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ABSTRACT

BETWEEN THE BAYOUS: THE MARITIME CULTURAL LANDSCAPE OF THE DOWNTOWN PENSACOLA WATERFRONT

Kendra Ann Kennedy

From 1740 to 1940, the downtown Pensacola waterfront between Bayou Chico on the west and Bayou Texar on the east changed dramatically. The small Spanish colonial outpost of Panzacola was transferred to the British, back to the Spanish, and finally to the United States. During the American period, the port became a major shipping entrepôt, but declined in the mid-20th century as local natural resources, like lumber and red snapper, became depleted. This study examines the history and archaeology of the Pensacola waterfront within a maritime cultural landscape (MCL) framework as defined by Westerdahl (1992). A social theory perspective, based on the work of Bourdieu (1977) and Giddens (1984), addresses questions of power, authority, practice, human agency, and resistance. The resistance and agency of sailors and other maritime workers, such as stevedores and baymen, is examined alongside the power and authority of local officials and businessmen, including timber merchants and fish house managers. The final two chapters—the first chapter a case study of the investigation of two seemingly prosaic ballast rock piles (8ES3366 and 8ES3367) on the waterfront—demonstrate how the tense interplay between employer and worker produced a waterfront that still resonates in the MCL of modern Pensacola.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: AN INVESTIGATION OF PENSACOLA’S MARITIME CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

I really don't know why it is that all of us are so committed to the sea, except I think it’s because in addition to the fact that the sea changes, and the light changes, and ships change, it’s because we all came from the sea. And it’s an interesting biological fact that all of us have, in our veins the exact same percentage of salt in our blood that exists in the ocean, and, therefore, we have salt in our blood, in our sweat, in our tears. We are tied to the ocean. And when we go back to the sea—whether it is to sail or to watch it—we are going back from whence we came.

~ John F. Kennedy (1962:684)

There lies the port; the vessel puffs her sail / There gloom the dark, broad seas.

~ Alfred, Lord Tennyson (Rolfe 1895:187)

Pensacola’s waterfront has seen many changes in the over two and a half centuries since Europeans began exploiting its resources and constructing buildings on its shore. Frequent territorial transfers between national powers, combined with the rapid technological changes that occurred in the past few centuries, have produced a waterfront with a dynamic history and complicated palimpsest of archaeological features (Figure 1). The changing nature of Pensacola’s downtown waterfront between Bayou Chico on the west and Bayou Texar on the east, a distance of about 5 km (3 mi.), is best explored by examining the intricate web of archaeological sites that can shed light on the area’s coastal activity, including shipwrecks, wharves, piers, jetties, warehouse foundations, boathouses, trading post ruins, ballast piles, refuse dumps, and bathhouses. When viewed as parts of a complex maritime cultural landscape (MCL), a concept further described
Figure 1. Project area.
below, these maritime-related resources reveal trends and changes over the years as well as between the various occupations. Most importantly, this study demonstrates that utilizing an MCL framework to investigate archaeological sites and features both on and adjacent to Pensacola’s waterfront provides an opportunity to employ social theories to examine the human agency of individuals involved in maritime industry as well as the agency of maritime workers, especially their resistance to the power and authority of local officials and the dominant culture. The human agency of maritime industrialists and workers both created and was created by the MCL of the Pensacola waterfront.

The town, and later city, of Pensacola and its immediate environs is only one landscape within many larger nested landscapes, from the landscape of the whole Pensacola Bay system to that of the Gulf Coast and the southeastern United States. Archaeologists Carole Crumley and William Marquardt argue that questions of scale are important considerations within the study of landscape because landscapes possess no defined boundaries. Archaeologist Barbara Bender notes, “[O]ne landscape nests within another like Chinese boxes—except that the boxes are permeable” (Crumley and Marquardt 1990, Bender 2001:6). The downtown Pensacola landscape forms an essential part of the landscape of Pensacola Bay, which itself is only one piece of the landscape of the Gulf Coast. One flows into the other just as the rivers and bayous around the city of Pensacola flow into Pensacola Bay and those waters, in turn, flow into the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean. A study of any and all of the landscapes described above could produce important information about Pensacola and its regional role. However, in order to present a detailed, coherent study within strict temporal and fiscal confines, this investigation focuses on the downtown Pensacola waterfront between
Bayou Chico and Bayou Texar from about 1740, the beginning of European exploitation of the area, until the port began to attain its modern character around 1940 with the collapse of major industry and the resulting decline in waterfront exploitation.

In 1978, Christer Westerdahl (1992) introduced the MCL paradigm utilized in this study. The MCL is tied to the development of the “cultural landscape” concept within the field of geography, which was later adopted by archaeologists for its usefulness in studying the human past (Sauer 1925, Westerdahl 1992, Anschuetz et al. 2001). The MCL concept aims to create a holistic understanding of all maritime resources with particular emphasis on several aspects, as adapted from Westerdahl’s (1992) definition of the term. For the purpose of this study, the MCL includes 1) natural topography—such as harbors, coves, and anchorages, 2) the built environment—including wharves, boathouses, landfill, ballast piles, shipyards, and shipwrecks, 3) navigation—pilotage and navigational aids, for instance, and 4) cognitive aspects—such as toponymy (the study of place names), traditions, and laws. Evaluated together, these elements reveal complex relationships based upon numerous factors, including agency, power, and authority, which can be examined once they are exposed. Unfortunately, much research inspired by the MCL concept goes no further than assembling the overall picture of an area’s maritime resources. While a comprehensive knowledge of maritime cultural resources is important, and this study begins by creating a comprehensive picture of the four MCL aspects on the Pensacola waterfront, an MCL study should go further to ask important questions, based on an explicit theoretical standpoint, of maritime sites and archaeological data.
The study presented here examines how an understanding of the transformations of Pensacola’s waterfront across the centuries in turn gives rise to an understanding, through social theories such as Gidden’s theory of structuration and Bourdieu’s theory of practice, of the human agency, resistance, power, \textit{habitus}, and practice that existed on or played out across the waterfront’s vibrant landscape (Bourdieu 1977, Giddens 1984). These concepts are explained in more detail below. In particular, this study examines human agency, the ability to affect one’s circumstances; \textit{habitus}, culturally-sanctioned habitual actions that both reflect and create culture; and practice, an individuals’ recursive knowledge of how to survive in their cultural milieu, which is revealed in Pensacola’s MCL. Resistance, a particular form of agency in which individuals strive against the dominant group, is examined as it was manifest by sailors and maritime workers.

A holistic study of maritime-related features of the waterfront, both those on land and in the water, permits an understanding of the significance and meaning of these features to the cultures that created, viewed, and utilized them. While informal cultural landscapes such as the Pensacola waterfront were not explicitly planned in the same sense as formal landscapes, e.g. parks and gardens, their structure reveals much about the tense interplay between the ideology imposed by those who held power, and thus directed the formation of the landscape as well as the creation of \textit{habitus}, and the individuals who resisted that authority through their agency, often subtly altering the intended landscape (Hood 1996, Hauser and Hicks 2007, Casella 2008).

This study begins with a review of the historiography on cultural landscapes, an elucidation of social theory concerning practice and human agency, and an examination
of the methods used to accomplish the study goals. The next three chapters provide an in-depth treatment of the history of the mainland Pensacola waterfront during the First Spanish period (1740-1763), British period (1763-1781), Second Spanish period (1781-1821), and pre-modern American period (1821-1940). Appropriately for a landscape study, this history relies heavily on historical maps, but also utilizes laws, codes, letters, deeds, plats, newspaper articles, government reports, and other archival documents, as well as a plethora of secondary sources. Since no comprehensive history has ever been written on the Pensacola waterfront, the history presented here is necessarily more descriptive than analytical and serves mainly as a starting point for future study of the waterfront, specific areas of the shoreline, and particular industries and business that flourished on the shore. The sixth chapter examines previous archaeological fieldwork, much completed by the University of West Florida’s (UWF) Archaeology Institute, on maritime-related sites both on the waterfront and near the shore. The seventh chapter combines the insights gained from these historical and archaeological reviews, along with the information gleaned from recent archaeological research on the foreshore of Pensacola, to present a case study of two unobtrusive rock piles on the waterfront whose histories are far more complex and elaborate than a cursory glance would indicate. The detailed history of the two rock piles presented in this chapter demonstrates how the descriptive history of the general waterfront presented in Chapters Three through Five offers a point of departure for more in-depth analysis of specific sites and areas. The final chapter demonstrates how a comprehensive understanding of Pensacola’s MCL helps to situate archaeological sites and finds, such as the two rock piles, within their
intricate context and contributes to an understanding of the human agency that played a role in the development of the downtown waterfront.

Throughout, this study examines the devices used by the colonial and American elite to accomplish the task of asserting and reasserting their authority over transient sailors and other maritime workers as well as the resistance offered by these laborers. While many archaeological texts have examined the use of landscape to legitimate the authority of the few over the many and numerous authors have studied the MCLs of coastal settlements around the world, none have combined these two approaches to better understand how maritime structures were used to maintain the status quo and keep maritime workers in the place ascribed to them by their societies (Baker and Biger 1992, Westerdahl 1992, Bender 1993, Jasinski 1993, Hirsch and O’Hanlon 1995, Yamin and Metheny 1996, Duncan 2000, McErlean et al. 2002, Ash 2005, Smith 2006, Jordan-Greene 2007).

Sailors and maritime workers, in general, were often treated differently from other laborers, owing to their dirty and dangerous line of work and, as regards sailors, their extended periods of absence from their home communities. Seamen were often stereotyped as rogues and drunkards, separate from “polite” society (Rediker 1987:207-253, Kindleberger 1992:56-62, Herndon 1996). Many physical and legal structures, such as seamen’s churches and maritime regulations, served to compel these pelagic voyagers to acknowledge the rules and ideology of the societies to which they returned. Behaviors and practices acceptable onboard ship were not necessarily suitable on shore; a sailor’s \textit{habitus} on land was not the same as that which existed at sea. Stevedores, longshoreman, dockworkers, and other maritime laborers, though not transient, also frequently suffered
the scorn of their “betters.” They often faced practices and laws that reduced their ability to effectively improve their circumstances and strive for a better, safer life (Russell 1966:9-12, Rosenberg 1988:47-55, Nelson 1990:2, Arnesen 1991:19-22, Schulberg and Silverman 2001:6). For example, African American stevedores in Pensacola rioted in the winter of 1872-1873 because Canadian stevedores, arriving from the frozen North where no work was to be had, were freely allowed to compete with, and displace, local stevedores. Only after illegally rioting were local stevedores able to pressure officials to enact laws that protected their right to procure employment in preference to foreign competitors (Shofner 1972, 1973; Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:60-61). Thus, despite the odds stacked against them, sailors and maritime laborers did use their agency, especially in the form of resistance, to find ways to circumvent or change restrictions that hindered their well-being.

Since the majority of maritime archaeological studies in Pensacola have focused on shipwrecks, and the terrestrial excavations near the waterfront have rarely included submerged resources, this thesis considers both maritime and terrestrial resources on the Pensacola waterfront using an MCL framework. This concept has been used successfully on Deadman’s Island near the Gulf Breeze peninsula across the bay from Pensacola as well as in Australia, Europe, and other parts of America, but not on the Pensacola waterfront (Westerdahl 1992, Jasinski 1993, Duncan 2000, McErlean et al. 2002, Ash 2005, Smith 2006, Jordan-Greene 2007). This thesis extends previous studies and expands the utility of the framework by using the MCL as a starting point from which to ask larger questions about the social structures created because of and perpetuated through the landscape. The strategies used by elite members of society, such as ideology
and authority, to maintain the status quo through landscape and *habitus* and the ways in which regular citizens, especially maritime workers, resisted this continuity and augmented change through their own agency serve as a focal point of this work.

Although this thesis focuses specifically on the MCL of Pensacola, the tools used and insights gained about the use of maritime structures and regulations to perpetuate social relations are useful for coastal, riverine, and lacustrine communities around the world. Although ideology can support stability, it can also perpetuate inequality and discrimination. Understanding the historical roots of ideological domination can assist archaeologists and their communities in recognizing, discussing, and eliminating its detrimental effects.
CHAPTER II

SHAPE AND BE SHAPED: PRACTICE, AGENCY, SOCIAL THEORY, AND MARITIME CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

To describe the landscape as a history of things that have been done to the land results in a cataloguing of the material transformations wrought upon the land. This procedure conforms with current archaeological expectations. To understand the landscape as inhabited demands a significant shift in our perceptions, and it is one that will not carry current methodological procedures with it. To inhabit the landscape is to look about, observe and to make sense of what one sees; it is to interpret.

~ John C. Barrett (1999:26)

We see things not as they are, but as we are ourselves.

~ Henry M. Tomlinson (1931:144)

Landscape: the term is quite evocative, suggesting bucolic images of sun-drenched fields, meandering streams, and expansive vistas. But this understanding of landscape is grounded in its origins as an artistic and literary style that first developed in Europe, especially Flanders and Italy, between the 15th and 16th centuries. The meaning and interpretation of landscape has changed dramatically since its beginnings. This chapter examines the origins and ramifications of the cultural landscape, derived from the idea of landscape, in the social sciences and its ties to the maritime cultural landscape (MCL) framework of Christer Westerdahl (1992). The chapter then offers an in-depth examination of the MCL and social theories that can be used in combination with the MCL concept. These social theories offer opportunities to delve into human agency, especially resistance, practice, and habitus as it played out in or was represented on
maritime landscapes in general and, more specifically, as these social characteristics are visible on the Pensacola waterfront.

Landscape in the Social Sciences

The original concept of landscape, as first formulated in Europe, privileged vision and control of space and was closely tied to changing attitudes about land use and labor during the Renaissance (Cosgrove 1984:21-27). Cultural geographer Denis Cosgrove thoroughly and cogently discussed the evolution of landscape from its painterly beginnings to its scholarly adoption in the form of the “cultural landscape,” as per geographer Carl Sauer, within the field of geography in the 20th century (Sauer 1925, Cosgrove 1984). Numerous authors have examined the development of the cultural landscape concept in the field of geography from that of a general unit of study to a complex, symbolic, and representational idea (Lewis 1983, Schein 1997, Harris 1999, Robertson and Richards 2003:1-18). Other social science disciplines, including history, ecology, archaeology, architecture, cultural anthropology, sociology, and urban planning, gradually adopted the concept of landscape and turned their attentions to issues and research designs particularly suited to landscape study (Baker and Biger 1992, Bender 1993, Harris 1999, Anschuetz et al. 2001:164-168).

Landscape Archaeology

The study of landscape in archaeology developed due to the field’s close connections to geography, history, and topography (Anschuetz et al. 2001:164-168, Johnson 2007:16,119-130). Archaeologists have long been interested in space and site distribution. The very nature of the discipline prompted the study of past cultures
through their material remains across vast regions and between discrete archaeological sites, but the past several decades have seen a precipitous rise in archaeological studies that take landscape, often explicitly defined, as their point of departure. The evolution of landscape archaeology and its diversification, from settlement patterns to phenomenological studies, has been thoroughly and meticulously discussed in numerous texts (Knapp and Ashmore 1999, Stoddart and Zubrow 1999, Anschuetz et al. 2001, Thomas 2001, Wilkinson 2003:3-14, Ashmore 2004, Hicks and McAtackney 2007, David and Thomas 2008:27-43). For that reason, this study only briefly examines the historiography of landscape archaeology and its adoption from the geographical sciences.

Since its inception as a discrete field of study, archaeology has been intimately concerned with spatial relations. Knapp and Ashmore clarify, “As long as archaeologists have studied the human past, they have been interested in space, and consequently in landscapes” (Knapp and Ashmore 1999:1). Archaeologists quickly realized that the distances and connections between individual artifacts, geologic strata, and sites are of great importance in the interpretation of archaeological remains. Although the terms “landscape” or “cultural landscape” were not regularly used in archaeology until the 1970s and 1980s, archaeologists became interested in questions of environment, regional variation, site interconnections, and settlement patterns early in the 20th century (Stoddard and Zubrow 1999, Anschuetz et al. 2001, David and Thomas 2008, Patterson 2008). Settlement pattern studies, such as Willey’s famous work in Peru in the 1940s, and ecological anthropology, like that of Steward and Clark in the 1940s and 1950s, spurred archaeologists to focus on ever broader scales of analysis. Regional studies increased and archaeologists began to focus not just on large sites, but also on smaller

In tandem with the general field of archaeology, landscape archaeology quickly embraced the new archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s. This new archaeology, promoted by Lewis Binford, was tied to a desire to transform archaeology from a largely descriptive, theory-free field into a scientific discipline concerned with process, systems, theory, and general laws, an approach labeled both positivist and processualist (Rossignol 1992, Anschuetz et al. 2001:168-172, Ashmore 2004:257-258, David and Thomas 2008:30-32). Processual archaeologists studied settlement systems, rather than settlement patterns, and focused on ecology and environment within processual landscape studies. From these initial landscape investigations, various approaches developed, including “nonsite” and “off-site” archaeology, that focused both on sites and the blank spaces between characteristically defined archaeological sites. These landscape and regional studies even challenged the very definition of “site” itself. Nevertheless, despite the important insights and advancements provided by processual archaeology, many scholars, especially in the UK, began to question a study of the human past that so completely excluded a consideration of humans themselves and produced deterministic statements that reduced humans to pawns simply reacting to the environment in which they lived (Anschuetz et al. 2001:168-172, David and Thomas 2008:30-32).

In response to these valid criticisms, archaeologists such as Ian Hodder, in parallel with colleagues in cultural geography and other social sciences, began to consider questions of meaning, ideology, representation, and cognition. Such approaches in archaeology have been labeled postprocessual, postpositivist, and humanistic (Hodder
2001:1-13, Ashmore 2004). Within the anglophone world, American archaeologists still remain generally positivist and British and Australian archaeologists are generally postpositivists, but scholars from around the globe have begun to recognize the importance and validity of diverse approaches for an understanding of the human past (Ashmore 2004:258-259).

The development of postprocessual archaeology revolutionized landscape archaeology just as it did the field in general. Where processualists may fall into the trap of viewing landscape as a constant factor of human existence that serves only as the stage for culture process, postprocessualists argue that humans assign meaning to the landscapes in which they live and, in turn, those meanings are used to reproduce and even challenge cultural continuity (Tilley 1994). Archaeologist Christopher Tilley (1994:25) defines landscape as the “physical and visual form of the earth as an environment and as a setting in which locales occur and in dialectical relation to which meanings are created, reproduced and transformed.” This definition highlights the important point that humans are not only shaped by the environment in which they live, they also shape that environment through their actions, which in turn creates new landscapes that again shape their actions, and sets in place a never-ending, recursive dialogue (Johnson 2007:145).

Postprocessual archaeologists have asked many questions of landscape, with many of their questions based in current social theory. These studies focus on ideology, meaning, resistance, human agency, change, gender, place, symbology, and multivocality, or the understanding that there is no one single landscape, but rather many landscapes experienced by different classes, ethnicities, and cultural groups (Hood 1996, Anschuetz et al. 2001:172-174, Ashmore 2004:258-266). Various authors have put
forward different categories of landscape, such as phenomenological, constructed, conceptualized, ideational, behavioral, ritual and sacred, ethnic, diasporic, and contested landscapes (Tilley 1994, Knapp and Ashmore 1999:11-13, Zedeño 2000, Anschuetz et al. 2001:178-181, Bender 2001, Bender and Winer 2001). Place, memory, time, gender, and power are key foci within postprocessual landscape archaeology, just as they are within the fields of archaeology and anthropology (Hirsch 1995; Feld and Basso 1996; Hood 1996; Yamin and Metheny 1996; Bender 2002, 2006; Stewart and Strathern 2003; Hicks et al. 2007; Casey 2008; David and Thomas 2008, Van Dyke 2008).

While postprocessual archaeologists have conducted both prehistoric and historic studies, historical archaeologists have mainly focused on power, ideology, resistance, ethnicity, and human agency. At first, many historical archaeologists centered their studies on formal landscapes; those explicitly planned and designed such as gardens and parks, where power and ideology were more readily visible. Many early historical archaeology landscape studies focused on the use of landscape as a form of elite ideological control and manipulation, such as the control of nature and use of order in formal gardens (Kelso and Most 1990, Kryder-Reid 1994, Hood 1996, Leone and Potter 1996, Yamin and Metheny 1996, Leone and Hurry 1998). Such research is still common among landscape studies in archaeology, but a concern with informal and everyday landscapes and the importance of human agency has gained in popularity. Landscapes were never simply expressions of elite power; the resistance and human agency of those who created and lived in them also altered landscapes. In addition, ethnicity and gender are also understood to be important factors in the way in which individuals create and understand landscapes (Joseph 2000, Hauser and Hicks 2007, Kelly and Norman 2007,
Casella 2008, Kearney 2008). In short, landscapes have multiple meanings. More recently, historical archaeologists have also turned a critical eye to their own interpretations of archaeological remains so as to make their personal and professional biases explicit and reveal the ways in which their interpretations affect the communities in which they conduct research (Shackel 2001, De Cunzo and Ernststein 2006, Matthews and Palus 2007, Yamin and Schuldenrein 2007, Lydon 2008).

Waterfront Archaeology and Maritime Cultural Landscapes

Humankind’s deep connection to water as a bodily necessity, provider of sustenance, and as a means of transportation or defense has produced a consistent clustering of archaeological sites along potable and navigable bodies of water since the origin of the species. Thus, it is no surprise that the archaeological study of waterfront areas, whether along oceans, bays, rivers, bayous, or lakes, began as early as the discipline of archaeology itself. The advent of cultural resource management in the United States and heritage management in Europe in the last quarter of the 20th century produced a multitude of reports and publications on foreshore areas due to the constant redevelopment faced by many urban waterfronts (Faulkner et al. 1978, Pastron et al. 1981, Huey 1984, Zierden and Reitz 2002). Regrettably, these early reports, and many waterfront studies produced since then, focus almost exclusively on land-based maritime sites to the detriment of submerged or amphibious cultural resources (Pastron and Delgado 1991, Booth et al. 1993, Reed et al. 1995, Balicki 1998, Bowers and Gannon 1998, McCarthy 1999, Delgado 2009).
Unfortunately, the divide between terrestrial and maritime archaeology, including the different methods and crews used by the two specialties as well as a lack of communication between the two, has created an artificial separation between maritime sites found on land and those found under the water. Earlier maritime archaeologists focused rather exclusively on shipwrecks and some even defined maritime archaeology as being concerned only with the underwater remains of maritime activities (Muckelroy 1998:24-25). However, maritime archaeologists have begun to challenge this division and embrace a more holistic study of maritime sites in order to produce a better understanding of maritime communities and the ties that bind land and sea together (Hunter 1994, Stammers 1994, Firth 1995, Meniketti 1998, Adberg and Lewis 2000, Rodrigues 2002, Breen and Lane 2003, Chapman and Chapman 2005).

Although maritime archaeology has typically been very site specific, especially in regard to shipwrecks, the concept of the MCL prompted a new emphasis on connections not only between shipwrecks and the land near which they wrecked, but also the connection between a variety of submerged sites, land-based maritime sites, and the communities that formed or utilized them (Westerdahl 1992, 1994). The MCL concept first attracted the attention of European archaeologists and quickly spread to Australia and the Americas (Jasinski 1993, Esser 1999, Duncan 2000, McErlean et al. 2002, Ash 2005, Smith 2006, Mueller-Heubach 2006, Jordan-Greene 2007, Rönnby 2007, Stewart 2007). This framework emphasizes a holistic understanding of the history and archaeology of all maritime resources, from shipwrecks to wharf remains to warehouse ruins. However, despite Westerdahl’s (1994) call to expand the MCL concept and consider deeper social questions, many MCL studies have generally eschewed a broader
theoretical base, instead preparing an annotated list of an area’s maritime activities as
determined from historical and archaeological research (Esser 1999, McErlean et al.
lack of explicit theory in MCL studies is unfortunate because the use of a landscape
framework allows for more than just an inventory of local resources. Fortunately, some
notable exceptions do exist and maritime archaeologists are increasingly aware of the
potentialities of explicit theory within the framework of the MCL (Parker 1999; Duncan

As described above, a landscape approach provides a base from which to consider
significant questions about gender, ideology, ethnicity, power, resistance, and agency
and Norman 2007, Casella 2008, Kearney 2008). Such foci are just as or more important
in MCLs where land-based elites exercised power over both landed maritime workers and
transient sailors, where ethnic groups clustered upon arrival in waterfront cities, where
the role of women in the maritime world is all too poorly understood, and where the
lowliest maritime laborer devised ways to lighten his load and resist the sharp demands of
his employers.

Social Theory: Bourdieu and Giddens

Although the concepts of cultural landscape and MCL serve as exceptional
frameworks for the study of large areas and regions, the frameworks themselves feature
no explicit link to specific archaeological theory. Some archaeologists have called for a singular definition, overarching theory, or established methodology to connect all landscape research, but others, including this one, celebrate the diversity of studies connected within the landscape paradigm (Rossignol 1992, Ingold 1993, Feinman 1999, Fisher and Thurston 1999, Layton and Ucko 1999, Anschuetz et al. 2001, Thomas 2001, Bender 2002, Wilkinson 2003, Ashmore 2004, Hicks and McAtackney 2007, David and Thomas 2008). However, due to this diversity, archaeologists studying landscape must be careful to explicitly define the theory or theories they use to ask questions of and guide research into the archaeological sites and artifacts under study.

To that end, this MCL study of the Pensacola waterfront focuses on the practice and agency of individuals whose interaction with and upon the bayshore colored their lives, including the elites who exercised power over maritime workers and the laborers themselves who strove to improve their lives through all means at their disposal. The work of social theorists Pierre Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens provide a means of understanding the working of human agency through the concepts of habitus, practice, and structuration (Bourdieu 1977, Giddens 1984).

Within any given culture or sub-culture, Bourdieu argues that individuals learn what actions are appropriate and permissible in given situations by evaluating the reactions of others to their actions and those of people around them. Individuals also learn how to push limits and skirt the edges of acceptability. This, in effect, is an individual’s habitus, from which practices are produced (Bourdieu 1977, Barrett 2001). Practice, or practical consciousness, is the understanding of how to dwell effectively in the world, based on habitus, which individuals understand tacitly and do not need to
discuss or explore (Giddens 1984:xxiii). Giddens’s theory of structuration is concerned with “social practices ordered across space and time” and the way in which these practices both create and are created by practice itself (Giddens 1984:2). As archaeologist John Barrett describes, “the practitioner [does] not stand opposed to the world experienced but [works] within it” (Barrett 2001:154).

Thus, the concepts of habitus, practice, and structuration all tie into the reality of human agency, which refers to the “capability [people have] of doing … things,” and relates to the power held by any individual (Giddens 1984:9). Put another way, “Agency is the means by which things are achieved” (Barrett 2001:141). Humans do not live in a world where the environment, their culture, or any other factor determines their actions, but such aspects of their lives structure the actions people take and the choices that stretch before them. Although agency is power, power is not agency. All humans have agency, the ability to act and thus change one’s circumstances, and thus all humans have power. But that is not to say that those who have more power, have more agency. Rather, those in power are situated in such a way as to more effectively wield the agency they possess. For example, a lowly stevedore has agency despite that he is answerable to the waterfront manager who employs him. The stevedore is often able to wield that agency in ways that serve to ameliorate his condition of employment and financial compensation, such as through strikes or union association, but the waterfront manager is positioned in such a way as to use his agency to often employ only the maritime workers he chooses to hire and reap many of the rewards from their labor.

Resistance, a particular form of human agency that serves as a central focus of this research, is tied into habitus and practice just as is agency in general (Hodder
As described above, *habitus* consists of an understanding of situation-appropriate actions and the limits of acceptability and practice is the ability to effectively and recursively follow the guidelines of *habitus*. Resistance, therefore, functions as opposition, whether overt or subversive, to *habitus*. Practice provides individuals with the tacit knowledge of what forms of resistance have the potential to be effective within their cultural milieu. Individuals may then use their agency to adopt those forms of resistance that would be most helpful in their situation. In the example above, both the stevedore and the waterfront manager possess agency or the ability to affect the course of their lives. While both may resist the domination of others, the waterfront manager is more likely to belong to the dominant group against which an individual or non-dominant group would resist. Thus, the stevedore could use his agency to walk out on conditions he considered to be intolerable in order to bargain for a better situation. If the waterfront manager or society allowed such actions by maritime workers, then the stevedore would simply be using his agency to gain a better life for himself. If, however, maritime workers were punished or jailed for leaving an unsatisfactory job, such as would have been more common in the colonial period, the stevedore could use his agency to resist the dominant group by illegally deserting his post in order to find another job elsewhere or use his absence to bargain for better conditions. In both situations, the stevedore uses his agency, just in different ways, one of which is commonly referred to as resistance.

Within archaeology, agency, including resistance, can be explored through their relationship to material culture and landscape. Just as humans create material goods and landscapes according to the conventions of *habitus* and practice, so do those created goods and landscapes structure the future creation of other material goods, landscapes,
and society (Giddens 1984:25, Barrett 2001:152). Barrett states, “Knowledge is made in the embodied practices, the performances, by which agents find a place for themselves in the world. By moving into the world, agents make both themselves and the social conditions of their time through those practices [emphasis added]” (Barrett 2001:157). Therefore, the world of material remains and cultural landscapes, including MCLs, offers insight into social practice and human agency. Since landscapes can and should be explored in a variety of ways, the following section describes the archaeological and historical methods used in this study of Pensacola’s MCL.

Research Design

In order to ask questions about the agency, power, and authority that played out upon the Pensacola waterfront, it is necessary to understand the MCL of Pensacola by examining the four categories that make up an MCL, including the natural topography, built environment, navigation, and cognitive aspects. To that end, this study undertook a dedicated review of archaeological fieldwork and historical resources to identify the four categories (and the many site types which fall into these categories) as represented on the Pensacola waterfront, which had heretofore not been examined for their connections under the overarching paradigm of the MCL. This review permitted a determination of the types of maritime sites that had been previously examined archaeologically, those which had not been so examined, and provided a starting point from which to determine whether investigation of certain types of sites would provide a deeper understanding of Pensacola’s MCL and an opportunity to ask question of social importance about maritime workers, such as those of agency and habitus.
Archaeological fieldwork previously conducted on or near the shore was examined for information about the various maritime site types, defined as those sites associated with sailors and maritime workers, on the Pensacola waterfront. Books, articles, and unpublished contract or permit reports, many available at and/or a result of fieldwork conducted by the University of West Florida (UWF) Archaeology Institute, were scrutinized for information important within an MCL framework. The site types were then classified into primary and secondary site types (Table 1). For the purposes of this study, primary site types are those associated directly with maritime workers, such as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abandoned vessels</td>
<td>bathhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballast / rock piles</td>
<td>billiard parlors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish houses</td>
<td>brothels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>dance halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>maritime laborers’ residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mills, saw and grist</td>
<td>sailors’ boarding houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naval stores companies</td>
<td>saloons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navigational aids</td>
<td>seamen’s churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piers</td>
<td>taverns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pilot houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seawalls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shipwrecks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shipyards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warehouses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wharves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the structures they built or the places they worked, and secondary site types are those associated indirectly with maritime workers, including the places where maritime workers lived, worshipped, and derived entertainment.
This division between primary and secondary maritime site types is an etic distinction, or one that is objective and related to the archaeological character of those sites, rather than an emic distinction that represents categories that would have been important to maritime workers and sailors. Because of the more direct connection with maritime workers, the artifacts and features found at primary sites are more likely to represent the actions of maritime workers. The artifacts and features at secondary sites may contain a plethora of artifacts that relate to maritime workers, but also to their families, fellow citizens, and the general population.

Once the primary and secondary maritime site types that had been archaeologically identified in Pensacola were examined, attention turned to historic documents in order to locate information on the history and character of maritime sites on the downtown Pensacola waterfront, especially those not identified in the archaeological record, as well as the four aspects of Pensacola’s MCL, within which the maritime sites existed. From a postprocessual stance, landscapes are “spatially and historically specific” so historical archaeologists must make every effort to understand a region’s history when studying landscapes (Bender and Winer 2001:4). As noted anthropologist, Clifford Geertz (1996:262), stated, “[N]o one lives in the world in general.” Each person experiences the world through within their specific historical and cultural habitus. Thus, a knowledge of the history of Pensacola, as can be deduced from historical documents such as official correspondence, ships’ logs, maps, newspapers, and other archival documents, is essential for appreciating the MCL of the downtown waterfront.

To that end, numerous archival collections and repositories were consulted during the course of this research. Local microfilm collections of Spanish documents at UWF’s
The John C. Pace Library Special Collections as well as translated documents and maps from various Spanish archives on file at the UWF Archaeology Institute provided insight into the First Spanish (1740-1763) occupation of the mainland in the area that would become downtown Pensacola. The John C. Pace Library Special Collections’ Colonial Office Five microfilm collection (originals housed at the National Archives of the UK) illuminates the history of the British period (1763-1781) of the city. Since the Colonial Office Five collection contains only occasional references to maritime concerns, the author visited the National Archives of the UK in order to search for maritime-related documents including customs records, naval ships’ logs, official letters from ship captains and customs officials, and nautical charts. While no customs records were located or appear to have survived to the present day, many ships’ logs, letters, and charts pertinent to this research were consulted. Archival documents that provided insight into the Second Spanish period of Pensacola (1781-1821) include the John C. Pace Library Special Collections’ Papers of Panton, Leslie and Company, which contains documents relating to the Panton, Leslie and Company trading firm from a variety of American and Spanish archives, and the University of Florida George A. Smathers Libraries Special and Area Studies Collections’ Papeles de Cuba, which consists of microfilm copies of documents relating to Florida from the Cuban Papers collection now housed at the Archivo General de Indios in Seville, Spain.

Documents relating to the American occupation of the city between 1821 and 1940, the study’s terminus, are housed in a variety of repositories. The several volumes of *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, available at the John C. Pace Library, bring together documents relating to the earliest years of the territory of Florida. The
John C. Pace Library Special Collections Department contains documents on a plethora of industries that operated in and around the city, historical studies of the port of Pensacola by several governmental and private entities, and numerous papers from or relating to Pensacola’s prominent families and local officials. Both the John C. Pace Library and Special Collections hold microfilm copies of Pensacola’s historic newspapers, including the issues that provide coverage of the frequent hurricanes and gale force storms that regularly hit Pensacola and affected the waterfront. The Pensacola Historical Society, now managed by West Florida Historic Preservation, Inc., also holds an excellent collection of maps and photographs of Pensacola harbor and information about Pensacola’s citizens. Two county repositories, the Escambia County Clerk of Circuit Court Official Records (CCCOR), housed in the former customs house on the corner of Palafox and Government Streets in Pensacola, and the Escambia County Clerk of Circuit Archives Division (CCCAD), on Blount Street in Pensacola, both contain important data that figures prominently in this study. CCCOR holds historical deeds, plat maps, and tax records relating to property in Escambia County while CCCAD houses probate records and historical court cases. The Digital Library Center of the University of Florida George A. Smathers Libraries offers a variety of digitized maps of Pensacola, including fire insurance maps from the Sanborn Map Company. The Library of Congress holds many historic photographs of the city and harbor online.

Numerous historians have written about the development of Pensacola and West Florida and have utilized sources from many of these repositories. This study differs in its focus on documents that illustrate maritime concerns, structures, regulations, laws, and customs. While many written histories discuss the waterfront and nautical topics, none
have focused solely on maritime concerns. This study concentrates on those very concerns in order to highlight an aspect of Pensacola’s history that was especially important in the city’s foundation and development.

Once the MCL of the Pensacola waterfront was elucidated through a study of the area’s archaeology and history and various examples of human agency, especially in the form of resistance, were identified in the historical record, two primary sites on the waterfront were chosen for further investigation. The archaeological and historical examination of these sites was intended to serve as a case study for the hypothesis outlined in this thesis—that maritime cultural resources identified in an MCL study have the potential to provide information both about the agency of maritime workers and about the nature of poorly understood types of maritime infrastructure. The two ballast rock piles investigated during the course of this research were chosen since little was known about these rock piles, their role in the formation of Pensacola’s waterfront, the general nature of rock piles and ballast dumps on Pensacola’s foreshore, and the maritime workers associated with the creation of the rock piles. In fact, the rock piles proved to be far more complex and unique than had been previously imagined. Chapter Seven explores in more detail the investigations of the ballast piles and the methods used in their examination, but the fieldwork principally consisted of a visual survey and a collection of diagnostic artifacts. While much more could be learned from an in-depth excavation of these rock piles, financial and temporal constraints limited this research. However, even the concise investigations conducted in the summer and fall of 2008 provided much significant information.
As described above, an MCL study of Pensacola serves to elucidate the agency and resistance displayed on Pensacola’s colonial and American waterfronts. The particular historical context of Pensacola is extremely important to such a study. Thus, the following three chapters trace the historical development of the downtown shoreline, including recorded incidents of resistance and accommodation, from Spanish establishment on the mainland circa 1740 to about 1940, when Pensacola’s port had generally attained its modern character.
CHAPTE III

COLONIAL PENSACOLA, 1740-1821: FROM SPANISH TO BRITISH AND BACK AGAIN

Often I think of the beautiful town / That is seated by the sea; / Often in thought go up and down / The pleasant streets of that dear old town, / And my youth comes back to me … .

I remember the black wharves and the slips, / And the sea-tides tossing free; / And the Spanish sailors with bearded lips, / And the beauty and mystery of the ships, / And the magic of the sea.


As is the case with most coastal settlements, water transportation of people and cargo played a major role in shaping the history of the city of Pensacola during the colonial period. Maritime activities on Pensacola’s waterfront have left a rich historical and archaeological record that can best be examined using the concept of the maritime cultural landscape (MCL). The MCL framework is a valuable device for recognizing and assessing the various elements that contribute to the cultural landscape of any maritime, lacustrine, or riverine environment. Since landscapes are historically contingent, the following discussion examines the history of Pensacola with particular emphasis on Christer Westerdahl’s (1992) MCL aspects, including natural topography, the built environment, navigation, and cognitive aspects.

Historic maps well illustrate many of the physical characteristics described above, so the following history relies heavily on these sources. Other elements, such as the cognitive aspects, are also suggested by map form and content, but are most apparent in
historic accounts, laws, regulations, codes, letters, and newspaper articles. These latter sources are utilized to elaborate on a simple understanding of the physical reality of the waterfront by elucidating the rules and traditions that governed the use and control of waterfront structures and transportation.

Given that no inclusive history of the Pensacola waterfront has ever been written, the history presented in this and the following two chapters is more descriptive than analytical. Nevertheless, such a history is indispensable as it provides a starting point for future study of the waterfront including certain areas along the shore and the specific businesses and industries that grew up along the water. For example, the case study included in this thesis contains a more detailed history of two particular areas of the waterfront; a history that begins from and builds upon the information presented below.

Early Exploration

Europeans first encountered Pensacola Bay and its surrounding landforms in the 16th century. As early as 1528, Spaniard Alvar Núñez Cabeça de Vaca, a member of the ill-fated expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez, recorded a probable visit to Pensacola Bay, “[A]t sunset doubling a point made by the land, we found shelter with much calm” (Hodge 1965:38, Coker 1999:5). For the next few decades, Pensacola received only occasional mention from explorers or scouting parties (McGovern 1974:8-10, Coker 1999:5-6). But in 1559, Spanish nobleman Tristán de Luna y Arellano led a colonization effort to Pensacola Bay in order to plant a settlement that would serve to strengthen Spanish claims in North America and protect Spanish treasure fleets from the predations of French and English corsairs (Smith et al. 1998, Coker 1999:6). However, a hurricane
struck the nascent colony and its fleet of vessels only weeks after reaching Pensacola Bay, setting the tone for the maritime history of Pensacola; damaging hurricanes occurred many times over the following centuries. Despite Luna’s early effusions—“The port is so secure that no wind can do [ships] any damage at all”—seven of the ten ships in the bay were lost and, after two years of efforts to regroup, the colonizers finally abandoned the attempt in 1561 (Priestley 1928[2]:275, Coker 1999:6, Cook et al. 2009, Worth 2009:83). Although archaeologists have never located the settlement site, they have discovered two of the seven ships under the waters of Pensacola Bay. The Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research partially excavated one vessel in the 1990s and the University of West Florida (UWF) is currently testing the other (Spirek et al. 1993, Smith et al. 1998, Cook 2009:93-98).

