# National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form*. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

## 1. Name of Property

**Historic name:** Shaw Homestead

**Other names/site number:** ___________________________________________________________________________

**Name of related multiple property listing:** __________________________________________________________________________________

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

## 2. Location

**Street & number:** 1214 Barth Road

**City or town:** Poplarville, MS, __________

**County:** Pearl River, __________

**Not For Publication:** [ ]

**Vicinity:** [X] __________

## 3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this nomination_request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

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

___ national ___ statewide ___X local

Applicable National Register Criteria:

___A ___B ___C ___X D

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

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title :</th>
<th>State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4. **National Park Service Certification**

I hereby certify that this property is:

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

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

5. **Classification**

**Ownership of Property**

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

- Private: [ ]
- Public – Local: [ ]
- Public – State: [ ]
- Public – Federal: [ ]

**Category of Property**

(Check only one box.)

- Building(s): [x]
- District: [ ]
- Site: [ ]
- Structure: [ ]
- Object: [ ]
Shaw Homestead
Name of Property

Pearl River, Mississippi
County and State

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)
DOMESTIC/Single Dwelling/Homestead Site
AGRICULTURE: storage
AGRICULTURE: outbuilding
AGRICULTURE: animal facility
AGRICULTURE: processing
INDUSTRY: mill

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)
OTHER/Historic Site
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

_____ OTHER: dogtrot house

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property:

_____ Pine Logs
_____ Steel roofing
_____ Brick
_____ Dimensional Lumber

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

The Shaw Homestead is a late 19th century domestic farm site consisting of several buildings and landscape features reflective of early settlement patterns in Pearl River County, Mississippi.

The homestead patent was awarded to Bernard Dedeaux by the United States Government on April 5, 1888, after he fulfilled the requirements 1862 Homestead Act, by settling on and farming the land for at least five years. Dedeaux would turn the property over to his brother-in-law Jules Ladner, who in 1902, would deed the property over to his daughter and son-in-law Melvina and Gilbert Shaw. Prior to deeding the property to his daughter, Ladner was responsible for the construction of the centerpiece of the homestead; a one-story, two-pen, dogtrot house of log construction. Raised off the ground on a wood pier foundation and featuring a metal roof, the dogtrot has full width, porches are across the front and rear of the building. On the front elevation (west), the dogtrot’s central passage has been enclosed with a frame partition but remains open at the rear elevation (east). The rear porch has been enclosed on either side of the dogtrot central passage with frame cabinet rooms. Directly behind the house, separated approximately one foot, is a wood-frame kitchen building. Oriented to face south, the kitchen’s southern elevation has a full-width undercut porch. Ancillary buildings included at the

Image of homestead patent granted to Bernard Dedeaux April 5, 1888 is located on page 13.
homestead are; the Smoke House, Jar House, Corn Crib, and the Grist Mill and Tractor Shed. Ruins of a two-story wooden barn remain. Other remaining landscape features are an inground concrete dip vat or tank for livestock, a fenced plot for the vegetable garden, and a fenced farmyard. During the period of significance, Pearl River County had open range livestock grazing laws, and because of this practice, areas surrounding the house, ancillary buildings, garden, and crop fields were fenced to keep livestock out, rather than creating a fenced pasture for containing livestock.

The homestead exhibits changes that were adapted by the occupants as they could afford them. Due to the frugal nature of the occupants, these changes reflected the bare minimum of upgrading necessary to ease the hardscrabble life on the farm. Because of this approach, the homestead retains a high level of integrity. The homestead's period of significance extends from c.1890 with the construction of the current two-pen dogtrot, until 1968, the last full year the homestead was inhabited. In August 1969, the last full-time resident of the homestead, Melvina Shaw, was evacuated from the homestead in advance on Hurricane Camille. After the storm, she did not return to the homestead, and it has stayed uninhabited since. In 2005 the homestead was acquired by the Land Trust for the Mississippi Coastal Plain, who has since then preserved and restored the extant homestead buildings, with the goal of creating an interpretive site for the history of homestead living in South Mississippi. Today the site consists of a clearing about one acre in size that contains the dogtrot house, five ancillary buildings, and the livestock dipping vat, all surrounded by a second growth forest.

