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**1. Name of Property**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic name</th>
<th>Dupree-Moore Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other names/site number</td>
<td>Thomas Dupree House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>street &amp; number</th>
<th>3901 Buck Moore Road</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>city/town</td>
<td>Falkland (Macclesfield, Edgecombe County - mailing address)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county</td>
<td>Pitt</td>
<td>code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zip code</td>
<td>27852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. State/Federal Agency Certification**

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,

I hereby certify that this **X** nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property **X** meets **does not meet** the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:

- [ ] national
- [ ] statewide
- [X] local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of certifying official</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Historic Preservation Officer</th>
<th>North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>State or Federal agency and bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of commenting official</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>State or Federal agency and bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. National Park Service Certification**

I, hereby, certify that this property is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of the Keeper</th>
<th>Date of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] entered in the National Register
- [ ] determined eligible for the National Register
- [ ] determined not eligible for the National Register
- [ ] removed from the National Register
- [ ] other (explain:)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply)</td>
<td>(Check only one box)</td>
<td>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X private</td>
<td>building(s)</td>
<td>Contributing 12 Noncontributing 0 buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - Local</td>
<td>district</td>
<td>1 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - State</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>1 structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - Federal</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>0 objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td>building(s)</td>
<td>0 object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)
N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register
N/A

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC:</td>
<td>DOMESTIC: single dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single dwelling</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE/SUBSISTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary structure</td>
<td>agricultural field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/SUBSISTANCE:</td>
<td>VACANT/NOT IN USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural outbuilding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLONIAL: Georgian</td>
<td>foundation: BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY REPUBLIC: Federal</td>
<td>CONCRETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-19TH CENTURY: Greek Revival</td>
<td>walls: WOOD: Weatherboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE VICTORIAN: Italianate</td>
<td>Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>METAL: Tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance of the property. Explain contributing and noncontributing resources if necessary. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, setting, size, and significant features.)

**Summary**

Located in Falkland Township in northwest Pitt County, the Dupree-Moore Farm is situated along Buck Moore Road approximately two-and-a-half miles northwest of the Town of Falkland and one mile west of the Tar River. Its address indicating the Town of Macclesfield in southern Edgecombe County, however, reflects the U. S. Post Office rural delivery service area for Buck Moore Road.

Spanning the nineteenth century through the middle of the twentieth century, theDupree-Moore Farm physically embodies the agricultural and domestic transitions typically associated with the historical development of farms in northwestern Pitt County a predominately rural area. The Edgecombe County line is approximately a half mile north of the farm, the Tar River is almost a mile to the east, and in Pitt County, the Town of Falkland is two-and-a-half miles to the southeast. Topographically, the farm overlays an undulating rural landscape bisected to the south by Otter Creek with its early nineteenth-century mill site and dominated by the historic plantation seat that is situated on high ground to the north and surrounded by open fields. Running on a north-south axis into Otter Creek, Deep Bottom Branch defines much of the farm's western boundary. The open fields are defined by drainage ditches, farm roads, and woodlands. As farm land and buildings changed with modern farming practices and introduction of new cash crops, both the placement of the plantation seat with its main house remained constant. Outbuildings and sometimes their placement, however, were subject to change during the historic time period. Today the farm contains 205.85 acres of which 185.85 acres are included in the National Register nomination. This acreage historically embodies the period of significance for the farm, its buildings, and its agricultural development. All of the historic buildings on the farm are included within three clusters of buildings: the plantation seat, tobacco grouping, and tenant complex. The construction dates for most are approximate based on construction details and Moore family oral tradition.

An early-nineteenth-century road, that bisects the farm and is now known as Buck Moore Road, forms a dramatic ninety-degree bend in front of the Dupree-Moore House (#1) shifting from an east-west direction to a north-south one. It provides road frontage for ancillary twentieth-century farm buildings, including a tobacco packhouse (#7) just north of the domestic complex on the east side side of the road and a small tenant complex (#s 8-9) to the east on the south side of the road. At this bend in the road that curves in front of the main house, a farm lane veers off to the southwest that passes by first a sweet potato house (#10) and then a cluster of tobacco related buildings (#s 11-14) before leading to the site of a ca. 1805 grist mill and its breached earthen dam. As this lane approaches Otter Creek, it diverges creating a fork: the eastern one leads to a ford across the creek and the western one rises in elevation as it leads directly to the dam. Near the dam, this elevated road includes an elevated wagon turnabout area to its west. Today there is no above-ground evidence of the former mill. The lane crossing the ford once continued on south of the creek in a southwesterly direction. Just northwest of the mill site along the north bank of Otter Creek, this bank rises dramatically to approximately thirty-five feet. The farm lane also runs the woods line that follows Otter creek and then Deep Bottom Branch. East of the mill dam, the meandering path of the creek extends through a lowland area mixed with hardwoods and cypress.

Shaded by a grove of pecan trees to the north and west, the plantation seat includes farm and domestic outbuildings. The front yard features dogwoods and an ancient cedar and elm stand near the sweet potato house. Both the equipment shelter (#5) and mule barn (#6) line the complex’s northern perimeter near Buck Moore Road, and the tobacco grading house (#3) and smokehouse (#2) are positioned side-by-side directly behind the dwelling. A recent move of these two outbuildings has preserved their relationship to the house and each other. A small brick pump house (#4) stands between these two groupings just northwest of the house. A branch of the farm road leads to the rear of the house. An orchard and household garden, both approximately one-half acre in size, once extended as long parallel lots southwest of this driveway.
A small tenant complex stands approximately three hundred feet east of the bend in Buck Moore Road and on its south side. It includes a tenant house (#8) and behind it to the southeast, a tobacco grading house (#9) with an attached shed. A drive just east of the house leads to this tobacco grading house. Two mature pecan trees shade the drive, and a cedar stands at the rear of the house to the southwest.

1. **Dupree-Moore House, ca. 1800-1825, ca. 1848, ca. 1861, contributing building**

   During the nineteenth century, two major remodelings transformed the original plantation seat to its present two-story form with rear two-story T-addition. Built between 1800 and 1825, only fragmentary information based on physical evidence and family traditions is known about the physical characteristics of the original one-and-a-half-story frame dwelling that had an asymmetrically fenestrated three-bay façade. Resting on finely tooled brick piers, it featured a side-gable roof, exterior gable-end chimneys, and a hall-and-parlor plan measuring approximately thirty-two feet by seventeen-and-one-half feet. An enclosed stair originally rose just inside the entrance, out of the hall, along the partition wall. The first major renovation took place ca. 1848 and adapted the house to a two-story one, extended the southern gable end, added a one-story shed-roof extension across the rear with a similar one-story porch to the facade, and modified the plan to a center hall with stair. The second remodeling occurred ca. 1861 and involved appending a two-story T-addition at the rear with flanking one-story shed-roof porches, and adding latticework supports to the front porch. Until its restoration and rehabilitation begun in 2011, little had been done to the dwelling except the replacement of the front porch and incorporation of plumbing and electrical systems.

   Today, the overall exterior character of the dwelling is Greek Revival in style with a one-story full-width shed-roof front porch that features Picturesque-style latticework. This fully-reconstructed one-story porch now highlights the symmetrical fenestration of the three-bay façade with its central double-leaf entrance. A plain surround frames this entrance and includes a seven-light transom and sidelights containing six vertically-placed panes over a single recessed panel. This panel detailing is repeated in each door leaf, which features two vertical panels. All windows are modern replacements that replicate the configuration of the double-hung sash associated with the first remodeling. The first-floor windows contain nine-over-nine lights and the smaller second floor ones are nine-over-six lights as are those associated with the rear shed rooms. Plain surrounds frame each window with squared sills. The cornerboards are also plain. A flat return with splayed Greek Revival-style molding and a simple rakeboard with molding accents each gable end and ties into the boxed cornice at the front and rear elevations. The exterior is sheathed with plain weatherboards.

   At the rear, the two-story T-addition extends for three bays and includes a exterior gable-end chimney with a stepped single-shouderer. The rear elevation of this addition has a single double-hung sash window with nine-over-six lights located just south of the chimney at the first floor. All other windows of the T-addition originally had double-hung sash containing six-over-six lights. A one-story shed-roof porch protects this portion of the north elevation and cutdown Italianate-style lattice posts, original to the front porch, support its roof. The porch includes an entry into the hall connector of this wing. On the south elevation, its twin was partly infilled ca. 1940 by the addition of a bathroom and then in 2011, fully remodeled again and enlarged by an addition at its southwest end.

   Exterior end chimneys are located at each gable that have small stepped bases, stepped single shoulders, and off-set stacks. All are built of common bond with variable header courses ranging from 1:6 to 1:17. Each stack has a cement overlay.

   A new solid brick foundation securely supports the perimeter of the dwelling with traditional piers underpinning the front, side, and back porches. Wooden steps lead up to the central entrance. Reproduction porch posts now support its shed roof, which also replicate those of the north porch of the T-addition. Each post has three latticework parts: a base with upright members, a cross-hatched central portion, and a cutwork upper panel with supporting stick brackets. A segment of rounded handrail binds the two lower sections of the post. In the reconstruction of the front porch, its balustrade incorporates this handrail with plain rectangular-section balusters.
The front entrance opens into a wide central stair hall with flanking parlor and master bedroom. The entrance into the parlor is located midway along the north wall, which also features a hall hat/coat rail. The door to the bedroom is just inside the entrance at the south wall where the stair rises to an intermediate landing and then turns for a short flight. The stair has square-in-section newel posts with simple cap, stick balusters, and a rounded handrail. Other Greek Revival-style woodwork includes four-panel doors displaying surrounds that have mitred corners and backbands with a typical splayed molding profile. The parlor windows have this same surround and feature a similar paneled apron beneath each. In the opposing south room, these surrounds and aprons are simpler and omit the splayed molding. The mantels in both rooms are similar and Greek Revival in style with a deep plain shelf and frieze supported by similar pilasters. A splayed molding accents each. Most walls and ceilings were originally plaster. However today, the plaster in the center hall except for its north wall best embodies its use. In most areas throughout this portion of the house, sheet rock replaces it. The original floors are heart pine, and most remain intact except those in the master bedroom, which have a modern but traditional in-style overlay.

On the second floor, a central hall opens into two bedrooms and a small former trunk room at the head of the stairs. A bath now replaces the trunk room. All doors and the two mantels date from the early nineteenth-century one-and-a-half-story dwelling of Thomas Dupree and exhibit respectively, Georgian and Federal-style characteristics. All were relocated here from the first floor of this dwelling during the ca. 1848 enlargement of the house. The doors with six raised panels were hung originally on HL hinges and show evidence of weathering and reduced sizing. Only one retains its original HL hinges and leather washers. The original paint on the doors appeared mid-nineteenth century and exhibited two hues of gray in the hall and bedrooms but ochre in the trunk room. The mantels have reeded pilasters, a plain frieze, and a shelf. The north mantel is more detailed and features a shelf with a reeded cutback edge. Both have black marbelizing.

Behind the front two-story section of the house, the ca. 1848 rear shed merges with the ca. 1861 two-story T-addition. Originally flanked by two rooms, the shed’s central hall has the flush sheathing horizontally laid along its side and front walls. This sheathing features wide hand-planed beaded boards. By comparison, the north room retains its form; however, the former south room is presently divided into a modern bath and dressing room. Within the dressing room, remnants of Federal-style woodwork serve as a truncated wainscot. Within the T-addition, a cross hall leads into the first-floor room, opens into an enclosed stair to the second floor, and originally provided exits to the flanking porches. The former first floor room with fireplace is now a modern kitchen with cabinets and retains the original closet beneath the stair and ca. 1861 post-and-lintel mantel. The hall’s north exit opens into the one-story porch. The south exit is now closed off. A single step of the quarter-turn stair with winders projects into the hall and an early-twentieth-century glazed door fully encloses the opening into the stair well above it. Plain horizontal flush boards line its walls.

The second-floor of the T-addition features a narrow stair hall that opens into a trunk room at the head of the stair and then two principal rooms. This hall includes a balustrade that protects the open-side of the stair well. This balustrade has a rounded hand rail, a square-in-section newel with cap, and rectangular-in-section balusters. Each room has deep baseboards. All woodwork exhibits plain boards. In the trunk room, Francis Marion Dupree, the son of Thomas B. Dupree, signed his name, F. M. Dupree, and added the date, March 22, 1877. The four-panel door, opening into the east room, had exceptional faux painting on its formal (room) side featuring robust straight graining on its rails, stiles and muntin but whimsical rows on each flat panel. In this room, a doorway and stair now provides a connection between the second floor of the T-addition and the hall landing in the front two-story portion of the house. The uptairs west room has a fireplace with a very simple post-and-lintel mantel with a plain shelf. On the reverse side of the mantel is written the date “April 6, 1861.”

The recent rehabilitation of the Dupree-Moore House has involved restoration, reconstruction, and modernization with all work within Secretary of Interior’s guidelines for rehabilitation. Three modern baths and a kitchen were incorporated within the main dwelling and a one-story side-gable-roof addition with a brick exterior-end chimney and weatherboard sheathing was appended at the rear of the south elevation that opens into the kitchen. This space includes a family room, laundry/mud room, and a small back porch. The design, scale, materials, and feeling of these additions plus the new standing seam metal roof of the dwelling all complement the overall historic character of the Dupree-Moore House.
2. **Smokehouse, ca. 1910, contributing building**

   This gable-front one-story frame smokehouse with plain weatherboard sheathing has a distinctive gable roof that extends approximately three-and-a-half feet beyond the front façade. Weatherboard sheathing encloses this front gable and standing-seam metal covers the roof. A deep eave overhang that extends two feet runs along each side elevation and features exposed rafter ends. This overhang extends only a foot at the rear. At the façade, the central entrance has a double layered door of tongue-and-groove beaded boards laid diagonally on the exterior and vertically on the interior. A plain surround frames this doorway. The interior features a dirt floor, exposed stud framing with corner bracing, and built-in work-surface shelf to one side that has an additional shelf below. The ceiling has narrow beaded boards with metal hooks for hanging meat. The building measurements conform roughly to a ten foot square and stood originally on a poured in-place concrete foundation. In the summer of 2011, it was moved back a short distance thereby maintaining its historic site integrity and relationship with the nearby grading house.