First Spanish Period (1698-1763)

Despite Pensacola’s excellent harbor, the Spanish made no other attempt to settle Pensacola for over a hundred years due to Spain’s financial struggles. In 1698, French and English designs on the area prompted the Spanish to place a settlement and presidio, or fortified military settlement, named Santa María de Galvé on the current site of the Naval Air Station to the west of downtown Pensacola (Coker 1999:8-9). When war broke out between France and Spain, Frenchmen from Mobile captured and burned Santa María in 1719, but returned Pensacola to Spain in 1722 after the two nations signed a treaty. Instead of rebuilding the fort and settlement where it formerly stood, the Spanish placed the settlement on Santa Rosa Island in order to guard the entrance to the bay. Although an ideal defensive position, a series of hurricanes devastated the island between
1722 and 1752 (Coker 1999:15-18, Harris and Eschbach 2006:19-48). These recurrent storms and the damage they caused eventually resulted in a permanent move to the area of present-day downtown Pensacola.

After extensive damage occurred during a 1740 hurricane, acting Governor Captain Nicolas Ximénez de Florencia began to examine other areas of Pensacola Bay with an eye toward building a warehouse for supplies in a more sheltered location. Workers built this warehouse in 1741 somewhere in the area of downtown Pensacola. In addition, the mainland hosted a brick kiln by 1741 as well. The new Governor, Colonel Don Gervasio Cruzat y Gongora, ordered that bricks be made there for a new blockhouse or small fort that he wanted built on Santa Rosa (Autos 1756:16, Childers 2000). Besides the warehouse and kiln, the Spanish built a mainland fort named San Miguel between 1741 and 1743, but it was destroyed by 1753, possibly by the same hurricanes that frequently damaged Santa Rosa Island (Autos 1756:24, Benchley 2007a:9). In 1752, the final straw for the settlement on Santa Rosa Island finally came in the form of a hurricane that flooded the settlement and destroyed all but two of its buildings. Fortunately, many of the foodstuffs survived untouched since they were stored in the mainland warehouse (Autos 1756:15).

After the 1752 hurricane, Santa Rosa officials realized the settlement on the island was no longer tenable. They moved many of the civilians and soldiers to the mainland, began construction of new buildings, and requested official permission from the Spanish crown to abandon the settlement on Santa Rosa. In so doing, they stressed the ideal location of the mainland site and the nearby availability of timbers for shipbuilding and staves, clay for bricks, and trees for the production of naval stores (Autos 1756). Many
of these resources later fueled the major industrial activities in and around Pensacola.

Two freshwater streams bounded the proposed site to the east and west, providing adequate water for the settlement. One official even emphasized the ideal deep anchorage in front of San Miguel, the perfect location to build “an excellent wharf for the unloading of … ships” (Autos 1756:56). Another stated,

It is the anchorage for the ships and is where all of them anchor because the bottom is loose mud. It is also covered from the northeast, east and southeast winds which are the most dangerous on that coast and it is helped by the Point named Benao which extends to the north a quarter to the northeast of it and by the one named Punta Aguero which is north-south (Autos 1756:69).

In 1756, the Spanish crown officially endorsed the 1753 move to the mainland and the Pensacola waterfront began to see more extensive development (Coker 1999). Thus, even the earliest days of the settlement’s waterfront were tied to its suitability as a maritime center with safe shelter, good anchorage, a warehouse, and nearby natural resources.

Only two maps uncovered so far depict Pensacola Bay and the area surrounding San Miguel during this period. The 1756 map provides no details on wharves, warehouses, or other maritime structures, but it does show a brick kiln on Escambia Bay, north of Pensacola, as well as the locations of natural resources like oysters, clay, and stone (Lopez 1756). The 1761 map, drawn by Joseph Porlier, captain of a vessel carrying additional soldiers to San Miguel, does not depict any wharves in front of the fort, but
does indicate the presence of a brick kiln to the east of the settlement (Figures 2 and 3) (Porlier 1761). Although the Porlier map illustrates no buildings outside the fort, documents indicate that the threat of hostile Indians caused officials to demolish all such buildings and move the populace into the fort in 1760. In addition, a hurricane blew through in August of the same year, causing serious damage to the presidio and probably affecting whatever surrounding structures remained (Porlier 1761, Coker 1999:20, Benchley 2007a:9).

Resistance to authority, in the guise of illegal trade practiced during this period, may be visible on the landscape in the form of two toponyms, or place names, to the east of the fort. While the crown monopoly on naval stores and timber circumscribed legal trade, merchants routinely engaged in commerce with any willing parties, such as the French and English (Autos 1756, Coker 1999, Benchley 2005). Documents record that Governor Miguel Roman de Castilla y Lugo was a major smuggler with ties to British trader, William Walton (Benchley 2005). The landforms in question, *Punta del Yngles* (English Point) and *Estero del Yngles* (English Estuary), are convenient locations for maritime trade located far enough east of the town center to allow for clandestine activities shielded from view (Figure 3) (Porlier 1761, Benchley 2007a:12).

Although the Spanish occupied the mainland from 1741 to 1763, only two other maps from the early Spanish period have been located. Both maps depict Presidio San Miguel just before transfer to the English in 1763, including one wharf—165 ft. long and about 17 ft. wide—and a dilapidated warehouse (Figure 4) (Ortíz Parilla and Ferringan Cortéz 1763a, 1763b). As of yet, no additional maps have been located that illuminate the maritime activities of this First Spanish mainland occupancy.
Map (m.2v.28) MXL 428, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Spain. On file at John C. Pace Library, Special Collections, The University of West Florida, Pensacola.

Figure 2. 1761 map of the port of Pensacola by Joseph Porlier.
Figure 3. Detail from 1761 map of the port of Pensacola by Joseph Porlier.
Map (m.2v.426) MXLII 426, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Spain. On file at John C. Pace Library, Special Collections, The University of West Florida, Pensacola.

Figure 4. 1763 plan of Presidio San Miguel by Diego Ortíz Parilla and Phelipe Ferringan Cortez.
British Period (1763-1781)

After the end of the Seven Years’ War, Spain traded Florida for Havana and Manila, which the British had captured. British military officers and soldiers took possession of Pensacola in August of 1763 and civil authorities arrived in 1764 (Coker 1999:23-26). Although relatively few maps of Pensacola exist for the first Spanish period, cartographers richly illustrated the British occupation. A 1763 British map of Pensacola shows a wharf “for small boats” extending out into the bay in front of the fort in the same location as the wharves in the 1763 Spanish maps. Although the 1763 British map shows no warehouse, the building labeled as such on the Spanish maps is unmarked on the British map (Figure 5) (National Archives of the UK 1763). A 1764 map by engineer Archibald Robertson is very similar to the 1763 map, but in addition to the wharf “for small boats,” two buildings carry the label “provision storehouses.” One is the Spanish warehouse and the other the former Spanish chapel (Figure 6) (Robertson 1764). Another 1764 map by surveyor George Gauld depicts a large portion of Pensacola Bay and surrounding landforms. The drawing is not to scale, but does denote a wharf directly in front of the fort, as well as a brick kiln in the same location as that indicated on the 1761 Spanish map. However, the map shows few buildings outside of the fort and no other wharves (Figure 7) (Gauld and Lindsay 1764).

A 1765 map by Elias Durnford also shows a large portion of Pensacola’s shoreline (Figure 8). The map indicates one wharf in the same location as on the 1763 and 1764 maps, but a note clarifies that the wharf was “partly washed out” by 1765. In addition, two boat shapes are present on the shore in waterfront lots 10 and 11. Whether these represent smaller boats that pulled ashore intentionally, ships that wrecked when
Figure 5. 1763 plan of the Fort at Pensacola.
Figure 6. 1764 plan of the Fort at Pensacola by Archibald Robertson.
Figure 7. 1764 map of Pensacola by George Gauld.
Figure 8. 1765 map of Pensacola by Elias Durnford.
they ran aground, or merely artistic fancy is unclear (Durnford 1765a). One of the best maritime depictions of colonial Pensacola is a 1765 etching by Gauld that shows the dilapidated wharf in front of the fort as well as a myriad of boats and ships in the bay in front of the town. The vessels range from British naval ships to small canoes and flatboats. This depiction, even more so than contemporary maps, shows how the town of Pensacola was intimately tied to nautical endeavors and transportation (Figure 9) (Gauld 1765).

As a maritime town, Pensacola required vessels of varying sizes to carry goods and people around the bay and across the ocean. It seems likely that such need, coupled with the area’s abundant timber resources, would have created a demand for shipwrights and a local shipbuilding tradition, but evidence for such is nebulous. Historian Cecil Johnson identified several references to boatbuilding during the British period, but none record the building of vessels in Pensacola itself. Instead, the vessels mentioned were constructed elsewhere in the province of West Florida (Johnson 1971:186-187). However, a register of burials in Pensacola records the death, on 29 July 1768, of a Thomas Waterfield and lists his occupation as shipwright (Durnford 1770). Whether Waterfield built large ships or small boats in Pensacola is not clear. In fact, he may have simply repaired, rather than built, vessels, an activity frequently recorded in period documents (Ware and Rea 1982:114, 135, 182-183). However, the contemporary title of ship carpenter would seem more appropriate for such activity; the title of shipwright suggests that laborers built at least some vessels in the province’s capital rather than on its periphery.
Figure 9. 1765 *View of Pensacola* by George Gauld.
A storm-plagued Pensacola, with its warm teredo worm-infested waters, certainly needed a steady supply of new vessels. In addition, ships probably wrecked regularly or became damaged by hurricanes. Indeed, the first hurricane to hit Pensacola during the British period occurred on 22 October 1766 and wrecked several vessels in the bay (Muir 1983:3). The storm also appears to have completely destroyed the decrepit central wharf. A two-part 1767 map by Engineer Elias Durnford shows both the current state of the fort and planned improvements. While the first part of the map indicates the lack of a wharf on the waterfront and the presence of two storehouses in different locations than the 1764 Robertson map, the second part of the map shows a proposed reorganized fort interior and a planned wharf extending from the exact center of the fort. In addition, the first part of the map depicts a “boat house” on the beach on the western side of the fort on the first map, the only such structure indicated on any colonial maps found to date. Both parts of the 1767 Durnford map also show a bathhouse out in the bay completely unconnected to the shore by any kind of wharf or pier (Figure 10). Although bathers could have accessed the bathhouse by boat, it seems more likely that a wharf, possibly destroyed in the 1766 hurricane, once connected this bathhouse to the shore. That the bathhouse survived destruction by the 1766 hurricane is quite surprising (Durnford 1767). Another 1767 map depicting the town lots around the fort shows a wharf in the same location as the 1763 and 1764 maps and not in the proposed location on the 1767 Durnford map. However, the map also depicts an outdated fort outline rather than the new star fort shown on the 1767 Durnford map (Figure 11) (Library of Congress 1767). Because of these two inaccuracies, it seems likely that this second 1767 map is either dated incorrectly or focused on the town lots to the detriment of an accurate depiction of the fort and wharf.
Figure 10. 1767 plan of the town of Pensacola.
Figure 11. 1767 plan of the stockade fort at Pensacola by Elias Durnford.
The potential for such cartographic errors must always be considered when using maps as a source for information on an area’s landscape; archaeological fieldwork can often serve as a check of historic maps.

A 1769 French map of Pensacola and the surrounding area shows no wharf in front of the town, which suggests that Durnford’s proposed wharf may not yet have been built. However, the map does depict a signal mast on Gulf Breeze peninsula and a pilothouse on Santa Rosa Island (Figure 12) (Noyan 1769). As discussed above, although this thesis focuses on the maritime cultural resources of the mainland, other structures farther afield, such as the signal mast and pilothouse, contributed to the maritime landscape of Pensacola’s waterfront as well as the larger MCL of the Pensacola Bay system. The next extant depiction, a 1772 map of the fort of Pensacola, shows some proposed buildings, such as blockhouses on the fort’s perimeter and storehouses in the west corner, as well as a wharf on the west side of the fort that passes next to a small building in the bay (Figure 13). This building, because of its location, appears to be the same bathhouse shown on Durnford’s 1767 map. Since the map does not label the wharf, bathhouse, and central barracks, it appears these structures actually existed rather than being planned edifices not yet in existence (Gage 1772). If this is the case, laborers had not built Durnford’s proposed central wharf, but instead repaired the ruins of the posited pre-hurricane wharf that ran next to the bathhouse.

Regrettably, no maps of Pensacola from 1773 to 1777 have been located so it is hard to assess how the waterfront grew and changed in the late 1770s. Four water-powered sawmills operated around Pensacola by 1766 and the British crown actively encouraged export of lumber to the West Indies so the waterfront likely saw commercial
Figure 12. 1769 map of Pensacola by Chevalier de Noyan.
Figure 13. 1772 map of the Fort of Pensacola by Thomas Gage.
activity during this time (Davies 1972[10]:25, 134; Moore 2002:11). Robin Fabel, in his work on the economy of British West Florida, suggests that maritime activity in Pensacola was generally minor prior to the Revolutionary War. But when the war negatively affected commerce in lumber and foodstuffs from the northern colonies to the West Indies in the 1770s, Pensacola stepped in to fill the gap and the port prospered (Fabel 1988:62-64). Accounts by both Loyalist colonists and American privateers, which mention ships bound from Pensacola for the West Indies filled with lumber and supplies, exemplify this war-related trade. While American vessels took some as prizes, others transported their loads of badly needed cargo to Jamaica and other British islands (Morgan 1970[5]:72-73, 108; 1976[7]:1024-1025; 1980[8]:997-998; 1986[9]:149-150; Marx 1985:100).

Despite a 1772 hurricane that raged through Pensacola from August 30 to September 3, destroying all the wharves but one and wrecking numerous boats, Pensacola prospered between 1770 and 1778 (Haldimand 1772, Romans 1962:4, Muir 1983:3). A 1778 map of Pensacola by Joseph Purcell (1778) shows a markedly more complex waterfront than that revealed in maps from 1765 to 1772 (Figure 14). The chart, which portrays a large swath of the waterfront, depicts no less than six wharves along the shore. Most of the wharves extend from lots containing large buildings that may have served as warehouses for the merchants who owned them. In addition, the brick kiln still exists to the east of the fort in approximately the same location as that shown on the 1761 Porlier map and 1764 Gauld map (Porlier 1761, Gauld 1764, Purcell 1778). The exact date of the production of Purcell’s map is unknown, but it seems likely Purcell drew it before 9 October 1778, the date of another severe hurricane in Pensacola that reportedly destroyed
Figure 14. 1778 plan of Pensacola by Joseph Purcell.
every merchant storehouse and wharf as well as many houses and parts of the fort’s batteries (Assembly of West Florida 1778, Stiell 1778, Muir 1983:4). According to another 1778 map, a centrally located wharf with attached bathing house, a new storehouse, two stockade walls extending out into the water, and even a necessary, or latrine, wharf near the western wall of the fort existed before the hurricane. However, Durnford’s map also indicates that the storm damaged or destroyed these waterfront structures, excluding the warehouse, as well as parts of the fort’s batteries (Figure 15) (Durnford 1778). In addition, the storm drove the majority of the ships in the harbor ashore with some sustaining major damage. The *Comet* mail packet boat wrecked beyond repair (Davies 1972[15]:213, 279; 1972[17]:55-57).

Nevertheless, the 1778 hurricane, a continuous struggle with a limited export market due to competition with the more established northern colonies, and crown-mandated exclusion from trade with the Spanish in nearby New Orleans do appear to have taken their toll (Moore 2002:12). In February 1779, the central wharf and necessary, or latrine, destroyed or damaged in 1778 were yet missing and a wharf for the landing of stores and provisions for the garrison was still wanting (Campbell 1779). By 1780, it appears workers had constructed these two planned garrison wharves, but had not reconstructed three of the other waterfront wharves. Maps from 1780 and 1781 by a German Waldeck officer and engineer, Henry Heldring, only depict four wharves on the waterfront (Figure 16) (Heldring 1780, 1781). Of these, Heldring’s maps shows two wharves in front of the fort and only two opposite private lots that probably belonged to merchants of the town, a reduction from the four merchant wharves shown on the 1778 Purcell map (Purcell 1778). Three 1781 Spanish maps show the same number of
Figure 15. 1778 plan of the Fort at Pensacola by Elias Durnford.
Figure 16. 1780 map of Pensacola by Henry Heldring.
wharves in the same locations (Figure 17) (Anonymous 1781, Brigadier 1781, Servicio Histórico Militar 1781).

As wharves figure prominently in the maps described above, it is useful to better understand the footprint these wharves left on the landscape and how these footprints may have influenced later building on the Pensacola waterfront. There are many documented styles of wharves; the term here refers to both piers that project into a body of water and quays that generally follow the shoreline, including solid-fill wharves, piling wharves, and block-and-bridge wharves. Since the block-and-bridge wharf, which consisted of timber cribs spaced far apart with bridges connecting them, is mainly suitable to shallow water locations with a hard bottom, it was probably not used at all or used infrequently in Pensacola’s mucky, soft bottom bays and bayous (Greene 1917:3-4, 112-158). The other two types—solid-fill and piling—are known to have been used in Pensacola at various times during the city’s history. These disparate wharf types would have left very different archaeological footprints due to their varied construction methods and structures.

Solid-fill wharves may be built in several styles including solid-fill crib, crib, cobb, and grillage/raft. The first three types were similar in that they all use timber box-like enclosures (cribs or cobbs) filled with various materials. The differences lay in the construction method of the cribs or cobbs and the types of fill intended for those cribs. Solid-fill cribs consist of cribs with very closely spaced timbers that can contain fine fill, such as mud and sand. Regular cribs have timbers that are spaced further apart and can contain coarser fill while cobb wharves consist of cobbs that are basically cribs with very widely spaced timbers. Cobbs contain the coarsest fills, such as ballast and brush. In
Figure 17. 1781 plan of the town of Pensacola.
some places, there may have been little distinction between regular crib and cobb
wharves (Reed et al. 1995:159-175, Balicki 1998:114-115). The last type of solid-fill
wharf, the grillage/raft wharf, is built by sinking wooden rafts one on top of the other and
weighing the rafts down with stones until a suitable surface projects above the water. As
these types of wharves are uncommon, it is less likely, but not impossible, that they were
used in Pensacola (Balicki 1998:114-115). Finally, piling wharves consist of piles driven
into the sediment with logs or planks connecting the pilings above water to form a
surface. These wharves are also called table wharves and are sometimes called “bridges”
in colonial documents (Reed et al. 1995:159-175).

While crib wharves are well documented in Pensacola in the American period,
there is little indication as to what kinds of wharf construction colonial Pensacolians
utilized (Clerk of Circuit Court Archives Division [CCCAD] 1878; Norris, Wellge & Co.
1885; Koch 1896; Joy and Lloyd 1988:84). According to studies in Jamaica and along
the Atlantic coast of North America from New York to South Carolina, colonial wharves
were generally solid-fill wharves rather than piling wharves, but the lack of studies on
archaeological wharf remains along the Gulf Coast makes it difficult to say if this held
true for colonial settlements on the Gulf of Mexico (Huey 1984, Polk 1988, Cotter et al.
colonial wharf excavated in Mobile, Alabama, appears to represent a type of piling wharf,
but researchers uncovered only the portion of the wharf closest to the colonial shoreline.
That portion consisted of pilings driven into the marsh on either side of planks laid
directly on marshy ground. The pilings did not appear to be connected to the planks, but
rather just hemmed in the planks so they stayed in place. Since archaeologists could not
locate the seaward end of the wharf, as construction of a waterfront drive had likely
destroyed it, researchers could not determine the exact nature of the wharf. However, it
seems likely that the wharf was constructed of pilings considering the character of its
northern end (Nielsen 1971a:3-9, 1971b:2-3, 1972:4). The excavations in Mobile suggest
that, since solid-fill wharves leave a larger and more durable footprint than piling
wharves by their very nature, piling wharves may simply be underrepresented in the
archaeological record of colonial North and Central America.

Although archaeologists have not excavated any colonial wharves in Pensacola,
there are some archival indications of the types of wharves built in the city at the time.
The captain’s log of His Majesty’s Armed Schooner *Sir Edward Hawke* records the
building of a piling wharf by the vessel’s crew from December 1768 to January 1769
while the ship was in Pensacola. According to the ship’s log, the crew first cut down and
fashioned trees into pilings. They then burnt the pilings to prepare them for use and
possibly to slow damage by marine boring organisms such as teredo worms. Next, the
crew used a spar to drive the piles, cut and squared more trees, and laid these planks
across the pilings to form the wharf (Warburton 1769). The log of His Majesty’s Armed
Sloop *West Florida* also records wharf building in March 1777 in preparation for
careenage, but not in as much detail as the *Hawke’s* log (Burdon 1779). Although both
*Hawke* and *West Florida* were in Pensacola Harbor, the ships’ logs do not specify their
exact anchorage within the harbor at the time the crew built the wharves or the location of
the wharves themselves. Nevertheless, since the crew built each wharf to facilitate
careening of the vessel, they probably constructed the wharves on or near Old Navy
Cove, part of modern-day Gulf Breeze peninsula, which was a major careenage area
It is difficult to determine whether the crew built the careening wharves described above as piling wharves simply to expedite the process of refitting vessels or because piling construction was typically used during colonial times in the warm, teredo worm-infested waters of the Gulf of Mexico. Gauld’s 1765 etching of the Pensacola waterfront provides the only other evidence of the type of wharves used in British Pensacola. The one wharf depicted extending offshore, albeit broken down, appears to rest on pilings with water freely circulating underneath it (Figure 18) (Gauld 1765). Although none of these clues provide direct proof that piling wharves dominated the waterfront scene in colonial Pensacola, the evidence is persuasive. Future archaeological research into colonial wharves or areas where these wharves once stood may serve to shed light on this mystery and highlight a striking difference between wharf construction in Atlantic colonial settlements and those on the Gulf of Mexico. In addition, the kinds of wharves constructed in colonial Pensacola would have determined the nature of the visible remains of hurricane-damaged wharves and thus the choice of placement of new wharves and replacements after a hurricane. Solid-fill wharves would have left a more substantial footprint that could have facilitated the rebuilding of wharves in the same locations where they previously stood. Piling wharves, however, would have sustained more permanent damage and new wharves may have been built to avoid such damaged remains rather than incorporating them into replacement structures.

All of the maps and historical accounts described above provide important insights into the topography, built environment, and navigational structures of Pensacola.
Figure 18. Detail from 1765 *View of Pensacola* by George Gauld.
Bay during the British period, but the cognitive aspects of the MCL are harder to ascertain through cartographic means alone. Laws, codes, restrictions, personnel appointments, and incidents recorded in period documents offer the best means of investigating these non-physical elements of the landscape.

A number of officials comprised the hierarchy that confronted sailors upon entering the port of Pensacola; some of these officials oversaw the actions of stevedores and other dockworkers while they unloaded ships. In December of 1764, the Council of West Florida appointed Samuel Carr as the pilot of Pensacola. Carr kept the position until 1776, when the merchants of the town complained to the Council that Carr’s negligence and ineptness were negatively affecting trade and had led to the wrecking of a vessel on an island near the bar. The merchants recommended James Mant, a local resident as Carr’s replacement. The Council approved Mant, but he resigned a few days later. In his stead, the Council appointed James Griest, formerly an assistant pilot on the Mississippi River, who came highly recommended by the captain of His Majesty’s Ship Diligence for whom Griest worked upon numerous occasions (Council of West Florida 1764b, Morgan 1970[5]:672, 1276). James Bruce served as the Collector of Customs in Pensacola during most of the British period and the port also featured a Naval Officer and a Comptroller of Customs, posts filled by James Ferguson and J. Martin, respectively, in 1771. Exactly how long Ferguson and Martin held these posts and whether their posts existed during the entire British occupation is uncertain. Documents indicate that each official collected fees for their services and kept records of the goods coming into and going out of Pensacola (Chester 1771, Fabel 1988:146-148). Unfortunately, very few of those records have survived to the present day. Detailed and exhaustive investigation at
the National Archives of the UK by the author found no extant records created by Pensacola’s customs officials, although contemporary references to said documents indicate that these records did once exist.

Fortunately, many other records documenting maritime activities and regulation in British Pensacola have survived. Even from the earliest days of West Florida, the town government discussed and legislated maritime activities. Minutes of the Council of West Florida from late 1764 reveal that advertisements distributed in the province informed inhabitants that they were prohibited from dumping dirt or ballast into any of West Florida’s harbors or waterways. As early as the winter of 1764, the Council assembled a committee to determine rates of pilotage (Council of West Florida 1764a, 1764b).

The earliest minutes of the Assembly of West Florida, which first met at the end of 1766, included discussion of a number of maritime concerns including wharves, wharfage, ownership of small boats and canoes, customs fees, passes for local coasting vessels, pilot certification, pilotage, and navy yards (Padgett 1939a, 1939b). Many legislative acts resulted from these Assembly meetings. In January 1767, the Assembly and Council of West Florida passed “An Act Concerning Coasters,” which aimed to encourage coastal trade by reducing the customs fees imposed on local trading vessels through the introduction of a pass system (Council of West Florida 1767a). The Council further refined this act in early 1768, thereby making it easier for the government to track coasters and ascertain that they paid the duties required from the sale of their cargo (Council of West Florida 1768). The Council once again revised this act in 1770 in an attempt to further stimulate coasting trade and prevent those indebted in the province
from leaving without posting bonds, but officials in London deemed the changes unconstitutional in 1771 (Council of West Florida 1770, King-in-Council 1772). “An Act for encouraging the Inhabitants of Pensacola and Mobile to Build Wharfs and for establishing rates of Wharfage,” passed in 1767, specifically encouraged owners of waterfront lots to build wharves off their properties and storehouses nearby, recognizing such as a “great convenience and service to the Merchants … of the said Towns” (Council of West Florida 1767b:25). The wharf act granted these landowners the right to claim fees, based on a vessel’s cargo, from the vessels that landed at their wharves if their wharf featured a crane for the unloading and loading of vessels (Council of West Florida 1767b). This right to wharfage gave the colonial government and landholders control over who used the town’s wharves and where goods could be unloaded.

Additional acts passed in 1767 also dealt with maritime issues. One act established penalties for the unauthorized use or intentional setting adrift of flat boats, canoes, and other small boats, thereby alluding to the importance of these vernacular craft in West Florida commerce and transportation (Council of West Florida 1767c). Another act facilitated tracking of merchant vessels that entered the province and the departures of any local citizens or slaves with these merchant vessels. Masters of vessels entering the ports of Mobile and Pensacola had to post a bond of 500 pounds with the Provincial Secretary, which they could not recoup if they did not receive a pass from the Governor before departing the province. Masters also needed to obtain the Governor’s permission if they intended to carry away in their vessels any free citizen or slave residing in the province (Council of West Florida 1767d).
Although less later regulations deal directly with maritime issues, one act does suggest the ways in which town merchants treated sailors, the quintessential maritime worker, differently from their land-based counterparts. A 1771 act that regulated liquor licenses and taverns specified that tavern keepers who sold liquors to sailors and gave them more than five shillings credit could not sue to recover these unpaid debts. However, tavern keepers could provide up to 5 pounds, or 100 shillings, of credit to inhabitants of the province before losing their right to sue for recovery (Council of West Florida 1771). This difference may have existed because officials believed sailors more able and likely to flee their debts, but this belief in and of itself was a statement on the prevailing attitudes about sailors and their respectability. No such caveat existed for roving traders and others who could also abscond from their financial responsibilities.

Sailors, maritime workers, and others experienced in the ways of the sea also constantly ran the risk of impressment by the British navy. Although anyone could be impressed, press gangs frequently targeted the taverns, boardinghouses, and merchant ships where experienced maritime laborers could be found (Gilje 2004). Pensacola, a Loyalist colony during the American Revolution, also suffered from the seizures of maritime workers despite the edicts and protests of the town’s officials. In March 1777, Thomas Lloyd, Captain of His Majesty’s Ship *Atalanta*, requested of the town council that they allow him to impress sailors to complete his vessel’s company and that of the other naval vessels in Pensacola either from on shore or from merchant ships in the harbor. The Council of West Florida deliberated on the question and decided that an act decreed by Queen Anne, which limited impressment in the American colonies, prevented the Council from approving Captain Lloyd’s request. However, the Council revealed its
true motivation in their suggestion for Captain Lloyd as to where he could find the sailors he needed. While the Council did not want Lloyd to press already engaged sailors, they pointed to the province’s Vagrant Act and asked the town magistrates to gather up all the vagrants and idle sailors on shore and deliver them to the British naval vessels in the harbor (Morgan 1980[8]:225-226). Rather than being concerned for the lives of those sailors Lloyd might have pressed, the Council was probably more apprehensive about potential riots and the effect Captain Lloyd’s press gangs would have on the province’s trade and shipping if the gangs deprived merchant ships of experienced sailors needed for trading voyages.

Despite the Council’s denial of Lloyd’s request in March 1777, Captain Lloyd sent an officer onboard the merchant ship Rebecca, anchored in Pensacola Harbor, on 2 November 1777 to impress two men to assist in the careening of HMS West Florida. James Cox, the master of the Rebecca, complained to Governor Peter Chester who informed Cox that there was nothing he could do, but suggested that Cox file a lawsuit against Lloyd to protest the impressment. Cox did so and, since Lloyd refused to return the carpenter and sailor his officer had enlisted, the West Florida General Court of Pleas fined Lloyd 20 pounds for each man pressed as well as court costs. In total, Lloyd asked the Admiralty Office in London to reimburse him for the 58 pounds, 11 shillings, and 4 pence he paid to cover the fines and court expenses (Lloyd 1778b). This case not only highlights the hazards the typical sailor faced at the mercy of several different parties, but also illumines the struggle for power waged between different members of the elite, in this case between naval officers and provincial officials.
The unequal laws and inequitable usage typified in the regulations and incidents described above clarify the disparate treatment of terrestrial and maritime workers, but do not shed light on the ways maritime workers resisted this treatment. Few accounts from laborers, such as personal correspondence, have survived in the archival record and West Florida did not publish a local newspaper during the British period. Thus, evidence of worker resistance is rarely discernable except as reflected in the official records of the province and British crown. Ship’s logs of the period are often an excellent source for incidents of resistance by sailors both at sea and while at anchor in harbor. Although merchant ship logbooks of the 18th century often did not survive to the present day, naval officers faithfully submitted British naval logbooks to the Admiralty Office in London where they are now housed in the National Archives of the UK. These logs reveal constant challenges to the authority of naval officers throughout the period of British occupation of Pensacola. The most common infractions to receive punishment by the lash included drunkenness, neglect of duty, disobeying command or orders, insolence, abusing an officer, absence without leave, mutiny, desertion, and theft. Unfortunately, the logbook authors rarely detail the events that resulted in punishment, but the number of incidents and number of different sailors punished suggests that these were not always clear-cut cases of disobedience to competent officers commanding adequately paid and well fed sailors (Carkett 1767; Murray 1767; Jackson 1768, 1769, 1770; Warburton 1769; Pakenham 1770; Pittes 1771; Onslow 1772; Carkett 1773; Hay 1773; Rodney 1774; Judd 1775; Ellis 1777; Burdon 1779; Ferguson 1779; McNamarra 1781; Servies 1982). There were probably sailors who abused the bottle and typically preferred to quarrel with their superiors rather than performing assigned duties, but many seamen likely rebelled against
unreasonable officers, forced labor due to impressment, harsh conditions, and constant drudgery.

In addition, when presented with an alternative, numerous sailors seized the opportunity to potentially improve their lot by fleeing to the enemy. According to the logs of naval ships that visited Pensacola, desertion was uncommon during most of the British occupation of that city. But when Spain decided to assist the American colonies and itself by recapturing West Florida during the end of the American Revolution, Spanish ships began regularly sailing past the bar of Pensacola Bay and incidents of desertion increased significantly (Bremer 1766; Carkett 1767; Murray 1767; Jackson 1768, 1769, 1770; Murray 1769a, 1769b; Anderson 1771; Drummond 1772; Phillips 1774; Judd 1775; Lloyd 1777, 1778a; Lymonds 1779; James 1781; McNamarra 1781; Servies 1982). When the Spanish attacked the town during the Siege of Pensacola in March 1781, desertion increased. Some deserters were recaptured, but others likely served in the Spanish navy and fought against their own countrymen (James 1781, McNamarra 1781, Servies 1982). All of these incidents reveal the ways in which maritime workers, specifically sailors, resisted officials and used their agency to better their situations.

The siege of Pensacola continued for several weeks, but the British lacked enough naval vessels, sailors, and soldiers to adequately protect the town. Despite a valiant effort, Pensacola fell to the Spanish in May 1781 (Johnson 1971:217-219). A new phase of Pensacola’s MCL had begun.
Second Spanish Period (1781-1821)

The end of the Siege of Pensacola in May 1781 found the Spanish once again in possession of Pensacola. The town’s merchants were now free to trade with New Orleans and many did so. Commerce boomed in the timber, naval stores, and deerskin markets (Moore 2002:12-13). Indian traders Panton, Leslie and Company and its successor, John Forbes and Company, processed hundreds of thousands of deer hides during the second Spanish period (Coker 1999:42-43). With this increase in commercial activity, one might expect an increase in wharves and other types of maritime structures, but maps and historical accounts from the period instead record the disappearance of wharves on the waterfront between 1781 and 1821.

As described above, British and Spanish maps dating to the period around the siege indicate that there were still four wharves on the waterfront to handle commerce and supply. Two were likely wharves dedicated to official activity as they extended out from the waterfront in front of the fort. Two others may have belonged to local merchants as they extended from private property (Figures 16 and 17) (Heldring 1780, 1781; Anonymous 1781; Brigadier 1781; Servicio Histórico Militar 1781). Unfortunately for the newly established Spanish inhabitants, Mother Nature, blind to the rules of conquest and victory, struck Pensacola in the form of a violent hurricane in late September 1781. Except for a frigate of war, every large vessel in the bay sank or ran aground, including two ships recently arrived from Havana and New Orleans. The mail packet sank next to the small wharf on which the troop’s latrine (or común) stood. Most of the small boats, including the launches and canoes, also sank or broke into pieces. Documents record that workers raised or hauled several of the vessels off the beach, but
the boats suffered extensive damage; not all appeared salvageable (O’Neill 1781a, 1781b, 1781c). Interestingly, the storm uncovered four old 2- and 3-caliber cannons that lay buried on the beach, but their age and whether they were English or Spanish was not known or recorded (O’Neill 1781d).

In addition, the surge from the storm washed away one of the wharves, probably leaving only three of the four recorded at the end of the British period (O’Neill 1781a, 1781b). A 1782 map of the bay supports this conclusion in that it depicts three wharves on the waterfront (Rivelles 1782). Although the chart is more of a sketch than a detailed survey map, when considered with other documents, the evidence strongly indicates that Pensacola was down to three wharves by 1782.

As waterfront structures disappeared, occasionally so too did sailors, ships’ carpenters, and other mariners. While wharves and warehouses vanished due to neglect or storm damage, sailors either absconded temporarily in order to bargain for better pay and working conditions or they left permanently to search for a better lot in life elsewhere. Unlike the chaotic 1780s, no raging wars presented sailors the opportunity to flee to the potential amnesty of another nation. Thus, those who fled ran an even greater risk of being recaptured and punished by their own countrymen. Nevertheless, some maritime laborers were willing to take their chances against such odds. A document written by the Pensacola commandant, Arturo O’Neill, in 1782 details the desertion of several crew members from the brigantine Santa Teresa. O’Neill’s sources thought some of the men, including one of the ship’s carpenters, had run off to New Orleans while others were hiding in the nearby woods. At least one, another carpenter, was captured and sent to the naval officer in New Orleans for punishment (O’Neill 1782a).
Considering the threat of retribution and the discomforts of fugitive life, mariners probably had solid reasons, such as poor working conditions and inadequate pay, for deserting from backwoods Pensacola.

Desertion was a significant problem during the colonial period due to the importance of trained mariners for maintaining maritime commerce. In the same way, a steady supply of well built ships and boats was essential for coastal and overseas trade, especially considering the constant fight against decay of wooden ships caused by marine life and the never ending loss of vessels during periods of inclement weather. Although timber from Pensacola was important for repairing vessels during the second Spanish period just like in the British period, it is unclear whether a boat or shipbuilding industry of any importance developed during the Spanish occupation of Pensacola. Several letters written during the period suggest that some civilian and government craftsmen built small boats for local and coastal activity, but there is no evidence of an industry that produced large, seaworthy vessels. As early as 1782, O’Neill asked acting Louisiana Governor, Estevan Miro, for permission for a Capitan Colver to make tar or pitch and cut wood in Miro’s district to construct a boat or small sloop (O’Neill 1782b). By December 1794, laborers had completed two lighters for the transportation of arms and building materials between Pensacola’s coastal forts (White 1794). In 1797, Pensacola commandant, Vizente Folch, lobbied for the hire of additional carpenters to hasten the completion of another lighter or barge for transporting heavy artillery to Fort Barrancas (Folch 1797c). In 1801, several witnesses described the destruction, during an August hurricane, of a lighter that was under construction in Pensacola near the Battery of San Antonio of Fort Barrancas and still resting on rollers on the launching slip near the shore (Folch 1801a).
Thus, it appears that workers sometimes constructed small boats in Pensacola, adding to the area’s MCL with boatyards and their related structures, but larger ships sailed to the port from other cities with shipbuilding industries.

Just as wooden vessels suffered from the depredations of marine borers and fierce storms, local officials constantly cited the decayed state of Pensacola’s wooden wharves caused by these same culprits. In May 1783, Pensacola commandant O’Neill once again broached the topic of the miserable state of the town’s wharves, concluding that at least one was a total ruin (O’Neill 1783). In 1785, O’Neill sent acting Louisiana governor Miro a list of damaged and decayed structures in Pensacola, as well as estimates for their repair. This list included a note on the troop’s latrine and the wharf on which it stood. Although it appears the latrine and wharf withstood the 1781 hurricane, by 1785, they were dangerously damaged and would cost 150 pesos fuertes to repair (O’Neill 1785).

In 1787 and 1788, respectively, a severe rainstorm and a hurricane again beset the beleaguered Spanish. The 1787 storm and resulting flooding damaged goods in the various warehouses and inundated houses all over town, but O’Neill makes no mention of damage to wharves or piers (O’Neill 1787a, 1788a). However, a December 1787 report on wharves in Pensacola revealed that the waterfront had experienced major changes. The report noted that two of the wharves present in 1782 were gone as Pensacola retained only one wharf. Even that wharf was in a state of serious disrepair and needed immediate attention to be prevented from collapsing entirely. In order to pay for the wharf reconstruction, O’Neill suggested that a small fee could be charged to everyone who unloaded at the wharf. He believed the resulting sum, combined with some additional income from penalties on illegal gaming, would pay for maintenance of the wharf.
Whether Estevan Miro, the letter’s recipient, ever authorized this expenditure is uncertain.

In contrast, the 1788 hurricane caused major damage that more directly affected maritime concerns (O’Neill 1788a). According to O’Neill, the storm threw three privately-owned vessels up onto the beach, breaking one into pieces right in front of the government house, pushing another so far inland that the cost to remove it was prohibitive, and splitting the last open. A government launch that ran over one of the beached vessels also broke into pieces. In addition, the storm surge rose so high it flooded the warehouse of the trading firm, Panton, Leslie and Company, and destroyed numerous houses on the beach. Winds ripped planks out from the walls of the town’s warehouses and tore off pieces of their roofs. The next two days of heavy rain spoiled more of the goods stored in these damaged warehouses (O’Neill 1788a). In addition, the storm ruined the building that had served as the English church, and later the Spanish hospital clothing storehouse, and destroyed the ruins of the frigate Fort Royal (or Port Royal), which lay grounded in the bay since September 1782 (O’Neill 1788c).

Storm surge also washed away the troops’ latrine (común) and half of the short wharf upon which it stood (O’Neill 1788a). Although O’Neill calls this structure a wharf, thus suggesting that there were two wharves on the waterfront by this time, the latrine wharf was not built for the unloading and loading of vessels. It likely existed in December 1787 when O’Neill described the waterfront, although possibly in a very deteriorated state, considering its mention in his 1785 letter (O’Neill 1785). Even though he did not describe the común in his 1787 report, this is not surprising as his report concerned wharves built for the purpose of docking vessels, not structures built to
accommodate the most basic needs of Pensacola’s troops (O’Neill 1787b). Whether the comín was repaired between 1785 and 1788 is unclear, but the 1788 hurricane certainly ended any further debate on the subject.

