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Diary Ralston Lattimore
Field Trip—Bentonville Battlefield, North Carolina

Dec. 11, 1935, Wednesday.....

9:25 A. M. Arrived Raleigh, N. C.
10:45 A. M. Interviewed Mr. C. C. Crittenden, Sec. N. C. State Historical Commission.
11:15 A. M. Purchased film, secured highway map, and made attempt to secure air photo of Bentonville Battlefield.

12:00 Noon Lunch with Mr. Crittenden.
1:00 P. M. Interviewed B. C. Stone, Jr., Project Manager, State Park Division, National Park Service, Raleigh, N. C.

1:30 P. M. Met Mrs. John E. Anderson, Chairman, N. C. Bentonville Battlefield Committee.

1:00 P. M. Was taken to Smithfield, N. C., by Mr. Crittenden and thence to Bentonville Battlefield in company with Miss. C. J. Cramton of Smithfield.
8:00 P. M. Called on Senator Josiah William Bailey.
9:00 P. M. Interview with Mrs. John E. Anderson.

Dec. 12, 1935, Thursday.....

9:00 A. M. Spent half a day touring Bentonville Battlefield area with Mrs. Anderson and local authorities. Transportation furnished by State Park Division, National Park Service.

1:00 P. M. Called on Mrs. Sanders, a member of U. D. C. Bentonville Battlefield Committee, in Smithfield, N. C.

1:30 P. M. Lunch.
2:00 P. M. Interviewed H. V. Jone, Clerk of Council, Smithfield, N. C.
2:30 P. M. Interviewed tax auditor, Johnston County, N. C.
3:00 P. M. Interviewed Mr. Abell of Abell and Gray, Real tors, Smithfield, N. C.
5:15 P. M. Returned to Raleigh via bus.
6:45 P. M. Diner with Mrs. John E. Anderson.
9:00 P. M. Interview with Mr. B. C. Stone, Jr., State Park Division, National Park Service.

Dec. 13th, 1935, Friday.....

10:00 A. M. Called at office of Gov. John G. Ervinghaus.
10:30 A. M. Interview with Mr. Crittenden.
11:30 A. M. Interview with Mr. Stone.
12:00 Noon Discussion with research workers North Carolina Historical Commission.
1:00 P. M. Lunch.
5:30 P. M. Left for New Bern, N. C., via bus.
Summary of Report on Bentonville Battlefield

1. That the Bentonville Battlefield should be included in the National Monuments of the Civil War Period.

2. That the battlefield should not be acquired or treated as a resettlement project. Cultivation of the land was in progress during the battle, and moving farmers off the land would change the character of the area.

3. That it would not be practical or desirable to acquire the entire battlefield (8,000 to 10,000 acres), due to difficulties connected with the purchase, high cost, and burden of maintenance.

4. That the area can be treated in a satisfactory manner by a plan of roadside marking and sample areas including breastworks.

5. That the area, if designated as a National Monument, should include Stevens Farm Yard, a group of farm buildings in the northern part of the battlefield typical of the small southern farmer in ante-bellum days.

6. That the proposed National Monument should include Sherman's Headquarters on the Newton Grove-Goldsboro Highway, the Bridge over Mill Creek near Bentonville over which Johnston's forces had to retreat, and the site of Johnston's surrender at Durham, N.C.
Bentonville Battlefield
Johnston County, N. C.

Proposed National Monument Site

Investigated by Ralston Batters, Junior Historian,
National Park Service.

December 11-13, 1939.

The Battle of Bentonville is the name given to designate a series of engagements between Confederate forces under General Joseph E. Johnston and Federal forces under General W. T. Sherman, March 19, 20, and 21, 1865, which took place near the hamlet of Bentonville, North Carolina. The battle is particularly significant in that it was the last offensive measure of the Army of Tennessee to delay Sherman's advance through the Carolinas toward the Roanoke River. It resulted in heavy losses on both sides and was terminated by the withdrawal of Johnston to Smithfield, N. C., on the night of March 21. On the 11th of April Johnston retreated across the Neuse River, abandoned Raleigh, and continued his retirement toward Greensborough, where on April 13, he applied to Sherman for a cessation of hostilities. Johnston surrendered at Durham, N. C., April 26.

(For a more detailed account of the battle see Appendix No. 1 of this report: "The Battle of Bentonville, N. C., March 19-21, 1865", by E. Steere, Historical Assistant, Historical Division, Branch of Research and Education.)
Location and Accessibility

Bentonville Battlefield is situated in the southeastern part of Johnston County, North Carolina, fifteen miles south of the town of Smithfield, and is three miles east of United States Highway No. 701. The battlefield lies within the upper section of the Coastal Plain and the topography is typical of this region. It is drained by the waters of Mill Creek, a tributary of the Neuse River. It is easily accessible in good weather by way of secondary roads extending eastward from Federal Route No. 701.

For location see "Map of the State Highway System of North Carolina, 1936," and "Railroad Map of North Carolina, 1922," enclosed with this report. See also blueprint of school road map of Johnston County, and small printed map of Johnston County enclosed. See also soil survey map of Johnston County enclosed.

Character of Land in Area

The terrain of the battlefield, which embraces an area of from 8,000 to 10,000 acres, is slightly rolling, and is cut by several swampy draws in the northern section in the vicinity of Mill Creek. About two thirds of the area is densely wooded with second growth pine and hardwoods. Nearly all virgin timber has been culled out, and in one small portion of the area timbering operations are now in progress. About one-third of the battlefield area is open and for the most part under cultivation, the better lands in tobacco, the poorer lands in corn and cotton. It is said by local residents that the area now in cultivation is
slightly greater than was cultivated in the pre-Civil War period.

Condition of People in Area

From observation and from local residents I learned that the effects of the depression have been less felt in Johnston County than in other parts of North Carolina and comparatively few people are here on the relief rolls. While improvements on farms in the Bentonville district are for the most part dilapidated in appearance, they are no worse that are seen throughout the South Atlantic, and the people seem well satisfied, if not prosperous.

Ownership of the Land

In the battlefield area land is held in small parcels by a hundred or more owners, white and Negro. There are only a few tracts that exceed 200 acres in extent. Cultivation is carried on both by farmer-owners, and by tenant farmers.

No property or tax map of Johnston county has yet been made, and to discover ownership of individual tracts in the Bentonville Battlefield area, it will be necessary to have a farm to farm canvass. In my opinion, however, such a project should not be undertaken by a stranger. If the department wishes to secure a list of all property owners in this area, it might employ Mr. C. E. Thornton of Smithfield, a retired furniture dealer, who is a property owner in the
Bentonville district and is well known and respected there.

Probable Purchase Value
of land

E. B. Stone, Jr., State Park Division, National Park Service, estimated the average purchase price of land in the area on July 19, 1935, as $15.00 per acre. (See Mr. Stone's report enclosed) This estimate, in my opinion, is much too low. Judging by the height of tobacco and corn grown in the region, the quality of the land is good. The wooded sections, being largely cut over, should not command a greater price than $15.00 per acre, but the open lands would be much more costly, and there are numerous farm buildings, barns, sheds, etc. Mr. Abell, of Abell and Gray, real estate brokers in Smithfield, N. C., estimated from recent sales in the neighborhood that the average per acre price would be about $30.00.

In numerous instances, judging from conversations with local people, it would be most difficult to get people to sell at any price. The past two years have been good tobacco years, and some of the finest tobacco in the State is said to be grown in the Bentonville district. Some owners have been on the land for generations.

Physical Remains of Battle

Several miles of breastworks and many rifle pits remain as evidence of the battle. These are well preserved
wherever protected by forest cover. Federal breastworks on the first day of battle (March 19, 1865) were hastily constructed largely of logs, and these have disappeared through natural decay and forest fires. Some of the timbers used in construction of breastworks, however, are still intact. In the area are a number of small farm groups, which were built before the Civil War. Two of these were used as military hospitals during and after the battle (see picture section of this report.)

Organisations Interested in the Preservation of the Bentonville Battlefield.

Interested in Bentonville Battlefield and desiring it recognized as a National Military Park area: the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the North Carolina Historical Commission, the State Conservation and Development Commission, the North Carolina Forestry Association, the Governor of North Carolina, Hon. Josiah William Bailey, U. S. Senator from North Carolina, Hon. Harold D. Cooley, U. S. House of Representatives. No local funds, however, are available for development of the project.

Monuments and Markers on Battlefield

The United Daughters of the Confederacy have placed a marker near the center of the battlefield giving a brief account of the battle (see picture section of this report and appendix no. 2.) A monument has also been erected at the Confederate Cemetery by the Goldsboro Rifles, an
organization which took part in the engagement. These are the only markers within the area. The North Carolina Historical Commission will place a metal marker at the intersection of U. S. Highway 701 and one of the secondary roads that lead into the area.

The quarter acre plot on which the memorial marker is located has been deeded to the Historical Commission of North Carolina by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. The plot of one-fourth acre, occupied by the Confederate Cemetery, is held by the Goldsboro' Rifles of Goldsborough, North Carolina.

**Recommendations and Suggestions**

On the premise that the Battle of Bentonville was of sufficient national importance to warrant permanent preservation of the scene by the Federal Government, the following suggestions are offered:

1. That the acquisition of the entire battlefield area is impractical. It would be difficult to obtain the land by purchase from so great a number of property holders, and condemnation proceedings would be unpopular. A large expenditure of money would be required for the purchase of the land and improvements, and burdensome annual appropriations would be necessary for the maintenance of the area.

2. That the purchase of 3,500 acres including all surviving breastworks (as suggested in Mr. Stone's report)
is also impractical and undesirable for the same reasons as stated above. A vast permanent labor force would be required to maintain the several miles of breastworks, for once they are stripped of underbrush and forest cover for exhibition purposes they will deteriorate rapidly.

3. That the purchase of the entire area or any large part of it for use as a recreation-demonstration or resettlement project would completely change the character of the battlefield and would therefore not be desirable.

At the time of the civil war very nearly the same amount of land was cultivated as at present. If the original aspect of the battlefield is to be maintained, the small farmers should not be removed from the area. The Raleigh section of North Carolina is already served by the Crabtree Creek Recreational Demonstration Project in Wake County. This project is only 70 miles from Bentonville. Open land in cultivation at Bentonville is not sub-marginal in character and occupies one-third or more of the whole area. The wooded lands serve as pasture for cattle and hogs. (See photograph showing character of hogs raised in the district.)

4. That a very careful survey of all breastworks, rifle pits, and other earthworks on the battlefield be made, and that a topographical map or relief model of the area be prepared. This will necessitate a careful study of all surviving battle maps.

5. That the area be designated as "Bentonville Battlefield National Monument".
6. That Bentonville Battlefield Monument embraces:

a) An entrance lodge on the old Averasboro-Goldsboro Road constructed in the vicinity of Harper's Farm, (see Bentonville Battle Map enclosed).

b) A skeleton roadside development as indicated on Battle Map enclosed.

c) The Confederate Cemetery.

d) The United Daughters of the Confederacy-North Carolina Historical Commission marker near center of battlefield.

e) The farm house and other buildings on Steven's farm near northern end of battlefield area.

f) The bridge over Mill Creek in the rear of Bentonville.

g) Sherman's Headquarters (Grahm's Store on the Newton Grove-Goldsboro Highway about five miles from the battlefield.

h) Site of Johnston's surrender at Durham, N. C.

Explanation and Elaboration of the Above Plan

a) Entrance Lodge

The logical entrance to the area is from the southwest on the road along which General Slocum's column was advancing toward Goldsboro. Hostilities began in the vicinity of Harper's farm; Harper's farm house was used as a hospital during the battle.

The entrance lodge should have topographical map or relief model illustrating Battle of Bentonville, map showing Sherman's route through Georgia and the Carolinas with explanation of what he was attempting to do, and map illustrating what Johnston expected to accomplish by opposing Sherman at this point. The lodge might also contain a collection of Harper's and Leslie's drawings illustrating the Carolina Campaign. An attendant should be stationed here to explain the battle, supply information, directions, and road maps.
b) Skeleton Roadside Development in Battlefield Area

The most important feature of the battlefield, especially on the first day, was the Averasboro-Goldsboro Road. Over it General Slocomb's column was advancing toward Goldsboro, when they ran into the whole of the Confederate army under Johnston, himself. Johnston's forces were entrenched so as to enfilade the road in the expectation of catching Slocomb's column in a trap and crushing it before reinforcements could be brought up.

Remnants of the lines occupied by the Michigan Engineers (see map) still exist, and portions of the Confederate and Federal lines of breastworks paralleling the Averasboro-Goldsboro Road, which have been protected by forest cover.

On the second day of the battle, March 20, 1865, the right wing of the Federal lines rested on the Averasboro-Goldsboro Road, and a "bastion" formation of the Confederate Line crossed the road at a point occupied today by the U. S. C. memorial marker.

All battlelines, breastworks, etc., should be marked wherever they cross or parallel the road. Roadside map markers should be used liberally.

Beginning at the entrance lodge narrow strips (about 50 to 75 feet in width) should be purchased on both sides of the Averasboro-Goldsboro road eastward to the road turning north beyond the house marked "N. Flowers", in order that modern roadside development might be controlled.

Sample areas containing typical breastworks and rifle pits (2 or 3 across each) on the principal roads leading from the Averasboro-Goldsboro Road to Bentonville should be purchased. (See Battle Map enclosed.)

c) The Confederate Cemetery

This cemetery, one-fourth acre in area, is owned by the Goldsboro Rifles of Goldsboro, N. C., an organization which took part in the battle. The known dead in the cemetery are from many southern states. It is located on the Goldsboro-Averasboro Road a few hundred yards from Harper.
d) **Memorial Marker** placed by the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the North Carolina Historical Commission near the center of the battlefield. This is situated on one-fourth acre of land on the Averasboro-Goldsboro Road, and is owned by the North Carolina Historical Commission.

e) **Stevens' Farm**

The central farm house, barns, sheds, brandy and wine house, well, etc., on John Steven's farm, constitute a group typical of the small southern farmer in ante-bellum days. This farm was used as a military hospital during the battle. About 5 acres of land would take in all farm buildings. It would be possible to purchase this property for a reasonable sum.

f) **Bridge over Mill Creek in rear of Bentonville.**

It was over this bridge after the battle that all Confederate forces had to retreat. A marker would be sufficient.

g) **Sherman's Headquarters at Grantham's Store**

During the battle Sherman maintained headquarters at Grantham's store on the Newton Grove-Goldsboro Road, about five miles from Bentonville Battlefield and about fourteen miles from Goldsboro. I was told that this store still exists. It should be acquired and restored as an ante-bellum southern cross-roads store.

h) **The site of Johnston's surrender at Durham is already marked and cared for by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Here the Civil War was ended. The site, while detached, should be tied in with the Bentonville project.**

Land required for the above project should not exceed 100 acres.

For roadside protection.............approximately 60 acres, (it might be possible to control roadside development by zoning, in which case the acreage would be unnecessary.)

Small areas including examples of breastworks....20 acres,

Steven's Farm Yard...........................5 acres.
Letter from G. E. Thornton, Smithfield, N. C.,
to R. B. Lattimore in reference to the Harper
and Stevens Farms.

THORNTON FURNITURE CO.
Pianos, Smithfield, N. C.
Jan. 4, 1936.

Mr. Ralston Bond Lattimore
National Park Service
Fort Pulaski
Box 918
Savannah, Ga.

Dear Mr. Lattimore:

I am writing in regard to the old Stevens home and the
Harper place, which was the old hospital, on the Benton-
ville battle-ground.

The Stevens place could be bought with a clear title, I
think. The lady that lives in the house has a life time
half interest in it. She said that all the heirs would
be glad to sell their interest in the place and maybe it
could be arranged with the minor heirs. The place, she
said, could be bought cheap. It would be a lot of trouble
to get a title to this place but I think it could be done.

I have seen the man that owns the Harper place; that was
the first place we went while we were down there.
I asked the price of that house and a few acres of land.
The man said he would not sell unless he could sell the
whole track which is about 155 acres. He would not set a
price either.

If you are interested in the Harper place I will look
into it. I am sure you can get a clear title to this
place without any trouble and it covers right much of
the battleground.

If there is anything else I can do for you I will be glad
to do so.

Yours truly,

INSCRIPTION ON THE MARKER
AT THE BATTLEFIELD OF BENJONVILLE

THIS MEMORIAL MARKS THE BATTLEFIELD OF BENJONVILLE WHERE, ON MARCH 19-20, 1865, GENERAL JOSEPH E. JOHNSTON, WITH ABOUT 15,000 CONFEDERATE TROOPS, PRINCIPALLY FROM NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA, GEORGIA, TENNESSEE, ALABAMA, AND MISSISSIPPI, CHECKED THE ADVANCE OF MAJOR-GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN'S ARMY OF UNITED STATES TROOPS UNTIL CONFRONTED WITH OVERWHELMING NUMBERS. CONSPICUOUS IN THIS BATTLE WERE THREE REGIMENTS AND ONE BATTALION OF NORTH CAROLINA JUNIOR RESERVES IN MAJOR-GENERAL ROBERT F. HOKE'S DIVISION.

ERECTED 1927 BY
THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
AND
THE NORTH CAROLINA DIVISION UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY.

Very respectfully yours,

Halston B. Lattimore,
Junior Historian.
Appendix No. 1

THE BATTLE OF BENTONVILLE, N. C.
MARCH 19-20, 1865

By E. Steere
(From Study File)

At daybreak of March 18, 1865, General Joseph E. Johnston, commanding the Confederate Army of Tennessee, received information from Lieutenant General Wade Hampton, his chief of cavalry, that precipitated the Battle of Bentonville. As recorded by General Johnston, this information was to the effect that:

"...The Federal army was marching toward Goldsboro': the right wing, on the direct road from Fayetteville, had crossed Black River; the left wing, on the road from Averasboro' had not reached that stream, and was more than a day's March from the point in its route opposite to the hamlet of Bentonville, where the two roads, according to the map of North Carolina, were ten miles apart....

(1) According to the reports of our cavalry, the Federal right wing was about half a day's march in advance of the left; so that there was probably an interval of a day's march between the heads of the two columns."

With the opportunity thus presented for striking Sherman's dispersed columns, Johnston hurried the concentration of his forces, screened by Hampton's cavalry, at Bentonville.

It was not, however, until the morning of the
19th that Hardee's corps joined the attacking column. Hardee took position on Bragg's right, who launched the thrust with a movement by the left toward Sherman's left wing.

To understand the bearing of Johnston's attempt at Bentonville, it becomes necessary to glance quickly over the strategic program defining the objectives that were sought by the army group under Grant's personal direction—the Army of the Potomac and the Army of the James—and the forces commanded by Sherman—the Army of the Tennessee. Briefly, the forces commanded by Grant were to hammer the Army of Northern Virginia on the anvil of Richmond, while Sherman entered the Rossville Gateway to Georgia and cut a deep gash through the vitals of the Confederacy. In Virginia the strategic program took the form, tactically speaking, of a persistent endeavor to pass the right wing of the Army of Northern Virginia. This movement began at the Wilderness and carried the two armies in a vast semi-circle to the east and south around Richmond to Petersburg, where, after a ten-months' near-stalemate, Sheridan's successful blow at Five Forks crushed Lee's right and hastened the westward race to Appomattox. Sherman's role in
execution of the program involved the greatest

march in modern history, (3) - from Eastern Tenne-

cesse by way of Atlanta to Savannah and from

thence northward through Georgia and the Caroli-

nas to the Roanoke River. Complementing Grant's

relentless hammering in Virginia, was Sherman's

policy of devastation in Georgia and the Carolinas.

Living on the country, he marched in parallel

columns, widely separated. To subsist, as well

as to carry out its work of destruction, the

devouring host must move. Yet its manner of

march courted the danger of shrewd blows from a

small but compact and mobile enemy. Thus Sher-

man was obliged not only to meet but to deci-

sively defeat any threat of opposition to his

continued advance. This demand corresponds, in

a tactical sense, to the need Grant felt for

unremitting effort against Lee's right flank.

An overwhelming preponderance of strength

enabled the Federal armies to support these dif-

ficult exertions. Both Lee and Johnston fore-

saw the impending danger. On the 11th of March,

eight days before the stroke at Bentonville,

Johnston informed Lee: "I will not give battle
to Sherman's united army, unless your situation

may require such a course; but will if I can
find it divided. Of this please advise me."

