HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF FORT ZUMWALT
By Andrew Weil

Built at the end of the 18th century and almost certainly inhabited into the 20th, Fort Zumwalt stood through the end of the colonial period, the earliest days of American Missouri, and the tumultuous 19th century. The fort’s inhabitants represent many of the personalities and qualities, both good and bad, which laid the foundation for contemporary American society. The building was constructed when American settlers first entered the territory of Upper Louisiana from the Upper South in response to Spanish offers of settlement rights. From a perch in the 21st century, these people are regarded as pioneers. However, they entered a land which had already been explored and to some extent settled by French, Spanish, and African peoples for over 100 years. Native Americans had likely been in the area for at least 12,000 years before that. About five years after the Zumwalt family arrived in what would become Missouri, control of the territory shifted again and the fledgling American government assumed control of the land. With the assumption of power, American settlement increased; their varied cultures combined with creole and Native American traditions and continued the constant process of cultural exchange that defined the frontier, and eventually fed modern American constructions of identity. The Zumwalt, and the later Heald families, along with generations of enslaved African Americans, played a role in the creation of both American culture and the state of Missouri as we know it today. Their stories are the stories of Fort Zumwalt.

Today, the site of Fort Zumwalt is embedded within one of the most rapidly developing counties in the United States. Because the short-term needs and wants of development and population growth often trump the long-term community benefit that can be reaped through the preservation of historical resources, the site of Fort Zumwalt has been fortunate to survive. All too often, communities preserve their heritage only in the names of schools, streets, subdivisions, and shopping malls. Citizens rarely recognize these names as remnants of their cultural past. Many people miss these links between past and present because it has simply never occurred to them to consider their surroundings from an historical perspective. Others live in the present, plan for the future, and willfully refuse to acknowledge a connection to the past. Though most citizens of the area have heard of Fort Zumwalt through the name of the local school district and a city park, the existence of Fort Zumwalt as a physical entity, and its role within local, state, and even national history, remains woefully unrecognized.

Purchased by the State of Missouri in the early 20th century, Fort Zumwalt has been passed down to present generations in the form of a chimney on a hillside. Impressive on its own, this massive structure with its twin fireboxes and rough dressed limestone speaks to the strength and resiliency of early frontier settlers and is an important symbol of its surrounding community. But what of the residence that once surrounded the chimney and, more importantly, who were the people that resided there?
THE FIRST SETTLERS

As outlined in the previous section, the region around Fort Zumwalt was occupied by Native Americans for at least 12,000 years prior to the arrival of Europeans. Although these people developed very rich, elaborate, and enduring societies, for reasons still not understood, they appear to have abandoned most of eastern Missouri around AD. 1400. The area became an open territory used by various tribes to hunt and trap including various groups of Illini to the east of the Mississippi River, the Fox and Sauk in southeastern Iowa, the Osage and Missouri in the western reaches of the state, and even the Sioux on the upper Missouri River.

French explorers, missionaires, and coureurs de bois were the first Europeans to utilize the region. They were attracted by the rich animal resources that could be exploited in the lucrative fur market, and by mineral resources, especially lead and iron. Although occasional early attempts were made to establish permanent communities west of the Mississippi, most of the French initially preferred to live east of the river at settlements like Cahokia, Kaskaskia, and Prairie du Rocher, which had been established at the turn of the 17th century. It was not until the mid 18th century that a group of habitants crossed the river and established a community at Ste. Genevieve, and in 1764 the trading post of St. Louis was founded. By that time, due to the outcome of the French and Indian War, France was forced to surrender its lands in Canada and the Illinois country (east of the Mississippi) to Great Britain. Devastated by war debt, they also bartered their land west of the river to the empire of Spain. Preferring to live under Spanish authority rather than submit to the hated British, many French colonists moved across the river into what had become Spanish territory. St. Louis became an administration center for Upper Louisiana; the territorial government was centered in New Orleans, which, in turn, answered to Madrid.

For the most part, Spanish authorities recognized the improbability of populating the new territory with immigrants from Spain. Instead, they viewed Upper Louisiana as an important geographical buffer between their British enemies in Canada, and the colonies in Mexico, Central, and South America which boasted rich mines and lucrative plantations. Despite the initial influx of French Colonial settlers, the population of Upper Louisiana in the early days of the Spanish regime remained insufficient to deter British incursion. In a bid to increase settlement and make the province more profitable, Spanish authorities began a policy of enticing American settlers into the territory. At the time, many Americans in frontier areas like Kentucky were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with their new government. In many cases, taxation and other “intrusions” into people’s lives and affairs had increased since the end of the Revolution and the American assumption of power. In addition, under the American regime, wealthy land speculators began to wrangle lands away from earlier settlers through the manipulation of loans, surveys, courts, and generally speaking, a bureaucracy few pioneers could successfully navigate.

In 1796, the Spanish authorities began circulating advertisements throughout Kentucky, the Ohio Country, and other areas of what was then the American West, proclaiming that settlers in Spanish territory would be given land for free and would pay no property taxes (Farragher 1992:274). Americans responded rapidly to the generous terms and arrived in great numbers.
Rather than balk at the tide of settlers flowing out of country, the American government was largely pleased with the idea. Though the Spanish were obviously manipulating Americans to create a buffer against English attack and to try to turn a profit, Thomas Jefferson believed it would be the United States who would have the last laugh. Knowing the nature of American settlers and anticipating a Louisiana where the Spanish were hopelessly outnumbered, Jefferson wrote of the Spanish terms “I wish a hundred thousand of our inhabitants would accept...it may be the means of delivering to us peaceably what may otherwise cost a war” (quoted in Farragher 1992:275). Among the Americans who responded to the enticements of the Spanish were members of the Zumwalt (sometimes spelled Sumwold, Zumalt, and Sommalt) family who were living in the vicinity of Lexington at the time.

The patriarch of the Zumwalt clan, Johann Wilhelm Andres Zumwalt [Andrew], came to Philadelphia from Germany in 1737 (Waselkov 1979:33; www.tamu.edu/ccbn/dewitt/andrew4.htm). It is unclear whether he married his first wife, Mary, in the United States or in Germany, but the couple moved to the vicinity of York, Pennsylvania where they began a substantial family. Andrew and Mary had two sons and three daughters before Mary’s premature death. Andrew later married his second wife, a woman named Ann Regina who was originally from Switzerland, and the couple moved to Frederick County, Virginia. Ann Regina and Andrew had five more sons and a daughter; among these children was a boy named Jacob.

Born in 1752, Jacob Zumwalt grew up in Virginia’s Shenandoah Valley and married Katherine (Queti) Miller in 1772 (Carrier 1989:31). Jacob and three of his brothers (George, Stophel [Christopher], and Adam) fought in the Augusta County militia during the Revolutionary War and later moved to Kentucky in the early 1780’s along with their three other full brothers (Waselkov 1979:34). Adam was apparently one of the first of the brothers to make the trek across the mountains and fought along with Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Boone and other early settlers at the disastrous Battle of the Blue Licks in 1782 (Farragher 1992:217; Waselkov 1979:34). Though the numbers are disputed, the force of Kentuckians who fought that day numbered only around 200 men; barely 130 survived. The American force was composed of militia from the small settlements of Boonesborough, Boone’s Station, Lexington, Harrodsburg, and their encompassing counties. Boone’s company was from Fayette County which may have been where Adam lived, as Jacob Zumwalt would soon move to land that was described as “near Lexington” which is in Fayette County; also, the brothers had a tendency to settle near each other (Waselkov 1979:340). Given the small size of the militia force which entered the fight at the Blue Licks, the even smaller force that left it, and the relatively small area from which the force was drawn, it is very possible that Daniel Boone and Adam Zumwalt met each other at this time.

BOONES AND ZUMWALTS, MYTH AND CIRCUMSTANCE

The Daniel Boone family moved to what would soon become the northeast corner of Bourbon County, Kentucky in 1783 to a town called Limestone on the Ohio River (present day Maysville) (Farragher 1992:235). Four years later, Jacob Zumwalt began farming land “near Lexington” (Waselkov 1979:34). The exact location of the Zumwalt farm is not known, but Jacob was listed on Bourbon County tax rolls from 1787 to 1791 (Waselkov 1979:34).
Lexington, however, was in adjacent Fayette County, not in Bourbon. This means that Zumwalt, if he did indeed live near Lexington, must have lived somewhere in the southwest corner of Bourbon County on the Fayette border. Boone meanwhile lived in Limestone, at the northeast corner of Bourbon county on the Ohio River. The two towns today are separated by a distance of approximately 60 miles. In addition, the Boones and the family of Jacob Zumwalt were only located together in Bourbon County for approximately two years (portions of 1787, 1788, and 1789) (Waselkov 1979:34; Farragher 1992:235).

In 1789, the Daniel Boone family moved to Point Pleasant in modern day West Virginia where they remained until 1795 (Farragher 1979:264-272). Meanwhile, Jacob Zumwalt moved to Harrison County, Kentucky in 1794; they appear on Harrison County tax rolls from 1794-1798 (Waselkov 1979:34). While this may indeed indicate that the Zumwals physically migrated, they may simply have been bureaucratically relocated by the fact that Harrison County was created from Bourbon and Scott counties in 1794.

The most intriguing period of Boone/Zumwalt geography began in 1795 when the Boones moved to a piece of land on the Maysville Road, which is essentially modern Highway 68 between Lexington and Maysville [formerly Limestone], Kentucky. Owned by their son Daniel Morgan Boone, this land was situated on “...Hinkston Creek, along the Maysville road about 12 Miles from the Blue Licks” (Farragher 1979:272). By following these directions on a modern road atlas, the Boone farm was likely somewhere in the range of six miles from the Harrison County line. If Zumwalt had not “moved” to Harrison County, but simply stayed put while the county was created under him, and, if he was still living at the farm “near Lexington” he would have been located somewhere near the Harrison, Bourbon border northeast of Lexington in the vicinity of the Maysville Road. If this was the case, this would appear to be the point when the families of Jacob Zumwalt and Daniel Boone lived in closest proximity in Kentucky.

Daniel Morgan Boone, like his father, spent much time on long hunts and in search of new land in which to speculate. Since 1795 (the year that his parents moved onto a portion of his property in Kentucky), he had been exploring westward. In 1797, possibly in response to advertisements he had seen in Kentucky, he investigated portions of Spanish Louisiana and received concessions for land near Femme Osage Creek in modern day St. Charles County, Missouri.

