

Introduction

LAWRENCE E. BABITS

The French and Indian War was a defining moment in American history. For the first time the various colonies organized and acted in concert. While this ultimately failed, they nonetheless worked together to defeat the French. The war marked the first time there was large-scale theater-level military activity in North America. The impact of over 40,000 British soldiers, their equipment, ideas, and money was dramatic and played a role in developing what turned into the American Revolution a few short years later. These changes can be seen in the popular introduction of a new architectural style and its accompanying furnishings and the rise of national figures, particularly George Washington and Benjamin Franklin.

The period marks the British army's introduction to the "American Way of War" and American perceptions about the vulnerability of the British army. In the long term, British logistical efforts during 1755–63 heavily influenced the notion that local North American resources could support British military forces. This misperception caused a disaster during the Revolution when two British armies, cut off from seaborne reinforcement and supplies, were forced to surrender. The British had forgotten that local support during the French and Indian War from an Anglo-American effort against a common enemy was much different than the situation throughout the Revolution.

The war also generated a national debt that caused Parliament to seek ways of paying for the war and for postwar North American garrisons. In turn, new tax laws and the attempted enforcement of older navigation acts led to colonial resentment, smuggling, and resistance.

Military construction activity on the Anglo-American frontier included settlers, colonies, and the British army working to create a defensive barrier against the French and their Indian allies. This study focuses on the frontier:

a cutting-edge stress area where traditional styles and expertise, new technology, tactics, and attitudes were exposed to trial and error against an experienced foe who did not fight “by the rules.” Some Old World aspects worked, others did not. As the war went on, colonists, the French, and the British refined how they waged war. In terms of fortifications, various approaches can be seen in the documents, images, and the archaeological record. Each of these resources provides evidence and contributes to understanding the forts and the fortification system as a whole.

The documentary evidence about fortifications includes initial, verbalized plans and directions to subordinates, inspection reports, and ultimately the sale or destruction of the posts. If the post was attacked, reports often contain supplemental details overlooked by the original planners. These documents are somewhat cryptic, often using image-laden, highly technical military and architectural terminology. They generally hold only snippets of information that must be tested against eighteenth-century language and extant examples of fortifications for more precise interpretation.

The images include maps, plans for various sites and cross sections, and artistic views of fortifications. Two starting points are Mary Ann Rocque’s 1763 and 1765 publications of her deceased husband’s drawings (Rocque 1765 is used here) and holdings in numerous repositories. Many of these sites are referenced in the following chapters. While the images are exceptionally helpful, they are only thin sections in a fort’s chronology and may not accurately reflect earlier and later construction episodes.

While the archaeological record is often the most incomplete, it can also be the most accurate. When features and artifacts are found on a site, they must be explained. In the search for meaning, specific questions are asked of documents and images that may not have been thought of before. In that sense, the presence of archaeological material might lead to new information. At the same time, if archaeologists do not ask the right questions of their artifacts, documents, and imagery, the answers are irrelevant (Pynchon 1987:251).

As a total package then, the documents, images, and artifacts can provide a composite, interpretive impression of a fort site that allows the current generation, now celebrating the 250th anniversary of the war, access to the past. When interpretation is further augmented by a reconstruction, the learning process continues as even more detailed questions arise through the course of construction.

This study focuses on a range of sites, extending from the southern frontier zones to the Great Lakes. It is not meant to be complete but

representative. In conjunction with other studies, most notably Charles Stotz's *Outposts of the War for Empire* (1985), which examined Pennsylvania, and Michael D. Coe's *Line of Forts* (2006), which dealt with northwestern Massachusetts, this current work provides a wider view of French and Indian War material culture and fortifications. Two other important studies should also be mentioned. J. C. Harrington's analysis of 1754 Fort Necessity (1970) is justifiably regarded as one starting point for historical archaeology (Schuyler 1978:xi). In similar fashion, Jacob Grimm's wonderful 1970 study of Fort Ligonier represents a key episode in material culture and military history studies, not only for the mid-eighteenth century but for archaeology in general.