The 1788 storm also significantly damaged the only viable wharf on the waterfront, the same mentioned in the December 1787 report (O’Neill 1787b, 1788a, 1788b). Interestingly, O’Neill described the ruined wharf as the one that once belonged to a Mr. Stevenson, likely a former British resident, even though O’Neill was writing over six years after the British left Pensacola (O’Neill 1788a). The wharf probably belonged to John Stephenson (sometimes spelled “Stevenson”), who was a merchant and West Florida Council member during the British period (Johnson 1971:196-197, 214).

Stephenson was also, at times, the official Pensacola agent of the London contractor for the British army and navy, supplying the troops and ships with food and liquor (Burdon 1779; Fabel 1988:168, 208-209). Ships’ logs from British naval vessels indicate that the agent possessed a wharf to which ships could dock to load supplies, but no documents describe exactly where this wharf stood (Pittes 1771). Although Stephenson owned at least two lots in British Pensacola, one a town lot and one a garden lot, they did not front on the water, thus precluding identification of the wharf by lot location (Durnford 1765b, Browne 1767). Nevertheless, Stephenson’s wharf must have been one of four wharves visible in both a 1780 British map and a 1781 Spanish map (Figures 16 and 17) (Heldring 1780, Anonymous 1781).

One of those four visible wharves existed directly in front of the fort and was likely the official town wharf rather than that of any single individual. Another wharf stood to the west side of the central wharf. Although built opposite the fort, it is possible
that town administrators permitted the construction of a private wharf in this location since it would serve for official purposes. Finally, the other two wharves were located off private property on either side of the central public plaza so one of these wharves could have belonged to Stephenson. Whichever wharf belonged to Stephenson, it was the only working wharf in Pensacola in September 1788 and the aforementioned storm damaged it extensively, leaving Pensacola without a proper commercial wharf. Once again, O’Neill beseeched Miro for permission to rebuild the wharf with the money collected from gambling fines, just as described in his 1787 report. As before, whether this wharf reconstruction took place as requested is unknown.

The following decade saw little improvement in Pensacola’s maritime infrastructure, but commerce and maritime concerns remained a constant topic of conversation. Despite the lack of adequate docking facilities, Pensacola’s harbor pilots were quite active. When the main pilot, José de la Peña, fell ill and was confined to the hospital, Pensacola officials exchanged a flurry of letters concerning potential replacements (Folch 1796, Paula Gelabert 1796). Peña eventually recovered and requested that Folch reinstate him in his former position as main pilot (Folch 1797b). In 1795, Pensacola commandant Enrique White broke the silence concerning wharf improvement or building that characterized the early part of the 1790s when he proposed another scheme for gathering funds to construct a wharf (White 1795). Instead of utilizing gambling fines and charging wharfage as O’Neill proposed, White suggested imposing a tax on vessels and local taverns to pay for wharf repair and construction. In 1796, the new commandant, Vizente Folch, also championed the idea and elaborated on White’s proposal, suggesting that monies raised from fining smugglers, as well as a
tavern tax, could be used to rebuild wharves (Carondelet 1796, Folch 1797a). Why
White and Folch proposed to tax the taverns is uncertain, but it seems possible that they
believed the establishments that benefited from the patronage of sailors and maritime
workers should bear at least part of the burden of maintaining the waterfront structures
that allowed their patrons to disembark and facilitated the livelihood of their loyal
clientele. Intendant Juan Ventura Morales later informed Folch that he could not allow
the collection of such a tax without first receiving the King’s approval of the tax and
permission to build a wharf (Ventura Morales 1797).

White’s 1795 and Folch’s 1796 letters also clarify the desperate condition of the
public wharf and the fact that, in order to unload vessels arriving in port, convict laborers
had to wade into the water and carry items to shore on their shoulders. In addition, White
and Folch revealed the presence of one other wharf in Pensacola, that of William Panton,
to whom city officials and merchants were forced to turn when a ship’s cargo was too
heavy for the laborers to carry. Both officials noted that Panton readily granted such
permission when asked, but Folch insisted that it was the King’s responsibility to provide
funds or permit the use of certain monies for building a public wharf so as to reduce the
wear and tear on Panton’s private wharf (Folch 1797a). Exactly when Panton built the
aforementioned wharf is unclear, but the reasons why are known. According to local
surveyor, Juan Francisco Arniaud de Courville, and port inspector and customs officer,
Gabriel Marin Pizarro, Panton only built his own wharf in front of his house and business
headquarters once the public wharf became so deteriorated that his business suffered due
to the damages goods sustained during loading and unloading (Arniaud de Courville and
Despite White’s and Folch’s pleas, the absence of an adequate wharf continued to plague Pensacola. In 1799, Panton offered to build the city a public wharf for a certain sum and officials accepted the proposal (Ventura Morales 1799). In April of that year, Folch sent the King’s schooner, *San Marcos*, to gather wood for Panton’s wharf project from the Camber River, but the sailors and laborers were unable to do so because the ship grounded in attempting to reach its destination due to insufficient water depth. The ship was forced to turn back (Arniaud de Courville and Marin Pizarro 1799). This early setback established the tone for the entire project. Little progress was made and, six months after Panton died at sea from an illness on 26 February 1801, the wharf was still incomplete and wood cut for the wharf lay unused nearby (Arniaud de Courville and Marin Pizarro 1801, Coker and Watson 1986:235). It seems likely that a hurricane in August 1801 damaged Panton’s wharf to some extent and probably obliterated any trace of public wharf remains, but this is uncertain as contemporary documents only record the harm inflicted on small boats (Folch 1801a).

In any case, a public wharf was badly needed in Pensacola. The town’s Chief Engineer, Francisco de Paula Gelabert, noting that Panton’s plan had failed to come to fruition, offered his own proposals for the construction of a wharf in either wood or stone (Figure 19). Although a stone wharf would cost far more than a wood wharf, Paula Gelabert, Folch, and even the parsimonious Intendant, Ventura Morales, strongly promoted the construction of a stone wharf due to its far greater permanence and reduced need for constant maintenance (Folch 1801b; Paula Gelabert 1801a, 1801b, 1801c, 1801d; Ventura Morales 1801).
Figure 19. 1801 wharf plans by Francisco de Paula Gelabert.
Nevertheless, in January of 1802, Paula Gelabert departed Pensacola for Spain, abandoned his project, and left the town without an engineer (Folch 1802). In the same year, customs officer and port inspector, Marin Pizarro, died (Wright 1982:190-191). Exactly who replaced him is unclear. In addition, despite all of the attempts, suggestions, and pleas concerning the construction of a wharf and Pensacola’s enduring lack of such a structure, the Spanish Crown finally rejected the wharf proposals and suspended all “unnecessary” expenditures in West Florida and Louisiana (Ventura Morales 1802a, 1802b). Considering these royal orders, it seems unlikely that Paula Gelabert could have built a wharf even if he had remained. In 1803, a French traveler to the area again confirmed that only one wharf existed in Pensacola (Landry 1966:3). Although he does not mention to whom it belonged, the documents outlined above suggest he was referring to Panton’s wharf and not a public wharf.

Despite these shortcomings of infrastructure, Pensacola’s maritime laborers still figured strongly in official communications. The appointment of maritime workers and the laws that dictated the fees these workers charged seem to have served as key strategic issues among officials striving to maintain their influence over other civil and military authorities. In 1803, Folch abruptly fired Pensacola’s pilot, Pedro Paz, possibly to replace him with someone more to his liking and, in 1804, he reminded Pensacola Treasury Minister, Arniaud de Courville, of the rules governing the distribution of pilotage fees (Ventura Morales 1803, Folch 1804).

Letters and official communication from the last two decades of Spanish occupation in Pensacola reveal a downward spiral in the town’s ability to improve or even maintain waterfront facilities. Although Pensacola faced a lack of funds for years, a
severe shortage of monies characterized the early 1800s, as evidenced by the Crown’s decision in 1802 to severely restrict expenditures in the province (Ventura Morales 1802a, 1802b). There was no money to buy much needed supplies, pay the troops, or fund many necessary expenses, let alone enough to build a substantial wharf (McAlister 1959). Officials abandoned Paula Gelabert’s and all others’ wharf projects in favor of spending what little money the province possessed on the most basic of necessities.

Paula Gelabert’s death on 17 July 1806 dealt the final blow to his ambitious wharf projects and no others stepped forward to offer their own proposals (Someruelos 1806).

Documents concerning a severe hurricane on 11 October 1811 conspicuously exclude any mention of wharves or wharf damage while describing the loss of every ship in Pensacola Bay except for His Majesty’s schooner *La Prosperina*, whose mainmast was cut, and an American Brig of War that dragged its anchor for about a mile and a half. The cost of the damages was immense, including the loss of two new English frigates in the harbor at the time, one of which was still loaded when the storm hit (San Maxent 1811a, 1811b). Had Pensacola possessed a viable, public wharf that suffered damage when this storm hit, it seems logical that Pensacola commandant, Francisco Maximiliano de San Maxent, would have detailed its destruction and included the wharf in his summary of storm-related financial loss. That San Maxent did not mention a wharf suggests that either any existing wharves were undamaged, which seems unlikely considering the toll the storm enacted on other maritime structures, or that, most likely, the Pensacola waterfront still lacked a public, commercial wharf. Thus, it appears that, for an extended time during the Second Spanish period of Pensacola, Panton’s wharf served as the main hub for the loading and unloading of vessels in Pensacola, both for
Panton, Leslie and Company and the town’s merchants, civil officials, and general public. It seems likely that the shore and bay directly in front of the Panton, Leslie and Company headquarters, next to the proposed site of the Pensacola Maritime Park, may hold remnants of the extensive trade conducted in the vicinity. Future excavations in the area and any plans to disturb the shore or bay floor should take this rich history into account.

No additional Spanish maps have been found that depict Pensacola from 1800 to 1812 and no post-1803 documents mention the presence of wharves in Pensacola or plans for their construction, so it is difficult to determine whether the Spanish built additional wharves before surrendering Pensacola. An 1813 map of Pensacola, which only depicts a small area, shows no wharves or warehouses, although it does depict the potential location for a new custom house in block C on the west side of the central downtown area (Figure 20) (Pintado 1813). As this custom house plan indicates, officials remained quite interested in issues that affected maritime commerce. As in 1804, discussions arose again in 1812 about the proper distribution of pilotage fees (Folch 1804, Losada 1812). The lack of specie even began to take its toll on the most basic of tariffs, such as customs fees and the aforementioned pilotage. In 1813, customs official Antonio Cabanas, who may have replaced former customs officer Marin Pizarro upon his death in 1802, sharply defended the use of credit in paying customs fees and disagreed with the Pensacola commandant, Mateo Gonzalez Manrique, who insisted that only a fourth of customs duties should be paid in credit. Cabanas pointed out the complete lack of *dinero* for paying duties and reasoned that credit was acceptable since debts could then be paid in cash upon the arrival of the official situado payments (Gonzalez Manrique 1813, Wright 1982:190-191). Whether these situado payments arrived regularly in cash-strapped
Figure 20. 1813 plan of Pensacola by Vicente Pintado.
Pensacola is unknown; irregular shipments of specie would certainly explain Gonzalez Manrique’s hesitation to accept credit as a form of payment.

Despite Pensacola’s obvious lack of funds and repeated arguments by town officials concerning payment of fees and taxes, shipping does not appear to have suffered substantially. In fact, in 1814, customs official Cabanas requested additional staff to work aboard ships in Pensacola Bay and rented a warehouse on the shore to serve as the custom house. Clearly, the proposed custom house on the 1813 Pintado map had not yet been built (Pintado 1813). Cabanas also suggested the appointment of Eugenio Lavalle as the custom house supervisor and guardian of the royal weights (Cabanas 1814a, 1814b). Two 1816 maps likely record some of this commercial activity with a depiction of five warehouses in the central plaza of Pensacola, as well as tanneries owned by Indian traders John Forbes and Company, successors to Panton, Leslie and Company. One of the 1816 maps shows a wharf, but only one and that in front of the John Forbes and Company property (Figures 21 and 22). Unfortunately, the maps do not show the custom house mentioned in 1813 and 1814, but they do clarify that Pensacola still did not have the public wharf it so desperately needed (Pintado 1813, 1816; Servicio Histórico Militar 1816).

No other maps depicting Pensacola before its transfer to the Americans in 1821 have been uncovered and Spanish officials were too concerned with the growing troubles, both on their borders and internationally, to discuss their waterfront. A map based on an 1822 survey by Major James Kearney shows only one wharf in Pensacola that extends from the central plaza (Figure 23) (Kearney 1822). It is unclear whether this wharf existed in 1822 as certain features on Kearney’s map date to the 1830s rather than 1822.
Figure 21. 1816 map of Pensacola by Vicente Pintado.

a. The city as it is in the present year 1816.

b. Government district.

c. Church.

d. The barracks of the troops in a very deteriorated condition.

e. Four strong houses [blockhouses] in fair condition.

f. Five warehouses in fair condition.

g. Kitchen in bad condition for colored people

(Parlos and Morenos).

h. Tivoli [High House].

i. Bivouac area.

j. Tannery and lands belonging to the house

[company] of John Forbes.

k. Canal that was cut by the said house [John Forbes & Co.] to supply water to the tannery.

l. Public laundries.

m. Public washhouse.

n. Well that supplies water to the population.

o. Lot established and given under condition that the

well be taken care of and cleaned.

p. Three wooden, two-story, strong houses

[blockhouses] constructed in 1810.

q. Slaughter house.

r. Cemetery.

s. Fort San Miguel 79 feet above sea level.

t. Land with thickets of trees and bushes that is

subject to inundation.

u. Lands with very thick bushes subject to inundation.

v. Ground full of rushes subject to inundation and

crossed by a small running stream.

w. Another but smaller area full of rushes called the

watering hole in front of the strong house (p).

x. Land high and dry at the foot of the heights

and covered with oaks.

y. Heights round about the plaza.

A. The stream San Gabriel always running and

inclosed with bushes.

B. Small stream of the watering hole always

running, also adorned with bushes.

C. Higher land between the two former streams

which can be traversed.

D. Only roads for those that go to the country with

carts.

E. Ditches opened in order to drain the lands

subject to inundation.

F. Vacant lot above the plaza sold by the town

council in 1814.

G. Works destroyed by the English called outposts.

H. Cattle path.  L. Lakes.
Figure 22. 1816 map of Pensacola.
Figure 23. Detail from an 1822 Map of Pensacola by Captain James Kearney.
The map in question appears to be a later revision of Kearney’s survey and the wharf may not have existed so soon after the Spanish transferred Florida to the United States.

In 1821, after years of encroachment into Spanish West Florida by American traders and frontiersmen, Spain finally transferred ownership of the territory to the United States. Although residents of Pensacola no longer salute the King and Queen of England and the Spanish language is no longer the lingua franca, the city’s colonial heritage is still highly visible in the downtown British gridded town plan and the Spanish names that pepper the city’s streets and geographical landmarks. Less visible, but still highly significant, colonial maritime legacies include the remnants of the sailing ships that plied the waters of Pensacola Bay in the 18th and early 19th century and the ruins of wharves and other maritime structures that lie buried under both water and earth along the downtown shoreline and in the harbor. The following century would produce significant changes on the Pensacola waterfront and the concomitant expansion of numerous industries, such as brick making and timber production, which had their start during the Spanish and British periods of the city.
CHAPTER IV

STARS AND STRIPES, 1821-1899: AMERICAN EXPANSION ON THE WATERFRONT

[Pensacola] was a squalid, brawling seaport of men on the make, a city renown [sic] for its flophouses, brothels, and cheap saloons. Beyond the abounding wharves and ‘gin mills’ of Zarragossa Street, the wood-frame dwellings of clerks, cooks, and stevedores gave way imperceptibly to a jumble of wholesale firms, offices, and ship chandleries.

~ Brian Rucker and Nathan Woolsey (1991:vii)

In 1821, the United States gained control of West Florida from Spain. During the early decades of American occupation, Pensacola remained a small town with limited industry. But historical events and important industrial developments gradually contributed to an increase in its commercial production and extensive modifications of the town’s shoreline and waterfront, which had heretofore changed little from its pre-colonial character. The following historical investigation of the pre-modern American period examines the natural topography, built environment, navigation, and cognitive components of the maritime cultural landscape (MCL) of Pensacola. Historical maps and documents both illuminate the physical landscape and provide insight into cognitive aspects that reveal human agency, resistance, and ideology. Contemporary newspapers are a critically important source for the American period that reveal much about the built environment, especially in descriptions of hurricane damage, and the ways in which local officials and residents both viewed and utilized the waterfront.
 Researchers and historians have written much about the various industries that thrived in Pensacola between 1821 and 1940 such as brick making, lumbering, fishing, and naval store production. Several industry-specific historical and archaeological studies provide more detailed information on Pensacola’s once thriving brick, timber, naval stores, and red snapper fishing industries (Polk 1971; McNeil 1977; Rucker 1990; Baumer 1991; Phillips 1993a, 1993b, 1996; Drobney 1997; Moore 2002; Burns 2003; Raupp 2004; Rawls 2004; Holland 2006; Martinkovic 2006; Sjordal 2007; Nones 2011). While precursors of these enterprises existed during the colonial era, the American period saw immense commercial and industrial growth in these and other areas.

Although Americans faced the same challenges as the Spanish when they arrived in Pensacola in 1821, such as lack of funds and wharves, major changes were about to occur in the town and on its shore. As early as April 1821, Addin Lewis was temporarily ordered to Pensacola from Mobile to act as the Collector of Customs in Pensacola until another could be appointed. Lewis appointed Thomas Brownjohn as his subordinate, Inspector of Customs. In May 1821, the President of the United States appointed Alexander Scott as Collector of Customs, William Steuben Smith as Naval Officer, Richard Hackley as Surveyor of the Revenue, and John Martin Baker as Inspector of the Revenue at Pensacola (Carter 1956:50-57). In July 1821, additional posts were filled. These included Branch Pilots David Wright and Luther Lincoln, Harbormaster Oliver Clark, and Port Warden David Cowan (Carter 1956:131-132). Naval Officer William Smith appointed Alexander Scott’s son, Alexander Scott, Jr., as another Inspector of Customs at Pensacola in September 1821 and transferred the other Inspector, Thomas Brownjohn, to Fort Barrancas so Brownjohn could monitor the entrance to the bay and
the coves and inlets nearby for illegal activity (Carter 1956:198-200). Customs officials established a custom house in early September 1821 in the house of the deputy collector of customs, possibly Samuel Myers, “on the extreme left of the public square, fronting the harbour” (Floridian 1821a:3, Carter 1956:551-552). Situated so close to the shoreline, the custom house probably served as a visible reminder of government control of shipping and trade.

Despite the rapid adoption of a building as a custom house, an historian of the antebellum era of Pensacola noted of the city at the time of its transfer, “Despite its location on a fine harbor, the port facilities of the city were virtually non-existent. Only one nearly ruined pontoon wharf was in existence and most shipping was unloaded by lighters” (Doherty 1959:339). Historic maps and documents do not indicate the location of this pontoon wharf, but it may have belonged to traders John Forbes and Company, which operated well into the American period. Alternatively, the pontoon wharf may represent a last-ditch effort by the Spanish government to provide some kind of waterfront infrastructure since a pontoon wharf would have been significantly cheaper to build than the wooden or stone wharves posited in the early 1800s (Paula Gelabert 1801a, 1801b; Brown 1959:336). In either case, the lack of a wharf and presence of a custom house make it clear that Pensacola officials were more concerned with asserting authority than facilitating trade.

On 15 September 1821, just as a hurricane greeted the Spanish upon their arrival in Pensacola in 1781, so too did Mother Nature welcome the Americans with a humbling display of her fury. The account of the hurricane reveals that 13 ships were in the harbor when the storm hit and that, although six ran aground, it appeared that five of those could
be restored to service only at great expense (Floridian 1821b:3). Salvagers later recovered the brig *Maryland* for its owner, who scrapped the vessel and sold anything of value at public auction, and a local Captain, George Donnelly, and his crew successfully pulled the sloop *Endeavor* off the beach after the storm (Ove 2010). Whether salvagers or sailors recovered any other vessels is unclear. In addition, hurricane accounts do not mention waterfront infrastructure, but, if there still was a wharf at the time of the storm, it did not survive. In November 1821, a Pensacola customs official, possibly the Deputy Collector mentioned above, noted that there was no wharf of any kind on the town’s waterfront and merchants had to land all incoming supplies on the beach (Carter 1956:282-284). If a pontoon wharf actually existed when Americans arrived in Pensacola in early 1821, it had either fallen into ruin by November 1821 or been destroyed by the September hurricane.

Between October 1822 and January 1823, Pensacola Customs officials finally gained a permanent custom house in the form of an old Spanish blockhouse near the beach that residents believed served as a custom house during the end of the Second Spanish period (Carter 1956:551-552, 600-601, 984-985). Indeed, this may well be the same building Spanish Customs official Antonio Cabanas rented in 1814 (Cabanas 1814b). In November 1822, Alexander Scott left Pensacola, appointing Alexander Scott, Jr. as the Deputy Collector. Samuel Myers, the former Deputy, believed Alexander Scott would appoint him as the main Collector of Customs, but Scott’s son was performing the duties of Collector in 1824, possibly evidence of an early case of nepotism in Florida (Carter 1956:198-200, 551-552, 840-841).
Despite the city’s humble beginnings and state of disrepair, government officials established Pensacola as the capital of the Florida territory, until its transfer to Tallahassee in 1824, and legislative council members successfully pushed for improved infrastructure and facilities. Also in 1824, Congress approved the construction of a road from Pensacola to St. Augustine and a lighthouse opposite Pensacola Pass using Pensacola brick (Doherty 1959:344, 353; Polk 1971:iv, 78-79). In 1825, the United States Government chose to establish a Naval Yard to the west of downtown Pensacola, an event that still defines modern Pensacola in the presence of today’s Naval Air Station (Doherty 1959:349). Despite all of these important changes, longtime residents testifying in an 1877 Escambia County court case recollected that Pensacola’s first American wharf was not built until 1826 or 1827 when a Joint Stock Company formed for that purpose. The company constructed the wharf at the end of Palafox Street. Previous to the construction of the wharf, “[L]ighters had to go out to schooners and bring freight as near into shore as possible and drays would go to the lighters and take the freight from them” (Clerk of Circuit Court Archives Division [CCCAD] 1877c). Lighters were small barges or boats used to transfer cargo both to and from ships and drays were low-slung carts capable of hauling heavy loads.

As described above, maps of Pensacola and its waterfront serve as the best indicators of changes to the shoreline. The earliest known extant American maps of the town date to 1827 (Figure 24) (Butler 1827, Exum 1827). Although a map by Major James Kearney carries the date of 1822, several features on the map date to 1836. Whether the map reflects Pensacola in 1822 or 1836 is not critical as the map closely
Figure 24. 1827 plan of Pensacola by James Exum.
agrees with the 1827 Butler and Exum maps (Figure 23) (Kearney 1822). All of these maps show relatively few differences when compared to the closest extant Spanish map of 1816, other than the addition of a central wharf probably lacking during most or all of the last half of the second Spanish period and during the first few years of the American period (Figure 22) (Servicio Histórico Militar 1816, Kearney 1822, Butler 1827, Exum 1827, CCCAD 1877c). Exum’s map does show the location of the custom house on the left side of the public square in the same area as that shown for a proposed custom house on the 1813 Pintado map, but the lot is quite large (Pintado 1813, Exum 1827). Another map by Florida enthusiast John Lee Williams shows a smaller building in the same area, probably the same blockhouse appropriated in late 1822 or early 1823 (Figure 25) (Williams 1827). The comments of a German visitor to Pensacola, who stated in 1826 that the custom house operated out of a blockhouse, support the contention that the custom house was in the same location as in 1822 or 1823 (Bernhard 1828[2]:45). An 1828 letter reveals that city officials did not tear down the custom house until that year, when they decided the property was worth more sold than retained (Carter 1958:290-291, 1030-1031). Thus, it is very unlikely that the city built a much larger custom house, as indicated by the area denoted on Exum’s map, before 1828. In fact, archaeological investigations in the area found no evidence of any American structures that pre-dated the 1880s (Bense 1999, Benchley 2007b).

In 1828 and 1831, respectively, construction began on Fort Pickens and Fort McRee, both at the entrance to Pensacola Harbor. Pensacola brickyards prospered due to these local projects, providing millions of bricks for the building of both forts and additional construction at the Naval Yard (Doherty 1959:345, Polk 1971:79-80). Local
Figure 25. 1827 plan of Pensacola by John Lee Williams.
businessmen did not ignore wharf improvement during this period of growth. According to historian Herbert Doherty, Pensacola’s central wharf extended out to a length of 1000 ft. by 1829 (Doherty 1959:339). In addition to improving port facilities, Pensacola hoped to attract the products of its bountiful hinterland, which were heretofore inaccessible due to a lack of navigable rivers flowing into Pensacola Bay, by building railroads that would connect the city to the rest of the region. Chartered in 1834, the Alabama, Florida and Georgia Railroad was promoted in Pensacola by the Pensacola Land Company, which purchased land to the east of Pensacola’s historic core. The company prepared this tract to serve as the southern terminus of the Alabama, Florida and Georgia, divided it into lots, and sold many of the parcels. Although the group had grand plans for the area and the railroad, the Panic of 1837, a national financial crisis, put a halt to the ambitious project, which finally failed in 1838 with the abandonment of the Alabama, Florida and Georgia Railroad (Doherty 1959:346-348, Pickett 1985:26, Pearce 1990:129).

Letters written by a visiting railroad advocate in 1858 indicate that the Pensacola Land Company built wharves off of the shore in the eastern area they styled “New Town” or “New City,” but a map of the development published by a member of the group in 1836 records no such wharves (Chase 1836, Pickett 1985:26). Later maps, at least up until the 1880s, often label this area as “New Town” or at least indicate the property lines of the lots laid out in 1836, but show no substantial commercial or residential activity to the east of Pensacola and certainly no wharves (Figure 23) (Kearney 1822; United States Coast Survey [USCS] 1859; Weiss 1861; Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885). Adding insult to the injury caused by the 1837 Panic, another hurricane roared through Pensacola in August of 1837, driving all non-military vessels but one onto shore and pushing the brig
Rondout straight through the wharf about 100 yards from its end. The hapless Rondout also drove out of the way the stern of the hull of an old steamboat wreck lying against the wharf and the storm razed every bathhouse along the shore (Pensacola Gazette 1837:3). Bathhouses, a ubiquitous feature of Pensacola’s waterfront, served a useful function during the years before indoor running water and bath tubs became the norm. The houses, often erected at the end of an insubstantial wharf, provided private bathing to Pensacola’s residents for a small fee (McLellan 1944:31-33).

By 1842, workers had repaired the wharf damaged in the 1837 storm, which still seemed to be the only wharf in Pensacola. An account of a hurricane that year in the local newspaper mentions that a ship left “our wharf” the morning before the storm bound for Mobile, wording that would be strange if Pensacola had more than one wharf (Pensacola Gazette 1842:2). However, an 1852 Pensacola Gazette article on the latest hurricane to hit Pensacola suggests that waterfront improvement had occurred. Although the article only specifically mentions one wharf, the article refers to it as the “main wharf,” implying that there was at least one other wharf on the waterfront and maybe more. The Gazette did not specify the location of this other wharf or wharves and they can hardly be deduced from the limited information available, but the “main wharf” is probably the same wharf indicated in the 1827 maps and 1842 hurricane account. During the hurricane, winds and surge washed away the majority of the main wharf, except for the seaward end of it, and destroyed the bathhouses that lined the shore (Pensacola Gazette 1852:2). No contemporary newspaper articles indicate when and if the main wharf was rebuilt, but later documents suggest such repairs did occur eventually.
Even though the physical waterfront remained in constant flux, maritime commerce was still an important concern and Florida legislators attempted to control the port’s maritime workers through the enacting of pertinent laws. In 1854, the U.S. government built Pensacola’s first federal Custom House on the northwest corner of Government and Palafox Streets (Appleyard 2001:61-62). The location of the custom house between 1828, when city officials tore down the old Spanish blockhouse that served as a custom house, and the dedication of the new custom house in 1854 remains a mystery (Carter 1958:290-291, 1030-1031; Appleyard 2001:61-62). In 1855, the State of Florida’s General Assembly passed an act to regulate pilots and pilotage in Pensacola Bay. The act established a group of “Commissioners of Pilotage,” who were responsible for evaluating and licensing pilots, and set forth rules and regulations for the actions, fees, and conduct of Pensacola pilots (General Assembly of the State of Florida 1855:23-29).

As described in the previous chapter, historical accounts indicate that wharves built prior to the American period were probably simple piling wharves, but evidence suggests that American residents turned to the use of solid-fill wharves at least by the end, if not the middle, of the 19th century (CCCAD 1878; Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885; Koch 1896; Joy and Lloyd 1988:84). A. J. Pickett, a supporter and stockholder of the proposed Alabama and Florida Railroad, wrote that there were multiple wharves in Pensacola in 1858, although he did not specify how many, and noted, “If the wharves of Pensacola were extended but two hundred feet further, and then filled up with sand, warehouses could be built on the water’s side, from which cotton, coal, lumber, and various other articles of export, could be turned right out of the doors of the ware-houses into the
holds of the largest merchant ships in existence [emphasis in original]” (Pickett 1985:30).

Although local tradition states that residents began infilling the waterfront and creating more land by 1836, a process that solid-fill wharves would have facilitated, Pickett’s statement seems to indicate that this land creation had not yet occurred in 1858 (Sutton 1979, Pickett 1985, Joy and Lloyd 1988:3).

Only a year later, an 1859 USCS map shows two wharves on the waterfront and records the first documented evidence of land creation in Pensacola (Figure 26) (USCS 1859). The wharf on the west appears to be the same wharf shown on the 1822 or 1836 Kearney map and is probably the “main wharf” mentioned in 1852. As described above, although historical accounts generally refer to this wharf as “the wharf” or “our wharf” or the “main wharf,” it gained the name of Palafox Street wharf by 1830, according to stock certificates sold to merchant John Innerarity (Silvester 1830). A small parcel of new land abuts the shore and flanks the eastern wharf, which may be another wharf implied in the 1852 account, on its west side; one or more buildings exist upon the new lot. These buildings may be the very warehouses Pickett advocated. A slightly later Civil War map of Pensacola shows the same two wharves as the 1859 map, but clearly depicts two buildings on the newly created land next to the eastern wharf (USCS 1859, Weiss 1861).

Based on its location, the eastern wharf in the 1859 map may be the first recorded manifestation of either the Jefferson Street Central wharf, Commendencia (also spelled Commandencia and Commandancia) Street wharf, or Tarragona Street wharf. An act passed by the Florida Senate and House of Representatives in December 1850 and approved by the Governor in January 1851 gave permission to Pensacola resident Joseph Sierra to build a wharf off of Jefferson Street, but it is unknown if Sierra ever built his
Figure 26. Detail from an 1859 map of Pensacola by the U.S. Office of Coast Survey.
wharf (Blount 1868:8). Local resident John Appleyard states that Pensacola residents Simpson and Gonzalez built Commendencia Street wharf in 1856 (Appleyard 1976:9). Another candidate for the second wharf on the 1859 map is the Tarragona Street railroad wharf. The former director of the Pensacola and Louisville Railroad Company testified in 1877 that his railroad had rebuilt a wharf at the end of Tarragona Street in the same location where the Alabama and Florida Railroad built a wharf in 1857 (CCCAD 1877c).

While the Tarragona Street wharf seems a likely candidate for the eastern wharf on the 1859 USCS and 1861 Civil War map, an 1850s painting suggests otherwise (Figure 27). The painting shows two major wharves on the waterfront, one of which is clearly Palafox wharf. The identity of the other wharf, which sports no railroad tracks either on the wharf or leading up to it, is unclear. Although it seems unlikely this wharf is the Tarragona Street railroad wharf built by the Alabama and Florida Railroad in 1857, considering the lack of rail tracks, it is possible the painter chose to omit such detail. However, the wharf, though more substantial than any of the other wharves depicted, is also significantly smaller than Palafox Street wharf to its west, which would be uncharacteristic of a wharf built to withstand the weight of freight cars. Thus, the eastern wharf shown in the 1850s painting and the 1859 and 1861 maps is more likely Central wharf or Commendencia wharf. The 1850s painting, which probably predates 1859 due to the absence of filled land next to the eastern wharf, also appears to depict a Palafox wharf at least partially filled with earth or rock. However, this appearance may instead be due to the artist’s choice of colors and textures rather than the nature of the wharf. The painting shows several other small wharves, likely leading to boat or bathhouses,
Figure 27. 1850s painting of Pensacola.
along the shore as well as quite a few small sailboats in various locations and two side paddlewheel steamers in the foreground. In a rare depiction, several people gather near a small boat docked at Palafox wharf, probably either to board the vessel or load cargo (West Florida Historic Preservation 1850s).

Waterfront developments such as the building of new piers and creation of filled land were no doubt linked to the port’s burgeoning brick and lumber industries, which flourished in the area prior to the Civil War and were intimately tied to Pensacola’s ability to provide ideal shipping opportunities from its deepwater bay. Merchants transported lumber to Pensacola for shipment elsewhere as early as 1822 and the lumber trade continued to grow in importance until the Civil War brought a temporary end to commerce (Polk 1971:32, Pickett 1985). Brick production, originally for local consumption, grew into an industry that began to supply New Orleans and other areas further afield, such as the defensive forts under construction on Key West and the Dry Tortugas (Polk 1971:22, 77). Vast stands of timber around Pensacola and towering cliffs of clay along the bay shores provided the raw materials for these industries, but even these abundant resources were not enough to sustain trade when the Civil War ended peaceful relations between the industrial North and the resource-rich South, and endangered shipments to other regions and nations from any part of the war-torn country. When Confederate troops retreated from Pensacola, they recognized the potential utility to the Union of the industrial infrastructure in and around the city and burned and destroyed every mill, brickyard, shipyard, and other industrial site throughout the surrounding area that they could access (Rucker 1990). Incipient railroads such as the Alabama and Florida line, which had only begun to serve Pensacola in 1860 and was
fully complete in 1861, were dismantled to prevent the movement of troops and resources (Polk 1971:23-24, Pickett 1985, Pearce 1990:130).

After the Civil War ended, this intentional devastation presented serious obstacles to new and old residents attempting to rebuild the city. Pensacolians had to begin from scratch rather than return to a city where at least some vestiges of the former industries remained. Once again, the city was cut off from its fruitful northern periphery, despite numerous smaller railroad lines, and would remain so until 1870 (Chipley 1877, Pearce 1990:131). Fortunately, the raw materials that fueled the industries prior to the Civil War, such as timber and clay, remained mostly intact. Pensacola did rebound, indeed more quickly than New Orleans and Mobile, thanks in large part to the resurgence of the lumber industry (Polk 1971, Pearce 1990:130). Unfortunately, it is difficult to follow this renaissance as manifested on the landscape due to the paucity of detailed maps, historical accounts, and period newspapers from Pensacola during the Civil War and for years afterwards. Many of these archival documents simply did not survive the upheavals, turmoil, and population movement caused by the Civil War.

Despite this lack of documentation concerning Pensacola just after the war, maritime infrastructure was certainly a major focus of rebuilding efforts due to the importance of docks and waterfront facilities in storing and transporting Pensacola’s lumber products. In addition, regulation of the waterfront, wharfage fees, and pilotage were major concerns of the city of Pensacola and State of Florida. Some of the earliest surviving post-bellum Pensacola newspapers include references to Pensacola’s wharves. In March of 1868, a storm blew through, causing the steamer Blossom to run aground on the shore next to the central wharf. Winds blew the schooner Rinaldo against the railroad
wharf, damaging the wharf severely and sinking the aforementioned vessel (*West Florida Commercial* 1868:3). The central wharf may have been Palafox Street wharf, but this is uncertain, and the location of the railroad wharf is unspecified. However, in an 1877 Escambia County court case, a former superintendent of the Pensacola and Louisville Railroad Company noted that said company completed a railroad wharf at the end of Tarragona Street in 1867 or 1868 (CCCAD 1877c). Thus, the railroad wharf referred to in the newspaper articles was likely that at the end of Tarragona Street. Palafox Street wharf did exist at this time as the Palafox Street Wharf Company offered it for lease only a few months later. According to a note in a later edition of the *Pensacola Observer*, a Mr. McKenzie and a Mr. Hernandez successfully leased Palafox Street wharf and completed repairs on it, possibly because of damage caused by the March storm. Laborers also quickly repaired the railroad wharf affected by the storm (*Pensacola Observer* 1868a:2, 1868b:3, 1868c:3). As described both above and below, wharves and vessels needed constant repair in storm-ravaged Pensacola. Unfortunately, contemporary documents almost never record the names of the companies and laborers who accomplished these repairs. A few references exist for the 1920s, but, in general, the identities of the hard workers who restored Pensacola’s maritime infrastructure after each hurricane are lost to history.

In July not long after the 1868 storm, government officials reenacted an act to regulate pilots and pilotage, which was passed in 1855 but interrupted by the Civil War. In September of that year, the newly formed Board of Pilot Commissioners, including McKenzie Oerting, S.J. Pons, Alfred Grinnell, and F.C. Humphreys, met to elect officers and schedule meetings for the examination of pilots for the port (*Pensacola Observer*
The Mayor and Board of Alderman of Pensacola also compiled a Code of Ordinances for the city in 1868. Whether this code was the first of its kind is unclear, but it is the earliest version to survive to the present day. The ordinances regulated various aspects of Pensacola city life, including the establishment and operation of bathing houses, the sale of goods onboard vessels and on the wharves, and the control of the waterfront and wharves (Blount 1868). The ordinance on wharves established a “committee on wharves, water-fronts and harbors … charged with the control and supervision of the water-front of the city, the wharves, docks, levees, and etc. that have been or may be erected” (Blount 1868:78). Thus it appears that, however haphazard the development of the Pensacola waterfront was before 1868, officials more tightly regulated future development. An 1872 act provides evidence of this regulation, as manifested statewide, in its establishment of procedures for the disposal of ballast in and around harbor cities in Florida, including Pensacola (Legislature of Florida 1872:54-56).

In 1876, the Norwegian Seamen’s Church, which would become an important cornerstone of the Pensacola waterfront, was built to welcome Scandinavian sailors far from home. The church stood at the corner of Palafox and Pine Streets on Palafox wharf for decades, until it was finally razed in 1934, and its steeple is clearly visible in later waterfront maps and images (Norris, Wellge and Co. 1885; Koch 1896; Pensacola Historical Society 1930s; McLellan 1944:24; Abercrombie 1959:460; Burns 2003:26-27, 76). By 1877, William D. Chipley, General Manager of the Pensacola Railroad Company, which formed out of the Pensacola and Louisville Railroad, noted that “extensive docks [had] been constructed” in front of the city and published an image of the U.S. Custom House at Palafox and Government (Chipley 1877:1, 6).
The 1870s also saw the introduction of railroads that connected Pensacola to the wider world. The Pensacola and Louisville Railroad, having purchased the destroyed Alabama and Florida line, successfully connected to Alabama railroads in 1870, providing Pensacola with a vital link to the north. The railroad terminated in a 2000-foot wharf extending into Pensacola Bay at the end of Tarragona Street following the same plan as the erstwhile Alabama and Florida rail line (Hildreth 1959:407, 410). Local railroads tied the city to nearby small towns throughout the area, especially mill communities, allowing for more efficient transportation of various goods to the port, including forest products. Workers completed both the Pensacola and Perdido Railroad and the Pensacola and Mobile Railroad in the 1870s. The Pensacola and Perdido Railroad operated from the town of Millview on Perdido Bay to the end of a lengthy wharf on the west side of downtown Pensacola and the Pensacola and Mobile Railroad traveled from the town of Muscogee on the Perdido River to Muscogee wharf on the east side of downtown Pensacola (Hildreth 1959:414-416). These changes and their impact on the revived lumber industry contributed to the renewed growth and prosperity of the port city. Maritime, mill, and railroad workers found ready employment; stevedores, those who loaded and unloaded ships at the wharves, formed an association to protect their interests (Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:60-61).