In order to qualify for a land grant, settlers typically had to occupy a property for one year and make measurable improvements like clearing trees and building a home. In an effort to attract desirable settlers, the Spanish lieutenant governor in St. Louis waved this process for the Boone’s because of their already significant reputation as explorers and community leaders (Farragher 1992:276). However, because the Zumwalt name did not carry the weight of Boone’s, it is likely that the family members acquired their lands through the official process of settlement. It has been asserted that members of the Boone family (Daniel Sr. and Nathan) encouraged the Zumwalt migration to Upper Louisiana (Waselkov 1979:34). The evidence for this is intriguing, but remains circumstantial. If indeed any member of the Boone family played a role in the Zumwalt’s decision to move to Missouri, it should be noted that Daniel Morgan, for the reasons already stated, is the most likely candidate and not his famous father or 16 year old brother Nathan.
THE MOVE TO SPANISH TERRITORY

Because of the Spanish policy regarding occupation and improvement of land, it is probable that most of the Zumwalt family members arrived in 1798 and improved the land for a year before applying for concessions from the Lieutenant Governor in October and November of 1799 (Figure 6). Jacob along with his brothers, sons, and nephews probably arrived in the area in the fall of 1798 as seven family members applied for their land concessions between October 27th and November 9th, 1799 (Spanish Land Surveys; Christopher, Jacob, Andrew, Andrew, Adam, Peter, and Henry Zumwalt) (Figure 7).

Figure 6: Jacob Zumwalt’s Spanish Land Grant Survey
(Spanish Land Surveys n.d.)
In their migration, it is likely that the Zumwalts traveled along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers for much of their journey to Louisiana. The mode of travel for the family probably consisted of using a large pirogue (dugout canoe) as well as smaller boats to carry belongings and passengers; some family members would have walked along the river banks driving animals before them. The emigration of the Boone party in 1799 relied on such a method (Farragher 1992: 277-278). In addition, Adam Zumwalt’s son Solomon remembered later that his father came to Missouri using a large boat, which he and several hired hands paddled to the mouth of “Barrack” (probably a corruption of Peruque) Creek in St. Charles County (James and McLarty 1954).

Jacob moved onto grant number 55 along with his wife Katherine (Queti), and their children Andrew, Henry, Jacob Jr., George, Dolly and Elizabeth (Waselkov 1979:34). In an episode that is heartbreakingly common, Katherine Queti Zumwalt died in July of 1799 and was buried near the log home that the family was probably still in the process of completing (Waselkov 1979:34).
When the Zumwalts moved into the St. Charles District, it was at the western fringe of American settlement in the territory. Technically part of Spain, St. Charles and the region known as “the forks” (a reference to the land north of the Missouri and west of the Mississippi Rivers) were sparsely populated. French settlers had established some small communities in the area during the 1770s, including one settlement near the mouth of Peruque Creek, and various Native American tribes continued to exploit the region for hunting and trapping as they always had. Sandwiched between the powerful Osage to the west, and surrounded on every other side by Sauk and Fox, Sioux, Kickapoo, Potawatomie, Ioway, Shawnee, Oto, Miami, and others, the St. Charles district was located in a vulnerable position. Relations with Native Americans were often unpredictable and as land-hungry Americans pushed further into the frontier, they found themselves increasingly at odds with Native American groups who feared losing their land (like the Osage), and Native American groups who had already been displaced (like the Shawnee). The situation was also complicated by the various European conflicts and political powers that manipulated policy, economics, and violence to further their interests on the North American frontier.

The Zumwalts could not have been strangers to the delicacy of Indian relations after spending nearly twenty years in remote Kentucky. In the manner of people used to living on the fringe of Euro-American society, they seem to have maintained civil and even quite friendly relations with Native Americans despite the horrendous violence that often accompanied the collision of the two worlds. Life on the frontier was defined by reciprocal influence; diverse peoples fluidly learned and adopted aspects of each other’s culture. Several stories about Jacob’s brother Adam in particular demonstrate the ability of many frontier peoples to maintain perspective despite often severely strained relations.

Adam, who lived on survey 294 to the northwest of Jacob’s home on what is now the Lincoln County line, apparently maintained constant connections with Native Americans, many of whom were among the best customers at his distillery. He even purportedly hosted the great Chief Black-Hawk a number of times in his home (Bryan and Rose 1876:196). It was recorded that the chief stayed with the family and greatly enjoyed dancing with the Zumwalt daughters. Another story recounts how an unnamed Native American chief died while visiting the house, and how Adam sanctioned and likely participated in his burial rights. The man was apparently buried near Adam’s home along with a loaf of bread, a butcher knife, and his sacrificed dog (Bryan and Rose 1876:196). These stories of Adam welcoming Native Americans into his home, trusting them with his family, and tolerating their religious practices says something remarkable about the man, especially when one considers the violence of the Indian wars in which he had fought in Kentucky. In general, success on the frontier was largely dependent on the capacity to adapt; Adam, and presumably the other members of his family seem to have possessed this quality.

THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE OF ST. CHARLES DISTRICT

The concept of the *cultural landscape* (meaning both the mosaic of different peoples and cultures who are distributed across a given area, as well as the cultural aspects of socio-political organization) is useful for understanding the society into which the Zumwalts moved. The
cultural landscape of the St. Charles district was different from what they were used to in Kentucky. Although the region was ruled by Spanish authority, the towns and people were typically French Colonial and creole (creole meaning a mixture of several nationalities, cultures, and ethnicities). French was the common language, although Spanish was the language used in official proceedings. For the Zumwalts, who were apparently illiterate in their primary language of English, the immersion in the new world of French and Spanish must have been trying (Waselkov 1979:35).

Generally speaking, American settlers like the Zumwalts preferred to live in scattered farmsteads, while earlier French inhabitants usually lived clustered together in villages. The French preference for semi-communal living stemmed both from long held cultural tradition as well as from a legitimate need for protection. French families typically had large, linear agricultural tracts grouped together in “common fields” that were located just outside their community. Each tract was of relatively equal size and crossed similar landforms, resulting in a fairly equitable distribution of land among families (Figure 8). Livestock grazed in another large communal tract known as the “Commons” which was also available for hunting and gathering resources like nuts, berries, and firewood (Ekberg 2000; Primm 1990:17; Peterson 1993:6-9). This system often perplexed Americans with an Anglo and Protestant heritage who believed that through their own hard work (in addition to spiritual devotion), a family would achieve economic, social, and heavenly success.
As a result, Americans preferred to live on their own farmsteads scattered across the landscape. Because successful endeavors were seen not only as a recognition of one’s own labor, but as an affirmation of righteousness in the eyes of God, Americans tended to compete for access to good land and resources and thus settle in a more diffuse pattern than their French neighbors.

The distribution of French and American settlers that Waselkov (1979) calculated for the St. Charles District in 1804 based on tax lists demonstrated that 92.1% of French households lived in the village of St. Charles (n=89) while 90.2% of American households lived on dispersed farms (n=132) (Waselkov 1979:15). These settlement patterns are supported by the Zumwalt’s “neighborhood” as it stood prior to 1803, and in most cases in the late 1790's. In a random (non-scientific) sample of the early surveys which surrounded Jacob Zumwalt’s property, 11% were inhabited by Frenchmen; the other 89% are Anglo Americans or Germans like the Zumwals who had been in North American for generations.

Many other differences existed as well. Though the French lived in log houses, they were generally constructed in a different manner from American settler’s homes. French habitations were typically built of logs placed vertically into the ground while Americans preferred the horizontal construction that has become emblematic of the frontier today.

The Americans (especially those who arrived after the War of 1812) and the French often interacted with Native Americans differently. French relations with Native Americans were typically more peaceable than their English and American counterparts. An outgrowth of their cultural heritage, French trappers had a reputation for being highly receptive to Native American customs. They often adopted aspects of Native American dress and culture and frequently married into Native American tribes. Though it was also common for Americans who had grown up on the frontier to adopt aspects of Native American culture, many had a tendency to distrust the familiarity with which the French treated native peoples. This was compounded by the fact that many Native American groups in the area trusted the French, while they distrusted the Americans. While French and Indian populations had been living together in the region for decades, Americans were a new variable. The American case was not helped by the fact that many of the Native peoples in the region were there because their prior lands had already been consumed by westward expansion.

Antagonism between the older native French population and the newer American immigrants was fairly common. Generally, however, the conflicts manifested themselves in political wrangling, economic discrimination, and clannishness rather than outright violence. An anecdote which is illustrative of Franco-American relations in the St. Charles area can be found in the memoirs of Solomon Zumwalt, Adam Zumwalt’s son. As previously mentioned, Adam Zumwalt ran a distillery which put him in a position to be widely known by all but the teetotaling members of the community. In an effort to cut into his father’s profits, or to simply keep liquor out of the hands of Native Americans, Solomon remembered that “French traders told the Indians [that his father’s] liquor was poison” (James and McClarty 1954). This type of maneuvering was typical in the competitive world of the Louisiana frontier.
METHODISTS AND COOPERATION

Jacob became a Methodist while in Missouri and was instrumental in the early establishment of the church in the state. It is understood that his family and Fort Zumwalt hosted the Reverend Jesse Walker as he performed the first Methodist sacrament in Missouri in 1807 (St. Charles Journal [SCJ] 14 February, 1963). John Travis, the first accredited Methodist circuit preacher, is said to have regularly held services in Jacob Zumwalt’s home and established a Class (a basic unit of a Methodist congregation which usually consisted of 10 or 12 people) from the Zumwalts and their neighbors (Gooch 2000:2). In addition, the Zumwalts regularly hosted “camp meetings” on their property from 1808 onward (SCJ 14 February, 1963). A core of people who initially worshipped at Fort Zumwalt would later go on to establish nearby Mt. Zion Church (Bryan and Rose 1876:395).

Methodist circuit riders had a reputation for having the persistence of a swarm of mosquitoes; their strategy did not involve locating Methodists among settlers along a circuit so much as it involved making Methodists among the settlers on the circuit (Gooch 2000:3). It has been stated that circuit riders often managed to locate new settlers long before their cabins were finished, and in some instances before they had even unpacked their wagons (Gooch 2000 :3). Therefore, given Jacob’s apparent conversion to Methodism from an earlier adherence to Calvinism, it is just as likely that Methodism found Zumwalt as it is that he actively pursued the faith.

Though a religious body, a Methodist Class met weekly not only for prayer, but for mutual assistance. The meetings provided excellent opportunities to establish and maintain networks of friends and family in the region, discuss the news, and organize strategies for collective aid and protection. The appeal of this system is obvious when one considers the relative isolation in which people on the frontier lived, and the critical reliance on cooperation that was dictated by their lives. Jacob had a large and centrally located home in which a Class could meet, and it is likely that he offered his home to the circuit riders with full awareness of the political, economic, and social advantages that came with hosting organized events such as socio-religious meetings in an isolated environment like the St. Charles frontier. For the Zumwalts, the use of their home for the Methodist meetings likely played a significant role in their ability to take on a position of stature and leadership within the community.