3. **Tobacco Grading House, ca. 1910, contributing building**

   Built as a grading room with ordering pit below, this gable-front one-story frame building has plain weatherboards deeply incised with circular saw marks. Its perimeter dimensions are roughly that of an eighteen-foot square with a single entrance at the façade’s southeast corner. Exhibiting pegged joints, a reused Greek Revival-style door with two raised vertical panels distinguishes the exterior of this entrance; however, its opposing interior side has four-flat panels. The rear elevation features a central double-hung sash window and the north elevation has a paired window with the same sash. Each window contains six-over-six lights. All door and window surrounds are plain. Standing-seam tin protects the roof. Plain narrow boards skirt the eave overhang and serve as a rakeboard. On the interior, narrow beaded boards sheath the walls and ceiling. Plain tall boards serve as baseboards, and quarter-round moldings finish corners and edges. The building’s temporary move in the spring of 2011 eliminated its poured in-place concrete foundation with eight-feet deep ordering pit. Featuring a dirt floor, the ordering pit originally had four-tier rooms for hanging tobacco and two entrances: an exterior one accessed through a crawl-space well located midway along the foundation of the front façade and an interior one with a trap door in the floor at roughly the same location. Its new location is directly behind the main house near the smokehouse and maintains its relationship with both. Although its façade was once in line with that of the smokehouse, its new location is set back only a few feet beyond the smokehouse and thereby generally maintains its historic orientation to the smokehouse and the plantation house.

4. **Pump House, ca. 1938, contributing structure**

   A simple shed-roof one-story brick structure built as a pump house/utility shed that measures approximately seven feet square. The façade’s central door has flush horizontal sheathing, and the brick is laid in common bond. Standing-seam metal protects the shed roof with its front to back downward slope. The roof has a deep one-foot eight-inch front overhang and a seven-inch one elsewhere. Large and small water faucet pipes extend through the wall of the east side elevation.

5. **Farm Equipment Shelter, ca. 1955, contributing building**

   Standing on the site of a former barn, this one-story frame equipment shelter with six open front bays was built with materials salvaged from the barn, which was destroyed by Hurricane Hazel in October 1954. Log poles capped with diagonal braces separate each open bay and help support the shed-roof which slopes from front to back. Flush diagonal sheathing encloses the side elevations, with flush horizontal sheathing along the rear. Until recently, these elevations were covered with asbestos shingles. Resting on an irregular concrete-block pier foundation, this equipment shelter measures approximately sixty feet by twenty feet.

6. **Mule Barn, ca. 1905, contributing building**

   Built to house four mule stalls as well as grain storage, this gable-front transverse-frame feeder barn features an open central bay and an overhead loft or mow as reflected by the double-tier fenestration of the front façade. It is sheathed with plain weatherboards, rests on a poured in-place concrete foundation, and protected by a standing-seam metal roof. Entered through a sliding wooden slat door, each stall has a corner hay rack, a feed box, and partially sided walls with flush horizontal boards. The loft is accessed from either the central aisle or the façade’s overhead entry. The barn measures approximately twenty feet by twenty-six feet.
with the width of the central aisle slightly smaller than that of the stalls. The aisle openings feature diagonally braced corners.

7. Tobacco Packhouse, ca. 1910, contributing building

Gable-front two-story frame tobacco packhouse covered with vertically applied metal sheathing features at the south elevation a one-story shed addition with weatherboard exterior. Brick piers support the original structure and concrete blocks underpin the shed addition. The front façade features central entrances at each floor, the upstairs entrance having previously been a window. Windows light the interior at the rear elevation, two at the first floor and one at the second. On the interior, each floor has a single room with exposed framing and tongue-and-groove flooring. A basic open straight-flight stair rises near the northwest corner. The building’s measurements are approximately forty feet by thirty-two feet. In 1937, this packhouse, was moved to its present site and enlarged by a one-story shed addition to its south elevation. It was originally located just east of Buck Moore Road at the edge of the present field to the north near the woods.

8. Tenant House, ca. 1922, contributing building

One-story three-bay frame tenant house with side-gable roof and rear two-room ell features a partial-façade shed-roof front porch and a similar L-shaped one at the rear with an enclosed pantry terminus. A deep apron with vertical beaded-board sheathing skirts the roof of these porches which also feature extended eave overhangs with exposed rafter ends. At the front porch, turned posts support the roof and simple chamfered ones serve the rear. Standing-seam tin protects each roof. Brick piers underpin the house, and plain weatherboards sheathe its exterior walls. Although nearly all are protected by metal sheathing, each standard window has two-over-two double-hung sash and a plain surround. The central entrance features a plain surround and a door exhibiting a large single light over three slightly-raised horizontal panels. Originally the interior followed a single pile center-hall plan with the rear ell containing a dining room and kitchen. An interior chimney with back-to-back fireplaces opened into the front parlor and the dining room, and a single brick stove stack pierces the east bedroom roof. A paired window also distinguishes the dining room along the west side elevation. Most doors have five horizontal flat panels; all walls were plastered with tall beaded-board ceilings; and the floors have standard width boards. The two mantels are similar and exhibit plain entablatures with bracketed shelves and simple beaded pilasters. Family tradition maintains that the house was originally built by local carpenter Joe Cobb for Mary, the daughter of L. A. Moore who married Lloyd E. Stokes on January 7, 1922 in Suffolk, Virginia. Later it became a tenant house and served as one until about 1990. It has since been vacant.

9. Tenant Tobacco Packhouse, ca. 1922, contributing building

Originally a tobacco grading house, this gable-front frame building has an open engaged shed extension along the west elevation. Metal sheathing covers the building’s exterior walls, and standing seam tin protects its roof, which features exposed rafter ends. A double-leaf central entrance provides access into the building. The measurements of the building’s perimeter are approximately twenty-eight feet by sixteen feet.

10. Sweet Potato House, ca. 1910, contributing building

Built to cure sweet potatoes, this rare small building not only embodies its original form but also exhibits changing drying methods during the early twentieth-century. Even though the curing methods associated within this building are not clearly understood, evidence exists that physical changes were made to the building. Supported originally by brick piers that later were in-filled with brick, this simple one-story frame building has a gable-front roof with exposed rafter ends, and plain weatherboards sheathe the exterior. Along the ridge, a central brick flue is flanked by vents. The exterior features a central double-leaf entry with typical exterior and interior double doors plus an opposing six-over-six double-hung sash rear window. This elevated entrance was reached by a heavy five-step wooden ladder that is stored now on the interior. Each exterior door leaf is double layered with vertical outer boards and a horizontally stacked board lining. The interior double-leaf doors also have vertical boards but in this instance secured with batten supports. This left leaf also has a fixed four-light sash. On the interior, the original tongue-and-groove floor is repositioned to provide ventilation between each board. The walls and ceiling have narrow beaded board sheathing, and in the case of the walls, it is applied over flush horizontal boards. The plan of this one-room building is a square measuring approximately sixteen feet and four inches.
11. Tobacco Looping Shelter, ca. 1910, non-contributing structure

Supported by log poles with a side-gable roof, this open shelter historically was used for looping tobacco and contained a broad central wagon bay that was flanked by two smaller bays for hanging green tobacco on sticks. Today, the poles defining the two eastern bays have applied to their interior faces a bracket system from which tobacco sticks hung that connected each pole. The removal of the shelter’s corresponding western bay ca. 1975 has compromised its integrity making it a non-contributing structure. Sheet metal protects the roof and its enclosed gable ends. Presently it measures approximately thirty-four feet by thirteen-and-one-half feet with the central bay approximately sixteen feet wide.

12. Log Tobacco Barn, ca. 1942, contributing building

One of two extant tobacco barns, this tall side-gable roof building, which stands on an enclosed brick foundation, is constructed of hewn square logs with mud daubing. Evidence of a wood burning furnace is now enclosed on the south side elevation. Barn metal encases most of the the exterior and obscures all log corner joints. Centrally-placed doors at both the front and rear facades provide entry into the barn; however, the front one is taller in height. Each side of the square-in-plan structure measures seventeen feet, and a low open lean-to shed extends from the side elevation near the farm lane. Beneath this shed, a small section of the log and daub construction of the barn is exposed. Originally, the interior featured four pole rows (rooms) that were seven tiers in height, the lowest, however, is now removed. A gable-roof frame looping shed that extends approximately fifty-eight feet connects this log barn with the more recent ca. 1951 frame tobacco barn. Family tradition maintains that during World War II, ca. 1942, sawn timber was a scarce commodity so Moore resorted to building this barn using a traditional log method.

13. Tobacco Barn, ca. 1951, contributing building

This frame tobacco barn virtually mirrors the other in shape and size. It rests, however, on a concrete block foundation, and its front and rear doors are similar and more typical in size. The perimeter of the structure measures seventeen feet by sixteen feet. Two circular flues pierce the foundation along the side elevations. On the interior, the dirt floor has a central circular clay stove base. Instead of tier poles, here the four hanging rows (rooms) are comprised of two boards paired and nailed to a vertical stud that is unsupported and rises for seven tiers.

14. Tobacco Packhouse, ca. 1951, contributing building

Fully sheathed with barn metal, this small one-story frame packhouse with a side-gable roof was built to provide a packhouse for the Stokes tenant farm following the 1950 division of the L. A. Moore farm. It was originally located near the east side of Buck Moore Road at the edge of the northeast field and directly across from the former Stokes tenant farm just north of the plantation seat. In an effort to preserve this packhouse after it was blown off its foundation by a storm, Bucky Moore moved it about 1995 to the present site. Today it rests on a concrete block pier foundation. Its central double-leaf entrance is protected by a simple shed extension from the gable roof, and along the rear elevation a single window is placed off-center. The large interior room is unfinished with exposed walls and roof framing. It has a tongue-and-groove floor. The building measures thirty-two feet by sixteen feet. It was last used for tobacco storage about 2000 and ever since for general farm storage.

15. Farm Landscape, contributing site

The Dupree-Moore Farm nomination includes 185.85 acres that consists of land inherited by Thomas Dupree in the late eighteenth century. An early-nineteenth-century road with an almost ninety degree bend near the plantation seat bisects the farm. This landscape includes the main domestic complex that includes farm buildings, a tenant complex, and a concentration of tobacco processing buildings that remain of a larger group of structures that once stood in the same area of the farm. With its mix of crop lands and woodlands surrounding these sites, this landscape has changed little over the past one hundred and fifty years as the Thomas Dupree family developed the farm and the family of John W. Moore maintained it. Slaves, tenants, and owners have worked this land with crop lands producing at various times through the years principally corn, cotton, and tobacco. Open fields surround the plantation seat. Woodlands frame these fields to the north, west, and south. Otter Creek bisects the southern portion of the farm and Deep Bottom Branch runs along much of the farm’s western boundary. A farm lane extends from the plantation seat, passes to the east
of the tobacco complex, and then curves south of the L-shaped irrigation pond where it rises and approaches from the north the remains of the mill dam. The two ends of this breached earthen dam help mark the site of an early nineteenth-century grist mill and its mill pond to the west. This elevated portion of the lane also includes a turnaround formerly used for wagons. A path that forks to the east off this farm lane north of the creek, parallels this dam as it fords Otter Creek, and then formerly meandered to the southwest bisecting historic farm woodland. Near the north boundary of the farm, another farm lane extends from the west side of Buck Moore Road and follows the woods edge before turning south and paralleling a field ditch. It then runs along the perimeter of the woods leading to the back fields near Deep Bottom Branch. Ditches historically drained open fields and, in various places, either bisected or edged them. The two northwestern fields are separated by a ditch as indicated on the 1937 aerial photograph. However, in 1954 a ditch draining the fields bisected by the farm’s north-south section of Buck Moore Road was drag lined to create a deeper canal. The trail of this ditch/canal is also clearly illustrated on the 1937 aerial photograph as it extends from the southern edge of the woodland just north of the plantation seat and west of Buck Moore Road, travels south, then curves to the southeast before crossing under the road, and diagonally crosses the lower portion of the open fields east of this same portion of Buck Moore Road. Other fields naturally drain to the south toward Otter Creek and west to Deep Bottom Branch. In recent years, the timber was cut and reseeded with pines on two of the farm’s woodland areas: in 2000, the woods north of the plantation seat and west of Buck Moore Road and in 2005, the area south of Otter Creek.

**Integrity Statement**

The historic rural landscape and buildings associated with the Dupree-Moore Farm nomination encompass 185.85 acres and represent that portion of the present-day farm which preserves and conveys its historic agricultural and architectural character. Changes in agricultural activity and use are commonplace on the rural landscape over time. The continuity of feeling and association, however, within a farm setting can remain and complement its overall character. Documentation for the rural landscape associated with the Dupree-Moore Farm includes two Civil War maps and a 1937 aerial photograph. The two Civil War maps depicting part of eastern North Carolina, Field map No. 3 drawn by H. J. Miller and dated July 28, 1863 and Jeremy F. Gilmer’s ca. 1864 map, illustrate regional land use patterns including the farm of Thomas B. Dupree. Open land, roads, woodland, waterways/tributaries, and plantation seats are all noted. Nearly seventy-five years later, a NARA aerial photograph of the region taken on September 15, 1937 clearly records the layout of the farm and shows little change in open fields, woodland, and roads except for the addition of three tenant complexes, two just north of the main complex, and another to the east. Field size, however, appears to increase, in all likelihood, due to twentieth century mechanization in farming. Today, the two tenant complexes to the north are now gone.

**Archaeology Statement**

The structures are closely related to the surrounding environment. Archaeological remains, such as trash pits, wells, and other structural remains which may be present, can provide information valuable to the understanding and interpretation of the property. Information concerning land use patterns, social and economic standing, and mobility, as well as structural details, is often only evident in the archaeological record. Therefore, archaeological remains may well be an important component of the significance of the property. At this time no investigation has been done to discover these remains, but it is likely that they exist, and this should be considered in any development of the property.
8. Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**
(Mark “x” in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **A** owed by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- **B** removed from its original location.
- **C** a birthplace or grave.
- **D** a cemetery.
- **E** a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- **F** a commemorative property.
- **G** less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years.

