1. Name of Property
   Historic name: Tangier Island Historic District 2015 Boundary Increase
   Other names/site number: VDHR #309-0001; VDHR #44AC0574; Fort Albion
   Name of related multiple property listing: N/A
   (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. Location
   Street & number: South of Tangier Island and submerged in Chesapeake Bay
   City or town: Tangier State: Virginia County: Accomack
   Not For Publication: N/A Vicinity: N/A

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
   I hereby certify that this X nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
   In my opinion, the property X meets - does not meet the National Register Criteria.
   I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:
   ___ national X statewide ___ local
   Applicable National Register Criteria:
   X A ___ B ___ C ___ D

   Signature of certifying official/Title: Virginia Department of Historic Resources
   State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
   Date: 6/30/15

   In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

   Signature of commenting official:
   State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
   Date

   Title:
4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ entered in the National Register
___ determined eligible for the National Register
___ determined not eligible for the National Register
___ removed from the National Register
___ other (explain:) ______________________

______________________________  _______________________
Signature of the Keeper                    Date of Action

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

Private:  [ ]

Public – Local  [ ]

Public – State  [x]

Public – Federal [ ]

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)

Building(s)  [ ]

District  [x]

Site  [ ]

Structure  [ ]

Object  [ ]
Number of Resources within Property  
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>1</strong></strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><em><strong><strong>1</strong></strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong><strong>0</strong></strong></em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register _____0_____

6. Function or Use  
Historic Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions.)  
DEFENSE: Fortification  
LANDSCAPE: Beach  

Current Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions.)  
LANDSCAPE: Underwater: Underwater Site  
LANDSCAPE: Beach
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

N/A

Materials: (Enter categories from instructions.)

Principal exterior materials of the property: N/A

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph
Tangier Island is located at the widest part of the Chesapeake Bay a few miles south of the Virginia-Maryland border and twelve miles east of Reedville, Virginia. Politically a part of Accomack County on Virginia’s Eastern Shore, Tangier Island is approximately three miles long and less than one mile wide. The Tangier Island Historic District Boundary Increase consists of approximately 1,453 acres of subaqueous land extending .25 mile in the Chesapeake Bay around the unimproved beaches at the southern end of Tangier Island to encompass the site of Fort Albion (also recorded as DHR archaeological site #44AC0574) and associated submerged resources. The entirety of the boundary increase area is owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia. This land has eroded over the course of the last 200 years, but would have included the beaches that self-emancipated slaves arrived at during the War of 1812 as well as Fort Albion itself, which was built by the British military. Additionally, the boundary increase includes an area where, from ca. 1808 to 1838, Methodist pastor Joshua Thomas held services known as “religious camps” in a temporary set-up located in the sandy marsh at the now submerged far southern tip of the island. Portions of the boundary increase area are only accessible by boat, while others are accessible via a 2-mile hike along unimproved beach. The entire boundary increase area is considered to be a single contributing site; dual DHR inventory numbers, 309-0001 and 44AC0574, have been assigned to indicate the property’s historic associations under National Register Criteria A and D.
Narrative Description

The following discussion consists of excerpts from Watts and Broadwater (2014) and Antonellis (2014), some of which have been revised for narrative clarity and to remove redundant information.

Setting and Landscape

About 18,000 years B.P., the Wisconsin Age glaciers began to melt and the resulting rises in sea level began to submerge the Ancestral Susquehanna River system. The process ultimately resulted in the formation of the modern Chesapeake Bay, which finally stabilized around 2,000 years ago. This inundation left numerous islands and wetlands in the Chesapeake Bay, including the island of Tangier. Tangier’s low profile and location in the open waters of the bay have exposed the island to countless storms that have severely eroded its west side and the southern sand spit “hook” (Watts and Broadwater, 8).

Long before European explorers and colonists discovered Tangier Island, the area had been used for thousands of years by Native American tribes for hunting and fishing purposes. Left behind as evidence of their presence on the island was a large oyster shell pile along the island’s eastern shore in the vicinity of the southern “hook.” While its original total area is difficult to estimate due to changing water levels, this shell pile was large and stable enough for island residents to build fish factories and a wharf on it during the 19th and 20th centuries. Residents reported that the shell pile was damaged in the hurricane of 1887 and was significantly reduced in size. Since then, changing sea levels and erosion have left much of the shell pile submerged today. Further archeological study would likely yield additional evidence of Native American presence in this area that is now underwater.

The rest of southern Tangier Island has eroded considerably since 1815, with much of the land that was once there washed now beneath the waters of the Chesapeake Bay or partially submerged as marshes. This eroded area most notably includes the site where, during the War of 1812, the British Navy’s Fort Albion stood on the southern “hook” during the War of 1812; a hand-drawn map from the papers of Vice-Admiral Sir Alexander Cochrane depict the fortification’s location, which now is located about .25 mile off Tangier Island’s current shoreline. When the fort was abandoned and destroyed after the war, this portion of the island and its use changed. Without the large population of British military personnel and recently self-emancipated African Americans with whom to trade, converse, learn, and do business, most Tangerians had little incentive to occupy the southernmost reaches. An exception was a stretch of beach northwest of where Fort Albion had stood, where Methodist pastor Joshua Thomas held “religious camps” from about 1808 to 1838, when a permanent brick church was constructed on Tangier’s more heavily populated middle section. Subsequent activities in the southern activities were limited by ongoing erosion and more diverse and vibrant economic activity elsewhere on the island. Today, this section of the island is most threatened by erosion and climate change due to strong easterly tides and winds (Antonellis 2014, 15).
Site Description: Results of Remote Sensing Survey

In 2014, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources’ Threatened Sites Program provided funding for a remote sensing survey of the waters off the southern point of Tangier Island. Tidewater Archaeological Research, Inc., conducted the survey with VDHR personnel.

Literature Review

A literature review was conducted and included review of historic maps and charts that indicate Fort Albion’s historic location. The likely location of the fort and barracks where British military members and self-emancipated African Americans were trained and housed likely was within .25 mile of the existing shoreline. Historic research did not indicate that any permanent structures had been constructed by Joshua Thomas for his camp meetings between 1808 and 1838, but Thomas is known to have performed services for the British at Fort Albion as well. Project personnel conducted research at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Library, Norfolk; National Archives Cartographic Branch and the United States Geodetic Survey, Washington, D.C.; Virginia Archives and Library of Virginia in Richmond; Earl Gregg Swem Library of The College of William and Mary; Mariners Museum Library in Newport News; McKeldin Library at University of Maryland, College Park; Joyner Library, East Carolina University; Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore; and the private library of consulting firm Tidewater Atlantic Research, Inc., in Washington, North Carolina (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 3).

Field Investigation Methodology

The remote-sensing survey took place June 1-3, 2014. The survey employed a high-resolution side-scan sonar, a cesium vapor magnetometer, and a CHIRP sub-bottom profiler to search for the location of Fort Albion and its associated submerged cultural resources. Vessel positioning and remote-sensing data collection were controlled by an onboard laptop equipped with HYPACK professional survey software. The laptop was tied to a TRIMBLE differential global positioning system. Analysis of the data identified 202 magnetic anomalies and 61 acoustic targets. While many could be associated with non-historic debris, others could be the associated with the remains of historic Fort Albion and associated British structures and correspond with the cartographical location of the British facilities (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 1, 3).

A 445/900 kHz KLEIN 3900 digital side-scan sonar (interfaced with SONARPRO data acquisition software) collected acoustic data in the survey area. The side-scan sonar transducer was deployed and maintained 10 feet below the water surface. Acoustic data were collected using a range scale of 50 meters to provide a combination of 300% coverage and high target signature definition. Acoustic data were recorded as a digital file with SONARPRO and tied to the magnetic and positioning data by the computer navigation system. These data were then imported into CHESAPEAKE TECHNOLOGY SONARWIZ.MAP for additional review and to create a mosaic. A TRIMBLE AgGPS was used to control navigation and data collection in the survey area. That system has an accuracy of plus or minus three feet, and can be used to generate highly accurate coordinates for the computer navigation system (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 4).
An EG&G GEOMETRICS G-881 marine cesium magnetometer, capable of plus or minus 0.001 gamma resolution, was employed to collect magnetic data in the survey area. To produce the most comprehensive magnetic record, data was collected at 4 samples per second. Due to shoal water within the project area, the magnetometer sensor was towed just below the water surface at a speed of approximately 3 to 4 knots. Magnetic data were recorded as a data file associated with the computer navigation system. Data from the survey were contour plotted using QUICKSURF computer software to facilitate anomaly location and definition of target signature characteristics. All magnetic data were correlated with the acoustic remote-sensing records (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 4).

Acoustic sub-bottom data was collected using an EDGETECH 3100P Portable sub-bottom profiler with an SB-216S tow vehicle. The SB-216S provides three frequency spectrums between 2 and 15 kHz with a pulse length of 20 msec. Penetration in coarse and calcareous sand is factory rated at 6 meters with between 2 and 10 cm of vertical resolution. During the survey the sub-bottom transducer was deployed and maintained between five to six feet below the water surface at a speed of approximately 4 to 5 knots. To facilitate target identification, sub-bottom sonar records were electronically tied to DGPS coordinates and recorded as a digital file using EDGETECH’s DISCOVER software and tied to the magnetic and positioning data by HYPACK in the helm-mounted navigation computer (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 6).

A TRIMBLE AgGPS was used to control navigation and data collection in the survey area. That system has an accuracy of plus or minus three feet, and can be used to generate highly accurate coordinates for the computer navigation system on the survey vessel. The DGPS was employed in conjunction with an onboard 2.4 GHz laptop loaded with HYPACK navigation and data collection software. Positioning data generated by the navigation system were tied to magnetometer records by regular annotations to facilitate target location and anomaly analysis. All acoustic records were tied to positioning events generated by HYPACK. All data is related to the Virginia South State Plane Coordinate System, NAD 83, U.S. Survey Foot (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 6).

