

10-23
(May 1929)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

----- NATIONAL PARK
Fort McHenry National Monument and
Historic Shrine
Baltimore 30, Maryland

FILE NO. H2215-A

Research for HARP at
The Library of Congress

Prepared by:

George C. Mackenzie
Park Historian

Fort McHenry National Monument
and Historic Shrine

May 1, 1958

IMPORTANT

This file constitutes a part of the official records of the National Park Service and should not be separated or papers withdrawn without express authority of the official in charge.

All Files should be returned promptly to the File Room. Officials and employees will be held responsible for failure to observe these rules, which are necessary to protect the integrity of the official records.

ARNO B. CAMMERER,
Director.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
FORT MCHENRY NATIONAL MONUMENT AND
HISTORIC SHRINE
BALTIMORE 30, MARYLAND

Research for HARP at
The Library of Congress

Prepared by:

George C. Mackenzie
Park Historian

Fort McHenry National
Monument and Historic
Shrine

May 1, 1958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Survey of Material	5
3. Materials Examined	21
4. Materials Remaining for Examination	28

Introduction

The primary objective that guided my research at the Library of Congress was to complete an examination of all collections, both English and American, believed to include information relevant to Fort McHenry or the events leading to the attack on Baltimore. This work was done under the auspices of the Historical and Archeological Research Project, which was started May 1, 1957.

Prior to my departure for Washington, D. C., a selective list of British and American collections to be examined was prepared from Grace G. Griffin, A Guide to the MSS Relating to American History In British Depositories Reproduced for the Division of MSS of the Library of Congress, Washington, 1946. At the Library of Congress I checked a copy of C. O. Paullin and F. L. Paxson, Guide to the Materials In London Archives for the History of the United States Since 1783, Washington, 1914, because I understood additional collections had been reproduced for the Library of Congress since the publication of Griffin's, Guide. These were starred in the earlier work.

Between October 14 and December 5 of 1957 I spent approximately thirty-six days in the Manuscript Division. Possibly, as

much as half my time was spent working with negative photostats of British documents in the Public Record Office; these consisted of Admiralty records and others from the War Office. The balance of my time was devoted to a study of particular private collections of Americans known to have been identified with Fort McHenry or the defense of Baltimore.

Ninety-four bound volumes, five folios, and eighty-two boxes of material were examined. In the study of the boxed material the most obvious difficulty was the fact that all boxed British material consisted of negative photostats, which were at times most difficult to read because of inferior reproduction. Moreover, the photostats were disarranged, making it frequently necessary to hunt for succeeding pages of certain letters. A further difficulty was the lack of a consistent arrangement of documents; I found some of these to be arranged by subject, while others showed an attempted chronological arrangement. Frequently, upon persistent inquiry, I learned I had been prematurely informed that all requested material had been brought me. Sometimes it was a case of there being a "Second Series" of bound volumes, which had been overlooked, or as in the case of the McHenry material an additional truck load.

By requesting for microfilming all items that appeared to have the slightest relationship or relevance to Fort McHenry, the defense of Baltimore, or the Chesapeake campaign, I allowed myself considerable latitude of choice in accordance with a basic HARP research policy. An item by item documentary listing with source references was made on eighty-five Library of Congress estimating sheets, individual documents in the various collections ticketed for Fort McHenry, and brief notes with citations taken on three by five note cards.

The note cards were expected to serve two purposes. First, they were to enable us to determine with certainty whether all documents requested for microfilming had been received. Second, the taking of brief notes served the purpose of enabling me to maintain sufficiently close familiarity with the more important documents examined that my critical sense in the search for additional sources of information was thereby enhanced.

A cursory check of the catalog file of British Captains' letters was made to no avail. In the case of the large Library of Congress Collection of British ships logs on the North American Station insufficient information prevented me from pursuing this line of inquiry to a successful conclusion. The need is for a complete list of British ships captains and vessels operating

in the Chesapeake.