On the 15th Lee replied: "If you are forced back from Raleigh, and we be deprived of the supplies from East North Carolina, I do not know how this army can be supported. . . . I think you can now understand the condition of affairs and correctly estimate the importance of resisting the farther advance of Sherman."(5)

At Bentonville the conditions of battle desired by Johnston were present. And the demand for action so urgently required by Lee's plight could no longer be postponed. Johnston stuck.

Hoke's division of Bragg's corps led the advance. A spirited opposition brought Hoke to a temporary standstill. Bragg then threw the operation into disorder by diverting Hardee's leading division, McLaw's, from its appointed mission in order to reinforce Hoke.

McLaws arrived "just in time to see the repulse Johnston, op. cit., of the enemy by Hoke."(6)

Hardee, on Bragg's right, continued the advance, gaining about a mile."(7) "We were able," reports Johnston to Lee, "to press all back slowly until . . ." [Page 127] when receiving
fresh troops, apparently he attempted the offensive, which we resisted without difficulty until dark. This morning he is entrenched." (8)

In his memoir Johnston explains his lack of success on the following grounds:

"The impossibility of concentrating the Confederate forces in time to attack the Federal left wing while in column on the march, made complete success also impossible, from the enemy's great numerical superiority. One important object was gained, however, - that of restoring the confidence of our troops, who had either lost it in the defeat at Wilmington, or in those of Tennessee. All were greatly elated by the event." (9)

The confidence thus restored was insufficient to compensate the disparity of numbers on the day following, when Sherman's columns gathered for the counter-attack. Johnston took up his retrograde movement. (10)

Sherman was also gratified over the results of March 19-20. In his general report of operations he writes: "I had expected just such a movement all the way from Fayetteville and was prepared for it....I am well satisfied that the enemy lost heavily, especially during his assault on the Left Wing during the afternoon of the 19th." (11)

On the 21st Sherman pushed forward and one-
tered Goldsboro'. His own opinion of the significance of this achievement carries considerable weight:

"Thus, as I have endeavored to explain, we had completed our march on the 21st, and full possession of Goldsborough, the real objective with its two railroads back to the sea-ports of Wilmington and Beaufort, N. C. I directed General Howard and the cavalry to remain at Bentonville during the 22nd, to bury the dead and remove the wounded, and on the following day all the armies to move to the camps assigned them about Goldsborough, there to rest and receive the clothing and supplies of which they stood in need." (12)

Subsequent events strengthened the soundness of Sherman's opinions, as stated in the foregoing. The Confederate Army of Tennessee never fought another battle. Just ten days after Sherman's occupation of Goldsborough, Sheridan overwhelmed Pickett at Five Forks—a circumstance which compelled Lee's immediate evacuation of Petersburg under fire, on April 1-2. During the night of April 6-7, Lee's marching columns were scattered at Sailor's Creek; Ord's Army of the James, reinforced by Sheridan's cavalry, reached Appomattox, thereby blocking Lee's only remaining avenue of retreat. Lee entertained proposals of surrender the day following Sailor's Creek and actually signed the articles of capitulation on April 9th.
Meantime, in North Carolina, Johnston endeavored to interpose his forces between the Roanoke and Sherman's army. On the 11th of April he retreated rapidly across the Neuse River, abandoned Raleigh, and continued his retirement toward Greensborough. There on April 13th, Johnston asked for a suspension of hostilities, applicable to the remaining Confederate armies in the field, pending negotiations for peace. Addressed to Sherman, the request states:

"The results of the recent campaign in Virginia have changed the relative military condition of the belligerents. I am therefore induced to address you, in this form, the inquiry whether, in order to stop the further effusion of blood and devastation of property, you are willing to make a temporary suspension of active operations, and to communicate to Lieutenant-General Grant, commanding the Armies of the United States, the request that he will take like action in regard to other armies - the object being to permit the civil authorities to enter into the needful arrangements to terminate the existing war."

The decision of Appomattox on April 9th forced Johnston's plea of the 13th. To have offered battle would only have invited another Sailor's Creek, and without the measure of justification that Lee had in
hoping he might still elude Grant and join hands with Johnston.

Bentonville thus acquired the importance of being the last offensive measure of the Army of Tennessee to delay Sherman's advance towards the Roanoke. Similarly Five Forks marks Lee's last offensive - defensive effort to thwart Grant's finally successful endeavor to pass the right wing of the Army of Northern Virginia. In short, Bentonville is one, and first in point of time, of the last two strokes launched by Confederate arms to arrest the deom that convergence of overwhelming force made inevitable.

Submitted by:

Historical Division,
Branch of Research and Education

Sgd. E. Steer
Historical Assistant
Dec. 6, 1934.
Photographs

Bentonville Battlefield

Harper's Farm House, Used as Hospital During Battle

A few of the Farm Buildings at Harper's
Monument Erected by Goldsboro Rifles at Bentonville Cemetery
Confederate Memorial at Bentonville Battlefield

Plaque on the Confederate Memorial
Typical Sand Road in Battlefield Area. The crown only is hard.

Sherman had to corduroy many of the roads in order to move through this section.
Same road as shown in view page 24, looking in opposite direction. Note portion of Federal breastwork in lower right corner.

Close up view of breastwork shown in above photograph.
Typical example of breastworks, which have survived on the battlefield of Bentonville. Note heavy forest cover.

Breastworks at Bentonville protected by forest cover.
Front view of Stevens' Farm House at Northern end of Bentonville Battlefield, used as a military hospital during battle. The group of buildings here forms a fine example of the activities and home life of the small farmer in the South of Ante-Bellum Days.

Rear View of House Shown Above, Well in foreground.
Wine and brandy house and wagon shed at Stevens' Farm in the north portion of Bentonville Battlefield.

Hog killing at Stevens' Farm. These hogs weighed better than 450 pounds each. A farm producing pork like this cannot be classed as sub-marginal.
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CHARLESTON HARBOR, SOUTH CAROLINA

Rogers w. Young

1936
CASTLE PIVCKNEY

SILENT SENTINEL OF CHARLESTON HARBOR

By
Rogers Y. Young

1936
INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This brief study has been made as an attempt to organize the few and widely scattered facts about Castle Pinckney, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, into an intelligible outline of its history. The sources upon which the study is based are of unequal value, but have been the most reliable ones available at this time. It should be noted that we had no access to the early files and records of the Treasury and War Departments, or to the later material of the Department of Commerce, being forced to rely on the printed records of the departments as were locally available, or to use information received by correspondence. However, it is believed that a generally accurate resume of the significance of this fortification is here presented.

Rogers W. Young
Fort Pulaski National Monument
December, 1936.
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Long a witness of the stirring and colorful events which have transpired in Charleston Harbor, the area known as Castle Pinckney National Monument has ever enacted the role of spectator and bystander at such scenes, or, at best, been a passive participant. Sole occupant of little Shute’s Folly in the harbor, the history of the Castle Pinckney area is closely identified with the story of the island, which is readily traceable through portions of three centuries. Since late in the eighteenth century, with the establishment on the island of the first of the two fortifications which were to bear the name of Pinckney, the history of island and of the area has been inseparable.

Opposite the southern extremity of the city of Charleston, in the harbor, lies a small sandy marsh island known since colonial times as Shute’s Folly. Originally little more than a sandbank and shoal at the mouth of the Cooper River, the island is approximately a mile slightly northeast of the East Battery. Around its seaward point swirl the “meeting waters of Rebellion Roads.”

Information on the island’s early history is quite meager. On August 9, 1711, the island was granted to Colonel Alexander Parris, and was then described as containing two hundred and twenty-four acres at low tide. Following its ownership for a number of years by the Parris family, it was sold to Joseph Shute on May 28, 1748, from whom part of its present name was derived. The use of the word “folly” in describing the Carolina sea islands appears to have commenced in colonial times. An old English word, “folly” was originally defined as a “clump of fir trees on a hill,” or “an object in thick woods.” Gradually it was applied to any thicket or densely wooded spot, and the buccaneers who infested the Carolina coast and the coastal inhabitants became accustomed to speak of the Carolina sea islands as “foollies.” Following such a definition, it would appear that Shute’s Folly, despite its sandy and marshy character, was then evergreen with native coastal plants, trees and shrubs.
Following the Revolution, in which Shute's Folly had played a part, little worthy of note, more than a decade was to elapse before the small marsh island assumed its first real importance, with its selection as the site of one of the new fortifications in the seacoast defense system then being developed. Spurred by Washington's warning of December 8, 1793, regarding the dangers of a defenseless Atlantic coast, Congress passed an act, approved March 20, 1794, providing for the early establishment of a system of fortifications, at certain ports and harbors, from Maine to Georgia. Charleston was one of the key harbors to be fortified under this act. To this city, in April, 1794, Secretary of War Henry Knox dispatched P. E. Ferrault, a civilian engineer temporarily attached to the War Department. Ferrault was instructed to select the sites for the new harbor fortifications, acting under the direction of Governor Moultrie, and to plan and supervise the erection of these fortifications in the shortest period practicable. Due to the fact that the comparatively low amount of some $11,000 had been set as the estimated cost of the projected harbor works, Secretary Knox suggested that their construction be of earth and timber.

This small amount, which soon became available for the Charleston works, proved so entirely inadequate that actual erection of the new works was to be postponed nearly three years. Ferrault had arrived in Charleston early in May, 1794, and immediately a disagreement arose with Governor Moultrie over the selection of the fortification sites. However, by mid-June the Engineer notified Secretary Knox that four "places designed to be fortified," including a site at "Shute's folly," had been "appointed" by the Governor; selections with which Ferrault apparently reluctantly concurred. At this time the Engineer also stated that the proposed forts and batteries were to be constructed of timber and earth. Estimates based on hastily prepared plans for these proposed earth and timber works were soon found to exceed the available funds, and none of the new fortifications was attempted during 1794. Due to the poor additional amounts made available for this work at Charleston in the next three years, little further
was done on the four sites during this period.

Repercussions from chaotic existing European conditions, with which the United States involuntarily became involved, suddenly caused aggressive steps to be taken toward the completion of the proposed fortifications at Charleston. Embroiled in a bitter commercial warfare upon the sea, both France and England had for several years prior to 1797 disregarded Washington's neutrality proclamation of 1793, repeatedly committing acts of aggression and spoliation upon American commerce and nationals. The French revolutionists were doubly resentful of the United States due to its failure to give them open support, and on the score that they considered Jay's Treaty of 1794 with England to be discriminatory against France.

At the height of this feeling, Washington recalled the popular American minister to France, James Monroe; sending in his place, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, an eminent South Carolinian, who landed in France early in the fall of 1796. Pinckney, of a distinguished line of Southern aristocrats, and a delegate to the Constitutional Convention from South Carolina, had long been prominent in the public affairs of that state and was held in high regard and esteem in Charleston. The disquieting news that the French Directory had refused to treat with Pinckney soon reached the United States, causing the newly inaugurated Adams to send a commission a commission, of which Pinckney was to be a member and including John Marshall and Elbridge Gerry, to Paris for the purpose of renewing negotiations. From October, 1797, until March, 1798, the commission waited in vain to be received formally by the Directory. Instead, the Americans were visited by mysterious emissaries, who suggested that the United States should pay a rather large sum to members of the French Directory in order that peaceful negotiations with the French Government might be opened. The American commission refused these importunities, and its relation with the secret French agents ended abruptly. For months feeling had been growing in the United States against France, and in the spring of 1798 when Adams laid the report of the commissioners, in which the names of the French agents were replaced by the letters I, Y and Z, before Congress, the intense excitement
produced spread throughout the country, which began preparations for war with France.

Exposed to the French west Indies, and with her harbor defenseless against attacks from that quarter, Charleston for some months past had been increasingly disturbed by the possibility of war with France. So concerned were the citizens of Charleston over the implications of the French effort to Pinckney that they could no longer wait for the federal government to commence the new harbor works, the construction of which it had so long delayed.

Late in 1797 a "meeting was held in St. Michael's Church and funds were subscribed for fortifications." This was an interesting revelation of caring for a city which only a few years previously had overwhelmed the French emissary Genet with warm and sympathetic hospitality upon his landing at Charleston. Together with the small appropriation allotted from Washington that year, these funds were applied immediately and during 1798, toward the strengthening and erection of several batteries in the harbor.

The most important of the works then erected was placed on the southeast tip of Shute's Folly, and named Fort of Castle Pinckney, in honor of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, the American storm center of the unhappy "K. M. Affair." Referred to in government records as "Fort Pinckney," this structure was apparently a small earth and timber battery constructed on a foundation of wooden piling. Hurriedly erected in the emergency confronting Charleston, Fort Pinckney was built in pallisaded style, and in none too stable a manner, its foundation being especially weak.

Erected on the privately owned land of the Shute family, and in such a temporary manner, Fort Pinckney was destined for a brief existence. During the years immediately following 1799 but very little money was expended on the Charleston fortifications and nothing further was done to strengthen and enlarge Fort Pinckney. After 1800 there is no record of funds being expended at Fort Pinckney, or of a military garrison occupying this post. It was quite fortunate...
that no garrison occupied Fort Pinckney early in September, 1804. During the early morning of September 3, a violent gale struck the coasts of South Carolina and Georgia, continuing its fury until the next day. Fort Pinckney was undermined, many of its foundation timbers giving way, and, as later stated in a government report, the whole work was left "almost in ruins."

Failure of the State of South Carolina to acquire, designate and cede the site of Fort Pinckney to the United States, as required by the fortification act approved March 20, 1794, coupled with the delays of the War Department, postponed for several years the rebuilding of the fortification on Shutes Folly.

On December 19, 1805, however, the State of South Carolina, by legislative act, conveyed to the United States full title to "an area of about 360 acres," which was "situated on Shute's Folly Island" at the site of Fort Pinckney. Secretary of War Henry Dearborn reported in February, 1806, that should the session of the Fort Pinckney site, together with the others in Charleston Harbor, meet the approval of Congress, improvements on the fortifications ought, without delay, to be commenced." Nothing further was done that year, however, toward the rebuilding of Fort Pinckney. Not until April, 1807, were the first steps made to this end. Lieutenant Colonel Williams then reported that it was not practicable to rebuild the old work, as it "could not be effectually repaired without taking it down to the foundation, and saving off the remnants of the hands of piles at low water mark." In August, 1807, the site of Fort Pinckney was designated by South Carolina as an area in Charleston Harbor requiring fortification, and as having previously been ceded to the United States for such a purpose. The government engineer and the South Carolina commissioners were mainly occupied during the fall reaching a satisfactory agreement over the final designation of the Charleston fortification sites, including that of Fort Pinckney.

By December 8, 1807, Secretary of War Dearborn, in a report concerning the proposed Charleston fortifications, stated that in the "few months past --- all necessary measures of preparation have been pursued for commencing and completing
the contemplated works, on the most permanent and durable principles." Still another year was to elapse, however, before actual work was underway on the Fort Minkney site. Late in 1808 the construction of a new brick fort was begun on this site, and on January 8, 1809, Secretary Dearborn reported that a "new fort of mason work on the site of old Fort Minkney is commenced, and in a rapid state of progress."

Once underway, construction operations on the new work progressed throughout the year 1809 "with all possible despatch," Major Alexander Beemey, then one of the most efficient officers in the United States Corps of Engineers, and later Chief Engineer, had direct supervision over the new work on Bute's Folly, as well as over the construction then underway at Forts Moultrie, 23 Mechanics and Johnston, in the same harbor. Temporarily, the new work was given the designation of the old, being called "Fort Minkney." In reporting the progress of the construction on the site, Secretary of War Austin, on December 19, 1809, listed the work as "Fort Minkney, an enclosed work of masonry for two tiers of guns, nearly completed."

A diagram, "Plan of Castle Minkney in the harbor of Charleston, . . . 1810," as copied from the War Department files for the compilation, Charleston, S.C. The Centennial of Incorporation, 1670, 1874, gives an interesting view of the condition of the work in that year. Apparently the word "Castle" had by that time been substituted for "Fort" in the name of the fortification. The diagram shows the floor plan and front elevation of a semi-circular brick structure, with eight gun casemates, a powder magazine, and a "powder room for filling cartridges," in the semi-circular front. The rear of the structure was enclosed by a straight wall or "throat" containing four soldiers' rooms and four officers' quarters; this wall being broken midway by the sole entrance or sally port. The structure is shown fully completed with the exception of the parapet wall of the barbette platform.

By the next year, 1811, the construction of the parapet wall apparently
had long been completed, and Secretary Bulist reported on December 10 of that year, that Castle Pinckney was "considered the most important fortification in the harbor of Charleston." His report described the completed work as "an elliptical form, built of brick; has two tiers of guns, and has thirty mounted. There is also in the castle a good magazine, which will contain two hundred barrels of powder, and quarters for two hundred men and officers."

Another source states that the thirty guns were then mounted "eight in casemates and the remainder on barbette."

Playing no part in the slight coastal operations of the War of 1812, Castle Pinckney continued a routine existence for many years following its completion. During this period, only in the years 1818-1819 does it appear actually to have been Garrisoned; then sharing with Fort Moultrie "small guard of artillery, 1st. and 2d battalions," under Lieutenant Washington. From the time of its completion, until 1829, no further construction work was carried on at Castle Pinckney "except to make minor repairs and to protect the foundations by depositing around it a quantity of large stones." By 1826 the War Department was already looking upon Castle Pinckney as a fortification of merely secondary importance in the defense of Charleston Harbor. On March 24, 1826, the Board of Engineers on the Defense of the Seaboard, in its revolutionary report on the projects for a proposed new system of coast defenses, informed the Secretary of War that:

"Castle Pinckney, which stands upon a small island a little below the city, should be maintained as an auxiliary in the defense of the harbor, and be serving as a sort of citadel in case of internal commotion." 30

Further reports of the War Department, in 1826, listed Castle Pinckney merely as an "existing work --- which it is advisable to preserve and retain as accessories to the proposed system of defense." It was not then to be "modified by the new system" or "to give place to new works."

Castle Pinckney was considered of enough importance, nevertheless, to maintain in a state of repair, and soon afterwards a program of general
repair work was begun there. Late in 1828, Lieutenant Henry Breverton, United States Corps of Engineers, arrived in Charleston to supervise the fortification construction in that harbor. After examining Castle Pinckney, he recommended in April, 1829, "the construction of a seawall, to strengthen the foundation" of the work. Later in 1829, he was instructed by the engineer department to place Castle Pinckney "in a state of thorough repair" due to the fact that it then entered "into the system of defences projected for Charleston Harbor." Repairs costing "about ten thousand dollars," and work on the seawall continued until late in 1831, when the engineer department reported that Castle Pinckney near the city of Charleston, has been thoroughly repaired and is ready to receive "garrison."

The readjustment of Castle Pinckney had been completed nearly a year, when the structure approached eligibility to actual use at the height of the 1832-1834 nullification movement in South Carolina. The rising agitation of the South Carolina nullifiers, after the opening of the year 1832, perhaps had a direct relation to the garrisoning of Castle Pinckney, in January of that year, by a detachment of the Second United States Artillery, under the command of Captain Thomas C. Legate. Influenced by the passage of the Adams Tariff in the spring of 1832, which the South Carolina nullifiers considered discriminatory against the South's cotton trade, the South Carolina nullifiers met in convention on November 19, passing a "Nullification Ordinance declaring the federal tariff act of 1828 to be null and void." This called upon by the convention, the South Carolina Legislature authorized the raising of a volunteer military force and the purchase of arms, to resist federal enforcement of the act. Conditions in South Carolina had been under the shrewd observation of President Jackson for many months, but even in the face of the dangerous state of affairs there, he was determined to preserve the Union, and to meet force with force, if necessary.

Prior to the meeting of the Nullification Convention, the United
States Army had already taken measures to prevent the seizure, by the South Carolina nullifiers, of Castle Pinckney, and the other fortifications in Charleston Harbor. Acting under the direction of President Jackson, Major-General Alexander Macomb, as early as October 29, 1832, issued an order warning Major J. P. Felker, in command at Charleston, that he would be "held responsible for the defence, to the last extremity" of the Charleston fortifications, including Castle Pinckney. This grave duty was to be exercised in the event, of which there then existed a possibility, that an attempt would be made by the South Carolina militia "to surprise, seize, and occupy" these posts. By mid-November, preparations to complete the armament of Castle Pinckney were underway and carriages for its barbette guns were rushed to Charleston. Armament operations were continued during the next year, 1833, and a "heavy battery — of twenty four pounders" was mounted at Castle Pinckney. During this year, Captain A. Allason, Corps of Engineers, erected a temporary palisade to protect the gorge of rear wall of the work. By November 23, 1833, Castle Pinckney had "been such improved as regards its "ability for defence."