---

**Areas of Significance**
(Enter categories from instructions)

- **Agriculture**
- **Architecture**

---

**Period of Significance**
ca.1800-1962

---

**Significant Dates**
1905

---

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

---

**Cultural Affiliation**
N/A

---

**Architect/Builder**
Unknown

---

**Period of Significance (justification)**

*See Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph.*

**Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)**

*See Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph.*
Collectively, the Dupree-Moore Farm, its buildings, and landscape embody over one-hundred and fifty years of local agricultural and architectural history in Pitt County with its Period of Significance extending from ca. 1800 through 1962. The farm meets Criterion A in the area of Agriculture for its continuous role in Pitt County’s agricultural history from early-nineteenth-century subsistence farming to the production of cash crops: cotton throughout the antebellum period and into the twentieth century and especially tobacco during the twentieth century. The 520-acre plantation of Thomas Dupree (1772-1854) and later his son Thomas Bird Dupree (1812-1882) was supported by slave labor until the Civil War. After which it continued to be marginally sustained through the late nineteenth century by the cash crop cotton. John W. Moore, a prosperous Pitt County farmer, purchased the “Dupree homeplace” in 1905, and throughout the remaining period of significance, the Moore family raised tobacco with the aid of hired hands and tenants. The production of corn, soybeans, and peanuts as well as cotton also played a significant role in the farm’s twentieth-century agricultural economic success as well as sweet potatoes on a smaller local scale. Its rural landscape conveys that of the antebellum period with its fields, woods, and plantation seat. However, throughout the twentieth-century, under the ownership of the descendents of John W. Moore, the developing tobacco economy left an imprint on the farm through the location of ancillary buildings, both tobacco and tenant. In conjunction with these buildings, the Dupree-Moore Farm conveys the mechanization of a modern farm and the interconnectivity between fields, drainage patterns, farm roads, woodlands, domestic work, and tenant farms as identified on its twentieth-century rural landscape. Although agricultural patterns have shifted during the Period of Significance, the disposition of the agricultural fields, woodlands, and plantation seat at the Dupree-Moore Farm remains little changed since the mid-nineteenth century.

The Dupree-Moore Farm also derives architectural significance under Criterion C from the Dupree-Moore House and the farm’s collection of twentieth-century ancillary buildings, both domestic and agricultural, that support its historic agricultural landscape. The Dupree-Moore House embodies a pre-Civil War two-story frame Greek Revival-style dwelling with a rear two-story T-addition update, a one-story shed-roof front porch supported by Picturesque-style latticework posts, and a similar porch along the north elevation at the rear. Its evolution from a transitional Georgian/Federal-style one-and-a-half-story frame dwelling with hall-and-parlor plan built ca. 1800-1825 into a commodious two-story house with center-hall plan ca. 1848 was completed by the T-addition ca. 1861. Thomas Dupree, a farmer and an “old school” elder active in the Primitive Baptist Church, constructed the original house that in turn was radically remodeled twice by his youngest son Thomas Bird Dupree (1812-1882) before the Civil War. It was first transformed into a two-story Greek-Revival-style house that featured a one-story front porch, one-story rear shed, and a center-hall plan. A recent widower with four children under ten-years old, Thomas B. Dupree was also a farmer. The blending of his and his father’s households plus the younger Dupree’s second marriage in 1849, in all probability, precipitated this extensive remodeling. By 1860, Dupree’s family had doubled and included eight children. Space was once again at a premium, which prompted the construction ca. 1861 of a rear two-story T-addition with flanking one story shed-roof porches. Distinctive Picturesque-style latticework supports, an element characteristically associated with northern Pitt County and neighboring Edgecombe County, updated the front porch. Interior features reflecting this evolution include: Georgian-style doors with six raised panels; Federal-style mantels with reeded pilasters; and Greek Revival-style front entrance with sidelights and transom, post-and-lintel mantels, and doors with two vertical panels. Recently restored and updated, the Dupree-Moore House also illustrates this stylistic evolution through its floor-plan development.

Although no nineteenth-century outbuildings or dependencies exist today, the farm centers around the antebellum plantation seat of the Dupree-Moore House and features a notable twentieth-century complement of domestic and farm-related outbuildings including smokehouse, pump house, equipment shelter, grading room, sweet potato house, and mule stable. Nearby, a small tenant farm represents one of three once associated with the farm. The main farm also has an extensive collection of tobacco-related buildings: two tobacco barns, three packhouses, two looping shelters, and one grading room that collectively and architecturally convey the bright leaf tobacco culture synonymous with eastern North Carolina. All of these
ancillary buildings are typical in design, and they are oriented to either Buck Moore Road or the farm lane leading to Otter Creek. Most date from the first half of the twentieth century. On the landscape, many in this collection of fourteen buildings convey integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association for this twentieth century tobacco farm and stand collectively as an increasingly rare farm complex in Pitt County. As a whole, the Dupree-Moore Farm embodies important building practices that exemplify nineteenth and twentieth century agricultural and architectural trends typical of coastal plain region in eastern North Carolina thereby fulfilling Criterion C for Architecture. This nomination's Period of Significance ca. 1800-1962 fully incorporates these important trends relating to agriculture and architecture and ends at the fifty-year mark in 1962 since there is no exceptional significance beyond this date.

Narrative Statement of Significance (provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance)

History of the Dupree-Moore Farm

Since the late eighteenth century, the Dupree-Moore Farm for most of its history has remained in the ownership of two families: first, James Dupree and his descendants, and then, John Wilson Moore and his descendents. All were farmers who cultivated the land and raised large families. Located on high ground a little over a mile west of the Tar River, the property was ideally situated to provide easy access to the river and market opportunities beyond.

Originally from Brunswick County, Virginia, James Dupree (ca.1720-ca.1784) settled in 1771 in Pitt County with his wife and three sons after purchasing 200 acres from Benjamin Evans for 200 pounds. He was married to Mary Donaldson of Surry County, Virginia, and his sons, Sterling, Benjamin Chapman, and Bird, were all born in Virginia. His fourth son Thomas was born in Pitt County in 1772. Dupree enlarged his land holdings in 1779 by thirty-nine acres purchased from Meredith Corbitt for ten pounds and, in 1780, by an additional 120 acres from Sterling Dupree for one-hundred pounds. These properties adjoined respectively Autre's Creek, later known as Otter Creek, and other land owned by James and Benjamin Dupree. Little else is known about James Dupree. [Fires at the Pitt County Courthouse in 1858 and 1910 may have destroyed Dupree's will.] All of James Dupree’s sons lived in Pitt County and apparently were neighbors as indicated by extant deeds.

Following the death of James Dupree about 1785, his youngest son Thomas (1772-1854), a minor, stood to inherit the homeplace. By this time, Dupree's three older sons were all married and living nearby as neighbors. Whether or not Thomas’s mother was still living is uncertain. In 1792. Thomas married Nancy Ann Renn (ca. 1772-1842), and they began a family that grew to include five children: Allen Renn (ca. 1794-ca.1823), Finette (1797-1871), Redmond Renn (ca. 1803-1877), William Redmond (1805-1854), and Thomas Bird (1812-1882). Thomas Dupree began acquiring additional property in Pitt and Edgecombe counties that eventually increased his holdings to almost 2,000 acres. Although a farmer, Thomas Dupree recognized a business opportunity and joined with his neighbor Dr. Robert Williams to have John Andrews construct a grist mill that was completed by July 30, 1804.

Drawn to the Primitive Baptist church, Thomas Dupree was a staunch “old school” elder throughout most of his adult life. Primitive Baptists were anti-missionary Particular Baptists that were referred to as old school since they believed that salvation was given by God only to those whom God chose and had predetermined. In eastern North Carolina, Primitive Baptists were the most prevalent sect of Baptists during much of the nineteenth century. In 1803, Dupree was first received as a member by the newly formed congregation at Town Creek in Edgecombe County and baptized on July 10th. His call was fulfilled on April 8, 1810, when he became an ordained minister. He was active within the Primitive Baptist church serving in

2 Copeland, *Chronicles of Pitt County, N.C.*, 280; Pitt County Deed Book T:90.
4 Hassell, *History of the Church of God*, 855; Copeland, *Chronicles of Pitt County, N. C.*, 280
various capacities as a preacher, messenger, and elder within the Kehukee, Neuse, and Contentnea Associations. His “old school” opinions related to ongoing missionary debates common within churches during the early to mid-nineteenth century, and on November 23, 1839, he published a circular letter in *The Primitive Baptist*.\(^5\) He was described as a prompt person, a strict disciplinarian, and a capable moderator, who had a keen eye and a persuasive manner.\(^6\) From 1820-1845, he served the Primitive Baptist congregation at Conetoe in Edgecombe County, and prior to his death, the church at Town Creek was under his pastoral care.\(^7\) The church at Conetoe was a part of the Kehukee Association and Town Creek, the Contentnea Association. Both associations followed “old school” principles.

As Dupree’s plantation grew and prospered, the family’s work load was eased by the acquisition of slaves. By 1840 his household included six family members. The census also notes that all family members were employed in agriculture. His holdings included eighteen slaves: eight male and ten female.\(^8\) Who the three children were that comprised his household is uncertain. Dupree’s youngest son, Thomas Bird, was still living within his father’s household. Two years later on February 16, 1842, Thomas Bird married Penina May (1818-1847). August of that year, misfortune struck the family with the death of Thomas’s wife, Nancy Ann Dupree.\(^9\) In an effort to manage his estate on August 12, 1848, Thomas Dupree gave his son Thomas Bird the 520-acre homeplace, its slaves, and its household goods. In return, he became a part of Thomas B. Dupree’s household and lived there until his death on March 4, 1854.\(^10\)

The family of Thomas Bird Dupree and his wife Penina soon grew to include four children: Robert Williams (1842-1863), Benjamin Franklin (1844- ), Laura Penelope (1845-1897), and Joseph Alvin (1847-1901). Benjamin appears to have died in infancy. Tragedy struck the family when Penina died on July 26, 1847, six months after the birth of Joseph. Whether or not her death may have influenced Thomas Dupree’s decision to transfer the homeplace to Thomas Bird the following year is uncertain. Thomas Bird soon settled his household by marrying Penina’s younger sister, Sarah W. May (1824-1888) on May 4, 1849 and living in larger quarters. Their family grew by four children: James W. (1850-?), Thomas (1855-1880), Francis Marion (1856-1912), and Redmond Renn (1859-1880).\(^11\) In all likelihood, these family upheavals and increasing spatial needs precipitated ca. 1848 a radical remodeling and enlarging of Thomas Dupree’s former home by raising it to two stories, lengthening the south elevation, and adding a one-story rear shed. Whether or not these alterations took place before or after Dupree’s second marriage is unknown.

Listed as a farmer in the 1850 census, Thomas B. Dupree was well established with his real estate holdings valued at $1,841. He also owned thirty slaves, fourteen male and sixteen female. His household of nine included his immediate family as well as: his father, Thomas Dupree; his mother-in-law, Susan May; her daughter, Adelia May, and an eighteen-year-old farmer, Elsberry Edwards. The farm consisted of 350 acres improved land and 176 acres unimproved with a cash value of $2,630. His livestock, which was valued at $596, included horses, one ox, milch cows, cattle, sheep, and swine. Indian corn was the principal crop grown on the farm with 2,000 bushels produced. It was followed by 450 bushels of sweet potatoes, 400 bushels of peas and beans, fifty bushels of Irish potatoes, sixty pounds of wool, and two bales of cotton.\(^12\)

\(^5\) The title of *The Primitive Baptist* also included “Edited by Primitive (or Old School) Baptist Ministers and Laity.” For many years, it was printed and published by George Howard in Tarborough, North Carolina. A circular letter is a form of “letter to the editor,” and in this case, one intended for members of the Primitive Baptist Church.

\(^6\) Copeland, *Chronicles of Pitt County, N.C.*, 280

\(^7\) Hassell, *History of the Church of God*, 852.

\(^8\) U. S. Census, 1840, Pitt County, N. C., Population Schedule. Note: The census figures actually notes seven for Thomas Dupree but only six family members were in his household. Listings for neighboring households had similar discrepancies.

\(^9\) Copeland, *Chronicles of Pitt County, N.C.*, 280.


\(^11\) Copeland, *Chronicles of Pitt County, N. C.*, 280. Note: the 1860 Census, includes a nine-year-old male child with the initials J. W. as a member of Thomas B.’s household and the 1870 Census again lists him as James. No additional information is known about James.

\(^12\) U. S. Census, 1850, population, agriculture, and slave schedules, Pitt County. Note: The monetary difference between the real estate value listed in the population schedule of $1,841 and the cash value of the farm in agriculture schedule of $2,630 may reflect a mortgage held on the property and support the house remodeling date.
Over the next ten years, Dupree invested in and benefited from a rapidly expanding cotton economy. By 1860 his land holdings had increased only slightly by the addition of thirty-four unimproved acres. The overall real estate value for the plantation, however, had risen to $12,000 and the value of his personal property was $22,800, making him one of the more prosperous farmers in the area according to household comparisons within the 1860 U. S. Census for Pitt County. Thirty-three slaves, thirteen male and twenty female, labored on the plantation, and they lived in its seven slave houses. An investment in working livestock, seven mules and three oxen, helped advance agricultural production as did a hefty increase in farming implements currently valued at five hundred dollars. During this period, the plantation’s cotton production had escalated from two to seventy-five bales, while other farm production remained little changed.\(^{13}\)

Whether or not increasing prosperity and a growing family prompted Thomas B. Dupree to again expand his home ca. 1861 is uncertain. However, a two-story four-room T-addition with flanking one-story shed-roof porches was made to the rear of the house at some time just prior to or after the Civil War. Given its similarity in form with the fashionable Foreman-Atkinson House completed in the late 1850s and located nearby, Dupree may have begun the work just prior to the war and quickly finished it as modestly as possible. An April 6, 1861, date on the back of the existing upstairs mantel in the T-addition gives credence to this theory.

In any event, the Civil War brought tragedy to the family although the plantation came through unscathed following a serious encounter on July 20, 1863 with Union forces associated with Potter’s Raid. James, the twelve-year-old son of Thomas Dupree, was captured and released that day by Union troops for shooting at the soldiers. Later in the evening, the raiders used Dupree’s Ford to cross Otter Creek and avoid a conflict with Confederate soldiers waiting near the Tar River at the bridge over Otter Creek.\(^{14}\) Within three months on October 14, 1863, Robert Williams Dupree, Thomas’s eldest son, was killed at Sharpsburg.\(^{15}\) At the age of seventeen on March 24, 1864, Joseph Alvin Dupree also enlisted in the Confederate Army. The following year he was captured at Fort Fisher on January 15, 1865 and released on June 11 from Point Lookout, Maryland, following Lee’s surrender at Appomattox on April 9.\(^{16}\) Only days after Lee’s surrender at Appomattox, Thomas B. Dupree had a deadly encounter with a marauding Union soldier who was trying to steal his buggy horse. After killing the soldier, Dupree and his son James hid nearby for two to three months in a cave that was especially dugout for them into the bank of Otter Creek. Eventually, a Union army officer resolved the situation allowing the father and son to return safely home.\(^{17}\)

Farm products were sold by Dupree to the Confederate Army during the war. Receipts document three of these sales between April and September 1863, of corn and fodder by Dupree. The first sale of 800 pounds of fodder for sixteen dollars took place near Falkland on April 22. However, the second two payments were received in Kinston. On May 30, he was paid $167.60 for 4,660 pounds of fodder and thirty-one bushels of corn, and again on September 28, $150 for fifty bushels of corn.\(^{18}\)

The years following the Civil War were challenging ones in which Thomas B. Dupree managed to keep the 520-acre plantation intact. His eldest surviving son Joseph Alvin studied law at the University of North Carolina in 1867-68 until the university closed and afterwards continued his studies living at home.\(^{19}\) In 1870, the Dupree household included five sons ranging in age from twenty-three to eleven years old. The valuation of the farm was $4,000, and Dupree’s estimate of his personal property had declined to $8,000. Paying wages to laborers required cash, and in 1870, Dupree acknowledged having paid $2,800 in wages. Most of his farming activities focused on cotton production using paid laborers in tandem with five mules and two oxen to

\(^{13}\) U. S. Census, 1860, agriculture and slave schedules, Pitt County. Note: Real estate and farm valuations corresponded in the 1860 Census.