However, on the basis of the research which it was possible to push to a successful conclusion, there is justification for the expression of the hope that evaluations made by present and future historians in the area concerning aspects of the Fort McHenry story may be facilitated by many of the documents found and that the latter may prove to be a valuable source of reference as further synthesis is attempted.

Survey of Material

The British and American records studied proved to be opposite sides of the same coin. It was, indeed, most striking to note the manner in which each complemented the other to in effect help recreate a balanced picture of what happened in the course of the British Chesapeake campaign. From British sources we hoped to broaden our understanding of the conduct of British naval operations in this area with a view to placing them in their proper context.

As a by-product of this phase of investigation, it was hoped that the dispatches from either Admiral Cockburn or Cochrane to the Admiralty Office might contain a reference to Francis Scott Key's truce vessel. We were disappointed in this expectation. Similarly, the Log Books of H.M.S. Albion and the Journal her commander Sir George Cockburn kept as commanding officer of the Chesapeake squadron are barren in this respect.¹

All of the British records that appeared to have the highest potential were researched. It was possible to establish exact relationships among documents found in the Admiralty

¹ Infra, Great Britain, Public Record Office, Admiralty 1, Secretary's Department, In-Letters; Sir George Cockburn, Log-books and Papers, 28 Volumes.

dispatches, the Cockburn Journal and the H.M.S. Albion ship's log to specific events. Ample material will be forthcoming to present in most composite terms many aspects of the story of the British activities in the Chesapeake 1813-1814, the capture of Washington, and the events connected with the attack upon Baltimore.

With reference to the question of prisoner exchange, frequent allusions were found to visits by "American Flags of Truce" to the H.M.S. Albion for the period from March 1813 to December 1814; in most cases these missions were concerned with the conduct of State Department business.

The earliest reference to such a vessel by name, and the only one I have been able to find to date, is in a letter from Charles Stewart, Captain of the U.S.F. Constellation to Sir George Cockburn dated 21 March 1813. This particular Flag of Truce was the "Franklin Tender," which operated out of Norfolk. In this case it was being used to transfer diplomatic dispatches to Cockburn for shipment to the Emperor of Russia.²

An earlier letter of the 6 March 1813 from Cockburn to Brigadier General Taylor, Commander of the Norfolk military

²

Cockburn MSS, Volume 24, pp 60-62.

district, called for conclusion of an agreement on a cartel.³ From another source we understand the government did charter a vessel at this time for an eighteen month period for \$1700.00.⁴ There is cause to wonder if the same vessel was always used, and this is of some importance in the determination of the name of Francis Scott Key's truce vessel, which visited the British fleet under arrangements made through the State Department.

Arranged chronologically, the abstracts on my note cards from items requested for microfilming from British records provide an effective commentary on the sequence of more significant events having particular reference to the Chesapeake campaign. Also deserving of mention in this context is Sir Charles Napier's Narrative of Operations in Potomac by Squadron of Captain Gordon 1814 because of the manner in which it relates to the foregoing sources.

3

Ibid., Volume 27, pp. 111-113.

⁴ Letter of Zack Spratt to Robert H. Atkinson, October 7, 1957, National Park Service History Files, "Star Spangled Banner Subject Binder," XI. For what it is worth Mr. Spratt writes that Colonel Skinner used the chartered Ferguson Line sloop "every few months as a cartel vessel to carry him to the British fleet."

Of interest are two letters from Alexander Cochrane to John Wilson Croker, Secretary of the Admiralty Office, which suggest that Cochrane had little taste for the naval or military operations in the Chesapeake area during the summer. The first of these letters dated July 23, 1814 voices strong opposition to such a campaign because of the high incidence of sickness of the summer before.⁵ A second letter of the 31st August 1814 reports a great deficiency of medicine. Faced with the prospect of heavy casualties in any direct frontal attack by the British land army upon the well entrenched defenders of Baltimore, there is ground to wonder if Cochrane's order to abandon the attack upon Baltimore stemmed from his fear that medical supplies were inadequate.⁶

Only after plans are well advanced for the expedition against New Orleans, which Cochrane heard about for the first time in Jamaica after leaving the Baltimore area, do we find in the British records a letter from John Wilson Croker to Cochrane of September 28, 1814 stating that measures have been taken to supply

⁵ Admiralty 1. Volume 506, Part V, pp. 881-883. An estimated 500-600 effectives are reported as being laid up with "fever [malaria] and ague." Cochrane recommended instead an attack upon Rhode Island.

