest of the original fort. The location of the original fort, atop the bluff, is where the third fort was built.

The next maps available are Pittman’s 1765 (Figure 10) and 1770 (Figure 11) maps which show gardens related to the garrison to the north and to the south. They are approximately three-hundred feet long by one-hundred feet wide. The gardens from this era are possibly located on the current NPS park property. There does not seem to be a relationship between the pentagon shape of the fort and the rectangular gardens, other than proximity. Although water from the well does look to be directed from the eastern garden to the bake house, where one branch goes to the fort, to what looks to be an orchard, and the main branch continues to the other garden before flowing out into the river. A bridge is indicated on the northern face of the fort which leads to a path system which leads to the bake house, a stable, and the gardens. A ‘partially burned’ stockade is also shown on the map. The relationship between the aforementioned features create the positive and negative spaces found in the layout during the military era, and the stockade creates a visual vertical plane, enclosing most of the fort’s resources. The bakehouse, stable, and parts of the stockade may have been located outside of NPS park property.

The Georges Collot 1796 map (Figure 13) shows the areas further out from the fort as the Town of Natchez became more developed. The fort is shown as a hexagon; however, it was actually in the shape of a pentagon as shown on previous maps. Notable is the ravine that flows nearly parallel to the Mississippi River and the roads that connect the town, fort, government house and houses. The bluffs are called out as “Steep rock 180 feet high” and early settlements beneath the bluff begin to appear in this map. The Bois St. Lys 1798 plan (Figure 14) appears to be a copy of the Collot 1796 plan, however, more detail is included, specifically in the town center. A cotton mill is visible west of the fort.

The next plan from 1864 (Figure 18) shows Natchez during the Civil War, with contraband Barracks visible on the waterfront and the fort visible in the top right of the map. The 1882 plan (Figure 19) shows the development of Natchez and Vidalia, and the fort is no longer visible.

Residential and Interpretive Replica Fort Era.
The earliest aerial map from 1941 (Figure 25) shows fifteen or more structures on what is now NPS park land. During this era, it is the homes, property lines, sidewalks, and interior streets which shape space. The character appears to be somewhat dense residential, with homes along South Canal Street set back approximately thirty feet from the road, and approximately ten to twenty feet apart from one another. The next most dense areas are the plots adjacent to Green Street and Rumble Street. Northwest of these areas, land seems to be more open. Linear features are found which connect rectangular structures. A path leads from the structure at the intersection of South Canal Street and D.A. Biglane Street. That structure was formerly the ticket office and gift shop associated with the Jefferson Davis Dickson interpretive fort replica era, dating to 1940.

In the 1959 (Figure 26) aerial, homes are discernable but are masked by a mature tree canopy that has grown since the previous aerial photograph was taken 18 years earlier. Density in the residential areas appears to be similar to the 1941 aerial, but the area containing the fort replica is overgrown, and the structures are difficult to locate. The 1964 aerial (Figure 27) is similar in character to the 1959 aerial, but a white shape appears in the north-center of the site. The space is seen in the 1959 aerial but by 1964, it grew by 200 to 300 percent. This could indicate a large structure or parking area. There are diagonal lines behind the lots adjacent to Green Street. This could indicate vegetable garden activity. The aerials also indicate that homes were located very close to the fort site, with a few immediately adjacent to it, and one may be located on top of it.

The 1969 map seen in Figure 28 is clearer and supports the analysis of the previous maps. At this time, the site remains a dense residential area. The land, which was once an interpretive replica fort, is overgrown and has no structures. The 1982 map (Figure 29) is not as clear as the 1969 map, but homes are discernable, and the site appears to still retain some semblance of a declining residential area.

During the residential and interpretive replica fort periods, the land was mainly divided into traditional lots which contained single family homes. The homes, outbuildings, lot lines, and the space between dictated spatial organization within the site. The interpretive replica fort seen in the earliest aerial had a different spatial organization. According to the 1941 aerial, the structures and linear fences were arranged on the outer edges. The interior space was open, and the photograph indicates dirt paths and lawn in this area. There appears to be no connection between the spatial organization of this era and the prior military era.
Existing Conditions:

It is the combination and arrangement of vertical and horizontal planes that work together to shape space at Fort Rosalie. Elements such as earth, trees, vegetation, paths, walls, and man-made structures create implied planes that articulate space.

Topography shapes space throughout the site, with some areas having subtle changes of a few feet, and others having steeper elevation changes of ten feet or more. The main topographic feature is the ridge which contains a portion of the remains of Fort Rosalie. This ridge rises to +240’ at its highest point, atop the fort remnant earthwork. The land slopes to +205’ near the southern part of South Canal Street and rises to +215’ at the northern portion of the street, where staircases and sidewalks related to a previous residential use lead from the street level up into the site. At this location, the land is ten feet above the street level, and access is limited to staircases which are integrated into six-foot tall concrete retaining walls.

Subtle changes in topography shape space and articulate flat land and terraces where homes were once located. There are four distinct terraces which slope up from south west to northeast. The terraces are assumed to be man-made since the slopes run southeast to northwest in a straight line.

Trees shape space vertically and horizontally. The character and porosity of the plane changes and depends on the season, variety of tree, and size of canopy. Trees within the site fall within three categories: 1) those that relate to the removed homes 2) those that relate to property lines of the removed homes, and 3) those that are on the ridge at the northwestern edge of the property. The street trees along South Canal Street are not on park property.

In the southern and northeastern portion of the site, mature deciduous trees are located in an informal manner and do not appear to be a part of a larger arrangement. Those trees are assumed to be related to the residential layer which existed on site. In addition to the larger deciduous trees, two crape myrtles are located in the middle of the site, atop the highest terrace. The trees are ornamental and are also most likely associated with the residential layer which previously existed.

There are four tree lines which form vertical planes that extend from the property line adjacent to South Canal Street to the northwest. The southern one follows Rumble Street. To the north, a middle one follows a concrete driveway. The next line to the north does not follow a vehicular feature, but all four are located on a sloped grade change between flat terraces. The northern-most line separates the open land that is most common on site from the Stietenroth House to the north. The tree lines are most likely associated with old property lines from the residential layer which previously existed.

The ridge along the northwestern perimeter which runs from southwest to northeast contains mature trees that are probably volunteer growth. The trees accentuate and extend the vertical plane created by the ridge. The view is mostly blocked from this location towards the river.