**Survey Data Analysis Methodology**
Using HYPACK single-beam editor, each line of magnetic data was reviewed by project personnel to identify and to characterize anomalies. Analysis produced an EXCEL table identifying each anomaly, its location coordinates, signature characteristics, source material, potential significance and recommendations for avoidance. Magnetic data were also contoured using AutoCAD and QUICKSURF for additional analysis in GIS (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 14).

**Signature Analysis and Target Assessment**
No absolute criteria for identification of potentially significant magnetic and/or acoustic target signatures exist. However, experience and available literature confirms that reliable analysis must be made on the basis of certain characteristics. The most reliable signature analysis can be made by comparative analysis of both magnetic and acoustic data. Data analysis should also be
carried out with consideration of the limitations of each instrument and the environment in which survey operations are conducted (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 15).

**Magnetometer Data Collection and Analysis**
Magnetic data is collected using DGPS interfaced HYPACK and stored as *.RAW files by line, time, and day. The sensor was towed from 10 to 14 feet above the bottom. RAW data files are opened and reviewed in HYPACK “Single Beam Editor” and layback parameters are set. The location, strength, duration, and type of anomaly are then transcribed to a spreadsheet along with comments. Contour maps of the magnetic data are produced with AutoCAD, QUICK SURF and saved as *.dxf files. Those files are imported to an ArcGIS project to create the report maps (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 15).

The contour maps provide a graphic illustration of anomaly locations, spatial extent, and association with other anomalies. Magnetic signatures are evaluated on the basis of three basic factors. The first factor is intensity and the second is duration. The third consideration is the nature of the signature; e.g., positive monopolar, negative monopolar, dipolar or multi-component. In conjunction with signature intensity in gammas and duration in feet, those four signature configurations are used to characterize, virtually, all magnetic anomalies (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 15).

**Side-scan Sonar Data Collection and Analysis**
Side-scan sonar data was collected using KLEIN’s SonarPro data acquisition software. Data correlated with GPS positioning coordinates were recorded as *.xtf files and stored by project, area designation, line and line direction. The sonar towfish was towed approximately 15 feet off the bottom and operated at a range scale of 40 and 50 meters per channel. On 20-meter line spacing that range scale generated over 200 percent overlapping data (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 15).

Post-processing of side-scan sonar data was accomplished using SonarWiz.MAP, a product that enables the user to view the side-scan data in digitizer waterfall format, record targets and enter target parameters including length, width, height, material and other characterizations into a database of contacts. In addition, SonarWiz.MAP mosaics the side-scan data by associating each pixel (equivalent to about .5 feet) of the side-scan image with its geographic location determined from the slant range distance from the GPS position. SonarWiz.MAP is the industry standard for creating sonar mosaics, and the results are exported as geo-referenced TIFFs and imported into the GIS project. SonarWiz.MAP also generates target reports in PDF, Word, or EXCEL format (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 15).

Acoustic signatures must be assessed on the basis of several primary characteristics. Perhaps the most important factor in acoustic analysis is the configuration of the signature. As the acoustic record represents a reflection of specific target features, wreck signatures are often a highly detailed and accurate image of architectural and construction features. On sites with less structural integrity, signatures often reflect more of a geometric pattern that can be identified as structural material (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 15).
Sub-bottom Data Collection and Analysis
Sub-bottom profilers record subsurface strata by emitting a pulse of acoustic energy. This energy travels through water and sediment and is reflected as an echo to a receiver. As sediment and its acoustical properties change (acoustic impedance), some energy is reflected. The delay between when a sound is transmitted until it is received is converted into distance. The energy reflected by different sediment beds is used to create sub-bottom cross-section profiles, which are displayed as light and dark areas. While it is possible to detect and preliminarily map shipwrecks with this type of system, it is more useful for detecting sub-bottom buried paleo-landforms such as relict river and stream channels, estuary complexes, berms, dunes and hammocks, that are associated with prehistoric sites (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 16).

Sub-bottom profiler data was collected using EDGETECH’s DISCOVER software. Data correlated with GPS positioning coordinates were recorded as *.JSF files and stored by project, area designation, lane and lane direction. The EDGETECH system recorded data using the 0.7 KHz to 12 KHz 20ms FM pulse setting. The sonar towfish was towed approximately between 8 and 12 feet below the water surface. The pulse repetition rate was set at twelve pulses per second. Like the side-scan sonar data, post processing of sub-bottom profiler data is accomplished using SonarWiz.MAP. For this application, the user views the data in a planar, trackline format. This program allows the digitization and classification of sub-bottom features and calculates linear extent and depth (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 16).

Results of Investigation – Magnetometer Data
Magnetic data generated during the Tangier Island survey was examined on a line-by-line basis in HYPACK. That analysis identified 202 magnetic anomalies. Using both AutoCAD 2010 and QUICKSURF those data were also contoured. Signature characteristics of the majority of the anomalies are indicative of small single ferrous objects. A total of 160 of the 202 anomalies fall into that category. With the exception of three of those associated with a sign on a piling marking the perimeter of a bombing range, the remainder generated signature characteristics that are indicative of larger or more complex ferrous objects. A total of 29 anomalies appear to represent moderate size ferrous objects and 10 appear to be generated by more complex objects or object clusters. While many could be associated with modern debris, others could be the associated with the remains of historic Fort Albion and the associated British structures (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 16).

Results of Investigation – Side-scan Sonar Data
Side-scan sonar data generated during the Tangier Island survey was examined on a line-by-line basis in SonarWiz. That analysis identified 61 targets or clusters of material on the bottom surface. Using SonarWiz those data were also used to generate a mosaic of the survey area (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 16).
Sonar targets included 46 images of bottom surface scatters of small objects. The majority of those were associated with softer bottom sediments. Ten images identified linear objects in association with scatters of small single objects. Two identified scatters with moderate objects and two images document small single objects. Images of each of the sites are included in a target report. Analysis of the sub-bottom data provides no insight into the nature of material generating either the magnetic anomalies or the sonar targets. Due to shallow water depths and a 2-to 3-foot chop, the sub-bottom records are of little analytical value. That is not unusual in those conditions and where bottom sediments are primarily compacted sand (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 19).

Conclusions of the Remote Sensing Survey
Little information on the construction of the main structures, such as the barracks, officers’ quarters, and earthworks is available in the historic record. Although a scaled site plan and rough sketches of the fortification survive, no field investigation of the site had been conducted until this remote sensing survey. Targets located during the survey correspond with the cartographic location of the British fortifications and facilities. The number and variety of magnetic anomalies and sonar images of bottom surface objects indicates that there is a strong possibility that objects and features associated with Fort Albion could be identifiable (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 19-20).

Integrity
The Tangier Island Historic District Boundary Increase has integrity of location, setting, and association. Additional investigation is needed to ascertain the site’s integrity of feeling, design, materials, and workmanship. The remote sensing survey has demonstrated that the Fort Albion site has potential to yield information important in history, specifically the events associated with the War of 1812 and the military ordnance testing between 1911 and 1921.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

☐ A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

☐ B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

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

☒ D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

☐ A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

☐ B. Removed from its original location

☐ C. A birthplace or grave

☐ D. A cemetery

☐ E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

☐ F. A commemorative property

☐ G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)
ARCHAEOLOGY: Historic – Non-Aboriginal
ETHNIC HERITAGE: African American
MARITIME HISTORY
MILITARY
RELIGION

Period of Significance
Ca. 1808-1921

Significant Dates
1808-1857 [1838?] (Camp Meeting site)
April 1814-March 1815 (British Occupation during the War of 1812)
March 21, 1815 (British evacuation and burning of Fort Albion)
1911- Sinking of San Marcos for target practice
September 23, 1921- Direct hit of Alabama by airplane

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
Euro-American
African American

Architect/Builder
N/A
The Tangier Island Historic District Boundary Increase is significant at the state level under Criterion A in the areas of Ethnic Heritage: African American, Maritime History, Military, and Religion, for its associations with the self-emancipation of enslaved African Americans, the War of 1812, British naval occupation, early twentieth century military ordnance testing, and the history of Methodism on Tangier Island. The boundary increase is significant at the state level of significance under Criterion D in the area of Archaeology: Historic – Non-Aboriginal for its potential to yield information about Fort Albion, built by the British military during the War of 1812, and about early twentieth century naval ordnance tests. Fort Albion also has been designated a site on the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom due to its direct association with emancipation of thousands of enslaved African Americans during the War of 1812. The period of significance is ca. 1808-1921, beginning with the first religious camp meetings at the site and ending with a significant military ordnance test associated with early aeronautics.

Criterion A – Military; Maritime History; Ethnic Heritage: African American

The Tangier Island Historic District 2015 Boundary Increase is significant in the areas of Military and Maritime History because of the construction of Fort Albion by the British navy on April 14, 1813. This fort served as a base of operations for the British navy under Rear Admiral Sir George Cockburn (1772-1853) and his 74-gun flagship, the Albion during the War of 1812. This naval force also was responsible for providing refuge to 2,000 self-emancipated African Americans who fled slavery in the Chesapeake area. Fort Albion was used as a rendezvous and transit point for the ships gathering the runaway slaves and the transport ships that provided passage for them as British subjects to colonies in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Bermuda. In addition, Fort Albion served as the training grounds for the Colonial Marines, a military unit composed of freed African Americans who served with honors in skirmishes along the Chesapeake Bay off the coasts of Virginia and Maryland. The Colonial Marines also participated in the British military’s entry to Washington D.C. after the Battle of Bladensburg, which resulted in the city’s burning.

