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Introduction

Fairfax, Virginia, sometimes referred to in the history books as Fairfax Court House, was established in 1798 as the seat of government for Fairfax County. Originally known as “Providence,” the town formed as the new courthouse site because the court had been meeting in Alexandria, which was under federal government jurisdiction and therefore was not actually part of Fairfax County. Once a simple crossroads, Fairfax grew into a community that, due to its proximity to Washington, D.C., was an important place throughout the Civil War.

In recent decades, the expansion of the suburbs surrounding Washington, D.C. has sparked the development of much of the land in and around the City of Fairfax. This land development poses a continuing threat to the physical traces of Fairfax’s past, including the archaeological remains associated with families, travelers, and soldiers who lived, visited, and/or occupied Fairfax during the Civil War. Given redevelopment planning needs and the City’s goals of making informed planning decisions that consider significant resources, the City and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources co-sponsored a survey of Civil War resources in the City in 2005 by researchers from the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research. This booklet summarizes the results and offers examples of what archaeology can tell us about the ways soldiers and civilians in Fairfax experienced the Civil War.

Fairfax Court House on the Eve of War

Before the war, the Fairfax region experienced the agricultural depression felt by much of Virginia. Economically focused on growing tobacco using enslaved laborers, colonial and early nineteenth-century Virginians found that the crops drained the nutrients from the soil and made the land unproductive. This lowered land values and brought farmers from the north into Fairfax, who experimented with a number of new fertilizing methods to restore productivity. In spite of this migration of people from Northern states, Fairfax was, in 1860, generally sympathetic to the concerns of the Deep South over the threat to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Buildup of Confederate troops in and around Fairfax C.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Confederacy votes to secede from the Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 27</td>
<td>Private Peyton Anderson, Rappahannock Cavalry, becomes first Confederate soldier wounded in the war while on picket north of Fairfax C.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>Lt. Charles Tompkins leads Company B., 2nd U.S. Cavalry in a much-celebrated raid on Fairfax C.H. Captain John Quincy Marr becomes the first Confederate officer killed in battle during the war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>More Confederate troops brought into Fairfax C. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 17</td>
<td>First Battle of Bull Run/Manassas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July-October</td>
<td>Confederate Occupation. 30,000 troops in the immediate vicinity. Headquarters are at the Mount Vineyard Plantation. On October 1, Confederate President Jefferson Davis holds key strategy meeting with Generals Beauregard and Johnston in Fairfax C.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November-February</td>
<td>Confederate outpost. Main army in winter quarters at Centreville, leaving Fairfax C.H. a no-man’s-land between the armies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>March – August</td>
<td>Union occupation (begins March 10). McClellan holds “meeting of the generals” on March 13. Army of the Potomac centered in Fairfax C.H. until March 17, when it leaves for the Peninsula Campaign. Fairfax C.H. remains a headquarters for various troops screening Washington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 27</td>
<td>Second Battle of Bull Run/Manassas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>Battle of Chantilly/ Ox Hill. Army of Virginia (US) retreats, evacuating Fairfax C.H. Confederates move on into Maryland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Brief reoccupation by Confederate artillermen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September – June</td>
<td>Union moves back into Fairfax C.H. by September 16. XI Corps stationed there until December, replaced by 2nd Vermont Brigade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 27</td>
<td>Raid by Confederate cavalry under Stuart approaches Fairfax C.H. but is stymied by the Vermont Brigade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Growth of guerilla activities around Fairfax C.H. Requires the maintenance of a large force in the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Army of the Potomac headquarters briefly located in Fairfax C.H., leaves to go to Gettysburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July – October</td>
<td>General Rufus King commands a force at Fairfax C.H. to counter the raids of guerillas in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October – November 1864</td>
<td>Corcoran’s Division replaces King’s. Fairfax C.H. is used jointly as a base to counter guerillas and a supply depot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 22</td>
<td>General Corcoran thrown from runaway horse; dies at the W.P. Gunnell house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Existing garrison replaced with the Separate Brigade under the command of Col. William Gamble. Largely a cavalry unit, the Separate Brigade proves more effective at countering mounted guerilla troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>Surrender of Lee’s Confederate forces. Effective end of the war. Gamble’s troops replaced by the Army of Occupation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Summary chronology of major events in the Civil War history of Fairfax Court House.*
extension of slavery posed by the Republican nominee, Abraham Lincoln, though they were not secessionists; at least, not at first. In the election they voted heavily in favor of John Bell, a pro-Union southerner. When Abraham Lincoln called for troops to put down the armed resistance in the south following the attack on Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor, Fairfax residents along with many other Virginians voted the Old Dominion out of the Union. Many enlisted to fight for the Confederacy, though Fairfax’s sizeable Quaker community, which had been the center of Fairfax’s abolitionist movement in the 1840s and 1850s, sought to stay out of the war entirely.

Before the war, Fairfax grew in importance as a stop on a number of transportation routes. The Little River Turnpike connected Washington, D.C. with the Shenandoah Valley, and the Orange & Alexandria Railroad passed near Fairfax, establishing a stop at Fairfax Station three miles south of town. John Esten Cooke, who visited Fairfax before the war and again in December of 1861, described the community as “a village with white houses, embowered in trees, and encircled by green hills and meadows.” The passing of armies during the Civil War would change every aspect of his description.

The Civil War in Fairfax Court House

In the mid-1850s, the Manassas Gap Railroad started construction with plans to pass directly through Fairfax itself. Though the grade for the line was built through town, traces of which are visible today, the coming of the war halted construction before track could be laid, and the line was never completed.