Modern historical research on the French and Indian War began with Francis Parkman (1885, 1892, 1995), continued with Stanley Pargellis (1966), Lawrence Gipson (1949, 1954), Howard Peckham (1947), Edward Hamilton (1959, 1962), and James and Stotz (1958) and continues today with Anderson (1984), Leach (1973, 1986), Schwartz (1994), Stotz (1985), Todish (2002), Waddell (1995).

Readily available, French and Indian War historical archaeology research really began in the 1950s when J. C. Harrington was tasked with learning about George Washington's Fort Necessity. His research into that post set a standard for historical research, archaeological test excavations, and interpretation that is used as a model today. Since then, well over three dozen French and Indian War fortifications have been examined archaeologically. Many site reports ended in the realm of gray literature that few students or historians ever have the chance to read. Others were never published, including work on some major fortifications.

In this book, no attempt was made to examine some well-known major sites that have been subjected to research and excavation for years. These sites include Fort William Henry (Starbuck 2002), Fort Michilimackinac (Stone 1974), Fort Ligonier (Grimm 1970; Stotz 1974), Louisbourg, Nova Scotia (Fry 1984), Québec (Charbonneau et al. 1982), Fort Chambly, Québec (Gélinas 1983), Niagara (Dunnigan 1996, 1989; Dunnigan and Scott 1991), Fort Stanwix (Hanson and Hsu 1970), Fort Ticonderoga (Hamilton 1970, 1995; Pell 1978), and Fort Toulouse in Wetumpka, Alabama (Heldman 1973). Other sites have been examined and published, including Fort Gage (Feister and Huey 1985) and Fort Bull (Hagerty 1971). Overviews with details of individual forts have been published for the northwestern Massachusetts frontier (Coe 2006), Pennsylvania (Stotz 1974; Kummerow et al. 2008; Waddell and Bomberger 1996), and the Lake Champlain corridor

(Bellico 1992). The upper Potomac River valley has a short study of its forts (Ansel 1984). Many frontier sites from the southern frontier and what was then the Far West have not been generally published. That oversight is partially rectified here.

Of particular interest is the mix of fortification types as they range from civilian/militia fortified farmsteads to provincial colonial fortifications and finally British and French works designed to show imperial power at the border of their respective realms. Many also served as trading posts, acting as an interface locus between European and Native American cultures for their mutual exploitation of resources. However, not all fortifications fit into this model of frontier military, diplomatic, and trading post. These latter fortifications were largely self-funded sites erected by the local citizenry for a particular emergency situation and then, in many cases, abandoned or returned to the landscape.

The forts were erected in accordance with tactical considerations modified by local terrain, expenses, and time. As will be seen, several forts incorporated preexisting structures to save time and effort. Others had irregular traces (*enceinte*) because the terrain dictated coverage of approach lines and dead space. Hart's essay presents something of these issues, but as he points out, engineers and fort builders were quick to adapt military principles to the local setting.

Some sites have been heavily collected by relic hunters, few of whom maintained any record of what they found and where. This is unfortunate, but happily the situation is evolving as archaeologists recognize that metal detectorists are both knowledgeable and dedicated to researching the past. Many professionals are now reaching out to the metal detecting community for advice and assistance, creating a more effective research effort at these very delicate sites. Some of that effort is reported in these chapters.

The book begins with two chapters on the war and fortifications. In "Clash of Empires," Scott Stephenson presents an overview of the war, making several points about supplies and the importance of waterways in the wilderness. In some ways, especially in the northern theater and Pennsylvania, the war became a war of posts used as stepping-stones to threaten the next enemy fort. Stephenson is followed by James Hart's "Forts on the Frontier," an essay on academic fortification as applied in North America. Hart's study of fortification principles concentrates on French Fort St. Frédéric at the Lake Champlain choke point, a short distance north of Fort Ticonderoga. One of his main points is that adaptation to frontier conditions was fairly quick, but within the framework of accepted Vauban-style

fortification principles. This controlled adaptation will be seen in the other authors' analyses of their respective forts.