Support for the idea that the Zumwalt’s Methodism was at least partly motivated by practical matters can be found in the fact that Jacob and Franqui were married by the priest of St. Charles Borromeo Church in 1800 (St. Charles Borromeo n.d.:13-114). Jacob was recorded as a Calvinist (an austere and increasingly antique 17th century creed) and Franqui a Lutheran; the Catholic priest married them in the home of George Gatey (aka Gaty and Gatii) “according to the orders of his majesty in regard to his non-Catholic subjects established in this colony.” Though official Spanish policy stated that all settlers in the territory were required to adhere to the Catholic faith, Spanish agents overtly ignored the rule in an effort to encourage Americans like the Zumwalts to populate the region (Farragher 1992:274-276). For that reason, their marriage by a priest is less likely to be the result of official coercion and more likely to stem from a desire to be officially married in the eyes of a church– any church. The marriage is truly
remarkable when one considers the extent of religiously fueled suspicion, antipathy, and violence that existed between Catholic and non-Catholic Christians of European descent at the time. The marriage of Jacob and Franqui Zumwalt at St. Charles Borromeo would appear to once again demonstrate the necessity of flexibility and adaptation on the frontier.

THE AMERICAN PERIOD

In 1800, Spain returned Louisiana to France in exchange for, among other things, an Italian kingdom destined to be ruled by Charles IV’s son-in-law. With the stroke of a pen, the Zumwalts had become French subjects. Then, in 1803, the United States purchased the Louisiana Territory from France; for the first time since leaving Kentucky, the Zumwalts were farming American soil. In March of 1804, the Spanish Lieutenant governor, acting as the agent of France (a telling example of frontier political elasticity and expediency), surrendered Upper Louisiana to American Captain Amos Stoddard at St. Louis (Primm 1990:72-73).

A few years after assuming control of the territory, the United States created a board of commissioners to “adjust” titles to land that had been distributed by the Spanish. All those who had received land grants were required to petition the board to recognize the legitimacy of their claims. This process was no easy matter. In an effort to combat fraud, the American government made the standard of proof necessary to confirm a grant of land almost impossible to meet and many notable personages such as Auguste Choteau and Daniel Boone initially had their claims rejected. Jacob Zumwalt’s petition floundered in the hands of the board for years before it was officially recognized in 1809 (American State Papers Public Lands Vol 2:690). Though it took several years, four members of the Zumwalt family had their Spanish land grants confirmed by the American government in what would become Dardenne Township of St. Charles County: “brothers Ad[am], J[acob], and C[harles],” as well as “H” who is probably Jacob’s son Henry (Anonymous 1885).

In terms of economy, it is likely that all the Zumwalt brothers practiced a modicum of diversified agriculture and husbandry on a semi-subsistence level. All would have farmed their land to a certain extent and likely grew cereal grains in addition to raising numbers of livestock. As mentioned previously, Adam operated a distillery which could be a highly lucrative enterprise. The conversion of corn into whiskey greatly increased its value as a commodity; everyone had corn, but everyone wanted whiskey. Other advantages that whiskey had over corn was that it was more compact (large amounts of corn made small amounts of alcohol) and thus could be transported more easily. In addition, unlike corn, whiskey could be stored indefinitely. Because Christopher Zumwalt set up a grist mill, and Jacob appears to have been primarily a farmer, it is likely that the brothers worked together to produce both food and whiskey. Although not certain in the case of the Zumwalts, this three part production model made great sense. Three brothers who were respectively a distiller, a farmer, and a miller were in a very favorable position. They each had a stake in the lucrative production of alcohol, they were each tied through family to either the critical supplies or infrastructure they needed for their livelihood, and the relationship allowed the three to circumvent profit-draining middle men.
In contrast with American settlers who primarily came to the territory in pursuit of good farmland, the French had been drawn to the area primarily by the fur trade and its associated mercantile industry. Though the French had farmed the district since their arrival, their focus on trade at the expense of agriculture occasionally proved problematic. Towns in the area such as St. Louis developed derogatory nicknames like “pain court” (short of bread) because of occasional food shortfalls (Primm 1990:12 & 23). Americans like the Zumwalts, however, were primarily interested in farming and the acquisition of land. As a result, their settlement provided important stability to the economic foundation; best of all, they created a food surplus.

THE WAR OF 1812 AND THE BIRTH OF ZUMWALT’S “FORT”

At the time of the Louisiana Purchase, relations with Native Americans were tense. Though not common, violent (and well publicized) encounters between Indians and settlers did occur; between 1805 and 1808, there were approximately ten white settlers killed in incidents in St. Charles County, although the number of Native American casualties is not recorded (Anonymous 1885).

In addition to the violence precipitated by American encroachment on Native American land, the acquisition of Louisiana by the United States created tension with Great Britain for control of land, trade, and resources. As antagonism rose in the years prior to the War of 1812, Indians allied with British interests on the Upper Missouri raided American settlements in Louisiana with increasing frequency. American hunters were ambushed in deadly encounters and families living in isolated farmsteads were occasionally murdered and mutilated by bands of warriors (Anonymous 1885). Various Native American groups, who in many cases had already been displaced several times and were all too familiar with the voracious American appetite for land, readily joined the British in an attempt to dampen American enthusiasm for the west. In response, American militia companies as well as the occasional regular soldiers launched punitive raids against Indian settlements to the north. A brutal though irregular state of war existed in the region long before Britain and the United States came to official blows.

In 1808, a worried Henry Dearborn (Secretary of War) authorized 100,000 militia to be raised; 377 of them would come from and protect the Louisiana Territory (Hurt 1998:78). Territorial Governor Meriwether Lewis announced the call for volunteers in the Missouri Gazette on November 28 (Hurt 1998:78). In addition, he called for the residents of the exposed western districts such as St. Charles to organize a system of forts, blockhouses, and stockades for their mutual protection (Hurt 1998:79). While some forts such as Fort Howard (about two miles south of present-day Winfield in Lincoln County) were built specifically for protection against Indian attack, others were simply large, centrally located houses where people could “fort up” when danger approached (Hurt 1998:88). Fort Howard covered one and one half acres and had towers at all but one corner of its stockade; in times of trouble the fort could give refuge to approximately thirty families (Hurt 1998:88). Zumwalt’s Fort (known popularly as Fort Zumwalt) on the other hand was simply the name given to Jacob Zumwalt’s stout log home with its close and reliable spring.
The fact that the Zumwalt home was chosen as a fort speaks to the position of the family and the structure itself within the framework of the developing community. The Zumwalt’s importance to the community can be seen in the uses to which their home and property was put prior to the war, and the fact that it was chosen as a fort during the war.

At the turn of the 19th century, information was passed largely by word of mouth, especially on the frontier. Though broadsheets, proclamations, and newspapers were an important conduit for spreading information, most people (apparently including the Zumwalts) were illiterate. Therefore, when a militia company mustered, for example, the men needed to meet at a central location with which they had personal familiarity, or to which they could easily find directions. People understood their landscape in diverse ways, but landmarks, watercourses, the boundaries of neighbors’ lands, and networks of kin were major factors in defining “place” on the frontier. When one examines the settlement pattern surrounding Jacob Zumwalt’s home it is easy to see the geographic reasons why it was chosen as a place of refuge during the war (Figure 9). Centrally located and well known, the property also served as the mustering point for Christopher Clark’s militia company in 1812 (Bryan and Rose 1876).
The choice of the home as a fort makes sense from a socio-cultural standpoint as well. Within the cultural landscape, Jacob Zumwalt’s home was probably understood in terms of being among the earlier American homesteads in the area, and in terms of respect for its owner as an elder statesman and veteran of the American Revolution. In addition, the home would have been understood as a part of the large Zumwalt clan whose holdings not only included the four properties in Dardenne Township, but the farms of three other brothers and their extended families as well (Waselkov 1979:35). In addition, Zumwalt properties included community focal points such as a mill, distillery, and a Methodist meeting house which would have increased their notoriety among both neighbors and the community at large. For these reasons, the Zumwalts collectively would have pulled a lot of weight within the St. Charles district.

As the Zumwalts became more prosperous and influential in the community during the first decade of the 19th century, the political situation became increasingly unstable. In November of 1810, following several years of escalating Indian activity on the frontier and the untimely death of territorial governor Merriwether Lewis, Benjamin Howard assumed control of the Missouri Territory (Hurt 1998:78). The following summer, Howard built upon Lewis’ initial steps to protect Missouri’s citizens from British and Indian attack. He toured the countryside with his new appointee William Clark, Brigadier General of the territorial militia, selecting and inspecting sites for fortifications. Despite the progress of the militia as a fighting force and the erection of a network of forts, by late August, many Missourians were too afraid of Indian attack to leave their homes; farms went un-worked. That fall, a party of Americans was ambushed while hunting about 40 miles north of St. Charles; three were killed. Later that winter, a family of eight living on an isolated farm near Clarksville was murdered (James and McClarty 1954:259). Solomon Zumwalt, Adam Zumwalt’s son, remembered that the Indians carefully avoided militia patrols. Not pursuing a traditional military victory, they preferred to attack soft targets like farmsteads and small hunting parties (James and McClarty 1954: 261).

The nature of the settlements and the economy of the area made the St. Charles District extremely vulnerable to this type of guerilla warfare. Focusing their attacks on civilians, British allied Native Americans were able to severely damage the economy of the area and substantially reduce enthusiasm for settlement through the effective use of terror. Widely scattered but vicious attacks kept the populace on edge and brought immigration to the area to a standstill. The Missouri Gazette advised people to tend their fields in groups and to post sentinels (Hurt 1998:92). Solomon Zumwalt confirmed this practice in his remembrance of the wartime years: “the settlers would fort for a while and there would be none killed for a while, they would move from the forts to their farms and someone would be killed then they would fort again...during that war, neighbors would collect to tend their corn, while they worked, some of them stood guard” (James and McClarty 1954: 261).

Solomon’s father, Adam Zumwalt had settled northwest of Jacob’s place on what is now the Lincoln County line near present day Flint Hill. For this reason, he apparently did not make the trek to his brother Jacob’s house, Fort Zumwalt, when threatened with attack. Rather, he brought his family to Pond’s Fort (near present day Wentzville) and White’s Fort (further west along the Boone’s Lick Road on Prairie du Chien), which were closer than Jacob’s place, before returning to guard his farm and distillery (James and McClarty 1954: 261). It can be assumed that Jacob and Franqui stayed put when Indian trouble threatened their area. Tradition has it that
as many as ten families were housed in their home during periods of Indian trouble; one of these families was probably that of Christopher Zumwalt who lived on an adjacent property.