Confederate troops gathered at Fairfax beginning in late April and early May 1861, camping in the fields surrounding the town. Shortly thereafter, Fairfax gained the dubious distinction of becoming the location of the first Confederate soldier injured and first Confederate officer killed in the Civil War. On May 27, Private Peyton Anderson of the Rappahannock Cavalry became the first Confederate soldier wounded while on picket duty just north of Fairfax Court House. The first Confederate combat death of an officer occurred on June 1, 1861, when members of the 2nd U.S. Cavalry, commanded by Lt. Charles Tompkins, galloped through town, shooting wildly. Confederate soldiers fired on them, causing them to turn and ride back through town, and ultimately withdraw. After the skirmish, the body of Captain John Quincy Marr of the Warrenton Rifles was found in a field south of the courthouse.

Following the Tompkins Raid, the Confederates retired south of Bull Run as the Federals pushed farther into Virginia from Washington, D.C. Wounded soldiers from both battles at Manassas were brought into Fairfax for treatment and shipment to hospitals in and around Washington, D.C. Following 1st Manassas, Confederate soldiers again occupied Fairfax, and General Pierre G.T. Beauregard, the Confederate commander, made his headquarters at Mount Vineyard Plantation. They remained in the area through October 1861 before retiring to winter quarters around Centreville.

Between October and the following March, neither side appears to have occupied the town. It might be fairly said, for that matter, that few people if any occupied Fairfax by this time. Throughout the war’s first year, civilians fled Fairfax, many heading south before the Union forces arrived, fearing that their secessionist leanings would land them in prison or cause them to have their property confiscated. When Union troops explored the area in February 1862, they reported the town practically abandoned. There were some citizens who stayed, however, and attempted to restore order, which included the establishment of a new municipal government and
measures to combat bands of marauders who were preying on the farms and plantations in the countryside.

In March, the Union Army began assembling around Washington, D.C., eventually growing to 200,000 men. The Union commander, General George B. McClellan, called a meeting of his generals at Fairfax Court House, possibly at the Mount Vineyard Plantation, to announce his plans for the invasion of the James-York Peninsula. Though this move reduced the number of troops in and around Fairfax, the Union did not lose hold on the area until after the debacle at 2nd Manassas, which was immediately followed by a fight at Ox Hill on the outskirts of town, though the site of the Battle of Ox Hill is located within the present-day boundaries of the City of Fairfax. This battle, also known to some as the Battle of Chantilly, pushed the Union forces out of Fairfax and back into Washington, D.C., leaving the new Confederate commanding general, Robert E. Lee, with an avenue into Maryland, which would culminate in the Battle of Antietam in September, 1862.

Following the Confederate retreat from Antietam, the Union re-occupied Fairfax through 1862 and the first half of 1863. First the XI Corps and then a brigade of Vermont regiments set up camps. The Freedman’s Bureau established some of the first schools for the region’s black population during this time, the nearest being at Manassas and in the basement of Mt. Zion.
Church in Washington, D.C. These schools remained in operation throughout the war, and served as important gathering points for emancipated Virginians during the war and throughout Reconstruction.

The white civilian population, by this time, was showing signs of the privation the war brought to them. The armies had picked over their larders for food, and had even stripped their homes for firewood after taking their fences. Many tried to make a living by cooking or cleaning for the thousands of Union troops now camped in town. Since there was no market, no fences to restrain livestock, and no crops that could be grown without being procured by the army, citizens had little alternative than to work in support of the occupying military forces. Some may have used their access to the camps as a means of gathering information that they then passed to the Confederates. Antonia Ford was arrested and reportedly imprisoned for her alleged role in one of the most celebrated raids in the war.

In January, 1863, the Confederate government authorized the formation of a partisan battalion under the command of John S. Mosby. Charged with disrupting Federal defenses around Washington, D.C. by raiding Union outposts in northern Virginia for supplies, gathering information, and wrecking Federal transportation and communication networks, Mosby and his men proved masters of the art. On the night of March 9th, 1863, they stole quietly into the Federal camp, dressed in Union army ponchos and guided by a Union deserter who had joined their ranks, and stole up to the W. P. Gunnell House. Inside, they woke Brigadier General Edwin Stoughton and spirited him back through the lines, all without firing a shot or arousing suspicion.

For the remainder of the war, Fairfax was under Union control, serving as the headquarters of the Artillery Reserve for the Army of the Potomac, Signal Corps, and Quartermaster’s Office at different times. The VI Corps camped at Germantown, which was

8th U.S. Infantry, Fairfax Court House, June 1863. Fairfax spent most of the war after mid-1862 under Union control. Library of Congress
located on part of the Mount Vineyard plantation (currently within the City limits), and a succession of special brigades occupied the town, using Fairfax as a base from which to chase Mosby back and forth across northern Virginia.

After the war, the community of Fairfax Court House worked to recuperate from the years spent housing armies from both sides. Some residents filed claims for reimbursement with the Southern Claims Commission beginning in 1870. Some residents returned to re-occupy their lands and to begin farming again. New residents arrived as well, lured by the low land prices.

**Why do Civil War Archaeology?**

As evident from the above historical overview, the area currently occupied by the City of Fairfax saw more than its fair share of military occupation, engagements, activity, and singular events during the Civil War. Diaries, letters, newspaper accounts, and memoirs are all sources that can be researched to inform such an overview. There are literally thousands of such works available in books or in archives. Why, then, if the history of the Civil War is so well-documented, do we need archaeology? Hasn’t everything worth knowing already been written down?

