NPS Form 10-900-b
(Revised March 1992)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

OMB No. 1024-0018

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

X New Submission ___ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

HISTORIC FAMILY FARMS IN MIDDLE TENNESSEE

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

I. Settlement and Subsistence Farming, 1780 to 1850
II. Expansion and the Market Economy, 1850 to 1900
III. Rural Reform and Agriculture, 1900-1945

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Carroll Van West

organization MTSU Center for Historic Preservation date November 7, 1994

street & number PO Box 80, MTSU telephone 615-898-2947

city or town Murfreesboro state TN zip code 37132

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Herbert L. Harper — 2/21/95
Signature and title of certifying official — Date

Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Tennessee Historical Commission
State or Federal agency and bureau

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

for Edson H. Beall — Entered in the National Register — 3/30/95
Signature of the Keeper — Date of Action

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee | Tennessee

Name of Multiple Property Listing | State

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and the title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

Primary location of additional data:

- ☐ State Historic Preservation Office
- ☐ Other State agency
- ☐ Federal agency
- ☐ Local government
- ☒ University
- ☐ Other

Name of repository:

MTSU Center for Historic Preservation

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

Agriculture has shaped Tennessee history and culture in indelible ways. This multiple property nomination to the National Register of Historic Places is an attempt to begin a systematic analysis of significant historic resources associated with Tennessee agricultural history. As its primary data base, it utilizes the existing historic family farms documented in the Tennessee Century Farms program, a joint project since 1985 of the Tennessee Department of Agriculture and the MTSU Center for Historic Preservation. (1) From this data base, historians have already produced a book and exhibit on Tennessee agriculture, along with several analytical papers and articles that address the documentary potential of the data base. (2) The data base has already been used as the primary historic context for the nomination of several historic family farms in Tennessee. (3) National Register historians at the Tennessee Historic Commission have also asked historians at the MTSU Center for Historic Preservation to use the Century Farms data base to analyze and comment on submitted farm nominations to the Commission. These comments have been incorporated in the final drafts of the nominations to the State Review Board. (4)

Because of these prior experiences, the presentation of information and analysis in this multiple property cover form is different. We have attempted to produce assessment guidelines for historic family farms, addressing the questions and types of contexts we have used in the past to assess the significance of farm properties. Due to the publication of Tennessee Agriculture: A Century Farms Perspective, and forthcoming books on Tennessee agriculture (especially those by Donald Winters, Robert Tracy McKenzie, and Mary S. Hoffschwelle), we strongly believe that a mere recitation of the facts of Tennessee agriculture would be quickly dated by the forthcoming scholarship. Furthermore, we wanted to produce assessment guidelines, grounded in new scholarship, that would help surveyors, who are probably little acquainted with the issues and types of analysis embraced in the new agricultural history, to better understand the significance of historic family farms.

For the purposes of this study, our universe for the assessment of historic family farms are those properties identified in the Tennessee Century Farms program. To be eligible for the Tennessee Century Farm program, families must

own and cultivate profitably the same family-owned land for, at least, the last one hundred years. Their farm must contain ten acres today (the current minimum acreage definition of a farm as set by the U. S. Department of Agriculture) and generate at least $1000 in farm income. At least one family owner must be a Tennessee resident and serve in an active managerial role over the farm's operations. To document the eligibility of the property, owners have to complete a detailed questionnaire about the farm's history. This application form asks the founder's name, why he or she moved to Tennessee, the original acreage, the commodities produced, the size of the founder's family, and kinds of important historical events associated directly with the farm or events in which the family participated. Identical questions are asked about the succeeding generations of the family owners, including the current status of the farm operation, especially acreage and commodities now being produced. Owners are also asked to identify buildings on their properties that are at least one hundred years old and are encouraged to submit photographs of the current condition of the farm, along with any photocopies of historic photographs they may have in their possession.

As detailed in other articles, the Century Farms data base has blind spots and gaps, especially in regards to families who cultivate small farms and to the involvement of African-American farm families. (5) Many Century Farm families "survived the transformations of American agriculture through grit, determination, and stubborness. But just as many, if not more, survived because the initial founder had the money, land holdings, and good location to enable survival of the family farm through the transformations of modern agricultural history. In documenting the history of the Century Farmers, you deal with a very special group of people, certainly worthy of study, but a group that cannot be taken at face-value as typical of the American family experience." (6) Yet, the total of over 800 documented Tennessee Century Farms (343 alone in Middle Tennessee) is such a large number of documented historic farms that it provides a useful measuring stick and context for analyzing historic resources in the rural landscape. Statewide, the properties represent a cross-section of family farms, with 94 of 95 Tennessee counties represented and the founding farm dates ranging from 1776 to 1892. The documentation "provides an unique perspective on agricultural history from the vantage point of those families who had weathered past crises to remain farmers of

the modern era. The individual farm histories detail the patterns of change that have transformed Tennessee agriculture during the last 200 years." (7) As functioning family farms, making economic and cultural contributions to the surrounding rural community, these properties are logical building blocks for developing regional contexts for rural history and architecture.

By creating multi-layered analytical contexts, the information generated in these comprehensive surveys of the Century Farms provides the foundation for multiple property nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. Their focus on complete farm complexes as historical documents of changing agricultural processes and movements, rather than the more typical focus on architecturally distinctive farmhouses, is an important contribution to the evolving concern of the National Park Service about the identification and preservation of rural resources.

This first multiple property nomination focuses on the Middle Tennessee region of the state. Middle Tennessee has been a land of agricultural diversity throughout its history. The eastern boundary is defined by the Cumberland Plateau and the western extension of the Plateau, known as the Eastern Highland Rim. This land has mostly rough, rugged land of cedars, rock outcroppings, and sparse topsoil. Early farms along here, not surprisingly, tended to subsistence farming, depending much on livestock running wild in the woods. Williamson County, in the region's Central Basin, is a much different landscape, containing some of the best farmland in the South, rich soil capable of producing high yields of cotton, soybeans, and foodstuffs. To the north, where the Eastern and Western Highland Rims meet, is another rich agricultural area, especially for dark-fired tobacco production in Montgomery, Robertson, and Sumner counties. Southern Middle Tennessee also has its distinctive patterns of agricultural production. Counties in the Central Basin, like Marshall and Lincoln, have been famous for their high yield dairy herds. But as you move west, and climb up to the Western Highland Rim, you encounter farms of marginal prosperity due to the thin, rocky topsoil and heavy forests.

The region's geology largely accounts for its agricultural diversity. Early settlers bypassed the "Barrens" of the Plateau and Eastern and Western Highland Rims and looked for richer lands

in the Central Basin. But later generations found that areas in the Barrens had significant agricultural value, especially in the northern area where tobacco produced some of the state's largest and most prosperous farms. (8) Other "Barrens" counties, like Humphreys County, regularly produced high yield corn crops. (9)

The Central Basin is the heart of Middle Tennessee. Called the "Garden" by early settlers and later historians, the Basin contains the best farmland in the region. (10) Farmers throughout the decades have raised many different types of crops in the Basin, ranging from high yields of cotton in the antebellum era (cotton is now returning to several counties) to large amounts of tobacco, hay, and corn today. One hundred and fifty years ago, the region first established its reputation as a livestock center, from the Merino sheep of Clifton Place plantation (NR 7/08/70) in Maury County to the champion race horses at Maplewood Farm (NR 1/12/93) in Williamson County. The Central Basin remains famous for its livestock, be they dairy cattle in Marshall or Rutherford County or the world-famous Tennessee Walking Horse in Bedford County.

Due to the regional geologic and geographic contrasts, Middle Tennessee farmers have worked their land in different ways. The farmscape of a tobacco grower in Robertson County, for instance, might have little in common with that of a Rutherford County cotton planter, or a horse breeder in Bedford County. Indeed, significant variation in farmscapes can exist depending on the crops produced. Dark-fired tobacco, for example, calls for a different barn than that used for curing burley tobacco. (11)

Yet common historical experiences have served to bind the farmers of Middle Tennessee. There are three significant periods in the agricultural history of the region:

(1) Settlement and Subsistence Farming, 1780 to 1850
(2) Expansion of the Market Economy, 1850 to 1900
(3) Rural Reform and Agriculture, 1900-1945.

These three periods will define the three historic contexts of this study.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee

I. Settlement and Subsistence Farming, 1780 to 1850

Prior research and nominations to the National Register lead to the conclusion that most historic family farms established between the years 1780 to 1850 achieve their significance under three themes: Settlement (Criterion A); Agriculture (Criterion A); and Architecture (Criterion C). Naturally a few farms will achieve their historical significance due to extraordinary and/or important individuals and historical events, such as the Revolutionary War, that are associated with the farm. Some will even be significant for having prehistoric sites on their property. Pleasant View Farm in Williamson County, part of which is listed in the National Register as the Samuel F. Glass House (NR 4/13/88), contains a Mississippian village site where cattle graze today. Another Williamson County farmhouse that has been listed in the National Register, Old Town (NR 4/14/88), contains the Old Town Archeological Site (NR 9/16/89).

Outside of these extraordinary properties, however, the eligibility of historic family farms, established from 1780 to 1850, may be tested by five basic inquiries related to the themes of Settlement, Agriculture, and Architecture. To provide guidelines on how to interpret a property's eligibility under this historic context, the following discussion will examine each area of inquiry, presenting information and raising questions necessary for a balanced assessment.

Inquiry 1) Is the founding date of the farm associated with the dates of initial settlement, first in the region, and then, second, in the county itself? If so, the farm may be eligible under the Settlement theme of Criterion A.

The earliest identified historic family farms in Middle Tennessee are Gillespie Farm and Wallace Farm, both of which were established in 1785 in Sumner County. Of the 343 identified historic family farms in Middle Tennessee, 44 were established in the initial generation of regional settlement, or by 1810. Middle Tennessee farms which date to this era of first settlement, from 1780 to 1810, may be eligible to the National Register under the Settlement theme of Criterion A. To emphasize that a Middle Tennessee farm founded before 1810 is associated with early patterns of agricultural settlement and development,

consider that 1844 was the mean average date for establishing a historic family farm in Middle Tennessee (more a generation later) while the mode average was 1850 (almost two generations later). (12)

But in assessing eligibility under the theme of Settlement, one should be mindful of the local context. Does the founding date of the farm represent one of the earliest dates for historic family farms in that particular county? Does the founding date coincide with the beginnings of settlement in that county in general?

These questions call for careful research and consideration because settlement patterns in Davidson County begin decades before significant permanent settlement in Wayne County. To provide guidance, Chart I gives the earliest founding date for identified historic family farms in each Middle Tennessee county as well as the corresponding date when each county was established.

Chart I: Earliest Founding Date, Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee

County	Date of Earliest Farm	Date County Founded
Bedford	1798	1807
Bledsoe	1816	1807
Cannon	1837	1836
Cheatham	1806	1856
Clay	1847	1870
Coffee	1818	1836
Cumberland	1801	1855
Davidson	1788	1783
DeKalb	1815	1837
Dickson	1787	1803
Fentress	1830	1823
Franklin	1813	1807
Giles	1809	1809
Grundy	1846	1844
Hickman	1810	1807
Houston	1833	1871
Humphreys	1814	1809

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Jackson	c. 1820	1801
Lawrence	1847	1817
Lewis	1839	1843
Lincoln	1808	1809
Macon	1804	1842
Marion	1808	1817
Marshall	1811	1836
Maury	1807	1807
Montgomery	1796	1796
Moore	1843	1871
Perry	1846	1819
Pickett	c. 1802	1879
Putnam	1814	1842
Robertson	1792	1796
Rutherford	1807	1803
Sequatchie	c. 1850	1857
Smith	1803	1799
Stewart	c. 1800	1803
Sumner	1785	1786
Trousdale	1794	1870
Van Buren	1823	1840
Warren	1816	1807
Wayne	1851	1819
White	1826	1806
Williamson	1800	1799
Wilson	1789	1799

Inquiry 2) Were early community institutions, such as schools, churches, post offices, or general stores, built on or located at the farm?

A farm that contains such surviving historic buildings or structures as the first church, school, post office, or ferry crossing in a particular community has properties that are associated with the beginning of Settlement (and or Education or Commerce as other examples). If these buildings are demonstrated to have a significant association with the patterns of early settlement in this county, they may contribute to the farm's significance under the Settlement theme. The buildings may also be individually eligible for their significance in education,

commerce, etc, irrespective of whether or not the farm is eligible. They might too be part of a larger rural historic district.

Inquiry 3) Do the farm's initial commodities serve as a representative example of the general trends in Tennessee agriculture from 1780 to 1850? If so, the farm may be eligible under the Agriculture theme of Criterion A.