Before the crisis of the nullification agitation had subsided in 1833-1834, Castle Pinckney had been designated by the Federal government to serve other functions than merely that of the defence of the Union. Along with Fort Moultrie, Castle Pinckney was to have been utilized as a storehouse for the valuable United States property in Charleston, should the army have been forced to retire from the city. Lieutenant Colonel James Fenkhead, commanding a detachment of the Third United States Artillery, by January, 1833, had replaced Captain Lawson, at Castle Pinckney. On January 25, 1833, he was instructed by General Macomb to be prepared, should it become necessary to receive, either at Castle Pinckney or Fort Moultrie, the collector and other customs officers, with their equipment and office files, in order that a customshouse could be maintained at Charleston under the protection of the
United States. However, Castle Pinckney apparently was not forced to serve either as a storehouse or customshouse in this crisis, which soon afterwards stated. A slight increase in the military and naval forces of the United States at Charleston, the appearance of the famed General Winfield Scott, ostensibly on an inspection tour, together with the passage of Clay's Compromise Tariff, had chastened the rabid nullifiers and removed their immediate cause for complaint. Castle Pinckney thus passed unscathed through its first near military encounter.

During the several years immediately following the nullification crisis, Castle Pinckney was maintained as a regularly garrisoned and fortified post. By the end of 1833, Lieutenant Colonel Bankhead had been replaced at Castle Pinckney by Major William Gates, commanding one company of the First United States Artillery. Major Gates continued as commander of the work until the middle of the year 1835. Under his command, at the end of the year 1834, the armament of Castle Pinckney consisted of six pieces: two, 3 1/2 inch brass howitzers; one, 8 inch brass mortar; two, 24 pounder iron howitzers; and one, 10 inch seamanet iron mortar. A post hospital was maintained at Castle Pinckney during this period, and the Surgeon General, Joseph Lovell, reported on December 26, 1835, that it then afforded "sufficient accommodations for the sick," and was "in good order," with the exception of certain "trifling repairs" needed. Soon after the middle of the year 1835, Major Gates was replaced in command of Castle Pinckney by Brigadier-General A. Kautis when the latter assumed command of the entire United States force at Charleston. By the beginning of the year 1836, General Kautis had placed Captain Giles Mortier in command of the one company of the First United States Artillery then garrisoning Castle Pinckney.

The withdrawal of the garrison from Castle Pinckney, early in 1836, marks the beginning of twenty-five years of inactivity for this work, an uneventful period that was not to be terminated until the opening days of
the war between the states. The outbreak of the second Seminole Indian war, on December 18, 1835, necessitated the transfer of Captain Porter and his command to the scene of that conflict, during January and February, 1836.

Castle Pinckney apparently was not reoccupied by the United States Government prior to its occupancy by South Carolina state troops in December, 1860.

That the War Department considered Castle Pinckney to be of only secondary importance in the defense of Charleston Harbor became increasingly clear during this period. Following the year 1836, no major construction was undertaken at the work apparently. Reports made during the years 1836-1838 on its status as a fortification, show Castle Pinckney as a completed work which was to mount twenty-one guns, and to contain a peace-time garrison of fifty men, or one hundred and five during war. However, its armament was then far from complete, and it contained no garrison. A report of Secretary of War Lewis Cass, dated April 7, 1856, in listing the coast defenses of the country, did not mention Castle Pinckney as forming a definite part of the defenses of Charleston Harbor. The site of Castle Pinckney was resurveyed in 1846, and it was "resurveyed to the United States by an act of the state legislature passed December 18, 1846." One of the main services rendered Charleston Harbor from the site of Castle Pinckney was begun as early as 1855. On August 3, 1854, Congress appropriated "one thousand five hundred dollars" to establish "a small light on Castle Pinckney, to mark the channel from the bar to the city and up the Cooper River." Early in the following year a light with "5th order Fresnel Lens" was installed "on some part of the fortifications." It was "described in the early light lists as a yellow tower with the light 50 feet above the level of the sea." Continuously since 1855, with the exception perhaps of several years during the war between the states, the Castle Pinckney light has been a well known aid to harbor navigation at Charleston.

Long inactive, by the year 1860, Castle Pinckney was to pass through important the most period of its history during the ensuing five years. Under fire for th
first and only time, during the war between the States, it was only in this period that the work saw actual service as a fortification. General repairs were made at Castle Pinckney in 1858 to preserve the structure, but it was not then placed in condition for war service. As reported to Washington in November, 1860, the work had long been ungarrisoned, and had served for many years, under the supervision of an army ordnance sergeant, merely as the powder storehouse of the city arsenal.

November and December, 1860 were crucial months for Castle Pinckney. With the secession of South Carolina obviously imminent, the United States began to take measures to protect and hold the fortifications in Charleston Harbor. Reporting on the condition of Castle Pinckney, the Assistant Adjutant-General, on November 11, 1860, noted that while "its armament is complete," it was ungarrisoned and required repairs to the quarters and magazine. He also stated that "while a small force under an officer would secure it against surprise," he "would not recommend its occupation." Increasing threat in Charleston soon convinced Major Robert Anderson, commanding there United States troops there, that Castle Pinckney should be prepared for immediate occupation. On November 23, he reported that "Castle Pinckney perfectly commanding the city of Charleston," required a few repairs, and strongly recommended its immediate occupation by a garrison, or at least, by a repair party "if the Government determines to keep command of this harbor." He then believed it apparent that South Carolina would "leave the Union and seize the harbor fortifications, observing that "Castle Pinckney, being so near the city, and with no one but an ordnance sergeant, they [the South Carolinians] regard as already in their possession." Three days later the War Department authorized Captain J. G. Foster, Corps of Engineers, at Charleston, to send a working party under an Engineer Officer to make the necessary repairs at Castle Pinckney. On December 3, Lieutenant J. W. Davis and twenty laborers were placed in the work, ten additional laborers arriving.
next day. Lieutenant R. K. Pendle relieved Lieutenant Davis on December 11, and continued repair operations until South Carolina took possession of the work on December 27, 1860.

South Carolina formally seceded from the Union on December 20, 1860, and within a week, Major Anderson's fears as to South Carolina's intentions regarding Castle Pinckney, were justified. On December 26, Major Anderson abandoned Fort Moultrie and occupied Fort Sumter. South Carolina then acted swiftly to prevent further occupation of Charleston fortifications by United States forces. About the mid-afternoon of the next day, December 27

--- a detachment of the first regiment rifles, South Carolina Militia, consisting of the Washington Light Infantry, Captain C. B. Lantos, the Carolina Light Infantry, Captain B. J. Pinckney, and the Weapons Guard, Captain A. McCrady, Jr., under the command of Colonel J. J. Pettigrew and Major Ellis, Capers, proceeded --- to railroad accommodation there, where the battalion embarked on the steamer King; landing at Castle Pinckney, the command scaled the walls with ladders and took possession of the fort, which was occupied at the time by a working party under Lieutenant Pendle, United States Army." 63

Lieutenant Pendle made no resistance, and he and the workmen were allowed to leave for Fort Sumter later in the afternoon.

Castle Pinckney was in excellent condition at the time of its seizure. Its armament, which was "all mounted, except two or three guns on the parapet tier, and one 42-pounder in the casemate tier," included:

"fourteen, 24-pounders, four, 42-pounders, four, 6-inch seacoast howitzers, one 12-inch and one 8-inch mortar, and four light artillery planes for flank defense," a total of twenty-eight pieces. The gun "carriages were in good order, and pretty good," while the "magazine was well furnished with implements and also contained some powder." However, with the exception of Major Robert Anderson, Castle Pinckney was not then regarded in military circles as an important fortification. Since the work was located only a mile from Charleston, Major Anderson regarded it as "perfectly commanding the city," and, in his opinion, "it was essentially important that this castle be immediately occupied" in order to hold Charleston. Colonel, later General W. A. Gillmore, United
States Corps of Engineers, who conducted the Federal sieges of Fort Pulaski and the Charleston forts, then considered Castle Pinckney to be "an old-fashioned work" of such small importance that even "its armament was not heavy at the opening of the war." Captain, later Major John Johnson, a Confederate engineer officer on the staff of General C. F. Beauregard, presented the viewpoint of the South Carolinians in 1861, regarding their prize, when he later stated that Castle Pinckney was then a complete little casemated work of that period, but on so small a scale and so near the city as to be of little value in the defense of the harbor."

While tension increased at Charleston, early in 1861, the South Carolinians were engaged busily in reorganizing their defenses of the harbor, including certain changes in the armament of Castle Pinckney. Colonel J. J. Petigrew, who had commanded the South Carolina troops which occupied Castle Pinckney on December 27, 1860, remained in charge of the fortification until January, 1861, when he was succeeded by a Captain Baker of the First South Carolina Regiment of Infantry. During January Castle Pinckney remained practically "as it was when taken," except that sand bags were placed around the parapet apparently for the purpose of protecting the heads of the South Carolina "sharpshooters." By January 31, it had been reported to the federal officers at Fort Sumter "that some of the guns have been taken from the castle to arm the South Carolina batteries on Morris Island and other places." Actually, it was not until March that seven guns, with carriages, two seacoast howitzers, and five twenty-four pounders, were really seen being removed from Castle Pinckney. With the beginning of April, 1861, the uncertainty in Charleston over the possible outcome of Major Anderson's continued occupation of Fort Sumter soon precipitated a crisis. This ended abruptly when General Beauregard's batteries opened on Fort Sumter at 4:30 o'clock on the morning of April 12. Fort Sumter's guns replied in turn, mainly
at the South Carolina batteries on Morris, James and Sullivan Islands, no shots being fired apparently at Castle Pinckney or the city, early in the afternoon of April 13, Major Anderson surrendered, and agreed to evacuate Fort Sumter on the next day. South Carolina has struck the first blow for the South. Castle Pinckney had commenced its role of an incidental participant in the only war to which it ever was to be directly exposed.

The events of the war passed lightly over Charleston and Castle Pinckney during the remainder of the year 1861. Captain Baker was succeeded as commandant of Castle Pinckney, in the spring, by Captain Joseph A. Yates, with a detachment of the first South Carolina regiment of artillery. Captain R. E. Ferley, of the same command, appears to have succeeded Captain Yates for a brief period in the early summer. By mid-summer a detachment of the Mason Cadets, from a local militia company in Charleston, under the command of Captain C. E. Chichester, had become the permanent garrison at Castle Pinckney. Their first important detail was the guarding of federal prisoners taken by the Confederates during the rout at First Manassas or Bull Run on July 21, 1861. The young soldiers continued this uneventful duty during the several months that Castle Pinckney was relegated temporarily to the status of a military prison. Late in the year, the ordnance remaining at Castle Pinckney was overhauled, remounted and generally prepared for service. Federal blockading operations at Charleston during December, 1861, and January, 1862, included the sinking of some vessels in the main ship channels at the entrance to the Harbor—the main war operations at Charleston during this time, these actions in no way involved Castle Pinckney.

Throughout the year 1862 the defenses of Charleston Harbor were being reorganized and strengthened, and careful plans formulated by the Confederates to withstand the long impending federal attack upon this strategic port. As these operations and plans developed, however, it became readily apparent that Castle Pinckney could be assigned but a secondary part in any scheme of major defense designed to protect the harbor. The first half of the year found
affairs very quiet at Castle Pinckney. Captain Chichester's command of Zouave Cadets were relieved in March, 1862, by a detachment from the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery, under Major Ormsby Blanding. By September the armament of Castle Pinckney had been considerably reduced. Late in that month, the work mounted only ten guns, three 24 pounders in the casemates, and a barbette battery consisting of six 24 pounders and one 24 pounder rifled cannon.

During September and October, 1862, prior to the adoption by the Confederates of a detailed defense plan for Charleston Harbor, they detailed General C. T. Beauregard to make a final and conclusive inspection of the fortifications of this valuable port. That he regarded Castle Pinckney to be of little value as a fortification, is obvious from his report of September 24, in which he emphatically states

"I did not visit Castle Pinckney, the armament of which is nine 24-pounders and one 24-pounder rifled, as I am acquainted already with this work, and considered it nearly worthless, capable of exerting but little influence on the defenses of Charleston."

General Beauregard reiterated this stand regarding the military effectiveness of Castle Pinckney on October 5, and next day, when an official Confederate report was issued, describing the defense plan and the defenses of Charleston Harbor, Castle Pinckney was not even included. About this time, Major Ormsby Blanding was relieved by Captain J. M. Ferrar, who assumed command of the one company of the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery then garrisoning Castle Pinckney. Late in December, 1862, when the Confederate defense plan for Charleston Harbor had finally been formulated and was issued, Castle Pinckney was definitely assigned a function in the second and third lines of defense, and in no way was to be concerned with the major defense measures of the first line of fortification.

The first major Federal attacks upon the defenses of Charleston Harbor began in 1863, continuing throughout the year. Detailed official reports, from both Confederate and Federal commanders, fail to show Castle Pinckney actively engaged in the bloody assaults of that year, which the Federals concentrated
mainly upon the outer or first line of defense. By March 13, 1863, Captain Farraroneau had been succeeded by Captain H. C. Farley as commandant of Castle Pinckney. The garrison of the work then consisted of Company H, First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery. "Castle Pinckney is reported to have been considered too small and too near the city to be counted upon for anything more than a part of second line defense." Beginning with the abortive Federal naval attack upon Fort Sumter and Poultrie, April 9, 1863, Castle Pinckney was to be indirectly exposed to successive Federal assaults during most of the year. As in this April engagement, the Federal descent on Morris Island, their assault on Fort Wagner and opening bombardment of Fort Sumter, during July and August, 1863, were actions comparatively remote from Castle Pinckney, which barely received incidental mention in the official Confederate and Federal reports of these operations. During the fall and early winter of 1863, similar attacks were continued by the Federals upon Morris Island and Forts Poultrie and Sumter, with which actions Castle Pinckney had little relation. However, at the end of the year 1863, the work still retained the status of a defensive harbor post. At the height of the Federal attacks upon Charleston Harbor's outer line of defense in 1863, Captain Farley had been relieved from the command of Castle Pinckney by Captain J. C. King. Captain King continued in command of the one company of the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery garrisoning Castle Pinckney, until that force evacuated the work in the face of the Federal advance in February, 1865.

With Fort Sumter badly shattered and other works in the Confederate first line of defense weakened or captured, the early months of 1864 found the Confederates industriously strengthening their second line of defense. By spring the character of Castle Pinckney as a fortification had considerably changed. On April 6, Colonel S. W. Davis, Federal Commanding on Morris Island, reported the Confederates to be occupied in "strengthening Castle Pinckney," stating that

"A great amount of work has been done at Castle Pinckney in the
past month, but it is not yet possible to tell the object of it. There has been a large amount of sand and turf carried inside the fort, and from present appearances they have commenced a wall of sand and turf within the present wall of the fort."90

Soon the Confederates had placed

"... an embankment of earth against the escarp wall of the main front, thus closing the casemate embrasures and converting it [Castle Pinckney] into a barbette battery, with emplacements [emplacements] for four guns—three 10-inch columbiads and one Brooks rifle on centre pintle carriage."91

Castle Pinckney's new barbette battery was not completed in 1864, and... 92

actual service in the Federal siege operations at Charleston during that year.

The desperate but futile strengthening of Castle Pinckney continued during the Confederacy's last tragic months in early 1865. During January, 1865, heavy working parties were engaged in banking, sodding grass, and apparently in making slight changes in the positions of the guns. By the end of the month, Castle Pinckney, "from the outside," presented "all the appearance of an earthwork," and "its casemates were disarmed, its front wall covered with an exterior wall of sand, well sodded, and its ramparts furnished with merlons and traverses."

The remodeling of Castle Pinckney was completed too late for it to be of any value to the desperate Confederate force in Charleston Harbor. Practically surrounded by an overwhelming Federal force, and with Sherman already ravaging the state, the Confederates were forced to evacuate the harbor and city of Charleston during the night and early morning of February 17 and 18, 1865.

Leaving his garrison flag proudly aloft, Captain J. H. King, in command of the one company of the First South Carolina Regiment of Artillery at Castle Pinckney, had removed his garrison under cover of darkness, along with the other Confederate forces in the harbor. By the middle of the morning, on February 16, Lieutenant Colonel J. C. Bennett, commanding the Twenty-first United States Colored Troops, had taken possession of Fort Moultrie, and he then

"... pushed for the city, stopping at Fort Moultrie and Castle Pinckney, from which works rebel flags were hauled down and the American flag substituted. The guns in these works were in good order..."
The only war it ever actually experienced was at an end for Castle Pinckney, a war, incidentally in which it barely fired a shot. Due to its location in the inner harbor, and the smallness of its armament and garrison, Castle Pinckney had been forced to occupy a position of secondary importance throughout the war. The position and importance of Castle Pinckney in the war is well characterized by Thomas Pettign Lescoue, the historian of Charleston County, who states in his recent Landmarks of Charleston, that in the "War for Southern Independence, it [Castle Pinckney] lacked opportunity to contribute materially to the defence of Charleston."

The period between 1865 and 1876 was very eventful for Castle Pinckney. Apparently having passed under the control of the Engineer Department, United States Army, immediately following the termination of hostilities in April, 1865, the fortification had been placed under the direct supervision of Major E. A. Gillmore, Corps of Engineers. Late in the fall of 1869, the Chief Engineer reported that

"The works for the defense of Charleston, South Carolina [including Castle Pinckney] remain very much as they have for several years past. Nothing beyond some clearing away of the rubbish has been undertaken."

In 1870 Major Gillmore recommended that Castle Pinckney be maintained in its existing condition, with moderate repairs, and that guns of medium caliber be mounted on the wooden platforms already erected. Later he recommended the mounting of 10 inch smooth bore or rifled cannon on barbette at this work, but between 1870 and 1877 no operations were undertaken as no funds were available.

Another novel period of usefulness opened for Castle Pinckney and its reservation in 1878, while then still looked upon, by Lieutenant Colonel Gillmore, as "one of the interior works in the system of defense" of Charleston Harbor, to all intents Castle Pinckney had been abandoned for such a purpose since the close of the war. Meanwhile, the Light House Board of the Treasury Department, was seeking a convenient site in Charleston Harbor upon which to
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establish a light station and depot of supplies. On April 11, 1876, the Secretary of the Treasury wrote the Secretary of War requesting "that Castle Pinckney be transferred to the control of the Light House Board for use as a depot." His letter was referred to Lieutenant Colonel Gillmore, who immediately approved the plan, and on April 30, Brigadier-General J. A. Humphreys, Chief of engineers, reported to the Secretary of War, that

"It is recommended that authority be granted to the Light House Board to use Castle Pinckney, Charleston Harbor, as a depot for buoys and other material, and to construct wharves and temporary buildings in the vicinity in such positions as may be approved by the officer of engineers in charge of the work- It being agreed that the premises shall be vacated when required by the War Department."

The Secretary of War approved this recommendation on April 24, 1876, and on the same day notified the Secretary of the Treasury that favorable action had been taken upon the latter's request. Copies of this official correspondence were forwarded to Colonel Gillmore for his "information and guidance" on May 1.

Soon afterwards apparently, the Light House Board began the establishment of its depot at Castle Pinckney. However, two years elapsed before the Chief of Engineers officially recognized this transfer of the reservation. His annual report for 1880, in commenting on the existing conditions at Castle Pinckney, stated that

"This work, situated on Shute's Ferry Island, about one mile east of the city of Charleston, is one of the interior works in the system of defense of the harbor -- In its present condition it is useless for defensive purposes, and is now in charge of the Light House Board for lighthouse purposes."

While the Corps of Engineers naturally expended no money on operations at Castle Pinckney between 1876-1884, the Light House Board appears to have been quite busy with construction at the reservation during this period. During 1880 a new harbor light was established on the Castle Pinckney reservation. This light was placed at the end of the wharf on pierhead on the south side of the island. By the early summer of 1886, it was reported to the Corps of Engineers that the "frame buildings near the fort, one large store house and the
"light keepers dwelling," previously completed and "belonging to the Light House Dept.," were in "excellent condition," presenting a "trim appearance." A wharf, also belonging to the Light House Board, was then "in very good condition" 107 with "16 ft. at the head at m. l. w."