In short, we do need archaeology, and despite the documents we have available, the amount of important unrecorded or incorrect history is considerable. As with the history of most warfare during the period of recorded history, much of the documentary record of the Civil War was initially recorded by military participants on either side of the conflict. Accordingly, the potential for political sympathies and biases to influence the historical record is great. Also, groups within the society at the time who did not frequently serve, such as women, seldom appear in the traditional histories of the war, regardless of the importance such groups may have had in shaping that history. Likewise, groups with low literacy rates, such as poor farmers drafted into the army or emancipated African Americans, left few memoirs and letters for study. On the other hand, the archaeological record, which can be less susceptible to the biases inherent in documentary accounts, has the potential to help us better understand the lives of those who were not able to leave their own written record, or who did not serve.

Histories and memoirs often focus on the battles and marches, not on the camp life and everyday experience of the common soldier. The daily routine of picket duty, drill, cooking, playing games, and corresponding with loved ones was the experience of war for soldiers North and South for the bulk of their time in the service. This experience is not necessarily the one that historians have studied thoroughly. We read vastly more about the few scattered hours spent in battle than we do about the months spent in wait. Archaeology can help us better understand the day-to-day life of the armies and the civilians who fed and gave comfort to men in uniform.

Also, archaeology offers a unique bridge to the past. Informed by historical sources, we investigate how people lived in the past through the analysis of the things they built, made, and used. By studying Civil War sites in their entirety, we learn how soldiers lived and died far from home, how civilians caught up in the war found ways to endure the hardships the war brought, and how Virginians both white and black experienced the ending of a way of life that had been built upon slave labor.

Artifacts recovered from intact deposits during controlled archaeological investigation within such sites can potentially reveal details about who was there, when, and what they were doing at the site. In order to recover and interpret such details, however, much more is involved than locating and removing the artifacts from the ground. The information potential of artifacts
that occur within relatively intact archaeological deposits is derived not only from the identity of an individual specimen, but where it was found within a site and how it relates spatially to other artifacts and site features. An inescapable reality of the recovery of artifacts from intact deposits, and even the most careful and thorough, professional archaeological excavation is that the archaeological resource is irreversibly disturbed or destroyed by the very process of excavation. Accordingly, given the non-renewable character of the archaeological resource, it is of the utmost importance that as much information as feasible about the archaeological context of the artifacts and deposits is documented during the recovery. Archaeologists use a combination of standardized methods, sophisticated equipment, and attention-to-detail to record information about the locations and character of artifacts, deposits, and features within a site during excavation. They also synthesize this information together with the results of laboratory analysis and identification of artifacts and field data, as well as knowledge of the historical context of the site, in order to present a more holistic perspective on the people, events, and activities in the past. This can be a complex and challenging task, most often involving the combined skills of a team of specialists with professional training and experience in their various areas of archaeological and/or historical expertise.

Doing Civil War Archaeology

Archaeologists typically find and record Civil War sites through a variety of survey techniques, some of which require specialized experience and expertise, and some of which involve a healthy dose of plain old common sense. Perhaps the most straightforward approach is to simply consult with various people who for a variety of reasons may already be familiar with the locations of sites and the relevant Civil War resources or existing information. Local historians, like Fairfax resident Edward Trexler for example, or members of local historical societies are often a tremendous source of important information given that they typically acquire their knowledge as a consequence of a passionate interest in the subject matter and, by extension, considerable accumulative experience with local records and resources that may not be widely available or known. Longtime landowners can be another important source of information if their familiarity and experience in the area includes oral traditions of unrecorded site locations or artifacts that may have been collected from particular properties over the years. Civil War collectors and metal detectorists familiar with the area are another potentially significant source of information if they are willing to share what they may know about the locations of unrecorded sites where artifacts have been recovered in the past. Members of groups such as the Northern Virginia Relic Hunters Association, for example, can potentially provide access to the collective knowledge of the group concerning unrecorded site locations, as well as the benefits of often incomparably thorough research over the years and familiarity with the relevant sources of information in the documentary records of the Civil War.

Other techniques are more research-intensive. Maps, diaries, and official reports written during the war can be used to make educated guesses about where sites may be located on the present-day landscape. Changes in the routes of roads, earth moving, and the inaccuracy of some period accounts can make this difficult at times, though. Once the relevant historical information has been analyzed with respect to the present-day landscape, prioritized lists of projected Civil War sites and resources are assembled. Priorities for selecting various potential site locations to subject to archaeological field survey can include the relative potential for the occurrence of
intact Civil War archaeological resources based solely on the recommendations of knowledgeable informants or documentary evidence, though locations may also be prioritized on the basis of seemingly mundane but nonetheless significant variables related to the current accessibility of the property or knowledge of previous disturbance.

Archaeology can involve much more than ground-truthing reported site locations and/or recovering artifacts, however. In some cases, intensive archaeological excavation or systematic survey within specific sites may be driven by academic research questions or the need to document significant archaeological information that is threatened by proposed public development projects. The specific methods employed in the recovery of archaeological data from a site may vary dramatically based on the nature of the questions driving the investigation or advance knowledge of the specific site type. For example, intensive archaeological investigation of a well-preserved Civil War military encampment might seek to address questions about the degree to which troops may have adapted official military regulations governing the layout of a camp to local conditions (or perhaps the extent to which official regulations may have been ignored altogether for various reasons). The investigation might instead focus on what the remains of uniforms (e.g., recovered military buttons) and military accoutrements, equipage, and ammunition found within a site may reveal about discrepancies between recorded history of conditions or placement of specific military units and the reality.