Despite the city’s new vitality and the number of vessels entering and leaving the port, maritime jobs were not infinite. Seasonal workers from Canada flocked to the harbor each winter to work in northwest Florida, taking jobs from local inhabitants. During the winter of 1872-1873, the mostly African American dock workers’ Workingmen’s Association closed down the docks because of violent encounters between
local and Canadian workers. The encounters continued, with the mayor and sheriff unable to control the violence, until the naval commander at the Navy Yard sent in a unit of Marines at the mayor’s pleading request. Even though the association and local officials reached a truce, occasional skirmishes continued until the coming spring prompted the Canadian workers to return home. These events eventually led to the passing of a Florida law that required a residency of at least six months for all those seeking employment as stevedores (Shofner 1972, 1973; Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:60-61). Although Spanish and British colonial sailors and maritime workers seem to have had little influence on their treatment and rights despite their judicious use of desertion and other bargaining tactics, American workers, in this case African Americans, were able to organize into associations and unions that gave collective voice to their complaints, helped them protect their livelihood, and facilitated the alteration of unjust practices.

While documentary evidence suggests that Pensacola’s maritime economy and infrastructure were rapidly expanding, most maps that show Pensacola’s waterfront in the 1870s and early 1880s fail to reflect this new growth. The exception, an 1873 map of Pensacola produced by Dr. James Herron to illustrate the proposed cause of a yellow fever epidemic, provides evidence that Pensacola had rebounded mightily since the Civil War. The map depicts the Pensacola and Perdido Company wharf on the west side of the city, Palafox wharf, Commendencia wharf, the Tarragona Street railroad wharf, and Muscogee wharf on the east side (Herron 1873). Other contemporary maps, such as the USCS maps of Pensacola for 1876, 1879, and 1882, depict a waterfront unchanged from that shown in the USCS 1859 map (USCS 1859, 1876, 1879, 1882). By 1873, as
described above, documents indicate that Pensacola’s waterfront had changed dramatically from its antebellum appearance. Thus, the focus of each USCS map may explain its outdated waterfront. Cartographers created the 1876 and 1882 maps to accurately depict the entrance to Pensacola Bay and the 1879 map to record the coast of Florida between Pensacola Bay and Choctawhatchee Bay. It seems the exact nature of the downtown Pensacola waterfront was not important to, and thus not revised by, USCS mapmakers intending to provide navigational aids for those traveling the coast of Florida or seeking entrance to Pensacola Bay. Researchers must thus critically assess the content of historic maps and make every effort to ascertain the cartographer’s intentions and the audience of any given document.

While a relative documentary and cartographic silence marks the 1860s and early 1870s, archival sources richly illustrate the 1880s and 1890s. These decades hailed the introduction of railroads that connected Pensacola to areas further afield, the production of numerous maps of Pensacola, including detailed Sanborn Insurance Company maps, the creation of rich accounts of the area by journalists and local residents interested in promoting the port, and, unfortunately for those promoters, the recording of damages caused by the many hurricanes that hit the area at the end of the 19th century. One of the first accounts of maritime travails in the 1880s was, appropriately, linked to the lumber industry. A frightful storm on 8 September 1882 pushed the lumber-laden British bark Rhoda onto its side near Santa Rosa Island and, despite the loss of the ship, the tug Juno rescued the crew. The Juno was probably one of the many tugs in Pensacola Bay that towed large ships into harbor and out to sea (Pensacola Semi-Weekly Commercial 1882:3, McLellan 1944:12, Rawls 2004). The journalist of the account, perhaps hinting
at his bias against seamen, wrote that the sailors “appeared joyful ‘as the merry tar’” after a hot meal and fresh clothing even though their ship was lost (Pensacola Semi-Weekly Commercial 1882:3).

Another small vessel, the quarantine station’s Governor Bloxham, capsized in the bay while on route to Pensacola and its two sailors drowned. While some vessels beached on Santa Rosa Island and Gulf Breeze Peninsula, the few contemporary accounts that exist make no mention of damage to the downtown waterfront. Later chroniclers disagree considerably; while some argue that the waterfront suffered substantially, others indicate that all large vessels, which would typically collide with the shore and wharves during major storms, had previously left the port due to a yellow fever epidemic raging at the time (Lavender and Owens 1964:1a, 8a; Ove 2010).

It seems likely that the wharves, bathhouses, and structures on the waterfront did sustain some damage from the 1882 storm, but the damage was either limited or repaired quickly since accounts and maps from only a few years after the storm do not mention or portray a devastated waterfront. In fact, wharf owners continued to bring in ballast to extend the shoreline and improve their facilities without bemoaning any past damages. An amusing account in the 29 December 1883 issue of the Pensacola Commercial records an altercation of sorts between the Palafox wharf owners and the U.S. Government, which maintained a barge office on the wharf. When the owners of the wharf asked the U.S. Government to pay rent for the use of the office, Uncle Sam ignored the request. In answer to this insult, the wharf owners proceeded to pile up ballast in front of the building. By the writing of the newspaper account in December, the wharf owners had succeeded in nearly hiding the office from view and blocking the front
entrance. Instead of addressing the wharf owners’ concerns, government officials built a
gangway to the back of the store rather than pay rent. Unfortunately, later issues make no
mention of the resolution of this dispute so it is unclear if the U.S. finally capitulated or if
the Palafox wharf owners completely shut off the building and forced the U.S.
government to abandon it.

The same issue of the *Pensacola Commercial* also mentions a bridge built by
lumber merchant W. L. Wittich between Palafox wharf and his offices on Central wharf
(*Pensacola Commercial* 1883a, 1883b). This bridge was likely the first manifestation of
what would later become Pine Street as the space between the wharves filled in. In later
decades, waterfront workers extended fill further south, creating more streets where water
once stood.

The 1884 Sanborn Insurance Company maps of Pensacola provide the best
evidence of the insignificant waterfront damage caused by the 1882 storm. These 1884
maps show 10 different substantial wharves on the waterfront, including the Tarragona
Street railroad docks. Numerous small wharves and walkways leading to boathouses and
bathhouses also existed. Many of the substantial wharves were made of a combination of
filled land and piling wharves, which would certainly have suffered during an intense
storm. A plethora of saloons, restaurants, boarding houses, shops, boathouses,
warehouses, dwellings, and more lines several of the wharves (Figure 28). It seems
unlikely that this wide variety of wharves, businesses, and residences would have existed
so soon after a storm that devastated the waterfront (*Sanborn Map Company* 1884:1, 8).

Although the 1884 Sanborn maps only document structures on Palafox Street
wharf, Central wharf (also known as Jefferson Street wharf or Wittich’s wharf),
Figure 28. 1884 maps of Pensacola by the Sanborn Map Company.
Commendencia Street wharf (also called the Ice House wharf), the very tops of Baylen Street and Tarragona Street wharves, and Sullivan’s wharf at the foot of Barracks Street, the insights they provide are invaluable. Two saloons grace the east and west sides of the head of Baylen Street wharf (Sanborn Map Company 1884:2). Overman’s Mill exists at the northwest corner of Main and Barracks Street and B. R. Pitt’s Planing Mill sits at the head of Sullivan’s wharf. A small wooden pier extends into the water to the east of Sullivan’s wharf and a little further east, at the foot of Adams Street, a walkway leads towards a boathouse (Sanborn Map Company 1884:6). The 1884 Sanborn maps do not fully illustrate the G. W. Wright Santa Rosa Mill at the foot of 10th Avenue and detail little of its maritime infrastructure, but records indicate that the mill was founded in 1872 (Sanborn Map Company 1884:5, Appleyard 1989:21-22). Even though some detail is lacking, these depictions of waterfront mills and commercial establishments clearly show the increasing industrialization and commercialization of the shoreline.

Palafox wharf is, however, completely detailed and bristles with structures, including the Warren and Company fishing firm buildings, the Norwegian Seamen’s Church, a sail loft, a machine shop, a pattern shop, a boiler shop, a boarding house for sailors, a shed for stevedores, a grocery store, a cigar shop, a barber, a cobbler, a gentleman’s clothing store, saloons, theaters, restaurants, billiard parlors, blacksmith shops, fish and ice houses, insurance and telephone offices, dwellings, various offices, warehouses, boathouses, and even the Harbormaster’s and Consul’s offices. While the other wharves are not nearly as crowded, Central wharf does feature a small guard post for the wharf police and the offices of Wilds L. Wittich, lumber merchant, who established himself there sometime after an 1881 ordinance allowed him to build a wharf
at the end of Jefferson Street. Wittich’s recently built bridge between Central wharf and Palafox wharf does not appear completed, but only a small space remains open over which a walkway likely existed that the Sanborn maps do not record. Commendencia wharf has a saloon and variety theatre, several shops, dwellings, and warehouses, and the Pensacola Ice and Fish Company’s storehouses (Sanborn Map Company 1884:4, 8; Webb 1885:122; Blount 1889:85-86; Clubbs 1959).

Clearly, visiting captains and sailors could find everything they needed or wanted, from housing to entertainment, without leaving the wharves. Wharf businesses probably grew up organically to serve the needs of maritime workers, but one local resident suggested that city officials intentionally restricted tavern licenses to the lower portion of Palafox Street south of Government for many years (McLellan 1944:47). Either way, Pensacola residents may have slept easier knowing that rowdy sailors from every port of call were safely ensconced on the distant waterfront. Indeed, Palafox and Baylen Streets soon gained quite a reputation for their raucous activity and even became known as the “Red Light District” of Pensacola. This district remained open until about 1917, when officials temporarily closed it due to concerns about the health of visiting military men, but briefly revived during the years between the wars. It was again closed in 1941 for much the same reasons as in 1917 (McLellan 1944:46-47, McGovern 1976:5, 11, 40, 71-80).

The extensive waterfront growth visible in the 1884 Sanborn maps can be, at least partially, attributed to the bustling lumber trade and the growing red snapper fishing industry, which featured both the prosperous firms of Warren and Company and E. E. Saunders and Company by 1882. The completion in May 1883 of the Pensacola and
Atlantic Railroad, by then a subsidiary of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad (L&N), to where it connected with other Florida lines that stretched east to Jacksonville and south to major Florida cities, certainly spurred growth on the waterfront (Hildreth 1959:411-414, Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:70-72, Pearce 1990:131). The year 1883 was also remarkable as the first year in which the U.S. Army Engineers dredged Pensacola Pass, deepening the channel to 23 or 24 ft., allowing larger sailing vessels to easily enter Pensacola Bay (Pearce 1990:131). An 1885 image of Pensacola, done in a style called “Bird’s Eye View” for its unique perspective, further illustrates the changes in Pensacola (Figure 29). The Bird’s Eye View clearly shows a lively city with numerous rail lines, tugboats guiding oceangoing vessels and rafts of timber, active mills, small fishing vessels and canoes, booms in the bay packed with lumber, bathhouses and private wharves, and dozens of ships lining both sides of each commercial wharf. The Bird’s Eye View also depicts the imposing U.S. Custom House building, which housed the Post Office as well, in its new location on the northwest corner of Government and Palafox Streets (Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885). This building, finally approved in early 1884, was not yet completed by 1885. Construction began at least by 1884 since the Sanborn map of that year labels the location of the future Custom House with the word “Foundations,” but a note in the 1885-1886 Pensacola Directory described the still ongoing construction. Workmen did not completely finish the building until 1887 (Pensacola Advance-Gazette 1884:3, Sanborn Map Company 1884:2, Webb 1885:12, Clubbs 1959:391, Appleyard 2001:62). The former Custom House, which had stood on the same spot as the new Custom House since 1854, burned in the devastating 1880 city fire; a memorial by the Pensacola Board of Trade to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives reveals that
Figure 29. 1885 Bird’s Eye View map of Pensacola.
Pensacola had lacked a Custom House since that fire (Pensacola Board of Trade 1884; Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:80; Appleyard 2001:61-62). It is unclear where the business typically transacted in the Custom House occurred between 1880 and 1887.

The 1885-1886 City Directory by Watson Webb details other maritime-related structures, wharves, and businesses not labeled on the 1884 Sanborn map and the 1885 Bird’s Eye View. These include the new Harbormaster’s Office on Palafox wharf with Harbormaster John Webb, who was also a stevedore, and Deputy Harbormasters Ole Frederickson, Edward H. Putnam, and Daniel Webb; the Stevedore’s Hall No. 2 on Tarragona near Intendencia; the businesses on Baylen Street wharf; Clubb’s wharf at the foot of Florida Blanca Street; commercial enterprises on Sullivan’s wharf at the foot of Barracks Street; lumber merchant Martin H. Sullivan’s offices on Sullivan’s wharf; boat builder Robert H. Langford on Baylen Street wharf; several additional boarding houses, including a second one on Palafox wharf; and a plethora of shipping merchants, agents, brokers, ship chandlers, shipsmiths, and ship carpenters. Together, the directory and maps give the overall impression of a bustling, noisy, commercial, maritime city far removed from its sleepy colonial counterpart (Sanborn Map Company 1884:1-2, 5-8; Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885; Webb 1885). A visitor to the city in 1884 expressed this same sentiment upon returning to the wharves from an excursion to Fort Pickens,

We had to pick our way among over a hundred vessels from foreign ports.

There were schooners, brigs, barks and ships from Russia, Denmark, Germany, England, France, Spain, Norway, Italy and Austria. The
principal business of these vessels is carrying lumber, many of which were loading as we passed them (Pensacolian 1884:5).

The June 1887 Sanborn Insurance Company map of Pensacola, which updated the 1884 version, shows basic differences along the waterfront, including the closing of some businesses, the opening of others in their places, and the addition of new buildings. The Sanborn Company also extended Pensacola map coverage in 1887 to the western bayshore between Barcelona and Devilliers Streets. Although the west side of Pensacola’s waterfront was relatively quiet, there was a small dwelling built out over the water just to the east of the end of Reus Street and two narrow wharf-like structures, probably leading to bathhouses or boathouses, on the shore between Reus and Barcelona Streets (Sanborn Map Company 1887:11). On Palafox wharf, the 1887 Sanborn maps reveals a new spar maker shop, a new ship chandlery, the closing of one boarding house and the opening of another, and the removal of both the Consul’s Office and the Warren and Company buildings, the latter of which had likely moved to Baylen Street wharf by that time. W. L. Wittich had expanded his business on Central wharf while Commendencia wharf had lost its saloon and variety theater. A new boarding house, located in three side-by-side buildings, existed at the southwest corner of Baylen and Main Streets near the head of the wharf. Most notably, the space between Palafox and Central wharves south to Pine Street, which was partially water-covered in 1884, existed as completely filled land only three years later (Sanborn Map Company 1884:1, 1887:1-2, 4-6, 8) (Appendix A, Figure A1). The G. W. Wright Santa Rosa Mill and the heads of Tarragona Street wharf and Sullivan’s wharf appeared to have experienced no obvious
modifications and the small wooden pier and boathouse walkway to the east of Tarragona and Sullivan wharves were unchanged (Sanborn Map Company 1887:5-6). The 1887 maps also depict the main portions of the Tarragona Street L&N Railroad wharf and Sullivan’s wharf. The L&N Railroad wharf hosted three warehouses and the end of Sullivan’s wharf featured Sullivan’s lumber shipping offices (Appendix A, Figure A2) (Sanborn Map Company 1887:9).

Shortly after publication of these maps, Pensacola experienced a hurricane on 19 October 1887 that caused some memorable damage to Pensacola’s wharves. The storm freed lumber from its booms and scattered it all over the bay, thereby damaging the pilings of several wharves against which the timbers collided. Hurricanes routinely divested such booms, which held timber in Pensacola Bay until stevedores loaded it onto vessels, of their lumber products when the storms swept through Pensacola (Pensacola Daily Commercial 1887:4). A 1903 photograph of a timber boom in the harbor amply illustrates how such fragile structures were vulnerable to major storms (Figure 30) (Detroit Publishing Company 1903, Appleyard 1976:11). In addition to scattering timber, the storm also grounded an Italian bark, Genitori Tarabocchia, on “Barclay’s Point,” but workers pulled the vessel off later that night (Pensacola Daily Commercial 1887:4). “Barclay’s Point” probably refers to the former property of George Barkley on the bayshore on the east side of town (Benchley et al. 2007). Another source stated that the bark went ashore near Clubbs’ wharf, which likely referred to the wharf of Alexander V. Clubbs, a carpenter and builder, at the foot of Florida Blanca Street (Webb 1885:48, 129; Ove 2010). The Barkley property was just to the east of Florida Blanca Street.
Figure 30. 1903 photograph of a timber boom in Pensacola by the Detroit Publishing Company.
During the same 1887 storm, the Russian bark *Rurik* became stuck fast on the pilings of Herron’s old wharf, located in the same area as the old Panton, Leslie and Company wharf from the Second Spanish period, between Barcelona and Baylen Street wharves. The hurricane also sank the fishing smack *Ripple* next to the Tarragona Street railroad wharf, throwing the ship against the wharf so violently that it was considered a total wreck. Even so, the owners, the Pensacola Ice and Fish Company, planned to raise the boat and assess its damage. The Pensacola Ice and Fish Company’s facilities on Commendencia wharf also suffered tremendously. The storm rammed a loaded lumber flat straight through the wharf, allowing the flat to pass through the gap while 40 ft. of the wharf and an 80 ft. wharf spur tumbled into the bay, unable to withstand the assault. Small boats around the bay sank and the gale unmoored a few lumber-laden lighters from which more timbers broke free, damaging Wittich’s wharf and Baylen Street wharf. In addition, three barges ran aground (*Pensacola Daily Commercial* 1887:4, Ove 2010).

During the storm, the efforts of numerous wharf hands saved a yacht that nearly crashed into Palafox wharf. Dockworkers tied a line to Merrit’s wharf to stabilize the vessel and used poles to keep the yacht from striking the wharf. The mention of Merrit’s wharf probably refers to the wharf spur of John A. Merrit, a ship broker and lumber and timber inspector whose office stood on Palafox wharf. Interestingly, this anecdote indicates that the short wharf spurs that projected off of main wharves like Palafox and Central likely each had their own name based on the company that owned it or the business conducted there (*Pensacola Daily Commercial* 1887:4, Jones and Jones 1893:104, 161). As the storm abated, Pensacola’s men, women, and children busily
gathered scattered lumber in order to collect the payment awarded for each returned piece of timber (*Pensacola Daily Commercial* 1887:4; Lavender and Owens 1964:1a, 8a).

The dynamic nature of the waterfront probably encouraged the revision of maritime sections of the Pensacola Code of Ordinances in 1889. Although the 1889 version is the next extant version after 1868, Pensacola’s government likely published some issues of the Code between those years, but these have not survived to the present day. Even so, the space of time that elapsed between the publications of the two earliest extant Codes must have been quite active as the two references are considerably different in their treatment of waterfront issues. While the 1868 Code regulated bathhouses, controlled the sale of goods from vessels and on the wharf, and established a committee to oversee changes to the waterfront, the 1889 Code of Ordinances devoted much more content to maritime issues, revealing an increasing sophistication in regards to waterfront regulation and a growing concern with the health and well being of the common sailor or, in the language of the day, the “merry tar.” The Harbor chapter specified how land could be created through the erection of barriers and the disposal of ballast.

Ballast, especially, received a great deal of attention, which alludes to the sheer amount of ballast material that ships unloaded at Pensacola’s wharves (Blount 1889:41-42). Illustrating the amount of land creation local officials believed would occur due to this abundance of ballast, surveyors plotted out part of the water in front of Pensacola as early as 1884 and platted the entire swath of water in front of the city by 1889 (Chipley and Davison 1890, Legislature of Florida 1899:191-200). The 1889 Code of Ordinance’s chapter on the Harbor also placed a time limit on the removal of sunken vessels and authorized removal by the city with fees assessed to the vessel owner if they failed to
adhere to the ordinance (Blount 1889:41-42). The hulks of vessels marring Pensacola’s waterfront after each hurricane may well have prompted such an ordinance.

While the 1868 Code of Ordinances was content to regulate waterfront sales and structures, the 1889 Code extended its concern to the sailors who frequented the bayshore. The chapter titled “Shipping Master and Protection to Seamen” called for the appointment of a Shipping Master to monitor the hiring of sailors for vessels needing extra hands and to prevent the unlawful onboard retention of persons who did not wish to serve as sailors. Article II of the same chapter required the close regulation of sailors’ boarding houses, including the charges assessed for room and board, and the sanitary conditions of the rooms and building. The President of the Board, the Chief of Police, and the Chairman of the Police Committee were given authority to inspect the boarding houses at any time they deemed necessary (Blount 1889:66-68, McGovern 1976:5).

Although these changes do not mean that city officials and residents began to view sailors as equals, the ordinances do imply that city officials understood that sailors deserved at least the most basic rights, especially considering their importance to the economy of Pensacola.

With the last hurricane comfortably past, no major storm looming on the horizon, and a set of ordinances to enhance and maintain Pensacola’s maritime assets, the deep-water city greeted the 1890s with a vital economy and vibrant waterfront. An 1890 USCS map, the first USCS map to depict any change on the waterfront since 1859, shows the extensive facilities of the Brent Lumber Company, founded in 1880, at the entrance to Bayou Chico, with a long wharf extending out into the bay, and the related enlargement of the island at the Bayou’s mouth (Figure 31). The map also shows more filled land
Figure 31. Detail from an 1890 map of Pensacola by the U.S. Office of Coast Survey.
between Baylen Street wharf and Herron’s wharf and between Herron’s wharf and Barcelona Street wharf, than that shown on the 1885 Bird’s Eye View. In addition, the map depicts a wharf and small peninsula of filled land near the end of Coyle Street and another wharf between Reus and Devilliers Streets that later maps better illustrate and further explain (Norris, Wellge and Co. 1885; USCS 1890; Koch 1896; Appleyard 1989:23). The USCS 1890 map is also the first to exclude any depiction of a substantial wharf at the end of Florida Blanca Street on the east side of the waterfront. While 1885 Bird’s Eye View map of Pensacola and the Sanborn overview maps from 1887, 1892 and 1897 show this wharf, more detailed Sanborn maps do not depict the area. The lack of a substantial Florida Blanca wharf on both the 1890 USCS and an 1896 Bird’s Eye View map suggests that map makers simply did not update the 1892 and 1897 Sanborn overview maps to reveal this waterfront change that occurred sometime between 1885 and 1890 (Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885; Sanborn Map Company 1887:1, 1892:1, 1897:1; Koch 1896).

As mentioned above, the first Sanborn maps of the decade date to 1892 and are similar to the 1887 Sanborn maps with some important differences. New land existed to the west of Palafox wharf and the wharf itself hosted many new businesses, including four more ship chandleries, two new hardware stores, another machine shop, the addition of a foundry to the existing machine shop, a coffee house, a bakery, several clothing stores, and more saloons. While a Gentleman’s Clothing store replaced the original Harbormaster’s office and the new office is not marked, the 1885 City Directory clarifies that the Harbormaster’s office was still located on Palafox wharf. In addition, the Pilots’ Association established an office on the wharf’s west side. Central wharf boasted a new
sail loft, blacksmith shop, and tin shop and filled land existed in the northern space
between Central and Commendencia wharves (Appendix B, Figure B1) (Webb 1885:118,
Sanborn Map Company 1892:8).

Commendencia wharf incurred the most change since 1887. While Wittich
repaired his wharf after the 1887 hurricane, the Pensacola Fish Company’s losses on
Commendencia wharf, at least temporarily, proved too great. By 1892, no trace remained
of the company on Commendencia. The packinghouses, icehouses, warehouses,
boathouse, sheds, and offices were all gone. By 1892, workers had repaired the wharf
spur formerly occupied by the Pensacola Fish Company, but the Piaggio Gang Saw and
Planing Mill replaced the former fish company as tenants (Appendix B, Figure B2)
(Sanborn Map Company 1892:1, 4). However, the 1893-1894 City Directory still lists
the Pensacola Fish Company’s location as Commendencia wharf and an 1896 Bird’s Eye
View shows the company, across from its former location, on a new wharf spur (Jones
and Jones 1893:163, Koch 1896). It seems that, though the Pensacola Fish Company
survived, it must have temporarily operated from another location between the storm in
late 1887 and 1893, when the information for the City Directory was compiled.

The eastern side of the waterfront had changed as well. Overman’s Mill at
Barracks and Main Streets had become the Sarragosa Planing Mill and the wooden pier to
the east of Sullivan’s wharf had disappeared (Appendix B, Figure B2) (Sanborn Map
Company 1892:6). The westernmost of the narrow wharves between Barcelona and Reus
Streets was also gone (Appendix B, Figure B1) (Sanborn Map Company 1892:11). The
1892 Sanborn maps that cover Baylen Street wharf, the end of the Tarragona railroad
wharf, and Sullivan’s lumber offices on Sullivan’s wharf show no appreciable changes in
the five years since the Sanborn Map Company had published its last set of maps (Appendix B, Figures B1 and B2) (Sanborn Map Company 1892:2, 9). Though its facilities remained unchanged, the G. W. Wright Santa Rosa Mill had been renamed for W. B. Wright, the son and inheritor of G. W. Wright (Sanborn Map Company 1892:13, Appleyard 1989:21-22). The 1892 Sanborn maps also extended coverage to the terrestrial portions of two mill complexes along the Pensacola waterfront and structures on Muscogee wharf on the bayfront’s east side. The extensive facilities of the J. R. Brent and Company Saw and Planing Mill stood on an island at the mouth of Bayou Chico while the Oliver Bronnum Planing Mill was situated on the western bayshore at the foot of Coyle Street. Unfortunately, the plan of each mill stops short of illustrating their wharves and other maritime structures. However, the 1892 Sanborn maps do show Muscogee wharf, including its two levels of railroad tracks, an elevated coal trestle, an office, and a large warehouse (Appendix B, Figure B2) (Sanborn Map Company 1892:12, 15).

The 1893-1894 City Directory, the next extant copy of the directory, combined with the information from the 1892 Sanborn maps, provides even more insight into Pensacola’s maritime infrastructure. While the 1893-1894 Directory lists fewer boarding houses than the 1885-1886 edition, the later directory specifically labels two of those accommodations as sailors’ boarding houses. The house run by James O’Brien, formerly located on Palafox wharf, moved to Baylen Street wharf. The other sailors’ boarding house listed at the corner of Main and Baylen, managed by Mrs. Margaret Williams, corresponds with the location of a boarding house on the 1892 Sanborn maps (Jones and Jones 1893:160).
The directory also lists a myriad of other maritime-related establishments and businesses, including ship brokers, timber and lumber merchants, fish companies, oyster wholesalers, hardware and mill supplies, lumber dealers and manufacturers, foundries and machine shops, planing mills, saw mills, ship chandlers, shipsmiths, billiard parlors, and plenty of liquor stores. Most of these businesses cluster on the southern portion of Palafox, Baylen, Commendencia, or Jefferson Streets either near or on the wharves. For example, all three billiard parlors operated on Palafox, south of Government. These locations support the statements of local resident, Don McLellan, who argued that city officials intentionally restricted tavern licenses, and maybe other similar businesses, to the lower portion of Palafox Street south of Government (McLellan 1944:47). The directory also lists quite a number of maritime workers, including Harbormaster Dennis Burns, Deputy Harbormasters Antonio Ferrara, William McKenzie Oerting, Daniel Webb, and George Williams, 40 bar pilots, 38 stevedores, 16 contracting stevedores, 1 stevedore contracting company, and 5 harbor pilots. The Harbormaster and first three Deputy Harbormasters filled four of the five harbor pilot positions (Jones and Jones 1893). Combined with the numerous mill workers and fishermen, and the probable army of unlisted, temporary, and transitory dockworkers and sailors, Pensacola’s economy clearly owed much to its maritime laborers.

Unfortunately, even Pensacola’s vivacious economy could not deflect Gulf Coast weather. In October of 1893, Pensacola experienced a terrible hurricane. The waterfront suffered extensive damage, losing wharves, railroad tracks, and numerous vessels. On Baylen Street wharf, winds blew the Warren and Company’s smokehouse on its side and lifted the entire house of Mr. Tapiola off the wharf, dropping it into Baylen slip between
Baylen and Palafox wharves. Two foreign barks grounded on the beach near “Capt. Slocumb’s lost timber crib,” whose exact location is unfortunately omitted from the account, but local harbor workers felt the vessels could be safely freed with little damage (Daily News 1893a:4). The sailors of Warren and Company’s fishing smack Isabel intentionally ran the vessel aground in Baylen slip behind Hamilton’s Saloon after its anchor cables parted, leaving it at the mercy of the storm. A barge sank near Baylen Street wharf, a lumber lighter sank at the foot of the Tarragona Street railroad wharf, and another at the end of Burns’ wharf. Several other lighters ran hard aground on the shore between Bronnum’s Mill and Burns’ wharf. While the local newspaper does not specify the location of Burns’ wharf and identified maps do not include any such label, an 1896 Bird’s Eye Map shows the Oliver Bronnum Planing Mill with its wharf on the waterfront between Devilliers and Coyle Streets. The only other wharf anywhere near this location is visible on the 1890 and 1901 USCS maps as well as the 1896 Bird’s Eye, which show a shorter, less substantial wharf jutting from the shore between Devilliers and Reus Streets (USCS 1890, 1901; Koch 1896). Although tentative, this mysterious wharf may be the Burns’ wharf indicated in the hurricane account. While the 1893-1894 City Directory lists seven individuals with the last name of Burns, none live near this location on the waterfront or run a business that would require such a wharf (Jones and Jones 1893:47). The 1893 hurricane also freed much of the lumber in the bay and the article notes that timber lay all over the beaches as far south as Big Bayou or Bayou Grande. Railroads around the city suffered greatly with communication being cut off to most points to the east and west (Daily News 1893a:4).
The day after the storm revealed more details about the extent of damage to the waterfront. Captain Slocumb, revealed to be the custodian of lost timber, actively directed crews who were gathering lost timber and piling it on the wharves. The *Daily News* describes Slocumb’s timber crib, mentioned the previous day, as the old ballast crib. Whether this crib was a ballast crib made of recovered timbers or a crib made for storing lost timber is unclear from these two sources (*Daily News* 1893b:4). However, since Captain George J. Slocumb’s office was located on the wharf at 603 South Palafox Street, it seems likely the crib was located nearby (Jones and Jones 1893:132). Workers successfully floated the two foreign barks grounded during the storm with no major damage and expected the lighters could be removed from the beach at high tide. The small schooner *Florence* that sank at the foot of Burns’ wharf appeared to be unsalvageable (*Daily News* 1893b:4).

The wharves did not fare well and each sustained some damage. Baylen Street wharf lost 10 ft. along with a tool shed. The local paper simply described Palafox wharf as “badly damaged” (*Daily News* 1893b:4). The *Daily News* stated that the Warren and Company’s smack, though still grounded in Baylen slip, would be freed after the removal of cargo and ballast, but expressed less optimism about the sloop *Bersattious*, which ran aground farther up the slip still laden with lumber. A British bark scraped against the railroad wharf during the storm and the schooner *Surprise*, which sank at the end of the wharf with a full cargo of lumber, required a survey to determine if she could be raised. Although vessels and structures sustained damage at the Quarantine Station on Gulf Breeze Peninsula and on Santa Rosa Island as well, the downtown Pensacola waterfront suffered the most extensive damage in the storm (*Daily News* 1893b:4).
An already distressed Pensacola fell victim to yet another storm in August 1894. Damage proved light compared to the 1893 storm, but winds and surge had again scattered timber across the bay, grounded the Norwegian bark *Thiorva* in Baylen slip, and crashed a timber raft into Central wharf causing considerable damage. The economy also suffered when the weather prevented maritime workers from working on vessels for at least two days (*Daily News* 1894a:4, 1894b:4). Even such conditions could not keep Pensacola officials from tweaking their city’s ordinances. In 1895, officials moved the landfill line—the line past which no ballast could be legally deposited behind bulkheads between wharves—to Magnolia Street, now Gimble Street, which is a block north of Pine Street and about 200 ft. south of Main Street. The 1889 Code of Ordinances had fixed the earlier landfill line at Pine Street, the street just north of the Scandinavian Church on Palafox wharf, about 300 ft. south of Main Street (Blount 1889:41-42, 1895:39-41). The reason for this decision to reduce the extent of land creation between the wharves on the waterfront is unclear, but may have had to do with leaving adequate depth for several deep draft vessels at the ends of the wharves without having to extend them further into the bay.

Despite the two damaging back-to-back storms of 1893 and 1894, hurricane-weary Pensacola ironically managed to rebuild just in time for another major storm. An 1896 Bird’s Eye View map of the city, like its 1885 counterpart, reveals a dynamic city with a profusion of ships loading at the various wharves (Figure 32) (Koch 1896). With its different perspective (roughly towards the west instead of towards the east) and enlarged scope, the 1896 Bird’s Eye provides even more information than the 1885 Bird’s Eye. On the east side of the bay, Muscogee wharf, built by the Pensacola and
Figure 32. 1896 Bird’s Eye View map of Pensacola.
Mobile Railroad, had become a part of the L&N Railroad and served as their second railroad wharf and coal dock. Its multilevel rail lines made it ideal for loading vessels at various heights (L&N 1901). The 1896 Bird’s Eye View illustrates the extensive W. B. Wright and Company Sawmill, or Santa Rosa Mill, at the end of 10th Avenue and a new short wharf at the foot of Florida Blanca street, which may be the one that eventually hosted Bliss’s bathhouse as mentioned in a later newspaper account (Koch 1896, Daily News 1906g:4). The Tarragona Street L&N Railroad wharf appears much as it did in the 1892 Sanborn, but Sullivan’s wharf on its east side shows some changes. Sullivan’s large complex near the end of Sullivan’s wharf, which is visible on the 1885 Bird’s Eye View and 1892 Sanborn maps, is noticeably smaller on the 1896 Bird’s Eye View. The Pensacola Manufacturing Company, which had made its home on the waterfront since at least 1893, is present on a wharf spur just off Sullivan’s wharf (Jones and Jones 1893:166, Koch 1896).

On Commendencia wharf, Stratton Ice Works replaced Piaggio’s Planing Mill and the Pensacola Ice and Fish Company operated from a new wharf spur opposite its former home. While the 1896 Bird’s Eye View does not label most of the buildings on Central, Palafox, and Baylen Street wharve, it does mark the E. E. Saunders and Company fish house near the end of Palafox wharf. In addition, the amount of new fill between these wharves is clearly apparent. While the fill between Commendencia and Central wharves and Palafox and Baylen Street wharves stops approximately at the platted location of Magnolia Street, as decreed by the 1895 city ordinances, the fill between Central and Palafox wharves extends about half a block past Pine Street, but was likely filled before the ordinances changed sometime between 1889 and 1895 (Blount
The Warren and Company fish merchants facility graces the end of Baylen Street wharf and new parcels of land exist between Baylen Street wharf’s and Herron’s wharf and also on the west side of Herron’s wharf. Barcelona Street wharf remains relatively unchanged along with a less substantial wharf to the west of it that might be the Burns’ wharf mentioned in earlier hurricane accounts. The image also depicts the O. Bronnum Planing Mill complex and wharf on the waterfront between Coyle and Devilliers Streets, the entire length of the Pensacola and Perdido Railroad wharf, Tharp’s Planing Mill just north of the wharf along the Pensacola and Perdido Railroad, and the R. J. Brent and Company Sawmill on an island at the mouth of Bayou Chico with a wharf extending out to a large platform on pilings where ships could easily dock. Numerous smaller wharves, probably mostly bathhouses and boathouses, dot the shore. The majestic Custom House and Post Office building still graces the northwest corner of Government and Palafox Streets (Koch 1896).

This 1896 snapshot of a vibrant, bustling Pensacola radically changed in July of the same year when a devastating hurricane blew across Northwest Florida and caused immense damage to the town as a whole, but especially to the waterfront and vessels in the harbor. Whatever the intensity of the storm compared to those that came before, the destruction reported in the local paper eclipses any reported previously. At the height of the gale, the Pensacola Daily News reported that waves broke over the wharves and the storm uprooted many of the shorter piers extending from the sides of the wharves and pitched them back and forth. Winds scattered all of the timber in the holding pens, amply illustrated in the 1896 Bird’s Eye View, throughout the bay and pushed much of it onshore (Daily News 1896a:2, Koch 1896). The hurricane demolished several structures on
the west side of the bay, including a wharf in front of the home of Alexander C. Blount and breakwaters belonging to William A. Blount and John S. Beard, all local lawyers. The exact location of these maritime structures is uncertain. City directories indicate that neither Blount lived on the waterfront; the directory only specifies Beard’s address as “near Bayou Grande.” Since Alexander Blount’s primary residence was not near the water in 1896, the article probably refers to his secondary or summer home on the western bayshore, a luxury enjoyed by many of Pensacola’s wealthy residents. By 1905, the erstwhile summer house was Alexander Blount’s primary residence, but relevant documents do not describe the exact location of the home (Brown Printing Company 1896:19-21; *Daily News* 1896a:2, 1896b:1-3; R. L. Polk and Company 1905:143; McGovern 1976:4-5).

The wrecks of six Choctawhatchee sailing lighters damaged by the 1896 storm also littered the western beach. One sank, three capsized, and the others grounded along with the Chaffin and Company’s lumber flat *Florida*, which was fully loaded. The fishing smack *Clara R. Grimes*, belonging to the firm of E. E. Saunders and Company, grounded to the west of Brent’s Mill at the entrance to Bayou Chico and the Italian brig *Diadema* grounded so high against the Brent Mill wharf that local experts felt she was unsalvageable. The fully laden Norwegian bark *Herman*, the British steamship *Fulham*, the British bark *Assyria*, and two other Norwegian barks all went ashore to the west of Perdido wharf (*Daily News* 1896a:2, 1896b:1-3). The sloop belonging to boatman James Conklin, who lived near Perdido wharf, sank (Jones and Jones 1893:54, *Daily News* 1896b:1-3). Winds flattened every house on Perdido wharf; an Austrian steamship and a British steamship collided with the wharf’s eastern side. The Norwegian bark *Svea*
settled half on Perdido wharf and half on the British steamship. The *Svea*’s mainmast broke in two and fell on a lumber car on the wharf, spreading timber all over, and her stern buckled as it ran into and dislodged a portion of Perdido wharf. A lighter sank just to the east of the wharf and five timber-laden schooners, the schooner *Eagle*, and the *Key West* grounded on the beach between Perdido wharf and Bronnum’s Mill. The storm drove the *Key West* quite high onto the beach and crushed the vessel’s sides. Surge swept away the Bronnum Mill wharf and Walter’s sizeable boathouse (*Daily News* 1896a:2, 1896b:1-3). The reference to Walter’s boathouse probably alludes to Frank W. Walter, whose residence sat facing the bay at the end of Devilliers Street (Jones and Jones 1893:144).

Baylen Street wharf seems to have suffered the most extensive storm damage of any wharf besides the Perdido wharf. The bark *Sentia*, moored at Palafox wharf, broke free and crashed through the foot of Baylen wharf. The smack *Althea Franklin* sank after forcing its way through the rest of the wharf and completely destroying W. J. Berry’s lumber shed which stood on Baylen wharf. The *Clarence Barclay*, moored at Baylen wharf, sank at anchor and two unnamed barks collided at the erstwhile end of the wharf as well. *Althea Franklin* and *Clarence Barclay* belonged to the unlucky Warren and Company fishing firm (*Daily News* 1896a:2, 1896b:1-3).

The western bayshore and Baylen Street wharf were not the only waterfront areas to suffer. A small schooner sank west of Herron’s wharf, which was itself completely obliterated, and the yacht *Phantom* sank off Palafox wharf. A Norwegian bark, anchored on the west side of the Tarragona Street Railroad wharf, broke loose at the stern and swung over to Cobb’s wharf (*Daily News* 1896a:2, 1896b:1-3). Cobb’s wharf was
probably the Commendencia Street wharf spur of the Pensacola Ice and Fish Company since Sewall C. Cobb was the company’s president (Jones and Jones 1893:53). The hurricane nearly destroyed the Pensacola Manufacturing Company, which occupied a pier off of Sullivan’s wharf. Four ships, including a pilot boat and three smacks, anchored for repairs in Sullivan’s timber boom, suffered severely from the storm. One of the smacks, *Josie May*, sank. The Norwegian bark *Johan Ludwig*, moored on the west side of Muscogee wharf, snapped its cables and ran aground halfway between the wharf and Wright’s Mill, which also sustained major damage (*Daily News* 1896a:2, 1896b:1-3).¹ The wind felled smoke stacks and the “top of the slab burner” and broke up the mill’s wharf (*Daily News* 1896b:1-3). Storm surge washed away all of the bathhouses on the eastern side of Pensacola as well as numerous shanties, strewing their collective wreckage along the beach. The storm also interrupted many of the rail lines throughout the city and washed away the ballast on which some of them stood (*Daily News* 1896a:2, 1896b:1-3).