On September 14, 1814, before the British soldiers and Colonial Marines departed for Baltimore, Maryland, a prayer service was held on the beaches of Tangier Island by local parson Joshua Thomas. Fallen British troops and Colonial Marines were buried on the beaches of Tangier Island after the failed Battle of Baltimore. After peace was declared in 1815, the British left Tangier Island and removed all materials that they had brought with them, dismantling and burning structures at Fort Albion but leaving in place the earthworks. They fulfilled their promise of freedom and British citizenship to the fortification’s self-emancipated African Americans.
American residents and Colonial Marine veterans by providing transit to Bermuda. During this event, “Virginians and Marylanders witnessed the greatest exodus of slaves from the coast of America since the Revolutionary War” (Smith, 113). On September 3, 1821, a severe hurricane swept through Tangier Island and severely eroded Fort Albion’s remaining earthworks. In the last 200 years, changing sea levels have submerged the land where the fort originally stood, but the location of the site has been established through a remote sensing survey. In addition to the fort’s site, hundreds of magnetic anomalies have been identified that likely date to the British occupation and to U.S. military tests during the early twentieth century. In 1911, the U.S. Navy sank the boat San Marcos off the Tangier Island. In 1920-1921, it and other ships were used for targeting practice for some of the first bombing runs by airplanes. The remote-sensing survey’s results suggest that unexploded ordnance could be within the boundary increase area and precautions taken if future investigations are conducted.

**Criterion A - Religion**

When Europeans began settling Tangier Island in the 17th century, the area of this Boundary Increase was a wooded area with a large beach that extended over half a mile into a hook shape and served as a harbor, which was named Cod Harbor. After the introduction of Methodism to the Chesapeake Bay area around 1808, the beach served as a camp meeting in the absence of a formal church building. The location was convenient both for the preachers who would sail to the island as well as for the accessibility to a waterfront for conversion baptisms. After the conversion of Joshua Thomas, the first Methodist of Tangier Island, the beach was a popular religious site and yearly camp meetings were held every year from 1809-1857, with the exception of the years the British occupied it, and the events drew hundreds of people from around the region. After 1857, when Tangier Island had built a permanent church for its Methodist services and the need for conversion and baptism was no longer prevalent in services, use of the beach as a camp meeting site fell out of favor.

**Criterion D – Archaeology: Historic – Non-Aboriginal**

In order to be significant under Criterion D, a site must have well-preserved features, artifacts, and intrasite patterning in order to provide information, or have potential to provide information, important to understanding an event or pattern of events in history. Through historic records, including maps, the general location of Fort Albion has long been known, but the site’s condition was not explored until 2014, when the Virginia Department of Historic Resources’ Threatened Sites Program provided funding for a remote sensing survey of the waters off the southern point of Tangier Island. Tidewater Archaeological Research, Inc., conducted the survey with VDHR personnel.

Fort Albion, though relatively insubstantial and temporary, played a major role in the War of 1812, serving as a British staging point for attacks throughout the Chesapeake Bay, including those on Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, Maryland. Further investigation of the fort’s site could shed new light on the types of structures that were built and the quality of life of the British troops and self-emancipated African Americans stationed here during the War of 1812.
Magnetic data generated during the Tangier Island survey was examined on a line-by-line basis and the analysis identified 202 magnetic anomalies (summarized in the attached table). Using both AutoCAD 2010 and QUICKSURF those data were also contoured. Signature characteristics of 160 of the anomalies were indicative of small single ferrous objects, of which three are associated with a sign on a piling marking the perimeter of a bombing range. The remainder generated signature characteristics that are indicative of larger or more complex ferrous objects. A total of 29 anomalies appear to represent moderate size ferrous objects and 10 appear to be generated by more complex objects or object clusters. While many could be associated with modern debris, others could be the associated with the remains of historic Fort Albion and the associated British structures. Although analysis of side-scan sonar data identified 61 targets or clusters of material on the submerged land (see the attached table), little insight was gathered into the nature of the material generating the magnetic anomalies described above or of bottom surface scatters of small objects (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 16). Due to shallow water depths and a 2-to 3-foot chop, the sub-bottom records are of little analytical value. That is not unusual in those conditions and where bottom sediments are primarily compacted sand (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 19).

Watts and Broadwater state that the results of the 2014 remote sensing survey, although mixed, indicate that sufficient archaeological integrity remains to warrant future investigations, particularly to answer research questions about Fort Albion and its occupants. Little information on the construction of the main structures, such as the barracks, officers’ quarters, and earithworks is available in the historic record. Although a scaled site plan and rough sketches of the fortification survive, greater research potential exists in examining physical remains of the submerged ruins. Targets located during the remote sensing survey correspond with the cartographic location of the British fortifications and facilities, lending greater incentive for future investigation. The number and variety of magnetic anomalies and sonar images of bottom surface objects indicates that there is a strong possibility that objects and features associated with Fort Albion could be identifiable (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 19-20).

As noted by Watts and Broadwater, however, several factors could complicate further investigations. Many of the anomalies and sonar targets are likely non-historic debris associated with both vessel operations and derelict blue crab traps. The site’s location on the perimeter of a designated U.S. naval bombing range increases the possibility that material in the area is ordnance associated. As there is the possibility that ground-truthing activities could encounter live ordnance, special protocols would be required to address this potential hazard. Conducting diving operations at the survey site would require considerable planning and logistical considerations. Ground truthing would require several days, during which weather will be a major factor. The site is exposed to winds, currents and storms that could create logistical and safety issues. Ground truthing would involve visual inspection of high-quality target areas along with water jet probing to search for buried features. In spite of the difficulties, ground truthing could provide the information necessary for pinpointing specific cultural resources associated with Fort Albion and determining where excavation could yield the most useful results. In addition, determining the exact location of Fort Albion would provide a solid benchmark for
testing the theoretical models that describe the extent of erosion during the past 200 years (Watts and Broadwater 2014, 19-20).

**Detailed Historical Background**

The War of 1812 occurred at the end of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1793-1815). As a neutral party, the United States sought trade with both parties. However, in 1809, the British attempted to restrict the United States’ maritime rights by imposing executive orders, through the Orders-in-Council. In addition to restricting trade with France and continental Europe through impressments, the British captured 400 American ships and 6,000 U.S. citizens were impressed into the British navy. While the United States did not have a standing navy to challenge the Royal Navy for its maritime rights, it felt that it could show a strong ground force against the British colony, Canada. As a result, President James Madison asked the 12th Congress to declare war against Britain to gain maritime concessions through the ransoming of Canada. Beginning in 1812 and continuing into 1813, the U.S. army began an invasion force into Canada with limited success. With the ending of the European war, the British directed their attention to the conflict in the United States (Eshelman, Sheads, and Hickey, 3).

On March 3, 1813, Rear Admiral Sir George Cockburn arrived in the recently blockaded Chesapeake Bay, after Madison admitted there was little the federal government could do to protect Virginia beyond Norfolk. Cockburn’s directive was to threaten Washington, D.C., to force the U.S. to switch from an offensive into Canada to a defense of its borders. Many of Cockburn’s attacks and raids in the Chesapeake were not militarily strategic but instead were retaliatory for attacks the U.S. had conducted in Canada. Cockburn’s assaults included the confiscation of tobacco and other valuable trade goods as well as a sustain effort to free enslaved African Americans.

The British military in past wars, including the Revolutionary War, had recruited enslaved people to fight against slave owners. Freed slaves provided valuable intelligence and were hard workers and, by their very presence, generated fear among the slave-owning class of slave revolts and rebellions. In addition, due to the consequences of the 1772 English Court decision *Somerset v. Stewart* and the 1807 abolition of the slave trade in Great Britain, any enslaved person who reached a vessel or land under the British flag could claim they were freed and seek to be treated as a British subject. Shortly after his arrival in the Chesapeake Bay, Cockburn had received word from Secretary of State for War and Colonies Earl of Bathurst that the British would not instigate a slave rebellion in their former colonies. Bathurst continued, however, that the British navy could receive runaway slaves as refugees if the runaways feared for their lives or if they volunteered to enlist in the navy. He specified that self-emancipated African Americans became free upon being under the British flag and had to be maintained by the British navy. Cockburn saw the value of these individuals from both military and economical perspectives. In recent years, slaves had become increasingly valuable, meaning that the loss of each self-emancipated slave represented a significant loss of wealth to the slave owner. Further, runaway slaves provided valuable intelligence as they knew as much, if not more than, their owners of the local terrain and population. As a result, Cockburn accepted any runaway slaves who were
willing, and soon had hundreds of refugees, including women and children. In an effort to appease, and likely annoy, slave owners, Cockburn invited any American to come aboard British vessels and attempt to persuade self-emancipated African Americans to return to enslavement; he later continued this practice at Tangier Island. While only a few former slaves opted to return to U.S. soil, the British respected their self-determination in the matter. Americans, who labored under the belief that slavery benefitted the enslaved, were mystified that runaways chose to trust the British navy’s promises of freedom and citizenship, rather than return to friends and family in slavery. On September 25, 1813, hundreds of self-emancipated individuals traveled on British ships to Bermuda dockyards where they would work or be sent as free persons to other British colonies, mainly Nova Scotia or Trinidad where they would be given land (Butler, 371).

On April 1, 1814, Vice Admiral Sir Alexander Cochrane assumed command of North American operations. With a shortage of British forces, he hoped to enlist thousands of self-emancipated African Americans in the military. The next day, he issued the Cochrane Proclamation that offered any resident in the United States an opportunity to emigrate from the United States onto British vessels or military posts, with their families, where they would be received as free persons. Without explicitly referring to “slaves” in the proclamation, Cochrane continued that these freed persons would have a “choice by either entering into His Majesty’s Sea or Land Forces, or of being sent as FREE settlers to the British Possessions in North America” (Taylor, 211). This proclamation soon led to Cockburn forming the Colonial Marines and training them at Fort Albion on Tangier Island.

In 1810, the population of Tangier Island had been just 79 people, many of whom were part of the Crockett extended family. Cockburn had visited the island briefly in June 1813, but returned the following April to oversee construction of a fortification, driven in part by a need to house the burgeoning population of self-emancipated African Americans. The fort’s location and design were selected from London by military engineers familiar with the island from the Revolutionary War. They chose the island’s southern “hook” and harbor because it offered water deep enough for the large ships and was safe from surprise attacks (Mariner, 34).

