THE EXACT SITE OF FORT WASHINGTON
AND DANIEL DRAKE'S ERROR
by ARTHUR G. KING, M.D.

The establishment of Fort Washington in 1789 has been described as the greatest single event in Cincinnati history. The Fort offered protection to the pioneers who pushed west of Fort Harmar at Marietta, and encouraged them to settle at this intersection of two great natural routes of communication into the interior. It was the base of the operations which cleared the hostile Indians from Ohio and Indiana. Finally it lent publicity and prestige to Cincinnati as the capital of the Northwest Territory, out of which Ohio became the first state to emerge just 150 years ago.

And yet, when the structure was razed after its abandonment in 1804, so little was thought of Fort Washington by the citizens of Cincinnati that its exact location was never determined officially. The sesquicentennial anniversary of Ohio is a fitting occasion to perform this service, particularly in the light of a recent discovery that makes it possible.

Daniel Drake was apparently the first to recognize the historical value of memorializing the Fort. In his "Picture of Cincinnati," published in 1815, he indicated the location of the Fort on the accompanying map, but gave no evidence or reason for the selection of the site. This site was copied by Farnsworth in 1819 on the map which accompanied the first Directory of Cincinnati, so that it achieved a semi-official status. In 1902 Robert Ralston Jones, in his little history entitled "Fort Washington," tried to show how Drake arrived at his conclusions. His chief contribution to history was to call attention to a law-suit in December 1829 at which Daniel Drake testified as to the location of the Fort. Drake's testimony is a little inconsistent and is in conflict with the testimony of other witnesses. However, Jones used selected portions of Drake's statement to support Drake's original placement of the Fort, and the site has unfortunately been perpetuated in bronze.

This location has often been questioned. For one thing it does not fit the excellent description given by the Reverend Oliver M. Spencer in his "Indian Captivity" (Waught and Mason edition,
New York, 1835, page 28). Speaking of Fort Washington as he saw it in 1791, he says: "On the top, and about 80 feet distant from the brow of the second bank, facing the river, stood Fort Washington, occupying nearly all the ground between Third Street and Fourth Street and between Ludlow Street and Broadway. This fort, of nearly a square form, had... four sides or walls, each about 180 feet long, which were constructed of hewed logs erected into barracks two stories high, connected at the corners by high pickets, with bastions or blockhouses, also of hewed logs, projecting about ten feet in front of each side of the fort, so that the cannon placed within them could rake its walls. Through the center of the south side, or front of the fort, was the principal gateway, a passage through this line of barracks about 12 feet wide and ten feet high .... Appended to the fort on its north side, and enclosed with high palisades extending from its northeast and northwest corners to a blockhouse, was a small triangular space in which were constructed shops for the accommodation of artificers. Extending along the whole front of the fort was a fine esplanade about 80 feet wide, enclosed with a handsome paling on the brow of the bank."

For another reason, Drake's location was militarily unsound. The Fort, as he placed it, would have been at a lower elevation than the broad plateau which extended northward from Third Street. Any Indian attackers from the north would have had a distinct advantage in observation, archery, and assault. Similarly the deep gully that later became Ludlow Street would have provided excellent defilade from the small-arms fire of the American troops within the Fort.

Impetus for determining the exact location of the Fort came from the recent discovery by Mr. Fred P. Bounds, the construction superintendent for the Frank Messer Company, while digging foundations for a garage for the Western and Southern Life Insurance Company, at Third Street and Broadway. Great credit belongs to Mr. Bounds for recognizing the possible value of the logs which were uncovered, for connecting them from the very beginning with Fort Washington, and for taking the responsibility of continuing the excavation for historical purposes at considerable expense to his company. His account of the "find" was reported in The Engineer and Scientist on December 1, 1952.
Figure 1. The Powder Magazine of Fort Washington in the Course of Excavation.
“The logs had been hewed and notched at each end to fit into each other . . . They had laid the logs in a horizontal position . . . and had notched them to fit at the corners of an irregular four-sided figure about ten or twelve feet across . . . About eight feet deeper they had changed the design to a five-sided figure using logs . . . about nine feet long. [Here] they had used vertical plank, 2" x 12", to hold the structure together . . . At the bottom of the plank we found logs flat on four sides and morticed at each end to fit the . . . figure, and fastened with wooden pegs. The planks were joined in a groove about two inches wide and two inches deep throughout the entire length of the flat [horizontal] log (and were held in place against the pegs by the pressure of the dirt on the outside) . . . At thirty feet below Third Street level it was decided to dig no farther, and we pulled three [of the upright posts] to see how much deeper [the structure] went. The posts were ten feet long . . . and I calculate that the bottom of the last post and planks was forty feet below the level of Third Street.” Figure 1 is a photograph of the logs in situ, and Figure 2 is a sketch to indicate the construction. The eastern edge of the structure, which was the longest side of the figure and the only side which was constant all the way down, lay at a bearing of North 30° 21' West. Its southern end was 49 feet from the line of Third Street and 204 feet from the line of Broadway. The measurements and angles are important in locating the Fort as a whole.