The fortification structure and the rest of the reservation, however, presented a neglected and abandoned appearance at this time. Lieutenant Thomas N. Bailey, of the district United States Engineer Office at Charleston, inspected Castle Pinckney on June 8, 1884, and two days later reported to Colonel Q. A. Gillmore that

"The fort is in a dilapidated condition; the walls have settled and cracked; there are no slopes, except accidental ones; the gun carriages have rotted away and only parts of the guns are exposed by the rubbish in which they are buried. The roofs of the magazines have fallen in. That part of the fort which was the barracks is a dangerous wreck, gradually falling to pieces. A frame building, North of the Fort, believed to be Engineer Property, is unserviceable, not worth repairs, and repairs are not needed as it answers well as a wood yard and potato cellar for the Light-House Attendant.

"A coat of limewash on the outside walls of the fort, might destroy its tone as an interesting ruin but would place it more in keeping with the trim appearance of the Light House Buildings." 109

That the War Department had long since ceased to regard Castle Pinckney as an effective fortification worthy of maintenance is evident from Lieutenant Bailey's report and his solicitude toward the preservation of the crumbling structure's "tone as an interesting ruin."

The status of Castle Pinckney remained unchanged throughout the movement begun by the Federal Government in 1865 to reorganize and rebuild the vast coast defense system of the United States. In 1885 the President was authorized by Congress to appoint a Board on Fortifications and other Defenses which was to make a survey of the coast defenses and to recommend improvements. This board, generally known as the Endicott Board, published its report in 1886, and pursuant to its findings, the Chief of Engineers on March 23, 1887 instructed the Board of Engineers to undertake the study and preparation of new defense pro-
jects for the principal ports of the country, including Charleston. Meanwhile, Colonel G. A. Gillmore, who had continued to exercise general supervision over Castle Pinckney, died, and early in 1888 was succeeded in this duty by Captain Frederic V. Abbot, Corps of Engineers. By 1894 the Board of Engineers had prepared a project for the erection of three batteries on Sullivan's Island at Charleston, but the fortification of the rest of the harbor, including the Castle Pinckney reservation was ignored. Two years later, however, work was commenced on the erection of a modern battery at Fort Sumter. It was during this period of the early 1890s that the crumbling walls of Castle Pinckney were reported to have been razed to provide sufficient space for the supply depot and light station of the Light House Board. While the Engineer Department commented upon the "bad condition" of Castle Pinckney, during this time, its official reports contain no record of the actual razing of the structure's walls.

The Spanish-American War, which created intense excitement along the South Atlantic coast in 1898, produced no changes at Castle Pinckney. Under the Act for National Defense of March 9, 1896, special batteries were erected at Charleston, but none was placed in Castle Pinckney. During the summer of 1898 Charleston Harbor was mined near Castle Pinckney, but early in the next year the mines were removed, having never been of use.

Castle Pinckney since 1900 has had a rather prosaic history. In 1911 the Castle Pinckney pierhead light, which had been established in 1880, was rebuilt. The reservation continued as a supply depot for the Lighthouse Service until January 8, 1917, when it "was abandoned" for this purpose, and "the keys of the various buildings turned over to the U. S. District Engineer Officer, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.," at Charleston, S. C. Upon being returned to the War Department on this date, "Castle Pinckney was placed in charge of the Engineer Department, under the custody of the District Engineer at Charleston," and since that time "has been used continuously as a supply depot.
by the Engineer Department."

Since 1924, Castle Pinckney, in addition to functioning mainly as a warehouse for the Engineer Department, has occupied the more dignified status of a national monument. Under the authority of "Section 2 of the act of Congress approved June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225)," President Calvin Coolidge on October 15, 1934, by proclamation declared as a national monument:

"Castle Pinckney, Charleston Harbor, S. C. - The entire reservation comprising three and one-half acres situated on Shutes Folly Island at the mouth of the Cooper River opposite the southern extremity of the city of Charleston and about one mile distant therefrom." 120

Only that small portion of Shutes's Folly actually in the Castle Pinckney reservation, at the higher southern point, thus became a national monument, 121 the rest of the island remaining in private ownership.

When established Castle Pinckney National Monument was under the control of the War Department, which continued to supervise the area for several years. However, soon after the beginning of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, it was determined to consolidate under one bureau the functions of several departments having supervision over various national historic areas. Late in the summer of 1935, pursuant to Executive Order No. 6184, June 10, 1933, issued under "the authority of Section 16 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (Public No. 428-47 Stat. 1317)," and Executive Order No. 6205, July 25, 1933, Castle Pinckney National Monument, along with various other historic areas, was transferred from the War Department and placed under the supervision of the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior. Although still serving as a warehouse and supply depot for the Engineer Department, the Castle Pinckney National Monument is now under the control of the National Park Service, and since December 13, 1955, has been under the general supervision of Herbert E. Kahler, Superintendent of Fort Marion and Fort Matanzas National Monuments, St. Augustine, Florida.
The Castle Pinckney pierhead light was again rebuilt in 1935, and is now an unwatched, four second red flashing light on a white wooden skeleton tower, twenty-six feet above high water. This light at Castle Pinckney serves not only to mark the end of the wharf at that point but is also a guide for vessels using the Folly Island Channel when passing between Charleston and the Intracoastal Waterway entrance just north of Sullivan's Island. Near Castle Pinckney for a number of years has been located the Castle Pinckney Lighted Buoy, a ten second red flashing gas light, placed in twenty-two feet of water in the Folly Island Channel. Castle Pinckney is perhaps best known in Charleston Harbor today, not for the significance of its history, but for the service rendered by these two lights.

The light in which Castle Pinckney and its significance is regarded today, even in Charleston, is perhaps best obtained from the observations of two recent local writers upon this subject. It was with regret that Katherine Drayton Simons, in 1930, found Castle Pinckney, along with the other great forts that once defended Charleston Harbor, to be in such a forlorn and forgotten condition, as only to be "counted among the... lights and buoys which serve to guide the ships of every nation through her [Charleston's] Channel to her docks." However, she observed that Castle Pinckney was more fortunate than the other historic forts, since it had at least been made a national monument. Thomas Petigra Lesesne, author of the History of Charleston County, and well known local historians, writes frankly comments in his Landmarks of Charleston, 1885, that

"Really there is more legend than history about Castle Pinckney, but long it has been a well-known landmark--An excuse for including it among Landmarks of Charleston is that many strangers promenading on the High Battery wish to know what Castle Pinckney is."
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"Cornwallis's Headquarters"

Referred to locally as "the Wilmington house", the
"Cornwallis House", the "Old Wright House", and the
Mary Rowe Wiggins property, this house stands on the
southwest corner of Third and Market Streets (No. 224
Market Street) in the City of Wilmington, N. C.

Court House Records

Lack of time prevented an examination of court
house records in Wilmington, but I was told by Miss
Mabel Webber, librarian, that the greater part of the
earlier records of Wilmington had been removed to
Raleigh.

History

Built prior to 1771, this house was the residence
of John Burgwin, who went to England just before the
outbreak of the Revolution not to return. After the
Revolution the house was occupied by Judge Joshua
Wright and family until after the Civil War (Judge Wright
received title by deed, April 10, 1799,) when it became
the property of Wm. H. McRary, and after his death the
property of his widow, and upon her decease the home
and property of Miss Rowe Wiggins, the sister of Mrs.
McRary, until Miss Wiggins death in the early fall of 1930.

Before leaving Winnsboro, Cornwallis ordered Lieutenant-
Colonel Hallowell at Charleston to send a competent force by
water to seize Wilmington and to establish a base of supplies
there. In consequence of which Major James H. Craig took
possession of Wilmington, Jan. 28, 1781. His force consisted
of eighteen vessels, carrying a full supply of provisions,
munitions, and 400 regular troops, artillery and dragoons.
At that time Wilmington contained but 200 houses and a
population of 1,000 people. The whole Cape Fear region was
defenseless. Tradition, which was well established as early
as 1754, claims that Major Craig selected and occupied the
Burgwin residence as headquarters. After the Battle of
Guilford Court House, Cornwallis withdrew to Wilmington,
arriving there April 7, 1781, and remained there eighteen days
for the purpose of reorganizing his shattered forces. On April 25, 1731, Cornwallis began his march toward Virginia. During the eighteen days that he remained in Wilmington, it is said that he occupied the Burgwin residence as headquarters. (I could find actual proof of this. The printed state and colonial records of North Carolina are silent on the subject. Various data was said to be in possession of Mrs. John B. Bellamy, Jr., but she was not in Wilmington and the data was not available to me.) Major Craig, left in command at Wilmington after the departure of Cornwallis, remained in the Burgwin house until toward the middle of November when he left Wilmington by sea with his forces.

Description of House

The Burgwin house, built on the down slope of a hill, is a two story frame structure, with cellar and attic, in a style of architecture, locally known, as Carolina Colonial. The best feature of its exterior is a very fine paladian door on the front facing Market street. The side lights and fan light were removed at a relatively late period and replaced with ornamental chased glass. (The original fan light can be found in the east room of the attic.)

An addition seems to have been built on the rear on the Third Street side of the house (interior finish much more simple), and a part of the back verandas (upper and lower) has been enclosed.

On the first floor, there is a stair hall of good proportions; the stair makes a double turn with a landing to the second floor; handrail and ballusters were carved mahogany of simple design, cornice in tact. Two rooms to east, small and not well proportioned, contain original cornices and simple mantels of wood. Drawing room to west of entrance contains very beautiful cornice, again of simple design—original mantel removed and replaced by white marble mantel (mid 19th century). This room is of excellent proportions. The hall and rooms on second floor duplicate the first floor plan. However, the west bedroom located over the drawing room, has the most elaborate finish of any room in the house. The present entrance seems to be through what was at one time a closet, the old entrance having been blocked up with some kind of wall board. Cornice, paneling, mantel, and doors of this room are intact. An original door knob and lock in this room would lead one to suspect that all hardware was at one time brass. The two or three small rooms on the second floor located in the newer part of the house are of no particular interest. Two storage rooms are located in the attic and several rooms in the cellar; in the latter are very simple wood mantels. Tradition claims that there are dungeons under the cellar, used at one time as a military prison. There is a deep bricked pit
at the front end of the cellar, but the construction of this feature appears to have been a necessary part of the foundations due to the slope of the land. It is also said that a large brick sewer leads from St. James church under the Burgwin residence to the river.

To the rear of the house is an old garden on the edge of which is contained the brick kitchens, now occupied by a negro caretaker, Matilda Oscar, and to the west of the garden is a brick stable building (probably dating from mid-19th century) and a one story frame structure containing three small rooms, said to have been slave quarters.

The brick and stone foundation under the kitchen building is massive and the details of its construction are of interest.

State of Preservation

Roof, tin in bad repair, a number of leaks being visible in the upper rooms and in the attic. The floors in nearly all of the rooms have sagged, which would lead one to suspect that the house has settled to a great extent, the woodwork and floors of the cellar rooms are in an advanced state of decay and would necessitate rebuilding. A large hot air furnace in an unfinished part of the cellar also appeared to be in a state of decay. The kitchen building and the slave quarters are also in a state of decay. Estimating roughly, I would expect that it would require from $10,000 to $15,000 to restore the property.

At the present time the property is owned by the heirs of Miss Rowe Wiggans (see will attached).

Trustees for the Estate of Miss Rowe Wiggans

The Safety Deposit and Trust Company Arm of Baltimore, Maryland, are trustees and executors for the above estate. The Wilmington Savings and Trust Company, Wilmington, N. C., Richard Rogers, Trust Officer, are trustees for the property located in Wilmington. They represent the estate and not the heirs. They have the right to sell the property, but the sale must be approved according to the terms of the will of Miss Wiggans.

Asking Price

The nephews of Miss Wiggans, who have power under the will to approve or disapprove a sale of the property by the Wilmington Savings and Trust Company, have indicated that they wish a total of $72,000 for the property located at Third and Market Streets. This property, in its entirety, consists of a plot of land, 146 feet on Market Street, 198 feet on Third Street, two small
one story brick stores on Market Street, the old residence on the corner of Market and Third, and the outbuildings mentioned above.

**Tax Assessments (City and County—no State)**


- **Land** ....... $25,740
- **Buildings** ....... 9,000
- **Total** ....... $34,740

Rates... City $1.50 per hundred
        County  .65 "  "

Insurance carried on the buildings amounts to approx. $8,000

**Value of property**

The Standard Oil Company has a filling station on the northwest corner of Market and Third—the northeast corner is occupied by an obsolete apartment house, and the southeast corner by St. James' Episcopal church.

An oil company, according to Richard Rogers, Trust Officer, has offered $25,000 for the corner site occupied by the Burgwin house. This amount was offered for a plot of land, 100x100 ft. Obviously this offer is more than the property is worth. The two one story stores on Market Street located on the Miggins Estate property bring in a gross revenue of not more than $25.00 per month each. The main business district is several blocks away, and no tendency of business to move eastward on residential Market street can be noted at present. The offer of the oil company was turned down by Miss Miggins nephews—one of whom wished $35,000, and the other $47,500. The Oil Company might be willing to pay $30,000. An offer made by the Colonial Dames several years ago, $20,000 for 65 ft. on Market street, the entire frontage on Third Street, and an "L" shaped piece of land in the rear including the stable and slave quarters, was also turned down.

**Cooperation by Colonial Dames of North Carolina.**

The North Carolina Society of Colonial Dames is most anxious to save the Burgwin house. If they are made custodians of the property and allowed to maintain headquarters in the building, they will attempt to raise from $12,500 to $15,000, which would be about their limit at the present time. The City of Wilmington might contribute a small additional sum, according to J. F. L. Wade, City Commissioner of Public Works. But to purchase the property and restore it would require a minimum outlay of approximately $50,000.
Other Historic Residences in Wilmington, N. C.

Bellamy Mansion

A great frame house on the northeast corner of Market and Fifth Streets, four stories including a brick basement, constructed 1857-1859 by the late Dr. John D. Bellamy, planter and merchant. The residences is said to have been built out of one year’s profits from the sale of tar, pitch, and turpentine.

This house is in good repair, and is complete even to its furnishings (mid-Victorian) and is an excellent example of the town house of a plantation owner.

It is now occupied as a residence by Miss Ellen D. Bellamy, 84 years of age, and will not be sold during her lifetime.

Masonic Hall

Small brick building on Front and Orange streets, between Front and Second Streets. Constructed 1803 and used as a Masonic hall until circa 1843, when it was sold to Thomas W. Brown as a residence.
Diary of Ralston Lattimore


11:15 P. M., Nov. 26. Arrived Wilmington, N. C.

9 A. M., Nov. 27. Took snapshots of "Cornwallis House" and neighborhood, and "Bellamy Mansion".

10 A. M. Nov. 27. Interview with Mrs. J. Walter Williamson, president, North Carolina Society, Colonial Dames, and Mrs. W. N. Harriss, Recording Secretary. Also interviewed John D. Bellamy.

11:30 A. M. to 12 Noon. Walked through old part of Wilmington with Mrs. Harriss.

12 Noon to 12:30 P. M., Nov. 27. Interview with Richard Rogers, trust officer, Wilmington Savings and Trust Co., which is trustee for the Cornwallis property.

12:30 to 1 P. M., Nov. 27. Interviewed City Commissioner of Public Works and secured marked map of Wilmington.

1 P. M. to 1:15 P. M. Secured city and county tax assessments and rate from auditor's office.

1:15 P. M. to 1:30 P. M. Made arrangements to secure photographs.

1:30 P. M. to 2 P. M. Interviewed Lewis W. Moore, Chamber of Commerce in regard to photographs.

2 P. M. to 2:30 P. M. Lunch.

2:30 P. M. to 3 P. M. Looking over collection of books in Historical room, Wilmington, Public Library.

3 P. M. Second interview with Mr. Rogers.

4 P. M. Second interview with Mrs. Williamson and tour of Bellamy mansion.

6 P. M. to 7 P. M. Dinner.

7 P. M. to 9 P. M. Taking notes in Wilmington Public Library.

11 A. M., November 28. Inspected "Cornwallis Headquarters".

12:30 P.M. to 1 P. M. Secured blue print of Wiggins property, and photographs.

1 P. M. to 1:30 P. M. Dinner.

1:30 P. M. to 5:30 P. M. Arranging report.

6:40 P. M. Left Wilmington, N. C., for Washington, D. C., via Atlantic Coast Line.

Historical Notes on Cornwallis's Headquarters in Wilmington, N. C.


Vol. II., p. 407.

"Before leaving Winnsborough, Cornwallis despatched an order to Lt. Col. Balfour, who commanded at Charleston, to send a competent force by water to take Wilmington."


"Craig held undisturbed possession of Wilmington until the arrival of Cornwallis, on the seventh of April, after his battle with Greene at Guilford. He remained in Wilmington with his shattered army, eighteen days, to recruit, and to determine upon his future course. His residence was on the corner of Market and Third Streets; now, (1852) the dwelling of Doctor T. H. Wright. (Illustrated by a small drawing of house). Apprised of Greene's march toward Camden, and hoping to draw him away from Rawdon, there encamped, Cornwallis marched into Virginia, and joined forces with Arnold and Phillips at Petersburg."


Pp. 61-67. Tell of movements of Craig and Cornwallis at Wilmington. On page 62 is the statement that Cornwallis occupied the Burgwin house as his headquarters.


Pp. 83-89. Relates incidents connected with occupation of Wilmington by Major Craig and Cornwallis, but does not mention headquarters.


Contains nothing of value.

Printed State and Colonial Archives of North Carolina contain no reference to the Burgwin house or Cornwallis's headquarters in Wilmington.


*Records collected and compiled from true and authentic data by John D. Bellamy, Jr., for his wife Mary Wright Giles.*

---


*Any errors in this article.*
BELLAMY MANSION; FIFTH AND MARKET STREETS,

WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA

(Sketch furnished by Mrs. J. Walter Williamson, President, North Carolina Society, Colonial Dames)

Was built by Dr. John D. Bellamy, then the wealthiest real estate and slave owner in the Wilmington section. Its construction began in 1857 and was finished in 1859 at a cost in excess of fifty thousand dollars. The design of the residence was made by the daughter of Dr. Bellamy, who was educated in Columbia, South Carolina, and who patterned the building after the old Colonial mansions of South Carolina. The architect was Mr. James F. Post, of Wilmington, N. C., who was the chief architect of that period. It is a fact that the labor in the construction of the building was done chiefly by negroes; in fact, nearly all the principal ante-bellum carpenters, masons, plasterers and interior finishers were negroes. Even the delicate and ornamental cornice work of plaster of Paris in the rooms was done by negro mechanics. The negroes Howes, Artises, Prices, Sadgwars, and Kelloggs were all employed in the work. The residence was occupied by the family just a year prior to the breaking out of the Civil War in 1861. Many of the bills for the columns, gas fixtures, grates and other costly furnishings were unpaid when war was declared, and the Confederate government sequestered the debts due by Dr. Bellamy to the northerners and forced them to be paid to the Confederate government, and after the Civil War terminated disastrously to the Confederate government Dr. Bellamy had to pay the debts over again to the northern creditors.

When Fort Fisher was bombarded and captured and Wilmington was evacuated, the Federal troops came into Wilmington and seized this residence for headquarters for the officers, and it was occupied by Generals Porter and Schofield successively, and finally by General Joseph R. Hawley, in command of the Wilmington district. The family have retained many of the painted signs that the officers tacked on the doors of the parlors and rooms of the home—general headquarters, orderlies' offices, private secretary's offices, etc.

It was when the residence was in the possession of General Hawley, in 1865, that Salmon P. Chase, who was Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court and who at the time aspired to become President of the United States, in opposition to the radical element of the North in congress who held that the Confederate states had gone out of the Union and should only be allowed to return under the most humiliating terms, took the position and declared that the Confederate states were never out of the Union, having unsuccessfully endeavored to go out, and that they were in the Union and
should be allowed to send members to Congress as usual to Washington. Judge Chase spoke from the piazza on Market Street to a crowd estimated to be about five thousand people. There were two military bands of music, which attracted the audience, composed chiefly of negroes, who were attracted by the music.