In terms of military service, of Jacob Zumwalt’s three boys, only Jacob Jr. served in an official militia unit. He performed a two-month stint (June 1-July 30) in 1815 as a private in Captain William Hurl’s company of Missouri Mounted Militia (Williams 2002). Militia companies varied in size and organization throughout the war as new threats required alterations to the composition of territorial defenses. The revised militia law of 1807 required all male inhabitants of the territory to present themselves for militia service at pre-determined dates seven times a year for three hours of drill. The companies, ranging from 38 to 70 men, could be required to serve for a maximum of 60 days out of the year and were expected to provide their own gun (Hurt 1998:53-54). Despite the fact that Jacob Jr. was the only son of Jacob Zumwalt to see active service during the war, the family itself made a valuable contribution to the war effort and to the security of their neighbors.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE FORT

Though the Zumwalt home was commonly referred to as a “fort,” it can be more accurately understood as a place of refuge. Neighbors went there when they felt threatened (by rumor or reality) and departed when the danger had passed. Though it is possible that the home was fortified in some way, it is most likely that those who sought shelter within its walls did so primarily for the safety that was offered by numbers and cooperation. There is significant debate with regard to how or if the building itself was enlarged or fortified during the War of 1812. The documentary record is rich in speculation and hearsay, but falls short on credible information.

Edna McElhiney Olson, a prolific historian of the fort who was affiliated with the St.Charles County Historical Society in the middle of the 20th century, stated in numerous letters, talks, and in-house publications that Jacob Zumwalt built two additions to the home during the war so that the property could be “used as a fort” (Olson: N.D.). She also noted that both the spring and the ice-house were enclosed in a stockade during the war (Olson: N.D.). Olson’s information is problematic because she relied fairly extensively on statements made by descendants of the Heald and Zumwalt families, whose comments may have been based more upon family tradition than upon fact. For this reason, much of her information remains tantalizing, but needs verification.

In 1926, an article appeared in the Kansas City Star written by a man named Lee Shippey who was a distant relative of the Heald family (the owners of the Zumwalt property from 1817 until the early twentieth century). Shippey stated that “early in 1812 or thereabouts, a bastion like addition was set up on the low ground around the spring...notched with rifle portholes” (Shippey 1926). He based this information on the recollection of “people still living” who claimed to have seen the logs of the stockade when they were still standing. This assertion is intriguing because of Shippey’s family connections, the reference to eyewitness accounts, and the logic inherent in defending the fort’s water supply. However, historic photos of the Heald spring-house (dating to the late 19th or very early 20th century and therefore likely falling into the period when Shippey’s “people still living” would have seen it) do not show the presence of any standing stockade logs (Photo 3).
Like the existence of a stockade, the existence of rifle ports in the fort itself are a common theme in Fort Zumwalt lore. This aspect of fortification would have made sense from a defensive perspective and is generally documented in the writings of contemporary travelers and modern historians alike. Stephen H. Long, who traveled through St. Charles and the Boone’s Lick Country on his way to the Rocky Mountains in 1819, visited Kennedy’s Fort (west of Fort Zumwalt in Warren County near present day Wright City) and several others in the vicinity. The forts that he noted were described as “strong log houses with a projecting upper story and loop holes for musketry” (Long 1905:45-46). It should be noted that this description is more reminiscent of some of the block houses constructed by the military during the war as opposed to house-forts like the Zumwalt’s. Edna McElhiney Olson re-iterates the presence of rifle ports at Fort Zumwalt in much of her writing, as did Shippey in his 1926 article. In addition, several discussions of the War of 1812 fort network in Missouri by historians such as Louis Houck, Edgar B. Wesley, Douglas Hurt, and the anonymous 19th century author of the “History of St. Charles, Montgomery and Warren Counties” all refer to rifle ports as a feature of various forts of the period in St. Charles County (Houck 1908; Wesley 1927-1928; Hurt 1998; Anonymous 1885). Though the presence or absence of rifle ports has yet to be definitively ascertained, the centrality of their existence to popular perceptions of Fort Zumwalt warrants some discussion of their plausibility.
Historic photographs of the building show narrow rectangular openings under the eaves that may have been used as rectangular rifle ports (Photo 4). These apertures, when coupled with the windows, would have allowed defenders a limited field of fire on the north and south sides of the fort. However, at least three points argue against the construction of specific, designated rifle ports in the building itself. The first point is that the photographic evidence only shows two possible rifle ports, the west end of the structure had no windows/ports whatsoever. Why would the Zumwalts have gone to the trouble of cutting ports into the walls if they were not going to cut them into every side? Another point is that if indeed the rectangular holes on both the north and south faces were built as rifle ports, (and not windows/vents), they were created by removing a section of log from the wall. This would have been an arduous task and contrary to the interest of fortification in that the structural integrity of a log building is predicated upon continuous log spans interlocking and supporting each other; every span that is broken in a log house significantly weakens the building. Logically, it doesn’t make sense to damage the structural integrity of a “fort” in the process of fortification. The holes may have been cut for light and air and subsequently used as rifle ports, but they were almost certainly not created specifically as a defensive element.
An alternative hypothesis stems from the fact that the stone and clay chinking between the logs of the fort could be removed quickly, easily, and wherever necessary to make holes through which to fire a musket. This is evident not only from the photographic remains of the fort, but also from the physical remains of other similar structures. Additional evidence that a hole could easily be made in the chinking and a musket effectively fired through it is presented by the fact that Sarshall Cooper (War of 1812 officer and namesake of Cooper County, Missouri) was killed during the War of 1812 when an Indian crept up to the Callaway County fort in which he was sleeping, silently scratched through the chinking in the cabin wall, and shot him through the hole (Hurt 1998:98; Wesley 1927-1928). Removing chinking to make rifle ports makes sense because any number of ports could be quickly located wherever necessary, and then just as quickly repaired without compromising the structural or insulating capacity of the building.

Although Zumwalt’s Fort is reported to have been periodically used for refuge during the War of 1812, there is no evidence that it was ever attacked. As previously stated, Native American raiders preferred soft targets such as isolated hunters, travelers, or farmers out in their
Through a combination of military and diplomatic efforts, the focus of the war was pushed farther and farther from the St. Charles District. As the war smoldered on throughout 1812 and 1813, more rangers were commissioned and what was essentially an “Indian free zone” was created around settled areas. Large scale offensive operations were also conducted in Illinois, where many of the raids against Missouri originated (Hurt 1998: 92-100). In the fall of 1813, Territorial Governor William Clark’s skillful diplomacy managed to separate the friendly Sauk and Fox from the elements of the tribe who were at war, which at least made the picture of the enemy a little clearer.

In the summer of 1814, an unfriendly portion of the Sauk and Fox tribe stole 150 horses and 300 cattle from the Booneslick region. Isolated killings, scalpings, kidnappings, and mutilations were also reported from settlements in the area of modern Fayette, New Franklin, Arrow Rock, and from farmsteads along Moniteau Creek and the Chariton River (Hurt 1998:99). In addition, attacks continued in Illinois and along the upper Missouri. Despite the Treaty of Ghent, signed in December of 1814, the sporadic attacks continued along the frontier. This vexed the people on the frontier to no-end as the treaty, signed by diplomats who did not understand how the war had manifested itself in the west, banned the militias from fighting the British allied tribes. Meanwhile, the combatant tribes ignored the treaty because the goals for which they gone to war had not been achieved. In fact, they had yet to suffer a serious defeat at the hands of the Americans. The status quo ante essentially continued after the treaty but for the fact that, as one frustrated Missourian put it in the Missouri Gazette, “we are not permitted to kill the enemy but on condition he first kills us” (Hurt 1998:105).

Gradually, the tribes which had formerly been allied with the British came to realize the futility of their position. At the same time, the American Government began to realize the necessity of negotiating a separate peace in the west. In the spring of 1815, Secretary of War James Monroe appointed William Clark, Ninian Edwards, and Auguste Chouteau as Indian Commissioners and assigned them the task of negotiating peace. In the late summer of 1815, the vast majority of antagonistic tribes, abandoned by their British allies and cut off from trade, came to Portage des Sioux to negotiate treaties with the Americans. The Rock River Sauk resisted making peace for another year, but, under threat of federal military action, arrived in St. Louis in the spring of 1816 and thus officially ended the War of 1812 in the American West.

THE SECOND WAVE OF AMERICAN MIGRATION

The initial treaties that were signed in 1815 sparked the beginning of a second and much larger wave of American migration into the Missouri territory. The finalization of peace in 1816 confirmed to the country that the lands west of the Mississippi River were indeed again open for business. Wagons poured across the river, passed through St. Louis and headed for open land in the Booneslick region and areas further west. This crush of immigrants and the often worthless currency they carried from chartered banks in Kentucky, Ohio, and western Pennsylvania, inflated the market in everything from land to butter in the vicinity of St. Louis (Primm 1990:108). By 1818, farmland between St. Louis and St. Charles which had sold for 25 to 50 cents per acre ten years earlier, was now going for eight to 12 dollars per acre; in some cases an
increase of several thousand percent (Primm 1990:109).

In 1817, Jacob Zumwalt turned 65. At approximately the age of retirement for 21st century Americans, Jacob had exceeded what for the time would have been the average life expectancy. He and Franqui appear to have been both economically and socially established. Their children were grown and had farms of their own, and the land that had been given to them by the Spanish was now worth an inflated price. The Zumwalts sold their farm to Nathan and Rebecka Heald for $1000.00 in 1817 and moved to Pike County, Missouri where they lived out their old age on the farm of their son Jacob Jr. (Waselkov 1979:37). The price they received for their land and house was approximately $2.61 per acre. Though not inflated to the level quoted by Primm, it represented a tidy profit on land that the Zumwalts had received for free.