\(^{14}\) Norris, Potter’s Raid, 119, 121-123. Note: Dupree’s Ford is near the site of the grist mill and dam built in 1804.

\(^{15}\) Copeland, Chronicles of Pitt County, N. C., 280.

\(^{16}\) Copeland, Chronicles of Pitt County, N. C., 281.

\(^{17}\) Crisp, “Uncle Aleck Was There But Didn’t Stay Long,” News and Observer, August 2, 1925; “Thomas Dupree’s Cave,” Pitt County Genealogical Quarterly, August 2003, 28-29; King, Sketches of Pitt County, 162.

\(^{18}\) Photocopies of National Archives receipts in Bucky Moore Family Records.

\(^{19}\) Copeland, Chronicles of Pitt County, N. C., 281.
harvest fifty bales. Yields were greatly reduced for other crops: corn, 1,250 bushels; sweet potatoes, 150 bushels; and Irish potatoes, fifty bushels. Livestock numbers had also diminished and included two horses, five pigs, and three milch cows. A valuation of $6,050 was given for all farm production that year.  

Although the financial situation for Thomas B. Dupree and his family seemed reasonably secure in 1870, a complex series of mortgages, payments, and land transactions over the next twenty years seems to convey a different financial story, one that was also filled with personal loss. Some problems were adverted when his brother, Redmond R. Dupree, a wealthy Edgecombe County farmer, purchased 300 acres of the farm on February 26, 1875, for $2,000. His son Joseph Alvin moved to Greenville in 1878 to become a Pitt County deputy sheriff. By 1880, Thomas B. Dupree’s household included nine people, three of whom were his sons and two were servants. Two sons, Redmond and Thomas Jr., were farmers, and the third, Francis Marion, sold lightning rods. The 1880 agricultural schedule lists sixty-eight year-old Thomas B. as the owner of a 115-acre farm valued at $2,000 and his eldest son Thomas as a tenant working a nearby 110-acre farm. The yields for the 115-acre farm included twelve bales of cotton on thirty acres, 200 bushels of Indian corn on thirty acres, and 200 bushels of sweet potatoes on one acre. Smaller quantities of oats and wheat were also harvested and five acres were devoted to fruit trees: four acres to a hundred apple trees and one acre to fifty peach trees. A grape arbor enabled Dupree to produce ten gallons of wine. The fruit of both the orchard and arbor were for domestic use only. Later that year, tragedy struck. In September, Dupree’s two sons, Redmond Renn and Thomas, died of typhoid fever within three days of each other. Their father Thomas died two years later on September 23, 1882. His widow Sarah continued to live on the farm until deteriorating finances caused her on January 28, 1887 to convey the 125-acre farm in exchange for $1,000 to M. B. Pitt and J. T. Dupree, trading as the firm of Pitt & Dupree at Sparta in Edgecombe County. Sarah then moved to Halifax County where she died on June 14, 1888.

Eight years later after the Dupree mortgages and estate issues were legally resolved, the Thomas Dupree place containing 150 acres was sold to John Morgan for $1,700 on January 22, 1896. Complications continued with new mortgage agreements that once again forced several turnovers until John Wilson Moore purchased the farm for $2,400 on October 3, 1905. This purchase increased Moore’s land holdings in the area. As the previous year, he had purchased the neighboring 170-acre J. A. Dupree tract.

John W. Moore (1856-1924), moved to Pitt County from the Black Creek area of Wilson County in 1863 as a child with his mother Emma Eliza Gardner Moore to live with his grandfather William Gardner following the death of his father Calvin Moore during the Civil War. In 1871, they resettled on fifty acres of woodland located between Falkland and Fountain that his mother purchased from her father. On December 13, 1877, John married Amanda Harrell and they soon began to raise a family that grew to include seven children, four boys and three girls. All were born at the homeplace, which totaled ninety acres in 1880. A farmer, John was growing a limited range of crops that included Indian corn, oats, wheat, and sweet potatoes. Eighteen acres, however, were devoted to growing cotton and producing eight bales. Much of what was grown on the farm supported their growing family. John Moore believed in hard work and the value of education.

As his farming ventures prospered, Moore acquired additional farms, including the 170-acre J. A. Dupree tract in 1904, the 150-acre “Thomas Dupree homeplace” in 1905, and the 269-acre J. W. Dupree tract in 1914, all near the Tar River and Otter Creek. Moore also purchased nearby a small two-acre tract on the

---

20 U. S. Census, 1870, agriculture schedule, Pitt County.
21 Pitt County Deed Book SS:609; TT:53; TT:176; I-3:455; B-3:410.
22 Copeland, Chronicles of Pitt County, N.C., 281.
23 U. S. Census, 1880, agriculture schedule, Pitt County.
24 Tarboro Southerner, September 23, 1880.
25 Pitt County Deed Book Q-4:356. Note: Thomas B. Dupree died without a will, and nine years after his death on August 4, 1891, the Pitt County Superior Court named his son Joseph Alvin Dupree as administrator for the Thomas B. Dupree estate. (Pitt County Record of Executors, Book 1:361)
29 Copeland, Chronicles of Pitt County, N. C., 529-530; U. S. Census, 1880, population and agriculture schedules, Pitt County.
Tar River called Dupree’s Landing where he operated a sawmill and cotton gin. At the Thomas Dupree homeplace, the land comprised both woodland and open fields. South of Otter Creek cut over timberland was allowed to naturally reseed. Also, during the early twentieth century, outbuildings associated with the farm began to reflect a cash crop trend in Pitt County, a shift from cotton to tobacco. The documented former existence of four log tobacco barns that once clustered around the looping shelter at its four corners underscores the growing importance of tobacco in Moore’s farming operations. Although cotton was once one of the farm’s vital crop, no such structural evidence exists today of it underscoring the wholesale importance of this shift. Also, two tenant complexes were established on the west side of the Buck Moore Road north of the Dupree homeplace. Both, however, are now gone. By 1918, John W. Moore owned debt-free 1,485 acres of farmland in addition to a sawmill and cotton gin at Dupree’s Landing. Throughout his adult life, he operated his farms while living at his family home between Fountain and Falkland on N. C. Highway 222. On February 5, 1918, Moore deeded a substantial farm to each of his children in turn for a modest annual rent that was paid to Moore until his death on October 11, 1924. Legally, each child’s deed was a life estate that would pass in fee simple to his or her children. Louis Alonzo Moore received the Thomas Dupree homeplace, which at that time included roughly 200 acres.31

Louis Alonzo Moore (1884-1950), as a single, twenty-two-year-old man, moved to the Dupree place in 1906 to operate the farm for his father as a tenant. He married Mary Lou Ida Wooten on October 19, 1907, and by 1920, their family included a son and three daughters. Moore was a farmer and locally peddled sweet potatoes using his truck and delivering them to customers as far as Fountain. He was also a member of the Falkland Presbyterian Church in nearby Falkland. Following the death of his first wife in 1928, Moore remarried twice and with his second wife Sarah had another son, Lindsey A. Moore born in 1937. Over time he purchased three additional properties: an eighty-five acre Tar River tract, the twenty-five acre Sharp Point tract, and 125-acre Halifax County farm located between Tarboro and Scotland Neck. In 1937, as a well-respected farmer in Falkland Township, he was appointed to be a Pitt County representative on the board of the newly established Edgecombe-Martin County Electric Membership Cooperative. It was the first New Deal-era electric cooperative established in North Carolina.32 The next year he introduced electricity to the farm and shortly thereafter had a brick pump house constructed to operate the household well. His domestic modernizations also included the installation of a bathroom ca. 1940 in the main house.

Operated as a tenant farm by L. A. Moore, the Dupree homeplace over time included three tenant complexes, two north of the main house and the one to the east that he had built ca. 1922, all located along Buck Moore Road. Up until 1958, all tenants were white and each tenant farm was described as a 1- or 2-horse crop. The fields were farmed on half shares with the land and equipment supplied by the farm owner and all labor furnished by the tenant. Expenses such as fertilizer were halved by the tenants and farmer. L. A. Moore’s brother, Joseph William Moore, lived in the northern-most tenant house until his death in 1936. The house burned in 1956. Little is known about the early tenants of the next complex. However, L. A. Moore’s daughter, Eva Pearl Moore, who married Ralph Stokes, inherited the property in 1950 and continued to rent it as a tenant farm until it was destroyed in the 1990s. When L. A. Moore’s eldest child Mary married Lloyd E. Stokes on January 7, 1922, he hired local carpenter Joe Cobb to build for the newly-weds the small tenant house (#8) located to the east. Later tenants included the Harris family and in the 1940s Eddie Strickland.33 This house and its packhouse (#9) are the sole survivors representing these tenant farming complexes.

For forty years, Moore’s management of the two-hundred acre farm illustrated a progressive transition from cotton to tobacco as a cash crop while simultaneously maintaining a production balance with other crops and the home garden. The household garden and orchard were each one-half acre in size and paralleled one another southwest of the main house. The orchard contained peach and apple trees that produced until about 1945. Moore regularly

31 Copeland, Chronicles of Pitt County, N. C., 530; Pitt County Deed Book V-25:275.
32 Encyclopedia of North Carolina, s.v. “Edgecombe County.”
33 Bucky Moore Interview, March 13, 2012.
took a portion of his peach crop to Belvoir and had brandy made for domestic purposes. In 1924 pecan trees were planted to the north and west of the main house and at the tenant house. By 1925, the farm included twenty-three acres of cotton, twenty acres of corn, nineteen acres of tobacco, and sixteen acres of soybeans. Minor crops included two acres of hay, one-and-a-half acres of sweet potatoes and a half acre of Irish potatoes. In Pitt County, the slow exit of cotton had begun as well as the introduction of peanuts. After ten years, in 1935, the numbers had shifted to include twenty-three acres of corn followed by a second crop of soybeans, sixteen acres of tobacco, and thirteen acres each of peanuts and cotton. The cultivation of sweet potatoes had grown to three acres. By 1945, cotton was no longer grown on the farm and the acreage for tobacco and peanut production had risen to the same level roughly twenty-eight acres. Sweet potato acreage declined slightly.

First as a tenant and later its owner, L. A. Moore modified the built environment of the farm by constructing new domestic and farm outbuildings as needed. A small sweet potato house (#10) was built ca. 1910 for curing and storage. Its location beside the farm lane near the front of the main house and road conveys the importance of the crop to Moore, as a peddler. He was also responsible for the construction of the smokehouse (#2), mule barn (#6), and several tobacco buildings, namely a packhouse (#7), log tobacco barn (#12), looping shelter (#11), and grading room (#3). Overtime, it was usual for tobacco related-farm packhouses to be relocated on the farm to more convenient locations. His two-story packhouse was moved in the early 1930s from the northern edge of the northeast field to its present site in the same field near the bend in Buck Moore Road opposite the mule barn. L. A. Moore may have also built the hen and biddy houses that are now gone but were located respectively near the main house to the west and south. From 1925 and 1935, Moore developed his livestock holdings increasing their numbers in most cases respectively from one hundred laying hens to three hundred and one sow to ten. In all likelihood, the Moores were locally selling their eggs. However, the need for milk cows declined from two in 1925 to none in 1945. In 1935, Moore owned four mules that could be housed separately in the four-stall mule barn. During the Depression he used mule manure for fertilizer since he was unable to get regular fertilizer.

Although mules continued to be used to plow fields, L. A. Moore welcomed modern timesaving methods of farming. In the mid-1930s, he first purchased a two-row John Deere model A tractor with spiked wheels as well as a disc and a Sickle mower attachment. He used this equipment to disc and mow his fields as well as cut hay and disc land for other farmers. Later, he converted its spiked wheels to rubber tires. During the 1930s he traded it for another John Deere tractor, a two-row model B with a cultivator attachment. L. A. Moore plowed his peanut fields with a two-wheel peanut plow with iron spokes. For harvesting peanuts, Moore owned a Benthall peanut picker. After the peanuts were dug and stacked in the fields to dry, the stacks were then loaded onto mule-drawn carts with two wood-spoked wheels and carried to the picker located in the field. Here the picker sorted the peanuts from its hay creating a dust laden environment. Later, the L. A. Moore farm also had a one-ton 1947 Chevrolet pickup truck. During the peanut harvest, it was rigged to provide power for the picker by jacking up the rear end, removing one back tire, and connecting a belt to the tire rim and the fly wheel on the side of the picker. When the truck was put in gear, it ran the stationary picker.