⁶Ibid. Volume 506, Part VII, pp. 1177-1179.

him with additional medical supplies.⁷

From the War Office 6 material one gains an excellent understanding of British strategy. This was one of the more valuable files of material examined; it is being microfilmed almost in entirety. Secret orders from Lord Bathurst to Brigadier-General Robert Ross in 1814 (the complete date is not given) establish the relationship between the Lakes theater and the Chesapeake. In these orders Ross was instructed "not to engage in any extended operations at a distance from the coast."⁸ Further orders to Ross relating to the foregoing orders immediately follow in this file under the date of July 30, 1814.

A dispatch of September 29, 1814 from the Home Office to Ross brought endorsement and encouragement of the British attack upon Baltimore. From this dispatch we learn that 10,000 troops were readied for service in the North American theater. It is coupled with a dispatch of the day before outlining additional possible points of attack.⁹ When a report by Adam Gordon to

⁷ Great Britain, Public Record Office, Admiralty 2, Secretary's Department, Out-letters, Volume 933, Part 1, p. 224.

⁸ Great Britain, Public Record Office, War Office 6, Secretary of State Out-letters, Volume 2.

⁹ Ibid., Volume 2.

John Wilson Croker of 6 October 1814 is added to these facts stating that a convoy carrying 5,000 pounds in gold was headed for Bermuda and later reports of the arrival of requisitions after the signing of the Treaty of Peace, it appears the British were prepared for a long war.¹⁰

The foregoing citations are representative of many documents found in the British material from the Public Record Office. The items for microfilming were most numerous in the Admiralty 1 dispatches and the Cockburn Journal consisting of many volumes. These consumed a considerable portion of the time I was working in the Library of Congress.

The preceding material will help to reconstruct in considerable measure not only the military side, but also the human side of the story of the British campaign. Many of the ills reported by medical surveys suggest the sick-bay was a convenient place to pass a few days. Those most frequently reported included: Hepatitis, debility, lame left leg, old ulcer, old age, rheumatism, curious shoulder and frostbitten toes.

The second phase of my investigation was devoted to a search for Francis Scott Key material. Letters and papers relating to Key were found in all but one of six private collections listed

¹⁰Ibid., Volume 2.

in Section 3 of this report. Key autographs were not numerous and were largely confined to legal matters. A selection of a number of the more significant items covers the period from 1814 to 1856.

Writing to Judge Joseph S. Nicholson May 21, 1814, Key commented on the incidence of fever at Annapolis; he added that at the time it was also quite prevalent in the Frederick area.¹¹ On September 2, 1814 Key wrote to his mother of his planned visit to the British fleet. It is regrettable that he made no mention of the name of the truce vessel.¹² Of the Key documents requested for microfilming only the Roger Brooke Taney letter to Charles Howard of March 17, 1856 relates specifically to Key's mission.¹³ The content of this letter was known to the staff, but the reproduction of the original will prove to be a valuable addition to our archival records.

From other references one gains a picture of Key's interest in public affairs. He was a close friend of Andrew Stevenson, to whom he wrote April 27, 1840 in a critical vein as to the lack of

¹¹ Joseph H. Nicholson Papers, Volume 7, pp. 2044-2045.

¹² U.S. Miscellany, American Letters and Documents, 1652-1845.