**Narrative Description**

1. **Site**

Originally, one-hundred-sixty and fifty-seven-hundreths of an acre were deeded to Bernard Dedeaux. Prominently placed on the site near Barth Road is the dogtrot house. Directly behind the house to the east are a separate kitchen and a smoke house. To the north is a jar house, and further beyond that is the garden plot. To the southeast of the house are the Corn Crib, Grist Mill and Tractor Shed, Livestock Dipping Vat, garden, and farm fields. While the immediate yard around the house and dependencies is cut grass, the areas surrounding the garden, dipping vat, and farm fields are grown over with a mixture of trees and dense underbrush. To the east of the dogtrot house are the ruins of a two story, front-gabled barn. Only a few vertical wood structural members that outline the foot print of the building’s first floor remain. These structural members are logs that have been notched at the top, to hold a horizontal member. Located directly south of the kitchen were a water well and garage. The well was filled in for safety purposes several decades ago, and the c.1950 garage is no longer extant. To the north of the house was a potato shed and an outhouse, neither of which are extant. Originally the house,
ancillary buildings, garden, and crop fields were fenced by wooden picket and rail fences, however, these would be replaced by drawn wire fencing by the 1950s. Inside of the fence around the house was a swept dirt yard. Today, only wood fence posts with short lengths of wire remain as indicators of the once extensive fencing around these areas. The current square parcel is approximately one acre, owned by the Land Trust for the Mississippi Coastal Plain. The remaining 159 acres are mostly wooded and sparsely populated.

2. C Dogtrot house c.1890

The one-story, two-pen, dogtrot house is of log construction with half-dove tail notch corners, and a side-gabled, broken-slope roof clad in five V-crimp metal roofing. While the logs making up the wall are rounded on the exterior, they are flat on the top, bottom, and interior face; square hewn logs make up the foundation sills and a header. The unpainted house sits on a wood-pier foundation made up of both pine and cedar logs that are oriented vertically. The house’s windows appear to be later additions, as the window frame supports are on top of the original log wall surface. In addition to supporting the window, the supports stabilize the logs that were cut to allow for the windows’ insertion.

The west elevation is the primary façade. A full width, projecting porch supported by posts constructed from two-by-four lumber, extends across the front of the building. The west opening of the central passage has been enclosed with a frame partition, clad in V-notch tongue and groove siding, with a centered board-and-batten door. The right pen has a single, board-and-batten door and a 4/4, wood, friction fit sash window, with all trim being a simple one-by-four board. Along the header log, notches holding the interior ceiling joists can be seen.

The rear (east) elevation contains the full-width rear porch, which has been enclosed on either side of the dogtrot with slightly inset frame cabinet rooms, clad in unpainted wood clapboard. Each cabinet room has two window openings, with strap hinged, board-and-batten shutters, rather than sash windows. The porch between the cabinet rooms is supported by two, wood, four-by-four posts.

The south elevation is constructed of logs up to the level of the top plate. Above this, the gable is of frame construction with unpainted clapboard siding. This elevation has a single brick chimney that is laid up in running bond, with white mortar. There is physical evidence remaining that there had been a previous wood frame chimney. On either side of the chimney are a single 4/4, wood, friction fit sash window, without trim. One-by-four boards on either side of the windows to stabilize the logs that were cut in two, to allow for the windows’ insertion. To the right of the elevation is the cabinet room, with a single square opening protected by a strap-

---

hinged shutter. Below the window are the remains of a rabbit hutch, built for housing domesticated rabbits. The two by three hutch consists of an elevated, wood frame with chicken wire enclosure, that backs up to the cabinet. The shed roof of the hutch is clad in asphalt shingles. The hutch has a hinged, centered door.

The north elevation is constructed of logs up to the level of the top plate. These logs have been covered over with dimensional lumber furring that is clad with v-notch tongue and groove boards that are oriented horizontally. Above this, the gable is of frame construction with unpainted clapboard siding. This elevation had a single chimney that is no longer present, removed prior to the installation of the v-notch siding. There is physical evidence remaining that there had been a previous wood frame chimney at this location. There are two, 4/4 wood, friction fit sash window, with one-by-four wood trim. To the left of the elevation is the cabinet room, with a single square opening protected by a strap-hinged shutter. Near the northwest corner of the building are the electric service weatherhead and a meter box.