Regardless of the specific focus of an archaeological investigation, however, careful, detailed documentation of artifact locations, stratigraphy, process, and context is paramount, given that significant new discoveries can often come from careful analysis of otherwise subtle nuances in the archaeological record. Such archaeological documentation typically includes detailed mapping of a site, noting where features such as hearths, wall footings, or post holes were situated, as well as the locations of diagnostic artifacts. Advance knowledge of the specific site type and informed expectations of how the entire site is structured often helps in the determination of specific methods. For instance, a metal detector survey will uncover bullets, cans, and other metal artifacts, but will not necessarily lead to ceramic, glass, or wood artifacts that one might expect to see in a camp; nor will metal detecting necessarily lead to definition of the outlines and remains of buildings, pits, hearths, and other kinds of features. The chemical composition of the soil affects what artifacts might remain, and the layering of the soil can tell us whether activities like farming or land-leveling have seriously affected the site.

After recovering archaeological data from a site, the artifacts and field notes are brought back to a laboratory. Each artifact is carefully cleaned, placed in a bag, and catalogued. Many are photographed. Careful analysis of the archaeological results together with pertinent documentary sources and information from knowledgeable informants can lead to new or enhanced understandings about specific events, patterns of behavior, or military tactics and strategies that is often published or otherwise made available to a specific or general audience of planners, scholars, and/or interested members of the general public, depending on the nature and goals of the study. Responsible managers and stewards of archaeological resources must consider the need to protect the archaeological record from the effects of unauthorized artifact collection.
Civil War Archaeology in Fairfax

In 2006 and 2007, archaeologists from the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research investigated 62 previously unrecorded potential Civil War sites in the City of Fairfax. These include potential military encampment sites, homes, taverns, and entrenchments that were important features in the city during the war. The general results of this work are summarized below, and are a distillation of the technical report provided to the city as a basis for planning and any further work that might be considered in identifying, protecting, and promoting Fairfax’s Civil War heritage.

Camps

Most numerous among the identified sites were encampments. These were often virtual tent cities inhabited by soldiers from both armies during their stay in Fairfax. Organized to keep men from the same company and regiment sharing space, these large rectangular camps included tents for officers and enlisted men, sinks (toilets), guard posts, kitchens, trash heaps, hospitals, sutlers (camp stores), stables, and stockpiles of supplies. They functioned much like a small city. In an era when there were only nine cities with populations over 100,000, and only 46 with populations over 20,000, the presence of a camp of 50,000 men instantly became one of the most densely populated communities of people in the whole country. The armies had to supply both military and domestic goods to provide for the sustenance, comfort, and fighting readiness of the troops. This meant that the camps in Fairfax were important points in the military networks that had to be constructed to keep armies in the field.

In all, the archaeologists identified 45 potential Civil War camps. Confederate camps in Fairfax lay primarily along the main access routes to the city, such as the Little River Turnpike. Probably the most extensive Confederate camp in the City of Fairfax during the war was Camp Harrison, which was constructed by the 7th, 11th, and 17th Virginia Infantry Regiments on the north and south sides of town in the late summer of 1861. Much of what we know about Camp Harrison was compiled from primary sources by Andrea Loewenwarter in a study she completed in 2005 in support of a consultant’s archaeological survey project. Camp Harrison served as a basis for scouting and reconnaissance missions towards Falls Church and Alexandria during the first months of the war.

Archaeological work at Camp Harrison helped confirm and document the extensive nature of the site boundaries and provided information that could point to the internal arrangement of Confederate regimental camps. Knowledge that Camp Harrison was established early in the war suggests that the site of the encampment may offer a rare opportunity to study Civil War camp life from that period, before Confederate material resources were stretched thin by the Union blockade of ports and the South’s failure to industrialize. Unfortunately, Camp Harrison, like most camps in the Fairfax area, cannot be studied as a discrete unit any longer, as development in the area has affected large portions of the camp’s original layout. Indeed, the archaeologists were fortunate to find elements of Camp Harrison, given that many of the other early war camps in Fairfax, such as the camps of the 2nd, 3rd, 7th, and 8th South Carolina Infantry regiments, have been long ago destroyed or buried beneath modern development. Others, such as Camp Conley (another early war Confederate camp), were destroyed by landscaping. What
remains of these camps takes on additional significance by virtue of its rarity, given the non-renewable nature of archaeological resources.

Union camps were scattered around Fairfax, both within the city core and its outskirts. Regiments hailing from New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Ohio all quartered in Fairfax at some point during the war. In some historic homes around the city, graffiti from these men, recording names, units, and other information, may still be seen scrawled on the walls. The Blenheim House, currently being refurbished by the City of Fairfax for use as an interpretive center, has over 100 signatures from Union soldiers on its walls and ceilings.

Archaeologists conducted limited testing of the projected location where the 5th New York Cavalry camped in 1863. Within the bounds of the site, they identified considerable quantities of what would otherwise be considered civilian artifacts representing domestic activities and architectural materials. As period documents indicate, buildings throughout Fairfax were stripped of wood for fuel and of bricks for constructing hearths and fireplaces in the camps. Seeking to re-create some of the comforts of home while in the field, Union soldiers literally disassembled some buildings. Furnishings were also taken from within the house for use by soldiers in the camps. Sites like that of the 5th New York Cavalry encampment can help us understand both what and how soldiers appropriated materials from the area surrounding their camp and sought to provide themselves with balance and comfort while in the field.