During World War II, L. A. Moore managed the farm without the assistance of his eldest son, Amos Louis “Buck” Moore (1918-1985) who graduated from Belvoir-Falkland High School in 1936 and enlisted in the U. S. Army on October 17, 1941. As the war was raging in the fall of 1944, L. A. Moore suffered a debilitating stroke that left him bedridden for the remainder of his life. After serving with the infantry in the European theater, “Buck” Moore was discharged on October 17, 1945 and returned home to manage the family farm for his father. On January 23, 1946, L. A. Moore’s third wife Ada Mayo died. From that point until his father died on January 18, 1950, Buck continued to live at the Dupree house and hired domestic help to take care of his father, household chores, and his thirteen-year-old half-brother, Lindsey A. Moore. Following L. A. Moore’s
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death, the 209-acre farm was divided into nine parcels among his five children. Buck Moore, the administrator of the estate, received the Dupree house tract which included thirty-five-and-a-half acres.38

On January 31, 1947, Buck Moore married Georgia Lou Williams (1919-1998), and they resided in the main house raising their son, Amos L. “Bucky” Moore Jr., who was born August 1, 1950, and Lindsay A. Moore. A black woman, known as “Aunt” Charity Gorham provided live-in domestic help during the week and returned to her nearby farm each weekend. On October 15, 1954 Hurricane Hazel damaged the farm destroying the primary barn and the lane of cedar trees leading up to the house. The next spring, the Moore family began to update the house adding a Mt. Vernon-style front porch.39 The firm of Eagles & Lovelace from Crisp, N. C. also was hired to paint several buildings and re-putty all windows. Buildings included in this contract were the main house, tenant house, pack barn, potato house, and shelter. All were scraped of loose scales with a wire brush before an undercoat was applied and then painted a gloss white. Both the main and tenant houses and the pack barn received a third coat of paint.40

On his farm, Buck Moore continued to raise tobacco, soybeans, corn, peanuts, and occasionally wheat by regularly rotating his crops and using fertilizer, respectively Smith-Douglas, Virginia-Carolina (V-C), and Blount’s. The grain crops were usually sold to a local mill and grain company in Fountain. Tobacco was sold at auction markets in Farmville, Tarboro, and Greenville. After selling the old Benthall peanut picker at his father’s estate sale, Moore began bartering peanut picking services with his nephew Ed Stokes for the peanut hay stating that he never wanted to take part in this “dirty work” again. Stokes sold this high quality hay, which was in great demand by cattle owners for feed, since it had more peanut leaves having been stacked in the traditional manner. Moore continued to stack his peanuts in this traditional manner through the late 1960s under contract to provide certified seed peanuts for the James Keel Peanut Company in Greenville. Moore farmed his own fields and had oversight of his half-brother Lindsey’s tenant farm, with the tenant receiving half share, Lindsey one third, and Buck one sixth. If the tenants worked at the homeplace farm, Buck paid them hourly wages. This arrangement continued until 1965 when Moore purchased the two parcels containing a total of thirty-five-and-a-half acres owned by Lindsey Moore.41

Attrition and advances in farming practices initiated other changes to the farm and its outbuildings. One of the log tobacco barns had burned prior to 1950, so Buck Moore replaced it with a frame one (#13) about 1951, returning the farm’s total number of tobacco barns to five. In 1954, he joined with his siblings and first cousin to collectively improve drainage on their property by using a drag line to expand into a deeper canal the ditch that historically bisected the fields from the northwest to the southeast. Later that year, Moore salvaged materials from the destroyed barn and constructed on the same site the present shed-roof equipment shelter with six bays. In the south pasture near Otter Creek, a large L-shaped irrigation pond was constructed in 1958 to help improve production yields. Just north of this area, the former apple and peach orchard had played out and was converted into a pasture. Paralleling it to the north was the household garden, which was tilled until 1985 when it became part of the row crop field. Bulk tobacco barns were introduced to the farm in 1972. By 1975, the three oldest tobacco barns near the looping shelter had been torn down, and the two remaining tobacco barns stood unused and obsolete.42

Throughout the year, the half-acre household garden provided vegetables and fruit for the family meals. Under the tutelage of Aunt Charity, Georgia Moore became well-known locally for canning fresh vegetables to be used during the off-season months. Plantings in the household garden reflected the seasons. The spring and summer garden included potatoes, onions, snap beans, butter beans, beets, carrots, sweet potatoes, squash, sweet corn, okra, field peas, strawberries, and tomatoes. Later winter salad greens were planted including mustard, cabbage and collards as well as turnips and rutabagas with their roots. To run rows and plow the garden, Buck would borrow a mule from his sister’s neighboring farm. Later he worked the garden using a John Deere 40 tractor. Like the orchard, this land became part of the row crop field in 1985.

39 Interview with Bucky Moore, March 13, 2012.
41 Interviews with Bucky Moore, March 13 and March 19 & 22, 2012.
42 Interview with Bucky Moore, March 13, 2012.
As the mechanization in farming continued to develop, more equipment was available to assist farmers. Earlier in 1950, Moore had bought his father’s John Deere model B tractor at the estate sale but quickly traded it for a model M with cultivator, disc, and planter. In 1954 he sold it and purchased a John Deere 40 tractor with its associated implement attachments. Even though beginning in 1964, Buck Moore added other larger tractors to his operation and had as many as five, it is the John Deere 40 that remains on the farm today. A New Idea corn snapper machine also allowed him to manage more profitably his corn crop. Noted for harvesting corn with the husk, this machine assisted Moore who oftentimes stored his crop in the two-story packhouse waiting for corn prices to rise. About 1965, two cylindrical metal grain bins, with a total capacity of 5,500 bushels, were installed at the farm between the looping shelter and household garden. These bins were removed in 2008.43

On the other hand, tobacco harvesting was not fully mechanized until 1972, when bulk barns were introduced. Until then, Moore had continued to rent two mules from J. P. Brewer in Belvoir during the harvest to truck tobacco from the fields to the looping shelter where tobacco was bundled, tied, and looped on sticks. These sticks were then taken to the tobacco barns and hung according to rooms to wait curing. At this time for curing in the traditional barns, Moore used kerosene oil. Bulk barns, however, required LP gas for curing the tobacco that had been mounded and compressed into metal racks in each barn.44

A. L. “Buck” Moore retired from farming 1979, and ever since, his crop land has been rented to local farmers. Buck Moore died on August 2, 1985, with his wife Georgia inheriting a life estate in the farm. The following year, Georgia purchased three additional parcels from Buck’s sister Florence M. Harrell containing 56.5 acres that were associated with the 1950 division of L. A. Moore farm. About 1995, a ca. 1951 packhouse was moved from the Pearl M. Stokes portion of the L. A. Moore division and relocated just west of the farm’s two tobacco barns. This move, from its original site on east side of Buck Moore Road where it was previously associated with one of the farm’s former tenant complexes, was undertaken to preserve it. Georgia Moore died three years later in 1998 and her son Amos Louis “Bucky” Moore inherited the farm.45

At the turn of the twenty-first century, the farm’s principal crops were cotton, peanuts, wheat, and soybeans. Cotton was re-introduced in 2000-2001, and soon became the farm’s major crop. The 2004-2005 buy out of tobacco quotas eliminated the presence of tobacco. The management of woodland was ongoing with the woods north of the main house and west of Buck Moore Road reseeded in pine in 2000 and the woods south of Otter Creek cut and also reseeded in pine in 2005. Farming practices through the years have obliterated any evidence of the Dupree family cemetery that is thought to have stood in the field southwest of the main house. Buildings known to have been a part of the domestic complex that are now lost include: wash house; a two-room wood house with one-room for stove wood and the other heater wood; hen house; biddy house; and a four-hole privy. In 2005, John W. Moore’s great-grandson “Bucky” and his wife, Sylvia Morris Moore purchased the last three tracts associated with the 1950 division minus a small lot with road frontage that contains two-fifths of an acre. Having virtually reunited L. A. Moore’s 209-acre farm historically known as the Thomas Dupree homeplace, the family of Bucky Moore is presently restoring the Dupree-Moore house. Recently, the North Carolina Department of Agriculture presented Amos L. “Bucky” Moore Jr. with a “North Carolina Century Farm” certificate honoring the Moore family’s ownership of the property.46

---

43 Interview with Bucky Moore, March 19 & 22, 2012.
44 Interview with Bucky Moore, March 19 & 22, 2012. Note: In Scism, “Carolina Tobacco Barns,” a room is defined as “the space from the top to the bottom of the barn that lies between two poles called tiers or racks.”
45 Ibid.
Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Agricultural Context for Pitt County, North Carolina

Throughout the nineteenth century, agriculture provided the economic backbone for North Carolina’s predominately rural population that lived largely on small farms laboring to produce subsistence crops. Indian corn was the state’s leading farm product. Only a small percentage of the population was associated with larger plantations that profited from the use of slave labor and production of commercial crops, such as cotton. With access primarily to local markets, farmers had limited trade outlets, a fact that stifled growth until internal improvements such as roads, canals and railroads were completed during the antebellum period. Commerce along navigable rivers, however, provided an important outlet for inland farmers. About 1840, a renewed interest in growing cotton took hold, and its production numbers steadily increased until the Civil War. It was the state’s leading commercial crop with approximately a dozen eastern counties producing the highest yields.47

Generally in North Carolina, most antebellum farms were small farms. In 1860, approximately seventy per cent of landowners in the state owned less than one-hundred acres with only two per cent owning more than 500 acres. Also, seventy per cent of North Carolina’s landowners did not own slaves. Two thirds of those who did, however, owned less than ten slaves each. An average farm contained 316 acres, slightly less than in 1850. In 1860, the U. S. census records 85,198 farmers and 121 planters in North Carolina.48

Located in the central coastal plain and bisected by the Tar River, Pitt County was comprised typically of small subsistence farms interspersed with a small number of plantations during the early nineteenth century and antebellum years. Trade along the Tar River aided commerce throughout the region. The county’s land area included principally upland piney woodland as well as river bottom and swamp areas. Pitt County also contained geologically a natural marl belt, a layer of mixed clays, carbonates of calcium and magnesium, and remnants of shells, forming a loam used as fertilizer. In response to promotions by leading agriculturists, new farming practices were slowly initiated that included the use of fertilizers to replenish soil nutrients. During the 1830s, local farmers increasingly made productive use of marl especially in piney woods areas. Its use by Josiah Barrett, a Pitt County farmer, resulted in a documented fifty-percent increase in his corn crop.49 Through the years, grain production prompted the development of local milling operations throughout the county. Established in the late eighteenth century, Sheppard’s Mill Pond is the county’s earliest survivor.50

By 1850, Pitt County farms included 86,382 improved acres and 216,142 unimproved acres. Indian corn with 458,478 bushels harvested was the county’s major crop followed by sweet potatoes, peas and beans, and rice. Only 171 bales of cotton and 102 pounds of tobacco were produced. Livestock commonly included horses, swine, sheep, milch cows, and cattle. At this time, 6,664 whites, 100 free blacks, and 6,633 slaves comprised the county’s population.51 The 1860 U. S. census figures indicate that improved farm land increased to 106,164 acres as did the number of farm implements and machinery. A rise in slave labor and improved farming methods helped support higher production figures for major crops: 707,703 bushels of Indian corn, 186,068 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 7,634 bales of cotton. Pitt County was one of twelve counties in the state that exceeded producing 4,000 bales of cotton and was considered a part of its “cotton kingdom.”52 Tobacco figures remained low with 737 pounds of leaf harvested. In 1860, the population of Pitt County was 16,080, of which 8,473 were slaves.53

During the Reconstruction years until the end of the nineteenth century in North Carolina, landowners relied heavily on tenant farming, especially sharecropping. With many landowners receiving a three-fourth crop share, both white and black laborers eeked out a living. Of the 2,361 farms in Pitt County, owners cultivated 1,446 farms, tenants rented seventy-three, and sharecroppers worked on 842. Cotton remained the
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53 U. S. Census, Agriculture 1860, 236; Power, Historic Architecture of Pitt County, N. C., 11.
state's principal cash crop. Production of all traditional crops such as corn, sweet potatoes, soybeans, peanuts, wheat, and hay continued. In 1880, Pitt County was described as one of the best cotton counties in the state with its acreage occupying half of the county's cultivated land. Shipments of cotton were made by steamboat from the county's landings along the Tar River and then on to Norfolk and New York. Pitt County’s grain crop was larger in proportion to that of most North Carolina cotton counties. Rice and potatoes, especially sweet potatoes, were also important.54 During this time In North Carolina, tobacco production of both burley and flue cured was rapidly advancing chiefly in its piedmont counties with the state receiving by 1900 international recognition for being the primary source of tobacco in the United States.55 With only three acres of tobacco grown in Pitt County in 1880, the county's acreage dramatically increased to 12,931, on which 10,733,010 pounds were produced in 1899.56

The one-hundred-fifteen acre farm of Thomas B. Dupree in 1879 reflects these farming trends and also illustrates possible familial tenant relationships. Dupree produced a cash crop of twelve bales of cotton on thirty acres and did not grow any tobacco. Indian corn, sweet potatoes, oats, and wheat were his other principal crops. He employed white farm laborers for twenty-two weeks and paid $100 in wages. Having purchased no commercial fertilizer, he farmed using one ox and two mules. His farm implements and machinery had a value of forty dollars. Of the five farmers listed in 1880 after Thomas B. Dupree, all were tenants renting for shares including Dupree’s son Thomas and his son-in-law W. B. F. Newton. His son Thomas, who lived at home, had 100 acres that included fifty acres of tilled land. Thomas produced on fifteen acres one-hundred and twenty-five bushels of Indian corn and on another fifteen acres seven bales of cotton. Like his father and Newton, he was also raising swine and poultry on a small scale. Using a yoke of oxen, Newton farmed fifty tilled acres, on which he planted twenty acres in Indian corn and thirty in cotton. These brothers-in-law, Thomas and W. B. F also respectively paid $150 and forty dollars in wages for farm labor and purchased forty and twenty-five dollars in fertilizer. Only Thomas owned farm implements and machinery, which had a value of one hundred dollars. All three farmers incurred costs of twenty-five to thirty dollars for repairing and building fences. None sold any forest products. The estimated value of all farm production was $800 for these two tenant farmers and $550 for Thomas B. Dupree.57

The cultivation of tobacco was an arduous and labor intensive business requiring close attention throughout all growing and curing phases. Each phase demanded the handwork of many, young and old alike, who labored through difficult conditions. The seasonal nature of the business created a tobacco culture and economy around which entire families and communities operated. Tobacco farms became recognizable on the rural landscape throughout North Carolina featuring fields, barns, grading rooms, packhouses, and sheds. At some farms, these buildings were clustered together and at others, they lined farm roads along side tobacco fields.58 Following the 1905 purchase of the Thomas Dupree homeplace by John W. Moore, this farm and its management embodies over the next thirty years a gradual transition in agriculture from cotton to tobacco. As Moore continued to purchase neighboring tracks of land that extended to the Tar River, he also bought Dupree’s Landing, where he operated a sawmill and cotton gin. Although cotton was Moore’s primary cash crop initially, tobacco production steadily increased requiring the construction of tobacco barns, packhouses, grading rooms, and looping sheds. Most were conveniently clustered along farm roads with grading houses near dwellings. Construction of barns over time shifted from log to frame and curing methods shifted from wood to kerosene oil. Packhouses were usually one-or-two story frame buildings with either a side- or front-gable roof, and oftentimes, a one-story shed addition served as an equipment or looping shelter. The looping shelters were open-sided structures with a roof to provide shelter while tobacco was tie and secured to sticks before being hung in barns for curing.

Another crop that began to command good prices thereby encouraging increased production in Pitt County at the turn of the twentieth century was peanuts. Between 1890 and 1910, acreage given over to growing peanuts steadily increased with 219 acres in 1890, 2,127 acres in 1900, and 4,383 in 1910.