¹³ Roger Brooke Taney Papers, A.L.S., 14 pp., 8^o, Ac 6467A, (Ac B.R. A26).

public leadership; he expressed fears for the loss of Virginia in the coming election and revealed his political sympathies through his outspoken lack of regard for VanBuren.¹⁴ In a second letter of July 29, 1840 to Stevenson Key expressed doubt as to the success of the existing form of the American Government; he believed the House of Representatives was to blame for its shortcomings. In this letter he also evinced an interest in the African Colonization scheme as a means of ridding the country of slavery.¹⁵

To Lewis Tappan, known for his connection with the abolition movement, he expressed similar feelings concerning slavery on January 15, 1841. In so doing he identified himself with the abolition movement. Like many perceptive persons of his day he saw in the slavery question, two decades before it occurred, the sparks that touched off the Civil War.¹⁶

In the final phase of research at the Library of Congress all available materials in American sources dealing with the Chesapeake campaign were sought. This task was expedited by the prepared list of personal papers in the Library of Congress of

¹⁴Andrew Stevensen Papers, Volume 19, pp. 29492-29494.

¹⁵Ibid., Volume 21, pp. 29920-29921.

¹⁶Lewis Tappan Papers.

prominent persons identified with our story, which is referred to in the Introduction. Collections which proved most rewarding were those of John Rodgers, Samuel Smith, James Monroe, James McHenry and William H. Winder; personal papers of others were examined as well, but with lesser results.

The John Rodgers collection is very large. It includes two series of bound volumes and numerous boxes of loose material. For the short period Commodore Rodgers was in Baltimore before and following the British attack upon Baltimore, many letters were found that clarify his roll as commander of the naval forces at Baltimore.

There is some evidence that his sailors, borrowed from the Delaware Flotilla, played a roll in the defense of Baltimore out of proportion to their small number. The barges they manned were moved down the Susquehanna and formed a significant part of the force commanded by John Rutter at the Lazaretto.¹⁷ In a letter of August 23, 1814 from John Rodgers to Alexander Murray at New Castle, Rodgers wrote of being ordered to Baltimore with 300 men of the Delaware Flotilla. It was these men who manned not only the armed barges reinforcing the battery at Lazaretto Point

¹⁷Papers of Rodgers Family, Box 1, 1800-1819, Folder 1814 - 1819.

but also the hulks blocking the entrance to the Northwest Branch. From a return of Rutter to Rodgers of September 11, 1814 this post was manned by 400 men, making it considerably stronger than formerly believed.¹⁸

There are in the Rodgers Papers many letters to document his close connection American naval operations. He was most instrumental in the organization of the flotilla commanded by Joshua Barney. Though its final fate was destruction, until then it operated as a considerable nuisance and tied down substantial British Forces near the mouth of the Potomac River.¹⁹

Other pages in the Rodgers collection document as well as any material found the continued fears that after Baltimore the British would strike at Philadelphia, while they also clearly indicate how thin our defensive forces were at this time for the Middle Atlantic area as militia drafts prepared to go home.

To compensate for this weakness a line of videttes extended from Elkton, Maryland to Philadelphia. Arrangements were completed for the movement of troops to the north or south as needed.

¹⁸John Rodgers Letter and Order Book, December 30, 1812 - March 13, 1815; John Rodgers Papers, Volume 8 (Second Series), p. 5562.

¹⁹Captain Gorden to Alexander Cochrane, September 9, 1814, Admiralty 1, Volume 507, Part 2, pp. 301-310.

This line of videttes was maintained. After the British withdrawal from Baltimore it was extended as well toward Washington.²⁰ Rodgers, meanwhile, was to maintain himself in readiness to move to the defense of Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Washington. To guard the approaches to Philadelphia he had a string of torpedoes stretched across the channel below New Castle.²¹

While Commodore Rodgers expressed great concern for the safety of Philadelphia and maintained himself in readiness at New Castle to go to the defense of that city, General Samuel Smith is shown through his papers to have believed the danger of a renewal of the British attack upon Baltimore was more imminent. Moreover, the Smith papers furnish much valuable information on measures taken for the defense of Baltimore. These deal with requisitions of both men and supplies, both of which were hard to get, defensive arrangements and the chain of command with particular reference to the Samuel Smith - W. H. Winder feud.