Unfortunately, as with the Confederate camps, Union camps in Fairfax are rapidly disappearing with increasing development, either in parts or in their entirety. It is through the coordinated efforts of archaeologists and preservation groups in Fairfax that what remains may be documented and properly managed for the benefit of all interested parties.

The W.P. Gunnell House is known to have served as the headquarters of Union General Stoughton in early 1863 (it was in this house that Confederate Lt. John S. Mosby captured Stoughton in March of that year), and it’s clear that associated troops were encamped in the vicinity. Other Union soldiers are known to have camped around various homes in the city. These sites were camps for troops from Massachusetts, Vermont, and Pennsylvania, whose officers enjoyed the comforts of sleeping indoors during their stay in Fairfax. Not only do the surrounding camps tell us about the lived experience of the war, but the houses themselves reinforce how civilians can be drawn into conflicts that they have the bad luck to be caught in the middle of. With such a prominent place in the history of the American Civil War, archaeology on any site inhabited or used by persons civilian or military during the war years is a fundamental part of the archaeological heritage of Civil War Fairfax.
Some sites, including the present City Hall property and the Willcoxon Tavern, were known or could be expected to have been the focus of multiple types of military occupations by both sides throughout the war. This can make teasing apart the cumulative archaeological remains of such multiple, overlapping occupations by both Union and Confederate troops difficult, to say the least. And even if evidence of Union or Confederate presence can be confirmed, the archaeologists need to be aware that multiple types of sites may be represented by similar artifacts, particularly if the evidence is limited to what could be documented or recovered during only a brief reconnaissance survey. Research by C.K. Gailey, Patricia Gallagher, and Andrea Loewenwarter into the records of Union deaths and interments in Fairfax Court House during the Civil War suggests the Willcoxon Tavern was among the sites used as a military field hospital by both Union and Confederate forces at different times. It was also clearly the focus of meetings and at least brief occupations by lots of troops at various times, as confirmed by the 1861 photograph shown above. At the reconnaissance level of investigation, archaeological differences between sites of large-scale meetings and more intensive encampment occupations may be relatively subtle and nuanced.

Even where sites can be confirmed as single-function military encampments, the possibility of multiple occupations by both sides must be considered. Such sites beg questions that can be as instructive as the internal dynamics of the site itself. For instance, why were these sites used and re-used by both sides? Was there a source of good water nearby? Was the area more defensible than others? Was the land shaded or exposed to the sun? Did the political leanings of the landowner agree with or offend one army or the other? These are all factors that officers considered when arranging army camps. By studying the ecological and social aspects of Civil War Fairfax, and how soldiers used the terrain, we add to our knowledge of how Civil War-era Americans understood and shaped the world around them.

The survey archaeologists investigated other potential campsites, but did not recover artifacts from them. In some cases, they had been built over. Period maps are helpful in locating sites, though it frequently happens that the site in question has been turned into a store, homes, or a road.

**Earthworks and Fortifications**

Documentary and historic map evidence indicates that there were several sites of Civil War earthen fortifications or earthworks within the City of Fairfax. Archaeological study of the sites of earthworks has the potential to provide important information about the routine activities of troops who occupied the fortifications and potential variation in tactics and field defenses.
between military regulations and their application in the field. Though no unambiguous surface evidence of military earthworks was identified during the reconnaissance survey, several sites were identified based on map projections that may contain subsurface or subtle surface remains of Civil War earthworks that might be identified with more intensive archaeological investigations.

Nineteenth-century field fortifications, in general, were temporary works usually employed to fortify points of strategic importance to an army’s operations at that time. Probably the most important function of a field fortification was to strengthen tactical positions and to provide the means for an inferior army to withstand and repel an attack by a stronger, more numerous enemy force. They also provided security for an army’s lines of communications and protection of its base of operations, as well as other strategic or tactical points not covered by more permanent fortifications. By tradition, field fortifications were generally classified and described by the shape formed by the lines and angles of the parapet. One of the earthwork sites situated within the City was labeled on period maps as the “Star Fort.” A star fort would be a field fortification that got its name from the general resemblance of its shape to the conventional symbol for a star. Unfortunately, the available documentary evidence does not indicate when the fort was constructed and what forces occupied the fort. A report from a Fairfax property owner to the Southern Claims Commission after the war does indicate, however, that Sigel’s XI Corps fortified Fairfax Court House during the autumn of 1862, so it’s possible that they were responsible for construction and occupation of the star fort.

An 1861 map of Fairfax Court House depicts what were clearly very early Confederate fortifications in Fairfax Court House. Documents confirm that in late June 1861, Confederate General Beauregard ordered defenses to be built around the village. Rifle pits were dug into positions adjacent to all of the eastern approaches to the community. Though the scale of the 1861 map and the documentary references lack the resolution and detail to pinpoint the locations of these early earthworks on the modern landscape, local historian, Edward Trexler reports that details on a large-scale 1950s topographic map of the region depict features that may represent at least some of the earthworks that were constructed on the periphery of the village. Again, though no obvious surface indications of such earthworks were identified during the reconnaissance survey, limited access to private property prevented close inspection of the high-probability areas, and it is possible that more intensive investigation could reveal subsurface evidence, should such an opportunity present itself in the future.