The *Daily News* article from the day after the storm also reveals an interesting, if temporary, facet of Pensacola’s maritime economy. After the storm scattered timber all along the shores of the bay, especially between Perdido wharf and O. Bronnum’s Mill, crews of men worked diligently to gather up the lost lumber. The custodian of lost timber paid the crews for each stick of hewn and sawn timber collected. Although women and children joined men in this endeavor in 1887, by 1896 timber-gathering

---

¹ The *Daily News* mistakenly records that the *Johan Ludwig* was moored to the west of Perdido wharf, which was on the west side of Pensacola. Wright’s Mill, however, was located on the east side of Pensacola. O. Bronnum’s Mill was located to the east of Perdido wharf, but a ship moored on the west side of Perdido wharf would not run aground between the wharf and the mill. A ship moored on the west side of Muscogee wharf, on the other hand, would very likely run aground between that wharf and Wright’s Mill (Koch 1896).
seems to have evolved into a more male-centered activity. The article revealed that fights, most only escalating to the extent of curses and threats, often erupted between rival crews and entire rafts of timber were sometimes stolen. One bayman was even injured during an argument when hit by a boat hook wielded by the bayman of an opposing crew (*Pensacola Daily Commercial* 1887:4, *Daily News* 1896b:1-3).

A new set of Sanborn Maps published in 1897 show some of the results of the 1896 hurricane’s devastation as well as the effects of new land creation (Sanborn Map Company 1897:1). The J. R. Brent and Company Saw and Planing Mill lost some of its tramways; storm damage may have also caused the reconfiguration of some of its buildings. In addition, the mill featured a new marine railway off of Bayou Chico. The O. Bronnum Planing Mill, which constructed a substantial lumber shed on the east side of its property before 1896, does not appear to have suffered extensively. However, since the maps of both mills do not show much of the companies’ wharves, which the 1896 storm reportedly damaged, changes to these maritime structures are less clear (Koch 1896; Sanborn Map Company 1897:12, 18). While a new shed or small hut existed over the water next to the dwelling on the bayshore just to the east of Reus Street, the narrow wharf extending out into the water just to the west of Barcelona Street wharf was gone (Appendix C, Figures C1 and C2) (Sanborn Map Company 1897:11). The small cove south of James Herron’s hospital had lost the small building that extended into it and the bridge that crossed it. The sailors’ boarding house at the head of Baylen Street wharf was still operating, but the saloons on either side of Baylen wharf had closed and the buildings repurposed as dwellings. Whereas before the Baylen wharf boarding house buildings were built out over the water, by 1897 much of this space was filled in, with
land underneath the houses. Quite a bit of new land existed between Baylen and Palafox wharves as well, providing space for a new rail spur of the Pensacola Terminal Railroad that extended south to the Pensacola Electric Light and Power Company next to Palafox wharf (Appendix C, Figure C1) (Sanborn Map Company 1897:2, 16).

Palafox wharf was still the center of waterfront activity even though many businesses no longer existed, some possibly due to expensive hurricane damages. Several ship chandleries, the Bay View Variety Theater, which had graced Palafox wharf since at least 1884, both sail lofts, the spar maker, two boarding houses, the Pilots’ Association Office, and other facilities were gone. Even so, other establishments replaced some of the former businesses and offices, including a bowling alley, new coffee shops, boarding rooms on the second floors of many businesses, a café, a secondhand store, and junk shops (Appendix C, Figure C1). The 1897 Sanborn maps amply detail the E. E. Saunders and Company fish house at the end of Palafox wharf, which earlier Sanborn maps did not illustrate. In addition, a new railroad spur extended the full length of Palafox wharf all the way to Saunders and Company’s facilities, offering efficient transportation of its fish products (Appendix C, Figure C2) (Sanborn Map Company 1897:8, 13).

Two new roads, Cedar and Magnolia Streets, also shown on the 1896 Bird’s Eye View, connected Palafox wharf to Central wharf. Central wharf, itself, boasted a new passenger terminal for the Pensacola Railroad Company at the corner of Main and Jefferson Streets as well as a sail loft, possibly one that moved from Palafox wharf. The area south of Pine Street between Palafox and Central wharves was partially filled by 1892, suggesting that the boundary line for creation of new land in Pensacola’s Code of
Ordinances was changed from Pine Street to Magnolia Street sometime after 1892, but before 1895. Lumber merchant W. L. Wittich no longer occupied offices on Central wharf as he had moved to 102 South Palafox Street. There were still several warehouses and a lumber shed at his former office location on Central wharf, but it is unclear to whom these belonged. A new small, unnamed sawmill existed halfway down Commendencia Street wharf and the Pensacola Ice and Fish Company stood near the end of the wharf with the former Piaggio Planing Mill sawmill located to the west of it (Appendix C, Figures C1 and C2). Exactly who owned and ran this mill in 1897 is uncertain (Brown Printing Company 1896:145; Sanborn Map Company 1897:8-9, 13).

In addition, a new shipsmith and carpenter shop replaced the wood warehouse at the head of Tarragona Street wharf and the L&N planned a new grain elevator for Tarragona wharf. The B. R. Pitt Mill Company, still located at the head of Sullivan’s wharf, featured additional facilities on a pier extending off the east of Sullivan’s wharf, the former location of the Pensacola Manufacturing Company that was irreparably destroyed in the 1896 hurricane (Sanborn Map Company 1897:6, 8-9, 13). The Sarragosa Planing Mill no longer existed at the corner of Barracks and Main Streets, but the rest of the eastern waterfront did not reveal appreciable changes (Sanborn Map Company 1897:6). The 1897 Sanborn maps also show that the extensive W. B. Wright Company Sawmill at the corner of 10th Avenue and Intendencia Street, whose maritime structures were previously uncharted, possessed two substantial wharves with one extending out into the bay approximately 900 ft. (Appendix C, Figure C2) (Sanborn Map Company 1897:19).
These 1897 Sanborn maps do provide some information that corroborates the 1896 accounts of storm damage, but also illustrate the limits of archival documents. The majority of hurricane destruction from 1896 occurred in peripheral areas not fully depicted on or even covered by Pensacola’s Sanborn maps, including the Brent Mill wharf, Perdido wharf, the wharf at Bronnum’s Mill, Baylen Street wharf, and Herron’s wharf on the west side of Pensacola and the bathhouses and shanties on the east side of Pensacola. The extent of damage to the wharves of the W. B. Wright Company Sawmill mentioned in the 1896 hurricane accounts is difficult to determine through comparison since previous Sanborn maps do not depict the mill’s wharf structures. However, some of the storm damage is visible or inferable, such as missing boathouses and bathhouses along fully illustrated portions of the shore, vacant and possibly damaged buildings that were once lively commercial ventures, and the absence of the Pensacola Manufacturing Company on the lateral wharf spur off Sullivan’s wharf.

Despite the depredations of storm after storm, many of Pensacola’s residents, merchants, and businessmen still longed to legally own their own piece of the waterfront. Even though many built wharves, erected houses over the water, and created new land on the bayshore, the ownership of Pensacola’s waterfront remained in litigation for over 30 years. Finally, in 1899, the Florida and United States Supreme Courts granted ownership of all waterfront lands to the State of Florida. In the same year, the Florida Legislature passed “An Act to Grant the Water Front of the City of Pensacola.” This act authorized the formation of a Waterfront Commission that would grant waterfront lots to those who applied for them within two years, especially if the grantees had improved the lots in some way, such as building wharves, other structures, or creating new land through the
use of fill. The act automatically granted some portions of the waterfront, especially any
lands covered by at least 12 ft. of water, to the City of Pensacola so they would remain
open for navigation (CCCAD 1866b, Legislature of Florida 1899:191-200). Numerous
individuals requested and obtained waterfront lots within the next two years and even
afterwards when the committee probably extended the deadline to allow enough time to
apply for all those interested in legal tenure of a portion of Pensacola’s bay front (Jones

As the 19th century came to a close, Pensacola’s future appeared bright indeed.
Lumber still reined as the supreme export product, but naval stores and red snapper also
provided jobs to numerous inhabitants and brought in steady revenue. Expansion
continued on the waterfront and several mills stood right along the shore. Nevertheless,
Pensacola’s prosperity would not last forever. A lack of conservation soon affected
Pensacola’s core industries. Competition from nearby ports with better access to the
interior, like Mobile and New Orleans, along with little effort to modernize the port’s
maritime infrastructure eventually led to Pensacola’s decline as a major shipping
entrepôt. The following chapter examines this waning of the city’s waterfront.
CHAPTER V

PROGRESSIVE PENSACOLA, 1900-1940: CHANGING TIMES

Directly we were in the shipping: Barges, schooners, barkentines, barks, full-rigged ships, rusty ill-smelling tramp steamers, and spick and span liners – a greater tonnage probably than Lord Nelson ever dreamed of, and a harbor that can accommodate twenty times as much.

~ F. F. Bingham (1991:33)

The 20th century dawned bright and clear on a Pensacola well recovered from its last few hurricanes and still enjoying the steady commerce provided by its lumber, naval stores, and fishing industries. Nevertheless, times were changing and the city would soon suffer the effects of a lack of conservation in both the forest and the deep as well as the depredations of a string of hurricanes that became famous for their severity and eerie regularity in 1906, 1916, and 1926. Surprisingly, fewer detailed maps of the Pensacola waterfront exist per decade for the first forty years of the 1900s than for the last two decades of the 1800s, but historians of the era have drawn from a wealth of archival documents and constructed a detailed image of Pensacola as it progressed during the first half of the century. In addition, photographers began to focus on the port’s facilities in the 1900s, especially as viewed from the water. Just as was the case at the end of the 19th century, maritime industries dominated Pensacola’s economy and extensive wharves held sway over the waterfront in the early 20th century. Palafox and Zarragossa Streets teemed with businesses, including dance halls, saloons, and licensed brothels, many of which catered to sailors and others who resided only temporarily in the city (Armstrong,
1930, Appleyard 1976, McGovern 1976:1-5, Sutton 1979, Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982). Although a United States Coast Survey (USCS) chart from 1901 does depict the Pensacola waterfront, the map was clearly not updated after 1890 (USCS 1890, 1901). Instead, a 1901 map by the Louisville and Nashville (L&N) railroad, which shows comparatively little change from the 1897 Sanborn maps, records the disappearance of the O. Bronnum Planing Mill at the end of Coyle Street. In addition, the map depicts the 28-ft.-deep channels that extended from the L&N’s Tarragona Street and Muscogee wharves into the deepest part of the bay (Figure 33) (L&N 1901).

In 1903, the Sanborn Map Company revised and expanded their map set of the city (Sanborn Map Company 1903:1). The Brent Lumber Company Saw and Planing Mills had expanded its operations with the construction of two new dry kilns and a second wharf. While the new Henry King Planing Mill with its wharf was open at the end of Clubbs Street, the O. Bronnum Planing Mill no longer stood on the waterfront as suggested by the 1901 L&N map (L&N 1901, Sanborn Map Company 1903:11, 31). A new walkway, probably to a boat or bathhouse, and short wharf existed on the bayshore between Devilliers and Reus Streets as well as a new boathouse and wharf at the end of Reus Street (Sanborn Map Company 1903:10). The Sanborn Map Company finally expanded its coverage in 1903 to show the entirety of Baylen Street wharf and the active portion of Barcelona Street wharf, which the W. H. Knowles Sawmill occupied (Appendix D, Figures D1 and D2).

Extensive filling had occurred on the west side of Baylen Street wharf and, while the sailors’ boarding house buildings at the head of the wharf had become dwellings, new
Figure 33. 1901 map of Pensacola Harbor by the Louisville and Nashville Railroad.
boarding rooms were open about halfway down the wharf. The wharf also boasted two carpenters, a shipsmith, and the R. H. Langford Ship Yard (Sanborn Map Company 1903:2, 32). Langford, a boat builder by trade, moved from Florida Blanca Street and established himself on Baylen Street wharf sometimes between 1893 and 1896 (Appendix D, Figure D1) (Jones and Jones 1893:93; Brown Printing Company 1896:153). The map of Baylen wharf showed the Warren and Company fishing firm buildings at the very end of the wharf as well as the smaller Victor Holst and Company fish house and a carriage house just north of Warren and Company (Appendix D, Figures D1 and D2). Holst, a former bayman and stevedore, who founded his fishing firm with William H. Hutchinson, a former commission merchant, began operation sometime between 1898 and 1903 (Brown Printing Company 1896:58, Maloney Directory Company 1898:170, 172; Wiggins Directories Publishing Company 1903:146, 363).

Between Baylen and Palafox wharves, the former Pensacola Electric Light and Power Company building was vacant and the rail spur extending to it was gone. Created land filled the space between the two wharves just south of Cedar Street, but several shorter wharf spurs and various buildings on pilings extended off the east side of Baylen and south from Cedar Street (Sanborn Map Company 1903:2, 32). As before, the 1903 Sanborn maps detail the shops and businesses on both sides of Palafox wharf. The network of small wharves and boathouses on the west side of Palafox wharf had noticeably expanded and some additional fill been added, but little to none dumped south of Magnolia Street. Although some of the businesses active in 1897 still existed, entrepreneurs operated numerous new establishments and new commercial ventures filled many formerly vacant buildings. The bowling alley on the west side was reborn as a
Chinese laundry and patent medicine shop while the coffee salon on the east side became a bicycle shop. A shooting gallery replaced the cigar shop; the secondhand store and one of the junk stores were replaced by the James Hughes Boiler and Machine Works, which formerly stood at the corner of Cedar Street and Central wharf. While the wharf had lost a shipsmith, it gained a sail maker and ship supplies store (Appendix D, Figure D1). The 1903 Sanborn maps also show the expanded facilities of fish dealers E. E. Saunders and Company at the end of Palafox wharf with a new shed next to their fish house (Appendix D, Figure D2) (Sanborn Map Company 1903:2, 16).

Changes also occurred on Central wharf. The edifice known formerly as the James Hughes Boiler shop, described above, was vacant and the buildings once occupied by lumber merchant W. L. Wittich then belonged to the Pensacola Foundry and Boiler Works (Appendix D, Figure D1). The wooden end of Central wharf, which suffered during the 1894 storm, does not appear to have been rebuilt to its pre-hurricane glory. By 1903, Central wharf ended about a block south of Pine Street rather than extending as before to the same length as Palafox wharf (Sanborn Map Company 1903:1, 2).

The 1903 Sanborn maps show changes to the eastern side of the Pensacola waterfront as well, revealing that Commendencia and Tarragona Street wharves had undergone massive alterations. Whether the heads of Commendencia and Tarragona wharves changed is not clear as the 1903 Sanborn maps do not illustrate those portions of the wharves, but the lower half of Commendencia had been entirely purchased or commandeered by the L&N, which expanded the wharf to either side, established a substantial freight storage warehouse, and ran eight rail lines down the wharf. The L&N also cleared the Commendencia wharf spur on which the Piaggio Planing Mill previously
stood and constructed an office building there instead. The railroad still occupied Tarragona Street wharf as well. The grain elevator planned for Tarragona Street wharf in 1897 had been built; numerous rail lines ran down to it and past to another freight storage warehouse at the end of the wharf (Appendix D, Figure D2).

The end of Sullivan’s wharf, which extended to the same length as Tarragona Street wharf in 1897, was truncated and likely contained few to no buildings (Sanborn Map Company 1903:29). The H. G. De Silva Mill Company occupied the shingle mill facilities on the lateral wharf spur off the east of Sullivan’s wharf and the planing mill complex at the end of Barracks Street, both of which formerly belonged to the B. R. Pitt Mill Company. More fill packed the space between Barracks and Adams Streets south of Main Street, but the small wharf or walkway at the end of Adams Street was no more. The ends of Alcaniz Street and Cevallos Street, not previously detailed, hosted a fish house and several boardwalks respectively (Sanborn Map Company 1903:5, 6, 16, 29). The W. B. Wright Company Santa Rosa Mill complex was not appreciably changed except for the relocation of the dry kiln on the western wharf and the addition of a tramway from the central facility to the end of said wharf (Appendix D, Figure D2) (Sanborn Map Company 1903:28).

Other significant changes to the port occurred in the early 20th century. Most notably, the Army Corps of Engineers, which began occasional dredging of the channel into Pensacola Bay in 1883 in order to maintain a depth of about 24 ft., finally provided their dredge Caucus to the Pensacola district in 1905. Continuous use of the dredge permitted Pensacola officials to improve the channel to a depth of 30 ft., allowing much larger vessels to enter the harbor (Pearce 1990:132). For about another decade, the
improved channel depth provided access to vessels entering the harbor for Pensacola’s famed pine lumber cargo.

The enhancement of Pensacola pass was a boon to Pensacola’s economy, but Mother Nature soon challenged man’s hubris as she ravaged Pensacola with a devastating hurricane in 1906. Second in a series of hurricanes in 1896, 1906, 1916 and 1926, these storms soon gained the legendary title of the “Big Sixes” and were regarded as the most destructive storms to ever hit Pensacola, even if not the largest hurricanes meteorologically. The 1906 hurricane struck Pensacola on 25 September and continued through the next day. The storm undermined railroad bridges throughout the city, leaving Pensacola nearly inaccessible by rail. The Brent Lumber Company Sawmill at the entrance to Bayou Chico, or Little Bayou, suffered extensive damaged and was considered a total loss. According to the Daily News, surge washed the mill on top of the former site of the Electric Terminal Bridge that crossed the entrance to Bayou Chico, which had itself been washed away, and piled a bark on top of the mill. Four vessels formerly docked at Perdido wharf, including three Norwegian ships and one Italian vessel, went ashore near the wharf. Four steamers also grounded, but their location was not specified. The unsecured earth at the end of several streets washed away, especially on the western side of the waterfront, and boats floated in the streets as far north as Zarragossa Street during the worst of the storm (Daily News 1906a:1, 1906b:1-2).

2 The newspaper mistakenly identified the mill at the entrance to Bayou Chico as the W. B. Wright Company Mill when the mill was in fact the Brent Lumber Company Sawmill. The W. B. Wright Company Mill was located on the eastern waterfront at the end of Intendencia Street and 10th Avenue.
Many vessels, including the dredge *Caucus*, moved from the docks into the middle of the bay due to weather warnings from the Weather Bureau, but even these precautions failed to prevent the loss of numerous ships of all kinds (*Daily News* 1906a:1, 1906b:1-2). The Norwegian ship *Hareford* moored at Baylen Street wharf was ready to move into safer waters, but was torn free before it could be shifted, taking part of the wharf with it. The vessel ended up on the beach near the foot of Barcelona Street (*Daily News* 1906b:1-2). All of the city’s fishing firms—V. Holst and Company and Warren and Company on Baylen Street wharf and E. E. Saunders and Company on Palafox wharf—suffered extensive damage to their fleets and facilities. Saunders and Company endured the wrecking or grounding of 32 of its 40 fishing vessels, only some of which were salvageable with extensive work (*Daily News* 1906l:8). The storm ruined V. Holst and Company’s warehouse and fishing buildings and destroyed the Warren and Company complex along with the entire 1000-foot Baylen Street wharf. Only a few pilings remained. Saunders and Company’s large warehouse on Palafox wharf was reduced to a shell and the end of said wharf, including the lateral wharf spur of the Dunwody-Aiken Tow Boat Company, shared the same fate as Baylen Street wharf (R. L. Polk and Company 1905:172, *Daily News* 1906c:1).

The tug *Okaloosa* came to rest on land behind the Harbormaster’s office at 806 Palafox Street on the wharf’s lower end, while the steamer *Captain Fritz* was stranded high on Baylen Street wharf (Sanborn Map Company 1903:2; *Daily News* 1906i:5, 1906p:5). The *Mary Lee* grounded behind the offices of Keyser and Company, located on the wharf at 806-810 South Palafox Street, the *Monarch* sank near Baylen Street wharf opposite the *Mary Lee*, and the *Britannia* beached in the slip between Jefferson and
Tarragona Streets. Tugs later towed the Mary L. Hardy, which may have been the Mary Lee, to deep water. Since Jefferson and Tarragona Streets are separated by Commendencia Street and do not border on a shared slip of water, the location of the Britannia wreck mentioned in the account is unclear (R. L. Polk and Company 1905:212; Daily News 1906b:1-2, 1906p:5; Ove 2010).

The feet of Commendencia and Tarragona Street railroad wharves experienced severe damage. A cement-laden Norwegian ship grounded on the rocks at the foot of Commendencia Street and several vessels in-between Commendencia and Tarragona wharves, including the sloop Hillary, sustained varying degrees of damage although the schooner Lucy H was later raised (Daily News 1906e:1; 1906n:1, 3). The grain elevator on Tarragona Street wharf suffered extensive damage. The Norwegian ship Campbell and the German ship Marie collided against Tarragona Street wharf and lay nearly parallel to each other at the foot of Barracks Street. The Marie rested on the former site of M. H. Sullivan’s offices, which had been utterly destroyed, while the Campbell lay submerged in the slip between Tarragona Street and Sullivan’s wharf. The Marie was eventually abandoned and sold at public auction. The schooner Survive sustained damage when it grounded at the foot of Barracks Street while waters inundated the H. G. DeSilva Company, near the same location, and choked the company’s facilities with timbers and planks (Daily News 1906a:1; 1906b:1-2; 1906c:1; 1906d:1; 1906h:4; 1906m:1; 1906n:1, 3; 1906o:5). Several feet of water covered the W. B. Wright
Company Santa Rosa Mill, but employees detected no major damage after the waters receded.³

Muscogee wharf suffered some of the severest effects of the storm. An entire team of men was needed to prevent a railroad building on the wharf from being swept off by the high tides during the storm and the rushing waters undermined much of the wharf (Daily News 1906a:1). Twenty loaded railroad cars and the engine attempting to move them from Muscogee wharf went straight through the wharf into the bay. After the storm, only one track was left on Muscogee wharf. Two barks went ashore in the eastern angle between Muscogee wharf and the beach, including the Swedish bark Alfhild. Another vessel, Ferreira, also nearly wrecked. The cargo of the Ferreira, previously known as the Cutty Sark, was presently sold at auction so that the vessel could be examined and evaluated for its seaworthiness after the storm. Determined to be salvageable, the ship was repaired and continued to operate under the Portuguese flag, carrying lumber from Pensacola (Daily News 1906a:1, 1906b:1-2, 1906c:1, 1906f:4, 1906p:5; Ove 2010).

After the 1906 storm abated, the daunting task of rebuilding remained for Pensacola’s residents. Gangs of men soon started clearing roads along the waterfront, collecting the mounds of scattered timber that lay all along the shore, and repairing various structures such as the L&N grain elevator. Employers chose stevedores first for their experience in handling lumber, but there was so much work that any unoccupied

³ Although the newspaper article states that Saunders Mill at the eastern end of Intendencia Street was partially submerged, this was actually the location of the W. B. Wright Company Santa Rosa Mill. Saunders Mill was located on north Palafox Street (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:43). However, local resident E. E. Saunders may have had an interest in the W. B. Wright mill, thus prompting the reference.
men quickly found employment. So much help was needed that officers began combing
the city for idlers and loafers, jailing those who could not account for themselves or
refused to work and charging them with vagrancy. Although a newspaper article claims
that both black and white vagrants were jailed, deep-rooted racism is clearly evident in
the writer’s focus on the city’s unoccupied black residents. An attitude that every
practical person should welcome readily available work also pervaded storm-related
articles in several issues of the Daily News. When 10 Chinese sailors refused to continue
working on the steamship E.O. Saltmarsh due to harsh conditions, inadequate pay, and
unhealthy provisions, they were sent to jail to await the departure of their vessel so that
they could be returned to the ship upon its sailing. Local officials prevented them from
deserting and forced them to work in spite of their concerns. Thus, despite supposed
gains in regards to seamen’s rights, as suggested by the 1889 Pensacola Code of
Ordinances, community leaders treated sailors and maritime workers more as peons than
as individuals without whom the local economy could not function (Daily News 1906j:6;
1906k:6; 1906n:1, 3; 1906q:5; 1906r:16).

Repairs following the 1906 hurricane were slow and tedious. In order to get his
business back on its feet, E. E. Saunders attempted to reconstruct the piling wharf at the
end of Palafox Street wharf and repair Palafox Street as soon as possible. But the city of
Pensacola insisted that Saunders’s lease of Palafox wharf did not allow him to rebuild the
Palafox Street right-of-way. Litigation on these matters lasted for five years. Although
the city allowed Saunders to continue using the street and wharf as before until the
expiration of his ten-year lease, these legal roadblocks likely took a toll on a company
already staggering under the 1906 hurricane’s devastation (Ove 2010).
Besides difficulties faced by Pensacola’s fishing firms, the city’s other major industry—lumber and timber export—suffered heavy losses in its facilities and shipping as described above. While previous hurricane damage had been swiftly repaired so that merchants could continue exploiting the region’s abundant forests, these same forests presented a different appearance in the era after the 1906 storm. Local lumber merchant Emory Fiske Skinner noted “The pine at this writing (1907) in comparison with 1865, is practically exhausted. Of course there is a great deal of it still left; enough to give employment to lumber men for several decades; but the end is in sight” (Skinner 1908:140). Other timber and lumber merchants agreed with Skinner’s assessment and were reluctant to rebuild their wharves and facilities to utilize such depleted resources. Although many merchants eventually did so, it would not be long before the lumber industry of Pensacola passed into history.

Even though the 1906 hurricane caused serious damage in Pensacola, the following years saw an unparalleled building boom in the city both in the downtown and in residential areas. Merchants quickly filled the gaps caused by the 1905 fire and residents continued to build outward from the city’s core into previously rural areas. Over the next several years, entrepreneurs reconstructed the Brent and Blount office buildings and built two new banks, a new city hall, and the San Carlos Hotel in Pensacola’s downtown. Residents expanded into areas around the city such as the Maxent Tract, Englewood Heights, Lakeview Park, and East Pensacola Heights (McGovern 1976:16-19).

Some 1906 hurricane damage as well as some of the subsequent reconstruction and new growth is visible in a set of Sanborn maps from 1907 (Sanborn Map Company
On the western waterfront, the Brent Lumber Company still operated despite dire predictions after it suffered severe hurricane damage, but the complex’s planing mill, marine railway, and a boathouse were no longer standing. The planing mill may have been the structure that reportedly washed onto the site of the Pensacola Electric Terminal bridge across the entrance to Bayou Chico. The Brent Lumber Company had also repositioned its dry kilns and built several new tramways. Since previous Sanborn maps do not show the mill’s entire wharf, it is difficult to tell how the wharf had changed; the 1907 maps depict a substantial wharf with two forks at the south end. The wharf structure is markedly different than its representation on an earlier Bird’s Eye View, but it is unclear if the storm demolished the platform at the end of the wharf or if the company expanded the wharf both widthwise and southward to create the two forks (Appendix E, Figure E1) (Koch 1896, Sanborn Map Company 1907b:44).

Further to the east, the Henry King Planing Mill and wharf at the end of Clubbs Street was gone, but a 300-foot wharf and other facilities for the new Dunwood and Eckels Shipyard (probably the Dunwoody and Eckles Shipyard) at the end of Coyle Street were in the process of construction (Sanborn Map Company 1903:11, 31, 32; 1907b:1, 2). Whether this shipyard ever operated is unclear. It is not listed in the 1908 City Directory, although the Dunwoody-Aiken Tow Boat Company (often misspelled “Dunwody-Aiken”) had moved to the Coyle Street wharf by 1908. This may, in fact, be the business referred to as the Dunwoody and Eckles Shipyard in the 1907 Sanborn maps (R. L. Polk and Company 1908:152). The small boathouse or bathhouse slightly to the west of the foot of Devilliers Street and one of the wharves to the east had disappeared and been replaced by a small walkway. A wharf and a boathouse at the end of Reus...
Street were missing as well and several dwellings at the southwest corner of Main and Barcelona Streets were in ruins (Appendix E, Figure E1). Whether the W. H. Knowles Sawmill on the Barcelona Street wharf survived is unclear since the 1907 Sanborn maps do not illustrate the wharf (Sanborn Map Company 1903:10, 11, 32; 1907a:2; 1907b:2, 3).

Despite the catastrophic reports that Baylen Street wharf was entirely destroyed, the 1907 Sanborn maps illustrate otherwise. The wharf lost a boat carpenter, a shipsmith, several boarding houses, and the R. H. Langford Shipyard, but the main wharf appeared intact and boasted the new Suarez and Shephard Boiler Shop. Numerous small wharves and storage buildings on the east side of the wharf spur that stretched into Baylen slip were gone although some fill had been added to the wharf right-of-way. As reported in the *Daily News* after the 1906 hurricane, the V. Holst and Company Fish House complex was entirely gone, but the decimated Warren Fish Company had rebuilt its facilities and built a new wharf spur (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:1, 9). Palafox wharf, which fared better than Baylen wharf during the hurricane, also appears to have been mostly repaired by 1907. Although there were notably fewer wharves and boathouses on the west side of the wharf extending into Baylen, slip and those that remained were shorter with fewer buildings on them, there were several new saloons, two new ship chandlerys, and a macaroni factory. The expanded facilities of the Pensacola Iron Works replaced the James Hughes Boiler and Machine Works. The former facilities of the Greary and McClintock Machine Shop and the Cosgrove Foundry and Machine Company were collectively renamed the Gulf Machine Works. Whether the two companies had combined and chosen a new name or whether the same company had bought out both is
unclear. The Jacoby Grocery Company became the Welles Kahn Company Wholesale Grocery and expanded towards Jefferson Street. The former reading room on the wharf was vacant and the shed behind the Harbormaster’s office was gone, possibly because the tug *Okaloosa* ran into it when the tug grounded in that area during the 1906 hurricane. E. E. Saunders and Company rebuilt its fish house, although the building was noticeably shorter, and expanded its wharf widthwise despite Saunders’s troubles with the city of Pensacola. Central wharf gained the sizeable Pensacola Grocery Company, but the Pensacola Foundry and Boiler Works was gone (Appendix E, Figure E2) (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:1, 9).

Although the hurricane reportedly damaged the ends of Commendencia and Tarragona Street, the destruction is not apparent on the 1907 Sanborn maps. However, an office and a few sheds were missing from the middle of Tarragona Street wharf and the damaged grain elevator and its conveyor on said wharf were still not functional in 1907 even though repairs were attempted shortly after the 1906 hurricane. Workers at the H. G. DeSilva Planing Mill had cleared the timbers that swamped the mill during the hurricane and constructed a major new lumber warehouse as well (Appendix E, Figure E2). Whether the H. G. DeSilva Shingle Mill on the Sullivan lateral wharf spur still existed is unclear since the spur was not illustrated in 1907 (Sanborn Map Company 1903:16; 1907b:10, 21). The small fish house at the end of Alcaniz Street was rebuilt on the west side of the street and a new boathouse built into the bay from 526 Zarragossa Street. Several boardwalks, probably to boathouses and bathhouses, were missing just to the west of the end of Cevallos Street. Maps of the eastern waterfront also show the amount of land that washed away during the 1906 hurricane. One property lost at least
The W. B. Wright Company Santa Rosa Mill, which reportedly avoided extensive damage during the hurricane, still showed significant changes. The western wharf was substantially shorter and had obviously lost some area, the eastern wharf was also missing some land, and several tramways had disappeared, but the complex had expanded westward with a new planing mill, lumber sheds, a steam dry kiln, and several new tramways (Appendix E, Figure E3) (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:8). More so than any previous Sanborn maps, the 1907 maps definitely show the dramatic effects of the hurricane on Pensacola.

As evidenced in the various maps of Pensacola, the city’s waterfront was a working one. While Pensacola is now known for its white sand beaches and blue-green Gulf waters, the shore of downtown Pensacola grew up as an answer to the various industries in the area whose products were more economically shipped by water than over land, especially before railroads connected Pensacola to the wider world. Numerous photographs of the Pensacola waterfront in the 1900s, especially two 1909 panoramic images of downtown Pensacola and the wharves extending from the shore, depict the numerous vessels in the bay, huge warehouses covering the wharves, black smoke rising from mills and foundries, timber stacked in piles on the beach, and dilapidated shanties only inches from the water’s edge (Figures 34 and 35) (Haines Photo Company 1909a, 1909b). Although Pensacola’s lumber era was rapidly fading, such photographs show that trade still thrived in this busy, commercial Gulf port.

While the coming years produced more hurricanes, they also welcomed additional development and changes on the waterfront in Pensacola. In August of 1911, another hurricane swept through Pensacola, but damage was relatively light. The storm destroyed
Figure 34. 1909 panoramic photograph of the Pensacola waterfront, view to the southwest, by the Haines Photo Company.

Figure 35. 1909 panoramic photograph of the Pensacola waterfront, view to the northeast, by the Haines Photo Company.
a large launch and a few small boats and blew ashore half a dozen barges and lighters as well as a substantial amount of timber, particularly between Baylen Street wharf and Perdido wharf. Workers later pulled most of the lighters off the beach and found that the vessels were in decent condition. The hurricane also damaged some motorboats near the Pensacola Yacht and Motor Boat clubhouse, but the local newspapers reported no other destruction (*Pensacola Evening News* 1911:1, 8; *Pensacola Journal* 1911:1). Compared to the recent damages from the 1906 hurricane, the 1911 storm hardly merited mention and Pensacola’s newspapers highlighted this in their accounts. Indeed, another major change in Pensacola, the decommissioning of the Navy Yard in October 1911, proved more detrimental to Pensacola’s economy than the August hurricane (Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:92).

Despite the uncertain future of Pensacola’s lumber industry and the hurricanes that routinely struck the port, businessmen still considered Pensacola a reasonable investment opportunity. Between 1911 and 1913, railroad magnate Henry McLaughlin and numerous influential Pensacola citizens financed construction of the Gulf, Florida and Alabama Railroad (GF&A) in order to bring products from mills into Pensacola while avoiding the monopoly of the L&N Railroad. The GF&A line stretched between Pensacola, Florida and Jonesville, Alabama, eventually reaching Kimbrough, Alabama in 1916. Since the central and eastern portions of the Pensacola waterfront were crowded with wharves, mills, businesses, and homes, the GF&A settled on creating an entirely new, 49-acre peninsula of land. This parcel—now known as the future site of the Pensacola’s Maritime Park—between Coyle and Barcelona Streets and incorporating the existing Barcelona Street wharf, accommodated the GF&A Railroad’s tracks, wharves,
warehouses, and yards. An early map indicates that the railroad intended to build five wharves off the property, but later maps and photographs show only three wharves (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:221; Moody 1992:8-11; Moody 2001; Dunlap and Martin 2000:54-55).

When war broke out in Europe in 1914, Pensacola both suffered and benefited. Shipping out of the port, which had been dominated by European vessels carrying lumber to markets across the Atlantic, gradually slowed and did not rebound to previous levels after the war ended (Pearce 1990:134). However, the opening of the Naval Air Station in the same year eventually produced great economic advantage for the city (McGovern 1976:29-30, Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:92, Pearce 1990:134).

Adding insult to an already injured Pensacola economy, the next set of storms to promulgate the legend of the “Big Sixes” attacked the port in both July and October of 1916. The July storm was particularly destructive, damaging the railroad bridge over Bayou Chico and grounding the Russian bark \textit{Avio} on the western waterfront against Perdido wharf where the vessel broke its back. The Aiken Towboat Company later floated the vessel and rebuilt it as an ocean barge (\textit{Pensacola Journal} 1916i:3, 1916m:5, 1916z:1, 1917e:2).

The GF&A Railroad piers, built 5 ft. higher than the city’s other wharves, did not sustain any damage from the storm itself, but several vessels buffeted by high winds pounded against the wharves and caused minor damage. Another vessel hit and sank the railroad’s piledriver, but the coal chute at the end of the docks survived intact (\textit{Pensacola Journal} 1916b:2, 1916o:1). Numerous lighters grounded in the cove near the GF&A wharves and several lumber barges grounded near the former Barcelona Street wharf.
(Pensacola Journal 1916r:1, 1916g:1). The storm piled a fully loaded coal barge belonging to the Aiken Towboat Company directly on top of Barcelona wharf and caused major damage to Pensacola’s fish companies (Pensacola Journal 1916w:3). Seven smacks of the E. E. Saunders and Company went ashore and some of Warren and Company’s vessels were damaged (Pensacola Journal 1916a:1). Winds and surge threw the pilot boat Shepherdess onto the “rock bulk head just south of the Warren company’s fish house,” thus tearing a hole in the vessel’s hull and causing her to founder to one side (Pensacola Journal 1916c:2). A later reference to a similar wrecking of a schooner, which may have been the pilot boat, suggests this bulk head was actually a rock pile (Pensacola Journal 1916f:1). Loose timbers caused additional damage and the Shepherdess was later offered at auction for salvage (Pensacola Journal 1916t:7, 1916z:1, 1917e:2).

Pensacola’s wharves suffered heavy damage during the July 1916 storm just as in the 1906 hurricane. According to newspaper accounts, Baylen, Palafox, and Central wharves had to be rebuilt and the L&N wharves needed repair. Vessels and wreckage choked the slips in between the wharves, especially Baylen slip between Baylen and Palafox wharves. The vessels included several fishing smacks, a few schooners, two yachts, launches, barges, and steamboats, about half of which suffered damage (Pensacola Journal 1916b:2). The Warren and Company’s smack Osceola sank on the east side of Baylen wharf, but a diver and the steamers Dixie and Allie R later recovered the vessel. The Saunders and Company smack Angelina sank on the west of Palafox wharf and the company contracted the Allie R to raise it as well (Pensacola Journal 1916l:3, 1916x:3, 1916ee:2, 1916ff:10). The launch Swan capsized, drifted into the slip,
and later collided with the steam tug *Florence*. The *Florence*'s crew attempted to break free of the *Swan*, but were forced to flee when the tug capsized at the head of Baylen slip. The *Pensacola Journal* reported the *Florence* a total loss, but the vessel was later floated and repaired (*Pensacola Journal* 1916l:3, 1916d:4, 1916j:3, 1916x:3, 1916z:1).

Of the vessels stranded in Baylen slip, two of the smacks, *James M. Keen* and *Alcina*, belonged to Saunders and Company. The latter was badly damaged, but the *Keen* was safely floated. One of the launches, the *Helmar*, was extracted from the mess and brought for repair to the shipways behind the Oerting McKenzie and Company hardware store at 601 South Palafox Street (R. L. Polk and Company 1916:352). Exactly who operated the shipways is unclear, but it was constructed sometime after 1907 (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:9). The government survey and engineering boat *Santa Rosa*, which only lost a little paint, also grounded in the slip, but laborers later pulled the boat free. A few other boats sustained minor damage, including the *Seaconnet*, *Kwasind*, *Lottie S. Haskins*, and *Sea Em* (*Pensacola Journal* 1916h:3, 1916y:3, 1916bb:1, 1916dd:1). The piledriver of Saunders and Company, composed of a donkey engine, boiler, upright hoist and hammer, wrecked behind the pilots’ association office at 717 1/2 South Palafox Street and sank almost entirely into the mud (*Pensacola Journal* 1916v:4, R. L. Polk and Company 1916:81). The revenue cutter launch *Penrose* pounded against and damaged Baylen Street wharf, but suffered little injury itself. Another launch, the *Owl*, sank next to Palafox Street. The storm also destroyed the Gulf Machine Works wharf spur off the west side of Palafox wharf and the warehouse on it (*Pensacola Journal* 1916b:2, 1916u:4).
As mentioned, Commendencia and Tarragona Street wharves suffered some minor injury. The smack *Emilia Enos*, damaged when it collided with Commendencia wharf near the head of the wharf, was later repaired, but several small boats wrecked on the east of Tarragona wharf (*Pensacola Journal* 1916:e:4, 1917:e:2). The Star Fish Company building, the Pensacola Manufacturing Company’s offices, and the old Gonzalez Mill at the foot of Alcaniz Street all sustained heavy damage (*Pensacola Journal* 1916:a:1). Despite early tragic reports, the Falk Fish Company at the foot of Alcaniz only suffered slightly with minor damage to its wharf (*Pensacola Journal* 1916:a:1, 1916:p:1, R. L. Polk and Company 1916:499). The tug *Celestine* beached high up on the former location of the W. B. Wright Santa Rosa Mill grounds at the corner of 10th Avenue and Intendencia Street, then occupied by the Escambia Land and Manufacturing Company, but was later pulled free with minor damage.