Interior: Doors leading from the dogtrot center passage into the pens and cabinet rooms are board-and-batten with strap hinges. Boards, similar in dimension to the flooring in the dogtrot center passage, are laid across joists above the passage to give the semblance of a ceiling. There is evidence that the space between the logs was once filled with clay chinking; split wood slats have been installed with wire nails to cover the gaps. Wooden floor boards are consistent in size and dimension. The interior walls of the two pens are the exposed flat surface of the log. A finished floor, of one-by strip pine flooring, has been installed in each pen. Atop this flooring, there are remnants of mid-twentieth century linoleum rug floorcoverings. Each pen at one point had a fireplace, with a rudimentary, site constructed mantel of dimensional lumber. The fireplace in the northern pen has been removed, however, the infilled opening is evident, and a radiant clay-backed gas heater from c.1950 sits on the location of the forehearth. The fireplace in the southern pen remains intact, with a brick firebox, and mantle shelf constructed of dimensional lumber. The firebox has straight sides and an exposed iron lintel. The outer and inner hearths are brick laid without mortar.

The ceiling in the north pen is higher than the ceiling in the south pen. Both ceilings are tongue and groove beaded board. A single ceiling-mounted light fixture was installed on the ceiling in each pen, a porcelain lamp holder actuated by a pull chain. In the right pen is a duplex, two-prong, electrical outlet, with a Bakelite wall plate. Wiring is of a nonmetallic sheathed cable type, insulated with asbestos-reinforced rubber covered with jute and tar. It is run along the interior wall surfaces, attached to the walls and ceiling by staples. The installation of the electrical wiring likely dates to c.1951.

---

In the dogtrot center passage between the two pens, is a two-by-four spanning, that supports a single porcelain lamp holder actuated with a pull chain. On the south wall of the left pen is a duplex, two-prong, electrical outlet, with a Bakelite wall plate.

The cabinet rooms have no interior finishes, just the exposed back of the clapboard siding, and log walls. Several sticks with a ‘Y’ shape have been nailed to the wall, for hanging clothing. In the right cabinet room, suspended from framing is a tongue and groove beadboard ceiling, that coves as it reaches the east wall. In this cabinet is a single porcelain lamp holder actuated with a pull chain. The left pen has a one-by-four wood plank ceiling, attached to the underside of the roof rafters.

The attic space of the dogtrot is unfinished. The attic can only be accessed by moving the loose one-by-eight boards that have been laid across the ceiling joists in the central passage. Rafters in the attic are two-by-four dimension lumber, spaced three feet apart, and notched over a hewn-log tilted false plate. The rafters support one-by wood purlins that carry the metal roof.

3. C Kitchen c.1917

The detached kitchen is separated from the dogtrot by approximately one foot. Such minimal detachment gives the appearance of being a continuous rear ell wing, attached to the dogtrot. The kitchen is a side-gable structure, constructed with a combination of board and stick framing. The building sits on a wood pier foundation and has five v-crimp metal roofing. The north and south elevations are clad in clapboard siding, while the east and west elevations are the exposed board framing with battens applied over the joints. While the north and south walls rely on minimal dimensional lumber stud framing, the east and west wall are of barge board construction, with the only dimensional lumber used on these walls being corner bracing. Evidence of asphalt roll siding, added c.1950, remains at several exterior locations. The south elevation has an undercut porch under the gable, supported by posts constructed from two-by-four lumber. This porch shelters a right-of-center, board-and-batten door, with a board-and-batten shuttered opening to the left. Both the door and shutter are hung from strap hinges, attached with nails and leather washers. The porch ceiling is v-notch tongue and groove material. This porch ceiling has a single white porcelain lamp holder with a glazed porcelain finish and a base socket. The north elevation has a centered, board-and-batten door, flanked on the left by a 4/4, wood, friction fit sash window and on the right by a board-and-batten shuttered opening. The east elevation has a centered chimney, constructed of bricks in varying shades of red, laid up in a white mortar, with a neck that steps in twenty-five courses off the ground. The kitchen chimney was disassembled and reconstructed in 2012.

The interior of the kitchen has no finished walls, and the back of the exterior cladding is exposed. There is no mantle above the fireplace. The firebox has straight sides and an exposed
iron lintel. The forehearth is covered in sheet metal. The stove and the sink date to c.1950. Supported by an open, two-by-four lumber framework, the kitchen sink is a single basin made of enameled metal. The faucet holes remained unused, as water was brought from the well. The drain pipe is cast iron and runs from the sink drain down though the floor, emptying directly beneath the kitchen. A white, enameled, Home Comfort brand gas stove occupies the kitchen.\textsuperscript{4} The stove features are an oven, a broiler, pantry storage drawer, and four cooktop burners are offset to the right side of the stove. The ceiling, suspended from framing, is constructed of tongue and groove beadboard. There are two electric light fixtures in the kitchen. Both are a white porcelain lamp holder actuated with a pull chain. The attic framing is of two-by-fours supporting one-by-purlins.