This building, as the other real estate of Dr. Bellamy, was seized by the Government, and was only restored to the Bellamy family after the Civil War, in 1866, when President Andrew Johnson extended a pardon to Dr. Bellamy on condition that he would make a bill of sale for his slaves to the Government and take an oath that he would never again own a slave or employ slave labor. This oath and pardon is now in the possession of the United States Government in the office of the Secretary of State in Washington, and the writer has seen the original bill of sale and the oath that Dr. Bellamy was required to take, which is now on file in Washington. Upon the restoration of this property to Dr. Bellamy in 1866 there was a condition annexed that he should not claim compensation for the use and occupation of the property by the Federal Government while in their possession.

(The above sketch was written by John Douglass Bellamy.)
List of Enclosures


1. Historical notes on Cornwallis's Headquarters at Wilmington, N. C., 2 pages.

2. Sketch (typewritten copy) of Bellamy Mansion by John D. Bellamy, two pages.

3. Fortieth Annual Report of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of North Carolina, 1934. (Containing sketch by John D. Bellamy on the "Old Wright House" also known as "Cornwallis's Headquarters"). One copy.


7. Blueprint—Showing plot of property owned by Estate of Rowe Wilson, at Third and Market Streets, Wilmington, N. C., on which is located the "Cornwallis House".

8. Leaflet published by Wilmington Chamber of Commerce listing points of historic interest, many of which have been marked by tablets. Contains small picture of "Cornwallis House" on cover. One copy.

9. Colored postcard showing St. James Episcopal Church, on corner of Third and Market, in Wilmington, opposite "Cornwallis House".


11. Panoramic photographs showing Cornwallis House, Bellamy House, Masonic Hall (1803), town residence of Mr. James Sprunt, which was the home of the first elected governor of North Carolina, and country house of Mr. James Sprunt, which was the plantation home of "King Moore".
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George the Second, King of England, on June 9, 1732 granted a charter to a Board of Trustees empowering them to establish a new colony in America, to be known as Georgia. The area of the new colony was to include all the land lying between the Savannah and the Altamaha rivers, and lines drawn from their headwaters to the South Seas, including all islands not more than twenty leagues from the eastern coast of said colony. Two important navigable streams were thus fixed as the northern and southern boundaries of the colony; the Savannah on the north, and the Altamaha on the south. The most active of the Trustees was James Edward Oglethorpe, who late in the same year sailed from England with the first group of colonists.

Arriving in Charleston early in January, 1733, Oglethorpe was befriended by William Bull, an important South Carolinian. On January 15, accompanied by Bull, Oglethorpe and his colonists departed for Beaufort, where the colonists remained for a few days while their leader pushed on to the Savannah to select a suitable site upon which to found their colony. After ascending the Savannah river for about eighteen miles, Bull and Oglethorpe located a suitable site on a high bluff, on the southern side of the river, which was then occupied by an encampment of Yamasaw Indians. Oglethorpe immediately returned to Beaufort and led his colonists to the site, which the whole group reached on February 12, 1733.

The northern part of the new colony occupied Oglethorpe's attention during the first year. Savannah and smaller communities were laid out, treaties were concluded with the Indians, and Fort
Argyle was erected to the southwestward of Savannah, on the Great Ogeechee river, to command the main passes by which the Indians had so recently invaded Carolina, and to afford the new settlers some sense of security against anticipated invasions by the Spaniards.

The southern frontier could not long be neglected, however. This whole southern region was a danger spot. As early as 1721, the Carolinians had erected Fort King George in the marsh, near the mouth of the Altamaha, in an attempt to forestall possible invasions from the French and Spanish to the southward. The Carolinians had claimed that their territory extended as far south as the Altamaha, despite Spanish protests, and had attempted to fortify this southern boundary; but Fort King George was abandoned in 1727, due mainly to the prohibitive cost of maintaining it. The way was thus left open for constant friction between the English and the Spanish, for clashes and for threatened invasions. The coming of Oglethorpe and his colonists six years later, promised the establishment of a strong, buffer state along this troublesome boundary.

The new colony had not long been established before Oglethorpe realized that it was going to have a military function as equally important as its philanthropic and experimental objectives. From the very fact that the colony lay south of St. Helena Sound, wholly within territory claimed by Spain, made it to an obvious degree a buffer against the Spaniards in Florida. Early in January, 1734, Oglethorpe left Savannah to explore the coast, and to select such settlement and fortification sites which appeared necessary for the protection
of the southern part of the colony. Looking for strategic points, he first selected a spot for settlement near the mouth of the Altamaha. Then, "forgetful of where his dominions stopped," he went on south of the Altamaha, crossed to St. Simon Island, and reconnoitered the future site of Frederica, on the western side of the island. He also explored the next island to the south, which he named Jekyll. This expedition convinced Oglethorpe that it was urgently necessary, for the proper defense of the colony, to build at an early date a military station and settlement near the mouth of the Altamaha river and a strong fort on St. Simon Island, as an outpost.

Oglethorpe sailed for England from Charleston, in May, 1734, to enlist further aid for his colony, and support for his plan to fortify the southern frontier against the Spanish. He was well received in England, Parliament voted additional funds, and many new people left for the new colony during that year. Meanwhile the southern frontier was assuming more importance, and consequently a military flavor was given to much of this activity on behalf of the new colony encouraged by the reports from Georgia, a strong group of Scotch Highlanders, with their wives and children, set forth for the new colony late in 1735. Arriving in Savannah in January, 1736, they proceeded southward to found a new settlement on the southern frontier. After "ascending the Altamaha river to a point about sixteen miles above St. Simon's Island," they landed and established a permanent settlement, which they called New Inverness. The settlement became known as Darien, and a village by that name still exists on the site today. Upon this site the Highlanders "erected a fort, mounting

1. This is used interchangeably today with St. Simon's Island.
four pieces of cannon,—built a guardhouse, a store, and a chapel, and constructed huts,—for living quarters; thus carrying out a portion of Oglethorpe's plan for the settlement and fortification of the southern part of the colony.

Near the end of 1735 Oglethorpe also set forth from England, with further settlers for the southern frontier of Georgia. His expedition, of two hundred and two persons, was conveyed in two vessels, which were also loaded with cannon, munitions of war, provisions and tools, and which sailed under convoy of a man-of-war. It was not until February 5, 1736, that the expedition reached the mouth of the Savannah river. Oglethorpe had hoped to locate all of the new emigrants at St. Simon Island, but he finally had to allow the Salsburgers and Moravians to settle with their friends in other parts of the colony, and it was even with difficulty that he was able to persuade the remaining people to go to the southward. Meanwhile, the captains of the two vessels had refused to take their ships into the uncharted Jekyll Sound. To secure, for this emergency, the use of the light draft sloop Midnight, which had recently arrived in the colony, Oglethorpe purchased its cargo, directing that it be delivered at St. Simon Island. In the sloop he placed the two reluctant captains, so that they might gain a knowledge of the waterways, and two of the leaders of the emigrants, a "Mr. Horton and Mr. Tanner, with thirty single men of the Colony, and cannon, arms, ammunition, and entrenching tools." Workmen were also engaged in Savannah to follow and assist this group. The sloop sailed on the morning of February 16, and late in the same day Oglethorpe set
out in the scout boat to meet the sloop at Dyer's Sound." Early in
the morning, two days later, Oglethorpe and his few companions in
the scout boat, reached St. Simon Island to find the sloop awaiting
them. The colonization of the military town of Frederica had begun.

No time was lost, even on that first day, February 18, in
immediately setting about establishing the settlement on the new site. Oglethorpe quickly set the whole group to work. The tall grass
growing on the bluff at Frederica was burned off, and a booth was
marked out "to hold the stores" by digging the ground three feet
depth, and throwing up the earth on each side by way of bank, and a
roof raised upon crutches with a ridge-pole and rafters, nailing
small poles across, and thatching the whole with palmetto-leaves." Several other booths, each between thirty and forty feet long, and
about twenty feet wide, were erected in a similar manner "without
digging under ground," in order to provide temporary homes for the
families of the colonists on their arrival. Oglethorpe lost little
time in beginning his fort. Early on the next morning, February 19,

"Mr. Oglethorpe began to mark out a fort with four
bastions, and taught the men how to dig the ditch, and
raise and turf the rampart. This day and the following
day were spent in finishing the house, tracing out the
fort."  

On February 23, another small boat "with workmen, provisions, and
ammon, for the new settlement" arrived from Savannah. In such
manner was commenced Frederica, so named in honor of George the
Second's eldest son, Frederick, Prince of Wales.

The arrival of the main body of colonists at Frederica was
delayed until March 8. By February 26, the two captains had returned
to Tybee roads at the mouth of the Savannah river, but they still refused to pilot their vessels to St. Simon Island. Though Oglethorpe was much incensed at this action, he was compelled to send part of the cargo by a small vessel, and to make arrangements to transport the colonists in a number of small boats. His fleet of small boats, containing the colonists, finally set out from Tybee roads on March 2, and after an unrelenting row through the inland waterways, Frederica was reached six days later.

Work on the new town and fort then proceeded rapidly. By March 23, "a battery of cannon, commanding the river, had been mounted, and the fort was almost finished." The fort's ditches or moat had been partially dug, though "not to the required depth or width, and a rampart raised and covered with sod." The cellar and first story of the projected three story, sixty foot storehouse was completed. All necessary streets had been laid out, crossing each other at right angles, and along them each family had erected a palmetto shelter, each about twenty by fourteen feet. The town contained no squares, "but there was an esplanade." Oglethorpe had divided the colonists into working parties to prevent duplication of effort and lost time. Some gathered building materials, while others put them up. The whole group of colonists were instructed in methods of agriculture by men already accustomed to farming in the region. About the last of March the colonists were gratified to learn that Captain Hugh Mashay, post commander of the Darien Highlanders, with the assistance of Massers, Augustine and Tolme, and certain Indian aid, "had surveyed and located a road, practicable
for horses, between Savannah and Carion."

The location of the new military town was excellent, both from a military and healthful standpoint. The site was on a dry and sandy bluff, rising some ten feet above high water mark, about a central point on the western side of St. Simon Island, and over-looking an inland waterway leading into the Altamaha. The settlement faced the west, at a bend called the Devil's Elbow, on a small river then known as a southern arm of the Altamaha, but now called the Frederica river. The town was located in the midst of an Indian field containing between thirty and forty acres; the level expanse extending about a mile into the interior of the island. The fort fully commanded the reaches in the river both above and below the settlement. The harbor was good, with a depth of twenty-two feet of water over the bar, and capable of containing a number of large ships. In the background of the town was a large forest of oaks, pines, and other native trees. The soil was fertile, and the climate moderate. Frederica was the most healthful of all the coast settlements in the new colony. On the eastern outskirts of this settlement, Ogilthorpe erected a simple cottage, the only home he ever had in Georgia.

With Frederica safely commenced, Ogilthorpe began to consider plans for the erection of outposts still further south, as a part of the southern defenses of the colony of Georgia. In March, 1736, he landed on the northern point of Cumberland Island, just below Jekyll, and there selected a site for a fort, which he named Fort St. Andrews, and commissioned a group of Highlanders from
Parian to build immediately. Continuing southward, he passed the mouth of the St. Marys river, and came to a large island below Cumberland, which he named Amelia. Tomo-Chi-Chi, Chief of the Yamasees, and Oglethorpe's trusted friend, then conducted him to a small island known as San Juan, near the mouth of the St. John's river. Here the old chief "pointed out the advanced post occupied by the Spanish Guard and indicated the dividing line "where" his Majesty's Dominions and the Spaniards join." Oglethorpe realised the value of fortifying this whole chain of islands, especially San Juan,

"for by so doing he could block the inner passage to Georgia and force the Spaniards out into the open sea, if they should attempt to attack Georgia."

Accordingly, three more forts, in addition to Fort St. Andrews, were immediately commenced, to protect the coast and southern frontier. By the early part of 1737, Fort St. Simon had been built at the southern point of St. Simons Island, some nine miles below Frederica, to aid in the protection of that place. Fort William had also been erected at the southern end of Cumberland Island, and at the very edge of the Spanish defences, had risen Fort St. George, on San Juan Island.

Work on the fortifications and public buildings at Frederica had continued energetically while Oglethorpe was on his expedition to the St. John's in March, 1736, since it was too late to plant a crop that year, most of the men had been "put upon pay and set to work upon the fortifications and public buildings." When Oglethorpe returned to Frederica, on March 26, he found the colonists busily

---

1. This island was soon after named St. George by the English, and is known as such today.
Blueprint of tracing of map on page 33 of T. Marton Coulter's A Short History of Georgia, 1933, after map in R. P. Brooks, History of Georgia, 1913.
engaged on the fort, the outer walls of which were being
"palisaded with cedar posts to prevent our Enemies turning up
the green sod." On the two bastions of the fort, platforms of
two inch plank had been laid to support the cannon. Below the
main fort, a piece of marsh had been

"converted into a water battery, called 'the Spur,'
the guns of which, being on a level with the water,—were
admirably located for direct and effective operation against
all vessels either ascending or descending the river."

Within the fort a well had been dug which supplied an abundance of
"tolerable good water."

The Spanish had not taken lightly Ogilthorpe's bold
activities south of the Savannah. Not only did they lodge strong
protests in England, but were said to have sent spies into the new
colony to observe and report every move. As early as May, 1736, the
colonists at Frederica were momentarily expecting an attack from
the Spaniards at St. Augustine. They kept an unrelenting watch on
the coast and inlets, and were constantly prepared to repel an in-
vansion if it should come. Already the soldiers had begun "making
brick and saving wood for building," in preparation for construct-
ing more permanent quarters. A powder magazine, made of heavy tim-
bers covered with several feet of earth, was hastily constructed
"under one of the bastions of the fort." Work was also continued on
"a large store-house, a smith's forge, a wheelwright's shop, and a
corn-house." Each day Captain McIntosh, leader of the Darien High-
lancers, trained the able bodied men in military drill. About this
time another fortified point was established on the coast, when
Lieutenant Delegal, commanding the King's Independent Company,
arrived to aid Oglethorpe, who located the new force on the eastern side of St. Simon Island. The state of alarm continued until early in the summer. It was then decided to continue at Frederica negotiations for a temporary settlement of disputes, which had been initiated earlier in the year at St. Augustine, by three English commissioners.

Oglethorpe decided to take advantage of this opportunity, to leave a profound impression with the Spanish commissioners of the English strength along the southern coast. Every available man was pressed into service to garrison the forts along the coast, "and as the Spaniards passed every available gun was fired" in salute. Upon their arrival at Frederica the Spaniards were greeted by a group of Indians, allies of the English, "apparently so enraged that they could not be restrained by Oglethorpe," but burst in with bitter reproaches for the cruelty of the Spanish. The treaty of Frederica, concluded at the end of this conference, provided

"that neither nation should occupy the mouth of the St. Johns and that all boundary disputes should be left to the home governments."

The elation of the English at this turn of events was short-lived, however. The Spanish King soon repudiated such an apparent surrender of his claims, and early in the fall sent a new official, Don Antonio Arroyo, to Frederica to inform the English

"that instead of the Spaniards receding to the St. Johns, Oglethorpe and his debtors must get out of all Georgia, for Spain owned the country as far as St. Helena Sound, beyond Savannah."

Such was the situation in November, 1736, when Oglethorpe embarked on his second trip to England, this time to ask that Parliament take
over the defense of Georgia and give him a regiment."

The Trustees of the colony and Parliament were now thoroughly alarmed, and took immediate measures to defend the colony. Soon after Oglethorpe's arrival early in 1737, a company of regulars from the Gibraltar garrison was sent to Georgia. Subsequently, in June, 1737, Oglethorpe was made a general, and "commander-in-chief of all His Majesty's forces in South Carolina and Georgia." Funds were voted, and by the fall of 1738 Oglethorpe had returned to the colony with the regiment he had been allowed to raise. The arrival of this military expedition, consisting of six hundred soldiers, some with wives and children, was accepted by the Spanish as a certain sign of Oglethorpe's warlike intentions.

Work had continued on the defenses of Frederica during Oglethorpe's absence in England. The settlement at Frederica was under the supervision of Captain Horton during this period. From his headquarters at Frederica, he made frequent inspections of the outposts on the southern frontier, of which he was also in charge. Upon the arrival of the first detachment of regulars in June, 1738, many of the soldiers were assigned to assist in the construction work which was still continuing at Frederica. Together with the carpenters, they were

"continuously occupied in building clap-board huts, carrying lumber and bricks, unloading vessels— in clearing the parade, burning wood and rubbish, making lime, and in other out-door exercises—"

The military town of Frederica was destined to become the English base of operations in the inevitable clash between the English and the Spanish on the southern frontier of Georgia. During the
year following Oglethorpe's return, with the aid of Mary Musgrave, his half-breed interpreter, he cemented his friendship with the Creek warriors. This was none too soon, as England declared war on Spain in October, 1739, and soon afterwards hostilities began along the southern coast. Although this struggle was not precipitated by the Georgia boundary dispute, it is entirely possible that its colonial aspect might have been. However, the events which led up to the declaration of the War of Jenkins' Ear in 1739, were more far reaching, being bound up with the struggle between England and Spain for sea-power and world trade. English violation of the "Asiento," or trading privilege with the Spanish colonies in America, granted by Spain in the Treaty of Utrecht, and the consequent Spanish reprisals on British shipping, had culminated in the removal of the ears of a smuggling Englishman, one Thomas Jenkins, and had provoked the declaration of war. The southern frontier of Georgia became the "principal land arena" for the struggle.

Meanwhile, in the face of the events which had all pointed to an impending struggle between the English and the Spanish, Oglethorpe had been forced to advance his own funds to furnish fortify the new town of Frederica. The finances of the Trustees were in a very bad condition, and late in 1739, we find him writing them that

"I am fortifying the town of Frederica & I hope that I shall be repaid the Expenses from whom I do not know, yet I could not think of leaving a number of good houses and Merch'ts Goods and, which was more valuable, the Lives of Men, Women and Children in an open Town at the mercy of every Party, and the Inhabitants obliged either to fly to a Fort and leave their Effects, or suffer with them."
About the close of 1739 he sent Captain Norton to London with a letter informing the Trustees of the condition and needs of his colony. In the letter he conveyed the information that for the better protection of the town, he had resolved to enclose it with fortifications. At the same time he gave the following interesting description of the proposed fortifications:

"It is [to be] half an Hexagon with two Bastions, and two half Bastions and Towers, after Monsieur Vauban's method, upon the point of each Bastion. The Walls are of earth faced with Timber, 10 foot High in the lowest place, and in the highest 15, and the Timbers from eight inches to twelve inches thick. There is a wet Ditch 10 foot wide, and so laid out that if we had an allowance for it, I can by widening the Ditch double the thickness of the Wall and make a severed way. I hope in three months it will be and entirely finished—-

Late in 1739 the first clashes of the war occurred. Following the Spanish attack on the Highlanders' outpost on Amelia Island, in November, Oglethorpe hurried from Frederica to the mouth of the St. Johns. Proceeding up the river, he attacked the two Spanish forts, Picola and St. Francis, located on its banks about forty miles directly west of St. Augustine. His capture of both forts on January 1, 1740, was rather disastrous to the Spanish, as their land connections with the Spanish settlement at Pensacola, in western Florida, were thus severed.