Along with the flat terraces, paths and driveways are part of the horizontal ground plane. The
sidewalks do not delineate space, but rather indicate the locations of homes previously removed. The driveways near Briel Avenue alone do not delineate space, but when viewed collectively with topography and tree lines, illustrate the property divisions of the former residential layer.

The four-foot wooden fence along South Canal Street erected by the NPS is a vertical plane which directs visitors to two preferred entrance points. In the same horizontal plane as the fence, a five-foot concrete wall follows the street sidewalk and retains soil which rises an additional five feet further into the site. This vertical plane is solid and is only penetrated by concrete stairways which lead northwest into the site. Views from the street are blocked by this feature, and the topography behind it.

Two man-made structures exist in the northeastern portion of the site. The Stietenroth House and the log cabin create vertical planes and blocks which shape space. The Stietenroth House has a traditional front yard which is the last portion of the site retained by the concrete wall. The rear land is also retained to protect the house. A small path leads to two doors in the rear of the house.

The log cabin is located a few feet from the South Canal Street sidewalk. It marks the northernmost point of the park. The areas around it are lawn and gravel parking. The relationship of the structure to South Canal Street gives an appearance of being more a part of the streetscape than of the park.
Character-defining Features:

Feature: Ridge
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Terraces
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Tree Lines
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Deciduous Trees
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Concrete Wall
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Landscape Characteristic Graphics:
Figure 35. The ridge and related tree line are visible to the right of the Fort Rosalie remnant earthwork in the center of the photo.
Figure 36. Two terraces in the distance. The edges are marked by tree lines and subtle grade changes.
Figure 37. A tree line marks the boundary and slope between two flat terraces.
Figure 38. Deciduous trees in the landscape.
Figure 39. The concrete retaining wall is visible along South Canal Street.
Circulation

Historic Conditions:

Immediate Path Network

Broutin’s map of the fort in 1723 (Figure 5) is the earliest map found which details a network of paths around the fort, and from the fort to other destinations in the Natchez area. Three paths converge at what appears to be an entrance to the fort at the north face of the structure. Unfortunately, this part of the fort does not exist, but two paths which lead east, although are not currently visible, were on high ground and were not part of the land collapse in the 1800s. Not far from the fort, the northern-most path splits into a northern and southern path which leads to structures shown on the map. It is unknown whether the structures are related to the fort. The path emanating from the fort’s northeastern corner leads west and connects to another path. Three paths connect at this point, including the one from the fort. One path leads back towards the Mississippi River, south of the fort.

The map also shows a path directly southeast of the fort, running northeast to southwest. This path connects to the others which emerge from the northeastern corner of the fort and leads to structures south of the fort. The circulation in Broutin’s 1730 map (Figure 1) is clearer and confirms much of what is found in his 1723 map. The Le Bouteux plan (Figure 7) from 1728 labels several paths including the Chemin de charors (chariot path), Chemin de pietons (pedestrian way), chemin de la pesche (fishing path), the R. du Moulin (Mill River), and the R. des Natchez (Natchez River).

Pittman’s 1765 and 1770 (Figures 10 and 11) map show a circulation system that has been simplified. The path which leads northeast to southwest on the eastern edge of the fort is still visible. It also shows a more local network northeast of the fort, and one path that leads away from the fort in a southeastern direction.

Regional Path Network

Collot’s 1796 map (Figure 13) and Bois St. Lys’ 1798 map (Figure 14) show a more regional network including the town of Natchez grid. In all maps, there is a main path leading from the fort northeast along the high bluff of the Mississippi River. This path intersects with a path leading southeast towards the town, and west towards the river. Although Lafon’s 1814 map (Figure 15) does not include a path system, it depicts a fort much larger than the original footprint.

In analyzing Vin Steponaitis’ October 13, 2015 presentation Fort Rosalie: A History in Maps, it is apparent that a significant portion of the fort’s eastern circulation system was not lost in the land collapse in the 1800s. Although the paths from the fort era are visible from maps, they are not legible today.
Existing conditions:

Sidewalks, Roads, Parking Areas and Driveways

Much of the site’s circulation occurs at the southern and eastern perimeters, along Green Street to the south and South Canal Street to the east. Although not within park boundaries, Green Street is adjacent to the site and runs northwest to southeast. It is a dead-end street which stops at its northwestern terminus. Vehicular parking is available along its northern edge. Parking is not formally delineated and vehicular and pedestrian zones meld together along this stretch of sidewalk and street parking. Most of the parking area is surfaced with a combination of concrete with exposed aggregate and small brown gravel. There is no ‘roll-over’ curb to separate street from parking. The street-side parking area appears to be a recent addition and therefore is considered noncontributing. Near Green Street’s western terminus, the wooden fence ends, and pedestrians are allowed to enter the site from this location.

At the intersection of Green Street and South Canal Street, the concrete pour is more recent and appears to meet A.D.A. slope requirements. The finish is natural concrete with a broom finish. At this location, the wooden fence is open, and bollards mark the pedestrian entrance into the park. From this point, there is no path or suggested pedestrian circulation, only a lawn surface. Along South Canal Street, the sidewalk is concrete with a light exposed aggregate finish. There are no entry points into the park from this sidewalk until the intersection of South Canal Street and Briel Avenue. Southwest of Briel Avenue, Rumble Street extends into the park for approximately one-hundred and fifty feet. A temporary wire fence with steel posts inhibits vehicular and pedestrian access at this location.

Past Rumble Street and along South Canal Street, the pedestrian sidewalk extends northeast to D.A. Biglane Street. Between Rumble Street and the Stietenroth House, there are six concrete sidewalks and stairways which are related to homes that once stood on this site during the box factory era. The sidewalks and stairways extend into the park with varying lengths between twenty-five and fifty feet.

West of Briel Avenue, Fort Rosalie Road extends into the site for one-hundred feet and curves northeast for approximately three-hundred feet. It curves southeast and meets South Canal Street south of the Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop. A metal pipe gate inhibits vehicular access. Near the Briel Street entrance, Fort Rosalie Road is surfaced with concrete. The material changes to asphalt approximately one-hundred feet into the site. The condition is fair, as cracks and weeds deteriorate the asphalt and grass grows along the edges. Because of the grassed edge, the total width is unknown but is most likely ten to twelve feet. This dimension is commonly used as the dimension for a one lane driveway. Past residents may have used this road as a one-way road ‘loop’ to and from South Canal Street, or the shoulder may have been used if the road was used as two-way when vehicles met head to head.