The nature of Tennessee farming before 1850 has been a subject of debate among historians for several decades. (13) "The crucial management decision for southern farmers in the pre-Civil War years was," according to historian Donald L. Winters, "between producing for the market or producing for home consumption. Although few operators followed one approach exclusively, most emphasized one strategy over the other in their selection of crop and livestock combinations." (14)

Chart II: Ten Most Popular Crops Produced by the Founding Owners of Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee

Crop	# of Historic Farms Producing Crop
Corn	253
Cattle	198
Swine	185
Wheat	143
Horses/Mules	105
Hay	88
Tobacco	87
Sheep	84
Cotton	65
Grains	50

n = 343. Note: Keep in mind that all farms produced more than one agricultural product.

Chart II indicates that the general trends for Southern agriculture noted by Winters' research are clearly reflected in the production tendencies of historic family farms in Middle Tennessee. The basic subsistence crop of corn dominates the

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

list; more market oriented crops like tobacco and cotton were produced at far fewer farms. From his research of antebellum Tennessee agriculture, Winters emphasizes:

> Corn was almost always a subsistence crop; it was normally sold only if output exceeded household needs. Cotton and tobacco were nearly always treated as cash crops to be sold off the farm. Livestock, on the other hand, provided both subsistence and income. The typical household, whether on a small farm or a large plantation, consumed much of the pork and, probably, most of the beef produced on the farm. Some operators, however, sold swine and cattle either on the hoof or as cured meat. (15)

These crop tendencies provide valuable guidance for the evaluation of the farmstead. If fields and buildings were geared toward the production of corn, cattle, and other subsistence crops like wheat and small grains, you are assessing a subsistence farm representative of the antebellum era. The farm may be eligible under the Agriculture theme as a representative example of subsistence farming in that county. However, if the fields, buildings, and other physical evidence are more related to the such crops as cotton and tobacco, you are assessing a quite different farm, one geared to market production, indicating probably an early significant example of the market revolution that overwhelmed Tennessee agriculture after 1850. This farm too would be eligible under the Agriculture theme, but the analytical historic context would focus on market agriculture rather than subsistence agriculture.

Inquiry 4) Do the farm's initial commodities serve as an unique example of agricultural production or as an example of significant agricultural experimentation for the years 1780-1850? If so, the farm may be eligible under the Agriculture theme of Criterion A.

This inquiry provides an opportunity to assess further the significance of a market-oriented farm of the antebellum era. In the early nineteenth century, farmers in Tennessee experimented with exotic new agricultural commodities like silkworm or specialized fruit production. (16) Agricultural journals in

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Jonesborough, Nashville, and Columbia urged their readers to try new crops and farming techniques. (17) Farms associated with these unique commodities, especially if surviving associated outbuildings or production facilities remain, would be eligible under the Agriculture theme. More typical, however, will be farms that concentrated in tobacco, cotton, or specialized breeds of livestock (like Merino sheep or Berkshire swine). Again, the historical association is strengthened if outbuildings or production facilities related to those livestock types remain. These farms grew in size and prosperity as the state emerged in the early to mid-1840s from the general economic depression of the late 1830s.

5) Does the farmhouse complex contains significant examples of vernacular or formal architecture in both dwellings (owners, slaves and/or tenants) and outbuildings? If so, the farm, or portions thereof, may be eligible under the Architecture theme of Criterion C.

This inquiry will be fully addressed in the Associated Property Types section of this nomination. For the early period of Tennessee agriculture, however, a careful assessment will consider the relationship between surviving historic buildings and the market orientation of the farm. The working hypothesis is that the more the farm's production is slanted toward outside markets, the more formal, academic its domestic architecture will be, and, accordingly, the larger and more substantial its production facilities (outbuildings) will be. The reverse is also true. The more the farm is geared to subsistence agriculture, the greater the tendency to find folk-derived domestic architecture (adaptations of central-hall, I-house, saddlebag plans) as well as a preponderance of corn cribs and livestock sheds among the outbuildings.

Assessments of the relationship between market orientation and the design and purpose of dwellings and outbuildings should consider if the date of construction of new houses and/or production facilities correspond with market-related shifts in agricultural production. A common phenomenon for dwellings dating to the 1830s or 1840s will be the updating of an older, more vernacular styled house with a Greek Revival portico and/or other classically derived elements. In Middle Tennessee,

classical elements are usually grafted onto the facade of the more traditional central-hall cottage or two-story I house, creating an identifiable regional architectural form. (18) The Century Farm data base contains no examples of Picturesque Victorian styles (Gothic Revival or Italianate) surviving from the 1840s in Middle Tennessee.

Perhaps the most important dwellings to be assessed will be slave dwellings, not only for their significant association with African-American history but also because so few of these dwellings exist today compared to the number populating past farms. J. M. Vlach's recent Back of the Big House provides an excellent guide to antebellum slave dwellings found on market-oriented farms. (19) His evidence, however, is slanted to more Deep South farming environments (the Tennessee equivalent would be the southwestern corner of the state) where farmers more typically specialized in agricultural production for the nascent capitalistic marketplace. His examples more typically date to the 1840s and 1850s, the last generation of slavery.

Middle Tennessee was a large slaveholding region in the antebellum era, but it was not a place where large-scale plantation slavery dominated the landscape. While there were more slaves in Middle Tennessee than the state's other two geographical regions, about 60 percent of Middle Tennesseeans owned no slaves and of those who possessed blacks, about 70 percent owned five or less. (20) Consequently, surviving slave dwellings, especially before 1850, are rare except on the larger tobacco and cotton plantations. A pre-1850 farm that has one or more surviving slave dwellings would be eligible for the National Register under the Ethnic Identity theme as well as under Agriculture for its association with market-oriented farming that relied on slave labor to produce agricultural commodities.

II. Expansion of the Market Economy, 1850-1900

Prior research and experience in assessing the eligibility of properties for the National Register lead to the conclusion that the significance of most historic family farms during the period of 1850 to 1900 will be associated with the themes of agriculture and ethnic identity under Criterion A and the theme of architecture under Criterion C. [Of course, the same caveat

found in the first historic context applies here. Properties may also be further eligible under themes of Criterion A associated with such significant regional events as the Civil War, railroad construction, and subsequent town development that happened to happen at the farm. There will also be properties which are associated with individuals who gain historical significance through political, economic, social, or cultural endeavors.]

In assessing a farm's significance under Criterion A during this period, three inquiries are especially pertinent: (1) is the property associated with the market revolution of the late nineteenth century? (2) is it associated with the reorganization of Tennessee agriculture from 1865-1880? and (3) is the farm associated with the various attempts to solve the labor problem of southern agriculture in the post-Civil War era? All three inquiries address a property's agricultural significance from 1850-1900. The second and third inquiries may also assess a property's significance under the Ethnic Identity theme since both address the creation of farms by newly freed African-Americans and newly-imported ethnic groups to Tennessee from the late 1860s to 1880s. A fourth inquiry addresses architectural significance under Criterion C: does the farm contain significant examples of vernacular or formal architecture in both dwellings (owners and/or tenants) and outbuildings?

Inquiry 1) Is the property--through its historic crops or buildings of agricultural production--associated with the market revolution in American agriculture during the late nineteenth century? If so, the farm may be eligible under the Agriculture theme of Criterion A.

Half of the historic family farms in Middle Tennessee were established during the second half of the nineteenth century. The construction of a regional railroad transportation network from 1850 to 1880 afforded Middle Tennessee farmers with new economic opportunities. Throughout the antebellum era, the majority of Middle Tennessee farm families worked self-sustaining properties. Poor to non-existent transportation alternatives, except for areas served by a river deep and wide enough to support commodity traffic, helped to discourage most farmers from producing large market-associated crops like tobacco and cotton. These farm families, stresses historian Donald Winters, "exercised caution even though such a practice meant that in most

years their production of foodstuffs exceeded their needs. They might, of course, sell their surplus, but at a profit smaller than they normally could have earned from cotton or tobacco." (21) Commodities might be exchanged and bartered within the immediate community or county, but rarely would farmers attempt to expand their commercial horizons to larger marketplaces.

By 1860, new railroads like the Nashville & Chattanooga, the Louisville & Nashville, and the Nashville & Decatur greatly enhanced access to regional and national agricultural markets. Farmers, more so than ever before, became active participants in a network of trade and commerce, with wheat and livestock hides joining tobacco and cotton as popular Middle Tennessee market commodities. (22)

The 1850s were also a decade when state officials and agricultural reformers made a decided effort to propagate the value of producing commodities for a wider marketplace. Some efforts involved producing new crops like silkworms for silk cloth on a much greater scale than ever before. In 1850, Tennessee ranked first in the nation in silk production, with over 2000 pounds produced. Weather and pests combined to destroy the nascent silk empire by the end of the decade. In 1860, only 71 pounds of silk was produced in the state. Governmental programs to improve the agricultural practices of farmers met with greater success. In 1854, the General Assembly established the State Agricultural Bureau, a precursor to the later Tennessee Department of Agriculture. The following year, the legislature authorized $30,000 in state bonds to acquire and construct a permanent state fairgrounds on the outskirts of Nashville. The new Bureau had a limited effect on Tennessee farmers, but its grants of $200 to qualified county organizations helped to promote more market oriented farming at the locally-sponsored agricultural fairs. (23)

The Civil War, however, left the mid-state's new railway system in shambles, wrecked the regional agricultural economy, and suspended governmental efforts to enlarge the agricultural market economy. The war affected the vast majority of historic family farmers in Middle Tennessee because, first, its demands for soldiers claimed thousands of needed agricultural laborers. The smaller farms lost the sons and fathers who had the primary responsibility of tending the fields, leaving sisters and wives

with the responsibility of doing even more work in the fields to keep the farm in production. Larger farms lost thousands of slaves who sought a new life in Union contraband camps, usually located in towns along the railroad lines. Their absence often meant that crops were not harvested and fields were left fallow. Second, such major battles as Stones River, Fort Donelson, Franklin, and Nashville devastated surrounding rural communities and killed or wounded thousands of Middle Tennessee farmers. Third, during the occupation and periodic warfare of 1862-1865, both Union and Confederate troops would swoop down on unsuspecting farms and strip them of livestock and foodstuffs. "Ravage and desolation were everywhere," wrote a correspondent at the end of the Civil War. Another commented that Tennessee farmers had little left "except the land and their debts." (24)

After the war, key antebellum market crops such as tobacco, cotton, wheat, and livestock hides remained important at the same time that agricultural reformers launched a concerted campaign to convince farmers to produce more specialized crops for the country's rapidily expanding urban centers.

Joseph B. Killebrew, secretary of the Bureau of Agriculture of Tennessee (for a Killebrew-associated property see White Chapel NR 6/26/86 in Montgomery County), produced new promotional pamphlets and books that promoted Tennessee's vast resources, assessed the quality of Tennessee farms, and promoted agricultural innovation and investment during the 1870s and 1880s. According to his biographer, Killebrew

> thought that a good flow of North-European immigrants to the South would help to cure the ills of the unstable agricultural labor system, and that it would provide the much-needed workmen for industry. The improvement of agriculture through a diversification of crops and a breaking up of the larger farming units held over from the plantation system was also a basic reform placed on the list of this New South leader.

Killebrew's Introduction to the Resources of Tennessee (1874) is an invaluable guide to the state's economy as it emerged from the Reconstruction era. As the state's rail network expanded throughout these same decades, the railroad corporations promoted increased agricultural production and new crops across the state.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

It is this study's good fortune that the only railroad in Tennessee to be fully studied for its ties to progressive agriculture is Middle Tennessee's Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railway, which had become part of the large Louisville and Nashville railroad empire in 1880. (25)

In 1893, in the wake of a terrible economic depression and as an attempt to encourage new and profitable business along the railroad line, the NC & ST.L established a Development Department and hired Joseph B. Killebrew to head its efforts. Killebrew produced a series of promotional pamphlets that were basic "surveys of the agricultural attractions of the territory, with special emphasis on Middle Tennessee." (26) His suggestions for new crops included commercial poultry and egg, winter cover crops, silage, percheron breeding, and truck farming (see Chart III). Killebrew further promoted such advanced agricultural techniques as using lime in the fields. In 1897, Killbrew and Herbert Myrick published Tobacco Leaf: Its Culture and Cure, Marketing and Manufacture, a book which urged more progressive cultivation and marketing techniques for Tennessee farmers.

Chart III: Sample Promotional Pamphlets on Agriculture Produced by Joseph Killebrew for the Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railroad, 1893-1900

1. Tobacco Culture along the NC & St.L
2. Commercial Poultry and Egg Production along the NC & St.L
3. The Value of Winter Cover Crops in Soil Building
4. Alfalfa and its Possibilities for Profitable Production
5. Silos and Silage
6. Lime in Agriculture
7. Perceron Breeding
8. Timber Resources Along the Line of the NC & St.L
9. Facts and Figures Concerning the Region Traversed by NC & St.L Railway

Source: Burt, "Railroad Promotion," 320-33.