Late in the spring of 1740 Oglethorpe was ready to attack the Spanish stronghold at St. Augustine. Having swept the Spanish from the St. Johns, and learning that the ships at St. Augustine, had left for Havana to secure much needed supplies, Oglethorpe felt that the time was most opportune to give the Spanish a severe trouncing.
With a reluctant promise of some six hundred men from the jealous South Carolinians, Oglethorpe assembled a force of about "200 regulars and provincial troops and 1,100 Indians with which to invade Florida." Early in May, the whole force met at the rendezvous, near the mouth of the St. Johns, and then divided to march southward, "the South Carolinians and the Highlanders marching across country and Oglethorpe taking his forces by water. Oglethorpe's plans to surprise the city by a combined land and sea attack immediately failed, however. Although the land forces successfully pushed their way to Fort Mosea, at the edge of the city, the joint attack was frustrated when the shallowness of the harbor's bar, and the presence of unexpected Spanish ships prevented the English ships from directly attacking the town and Fort San Marcos. Oglethorpe now tried to institute a siege, with the idea of starving the Spanish garrison and town into submission, but again his plans went awry. A Spanish flotilla from Havana was allowed to slip in to the aid of the besieged city, and Oglethorpe's land forces at Fort Mosea were forced to abandon that position in a disastrous surprise raid by the Spanish. With the Carolinians in retreat on the mainland, Oglethorpe was forced to abandon the siege. By July 19, he had retreated to the St. Johns. The whole campaign, which had been so ill-organized, and had met with such misfortune, ended as a fiasco, as far as the capture of St. Augustine was concerned. Eventually, Oglethorpe matched his troops, many of whom were sick, back to Frederica, and here he lay ill during the next two months, "of a continued fever contracted during the exposures and fatigues" of the siege.
Blueprint of tracing of map facing page 45 in Charles C. Jones, *The Dead Towns of Georgia*, Collections of the Georgia Historical Society, IV.
The fortunes of war kept the Spanish on the defensive for the next two years, and Oglethorpe took advantage of this interim to strengthen all of his fortifications along the coast. Frederica and Fort St. Simon, at the southwest end of the island, became the headquarters for Oglethorpe's regiment after the attack on St. Augustine. From these two posts, detachments were sent to repair, strengthen, and garrison forts St. Andrews, William, and St. George, and the Amelia Island outworks. Oglethorpe realized that the Spanish would retaliate with a counter attack as early as possible, and prepared to meet it.

Frederica in 1740 was a well fortified village with an estimated population of one thousand inhabitants. The town was "regularly laid out in streets called after the principal officers of Oglethorpe's regiment." The whole settlement was embraced in an area "about a mile and a half in circumference." Included in this area was a military camp on the northern boundary, the parade ground and fort on the east, and

"a small wood on the south which served as a blind to the enemy in case of attack from ships coming up the river. By this time the fort was well armed, and its walls had been strongly built of tabby, a type of masonry made of a mixture of oyster shells, sand, and lime; the latter being produced by burning oyster shells. In front of the fort was a ravelin, or detached work, upon which several eighteen pounder cannon were mounted to command the river. Two of the garrison buildings, which were also made of tabby, were used as barracks; while "next to the Water Post [or town gate near the river] was the guardhouse, under which was the prison," a
brick structure. Near the fort were "twenty-seven brick houses" which had been erected for the officers of the garrison. On the land side, the town was now defended "by substantial intrenchments," which consisted of "a wall ten feet high, faced with timber, outside of which was a deep ditch---" Tidal water could be let in and cut this ditch, thus providing if necessary, a moat completely encircling the town. In the wall were "two entrance gates---called the Town and Water Posts [or Landport and Waterport]---, "located respectively on the eastern and western sides of the settlement. At that time there were a number of permanent houses in the town, "several of which are brick." Near the town were the parcels of farm lands upon which sufficient food was produced "to supply both the Town and Garrison." A town government was also in existence, with proper administrative officials, and there was "a Town-Court for administering [sic] Justice in the Southern Part of the Province, with the same Number of Magistrates as at Savannah."

Oglethorpe knew that the avowed intention of the impending Spanish invasion was the utter destruction of Georgia and South Carolina and their Indian allies. In 1741 he cast about for aid, but was left more or less to his own resources, when the disgruntled Carolinians refused further assistance, and the home government, engaged in furious West Indian attacks on the Spaniards, failed to heed his plea for reinforcements. The Spaniards apparently hoped to smash the Georgians and the Carolinians in one decisive campaign, and early in 1742 were organizing a great expedition for that purpose.
The Spanish assault on Georgia came early in July, 1742. Organising a large army and fleet, the expedition consisting of 1,800 soldiers and 1,000 seamen, moved northward along the coast in fifty vessels. Oglethorpe's outposts on the sea islands proved helpless in the face of such strength, and on July 4, the expedition had arrived off St. Simon Island. Passing Fort St. Simon with little difficulty, the expedition landed on the inner passage some distance below Frederica. The English garrison at Fort St. Simon thereupon spiked their guns, and, to prevent being captured, retreated up the island along the road to Frederica, which Oglethorpe had opened in 1738. This road, through the center of the island, subsequently "became the center of Oglethorpe's strategy," in repelling the Spanish invasion.

A series of skirmishes along this road finally culminated in the so-called battle of Bloody Marsh, and the eventual retirement of the whole Spanish force from Georgia. On July 7 a fairly large force of Spaniards approached within about a mile of Frederica along this road. The force was energetically attacked by Oglethorpe at the head of his Rangers and Highlanders. The Spanish commander was captured, and most of the Spanish force either killed or captured. Oglethorpe then pursued the rest of the force, which retreated along the road. Reaching an open glade, the Georgians concealed themselves for the purpose of ambushing the Spaniards on their second attack. Oglethorpe then returned to Frederica for reinforcements. Meanwhile, another force of Spaniards had appeared, discovered the Georgians,
and had forced them to flee up the road toward Frederica. On the way back from Frederica, Oglethorpe discovered this group in flight and reorganized them. Meanwhile, two of his lieutenants, Southerland and Mackay had executed a flank movement and had stationed their force of Highlanders a few miles north of Fort St. Simons, and to the rear of the Spanish. Here the Highlanders waited in ambush for the return of the Spaniards from Frederica. The Spaniards unsuspectingly marched into this open glade, around which the Highlanders were hid, and began to stack "their arms better to rest from the excitement of their victory" near Frederica. Suddenly the Highlanders opened fire and rushed upon them, and in the resulting struggle about two hundred Spaniards were either killed or captured. This was the battle of Bloody Marsh, and though little more than a brush or skirmish, it did much "to unnerve the main Spanish force and led to its ultimate return to Florida."

Oglethorpe then worked a strategy which undoubtedly had much to do with the complete withdrawal of the Spanish force. Soon after the battle of Bloody Marsh, he learned that the main Spanish force, which had encamped to the northwest of Fort St. Simon, was rapidly becoming demoralized by internal dissension. Hoping to surprise this disorganized force, he hurriedly marched down the island with some five hundred troops, nearly his whole force. His plan was upset however when a French deserter fled to the Spaniards with the news that Oglethorpe's forces were comparatively weak. To counteract this situation, Oglethorpe desperately tried a timeworn ruse. He released a Spanish prisoner with a letter to the Frenchman, which made
the latter appear as a spy, rather than a deserter. The letter in-
structed the Frenchman

"to lead the Spanish fleet up toward Frederica where
masked batteries could better destroy it, and to induce
the Spaniards to remain on St. Simons at least three more
days, for by that time reinforcements of 2,000 infantry-
men and six men-of-war would arrive."

This letter immediately found its way to the Spanish commander, as
was hoped, who called a council of war. After discussing the whole
situation, the disheartened Spaniards decided to give up their
campaign, which now appeared hopeless in the face of Oglethorpe's
vigorous resistance. About the middle of July, then, the remaining
Spanish force withdrew to its ships and sailed away.

This remarkable withdrawal marked the end of Spanish
participation on the North American continent in the War of Jenkins's'
Bar. The move afforded great relief in Georgia, and in the other
English colonies, Oglethorpe's effective resistance to the great
Spanish invasion had successfully forestalled Spain's most militant
attempt to affirm her claim to the territory embraced by Georgia
and much of South Carolina. Spain's desire to expand northward was
definitely squelched. Never again did she make an active attempt
to enforce her claim to any North American territory along the
Atlantic coast, except in Florida.

The Spaniards had barely disappeared before Oglethorpe
undertook measures to strengthen the fortifications at Frederica,
and at other points along the coast. Apparently he momentarily ex-
pected the Spanish to renew their attack on the colony. After
strengthening the works on Jekyll and Cumberland Islands, he con-
centrated his attention on the defenses at Frederica, and elsewhere on St. Semon. Late in January, 1743,

"great numbers of men were employed in compleating the Fortifications at Frederica, the Walls whereof are judged strong enough to be proof against eighteen pound shot." Frederica as an active military post and strategic fortified point, during these years, 1742 and 1743, experienced "the period of its greatest prosperity and importance."

A contemporary description of Frederica, shows that early in 1743, the town was "defended by a pretty strong Fort of Tabby --- Immediately surrounding this fort was a

"quadrangular Rampart, with 4 Bastions, of Earth, well stockaded and turfed, and a palisadoed Bitch which include also the King's Storehouses, (in which are kept the Arsenal, the Court of Justice, and Chapel) two large and spacious buildings of Brick and Timber---"

The whole settlement was also surrounded by

"a Rampart, with Flankers of the same thickness with that round the Fort, in form of a pentagon---"

Following the great Spanish attack in the previous July, in the northeast and southeast angles of this wall had been

"erected two strong cover'd pentagonal Bastions [or towers], capable of containing 100 men each, to secour the Flanks with Small Arms, and defended by a Number of Cannon---"

On the tops of these Bastions were

"Look-outs which command the View of the Country and the River for many miles: The Roofs are shingled, but so contriv'd as to be easily clear'd away, if inconsistencies in the Defense of the Towers."

Near the northern end of the settlement, within the walls, were
located

"the Barracks, which is an extremely well so contriv'd Build-
ing in the form of a Square, of Tappy-Work, in which at pre-
present, are kept the Hospital, and Spanish Prisoners of War.

At that time some of the dwellings were "built entirely of Brick,
some of Brick and Wood, some dow of Tappy-Work, but most of the
meaner sort, of Wood only." In this busy little settlement, a Market
every Day." The population was made up of

"Officers, Merchants, Store-Keepers, Artisans, and People
in the Provincial Service; and there are often, also, many
Sojourners from the neighbouring Settlements, and from New
York, Philadelphia, and Carolina, on account of Trade."

The military life of the post was "regulated as in all garrison-
tonns in the British Dominions." The civil government of the settle-
ment was "administered by three Magistrates, or Justices, assisted
by a Recorder, Constables, and Tything Men." Such was Frederica in
its heyday.

Oglethorpe launched only one more attack against the Spaniards
from his base at Frederica, taking a small force of his regulars, and
some Indian allies, he descended upon St. Augustine in March,
1743. He hoped to bestir the Spaniards to engage him in a pitched
battle, but the Spaniards refused to leave their stronghold. His
force being too weak to assault the city, Oglethorpe had to content
himself with driving the Spaniards from their advanced posts in
Florida. The whole campaign lasted only four days. Still unsuc-
ced that the Spaniards would not again attack Frederica, Oglethorpe
continued the strengthening of the southern defenses until he sail-
away from Georgia, on July 23, 1743, never again to return.
No great changes occurred at Frederica in the four or five years immediately following Oglethorpe's departure from the colony. Major Horton was left at Frederica in charge of Oglethorpe's regiment, and the protection of the southern frontier. By 1744 the abortive War of Jenkins' War had merged in a greater European conflict, called the War of the Austrian Succession abroad, but known in America as King George's War. The scene of conflict in North America was transferred to Cape Breton and Acadia, and the southern frontier left undisturbed. Nevertheless, until 1745, the year the larger conflict ended, with the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, Frederica "retained its importance as a military post, and was regarded as the safeguard of the Province against Spanish invasion."

Frederica's commercial importance, which indeed was ever scanty, had begun to decline not long after Oglethorpe's departure in 1743. The authorities attempted for several years to maintain the town's prosperity, but soon rumors were widespread as to its decadence. It was also reported that the inhabitants were rapidly leaving the settlement. Two traders attempted to refute these rumors in an account dated June, 1747, which purported to describe actual conditions in Frederica. They pictured the town as a well fortified, prosperous settlement, important in trade, and surrounded by rich farms. New settlers were reported bound for the town. Despite the fact that the settlement was on the down grade after 1743, some of its most prosperous days were experienced between 1745 and 1746.

The ending of King George's War brought a great change at Frederica. With the Spanish quiescent to the south, there was no
longer any need for a large garrison on the southern frontier. Soon after April, 1740, most of the troops on St. Simon Island were withdrawn and the regiment disbanded. Gone was Frederica's life blood now, and decay was soon to set in, where once was the scene of great activity. After the departure of the regiment, few people other than the guard were left. Although the Trustees laboriously attempted to make the settlement a great commercial port, it began steadily to decline, to crumble, and to lose all importance. Having served its purpose as the main military outpost and stronghold of the southern frontier, its day had passed.

Six years after the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, Frederica already presented a melancholy scene of ruin. The Trustees had re-possession of the colony, and late in 1754, Captain John Reynolds, the first royal governor, arrived to assume his duties. One of the first reports he made, early the next spring, was on the condition of Frederica. On a tour of inspection, "he found the town 'in ruins; the fortifications 'decayed,' and the houses falling down;' "Along the walls some twenty cannon were dismounted, and were "spoiled for want of care." He was dismayed over"

"houses without inhabitants, barracks without soldiers, guns without carriages, and streets grown over with weeds." A severe fire had long since destroyed all of the homes, which had not otherwise crumbled into ruins. He found the fort practically dismanted. Although he immediately recommended the construction of a new fort at Frederica, it was never built, and neither was any "effort made to repair the works then crumbling---"

The final blow to the life of the crumbling outpost came in
1763. The Treaty of Paris, in 1763, removed the Spanish from Florida, transferring that province to England. No longer was there an enemy to the south. Soon the fort at Frederica was abandoned as an active post, and by 1767 the last men of the Independent Company were withdrawn. No longer of any military significance, Frederica continued in its decline in oblivion. It had become a dead town, and "between 1760 and 1775 every foot of Frederica was acquired by purchase by Donald McKay." On December 20, 1773, Sir James Wright, then royal governor of Georgia, reported that what remained of the fort was "going to decay very fast," and only "some remains of good Tabby walls—were still standing." William Bartram, the famous naturalist, visited St. Simon the following year, 1774, and found that Frederica "the ruins of the town only remain," while the fort was greatly dilapidated.

The destruction of the crumbling houses and fort at Frederica was completed during the Revolution. Early in the conflict, "the Council of Safety ordered all guns at Frederica to be secured, and they were used in fortifying other points on the coast deemed of greater importance." Colonel Elbert, of the Georgia Colonel Forces, on landing at Frederica "to air" his troops in May, 1777, reported that

"Frederica was once a pretty little Town, as appears by the Ruins, having been burned down some years since; the fort at this place, with a little expense, might be made defensible, and might, if properly garrisoned, be a means of protecting great part of our Southern Frontier. There are about twelve men that bear arms [In Frederica] ; in my opinion all Tories. Their Captain, Ditter, says otherwise of himself, and informed me that about 6 or 8 of the inhabitants had lately gone to Florida for protection."

In 1778 an attempt was made by the colonists to repair the old deo
fensive works at Frederica, but the work was never completely carried out, being soon abandoned. During the war the whole coast was pillaged by the British. Frederica was taken by scouting parties from British ships in the sound. This time the walls of the fort were dismantled, the barracks burned, and the few remaining inhabitants driven away. At the end of the Revolution very little remained at Frederica except the ashes of burned houses and heaps of brick and tabby ruins.

The Georgia Legislature made several futile attempts between 1792 and 1802 to revive the corporate existence of the town of Frederica. Town commissioners were appointed, efforts were made to re-survey the town, and to raise taxes, but in vain. An effort to revive commerce at the place through special legislation also failed. In fact, as late as 1814, efforts were made to raise revenue by taxing town lots in Frederica. Its mission long since accomplished however, nothing came of these steps to revivify the once important settlement.

Nearly all of the signs of the old settlement at Frederica vanished during the nineteenth century. While the rest of St. Simon thrived and prospered during much of this period, Frederica only continued to disappear. In 1805 most of the old masonry material at Frederica was carted away to the southern end of the island to be used in building a lighthouse at that point. Late in the War of 1812, St. Simon was occupied by the British, but no significant event took place at Frederica, or at any other place on the island. The famous Fanny Kemble, English actress, who visited the site of
Frederica in the spring of 1839, has left the following interesting
impression of her visit to the deserted spots:

"This Frederica is a very strange place; it was once
a town, the town, the metropolis of the island. The Englis-
lish, when they landed on the coast of Georgia in the war
destroyed this tiny place, and it has never been built up
again. Mrs. Afs and one other house are the only dwell-
ings that remain in this curious wilderness of dismantled
gray walls compassionately cloaked with a thousand pro-
fuse and graceful creepers. These are the only ruins, pro-
perly so-called, except those of Fort Putnam, that I have
seen in this land—-

St. Simon was hastily evacuated in December, 1861, in the face of the
advancing Federal forces. Federal troops occupied the island during
most of the war, carrying on much pillage, even among the ruins at
Frederica. The year 1866 ushered in a new era for St. Simon, and
others of the sea islands, but not for old Frederica, in that year
wealthy northerners began to use the sea islands as a pleasure re-
sort, and a fine hotel (not the present one) was built near the
beach on St. Simon.

The new century brought an attempt to preserve the last
remaining fragment of Frederica. On February 23, 1909, one Bell V.
Taylor of Glynn County, Georgia, who then owned the site of the
old fort, and resided nearby, conveyed to the Georgia Society of the
Colonial Dames of America, as a gift (i.e., in consideration of one
dollar).

"All that certain piece or parcel of land, situated,
lying and being at Frederica, on the Island of St. Simons
in the County of Glynn, and in the State of Georgia, on
which is located the ruins of the old Colonial fort—
including the site of said ancient fort or water battery,
and extending for a distance of sixty (60) feet in all
directions therefrom, and surrounding the same; and also
the said ruins of said ancient fort or water battery; and
also a right of way, or easement, of suitable width for vehicles, for affording access to said above described and conveyed piece of land from the main or public road near the present Christ Church."

This patriotic act of Mrs. Taylor, and of the Society in assuming the care of the property, was not legally consummated however, until June 29, 1914. Unfortunately, in 1903, the charter of the Georgia Society of Colonial Dames did not empower it to own real estate; and it was not until 1914, when the charter was amended, authorizing the Society to acquire and own real estate, that an indenture was finally entered into conveying the property to the Society.

The latest development in regard to this historic spot was initiated in January, 1935. Interested citizens of South Georgia instituted a movement to have the Federal government officially designate the site of old Frederica as a national monument. On January 21, 1935, Congressman Braswell做一个 of the Eighth Georgia District, introduced in Congress

"A bill (H.R. 4675) to provide for the establishment of a national monument at Fort Frederica, St. Simon, Ga., to be known as 'Fort Frederica National Shrine."

On the same day this bill was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. Meanwhile, old Frederica slumbers on its bluff, amid the memories of a nearly forgotten past.

Note: Bill authorizing Secretary of the Interior to establish a national monument at Frederica when a certain acreage has been donated to the Government was passed by Congress on
REPORT ON VARIOUS

FORTIFICATIONS ON THE GULF COAST

C. L. Johnson
A - PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

This investigation was undertaken after approval by the Director to determine the conditions of the various masonry forts along the Gulf Coast in Florida, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana. It was hoped that examination of these forts would prove valuable, as a number of similar forts in the District (Fort Clinch, Florida; Fort Morgan, Alabama; and Forts Pike and Mascomb in Louisiana) are now included in State Parks and (Fort Pulaski, Georgia; Fort Marion, Matanzas and Jefferson in Florida) National Monuments. While none of these forts are identical, there are a large number of architectural, engineering and military features which are similar. Therefore, it was felt that a comprehensive knowledge of the chain of coastal forts (all of which were contemporaneous and built during the period 1818 to 1860) would be invaluable in the restoration and preservation of a number of forts which is now underway.

B - ITINERARY OF THE INVESTIGATION

In company with Mr. Balthom B. Lattimore, Acting Superintendent of Fort Pulaski National Monument (and who has had general supervision of the restoration of that fort), I followed the itinerary shown below:

Friday, July 17 - En route to St. Marks, Florida from Atlanta, Georgia.
Saturday, July 18 - St. Marks, Florida, Fort San Marco
Sunday, July 19 - Forts Barrancas and San Carlos Pensacola, Florida
Monday, July 20 - Fort Morgan, Alabama
Tuesday, July 21 - Fort Gaines, Alabama
Wednesday, July 22 - Fort Massachusetts, Mississippi
Thursday, July 23 - Forts Pike and Mascomb, Louisiana
Friday, July 24 - Forts Jackson and St. Philip, Louisiana
Saturday, July 25  – Fort Livingston, Louisiana
Sunday, July 26  – En route to Atlanta

Each of the above forts will be treated in a separate section below. It is not felt that this report should cover the history of the forts visited, but the history of any of the forts can be submitted on short notice.