Pensacola’s naval stores industries also suffered when 2,000 barrels of rosin from the aforementioned Escambia Company, whose president was John H. Pace, swept onto the beach between Sullivan’s wharf and Muscogee wharf (*Pensacola Journal* 1916q:1, 1916x:3, 1916n:5; R. L. Polk and Company 1916:200, 356). The storm also tore away the south end of Muscogee wharf and, although no vessels sank near it, numerous boats, timber, and debris piled up just to the east of the wharf (*Pensacola Journal* 1916k:3). Two schooners, the *Norwich* and *Katherine B*, wrecked on two rock piles on the eastern shore (*Pensacola Journal* 1916z:1). For the first time, newspaper accounts described hurricane damage to Bayou Texar, specifically that at Bayview Park. Either Bayou Texar had heretofore escaped damage during hurricanes or that damage had failed to receive attention. However, in 1916, the Park’s high dive platform fell during the storm and the
wharf, boathouse, and pavilion sustained some damage, but the bridge over the bayou escaped injury (Pensacola Journal 1916f:1).

Rebuilding work commenced even before the storm ended and continued thereafter, particularly focusing on the wharves and debris removal (Pensacola Journal 1916f:1). Less than 10 days after the storm, the port of Pensacola once again bustled with activity. Several ships unloaded various cargo of mahogany logs, rosin, and turpentine, and numerous vessels awaited cargos of lumber, cross ties, cotton, naval stores, and provisions (Pensacola Journal 1916cc:1). The ravages of the July 1916 hurricane prompted some citizens, including Captain I.H. Aiken of the Aiken Towboat Company, to assert their interest in a shipyard and dry dock for Pensacola so that ship damages could be repaired in a timely matter and the money spent on such repairs kept in the local community (Pensacola Journal 1916s:1, 1916aa:4).

Only three months after the July storm swept through Pensacola, another storm arrived to again damage Pensacola’s waterfront and shipping interests. The United States Weather Service and several other entities provided ample warning of the approaching storm and crews moved as many vessels as possible from the wharves out into the harbor. Two vessels docked on the west side of the GF&A piers—the bark Oaklands and the Russian bark Albyn—were not moved due to the approach of nightfall and the lack of an available tugboat. Highlighting the proximity of the two storms, when the October storm hit, workers were still finishing repairs on Palafox wharf from damages caused by the July hurricane (Pensacola Journal 1916gg:1-2, 1916hh:8). Although the October storm was far less deleterious than the previous hurricane, Pensacola did not escape unscathed. The winds blew the two barks that had remained at the GF&A wharves from their
moorings. The Albyn simply drifted into the harbor, but the Oaklands collided with the schooner J.E. DuBignon that was undergoing repairs. Otherwise, shipping fairied relatively well except for the loss of many small craft and the minor damage of some ships docked at the L&N wharves. Several smacks stranded, but were later floated. The storm blew off the roofs of the storehouses on the L&N wharves and dropped them on the ships at the wharves, but with little consequence. The perennially unlucky grain elevator lost its second story (Pensacola Journal 1916ii:1, 1916jj:1, 1916mm:3).

The launch Robert L.E. sank near Muscogee wharf and the storm demolished Captain Will Dunham’s boathouse, which was under construction. Several of the boats in it were damaged and several pieces blown off the boathouse ended up on Zelius’s boat shed (Pensacola Journal 1916kk:3, 1916ll:3). William Dunham lived on Romana Street, several blocks north of the water, so it is unclear where his boathouse was located. Although he worked as a contractor, his business address is not listed in the City Directory. The reference to Zelius may allude to a shed behind the offices of Alexander Zelius at 709-711 South Palafox. Zelius was a ship chandler and also the Vice Consul for Norway and the Netherlands (R. L. Polk and Company 1916:194, 482). Suggestions by local citizens had been heard since the July hurricane; Pensacola now had its own ship repair yard, the Pensacola Launch and Machine Company, which saw steady business after the October storm (Pensacola Journal 1916nn:11). A dry dock, however, remained absent from Pensacola’s list of maritime businesses so wooden vessels that needed major repairs still had to be sent elsewhere.

In April 1917, Pensacola and the rest of America entered a new era when the United States joined the international struggle of World War I. Although the preoccupied
European states imported far less lumber, which negatively affected Pensacola’s economy, the city soon gained from the war effort. The Naval Air Station ramped up construction and training activities, bringing financial benefit to Pensacola’s merchants.

A Chicago firm, which won a multi-million dollar contract to build steel vessels for the United States government, established the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company on Bayou Chico, hired workers, and began building ships. Even though none of the vessels left port before the Armistice of 11 November 1918, the company hired thousands of workers, revitalizing Pensacola’s economy in the process. In addition, the 1916 appeals of local citizens were heard when the Bruce Dry Dock Company, founded by president Thomas A. Johnson, was established in early 1917 to the west of the GF&A waterfront property (McGovern 1976:30-31, Ellsworth and Ellsworth 1982:96, Pearce 1990:134). The company sent a proposal with an attached map in the spring of 1917 to the Army Corps of Engineers requesting permission to dredge a channel just to the west of Coyle Street (Bruce Dry Dock Company 1917). A 1917 storm that swept the area did relatively little damage, especially compared to its “Big Sixes” brethren, but a storm-related article mentioned the construction and land creation associated with the Bruce Dry Dock Company. Bulkheads, fill, and wharves were already in place and dredging had been ongoing for several weeks to create the new land on which the company stood. A few pilings were damaged when storm winds blew a Warren and Company fishing smack into them, but the Bruce Dry Dock Company was otherwise unaffected (*Pensacola Journal* 1917h:2).

As mentioned above, the 1917 storm was far less destructive than those of 1916 and part of this was due to early weather warnings that prompted city merchants and
officials to move vessels to safe anchorage across the bay (Pensacola Journal 1917a:1). Some vessels did go adrift, but many were found or later floated (Pensacola Journal 1917b:1, 1917c:1, 1917d:1, 1917j:2). Storm surge flooded the waterfront up to Main Street in some areas and Cedar Street in others and, with the help of the winds, destroyed a brick structure at 703 South Palafox south of Magnolia Street. The water also flooded and damaged several small boats in Baylen slip (Pensacola Journal 1917f:2, 1917g:3). Reminiscent of a similar event in July 1916, about 150 barrels of rosin from the Escambia Land and Manufacturing Company went adrift, but were later collected (Pensacola Journal 1917i:9). One partially finished, locally built schooner weathered the storm, but the article revealed that the shipways where the vessel was under construction were located at the end of Barcelona wharf (Pensacola Journal 1917d:1). The owner of the vessel and shipyard was Frasier F. Bingham, vice president of the Pensacola Finance Company and assistant manager of the Southern States Lumber Company (R. L. Polk and Company 1916:123, Rucker and Woolsey 1991:xvi). According to local historians Brian Rucker and Nathan Woolsey, Bingham’s shipyard produced wooden motor schooners and built over $200,000 worth of vessels over the course of its operation. Several were even sold to the government of France (Rucker and Woolsey 1991:xvi). As regards the 1917 storm, the hurricane generally had little affect upon the Pensacola waterfront, but extensively damaged inland stands of timber, causing some lumber companies to refocus their businesses away from lumbering (Sjordal 2007:17-18).

After World War I ended in November 1918, Pensacola’s economy languished. While some new companies established themselves at the port and the Pensacola Shipbuilding and Bruce Dry Dock Companies continued to prosper for several years,
fewer naval aviators needed training at the Naval Air Station, though the Station remained a mainstay of the city’s economy, and lumber prices continued to decline worldwide (McGovern 1976, 1980; Sjordal 2007). Two events exemplify the discontent and uncertainty facing Pensacola’s workers in the 1920s. A strike in 1920 at the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company resulted in the firing of 800 employees and laborers belonging to the International Longshoremen’s Association walked off the job in 1922. Neither strike was resolved successfully for the workers involved (McGovern 1976:82). During the same period, the city of Pensacola, trying to improve its dock facilities, purchased the end of Palafox Street wharf from E. E. Saunders and Company. However, the water was so shallow around the wharf that large ships avoided docking there and only coastal vessels, fishing smacks, and other small boats used the municipal wharf (McGovern 1976:83).

A 1922 study of the port by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the Army Corps of Engineers, which included a map and an aerial photograph of the port of Pensacola, showed the evolution of the harbor (Figures 36 and 37) (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922). The Brent Lumber Company and the island on which part of it had stood at the entrance to Bayou Chico were gone, although two small, unnamed lumber plants still existed on the west shores of the bayou. The Pensacola Shipbuilding Company appears well established on the eastern shore of Bayou Chico with a permanent bulkhead, a rail line running to it, and a 13.5-foot channel extending from the company’s facilities out into the bay. However, the report clarifies that the company, which
1 - Pensacola Shipbuilding Co.; 2 - Perdido Wharf; 3 - The Texas Co.'s Wharf; 4 - Brice Dry Dock Pier; 5 - Muscle Shoals, Birmingham & Pensacola Railway Co.'s Pier No. 3; 6 - Muscle Shoals, Birmingham & Pensacola Railway Co.'s Pier No. 2; 7 - Muscle Shoals, Birmingham & Pensacola Railway Co.'s Pier No. 1; 8 - Baylen St. Wharf; 9 - Palafox St. Wharf; 10 - Central or Jefferson St. Wharf; 11 - Commandencia St. Wharf; 12 - Tarragona St. Wharf; 13 - Sullivan’s Wharf; 14 - Muskogee Wharf.

Figure 36. 1922 map of Pensacola by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
Figure 37. 1922 aerial photograph of Pensacola by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
formerly built ships, by 1922 only repaired ships and built barges and bridges (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:160b, 184, 221). By the end of the 1920s, the company dissolved (McGovern 1976:85).

To the east, Perdido wharf, which was then owned by the Pensacola, Mobile and New Orleans Railroad Company, no longer operated and the report noted that it had been almost completely destroyed. A large new peninsula of land adjacent to the Bruce Dry Dock Company, with a piling wharf extending off of it next to a 28-foot channel, existed on the waterfront between A Street and Donelson Street and housed the Texas Company’s oil bunkering facilities (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:160b, 184, 221). Exactly when this peninsula was created is unclear, although it was completed either after or at the same time as the Bruce Dry Dock Company landfill. Two 1917 and 1922 maps by the Bruce Dry Dock Company, which were included in dredging applications sent by the company to the Army Corps of Engineers, show that the Texas Company’s peninsula did not exist in 1917, but was present by 1922 (Bruce Dry Dock Company 1917, 1922). The Bruce Dry Dock Company land between Donelson and Coyle Streets featured a reverse L-shaped wharf and several dry docks on the foreshore as well as an 18-foot channel extending into the bay (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:160b, 185, 221).

The 1922 map and aerial photograph also depict the former peninsula and wharves of the GF&A Railroad, which the Muscle Shoals, Birmingham and Pensacola (MSB&P) Railroad had taken over in April 1922 (Moody 1992:11-13). The sizeable parcel of land, which included the former property of Barcelona Street wharf, had three substantial piers to which several rail lines connected. Pier No. 3 served for the loading
and unloading of lumber, Pier No. 2 for general cargo, and Pier No. 1, with its 40-foot coal tipple, provided bunker coal to docked vessels. All the piers extended into a 30-foot dredged channel. The outer end of Pier No. 3 had been destroyed at some previous time, probably during a hurricane, and Pier No. 2 featured a large transit warehouse. All three wharves were made with creosoted pilings and Piers No. 1 and 3 were partially filled and bulkheaded (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:160b, 185-186, 221). Baylen Street wharf was owned by and still housed the facilities of the Warren Fish Company. The company had added a marine railway, which had been in place since at least 1913, on the west side of their complex, which was formerly Herron’s wharf (R. L. Polk and Company 1913:414). Palafox Street wharf, still mostly owned by E. E. Saunders and Company, served as the company’s headquarters. The report noted that coasting vessels’ berths were available for rent on the wharf and that a fertilizer plant existed on the wharf as well (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:160b, 186, 221).

Central wharf, Commendencia Street wharf, Tarragona wharf, Sullivan’s wharf, and Muscogee wharf all belonged to the L&N Railroad Company. Central wharf was used for docking small bay and river boats, and loading lumber and naval stores. Commendencia Street wharf’s facilities permitted vessels to transfer cargo to railroad cars or warehouses and vice versa; the wharf’s warehouses also offered freight storage. Tarragona Street wharf was specifically a freight terminal and also provided storage. According to the report, the grain elevator that had once stood on the wharf was no longer in operation, probably due to extensive damage from both the 1906 and October 1916 hurricanes. There was likely no rush on repairs to the grain elevator since very few
shipments of grain had ever passed through it (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:160b, 186-188, 221; Parsons, Klapp, Brinckerhoff & Douglas [PKB&D] 1927; McLellan 1944:27). Only Muscogee wharf had any other grain loading chutes. Central, Commendencia, and Tarragona wharves all led into a 28-foot channel.

Sullivan’s wharf, the wharf spur connected to and jutting out to the southeast of Tarragona Street wharf, was used for lumber and timber handling. A lumber plant still existed at the end of Barracks Street, but the Escambia Land and Manufacturing Company at the end of 10th Avenue was gone. Muscogee wharf, constructed of treated pilings, was a coaling wharf with a coal tipple. The wharf, which had access to a 28-ft. channel, had 7 railroad tracks on it; 5 were on the wharf and 2 were elevated above to connect to the coal trestle (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:160b, 186-188, 221). While Pensacola had seen quite a deal of change since the 1907 Sanborn maps were published, the 1922 Army Corps of Engineers report clearly shows that several lumber mills on the waterfront had closed and Perdido wharf, which once connected to sawmills on Perdido Bay, was no longer in operation. The disappearance of the vast timber stands that once existed in northwest Florida had finally taken a toll on the Pensacola lumber industry.

An entirely new set of Sanborn maps for Pensacola was not produced until 1951, although many map sheets were revised over the intervening years. Four new or revised sheets were produced in 1918 and ten new or revised sheets in 1923 (Library of Congress 1981). While the 1918 Sanborn map revisions do not cover any portion of the waterfront, the 1923 Sanborn map revisions include two sheets that provide information about changes along the shore. The new peninsula between A Street and Donelson Street
hosted specialized oil storage facilities. While the 1922 Army Corps of Engineer map only denotes the Texas Company on that peninsula, the 1923 Sanborn map shows that the numerous houses that once stood in the area were gone and the Gulf Oil Corporation and Sherrill Oil Company, along with the Texas Company, owned extensive facilities on the peninsula including offices, warehouses, oil tanks, gasoline tanks, and auto repair shops. The map did not extend all the way to the shore so there is no alternate view of the Texas Company wharf (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:1, 1923:1; Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:221).

The MSB&P railroad piers appear as shown on the 1922 Army Corps of Engineers map, but the 1923 Sanborn maps detail the huge warehouse on Pier No. 2, the most substantial of the three MSB&P piers (Sanborn Map Company 1923:67). The Warren Fish Company complex on Baylen Street wharf included the new marine railway as well as a new boatbuilding shed, lumber shed, storage building, and a rail line running to the expanded fish warehouse and improved wharf. E. E. Saunders and Company’s facilities on Palafox wharf had also grown. The company doubled the size of their fish warehouse, increased the width and length of the wharf, and added a new fertilizer factory and boat building area. The facilities on Central wharf were unchanged (Sanborn Map Company 1923:1). Other sources reveal that the Warren Fish Company and E. E. Saunders and Company also completed the transition from sailing smacks to steam fishing vessels by this time (Ove 2010). In 1925, the Saint Louis and San Francisco Railroad (Frisco) purchased the MSB&P Railroad, including its piers and rail lines in Pensacola. The Frisco quickly began improving the MSB&P’s wharves and waterfront
facilities on Pensacola’s downtown shore and dredged a deeper channel next to its piers in order to permit the docking of larger vessels (McGovern 1976:87, Moody 1992:15).

Even though the lumber industry was in decline, the 1922 Army Corps of Engineers map and 1923 Sanborn maps vividly show that Pensacola’s waterfront still hosted a fair amount of commercial and industrial activity (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922, Sanborn Map Company 1923, Pearce 1990:135). The Pensacola Journal clarified that the majority of ships arriving in port still came to the city to load lumber and naval stores (Pensacola Journal 1926f:1). However, the “Big Sixes” hurricanes had not yet finished with Pensacola.

In September of 1926, a violent storm blew through that caused damage to many of the wharves, disabled several vessels, sank numerous small boats in Bayou Chico that had been moved there to withstand the storm, and wrecked the casino in Bayview Park on Bayou Texar (Pensacola Journal 1926a:1, 1926b:1-2). The L&N Railroad’s wharves and warehouses endured some of the worst damage from the storm. Railroad officials believed it would take at least two weeks to repair Muscogee wharf’s coaling facilities (Pensacola Journal 1926c:2). Interestingly, the two special storm editions of the Pensacola Journal from 22 and 23 September 1926 included fewer specific details on storm damage in the city than had been reported in Pensacola newspapers during previous hurricanes. Instead, the papers focused on other Florida communities, especially Miami, which were hit hard by the same storm. This focus may reflect a conscious attempt to downplay the effects of the 1926 hurricane in the city so as to allay the concern of industries considering a Pensacola branch.
Later editions of the paper and other sources note that the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company in Bayou Chico and many vessels, which entered the bayou for its shelter, survived the storm with little damage. In fact, the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company advertised its services to those needing help with ship and wharf repair (Pensacola Journal 1926d:5, 1926e:8). Despite the vessels location within the shelter of Bayou Chico, the anchor of coast guard cutter AB-19 failed to hold and a loose timber punched a hole in the vessel (Pensacola Journal 1926j:8). The Bayou Chico bridge twisted beyond recognition (Ove 2010). In addition, the storm pulled the hulk of the steamer Wasp, which had caught fire years before and been sunk on the western waterfront, from the mud and tossed it onto the old Brent mill property. Officials intended to burn the wreck after it dried out (Pensacola Journal 1926i:8). The loaded lumber schooner Kingsway, moored at the Frisco terminal, was thrown onto a sandbar on the western shore, but later floated (Pensacola Journal 1926m:1).

Baylen Street wharf suffered extensive damaged and independent fisherman all along the bayshore lost equipment and launches from their wharves. Twenty of E. E. Saunders and Company’s twenty-five fishing smacks, many of which had been moved into the slip between Commendencia and Tarragona wharves for their protection, were nevertheless injured during the storm (Pensacola Journal 1926f:1, McGovern 1976:88-89). Surge washed numerous crossties stacked on the Frisco piers into the streets of Pensacola, but the dedicated dock master saved the coal tipple fromtoppling into the bay. The Frisco piers suffered some structural damage and the property bulkheads needed some repair, but damage was slight compared to what had been feared (Pensacola Journal 1926f:1, 1926g:10). The Frisco intended to rebuild the lumber pier on the
western side of the property and the coaling pier on the eastern side but made no mention of the central pier that served for loading general cargo. A newspaper article also revealed that 20 rail cars, which apparently sank during the 1916 hurricane, had not yet been salvaged from the bay (*Pensacola Journal* 1926h:1, 6). These were raised in July 1927 and used to build six new rail cars (Moody 1992:16). The storm also destroyed the Tarpon landing, named for the well-known coastal steamer captained by W. G. Barrow and used for the docking of coasting vessels on Central wharf. Local officials were hesitant to rebuild, but influential merchants and businessmen convinced them of the landing’s importance in coastal trade and maintenance of low freight rates (*Pensacola Journal* 1926k:8, 1926l:1; Ove 2010). As had happened before, the storm washed away part of Muscogee wharf (McGovern 1976:89). Other reports note that the 1926 storm grounded at least 40 vessels around the harbor and destroyed many of the waterfront warehouses (Ove 2010).

A 1927 report sponsored by Pensacola’s Junior and Senior Chambers of Commerce and produced by the New York City PKB&D engineering firm detailed some additional effects of the 1926 hurricane on the waterfront, as well as the port’s assets and failings (PKB&D 1927). The report provided specific descriptions of the port of Pensacola as well as suggestions for beneficial additions and renovations and optimistically noted that, though the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company was no longer operating, it could be reopened with a substantial infusion of capital (PKB&D 1927[5]:52). The Sherrill Terminal Company had taken over the Texas Company wharf. By 1922, the Bruce Dry Dock Company had modified its L-shaped wharf with the main part expanded from 675 ft. to 716 ft. and the wing slightly decreased from 300 ft. to 271
ft. (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:185). However, a ship collided with the wharf during the 1926 hurricane, leaving only about 450 ft. of useable space. According to the 1927 report, the company owners were considering rebuilding the wharf but had not decided for sure (PKB&D 1927[2]:102-103). The 1927 report also clarified that all three Frisco wharves were completely rebuilt in the past year. Frisco Pier No. 3, which formerly measured 1,375 ft., was only rebuilt to a length of 900 ft. Pier No. 2, formerly extending out 800 ft., was rebuilt to a length of 1,200 ft. and the pier’s transit shed also reconstructed. Pier No. 1 was rebuilt to its former length of 600 ft. (PKB&D 1927[2]:102). Baylen Street wharf survived mostly unscathed, except for some minor washout (PKB&D 1927[5]:50).

Despite these successes, Palafox wharf, though still the same length, suffered considerably from the 1926 storm and Jefferson or Central wharf, though partially rebuilt, was in poor condition (PKB&D 1927[2]:103; 1927[5]:39, 45). Saunders and Company expanded their facilities at the end of Palafox wharf with a platform for the docking of fishing boats (PKB&D 1927[5]:53). The L&N Railroad’s Commendencia wharf, Tarragona wharf, and Muscogee wharf, including its coal tipple, were being entirely restored by the railroad, but the grain elevator on Tarragona wharf had not been rebuilt (PKB&D 1927[2]:103, 1927[5]:46-48). Sullivan’s wharf on the side of Tarragona wharf, completely destroyed and consisting simply of ballast and riprap, was still being used for the tying up of lumber (PKB&D 1927[5]:51). Overall, the port suffered some detrimental effects from the 1926 hurricane and, while private companies were able to rebuild and renovate their wharves, the city of Pensacola had a far more difficult time improving and rebuilding the public portions of Palafox and Central wharves.
By 1929, when the Army Corps of Engineers issued its second report on the port of Pensacola, many of the still lingering effects of the 1926 hurricane had been repaired and other improvements made (Figure 38) (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1929). A new marine railway, owned by the Runyan Machine and Boiler Works, was located near the entrance of Bayou Chico. Despite promises by the Frisco Railroad to build a grain elevator on their piers, the port had no such facility in 1929 and the grain elevator on Tarragona had not been rebuilt. The damaged Bruce Dry Dock Company wharf reclaimed some of its former glory and extended to a length of 650 ft. on the main part with a wing measuring 275 ft. (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922:185-192, 1929:17-25, 67; PKB&D 1927[2]:103). Central wharf was listed as a lumber and naval stores wharf and still rated for coastal vessels; the ship landing damaged in the 1926 storm was rebuilt just as local merchants had requested (PKB&D 1927[5]:40). The headquarters of the Runyan Machine and Boiler Works, which repaired many types of vessels, was located at the corner of Palafox and Pine Streets on Palafox wharf, which itself had been rebuilt to a length of 700 ft. The Saunders and Company extension on Palafox wharf was built out to 500 ft., but Sullivan’s wharf off of Tarragona wharf had not been repaired and was no longer listed as a separate wharf. Muscogee wharf’s coaling facilities, however, were repaired just as described in 1927 (Pensacola Journal 1926h:1, 6; R. L. Polk and Company 1927:64, 437; Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1929:12-23, 67).

Despite these improvements, neither Pensacola nor the rest of the nation could withstand the Wall Street Crash of 1929 and the resulting Great Depression. The first few years of the 1930s seemed to provide Pensacola some respite from the events
Figure 38. 1929 map of Pensacola by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
sweeping the rest of the country, but the city’s economy gradually slipped to the same 
lows as elsewhere in the United States. The most striking change on the waterfront was 
the completion in 1931 of the Pensacola Bay Bridge from the eastern bayshore near 
Bayou Texar to the Gulf Breeze Peninsula and the concurrent completion of the Santa 
Rosa Sound Bridge, now named the Bob Sikes Bridge (McGovern 1976:92). Together, 
these two bridges permitted easy movement between downtown Pensacola and the Gulf 
of Mexico’s beaches, foreshadowing the city’s eventual rise as a tourist mecca after the 
country rebounded from the effects of the Great Depression.

Many sources attribute the waning of Pensacola’s shipping economy to the 
constant ravages of hurricanes, the unfettered cutting of timber stands throughout 
Northwest Florida that resulted in the decline of the lumber and naval stores industry, and 
the overfishing of the red snapper banks in the Gulf of Mexico that decimated 
Pensacola’s fishing business. Undoubtedly, all of these factors played a role in 
Pensacola’s gradual demise as a major national and international shipping port, but the 
effects of the Great Depression on an already weakened maritime economy should not be 
ignored. Whereas merchants were typically able to rebuild from the destruction of 
hurricanes that lasted only a few days at most and continuing innovation in some 
industries helped compensate for declining stock, such as the use of ice to preserve fish 
and steam to increase the speed of vessels in the fishing industry, the Great Depression 
lasted for years and impacted every aspect of society (McGovern 1976, Pearce 1990, 
Industries already struggling to maintain or increase profit due to the factors outlined 
above probably could not stay competitive when faced with the financial difficulties
rampant after the Crash of 1929. A panoramic photograph of the Pensacola waterfront from the 1930s shows a noticeable lack of vessels in the harbor, especially as compared to maritime activity visible in photographs from the 1880s through 1910s (Figure 39, Appendix F) (Pensacola Historical Society 1930s).

The economy began to recover in the latter half of the 1930s and, although a hurricane hit Pensacola in August of 1936, little damage occurred on the waterfront. Ample warning allowed the few vessels in port to anchor in the middle of the bay while smaller boats sought shelter in the bayous, thus avoiding injury from the storm (Pensacola Journal 1936a:2, 1936b:2). A 1937 Army Corps of Engineers report with enclosed map documents the changes along the waterfront (Figure 40) (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1937). Although the report lists several additional wharves that were not present in 1929, the inserted map clarifies that these wharves were actually company locations and wharf spurs on the main wharves that had not been previously demarcated as separate wharves. The Pensacola Shipbuilding Company no longer existed on Bayou Chico and the Bruce Dry Dock Company pier lost 250 ft. Baylen Street wharf was 200 ft. shorter as well and no longer hosted Warren and Company’s marine railway. No actual new wharves had been built since 1929. Saunders and Company occupied two sections of Palafox wharf and the Coast Transportation Company occupied another, but neither had a separate wharf. City officials built a new municipal bulkhead of timber with fill south of Pine Street on Palafox wharf as a berth for small vessels and the Pensacola, St. Andrews and Gulf Steamship Company was located on Jefferson wharf, which gained 170 ft. Commendencia Street wharf lost almost
Figure 39. 1930s panoramic photograph of the Pensacola waterfront.
1 - Sherril Oil Co. Pier; 2 - Bruce Dry Dock Pier; 3 - Frisco Lines Pier No. 3; 4 - Frisco Lines Pier No. 2; 5 - Frisco Lines Pier No. 1; 6 - Baylen St. Pier; 7 - Saunders and Co. Wharf; 8 - Palafox St. Wharf; 9 - Coast Transportation Co. Wharf; 10 - Municipal Bulkhead; 11 - Pensacola, St. Andrews & Gulf Steamship Co. Wharf; 12 - Jefferson St. Wharf; 13 - Commandencia St. Pier; 14 - Tarragona St. Pier; 15 - Muskogee Pier.

Figure 40. 1937 map of Pensacola by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
1,000 ft. while Tarragona Street wharf gained almost 800 ft. (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1937:20-25, 80). A 30-foot channel had also been dredged between the channels extending from the Frisco Railroad wharves and L&N wharves. Unfortunately, outdated port facilities, the closure of some of the last major mills in the area, such as the Bagdad Land and Lumber Company in 1938, and the loss of the Bruce Dry Dock Company in 1939 all contributed to the decline of Pensacola as a major shipping port in the 1930s (McGovern 1976:135-137). While the Naval Air Station to the west of Pensacola expanded, becoming increasingly vital to the city’s economy, and tourists flocked to the sugar-white beaches of nearby Santa Rosa Island in ever increasing numbers, fewer and fewer foreign vessels entered Pensacola Bay (McGovern 1976:128-130; 1980). Pensacola’s transition from a commercial entrepôt to a military town and tourist mecca was nearly complete.

The 1940s held in store additional changes for Pensacola’s waterfront. The entrance of the United States into World War II in 1941 brought more officers and flight trainees to the Naval Air Station and thus more military individuals who spent their leave in Pensacola’s dance hall and billiard parlors (McGovern 1976:152). In 1943, the city finally created a port authority, which Pensacola’s citizens requested as early as 1912 and many times in the following years, and began to build municipal wharves or consolidate existing ones in order to facilitate commercial use of the port (Oaks 1970:16-17, Appleyard 1976:28-33). These changes ushered the Pensacola waterfront into a new modern age.

The era when sailing ships plied the bay’s waters and docked at piling wharves, when stevedores stuffed waiting vessels with timber, cotton, and naval stores, and when
fishing smacks returned from the snapper banks loaded with fresh fish for national consumption had come to an end. Nevertheless, the story of Pensacola’s port continues even today and new campaigns, such as plans for a Maritime Park on the site of the former Frisco Railroad property, highlight the role of the harbor in the development of the city of Pensacola. This investigation of the first part of the 20th century on the Pensacola waterfront focused on the physical and cognitive aspects that composed the downtown’s harbor’s maritime cultural landscape (MCL) and provided insight both into the port’s built environment, such as mills and wharves, and the laws and codes established to govern maritime activity that, at times, both protected maritime workers’ rights and incited violent resistance to unfair practices. Many of the revelations produced by this study would have remained buried in Pensacola’s complex history if not for the MCL framework that provided a means to access and evaluate the port’s maritime history. While the echoing shots of cannons from the Fort of San Miguel, the thunderous snap of hundreds of canvas sails against the rising wind, and the calls of baymen gathering lumber on the foreshore will never again be heard in Pensacola, the city will forever be indebted to a maritime heritage that transformed it from a small colonial outpost to a bustling commercial entrepôt.
CHAPTER VI

ARCHAEOLOGY ON THE WATERFRONT

I must down to the seas again, to the lonely sea and the sky, / And all I ask is a tall ship and a star to steer her by, / And the wheel’s kick and the wind’s song and the white sail’s shaking, / And a grey mist on the sea’s face and a grey dawn breaking.

~ John Masefield (1923:27-28)

For whatever we lose(like a you or a me) / it’s always ourselves we find in the sea.

~e. e. cummings (Firmage 1991:682)

Within the maritime cultural landscape (MCL) framework, maritime cultural resources include a range of site types, but the classification of these types as maritime resources and their presence in any given region varies from study to study. For the purposes of this research and within the appropriate scale of analysis, maritime cultural resources on the Pensacola waterfront include both those connected directly to the maritime industry or maritime infrastructure of Pensacola (primary maritime site types) and those connected indirectly to maritime industry and infrastructure (secondary maritime site types) (Table 1). Primary site types, generally those that maritime workers built or where they labored, include wharves, piers, seawalls, warehouses, waterfront industrial sites, shipyards, shipwrecks, abandoned vessels, ballast piles, and landfill. Secondary site types—those where maritime workers lived, worshiped, and made merry—include the residences of maritime laborers, seamen’s churches, bathhouses, boarding houses, taverns, brothels, and dance halls. It is important to note that these type distinctions are purely archaeological and do not, necessarily, represent the ways in
which maritime workers viewed their lives and surroundings. Archaeologically, primary site types are more likely to contain material culture deposits that can be closely tied to maritime workers. Secondary site types may contain artifacts not associated directly with maritime contexts. Nevertheless, they may hold components and artifacts that provide insight into the lives of local maritime laborers and transient maritime workers, such as sailors, whose brief stops in Pensacola are difficult to identify archaeologically.

Examples of most of the aforementioned site types have been excavated or surveyed in Pensacola, but some are known only from historic documents such as seamen’s churches, bathhouses, brothels, and sailors’ boarding houses. Sites with no known archaeological examples are not explored in this section but are discussed in the preceding historical context chapters.

Archaeologists have conducted research in Pensacola since the early 1900s, but no studies have been dedicated to a holistic examination of Pensacola’s downtown waterfront or its historic MCL (Phillips 1993a:20). Numerous investigators have asked various research questions, but none of these questions have focused specifically on maritime resources or the lives of maritime workers. This chapter analyzes the results from numerous terrestrial and maritime excavations and surveys on, near, or along the waterfront, which featured the investigation of historic maritime cultural resources (Figure 41). Early archaeological work in Pensacola focused on prehistoric sites, but researchers turned their attention to historic archaeological sites in the 1960s (Bense 1989). Initial historical archaeology work focused primarily on colonial sites in Pensacola’s city limits where most colonial occupation took place. Outlying areas not heavily occupied during the colonial period—such as Bayou Chico on the western edge
Figure 41. Location of Pensacola waterfront archaeological sites.
of the city—were not investigated until decades later. In the 1980s, archaeologist Judith Bense of the University of West Florida (UWF) began an intensive study of archaeological resources in Pensacola (Bense 1989). The Pensacola Archaeological Survey (PAS) investigated archaeological sites throughout Pensacola and identified numerous maritime sites along the bayshore and bayous. Since the survey was intended only to create a desperately needed database of sites in the city, no intensive excavations were conducted. The information Bense provided in the report generally includes only presence or absence of particular components—such as prehistoric, late colonial, and early American—rather than detailed descriptions of features and artifacts; many of the sites investigated during the survey never received additional study.

Along Bayou Chico, the only significant maritime site explored during the PAS was the site of the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company (8ES1334), which operated for a short time after its establishment in 1918. Archaeologists located both architectural features and a midden (Bense 1989[1]:117, [2]:123-124). Although the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company did not flourish, it is the only shipbuilding company ever examined archaeologically in Pensacola. While Pensacola was famous for its maritime industry and extensive timber supplies, the city never developed a substantial shipbuilding industry. Those few shipyards and boatyards described in the preceding chapters seem to have operated for short periods of time and do not appear to have been extremely prolific.

In 1991, the Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research (BAR) conducted an intensive survey of shipwrecks in the Pensacola Bay system designed to create a model of maritime research for other areas of the state. During the survey, BAR archaeologists
identified the remains of four barges in Bayou Chico, with three of the barges being submerged (8ES1896, 8ES1902, 8ES2837) and one having been removed and deposited on land. Although the BAR accomplished some general recording, unsafe diving conditions in Bayou Chico and time restrictions prevented an exhaustive study of the wrecks. Nevertheless, three of the barges were determined to date to the early 20th century and the other appeared to be modern. As described in the report, further study of the submerged barges would likely provide information concerning the types of craft used in inland waterways, especially any adaptations particular to Pensacola and the Gulf Coast (Franklin et al. 1992:187-195). Other investigations in Bayou Chico included a terrestrial and maritime survey of a small northern portion of the bayou and adjacent shore in preparation for construction of a marina. UWF archaeologists excavated shovel tests on land and conducted a remote sensing survey with side scan sonar, magnetometry, and ground-truthing of detected targets, but they encountered no significant archaeological deposits on land or under the water (Mickwee et al. 2007).

As described earlier, several steam-powered sawmills operated in Pensacola at various periods during the height of the lumber boom in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Two of these, the R. J. Brent and Company Sawmill (8ES1960) at the entrance to Bayou Chico and Tharp’s Planing Mill (8ES1961) further inland, were identified on historic maps and surveyed in October of 1992 during a reconnaissance of mill sites in Escambia and surrounding counties. The examined portions of the sites had been disturbed by development and no features were located, but researchers suggested that additional investigation of these sites, as well as the nearby bay, could provide information about

In 1998, UWF and the United States Navy conducted remote sensing survey of parts of Pensacola Bay and the Gulf of Mexico using both side-scan sonar and a magnetometer. The survey revealed a cluster of anomalies to the east of Bayou Chico relatively close to shore. Unfortunately, none of these anomalies were ground-truthed so their identity remains uncertain. Since their location suggests they may represent shipwrecks of vessels leaving the port of Pensacola, a depositional area for hurricane debris, including wrecked vessels, or remnants of an historic sawmill in the area, investigation of these anomalies may provide crucial information about Pensacola’s MCL (Bratten 1998). Bayou Chico, as described in previous chapters, was a haven for small boats during hurricanes and the island once located at its entrance was the site of the Brent Lumber Company, a massive sawmill that operated from 1880 to at least 1907 (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:44, Appleyard 1989:23).

Further east of Bayou Chico along the Pensacola waterfront, archaeologists located three sites during the 1991 and subsequent 1992 Florida BAR studies of Pensacola Bay. A barge investigated in 1992 (8ES2842) may have been associated with the lumber industry, but the vessel has since been removed (Spirek et al. 1993:76, Cook 2006:11). The possible remains of the Bruce Dry Dock Company’s floating dry dock (8ES2960) were investigated during the 1991 survey and additional work was recommended (Franklin et al. 1992:209, 215-216). Illustrating the tangled, rich archaeological record in Pensacola’s waters, later work in the immediate area failed to relocate the dry dock remains but uncovered a previously unknown site. This site, which
was at first confused with the remains of the dry dock, was eventually identified as the
cruising of a middle to late 19th-century vessel, nicknamed the B-Street Schooner
(8ES1903), with cupreous sheathing and heavy wooden framing. Some parts of the
wreck appeared to have been exposed to fire (Franklin et al. 1992:209, 215-216; Spirek et
al. 1993:72-76, 81). Additional investigation of the wreck by UWF archaeologists in
2005 included recording the hull structure and collecting diagnostic artifacts. Based on
these artifacts and archival research, the B-Street Schooner appears to date to the early
20th century and may have been associated with the Pensacola lumber industry.

However, recent work suggests that the wreck might predate the Civil War (Bratten and
Cook 2005:56-70; Gregory Cook, pers. comm. 2009).

Along Pensacola’s waterfront south of the future site of the Pensacola Maritime
Park, an area of fill that runs between Coyle and Spring Streets and once hosted extensive
railroad facilities, UWF archaeologists conducted a marine magnetometer survey in 2004
to determine whether any cultural resources would be affected by planned dredging just
south of the property. While several anomalies were ground-truthed, all were determined
to be modern debris less than 50 years old. One anomaly appeared to be part of a wharf,
but the presence of iron frames suggested a modern structure rather than one associated
with Pensacola’s historic maritime industries (Cook 2006:19). Slightly to the west of the
Pensacola Maritime Park property, in an area set aside as a proposed disposal area for
dredge spoil, divers located the partial remains of a wharf. The wharf was not considered
to be significant since consulted historic maps do not show activity in the area before the
20th century and because no accompanying historic artifacts were identified in the
 disposal area (Cook 2006:20-21). Nevertheless, judging by its location, it is possible that
this wharf could be the remains of the reverse L-shaped Bruce Dry Dock Company wharf or of an historic maritime structure that was never represented on period maps (Figure 36). In either case, study of the wharf could provide information about historic wharf construction. Even if the wharf was built in the early 20th century, the remains could illuminate the period of Pensacola’s decline as a major shipping port. In addition, just to the north of the Pensacola Maritime Park property, the Oliver Bronnum Mill (8ES1963) was investigated during the 1992 mill reconnaissance, but modern construction so disturbed the area that no features were identified (Phillips 1993b:29). Although investigations in and around the Pensacola Maritime Park property have not produced positive evidence of historic occupation and land use, this area should be reevaluated as it played host to numerous maritime industries, especially the yards and shipping piers of the Gulf, Florida and Alabama (GF&A) Railroad and Muscle Shoals, Birmingham and Pensacola (MSB&P) Railroad. While some areas revealed recent disturbance, others may be untouched by modern activity.