In conjunction with Killebrew's promotional efforts, railroad president John W. Thomas travelled through the region, exhorting farmers to become part of the emerging progressive

farming crusade. In 1894, he addressed a convention of Middle Tennessee farmers at Shelbyville. Farmers, he proclaimed, could meet with success because they had at their disposal the fertile soil of the limestone basin, hard-working farmers and laborer, and easy access to market via the railroad. In Maury County, Thomas pointed out, farmers were now producing early white potatoes, cabbage, onions, and tomatoes and beating their northern competition to profitable urban markets. The same could be true, he insisted, for snap beans, Irish potatoes, sugar corn, and burley tobacco. "To cultivate this crop and the others which I have mentioned," Thomas concluded,

> would require more skill and care than the raising of our standard crops, cotton and corn and wheat, but would be far more profitable, and would result in the abandonment to a great extent of the old-style plantation farming and establish the new style of small farms with varied crops. . . .(27)

Historians agree that the progressive farming boom in Tennessee is largely a twentieth century phenomenon. Any evidence of farmers heeding the advice of the agricultural promoters of the late nineteenth century, therefore, is significant, especially so when outbuildings or field divisions associated with the new crops and cultivation techniques still survive.

Inquiry 2: How is the farm associated with the "reorganization of Tennessee agriculture" from 1865 to 1880? If associated by either founding date or by the ethnic affiliation of the founder, the farm may be eligible under the Agriculture theme of Criterion A.

For twenty years after the Civil War, the agricultural landscape of Middle Tennessee experienced even greater change than what occured during the war years. The "reorganization of Tennessee agriculture," as historian Robert Tracy McKenzie has described it, led to a large increase in the number of farms established across the state as well as leading to several experiments on how best to control and even choose those who worked the farm for the landowners. (28)

Chart IV, taken from McKenzie's research, documents the

large number of new farms established in the Reconstruction period, both statewide and in Middle Tennessee. Indeed, he found that there were "profound alterations in the number and size of Tennessee farms" in this period. In general, "the total number of farm units across the state doubled, while the average size of a farm decreased by 50 percent" between 1860 and 1880. (29)

Chart IV: Increase in Farm Operators, Sample Tennessee Counties, 1860-1880

	Statewide	Middle TN
Total increase in farm operators	11,475	3,434
Increase in all white operators (percentage of total)	7,575 (66%)	2,401 (70%)
Increase in white-owner operators (percentage of total)	4,914 (43%)	1,657 (48%)
Increase in white tenants or croppers (pecentage of total)	2,661 (23%)	744 (22%)

SOURCE: adapted from McKenzie, "Freedmen and the Soil," 77

This same pattern of creating new farms in the aftermath of the Civil War is quite clearly delineated in the documented historic family farms of Tennessee. The single most popular year to establish a Century Farm was in 1866 when 28 of the farms statewide came into existence. Indeed, 15 percent of all historic family farms, or a total of 117, were established between 1865 and 1870. (30) In Middle Tennessee, the numbers closely paralleled the statewide rates. Out of 334 farms, 53 (or 15.5%) were created between 1865 and 1870. As Chart V shows, this explosion of new farms slowed during the 1870s. Statewide, 76 new historic family farms started in the years from 1871 to 1880, with 56 of this total dating to the five first years (1871-75) of the decade. In Middle Tennessee, 21 farms started in the years from 1871 to 1875 while only 11 dated to the second half of

the decade. The total for the 1870s was 33, a marked decrease from the 53 farms established in the immediate post-Civil War era.

In Middle Tennessee, African-Americans and whites both established new farms in the Reconstruction period, although whites did so at a much larger rate. Due to structural racism, economic inequality, violence, and the imposition of Jim Crow segregation late in the century, blacks found it much more difficult to keep their farms in operation as the 1870s stretched into the 1880s. McKenzie's research has found that "a small number of blacks owned their own farms by 1870," but "32 percent of these unusual freedmen lost title to their farms within the next ten years; black landowners who persisted through 1880 were three times more likely to lose their land than persisting white owners." (31) [This process of African-Americans leaving the farms that began in those years persisted in the twentieth century, the result being that only a handful of the Tennessee Century Farms now belong to African-American families.] (32)

Chart V: Number of Historic Family Farms Established during the Reconstruction Era

Years	Statewide	Middle Tennessee
1865-1870	117	53
1871-1875	56	21
1876-1880	20	11

SOURCE: author's calculations, Century Farms data base

Immigration, although greatly promoted, contributed only slightly to the reorganization of Tennessee agriculture in the Reconstruction Era. (33) In Middle Tennessee, the most important groups were Germans and Swiss who moved to the southern part of the region and established colonies in places like Belvidere in

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Franklin County, Hohenwald in Lewis County, Gruetli in Grundy County, and Allardt in Fentress County. (34) The Grundy County settlements have already been assessed for the National Register which led to the listing of the Stoker-Stampfil Farm (NR 4/02/87). The German settlement at Allardt has been fully assessed with a series of individual and district nominations [for example, see the Allardt Historic District (NR 10/29/91).] The Franklin County settlements are largely unassessed except for Zaugg Bank Barn (NR 12/18/73) near Belvidere. In this county, however, historic family farms include the Glaus Farm, established by Michael Glaus of Switzerland in 1869; the Schwartz Farm, established by German immigrant George M. Schwartz in 1868; and Eastview Farm, established by John and Anna Kurt Warmbrod of Switzerland in 1875. Joseph Killebrew provided a long description of the Belvidere settlement in the Nashville Daily American, May 27, 1893; also see the later formal study of the area produced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Walter Kollmorgen's The German-Swiss in Franklin County, Tennessee. Lawrence County received considerable immigration from a corporation known as the German Homestead Association, which acquired large tracts of land in the county and established the small towns of Loretto and St. Joseph. Three historic family farms associated with the German Homestead Association remain in operation: the Beuerlein Farm, established in 1872 by Michael Beuerlein of Bavaria; the Rocky Top Holstein Farm, establish by Nickolas and Anna Bauer Oehmen in 1872; and Frank Niedergeses Farm, established by Frank and Sophia Niedergeses of Prussia in 1871. (35)

In conclusion, assessing Criterion A significance under the reorganization of Tennessee agriculture from 1865 to 1880 will consider the founding date of the farm and the ethnic identity of the founding family. Farms with a historical association with African-Americans (see John H. Carothers House (NR 11/27/89) in Williamson County) and ethnic immigrant movements during these years are probably eligible both for their Agricultural significance (the new order in Tennessee agriculture) but also for their association with ethnic identity and the creation of new ethnic settlement patterns.

Inquiry 3: Is the farm associated with the various attempts to solve the "labor problem" of southern agriculture in the post-

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Civil War era?

While this question is clearly related to the previous one concerning the reorganization of Tennessee agriculture, its focus is on the creation and expansion of sharecropping and other forms of free yet unfree labor arrangements that increasingly became part of the late nineteenth century agrarian landscape. Too often properties with remaining sharecropper houses are taken lightly, unless the cropper houses reflect some significant example of folk architecture.

Such an assessment, however, does little justice to the property's agricultural significance as an example of a farm that undertook sharecropping as its solution to the "labor problem" identified by state officials and agricultural leaders in the decades after the Civil War. Farming by shares was adopted quickly by some Middle Tennessee planters. In 1867, former Confederate general Richard Ewell who operated a farm (NR 5/24/76) near Spring Hill remarked to his son-in-law Major Campbell Brown that "if one wishes to farm profitably to any extent it must be by grazing or else by planting on shares." (36) But other landowners did not immediately turn to tenancy and sharecropping as the predominant form of labor organization after the Civil War. Among African-American laborers, the trend toward sharecropping dominance, instead, evolved from 1865 to 1880. During these years, a few African-Americans acquired land; some became croppers or tenants while the majority continued to work as a wage laborer, often in "gangs" not much different from former slave work arrangements. (37)

After 1880, share tenants and sharecroppers dominated both the white and black labor force of Tennessee agriculture. Share tenants were farm renters "who provided all the essentials for farm operation except the land itself and who paid rent in the form of a share of the crops they produced;" sharecroppers "farmed specific plots but supplied only their labor, receiving work stock, tools, and seed from their landlord." (38) While their lives existed at a subsistence level, the products they produced became part of national and international markets, with access and profits controlled, of course, by the landowners.

Tenancy, sharecropping, and peonage (in some extreme cases) became the pillars of the southern agricultural labor system

until the 1940s. (39) Historic family farms which retain houses for agricultural laborers are especially significant documents of a way of life that still included 1.8 million southerners as late as 1935.

Inquiry 4) Does the farm contain significant examples of vernacular or formal architecture in both dwellings (owners, and/or tenants) and outbuildings? If so, the farm, or portions thereof, may be eligible under the Architecture theme of Criterion C, or may represent an eligible historic district under Criterion C.

Assessments of farm buildings constructed in this period of 1850 to 1900 will be fully addressed in the Associated Property Types section of this nomination. Determining architectural significance for this era, however, may still be guided by the general hypothesis outlined in the first historic context. Farms that are self-sufficient or subsistence will have a greater liklihood to contain folk dwellings and outbuildings. Farms geared toward market production will be more likely to have dwellings that embrace formal architectural styles popular in the Victorian era.

Research in the dwellings of historic family farms in Middle Tennessee has determined that, in general, the region's families built Victorian styled residences at a slower rate than Tennesseans who lived in towns or cities. The central hall house remained popular through most of the period; Greek Revival styled porticoes (although sometimes decorated with Victorian detail) were still often added to these homes, especially in the Reconstruction era of 1865-1880. Of the formal styles that were constructed (and survive today), Gothic Revival and Second Empire were the most popular. Queen Anne styled farmhouses were constructed, but more typically farmers merely added Queen Anne-associated details (like fish-scale shingles) to their more plain house designs. The dominant Folk Victorian form was the distinctive gable-front and wing dwelling. Tenant or sharecropper homes were invariably one-story small frame houses. A few were of gable-front and wing design. Most were saddle-bag deriatives where a central shared chimney divided a small frame house into two parts, with two front doors being the defining characteristic of the exterior. Shotgun houses gained popularity

as appropriate housing for both African-American and white tenants; indeed the house style became generic for almost any working-class rural southern community.

Outbuildings became more specialized as the dictates as the progressive farming movement took hold among rural families in the late nineteenth century. All types of "houses" (cribs seem to be a word reserved solely for corn) were constructed to store potatoes, apples, and other market crops. Of the new structures introduced in this period, silos are perhaps the most important. As commercial dairy farming began to establish itself, the first silos were constructed in Middle Tennessee. Silos first came to the attention of American farmers from a series of articles in the American Agriculturalist in 1875 and later follow-up articles on successful first silos in 1877 and 1881. But diffusion of the new technology came at a snail's pace. Tennessee farmers built their first silos by 1880, but by 1882, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, only 91 farms in the United States had silos. The first were wooden rectangular structures; wooden, circular silos became more common by the end of the century.

III. Rural Reform and Agriculture, 1900-1945

In 1900, Tennessee agriculture reached its peak, with over 20.3 million acres in cultivation. The average size of a farm, however, slipped under one hundred acres to 90.6 acres per farm. Over the next four decades, the number of acres under cultivation would steadily drop as would the size of the average farm, which declined to 73 acres by 1930. But at the same time, the production of Tennessee farms increased significantly, spurred on "by enormous advances in technology and science," according to historian Robert E. Corlew. (40) Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, agricultural reformers pushed farmers to accept new technology, such as gas-powered tractors and machinery, and to embrace new agricultural techniques, fertilizers, and fungicides.

In the first two decades of the twentieth century, Tennessee farms became more diversified than ever before. Breeded beef cattle and dairy cattle became important contributors to the

Middle Tennessee economy. The University of Tennessee agricultural extension service built a demonstration dairy farm outside of Lewisburg in Marshall County. Encouraged by agricultural experts, and the construction by the Borden Company of a large dairy products plant (NR 7/14/88) in Fayetteville and the building of another milk plant by the Carnation Corporation in Murfreesboro, the dairy industry became very important in central and southern Middle Tennessee. The new emphasis on livestock kept corn production at relatively high levels, produced both as a basic item for the dinner table and for the consumption of the livestock. New types of grass and hay, alfalfa and lespedeza in particular, were pushed by the agricultural experts as additional foodstuffs for livestock.

Northern Middle Tennessee, especially the Black Patch belt of Montgomery, Robertson, and Sumner counties, had been famous for its dark-fired tobacco production since the early nineteenth century. In the twentieth century, most other farmers in Middle Tennessee turned to burley tobacco for a reliable cash crop. Tobacco barns joined silos as regular features of the landscape.

The Good Roads Movement of the progressive era also aimed to improve market access for Middle Tennessee farmers. Not only did the emerging system of improved state highways (like the Dixie Highway and the Memphis-to-Bristol Highway) and county roads provide better access to local railroad trade centers, the new roads improved the ability of farmers to take their products to urban markets and encouraged the development of truck farming as a cash source on family farms.