4. C Smoke House c.1890

The Smoke House, a small, one room structure, constructed of round saddle notched logs. Originally this structure was within the fenced yard of the house and kitchen. On the exterior, some of the spaces between logs have been covered with spilt wood slats that are held in place with wire nails to cover the gaps. The building sits on a mudsill foundation and has a front gable roof clad in corrugated metal roofing. The gable ends are clad in vertically oriented boards. The interior is accessed by a single board-and-batten door centered on the west façade. Inside is a concrete floor. Joists span north/south approximately four feet high, and poles were placed across these for meat to be hung and smoked. There is no ceiling, and the underside of the metal roofing is exposed. The roof framing is of two-by-four dimensional lumber spaced an equal distance apart. These rafters are notched into a log at the top of the wall, and support purlins that carry the corrugated metal roof.

5. C Jar House c.1945

The Jar House is a small, one room, front-gabled building for storing canning jars and for related canning activities. The walls are of barge board construction, with the only dimensional lumber used on these walls being corner bracing. The building sits on a mud sill and has a five V-crimp metal roof. The board-and-batten entry door is off set to the right side of the south elevation. There is one, board-and-batten shuttered opening on the west elevation. Inside is a wooden floor, and interior walls are lined with built-in shelving for the canning jars. There is no ceiling, and the underside of the metal roofing is exposed. Roof framing is of two-by-fours supporting one-by-purlins.

\textsuperscript{4} The Home Comfort brand of stoves was manufactured by the Wrought Iron Range Company of St. Louis, Mo. Wrought Iron Range Company was established in 1864. The stoves were sold by traveling salesmen, who were regular employees of the company, rather than contractual agents. Beginning in 1923, all Home Comfort ranges were finished in enamel. The company was bought by Universal Match Company in 1960.
6. C  Corn Crib  c.1890

This small, one room structure, constructed of round saddle notched logs, sits on a mudsill foundation and has a front-gabled roof clad in corrugated metal roofing. The gable ends are clad in vertically oriented boards. On the exterior, some of the spaces between logs have been covered with spilt wood slats that are held in place with wire nails to cover the gaps. The interior is accessed by a single board-and-batten door centered on the west façade. The structure has a wooden floor, unfinished interior walls, and no ceiling, with the underside of the metal roofing exposed. The roof framing is of two-by-four dimensional lumber spaced an equal distance apart. These rafters are notched into a log at the top of the wall, and support purlins that carry the corrugated metal roof.

8. NC  Grist Mill and Tractor Shed  2017

Reconstructed from a photograph and remaining physical evidence, the grist mill and tractor shed is a small, one room structure, constructed of round saddle notched lumber. The front-gabled roof has a shed lean-to on either side of the structure. The building sits on a wood pier foundation and has a five V-crimp metal roof. There is a raised wood floor, and the underside of the metal roofing is exposed. The east lean-to housed farm equipment, which eventually included a tractor. The building and west lean-to housed the milling operation equipment. It is the only structure that the date of construction is known.

9. C  Livestock Dipping Vat Site  c.1910

The concrete in-ground vat and a draining race are some of the few remaining elements of the dip site. A few of the wooden fence posts for the collecting pen remain, but most of the wooden elements of the feature have deteriorated beyond recognition. The vat itself is several feet long and deep, but it is not very wide. This design allowed for complete submersion of dipped animals and prevented them from turning around or thrashing. The walls of the vat are made from concrete approximately several inches thick. The west end of the vat, where the animal would enter the bath, is a steep drop off, while the east end exit is gradually angled, with rudimentary steps. Beyond the vat exit is the draining race, and a narrow, ribbed path of concrete.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