Cockburn oversaw its construction from his 74-gun flagship, Albion. On April 11, 1814, Lieutenant Fenwick of the Royal Engineers began construction with 200 freed laborers and a marine guard using “1 saw, 1 hammer, and 1 basket of nails [to] erect a storehouse and barracks” (Smith, 102). In Cochrane’s papers, drawings of the fort included “Captain and Subaltern quarters, field officer quarters, staff officer quarters, mess house, men’s barracks, cooking places, privys, main guard house, grand parade, garden ground, N. E. bastion of the fort, wet ditch, 320 foot street, roads.” (Smith, 102). Tangier Island’s Fort Albion was the only fortified British site in the Chesapeake Bay during the War of 1812 (Butler, 371). In addition to erecting a military breastwork with eight 24-pound cannons, the British added houses, “barracks for a thousand,” a chapel, and gardens for the refugee population (Kirkner, 70). In addition, accounts state that several British and Colonial Marines who died in service were buried on the southern beaches of Tangier Island. Between 700 and 1,000 freed men worked on erecting Fort Albion, while women and children were given safe passage to British colonies in Bermuda and Nova Scotia. Fort
Albion ultimately served as a port for 3,400 runaway slaves from Virginia and Maryland, 300 of whom volunteered for military training and became part of the Colonial Marines.

By the end of the month, hundreds of self-emancipated men, women, and children had reached on Tangier Island and one company of Colonial Marines (50 men) were training. Cockburn assigned the training of the new corps of Colonial Marines to Sergeant Major Charles Hammond, who he had commissioned as an ensign. While Cockburn was at first skeptical of the former slaves’ abilities and motivation, by the end of the month he had transformed his opinion, reporting to Cochrane that the marines “are getting on astonishingly and are really very fine fellows” (Smith, 104). By the end of the war he would boast that the Colonial Marines were some of the best troops in the campaign and could be trusted more than the Royal Marines.

In addition to the Colonial Marines, self-emancipated African Americans served as pilots, guides, scouts, intelligence gatherers, double agents, and informers. With information provided by them, Cockburn was able to conduct more raids further into the Northern Neck of Virginia and as a direct result successfully predicted the ease with which Washington, D.C. could be captured. “No mere by-product of the British operations in the Chesapeake, the runaways transformed that offensive by becoming essential to its success” (Taylor, 314).

While the British were not overtly hostile to the island plantation and purchased goods from them regularly, there was tension in the occupation of Tangier Island. During the fort’s construction, it appeared the soldiers had cut down the trees on the Methodist camp meeting ground that was also located on the southern end of the Island. Popular folklore states that Parson Joshua Thomas demanded an audience with Cockburn, insisting that he respect the sacredness of the camp meeting grounds. Whether this event took place is debatable, however, despite the desperate need for lumber and supplies for the fort, as the camp meeting grounds were intact when religious gatherings resumed after the war ended in 1815. More difficult for islanders was that the British declared them to be prisoners of war, restricted all travel off the island without a passport, and registered all of the vessels on the island. In the summer of 1814, when construction of the fort was lagging, efforts were worsened when a sloop was lost. Admiral Cockburn suspected islanders of sabotaging it. He ordered that the inhabitants be informed that, “if I hear of another instance any canoe or person belonging to the [mainland], fishing in company with them, or being near the islands without it being immediately reported I shall direct everything in the islands be destroyed & the inhabitants sent as prisoners to Bermuda” (Butler, 394).

Meanwhile, Cockburn was impressed by how many self-emancipated freedmen were willing to return to their former plantations, explain the British presence and promise of freedom, and bring additional runaways to Fort Albion. While slave owners generally feared slave revolts, it was not until the British occupation of Tangier Island that they realized the extent of slaves’ communication networks and the intelligence that they could provide to the British. “By traveling at night, slaves had maintained ties with spouses, and children on other farms in their neighborhood…That community suddenly became apparent to white folk when a network of enslaved kin and friends came together one night to flee” (Taylor, 253).
County records indicate that a family of slaves, Lucy (mother), Paul (husband), Caleb and Mary (children) from three different plantations successfully escaped on the same night in stolen canoes destined for Tangier Island (Mariner, 77).

In 1810, Virginia had 390,634 enslaved persons, the most of any state and representing 41% of its total population. Due to inconsistent accounts between the U.S. and British records, it is impossible to know with certainty how many slaves escaped to the British. At the end of the war, through testimonials and letters of evidence, the British empire was required to reimburse Virginia and Maryland for 2,435 enslaved persons who had been proven to have escaped through Tangier Island by the end of the war (Smith, 113). Despite this significant loss, by 1820, Virginia’s slave population had grown to 425,200. Yet the War of 1812 likely impacted the Tidewater’s slave economy because, between 1810 and 1820, slave concentrations moved from there further inland to the Piedmont Region. While the average county in Virginia saw an 8% increase in slave population, the Tidewater’s Lancaster, Accomack, Northampton, King George, Charles City, Middlesex, Prince George and Warwick all experienced a decrease. Westmoreland and Northumberland saw over a 15% decrease in their slave populations and they would never return to their 1810 slave population size. While part of this change may have been due to migration, Westmoreland and Northumberland counties also reported a larger loss of slaves than the rest of the Tidewater region combined (Census 1810, 1820, 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860). The population loss was more remarkable in light of efforts to contain it. In 1814, Accomack County spent 36 percent of its county budget on hiring 118 additional slave catchers from its prewar amount of 22. Lieutenant Colonel M. Bayley, commander of Accomack Militia and U.S. Congressman, ordered all canoes and boats secured or confiscated in order to prevent slaves from escaping to Tangier Island. Bayley was willing to go to extreme measures even though it caused a hardship on a community heavily reliant on fishing (Kirker, 73).

At Fort Albion by the end of May 1814, food resources were becoming depleted as a result of the influx of self-emancipated African Americans arriving every day. Even with male refugees on half rations and women and children on quarter rations, Tangier Island did not have the food resources to support the fort and supplies from Bermuda were limited. While the Colonial Marines attracted young, healthy, strong, single men, the majority of married men preferred to continue with their families as free British citizens to Bermuda. Only one company, 50 men, had been trained as Colonial Marines and given a red uniform, musket, full ration, and enlistment bounty. As a result, Cockburn decided to send raiding parties to neighboring areas, seeing it as the perfect opportunity to test his company of Colonial Marines. From their experience during the Revolutionary War, “the British had hope that slaves-made-soldiers would prove to be infinitely more dreaded by the Americans than the British troops” (Mariner, 73).

On May 30, 1814, 500 Royal Marines and 30 Colonial Marines, under the command of Captain Ross, sailed across the Tangier Sound to Accomack County, into Pocomoke Sound and up the Pungoteague Creek where a Virginia militia camp had been established. Their objective was removal of the batteries that the militias had placed there. With Colonial Marines leading the charge, the Royal Marines successfully repelled the 60 men and one six-pound cannon stationed at the creek. They raided the nearby Smith property and seized livestock and foodstuffs. As
militiamen gathered from across the county, the British and Colonial Marines retreated with their new possessions back to the creek. They took the six-pound cannon and foodstuffs but left the body of Colonial Marine Michael Harding, who had been killed in action. According to Cockburn, the Colonial Marines, instead of being disheartened by the loss of Harding, “behaved to the admiration of every Body” (Eshelman, Sheads, and Hickey, 257). At Fort Albion, Cockburn awarded the captured cannon to the Colonial Marines as a gesture of their excellent performance; another company member, Midshipman Frazier, was buried in a graveyard (cause of death unknown) on the beach of southern Tangier Island (Smith, 106).

Under a flag of truce, militia member Captain Joyner visited Fort Albion to complain about the raids and the arming of ex-slaves. While Cockburn allowed any former owner to visit Albion and communicate with the self-emancipated men and women, the former slaves determined their own destiny. Joyner expressed his dissatisfaction by taunting Scott, “…seize me in the bramble-bush of damnation if I don’t blow you to hell if you put your foot within a mile of my command…” Before dawn on June 25, 1814, with the aid of Joyner’s former slave, 500 Royal Marines and 50 Colonial Marines landed undetected at Joyner’s battery at Chesconeesex Creek (Eshelman, Sheads, and Hickey; 224). After a brief skirmish, with the British forces outnumbering and outflanking Joyner’s position, Joyner was forced to retreat, leaving behind his sword, hat, and coat uniform. Before the American forces could regroup, the British burned the barracks and a public residence, seized cannon, baggage, and public stores, and headed back to Fort Albion (Taylor, 276). High desertion rates among British troops, contrasted with the Colonial Marines’ motivation and skill, led Cochrane to consider “the [Colonial Marines] the most effective and intimidating troops for fighting the Americans” (Taylor, 286).

The British planned a massive assault on the Chesapeake region, but until troops and ships could be summoned, Cockburn was tasked with attacking Virginia to draw American troops back from Canada, as well as to pay retribution for attacks that the U.S. had inflicted on merchant ships at sea. Cochrane instructed Cockburn that “we have no means of retaliating but on shore, where they must be made to feel in their Property, what our Merchants do in having their Ships destroyed at Sea” (Butler, 397). Of the 73 armed conflicts that took place between Virginia militiamen and British forces during the War of 1812, most of these originated from the Chesapeake Bay by naval forces under Cockburn’s command and dozens were staged from Fort Albion on Tangier Island.

Over time, increased slave patrols and securing of vessels on the Virginia mainland made it increasingly difficult for runaway slaves to reach British ships, so Cockburn prioritized emancipation during coastal raids. The Colonial Marines provided valuable intelligence about the most strategic places to attack and often served as light infantry skirmishers during these raids. Cockburn praised them as the best skirmishers possible for the “thick Woods of the Country” and Captain Robert Rowley added, “’Tis astonishing with what rapidity & precision they advance” (Taylor, 285).