There is the possibility that pre-war landscape modifications originally intended for civilian purposes were adapted for use as earthworks during the Civil War in Fairfax Court House. Before the war, the nearest railroad line to Fairfax was the Orange & Alexandria Railroad, which passed through Fairfax Station three miles to the south. The O&A linked Alexandria with points south, running through Manassas. In the 1850s, another line was built. Known as the Manassas Gap Railroad, it connected the Shenandoah Valley with Alexandria and
Washington, D.C., proving an important means of bringing goods from the fertile valley to the merchants in the city. The two roads linked at Manassas, with the Manassas Gap Railroad paying a rental fee on the tracks to Alexandria to the O&A. In order to escape from paying this fee, the MGRR received permission to build a new line directly into Alexandria. This line was planned to pass directly through Fairfax.

Construction began on the railroad grade in 1854. Work went slowly, as land was expensive and the route had to cross numerous hills and draws, which required substantial earthmoving. It was still incomplete in 1861 when the war came, and the disruption of the advancing armies meant that the line was never completed. Nevertheless, the trackless grade was built through Fairfax, and was used in a variety of different ways by both Confederate and Union troops.

Early in the war, around the time of the Tompkins Raid, the Confederate army established a number of camps in and around Fairfax, as mentioned above. A map made at the time shows a curved field separating Confederate camps from the town. The curve closely matches the path of the railroad grade, suggesting that the Confederates were using the embankment as a ready-made earthwork. They camped on the side opposite from which the Union would have to come in order to take Fairfax, and the open field between the railroad grade and the town would have provided the defenders an open field of fire.

Earthworks (converted from civilian railroad grades or not) could possibly serve purposes other than military defense. At one point during the archaeological survey, the archaeologists identified a scatter of fired bullets, sometimes referred to as minié balls. All identifiable rounds are the same caliber and appear to have been fired by the same kind of weapon. But, why would there be such a tight scatter of rounds in an earthen embankment? There are multiple explanations, two of which seem mostly likely.

First, it was standard practice in both armies to have the routine of the day include time spent on the rifle range, perfecting the aim of soldiers who were until recently civilians. Some of the men in both ranks went to war with little experience in handling firearms, and some had never touched them. In order to turn these raw recruits into an effective fighting force, they had to practice loading and firing their muskets. A steeply sloped embankment would have made a handy backstop for such practice.
This cluster of bullets could also mark the presence of a guard tent. Screening every encampment from surprise and attack were a series of pickets, guards to keep away the enemy and to control the movement of people out of and into the camp. Guard duty was a shared responsibility of the entire regiment, with men taking turns serving shifts that lasted several hours. When on guard, weapons had to be kept loaded. When coming back from guard, the soldiers had to unload their weapons so they did not accidentally go off in camp, wounding or killing a fellow soldier. This also made the weapon ready to be cleaned in preparation for inspection. When guards came off picket duty, they would stop at the guard tent to report on any suspicious activities and ensure that their weapons were not loaded. It was common for them to do so by firing them into some sort of embankment. It is possible that the scatter of bullets recovered from an embankment during the survey represents just a group of guards coming in from the front lines, headed back to camp. It is a brief moment in the daily routine of the common soldier.

Battlefields and Skirmishes

The archaeological sites of battlefields and skirmishes can be particularly challenging site types from which to recover archaeological information. Depending on how a particular battle or engagement unfolded, the physical remnants of the action (e.g., dropped or fired ammunition, uniform buttons, accoutrements, horse-related hardware, artillery and wagon hardware, etc.) could be widely scattered or discretely clustered in areas of the overall site, with no clear documentary evidence that would have sufficient resolution to suggest where clusters of artifacts
could be located. As discussed by archaeologist Robert Jolley in a recent article summarizing survey of a Civil War battlefield in Winchester, Virginia, archaeologists have only recently accumulated sufficient opportunities to conduct battlefield archaeology to begin to seriously consider the archaeological research potential and value such sites hold. When subjected to careful archaeological investigation, the site of a battlefield or skirmish can potentially provide significant information that may conflict with or be altogether absent in historic accounts recorded by participants, witnesses, or historians.

Identification of the sites of military engagements that took place within Fairfax Court House during the Civil War would be a tall order indeed, given the typically large and scattered character of the expected archaeological resources combined with the relatively high density of post-Civil War and especially modern development and potential disturbances to the archaeological record. The Tompkin’s Raid on May 31, 1861, for example, involved members of the 2nd U.S. Cavalry, commanded by Lt. Charles Tompkins, galloping through town, shooting wildly, and then receiving fire from Confederate soldiers, which caused the Union cavalry to turn and ride back through town, and ultimately withdraw. Archaeological identification of the physical remains of such an ephemeral military encounter, within what is now the highly developed landscape of downtown Fairfax, and distinguishing such remains from multiple other components of Civil War occupation may not be impossible, but it would certainly involve much more intensive investigation than is possible during a reconnaissance-level survey of the type recently conducted.

**Blenheim**

The Willcoxon family, who maintained the tavern in Fairfax, also owned a farm on the outskirts of the town. The farmhouse, known as Blenheim, still stands and today is part of the city’s extant Civil War landscape, along with the courthouse, the Ratcliffe-Allison House, the Joshua Gunnell House, the Moore House, the William P. Gunnell House, the Draper House, the Ford House, and the Margaret Willcoxon Farr Cottage (Grandma’s Cottage). The Willcoxon Family built Blenheim ca. 1859. The name “Blenheim” was apparently the Willcoxon family’s name for the property in the late nineteenth century, given that it was referred to by that name in 1903 in a family obituary.