Mr. Bounds notified Mr. Henry Gest, the architect’s field superintendent, who called Mr. Virginius Hall, Director of the Historical and Philosophical Society. He, in turn, initiated the research. The “structure” was identified as the powder magazine of old Fort Washington. Not only did the wood and the method of construction conform perfectly to the period, but the shape of the upper part of the shaft fitted exactly the design of the powder magazine shown in the drawing of Fort Washington, dated 1792 (part of the McHenry Papers). This drawing also shows the northern extension of the Fort, referred to by the Reverend O. M. Spencer, and the later western extension shown in various paintings and lithographs.

Thus for the first time in 150 years evidence was available to fix the site of the southwest blockhouse behind which the powder
Figure 2. Detail of Construction of the Powder Magazine.
Site of Fort Washington

magazine was located. But the position of the rest of the Fort, i.e. in which direction it faced, can be deduced only from indirect evidence. It will be observed that the powder magazine was situated with its long side parallel to the side of the barracks and therefore at right angles to the south line of the Fort. To find the bearing or direction or azimuth of the front line of the Fort one need only rotate the drawing from the McHenry Papers so that the long side of the powder magazine on the drawing coincides with the direction of the long side of the powder magazine in the ground. Since the latter lay at a bearing of North 30° 21' West the front face of the Fort must have been at right angles to it, or at a bearing of North 59° 39' East. This is confirmed within the limits of acceptable accuracy by the official drawing of Fort Washington in the National Archives where the bearing or direction of the front row of barracks is specifically recorded as North 59° 16' East.

But to be certain of the exact location of Fort Washington all the conflicting testimony concerning it must be reconciled or explained. As far as can be determined there is universal agreement as to the site with one single exception, namely the small part of Daniel Drake's total evidence which claimed that the southeast blockhouse was on property that he had bought. His house, which is still standing as the Syrian Maronite Roman Catholic Church at 429 East Third Street, is at the very eastern edge of what is known in the Hamilton County Deed-books and Plat-books as the “U. S. Subdivision.” Exactly when the United States acquired title to the “Military Reservation,” if it ever actually did, once the patent to John Cleves Symmes had been granted, and how large an area it encompassed, is not clear. For example the Mansfield Survey, made upon order of the Federal government, specifies 15 acres, whereas the Town of Cincinnati claimed it was only 13 acres.

Much information about the area and about some of the early settlers and their activities appear in the voluminous records, occupying 45 large ledger pages (page 263 through page 308 inclusive) of fine script in the case of The Heirs of Josiah Harmar, Deceased, vs. George Morris and David Gwynne, a Suit for Ejectment, heard the 28th of December, 1829, at Columbus, Ohio, in the United States Circuit Court, Ohio District, before Justices John McClean and John W. Campbell, and a jury. The volume
of "Complete Record" containing this case is currently in Cincinnati in the files of the Circuit Court. The suit was the last phase of litigation started in 1809 against Ethan Stone in the Common Pleas Court, where he lost. The judgment against him was not satisfied until the sheriff sold some of his property at auction, where it was picked up by George Morris. David Gwynne got into the case by reason of having married the widow of John Piatt who had been Stone's partner in some other real estate deals.

The sworn statement of John Cleves Symmes (taken in 1809 but read into the evidence) declares: "In the fall of 1789 Major John Doughty arrived... and laid the foundations of Fort Washington... Early in 1790, at the request of many officers of the Garrison... I was induced to lay out lots of 60 square rods each lying between Fort Washington and the Parade on the west and Deer Creek on the east." The actual surveying, it appears, was done by Israel Ludlow, and his plat, dated 1790, was registered as "In the Eastern Part of Cincinnati." It has the notation that the "course of the streets and lines running from the River was North 44° West," and appears on page 483 of Deed-book W-2 in the office of the Recorder of Hamilton County. This plat is shown in Figure 3.