There is one additional vehicular driveway which enters the site north of the Stietenroth House. This driveway extends approximately forty-five feet into the site, next to the house. The driveway was most likely built during the box factory era. There is a limestone parking lot located north of the driveway. There is also a sidewalk and stairway leading from the street sidewalk to the
limestone parking lot. Although the sidewalk and steps are not tied into the box factory era retaining wall, it may have been built within that time period. Since the origin is unknown, the steps and path leading to the limestone parking lot were not counted as a contributing feature.

The existing driveways and roads as described above are contributing features and are associated with the Stietenroth House or the National Box Factory neighborhood that once stood on the site.

**Condition:**
All existing driveways, paths, and stairways within the park are in good condition and date to the last quarter of the 1800s and first quarter of the 1900s. With the exception of the paths immediately connected to the Stietenroth House, they are all part of the neighborhood associated with the box factory previously located nearby. Due to the proposed stated significance of the National Box Factory period and the Stietenroth House that precedes it, the existing sidewalks and driveways associated with those periods are considered an important layer of the park’s history.

**Character-defining Features:**

- **Feature: Green Street**
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Contributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature: Six Box Factory Neighborhood Era Pedestrian Stairs and Sidewalks**
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Contributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature: Box Factory Neighborhood Era Fort Rosalie Road**
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Contributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature: Parking Area Adjacent to Green Street**
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature: Stietenroth House Driveway**
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Contributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature: Box Factory Era Retaining Wall and Steps Adjacent to Stietenroth House**
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Limestone Parking Area
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
IDLCS Number:
Landscape Characteristic Graphics:

Figure 40: View from Green Street looking East toward S. Canal St.
Figure 41: Concrete sidewalk and brick steps associated with the early 1900s neighborhood formerly located on the site.
Figure 42: Concrete stairs and metal railings associated with the early 1900s neighborhood formerly located on the site.
Figure 43: Fort Rosalie Road associated with the early 1900s neighborhood located on site.
Figure 44: Gravel parking area starts near the corner of S. Canal St. and runs parallel to Green St. towards the Mississippi River.
Figure 45: Box factory era concrete driveway associated with the Stietenroth House.
Figure 46: The retaining wall and steps leading to the Stietenroth House is associated with the Box Factory era.
Figure 47: Limestone parking area northeast of the Stietenroth House.
Land Use

Land Use eras within the Fort Rosalie Unit are broken down into multiple distinct but sometimes overlapping eras. The Colonial period is very distinct and is related to the use of the property as a military garrison and outpost by successive colonial empires. The early Antebellum and Post-bellum era is when land use begins to be clouded by encroaching development from the north. The box factory era overlaps with the construction of the replica fort by Jefferson Davis Dickson and its existence as a ruin until its eventual collapse and removal. These eras are further detailed, including their overlaps, below. In addition, more recent eras and their land uses are included.

- Colonial Era (1716 to 1803): Prior to the Louisiana Purchase, the Fort Rosalie Unit was a military outpost of successive Colonial empires, with the associated outlying support structures, gardens, stables, and other features that maintained the viability of the fort.

- Antebellum, Reconstruction, and Post-bellum Eras (1803 to 1938): With the construction of Rosalie Mansion, the land became part of the extended landscape and gardens that supported the house. While there is no evidence that any part of the current landscape contained formal gardens, the area encompassed by the Fort Rosalie unit was probably part of the more picturesque, open area of the mansion, with specimen trees and lawns extending partway along the Natchez bluff.

- Box Factory Era (circa 1917 to 1970): With the need for worker housing in close proximity to the newly constructed box factory, a neighborhood comprised of box factory workers with late Victorian and early Bungalow architectural style structures on the surrounding landscape. Roads, underground infrastructure, overhead utilities, and pedestrian access points and stairways still exist in various densities on the site, primarily along the Canal Street side of the property and along the east-west retaining wall.

- Interpretive Replica Fort Era (1940 to 1946): The Jefferson Davis Dickson tourism development of a replica fort took advantage of the actual fort site to tell the story of the early Colonial development of Natchez, the region, and the United States. Capitalizing on the 1932 advent of the Natchez Spring Pilgrimage, Dickson leveraged the growing interest in American history, and used the land for tourism purposes.

- Post-Interpretive Replica Fort Era: With the Dickson’s death in Germany in 1943, the fort complex began to fall into disrepair. The site was sold to the Biglane family in 1946, where the family owned many homes in the surrounding neighborhood and adjoining land tracts.

- NPS Era: With the identification of the remnant fort location, the National Park Service was able to procure the fort site and began purchasing blighted properties in the area immediately surrounding the fort site. Over many years, properties were purchased and torn down to open up the fort site as a park landscape in NATC. Park headquarters were originally located in the Stietenroth House and the decision to protect and rehabilitate the Jefferson Davis Dickson cabin at Canal and Biglane was made in 2006.
Views and Vistas

Historic and Existing Conditions:

During the Colonial period, when the site was a mixed military and agricultural setting, the views to the south and east were maintained in a cleared state to maximize visibility for defense. The views over the bluff to the Mississippi River and up and down river provided early notification that enemy vessels were traversing the river and warned the existing garrisons to take cover and to prepare to shell enemy troops and vessels.

Once the Colonial period ended, the views to the south and east changed as the city of Natchez developed, and architecture in the foreground and the regrowth of a forest and understory canopy encroached on the long views into the surrounding landscape. The view over the river is still an important feature of the site but is somewhat limited by the tree canopy on the downslope embankment and plateau between the bluff edge and D. A. Biglane Street.

From the Fort Rosalie site, the primary view is to the west out to the Mississippi River and Louisiana in the distance. This spectacular view is the dominant reason for the original location of the fort complex. Two factors limit or impede the view:

- The necessity of keeping visitors away from the edge of the bluff
- The canopy of trees between the bluff edge and Biglane St. below.

The trees and vegetation are located on land that is not owned by the NPS. Therefore, challenges relating to ownership and slope stabilization impede selected views to the river. Views from the western edge of the bluff allow visitors to see back adjacent parts of the city of Natchez, but the elevation is not sufficiently high enough to see much beyond the adjoining neighborhoods.