One reason the Zumwalts may have been willing to sell the land to the Healds at that price was that the Healds had “safe” currency. As stated, at the time of the sale, the region was in economic turmoil and inflation was rampant. A major reason for the inflated prices in the St. Louis area was the abundance of devalued and worthless currency distributed by counterfeiters and chartered banks who printed more money than they actually controlled. Supplies of hard money in the area, issued by the federal government, were extremely limited. Most of the hard currency entered the economy through federal bureaucrats and military men. Heald, a recently retired military officer with a significant pension, had been on the United States payroll since 1799. In addition, his wife Rebecka came from a military family which makes it likely that she also had access to U.S. currency. The Zumwalts may have made a calculated decision to sell their land at a somewhat reduced price that was paid in hard money rather than accept an inflated value that was paid in unpredictable scrip. At any rate, the favorable economic circumstances under which the Zumwalts sold their land, their age at the time of sale, and the fact that they took $1000.00 in what was likely full-value cash and moved in with their son was a sensible strategy of retirement. Interestingly, the timing of Jacob and Franqui Zumwalt’s successful retirement corresponds directly to the retirement of St. Charles’ status as a frontier district.
THE HEALDS

Nathan Heald was born in New Hampshire in September of 1775; he had at least three brothers (Jonas, Ebenezer, and Thomas) and at least two sisters (Sybil and Mary) (Draper Ms 24U). On March 2, 1799, at the age of 24, he enlisted as an ensign in the United States 2nd Infantry in Springfield, Massachusetts (Heald Family Papers 1). Heald’s career began auspiciously; he was promoted to Second Lieutenant the day after his enlistment and continued to rise from there. By the fall of 1799, he was promoted to 1st Lieutenant, a rank he held through his transfer to the 1st Infantry in 1802 (Heald Family Papers 1). In 1805, he was given command of Fort Massack in the Northwest Territory, and in 1807 he was promoted to Captain and assumed command at Fort Wayne, Indiana. It is here that he met his future wife Rebecka (Photo 5), who had accompanied her father Colonel Samuel Wells (Figure 10) on a visit to the fort (www.chicagohs.org; Magazine of American History 1892:114). In addition to what was probably official military business, the Wells had personal reasons for journeying to Fort Wayne. Samuel’s brother, William Wells (Figure 11), lived at the fort on acreage he received for his service as an Indian agent, and Wells’ daughter Mary Elizabeth (Rebecka’s sister) lived there as well with her husband James Audrain. Samuel Wells and his son-in-law James Audrain would later serve together at the Battle of the Thames in Ontario in 1813, and Wells eventually married Audrain’s sister, the widow Margaret Audrain Hoffman, after the death of his second wife Mary Spear (www.celebrateofallonmo.com; Hahn 1998:1).
Samuel Wells’ brother William was abducted by Indians as a child and was raised by the famous Miami war chief Little Turtle (www.ohiohistorycentral.org). He apparently gained a reputation as a fierce warrior among the Indians fighting alongside the Miami against American settlers and military expeditions in what was then the Northwest Territory in the 1780’s and early 1790’s. Later, Wells went back to the American side and joined the army of Anthony Wayne in 1794, serving as a scout and interpreter (www.ohiohistorycentral.org). Apparently, Wells had some contact with his former family after his abduction, including his niece Rebecka who was present when her father and several other family members convinced William that they were indeed related (Magazine of American History 1892:114). When Nathan Heald was put in charge of Fort Wayne in 1807, William Wells had been serving as Indian Agent (at the appointment of Thomas Jefferson) for five years; a post he would retain until 1809 under Heald. In 1810, Heald was transferred to command of Fort Dearborn. While on furlough in the summer of 1811, he made a trip to Louisville, Kentucky (Rebecka Wells’ home) where the couple was married. As American tension with Great Britain threatened to boil over into all out war, the couple returned to Fort Dearborn accompanied by Rebecka’s slave Cecily (Waselkov 1979:37; Heald Family Papers 1). Their stay at Dearborn would not be a long one.

On June 18th, 1812, the United States and Great Britain went to war. Heald was ordered to evacuate Fort Dearborn and move the garrison to Fort Wayne (www.chicagohs.org; www.ohiohistorycentral.org; Wilson et.al.1999). Rebecka Wells’ uncle William went to Dearborn with a small force of Miami to act as an escort for the garrison. Heald led the small force out of the fort and into a devastating and nearly immediate ambush by more than 500 British allied Pottowatomie on August 15th. During the engagement, Nathan Heald received a hip wound which, though not fatal, would plague him for the rest of his life. His young wife, her slave Cecily, and her uncle fared even worse; Rebecka was wounded three times in one arm, once in the other; one bullet broke the bone. In addition, one bullet entered her side, and yet another grazed her breast; Cecily was apparently killed while attempting to protect children in the wagon train. William Wells, a respected figure among the Pottowattomie, was knocked to the ground by a shot through his lungs. While a dazed Rebecka looked on, warriors scalped him, then cut out his heart and ate it in a tribute to his bravery (Quaife 1913:410).

Nathan and Rebecka were taken captive by different groups of the war party, though they were re-united through the efforts of a man named Jean Baptiste Chardonnis, a French and Native American trader who was familiar with their Indian captors (Quaife 1913: 413). Brought directly from Fort Dearborn to Fort Michilimackinac, the prisoners were quickly paroled by the British due to Heald’s status as an officer (he had been promoted to Major during his captivity on August 26th, 1812) and his fortunate connections as a Mason (an affiliation that would be continued by his son Darius) (Quaife 1912:410-413; Heald Family Papers 12). The couple, recovering from serious physical and psychological trauma, returned to Rebecka’s parent’s home in Louisville, Kentucky where they remained until moving to the Missouri Territory in 1817 (Heald Family Papers 2).

Nathan and Rebecka, along with their two young daughters Mary (born ca. 1814) and Margaret (born ca. 1816), apparently left Kentucky for St. Charles on March 22, 1817, probably floating down the Ohio to the Mississippi (Heald Family Papers 3). From there, a descendant (one of Nathan’s grandsons) recalled that the family came down the Mississippi in a flat boat to
the mouth of “Barrack” [Peruque] Creek to a place near the Zumwalt property (Heald Family Papers 2). The family arrived in St. Charles on April 15th, 1817 and spent the summer at the plantation of Joseph Batys (Heald Family Papers 2). The following November, they purchased the Zumwalt property; scrawled at the corner of the deed is a note which indicates Heald’s unfamiliarity with the French land system, “450 arpents is equal to 382 & 8/10 acres” (Draper Ms 23U). Though Nathan’s brother Jonas had apparently also settled in the area by 1821, it is not clear if he came with his brother’s family at this time (Draper Ms 24U).

Arriving with a pension from the federal government, the Healds set to work on the farm that Jacob Zumwalt had begun. At about the same time, Colonel Samuel Wells moved to an adjoining property (Figure 12), which had been previously occupied by Christopher Zumwalt (Heald Family Papers 4). Likewise, James Audrain and his wife Mary Elizabeth Wells (Audrain) also moved to St. Charles County in 1816-1817 and settled nearby along Peruque Creek on Survey #1773 (Gast c.1850). The extended family began to improve and consolidate their holdings into what would become valuable estates.
Rebecka’s father Colonel Samuel Wells was a wealthy and distinguished man. A veteran of both the American Revolution (in which he served under George Rogers Clark), and the War of 1812, Wells had represented Jefferson County, Kentucky in the state legislature in 1795, 1796, and 1799 and rose to the rank of Major General in the Kentucky militia (Hahn 1998:1). His daughter Rebecka was born to his second wife, Mary Spear, who died before the move to Missouri (Hahn 1998:2). Wells’ third wife, Margaret Audrain Hoffman, accompanied him to St. Charles County in 1817. The Wells eventually acquired close to 2,500 acres north and west of Peruque Creek as well as 350 acres near Troy. Continuing his record of public service, Wells served as a St. Charles County Court Judge in 1826 and 1827. Samuel and Margaret apparently lived on a property that is now part of the Fred Weber Quarry (Hahn 1998:2).

SLAVERY, IDEOLOGY, AND THE END OF ST. CHARLES FRONTIER

In contrast with the frontier economy of hunting, trapping, and small-scale farming which dominated the St. Charles District prior to the War of 1812, the new migration of Americans, personified by the Healds, represented the arrival of an agrarian and increasingly diversified capitalist economy. This transition, in addition to the influence of the enlightenment and the ideologies which supported plantation slavery, can be seen in the way Heald took over and operated the Zumwalt farm. His pursuit of increase, wealth, knowledge, control, and order are clearly seen in the records of his life in Missouri.

After moving to the Zumwalt property, the couple gave birth to two more children: daughter Rebecka (who died in infancy) was born in 1819, and son Darius was born in either 1821 or 1822 (Heald Family Papers 5; Quaife 1912; Reed 1964). By 1825, the Heald farm was producing beef, pork, sheep (primarily for wool), wheat, corn, oats, potatoes, clover, hay, honey, apples, and peaches; at least four adult slaves worked the property (Waselkov 1979:38-39).

By 1827, at least two additional buildings had been built on the farm. One was probably a one-room slave cabin (built in 1825) and the other was a loom house where enslaved women produced cloth that was sold or bartered within the community (Waselkov 1979:39). The building likely contained a loom as well as spinning wheels and the other necessities of cloth production, and may also have served as slave quarters (Vlach 1993:84). This cottage industry, though not well represented on the agricultural censuses in terms of “value of household production sold” is consistently represented in the Heald’s accounts from the mid 1820’s through Rebecka’s death in 1857 (Draper Ms 24U1-101). The fact that the industry escaped the census taker’s notice may indicate that the materials produced were primarily used within a barter economy and thus generated no specific monetary value. Also, it is likely that the family and their slaves were largely clothed with items produced on-site. From the materials the Healds produced (namely, large quantities of wool) and the materials they bought (finished calico, gingham, buttons, ribbons, ribbon-wire, etc) it appears that both raw cloth and as finished clothing was produced on the property.

In 1829, Heald embarked upon another construction project. At this time, it appears that the south kitchen wing was built in addition to what appears to be a school house somewhere nearby (Draper Ms 24U44,45, 57). In 1830, Nathan acquired an additional 100 acres of land, and
continued building through the years, eventually constructing a brick spring house, a stable, several barns, and a root house (Missouri State Parks archives 1; Draper Ms 24 U).

Of course, when one considers the operation of the Heald farm, it is critically important to realize the presence and contributions of enslaved African Americans. Directly tied to the success or failure of the farm, enslaved labor created the profit margins that allowed the Healds to expand their holdings and acquire wealth and status. Slaves worked the fields and looms, they cooked and cleaned, they tended animals, they built fences, cut wood, carried water, lived and died on the Heald property. Unfortunately, because of enforced illiteracy and institutionalized discrimination, these people generally come down through history as an anonymous presence, a tally on a census slave schedule, or a note in an account book. This, to an extent, is the case with the slaves on the Heald farm. However, unlike so many others, their existence has not been entirely obscured.