Many officers bought these lots from John Cleves Symmes, including General Harmar, Captain Pratt, Captain Strong, Doctor Allison, and General St. Clair. There is sworn testimony to flourishing gardens, crops of corn in 1791, the erecting of fences, the construction of a summer house for General Harmar (50 yards west of Lawrence St.) and the digging of a cellar for General St. Clair somewhere north of Front Street and west of Lawrence Street. General Wilkinson ordered "some of the fences thrown down in order to extend the ground for the exercise of the troops." General St. Clair ordered "prostrated" some of the "improvements" of General Harmar. One can be sure of only three landmarks: one was the house of Major Ruffin on the northeast corner of Front and Lawrence Street, another was Lawrence Street itself, and the last is Third Street. In regard to Third Street, the Reverend O. M. Spencer, on page 36 of his book already cited, has this description as of 1794: "A narrow road leading from Columbia to Cincinnati, just wide enough for the passage of a wagon, which, winding round the point of the hill above Deer Creek descended... and crossing that creek..."
Figure 3. Official Plat, "In the Eastern Part of Cincinnati" by Israel Ludlow (1790) bearing the notation "The Course of the streets and lines from the river N 44° W." Major Ruffin's house added.
ascending gradually its western bank, led along the ground now Symmes Street [the old name for Third Street east of Ludlow Street] directly toward Fort Washington, and diverging at the intersection [sic] of Lawrence Street to the right and left of the Fort [and the Parade enclosed in a handsome paling?] entered the Town.”

Since Israel Ludlow could not possibly have surveyed, and John Cleves Symmes could not possibly have sold, any ground on which the Fort itself stood, it is obvious, and should be indisputable, that the Fort must have been located outside the Ludlow 1790 plat.

On May 6, 1791 Symmes sold to Josiah Harmar, Brigadier-General in the Army of the United States, 8 lots, each 60 square rods. This deed was confirmed over and over again in the several law-suits heard between 1809 and 1829. Unfortunately the numbers of the lots were not given so that their location must be deduced from the description in the deed, which was: “bounding on the south side on Front or River Street in the said Town, lying directly in front of Fort Washington, being 12 rods wide on said street, including two lots, and extending northwards from said Front St 20 rods to the south side of the second street from the Ohio [present Pearl St.] and adjoining the said second street to 12 rods from east to west, and on the east bounded by the lands of Governor St. Clair. The other four lots, being part of the 8 lots aforesaid, are butted and bounded as follows: southward by the north side of the second street, 12 rods wide on said street including the two lots on the east bounded by the first street running northwardly from the Ohio [present Lawrence Street] on the east side of Fort Washington [reservation?] adjoining said street 20 rods from north to south; on the north by the south side of the Third Street from the Ohio River, adjoining said Third Street for 12 rods east and west, the said 4 lots being an oblong square of 12 by 20 rods from street to street lying eastwardly from Fort Washington.” The best that can be made out of this deed is that the four “lower lots” were numbers 1, 2, 23, and 24 (with General St. Clair owning Lots 3, 4, 21, and 22) and that Harmar’s “upper lots” were numbers 27, 28, 45, and 46. (Figure 3.) Throughout the trial most of the controversy as to just where the Fort stood came about in order to interpret the significant words: “lying directly in front of Fort Washington.”
There is not space here to describe the many legal ramifications, which included such things as Nicholas Longworth's statement that it was Symmes' practice to sell lots even before he had title to them, or that Symmes' title to these lots was confirmed only in 1794 when "General Harmar was away in the service of his country," or that the first suit by General Harmar was abated by his death and the second suit by reason of his son's being under age 21, or that General St. Clair sold Lots 1 through 24 to John Fricker who was killed in the Indian Wars and "his heirs could not locate the town of Losantiville in order to claim the property."