The most important view within the park is of the Fort Rosalie earthwork, on the western part of the site. The remnant earthwork is ten to twenty feet above the surrounding grade and is prominently visible in most areas within the southern portion of the site. During the residential era, the view would have been impeded by the surrounding residential homes and outbuildings. The view would have been only accessible to those directly adjacent to the fort site.

The Vidalia Riverfront is visible across the river. Although not historic, the feature serves as a reminder of the complete removal to the west of downtown Vidalia in order to build more extensive levees after the 1927 Mississippi River flood. To the southwest, the Natchez-Vidalia Bridge spans the Mississippi River and connects the two states; Louisiana and Mississippi. The bridge impedes the view that was once clear downriver. Along with the far view upriver, it is also this open view that was strategic and played a part the fort’s selected location.

Rosalie Mansion, located north of the park, was built by Peter Little in 1823. Land now owned by the NPS, including land occupied by Fort Rosalie, was part of the original land purchase in 1820. According to legal records, the land contained fences, corn fields, and gardens. From this description, it is assumed that views to and from the site to the mansion were generally open and therefore opening views for today’s visitors could aid in the interpretation of this relationship. Currently, views to the mansion are
limited by trees and vegetation on the slope between the park and D.A. Biglane Street. The slope containing the vegetation is not within the NPS park property.

Views southeast toward residences and businesses are not particularly significant but are noted and photographed since they are prominent and are part of first impressions leading into the site.

Feature: View of Fort Rosalie Earthwork
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: View of Mississippi River
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: View of Vidalia Riverfront
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Non-contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: View of Natchez-Vidalia Bridge
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Non-contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: View of Rosalie Mansion
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: View of Natchez businesses
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Non-contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: View of Natchez neighborhood
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Non-contributing
IDLCS Number:
Figure 48: View of Fort Rosalie remnant earthwork from a picnic area.
Figure 49: Looking north along the edge of the bluff over the Mississippi River.
Figure 50: Mississippi River and Vidalia, LA riverfront.
Figure 51: Natchez-Vidalia Bridge.
Figure 52: Rosalie Mansion.
Figure 53: View of businesses and homes at the intersection of Green Street and South Canal Street.
Figure 54: View toward residential area across South Canal St.
Vegetation

The landscape surrounding the Fort Rosalie Unit consisted primarily of support functions of the fort itself and the agricultural community that began as a part of the early fort. Survival depended first and foremost on foodstuffs, so it was imperative that early colonials be able to supplement the commodities brought in by their European sponsors and companies with additional food. The Le Bouteux map (Figure 7) shows that each building has an associated garden. It also depicts a tobacco plantation, fallow fields, scrub land, prairie, and cypress swamps near the river. The Pittman maps (Figures 10 and 11) depicting the fort during 1765 and 1770, show a much different landscape that is more sparsely populated than the previous fort. Here, the fort stands alone except for two large gardens that measure about 300 feet by 100 feet. The 1796 Collot map (Figure 13) and the Audubon painting show that the population has largely moved into the town, and the fort stands alone on the bluff.

After the end of the Colonial period, once the fort fell into disuse, there is historical information that says that the area immediately surrounding the fort began to regenerate as forestland, with second-growth trees taking over the previous military and agricultural lands. The ecotones between the antebellum Rosalie House and the regenerative landscape are not clear.

The development of the box factory neighborhood and the Fort Rosalie replica removed any regenerative landscape that would have existed. This vegetation would all have been cleared to make way for twentieth-century improvements, and judging from an early photograph (Figure 24) that shows the fort and neighborhood complex, there is very little vegetative cover on the site, excepting for the natural loess bluff embankment.

After the end of the neighborhood, another era of regenerative forest began to develop along the bluff edge. Aerial imagery (Figure 26) shows a forested and vegetative canopy obscuring the remnant pentagon point earthwork, and the area from the edge of the bluff east for a distance of approximately 100 feet toward S. Canal St.

When the NPS took over the unit, the first order of business was to remove the architectural intrusions, and after that was complete, vegetative growth was removed from the perimeter of the fort earthworks and surrounding landscape to provide sightlines onto the actual fort site. Today, downslope on the bluff embankment, a grove of primarily non-native trees and mulberries has created a dense stand between the bluff edge and D.A. Biglane St. below.

Remnants from ornamental plantings related to the historic residential era are found near previous home sites. Spider lilies, aspidistra, and crape myrtles are examples of non-native ornamentals. They are considered contributing features since they originated from the box factory neighborhood era. Wisteria vines are also found, but most likely have migrated from the original planted location, therefore they are considered noncontribution. More recent annual color plantings were noted in front of the historic gift shop near the intersection of South Canal Street and D.A. Biglane Street, and these postdate the period of significance. The crape myrtles along South Canal Street were planted circa 2000 as part of a citywide effort to celebrate the millennium and are therefore noncontribution.
A terraced grassed lawn follows the natural grade and covers most of the site. The terraces are a remnant of the box factory era neighborhood and are therefore considered a ‘contributing’ feature. The lawn is compatible with the current use since views are maintained into and outward from the site and the grass provides soil stabilization. Within the terraced lawn, large deciduous trees mark previous home sites and property lines. Most existing large trees are natives such as hackberry, water oak, and other oaks and species that are common ‘volunteers’ along fence rows.

**Character-defining Features:**

- **Feature:** Box Factory Neighborhood Era Deciduous Trees
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Contributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature:** Box Factory Neighborhood Era Tree Stumps
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature:** Crape Myrtle Street Trees
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature:** Box Factory Neighborhood Era Spider Lilies, *Hymenocallis radiata*
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Contributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature:** Box Factory Neighborhood Era Wisteria
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature:** Box Factory Neighborhood Era Aspidistra
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Contributing
  - IDLCS Number:

- **Feature:** Annuals
  - Feature Identification Number:
  - Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
  - IDLCS Number:
Feature: Box Factory Neighborhood Era Grassed Terraces
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Box Factory Neighborhood Era Cedar Tree
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Box Factory Neighborhood Era Crape Myrtle Trees
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Landscape Characteristic Graphics:
Figure 55: The site has been mostly cleared. The deciduous trees that exist in the landscape are remnants of the box factory era neighborhood. Species present are a mix of hackberry, water oak, and other oaks.
Figure 56: Remnant earthwork of Fort Rosalie. Tree stumps from the Box Factory Neighborhood Era are visible from most areas adjacent to the mounds. The tree stumps and roots were not removed in order to protect the archaeological potential and artifacts that may lie below the surface.
Figure 57: Crape myrtle trees are planted along South Canal Street. These trees were planted in anticipation of the upcoming millennium, when local resident Sallie Ballard led an effort to plant 2000 crape myrtles throughout the city.
Figure 58: Spider lily foliage are remnants from yard plantings associated with the homes from the Box Factory Neighborhood Era which existed on site in the late 1800s and early 1900s.
Figure 59: Box Factory Neighborhood Era wisteria vines grow in the tree line between the open land and the Stietenroth House. It is not clear if these were associated with former habitation or spread onto the site as an invasive.
Figure 60: Box Factory Neighborhood Era aspidistra grows in the tree line between the open land and the Stietenroth House. They are probably remnants from yard plantings associated with the homes which existed on site in the late 1800s and early 1900s.
Figure 61: Annuals planted along the log cabin façade.
Figure 62: Grassed terraces are remnants of the box factory era neighborhood.
Figure 63: Box Factory Neighborhood Era native cedar tree near the intersection of Green Street and South Canal Street.
Figure 64: Two crape myrtle trees (right of center) are associated with the box factory neighborhood era.
Buildings and Structures

Two buildings and one major structure are located on the site: the Stietenroth House, the Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop log cabin, and the large retaining wall along Canal St. The three elements serve as physical reminders of different eras of development on the site. The two buildings serve as bookends for the architectural history of the site. The Stietenroth House was probably the earliest known neighborhood structure on the site, while the Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop was among the later structures on the site associated with the interpretive reconstruction of Fort Rosalie constructed by Jefferson Dickson Davis. The retaining wall along Canal St. dates to the Box Factory era which occurred between the two periods when a neighborhood developed on the site.

The Stietenroth House was originally constructed in 1871 and was then further modified throughout its existence. It served as the home of the Stietenroth family for several decades. It then housed a series of commercial enterprises and finally operated as the administrative headquarters of Natchez National Historical Park for many years. The house is not currently occupied.

The Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop operated as the ticketing office and gift shop of the Fort Rosalie development during the 1940s. It was sold by Louise Mastbaum Dickson to a family in 1949 and housed a series of religious and commercial entities until 1989, when it was converted into a restaurant named Fat Mama Tamales. The NPS purchased the structure and lot in 2005. The structure has been repaired and rehabilitated and is currently unoccupied.

The retaining wall along Canal Street serves to define the eastern edge of the site. They are reminders of the former existence of the neighborhood that developed during the Box Factory era that covered most of the site.

Character-defining Features:

Feature: Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop Log Cabin
Feature Identification Number: 
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number: 

Feature: Stietenroth House
Feature Identification Number: 
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number: 

Feature: Box Factory Neighborhood Era Retaining Wall
Feature Identification Number: 
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number: 
Landscape Characteristic Graphics:

Figure 65: Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop associated with the circa 1940s Fort Rosalie reconstruction.
Figure 66: Stietenroth House is the only home left on the NPS property from the box factory period. Currently not in use.
Figure 67: Concrete retaining wall associated with the early 1900s neighborhood located on site.
Small Scale Features

There are multiple small-scale features that serve as reminders of the multi-layered history of the site. Most of the small-scale features are associated with later periods of development including the residential neighborhood associations and the fort replica era.

On top of and along the ridge, several wooden post remnants were found. Some were standing vertical, some were cut at ground level, and some were laying on the ground horizontally. The material and location of the remnants are consistent with the material and location of the circa 1940s replica fort. Also, along the ridge and within the forest, brick steps were found. Due to location, this is also most likely related to the 1940s replica fort.

On top of the Fort Rosalie earthwork, a brick foundation and a flagpole remnant are found. The flag was erected in 1939 by the Daughters of the American Revolution. The brick foundation is of unknown origin but may be part of the replica fort.

Among the terraces on the southeastern portion of the site, concrete features are quickly being covered by fast growing lawn. Features are made of concrete or brick. They are most likely associated with the residential era which previously existed on site and could be remnants of retaining walls, building foundations, and sidewalks. A cylindrical brick cistern was also found on site and is also most likely associated with the residential era.

Other more recent features were added to protect the remnant earthwork and to control visitor circulation. Temporary orange construction fencing is present and marks the ridgeline. A wood split-rail fence is located on the southern part of the site, along South Canal Street and Green Street. At this intersection, there is an opening in the fence that provides pedestrian access and bollards are present to prevent vehicle access. At the intersection of South Canal Street and D.A. Biglane Street, a formal metal sign stands marking the Ft. Rosalie site. Adjacent to the Stietenroth House, a driveway connects South Canal Street and winds into the interior of the park. The driveway dates to the residential era. A metal pipe gate restricts access.

One waste and recycling receptacle is located at the end of Green Street, near a picnic area. Within this area, six picnic tables are arranged below three mature trees near Green Street. Most of the contributing small-scale features noted were found on the terraces and along the ridge on the western part of the site.
Character-defining Features:

*Feature: Wood Post*

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Contributing
- IDLCS Number:

*Feature: Wood Post*

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Contributing
- IDLCS Number:

Feature: Flagpole

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Contributing
- IDLCS Number:

Feature: Wood Lumber

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Contributing
- IDLCS Number:

Feature: Concrete Foundation

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Contributing
- IDLCS Number:

Feature: Low Retaining Wall

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Contributing
- IDLCS Number:

Brick cistern

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Contributing
- IDLCS Number:

Feature: Fencing – Temporary

- Feature Identification Number:
- Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
- IDLCS Number:
Feature: Fencing – Wood
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Bollards
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Brick Steps
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Contributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Signage
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Litter and Recycle Receptacle
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Picnic Tables
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
IDLCS Number:

Feature: Vehicular Gate
Feature Identification Number:
Feature Contribution: Noncontributing
IDLCS Number:

Landscape Characteristic Graphics:
Figure 68: Remnant wooden post foundation, assumed to be from the circa 1940s Fort Rosalie reconstruction.
Figure 69: Wooden post on left is embedded in the ground standing up vertically and the wooden post on the right is lying on the ground. They are assumed to be from the circa 1940s Fort Rosalie reconstruction or serve as a form of bluff stabilization.
Figure 70: Remnant flag post foundation and brick foundation. The brick foundation is assumed to be from the circa 1940s Fort Rosalie reconstruction. The flagpole was erected circa 1939 by the Daughters of the American Revolution, prior to the Fort Rosalie Reconstruction.
Figure 71: Retaining lumber, assumed to be from the circa 1940s Fort Rosalie reconstruction.
Figure 72: Remnant foundation associated with the houses and neighborhood built in the early 1900s.
Figure 73: Brick and concrete retaining wall associated with the early 1900s homes which previously existed on this site.
Figure 74: Brick cistern assumed to be associated with the early 1900s neighborhood located on site.
Figure 75: Temporary construction fencing tied to metal posts surround the remnant earthworks.
Figure 76: A wooden fence surrounds the southeast and southwest site perimeter. It was installed in 2016, when the site was opened to the public.
Figure 77: Bollards and informational pamphlets located at the corner of the site at S. Canal Street and Green Street.
Figure 78: Remnant brick stairs assumed to be associated with the replica fort reconstruction of Fort Rosalie from the 1939/1940 era.
Figure 79: Brick ruins located behind the log cabin in a wooded area assumed to be associated with the circa 1940s reconstructed Fort Rosalie.
Figure 80: Signage for the Fort Rosalie site along D.A. Biglane St. It Reads “Ft. Rosalie (Ft. Panmure) Occupied 1716 – circa 1800 by successive French, British, Spanish and American garrisons during struggle for control of the Miss. River Valley. Nucleus of early settlements in the Natchez District. Mississippi Department of Archives and History. 1988”
Figure 81: There is one waste and recycling receptacle on the site. It is located along Green Street near the picnic benches.
Figure 82: There are approximately six picnic tables located on the site. They are located in proximity to the parking area along Green Street and in a shaded area.
Figure 83: Gated access to asphalt road.
Archaeological Sites

Locations of archaeological sites are not included in this CLI.
Condition Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory Unit</th>
<th>Fort Rosalie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition Assessment</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition Assessment Date</td>
<td>08/15/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition Assessment Explanatory Narrative

The condition of the Fort Rosalie Unit landscape is “fair.” There is some evidence of negative disturbance and deterioration by natural and/or human forces. The cultural and natural values are as well preserved as can be expected given the local environmental conditions, especially those associated with the erodibility of the parent loess soil material and its depth. No immediate corrective action is recommended to maintain its current condition, but overall concerns related to the stability of the bluff will affect the recommendations included in that section of the report related to monitoring of any openings in the loess cap atop the bluff.

Impacts to Inventory Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>Erosion, Exposure to Elements, Structural Deterioration, Vegetation/Invasive Plants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal or External</td>
<td>Both Internal and External</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Explanatory Narrative

The current condition of the fort is threatened by impacts from erosion caused by rainfall on the highly erodible loess bluff on the Mississippi River. The Bluff Study from 1985 states that the bluff has a history of sloughing and sliding and that infiltration and rainfall during heavy periods of rain saturates the loess and weakens the material. One control method is controlling runoff to keep it from ponding or running off the edge of the bluff using a dyke. Tree roots also factor into weakening the soil as they shift during heavy winds; therefore, vegetation removal has been completed on some parts of the fort area. The stumps of the trees were left in place so as not to disturb the foundation of the fort and potential archaeological resources. The non-NPS adjacent lands to the west impact the site due to increased vegetation, which blocks historic views and increases the risk of slope failure due to the inability to stabilize the bluff that is outside and adjacent to the site.
Fort Rosalie
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Treatment

Inventory Unit            Fort Rosalie
Approved Landscape Treatment Preservation
Approved Landscape Treatment Completed Yes

Approved Landscape Treatment Explanatory Narrative
According to the General Management Plan for Natchez National Historical Park, the approved management objectives for Fort Rosalie include preservation, protection, and management of the cultural resources on site, which includes the view to the river, topography, and archaeology. In addition, the objective includes creating a setting that allows the visitor to interpret the fort in relation to the river as it was during the 1700s.

Surface stabilization of roads and paths is recommended when roads and parking areas are constructed. The stabilization of aggregate creates the appearance that the roads and paths are unpaved as they were in the nineteenth century, while accommodating twenty-first century vehicular traffic.

The Fort site was intended to be established as open space through removal of all structures with the exception the Stietenroth House, which was to be rehabilitated for use as NPS administrative headquarters. One additional structure was also retained on-site—the Gift Shop. Documentation of the Historic Structures was also ordered for both structures, and to date the HSRs have been completed. The removal of thirteen buildings on the property was the result of a formal Memorandum of Agreement signed by the park superintendent, the NPS Regional Director, the State of Mississippi State Historic Preservation Officer, with concurrence from the City of Natchez and the Historic Natchez Foundation.

Former streets would be mowed and allowed to be woodland paths and surfaced with native gravel. The document suggested that trees be planted along Canal street and the understory be cleared to create a more park-like setting. Large trees were to be removed from the bluff and a grassy 18-inch dyke was to be installed to help control runoff and erosion on the bluff. If this treatment were used, it would be essential to monitor infiltration into the substrate to ensure that the bluff remains stable. Water infiltration from various sources has been identified in prior studies as the primary reason that the bluff has suffered erosion and collapses.

The document recommended that archaeological investigations be completed, and to date, an extensive survey has been completed. Further investigation is recommended.

Approved Landscape Treatment Document General Management Plan
Approved Landscape Treatment Document Date 05/05/1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approved Treatment:</th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Documentation:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Date:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Document Explanatory Narrative:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Treatment Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Date:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography

Citation Author: Barnett, James.
Citation Title: “The Natchez Indians: A History to 1735.”
Year of Publication: 2007
Citation Publisher: Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.

Citation Author: Bryhn, Rolf.
Citation Title: “Sonja Henie. Store Norske Leksikon.”
Year of Publication: nd
Citation Publisher: snl.no/Sonja_Henie. Accessed 2017.09.14.

Citation Author: Case, Harold M.
Citation Title: “Brilliant Confederate Ball, Tableaux Feature Pilgrimage.”
Year of Publication: 1941, Mar. 02
Citation Publisher: Jackson, MS: Clarion-Ledger.