Extension agents also urged farmers to continue to diversify their production of fruits and vegetables for the ever-expanding urban centers of Tennessee. Many farms added orchards for apples, peaches, apricots, cherries, pears, and plums not only for their own consumption but for sale at nearby towns or to wholesale companies for distribution at the state and national levels. Strawberries became a particularly popular crop in areas with good railroad access so the ripened fruit could be rushed off to northern urban markets. Portland, in Sumner County, was an important strawberry center in Middle Tennessee. Sweet potatoes, peas, sorghum, and sugar beets also gained popularity as market crops.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Extension agents from the University of Tennessee were not alone as agents of rural reform. The George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, which was in operation in the early 1910s, emphasized classroom instruction in home economics education. Newly established state schools such as Middle Tennessee State College in Murfreesboro, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial College in Nashville (both in 1909), and Austin Peay State College in Clarksville (1927) provided young men and women with instruction in the latest in farm management. The railroads also stepped up their educational programs for progressive farming during the early twentieth century. From 1915 to 1918, for example, the Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railroad established and operated demonstration farms at Decherd, Tullahoma, Spencer, Dickson, and St. Andrews. The farms were estabished "with a view to encouraging agricultural methods among the farmers operating in our territory." (41)

The boom in Tennessee agriculture abruptly ended in the early 1920s and the depressed state of the farm economy really did not recover, despite the best efforts of such New Deal "alphabet agencies" as the TVA, AAA, and CCC, until the Second World War increased demand for agricultural products. New Deal agencies, however, helped to create a foundation for agricultural economy. The Civilian Conservation Corps, for example, restored devasted farmland and reforrested heavily logged regions. Historic family farms that experienced such CCC conservation efforts would be eligible under the Agriculture theme. The same would be true for farms that entered the various agricultural reform and improvement programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which designated and assisted various model or demonstration farms throughout the region.

The 1940s not only brought economic relief; it also was the decade when gas-powered machinery, especially tractors, took hold. That event, combined with the wartime demand for labor, largely spelled the end for the dominance of tenant farming in Middle Tennessee agriculture. Tenants would remain on the land (and may still be found today), but increasingly farm owners invested in mechanization as a way of solving their need for labor on their properties.

Corlew's research provides a good summary of where Tennessee agriculture stood in 1950:

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

> 1,016,204 people lived on 231,631 farms; their land, buildings, livestock, and equipment were valued at two and one-third billion dollars. Many farmers were putting their land into permanent pasture for the grazing of dairy and beef cattle, and livestock became the state's largest single source of farm income. The gross value of dairy products was $105,148,000, and Tennessee ranked fifth in the nation in the production of cheese. Beef, pork, and mutton together were valued at $185 million and poultry at $40 million. Cotton was still king [especially in West Tennessee], and the crop sold in 1951 brought $118 million. Corn was second at $106 million; tobacco came third at $67 million. Farmers cleared their forest lands to take advantage of high lumber prices brought about by the postwar boom. At mid-century Tennessee was the world's largest producer of hardwood flooring. (42)

Chart VI lists the most common products found on Middle Tennessee Century Farms today. When the typical production of these properties in the mid-1980s is compared to Corlew's description, you may see that the agricultural patterns established by mid-century still define Tennessee historic family farms today.

Chart VI: Ten Most Popular Agricultural Products, 1986, Middle Tennessee Century Farms

Product	# of Farms Producing Product
Beef cattle	219
Hay	189
Corn	152
Tobacco	140
Soybeans	73
Wheat	61
Swine	59
Pasture	35
Dairy cattle	33
Grains	22

n = 343

SOURCE: author's calculations

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

The above discussion is a brief summary of the significant changes that occurred in Tennessee agriculture in the first half of the twentieth century. To assess the agricultural (Criterion A) and architectural (Criterion C) significance of historic family farms during this era, four areas of inquiry are important. 1) Is the farm associated with the new crops and techniques of the progressive farming movement? 2) Is the farm associated with the farm demonstration programs and projects of the agricultural extension service? 3) Is the farm associated with recovery and/or relief programs associated with such New Deal initiatives as the TVA, AAA, CCC, or Rural Electrification? 4) Does the farm contain dwellings and/or outbuildings that are significant representatives of twentieth century domestic architecture and of twentieth century farm structures?

Inquiry 1) Is the farm associated with the new crops and techniques of the progressive farming movement? If so, the property may be eligible under the the Agriculture theme of Criterion A.

Early Tennessee farmers generally used traditional agricultural practices that led to erosion and depletion of nutrients in the soil. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, farmers began to adopt more efficient methods known as progressive farming. Tennessee progressive farmers were measured by their willingness to practice soil conservation and modern farm management as well as their willingness to accept the advice of agricultural experts from the University of Tennessee extension service, the Farm Bureau Federation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. (43)

Farm demonstration programs began in Tennessee in 1909 and during the winter of 1910-11 and "with the passage of the federal Smith-Lever Act in 1914, the role of the county agent and the extension service became a permanent part of the farm community." In 1916, the state formally established the County Home Demonstration program for rural women; it also hired its first African-American extension agents, "which extended the program to virtually every farmer in Tennessee. By 1920, the methods and ideas of progressive farming touched the lives of farm families everywhere." (44)

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

A progressive farm of the early twentieth century had several common characteristics. First came the use of new commercial fertilizers such as sulphate of ammonia, Tennessee phosphate rock, and potassium chloride to supplement the traditional use of organic fertilizers. Second, progressive farmers turned to lead arsenate and calcium arsenate as new insecticides because these two poisons did not burn plant leaves as much as Paris Green, a popular insecticide in the nineteenth century. To combat insects that suck plant juicies, rather than eat the leaves, progressive farmers turned to contact insecticides like nicotine suplhate, kerosene emulsions, and such plant extracts as rotenone.

Third, progressive farmers turned to irrigation as a safety-valve against crop failure during time of drought. Besides providing water to fields, irrigation also helped rid plants of harmful elements like alkali. These three traits--use of fertilizers, insecticides, and irrigation--did not solve the prevalence of worn-out soil, a basic problem plaguing Middle Tennessee farmers in the early twentieth century. The decades of planting the same crop in the same straight row made many fields unfit for production. Using the progressive methods of contour cultivation and crop rotation, however, farm families were able to bring their fields back into efficient production.

Contour cultivation allows farmers in hilly areas to cultivate fields without the damaging effects of soil erosion. By plowing furrows along the contours of a hillside, the rows act as barriers to soil erosion and the soil can absorb the water. Terraces, or low banks, slow the downward movement of water on steeper grades. They help diminish wind erosion and conserve water as well. Many farms have surviving evidence of this type of progressive reshaping of the farm landscape.

Crop rotation brought additional benefits. Important new crops, especially in Middle Tennessee, included lespedeza and alfalfa for expanding livestock production. Leguminous plants, such as clover and soybeans, returned the essential element of nitrogen into the soil. Crop rotation also gave the farmer feed for livestock, eradicated plant diseases, insects, and weeds, and kept a groundcover on fields which prevented erosion. Crop rotation is not as important in modern agriculture as it was at the beginning of the century since farmers rely heavily today on

commercial fertilizers to keep mineral content high in constantly producing farm land.

A final trait of the progressive farmer of the early twentieth century was the willingness to use breeded livestock and to use commercially produced hybrid seeds. By raising hybrid plants, farmers have been able to grow superior corn, tobacco, and cotton crops. Farm animals are also cross bred to produce hybrids. The mule--the primary power source for Middle Tennessee agriculture in the early decades of the century--is an obvious example, but productive hybrids have been produced in beef and dairy cattle as well as poultry.

Significant evidence of any or all of these activities on a historic family farms means that the property is associated with the progressive farming movement in Tennessee agriculture and thus would have agricultural significance for the era of 1900 to 1945.

Inquiry 2) Is the farm associated with the farm demonstration programs and projects of the agricultural extension service? If so, the property may be eligible under the Agriculture theme of Criterion A.

Farm demonstration programs in the United States evolved from progressive concerns about the condition of rural life at the turn of the century. (45) Officials such as Dr. S. A. Knapp of the U.S. Department of Agriculture wanted to eliminate past farming practices that caused soil erosion and poor productivity. In 1904, in reaction to the plague of the cotton boll weevil, Congress approved the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstrations program and two years later, federal officials extended this model farming program throughout the country while expanding the demonstrations to include general agricultural techniques.

Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration work began in Tennessee in 1909. Between December 1910 and February 1911, state officials selected the first six county agents. Within three years, the University of Tennessee established a Division of Extension in its College of Agriculture and assumed administration of the county agents. Congressional passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 institutionalized the extension

service on a statewide basis. Within a generation most counties had their own local extension agent, especially once the Tennessee General Assembly approved the Agriculture and Home Economics Cooperative Extension Act in 1929.

Another important development was the creation of the Farm Bureau. (46) The Tennessee Farm Bureau grew out of the County Councils of Agriculture, first established in Blount County in 1919. By 1921, the County Councils had formed a statewide union and in 1923, the group took on the name of the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation and joined the American Farm Bureau Federation. That same year, the Farm Bureau organized the Tennessee Cotton Marketing Cooperative and nine years later, in 1932, it helped to organize the Tennessee Livestock Producers' Marketing Association. The Bureau also helped to create the Tennessee Burley Tobacco Growers' Association in 1941. In addition to raising prices through market cooperatives, the Farm Bureau directed its attention to agricultural education, publishing magazines and pamphlets and conducting educational sessions. The Farm Bureau strongly supported the rural reform movement, advocating better rural health programs, better roads, better schools, and rural electrification.

The goals of the extension agents, and other educational reformers, were to demonstrate better methods of farming and to encourage agricultural diversification. The extension programs, however, did more than preach the value of soil conservation and truck farming. Their demonstration farms scattered throughout the state showed farmers the latest in equipment, fertilizers, and agricultural methods. The extension service also provide building plans so families could construct such modern facilities as privies, hog "parlors," tobacco barns, equipment sheds, and granaries. Families sometimes adapted their standardized plans to their own needs and traditions, but many of buildings found on the rural landscape today owe their genesis to construction plans provided by the extension service.

In 1910, the state established "Corn Clubs" for Tennessee boys for the purpose of teaching new farming methods to future farm operators. That same year, the state established "Canning Clubs," which taught new methods of food preparation and household management to future farm wives and women operators. The "Canning Clubs" evolved into the County Home Demonstration program by 1914. The first years of Home Demonstration work

emphasized the woman's side of production on the farm such as canning, chickens and eggs, fruit, and nuts. Artifacts of this reform initiative can be found in many farm yards. Cellers were constructed where canned goods could be kept. Chicken houses, often based on standardized plans, were erected. Small orchards were planted near the house. In the 1920s and 1930s, however, home demonstration programs shifted their emphasis to home improvement. According to historian Mary Hoffschwelle, demonstration agents

> preached the gospel of home conveniences. These ranged from an egg beater to a complete indoor water system. Home conveniences addressed the primary problem confronting rural reformers: the farm wife. If her burdens could be lessened so that she might spend more time and effort on creating a homelike atmosphere in her own home and her community, the quality of rural life would improve enough to keep her children in the country. (47)

As an author in the Tennessee Extension Review noted: "What is more important than a comfortable, joyous home life? Nothing in the world, and the equipment of it with modern labor-saving conveniences and comforts should have first consideration." (48)

"Home management projects," concluded Hoffschwelle, "injected the modern, urban-oriented standards of home economics into the rural home and reordered farm women's traditional domestic activities and spaces." (49) Assessments of farm house interiors that date to this period, consequently, may involve more than architectural significance. The redesign of kitchens, the use of more labor-saving devices, adding wallpaper, erecting and repairing yard fences, and other evidence of home improvement during the 1920s and 1930s may be associated with the agricultural reform programs of the extension service and, consequently, have agricultural significance under Criterion A. Another important piece of evidence that documents the participation of historic family farms in these home demonstration programs is the 1928 publication Improved Country Homes in Tennessee. This book lists county by county the farms that had registered their farm name with the extension division. Listing in the book demonstrates that a family was involved in the program. As Charles A. Keffer, director of the Agricultural Extension Service at the University of Tennessee, explained:

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

> The one outstanding need of farm life is better homes. To meet this need we must have better farms and more profitable farming. The writer can recall when even in towns of ten thousand population a bathroom was a luxury, enjoyed only by the rich. Nobody in town or country had electric lights. Most homes were heated by stoves. Today many mechanic's homes are electric lighted and provided with running water; heated by steam or hot air furnaces. Every country visitor in such a home longs for like luxuries, and thinks of leaving the farm to enjoy them. Electric conveniences are too expensive in most rural communities, but there are reasonable priced lighting and heating systems everywhere. A comfortable home lightens labor and increases interest. Money in the bank will not make a contented farm family. The best reason for better farming, which means economic production, due care of the soil and the livestock and successful marketing, is a better home, not an increasing cash balance. There is no antagonism between `Better Homes and Better Farms.' Quite the contrary. Each of these ideas implies the other: they should be inseparable. Let us do better farming--more profitable farming--in order to have better living conditions in the country and no power on earth can lure our people from the farm. (50)

If the property has buildings or interior renovations that were associated with the property during this period, it is probably eligible for nomination under the Agriculture theme of Criterion A (and probably eligible under Criterion C as well), as an example of how "Better Homes" meant "Better Farms." During 1920 and 1940, many farm families "modernized" their traditional-styled farm houses, or built new homes in such "modern" styles as the bungalow or American Four-Square, in response to this major theme in the progressive farm movement. This improvement in the domestic environment, which would produce a grouping of buildings potentially eligible as well as a historic district with architectural significance, would also be significantly associated, as a historic district, with this reform movement of "Better Homes, Better Farms" in agriculture.