☐ A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

☐ B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

☐ C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

☐ D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

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

☐ A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

☐ B. Removed from its original location

☐ C. A birthplace or grave

☐ D. A cemetery

☐ E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

☐ F. A commemorative property

☐ G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)
AGRICULTURE
EXPLORATION/SETTLEMENT
ARCHITECTURE

Period of Significance
1890-1968

Significant Dates
1902, 1951

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Cultural Affiliation

Architect/Builder
UNKNOWN
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

The Shaw Homestead is locally significant under Criterion A in the areas of Exploration/Settlement and Agriculture as an intact homestead from the early years of settlement in Pearl River County. Situated in the band of pine forest stretching from the Carolinas to Texas, the county’s sandy soil was not fit for large-scale farming, and early settlers relied on livestock farming on an open range. The homestead patent for the property was awarded to Bernard Dedeaux on April 5, 1888. Dedeaux’s niece, Melvina Shaw and her husband Gilbert would be the longest occupants of the homestead, as Melvina lived on the site from 1902 until August of 1969.

The Shaw Homestead represents a wave of western migration brought about by the Homestead Act of 1862, part of a larger movement by the U.S. government to settle areas of the country. The Shaw Homestead is also locally significant under Criterion C for its vernacular type and form, the dogtrot, along with the method of construction, squared and notched logs. The Shaw Homestead demonstrates a local application of building design skills to create a complex of vernacular structures that represent the functions and needs of a subsistence-farming homestead in southeast Mississippi. The property is not being interpreted as a static, frozen-in-time dwelling. Rather, the changes apparent in the house provide a view into the lives of white subsistence farmers, a socioeconomic class whose architecture was transitory and often has not survived for study. Additionally, the Shaw Homestead is locally significant under Criterion D having the potential to improve our understanding of Native American settlement patterns in this region and improve our understanding of these site types. Additional testing of the ridge system in this region could yield similar aboriginal lithic and ceramic scatters that would contribute to our understanding of settlement and occupational patterns as a whole.
Shaw Homestead

Name of Property

Pearl River, Mississippi

County and State

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

In 1888 the U.S. Government granted a homestead patent for one-hundred-sixty and fifty-seven-hundredths of an acre near the Wolf River in Pearl River County, Mississippi, the property that would become the Shaw Homestead, to Shaw relative Bernard Dedeaux (1856-1936).

Dedeaux applied to receive the patent in 1880, and over an eight-year period, would improve the land, most notably with a two-room cabin. About 1890, Dedeaux’s brother-in-law, Jules Ladner (1862-1936), replaced the two-room cabin with the current dogtrot house of log construction.\(^5\) According to the 1891 Pearl River County tax roll, Jule Ladner owned fifty sheep, seven cows, and a horse. In 1902, Ladner’s daughter and son-in-law Melvina (1883-1973) and Gilbert Shaw\(^6\)

---


\(^6\) The Dedeaux and Ladner families can trace their roots in southeast Mississippi dating back to the 18th century. The Shaws emigrated from Georgia and the Carolinas to southeast Mississippi in the mid-19th century. The Ladner
Shaw Homestead  
Name of Property  

Pearl River, Mississippi  
County and State

(1878-1948) were married and began living in the dogtrot. The Shaws would live in the dogtrot and farm the property for nearly the next seventy years. The Shaws were subsistence farmers and raised livestock, such as pigs, sheep, and cattle, which foraged the open range. Livestock that wasn’t consumed was sold, providing the family with a small amount of cash for necessities they could not produce themselves. Even basic and seemingly essential improvements to the homestead such as windows or electricity were made only out of necessity, never due to fashions or popular trends. The Shaws had seven children, who were all reared in the dogtrot and several of these children lived in the dogtrot with their parents into adulthood. The 1930 U.S. Census cites daughter Stella, then in her early twenties, as the only household occupant with a job off the homestead, providing the family with a much needed source of cash income. During World War II, the Shaw’s youngest son Hugo (1917-2000) temporarily relocated to New Orleans, working for the war-related effort, sending his income home. While in New Orleans he met and married, Mary Frances Green (1924-2012). Mary related how Hugo wished to return to the homestead and it’s lifestyle after the war ended.

“When Hugo ask me to marry him, he said, ‘Let me tell you one thing, I intend to go back to the country.’ And I knew that, though I was a city girl. But I was raised Catholic, and I intended to keep my vows no matter what, and I stayed. And it was hard, but I overcame it all.” -Mary Shaw

After World War II, when the newlyweds returned to the Shaw Homestead, it was to a way of life completely different from the convenience and amenities of New Orleans that Mary had grown up with, as the homestead still lacked seemingly basic amenities such as electricity and running water. However, with funds saved from Hugo’s war time labor along with government modernization programs, such as the Rural Electrification Act, the homestead would receive several significant upgrades during the late 1940s and early 1950s. Primary of these is the installation of electricity to the house in 1951, another would be the introduction of a gas-fueled

and Shaw families would intermarry often. In this instance, Melvina and Gilbert Shaw shared a great grandfather, Carlos Ladner Sr., on their paternal sides.