Citation Author: Cornelison, John E., Jr., and Meredith D. Hardy, eds. With contributions by John E. Cornelison, Jr., Meredith D. Hardy, Brian Worthington, Vincas P. Steponaitis, Jim Barnett, Jessica McNeil, Jessica Fry, Michael E. Seibert, Alex Parsons, R. Stephen Kidd, Charles Lawson, Mercedes Harrold, Joseph Frank III “Smokeye,” Jack Elliot, James A. Nyman, Clifton Hicks, and Michelle Gray.
Citation Title: “Archeological investigations of Fort Rosalie, Natchez National Historical Park.” DRAFT
Year of Publication: 2017
Citation Publisher: National Park Service, Southeast Archeological Center. Tallahassee, FL.
Fort Rosalie
Natchez National Historical Park

Citation Author: “Corps of Engineers.” US Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg District.

Citation Title: “The Natchez Bluff Study.”

Year of Publication: 1985.

Citation Publisher: Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior/National Park Service.

Citation Author: “Cultural Resource Challenge”

Citation Title: “National Park Service Cultural Resource Challenge: preserving America’s shared heritage in the 21st century.”

Year of Publication: 2013

Citation Publisher: Washington, DC: National Park Service, Washington, DC

Citation Author: Elliott, Jack D., Jr.

Citation Title: “Paving the Trace.” The Journal of Mississippi History

Year of Publication: 2007 Fall

Citation Publisher: Jackson, MS: Mississippi Department of Archives and History

Citation Author: Elliott, Jack D., Jr.

Citation Title: “The Fort of Natchez and the Colonial Origins of Mississippi”

Year of Publication: 2013

Citation Publisher: Natchez, MS: Natchez National Historic Park

Citation Author: “Fort Bunker Hill”

Citation Title: “Fort Bunker Hill: Rock Creek Park – Fort Circle Park – North”

Year of Publication: 2017
Fort Rosalie
Natchez National Historical Park

Citation Publisher: National Park Service, Cultural Landscapes Inventory
Citation Author: “Fort Harrison”
Citation Title: “Fort Harrison: Richmond National Battlefield Park”
Year of Publication: 2015
Citation Publisher: National Park Service, Cultural Landscapes Inventory
Citation Author: Grant, Ethan
Citation Title: “The Treaty of San Lorenzo and Manifest Destiny”
Year of Publication: 1997
Citation Publisher: Mobile, AL: Gulf Coast Historical Review
Citation Author: Jaeger Company/Quinn Evans Architects
Citation Title: Natchez National Historical Park: Historic Structure Report for Stietenroth House
Year of Publication: 2013
Citation Publisher: Gainesville, GA/Ann Arbor, MI
Citation Author: Jones, Tommy H.
Citation Title: Natchez National Historical Park, Old Fort Rosalie Gift Shop: Historic Structure Report.
Year of Publication: 2006
Citation Publisher: National Park Service, Southeast Regional Office. Historical Architecture, Cultural Resources Division.
Citation Author: Lail, Erin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Title:</th>
<th>“D. A. R. Would Establish Monument at Natchez”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citation Publisher:</td>
<td>Greenwood, MS: <em>Greenwood Commonwealth</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Author:</td>
<td>Layton, Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Title:</td>
<td>“The Boll Weevil In Mississippi: Gone, But Not Forgotten”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Publication:</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Publisher:</td>
<td>Starkville, MS: Mississippi State University Extension Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Title:</td>
<td>The history of Louisiana, from the earliest period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Publication:</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Publisher:</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA: James Gresham, Publisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Author:</td>
<td>na: In-text citation as “A CASUALTY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Title:</td>
<td>“A CASUALTY”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Publication:</td>
<td>1838, Feb. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Publisher:</td>
<td>Natchez, MS: The Natchez Daily Courier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Author:</td>
<td>na: In-text citation as “ANOTHER BREAK”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Title:</td>
<td>“ANOTHER BREAK”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Publication:</td>
<td>1853, Mar. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Publisher:</td>
<td>Natchez, MS: The Natchez Daily Courier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Author</td>
<td>Citation Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na: In-text citation as “Captain Jefferson Davis Dickson”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na: In-text citation as “Former Natchez Farm Boy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na: In-text citation as “Fort Rosalie Vandalized”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Publisher:</td>
<td>Natchez, MS: <em>The Natchez Weekly Courier</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Author:</td>
<td>na: In-text citation as “Jeff Dickson”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Title:</td>
<td>“Jeff Dickson. International Boxing Hall of Fame.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Publication:</td>
<td>nd. Accessed 2017, Sept. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Publisher:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ibhof.com/pages/about/inductees/nonparticipant/dickson.html">www.ibhof.com/pages/about/inductees/nonparticipant/dickson.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Citation Author: | na: In-text citation as “Mammy’s Cupboard” |
| Citation Title: | “Mammy’s Cupboard, Adams County” |
| Year of Publication: | nd. Accessed 2018, Nov. 27 |
| Citation Publisher: | [https://misspreservation.com/101-mississippi-places-to-see-before-you-die/mammys-cupboard-adams-county/](https://misspreservation.com/101-mississippi-places-to-see-before-you-die/mammys-cupboard-adams-county/) |

| Citation Author: | na: In-text citation as “MR DAVIS” |
| Citation Title: | “MR. DAVIS WANTS A BOX FACTORY” |
| Year of Publication: | 1910, Oct. 2nd |
| Citation Publisher: | Natchez, MS: *Natchez Democrat* |

| Citation Author: | na: In-text citation as “Natchez has the box factory” |
| Citation Title: | “Natchez has the box factory” |
| Year of Publication: | 1907, July 4 |
| Citation Publisher: | Natchez, MS: *Natchez Democrat.* |

| Citation Author: | na: In-text citation as “Natchez-Vidalia Bridge” |
| Citation Title: | “Natchez-Vidalia Bridge and Toll Plaza-Natchez MS” |
| Year of Publication: | Accessed 2018, Nov. 27 |
Citation Publisher: https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/natchez-vidalia-bridge-and-toll-plaza-natchez-ms/

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “Peace field”

Citation Title: “Peace field: Adams National Historical Park”

Year of Publication: 2012

Citation Publisher: National Park Service, Cultural Landscapes Inventory

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “Purchase of Shrine”

Citation Title: “Purchase of Shrine”

Year of Publication: 1937, Mar. 5

Citation Publisher: Jackson, MS: Clarion-Ledger.