Inquiry 3) Is the farm associated with recovery and/or relief programs associated with such New Deal initiatives as the TVA, AAA, CCC, or Rural Electrification? If so, the property may be eligible under Criterion A.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

The New Deal, particularly the Tennessee Valley Authority, cut a wide swath across the agricultural landscape of Tennessee. In Middle Tennessee, TVA's presence was not as strongly felt from 1933 to 1945 as it was in East Tennessee. But agencies, like the Civilian Conservation Corps, made their mark through reclamation of devastated farmland and forests. Another agency making direct contributions to local farmers was the Works Progress Administration (WPA). The WPA, as well as the earlier Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), rebuilt and expanded local farm to market roads. WPA workers built sanitary privies for a basic low cost of $3 to $5. It also cultivated and maintained community gardens to provide food for poverty stricken farm families. One plot was in the Bluewing community of Cannon County where the WPA provided the land, equipment, and seeds, while local residents tilled their small section of the overall plot for their own food needs. The Rural Electrification Administration began to impact Tennessee farms by the late 1930s. The cheap availability of electricity led dairy farmers, for example, to add more efficient electrical machinery and refrigerators to their operations. Rather than constructing or repairing traditional wooden and wire fences, farmers strung a wire or two of "electrical fence" to keep their cattle in place.

Evidence that would directly link the property to the New Deal era would probably make the property eligible for the National Register under Criterion A. If missing such a defining physical feature, the property is probably not eligible under this theme for Criterion A.

Inquiry 4) Does the farm contain dwellings and/or outbuildings that are significant representatives of twentieth century domestic architecture and of twentieth century farm structures? If so, the property may be eligible for architecture under Criterion C.

The farm bungalow, in all of its many variations, became an early twentieth century symbol of the prosperity enjoyed by Tennessee agricultural families in the first two decades of the twentieth century. The bungalow also symbolized the progressive ideology of farming popular in those decades. This house style

may be considered the most important domestic architectural statement of the era.

Except for the Colonial Revival, the revival styles popular in the first three decades of the century are rarely found expressed in rural dwellings. Nor are the International style or Art Deco found in farmhouse architecture. These were urban styles that had little association or meaning to rural Tennesseans. The Colonial Revival style, however, was very popular with agricultural reformers, especially when used to update more traditional folk homes, both in the exteriors and particularly the interiors. In 1928 Lillian Keller of the extension service explained: "in the living room campaign[,] spaciousness, order and harmony were striven for, rather than the old ornate, cluttered decorativeness or the severe stiffness of the `hair cloth sofa' age." Pictures of two Colonial Revival interiors were used to illustrate her point. (51)

To be sure, such traditional folk plans as the gable-front and wing dwelling continued to be built in the early decades of the century. Other popular forms included the pyramid cottage and the two-front door, no hallway, central chimney dwelling that was found among farmers of small acreage as well as tenant families. But just as standardized plans provided by the USDA or county extension agents began to gain in popularity in the barn yard, families left their folk past for new homes that could be acquired as complete packages from mail-order firms or independent companies and contractors. The dominant rural dwelling of the twentieth century--the ranch style house (especially with a colonial revival influenced front porch)--would not emerge until the 1950s.

By the early twentieth century, farmers had many possible sources for farm outbuildings--pattern books, extension service plans and bulletins, and mail-order companies--and the relatively cheap and easy availability of these structures led families to replace folk traditions in outbuildings with the new architecture of progressive farming. Bulletins and pamphlets abound extolling the virtures of new materials like concrete. Permanent Farm Construction, published by the Portland Cement Association, argued that concrete was perfect not only for silos and cellars, but also for houses, hog houses, milk houses, dairy barns, corn cribs, garages, implement sheds, manure pits, and chicken houses.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

An announcement at the end of the 70+ page pamphlet reminded farmers that

> plans and construction details for the larger types of farm structures such as farm residences, barns, hog houses, poultry houses, milk houses, granaries and other of the more important buildings are contained in special booklets and blueprints . . . . When you have a construction problem write us and appropriate literature and plans will be gladly sent you without charge or obligation. (52)

The rural landscape of the early twentieth century was more standardized than ever before, reflecting how the market revolution, that first appeared and evolved in the nineteenth century, had become the dominant influence on the shape and nature of rural culture. (53)

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Endnotes to Historic Contexts

1. Carroll Van West, "Continuity and Change in Tennessee Agriculture: The Century Farmers of Tennessee," Tennessee Historical Quarterly, 47(Fall 1988): 162.

2. Carroll Van West, Tennessee Agriculture: A Century Farms Perspective (Nashville: Tennessee Department of Agriculture, 1987); the exhibit was titled "Tennessee's Century Farms: Change and Continuity over 200 Years of Farming," funded in part by the Tennessee Council for the Humanities, 1988-89; also see Carroll Van West and Caneta Skelley Hankins, "Documenting the Agrarian Past: The Tennessee Century Farms Project," History News, 44(January/February 1989): 8-13; Carroll Van West, "`Century Farms' Programs as Documentary Sources in Agricultural History," Proceedings of 1989 ALHFAM Annual Meeting: Harvesting New Rural History 12(1992): 168-72; Carroll Van West, "Family Farm Recordation Projects and the National Register: A Partnership Whose Time Has Come," 1990 AASLH Annual Meeting, Washington D. C.

3. National Register nominations include: Murray Farm, Rutherford County; Smith-Sanders Farm, Rutherford County; Eakin Farm, Bedford County; Maplewood Farm, Williamson County.

4. National Register nominations include: Ashcrest Farm, Sumner County; Walker-Crawford Farm, Fayette County; Scott Mansion and Farm, Monroe County.

5. West, "Continuity and Change in Tennessee Agriculture," 162-63; West, "Century Farms as Documentary Sources," 170-71.

6. West, "Century Farms as Documentary Sources," 170.

7. West, "Continuity and Change," 163.

8. Robert Tracy McKenzie, "Civil War and Socioeconomic Change in the Upper South: The Survival of Local Agricultural Elites in Tennessee, 1850-1870," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 52(Fall 1993): 173.

9. Wayne Clark Moore, "Farm Communities and Economic Growth in

the Lower Tennessee Valley: Humphreys County, Tennessee," Ph:d dissertation, University of Rochester, 1990.

10. Donald G. Alcock, "A Study in Continuity: Maury County, Tennessee, 1850-1870," Ph:d dissertation, University of Southern California, 1985; Carroll Van West, "`The Money Our Fathers Were Accustomed To:' Banks and Political Culture in Rutherford County, Tennessee," Ph.D dissertation, College of William and Mary, 1982, chapter 2.

11. The above paragraphs have been adapted from West, Tennessee Agriculture, 115.

12. The mean average was based on an universe of N = 343. The mode average for Middle Tennessee was 1850, with a total of 14 farms established in that single year.

13. Blanche H. Clark, The Tennessee Yeomen, 1840-1860 (Nashville, 1942); Frank L. and Harriet C. Owsley, "The Economic Structure of Rural Tennessee, 1850-1860," Journal of Southern History 8(1942): 161-82; Frank L. Owsley, Plain Folk of the Old South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949); Donald L. Winters, "`Plain Folk' of the Old South Reexamined: Economic Democracy in Tennessee," Journal of Southern History 53(November 1987): 565-86; Donald L. Winters, "Farm Size and Production Choices: Tennessee, 1850-1860," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 52(Winter 1993): 212-24; Donald L. Winters, Tennessee Farming, Tennessee Farmers: The Antebellum Period (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994).

14. Winters, "Farm Size and Production Choices," 213.

15. Ibid., 217; also see, "Harriette S. Arnow, "The Pioneer Farmer and His Crops in the Cumberland Region," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 19(Winter 1960): 297-327.

16. Stanley J. Folmsbee, et. al., Tennessee: A Short History (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1969), 294-95.

17. The Agriculturalist, and Journal of the State and County Societies was published in Nashville from 1840 to 1845. It absorbed the earlier Tennessee Farmer (Jonesborough, 1834-1840)

and the Southern Cultivator (Columbia, 1839-1840).

18. Claudette Stager and Elizabeth Straw, "Middle Tennessee I-House," Old House Journal 18(September/October 1990): 98.

19. John M. Vlach, Back of the Big House: Architecture of Plantation Slavery (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

20. Owsley and Owsley, "Economic Structure of Rural Tennessee," 179-80; Chase C. Mooney, Slavery in Tennessee (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1957), 104-5, 113-14, 117, 184.

21. Winters, "Farm Size and Production Choices," 219.

22. Bonnie L. Gamble, "The Nashville Chattanooga and St. Louis Railroad, 1845-1880: Preservation of a Railroad Landscape," M.A. thesis, Middle Tennessee State University, 1993, pp. 44-45, 60-64.

23. Folmsbee, Tennessee, 295.

24. West, Tennessee Agriculture, 116.

25. Samuel B. Smith, "Joseph Buckner Killebrew and the New South Movement in Tennessee," Ph: d dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962, 4; Jesse C. Burt, Jr., "Railroad Promotion of Agriculture in Tennessee," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 10(1951): 320-33; for additional useful detail and context, see Burt's "History of the Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis Railway, 1872-1914," Ph: d dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1950.

26. Burt, "Railroad Promotion," 323.

27. Ibid., 327.

28. Robert Tracy McKenzie, "Freedmen and the Soil in the Upper South: The Reorganization of Tennessee Agriculture, 1865-1880," Journal of Southern History 59(February 1993): 64-84.

29. Ibid., 73.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

30. West, "Continuity and Change in Tennessee Agriculture," 163.

31. McKenzie, "Freedmen and the Soil," 80.

32. The modern pheonomenon of blacks leaving agriculture has received considered attention in the last few years. For a sampling of the popular literature, see Tom Halicki, "The Forgotten Farmer," The National Voter 37(April 1988): 13-15; Guy Gugiotta, "Trapped in a Sad Circle, Black Farmers Fade into Past," Minneapolis Star-Tribune, September 19, 1990; Tracy Walmer, "Black Losing Roots of Power: The Land," USA Today, June 7, 1990, 10a.

33. According to the 1880 Census for Tennessee, only 1% of the state's population was foreign-born.

34. John Egerton, Visions of Utopia: Nashoba, Rugby, Ruskin and the `New Communities' in Tennessee's Past (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1977), 5-7.

35. West, Tennessee Agriculture, 148-49, 167-69; Walter Kollmorgen, The German-Swiss in Franklin County, Tennessee (Washington: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1940); Smith, "Killebrew," 237-238.

36. McKenzie, "Freedmen and the Soil," 72.

37. Ibid., 70-75.

38. These definitions are from ibid., 74.

39. Pete Daniel, "The Metamorphosis of Slavery, 1865-1900," Journal of American History 66(June 1979): 88-99.

40. Robert E. Corlew, Tennessee: A Short History, 2nd ed., (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981), 500.

41. Burt, "Railroad Promotion of Agriculture," 330; also see Mary S. Hoffschwelle, "The Science of Domesticity: Home Economics at George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1929," Journal of Southern History 57(November 1991): 659-680.

42. Corlew, Tennessee, 513, 515.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

43. This section is adapted from a historical insert prepared by Jeff Durbin in West, Tennessee Agriculture, 268. Also see: Dewey Grantham, Southern Progressivism: The Reconciliation of Progress and Tradition (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983), 320-48; George L. Robson, Jr., and Roy V. Scott, eds., Southern Agriculture Since the Civil War: A Symposium (Santa Barbara, CA, 1979); William L. Bowers, The Country Life Movement in America, 1900-1920 (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1974); and David B. Danbom, The Resisted Revolution: Urban America and the Industrialization of Agriculture, 1900-1930 (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1979).

44. This paragraph is adapted from a historical insert prepared by Jeff Durbin and Carroll Van West in West, Tennessee Agriculture, 153.

45. Ibid.; also see: Almon J. Sims, A History of Extension Work in Tennessee: Twenty-Five Years of Service to Rural Life, 1914-1939 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee College of Agriculture, Bulletin 223, May 1939); Roy V. Scott, The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970); and Lloyd D. Blauch, Federal Cooperation in Agricultural Extension Work, Vocational Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1935).

46. This paragraph is adapted from a historical insert by Jeff Durbin in West, Tennessee Agriculture, 325.

47. Mary S. Hoffschwelle, "Rebuilding the Rural Southern Community: Reformers, Schools, and Homes in Tennessee, 1914-1929," Ph: d dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1993, p. 176.