The Colonial Marines participated in raids into the Northern Neck of Virginia as well as the Rappahannock and Potomac rivers and even into Maryland. Some of the skirmishes where
Colonial Marines or runaway slaves played a significant role included Carter and Nomini Ferry, Mundy’s Point, Cockerell’s Creek, Kinsale, and Coan River. The raids resulted in capture of valuable good including tobacco and livestock. In addition, hundreds of enslaved African Americans chose freedom with the British. Raiding parties would often be led by able-bodied men returning with British forces to bring their families back to Fort Albion with them. While Virginia did report that it had a militia size of 83,000, militias in the Northern Neck were kept in their resident county until called upon (Butler, 86). Through the use of naval vessels and quick, unpredictable raiding parties, including marines and light infantry, the militias were never able to gather overwhelming forces before the British returned to the waters. As a result of these raids, Cockburn saw very little resistance in the Northern Neck and was convinced that the U.S. did not have sufficient military forces in place to protect Washington, D.C. He would be instrumental in convincing Cochrane that the capitol city should be a high priority target and that his troops, including the Colonial Marines, an integral part of the operation (Butler, 413).

For a time, Cochrane hoped the self-emancipated slaves could be transformed into an army, which would reduce the number of British soldiers needed to mount an invasion of the U.S. “In July [1814] he wrote his superiors in London claiming that large numbers of escaped slaves could be recruited and that he had ordered equipment for an anticipated one thousand black cavalrmen” (Cassell, 151). Slaves further inland, however, were not as quick to seek refuge with the British as their counterparts in the Tidewater, perhaps because they knew they could not safely reach the Chesapeake or because they did not know where to find British encampments. Slave owners also had not hesitated to tell their enslaved workers that the British themselves were selling runaways into slavery. Moreover, Cockburn realized that, while the Colonial Marines performed admirably, women and children outnumbered men who were enslaved, and a minority of the men to date had volunteered to serve in the Colonial Marines. For example, Corotoman Plantation lost the most enslaved people, 69, of any plantation in Virginia during the War of 1812. Less than half of the slaves choose to leave with the British. Of the 69 slaves who did, 46 were children and 13 were women. In the chaos of the moment, many slaves could be reluctant to leave the only home they knew for an uncertain future with strangers (Taylor, 236). Given the demographics of the self-emancipated African Americans, a large slave army never developed, and the number of men serving in the Colonial Marines averaged about 300. Therefore Cockburn requested that 10,000 British troops sail from Bermuda with Cochrane in order to launch a massive land campaign and bring the war to a close.

On August 1, 1814, Cochrane finally departed Bermuda with 4,000 troops, significantly less than Cockburn had wanted, but sufficient to allow him to target Washington D.C. and Baltimore. On August 15, Cochrane’s forces arrived in the Chesapeake and were quickly divided into three groups for the assault on Washington D.C. The majority of the force, approximately 4,500 men, consisting of Cockburn’s ships and Ross’s army, sailed up the Patuxent River and led a land invasion across Maryland into Washington. Two smaller forces supported this effort. Parker’s forces sailed up the Chesapeake to Baltimore to prevent American troops from flanking Ross’s main army. Simultaneously, Gordon’s squadron sailed up the Potomac and attacked Fort Washington. The plan was for Gordon to assist with the attack and retreat from Washington.
The British planned to confuse the Americans with three simultaneous attacks so that the Americans would not know where to concentrate their forces.

From previous shore raids, Cockburn had secured all of Maryland south of Benedict. A small detachment, 190 marines, reached Benedict on June 15, 1814, displaced the local militia positioned there and spiked the artillery. Cockburn promised leniency to all citizens who accepted the occupation but promised destruction to all who resisted. In fact, he even enticed the commander of the Calvert County militia to immobilize the militia, in return for buying cattle and leaving the rest of his property in peace (Taylor, 292). On July 17, 1814, Cockburn wrote Cochrane that: “I consider the Town of Benedict in the Patuxent, to offer us advantages… It is I am informed only 45 miles from Washington and there is a high road between the two places which tho’ hilly is good… I therefore most firmly believe that within forty-eight hours after the Arrival in the Patuxent… the City of Washington might be possessed without difficulty”(Eshelman R., Sheads S., Hickey D. p. 80). On August 19, 1814, Ross and his 4,400 British soldiers landed at Benedict. Preferring the new Colonial Marines over the rest of the Royal Marines, Cockburn led fighting soldiers and the Colonial Marines, a total of 370 men, up the river in barges in pursuit of the British flotilla and provided support for troops moving into Maryland from the Patuxent River, where Cochrane remained in the deep waters.

In pursuit of the U.S. Chesapeake Flotilla, under command of American Commodore Joshua Barney’s, the naval barges under Cockburn headed up the Patuxent River, while Ross marched from Benedict to Nottingham, the U.S. flotilla naval base. By the time the British forces reached Nottingham on August 21, the flotilla had already abandoned the town. Leaving a rear guard, the British land forces and naval forces continued north along the Patuxent River in pursuit of Barney’s flotilla. On August 22, 1814, as the Paxutent River turned to shallow wetlands at Pigs Point, the U.S. flotilla could sail no farther inland. As the road taken by Ross’s troops diverted away from this river, Cockburn and his marines were forced to pursue Barney’s flotilla on their own. Cockburn, sending his marines ashore to cut off a land escape, approached the sloops. However, as he grew close, he realized the sloops were already abandoned and rigged to explode. Shortly after they exploded, Cockburn and his sailors began receiving sniper fire from the rear guard of Barney’s flotilla; however, Lieutenant Scott and his Colonial Marines quickly captured them. When American cavalry appeared, the British marines dispersed them using Congreve rockets. Barney and his 400 troops had been forced to abandon the flotilla, blowing up the sixteen sloops that had been patrolling the Chesapeake in pursuit of the British for the majority of the war. Cockburn had successfully destroyed the only U.S. naval presence in the Chesapeake (Eshelman R., Sheads S., Hickey D., p. 169-72).

Similarly to the U.S. flotilla, the British naval fleet was also forced to halt its advance up the Patuxent River. Instead, the naval forces occupied Mount Calvert, a federal style plantation home south of Upper Marlboro. Instead of remaining behind with his ships, Cockburn led his trusted Colonial Marines, along with the Marine Artillery, and a segment of fighting seamen to Upper Marlboro to join with Ross’s troops. If Cockburn had remained at Mount Calvert, the Colonial Marines would not have likely played a role in the burning of Washington D.C. After just missing Barney’s troops, who also passed through Upper Marlboro, Ross cautiously entered

On August 23, 1814, the British forces left Upper Marlboro for Washington D.C., which was only 20 miles away. Unsure of where the British forces were headed, U.S. Secretary of War John Armstrong, Secretary of State James Monroe, and President James Madison all took to the countryside of Maryland attempting to decipher the British’s actions along with Brigadier General William H. Winder, who was the commander of the D.C defenses, Military District #10, with 16,000 men under his command. Parker’s more visual actions in Baltimore convinced Armstrong that Baltimore was the true target, while Madison was certain that the British were focused on Washington D.C. Secretary of State Madison, while performing volunteer scouting work in Maryland, finally sent word that Ross had landed at Benedict and was heading toward the capitol city. Instead of sending “the large number of bayonet-wielding soldiery” back to Washington D.C., Winder, a political appointee, started for Marlboro with the intention of confronting the enemy, then reversed course back toward the city and ordered Maryland forces to Bladensburg (Brodine, p. 20).

Bladensburg strategic value lay in that it was the only fordable area of the Anacostia River (formerly called the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River). Brigadier General Tobias Stansbury and his Maryland militia brigade were the first to arrive on the scene at 2 a.m., approximately 12 hours before the British would attack. He began lining up three lines of defense on the western side of the river. He placed an artillery line behind the bridge crossing the river. Lacking orders from Winder and any clear leadership structure, brigades, regiments, companies, and artillery were placed at the best judgment of their commanders. When Monroe arrived later in the morning, seeing no cohesion in the battle lines, he began moving columns of men different positions. Armstrong and Madison arrived on the scene and began arguing with Monroe and Stansbury about troop positioning. The only contribution Madison made was to move seasoned marines from a support position to the front lines. While approximately 7,500 American troops, including militia, regulars, marines, and flotillamen, were gathered at Bladensburg, it can be argued that only the 124 marines and 400 flotillamen were combat veterans. They faced a British force of 4,000 troops, including Ross’s army troops and Cockburn’s Royal Marines, many of whom were hardened veterans of the Napoleonic War, and Colonial Marines (Reid, pg. 26).

On August 24, 1815, at 1 p.m. the British began their attack on the American troops at Bladensburg. Colonel William Thorton, of the British 85th Foot, led forces across the bridge directly into General Stansbury’s militia line. Attributed to Madison’s meddling of troop locations as well as inexperience of the militia, the first line of the American forces quickly retreated. When the British began firing Congreve rockets, the militia on the second line began to disperse as well. Despite mass retreats of militiamen, enough regular troops led by Col. Thorton, including Sterrett’s 5th Baltimore and Scott’s U.S. Army regulars, remained to repulse this small British advance. Seeing over 1000 militia fleeing the battlefield though, the late-arriving Winder was convinced the battle was lost. He ordered all troops under his command to retreat, including the thousands of remaining militia and 1000 regulars. While at first refusing to
accept these orders, his troops eventually retreated, albeit in good order since most had not yet fired a shot. The only troops who did not receive Winder’s orders to retreat were the marines and flotillamen because he did not believe them to be under his command. Barney’s 400 flotillamen and Miller’s 114 marines were left to hold off the British advance. One of the men manning the artillery was Charles Ball, a freedman, who had visited Tangier Island to entice some of the Colonial Marines to return to slavery (Smith, 120).

Expecting little resistance from a retreating army, Thorton’s men continued to advance directly into the remaining U.S. forces. After four consecutive charges, including hand-to-hand combat, the 85th Foot was unable to break the American lines and suffered over 200 causalities. Finally Ross and the rest of the British reinforcements arrived, surrounding the American forces on three sides, forcing them to retreat with the militiamen experiencing a minimal loss of casualties. However, the American forces were never able to regroup, because many militia members were more concerned about the possibility of slave revolts and focused on protecting slaveholders instead of the city. Although no slave revolt occurred in Washington D.C. or at anyplace or time during the War of 1812, Washington D.C. was left fully exposed to the British forces after the Battle of Bladensburg (Reid, 30; Taylor, 301).