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “Rockefeller”

Citation Title: “Rockefeller III Visits Natchez”


Citation Publisher: Jackson, MS: Clarion-Ledger

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “Rodin Museum”

Citation Title: “Rodin Museum”


Citation Publisher: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rodin_Museum

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “Says the Natchez Democrat”

Citation Title: “Says the Natchez Democrat of the 25\textsuperscript{th}”

Year of Publication: 1870, Jan. 29th.
Citation Publisher: Vicksburg, MS: The Vicksburg Herald.

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “SHERIFF’s SALE”

Citation Title: “SHERIFF'S SALE. THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI. ADAMS COUNTY. G. Martin Davis, vs. Elam Bowman, A. L. Wilson et al.”

Year of Publication: 1871, Feb. 15

Citation Publisher: Natchez, MS: The Weekly Democrat.

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “Sonja Henie”

Citation Title: “Sonja Henie”

Year of Publication: 1936, Mar. 30

Citation Publisher: New York, NY: Time Magazine

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “The Natchez Packing Company”

Citation Title: “The Natchez Packing Company”

Year of Publication: 1911, Sept. 1

Citation Publisher: Natchez, MS: Natchez Democrat

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “The People”

Citation Title: “The People”

Year of Publication: 1869, May 18

Citation Publisher: Natchez, MS: Natchez Democrat.

Citation Author: na: In-text citation as “There is good reason”

Citation Title: “There is good reason”


Citation Publisher: Monroe, LA: The Monroe News-Star


Citation Title: “‘Ring Master Of Paris’ Rebuilds Fort Rosalie: Jefferson Davis Dickson To Open Shrine At Natchez Today”


Citation Publisher: Monroe, LA: The Monroe News-Star
Supplemental Information: Newspaper References


Transcription of portion of Figure 48 related to Ft. Rosalie:
Also, the whole of the lots of land and their tenements, appurtenances, lately the
residence of Peter Little, deceased, beginning at the southwest corner of the intersection
of Canal and Orleans streets; and then along Canal street to the property of C. Stietenroth
(sic) thence following the inside or western boundary of said Stietenroth (sic), to the
northwest corner of his property; thence continuing in the same direction and along the
Briel line, upon which are the remains of an old fence, to a point near the site of the old
Fort, marked on the plat of the P. Little estate, site of Fort Rosalie; then nearly at right
angles upon the red line marked and designated, on said plat “fence,” to the margin of the
Bluff, at a point about —— feet northeast of said old Fort; then following the margin of
said Bluff up to the fence enclosing the garden and corn field attached to said residence;
then in a westwardly direction, along the margin of said Bluff, to the western angle or
corner of said garden … .
Natchez has the box factory and the farmers have the lands, so get together and raise the fruits and vegetables that can be crated and shipped to market. All of this means ready cash just at a season of the year when the long green looks better than it does in the fall and winter.

The month of July would have

Figure 85: “Natchez has the box factory.” 1907, Jul. 4. Natchez Democrat. Natchez, MS. p. 4.
There is good reason to believe that a permanent Truck Growers' Association will necessitate the operation of a canning factory to assist in taking care of surplus produce. Then, too, it is probable the members of the Association will find they can manufacture the crates in Natchez, and a trade in this direction could be built up so that a box, crate and excelsior factory can be erected. If all this can be accomplished, truck growing will enhance its value to this city and county. Truck will bring ready money, so will the canning factory and a box factory.
Figure 87: "Mr. Davis Wants a box factory." 1910, Oct. 02. Natchez Democrat. Natchez, MS. p. 7.

MR. DAVIS WANTS A BOX FACTORY.

The current edition of the Manufacturers’ Record has a letter from Secretary L. E. Davis, of the Chamber of Commerce, asking for a box mill in this city.

He sets forth in his letter than an aggregate of 100,000 boxes and crates are used by local companies annually and there is an aggregate of about 200 barrels used a day by the local institutions.
Figure 88: “The Natchez Packing Company.” 1911, Sep. 01. Natchez Democrat. Natchez, MS. p. 3.

The Natchez Packing Company is erecting a new building to be used as a box factory.

5 or 6 doses of “666” will cure any
with the demand for crates."


Figure 89: "With the demand for crates." 1914, Mar. 29. Natchez Democrat. Natchez, MS. p. 4.
Figure 90: “Purchase of Shrine.” 1937, Mar. 5. Clarion-Ledger. Jackson, MS. p. 4.
The conference is expected to bring a decision by the D. A. R. assembly as to which historic home in the city of Natchez will be purchased as a state D. A. R. headquarters and shrine. Several homes are under consideration, prominent among which is “Rosalie,” the home of the Rumble family. The regent of a local D. A. R. chapter received a letter setting forth the merits of Rosalie in concise, interesting form. Extracts from the letter follow:

“History is written in the very walls of this old mansion, the story of which is briefly this – It was completed in 1823, being built by Peter Little, the first lumber king of Mississippi. Every piece of timber was hand cut to fit and being for his own home he saw that only the finest woods were selected. The bricks were burned by slaves. “The land on which it stands was included in the famous old Fort Rosalie. The titles proving this fact can be obtained. Rosalie, as you know, is the most historic site in the Mississippi Valley. Founded in 1716, it was first a French stronghold, then became British in 1763. Prior to the treaty making this change, the Natchez Indians fell on the fort and massacred the French garrison and citizens. Rosalie mansion stands on ground once reddened with French blood.”

“The Spanish captured Fort Rosalie in 1779. This was during the latter years of the American Revolution and Natchez was then an unrecognized colony of Great Britain.”

“And last but not least, being in government service, I know that a movement is afoot to restore the fort, the site of which is just back of the house. Here the local D. A. R. maintains a flag pole. This would mean that the D. A. R. shrine would be adjoining the restored fort where thousands would visit each year. It would also mean that government up-keep of the ground might be arranged for, since it stands on fort lands.” (“Purchase of Shrine”)
Figure 92: “‘Ring Master of Paris’ Rebuilds Fort Rosalie.” 1941, Feb. 16. The Monroe News-Star.
Monroe, LA. P. 9.
Figure 93: “ROCKEFELLER III VISITS NATCHEZ.” 1941, Feb. 23. Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, MS. p. 10.
Figure 94: “Brilliant Confederate Ball, Tableaux Feature Pilgrimage.” 1941, Mar. 2. Clarion-Ledger. Jackson, MS. (Case 23).