48. "Efficient Farm Homes," Tennessee Extension Review 4(June 1921): 8.

49. Hoffschwelle, "Rebuilding the Rural Southern Community," 205. In particular, see Ruth Van Deman, The Well-Planned Kitchen (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1921); M. C. Wilson, Kitchen Arrangement and Equipment, USDA Extension Service Circular 30 (typescript, December 1926); and Lillian L. Keller, The Living Room That is Livable (Knoxville: University of Tennessee College of Agriculture, Division of Extension,

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Publication 134, December 1925).

50. Improved Country Homes of Tennessee (Nashville: Tennessee Department of Agriculture, 1928), 2.

51. Ibid., 8.

52. Permanent Farm Construction (Louisville, KY: Louisville Cement Company, n. d.), backpiece. We thank Liz Straw of the Tennessee Historical Commission for bringing this source to our attention.

53. On this point, see the insightful study of Charles E. Martin, Hollybush: Folk Building and Social Change in an Appalachian Community (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984).

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

F. Associated Property Types
FI. Historic Family Farms
FII. Description

Historic family farms in Middle Tennessee range from at least ten acres to over one thousand acres in size. This range of farm acreage embraces farms of one hundred acres or less that families operated soley with their own labor, perhaps assisted at seasonal times by hired labor; farms of less than five hundred acres where the family worked with ten or less slaves in the antebellum period or with a small number of tenants in the postbellum era; and plantations of five hundred to thousands of acres where the family owned ten or more slaves or employed a like number of tenants after the Civil War. This test of ten or more slaves, with more than five hundred acres of land, to define a Middle Tennessee plantation reflects the agricultural and economic context of Middle Tennessee. Middle Tennesseans owned more slaves than any other region in the state, but sixty percent owned no slaves and of those who were slaveowners, about 70 percent owned five or less. (1) Whatever their size, these farmsteads have four broad categories of buildings and/or structures: 1) dwellings 2) outbuildings 3) fences and fields and 4) cemeteries. For the descriptive section of this discussion, we will consider each of these categories in order and list the primary types of buildings and/or structures found in each category. However, for general assessment purposes, the following should be kept in mind. We argue that for a property to meet the description of a "historic family farm," it should exhibit, at least, extant historic resources from the first three categories. That is, the nominated farm complex usually should contain a historic dwelling; outbuildings that are associated with the dwelling and/or associated with a significant agricultural period in the history of the farm; and historic fields that are associated with a significant period of agricultural production in the history of the farm. Family cemeteries may or may not be on the property. This resource is an important feature, if present, but its presence is not necessary to define a "historic family farm." Nor is it necessary for the same family to have owned and operated the farm over a long period of time; depending on the individual situation, changing ownership may add to, or detract from, the architectural significance of the property. It is highly

doubtful that a "historic family farm" is present, if the dwelling was built after 1945 and/or there are no extant historic outbuildings or historic fields.

The chronological period for the extant resources in the three categories of dwellings, outbuildings, and fields may be mixed; that is, the house may be more recent than the field patterns or the outbuildings may be more recent than both the dwelling and fields. The nominated property's period of significance, especially for the agriculture theme of Criterion A, will define the chronological range represented by the individual resources of a historic family farm. A farm might have a founding date of 1860, for example, and the fields and some outbuildings may well date to the mid-nineteenth century. The house, on the other hand, might be a 1920s bungalow. This chronological range is not unusual; farm families updated outbuildings and dwellings as circumstances on the farm changed, particularly in the early twentieth century in response to the progressive farming movement. The crucial determination for a historic family farm is to determine the period of significance for agriculture. If the property does not have significance in agriculture, however, it should be carefully assessed for architectural significance under Criterion C as a historic district. A "historic family farm" may not be present, but a significant "farm complex" may be extant "if the buildings had integrity and were good examples of a type, period, or method [of] construction." [Letter from Claudette Stager, Tennessee SHPO, to author, 9/27/94] This architectural grouping may be associated, as well, with significant developments or periods in agricultural history and may be eligible under Criterion A for the theme of agriculture.

1) Dwellings: places of human occupation in the present or in the past that remain on the farmstead

single-pen log cabin (1785-1900). A one-room log house, with a single gable end chimney, which may be further described according to its notching type. Often used as dwelling of initial occupation, but may have been built later in the nineteenth century for use as slave quarters and/or tenant housing.

double-pen log cabin (1785-1900). A two-room log house, with

either gable end chimneys on either one or two ends, which may be further described according to its notching type. Often used as dwelling of initial occupation, but may have been built later in the nineteenth century for use as slave quarters and/or tenant housing.

saddlebag house (1785-1930). The original type of saddlebag house was a two-room log cabin with each room flanking a shared central chimney and each room having its separate front door entrance. Often used as dwelling of initial occupation, but may have been built later in the nineteenth century for use as slave quarters and/or tenant housing. Indeed, the basic form of two rooms, central chimney, and two front doors survived as a popular housing type for both whites and blacks well into the twentieth century, usually built as a frame house. Glassie has called this type the "Cumberland" house, but the house type can be found throughout the region and not just in the Eastern Highland Rim and Cumberland Plateau.

dogtrot house (1800-1860). This two-pen log house features an open breezeway with gable end chimneys. Often used as a dwelling of initial occupation, but may have been used later as a central hall house once the logs were covered with weatherboard and the breezeway covered over to create a central hall.

These first folk forms of dwellings were often incorporated into larger homes as the family expanded the house in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

central hall house (1800-1900). The basic form of this one-story frame or brick dwelling is a central hall flanked by roughly equaled sized rooms. An interesting variation, sometimes found in Middle Tennessee, is an adapted Irish folk design where the central hall is the largest room, with roughly equal but smaller rooms flanking the central hall. By the middle decades of the nineteenth century, an ell-wing had usually been added to the dwelling for the purposes of creating a separate dining room, additional bedrooms, and connecting the kitchen to the main house.

I-house (1800-1900). First identified and defined by geographer Fred Kniffen, this is a frame or brick (and in rare instances

log) two-story dwelling, based on a central hall plan, with two or four flanking rooms on each story. By the middle decades of the nineteenth century, an one-story (sometimes two-story) ell-wing was added to the dwelling for the purposes of creating a separate dining room, additional bedrooms, and connecting the kitchen to the main house.

Middle Tennessee I-house (1830-1875). Defined by Stager and Straw as an I-house with a dominating two-story Greek Revival styled portico. In the years shortly before the Civil War, and in the Reconstruction period, Victorian designs would often influence the portico and Italianate-styled double brackets would decorate the eaves.

Greek Revival (1830-1870). Architectural style popular with the planter class. A temple-form two-story dwelling with dominating two-story classical portico. Columns may have Cornithian, Ionic, or Doric capitals. A more vernacular statement of the style is found in the Middle Tennessee I-house where the two-story classical portico would be added to the I-house form or a single-story portico would be added to a single-story central-hall house.

Italianate (1850-1880). Architectural style popular with the planter class, strongly associated with the general boom in the southern agricultural economy during the 1850s. Two important characteristics are brackets under the eaves and round arches which appear on windows and doors, and, quite often, repeated in the porch design. An asymetrical facade, with a square tower, would be found in more formal statements of the style. Elements of Italianate design, especially the bracketed eaves and rounded arches, were often added to houses of an earlier period and more vernacular style, when owners wanted to "Victorianize" their homes.

Gothic Revival (1850-1880). According to a recent study of Middle Tennessee domestic architecture by Caneta S. Hankins, "Gothic Revival cottages were almost always built of wood and have steeply pitched roofs and equally steep cross gables which may be located to the front, centered, in pairs or threes, or compound to the center, side, and front. The gables commonly have decorated vergeboard and a window within the gable. Windows

may have flat lintels, drip molding, surrounds, or pointed arches. A one-story porch covers the entry or runs the full width across the facade." (2)

Second Empire (1865-1885). Popular among advocates of the "New South" and economic change in Middle Tennessee in the years after the Civil War. Mansard roof, multi-colored tin plate roofs, and decorative iron cresting are basic architectural elements. "The Second Empire often includes details closely related to the Italianate such as brackets, arched windows with heavy moldings, doors, and porches," according to Hankins. "When the tower is present, its roof line may be of a different shape than the roof over the main house. Like the Italianate, Second Empire floor plans are irregular, the facade is asymmetrical, and windows are different shapes and sizes." (3)

Shotgun (1870-1940). Vlach has identified the cultural origins of this dwelling as African-American, especially in the urban crucible of New Orleans during the antebellum era. The house, in its basic form, is a one-story frame dwelling and contains at least three interconnected rooms, with no hallway, with the entrance being on the gable end. In the reconstruction era, African-Americans constructed the house type both in urban and small town areas from where it diffused into the countryside and became a basic house form for tenant farmers and sharecroppers.

Gable-Front and Wing (1870-1910). Described as Folk Victorian by the McAlesters, this house type was the dominant rural dwelling of Middle Tennessee during the late nineteenth century. According to Hankins, "a side-gable wing was added at right angles to a gable front plan to produce the gable-front and wing shape. A porch, usually with Victorian millwork, was typically placed within the `L' made by the two wings." (4)

Up-right and Wing (1870-1910). A two-story version of the Gable-Front and Wing dwelling.

Queen Anne (1880-1900). "The primary characteristics of the Queen Anne style," concludes Hankins, "include windows of different shapes, towers, turrets, bays, fish scale shingles, and cut-aways to give a fanciful or informal appearance. The asymmetrical roofline of gables and hips, wrap-around porches

with spindles, and decorative millwork are also part of the style." (5) The Queen Anne influence on various folk forms of farm housing is common, usually exhibited as fish scale shingles, millwork, and wrap-around porches.

Classical Revival (1900-1940). This new interpretation of classical architecture was built in both brick and frame and "drew on Georgian, Greek, and Roman classical designs producing combinations of forms and elements that were decidedly modern, yet highly reminiscent of earlier" classical styles. (6) Overwhelming two-story classical porticoes and symmetrical facades particularly defined the style in domestic architecture.

Bungalow (1905-1940). A one to one and a half story brick, stuccoed, or frame dwelling with a low pitched overhanging roof and wrap-around porch that, in its pure state, eschews historical ornament for more naturalistic decorative details. This house style became very popular with "progressive farmers" in the early twentieth century, but many examples in Tennessee would embrace the "classical bungalow" form, that is, the dwelling would be a bungalow but its porch and windows would reflect the influence of classical revival design by using classical columns, capitals, and Palladian-like windows.

Foursquare (1905-1930). A two-story brick or frame house, with Craftsman-influenced brackets under the eaves and typically a shed dormer on the low pitch roof. Popular among "progressive farmers" during the early twentieth century. Would sometimes take on the appearance of the Classical Revival house by the addition of a two-story classical portico but more common was the addition of a largely unadorned one-story portico which gave the dwelling a more Colonial Revival appearance.

Colonial Revival (1920-1950). Very popular style in rural Tennessee, especially between World War I and World War II. "Georgian Revival" would typically be a two-story brick house with a steep gable roof, symmetrical facade, and dormer windows. The "Georgian cottage" would be a one-story version of this same style, built in either frame or brick.

Minimal Traditional (1935-1955). Identified and defined by the McAlesters, this one-story frame or brick dwelling is a small

(three to five rooms) one-story house that features a symmetrical facade and has little ornamentation. Popular among farmers of smaller amounts of acreage and can be found on larger estates as tenant housing. Sometimes this house form is referred to as a "tract house," identifying its origins in the immediate post-World War II housing boom.

2) Outbuildings: places of human work and where animals, agricultural products, and equipment may be stored. In general, the outbuildings for historic family farms are arranged in a domestic complex, usually defined by a fence or tree/shubbery line, that surrounds or lies in close proximity to the dwelling, and in the agricultural complex, or work complex, that would lie farther away from the dwelling and to the rear or the side of the domestic complex.