57 U. S. Census, 1880, agriculture schedule, Pitt County, N. C.
Production levels rose dramatically from 4,234 bushels in 1890 to 173,804 bushels in 1910. Competition for acreage possibly with tobacco advancing as a new cash crop may have instigated a precipitous drop in the county’s peanut production with 612 acres planted in 1920 that yielded 32,949 bushels.\(^5^9\) In eastern North Carolina intrepid farmers and inventors developed patents for peanut pickers. F. F. Ferguson and J. T. Benthall of Murfreesboro patented a version in 1905 as did J. L. Harrington of Lewiston several years later in 1912. Ferguson and Benthall continued to refine their equipment in 1909 but separately. Benthall had moved his business to Suffolk, Virginia, where in 1909 he patented a combination peanut picker and stemmer. By 1921 Mordecai M. Nixon of Edenton had designed a machine for digging peanuts out of the ground. How profitable and productive these machines became is unknown combined with the numerous others submitting patents for peanut pickers.\(^6^0\) In Pitt County, yield figures, however, fluctuated through the 1950s with 16,044,901 pounds harvested in 1944, 6,093,621 pounds in 1949, and 8,754,496 pounds in 1959.\(^6^1\) From the 1920s into the 1940s, the decisions being made by farm owners of moderate-sized farms in Pitt County about growing peanuts as a profitable crop is illustrated by L. A. Moore at the Dupree-Moore Farm in Falkland Township. The 1925 census records that Moore did not devote any acreage to growing peanuts that year, but by 1935, he had thirteen acres planted in both peanuts and cotton and by 1945, twenty-eight acres in peanuts. At some time possibly the 1930s, Moore purchased a Benthall peanut picker that was used on the farm until it was sold at his estate sale in 1950.\(^6^2\)

During much of the twentieth century in North Carolina, agriculture continued to be the backbone of the state’s economy in part due to tobacco production and improvements in fertilizers and farming practices. Mules were increasingly relied upon to work the fields and through the first half of the century their numbers rapidly increased. Their endurance, sure-footedness, hardiness, and reduced feed requirements underscored their usefulness to farmers.\(^6^3\) In 1924 the invention of the Farmall tractor began to allow farmers to mechanically cultivate fields as well as plow them. Mechanization on North Carolina farms, however, became more common place during the mid-twentieth century and precipitated an increase in the size of plowed fields. By the Great Depression, the destruction of cotton crops by the pest, boll weevils, radically diminished its growth throughout the state.\(^6^4\) Although farmers experienced tremendous hardships when crop prices fell precipitously, a quota system was initiated in 1938 to aid them that began providing price supports for crops including tobacco. Nearly twenty years later, tobacco reached its high point in North Carolina with the production in 1955 of the state’s largest crop, nearly one billion pounds. Also, four of the “nation’s top leading tobacco-manufacturing centers” were located in the state. Growing health concerns associated with smoking began to slowly erode the industry throughout the last half of the century.\(^6^5\) North Carolina, however, continued to grow more flue-cured tobacco than any where else in the world. Until the 1970s, harvesting and curing tobacco was labor intensive, requiring the handwork of many workers. This system was soon revolutionized by mechanization and bulk curing.\(^6^6\)

The Dupree-Moore Farm in Pitt County mirrors these general agricultural trends from the continued use of mules and fertilizer to the mechanization of farm equipment and a shift toward tobacco production. Mules were used to plow fields and the domestic garden until the mid-twentieth century. Commercial fertilizers helped increase crop production but during the Depression when L. A. Moore was unable to regularly get it, he used mule manure. Moore also began purchasing modern farm equipment, including in the 1930s a John Deere tractor with mower and a Benthall peanut picker. By the mid 1940s, Moore was no longer raising cotton and tobacco had taken its place. As tobacco production on the farm increased, tobacco barns and packhouses were constructed. However, in 1972, most of these buildings became obsolete when bulk barns were introduced to the farm.


\(^{60}\) York, Peanut Pickers Research File with notes.

\(^{61}\) York, Peanut Pickers Research File with notes.


\(^{64}\) Encyclopedia of North Carolina, s.v. “Mules.”

\(^{65}\) Encyclopedia of North Carolina, s.v. “Agriculture” and “Boll Weevils.”

\(^{66}\) Encyclopedia of North Carolina, s.v. “Tobacco.”

Agricultural trends within the state were mirrored by farms in Pitt County during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. By 1890 there were 2,102 farms in the county and their acreage included 153,136 improved and 185,690 unimproved acres. By 1910, 3,047 of the county’s 4,696 farms were tenant operated and 2,602 of these were share croppers. The number of farms continued to rise to 5,937 by 1920, of which 4,252 were tenant operated and 1,674 by owners. Most Pitt County farms in 1920 contained between ten and forty-nine acres totaling 3,954; however, the number of larger farms was appreciably smaller. There were 497 farms with 100 to 174 acres and 134 farms containing 175 to 259 acres. Over these thirty years, many farmers began to invest heavily in tobacco and slowly reduce cotton acreage. Although 39,369 acres produced 12,493 bales of cotton in 1890, improved farming practices had increased production figures in 1920 to 20,611 bales on less acreage that totaled 28,922. Tobacco acreage, on the other hand, grew exponentially from seventy acres in 1890 producing approximately 27,000 pounds to 32,643 acres in 1920 generating 25,390,860 pounds of bright leaf. Within North Carolina, Pitt County was in the center of the tobacco growing area known as the “New Bright Belt.” Corn, soybeans, sweet potatoes, and peanuts remained the county’s staple crops with the following 1920 production figures: 1,029,957 bushels of corn on 42,937 acres; 9,281 bushels of soybeans on 1,033 acres; 134,546 bushels of sweet potatoes on 973 acres; and 32,949 bushels of peanuts on 612 acres. Most orchards included apple, peach, and pear trees. Also, 111,144 pounds of grapes were harvested from 1,323 fruit bearing vines. Mules were increasingly relied upon to plow and cultivate the land. In 1890, there were in the county 1,545 mules, a number that had dramatically risen to 5,458 by 1920.

Even with the Depression in the 1930s, farming production figures continued to rise in Pitt County. By 1935 in Falkland Township, owners cultivated only 680 acres while tenants farmed 7,690 acres. These farmers were raising a cross-section of crops including corn on 3,392 acres, cotton on 1,180 acres, tobacco on 2,331 acres, peanuts on 240 acres, soybeans on 945 acres, sweet potatoes on 146.4 acres, and Irish potatoes on sixty-six acres. The 1934 tabulations for Pitt County were the following: 54,769 acres of corn yielded 1,105,863 bushels; 8,421 acres of cotton produced 9,189 bales; 32,312 acres of tobacco produced 29,507,976 pounds; and 2,047 acres of sweet potatoes yielded 233,760 bushels. Mules continued to provide labor in Pitt County fields and their number totaled 3,866 in 1935.

For the Dupree-Moore Farm near Falkland in Pitt County, its operation and crop production followed suit with many of the county’s moderately sized farms during the first half of the twentieth century. By the 1930s, it included three separate tenant complexes that at times were occupied by extended family. Tenants worked on half shares and all tenants were white. On the farm, while cotton production was diminishing, tobacco became its replacement. In 1925 Moore was growing cotton on twenty-three acres and tobacco on nineteen acres, but by 1935 during the Depression, he planted only thirteen acres of cotton and sixteen acres of tobacco. Tobacco had begun to surpass cotton even during these depressed times. Corn, soybeans, and sweet potatoes were standard crops during these years. Peanut production, however, was also on the rise. Even though Moore began to acquire modern farming equipment in the 1930s, mules continued to plow his fields. Electricity was introduced at the farm in 1938.

Following the World War II, farm production statistics continued generally to rise but figures for cotton had diminished significantly. Within Pitt County, 4,367 tenants farmed seventy-three percent of the land. In Falkland Township owners cultivated 524 acres while tenants farmed 8,843 acres. Farmers were raising varied crops including corn on 3,508 acres, cotton on 205 acres, tobacco 2,398 on acres, peanuts on 1,475 acres, oats on 418 acres, soybeans on 290 acres, sweet potatoes on 65 acres, and various types of hay on 1,213 acres. In Pitt County the 1949 agricultural production figures for its major crops included the following:
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2,029,931 bushels of corn; 46,143 bushels of soybeans; 181,314 bushels of sweet potatoes, 7,897 bales of cotton, and 36,057,376 pounds of tobacco.  

By the 1950s, the modernization of farms was well underway in many counties in North Carolina, including Pitt County. However, approximately sixty-six percent of the county’s farms were tenant farms in 1959. Rural electrification had opened up new opportunities to save time and money in the home as well as the fields. Farm equipment now included tractors, trucks, and combines as well as milking machines at dairies. Households had telephones, refrigerators, freezers, and washing machines. In Pitt County of the reporting farms, there were 271 grain combines, 497 corn pickers, and 102 pick-up balers, 3,448 farm tractors, 3,416 automobiles, 1,003 telephones, and 1,750 home freezers. Most farm production figures for major crops continued to rise including the following: 3,279,368 bushels of corn, 289,592 bushels of soybeans, 127,242 bushels of sweet potatoes, 5,465 bales of cotton, 8,754,496 pounds of peanuts, and 34,545,086 pounds of tobacco.

Following World War II, the Dupree-Moore Farm was in the grip of major transitions. Cotton was no longer grown on the farm, and its management had shifted to Amos L. Moore after his discharge from the army in 1945. His father, L. A. Moore had suffered a debilitating stroke in 1944 and subsequently died in 1950. A division of the estate apportioned the farm among four siblings, with Amos L. Moore receiving the homeplace comprising thirty-five acres. He, also, managed the tenant farm that his minor brother, Lindsey A. Moore inherited. Both of his sisters continued to operate as tenant farms their inherited portions of the Dupree-Moore Farm. In this shuffling of property, a tobacco packhouse was constructed at one tenant farm since it had none, and another tobacco barn built at the homeplace. Through the joint effort of various family members, a field drainage ditch common to all was converted into a deeper drainage canal. Corn, soybeans, peanuts, and tobacco continued as principal crops. During the 1950s, tractors replaced the work of mules on the farm, except for the plowing of the domestic garden with a borrowed mule. At one point, Amos L. Moore had as many as five tractors. Through the use of electricity and modern appliances, canning and freezing of garden and orchard produce also became an integral part of the farm’s domestic life.

**Architecture Context: Pitt County Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Plantations/Farms**

Domestic architecture in rural Pitt County also followed the traditional and stylistic patterns typically associated with its development in eastern North Carolina throughout the nineteenth century. Frame one-story and one-and-a-half-story dwellings built of mortise-and-tenon construction that were once the norm on the county’s agricultural landscape during the early-to-mid nineteenth century are now rare. Many of these modestly-scaled side-gable houses with traditional hall-and-parlor plans originally incorporated the distinctive form of a coastal cottage through the inclusion of an engaged porch. The hall-and-parlor plan was commonly employed by most small planters and farmers until the mid-nineteenth century. More prosperous planters chose to build large two-story side-gable-roof frame dwellings which followed either a hall-and-parlor or center-hall plan. Each of these house forms exhibited Federal-style features such as, fanlights, three-part mantels with reeded pilasters and sunburst motifs, and doors with six flat panels. Some, however, maintained a retardataire use of Georgian-style doors with six raised panels, for example the William Cobb House (ca. 1819) near Penny Hill. The Guilford Murphy House (ca.1832), now gone, illustrated the modest form of a traditional Federal-style one-story dwelling with side-gable roof, habitable attic, hall-and-parlor plan, and two exterior gable-end paved-shouldered chimneys. These chimneys exhibited the only examples of diapered brickwork in Pitt County. Two of the county’s best examples of a Federal-style coastal cottage are the William Cobb House and the Alfred Moore House (1825) that was once located near the Bell’s Fork area. Although now gone, the Wilson House near Pactolus stood as a Federal-style two-story dwelling with hall-and-parlor plan. At Green Wreath near Bruce, the two-story plantation house (ca.1800) with center-hall-plan fully embodies high-style Federal features including a double-tiered entrance portico with fanlight and a modillion block cornice.

---

Although each of these buildings is an example of the Federal-style, all, however, reflect a vernacular as opposed to an academic interpretation of it in form and detail.\(^\text{77}\)

During the 1840s, a new national architectural idiom, the Greek Revival style, began influencing architectural trends in Pitt County and continued into the post-Civil War years of the 1870s. Its emergence was broadly reflected in a variety of the county’s buildings: houses, churches, stores, and outbuildings. Center-hall plans, many of which were double pile, and hip roofs became synonymous with the Greek Revival-style as did the use of boxed cornices with returns and pedimented gable ends. Mantels, as well as, door and window surrounds often featured fluted pilasters, spayed molding profiles, and cornerblocks as well as elements associated with the classical Greek orders: Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian. The formal adoption of Greek and Roman classicism was promoted through the publication of architectural patternbooks such as Asher Benjamin’s *The Practical House Carpenter* published in 1830 and Minard Lefever’s *The Modern Builder’s Guide* published in 1849. Most rural buildings in Pitt County reflect the combined interpretation of this style made by clients in tandem with local builders and carpenters that produces a blending with vernacular forms and creates a transitional appearance between the earlier Federal style and the Greek Revival mode.

The style was readily embraced throughout the county, a fact reflected in both small one-story dwellings as well as large two-story double-pile dwellings. The Adrian Savage House (ca. 1856), a one-story dwelling with rear shed, combines a more traditional hall-and-parlor plan and with woodwork featuring Federal style-forms that utilize Greek Revival-style moldings. On the exterior, façade windows are framed by fluted pilasters and a simplified entablature, and the side-gable roof has boxed cornices with returns. The two-story Thomas Sheppard House (ca. 1845) exhibits an academic one-story Doric portico, the only surviving example in the county. The two-story, hip-roof, and side-hall-plan DeBerry-Mayo House (ca.1849) exemplifies the influence of architectural patternbooks through its fully elaborated double-leaf entrance featuring sidelights and a transom flanked by fluted pilasters with cornerblocks. Its hip-roof is distinguished by a fully-elaborated academic Doric entablature with a deep eave overhang. In contrast, more modest dwellings incorporated Greek Revival-style details that conveyed its characteristic forms without expressive details. For example at the Nelson Nichols House, the pilasters, frieze, and cornice of its mantels are formed by plain boards with splay-edged details. In the majority of homes, this mantel along with doors distinguished by two-vertical panels were the most common elements used to convey the Greek Revival style.