Further east along Pensacola’s bayshore, several archaeologists and local enthusiasts have investigated the Second Spanish period Panton, Leslie and Company trading firm’s headquarters, and those of its successor, John Forbes and Company, since the 1960s (8ES34). Although this location was occupied as early as 1765, the Panton, Leslie and Company site has been the focus of all archaeological fieldwork on the property due to the firm’s major role in the economy of Second Spanish Pensacola and in trade with Indians throughout the region (Durnford 1765a, Coker 1999:42-43). Since Panton, Leslie and Company had a sizeable complex that “consisted of large tanning yards, residences, business offices, and saloons,” a significant number of archaeological
features may exist in the area (Bense 1999:183). Unfortunately, most of the records and artifacts from the earliest excavations at the site, conducted on a portion of the Panton Mansion by Florida State University in 1964, have been lost and no final report was ever written. A local enthusiast, Leora Sutton, conducted the next round of excavations in 1975, but the information provided in the final report is difficult to interpret and the artifacts cannot be located. Although Sutton (1976) conducted investigations on various portions of the company’s headquarters, her team completed no artifact analysis. In the 1990s, UWF excavated a portion of the site that was due to be impacted by construction of a parking garage, but the report of those investigations has yet to be finalized (Siska Williams, pers. comm. 2009). Although it is difficult to determine whether maritime cultural resources have been uncovered at the location of Panton, Leslie and Company, it is likely that such resources exist due to the heavy maritime traffic that centered upon the trading firm.

Moving south onto filled land created adjacent to the original colonial shoreline in the 1800s, excavations in the 1980s at the intersection of Palafox Street and Main Street (8ES1375) uncovered remnants of a brick wall that may be an early seawall (Joy and Lloyd 1988:75-77). Main Street closely follows the original shoreline and may have been stabilized with such a wall. Although numerous wharves, piers, and other partially submerged maritime structures have been built along Pensacola’s waterfront since the First Spanish occupation of the mainland after 1740, this potential seawall represents the only remnant of that type of maritime infrastructure to have been archaeologically excavated. Slightly to the east, two different mill sites, the M. F. Gonzales and Company Grist Mill (8ES1959) and the B. R. Pitt Mill (8ES1962), were surveyed during the 1992
UWF mill investigation but produced no definitive results due to modern disturbance (Phillips 1993b:26-29).

Further east, numerous areas in the heart of colonial Pensacola, which featured the Spanish and British forts and later the town center, have been excavated over the past few decades. A Spanish residential complex (8ES981) and the Commanding Officer’s Compound (8ES1150), part of the colonial military district, have served as two specific foci of colonial research in downtown Pensacola. Although archaeologists have not uncovered any discernibly maritime resources during these excavations, the existence of the fort and town was the very reason that Pensacola functioned as a maritime center (Benchley 2007a, 2007b; Benchley et al. 2007). Sailors and other maritime workers certainly boarded or lived within this colonial enclave even though recognizing the sites they inhabited may be especially difficult. For example, UWF excavations uncovered features related to the operation of one of Pensacola’s major entertainment venues, the Tivoli house. Three refuse dumps—a midden (8ES49), a trash pit (8ES49), and a filled well (8ES1309)—located near this former dance hall and gambling room, active during the Second Spanish period, likely contain artifacts from sailors and other maritime laborers who frequented the establishment (Bense 1999:187). Although these artifacts are mixed with those of all the other dance hall patrons and its owners, excavations have the potential to provide an understanding of entertainment in Pensacola, which in turn illuminates the recreation options available to workers employed in the often difficult and dangerous maritime industries of the city.

Several other lots to the east of the colonial downtown have also been investigated. In 1975, prior to construction of Shoreline Drive, now named Bayfront
Parkway, archaeologists excavated several areas that would be impacted by the construction of the new street. The eastern segment of the project area consisted of a new right-of-way along generally unaltered shoreline, which appeared much as it did at the beginning of Pensacola’s colonial era. Because of the lack of modern disturbance, archaeologists conducted intensive testing and excavation along this part of the route (Long 1976). Excavations at the Lee House parking lot (8ES115) investigated the area of a former British warehouse with an associated wharf. A burned sill and a few postholes associated with 18th-century artifacts were located, but no structure could be delineated (Purcell 1778, Long 1976). UWF archaeologists recently completed additional, extensive investigations at the Lee House and excavated a trash pit that is likely associated with the colonial warehouse that stood nearby. Analysis has not yet been completed on these recent excavations, but this trash pit may shed light on the kinds of goods shipped to and stored in Pensacola during the British period (Norma Harris, pers. comm. 2009).

During preparation for the construction of Shoreline Drive, researchers conducted excavations in the southern portion of the Barkley House Yard (8ES119) slated to be impacted by the new road. According to the report, various historic maps show that two 20th-century structures, possibly warehouses associated with the lumber industry, once stood in the area under investigation. However, no documents uncovered thus far clarify the identity of the possible warehouses or, indeed, support the conclusion that they were warehouses. While the Shoreline Drive excavations uncovered trash pits and remnants of a possible 19th-century structure, archaeologists did not locate any resources definitively related to maritime activity (Long 1976). Although Pensacola Harbormaster David Sheehan lived in the Barkley house from 1899 to 1906, the long period of occupation at
the site makes it difficult to tie specific components exclusively to Sheehan (Bense 1984:6). UWF archaeologists conducted additional excavations at the Barkley House in the early 1980s and between 1999 and 2001 but focused on the northern part of the property (8ES2952), especially around the extant Barkley house, and did not uncover any decisive evidence of maritime industry or infrastructure (Bense 1984, Phillips and Mullins 2000, Benchley et al. 2007). In 2008 and 2009, UWF archaeologists returned to the site. Although archaeologists excavated shovel tests across the southern edge of the property, they located no maritime structures and documented little fill (Elizabeth Benchley, pers. comm. 2009).

Located just past the Barkley house lot, UWF archaeologists also surveyed another mill site, the W. B. Wright and Company Sawmill (8ES1958), during the 1992 mill site reconnaissance, but the site was found to be as disturbed and devoid of features as the others investigated during the survey (Phillips 1993b:26). In 2008, UWF archaeologists ground-truthed several waterfront magnetic anomalies, discovered during the 2004 and 2005 magnetometer survey described below, on the foreshore near the former location of the W. B. Wright and Company Sawmill. The ground-truthing of anomalies resulted in the identification of a scatter of “metal debris, ballast, and bricks” (8ES3491) that may be connected to the wharves that once stood in the area and mill activities that once took place nearby. Only a preliminary investigation of the site was conducted; additional work may reveal the identity of this eastern waterfront debris scatter (Kennedy 2010:72).

Further to the east, excavations in the Hawkshaw (8ES1287) neighborhood in the early 1980s prior to construction of the new Gulf Power headquarters, uncovered
evidence of historic habitation, including the presence of maritime workers. Since Hawkshaw was a predominately African American working-class neighborhood and many of the families who occupied its lots were involved with maritime industry, excavations at one such family plot—the Grey House, occupied continuously from pre-1850 to the 1980s—produced evidence of maritime pursuits. The employment of former tenants of the lot is listed in city directories as “baymen,” an occupation that consisted of diverse activities including loading vessels, fishing, oystering, and collecting timber that had floated out of holding pens in the bay (Bense 1985:180, 193). The bayman was thus a quintessential maritime jack-of-all-trades, involved in numerous aspects of Pensacola’s maritime industries. Excavation of features in the Grey House lot provided direct evidence of this occupation in the form of “timber dogs, carpenter tools … copper boat nails” and “fishing rods, cutlery, line swivels, and a (sic) oyster hamper” (Bense 1985:257, 271). Although only a sample of features from the lot was excavated, recovered artifacts confirmed this working-class lifestyle through a scarcity of luxury goods and evidence of recycling of items for other uses (Bense 1985:271). The excavations at Hawkshaw demonstrate the likelihood of identifying maritime workers in Pensacola through their material culture even without accompanying historic documentation. Future excavations in Pensacola in areas where residences of maritime workers once stood have the potential to illuminate the lives of those laborers whose day-to-day activities supported the city’s bustling maritime industry.

While industries, trading companies, and the house lots of maritime workers are clearly related to maritime activity, landfill (or created land) is less commonly discussed in MCL studies. This omission is unfortunate as landfill represents the ultimate attempt
by humans to modify their maritime landscape by constructing shoreline where none
existed before and creating habitable surfaces where the sea once laid claim. Landfilling
by residents and officials has altered the character of numerous littoral urban areas;
Pensacola is no exception. Although the most extensive examples of landfill in
Pensacola are located in the center of downtown, which is constructed partially on
created land, landfill exists along the shore from Bayou Chico to Bayou Texar. Some of
those landfill episodes have been documented archaeologically. The PAS conducted in
the 1980s highlighted the presence of a rich colonial midden at the edge of the former
bayshore near the Panton, Leslie and Company site, which may be evidence of the
earliest attempts to create new land along the shore (Bense 1989[1]:63-66).

The PAS also located additional evidence of landfill, dating to the Victorian
period (1865-1918), at several sites including the Old Police Station site (8ES1321),
Vacant Lot 116 (8ES1302), and at various areas of Palafox and Barracks Street.
Interestingly, the nature of this fill differed from its colonial counterpart in that it was not
composed of domestic waste, but rather “rocks and gravel ballast, sand and sawdust”
(Bense 1989[1]:70). Monitoring of construction by UWF on south Palafox Street, part of
the downtown area composed entirely of land created with fill in the late 19th century,
documented numerous different fill episodes and various kinds of fill material from
ballast to oyster shell to French terra cotta roofing tiles. Timbers from the log cribs used
to hold the ballast were also uncovered (8ES1375) (Joy and Lloyd 1988:70, 78-86).
Finally, the PAS documented additional landfill evidence from the colonial period at
Hawkshaw (8ES1287) along the bay terrace’s edge (Bense 1989).
Another kind of landfill not archaeologically documented in Pensacola should nevertheless be noted as it has been found in port cities throughout the United States. Obsolete or damaged ships, often purposefully scuttled, were frequently used like large timber cribs to hold sand, ballast, mud, and refuse in order to create land. These ships were often gradually covered by additional fill. Waterfront excavations in California, New York, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mobile, Alabama, have resulted in the discovery of numerous such vessels used to create filled land (Nielsen 1971a:4-5, 10; Gulf Engineers and Consultants and Tidewater Atlantic Research 1996:3; Beard 1997:67; Delgado 2009:113-136; Cantwell and Wall 2001:233-236). Even though this type of landfill has not yet been discovered in Pensacola, fill ships may well lay buried under created land all along the city’s waterfront.

Although landfill is not the most romantic of maritime cultural resources, dedicated study of land creation episodes in Pensacola may illuminate the history of Pensacola’s waterfront by accomplishing several goals: 1) clarifying the process of land formation in the city since historic maps and documents do not adequately record the various stages, 2) revealing changes in landfill materials from the colonial period to the American period, 3) exposing differences between landfill episodes in different neighborhoods, and 4) uncovering resistance to landfill and ballast dumping regulations in the city by dating materials in landfill episodes and comparing the materials to the regulations. All of these goals may indicate changing attitudes about sanitation and refuse disposal in Pensacola and the human agency that sometimes circumvented local restrictions. Even the most humble of maritime cultural resources has the potential to elucidate Pensacola’s MCL.
Finally, between 2004 and 2005, UWF underwater archaeologists conducted an intensive magnetometer survey in the bay along Pensacola’s waterfront from the mouth of Bayou Chico to the mouth of Bayou Texar, out to 1000 yards in most areas. A few small areas were also surveyed with side-scan sonar. Surveyors identified numerous anomalies during the project. Some were clearly related to wharves that once extended from the waterfront, but the identity of others could not be determined. Several anomalies were ground-truthed during the summer of 2005, but other than the previously recorded B-Street Schooner, all were found to be modern debris. Nevertheless, this survey represents an ideal starting point for investigation of the Pensacola waterfront’s submerged cultural resources. Further investigation of anomalies recorded during this survey, as evidenced by the identification of the eastern waterfront debris scatter (8ES3491) described above, could provide much information on historic shipwrecks and maritime infrastructure (Bratten and Cook 2005, Kennedy 2010:72).

Pensacola’s bayfront and adjacent waters contain layer upon layer of archaeological resources from romantic shipwrecks to prosaic landfill. Numerous studies by various entities, particularly UWF since 1983, have investigated the archaeological remains associated with the dynamic history of Pensacola’s protean bay and bayou shores. From a quiet colonial outpost to an active industrial shipping port to a declining harbor that fell victim to a lack of environmental management and the stresses of the Great Depression, Pensacola has witnessed vast changes in the maritime industry and infrastructure that, at times, crowded its shoreline. While examples of Pensacola’s many maritime sites have been surveyed or excavated, including seawalls, warehouses, waterfront industrial sites, shipyards, shipwrecks, ballast piles, landfill, maritime worker
residences, taverns, and dance halls, many more examples of these site types and others, including seamen’s churches, bathhouses, brothels, and boarding houses, remain buried under land or water.

The preceding chapters established the utility of an MCL framework combined with a social theory approach and provided an overview of the historical context of the Pensacola waterfront and the previous archaeological research conducted on or near the shore. The following case study demonstrates that investigation of even the most inconspicuous maritime sites on the waterfront, especially when they are considered within their historical context, provides insight into both the lives of maritime workers and the maritime infrastructure required to maintain and augment the port’s activities.
CHAPTER VII

ROCKS AND RATS AND RUBBISH: ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS OF TWO PENSACOLA ROCK PILES

I leaped headlong into the sea, and thereby have become better acquainted with the soundings, the quicksands, and the rocks, than if I had stayed upon the green shore. …

~ John Keats (Kemp 2003:147)

Break, break, break, / On thy cold gray stones, O Sea!

~ Alfred, Lord Tennyson (Rolfe 1895:307)

Utilizing the theoretical and methodological framework described above, the previous chapters have examined primary and secondary maritime site types along the Pensacola waterfront as evidenced in both historical and archaeological literature. This examination provided tantalizing glimpses of the human agency, including resistance, which contributed to the formation of the maritime cultural landscape of Pensacola. However, numerous site types along the waterfront, such as landfill and ballast piles, were rarely discussed in historical documents even if they were noted on maps and charts. In addition, many maritime site types that existed on the Pensacola waterfront, such as bathhouses and sailors’ boarding houses, have infrequently been investigated archaeologically. The University of West Florida (UWF), a major player in the archaeological investigation of Pensacola, has generally focused on shipwrecks, to the detriment of other maritime site types.
Methods

In order to test the theoretical paradigm outlined above, two rock piles on the Pensacola waterfront, a site type generally ignored in both archival records and archaeological literature, were chosen for investigation (Figure 42). As a primary site type, this study argues that these ballast/rock piles offer a means of investigating maritime workers, the creation of maritime infrastructure, and the formation of the Pensacola maritime cultural landscape (MCL). In 2008, UWF archaeologists, directed by the author, examined these two rock piles in order to answer some basic questions. Archaeologists and students had earlier inspected the larger of the rock piles during the 2006 summer field school and collected a few diagnostic artifacts, but no research questions were posed or answered during this concise investigation. Several research questions were formulated for the study of these piles in 2008. Did these rock piles represent ballast piles that resulted from one or more shipwrecks, ballast dumps from intentional ballast disposal, whether from a shipwrecking event or the unloading of ballast from vessels intending to load cargo, or another heretofore unidentified type of rock pile? When were these piles created and how? What do historical documents say, or not say, about their creation and existence? Since both ballast piles and ballast dumps are associated with maritime workers—sailors and maritime laborers, respectively—what could artifacts on the rock piles say about the maritime workers associated with the piles?

From late July to December 2008, graduate student supervisors, graduate students, and undergraduate students, led by the author, embarked on a dedicated examination of the two rock piles in order to provide answers to these questions. The piles were measured, by laying out tapes along the long and short axes of the piles, in
Figure 42. Location of rock piles.
order to determine the boundaries of each site as well as clarify the nature of the piles. Very large piles of ballast would more likely represent intentional dumping in a designated area rather than a ballast pile associated with a shipwreck, even multiple wrecks, or ballast disposal from a single wrecking or near-wrecking event. Artifacts on the piles, including large machinery, were investigated and diagnostic artifacts collected to assist in the determination of the age of the rock piles as well as the nature and function of the piles. Artifacts hold the potential to reveal exactly when the piles were created, how the piles were used, and by whom; they may also illuminate the lives of the maritime workers who built or worked on the piles. The provenience of artifacts and methods used in their sampling were based on the quadrants formed by the tape measure axes. All recovered artifacts were taken to the UWF Archaeology Conservation Lab for cleaning and conservation. Students in the Fall 2008 Conservation Lab class drew pre-conservation sketches, took photos, recorded pertinent data, and conserved and consolidated all of the artifacts. Post-conservation steps included taking photos and entering information on all artifacts into a relational database. Artifacts were identified using UWF’s comparative collection, numerous artifact reference publications, and the help of archaeological professionals, artifact collectors, and architectural historians through various email listservs and Internet sites (Hume 1969, Brown 1982, South 2002, Stelle 2007, Lindsey 2008).

Once the approximate creation dates and nature of the two piles were determined from site measurements and artifact analysis, additional focused archival research was conducted into ballast disposal in Pensacola, lot histories for the large rock pile and shore areas near both rock piles, and various waterfront industries that operated nearby and
appeared to have connections to the rock piles. This research further illuminated the creation of the rock piles, the way in which they were used, and their associations within Pensacola’s MCL. These discoveries, in turn, pave the way for future research questions and archaeological fieldwork.

Large Rock Pile

The large rock pile (8ES3366), located on the western side of the waterfront, is composed of various kinds and sizes of ballast rock. Prior to the introduction of iron ballast, most ships used large boulders, rocks, cobbles, and sand as ballast, a substance placed into a ship to improve its control and stability (Lamb 1988:5). Since Pensacola Bay has a sandy, mucky bottom and is naturally devoid of rock deposits, large piles of stone in the bay can be assumed to have been imported as ballast in sailing ships. However, deposits of rock along the shoreline, and sometimes around wharf and bridge pilings, which are composed of relatively uniform, jagged stones or broken concrete may instead be modern riprap used to stabilize said shoreline and structures. The large rock pile, which contains small cobbles, medium-size stones, and large boulders, appears to be composed of ballast from sailing vessels. In addition, the pile is strewn with a gallimaufry of artifacts from Delft ceramics to blown glass bottle fragments to electric Christmas lights and aluminum beer cans.

The first graphic evidence of the pile comes from an 1890 United States Coast Survey (USCS) map that shows a small island just north of the end of the Pensacola and Perdido Railroad Wharf (Figure 31) (USCS 1890). An 1896 Birds’ Eye View map of Pensacola shows the pile with two small buildings situated on it (Figure 32) (Koch 1896).
Although these structures are long gone, today the pile is a well-known fishing spot that attracts numerous boats every weekend and serves as a repository for the garbage they discard. Investigation of the large rock pile was conducted to collect data that would help clarify the usage period and character of this little understood maritime cultural resource.

**Investigation**

Recording began on the large rock pile in late July 2008. The first task involved determining the pile’s length and width. Since the pile is mounded in the center, only partially submerged, very uneven and irregular, and runs from north to south along a natural depth incline—approximately 3 m of water depth at the northern end of the pile to about 4 m in depth at the southern extent—it was impossible to accurately measure the length and width simply by laying tape measures across the pile. Instead, after some consideration and planning, metric tape baselines were oriented along the major axes of the rock pile—135°/315° and 45°/225°—and were secured with metal rods or anchors to prevent excessive movement of the tapes. In order to account for the varying angles of the tape measures across the pile from northwest to southeast and northeast to southwest, depth measurements from surface to rock pile were taken with a plumb bob every 1 m along each tape measure so that the information could be graphed and the actual length and width of the pile determined.

Handheld and wrist compasses were used to orient the tape measures, but the amphibious nature of the rock pile, especially its ever-changing depth above water and the waves that crashed over it from all directions in the slightest of weather conditions, made it extremely difficult to accurately lay the tapes and keep them in place. Laying
each baseline required some strenuous and slippery work that included removing cumbersome, top-heavy SCUBA gear in order to walk safely across the exposed portion of the wet, slime-covered rock pile and then donning gear on the other end in order to descend to the deep, opposite extent. For those reasons, measuring of either axis had to be completed within the span of one day and preferably in the shortest amount of time possible so that tides would not noticeably alter the depth of water at the rock pile while depths were being recorded. In addition, wave action broke and abraded numerous tape measures until they were reinforced with a nylon line that itself saw considerable wear.

Once the general dimensions of the large rock pile had been recorded, attention turned to the artifacts and historic debris scattered on and around the pile. The quadrants—northeast, northwest, southeast, southwest—established on the large rock pile with the two tape measures served as ideal divisions for sampling strategies and as designations for locations of any collected artifacts. Initially, diagnostic artifacts in the quadrants were marked with pin flags for later retrieval and position recording, but this was a slow and tedious process that ultimately proved unfeasible. Unless artifacts were collected at the time they were located, wave action ripped out pin flags and reburied smaller artifacts.

Shortly after the disappointing pin flag experiment, an excellent opportunity presented itself during a day with exceptional weather—low winds and little current—and unusually low tides when a much larger than normal portion of the rock pile was exposed and numerous artifacts were readily visible. These conditions presented the perfect occasion to collect artifacts from the rock pile with minimal difficulty. Approximately 40 diagnostic artifacts were collected from the exposed and shallow
sections of all 4 quadrants of the pile. The location of each artifact was plotted from both the 135°/315° and 45°/225° baselines, and the specific quadrant recorded, in order to maintain a high level of provenience precision.

Although collecting artifacts in this manner was efficient, more artifacts were needed to create a representative sample, especially from deeper sections of the pile, and provide additional information that might help date the feature. The northeast quadrant was chosen for this in-depth collection. The author designed and tested several methods for collecting artifacts from deeper sections of the targeted northeast quadrant, but none permitted accurate, simplified recording of artifact position. Graduate student Siska Williams suggested a method that, though seemingly complicated, was simple and straightforward in practice and allowed for excellent provenience control and adequate sampling. Four offset lines were established in the northeast quadrant with anchors and tape measures at 5 m intervals along the 45°/225° baseline from 0 m to the baseline center at 17 m. These offset lines paralleled the 135°/315° baseline. In order to locate, collect, and record artifacts, two divers swam along either side of every offset line, scanning for artifacts in their 5 m lanes. Diagnostic artifact locations were recorded with the 45°/225° baseline measurement (0 m, 5 m, 10 m, or 15 m), the offset line measurement (variable), and measurement off of the offset line with a folding ruler so that artifact locations could be exactly plotted. The locational information was recorded on a mylar tag that was placed in the artifact bag with each artifact. In total, 105 diagnostic and representative artifacts were collected in 2008 from the large rock pile, including ceramics, glass, leather, modified stone, and bone.
Results and Artifact Analysis

Despite numerous setbacks, dedicated students and supervisors succeeded in measuring the large rock pile’s northwest/southeast axis at 107 m and the northeast/southwest axis at 48 m, both axes established from the center of the exposed portion of the rock pile, not necessarily from its geographic center (Figures 43 and 44). The substantial size of the pile clearly indicates that the large rock pile was not the result of a shipwreck or shipwreck-related ballast disposal event. Instead, the large rock pile must have been the result of numerous ballast dumping episodes or dedicated construction of a ballast pile.

The majority of artifacts found on the large rock pile in both 2006 and 2008 dated to the mid to late 19th century (Hume 1969, Brown 1982, South 2002, Stelle 2007, Lindsey 2008). Most of the ceramics consisted of pearlware and whiteware, with a few examples of creamware, stoneware, coarse earthenware, and porcelain. Although the ceramic sherd count was 67 and a mean ceramic date was calculated from only 56 diagnostic sherds, the resulting date of 1848 is somewhat early when compared to the history of the large rock pile discussed below (Table 2). However, it is not surprising that the mean ceramic date is early as ballast was often reharvested from harbors where ballast dumping was common and sold to ship captains who needed more weight to sail efficiently. Artifacts caught in the ballast could thus date much earlier than the ships in which they sailed and could be redeposited with newer artifacts in distant harbors. In addition, the laborers who worked on the large rock pile and ate in its kitchen, described below, probably did not use the latest and best tablewares when eating their meals. Even
Figure 43. North/South profile of the large rock pile (8ES3366).
Figure 44. East/West profile of the large rock pile (8ES3366).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic type</th>
<th>Type median</th>
<th>Sherd count</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware, annular</td>
<td>1874.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1874.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light blue transfer print</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light blue willow pattern transfer print</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crumb blue hand-painted</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalloped rim, impressed straight lines</td>
<td>1817.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1817.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalloped rim, impressed bud</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscalloped, impressed rim</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscalloped, unmolded</td>
<td>1873.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1873.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light blue transfer print</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green transfer print</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow mulberry</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow blue</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscalloped, unmolded</td>
<td>1873.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1873.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green cut sponge</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue cut sponge</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White salt-glazed stoneware</td>
<td>1757.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1757.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany slip stoneware</td>
<td>1932.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline glaze stoneware</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed redware</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unglazed redware</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-glazed slipware</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basaltware</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>103476.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date: 103476.5/56=1847.8
so, the mean ceramic date of 1848 provides an archaeological counterpart to the dating provided through historic research.

Of the several bottles and pieces of glass discovered on the rock pile, only six were diagnostic. The first three bottles described below, as well as two unmarked examples, were all formed using a snap case device, which was developed between 1850 and 1860 and used until about 1903, when complete automation was introduced in the bottle industry (Deiss 1981:54-57, 78-79). These manufacture dates coincide well with the known context dates for each individual bottle. The first bottle remnant is a dark olive green bottle base, with a pronounced push-up, with the mark “CW & Co,” followed by a small fleur-de-lis or cross, encircling the base (Figure 45). Bottle researcher Julian Toulouse found this mark on a Guinness Beer bottle, minus the cross or fleur-de-lis, but could not associate it with any known British glass company or bottler (Toulouse 1971). Members of the Bottle Research Group, a group of archaeologists and bottle collectors dedicated to determining and refining production dates, factory origins, and other information about historic bottles, could not suggest a definitive company name associated with this mark, but were able to provide a few examples of bottles with the same mark in archaeological literature. The “CW & Co” mark was found on a bottle from the Gila Bend Stage Station in Arizona in a context dating from 1858 to 1880, and is frequently found in Gold Rush-era contexts in California, including one from Old Town San Diego dating to the late 1850s or early 1860s (Berge 1968:191; Schulz 2008; Peter Schulz, pers. comm. 2008). In addition, three “black beer” bottles marked “CW & Co” were recovered from an 1859 to 1874 context during salvage excavations at the former site of the Settlers Hotel in the port city of Whangarei, New
Figure 45. Diagnostic bottle marks from the large rock pile (8ES3366).
Zealand (Campbell and Harris 2008:26). Finally, four “CW & Co” bottles were found in an 1865 context at the Victoria Hotel site in Auckland, New Zealand (Brassey and Macready 1994:90). Although none of these dates are definitive, the date ranges fit well with that derived from the mean ceramic date of the large rock pile as well as its known history.

The remaining three marks are less promising, and have little to no specific date information, but they nevertheless connect Pensacola to a wider maritime frame of reference. Two of the marks, both from dark olive green bottle bases with pronounced push-ups, are very similar. Respectively, they read “6 to Gallon p” and “6 to the Gallon” followed by a rotated “C” or omega symbol (Figures 45 and 46). Surprisingly, bottles with this mark appear to be common on mid-19th to early 20th-century Australian sites in the western and middle part of the continent. One example comes from excavations of a house/store combination in the port town of Cossack within an 1895 to 1910 context (Gaye Nayton, pers. comm. 2009). Several other bottles were collected from a maritime context associated with the Long Jetty site in Fremantle. No reliable dating information is available for these bottles due to the lack of provenience control during excavation and collection (Garratt 1994; Souter 2007; Samantha Bolton, pers. comm. 2008). Other examples include “6 to the Gallon” bottles from an 1862 to 1896 context in Strangways, South Australia, and those from Artlunga, a mining site in the mid-continent occupied from 1887 to 1914 (Holmes 1990, Paterson 1999). No examples have yet been uncovered from any other North American contexts.

Finally, the base and part of the side of a light blue bottle with a partial mark on the side was also found on the large rock pile. The mark, what there is of it, reads
Figure 46. Diagnostic bottle marks from the large rock pile (8ES3366).
“… HERS” on the first line and “… CK” on the second or third line (Figure 46). The bottle’s shape—four sided with chamfered corners—suggests that the contents were likely medicinal or hygiene-related. For that reason, members of the Bottle Research Group tentatively suggested a connection to the product *Mother’s Relief* made by G.A. Bartholick and Company, a producer of patent medicines. Without a more complete example of the bottle from the large rock pile or another site, the identification is tentative at best (Bartholick and Co. 1839; Carol Serr and Bill Lockhart, pers. comm. 2009). Considered together, the various bottles on the rock pile do suggest that the maritime workers who labored there did occasionally enjoy intoxicating beverages shipped to Pensacola from areas around the world.

While several other categories of artifacts were recovered from the large rock pile, none proved useful for establishing a date range for the pile. Divers recovered 14 pieces of pipe stem, but their uncertain country of origin and the small sample size make it impossible to use Harrington’s pipe stem dating method. However, these pipe stem fragments do imply that those who visited the large rock pile or worked on it may have enjoyed a smoke along with their libations. Although divers also collected several bones, the types of bone only suggest that sailors, or those working on the large rock pile, ate goat or sheep and ham steak at some point in time. Lastly, a few modified stones appear to be fishing weights and demonstrate the site’s popularity as a fishing spot, rather than illuminating its commercial past. Nevertheless, many of the artifacts recovered from the large rock pile do help to reveal something about its period of use and character, information only partially divulged by the archival record.
In addition to the smaller artifacts, a metal structure was located and recorded just off the northeast quadrant of the pile (Figure 47). Although more investigation is needed, the metal structure appears to be a portion of a boiler and gear wheel, possibly from a steam-powered vessel. The structure might also be the remnant of a smoke stack that was present on the rock pile in 1901 (Clerk of Circuit Court Official Records [CCCOR] 1901c).

Small Rock Pile

The small rock pile (8ES3367) is located to the east of the large rock pile and to the west of Pensacola’s waterfront center in an area that has seen major maritime activity since the 1780s when the Panton, Leslie and Company trading firm established their headquarters on the shore (Coker 1999). The earliest documentation of the small rock pile is a 1922 aerial photograph taken for a report on Pensacola’s port by the Army Corps of Engineers (Figure 37) (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922).

Investigation

Recording of the small rock pile was conducted in similar fashion to the large rock pile, but was completed much more quickly due to experience gained on the large rock pile and the sheltered location of the small pile, which provided a more stable working environment. The small rock pile’s surface is also more submerged than the large pile. Baselines were laid along the major axes of the pile, which run conveniently north/south (0°/180°) and east/west (90°/270°). Depth measurements were recorded with a plumb bob every 3 m along each baseline. A few artifacts were collected from the small rock pile, but the extreme difference between artifact types on the small and large
Figure 47. Possible boiler and gear wheel on the large rock pile (8ES3366).
rock piles prompted different recording and sampling methods. Earlier orientation
surveys of the small rock pile had revealed the presence of tiles impressed with what
appeared to be French words. After the small rock pile was measured, two divers
resurveyed the pile in search of tiles with more complete inscriptions. Numerous tiles
were identified and five of the most complete specimens were collected from the same
location in the southeast quadrant.

Results and Artifact Analysis

After graphing the measurement data, the small rock pile was determined to
measure approximately 48 m long and 22 m wide (Figures 48 and 49). Although smaller
than the large rock pile, the small rock pile still appears to be too large to represent a
single shipwreck or ballast disposal event. Instead, just like the large rock pile, the small
rock pile likely represents several episodes of ballast disposal. As the small rock pile
does not protrude from the water like the large rock pile, it is less likely that the small
rock pile represents an attempt to build a maritime structure with ballast. Similar to the
large rock pile, the small rock pile is composed of large boulders and tiny stones. The
small rock pile, however, differs significantly from the large rock pile in the artifacts it
contains. While the large rock pile is covered with all manner of artifacts and debris, the
small rock pile features artifacts of a limited nature. These consist exclusively of flat and
rounded terra cotta roofing tiles, some with impressed designs and makers’ marks. No
ceramics or bones were encountered and the only glass containers found were a few
modern beer bottles. Although there are numerous crabs on the small rock pile and
Figure 48. North/South profile of the small rock pile (8ES3367).
Figure 49. East/West profile of the small rock pile (8ES3367).
occasionally crab traps placed on it or nearby, the site does not generally attract the same attention from local fishermen and outdoor enthusiasts as does the large rock pile.

The artifacts collected on the small rock pile consisted of only five French terracotta roofing tiles with various portions of the following inscription: “Arnaud Etienne et Cie / Marseille [Maltese Cross] St Henry” (Figure 50). These flat, interlocking roofing tiles, known worldwide as Marseille tiles due to their production in Marseille, France, have been found at archaeological sites throughout the world from Israel to Australia to the U.S. (Ratier 1989; Varman 2006; Gerald Finkielsztejn, pers. comm. 2008; Lewis 2009). Surprisingly, precise production information on these tiles is difficult to obtain. The first producer of the Marseille tile appears to have been the Tuileries Martin Frères in the 1850s (Ratier 1989:24). Several other manufacturers in Marseille soon began fabrication of these tiles, including Arnaud Etienne et Cie, which appears to have been in production of some kind of tiles or brick as early as the 1840s. The company’s logo was a Maltese cross (Lewis 2009:6.07.5-6). In 1881, Arnaud Etienne and other tile factories in the same region formed a syndicate called the Société des Tuileries et Briqueteries de Marseille (Ratier 1989:28, 234-236). Although it is tempting to assume that the Arnaud Etienne imprint and logo would have been discontinued after the creation of this syndicate, tiles with the Arnaud Etienne et Cie imprint were being advertised in Australia as late as 1899 and a flyer listing the company’s name and logo, as well as those of other tile producers, was printed for Marseille’s 1922 Colonial Exposition (Lewis 2009:6.07.5-6, Ratier 1989:43). Thus, although specific production dates for the tiles cannot be determined, the small rock pile must have been created sometime after the first production of the Arnaud Etienne tiles in the 1850s and the
Figure 50. Marseille roofing tiles from the small rock pile (8ES3367): (a) Artifact 001 front; (b) Artifact 001 back; (c) Artifact 002 front; (d) Artifact 002 back.
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appearance of the small rock pile in the 1922 aerial photo, which coincides with the major landfill episodes on Pensacola’s waterfront.

Additional research into *Arnaud Étienne et Cie* and other tile producers, including the meanings of numeric imprints that vary on tiles by the same manufacturers, may assist in establishing precise date ranges for several maritime and terrestrial sites in Pensacola where these tiles have been found (Figure 51). Excavations on Cedar Street in the 1980s (8ES1375), a street constructed on filled land, produced several examples of these tiles from various French producers, including *Martin Frères* and *Pierre Sacoman*, as well as some Italian or Spanish tiles (Joy and Lloyd 1988:70, 78-86; Ratier 1989:43). Historical documents and local lore specifically note the presence of broken French roofing tiles in the fill on which much of downtown Pensacola is located (Barr 1927). Marseille tiles produced by *Pierre Sacoman* and either the *Société Générale des Tuileries de Marseille* or *Tuileries de la Méditerranée* were also found in association with ballast in Butcherpen Cove across the bay from Pensacola (8SR1551, 8SR1555) (Cozzi et al. 2001). Tiles made by *Guichard Carvin et Cie*, *Antoine Sacoman*, and possibly *Roux Frères* were found by a local resident near Bayou Texar on the east side of downtown Pensacola (John Bubba, pers. comm. 2008; Lewis 2009:6.07.5). Other local residents have also indicated the presence of these tiles in Santa Rosa Sound on the bay side of Santa Rosa Island near the piers of the Bob Sikes Bridge that connects the island to the mainland (Janet Lloyd, pers. comm. 2008).

The presence of Marseille tiles in Pensacola and surrounding areas is especially surprising since most sources note that these tiles were only rarely exported to the United States (Ratier 1989:25-26, Lewis 2009:6.07.1-2). Only two other consulted works
Figure 51. Roofing tile recovery locations in Pensacola and surrounding area.
describe the presence of these tiles in archaeological investigations in North America, specifically in 20th-century coastal landfill at Fort Johnson, South Carolina and Galveston, Texas. The tiles found in Galveston were discovered in a disturbed context during the excavation of a large sewer trench on the island (Meissner 2000). As Galveston has seen quite a few filling episodes, it is reasonable to assume these tiles were deposited as fill just like those in Pensacola. Those found in South Carolina were associated with ballast that may have been offloaded during quarantine procedures (Steen et al. 2002:6.7-798-6.7-800). Thus, in all known cases, broken Marseille tiles in America have a strong association with landfill and ballast and may only have been transported to the continent in that capacity. Since broken tiles were useless as roofing material, selling such tiles to ballast brokers would have provided a means of acquiring an economic benefit even from apparently worthless items.

History of Ballast Disposal and Rock Piles in Pensacola

The history of Pensacola waterfront presented in previous chapters includes descriptions of various industries, regulations, and events that may have played a part in the creation of the large and small rock piles. That history, which is more descriptive than analytical, set the stage for the more detailed history of ballast disposal and the two rock piles included in this case study. The following section offers an in-depth treatment of several aspects of Pensacola’s waterfront history that factored into the creation of rock piles in Pensacola as well as a look at the history of the large and small rock piles as evidenced in archival documents.
As mentioned, much of Pensacola’s waterfront consists of created land built up over the course of decades during numerous filling episodes. While earlier fill was composed of earth and terrestrial rubble, later filling utilized the ballast brought to Pensacola by the countless ships that entered the bay (Bense 1989[1]:63-70, Joy and Lloyd 1988:84). As one local resident noted, discarded ballast from the various ships that visited the port included,

[C]lay from Greece, rock from Norway, slatey [sic] substance from Sweden, chalk from the white cliffs of Dover, pyrites from Portugal, stone from Denmark, sand from Ireland and Wales and England, Manganese ore slag from Brazil, iron ingots from Argentina, lava from Martinique, and other deposits brought as ballast. Some of the ships would bring salt as ballast (McLellan 1944:13).

Since both rock piles are likely composed of ballast, this section begins with a discussion of ballast dumping in Pensacola Bay and the filling of Pensacola’s downtown waterfront—largely unexamined topics both in historical and archaeological literature—as evidenced by maps, local ordinances, Florida state laws, and civil court cases, and then moves to an examination of the history of each rock pile and its nearest point of land using charts and property deeds.

As sailing ships entered harbors around the world, they regularly discarded ballast from their holds in order to load new cargo destined for their next port of call. While local entrepreneurs sold some of this ballast to other outgoing ships and to road builders and contractors, some of it remained on the bottom of the bays and waterways where it
had been discarded, creating ballast piles that still exist today (McLellan 1944:13, Lamb 1988:6). Pensacola is no exception and has numerous ballast piles scattered throughout the Pensacola Bay system from Santa Rosa Sound in the south to Pensacola’s waterfront in the north. Today, ballast piles can be found throughout Pensacola Bay even though regulation of ballast dumping was a major concern of early Pensacola officials.

As the number of ships entering Pensacola Bay increased over the centuries, appropriate ballast disposal became a concern to local and state officials desirous of maintaining safe, navigable channels into and out of the bay. In 1855, the State of Florida’s General Assembly passed an act that required Pensacola’s harbor pilots to report any dumping of ballast in the Bay or within 3 mi. of the Pensacola Bar. Harbor pilots risked losing their license if they failed to report any ballast dumping and the act gave the Commissioners of Pilotage of the Bay and Harbor of Pensacola authority to sue the captain or master of any vessel accused of illegal dumping (General Assembly of the State of Florida 1855:23-29). The establishment of a quarantine station as early as 1871, and possibly earlier, at Old Navy Cove on the western end of the Gulf Breeze peninsula, across the bay from downtown Pensacola, contributed to the creation of numerous ballast piles in the surrounding area and the disposal of ballast far from the waterfront. Ballast was removed from ships and discarded in the bay nearby so that the vessels could be fumigated to prevent the transmission, as believed at the time, of yellow fever and other infectious diseases. Officials proposed to move the quarantine station to the southern side of the Gulf Breeze peninsula in 1879, but it is unclear if this occurred. However, in 1882, the station was moved to Little Sabine Inlet on Santa Rosa Island, which is south of the Gulf Breeze peninsula (Davison 1876, Pearce 1978:460, Jordan-Greene 2007:34-40).
According to local lore, ballast dumping had begun in 1876 at the entrance to Little Sabine Bay; the island that formed from repeated dumping episodes served as the site of the new quarantine station for over half a century and today serves as the site of the Environmental Protection Agency’s Gulf Ecology Division (Gulf Ecology Division 2008, Bookout 2010:2). During the same period as the establishment of the quarantine station, the Legislature of Florida strengthened ballast regulations in 1872, giving the Board of Pilot Commissioners in Pensacola, and in harbor cities throughout Florida, the authority to detain any persons who disposed of ballast in any areas other than those designated by the Board and the right to impose a fine of up to 2,000 dollars for such actions (Legislature of Florida 1872:54-56).