Within the domestic complex, the following outbuildings would be most typically located:

carriage house (1800 to 1900). A rectangular one-story gable roof frame or brick building used for the storage of carriages and/or horses for carriages.

cellars (1800 to 1990). A few nineteenth century cellars may still be located (the structures were known then as root cellars) and they used were for the underground storage of potatoes, turnips, and other root vegetables. In the middle decades of the twentieth century, many progressive farmers constructed cellars out of concrete so canned goods could be stored there throughout the year.

dairy (1840-1900). A small frame building, with ventilation grills in the top half, that is taller than it is wide (but not as tall as a smokehouse) and used for milk storage.

garage (1900 to 1945). A rectangular one-story gable roof frame or brick building used for the storage of automobiles.

ice house (1800-1940). Found more typically on large plantations, this rectangular, frame building was used for the storage of ice and other perishable commodities. Most were

abandoned or turned to new uses after the introduction of electricity in the early decades of the twentieth century.

kitchen (1785-1900). A rectangular one-story gable roof frame or brick building used for the preparation of meals. Typically by 1900, the separate kitchen had been incorporated into the dwelling by means of a L-wing.

office (1780-1940). A rectangular one-story gable roof frame or brick building used for administering and managing farm work and sales. Often part of the domestic complex, it may also be located as a "buffer" between the domestic complex and the agricultural complex.

privy (1785-1970). Although built early in a farm's history, these tall structures, with usually side ventilators, for human waste disposal are rarely found on extant farms and if they do remain, most date from the twentieth century.

smokehouse (1785-1990). A tall but fairly narrow log, brick, or frame structure used for the smoking and preservation of meats, usually pork. Most log smokehouses in Middle Tennessee date prior to 1860; the frame smokehouses are mostly of the twentieth century.

spring house (1785-1840). A small usually gable roof building of brick, limestone, log or frame used to protect the family water supply and to provide a cool spot for the temporary preservation of perishable dairy items.

washhouse (1800-1940). Typically a frame one-story gable roof rectangular building that housed the machinery, pans, and pots for washing clothes. Still stands on some farms and used for storage today.

well (1785-1990). Wells refer to the structures built over a dug-out or drilled well to underground water. It is uncommon to find a frame or log well head today; beginning in the twentieth century, farmers built either a frame well house to cover the well opening and pump or located the machinery within a concrete well head.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

wood shed (1800 to 1990). A small rectangular typically frame building with an overhanging gable roof used to protect the wood supply from rain. Still used on properties that rely on fireplaces and/or wood stoves for winter heating.

The agricultural complex typically contains the larger outbuildings of a historic family farm. The centerpieces are the various barns, around which are loosely arranged cribs, granaries, equipment sheds, and other buildings devoted to agricultural production and storage. On larger farms, especially tobacco farms, barns may be located throughout the farm, closer to the productive fields with which they are associated.

Barn types would include:

single crib barn (1785-1960). According to Noble, single crib barns "are merely a crib, or pen, constructed of rough-hewn logs and covered by a simple gable roof." (7) Commonly, the barns are between eight and twelve feet in length and have a door on the gable end. Used for corn and grain storage, this type of barn was constructed of frame in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Often, the original log crib remains intact, but flanking frame (or even metal) sheds have been added to increase the barn's storage capacity.

double crib barn (1785-1960). "In these barns," Noble states, "a second crib, sometimes identical to the earlier crib and sometimes of rather different dimensions, was erected so that it could share with the first crib a common roof, which extended across a central aisle or breezeway." (8)

four crib barn (1820-1920). "Four separate cribs are erected, one at each corner of the barn, and a single gable roof is put over the entire structure. The two aisles thus formed cross in the middle of the building." (9)

transverse frame barn (1820-1990). Very common barn type in Middle Tennessee. The four crib barn design was basically filled in as the side aisle openings were eliminated, leaving only a center aisle open at the gable ends. Another pen replaced the side aisle opening, giving farmers six storage pens rather than

the four of the double crib barn. Over time, the center aisle has been elongated, with some transverse crib barns having five or six pens on either side of the center aisle. The USDA developed standardized plans for transverse crib barns, used for curing either burley or dark-fired tobacco, in the mid-twentieth century. This barn type has also been transformed into a stock barn, particularly on the increasing number of farms which no longer produce tobacco.

rack-side or pennyroyal barn (1900-1970). Found most often in northern Middle Tennessee, this is a transverse frame barn that has "inward slanting sides, which enclose interior mangers fed from the loft above." The barn developed in response to a shift to livestock production from dark-fired tobacco production. (10)

three-portal barn (1850-1990). Attributed to the Midwest and a German ethnic influence by Noble, these barns may also be found in large numbers in the Upper South. This type is a transverse crib barn to which has been added large sloping sheds on either side, creating a large barn with three gable to gable aisles.

bank barn (1850-1990). Attributed to German cultural traditions, the bank barn is a large gable-roofed barn that has either been built into a bank or has had a sloping ramp that allows direct wagon access to the threshing rooms of the second floor.

pole barn (1945-1990). A popular post-World War II barn type, this low-pitch roofed, one-story frame or metal barn is placed on a concrete slab and upright poles provide the framing of the barn walls and steel-girder trusses provide support for the roof.

dark fired tobacco barn (1810-1990). These log or frame barns measure "about twenty to twenty-two feet by twenty-six to forty-eight feet. These gable-entry structures are about eighteen to twenty feet high, with five or six tiers or racks of poles on which the tobacco sticks are hung." (11)

flue cured tobacco barn (1810-1990). A few examples of this barn type exist in Tennessee; many more are in North Carolina. The basic form is of a tall rectangle or square around the lower half of which has been constructed a shed supported by wooden poles that surrounds the building.

burley tobacco barn (1880-1990). Burley tobacco is air-cured and does not require a special type of barn configuration. Most burley tobacco barns in Middle Tennessee are tall, elongated gable roofed barns, with entrances on the gable end. The barns have ventilators along the roof ridge to enhance air circulation and they often have movable panels on both the sides and gable ends to increase circulation.

Crib types would include:

corncrib (1785-1990). A basic element of most Middle Tennessee farmsteads. Different types of cribs are located throughout the United States, but in this region, most cribs are elongated but narrow buildings constructed off the ground on wooden supports that have slatted walls to provide proper ventilation for the corn.

drive-in crib (1800-1940). Similar to a double crib barn, but different in that there is no loft, the two cribs are elongated, and the aisle is quite wide.

front drive crib (1800-1920). A single crib barn built of logs or frame with a projecting front roof which is then braced and supported by corner poles.

side drive crib (1800-1920). This type "has an aisle and a crib of about equal dimensions, and each is covered by approximately one-half the roof, the slope of which is unbroken." (12)

Other agricultural production/storage buildings would include:

chicken coop (1900-1990). The production of poultry became a major agricultural commodity during the progressive agriculture era. Extension service agents provided farmers with standardized plans for small, medium, and large chicken houses and many of these buildings are still extant on farms, although few are in use today. Farms that produced small amounts of chicken utilized a coop that featured two to three windows on one side with a shed roof. Larger chicken coops have a low pitched roof over an elongated building with six to ten window openings on each side.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

granary (1785-1990). First constructed of logs, and later frame, and most recently of metal, these typically gable-roofed structures provided storage for wheat, oats, and other small grains. Cylinder shaped metal granaries have become common in the second half of the twentieth century.

hog houses (1800-1990). Also known as pig pens or even hog parlors, the hog house was located as far away from the dwelling as possible. In the nineteenth century, a simple single-story frame building with gable roof was typical since the basic function of the structure was to protect the pigs in inclement weather. In the early twentieth century, however, standardized plans from extension agents provided a more integrated design so that the corn or other foodstuffs could be stored next to the feeding pens. These buildings are often referred to as hog parlors. Modern hog houses built since the 1970s on large swine-producing farms are elongated one-story metal buildings with a gable roof, which are almost completely enclosed except for a single entrance at the gable end.

milkhouse (1900-1990). Associated with the boom in the Tennessee dairy industry during the twentieth century. Most extant milkhouses are built of concrete blocks and are one-story in height, unadorned, and have a gable roof. Inside the building is where the modern dairy equipment is located.

silo (1880-1990). A tall usually circular storage system for ensilage. Since their introduction to the United States, silos have evolved from rectangular wooden structures (1880 to 1900) to circular wooden-stave structures (1900 to 1920) to huge concrete silos (1920 to 1980) and to the modern Harvestore systems of today (1945 to 1990)

stable (1785-1990): a type of barn used to house livestock, typically horses or mules. These rectangular one-story log or frame structures became much larger and more elaborate by the mid-twentieth century when Walking Horse owners built elaborate horse stables of frame or even brick to house their prized breeding stock.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Storage sheds would include:

equipment shed (1920-1990). Associated with the gas-powered engine mechanization boom in agriculture during the twentieth century. These one-story frame structures, often with a shed roof, are garages for farm equipment, with typically multiple bays to shelter tractors, combines, seeders, wagons, etc. Extension agents also provided farmers with standardized plans for these buildings.

hay shed (1940-1990). Since the mid-century, farmers for reasons of cost have turned increasingly to building one and even two-story hay sheds to protect their hay crop. These are rectangular gable roof buildings, with the roof supported by wooden or metal poles, that are open on the sides.

Other features:

pond (1900-1990). Associated with the progressive farming period and the twentieth century switch to livestock production. Certainly ponds were constructed on farms before 1900, but those identified in the Center's fieldwork have dated to the mid-twentieth century (or later).

III. Fences and Fields

When assessing the fences and fields that comprise an individual farmstead, it is crucial to remember that family farms are individual units of production. Comparing a historic family farm to a historic factory building is a valuable analogy. Like a historic factory building, the outside (that is, the farm boundaries) are constants (although additions may be made through the years). How space is divided on the inside (or within the fields), however, may change through the years, according to the commodities being produced at a given period.

On a historic family farm of 150 years in age, in other words, the size of fields, and the types of crops produced, have undoubtedly changed from the date of establishment to today. If such changes have not happened, the farm would probably not have remained successful and remained as a farm today. (Obvious exceptions come to mind when you consider the valuable cotton

farms of West Tennessee and the tobacco farms of the Black Patch in Middle Tennessee. But even there, the amount of acres in production is nothing compared to the extent of the antebellum years due to increased yields, agricultural market prices, and federally mandated production quotas.) Also, due to changes in farm technology and mechanization, as well as the decline of farm tenancy, fields from the mid-twentieth century are often larger in acreage than those that could be managed efficiently by earlier available technology and labor systems. This change in field size, in most cases, is significant to the agricultural history of the property in that the changes reflect the general trends of labor, farm management, and crop production of twentieth century agriculture. The fields, in other words, become valuable documents of how agricultural production evolved from the nineteenth to the twentieth century.

When assessing fields, consider whether boundary lines between fields have been defined by past historical markers or by past historical behavior. Sometimes, historic fence lines are in place; sometimes, historic documents (soil conservation surveys from the 1930s; deed records; aerial photography from the 1930s-50s) will document the definition of the fields. Most often, however, "natural" fence lines, such as trees, bushes, and terraces, are still apparent around the boundaries of fields. If these types of historic boundaries exist around the fields, defining their historic boundaries as individual production areas within a larger unit of production, a significant agricultural sense of time and place is conveyed.

limestone fence (1840-1950). Most of the extant historic fences dating to the nineteenth century in Middle Tennessee were made of flat limestone stones. In this region, the earliest fences of this type probably date to late antebellum period, built both by slaves and Irish laborers. Extant limestone fences, however, may also be from the mid-twentieth century and associated with members of upper-middle class who moved to the "country" and built Colonial Revival estates.

rail fence (1800-1900). Also known as the worm, snake, or zig-zag fence. These types, according to Noble, "refer to the crooked pattern that the fence makes, the result of a necessity to alternate directions in order to maintain stability." (13)

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

board fence (1850-1990). Square lumber posts connected by three to five wooden boards (typically four were used). Used primarily to enclose livestock lots.

barbed wire fence (1900-1990). Although introduced in the Midwest during the 1870s, and gaining immense popularity in the Western states in the late 1800s, the barbed wire fence in Tennessee is usually twentieth century in origin and is associated with the shift to cattle production in this century.

net wire fence (1900-1990). Like the barbed wire fence, woven wire fences were first available in the 1880s, but in Tennessee most extant fences are twentieth century in origin. This type of fence is very common.

electric fence (1935-1990). Once the Rural Electrification Administration began to provide cheap electricity to rural areas, farmers began to use single or double strands of electric wire to fence livestock.

IV. Cemeteries

Several historic family farms retain family cemeteries, which may be significant contributing elements of the farmstead if the majority of graves date prior to 1945, if the grave markers are significant artifacts of folk culture, and if the cemetery itself represents a significant example of a designed landscape. Some historic family farms will have "slave cemeteries" as well. It is important to document if the cemeteries are actually from the era of slavery or is the cemetery more for the graves of black tenants and sharecroppers who worked in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Either type of cemetery, however, if they meet the general requirements noted above, would be significant contributing elements to the farmstead and, in fact, could be individually eligible for their significant association with ethnic identity theme of Criterion A.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Endnotes, Associated Property Types

1. Frank L. and Harriet C. Owsley, "The Economic Structure of Rural Tennessee, 1850-1860," Journal of Southern History 8(May 1942): 179-80; Chase C. Mooney, Slavery in Tennessee (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957), 104-5, 113-14, 117, 184.

2. Caneta S. Hankins, Hearthstones: The Story of Rutherford County Homes (Murfreesboro: Oaklands Association, 1994), 69.

3. Ibid., 71.

4. Ibid., 49.

5. Ibid., 76.

6. Ibid., 82.

7. Allen G. Noble, Wood, Brick & Stone: The North American Settlement Landscape (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984), II, 3.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., 10-11.