Blenheim is known for the well-preserved graffiti of individual Union soldiers who spent time in Fairfax Court House. Upon the walls of the attic are written more than 120 signatures of men from different units, as well as their drawings. Sergeant Numa Barned of Company B, 73rd Pennsylvania Infantry left his name there along with Corporal August Seeber of Company I, 54th New York. Some units signed as a group, such as William Penn Hose Company #18, part of the 72nd Pennsylvania Infantry.
known as Baxter’s Philadelphia Fire Zouaves (troops referred to as “zouaves” wore a North African style uniform made popular by similarly-attired elite forces fighting for the French in the Crimean War). Men from Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Michigan have so far been identified amongst the signatures.

One soldier whose December 2, 1862 signature appears among the graffiti, Private Morris Coats, has been identified as recuperating in an XI Corps hospital at the time, suggesting Blenheim’s possible use as a hospital. Part of the XI Corps hospital system was located within the village. Recent research by archaeologists from John Milner Associates indicates the Blenheim yard served in the spring and late June of 1863 as a cavalry camp, occupied by the 1st Michigan. Interpretation of Blenheim’s role in the war may change, as the researchers continue to uncover and research more names as they appear during renovation of the building.

**Mount Vineyard Plantation**

While the enlisted men lived in tent camps in and around the city, the highest-ranking officers enjoyed the luxury of living in one of a number of wealthy homes in Fairfax. No home boasted more famous visitors or momentous events than the main house at Mount Vineyard Plantation, located on the west side of Fairfax. The house burned in the 20th century, and the site has since been developed, leaving little surface evidence that a mansion once stood there, though it is likely that intensive archaeological investigations could identify subsurface remains that could offer significant information pertaining to its construction and use.

The Mount Vineyard Plantation was headquarters for several generals, both Union and Confederate. Early in the war, Confederate general P.G.T. Beauregard commanded southern forces from its parlor, and there is some evidence that the Confederate battle flag was designed there after 1st Manassas.

When the Union army retook the town, General George B. McClellan claimed Mount Vineyard as his headquarters. It was here that the disastrous Peninsula Campaign of 1862 was planned. Though the plantation house has been destroyed, archaeology has permitted us to recover artifacts relating to the site and the men and women who occupied the house during the war.

The domestic artifacts that would have graced the tables of the officers who met and ate at Mount Vineyard, though resembling many similar civilian assemblages from other sites, remind us how thin the line between archaeological evidence of civilian versus military life can become during times of conflict. In order to cope with the boredom of time spent on guard details, far from the front lines, soldiers guarding the house sought to occupy their minds and hands with a number of tasks. Whittled bullets appear widely throughout the archaeological
record, reminding us that soldier life consisted of long periods of tedium punctuated with the extreme terror of battle. The man who carved these bullets could have left Mount Vineyard to fight at Manassas, or board a boat at Alexandria to sail down to the York-James Peninsula and join in the attempt to take Richmond.

**Fairfax Cemeteries**

Anytime a Civil War army stopped in one place for very long, men died. Poor sanitation, inadequate medical facilities, and rotten, poisonous rations killed two men for every one that died on the battlefield. It would not be until the Korean War that the U.S. Army shipped home all accounted-for war dead. As a result, tens of thousands of northern and southern soldiers remain buried far from the homes and families they left behind. In some instances, families paid to have their loved ones brought back (embalming became widespread during the war). After the war, the U.S. government undertook an effort to move all Union war dead into a system of national cemeteries, most of which were situated on or near major battlefields. Soldiers buried elsewhere were disinterred and moved to one of these larger cemeteries.

During the war, Union dead were interred in a number of places, including both private property and church grounds. Since not all are associated with places known to be hospitals, they could have been interment sites for dead from the battles of 2nd Manassas or Ox Hill. The other sites likely contain those who died of disease or accident while in Fairfax. It is important to note that not all men who died in Fairfax remained there. During the 2nd Vermont Brigade’s stay in the town in late 1862 and early 1863, at least twelve men died of disease, of which only one, Corporal John C. White of Company F, 13th Vermont, remained in Virginia. All others, enlisted men all, were shipped back to Vermont for burial.

As mentioned previously, C.K. Gailey, Pat Gallagher, and Andrea Loewenwarter have done substantial research on Civil War burials in and around Fairfax. They found that those who were not shipped home were relocated just after the war. The U.S. government disinterred them in 1866, moving them to nearby Arlington National Cemetery. Specific counts for all men so relocated are not available, though 36 are known to have been taken from Mount Vineyard to Arlington. Of these, the names of only two are known, Jacob Krieg and August Frey. Private Frey was a Swiss immigrant shoemaker who enlisted in the 16th New York Cavalry in early 1864. His service was short, however, as he died of disease less than two months after enlisting. Krieg, of the same regiment, was a young molder from Stamford, Connecticut who enlisted in mid-1863. He died the day after Christmas that same year of either typhoid or consumption. Historical sources suggest that dozens if not hundreds of burials in the immediate vicinity of the town were relocated. They were part of a larger effort that moved over 800 soldiers from Fairfax and
Alexandria Counties in Virginia, Montgomery County, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to Arlington National Cemetery. These were in addition to the soldiers buried in Arlington during the war.