To satisfy a judgment against John Cleves Symmes all his property "east of Broadway" was sold at public auction, and it was "cried down" to Ethan Stone in February, 1803. But just who owned these lands just east of Broadway was apparently not well established. Much of it was considered "publick," and the Ordinances of the Town of Cincinnati, under the date of 27 October 1804, contain the following resolution passed: "to petition for the fee of the Thirteen Acres now occupied by the Garrison and other Publick Buildings, and should Congress conceive this incompatible with their former donations of lands, that the ground lying north of a street running from the stone house of Daniel Symmes [Third St.] be granted in trust to the Corporation for the purpose of erecting an Academy, and that the land lying south of said street be granted to Jeremiah Hunt and Ethan Stone . . . and [the Corporation] shall grant to said Hunt and Stone a deed for such part thereof that lies south of said street on their paying the value thereof." The outcome of this petition is not known. What is now Arch Street was for a long time called School St., and the Guilford School is, of course, just north of it, and further research may reveal that this part of the "publick" land was set aside for educational purposes. But it would appear that Ethan Stone was trying to protect his title. That this land never became legally his is indicated by an entry on page 481 of Deed-book W-2 in the Recorder's Office, dated July 20, 1816, to the effect that he returned to numerous individuals (Daniel Drake not being included), moneys they had given him for lots to which he had asserted possession by reason of the sale in 1803 by the Sheriff, James Smith, as recorded in Deed-book L-1, page 446. The releases that followed on this entry are referred to frequently in the course of the 1829 law-suit and formed part of the charge to the jury.
Figure 4. Official Plat, "Fifteen Acres of Publick Lands Lying in Cincinnati" by Jared Mansfield (1807). Daniel Drake's House Added.
In 1807 Jared Mansfield, in behalf of the U. S. Government, made a survey of the “Fifteen Acres of Publick Land Lying in Cincinnati.” This survey is shown in Figure 4, and all testimony, measurements, and even an Ordinance of the Town of Cincinnati in 1814 indicate that the eastern edge of Ludlow Street is the eastern boundary of this tract. The Fort itself is not shown at all. This makes for a very strong presumption that by 1806 the buildings had been completely dismantled, leaving no vestige that a surveyor could use for a reference point.

Evidence was adduced over and over again that the Fort faced generally southward, between Broadway and Ludlow Street. The defense tried in vain to get David Lewis to say that the southwest and northwest blockhouses were on the line of Broadway. William Orcutt swore that the southeast blockhouse was on “Drake’s Corner,” meaning Third and Ludlow. He was not asked to specify which of the four corners involved he meant, but there is nothing to show that it was not the northwest corner. Defense admitted that on May 31, 1816, the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio had ruled that Harmar’s Heirs had title to certain lots bounded on the east by the first street running northward from the river on the east side of Fort Washington to a width of 12 rods and bounded on the north by the south side of Third Street, but Ethan Stone’s affidavit specified that he was “not confessing or acknowledging all or any of the matters in the said Bill to be true.”

Thomas Henderson, surveyor for Hamilton County from 1807 to 1814 and then Recorder of Hamilton County, testified that in 1811 a “disturbance” arose in relation to the commons or esplanade laid out by Judge Symmes. His plan, made by Israel Ludlow, showing Lots numbered 1 through 57, was certified and made a matter of record. In the argument plaintiff said that this plat of Israel Ludlow’s was accepted by everyone except Ethan Stone; the defendant’s objection to this and the introduction of the plat as evidence was overruled. Henderson continued that “there were no streets between Lawrence and Broadway prior to 1807.” He further testified that “The U. S. Survey (Mansfield’s) did ‘interfere’ with the lots laid out by Judge Symmes.” Nicholas Longworth stated that Lot #24 bounded on the Reservation, i.e. Ludlow Street. Christopher Cary testified that in 1807 he was erecting a fence for Ethan Stone on a lot through the western part of which ran Ludlow Street (Lot #46) and that Jesse Hunt and
David Ziegler warned him there would be a lawsuit, as the land belonged to General Harmar. Griffith Yeatman felt that the reason General St. Clair never built his house on the cellar he had dug was that St. Clair feared there was a possibility that his house might come to lie within the Reservation. John Riddle confirmed this.

What was meant by “interference” can be readily seen if the Mansfield Survey and the Ludlow Survey are drawn to the same scale and oriented with the streets running correctly in relation to true north as each of these surveyors recorded them (and as they run now), and then combining them correctly at two established points. Figure 5 presents this composite map.