²⁰Sam Smith Papers, Box 6, Folder 1814, September 1-3; Sam Smith to James Monroe, September 21, 1814, Sam Smith Papers, Box 16, Volume 5; Sam Smith to Lieutenant Stump, September 22, 1814, Ibid.

²¹Letter of B. Henry to John Rodgers, September 17, 1814, in John Rodgers Papers, Volume 8 (Second Series), pp. 5564 - 5565.

Orders were issued from Samuel Smith's Headquarters 23 August 1813 that British ship movements were to be observed by a barge sent to the mouth of the Patapsco River. A blue Jack was to be displayed if the British were standing down the bay and a white Jack if they were coming up the bay.²²

Concerning the dependability of militia drafts for the defense of the city there was considerable doubt. In a report of 6 September, 1814 from George Armistead and a fellow officer by the name of Mason on an inspection of armed points on the land approaches to Baltimore they described the guard duty performed by the men as a "mockery."²³

A majority of the documents found relating specifically to Fort McHenry came from the Smith collection, though there are a number of significant items from both the McHenry and Rodgers papers as well. These are far too numerous to cite, but dating from 1799, when James McHenry was still Secretary of War, they relate to construction details, conditions at Fort McHenry 1813-1814, ordnance needs and details of defense, including a discussion of the use of night signals.

²²Sam Smith Papers, Box 16, Volume 4.

²³Sam Smith Papers, Box 6, Folder 1814, September 4 -7.

One record found in the McHenry papers for the year 1798 is of particular interest for the light it sheds on construction work then in progress at Fort McHenry and for the manner in which it corroborates similar findings from sources in the National Archives. This document includes an itemization of materials used, listing 600,000 bricks and the quantities of sand and lime needed to make the mortar.²⁴

In the Spring of 1813 there was a lack of travelling carriages at Fort McHenry; only four are said to have been fit for service. To meet this need Sam Smith directed a request of 30 March 1813 to Secretary of War Armstrong for replacements with travelling furnaces. Travelling carriages were much desired so that they could be quickly moved to any point of threatened attack.²⁵ The reason for such concern was the ever constant fear through the Summers of 1813 and 1814 that an attack upon Fort McHenry could come at any time and the recognition of the fact she was particularly vulnerable to attack from the direction of the Ferry Branch of the Patapsco River. By letter of 2 September 1814 Sam Smith emphasized this weakness to John Rodgers, whose responsibility

²⁴Papers of James McHenry, Box 2, Folder, January to July 1798.

²⁵Sam Smith Papers, Box 16, Volume 1.

it was to handle the setting of the harbor obstructions.²⁶

Then, apropos the British bombardment of Fort McHenry, Armistead wrote to Sam Smith 13 September 1814: "From the number of barges and the known situation of the enemy I have not a doubt but what an assault will be made this night on the Fort."²⁷

After the conclusion of the British attack communications passed among commanding officers were full of expressed fears of a renewal of the attack upon Baltimore or Washington. Regarding Fort McHenry a requisition for 18 September 1814 was found requesting 192,000 bricks and 40 bricklayers to render the magazine bombproof. In addition, 24,000 cubic feet of square timber and 50 carpenters, together with an indeterminate number of laborers to dig earth, move timber and make fascines were also requisitioned.²⁸

Other documents relate to the establishment of the Headquarters for the 10th Military District between Baltimore and Washington. This was a matter of considerable concern to Sam Smith who feared the consequences of a dispersal of his forces.

²⁶Sam Smith Papers, Box 16, Volume 5.

²⁷Sam Smith, Box 7, Folder 1814, September 16-30.

²⁸General William H. Winder, Manuscript Calendar of Correspondence, 1812-1814, Part 3 A 300.