The sequence of chapters then shifts to South Carolina's two frontier forts. The first is by Marshall Williams, who covers the history and archaeological work conducted at the site of Fort Prince George in 1966–68. This key fortification was excavated but not reported until Williams, drawing from his personal field notes and the archaeological drawings, set down his recollection of the project. The site is now underwater.

Next, Carl Kuttruff presents a summary of work conducted at Fort Loudoun, a post located west of the Appalachians in present-day eastern Tennessee. It was constructed to solidify Overhill Cherokee alliances with the British and to prevent French encroachments into the area from Fort Toulouse. As planned, the Fort Loudoun defenses were perhaps the largest of frontier forts of this period. The fort is described and compared with other French and Indian War frontier forts, especially Fort Prince George, its sister fort on the eastern side of the Appalachians. Artifacts recovered from hand excavations of approximately 90 percent of the fort interior and large portions of the surrounding ditch are summarized. Distributions of several artifact categories are presented to illustrate refuse disposal patterns within and outside the fort. The overall artifact assemblage is compared to the current Carolina and Frontier Patterns, and suggestions are made for developing a separate Frontier Fort Pattern.

Moving north, Lawrence Babits details the history of 1756–63 Fort Dobbs, North Carolina, and discusses how 40 years of archaeological and historic research produced enough information to re-create the fort. This led to new interpretations about the main structure and outworks. Fieldwork and research involved numerous people, many of whom developed ideas of what the fort once resembled. This latest endeavor, essentially a historical architectural study of a building no longer extant, utilizes documentary research, archaeological findings, and comparisons with slightly earlier British frontier fortifications in the Scottish Highlands to explain terminology used by those who designed and inspected the fort.

Moving into Virginia, three forts (two civilian and one provincial) are interpreted from the documents and the archaeology. The civilian forts Edwards and Vause were researched and excavated by the McBrides, who confirmed site locations and learned that the forts were built on property owned by local elites. Through Fort Edwards, Stephen McBride examines Virginia's response to Braddock's defeat in July 1755. The Virginia Regiment under Colonel George Washington began constructing forts along

Virginia's western frontier to defend settlers against anticipated French and Indian attacks. In 1756, this defensive line was greatly expanded by new forts and by incorporating existing private forts. Among the forts added to the Virginia frontier defensive chain was privately built Fort Edwards, in present Hampshire County, West Virginia. The investigations were directed toward assessing the nature of archaeological deposits across the site and successfully located evidence of the French and Indian War fort and its occupation.

Kim McBride conducted the research at Fort Vause, Virginia—a post that was built and occupied from fall of 1756 to fall of 1757 by soldiers from the Virginia Regiment under the command of Peter Hogg. The construction was the local response to the June 1756 destruction of the first Fort Vause by a party of Shawnee and French. Period accounts suggest that the first Fort Vause, located at the home of Ephram Vause, was a wooden stockade, but little was known of the second fort, except that it was not to Washington's liking. Preliminary archaeological investigations were conducted at this second fort under the direction of Ned Heite in 1968, and the site was listed as a Virginia Historic Landmark. Recently, excavations were expanded and a more comprehensive survey of the site was conducted, providing better knowledge of the boundaries of deposits and the physical construction of the fort.

Fort Loudoun at Winchester is one of the few frontier forts associated with a town. Unlike the civilian forts, this post was constructed of earth-filled cribs to create bastions connected by palisade walls. Robert Jolley found that even though it was a major depot, Fort Loudoun was still plagued by the same construction and supply issues typical of virtually all the forts in this study.

In Pennsylvania, Stephen Warfel conducted excavations at a third Fort Loudoun. This post was one of the chain of forts built to support the Forbes expedition against Fort Duquesne. The excavations were designed to learn more about the specifics of this fort's chronology and structural features in conjunction with earlier research on other Forbes forts.

Charles Fisher and Paul Huey address the basics of the two sequential posts on Lake Champlain. British Crown Point was erected adjacent to the earlier French Fort St. Frédéric, a site theoretically discussed by Hart. This location was an ideal point to project imperial power, attract allies, and hold the Lake Champlain Narrows. By 1742, Fort St. Frédéric was the most powerful fortress in terms of cannon, second only to Québec (Bellico