Jesse Hunt testified that he had arrived in Cincinnati in March 1789, that from 1801 or 1802 until 1821 he was General Harmar’s agent, and that “two lots of Harmar’s were lost by the Garrison Reservation.” He was then asked this question: “Did you understand during your agency for Harmar’s Heirs that but for the interference of the Garrison reservation, Harmar’s upper block could have enclosed the ground on a part of which Dr. Drake’s house now stands?” The answer was: “I did suppose that the upper block would come somewhere near where Dr. Drake’s house now stands.”

But probably the most startling sworn statement was that of Joseph Gest. Under cross-examination he admitted, and it was borne out by other testimony, that he had made the survey of the disputed lands, not independently, but from the description given him by Ethan Stone! In addition to that, it has been known for years that some of Gest’s measurements contain an error due to his use of a nonstandard rule. And yet Daniel Drake explained that he knew he was right about the site of Fort Washington on the basis of the plat made by Gest. The court refused to admit Drake’s map in evidence and insisted that he personally testify. His description of Fort Washington was accurate as to the direction in which it faced, but in answer to the question: “What would be the location of four lots, the calls of which were ‘lying directly in front of Fort Washington’?” he replied only that they would lie west of Ludlow Street, making no mention of Third Street.

Drake’s statement that the front of the Fort was on Front Street was an obvious slip of the tongue. If one includes the
Figure 5. The Ludlow Plat and the Mansfield Plat, Drawn to the Same Scale and Correctly Superimposed, to Show the "Interference" by the U.S. Survey with Land Titles, Settled in 1829 by the U.S. Circuit Court.
Parade, as almost everyone did, his map shows the front of the Fort on Congress Street (now Pearl Street). Or it may have been a slip of the pen of the Clerk of Court. The entire record shows numerous words crossed out, others duplicated and not crossed out, others very obviously omitted, and there are many inter-lineations and additions, all in the same handwriting but some in different ink. The record, naturally, was reviewed and corrected, but in a phrase such as “south front was on the south side of Front Street” the error must have gone undetected.

When Daniel Drake placed the Fort straddling Third Street, part of the Fort, as contrasted with the Military Reservation, was on his property. Whether due to faulty memory, or wishful thinking, or independent reconstruction of fragments of evidence he had heard, or because, like Joseph Gest, he believed Ethan Stone, the net effect was to exclude his property from the disputed “lands lying directly in front of the Garrison.” However, the jury found for the plaintiff in accordance with the charge of the court. This reaffirmed the validity of the deed from Symmes to Harmar for the eight lots indicated on the Ludlow 1790 survey and described as lying directly in front of Fort Washington. This places Fort Washington directly behind the disputed lots, and officially rejects the site shown by Drake in 1815, restated by Jones in 1902, and inscribed on the monument at Third Street and Ludlow Street. The recent discovery of the powder magazine proves the correctness of the verdict of the jury and the error of Daniel Drake.

Apparently also in error is the compromise location offered by Richard Knopf, Raymond S. Baby, and Dwight L. Smith in the January 1953 Bulletin of the Historical and Philosophical Society (vol. 11, page 3). Their text states: “the 1789 plan shows the fort was constructed on an angle (??) the front facing west of south,” but their own figure 3 shows it facing east of south. They title their figure 3 as “Map of 1789 showing N 59° 16’ E construction line” but in their text and in their figure 4 they speak of a “N 59° 16’ E construction angle.” By these contradictory terms they are probably referring to what the original drawing shows as a bearing or direction of the line under which it is written, a universal surveyors’ practice in use for at least 200 years. They use this interpretation of the bearing N 59° 16’ E, calling it the north-
south axis of the fort, to explain the “north” that appears in the 1792 (McHenry Papers) drawing of Fort Washington shown in their Figure 2. This “north” is the sole point of argument, and admittedly is a little puzzling. On the other hand, as a representation of north it is very unusual and looks as if it might have been added as an afterthought. If General Harmar or General St. Clair felt that the relationship of the Fort to the terrain or the river or to other artifactual elements such as a street were important, there would most certainly have been other indications of orientation. Could the original draftsman have been confused by the similarity of the two triangular extensions and put the symbol for “north” on the west arm, without the error being detected at the time? An example of how this could happen as a draftsman’s error is the fact that the Mansfield survey of 1807 shows Broadway correctly but has “N 11° W” on the copy used by the Cincinnati City Engineer (1819) and also in the copy submitted to the court in 1829, whereas the very same map in the Hamilton County Deed-book (W-2, page 483) entered in 1808, has the notation correctly, as N 16° W. In any case, all other evidence as to the way the Fort faced is so overwhelmingly great that the dependability of that particular compass reading can be doubted.