The growing national popularity of architectural patternbooks continued to influence the adoption of domestic architectural styles throughout the nineteenth century in rural Pitt County. Publications by architects A. J. Downing, Calvert Vaux, and Samuel Sloan popularized picturesque styles. Locally, the Italianate and Gothic Revival styles had little influence on the county’s domestic architecture.\(^\text{78}\) However, the Foreman-Atkinson House (late 1850s) located near Falkland, incorporates several features in combination with its overall Greek Revival-style character to form a dwelling unique within the county. It stands as the county’s only example of a two-story T-plan dwelling with a center hall. Its hip-roof has a deep-eave overhang that is encircled by cornice brackets, a feature characteristic of the Italianate style. Also, each corner post with molded cap has a lancet arch motif that is typical of the Gothic Revival style. On the interior, the walls of the center hall are skillfully marbleized to depict cut laid blocks, and the principal door and window surrounds have robust single crossettes.\(^\text{79}\)

In neighboring Edgecombe County to the northwest, the stylish and picturesque house forms espoused by A. J. Downing in his publications *Cottage Residences* and *Architecture of Country Houses* and Minard Lafever in *Architectural Instructor* (1858) were embraced in both town and rural settings. Noted North Carolina architectural historian, Catherine W. Bishir writes: “Although replication of patternbook plates was the course urged by their authors, most builders used their motifs in the same selective way in which they had employed previous builders’ guides, choosing and adapting certain elements into established building types and local
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preferences. In Edgecombe County, builders on occasion came close to replicating these high-style designs but more often preferred to choose and adapt elements. Porches commonly incorporated the characteristics of picturesque styles by utilizing more readily available turned, scrollwork, and sawnwork elements, such as balusters, brackets and posts. During the mid-nineteenth century at the Blount-Bridgers House in Tarboro, a delicate lattice porch was added around all four sides. In the county, the Cedars (1860) was built as a two-story T-plan dwelling that according to Bishir reflects a "local Italianate idiom at its liveliest, with bracket cornice, molded window hoods, ...and a fanciful version of the lattice porch." Just east of Pinetops, Vinedale built ca. 1855 is a rural example of the Italianate villa with cupola and bracketed eaves that was contemporary with those being constructed in Tarboro, the county seat. Its latticework posts are notable.

Within the northwest portion of Pitt County adjacent to Edgecombe County, several examples of these delicate lattice and sawnwork porches are documented. An early photograph of the Foreman-Atkinson House records the original openwork supports for its hip-roof porch. Another documentary photograph records the now demolished Collier Cobb House and illustrates a small hip-roof porch with lattice supports featuring small curvilinear brackets. Located near King's Crossroads, the two-story Greek Revival-style King House stands as "one of the best preserved antebellum houses in the county and is distinguished by an exceptional hip-roof porch with decorative latticework posts." Near this same intersection, the Tyson House, a modest one-and-a-half-story dwelling with side-gable roof and rear-shed rooms, also exhibits a hip-roof porch with lattice posts. Each of these rural houses was constructed during the mid-nineteenth century. Nearby in the village of Falkland, the Dr. Peyton Hopkins Mayo House (ca. 1859) fully embraces the two-story double-pile form associated with the Greek Revival with a hip roof and a hip-roof porch. Its porch posts are lattice and foliate brackets embellish each.

In comparison, the Dupree-Moore House, as the seat of a modest plantation, illustrates for Pitt County typical stylistic and design progressions common to antebellum domestic architecture as it transitions through the Georgian/Federal, Greek Revival, and then Picturesque/Italianate periods. During these later two stylistic periods, the house was enlarged ca. 1848 and ca. 1861 with some earlier elements remaining in-situ or reinstalled elsewhere within the dwelling. Constructed during the first quarter of the nineteenth century for Rev. Thomas Dupree, his modest one and-a-half story frame dwelling with side-gable roof followed a hall-and-parlor plan. Its Georgian-style doors with six raised panels were originally hung on HL hinges. The mantels reflected a late-Federal style featuring reeded pilasters, plain frieze, and molded cornice. Dupree's son Thomas B. Dupree transformed this dwelling ca. 1848 into a handsome but restrained Greek Revival-style two-story house featuring a center-hall plan with a one-story shed-roof porch and rear addition. Both the doors and mantels from the earlier house were relegated to the rooms on the second floor. Greek Revival in style, its new primary mantels were unadorned post-and-lintel in design and doors typically featured two-vertical panels. Prior to the Civil War, Thomas B. Dupree again enlarged and updated his home by adding an upscale two-story T-addition with flanking one-story shed-roof porches in contrast to a one-story or two-story rear ell. Fashionable Picturesque-style latticework porch supports also updated the façade. All interior features of this addition are plainly executed: baseboards, surrounds, and stair balustrade. In the upstairs, the doors have four slightly raised panels and the mantels are stark post-and-lintel ones. The reverse side of one door exhibited fanciful faux graining. Whether or not this addition was fully finished on the interior before or after the Civil War is uncertain.

Throughout the twentieth century additions and modern conveniences were incorporated into the dwelling, but the overall integrity of the house was not compromised. Electricity and indoor plumbing were introduced about 1940. The kitchen in the T-addition was periodically updated, and in some rooms during the mid 1950s, modern oak flooring was installed on top of the original heart pine floors. In 2011, a major restoration and rehabilitation project of the house was undertaken by its owners Bucky and Sylvia Moore. Aluminum siding was removed from the exterior exposing plain weatherboard sheathing. A Mt. Vernon-type porch added in 1955 was replaced by a reconstruction of the original one using documentary and recently

discovered physical evidence. Three new bathrooms were sensitively installed by replacing the façade’s second-floor trunk room and redefining a former bathroom and closet area within the first floor shed/T-addition connector in an area that formerly included a closet, bathroom and portions of the enclosed south porch. A family room addition now extends from the south elevation that opens into the kitchen and it contains at the rear a laundry room and small engaged porch. The scale, design, materials, workmanship, and location of this addition complement the original dwelling and does not detract from its historic character. Throughout the project, only one miscommunication caused an unfortunate mishap, the loss of historic paint surfaces when several important mantels and doors were sanded and scraped. The success of the Dupree-Moore project can be measured by the fact that it has renewed and rescued an important local link within the fabric of Pitt County’s historic architecture and its agricultural legacy for years to come.

Outbuildings and Farmsteads:

Set within the central coastal plain of eastern North Carolina and bisected by the Tar River, the architectural development of Pitt County throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is tied to its agricultural heritage with farms traditionally ranging from small farmsteads to large plantations. Historically, terrain and use dictated the placement of buildings on the landscape, with dwellings placed at the highest elevation and convenient to road or river traffic, whenever possible. Small or large, all farms included a number of domestic and agricultural-related buildings. In Pitt County, complete pre-Civil War and late nineteenth century examples of these complexes do not exist today, only remnants from various building periods that reflect different building types. On rare occasions, however, these remnants preserve the overall setting, feeling, and association of the farmstead or plantation complex.

During the early nineteenth century and antebellum period in Pitt County, domestic outbuildings such as smokehouses, dairies, and kitchens were easily accessible to the dwelling and usually placed behind it. With large farms and plantations, these complexes became known as seats, reflecting their domestic core. The main house was frame and usually either a one-and-one-half story or two-story dwelling with side-gable roof. Most houses had attached porches. A domestic area might also include other dependencies such as a carriage house, school, office, loom house, and brandy house. Ancillary farm buildings, such as livestock and feed barns, cribs, stables, cotton gins, slave dwellings, and even cemeteries were distanced from the seat. Farm outbuildings were log, plank, or mortise-and-tenon frame construction. Most were frame with either front or side gable roofs and possibly had shed additions. Notable recorded Pitt County examples of these various farm outbuildings are: the plank gable-front smokehouse with extended square-notch corner timbering, the mortise-and-tenon frame corn crib with side gable-roof, and similar gable-front barn located at the Isaac Worthington Farmstead near Ballard’s Crossroads, which are now gone; the two-door brandy house and gable-front smokehouse, both with mortise-and-tenon construction and are located on the John May Farmstead near Farmville; the frame plantation offices located at Greenwreath near Falkland and the Col. Samuel Vines Plantation near Fountain; the cotton gins located at the Cherry Farm near Bethel and Hines Farm near Farmville; and the Yankee Hall storehouse at the nearby landing on the Tar River, which was lost after Hurricane Floyd.83 Outbuildings both domestic and agricultural such as these may have once supported the antebellum plantation of Thomas Dupree.

Located near Simpson, the Daniels-Tucker Farmstead (ca. 1840) stands as “one of the best examples of a middle-class nineteenth-century farmstead” in Pitt County with both domestic and farm-related outbuildings and provides an insight into how the Thomas Dupree farm might have appeared during the early-to-mid-nineteenth century. The house is a Coastal Cottage with Greek Revival-style details, and at the rear, stand three historic outbuildings: a two-room detached kitchen with massive exterior end chimney, a smokehouse made of skinned poles with vertical board sheathing and extended front-gable roof, and a large barn with hewn frame mortise-and-tenon construction. Purchased by the Tucker family in 1872, the farm also includes several complementary late nineteenth and early twentieth century outbuildings just south of the
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dwelling, namely, a four-stall stable, two-door corn crib, and two-story frame packhouse. The Tucker family
cemetery, once outlined by a wrought-iron Victorian era fence, stands nearby in an adjacent field.84

The Robert Joseph Lang Jr. Farm (NR, 1990, domestic complex only) in the vicinity of Fountain stands
as an important late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century farm that includes both domestic and agricultural
outbuildings. Surrounded by fields and approached by a long lane that encircles the dwelling, this farm seat
includes a one-story double-pile frame late-Greek Revival-style house with center-hall plan. It was built as the
centerpiece for the 632-acre farm shortly after it was purchased in 1870. A detached one-story two-room
kitchen stands directly behind (west) the dwelling, and a small family cemetery is located to the south of the
house and lane. Further west there is an extensive collection of twentieth century farm buildings including a
cotton gin, corn crib, stables, tobacco grading room, two packhouses, and a separate cluster of five tobacco
barns. This farm illustrates through its lanes the important linkage between these various types of farm
buildings and the work units both domestic and agricultural within the context of a farm. The same holds true
for the Dupree-Moore Farm as it evolved into a twentieth-century tobacco farm with the farm lane linking farm
seat with the sweet potato house nearby, the tobacco complex, the irrigation pond, and fields to the west. This
lane also forks off and leads to the former mill site as well as the ford below the dam to the east. Another lane
links the northwestern fields. At the Dupree-Moore Farm, the present mid-nineteenth-century Dupree-Moore
House is centrally located within the farm seat and surrounded by primarily early-twentieth-century domestic
and agricultural outbuildings: a grading room, smokehouse, pump house, equipment shelter, and mule barn.
Its contemporary tobacco complex, once more extensive, now includes a looping shelter and two tobacco
barns. Today, Buck Moore Road directly approaches the farm seat as a mid-nineteenth century lane might
have before making an approximately ninety-degree turn to the north.

During the first half of the twentieth century as agricultural crops shifted to include tobacco and peanuts
and new buildings were constructed to fill these needs, domestic building requirements fluctuated only
marginally. Smokehouses, dairies, washhouses, chicken houses, and wood houses remained common
elements within a farm seat. Oftentimes, stables and sheds were included within the domestic complex but
located on its periphery as were household garden and orchard. A garage or car house was added as motor
cars became more commonplace during the 1910s and 1920s. Most outbuildings were frame construction with
plain weatherboard siding and featured a gable-front, side-gable, or shed roof. In Pitt County, the William
Reuben James Sr. Farm illustrates the use of fencing, both wire and board, to define agricultural and domestic
areas in association with its outbuildings that include stables, corn crib, sheds, smokehouse, packhouse, and
car house. A grape arbor and fruit trees also grew near one side of the house, cedar trees grew between the
house and road, and a fenced-in pecan grove stood adjacent to the farmyard. Another important Pitt County
farm complex is the Charles and Maggie McLawhorn Farm, in the Renston Rural Historic District (NR, 2003)
near Winterville. At the Charles and Maggie McLawhorn House, an impressive range of frame outbuildings
complement the ca. 1910 Colonial Revival-style dwelling. Two pecan groves flank the lane leading up to the
main house. All domestic outbuildings are located behind the house and several agricultural buildings are
situated to its west. These ancillary domestic buildings include a smokehouse, dairy, storage sheds, and
washhouse. A barn, commissary/stable, well house, sweet potato house, and storage shed round out the
home site.85

During the twentieth century, agricultural and domestic outbuildings tended to be more closely
associated with the main house. Domestic buildings such as smokehouses, dairies, hen houses, washhouses,
wood sheds, offices, and garages were usually in the side or rear yard. Barns, packhouses, potato houses,
stables, and equipment shelters were at the outer perimeter of the complex. These early-twentieth-century
outbuildings were usually constructed in a traditional form and using commonplace materials and building
techniques. Most were frame and sheathed with plain weatherboards. Smokehouses, dairies, washhouses,
and sheds had either front- or side-gable roofs. Oftentimes, wood houses and chicken houses had shed roofs.
Privies might have either gable roof or a shed roof. Early roofs were protected by wooden shingles but soon
standing-seam metal became a common replacement. In many instances, dairies, used to keep milk and dairy
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products cool for family consumption, were constructed on stilts and occasionally had a recessed central entrance with shelves to each side. Car houses with one- or two-portals became commonplace by the 1930s. The most prevalent agricultural buildings were barns and stables aside from tobacco-related buildings. Barns were used to store grain and feed as well as house livestock. Some were modest gable-roof structures, but during this period, the construction of large gambrel-roof barns was promoted by leading North Carolina agriculturists. Gable-front stables had an open central aisle with flanking stalls usually for mules and many had a hay storage mow. Sometimes shed extensions were constructed on one or both sides. An excellent cross-section of these domestic and agricultural outbuildings was recorded at the William Reuben James Sr. Farmstead near Bethel, the Alfred McLawhorn Farmstead near Winterville, Benjamin May-Lewis House (NR, 1985) near Farmville, and the Charles and Maggie McLawhorn Farm in Renston.

At the Dupree-Moore Farm, a cross-section of similar outbuildings remain including a smokehouse, pumphouse, equipment shelter, and mule barn. Its frame smokehouse by comparison has a distinctive front gable that extends over three feet from the facade and a deep eave overhang elsewhere. The door of the central entrance is double layered with diagonally laid boards on the exterior and vertical on the interior. The smokehouse interior originally had a dirt floor and included a built-in work surface. Although recently moved directly back from its previous location by approximately twenty feet, this smokehouse retains the integrity of its relationship with the main house. The small brick pumphouse is a simple utilitarian structure with shed roof. Brick examples, however, are relatively uncommon. The mule stable follows the form of a transverse-frame feeder barn with an open central bay and overhead mow. This common form typically housed mules throughout the first half of the twentieth century. In the case of the Dupree-Moore Farm, a mule lot with board fence formerly stood just south of the barn. The construction of the equipment shelter, a simple shed-roof structure with six open bays, fulfilled a need plus marked a mid-twentieth century transition toward more mechanized farming practices. It was built ca. 1955 on the site of a former barn following its destruction during Hurricane Hazel.