10. Ibid., 12.

11. Ibid., 48.

12. Ibid., 8.

13. Ibid., 121.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

F-III. Significance

Assessing the significance of the individual family farmstead, and its associated dwellings, outbuildings, fences and fields, and cemeteries, has been analyzed in detail in the narrative portion of this nomination. Historic family farms are most often significant for their association of the history of agriculture and the history of settlement in that area (Criterion A). They may well be the homes of individuals significant in the history of agriculture (Criterion B) or in other areas where the property would have its own context for potential Criterion B eligibility. Many contain examples of architecture and craftsmanship that would be significant under Criterion C of the National Register. Some farms may best represent farm complexes eligible under Criterion C as a collection of buildings with integrity that are good examples of a type, period, or method of construction. If the district is associated with significant developments and periods in agriculture, it may be eligible under Criterion A for the theme of agriculture

Agriculture, settlement, and architecture, then, are the primary historical themes of significance for historic family farms. But properties may have secondary areas of significance due to extant historic properties such as offices (medicine), schools (education), churches (community), road systems and/or transportation-related buildings, and slave and/or tenant housing (ethnic identity and labor) or due to a significant association with an individual of significance (politics, science, medicine, law, education, ethnic identity, etc.)

Several historic family farms have extant archaeological resources; some even have extant prehistoric archaeological resources. These resources must be carefully evaluated for their eligibility, both individually and as contributing elements, under Criterion D.

F-IV. Registration Requirements

Key thematic and analytical questions to assess the significance of eligible properties under the three historic contexts of this nomination have been discussed above. Properties that possess significance under these different inquiries may still not be eligible for listing in the National Register, however, if they no longer possess architectural integrity. The integrity of a property is assessed by evaluating its design, workmanship, materials, setting, location, feeling, and association, and how these characteristics have been altered since the property's period of significance. Determining the farm's period of significance, consequently, becomes a key step in determining its eligibility. A farm that no longer contains an adequate number of historical and architectural characteristics that date to its period of significance will not be eligible since it no longer conveys a sense of time and place nor is it a historical artifact of a significant period in the history of agriculture, settlement, and architecture. Not every historic family farm recorded in the Tennessee Century Farms data base, in other words, will be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. In assessing integrity, careful attention should be directed at the exterior and interior integrity of the farmhouse, since it was the administrative center of the farm, and careful attention should be directed to the extant historic outbuildings. It will be important to identify whether the modernization of the interior and/or exterior took place as part of the progressive farm improvement programs of the twentieth century, programs like the "Better Homes, Better Farms" initiative of the 1920s. As stated earlier, a farm with no extant historic outbuildings does not meet the definition of a "historic family farm."

Properties which contain physical resources that may be significant under Criterion D may be of such a nature, extent, and potential significance that an evaluation by a professionally certified archaeologist is required. Such resources which are to be contributing elements in a nomination may often be adequately assessed by a certified historic preservation professional. Resources that may be individually eligible must be assessed by a

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

professionally certified archaeologist.

These registration requirements should be used when assessing properties in all three historic contexts of this multiple property nomination.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

G. Geographical Data

This multiple property cover sheet addresses the following counties of Middle Tennessee and the Cumberland Plateau: Bedford, Bledsoe, Cannon, Cheatham, Clay, Coffee, Cumberland, Davidson, DeKalb, Dickson, Fentress, Franklin, Giles, Grundy, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Jackson, Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln, Macon, Marion, Marshall, Maury, Montgomery, Moore, Perry, Pickett, Putnam, Robertson, Rutherford, Sequatchie, Smith, Stewart, Sumner, Trousdale, Van Buren, Warren, Wayne, White, Williamson, and Wilson. These counties define the "Middle Tennessee" region in the Tennessee Century Farms program.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

This multiple property nomination to the National Register of Historic Places utilizes as its primary data base the existing historic family farms documented in the Tennessee Century Farms program, a joint documentary project since 1985 of the Tennessee Department of Agriculture and the MTSU Center for Historic Preservation. The data base has already been used as the primary historic context for the nomination of several historic family farms in Tennessee. National Register historians at the Tennessee Historic Commission have also asked historians at the MTSU Center for Historic Preservation to use the data base to analyze and comment on farm nominations submitted to the Commission. These comments have been incorporated in the final drafts of the nominations to the State Review Board.

This nomination focuses on Middle Tennessee because its agricultural history is more broadly representive of the entire spectrum of Tennessee agriculture than the other two grand divisions. Middle Tennessee contains mountainous terrain, like East Tennessee, while some of its river bottomland would challenge the richness of the best cotton soil in West Tennessee. Historically, there are areas in Middle Tennessee that had little slavery while other Middle Tennessee sub-regions, especially the dark-fired tobacco country of Robertson County and the plantations of the Ashwood district in Maury County, would be very similar to the plantation districts of West Tennessee.

The data base for historic family farms in Middle Tennessee contains 343 properties. Admittedly there are biases within the data base, especially in regards to families who cultivate small farms to the involvement of African-American farm families (see extended comments in the introduction to the historic contexts). Yet this large number of historic family farms provides an useful comparison as well as an unique perspective on the state's agricultural history as emboded in actual surviving farms that remain part of the process of historical change that has defined Tennessee agriculture since its beginnings. The multiple property cover sheet has been prepared by Professor Carroll Van West, who has directed the Century Farms program since 1985 as well as directing the nomination of several Century Farms to the National Register.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

I. Major Bibliographical References

Alcock, Donald G. "A Study in Continuity: Maury County, Tennessee, 1850-1870." Ph: d dissertation, University of Southern California, 1985.

Arnow, Harriette S. "The Pioneer Farmer and His Crops in the Cumberland Region." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 19(Winter 1960): 297-327.

Ash, Stephen V. Middle Tennessee Society Transformed, 1860-1870: War and Peace in the Upper South. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Barn Again! A Guide to Rehabilitation of Older Farm Buildings. N.P.: Successful Farming and National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1988.

Blauch, Lloyd D. Federal Cooperation in Agricultural Extension Work, Vocational Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1935.

Bowers, William L. The Country Life Movement in America, 1900-1920. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1974.

Burt, Jesse C., Jr. "Railroad Promotion of Agriculture in Tennessee." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 10(1951): 320-33.

Clark, Blanche H. The Tennessee Yeomen, 1840-1860. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1942.

Corlew, Robert E. Tennessee: A Short History. 2nd ed. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981.

Danbom, David B. The Resisted Revolution: Urban America and the Industrialization of Agriculture, 1900-1930. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1979.

Daniel, Pete. "The Metamorphosis of Slavery, 1865-1900." Journal of American History 66(June 1979): 88-99.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

"Efficient Farm Homes." Tennessee Extension Review 4(June 1921): 8.

Egerton, John. Visions of Utopia: Nashoba, Rugby, Ruskin and the `New Communities' in Tennessee's Past. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1977.

Ferleger, Lou, ed. Agriculture and National Development: Views on the Nineteenth Century. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1990.

Folmsbee, Stanley J., et al. Tennessee: A Short History. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969.

Gamble, Bonnie L. "The Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis Railroad, 1845-1880: Preservation of a Railroad Landscape." M.A. thesis, Middle Tennessee State University, 1993.

Glassie, Henry. Pattern in the Material Folk Culture in the Eastern United States. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

Grantham, Dewey. Southern Progressivism: The Reconcilation of Progress and Tradition. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983.

Gray, Lewis C. History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860. Washington: Carneige Institute, 1933.

Halicki, Tom. "The Forgotten Farmer." The National Voter 37(April 1988): 13-15.

Hoffschwelle, Mary S. "Rebuilding the Rural Southern Community: Reformers, Schools, and Homes in Tennessee, 1914-1929." Ph: d dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1993.

Hoffschwelle, Mary S. "The Science of Domesticity: Home Economics at George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1939." Journal of Southern History 57(November 1991): 659-680.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Improved Country Homes of Tennessee. Nashville: Tennessee Department of Agriculture, 1928.

Jensen, Joan. With these Hands: Women Working on the Land. New York, 1981.

Johnson, Dexter W. "Using Old Farm Buildings." North Dakota Agricultural Engineering Research Report No.88-1, July 1988.

Johnson, Paul C. Farm Inventions in the Making of America. Des Moines, 1976.

Keller, Lillian L. The Living Room That is Livable. Knoxville: University of Tennessee College of Agriculture, Division of Extension, Publication 134, December 1925.

Kollmorgen, Walter. The German-Swiss in Franklin County, Tennessee. Washington: USDA, 1940.

Martin, Charles E. Hollybush: Folk Building and Social Change in an Appalachian Community. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984.

Martin, Walter. "Agricultural Commercialism in the Nashville Basin, 1850-1860." Ph:d dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1984.

McAlester, Virginia and Lee. A Field Guide to American Houses. New York: Knopf, 1984.

McGee, Leo and Robert Boone, ed. The Black Rural Landowner: Endangered Species: Social, Political, and Economic Implications. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979.

McKenzie, Robert Tracy. "Civil War and Socioeconomic Change in the Upper South: The Survival of Local Agricultural Elites in Tennessee, 1850-1870." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 52(Fall 1993): 170-184.

McKenzie, Robert Tracy. "Freedmen and the Soil in the Upper South: The Reorganization of Tennessee Agriculture, 1865-

1880." Journal of Southern History 59(February 1993): 64-84.

McKenzie, Robert Tracy. One South or Many? Plantation Belt and Upcountry in Civil War-Era Tennessee. Cambridge, GB: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Moore, Wayne C. "Farm Communities and Economic Growth in the Lower Tennessee Valley: Humphreys County, Tennessee." Ph: d dissertation, University of Rochester, 1990.

Noble, Allen G. Wood, Brick, & Stone: The North American Settlement Landscape. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.

Orser, Charles E., Jr. The Material Basis of the Postbellum Tenant Plantation: Historical Archaeology in the South Carolina Piedmont. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.

Otto, John S. Southern Agriculture During the Civil War Era, 1860-1880. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1994.

Owsley, Frank L. Plain Folk of the Old South. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949.

Owsley, Frank L. and Harriet C. Owsley. "The Economic Structure of Rural Tennessee, 1850-1860." Journal of Southern History 8(1942): 161-82.

Ransom, Roger and Richard Sutch. "The Impact of the Civil War and Emancipation on Southern Agriculture." Explorations in Economic History 12(1975): 1-28.

Ransom, Roger and Richard Sutch. "The `Lock-In' Mechanism and Overproduction of Cotton in the Postbellum South." Agricultural History 49(1975): 405-425.

Robson, George L., Jr., and Roy V. Scott., eds. Southern Agriculture Since the Civil War: A Symposium. Santa Barbara, 1979.

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee MPN

Rosenfeld, Rachael. Farm Women: Work, Farm, and Family in the United States. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.

Scott, Roy V. The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

Sims, Almon J. A History of Extension Work in Tennessee: Twenty-five Years of Service to Rural Life, 1914-1939. Knoxville: University of Tennessee College of Agriculture, Bulletin 223, May 1939.

Smith, Samuel B. "Joseph Buckner Killebrew and the New South Movement in Tennessee." Ph:d dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962.

Stager, Claudette and Elizabeth Straw. "Middle Tennessee I-House." Old House Journal 18(September/October 1990): 98.

Van Deman, Ruth. The Well-Planned Kitchen. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1921.

Vlach, John M. Back of the Big House: Architecture of Plantation Slavery. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Walker, Melissa. "Home Extension Work Among African-American Farm Women in East Tennessee, 1920-1939." Paper presented to 5th Conference of Rural and Farm Women in Historical Perspective. Washington, D.C., 1994.

West, Carroll Van. "`Century Farms' Programs as Documentary Sources in Agricultural History." Proceedings of 1989 ALHFAM Annual Meeting: Harvesting New Rural History 12(1992): 168-82.

West, Carroll Van. "Continuity and Change in Tennessee Agriculture: The Century Farmers of Tennessee." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 47(Fall 1988): 162-68.

West, Carroll Van. "Family Farm Recordation Projects and the National Register: A Partnership Whose Time Has Come." Unpublished paper, 1990 AASLH Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.

West, Carroll Van. Tennessee Agriculture: A Century Farms Perspective. Nashville: Tennessee Department of Agriculture, 1987.

West, Carroll Van and Caneta S. Hankins. "Documenting the Agrarian Past: The Tennessee Century Farms Project." History News 44(January/February 1989): 8-13.

Wilson, M. C. Kitchen Arrangement and Equipment. USDA Extension Service Circular 30, typescript, December 1926.

Winters, Donald L. "Farm Size and Production Choices: Tennessee, 1850-1860." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 52(Winter 1993): 212-24.

Winters, Donald L. "`Plain Folk' of the Old South Reexamined: Economic Democracy in Tennessee." Journal of Southern History 53(November 1987): 565-86.

Winters, Donald L. "Postbellum Reorganization of Southern Agriculture: The Economics of Sharecropping in Tennessee." Agricultural History 62(1988): 1-19.

Winters, Donald L. Tennessee Farms, Tennessee Farmers. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994.

Wright, Gavin. The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets, and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century. New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.

Wright, Gavin and Howard Kunreuther. "Cotton, Corn, and Risk in the Nineteenth Century." Journal of Economic History 35(1975): 526-51.