The known history of the Healds as slave owners begins with Rebecka’s slave Cecily who accompanied the young couple to Fort Dearborn during the War of 1812 and was subsequently killed during the ambush by the Pottowatomie. In the first years in Missouri, the Healds acquired more slaves. Though not much is known of these people, a close reading of Nathan Heald’s account book has identified approximately eleven individuals who appear to be slaves on the property at various times between 1820 and 1831: Jim (a.k.a. James), Absalom, Sal, Rier, Alex, Harry (Henry?), Stephen, Frank, Marien (Maria?), Cisely, Sis (possibly the same person) and Eveline (Draper Ms24U1-102).

These people appear in glimpses through references made by Heald in his accounts. James, Harry, Absalom, and Alex are often rented (sometimes with a team of oxen) to neighbors for labor. Because these men worked at tough jobs in the field, Heald records buying some of them shoes with “double soles” (i.e. Draper Ms 24U34). In 1823, Harry (Henry?) was issued “one Tow Linen Shirt” as well as cloth and tailoring costs for “Makeing Pantaloons, as well as “1 Pair Socks, 1 Pair Shoes” at a total cost of $7.63 (Waselkov 1979:112). At other times, Heald recorded the costs of purchasing wool hats, mittens (nine pairs), and “palmetto hats” which seem at least in part to be destined for his slaves (Draper Ms.24U60-75). In 1825, Nathan recorded the construction of a small, one room cabin on the property, which may be the point when a portion of the Heald’s slave population moved out of their likely quarters in the main house and into a separate space.

Much has been written about the organization of space in the context of the master-slave relationship (Vlach 1993; Singleton 1995; Leone 1984; Kryder-Reid 1995; Babson 1995). The movement of slaves from the space shared by the master and his family, to a space monitored by the master and his family probably registered with the Healds on the basic level of logistical necessity, but it also functioned more subtly. The movement, being a reflection of ideological beliefs regarding the definition and maintenance of power and authority, would have marked a transition in the status of the Healds, particularly Nathan (Vlach 1993:43-44; Singleton 1995). With the creation of the separate slave quarter and the subsequent loom house, Heald was moving from the initial stage of settling and improving the farm, to the beginnings of an estate that would reflect his status as a gentleman. This pattern would continue throughout the rest of Nathan Heald’s life and be continued by his son Darius.
Nathan died in April of 1832 and a probate inventory of his property was taken the following November (Nathan Heald Probate Inventory 1832). At the top of the inventory was a list of the ten slaves he owned at the time (Table 1). These individuals were promptly divided up among Rebecka (sr.), Mary, Margaret, and Darius.

Table 1: List of Nathan Heald’s Slaves in 1832 Probate Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Assessed Value $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicily</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelina</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>No age given</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The possession of slaves not only spoke to the status and self image and ideology of an owner, they also represented an immense amount of investment. The aggregate cost of Heald’s three horses, 15 cows, five steers, four heifers, four year-old cows, one yoke of oxen, 14 sheep, 21 hogs, and one wagon came to a dollar less than the appraised value of his slave James (Nathan Heald Probate Inventory 1832). In another example, Harry (Henry?) was purchased for $500 dollars in 1823. This is remarkable considering that the entire farm had been purchased six years earlier for $1000 (Draper Ms. 24U).

The household and farm implements recorded in the probate, as noted by Waselkov (1979; appendix A), are unremarkable for a middle class household of the time, however, the library speaks to the man that Heald considered himself to be. The variety of books included in the library was quite broad including works on chemistry, geology, history, botany, biography, grammar, navigation, accounting, and 12 volumes of “Nicholson’s Encyclopaedia.” In addition, he owned hymn books, a copy of the bible, and a subscription to the Missouri Gazette (Nathan Heald Probate Inventory 1832; Draper Ms. 24U).

The wide variety of scholarly books indicates a connection to the Enlightenment goal of knowledge, and the Georgian ideals of order and control. This plays into Heald as a slave owner because these ideas were (paradoxically) critical to the ideological underpinnings of slavery and class that developed in the plantations of the Deep South and Chesapeake in the 18th century, and were subsequently exported as slaveholders migrated into the American interior (Berlin 2003:63). Slave holders who aspired to the image of planter as aristocracy necessarily subscribed to the ideology that shaped the planter’s idealized world. Among other things, they envisioned themselves at the center of the world which their families and slaves inhabited. As the historian
Ira Berlin put it, slaveholders who were shaped by this ideology envisioned themselves as “the prime movers of all things” (Berlin 2003: 63). The world of the ideal plantation was guided by rationalism and formalism, and it was “suitably improved only after it was transformed from its chaotic natural condition into a scene marked by a strict, hierarchical order” (Berlin 2003: 63). The planter’s pursuit and application of science and thought, and his imposition of order, was intended to be proof of his natural superiority (Vlach 1993:5). This ideology, though modified through space and time, accompanied slaveholders from the upper south into Missouri in the early 19th century. Though Heald was originally from New Hampshire, he had married into a powerful family from Kentucky and apparently wholeheartedly embraced planter ideology.

Other manifestations of Heald’s pursuit of the Enlightenment goals of order and increase, and of his planter’s obsession with control, are visible in his account book. A fastidious bookkeeper, Heald noted every expense he incurred and every debt he was owed. He took careful inventories of his food supplies and calculated average food consumption on the property in different seasons. He weighed all of his slaughtered animals and calculated statistics such as mean weight and ratio of meat to tallow per animal. He even regularly recorded the amount of salt he used in his pickling brine. His accounts also indicate that he was an active businessman who traded goods in Portage de Sioux, St. Charles, St. Louis, and even New Orleans. He owned a rental property in the town of St. Charles, regularly sold the labour of his slaves, pursued a cottage cloth industry on his farm, produced grain, livestock, vegetables, and orchard produce; he even sold small amounts of whiskey. In return, he accepted a variety of payments including cash, credit, labour, food, and raw materials. He also had credit lines with several merchants where he purchased a diversity of goods including a wide range of foods, tea, coffee, window glass, indigo, black pepper, thimbles, needles, buttons, boot blacking and even silk braid to adorn the clothing made at his loom house.

The fastidiousness of Heald’s account keeping, his concern with order and control, his pursuit of material wealth and willingness to spend money on luxuries, his expansion and improvement of the Zumwalt property, his acquisition of increasing numbers of slaves, and his diversification of economy all speak to the enlightenment planter ideology that drove Nathan Heald. The arrival and settlement of large numbers of people with cultures and ideologies like the Healds in the region after the War of 1812 signalled the end of the frontier period and the establishment of a cultural trope that would dominate this part of Missouri until the waves of German migration in the 1840’s and the coming of the Civil War.

THE HEALDS AND A SCHOOL?

The library that Nathan Heald owned was undoubtably known and used by his wife Rebecka. Coming from an upper-class family herself, she was obviously given access to an education as a child. She later continued this tradition by teaching school in her home to her children as well as the children of her neighbors (Heald Family Papers 4). In the process, she probably used many of the books from her husband’s library. As a result, the books recorded in Nathan Heald’s probate inventory almost certainly reflect the curriculum of the very first Fort Zumwalt school (Appendix 1). Tradition holds that Rebecka taught school at Fort Zumwalt, and
indeed, by the mid 1820's, entries begin to appear in Nathan’s account book which seem to indicate the presence of some kind of school on the property. An entry in Heald’s account book from 1825 notes that a man named Isaac Keith paid off part of a debt by “schoolkeping” (Draper Ms. 24U18).

Interestingly, in the winter, spring, and fall of 1829, it appears as if the Healds may have been building and equipping a schoolhouse. In January, he recorded an order for “school house glass, say 16 lights” (Draper Ms 24U44). In the early spring, the Reverend William Lacy paid part of a debt to Heald by giving him one geography, one atlas, and one “spel book” (Draper Ms.24U52). By the summer, a building was going up and Heald recorded expenses for quarrying stone, putting up a chimney, as well as days spent pointing and painting (Draper Ms. 24U57). Though these entries remain cryptic, they certainly seem to support the reputation of the Healds as early supporters of education in the area.

At the time of Nathan’s death in 1832, his daughter Mary had wed a man named David McCausland who later became the county sheriff; from the census data, it appears that the couple shared the Heald home along with the rest of the family as early as 1830 (U.S.Census 1830: Heald Family Papers 8). At that time, Nathan’s household consisted of three women and four men. From their ages the women are almost certainly his wife Rebecka, and daughters Mary (age approximately 16) and Margaret (age approximately 14). Nathan appears along with his son Darius (age approximately 11) in addition to a man who is probably David McCausland (Mary’s husband); there is one other man between the ages of 40 and 50 who cannot be explained. Sadly, an unidentified child appears to have died on the property in the spring of that year as Nathan recorded a debt as having been paid to him in the spring of 1830 by the delivery of a “small coffin” (Draper Ms. 24U43).

THE SECOND GENERATION OF HEALDS

At the time of Nathan’s death, the Heald family appears to have been financially stable. In addition to the income from the farm, the family had Nathan’s pension and enjoyed the support of Rebecka’s wealthy parents. Nathan’s probate inventory lists the possessions of a solidly middle class family, in addition to herds of animals and valuable slaves. Waselkov asserts that the vast majority of Nathan’s belongings were sold at auction, although the probate records do not seem to support this statement. Most property was divided between Rebecka and her children (Nathan Heald Probate Inventory; Waselkov 1979:39). Nathan’s death at the age of 57 would have been a blow to the family and the operation of the farm, though it does not appear to have had a major impact on the fortune of the family.

The decade of the 1830's was not kind to the Heald family. In 1835, Mary Heald McCausland died leaving two young sons and her husband David behind (Reed 1964). In 1837, Margaret Heald died unmarried after a long illness for which she had been receiving constant medical attention, apparently beginning in the summer of 1836 (Bryan and Rose 1876: Nathan Heald Probate debts owed).
In 1840, the census recorded the widowed Rebecka as the head of the household. She lived with her son Darius, age approximately 21, and two unidentified male children between the ages of five and ten, who were almost certainly her deceased daughter’s sons Nathan and Alexander (Reed 1964).

The Heald family was not recorded in the 1850 census, although Rebecka was documented on the slave schedule as owning 24 enslaved people (U.S. Census Slave Schedule, 1850). This is a large number of slaves for the area and is somewhat incongruous when one considers the details of farm production that were recorded for the property on the agricultural census.