Writing to James Monroe 23 September 1814 he cited the lack of time to complete troop dispositions when the British landed at North Point. In a second letter to two associates 26 September 1814 Smith wrote the enemy could get to Baltimore before American troops from camp thirty miles away.²⁹

Of other collections examined, the papers of James Monroe for the period 1812-1815 offered additional items of interest. They shed additional light on British intentions and help to establish the relationship of what went on in the Chesapeake area with British actions elsewhere.

Thomas Jefferson, likewise, commented on many of these same events. One document of particular interest is a letter of 29 August 1814 to Jefferson from a correspondent named D. Wallace. The latter rendered a vivid eyewitness account of the Battle of Bladensburg. In this account he gave the troop dispositions and the number of troops involved.³⁰

Parts Three and Four of the William H. Winder Manuscript Calender of Correspondence were found to contain much useful material, some of which deals with Winder's relations with Sam Smith. Because of the relevance of these documents they were

²⁹Sam Smith Papers, Box 16, Volume 5.

³⁰Thomas Jefferson Papers, Volume 202, pp. 35936-35937.

requested for microfilming in entirety.

Though it was not possible to complete all needed research at the Library of Congress, those sources which appeared to offer the greatest possibility of reward have been completed. A synthesis of documentary material secured from British and American sources should help us to appraise the course of events in the Chesapeake Bay area for the years 1813 and 1814.

Materials Examined

All collections listed in this section were examined in entirety, document by document. All records with any relevance whatsoever to the Chesapeake campaign, the capture of Washington, or the attack upon Baltimore were microfilmed. Frequently, a given document, though appearing at first to be of little importance would take on added significance in the light of other material found.

1. British Collections:

- a. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Admiralty 1, Secretary's Department In-letters, Volumes 506-509.
- b. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Admiralty 2, Letters of Secretary of Admiralty to Commander in Chief of North American Stations, 1808-1815, Volumes 932,933.
- c. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Admiralty 2, Secretary's Department Out-letters, Volumes 1375-1380. A spot check was made of volumes 1376-1379: these contained materials largely extraneous to the needs of the Research Project.
- d. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Correspondence of Special Missions, Foreign Office, Volume 100. This related to prisoner exchange, but was found to be a most disappointing file.
- e. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Foreign Office 115, 1812-1815, Volumes 22, 23. This file includes records that correspond to Foreign Office 5, United States, but they are considered more complete for the period covered.

f. Great Britain, Public Record Office, War Office 6, Secretary of State Out-letters, Volume 2.

g. Cockburn, Sir George, Logbooks and Papers, Volumes 1-52, Logbooks February 1813-January 1815.

h. Napier, Sir Charles, "Narrative of Operations In Potomac by Squadron of Captain Gordan 1814," 34 pp. This account supplements well other documents secured from Admiralty 1 and Admiralty 2. It also relates to materials found in the Cockburn Journal and is of importance for its general background information. This material was requested for microfilming in entirety.

2. Francis Scott Key Material:

a. Francis Scott Key Papers - Gathered by and donated to the Library of Congress by his grandson, Francis Scott Key Smith.

b. Alexander William Armour Papers, 1757-1923.

c. Galloway, Maxcy, Markoe Papers, Volumes 31 and 60 (indexed).

d. Joseph H. Nicholson Papers, Volumes 1 - 7.

e. Andrew Stevenson Papers (indexed).

f. Roger Brooke Taney Papers.

3. Other American Collections:

a. William Eustis Papers, Volume 1, January 9, 1761 to December 5, 1808; Ibid., Volume 2, December 6, 1808 to October 24, 1815.

b. Thomas Jefferson Papers, Volume 202, August 17, 1814 - December 10, 1814.

c. James McHenry Papers, Volumes 1-2 (First Series), October 11, 1778 - December 20, 1814; Ibid., Volumes 3-6 (Second Series), September 24, 1794 - July 16, 1804.