There were, as suggested by the 1872 Act, some legal outlets for ballast dumping through the use of ballast to create new land along the waterfront, despite the dumping of ballast across the bay near the quarantine station. Dedicated filling of the waterfront reportedly began as early as 1836, but the first documented evidence of this land creation is offered by an 1859 USCS map that shows a tiny area of new land with one possible structure to the west of one of the two wharves on the waterfront (Figure 26) (USCS 1859, Joy and Lloyd 1988:3). In addition, a Civil War era map of Pensacola highlights the city’s war-related structures, but also records two wharves, the small plot of created land, and two buildings erected upon it (Weiss 1861). Contrariwise, a ca. 1830s map of Pensacola shows only one wharf and no landfill (Figure 23) (Kearney 1822). Although Pensacola’s Board of Pilot Commissioners zealously exercised the authority vested in them in 1855 and 1872 in regards to litigating those who dumped ballast in or near Pensacola Bay, suing at least four different parties for illegal ballast dumping between
1855 and 1886, none of the court proceedings that resulted specify the location of approved ballast disposal areas (Clerk of Circuit Court Archives Division [CCCAD] 1866a, 1877a, 1886a, 1886b). In addition, the 1868 Code of Ordinances for the city of Pensacola, the oldest extant Code, does not specify any regulations or locations for ballast disposal. It does, however, require the establishment of a committee “charged with the control and supervision of the water-front of the city, the wharves, docks, levees, and etc. that have been or may be erected” (Blount 1868:78). An 1878 court case, involving a suit brought by the Barcelona Street Wharf Company against the Board of Pilot Commissioners, does suggest that ballast could be legally disposed of, prior to 1877, in wooden crib containers built adjacent to waterfront property, but no specific properties or areas are mentioned (CCCAD 1878).

Interestingly, the large rock pile was built in the 1870s during the height of the formulation of Pensacola’s ballast disposal and fill regulations, but its story began decades before and far away from the city’s bay and harbor. Henry Gerhard Sophus Baars, the eventual builder of the large rock pile, was born in Oldenburg, Germany in 1844, a son of prosperous property owners (Baars Family Papers 1985). Upon his graduation, his father purchased an interest for him in the lumber exporting firm of Carl Epping and Company with offices in South Carolina and Georgia (Via Pensacola 1986:6, 8-9). Shortly before the Civil War broke out, Baars traveled to the United States to begin his employ with the company in its Darien, Georgia offices (Wentworth 1940). During the war, Baars served admirably with the Savannah Guards, even becoming a Union prisoner. After the war, Baars was promoted to junior partner in the company and went back to Georgia to reopen the firm’s offices (Wentworth 1940, Willis 1975).
Recognizing the potential of Pensacola for the future of the lumber industry and the company for which he worked, Baars moved to the Deep-Water City in 1871. In the same year, he returned to Darien to marry Mary Ellison Dunwody (or Dunwoody) and brought her back to Pensacola with him (Appleyard 1989).

In 1873 and 1874, Baars signed leases with various individuals who claimed riparian rights for the western waterfront, including J. M. Justiniani, A. C. Blount, and L. M. Merritt, and proceeded to build a “crib wharf” east of the Pensacola and Perdido Railroad Company wharf and opposite the Maxent Tract on the western shore (CCCOR 1877a). Based on the description in the deed, the crib wharf is actually the large rock pile, even though the rock pile does not fit the definition of a traditional wharf. Later documents refer to the same property as a ballast crib, rather than a crib wharf (Jones 1901). Baars also held leases on property owned by the Pensacola and Perdido Railroad Company and Benjamin Simmons and had built a lumber bed and turntable on that property, most likely for the use of his firm, which had become Epping, Bellas and Company sometime in the intervening years (CCCOR 1877a, Appleyard 1989:18).

Between 1873 and 1877, Baars built the large rock pile in the same way one would construct a ballast crib. He used palmetto logs to assemble the portion of the crib below the water and pitch pine for the portion above water, and then filled the crib with ballast until a surface was formed above high water mark. He also constructed an office and kitchen on the large rock pile and built a timber boom—a type of holding pen for lumber—next to the pile, all of which were used by Epping, Bellas and Company, most likely to store and manage timber for shipment on oceangoing vessels (CCCOR 1877a, Jones 1901, Appleyard 1976:11). In essence, the large rock pile was an innovative
response to the transshipment of lumber from Pensacola. Rather than expending the amount of money it would take to construct a crib wharf, piling wharf, or combination wharf from the western shore all the way to deep water, it appears that Baars conceived of building a detached wharf or artificial island to serve the same purpose. Such a maritime structure would have been ideal for Epping, Bellas and Company, which owned a lumber boom on Escambia Bay at Ferry Pass (CCCOR 1877b). Timber floated into Pensacola Bay from Escambia Bay could be stored in the timber boom next to the large rock pile, counted and managed by the employee or employees who ran the office, and loaded by stevedores into vessels that anchored near the rock pile. In effect, the large rock pile represents an unusual and inventive maritime structure that creatively and economically answered the needs of Epping, Bellas and Company.

Between 1875 and 1877, Epping, Bellas and Company liquidated their assets, ostensibly because Hugh Bellas had decided to leave the company. Epping and Baars formed Epping, Baars and Company to continue the original firm’s activities (CCCAD 1877b). In early 1877, the liquidated Epping, Bellas and Company entered into an agreement with D. F. Sullivan, who acted as agent in the sale of the firm’s assets. Interestingly, Hugh Bellas purchased his former company’s assets when they were put up at auction and soon thereafter purchased the leases on the large rock pile and the buildings constructed upon the pile from Henry Baars (CCCOR 1877a, 1877b). Thus, the large rock pile passed out of the hands of Epping, Bellas and Company and its successor, Epping, Baars and Company. Although Hugh Bellas may have gone into business for himself or with others and operated a lumber exporting business off of the large rock pile,
no evidence has been uncovered regarding what Bellas did with the pile, if anything, or whether he later sold it.

Meanwhile, the Pensacola waterfront changed dramatically and numerous lumber and timber exporters operated out of the port, revitalizing Pensacola’s postbellum economy (Polk 1971). Few maps of Pensacola from the 1860s to early 1880s clearly indicate these changes, but the 1885 Bird’s Eye View map reveals an explosion of maritime activity and important changes in Pensacola’s downtown shoreline (Figure 29). Instead of only two wharves, ten major commercial wharves extend from the waterfront as well as numerous smaller piers. Several areas of created land are visible south of Main Street, which generally follows Pensacola’s original shoreline. The new land exists mostly adjacent to or in-between the major wharves (Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885). Fill along Baylen Street and Herron’s wharf was gradually extending the shoreline out to the future location of the small rock pile. Unfortunately, the large rock pile, which existed far from the new fill along the shoreline, is not shown on the 1885 map even though other documentary evidence proves that it did exist. However, it is not difficult to understand why a landscape feature as apparently insignificant as a ballast crib would be ignored by many map makers or artists, especially those creating a somewhat romanticized, appealing version of Pensacola for sale to local citizens.

The next extant Code of Ordinances for the city of Pensacola for 1889 reflects the increasing complexity on the waterfront with an entire chapter dedicated to the harbor; several sections specifically regulate ballast disposal in prescribed areas (Blount 1889:41-42). In the same year, the city of Pensacola finished platting out the water lots on the
western side of the Pensacola waterfront in preparation for filling and new commercial activity (Figure 52) (Chipley and Davison 1890). The eastern water lots had been platted out as early as 1884 (Lee and Davison 1884). However, these preparations would not be of use until a legislative ruling in 1899. An 1890 USCS map is the first to show the large rock pile (8ES3366) next to the Perdido railroad wharf, but the map does not identify structures on the large rock pile or anywhere on the waterfront (Figure 31) (USCS 1890). In 1893, the lease on the large rock pile, previously held by Baars and then Bellas, ran out. Alexander C. Blount, Jr., son of Alexander C. Blount, reclaimed the pile, now a part of Waterfront Block 131, and deeded it to James W. Blount along with any and all appurtenances thereon. Unfortunately, the deed does not clarify how James Blount intended to use the large rock pile or its structures (Chipley and Davison 1890, CCCOR 1893).

Other changes were occurring along the waterfront as well. The 1895 Code of Ordinances for Pensacola sets the platted Magnolia Street, now Gimble Street, as the southern boundary for erection of rock bulkheads designed to contain ballast and the 1896 Bird’s Eye View map shows entire new blocks of created land as well as major development along Palafox Wharf (Figure 32) (Blount 1895:39-41, Koch 1896). Also visible in the 1896 view of Pensacola is the first graphic evidence of two structures on the large rock pile (Figure 53) (Koch 1896). Whether these structures were the same that existed in 1877 is unclear, but one structure is larger than the other, suggesting a main edifice and outbuilding, such as an office and kitchen.

Unfortunately, the purpose of the buildings on the large rock pile between 1877, when Bellas purchased them, and 1896 is not clear. The 1885 City Directory still lists
Figure 52. 1890 map of platted Pensacola waterfront by Chipley and Davison.
Figure 53. Detail of the large rock pile (8ES3366) from 1896 Bird’s Eye View map.
Bellas as a timber merchant boarding at the New Continental Hotel, but by 1893, Bellas was absent from the City Directory (Webb 1885:38, Jones and Jones 1893). Alexander Blount’s deed to James Blount does not specifically mention the structures on the rock pile nor indicate what the pile was used for at the time, nor was James Blount listed in the 1893 City Directory (CCCOR 1893, Jones and Jones 1893). However, a tentative possibility for the function of these structures is suggested by an account of work that occurred on the waterfront after a hurricane struck in 1893. Captain George J. Slocumb, the custodian of lost timber, owned or used a timber crib that was described as “the old ballast crib” in the hurricane accounts. Whether this is the same “old ballast crib” built by Henry Baars in the 1870s could not be determined, but it remains an important possibility. If the two sources refer to the same ballast crib, then the structures on the large rock pile in the 1896 Bird’s Eye View may have belonged to Captain Slocumb and would still have been related to the gathering of timber. Although Slocumb’s office was located at 603 South Palafox on the wharf, he may have also operated out of the buildings on the large rock pile (The Daily News 1893a:4, 1893b:4; Jones and Jones 1893:132).

The next major development on the waterfront that affected the large and small rock piles occurred when ownership of the submerged lands in front of the western waterfront, which had been strongly contested for over 30 years, was awarded to the State of Florida in 1899 by rulings of the Supreme Courts of Florida and the United States (CCCAD 1866b, Legislature of Florida 1899:191). In the same year, the Florida Legislature passed “An Act to Grant the Water Front of the City of Pensacola,” which aimed to distribute waterfront lots to those who had improved them with permanent wharves or structures. Persons interested in claiming waterfront lots had two years in
which to do so and were required to submit an application to the Waterfront Commissioners detailing how they had improved the lots requested (Legislature of Florida 1899:191-200). In 1901, several prominent lawyers, insurers, and real estate agents—William A. Blount, son of Alexander C. Blount, Sr.; William H. Knowles; William J. Van Kirk; Louis E. Thompson; and William Fisher—requested, and were granted, portions of several lots in Waterfront Block 131, the same lots that had been deeded to James Blount by Alexander Blount, Jr. in 1893. The accompanying plat map depicts the boundaries of the large rock pile, or “Rat Island” as it was known at the time, within Waterfront Block 131 (Figure 54). This same plat map clarifies that the structures on the large rock pile no longer existed, but shows a smokestack on the northern portion of the pile, which may have belonged to the erstwhile kitchen (Webb 1885; CCCOR 1893, 1901a, 1901b, 1901c; Jones and Jones 1893).

A document recorded by the City Attorney, John B. Jones, during the Waterfront Commission meetings indicates that William Fisher gained control of the large rock pile sometime after Baars’s lease ran out in 1893 (Jones 1901). However, no deed granting the large rock pile from either Alexander Blount, Jr. or James Blount to William Fisher could be located. Nevertheless, it is clear that the group of prominent citizens listed above had direct or family ties to the large rock pile. This probably explains their success in obtaining Waterfront Block 131 from the Waterfront Commissioners. What the group intended to do with the large rock pile and why they wanted it is not certain, but William Blount was already well known as a speculator in waterfront lands and several of the grantees had already formed a land company. William Blount, William Van Kirk, Louis E. Thompson, and William Fisher, along with local real estate magnate Thomas C.
Figure 54. 1901 plat map of the large rock pile or “Rat Island” (8ES3366).
Watson, had formed the Maxent Tract Company before 1893 as they are listed in the Pensacola City Directory for that year (Jones and Jones 1893, Muir 1988:9). Thus, the request of Rat Island may have been intended to gain property rights for a block that would lie directly on the new waterfront line established by the state, past which no additional land could be created (Legislature of Florida 1899). Had the entire waterfront been filled as city officials planned, Rat Island would have been a valuable piece of waterfront property. The origin of the name Rat Island is unclear, although it may have been suggested by the presence on the island of rats fleeing sinking ships in the harbor or ships unloading ballast from and loading lumber into the holds in which the rats lived. If the island’s kitchen and trash mixed in with discarded ballast provided enough scraps to feed these displaced rats, the rodents might well have thrived there.

In January 1906, almost three years after the death of William Fisher, Blount, Knowles, Willoughby A. D’Alemberte, William S. Keyser, and Alston A. Fisher formed the Maxent Land Company, probably transferred at least some of the Maxent Tract Company’s land holdings to said company, and continued to speculate in land in the Maxent and Waterfront tracts (Jones and Jones 1893, Blount et al. 1906, Armstrong 1930:283-284). By 1917, the Maxent Land Company had changed its name again to the Maxent Corporation and in 1921, the Maxent Land Company officially re-filed its grant of all of its land holdings to the Maxent Corporation. Block 131 of the waterfront was again specifically described and Rat Island geographically defined. When this original grant occurred is uncertain, as the first deed appears to have been lost, but the property transfer likely occurred at the time of the firm’s name change (CCCOR 1917, 1921). In 1918, the City of Pensacola granted several waterfront blocks to the Bruce Dry Dock
Company and made the error of including Waterfront Block 131 in that deed. The associated plat clearly shows and marks Rat Island within that block (Figure 55) (CCCOR 1918a, 1918b). It appears that this error was soon discovered as the Maxent Corporation sold Rat Island to Thomas A. Johnson, the president and general manager of the Bruce Dry Dock Company, in 1920 (CCCOR 1920, Armstrong 1930). Whether the Bruce Dry Dock Company made use of this property is uncertain; company records do not mention it other than to record the original erroneous deed by the City of Pensacola (Johnson 1918). Finally, in 1949, the City of Pensacola foreclosed on Rat Island, possibly for failure by Thomas Johnson to pay property or other taxes on the land, and sold the property at public auction to the highest bidder. The high bidder, at $838.71, was the City of Pensacola, which still retains property rights to this tiny island just off Pensacola’s waterfront (CCCOR 1949).

Although the large rock pile, a.k.a Rat Island, has a complex and distinct history as revealed by historical documents, the small rock pile’s pedigree is far more vague. This is possibly due, in part, to its more inundated nature. The small rock pile is only visible above water at very low tides during the winter months and, even then, only the tips of some of the highest rocks are visible. The first potential reference to the small rock pile comes from an account of the August 1911 hurricane. According to the Pensacola Evening News, a British steamship nearly collided with the “dangerous rock-reef, running out from Barcelona Street Wharf, and which is marked with a red buoy. The bringing of additional mud hooks into play, however, saved the vessel from going on the rock pile …” (Pensacola Evening News 1911:1, 8). The small rock pile is more closely aligned with the end of Herron’s former wharf or Baylen Street Wharf, which
Figure 55. 1918 plat map of Bruce Dry Dock Company grant.
were east of Barcelona Street Wharf, so it is not certain whether this article referred to that pile, but it is a likely possibility. Another potential mention occurred during the 1916 hurricane when the pilot boat *Shepherdess* was dashed against the “rock bulk head just south of the Warren company’s fish house,” which was at the end of Baylen Street Wharf, causing great damage to the side of the ship (*Pensacola Journal* 1916c:2). A later article noted that a schooner, which potentially refers to the same ship, “was tossed bodily upon the rock pile, like a shingle, and stove in” (*Pensacola Journal* 1916f:1). Collectively, these two articles appear to refer to a rock pile near the end of Baylen Street Wharf, which is the current location of the small rock pile. However, the first definitive evidence of the small rock pile is visible in an aerial photograph taken by the Army Corps of Engineers in 1922 for a report on the port of Pensacola (Figure 37) (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922).

Although late 19th-century maps and views do not denote an isolated ballast pile where the small rock pile now exists, these documents do show that a crib wharf existed directly adjacent to or even on top of the small rock pile and created land near it (Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885, Koch 1896). Prior to the creation of the crib wharf, the waterfront just opposite the small rock pile served as the location for first the Panton, Leslie and Company trading firm headquarters and then that of its successor, John Forbes and Company. John Innerarity and his family later moved into a house on the same parcel of land that had served Panton, Leslie and Company (Coker 1999:42-43). In 1873, the three surviving heirs of John Innerarity sold the property, as well as all the buildings situated upon it, including a bathhouse and boathouse, and the wharves extending from it, to Doctor James S. Herron (CCCOR 1873). The 1885 Bird’s Eye View map of Pensacola
clearly shows that a large portion of Herron’s wharf had been built over ballast fill and some new land had been created on his waterfront property just south of Main Street (Figure 29) (Norris, Wellge & Co. 1885). The 1896 Bird’s Eye View map depicts a markedly changed waterfront in front of Herron’s original 1873 deed with extensive filling southward from Main Street as well as on either side of Herron’s wharf and as far east as Baylen Street Wharf (Figure 32). Several buildings are present on the southern end of the property (Koch 1896). In 1901, Doctor Herron requested and was granted official property rights for his wharf and adjacent created land from the Pensacola Waterfront Commissioners. Herron’s wharf was recorded in a plat that accompanied the 1901 deed (Figure 56) (CCCOR 1901d, 1901e). Adjacent to Herron’s property, the Baylen Street Wharf Company, which had been incorporated in 1889, began buying up lots around its wharf in 1899. The company requested and was granted property rights by the Waterfront Commissioners to their crib wharf and surrounding lots between 1900 and 1901 (CCCOR 1899a, 1899b, 1900a, 1900b, 1901f; Altman 2006).

It is unclear specifically how Doctor Herron utilized his wharf property or what the functions of the buildings on it were until 1906 when deed records indicate Herron leased part of the wharf to the Joel Frater Lumber Company. The 1907 Pensacola Sanborn maps indicate that Joel Frater ran a planing mill and sash and blind factory at his location on Herron’s wharf (Appendix E, Figure E2) (Sanborn Map Company 1907b:9). In 1908, Herron leased another part of the wharf to F. M. Daniel and Company, whose business dealings are not described, and renewed the lease to the Frater Lumber Company (CCCOR 1907a, 1907b, 1908). The Baylen Street Wharf Company’s property, however, served as the home of the Warren Fish Company as early as 1887 and the
Figure 56. 1901 plat map of Doctor James Herron’s wharf and surrounding area.
stockholders of the Warren Fish Company also held the stock of the Baylen Street Wharf Company (Sanborn Map Company 1884, 1887; Altman 2006). It appears from deed records that the Baylen Street Wharf Company and Warren Fish Company gradually bought up the lots on which Herron’s wharf had originally stood until all or most of the constructed peninsula belonged to both companies (CCCOR 1910, 1937). A 1922 map of the Port of Pensacola by the Army Corps of Engineers shows a marine railway on the southwestern end of the Baylen Street wharf peninsula and a 1929 report specifies that the marine railway belonged to the Warren Fish Company for maintenance of their fishing boats (Figure 36) (Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 1922, 1929). A 1930s panoramic photograph of the waterfront clearly shows the small rock pile in the center foreground with the Baylen Street wharf peninsula in the center background (Figure 39) (Pensacola Historical Society 1930s). In 1949, the Baylen Street Wharf Company finally merged with the Warren Fish Company, which operated until the 1950s (Altman 2006).

Because of the Warren Fish Company’s long tenure on Baylen Street wharf and the presence of a marine railway just opposite the small rock pile, which had operated in that location since at least 1913, it is very possible that the small rock pile was created with discarded ballast from marine railway operations (R. L. Polk and Company 1913:414). Alternatively, the small rock pile may represent a small parcel of created land that was never finished or was later abandoned. The various maps and photos of the area, discussed above, often show that the Baylen Street wharf landfill peninsula had a ragged, unfinished edge, especially in the southwest corner where the small rock pile is located today. Later attempts to beautify the area and square off the peninsula may have resulted
in the abandoning of small areas of landfill. Future investigation of the small rock pile could well remove this ambiguity. Excavating deep into the pile could help determine whether the ballast fill is contained within a wooden crib structure or sits directly upon the bay floor. In turn, these results could provide significant information about the operation of the Warren Fish Company marine railway or the creation of new land along Pensacola’s waterfront.

In the field of maritime archaeology, shipwrecks hold the greatest allure, easily attracting the attention of academics, media, and the general public. Certainly, the excavation of shipwrecks has taught us much about trade, navigation, commerce, shipbuilding, sailor’s lives, and onboard organization, among other areas. But the study of waterfront structures and their associated refuse is an avenue of research lined with startling potential for deciphering the realities of maritime commerce, the lives of maritime workers, and humankind’s continual struggle against nature and chaos to mold the landscape to our needs and wants. The following chapter explores the insights provided through the examination of the large and small rock piles as well as the information gleaned from an MCL study of the Pensacola waterfront, especially the agency and resistance visible from this historical and archaeological study.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Home is the sailor, home from sea.  
~~~ Robert Louis Stevenson (Gardner 1972:794) 

It is not the going out of port, but the coming in, that determines the success of a voyage.  
~~~ Henry Ward Beecher (Drysdale 1887:56) 

O Captain! my Captain! our fearful trip is done, / The ship has weather’d every rack, the prize we sought is won, / The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting … . 
The ship is anchor’d safe and sound, its voyage closed and done.  
~~~ Walt Whitman (1997:239) 

Discussion

The case study provided in the previous chapter highlights the history and archaeology of two inconspicuous ballast piles on the Pensacola waterfront. Ballast piles, and other examples of maritime infrastructure, have received relatively little attention from archaeologists and historians. However, such maritime cultural resources hold the potential to illustrate the human agency, including resistance, exemplified by past societies in the creation of their waterfronts and maritime cultural landscapes (MCLs).

Without the larger historical context that surrounded them, the two rock piles seem isolated and even unimportant, but a knowledge of the industrial and commercial activity that played a part in their creation, including the individuals and companies that built them, highlights the human agency, including resistance to *habitus*, as revealed in codes and regulations, that played a role in their creation. The large rock pile appears to
be an innovative response to the commercial needs of timber and lumber exporters through the creation of an artificial island in Pensacola Bay instead of a wharf extending from shore. German immigrant and timber merchant, Henry Baars, purchased the riparian rights for the area where he and/or his employees built the large rock pile. Baars’s agency, therefore, changed the appearance of Pensacola Bay and built an island that still attracts the attention of fishing enthusiasts and the occasional curious boater or archaeologist. Whether Baars conceived of the idea of an artificial island for transshipment of goods entirely on his own or was inspired by similar islands he had seen in other harbors does not change the fact that he used his agency to build one in Pensacola. If he devised the idea entirely on his own, then he is an innovator and inventor. If he saw examples elsewhere and brought the idea to Pensacola, Baars was still the only shrewd businessman to build such an ingenious structure in Pensacola Bay. Additional research on ballast and rock piles in harbors and bays around the world could help establish the frequency, or lack thereof, of artificial islands created as maritime shipping points.

On the large rock pile, the office and kitchen likely served as a center of activity for Baars’s employees and the tug captains who brought lumber from Escambia Bay to store in the island’s timber boom. A preliminary investigation of the pile, an initial collection of diagnostic artifacts, and additional archival research on ballast disposal and property deeds relating to the large rock pile provide only tantalizing glimpses into the lives of the workers who spent their days, and maybe nights, on an artificial island in Pensacola Bay. However, the very presence of quantities of such varied artifacts on the large rock pile, especially the ceramics, glass, and faunal remains typically found in
residential middens, stands in stark contrast to the limited range of artifacts found on the small rock pile.

Judging by the artifacts found, the large rock pile, in its role as a transshipment point for Epping, Bellas and Company, appears to have hosted numerous maritime workers, some of whom ate, drank, and disposed of their refuse on the ballast pile. Considering the presence of many kinds of ceramics, such as creamware and pearlware, whose production periods predate the creation of the large rock pile, the maritime workers on the pile may have used older ceramics that could have been purchased at a cheaper price than the more popular, newer styles. This potentially suggests a lower socioeconomic status than that of their employers and local elites. The presence of animal bones, beer bottles, and pipe stems points to the food and drink the workers consumed and the stimulants they used, but, since only a small number of artifacts were collected, it is dangerous to produce any overarching statements about the quality of their diet as compared to the local population. Additional excavation on the large rock pile would likely expand our knowledge of the maritime workers who labored upon the pile, including their diet and eating habits, and paint a rich picture of the lumber industry in Pensacola as it was experienced by the stevedores, baymen, tugboat captains, and office clerks who brought timber to the island, floated it into the boom, evaluated it, sold it, and loaded it onto ships that left Pensacola’s waters for deep oceans and distant ports around the world.

The small rock pile offers, on the other hand, a possible view of resistance on the Pensacola waterfront. The lack of artifacts on the small rock pile strongly suggests that the pile was the result only of ballast disposal and did not serve as a structure on which
maritime workers congregated. Although less is known about the small rock pile’s creation, it appears to have been related to the marine railway established by the Warren and Company fish house sometime before 1913 to service their fishing fleet. The marine railway may also have been used to repair other small boats that frequented the bay, but no evidence exists to verify this supposition. The mending and patching of hulls, both inside and out, of vessels pulled onto the marine railway likely resulted in the occasional removal of ballast from the vessels. It appears that the employees of Warren and Company deposited ballast in a place convenient to them, resulting in the small rock pile, despite that such ballast disposal had been illegal, and frequently litigated, in Pensacola since 1855. The 1855 ballast laws were even strengthened in 1872. Indeed, Pensacola’s Board of Pilot Commissioners sued at least four different companies or individuals for illegal ballast dumping between 1855 and 1886 (Clerk of Circuit Court Archives Division [CCCAD] 1866a, 1877a, 1886a, 1886b). These ballast disposal laws formed part of the *habitus*, or limits of acceptability and situation-appropriate actions, familiar to maritime workers. With their practice, or practical conscious, Warren and Company maritime workers used their agency to effectively resist the accepted norms that prevented the maritime workers of other companies from disposing of ballast on the waterfront. Thus, maritime worker resistance to local regulations produced a lasting landscape feature that still attracts the occasional diver and crab fisherman.

While the existence of the small rock pile suggests this resistance, the limited artifacts on it cannot tell us about the day-to-day lives of Warren and Company’s maritime workers, but rather informs us about ballast disposal and the business activities of Warren and Company. Additional research into Warren and Company, local ballast
disposal permits, and the French roofing tiles that cover the small rock pile may refine the
date during which the pile was constructed, verify its connection to local industry, and
further strengthen the hypothesis that the small rock pile represents resistance to ballast
regulations. However, it is also possible that additional research may show that the small
rock pile predates Warren and Company or that the fish house requested and received a
permit to dispose of ballast near its property. In the latter case, the receipt of a ballast
disposal permit by Warren and Company, and the apparent lack of other such ballast
disposal piles on the Pensacola waterfront, may indicate that Warren and Company
managers used their agency to pursue a more economical means of ballast disposal than
other nearby companies.

The comprehensive vision of the Pensacola waterfront provided by the use of an
MCL framework along with the benefits of a social theory perspective has revealed much
about the large and small rock piles that would have been otherwise lost to the researcher.
This study of two discrete, unobtrusive rock piles on Pensacola’s waterfront has opened a
small window into maritime life on the foreshore of downtown, revealing key
information about ballast disposal, land speculation, creation of new land, and the city’s
commercial enterprises, especially the lumber and fishing industries. Aspects that
seemed mysterious and unusual in isolation are clearly comprehensible within the larger
context and history of the Pensacola waterfront. Additional examination of these piles
holds the potential to further illuminate Pensacola’s maritime industries and the lives of
maritime workers on the Pensacola waterfront. Extended to other waterfront features and
areas in harbors around the world, the combined MCL and social theory approach has the
potential to revolutionize our understanding of maritime cultural resources from the
lowliest rock pile to the most appealing shipwreck. This study serves as an example for those who take up the challenge and investigate other waterfront areas in Pensacola and around the world for more than just the shipwrecks they contain, thereby pushing back the shadows to obtain a glimpse of the lives of those maritime workers on whose backs civilizations were built.

Recommendations for Future Research

Numerous archival repositories were consulted during the course of this research in order to elucidate the history of the Pensacola waterfront, but several could not be investigated or fully explored. Most notably, these include the Archivo General de Indias in Seville, Spain, as well as the Biblioteca Nacional de España and the Archivo General Militar of the Instituto de Historia y Cultura Militar, both in Madrid, Spain. Research at these archives would likely produce much information about maritime infrastructure, officials, regulations, and fees during the First and Second Spanish periods of Pensacola. The Guildhall Library in London may also hold important maritime documents relating to the shipbuilding industry in Pensacola, or the lack thereof, during the British period as it contains the detailed records of Lloyd’s of London, a major insurer of nautical vessels. Although several weeks were spent at the National Archives of the UK examining and evaluating ships’ logs, official letters, and nautical charts, many more captains’ letters and naval ships’ logs from vessels that visited Pensacola between 1781 and 1821 remain to be examined. While the ships’ logs of merchant vessels are more scattered and harder to locate, some from vessels that visited Pensacola may be stored at the Guildhall Library or the National Archives of the UK.
Additional information about the American period of Pensacola is available at the Library of Congress and the National Archives in Washington, D.C., including possibly custom records, Army Corps of Engineers reports, and other documents. Researchers of various waterfront areas in Pensacola will find property deeds and data on lot histories from the Escambia County Clerk of Circuit Court Official Records (CCCOR), the Escambia County CCCAD, the University of West Florida (UWF) John C. Pace Library’s Special Collections, and the Pensacola Historical Society. The use histories of many waterfront lots would likely highlight the human agency and ideology that featured in the creation of the Pensacola waterfront, as is the case with the large and small rock piles.

The historical and archaeological review of Pensacola’s MCL also exposed several areas of the city’s waterfront that present tremendous opportunities for future study of important aspects of Pensacola’s MCL. These include the locations of historic wharves at which colonial and American ships loaded and unloaded, former waterfront mills, and the various ethnic communities whose members worked on or near the shore as stevedores, baymen, pilots, and longshoremen. As noted in Chapter Three, the beach and foreshore in front of the Panton, Leslie and Company trading firm headquarters (8ES34), on the western shore of Pensacola, served as the primary disembarking wharf for heavy cargos for the town of Pensacola during most of the Second Spanish period. Although portions of the land site of the trading firm have been excavated, no one has studied the water and shore nearby. Such a study would likely reveal much about the nature of commerce during the Second Spanish period and might also uncover remains of Panton, Leslie and Company’s long-standing colonial wharf.
Other areas of research potential are the former locations of waterfront industrial sites, especially saw and planing mills, that operated in the late 19th century and early 20th century. As described in previous chapters, examples include the Brent Lumber Company (8ES1960) at the entrance to Bayou Chico, founded in 1880 and in operation until at least 1907, and the G. W. / W. B. Wright and Company Sawmill (8ES1958), which opened in 1872 and operated until at least 1907. The Escambia Land and Manufacturing Company, naval store producers, began operation on the same property at the W. B. Wright and Company Sawmill sometime after the mill closed and existed until at least until 1917. Maritime remote sensing survey near the site of the Brent Lumber Company revealed a cluster of anomalies that may be related to the company’s extensive facilities and anomaly testing during the summer of 2008 revealed the presence of an eastern waterfront debris scatter (8ES3491) opposite the site of the G. W. / W. B. Wright and Company Sawmill. Archaeological investigation of these sites could supply much information about Pensacola’s waterfront industries, which contributed to many of the dramatic changes along Pensacola’s shoreline in the 19th and 20th centuries, and the laborers who were employed in those industries.

The Hawkshaw area, an historically African American neighborhood studied in the 1980s (8ES1287), as noted in Chapter Six, was the home of laborers such as baymen and possibly other maritime workers. The working waterfront of Pensacola, much like New Orleans, was probably far more integrated than other industries and commercial ventures in the city (Rosenburg 1988, Arnesen 1991). A study of the Hawkshaw neighborhood, including a reanalysis of the data and artifacts collected in the 1980s, could elucidate the lives of African American maritime workers in Pensacola. City
directories and maps would allow for targeted excavation of the lots of those who gained their livelihood on the foreshore. Such a study would not only contribute to our understanding of Pensacola’s MCL, but also shed light on the struggles and triumphs of a minority group that played a significant role in the development of the Pensacola waterfront.

The two ballast piles examined during the course of this research represent only two examples of a type of site that can be found throughout the Pensacola Bay system. Ballast dumps and piles, which this thesis demonstrates can often be dated by analyzing the artifacts they contain, represent both the extensive trade networks that centered on Pensacola and the maritime workers who removed this ballast for commercial or sanitary reasons as described in Chapter Seven. Investigation of ballast piles around Pensacola Bay, which have been documented on the downtown waterfront, Butcherpen Cove on the northern side of the Gulf Breeze Peninsula, English Navy Cove on the peninsula’s south side, Little Sabine Bay on the north side of Santa Rosa Island in Santa Rosa Sound, and elsewhere, could provide much data about the nature of shipping and ballast disposal in Pensacola, changing ballast regulations and the concomitant understanding of diseases thought to be carried onboard ships, and the lives of those maritime workers tasked with the dirty job of removing and discarding old ballast.

Finally, this thesis explores a small portion of the Pensacola bay coastline, that of the downtown waterfront from Bayou Chico to Bayou Texar, but the MCL of the Pensacola Bay system is far larger. Study of other waterfront areas in the bay system, such as the industrial havens of Escambia and Blackwater Bays and the waterfront of the Pensacola Navy Yard and Naval Air Station, would expand the benefits of this approach
to the larger landscape of which the downtown Pensacola waterfront forms a part. Combined with previous research, such as this thesis and a recently completed study of the MCL of Deadman’s Island off Gulf Breeze Peninsula, future examination of Pensacola Bay could reveal the interconnectedness of the Pensacola bayshore and the waterfronts of its surrounding communities (Jordan-Greene 2007).

Conclusions

This investigation of the Pensacola waterfront provides an excellent example of the benefits of an MCL approach combined with social theories in elucidating the rich and dynamic stories and struggles of the generations of men and women who survived and thrived on the shores of oceans, rivers, lakes, and other water bodies the world over. As described above, landscapes are far more complex than processual archaeologists had previously acknowledged; the concern with meaning, ideology, and human agency provided by postprocessual archaeologists has provided a more nuanced way in which to research and interpret landscapes of both the past and present. As Yamin and Schuldenrein (2007:76) state, “[L]andscape archaeology both recovers past meanings and constructs new ones.” Social theories, such as Bourdieu’s (1977) theory of practice and Giddens’s (1984) theory of structuration, offer possibilities for accessing the meaning and significance of landscape to past generations.

The historical examination of Pensacola’s shore included in this study revealed examples of human agency, especially incidents of resistance, by sailors and maritime workers, from Spanish colonial mariners to African American stevedores. These examples include the desertion and disobedience of British and Spanish sailors, the
winter 1872-1873 riots by African American stevedores whose jobs were threatened by the encroachment of Canadian laborers, the 1906 refusal of 10 Chinese sailors to work on the steamship *E.O. Saltmarsh* due to harsh conditions, a 1920 strike at the Pensacola Shipbuilding Company, and a 1922 walkout by members of the International Longshoremen’s Association. In addition, this study revealed the consistent efforts by officials to both improve their city’s maritime infrastructure and limit the freedoms available to the workers whose labor Pensacola’s elites required for their ambitious plans.

The review of previous archaeological work conducted on and near the shore of Pensacola’s downtown points to the abundant presence of primary and secondary maritime site types on the waterfront and the potential for future work in key areas that may illuminate more examples of human agency, especially those not visible in the archival record. In addition, the case study of two unobtrusive rock piles off the shore clearly demonstrates that traces of human agency, including resistance, can be found in the most unlikely of places. While the limited archaeological investigation of these two rock piles only hints at the details of the lives of maritime workers laboring on or near the piles, the documented history of the piles, their connections or potential connections to maritime industry, and their continuing presence on the waterfront suggest the lasting importance of human agency, including resistance, to the creation of Pensacola’s MCL and the formation of its constituent components.

Additional investigation of other maritime cultural resources and areas of maritime interaction in Pensacola, such as the heavily-trafficked cove adjacent to the former Panton, Leslie and Company headquarters and the waterfront neighborhoods that housed the city’s maritime workers, is likely to elucidate significant aspects of the lives
of sailors, stevedores, pilots, baymen, and others whose occupations placed them in
constant contact with the ever-changing bayshore. Such studies can provide a glimpse of
the complex interactions between seamen and townfolk, worker and employer, mariner
and landlubber, which characterized daily life in both the sleepy colonial town and the
busy American port of Pensacola.

Pensacola’s waterfront has changed dramatically over the centuries, from a distant
colonial outpost to a bustling American entrepôt to a quiet city somewhat overshadowed
by the pristine white beaches to its south that attract thousands of tourists each year. The
ding of lines on the metal masts and railings of today’s pleasure boats and yachts on the
downtown waterfront, the quiet sounds of water lapping against riprap, and the
sophisticated smells wafting from local hotspots like the Fish House Restaurant and Atlas
Oyster Bar are very different from the sights, sounds, and smells that greeted visitors
during the American lumber and fish boom. The working waterfront of decades past
exuded the thick smells of burning coal and fish offal mingled with the roar of steam
engines and mills and the booming voices of black and white stevedores engaged in
incessantly moving cargo from ship to shore and back again. Pensacola became the city
it is today in part because of the exertions of those long gone mariners and maritime
laborers. As Pensacola stands poised to enter a new era with the revitalization of the
waterfront and the construction of a Maritime Park, one can hope that the multiple voices
of history, the various landscapes that were and are viewed by Pensacola’s diverse
community, will be represented and celebrated in museum exhibits, public festivals, and
a growing understanding that none of us, not one, stands alone on the cusp of history.
Shipwrecks are fascinating and Pensacola is fortunate that its bays and rivers hold more
than their share of these maritime treasures. But without the infrastructure of wharves, piers, ballast dumps, warehouses, and the many other maritime structures that connected these pelagic voyagers to the lands they visited, as well as the laborers on land who welcomed vessels and stored the goods they carried, ships and sailors of old could never have gained the almost mythic status they carry in humankind’s collective consciousness.

Archaeologists in Pensacola and other cities the world over have before themselves a daunting task: to bring to light the stories of those whose histories were never written; to commemorate the role of the worker in a world system that increasingly minimizes the importance of manual labor; to provide a voice to the untold numbers of people whose color, creed, or religion has caused them to be overlooked by the majority; to highlight the indispensable role of women in the creation of society; and to celebrate a diversity of voices, interpretations, and opinions on where humankind has been and where we are going. In addition, archaeologists must also consider the importance of landscape to different communities and the effect certain interpretations can have on descendant populations, as well as their own role in encouraging local officials to tell a diversity of stories rather than espousing the dominant storyline (Shackel 2001:2-3, Van Dyke 2008:277). Some of the most fruitful locations for such research can be found in coastal cities with their constant influx of new ethnic groups and presence of workers who were far more visible to the population at large than those laborers closed up in oppressive factories, hidden deep in mountain mines, or strung out in small gangs along isolated railroad beds. This investigation of the Pensacola waterfront highlights the
importance of maritime workers and maritime infrastructure in the creation of a city and a landscape that both reflects the lives of those who labored and exposes the way those lives sculpted a small portion of the coastline of North America.
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