From the agricultural census, it appears that the Heald household continued to be productive under the management of Darius (Photo 6), who by 1850 would have been approximately 31, and his aging mother. At that time, the farm was larger than most of its neighbors in terms of acreage and overall value. At some point the family had acquired additional property, though its location is unknown. The slaves and Darius worked 200 improved acres with an additional 300 acres in pasture or woodlots (the original Zumwalt tract was only about 380 acres). Rebecka had taken advantage of a new law in 1853 which entitled her to receive half of her deceased husband’s pension for five years which certainly helped with the family’s liquidity (Draper Ms.24U75-101). In addition, she continued to purchase materials for the finishing of cloth and clothing which indicates that the loom-house was still a viable operation (Draper Ms.24U75-101). The farm animals included nine horses, nine mules, five milk cows, five working oxen, 15 “other cattle,” 15 sheep, and 35 hogs for a total livestock value of $1,000. The farm produced wheat, Indian corn, oats, wool, potatoes, $35 in orchard produce, 200 pounds of butter, six tons of hay, 80 pounds of beeswax and honey, and slaughtered $150 worth of animals (U.S. Census Agricultural Schedule 1850). This value and diversity of production was unremarkable in comparison with neighboring farms. Strangely, the farm produced no cash crops such as tobacco or hemp, which are typically associated with slave labor in Missouri. This fact makes the Heald’s possession of 24 slaves worthy of further discussion.

The agricultural economy of the farm was such that large amounts of labor would only be necessary at times of planting and harvest. The rest of the year the slaves would have been employed in tasks such as clearing land, building and maintaining fences, and tending to animals. Though there would always have been work to do, the economics of maintaining such a large slave population for this type of work coupled with the amount of money tied up in the investment itself makes the situation on the Heald farm curious.
There are several possible explanations for the size of the slave population on the farm: the first is that Darius hired out his slaves to work on the property of his neighbors, a practice employed regularly by his father, though on a small scale.

Another explanation is based on the demographics of the slave population. The slaves on the Heald farm were primarily children. Approximately 60% of the individuals were under the age of fifteen (15 out of the 24 slaves); a majority of these were age seven and younger. Though children were commonly put to work at light tasks or as helpers for older laborers, they were generally viewed as an investment (both in terms of value and in terms of keeping their parents and older relatives, the real workers, as content as possible). Three more of the slaves on the Heald farm were aged 58, 60, and 70 respectively. Though 58 doesn’t strike the 21st century American as an age of infirmity, the combined effects of hard labor, sub-optimal housing, poor diet, inadequate health care, and an almost certain degree of psychological stress combined to wear down enslaved people long before their time. When the children and aged are removed from the total slave population, the Healds only owned six fully-effectual workers: three men and three women. This working population is a much more reasonable slave labor force at a farm like the Heald’s. It appears that the Heald’s financial situation in 1850 allowed them to refrain from selling off and dividing up slave families and thus damaging the morale and productivity of their most valuable property.

Darius Heald married Virginia Campbell, daughter of Captain James Campbell of Virginia, in 1846; she bore two sons by Darius before her death in 1852. Heald served in the Missouri legislature from 1854 to 1856. A consummate hunter, Darius introduced the first bill for the preservation of game in the state (SCDB 25 November, 1904). In 1857, Darius’ mother Rebecka Wells Heald, Nathan Heald’s widow, died at the home that she and her husband had purchased back in 1817; she was 68 years old (Heald Family Papers 5).

In 1860, on the eve of the Civil War, the Heald farm was still among the most valuable properties in the immediate area. The farm had increased in size by fifty acres (550 in all) and crop production had generally increased since the previous decade. Strangely, the census taker recorded a reduction in improved acreage (150) being farmed since 1850. The farm grew five times more wheat and five times more oats in 1860 than it had in 1850; in addition, it produced oats, butter, hay, honey, and had added rye to its rotation. The family owned ten horses, four mules, six milk cows, four working oxen, seven other cattle, thirty five sheep, and thirty swine for a combined value of $1,000 (U.S. Census Agricultural Schedule 1860).

The slave population in 1860 had decreased by 50% from its high in the 1850’s. Twelve slaves lived on the property in two “slave dwellings” (U.S. Census Slaves Schedule 1860). Of these, only nine can be tentatively associated with people who had been recorded there in the previous decade; one new adult had arrived, and two new children had been born. This means that between 1850 and 1860, the Healds sold off 12 slaves. This action was almost certainly accompanied by a period of turmoil among the enslaved people as friends and family members were separated. The division of the Heald’s slaves appears to have been precipitated by the death of Rebecka Heald in 1857. She was recorded as owning the 24 slaves in 1850, though her son Darius was in charge of the farm. In 1868, Nathan Heald McCausland, son of David McCausland
and Rebecka’s daughter Mary, recorded a receipt for “moneys, land, and negros from D. Heald belonging to the estate of Nathan and Rebecka Heald” (McCausland Papers 11/4/1858). This indicates that Rebecka’s estate was divided between her two living children and their offspring in 1858.

Though half of the slaves who had been living on Darius Heald’s farm were gone by 1860, there were two new children born on the property to some of the slaves who had not been willed to the McCauslands; one of the children was recorded as being mulatto. All of the enslaved women on the property in 1860 can reasonably be matched with women who were recorded on the property in 1850. As a result, we can surmise that the child’s mother was living on the farm at the time of the child’s conception. This begs the delicate question of who the child’s father was?

In addition to the widowed Darius on the farm in 1860, the census recorded the presence of four young white men; Strangely, Darius’ sons were not among them. David Malder was a 29 year old laborer from Pennsylvania, Daniel Stickey was a 20 year old laborer from Kentucky, William Hubbard was a 35 year old laborer from Germany, and Darius’ 26 year old nephew Nathan H. McCausland was living at the farm listed as “gentleman” (U.S. Census 1860). Despite the presence of eight able bodied adult slaves and his nephew, it appears that Darius was hiring help on the farm.

In 1861, Darius married Martha Hunter, of Virginia. In all, the couple produced five daughters; Lillian, Edmonia, Nina, Martha, and Fannie. All the Heald children were born and grew up in the log house (St. Louis Republic 12 February, 1899).

THE CIVIL WAR AND THE HEALDS

The year Darius and Martha were married, the Civil War began and Missouri fragmented politically. Almost certainly a democrat, Heald sided with most other Missouri families whose heritage derived from the upper south. Unlike the majority of immigrants that had been arriving in Missouri from Germany and other parts of Europe since the 1840’s, Heald was a slave-holder and actively supported the Confederacy.

At the outset of the war, Union forces seized critical cities and infrastructure in the state. At the same time, a large portion of the population was sympathetic to the Confederacy. The result was an internal civil war in which Confederate guerrilla bands and militia units contested the Union presence in a bloody smoldering conflict that occasionally flared into major battles. Though St. Charles County’s population divided into armed camps, it largely escaped the levels of violence that defined other parts of the state. The strength of the Union army in the vicinity of St. Louis, Illinois, and along the rivers was too strong for effective grass-roots Confederate resistance, though many men formed companies or slipped off on their own to join southern armies in other states.

Though he doesn’t turn up on any official Confederate muster rolls, Darius Heald was apparently the captain of an ill-fated company of Confederate militia that drilled on Dardenne
Prairie, and it appears that his nephew Nathan McCausland was involved as well (Heald Family Papers 6). Apparently the company planned to head south to Arkansas to rendezvous with Confederate General and former Missouri governor Sterling Price. The Union army thwarted these plans when it captured a good number of the company sometime in 1862 (Heald Family Papers 6). It doesn’t appear that Heald or McCausland were captured at this time, but Darius’ position as the ranking officer in the company, and the fact that Nathan lived in his household are almost certainly the reasons for the raid that Union soldiers later carried out on the home. Darius himself discussed the raid briefly with historian Lyman Draper in 1868, though the date of the incident was not recorded. Apparently, soldiers ransacked the house “from cellar to garret”, burned a number of possessions, and stole Nathan Heald’s officer’s sword. The sword was later recovered by one of Heald’s slaves from a neighboring farm where it had been found and was being used as a “corn knife” (Photo 7) (Magazine of American History 1892:122; Quaife 1912:410). Though he could not be certain, Heald later recalled that the unit who plundered the house was a portion of the Hecker German Regiment of Chicago volunteers (Quaife 1912:410).

Though the date of this incident is unknown, it probably occurred in the first 8 months of the war. The war began on April 12, 1861 and on February 17, 1862 Darius received a letter from the Union Provost Marshal in St. Charles, Arnold Krekel, instructing him to report to headquarters to take an oath of loyalty to the United States Government, and post a $2,000 bond (Heald Family Papers 9). This privilege was reserved for those citizens who were strongly suspected of (or known to be) aiding the Confederacy; the size of the bond (more than the value of most of Heald’s neighbor’s farms in 1860) indicates the seriousness of the situation (U.S. Agricultural Census 1860). Because citizens who violated an oath of loyalty could lose all their property and be banished from the state or worse, it seems that Heald retired altogether from his experiment with military life.

Desiring to keep relations with the Union military neutral, in June of 1863, he paid $94.50 in commutative tax to be exempted from militia duty (on the Union side); by the next winter, his attitude toward the Union had apparently warmed. In February, he began planning a hunting trip with Colonel Anson More, an officer attached to the Union Quartermaster General’s office in St. Louis (Heald Family Papers 10, 16).

Nathan McCausland was apparently not as easily deterred from aiding the Confederate cause as his uncle Darius had been. In August 1862 he was also summoned to Arnold Krekel’s office to take an oath of loyalty to the United States (McCausland papers 9/4/1862). Despite
signing the document, McCausland apparently did not remain true to his word and by October 10th, 1864, he was writing letters to his wife from Gratiot Street Prison in St. Louis (McCausland papers 10/18/1864). A former medical college, the Gratiot Street Prison at times housed hundreds of political detainees, Confederate P.O.W.’s, Union deserters and even common criminals. Descriptions of conditions at the prison vary; when first converted to a prison in 1861, three wagon loads of human bones were removed from storage in the basement, and the dissection laboratories were converted into mess-halls (Winter 1994:80). In 1863, Confederate prisoner Griffin Frost described Gratiot as a “hell on earth,” and surmised that it was an “excellent place to starve” (Winter 1994:80). McCausland did not find it nearly so bad, and wrote to his wife in October “we are all well and enjoying the finest health;” a month later he remained healthy and expected to be released soon (McCausland papers 10/18/1864, 11/9/1864). It is not known why McCausland was imprisoned, or when he was released, but he did survive the war and returned to O’Fallon.

Arnold Krekel, the Union officer who apparently plagued Darius Heald and Nathan McCausland during the war, was a respected German immigrant and merchant in O’Fallon who lived very close to the Heald property. An enterprising and atypical republican, Krekel was the editor of the St. Charles Demokrat, and the leader of a Union militia company known as “Krekel’s Dutch” (Gerteis 2001:75). Though Darius Heald later equivocally remembered the Union soldiers who raided his home as a German unit from Chicago, it is entirely possible that the men were actually Krekel’s Germans. Though a slaveholder, Krekel was primarily a politician and would later preside over the 1864 state constitutional convention which abolished slavery in Missouri (Primm 1990:275).