Boxed Material:

- (1) Papers of James McHenry, Box 1.
 - (a) John McHenry and Company Letterbook, January 13, 1790 - June 7, 1810, Ac 7706 (Ac D.R. D. 1428).
 - (b) James McHenry Secretary of War - Letter Press copy book (mainly letters to Presidents Washington and Adams), 1795-1797, Ac 7708, (Ac D.R. D. 1430).
 - (c) Drafts of Letters and Articles to Newspapers (Approximately 70 undated pieces), Ac 7708, (Ac D.R. D. 1430).
- (2) Papers of James McHenry, Box 2, Letters, Reports, and memoranda (mainly drafts and press copies), September 1778 - December 1798:
 - (a) Ac 7476 - (Ac D.R. C 2010, pt.1)
 - (b) Ac 7707 - (Ac D.R. D. 1429)
 - (c) Ac 7708 - (Ac D.R. D. 1430)
 - (d) Ac 7812 - (Ac D.R. D. 2280)
- (3) Papers of James McHenry, Box 3, Letters, Reports, and Memoranda (mainly drafts and press copies), January - August 1799.
 - (a) Ac 7476 - (Ac D.R. C 2010, pt.1)
 - (b) Ac 7707 - (Ac D.R. D. 1429)
 - (c) Ac 7708 - (Ac D.R. D. 1430)
 - (d) Ac 7812 - (Ac D.R. D. 2281)

(4) Papers of James McHenry, Box 4, Letters, Reports, and Memoranda (mainly drafts and press copies), September 1799 - April 1800.

(a) Ac 7476 - (Ac D.R. C 2010, pt. 1)

(b) Ac 7707 - (Ac D.R. D. 1429)

(c) Ac 7708 - (Ac D.R. D. 1430)

(d) Ac 7312 - (Ac D.R. D. 2281)

(5) Papers of James McHenry, Box 5, Letters, Reports, and Memoranda (mainly drafts and press copies), May 1800 - December 1801 and undated items.

(a) Ac 7476 - (Ac D.R. C 2010, pt. 1)

(b) Ac 7707 - (Ac D.R. D. 1429)

(c) Ac 7708 - (Ac D.R. D. 1430)

(6) McHenry Papers, Folio III - 46 - H, 1, 1775 - 1800.

(7) Papers of James McHenry, 1776 - 1814 (folio), Ac D.R. E 503.

(8) James McHenry, Letters Received 1779-1812 (Typed Transcripts), Ac 1605 A.

d. Papers of Montgomery C. Meigs

Boxed Materials:

(1) 1859-1886 and undated items - Ac 7457

(2) 1859-1889 Ac 7451

(3) 1850 -1885 Ac 7451

(4) Papers of Montgomery C. Meigs - Journal of Battle of Chattanooga, September 18-26 and notes concerning his travels in Europe in 1875 - Ac D.R. C 2002.

(5) Miscellaneous Papers Ac 2281.

(6) Diary in 11 volumes, 1863-1872 Ac 2281.

(7) Lincoln to Winfield Scott, June 5, 1861 (folio) Ac 3885.

(8) Newspaper Clippings and Papers of Montgomery C. Meigs. Includes sketches and studies 1857-1882, but none of Fort McHenry. Ac 2281.

e. Papers of James Monroe, Volumes 19-22, September 11, 1812 - April 30, 1815.

Boxed Material:

(1) James Monroe Papers 1783 - 1831. Ac 9405,
I - 6 - B - 6.

(2) James Monroe Miscellany, Photostats, Various Accessions Ac 4798, Ac 4310, Ac 8695 pt. 3, Ac 10642.

f. John Rodgers Papers, Volumes 1-2 (First Series, 1791 - 1819; Ibid., Volume 8 (Second Series), June 19, 1814 - January 27, 1815.

Boxed Material:

(1) Papers of the Rodgers Family, Box 1 (in 3 boxes), 1800-1819. This consisted mainly of letters to John Rodgers from naval officers.