The British rested briefly in Bladensburg before leaving for Washington D.C. at 5 p.m. Around sunset, they arrived at a large clearing about two miles away from the capitol and rested. In the distance they could see the fires of the U.S. navy yard that the Americans had started before abandoning the city, ensuring that the valuable naval supplies would not fall into British hands. The majority of the troops stayed behind at this rear guard encampment; however, a few detachments were chosen to accompany Cockburn and Ross into Washington, including the Colonial Marines. As an honor to the Colonial Marines and as an insult to the Americans, Cockburn allowed these soldiers to enter, as victors, the capitol of a nation that had previous enslaved them. “Colonial Marines participated in the incendiarism that destroyed both houses of the U.S. Capitol” (Smith, 123), and “Cockburn ordered the mansion [White House] torched by fifty sailors and Colonial Marines, who broke the windows with long poles and hurled in incendiary devices” (Taylor, 302). On August 25, 1814, the British finished burning most of the property belonging to the U.S. government.

Approximately one-third of the city’s population was comprised of enslaved African Americans, but it is not known to what extent individuals or organized groups may have participated in assisting the British. Some reports claimed that abandoned properties were ransacked before the British arrived, while others maintained that enslaved persons hid in basements for fear of forcible removal by the British. At least some individuals sought out Ross and offered their assistance in exchange for freedom, but he denied the offers out of concern they would slow down the British retreat through the unpredictable Maryland countryside. Despite this, Cockburn recorded that 500-600 self-emancipated individuals followed behind the troops and were given assistance once they reached the British boats at Benedict, Maryland (Smith, 125) (Taylor, 303).

Similar to their march to Washington, the British return march was largely uneventful. The only incident occurred in Upper Marlboro from an unsuspecting acquaintance. When a few soldiers
remained behind in town, possibly looting or deserting, citizens under the command of Dr. Beanes arrested these soldiers. Ross, who had dined with Beanes prior to the march to Washington, felt greatly betrayed and ordered the arrest and return of the captured soldiers, but also took Beanes into custody. On August 29, 1814, the British troops boarded their large transport ships and sailed down the Patuxent River, having successfully completed their mission (Taylor, 309).

Returning to Fort Albion on Tangier Island, Cochrane, Ross, and Cockburn began planning their next mission, which was to attack Baltimore. On September 11, 1814, just prior to the British departure for Maryland, Methodist parson Joshua Thomas held a public meeting that included British troops. Thomas already was well acquainted with the occupying British forces, as he had asked Cockburn to instruct his soldiers who cut lumber for Fort Albion’s construction to spare a shaded part of the nearby beaches called “the campground of mourners.” Cockburn granted his request. Some of the British soldiers even converted to Methodism; “Brother Thomas obtained favor with the officers and soldiers of the army, and sought every means to do good among them” (Wallace, 143). Thomas reported that 12,000 troops were assembled on the beach to hear him preach. He “told them of the great wickedness of war, and that God said, ‘Thou shalt not kill!’ If you do, he will judge you at the last day; or before then, he will cause you to ‘perish by the sword.’” (Wallace, 152). Despite the limited resistance that the British had seen in their Chesapeake campaign, Thomas continued, “You cannot take it [Baltimore]!” and pleaded that they reconsider for fear that many lives would be lost (Wallace, 153). Thomas reported that some British soldiers converted to Methodism on the spot, but his advice was not heeded, although neither was it angrily dismissed. While the sermon and following incidents became infamous throughout Tangier Island and the Chesapeake Bay region, it was not mentioned in any official British correspondence. However, since Methodism was a minor religious sect, most popular with the working class, it may have not been a concern of the leadership.
Due to a signal station located close to North Point, 12 miles from Baltimore, the Americans were already alerted to the arrival of British ships before a combined army and navy force of 4,500 disembarked. Just three miles from their landing point, the British met feeble resistance at an unfinished defensive earthwork. Upon the approach of British skirmishers, the American forces quickly moved to a line of defense closer to Baltimore. Some dragoons left behind quickly surrendered to the British. The British forces slowly made their way up the road after removing trees left in their path by the Americans. After resting late in the morning at the Gorush Farmhouse, Ross was notified that there were American troops in the area. He rode out to rally his troops into battle, only to be shot by sharpshooters. Colonial Marines and other light skirmishers quickly repelled them, resulting in four Colonial Marine causalities, including one fatality. However, the damage was done and Ross quickly succumbed to his wounds. Command was handed over to Colonel Arthur Brook (Eshelman, 161).

Motivated by the loss of Ross, Brook quickly assembled the troops and set off for Baltimore. Three miles from the city, he encountered the first line of defense, Brigadier General Strickler’s 5th Regiment Militia. It was made up of 3,200 militia who had encamped near the Methodist Meeting House at Godley Wood. The American forces exchanged strong fire with the British
until the British reached their location. The Americans then made an orderly retreat to the stronger entrenchments at Baltimore, but leaving behind a couple of field cannon and hundreds of wounded. While both sides experienced serious casualties, limited visibility is believed to have reduced the number of troops killed in action. (Eshelman, 163). Although a tactical victory for the British, this first engagement dampened morale; due to the loss of Ross and disagreeable weather, Brook did not seize on the advantage of the success by pressing on. Instead he waited until the next day to make the final march of three miles to reach the city’s defenses. By then, 23,000 soldiers were deeply entrenched with a strong battery, far outnumbering the 4,000 British troops.

Brook sent word to Cochrane, who was in the Chesapeake Bay facing Fort McHenry, that naval bombing was needed to break the line. Beginning on September 13, Cochrane began a 23-hour bombing campaign on Fort McHenry. Attorney Francis Scott Key, who had just successfully negotiated the release of his friend Dr. Beanes, was aboard a ship in the Baltimore Harbor just before the battle began. From this ship, Key wrote the famous lyrics to the “Star Spangled Banner.” Although extensive, the British bombing effort was largely ineffective, which is attributed to the inadequacy of the Congreve rockets that Key memorialized as “the rockets’ red glare.” The British chose to use Congreve rockets because they had a longer range than traditional cannons, allowing their ships to fire on Fort McHenry while staying beyond the Americans’ artillery range. While the rockets had a long range, they were difficult to aim, and thus of little use against fortified positions. Key wrote the lyrics for “Defense of Fort McHenry” to the tune of “To Anacreon in Heaven” and the verses were which was printed on September 17, 1814. Shortly afterward the song was renamed “The Star Spangled Banner” and became a household patriotic song (it was finally made the national anthem in 1931 though it had been in use by the U.S. Navy since 1889). While only the first verse is usually sung, the third also is relevant to this nomination because it includes “Key’s dig at the British for employing Colonial Marines to liberate slaves: No refuge could save the hireling and slave; From the terror of flight or the gloom of the grave.” It can be argued that without Cockburn’s shore raids up the Patuxent River from Tangier Island, the successful invasion of Washington, D.C., and its aftermath, the song that became the national anthem would have never been written (Taylor, 309-310).

Without the fall of Fort McHenry, Cochrane concluded that a battle at Baltimore would be unwise. The American troops viewed this as a victory that repulsed the British forces; the British authorities saw differently. “In the British version of the battle, they had suffered no defeat for they had merely probed the defenses, wisely withdrawing once they found the enemy numerous and entrenched, rather than suffer the heavy casualties necessary to take the city” (Taylor 310). Further, Baltimore was considered just one theatre so its capture was not essential to winning the war. The defense of Canada was still the primary objective for the British and they were unwilling to risk large casualties for a secondary campaign. After the defeat at Washington, D.C., the Americans needed a victory and seized the defense of Baltimore as just that. The Battle of Baltimore also served as an important factor in the peace talks that had begun the previous month in Ghent, Kingdom of the Netherlands; combined with the loss at the Battle of Plattsburg, also on September 11, 1814, it prompted the British to drop all claims to American territories and propose a return to 1811 boundaries for Canada and the U.S.
On September 14, 1814, the British fleet sailed away from Baltimore and Brook’s troops returned to their ships at North Point. The large British force sailed back to Fort Albion at Tangier Island, but did not remain long. “Vice Admiral Cochrane… left the Chesapeake Bay for Halifax… Admiral Cockburn sailed for Bermuda on 26 September” (Butler, 464). A small squadron remained at Fort Albion under the command of Captain Robert Barrie, including the Colonial Marines. During the final months of 1814, “British army and marine units invaded Virginia twice and conducted some of their most destructive raids of the war” (Butler, 489). These raids included Northumberland Courthouse, Tappahanock, and Farnham Church, and the targets included tobacco and provisions, as well as continued recruitment of enslaved African Americans. Morale suffered among the British remaining at Fort Albion, however, and desertion greatly increased. Captain Rowley reported, “It is horrible here…. I must tell you I am heartily tired of the Chesapeake and of the mode of Warfare we are obliged to carry on” (Taylor 311). While over 200 slaves were freed during Barrie’s command, the British desertion rates were equally high. “Here [Farnham Church] was a swap all too characteristic of the Chesapeake campaign for the British: to liberate 20 slaves while losing a dozen Britons to drink and desertion” (Taylor 312).

On December 13, 1814, Captain Barrie and the 356 recruited Colonial Marines, along with most of the British fighting force, left Fort Albion to join Cockburn in Georgia at Cumberland Island. Cumberland Island was among the Sea Islands of Georgia, a rural section of Georgia where enslaved African Americans outnumbered free whites. Cockburn continued his strategy of shore raids to free runaway slaves, much to the fear of the white population. The only force that remained at Fort Albion was Captain John Clavell and his five frigates and three small boats. Tasked with blockading the Chesapeake Bay, they lacked enough ships to continue shore raids; however, they continued to accept self-emancipate African Americans onto their ships (Taylor, 327).