Although not a major cash crop, sweet potato storage began prompting the construction of curing barns during the first half of the twentieth century. However, many growers who produced small harvests continued to store sweet potatoes in pits, banks, or cellars, a practice in which forty per cent or more roots might perish from decay. In order to keep sweet potatoes in good condition, they must be: “well matured before digging,...carefully handled,...well dried or cured after being put in the house, and ...kept at a uniform temperature after they are cured.” Approximately a ten-day process, curing is “simply driving the excess moisture from the potatoes by means of heat, which creates air circulation.”86 During the 1910s and 1920s, the U. S. Department of Agriculture published a number of farm bulletins that addressed issues related to raising sweet potatoes. One that was published in 1922 focused on the economic conversion of a tobacco barn during the off-season into one for sweet potato curing. Throughout eastern North Carolina, large and small examples of barns built for sweet potatoes remain on the agricultural landscape. In Martin County, the John M. Bowen Farm (ca. 1900) has a large frame barn with a side-gable roof that features an interior chimney and two small gabled vents.87 Two examples from the late 1930s are located in Chowan County near Edenton. Both are patterned after a coal-heated sweet potato barn erected by county agriculture agent N. K. Rowell. Located at the Lewis E. Francis Farm, an eighteen-by-fourteen-foot frame sweet potato barn is raised on a four-foot-tall brick foundation” with a brick firebox positioned in the crawl space that was fed from the exterior. A system of metal ducts distributed the heat evenly with hot air rising through a slatted floor. Inside the barn, sweet potatoes were stacked in slatted crates. Straddling the ridge of the gable roof, two gabled vents eliminated excess moisture and heat while an exterior chimney drew off smoke. Today asphalt shingles sheathe the exterior of this barn. The one at the R. C. Holland Farm has a similar design.88 In Pitt County, Charles and Maggie McLawhorn Farm and the Dupree-Moore Farm have more modest examples of sweet potato houses. Both are gable-front frame buildings sheathed with plain weatherboards. The one at the Dupree-Moore Farm stands on a high in-filled brick pier foundation requiring a step ladder to its central entrance. It has a ventilated floor, evidence of an interior crate system, plus an interior hanging chimney flanked by two small ventilators.
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Few details are known about the curing process associated with each of these sweet potato houses. Closer to Falkland at the Jordan Tenant Farm historically associated with the K. R. Wooten Farms, there is a large gable-roof sweet potato barn that features a brick foundation, weatherboard exterior sheathing, standing-seam metal roof, and diagonal-board interior sheathing. Its roof has six ridge ventilators and two brick interior chimney flues.

By the turn of the twentieth century, the overall character of larger home farms included small tenant farms with their respective ancillary farm buildings. These tenant farms were oftentimes associated with the county’s rapidly growing tobacco economy. The main dwelling with its outbuildings was the focal point of a home farm, and the tenant houses were usually located on the farm near the fields or along public or farm roads. In the late-nineteenth-century, a tenant complex usually included a modest two-room single-pile center-chimney dwelling with front and rear shed-roof porches plus ancillary related outbuildings, possibly privy, smokehouse, hen house, and shed. Twentieth century versions of this basic tenant house tended to follow a center-hall plan and included a two-room rear ell. Over twenty years ago, Scott Power, an author and the editor of The Historic Architecture of Pitt County, North Carolina, wrote about the status of the Pitt County’s tenant farms in relation to their home farms expressing that “few extensive and identifiable complexes exist due to the mechanization and automated nature of current farming practices.”

In recent years in Pitt County, abandonment, neglect, and demolition have left fragments of countless home farms on the rural landscape as random buildings, both domestic and agricultural, that are individually limited to conveying only their original function. This trend has only marginally impacted the Dupree-Moore Farm which once had three tenant farms, all of which were oriented to Buck Moore Road. Only one ca. 1922 example remains intact and stands as an increasingly rare example on the rural landscape in Pitt County today that remains associated with its primary home farm, main dwelling, and agricultural landscape. This tenant complex includes a one-story, center-hall-plan, frame house with a two-room rear ell and a one-story gable-front frame tobacco packhouse. Typically, the three-bay house, sheathed with plain weatherboard, has a side-gable roof with extended eaves and a central entrance. Its front porch protects each bay and features a shed roof, turned posts, and exposed rafter ends. By comparison, the Ichabod H. Little Farmstead near Bethel, with its four tenant houses lining the road across from the main farm house, was considered over twenty years ago by Scott Power as one of the few extended tenant farm complexes remaining in the county. These examples were mainly one-story side-gable-roof frame houses with a central chimney and a two-room rear ell. Originally, this farm row included six tenant dwellings. The Renston Rural Historic District records fourteen tenant and sharecropper’s houses constructed from the 1890s through the 1940s that respectively illustrate the use of light timber framing to concrete block.

Tobacco farming introduced a range of ancillary buildings to a farm that often included multiple curing barns, looping shelters, packhouses, and occasionally grading rooms. In Pitt County, many were integrated into the farm landscape near associative work areas or along farm lanes and roads. Some grading rooms and packhouses also functioned within the domestic complex of a farm seat or tenant house. During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century most tobacco barns were tall square-in-plan buildings that were constructed of round or hewn logs and chinked with wood and daubed with mud or mortar. These barns typically featured a side-gable roof, a low central entry, and a dirt floor. Standardized proportions define a barn’s size and the spatial arrangement of its tiers or racks with units called rooms. Through the years, boards, tar paper, shingles, or sheet metal was applied as exterior sheathing to many tobacco barns. Depending on the size of the farm, a barn might stand alone or as a part of either a cluster or an extended row. In many cases, sheds used for grading encircled a barn or linked it with others thereby forming a chain. These sheds provided shelter from the sun and rain as well as a place for stringing operations. Packhouses were typically two-story rectangular frame structures with a gable roof. Many incorporated one-story shed-roof additions, and at times, these sheds were used to shelter farm equipment. Small one-story gable-roof
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structures with one room known as grading rooms were more commonly associated with dwellings on prosperous farms. On the interior, a wood or coal stove might be included for warmth. Ordering pits were usually constructed as a cellar associated with a packhouse and were used to “restore moisture to brittle leaves.”

Tobacco-related outbuildings associated with the Robert Joseph Lang Jr. Farm, the Renston Historic District (NR, 2003), the Pollard Farmstead near Ballard’s Crossroads, and Dupree-Moore Farm illustrate the type, form, and placement of tobacco-related buildings commonly found on Pitt County farms. The placement of tobacco barns in clusters near farm lanes or roads is illustrated at the Robert J. Lang Jr. Farm and within the Renston Rural Historic District, which has three clusters of barns near the Langston Edwards Farm, the Charles L. McLawhorn Sr. House, and the R. H. McLawhorn Tenant Farm No.4. All of these tobacco barns are frame with gable roofs and concrete block foundations. The five near the McLawhorn House are sheathed with tar paper, and the four near the McLawhorn Tenant House No.4 are sheltered in a wooded area. Packhouses in the historic district are usually two-story frame buildings with gable-front roofs. A ca. 1920 side-gable two-story example was moved within the historic district from the David Stokes House. Three tobacco packhouses with brick-lined ordering pits are associated with the Pollard Farm Complex north of Ballard’s Crossroads. According to Scott Power, they represent one of the county’s best examples of an historic tobacco and tenant farm complex. All buildings are frame and the site included three main farm dwellings, two tenant houses, four gable-front packhouses, five tobacco curing barns, one open grading shelter, a large feed crib, hay barn, crib, and smokehouse. These buildings are clustered together near the dominant dwellings with many oriented along a winding unpaved secondary road. At the Dupree-Moore Farm, the tobacco barns and looping shelter were originally clustered together and the packhouses were positioned along the main road near the fields. Its two surviving curing barns were later additions. The log barn was probably constructed during World War II when log barns re-emerged due to the scarcity of milled lumber. The remaining frame barn built ca. 1952 replaced a log one that accidentally burned. A grading room stands directly behind the main dwelling. A small packhouse is located behind the remaining tenant house, and two larger packhouses are presently on new locations within the farm. The farmscape created by these tobacco buildings is typical of ones identified on farms elsewhere in the county but fast disappearing. All of these tobacco-related buildings are similar in form.

Currently, throughout Pitt County, these now obsolete historic tobacco resources are under a constant threat either of neglect or demolition. The complete removal of the once exceptional cluster of side-gable-roof log tobacco barns with pent roofs at the Joseph Franklin Pollard Farm near Greenville is a prime example. Historic precedence supports the need for relocating tobacco-related support buildings that are ancillary to curing barns. Packhouses were traditionally located either near fields or in association with a tobacco barn cluster. Convenience dictated their placement. As this historic convenience changed, in certain cases, a packhouse would be relocated as in the case of three Pitt County packhouses, one formerly located at the David Stokes House within the Renston Rural Historic District and two others at the Dupree-Moore Farm. For the two-story packhouses, the side-gable one in Renston and the gable-front version at the Dupree-Moore Farm, the moves were within the historic period of significance. The one-story side-gable packhouse at the Dupree-Moore Farm, however, was moved ca. 1995 in order to preserve it after having been blown off its foundation by a storm. In 2011, the farm’s grading room associated with the main house was also moved back from its original location and continues to maintain its relationship with the nearby smokehouse. In recent years, growing threats of demolition to these now obsolete and oftentimes vacant tobacco-related buildings has heightened the need for their preservation. A move that maintains a compatible association with either its original location or other tobacco related buildings is viewed positively and does not impinge upon its integrity.
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Previous documentation on file (NPS):
preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67 has been
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recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey

Primary location of additional data:
X State Historic Preservation Office
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Other
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PT470

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 185.85 acres
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage)

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>269560</td>
<td>3957280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>270400</td>
<td>3956160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>270100</td>
<td>3957290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>270000</td>
<td>3955990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbal Boundary Description (describe the boundaries of the property)

The boundaries for the Dupree-Moore Farm are illustrated on the accompanying map drawn at a scale of 1 inch equals 300 feet which encompasses all of Pitt County tax parcel # 79876 with the exclusion of that portion of Moore parcel Lot 1A that lies east of Buck Moore Road and described in Pitt County Deed Book V-25, p. 275 as: “beginning at a point in the center of road which leads to N. C. Highway 43 thence S. 83-50 E. 171 feet, N. 88-00 E. 128 feet, S. 60 E. 342 Feet to Dean’s line, and corner; thence along the line of Dean’s land N. 1-20 E.533 feet to an iron stake; thence N. 12-10 W. 1110 feet to a stake on edge of field and corner; thence S 89-30 W. 564 feet to center of said road; thence along with the center line of said road S. 1-00 W. 88 feet, S. 12-15 E. 148…thence down center of said road S. 12-15 E. 245 feet, S. 1-00 E. 274 feet to the point of beginning…. Also excluded is Pitt County tax parcel # 15264, known as the 0.4 acre Dudley Webb tract on the west side of Buck Moore Road.

Boundary Justification (explain why the boundaries were selected)

The National Register boundary for the Dupree-Moore Farm includes approximately 185.85 acres that contain the Dupree-Moore House, its outbuildings, pastures, agricultural fields, and woodland that have been under the ownership of the Moore family since 1905 and historically relate to the antebellum plantation of Thomas Dupree. A 20.11 acre parcel in its northeast corner on the east side of Buck Moore Road and the 0.31 acre Dudley Webb tract are excluded because they contain noncontributing resources that do not contribute to the architectural and agricultural significance of the Dupree-Moore Farm. Both parcels are located north of the Dupree-Moore House with the Webb property on the west side of Buck Moore Road and the L. A. Moore parcel on its east side. The exclusion of these two properties also dictated that the boundary line could not include the farm’s northeast field, east of Buck Moore Road.
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name/title Drucilla H. York
organization Local History Associates date March 26, 2012
street & number 2001 East Fifth Street telephone 252.752.5260
city or town Greenville state NC zip code 27858
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Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property’s location.
  
  A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Continuation Sheets**

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)
Photographs:
Submit clear and descriptive black and white photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map.

Name of Property: Dupree-Moore Farm

City or Vicinity: Falkland vicinity (Macclesfield, mailing address)

County: Pitt County State: North Carolina

Photographer: Drucilla H. York

Date Photographed: (see listing)

Description of Photograph(s) and number:

1 of 23.

1. West view of farm complex from Buck Moore Road; March 25, 2012.

2. Southwest view of tenant farm (# 8-9) with tobacco complex (# 11-14) in the distance; February 23, 2011.

3. Southwest view down farm road with sweet potato house (# 10) to the left and tobacco complex (# 10-14) in the distance; February 23, 2011.

4. East view of farm canal with [left to right] tobacco packhouse (# 7), tenant farm (# 8-9), mule stable (# 6), and equipment shelter (# 5); May 8, 2012.

5. Northwest view [left to right] tobacco complex (# 10-14), tobacco grading house (# 3), smokehouse (# 2), Dupree-Moore House (# 1), sweet potato house (# 10), mule barn (# 6) and tobacco packhouse (# 7); May 8, 2012.

6. West view of tobacco complex: (left to right) tobacco barn (# 13), packhouse (# 14), log tobacco barn (# 12), and looping shelter (# 11); February 23, 2011.

7. Northwest view of outbuildings buildings: farm equipment shelter (# 5), mule barn (# 6), and tobacco packhouse (# 7); February 23, 2011.

8. Northeast view of plantation seat (# 3 & 1), tenant farm (# 8-9), and tobacco complex (# 11-14); May 8, 2012.

9. South view of breached mill dam on Otter Creek from elevated farm road; March 19, 2012.

10. Northwest view of irrigation pond with former site of cemetery on rise between two clusters of pine trees; March 19, 2012.

11. Southwest view of farm road linking northern agricultural fields; March 19, 2012.
12. Southwest oblique view Dupree-Moore House (#1); June 11, 2012.

13. North view of Dupree-Moore House (#1) south elevation including, left to right, tobacco grading house (#3) and smokehouse (#2); June 11, 2012.

14. South view of Dupree-Moore House north elevation including, in foreground to background, pump house (#4), smokehouse (#2), and tobacco grading house (#3); May 27, 2012.


17. Dupree-Moore House, first-floor north parlor mantel and flanking windows with apron panels; May 27, 2012.


19. Dupree-Moore House, flush beaded paneling in central hall of former one-story rear shed that was incorporated within T-addition; May 8, 2012.


**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, PO Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.