Their Figure 4 shows the long side of the powder magazine lying at a bearing of North 30° East, whereas actually it was found lying at a bearing of North 30° West, a disorientation, again, of exactly 90 degrees. Further, they show Broadway running true north, whereas it still runs, as Israel Ludlow stated he intended it, 16° west of north. They have placed the powder magazine 170 feet from Broadway, whereas it actually was found 34 feet farther east than that. Correcting their error, they would have the northeast blockhouse on the other side of Ludlow Street, well outside the Military Reservation, and the southeast blockhouse in the Ludlow Street gully. The triangular extension to the north would then wipe out Lot #49 which Symmes sold to Captain Pratt. The “handsome paling” which is supposed to have surrounded the Fort would block Lawrence Street, over which Oliver M. Spencer drove his wagon in 1794, and would encroach on the property of Dr. Allison. It is hardly fair to rob Dr. Allison to pay Dr. Drake.

One more site of Fort Washington must be mentioned. The Historical and Philosophical Society has in its possession a map of
Figure 6. The Exact Site of Fort Washington.

(erratum: The bearing of BROADWAY should read "N 16° W")
Cincinnati and Fort Washington. Unfortunately, complete identification of the map and its origin has not yet been made. Informally called "the St. Clair Map" it deals with "the military lines as drawn by General St. Clair's order in 1792," and from the names and military ranks of the property owners shown, it can be dated with assurance as of 1792. The Ludlow Survey is correctly incorporated, as well as the "second bank" and the gully, and although it is a crude map, obviously not that of a professional surveyor, it has every indication of being an authentic military sketch. *It shows Fort Washington with the southwest blockhouse exactly where the powder magazine was found, and the front of the Fort at a bearing of approximately North 65° East.* Considering that this is a sketch rather than a draftsman's plat, it may be taken as very strong supporting evidence.

**SUMMARY**

Figure 6 illustrates the exact site of Fort Washington, built in 1789. With two minor exceptions which are discussed in the text, this site fits every known description and drawing of the Fort, together with every known scrap of ancillary evidence. The facts to support this site consist of the following:

1. The Fort must necessarily have stood outside the limits of the 57 lots surveyed by Israel Ludlow in 1790 and sold by John Cleves Symmes. The plat is recorded in Deed-book I, page 458 (old page 628) of the Hamilton County records, and the validity of the sale of the lots has been upheld by the courts over and over again.

2. The recent discovery of a structure, identified as the powder magazine, makes possible the pin-pointing of the southwest blockhouse behind which it had been dug, according to coeval evidence and the plan of Fort Washington of 1792 found in the McHenry papers. This is a spot 49 feet from the north line of Third Street and 204 feet from the east line of Broadway.

3. The direction in which the Fort faced is determined by evidence from independent sources: (a) The south line of the Fort was at right angles to the long side of the powder magazine, or at right angles to a carefully determined bearing of North 30° 21' West, making the line of the front of the Fort, North 59° 39' East. (b) The recorded bearing of the front of the Fort, as given in the official plat of 1789 in the National Archives, is North 59° 16' East,
essentially the same. (c) Without exception every one of the many recorded descriptions of the Fort confirms this direction, that is, that the Fort faced a little (30°) east of true south.

4. The Fort, the westward triangular addition and the northward triangular addition to the Fort, as well as the 80 feet of "Parade" in front of the Fort must have been within the Mansfield Survey of the U. S. Government Military Reservation. It is hardly possible that the parade could have included the Ludlow Street gully which goes southward from Third Street. A corollary suggestion is made that as no landmark representing the Fort appears on this survey of 1807 (the year that Ludlow Street came into existence) it is likely that every vestige of the Fort had been obliterated before that year.

5. The various other sites suggested heretofore (with the exception of the still unidentified "St. Clair" map) were based on the testimony of Daniel Drake that his property included a portion of the Fort rather than being part of the disputed land "lying directly in front of the Fort." The background of this controversial testimony is discussed in detail, with strong implications that it was in error.