For the Confederate dead, there was no such Federal support. The U.S. government steadfastly refused to pay for cemeteries for those who fought against it. The task fell to private associations throughout the south, many of which were directed and managed by women. In Fairfax, the Ladies Memorial Association purchased land along the Little River Turnpike in 1866 to serve as a formal Confederate cemetery. Throughout the south, such cemeteries were placed in the center of town as a way of keeping the dead of the war as central parts of civic life, keeping the salience of the fighting prominent in the minds of future generations. Keeping the most tangible and forceful traces of the conflict close at hand served an important tool as local whites sought to come to grips with defeat in the war while maintaining the systems of racial stratification and control that had been at play before the fighting in the face of federally-backed reconstruction governments. Confederate dead were moved to the cemetery in Fairfax through the late 1860s. The cemetery expanded steadily over the following decades, and now serves as the city cemetery. A marker to Confederate dead was added in 1890 honoring the 200 unidentified Confederate dead gathered from around Fairfax County for internment in the cemetery.

Some Confederate dead are known from the regimental records. In early and mid 1861, the 7th and 11th Virginia Infantry Regiments, camped at Camp Harrison, lost a number of men to disease. C.K. Gailey, Patricia Gallagher, and Andrea Loewenwarter report that the 7th lost at least five to pneumonia and dysentery, while typhoid fever killed between six and eleven men in the 11th. These were all enlisted men, and all for whom recorded professions exist save one were farmers. George Jackson and Lewis Harlow, both from Madison County, died the same day. Neither Luther Johnson nor Thomas Davis had reached the age of twenty before typhoid claimed them. More men were given discharges due to their ailments. Those who were not so fortunate either remained to die in Fairfax or were sent home after death for burial. This could account for the lack of officer’s interments, as the early war officer corps was drawn heavily from the upper class, with families who could afford to have a body shipped home. When Captain John Quincy Marr became the first Confederate officer to die in battle at Fairfax, his body was shipped home to Warrenton for burial.

Of course, men did die in battle, three of which were fought just outside the city. Two battles at Manassas and one at Ox Hill resulted in wounded, bleeding men being brought into the homes and public buildings of Fairfax Court House. Several field hospitals were set up, as well, in an attempt to aid these men, as discussed above.
Developed Sites

As noted several times already, development of the suburbs surrounding Washington, D.C. has resulted in the outright destruction of numerous Civil War sites. We know the location of some of these because interested members of the community report finding Civil War material there before or during construction. In some cases, we have been permitted to inspect and sometimes photograph collections from such sites, which give us some idea of what was there before a shopping mall, apartment complex, or new highway was constructed.

Some sites are, unfortunately, almost entirely lost to us. One of these is Mount Vineyard Plantation, headquarters of Generals Beauregard (CS), McDowell (US), and McClellan (US), when they stayed in Fairfax. The site has since been turned into an apartment complex. Other sites have been substantially compromised by the effects of unauthorized and undocumented metal detecting and artifact collection. This sad loss of the heritage of Fairfax, the Commonwealth, and the nation is a frustration to both archaeologists and members of the public who value the history of the Civil War.

In a few cases, however, sites may be gone but all might not be lost. One of the facts of the American automobile culture is that buildings require parking lots. Parking lots do not require the kind of deep-earth excavations that buildings do, so it is quite possible for archaeological sites to remain intact underneath the blacktop. In cases where a period map, diary, or other source of information suggests that there might be a site beneath a modern day parking lot, we maintain a record of that possibility. That way, if the parking lot is ever turned into something else, and an archaeological survey is called for, future archaeologists will know of the site and can take steps to prevent the loss of significant information from any future threats. As is the case with all aspects of archaeology, careful documentation is the key!

Conclusion

Overall, the results of the study show that there are Civil War sites throughout the City of Fairfax, though many have been destroyed by development in the nearly century and a half since the guns fell silent. While occupation by both armies focused around the courthouse proper, little of the town was spared the hard hand of war.

Although the body of literature on Civil War archaeology is growing, the rapid rate of land development continues to threaten many sites, too many of which have not been documented archaeologically. In some instances, federal law requires archaeological survey in advance of construction, but this is not always the case. With every camp site, battlefield, entrenchment, and period home lost, we lose a bit more of our heritage. This is not simply an issue for Civil War buffs or history lovers. Our very sense of identity as Americans or Virginians comes in large measure from the past and the travails we as a community have endured and experienced.
Civil War Attractions in and Around Fairfax

Fairfax City
Ox Hill (Chantilly) Battlefield (West Ox Road and Monument Drive)
Confederate Cemetery Monument (10563 Main Street)
Fairfax County Courthouse (4000 Chain Bridge Road)
Fairfax Museum (10209 Main Street)
St. Mary of the Sorrows Church (5222 Sideburn Road)

Surrounding
Arlington National Cemetery (214 McNair Road, Arlington)
Fairfax Station Railroad Museum (11200 Fairfax Station Road, Open Sundays 1-4)
Fort Marcy (671 Chain Bridge Road, Fairfax County)
Manassas National Battlefield (12521 Lee Highway, Manassas)
Sully Plantation (Highway 28 near Dulles Airport, Fairfax County)
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**Online Resources**
Civil War Archaeology (Projects conducted by the National Park Service’s Southeast Archeological Center) [http://www.nps.gov/seac/civilwar/index.htm]

Johnson’s Island, Ohio (Prison for Confederate soldiers, mainly officers, including many Virginians) [http://www.archaeology.org/interactive/johnsons]

Metal Detectorist/Archaeologist Partnership Projects [http://www.saa.org/Public/resources/MetDet_Par.html]