On February 16, 1815, the Treaty of Ghent was ratified by the United States Senate. Among its provisions was the return of all enslaved person in British-occupied areas to their owners. Cockburn and Cochrane interpreted this to apply only to slaves who had been present before the British occupied a given place. Because Tangier Island had no slaves prior to British arrival, no slaves from the Chesapeake had to be returned. When several slave owners went to Tangier Island to demand the return of their self-emancipated slaves, they were denied by Clavell; and although permitted to address their former slaves and request their return, they met with little success. Clavell had orders not to leave any refugees behind, except those who chose to stay. In addition, the treaty did not stop the Royal Navy officers from staging one last raid to free self-emancipated African Americans. On February 20, 1815, when they reached the plantation of George Loker in St. Mary’s County, Maryland, Loker protested that the war was over. The British offered freedom to four slave children and three women, including the wife of an African American man serving as their guide (Taylor, 337). On March 21, 1815, the British troops, Colonial Marines, and all the self-emancipated civilians left Tangier Island after removing all items of value from Fort Albion and burning all structures that remained. The ships remained in the Chesapeake Bay until sailing to Bermuda in April 1815.
While most of the civilians were sent to Nova Scotia for resettlement, the Colonial Marines remained, along with their families, at the Ireland Island, Bermuda, British naval base in the service of the British Empire. Several attempts were made to incorporate them into a West Indian army regiment, but the Colonial Marines argued this was not in accordance with original promises made by Cockburn. In November 1815, the Colonial Marines were discharged from service and given farmland to settle in Trinidad. In August 1816, 404 Colonial Marines along with 170 family members arrived in the Naparima region of Trinidad and settled in communities based on their old companies, calling themselves Merikans. The previous year, 200 Chesapeake refugees had arrived in this same region. While they were given government rations and supplies to build settlements, in addition to their land grants, after eight months they became self-sufficient and added to the local economy. Despite being a strong believer in white supremacy, Trinidad Governor Woodard “consistently praised his black settlers as industrious, orderly, and peaceable” (Taylor, 378).

The Colonial Marines and their families fared much better than the 2,811 civilians who had been sent to Nova Scotia and the 371 sent to New Brunswick. Despite Cochrane’s enthusiasm for freeing slaves in the United States, he was still willing to separate extended families. All men without wives and children were initially kept at Ireland Island, while families were transported to Nova Scotia. The British did not understand the importance of the familiarity of extended family and plantation slave communities to these immigrants in a foreign land. Men with close ties to the departing families initially refused to work, resulting in Cochrane withholding their rations. Eventually he allowed the protesting workers to work for passage to follow their friends and family to Nova Scotia, provided they returned to work and remained on good behavior. However, it was his threat to return these refugees to Virginia that finally enticed them back to work (Smith, 191). “When British officers began separating communities and shipping them away, the refugees’ greatest fears seemed to materialize because it appeared to them that they were being reenslaved in another land, but without their network of family and friends” (Smith, 193).

Nova Scotia was unprepared and unappreciative of the immigrants who had been deposited on their soil by the Royal Navy without proper supplies or warning. The colonial legislature refused to provide funding, even basic supplies such as shoes, and supplies from Britain took over a year to arrive. “As a result many of these former slaves died during the winter of 1814-1815” (Smith, 194). Even when supplies arrived, the survivors were directed to 10-acre plots for settlement with licenses of occupation, without land deeds, to prevent their migration to more fruitful land. “Colonial officials did not envision them becoming anything other than a perpetual laboring class, tied to the land they tilled and working for others” (Smith, 197). Despite this hardship, only 95 refugees accepted the Canadian government’s request to relocate to Trinidad. While refugees thrived in Trinidad, most refugees in Canada preferred their brand of freedom to the possibility, or fear, of re-enslavement in the West Indies. “By the 1830s [when slavery ended in the West Indies] some of the refugees living in Canada had begun to prosper, and the majority saw no reason to leave the sense of security they had finally developed” (Smith, 198). They learned to adapt to the severe climate and cultivate land that had once been abandoned by
Canadians. “In 1842, some twenty-seven years after their arrival, the Canadian government finally granted the refugees ownership of the 1,800 acres of land. Not surprisingly many sold their land and many chose to move on” (Smith, 199).

While the British had been unwilling to return self-emancipated African Americans at the end of the war, the United States government was unwilling to accept the loss of slave property without some sort of restitution, as had occurred after the Revolutionary War. President Madison tasked his Secretary of State, James Monroe, with enforcing the Treaty of Ghent’s stipulations for restitution to slave owners. Monroe’s first strategy hinged on the American belief that they were better humanitarians than the British. “The believers [including Madison and Monroe] operated from the premise that the British were wicked people responsible for American slavery; incapable of liberating slaves, they must have taken them for sale as plunder” (Taylor, 355). During and following the war, several accounts of this claim surfaced, however, they remained uncorroborated by physical evidence. This did not deter Monroe and other believers, “as with any conspiracy theory, the believers wove a tautology where the lack of substantial evidence became proof for a cunning cover-up…” (Taylor, 355).

Monroe hoped to reframe the U.S. effort to obtain restitution by focusing on the issue of stolen property. He sent three special agents into the British colonies to collect evidence that the self-emancipated African Americans had been enslaved by the British, as well as to collect anyone who preferred re-enslavement in the U.S. to the British colonies. In addition, the agents were authorized to appeal personally to the former slaves. This task fell to Thomas Spalding, Eli Magruder, and Augustine Neale. All three agents were unsuccessful in both persuading British officials and enticing freed persons to return with them. Neale had the most difficulty in the port of Halifax, where animosity toward the newly arrived African Americans was far outweighed by hatred of the American government. He reported back to Monroe that the vast presence of freedmen clearly outnumbered any who may have been re-enslaved. When four freedmen who had sailed with him deserted his ship, Nonsuch, Neale actually left the port with just one elderly man he had persuaded to return Baltimore, resulting in a net loss of four individuals. Private merchants had a bit more luck successfully encouraging nine former slaves to return home to their friends and family. “These nine were exceptions that proved the rule, for almost all of the 3,400 Chesapeake runaways preferred British freedom over American slavery” (Taylor, 359). “Soon Monroe lost interest in further missions that could only discredit the consoling fictions he wanted to believe as a slaveholder” (Taylor, 365).

While Monroe was unsuccessful pursuing the issue covertly, Secretary of State John Adams renegotiated the Treaty of Ghent. “In 1818, both governments agreed to accept the arbitration of Russian Czar Alexander I to adjudicate the question of slave compensation” (Smith, 211). It is ironic that the person who two English-speaking countries had adjudicate an English treaty, signed in the Netherlands, was Russian. “In 1823, he [Alexander] ruled the English should pay a ‘just indemnification for all private property [including slaves] which the British forces may have carried away’” (211, emphasis added). This would prove an important clause for Virginia slaveholders because in the original treaty, the language specified that all slaves still in U.S. territory should be returned. As most of the self-emancipated African Americans from the
Chesapeake had made it into English territory by the end of the war, there been a low expectation of restitution by the British. With this new arbitration, plantations across the south were eligible to argue over who was more deserving of restitutions.

An important caveat was that slaveholders had to prove that former slaves had been transported by the British out of the country. After three years of deliberation between the British and American authorities, with arbitrators often making the final decision, tangible evidence was confirmed for approximately 3,600 African Americans having left slavery. In order for a slave owner’s claim to be accepted by this international commission, they had to prove ownership and probable cause that their slave had escaped to the British. Many freedmen had written to their former owners and inquired about their friends and family. While owners were outraged and betrayed to be contacted as if they were equals, they presented the letters to the commission as proof, which resulted in preservation of correspondence in archives. From this arbitration process, it was determined “a total of 3,582 slaves had been taken from the American coast – 1,721 from Virginia, 714 from Maryland, 833 from Georgia, 259 from Louisiana, 22 from Mississippi, 18 from Alabama, 10 from South Carolina, three from Washington D.C. and two from Delaware” (Smith, 211). After a final tally, value was assigned to the “stolen property,” with average values assigned based on their region. “Because slaves were more expensive in the Deep South, the board fixed the value of a Louisiana slave at $580; an Alabama, Georgia, or South Carolina slave at $390; and a Chesapeake claimant could collect only $280 per slave.” As a result “the British faced a total liability of $2,693,120 including interest from February 17, 1815.” However, in November 1826, the U.S. government settled for a lump sum of $1,204,960 to be divided equally among the claimants (Taylor, 432). As a result, the majority of the settlement went to Virginia slave owners whose former slaves had escaped through Tangier Island. The largest award went to Joseph C. Cabell of Corotoman Plantation in the Tidewater, who received $20,640 for the 69 slaves who accepted the British offer of freedom (Taylor, 434).

British records indicate that 4,800 self-emancipated persons were evacuated during the War of 1812, but they paid restitution for 3,582. The actual number of African Americans who achieved freedom during the War of 1812, let alone how many passed through Tangier Island, likely will never be known. For the purposes of the Treaty of Ghent, slaves were treated as property and proof of theft had to be presented and not simply proof of existence. While it is distasteful, and disturbing, to consider a human life property, without this process there would have been no preservation of the brave individuals who risked their lives leaving behind everything they had ever known for the promise of freedom. The British activities at Tangier Island and the subsequent arbitration process, allowed an important aspect of African Americans’ experience to be preserved in historic records.

At Tangier Island, Fort Albion was a major presence for the short duration of its occupation from April 1814 to March 1815. It housed over a thousand British troops, including Colonial Marines, and some sources record that it supported up to 12,000 individuals on the eve of the Battle of Baltimore in September 1814. This was the largest population to occupy the island in its recorded history, but much of Fort Albion disappeared from view shortly after the British left. “The ‘British fort’ on Tangier Island shows clearly on a map of Accomack County published by
a man named John Wood in 1820, but that is its last known appearance” (Mariner, 45). On September 3, 1821, a severe hurricane swept through Tangier Island and removed all trace of the fort and “by mid-century, the site lay completely underwater” (Marine, 45).