I  – Fort San Marco de Apalache
(St. Marks, Florida)

The historical study made sometime ago by E. Steere, Historical Assistant, and the study made by Dr. Mark P. Boyd of Tallahassee, Florida (copy of which was submitted with Mr. Kahler’s report dated July 22) adequately covers the history of this fort.

On July 18 Mr. R. B. Lattimore and I met Mr. Kahler at St. Marks and visited the site of Fort San Marco.

The site of the fort is inaccessible except by boat. The town of St. Marks, which is reached from Tallahassee, a distance of about twenty-three miles, is a small village of about three hundred people. The town, which supports itself by selling seafood and catering to fishing parties, is a popular place for fishermen. Their principal interest in securing a park seems to be to attract more people to spend money there.

The entire area between the St. Marks and Wakulla Rivers has been surveyed and divided into lots. Anticipating the sale of these lots to people for summer and fishing cottages, the price is exorbitantly high. Mr. O. F. Shields, the owner of the site at Fort San Marco, set the price of the five acres needed at $5,000. The scheme of the townpeople to get a park devolves itself into one of promotion and advertising.
The town is making no concessions in order to receive a park or monument.

Aside from the above, it does not seem advisable for the National Park Service to acquire the property. The historical significance of the fort is primarily connected with the State of Florida, although it does have national ramifications. If the state acquires the property, the National Park Service could render valuable assistance in its development. The present remains of the fourth fort built on the site (1758) are so badly preserved that a restoration project is almost out of the question, except at a large cost. I recommend that the State take over the site, if possible, as it does not seem to be of National Monument calibre.

II - Forts Barrancas and San Carlos

(FUNACO, Florida)

Fort Barrancas is a square masonry fort on the Military Reservation just south of Pensacola.

The fort is unusual in several details.

1- The fort is built adjacent to and connected with an older fort, San Carlos (present part built 1751) by a tunnel and a portion of it is superimposed over the older fort.

2- The counterscarp of masonry which surrounds the fort on the two land sides is hollow and contains casemates for some flanking howitzers to command the bay. Magazines or the ordnance mounted in the counterscarp, as well as a large number of rooms evidently for use of the troops, are found. A series of embrasures for rifles are in the counterscarp. This is the only occurrence of this use of the
counterscarp that I have ever seen in any fort except that Fort Livingston on Baratarie Bay, Louisiana has a similar arrangement.

3- A drawbridge over a dry ditch is unusual. The machinery for operating the drawbridge is in fair condition.

4- A tunnel connects the interior of the fort with the hollow counterscarp. Another tunnel connects Fort Barrancas with Fort San Carlos.

5- The Fort has no bastions and no provision is made for mounting guns in casemate, all guns being mounted on barbette. The fort wall is pierced with loop-holes for musket fire.

Fort Barrancas is open to the public at regular hours (9 to 6) each day. Visitors enter at their own risk and no guide service is available. Except for policing the grounds, no care is given the fort.

The fort is not suffering any serious deterioration, and as it is on an active army post no recommendations are thought necessary at this time.

Fort San Carlos is a small, half circular work surrounded by a fossa. The only means of entrance is through a tunnel from Fort Barrancas. All guns were mounted on barbette.

If at all possible some work should be done on this old Spanish fort. The decorative cornice
and the decorations over the doors and around the
weep holes which are made of plaster are falling off.
Pieces of the decorations are lying around in the
parade and in the magazines. Enough of the decora-
tions are left to permit a restoration and this
should be done before all of the evidence is destroyed.

III - Fort Morgan (Mobile Point, Alabama)

In view of the fact that this fort is being
worked on by Alabama Transient Park Camp No. 2, it is
thought advisable to make a rather detailed report
including recommendations for work there.

No. 1 Casemate - (on left of entrance)

Remove brick from embrasure.
Remove partition between casemates No. 1
and No. 2. This partition was added
after the Fort surrendered during the
War Between the States.

No. 2 Casemate

Repair floor
Repair entrance, south side. Put bar
across door to keep visitors from
using, as it is dangerous.
Loose scales of brick caused by fire to
be removed, as they are dangerous.
Loose bricks to be reset or repointed.

No. 5 Casemate

General cleanup.

N.E. Bastion, Room No. I
Point up brick in fireplace.

N.E. Bastion, Magazine No. I
Wall and floor framework and covering
of wood gone. Fill with sand to
threshold level. Relay thresholds.

N.E. Bastion, Magazine No. 2
Same as No. 1

N.E. Bastion, Room No. 2
General cleanup

No. 4 Casemate
Reset bricks in floor
Repair embrasure

No. 5 Casemate
Clean out embrasure

No. 6 Casemate
General cleanup

No. 7 Casemate
Remove wooden bars from embrasure

Nos. 8, 9 and 10 Casemates
General cleanup

S.E. Bastion
General cleanup
Repair fireplace
Original doors to magazine to be treated with hot linseed oil for preservation.
Iron work to be painted with red lead and black asphalt paint to preserve

S.E. Bastion, Magazine Nos. I and II
Hang doors which are down. Nail copper flashings down and also loose boards on floor.
This magazine is in fair condition, probably the second best on the coast next to that at Fort Massachusetts.

No. 11 Casemate

Remove old concrete machinery blocks of later date. Plug up hole to adjoining casemate which is blocked off by Battery Duportail.

Nos. 12, 13 and 14 Casemates

Reset bricks in floor
General cleanup

S. W. Bastion
Reapir fireplace
General cleanup

No. 15 Casemate

Repair fireplace

Nos. 16 and 17 Casemates

Remove partition between casemates.
Reset bricks in floor

There are a number of irons which go on the traverse circles; these should be put in place.

The parade is being leveled to grade except for the railroad from the entrance to the modern Battery. The bricks in the old drains are being salvaged as the drains never seemed to work. Entire parade except the railroad track to be greased.

All brick work to be gone over and any loose brick reset and scales caused by fire removed.
Battery Duportail which takes up almost one half of the interior of the fort and mounts two 12" disappearing rifles is rather unsightly at the present time because the original paint is scaling. It is planned to repaint the battery with black asphalt paint and use a grey trim (as done originally).

According to Colonel Arthur at Fort Barrancas, the two rifles were included in the transfer of the fort to the State of Alabama. But according to the quit claim deed executed between the United States Government and the State of Alabama, the guns and appurtenances were reserved by the Government. As the battery without the guns will be just a mass of steel and concrete, it is hoped that the rifles can be kept in place. If this is done, approximately one half of the fort can be treated and developed as of the period 1818 to 1885, and the other as semi-modern, and the contrast will be both interesting and educational.

Fort Morgan is a regular, pentagonal, bastioned work of masonry. It was designed to mount both barbette and casemate tiers of guns, the total number being 118. The bastions are used for magazines and have two chambers to mount flanking howitzers to sweep the fosse. A tunnel pierces the counterscarp on the entrance side. It has two doors as did also the entrance of the fort. A second tunnel pierces the counterscarp on the land side, but the interior end opened up to the top of the wall rather than into the fosse. No explanation can be given as to why it was so constructed.

The fosse has a small open brick drain twelve inches wide and fifteen inches deep. This drain is to be repaired so as to take care of the surface water on three sides.
A small outwork immediately opposite the southwest bastion contains traverses to mount twelve guns and also a hot shot furnace. This outwork (or ravelin) is not on state property. Because of its present unsightly condition and the interest that it would have if cleaned up and preserved, it is hoped that some arrangement for its use can be made with the Department of Commerce which now owns it as a part of their lighthouse property.

The small dummy engine on the reservation is rusting on a side track. This engine, if it can be secured, cleaned up, and painted would be interesting to visitors. It was used to haul supplies from the wharf to the fort and other parts of the reservation.

Maps and other data on Fort Morgan are badly needed. The entire series of maps and photographs on file in the office of the Chief Engineer of the War Department at Washington should be secured. They would be valuable for use now and for the museum later. Battery Duportail has a number of large rooms which could be used for museum and other purposes.

I hope that Mr. Applesan can visit this fort at some time in the near future, and go over the development plans as now conceived. This is one of the most interesting forts now under the administration of a state park and deserves careful study and planning. A base map of Fort Morgan was submitted to the Washington office on June 2, and will be useful in locating portions mentioned in the above.

IV - Fort Gaines (Dauphin Island, Alabama)

This fort is very similar to Fort Clinch, Amelia Island, Florida, and was built at the same time (1844).
It is a pentagonal, bastional masonry work with the gorge being somewhat longer than the flanks and faces. The bastions are hollow and designed to mount four guns each. Other than the guns mounted in the bastion, there are no casemate guns, the principal defense being a full barbette tier, the total number to be 118.

The fort is the property of the City of Mobile and is rapidly deteriorating. Two guns stamped 1821 and 1822 lie in the parade. These are 22-lb. smooth bore, and if possible should be secured from the City of Mobile by the State of Alabama and mounted at Fort Morgan.

A large amount of hardware, including doors, and ironwork, is suffering greatly from rust. I am of the opinion that this hardware would fit in Fort Clinch. Properly cleaned and painted, it would last indefinitely but under present conditions it will soon be useless. If it could be bought reasonably, it could be put to good use at Fort Clinch and it will soon be worthless where it is.

I made a report on this fort on August 8, 1935, and this report is on file in the Washington office.

As this fort is inaccessible except by a boat trip of about eight miles, no other recommendations are made other than that if possible such material as can be used at other forts, which are being preserved, be salvaged.

V - Fort Massachusetts (Ship Island, Mississippi)

Fort Massachusetts was the last fort to be constructed on the Gulf Coast. It was seized on January
20, 1861 by State troops and subsequently strengthened with three companies of Fourth Regiment, Louisiana Volunteers and several guns. Work continued on the fort until it was evacuated by an order issued on September 15, 1861, being considered untenable by the Confederate officers and difficult to provision because of the presence of Union boats in the Gulf. All Ordnance and stores were saved at the time of the evacuation.

The fort was occupied by Union forces under Brigadier General J. W. Phelps on December 5, 1861 and remained in their possession during the war. At this time the fort was finished only up to the top of the casemate tier and was damaged by the fire set by the Confederate forces when they evacuated. The fort was occupied by negro troops during most of the way.

A United States Military Prison was located on the Island from October, 1864 to July 1865. The largest number of prisoners was 4556 in April, 1865, and the smallest number 10 in June, 1865. During May most of the prisoners were paroled.

The fort is a half-circular masonry work designed for a garrison of 400 men. It has two half bastions and had full tiers of guns, both in casemate and en barbette. The fort was designed to mount twenty-three guns in casemate, ten en barbette on the seal-circular side and four en barbette on the gorge wall. One large 15" smooth bore gun is mounted on a heavy iron carriage on the gorge. This gun bears the inscription: "Fort Pitt, Pa., 1865". Portions of several other guns lie on the terreplein of the gorge wall. Three spiral staircases connect the parade with the terreplein. These stairs are similar to those at Fort Pulaski.
Completed by the Union forces, the fort stands at present in about 90% repair. All of the granite traverses with iron tracks, and pindles on the terreplein are in good condition, as are the traverses, pindles and some of the tongues in the casemates. All the iron shutters on the casemate embrasures are in place in good condition. The double entrance had a short drawbridge and some of the machinery for operating the bridge is in place. There is no indication that there was a moat or fosse. A portion of the moat touches the water, and a sea level moat would have been possible. A check of the plans would reveal whether a moat existed or not.

I have what I consider a pardonable enthusiasm for this fort and consider it of National Monument calibre for the following reasons:

1- Located twelve miles from Biloxi, Mississippi, it can be reached twice daily by a boat which carries fifty people at a cost of $1.00 per person for the round trip. It is therefore very accessible, and is visited by a large number of people. Visitors go to the island to see the fort, for swimming and picnicking. The Mississippi coast has no good beaches because of its seawall and the island has an excellent beach.

2- The fort is the best preserved of any of the forts that I have seen in the South. It is a wonderfully preserved example of the smaller types of coast defense constructed on the Gulf of Mexico. Its magazine is in over 85% repair with original doors, floors and most of the wooden walls. It is called a dungeon at present and visitors are charged 5¢ for admission. The hot shot furnace is in about 90% repair and is the best preserved one that I have seen.

5- The fort is at present owned by the American Legion of Gulfport, Mississippi and is used for dining
rooms, bar, gambling and dancing. Under present use it will deteriorate rapidly and it is worthy of preservation.

4— This location has the possibility of being one where historical, scenic and recreational values values can be combined so that one will not predomi-
nate at the expense of the others. Some of the abut-
ting property is owned by the Department of Commerce for a lighthouse site probably in excess of actual needs.

VI — Fort Pike (on the Rigolets) and Fort Macomb (on Chef Mentour), Louisiana

These two forts are so nearly identical that they can both be discussed under the same head. Fort Pike Military Reservation was acquired from the United States by the State of Louisiana in February, 1928. The 125.4 acres in the Reservation are being developed as a State Park. Fort Macomb Military Reservation, comprising 16.05 acres, was also acquired by the State of Louisiana, and when some present litigation is over, it will be used for park purposes.

Fort Pike is thirty miles from New Orleans and Fort Macomb is about twenty-two miles from that city. Both forts are on U. S. Highway 90, which is well improved throughout its length. The State has a wide parkway proposed between the two areas so that they can be developed as a unit.

Fort Pike has been cleaned up so that it is very attractive and many people stop to see it as it is within a hundred yards of the highway. Fort Macomb is, however, completely overgrown. Of the two, Fort Macomb is much better preserved.
These forts are triangular masonry works designed for guns both on casemate and on barbette to the number of 48. Sea level moats with drawbridges and a heavy counterscarp are present. In both cases there is space between the moat and the counterscarp. At Fort Macomb a water battery was planned behind the counterscarp. The traverses and some of the casemate carriages are at both forts. At Fort Macomb four of the barbette carriages are present and one smooth bore 6" gun.

Several of the original doors are in place at Fort Macomb.

The State of Louisiana is very anxious to secure a CCC camp to preserve these two forts and to develop the area. I trust that in the next allocation of camps this area will receive favorable consideration. Because of their favorable location, these forts will have many visitors.

VII - Fort Jackson - On the Mississippi River below New Orleans, Louisiana

Fort Jackson is a regular bastional pentagonal work of masonry with a moat and drawbridge. Its shape and interior arrangement compare with Fort Morgan, Alabama. This fort, with Fort St. Phillip, which is almost opposite it on the east bank of the Mississippi River, was built to protect New Orleans from an attack from the sea and to prevent vessels ascending the river.

It surrendered on April 28, 1862 as did Fort St. Phillip, not from the attack of the enemy (as the forts were still tenable after a heavy bombardment) but from mutiny of the garrison.

The fort is now in private hands and is badly overgrown. Although deteriorating, it is still well preserved. The drawbridge machinery is complete and well preserved, being the best that I have seen.
Several complete, and portions of, modern carriages designed to mount 24-lb. flanking howitzers are in the casemates in the bastions. A considerable amount of the original hardware is present. I have written the Louisiana State Park Commission that it would be advisable to salvage the carriages and such hardware as would fit in Forts Pike and Masomb (which are now in a State Park). If they can secure permission from the owner, this will be done.

Fort Jackson is located on a poor road, off of any main thoroughfare, and therefore little visited. A large semi-modern battery of steel and concrete takes up a large portion of the parade. In building this battery, the citadel was demolished as was the case at Fort Morgan, Alabama.

Except for the suggestion that the above-mentioned material be salvaged, I have no recommendation in regard to this fort.

VIII - Fort St. Philip at Plaquemine, Louisiana

This fort was partly built by the French and Spanish and later finished by the United States. One of the first descriptions (1809) says that it is "an enclosed work of masonry and wood, calculated for twenty guns, with a magazine and barracks for one company". In 1818 it mounted 49 guns. It was improved through the years, and at the time of the War Between the States, it is described as a "very irregular figure. It occupies a quadrilateral space about 150 x 100 yards". It had a moat with two entrances and drawbridges. Seventy-two channel bearing guns were mounted in the fort, which with the 105 channel bearing guns at Fort Jackson were calculated to successfully resist the passage of gunboats. All of these guns were mounted on barbette.
About 1908 the parade of this fort was filled with earth to the top of the arches of the casemates and the moat filled to the same level. With the abandonment of the military reservation, dense growth took the area except the parade which is now cultivated. Very little of the fort is visible, although such portions as can be seen are in good condition.

The fort is privately owned at the present. Its history goes back into the Eighteenth Century, and is most interesting. At the present the fort is not deteriorating greatly, and perhaps the State of Louisiana can at some time in the future acquire it. Properly cleaned up and preserved and with its history properly presented, it would make an interesting link in this chain of State Parks.

IX - Fort Livingston, Grand Isle, Barataria Bay, Louisiana

This fort is an irregular masonry work without bastions or casemates. It is in the shape of a diamond with two long sides, each 236 feet long, and two short sides, one 242 feet and the other 240 feet. It has a sea level moat with a double drawbridge. The counterscarp (on two sides only) is hollow and designed to mount flanking howitzers to sweep the moat. The sea has taken one of the sides and portions of two others, as well as a part of the counterscarp.

The property is owned by the Department of Commerce which maintains a lighthouse near the fort. Five smooth-bore 32-lb. guns lie on the terreplein. These are stamped 1862. I was informed that three other guns are in the water. The War Department once sold those guns for junk. The buyer used powder to break them up.
A fragment from one of the guns struck the lighthouse and he was told that he must move them whole. The eight guns mentioned were left, because they were too heavy for the buyer to handle.

These guns probably reverted to the War Department. If so, they should be transferred to Fort Pulaski National Monument at Savannah. They are the same type used at that place and Fort Pulaski has no guns at present. These guns would be a valuable addition to the monument. Some traverses and hardware might also be salvaged for Fort Pulaski.

The sea will eventually take the remainder of the fort and except for the salvaging of such material as could be used in National Monuments and State Parks, I have no other recommendations at the present.
LOCATION OF

1. Fort Barrancas, Pensacola, Florida
2. Fort San Carlos, Pensacola, Florida
3. Fort Gaines, Dauphin Island, Alabama
4. Fort Morgan, Mobile Point, Alabama
5. Gulf State Park, Alabama SP-6
LOCATION OF:

1- Fort Massachusetts, Ship Island, Mississippi
2- Fort Pike, Rigolets, Louisiana
3- Fort Macomb, Chef Menteur, Louisiana
4- Fort Jackson, Louisiana
5- Fort St. Phillip, Louisiana
6- Fort Livingston, Grand Isle, Barataria Bay, Louisiana
OLD EBENEZER

James W. Holland

October 17, 1936
OLD BENEZER

Name of Site: Old Benezer.

Location: The site of Old Benezer is about one-fourth of a mile from Dixie Highway at a point known as Bird Mill Place.

Accessibility: Due to its proximity to the Dixie Highway, it may be considered accessible, even though there is no road to the site itself.

Description of Setting: The approach to the site of Old Benezer is through a marshy region, characterized by dense pinewoods.

Description of Site: The old town was abandoned 200 years ago, and, at best, was only a group of crude shelters, which were in use somewhat less than two years. Hence all traces of its original character have passed away and, to all appearances, the town ever existed there.

Historical Narrative: During the three years prior to the settlement of Georgia (1733), a violent persecution by the Catholic clergy of the Lutheran inhabitants of the papal state of Salzburg forced some 50,000 Salzburgers to flee to various parts of Europe. A party of these exiles, chiefly through the efforts of Samuel Ulleramus, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and the German Evangelical Lutheran Church, was directed to the colony and its passage to that place provided. The Trustees of Georgia allowed each of the emigrants fifty acres of land in fee simple and provisions sufficient to sustain them until their land should yield crops.

Accordingly, forty-two Salzburgers and their wives and children — in all a party of seventy-eight — left Breslau, Germany, where they were joined by their chosen religious teachers, the Rev. John Martin Bolzian and the Rev. Israel Christian Groen. Thence they sailed for Dover, where they took the oath of loyalty administered by the Trustees of the Georgia Colony.

In March, 1734, the Salzburgers arrived at Savannah, where the English settlers received them with cheering, the firing of salutes, and a feast featuring "very good and wholesome English strong beer." Temporarily housed in tents at Savannah, the Salzburgers awaited the selection of the site of their settlement by Baron Christian von Donop, their temporal sovereign, and General James Oglethorpe.