(2) Papers of John Rodgers, Box 1 (in 3 boxes), 1804 - 1808. This material consisted of Court Martials and reports of Stores Returns.

(3) Papers of John Rodgers, Box 2, 1809 - 1825. Included here are correspondence, court martial proceedings and boatswains' reports.

(4) Papers of John Rodgers Family (John Rodgers and Others, 1802-1835). I found here correspondence relating to naval affairs and the War of 1812.

(5) John Rodgers and Others, Letters and Documents, December 29, 1799 - January 2, 1848.

(6) Papers of John Rodgers, 1786-1842.

(7) John Rodgers Letter and Order Book, December 30, 1812 - March 13, 1816. This proved to be a most valuable source of reference.

g. Edward Ross Papers, 1812 - 1814.

h. Sam Smith Papers

Boxed Material:

(1) Box 4, January 22, 1812 - July 31, 1813

(2) Box 5, August 6, 1813 - August 31, 1814

(3) Box 6, January 6, 1814 - September 7, 1814

(4) Box 7, September 8, 1814 - December 31, 1814

(5) Box 14, Undated Material

(6) Box 15, Items from 1738-1816

(7) Box 16, five boxes containing relevant material for 1813 - 1814.

(8) Box 17, Journals, Notebooks, Scrapbook for 1803 - 1811 and later periods up to within a month of Sam Smith's death in 1866.

(9) One folio containing letters to and from Sam Smith.

i. Winder, Gen. William H., Manuscript Calendar of Correspondence, 1812-1814. Parts III and IV of this file were requested for microfilming in entirety.

In addition to the foregoing collections of material, the logs for H.M.S. Rover and H.M.S. Meteor were checked. Of the list of vessels known to have been in the vicinity of Fort McHenry at the time of the British bombardment, these were the only two vessels for which logs were available. In the case of the H.M.S. Rover there are only scattered logs for the years 1810, 1811, 1812, 1813 and 1832. For the H.M.S. Meteor I found two boxes of logs, all of which belong to a later period.

Materials Remaining for Examination

There still remain a number of English and American collections which should be examined before we will have approached that point at which we may say the most likely sources in the Library of Congress have been exhausted. In the case of the British materials these could be examined at Fort McHenry National Monument through an Inter Library loan; possibly, six boxes with each request could be sent here. The American collections, with the exception of the Montgomery C. Meigs 4 volume Journal in shorthand and the Lafayette Papers, should provide us with more information on events associated with the conclusion of peace in 1814.

1. British Collections:

a. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Admiralty 1, Secretary's Department In-letters, Volumes 502-505. These volumes relate to the period Admiral Warren commanded the Chesapeake Squadron 1812-1814. For the most part they concern an earlier period than that in which we are most interested.

b. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Foreign Office 5, United States Correspondence between the Foreign Office and the British Minister to the United States.

(1) Volumes 83 - 88, 1812-1813.

(2) Volumes 105 - 108, December 1814 - 1815.

c. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Correspondence of Special Missions.

(1) Volume 101 - Concerns peace negotiations at Ghent.

(2) Volume 102 - Includes Dispatches from British Commissioners.

d. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Privy Council 2 Registers, 1812-1814. Volumes 129-196 cover the inclusive period 1754-1815.

e. Great Britain, Public Record Office, War Office 1, Volumes 141-144.

2. American Collections:

a. Bayard, J.A., Diary 1813-1815.

b. Brent, William MSS relating to claims.

c. Crawford, William H., Letterbook 1813-1815.

d. Carr, Lewis, Letters 1813-1859, 15 pcs.

e. Lafayette, Marguis, Newspaper clippings.

f. Meigs, Montgomery C., Journal (4 volumes in shorthand).

g. Microfilm Collections of the Library of Congress Prepared for the American Council of Learned Societies 1941-1945.

George C. Mackenzie

George C. Mackenzie
Park Historian

Fort McHenry National Monument
and Historic Shrine