While the site of the fort may have been underwater by the 19th mid-century, the surrounding area that the British also occupied, including the religious camp meeting grounds, remained in use by the residents of Tangier Island into the 20th century. After the British occupation, the largest imprint on this part of the island would have been left by the yearly camp meetings held on the beaches adjacent to the old fort. While the permanent population of the island remained less than 100, over 5,000 people attended the 1821 camp meeting, with over 260 tents covering the area that the British had occupied less than a decade before. Providing transport from the mainland, 400 boats docked in the same waters of Cod Harbor that had been occupied by Cockburn and his fleet. People traveled from as far as Norfolk to attend the camp meetings, which also were the reason for the first steamboat service operated between Norfolk and Tangier and just five years after the first steamboat had arrived in the Chesapeake Bay. The camp meetings were well-attended until the 1840s, when the Methodist denomination began to fracture over the issue of slavery. Eventually Methodism split between northern and southern sects, with Tangier Islanders following the northern sect. Northerners from Baltimore never enjoyed the camp meetings quite like the southerners from Norfolk. In 1857, the 49th, and last, camp meeting was held; only in 1814, when the British built Fort Albion, had a meeting not occurred. “It [the camp meetings] had outlived its usefulness…But in the process it had helped to change Tangier, for never again would the island be quite so remote…” (Mariner, 59).

Cod Harbor, the island’s deepest harbor, had become increasingly important by the eve of the Civil War. In 1861, the largest commercial property to date, a 35-room hotel, was built on the former camp meeting site. Edward J. Poulson, of the Eastern Shore, received the land from the state and constructed the Chesapeake Pleasure House, much to the chagrin of the local population, which still numbered less than 500. The war’s onset spelled the venture’s doom within a few months and no subsequent activity occurred for the duration (Mariner, 63). In 1866, renewed commercialization arrived shortly after a railroad line was completed in the Northern Neck and shipbuilders from Delaware established the Eastern Shore Steamboat Company.

The same year, menhaden, an inedible fish was discovered in high volume in the southern harbor. After processing, the fish’s oil could be used in paint and cosmetics, with the rest of the fish being used for manure. In 1873, Henry Crockett built a fish factory on the prehistoric shell pile in the Cod Harbor. By 1883, five more factories were established around the harbor near the old fort site. A few years later, one of the worst recorded hurricanes hit the island, destroying the shell pile and Crockett’s fish factory, which forced him to move his operation to the southern tip of Tangier as well. Eventually his operation was acquired by the Davis-Palmer Company, which expanded operations to include a fish-packing house and a bottling plant. The enterprise continued in operation Beach Packing Factory purchased it in 1920 (Mariner 97).
Cod Harbor was also a transportation hub for the island. In August 1884, steamboat service arrived and a small fish factory was replaced with a steamboat wharf. Cod Harbor remained Tangier Island’s best natural harbor until the 1910s, when the federal government sent a dredge to create a new port closer to the town limits. In 1921, a federal contractor dug a channel as well. “Though the steamers continued to use the wharf in Cod [Harbor], the northern end of Main Ridge became almost immediately the new center of activity and commerce, and became in time the island’s downtown” (Mariner 97). When the steamboat company went bankrupt in 1932, the old steamboat wharf were abandoned. During the 1920s, as the island’s first improved road network was being constructed, there was no demand to extend a road 1.5 miles south to reach the fish factories at the island’s southern tip, as workers could reach them by boat. With the onset of the Great Depression, the last of the factories closed and the southern end of the island was abandoned (Mariner 107). Since the early 20th century, storms, easterly tides, and changing water levels have eroded the beaches that once provided camp meeting sites and then sites for fish factories, leaving most of this once-developed area underwater.

Almost a century after the British first occupied Tangier Island, another naval force, the U.S. Navy, arrived on February 15, 1911. The navy towed the derelict USS San Marcos to a location southwest of the Fort Albion location but within view of the island and began using it for target practice (Mariner, 92). Armaments testing continued after World War I, during controversial testing of an airplane’s ability to bomb and destroy the strongest military vessel, the battleship. The strongest proponent of airborne attacks, General Billy Mitchell, whose peacetime rank was Colonel, is best known for his criticism of the War Department after World War I, which culminated with a scathing review to the national press. Military officials conducted a highly publicized court martial of Mitchell that finally ended in 1925. “As far as War Department historians could determine, the Mitchell court-martial had been the longest ever in the U.S. Army for a senior officer” (Waller, 316). It also had captured the attention of the American public, which largely supported Mitchell, while the prosecution had only the personal support of President Calvin Coolidge. “The War Department had hoped for as little publicity as possible, but the trial was the biggest media event in the country” (Waller, 46). In addition to fascinating the public with his predictions of aeronautics potential, Mitchell argued that national defense would someday rely on a separate air. He maintained that, in its current state, the U.S. military was unprepared to defend the country from European and Asian countries’ aeronautic advancements. To catch up, he advocated cutting back on shipbuilding and coastal defense sites and replacing them with air defense sites. In a country that prided itself on its navy and artillery, Mitchell’s arguments were not well received, especially in military quarters. The issue came to a head when at a Congressional hearing, Mitchell declared that an airplane could sink a battleship and that “1,000 bombardment planes can be built and operated for about the price of one battleship” (Levine, 202).

In an effort to disprove Mitchell’s theory, the U.S. Navy conducted its own classified tests off the coast of Tangier Island. The navy brought the battleship U.S.S Indiana to a location off Tangier Island’s southern end where they hoped few witnesses were likely to travel. The tests were scheduled for the week of October 28-November 3, 1920, to coincide with the presidential election between Warren Harding and James Cox. The navy simulated an air attack on the
battleship and concluded that “The entire experiment pointed to the improbability of a modern battleship being either completely destroyed or completely put out of action by aerial bombs” (Levine, 209). When two pictures of the bombed ship appeared in the *London Illustrated News* on December 11, 1920, however, the public questioned its durability against air raids. The bombing test off Tangier’s southern tip resulted in “the first time such photographs had been published in the world… and [it] was often used in books and magazines to illustrate the effect of the detonation of an aerial bomb on the deck of an unnamed battleship” (Levine, 207).

Another phase of naval testing began in Tangier Sound in 1921. Mitchell’s goal was to demonstrate how an air assault could be conducted during a real-world situation. The U.S. Navy provided a derelict battleship, *U.S.S. Alabama*, and Mitchell conducted a night raid. “The purpose was to try out gas and smoke bombs, smoke-screens and night attacks at sea, powerful calcium flares designed to locate targets in the dark and to blind anti-aircraft gunners” (Levine, 271).

At this time, waters in the Tangier Sound had a depth of 30 feet. While the Navy successfully removed the *Indiana and Alabama* after testing ended, the older *San Marcos* wreckage was left behind. “Built prior to the Spanish-American War, the Texas/San Marcos never sank a ship in battle but managed just before the Second World War to take down the last of the Baltimore-based steamboats to the Eastern Shore of Virginia” (Mariner, 113). The ship’s remains again were used for target practice during World War II, but it still retained enough solidity that, “by 1957 seven ships and boats had sunk after colliding with her” (Marine, 123). After a few unsuccessful demolition attempts, the federal government dug a trench in the Sound’s bottom and pushed the San Marcos into it, leaving it about 20 feet below the current water line.

Although all of the Tangier Island Historic District 2015 Boundary Increase is composed of submerged land, historical research and a remote sensing survey have demonstrated that this area is associated with significant historic events, including the War of 1812, the self-emancipation of thousands of African Americans, early Methodism in the Chesapeake Bay, and early twentieth century naval ordnance testing. The area’s multiple layers of significance are similar to that of the original Tangier Island Historic District. Taken together, the original district and the boundary increase area encompass a rich heritage that is significant in Virginia’s history.
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Figure 3: Historic map of Tangier Island (1939) showing southern point before eroding. Source: Hall, S. Warren III. (1939). **Tangier Island: A Study of an Isolated Group** [University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939]; see Antonellis, 2014.)
By the Honorable Sir ALEXANDER COCHRANE, K. B.,
Vice Admiral of the Red, and Commander in Chief of
His Majesty’s Ships and Vessels, upon the North Ameri-
can Station, &c. &c. &c.

A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS it has been represented to me, that many Persons
now resident in the United States, have expressed a de-
sire to withdraw therefrom, with a view of entering into His Ma-
jury’s Service, or of being received as Free Settlers into some
of His Majesty’s Colonies.

This is therefore to Give Notice,

That all those who may be disposed to emigrate from the Uni-
ted States will, with their Families, be received on board of
His Majesty’s Ships or Vessels of War, or at the Military Posts
that may be established, upon or near the Coast of the United
States, when they will have their choice of either entering into
His Majesty’s Sea or Land Forces, or of being sent as FREE
Settlers to the British Possessions in North America or the
West Indies, where they will meet with all due encouragement.

GIVEN under my Hand at Bermuda, this 2nd
day of April, 1814.

ALEXANDER COCHRANE.

By Command of the Vice Admiral,
WILLIAM BALHETCHET.

GOD SAVE THE KING.
Figure 4: Drawing of Tangier Island Point with plan of Fort Albion, 1814. Source: Papers of Vice Admiral Sir Alexander Cochrane, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. Found in: Taylor, p. 278.
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The project area is located just southwest of Tangier Island, in the central region of the Chesapeake Bay, Virginia, south of the Virginia-Maryland border (Figure 1; Figure 8).

About 18,000 years B.P., the Wisconsin Age glaciers began to melt and the resulting rises in sea level began to submerge the Ancestral Susquehanna River system. This inundation process ultimately resulted in the formation of the modern Chesapeake Bay, which finally stabilized around 2,000 years ago. This inundation left numerous islands and wetlands, in the Chesapeake Bay, including the island of Tangier.

Tangier’s low profile and location in the open waters of the bay have exposed the island to countless storms that have severely eroded away its west side and the southern sand spit “hook.” By comparing an 1846 U.S. Coast Survey map with a current chart of the bay, Lowery et al. (2012:17) were able to illustrate the remarkable landscape alteration of Tangier Island just over the past 160 years (Figure 9).
Figure 12. Contoured magnetometer data with the locations of anomalies identified.

Figure 13. Sidescan sonar mosaic of survey area with locations of targets identified.