The site chosen was on a crooked, sluggish little creek which writhed its way some two miles to the Savannah River, which was only six miles distant in a straight line. Both the stream and the town site were named "Benezer," and there the energetic German refugees proceeded to build shelters and to clear the land. Before the work had been completed, the Salzburgers
had founded in their new settlement the first Sunday School (as opposed to catechetical) in Georgia and one of the first in the world.

Although doubtless cleared by the arrival, in 1735, of fifty-seven of their countrymen and, about a year later, by the addition of about eighty more in the "great embarkation," the Salzburgers were becoming increasingly aware that they had been mistaken as to the fertility of the land selected. Ill sickness prevailed and their isolation was depressing. In 1736, then, Bolzins and Groneau petitioned Cglethorpe to relocate their congregation on more suitable land. After some hesitiation, Cglethorpe complied, establishing the Georgia Salzburgers at old Bluff on the Savannah at the mouth of Ebenezer Creek. The new town was given the same name as its predecessor, which rapidly declined, soon to become a cow-pen and the first of the "dead towns" of Georgia.

Historical Evaluation: Old Ebenezer is definitely of interest as the refuge of a group of people who were persecuted in their own land; it is a site connected with the traditions of America as a land of liberty. More particularly it illustrates the philanthropic motives in the founding of Georgia by the Trustees and General Cglethorpe. The site is historically important, too, as the location of the first of the unfortunate towns of colonial Georgia, which have completely faded away, due to unsalutary qualities, barrenness and swampy condition of soil, and a combination of other causes. Among these are numbered Sunbury, Berwick, New Ebenezer, and others, but Old Ebenezer was the first of them.

Sponsorship: The Georgia Salzburger Society doubtless is interested in this site, as is also the congregation of Jerusalem Church (Lutheran) at New Ebenezer; Rev. L. C. Denker of Rincon, Ga., pastor. Dr. C. A. Linn, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Ascension, Savannah, has made extensive studies in the history of the Georgia Salzburgers and, no doubt, may be considered among the probable sponsors of treatment of the site of Old Ebenezer.

Restoration and Care: Aside from the construction of a parking area, none would be practicable.

Previous treatment: None.

Suggested treatment: In view of the fact that the site marks the first home in America of a group whose descendants have become worthy citizens of our nation, and the fact that it was the first of Georgia's "dead towns," it is thought of sufficient importance to warrant the erection of a bronze marker.

Bibliography: (See bibliography for "New" Ebenezer -- there are no materials which deal with Old Ebenezer alone; hence most of the items in the bibliography of "New" Ebenezer are applicable to the Old as well).
An early map (circa 1735) "of the County of Savannah" showing location of Old Ebenezer. From Ulasberger Tracts, I, in Ga. Historical Society Library, Savannah.
Name of site: New Ebenezer

Location: In Effingham County, Georgia, about 25 miles up the Savannah River from the City of Savannah.

Accessibility: New Ebenezer is reached by turning off State road No. 21, either at Rincon or at a point five miles north, and proceeding over a fair sand road for a distance of eight miles. It has been announced in the press (Savannah Morning News, Oct. 16, 1936) that the road from Rincon to Ebenezer is to be paved by the state highway commission and "the work will be rushed to a finish." This action on the part of the state will, of course, make Ebenezer more accessible and will correspondingly increase its availability as an historic site.

Description of setting: The eight-mile road to Ebenezer from Rincon passes through a region of wild unkempt beauty. Except for an occasional very small cotton patch, it is not under cultivation and the living conditions of the few families which reside along the road approximate those of the American frontier. At the end of the road is a grove of giant virgin pines and live-oak, partly shrouded in long Spanish moss, and through this vista a dark red brick structure is plainly visible.

Description of site: The only structure remaining of the many which once comprised the prosperous town of Ebenezer is the Jerusalem Church, the brick building mentioned above. Constructed in 1808, it is, nevertheless, in an excellent state of preservation. A clock on the north side, and the slave gallery of the interior are interesting features. In the churchyard is a small marker simply bearing the words: "Ebenezer 1734-1934." The site is on a high bluff overlooking the Savannah River and the point of confluence of Ebenezer Creek, west of the bluff is a cypress swamp.

Historical Narrative: After leaving the older Ebenezer, the Georgia Salsburgers proceeded, with the same energy and piety, to establish an orderly and prosperous society at the new. Among their first accomplishments at the new site was the establishment, in 1737, of an orphanage to which, in the following year, George Whitefield, later founder of Bathesda Orphanage, was an interested visitor. The first church building in the Georgia colony was built in 1741, and it was there that the Salsburgers welcomed, in the following year, Henry Muhlenberg.

In 1763, John Martin Belinane, who had been the leader in their journey across the sea, died, and was succeeded by Herman Lenke. Under his administration, the church building which still stands was begun, in 1767, and completed under his successor, Christian Hebelhorn, in 1769. In this substantial brick
church the Jerusalem congregation, with 188 members, chiefly descendants of the original Salzburgers, still holds services on the second and fourth Sunday of each month. It is said to be the only colonial public building still standing in the state of Georgia and is the only building that remains of the once populous town of Ebenezer.

Throughout the colonial period of Georgia's history, the Salzburger town of Ebenezer was noteworthy for the industry and law-abiding qualities of its citizens. Under such leaders as Bozianu, Grozna, Lance, and Meichenhart, the political and social life of the people was controlled almost as much as their religion. There were no courts and no crimes, disputes being adjudicated by a commission of three or four elders appointed for that purpose by the minister.

At one time, when money was scarce in the settlement, Rev. Bozianu issued slips of ordinary paper with amounts of money written over his signature. These were circulated at face value as currency among the Salzburgers -- a striking commentary on their faith in their pastor and, likewise, on the inherent honesty of the community.

Near Ebenezer, the Salzburgers erected the first saw mill and the first grist mill in Georgia, and probably the first rice mill in America, with machinery of their own invention and construction. Perhaps the greatest industrial development at Ebenezer, however, was in silk culture, in which they excelled and in which they continued to engage after it had been abandoned as unprofitable elsewhere in Georgia. That they did not rely wholly upon this "silk crop", but were a self-sustaining people, seems apparent from the observations of DeBrahm in 1751, when he found the Salzburgers raising "wheat, rice, barley, oats, also flax, hemp, tobacco, and rice, indigo, peas, pumpkins, melons -- they plant mulberry, apple, peach, hesterine, plum and guine trees besides all manner of European garden herbs."

The Salzburgers developed the most numerous single population element in Georgia during the period of the Trustees, which, in fact, made Georgia more German than English. The town of Ebenezer reached the height of its importance about 1774; it was then a flourishing town and supported a lively trade with Charleston and Savannah.

The absolute decline of Ebenezer dates rather definitely from January 2, 1779, when it was occupied by British troops under Col. Archibald Campbell, who threw up a redoubt within a few hundred feet of Jerusalem Church and fortified this position. The church was converted into a hospital and stable; the church and other buildings were subjected to acts of vandalism by certain lawless elements spread terror among the peaceable Salzburgers and many left their homes never to return.
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Ebenezer, by reason of its central location, became the principal point on the thoroughfare from Augusta to Savannah, and remained in British hands until American troops under Gen. Anthony Wayne occupied the town in 1782. Soon thereafter, John Martin, governor of Georgia, and the legislature, met at Ebenezer, which thereafter became the capital of Georgia for a space of a very few days after which the government was moved to Savannah.

After the Revolution, with the aid of Dr. Muhlenberg, an effort was made to re-establish Ebenezer and to rebuild it to its former condition. This proved unsuccessful; the town never regained its former state of industry and seeming permanence. During the period when it seemed that its renaissance might become an actuality, it was designated the county seat of Effingham County but remained so only three years, 1796 to 1799. In the latter year the public buildings were sold and the county seat removed to Springfield.

Year by year thereafter Ebenezer became more sparsely populated, and in 1855, there were only two houses left and but one of those was occupied. In that year an ex-pastor of Jerusalem Church sadly viewed the ruins of the town and wrote: "Desolation seems to have spread over this once-favored spot its withering wing . . . scarcely anything is to be seen except the sad evidences of decay and death."

Yet again, Ebenezer was to play a part in the nation's history -- a very minor part this time -- when it became the scene of a series of skirmishes in the Civil War as Sherman's troops advanced upon Savannah. Fourteen years later, a Georgia historian placed both Old and New Ebenezer among the sites he called the "Dead Towns of Georgia."

**Present Ownership: Congregation of Jerusalem Lutheran Church**

Located on the site of Ebenezer. The church would not consider relinquishing title to the church building and its immediate grounds, including cemetery, but would probably be interested in having a memorial park established on the remainder of the site of the dead town.

**Sponsorship:** The Salzburger Society of Georgia would, in all probability be interested in any movement to perpetuate the memory of Ebenezer. This is not a church society, but a society of descendants of the Salzburger emigrants, many of whom have left the Lutheran denomination. However, the constitution of the Society provides that a majority of the directors shall be Lutherans. The Rev. L. C. Rasher is either president of this Society or is very high in its councils. He is also pastor of Jerusalem Church and resides at Rincon, Georgia.
Historical Evaluation: As the site of the place where a group of German settlers in Georgia developed a sturdy industrious citizenship, it is significant in Georgia colonial history. In a larger sense, the place is significant as the home of people driven from their own country who found in America freedom to follow their religion without political interference. The industry of the German Salzburger at Ebenezer was shown by their construction of the first saw mill and grist mill in Georgia and what is thought to have been the first rice mill in America. Furthermore, the church which stands today is a memorial to their labor, and was built 1767-1769. It is the only colonial building now standing intact in Georgia. In addition, Ebenezer is an example of one of Georgia's dead towns - those places where the wheels of progress seem to have been thrown in reverse until not a trace of a town remains.

Restoration and Repairs: No extensive program of restoration would be advisable here. The church is kept in good repair by its congregation, which uses it twice a month for services. The restoration of the town would be a project entailing an expenditure beyond that warranted by its historical importance, interesting and important though it is in Georgia's colonial history.

Previous treatment: None, except repairs from time to time on Jerusalem Church. Picnic parties from Savannah and vicinity sometimes are held on the site of Ebenezer, but there have been no efforts to exploit it or even to improve it.

Suggested treatment: The improvement of the road, which, it seems, the state will undertake, and the clearing away of underbrush to make the site more accessible should be undertaken. The placing of a marker where the road turns off to direct tourists to Ebenezer, and to give them, in brief form, an idea of its historical significance. At the site, suitable markers should be placed indicating points of particular interest in the area.

Research required: Historical research should be undertaken for the purpose of presenting an accurate, non-sectarian account of the history of the region. The placing of the markers in the area would also require a considerable amount of research.

Bibliography (For the most part, materials cited below are also pertinent to Old Ebenezer).
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2. Colonial Records of the State of Georgia. Official records in which there are many references to the activities of the Salzburgers at Ebenezer.


4. Extract from the Journals of Mr. Commissary Van Hook, ... and of the Rev. Mr. Bolsius, etc. (London, for the S. P. C. K., 1784, reprinted in Peter Force, Tracts, Washington, 1836-1846, Vol. IV, 1846, No. 5.)

5. Ebenezer Record Book containing Early Records of Jerusalem Evangelical Lutheran Church, St. Paul, Ga., more Commonly Known as Ebenezer Church, tr. by J. P. Veight and ed. by C. A. Linn (Savannah, 1929). Translation of copy in Georgia State Library, Atlanta. Comprises church records, 1754-1781 of baptisms, marriages and burials.


10. Ullspurger, Samuel, Zuverlässige Handschriften von den Geist und Leiblichen Umständen der Salzburgischen emigranten ... (Halle, 1784), 14 p.
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5. Stevens, Illman R., "A Brief History of the Silk Culture in Georgia," in Thaddeus H. Harrell, Biographical Memorials of James Ogilthorpe, Founder of the Colony of Georgia in North America (Boston, 1841). Chiefly about the Salzburgers of Ebenezer since it was they who took the lead in the silk industry.

6. Strobel, F. A., The Salzburgers and Their Descendants; Being the History of a Colony of German (Lutheran) Protestants, who Emigrated to Georgia in 1734, and Settled at Ebenezer, Twenty-five above the City of Savannah (Baltimore, 1855). The standard history of the Salzburgers at Ebenezer, written by a former pastor at the Jerusalem Church.


General.
1. Coulter, M. Barton, A Short History of Georgia (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1933), pp. 94-6, 52, 57, 65, and 128. Places the Salzburgers in proper perspective as regards the history of Georgia as a whole.

2. Friis, Adelaide L., The Moravians in Georgia, 1735-1742 (Raleigh, N.C., 1905). The Moravians should not be confused with the Lutherans. In the history of the Moravians in Georgia, there is occasional mention of the contemporary Salzburgers in the same colony.


5. M'Call, Hugh. The History of Georgia: Containing Brief Sketches of the Most Remarkable Events up to the Present Day (1784). Published in 1811 and 1815. Reprint, Atlanta, 1909. A Georgia history written before Ebenezer became a "dead town".

**Local authorities**

Perhaps the best informed local authority is Dr. Charles A. Linn, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Ascension, Savannah. Dr. Linn has studied the subject of the Georgia Salzburgers intensively in this country and in Germany and has written a doctoral dissertation in that field. The dissertation is not available, but there is a paper of his authorship on the same subject on file at the Savannah Historical Research Association, Hodson Hall, Savannah.

Judge Gordon Leesey, of Savannah, is in possession of much information especially as regards land records.

Another person possessing considerable information on the subject is Mrs. Emmaluke Floyd, librarian of Georgia Historical Society, Savannah.

Rev. L. A. Bascher is the present pastor of Jerusalem Church and is best informed on current policies, present condition, etc. His residence is at Rincon, Va.

**Published plans and photographs**

Plan of the town of Ebenezer appears in Le Brehm's History of the Province of Georgia ..., (Colesale, 1849); also in C. E. Jones, Dead Towns of Georgia, Coll. of Ga. Hist. Soc., IV (Savannah, 1876).

Photograph of Jerusalem Church in P. A. Strobel, The Salzburgers and their Descendants (Baltimere, 1885); also in C. W. Goulter, Short History of Georgia (Chapel Hill, 1933), 90.
TWO VIEWS OF JERUSALEM CHURCH
At Ebenezer. Completed in 1769, it is said to be the only colonial building in Georgia standing intact. The virgin pines in the foreground are approximately a hundred feet in height.
TWO VIEWS OF SAVANNAH RIVER
From Bluff at Ebenezer. (The river is approximately one-eighth mile from the church)
Cemetery at Ebenezer
about 100 yards west of Jerusalem Church.

Swamp near Ebenezer
About one-eighth mile northeast of church,
at base of bluff.
MONUMENT, KAHLER CEMETERY
In memory of Siezburger leaders, Bolzies, Gronau, Lemke and Rabenhorst.
SPRINGFIELD MAN NAMED PRESIDENT

Georgia Salzburger Society Holds Election

DR. C. A. LINN SPEAKS

Settling of Ebenezer Great Historical Romance

Ernest B. Mingledorf of Springfield was elected president of the Georgia Salzburger Society yesterday at the annual meeting held at Ebenezer. The Rev. C. A. Linn, D. D., pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Ascension, Savannah, was the principal speaker.

Other officers elected at the meeting included J. B. Kessler of Rincon, vice president Fred B. Gnann of Stillwell, secretary, and Milton Arden of Clayton was re-elected treasurer.

New members of the executive committee elected for a term of three years were Blois G. Zeigler, replacing J. B. Kessler; W. E. Cramer, succeeding W. A. Exley, and Mrs. Gussie Pool to fill the place left vacant by Mrs. Katie Morgan.

A committee composed of Dr. R. L. Gnann and the Dr. Linn and Julian H. Shearouse of Springfield was appointed to confer with officials of the WPA relative to obtaining a project for tracing the lineage of the Salzburger family in view of the valuable connections with early Georgia history.

The committee handling the work of having an ornamental iron fence erected around the old Zion Cemetery, containing the graves of two of the first ministers and several of the early members was continued.

Dr. Gnann, who is a member of the society, made a plea for all the members to seek contributions of historical documents for the society in order to build up its records.

Dr. Linn, Dr. Gnann and Mr. Arden were named as a committee to obtain an enlarged picture of St. Ann’s Church in Augsburg, Germany, at which the Salzburger congregation was organized Aug. 31, 1733 before coming to Georgia. The picture will have a summary of the history connected with it, condensed in three lines underneath, and will be handsomely framed. The present congregation that now worships at Ebenezer has continued unbroken since 1733.

One other business matter taken up at the meeting was in regard to the branch line road from Georgia route No. 21 to the church. Dr. Gnann, Robert Cramer and Dr. Linn were appointed as a committee to see the proper officials about a slight change desired in the course.
The Battle of Bentonville

The Battle of Bentonville was fought on April 10th, 1865, during the American Civil War. The battle was fought on the outskirts of Bentonville, North Carolina, and was the last major battle of the war. The Union Army, commanded by Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, was victorious, but the battle was bloody and resulted in a high number of casualties. The battle is also known as the Battle of Fair Oaks or the Battle of Bentonville.

The Battle

In the early morning hours of April 10th, Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman began his advance towards Goldsboro, North Carolina. The Confederate Army, commanded by Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, was preparing to meet the Union forces.

The Battle of Bentonville lasted for several hours, with both sides suffering heavy losses. The Union forces were able to break through the Confederate lines and capture the town of Bentonville.

The Casualties

The battle resulted in a high number of casualties on both sides. The Union forces suffered approximately 3,000 casualties, while the Confederate forces lost about 2,500. These casualties included wounded, missing, and killed.

The End of the War

The Battle of Bentonville marked the end of the American Civil War. The Union forces went on to capture several Confederate forts, and the war ended with the surrender of Gen. Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia on April 9th, 1865.

The Aftermath

The aftermath of the battle was marked by a significant decrease in the number of active soldiers on both sides. The war had claimed over 600,000 lives, and the cost in terms of physical infrastructure and human lives was immense. The United States was left with a significant amount of rebuilding to do.

The Battle of Bentonville was a significant event in American history, and its legacy continues to this day. The town of Bentonville, North Carolina, has several landmarks and museums dedicated to the battle and its significance.

The table below shows the results obtained in tests of 151 farmers on 1,745 acres of tobacco. The results were compared with the rights of the farmer and the price paid for tobacco containing 10% potassium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tobacco Variety</th>
<th>Yield (Bushels)</th>
<th>Price per Bushel (Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The price paid for tobacco containing 10% potassium was $0.55 per bushel.

The table shows that the yield of Virginia tobacco was the lowest, while the yield of Burley tobacco was the highest. The price paid for Virginia tobacco was the lowest, while the price paid for Burley tobacco was the highest.

Conclusion

The Battle of Bentonville was a significant event in American history. The legacy of the battle continues to be remembered and studied, and its impact on American society and culture cannot be understated.
THE SMITHFIELD HERALD
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A New Way to Get Results for pennies a day—Get results that will pay for itself in pennies a day—Get results that will pay for itself in pennies a day—Get results that will pay for itself in pennies a day—Get results that will pay for itself in pennies a day.

Lots For Sale!
Bargain For Cash

* 5 white residential lots on Lee Street near Old Mill section.
* See May 27 No. 2, Page 28 for details.

D. L. TURNAGE
GREENVILLE, N. C.

CALL 10
Herald Want Ads

A FEW OF OUR SPECIALS!

4-Poster Walnut Bedroom Suite $49.50

DUNN FURNITURE C. O.
of SELMA

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED
in BUILDING see US for LUMBER and complete BUILDING MATERIALS

- LINE - BASH - 1. CLEM
- CONCNT - ROOFS - VOLS. - CLE.
- PLASTER - FRAMES - LCS
- CEASER BOARD - SHEET ROCK - P.
- BURLERS, LAD.
- WOOD LATH
- ROCK LATH

GUY C. LEE Manufacturing Co.
Phone 229-7
Soculdfield, N. C.

EXTENSIVE USE OF BLACKWOOD FOR THE SOUTHERN FARMER

Two Effects of Hard Winter

This Winter Sure Of Big Page In Weather History

Columbus! But real value. And getting ready to buy. For the next six months or even longer, the item most likely to sell out is the Southern Farmer.

COLUMBUS! But real value. And getting ready to buy. For the next six months or even longer, the item most likely to sell out is the Southern Farmer.