POST BELLUM YEARS

Throughout the 1860’s Heald continued to acquire land. He almost always paid his taxes, and the farm flourished despite the disruption of the war (Heald Family Papers 11). Following the cessation of hostilities, normalcy slowly returned to Missouri. In 1868, historian Lyman Draper appeared at Heald’s door to discuss his early days as a youth on the Missouri frontier and the story of his parent’s ordeal at Fort Dearborn. Heald discussed his family history at length with Draper who dutifully recorded the accounts and filed them among his massive archive of interviews at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

Though census data was not recovered for 1870, the agricultural census indicates that the family weathered the Civil War financially intact and was enjoying a period of unparalleled prosperity. The farm had increased to 1,000 acres (Figure 13), though only 200 were improved; the property was valued at $40,000. This size and value is far above the majority of the Heald’s neighbors in the county. Despite the jump in value and size, farm production was essentially unchanged from 1860, probably due to the fact that the amount of improved acreage was the same. It seems that the main differences were an increased production of wool, 300 pounds annually, and the fact that Darius now had to pay approximately $300 a year in wages to workers, his slaves having been emancipated.
In 1873, Mary Hunter Heald died once again leaving Darius a widower; he would not remarry. In 1878, Darius was involved in relocating a school for women to O’Fallon which came to be known as the Woodlawn Institute (Figure 14). Several of his daughters attended the school which provided a classical education including lessons in Latin, Greek, Mathematics, Music, and Literature (www.celebrateofallonmo.com; Missouri State Parks Archive 7).

The Heald household in 1880 shows the widower Darius living with his daughters Lillian, Edmonia, Louise (a.k.a. Nina), Martha, and Fannie (Francis) whose middle name was Otey. In addition, a 50 year old woman also named Fannie Otey (who was recorded as Darius’ niece) was keeping house. Finally, two servants—Matthias Woods, a white hired hand, and a ten year old African American hired girl whose name is illegible [Nancie?] lived on the property (U.S. Census 1880).

Some time around 1890, the Heald family moved out of the old log house and into a new brick home called Stony Point which still stands northeast of the site of Fort Zumwalt. Even at this early date, interest was starting to grow among Missourians about “the old fort” on the property and its place in the history of the state.
As early as 1899, a reporter from the St. Louis Republic interviewed Darius Heald to learn about the history of his family and Fort Zumwalt (St. Louis Republic, 12 February, 1899). When the reporter arrived, the 78 year old Heald was on the roof of the fort making repairs. Heald reported that a hired hand was living in the old log house at the time (St. Louis Republic, [STLR] 12 February, 1899).

By that time, the Heald children had married and for the most part moved away. Campbell Heald (one of Darius’ sons from his first marriage) had moved to Eldorado County, California where he worked as a miner and a merchant; the other son, (Nathan ?) had died. Lillian Heald married Joshua Richmond of St. Louis, Edmonia married Thomas McCluer of O’Fallon, Nina married Arthur McClure of O’Fallon, Martha married Wright Johnson of St. Louis, and Fannie (Francis) Otey married Dr. Lapislaus Michael Ottofy of St. Louis (STLR 12 February 1899; SCDB 25 November 1904).

Suffering from kidney disease and weakened by a recent case of pneumonia, Darius Heald died on November 25, 1904 at the age of 83 and was interred at the family burial ground. Until the time of his death, Heald had kept up the old fort, but in 1905, the estate was divided among his children.

In 1909, the Rebecka Wells Heald chapter of the United States Daughters of the War of 1812 was organized in the old log house by Rebecka Heald McCluer, a great grand daughter of...
Rebecka Wells Heald. For several years the structure was apparently used as a chapter house for meetings of the group (Heald Family Papers 7). Through the efforts of the chapter, Fort Zumwalt achieved greater recognition as an historical landmark. Despite public interest in the property, the land was sold out of the Heald family in 1914 (Heald Family Papers 4; www.celebrateofallonmo.com). Three new landowners acquired portions of the property, a man; named Fred Gentemann, bought the home at Stony Point along with the old fort which he converted into a barn.

In September of 1929, largely through the efforts of interested family members like Francis Heald Ottofy and her niece Rebecka Heald McClure (who were members of the United Daughters of the War of 1812 among other historical groups), a marker was placed near the house along Highway 40 to commemorate the history of Fort Zumwalt. The proceedings were attended by representatives of state government, interested citizens, the press, and members of several historical preservation groups including the Colonial Dames of St. Louis, the First Families of Virginia, the Colonial Daughters of the 17th Century, and the St. Charles chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (SCBN 18 September, 1929; SCBN 17 September, 1929).

In 1936, at the state council meeting of what was presumably the United Daughters of The War of 1812, resolutions were presented to petition the state legislature to buy an 87 acre tract surrounding the fort for a state park (Heald Family Papers 15). In the same year, the remaining elements of the building were recorded by the Historic American Buildings Program which is overseen by the United States National Park Service.

In 1937, the 59th general assembly of Missouri voted funds to expand the state park system. Among the appropriations was $12,500 intended for the purchase of the site of Fort Zumwalt (SCBN 15 June, 1937). The original plans were to build a museum to “house a display of relics of the War of 1812,” but the museum never became a reality (SCBN 15 June, 1937). In 1938, the State of Missouri filed condemnation proceedings against the three landowners who held the 40.63 acres that the state desired for the park. At the same time, the state created a board of commissioners to determine the market value of the land (SCBN 7 December 1938). On January 3rd, 1939, the park was purchased for $9,000 from Ernest L. Plackmeier, William Steiner, and Fred Gentemann (St. Louis Post Dispatch [SLPD], 4 January, 1939).

Initially, the park was used primarily by the citizens of O’Fallon, but it gradually gained a reputation as an interesting stopover for people traveling along Highway 40 and later Interstate 70. In the 1950’s, as the family “road trip” became a staple of American life, many travelers stopped at Fort Zumwalt to relax and take advantage of the overnight camping and picnic facilities. It is probably at this time that the concrete slab that sits in the middle of the site of Fort Zumwalt was poured as a picnic table platform (Waselkov 1979: 41). In 1959, Joseph Jaeger Jr., the Director of Missouri State Parks, signed off on the first of many planned restoration projects at the park. The first order of business was the reconstruction and stabilization of the large double hearth chimney that had fallen into disrepair. On December 22, 1959, Jaeger instructed then Park Superintendent John Adams (who lived at the old Heald house at Stony Point) to begin removing, cleaning, and stacking the remaining stones in the old foundation east of the chimney for use in the reconstruction effort (Missouri State Parks 2). The chimney was rebuilt in the following year, but the contractor’s receipts do not account for any stone. This would appear to
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indicate that the chimney was entirely reconstructed from the remains of the fort’s foundations (Missouri State Parks 3). Other salvage/restoration programs that were instituted by the state include the removal of the Heald’s brick smoke house which began in 1961; the bricks were delivered to Arrow Rock State Park and apparently used in a restoration project of the Dr. Hall House (Missouri State Parks 1, 4).

In February of 1970, Lawrence T. Shelton, an archaeologist with the state park system, met with Carl Chapman of the Archaeological Survey of Missouri (University of Missouri, Columbia). At the meeting, they agreed that an archaeological survey of all state parks should be initiated, but that priority should be given to known sites that would be endangered by current or planned development (Missouri State Parks 5). As plans for the reconstruction of Fort Zumwalt were being considered at the time, archaeological work began to be discussed a few years later in 1974 (Waselkov 1979:1). In 1975, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources sponsored the excavation of portions of the east and west pens on either side of the fort’s standing chimney in addition to testing of several yard features. The work was conducted by a team of archaeologists under the supervision of Greg Waselkov of the University of Missouri, Columbia (Waselkov 1979:40). Robert T. Bray of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Missouri was the principal investigator.

Field work was carried out from May 18th through June 6th, 1975, and was designed to address both theoretical archaeological questions, and identify construction details for possible future reconstruction. Waselkov excavated most of the fill beneath the floors under the east and west pens of the saddlebag style residence and uncovered sections of the limestone foundation still intact (Figure 15). He also identified the construction trench (Feature 2) dug during the construction of the southern wall foundation and a drip line between the west pen and the southern addition, that likely formed after the addition had been razed. The standing chimney was identified as Feature 1. Unfortunately, Waselkov found that artifacts within the fill beneath the floor were mixed due to rodent and other animal activities (Waselkov 2006: personal communications). Two sections of the fill were left unexcavated under the west pen (Figure 15). Two trenches were excavated outside the residence. One of the trenches exposed the remains of the southern addition’s chimney attached to the south gable (Feature 4). One of the limestone slabs used in the chimney construction was etched with the initials “D H”, probably those of Darius Heald. The hearth contained nearly 10 cm (4 inches) of ash, and below the base of the hearth a small basin shaped pit (Feature 5) was found, which contained two chert flakes and two deer bones. Waselkov believed this to be the base of a prehistoric feature. The second trench, placed in the yard area, just southwest of the southern addition, uncovered five pit features (Features 6-10). Due to the accumulation of ash and bones, Waselkov believed that some of these features may be related to a smoke house. Feature 8 contained a dense concentration of coal, a nail rod, and various tools suggesting this pit was near where blacksmithing activity was performed.
Figure 15: House Foundations and Features Exposed During Waselkov’s Excavations in 1975  
(Adopted from Waselkov 1979:42, Figure 7)
After Waśelkow completed excavations, plans to rebuild the fort were once again put on hold. In 1978, the State of Missouri sold Fort Zumwalt State Park to the City of O’Fallon for one dollar with the stipulation that the city continue to maintain the property as a public park. In 2005, the O’Fallon Community Foundation, with the consent of the City of O’Fallon, resurrected plans to reconstruct the fort. In pursuit of that goal, they retained the services of the Archaeological Research Center of St. Louis to complete the excavation of the fort.

Today, Fort Zumwalt is a critical part of the identity and heritage of the City of O’Fallon and the State of Missouri. It is a reminder of the days before the city and state existed. It places life in the 21st century into perspective and acts as a reminder of the hardships American pioneers endured as they laid the foundations upon which the community now rests. The existence of the park, a peaceful oasis in the midst of a rapidly developing city, is a testament to the foresight of Missouri’s citizens. Now, as before, the site of Fort Zumwalt is a refuge. Even though its stout log walls no longer exist to protect against attack, the site offers respite from the hustle of jobs, traffic, deadlines, and chores. There, visitors can sit under a tree, close their eyes, and imagine life in the former frontier wilderness that has become Missouri.