7 By 1917 the nearby sawmill town of Barth was incorporated, and the Edward Hines Yellow Pine Co. railroad provided rail service to the immediate area. This nearby mill meant ready access to cut lumber for the Shaws that they would utilize improvements on the homestead. The town Barth was in decline by the late 1920s as much of the surrounding yellow pine forests had been cut over. However, by then overland road transportation had improved to the nearby county seat of Poplarville where milled-lumber was easily accessible to the Shaws. They would utilize milled-lumber over logs for construction projects such as the jar house constructed c.1945.
8 Alfred b.1903, Monroe b.1905, Stella b.1907, Velma b.1910, Hubert b.1912, Calona b.1914, Hugo b.1917
9 1940 US Census lists the homestead occupants as Gilbert 62, Melvina 57, Monroe 30, Hubert 27, Calona 24, and Hugo 22.
10 Per census and draft registration records Gilbert Shaw, nor his children ever served in the military.
range and oven. After Gilbert Shaw’s death in 1948, his children would move away from the farm, to farmsteads of their own, or to opportunities in urban areas, leaving Melvina the sole occupant of the homestead by the 1960s. In advance of Hurricane Camille in August of 1969, Melvina’s children would evacuate her from the homestead. While the dogtrot weathered the hurricane well, Melvina would never return to live in her home of nearly seventy years.

CRITERION A: EXPLORATION/SETTLEMENT AND AGRICULTURE

Homestead farming

The extant buildings and spaces at the Shaw Homestead reflect the variety of activities that took place on the farm. Homesteading is subsistence farming. Anything the homestead required was grown, raised, or crafted onsite. This type of farming is an example of Yeoman farming culture that Thomas Jefferson revered so much and sought to encourage the independent, self-sustaining Yeoman culture across the United States. What cash currency the family took in, for example from the yearly sale of sheep’s wool, was for tools and other items that could not be self-produced.

“There are some pictures that really show the glory of this old place, the old picket fence, and the way that it was all open that way; we used to pen cattle, and pen sheep, and pen hogs. To me it was a wonderful lifestyle; we never did have much money, but we always had something to eat. It was an enjoyable lifestyle that we had. It was living on the last frontier.” -Arthur Shaw, son of Hugo & Mary Shaw, grandson of Gilbert & Melvina Shaw

Corn was an incredibly important crop for the Shaws. Not only could a plethora of foods stuffs be created from it, it could also be used for livestock feed if necessary. As whole grains go rancid in hot weather, corn meal was a reliable food source in southern climates. Not only could a plethora of foods stuffs be created from it, but it could also be used for animal feed if necessary. Corn would be allowed to dry on the stalk in the field. Afterward, the husks were removed, and the ears of corn would be placed in the crib. When cornmeal was needed, first the cob would be shelled, removing the kernels, then the kernels would be ground to the desired consistency in the gristmill. Early on gristmills at Shaw were animal powered, later they would

---

12 The exact date of the modern Home Comfort brand stove’s installation at the Shaw Homestead is unknown, but likely dated to between Gilbert Shaw’s passing in 1948 and the acquisition of the Wrought Iron Range Company by the Universal Match Company in 1960.
be run through a power takeoff from a tractor, automobile, or four-stroke internal combustion engine.

“*My dad had his own grist mill to make corn meal. He was also good at making grits. Corn in the crib was always a good feeling. If you had corn in the crib, it meant that you had something to eat.*” -Arthur Shaw

Vegetables were grown in the garden, just north of the dogtrot, and canned goods were kept in the Jar House.

“*Women were largely responsible for vegetable gardens. Men grew crops, women grew the vegetables. Women’s work, it was tough, around the turn of the century.*” -Michael Cruthird, son-in-law of Hugo & Mary Shaw

“*What did I can? Honey, ask me what I DIDN’T can. Tomatoes, soup stock, butter beans, peas, corn. Sweet potatoes. At first, we just we did a water bath, then we got a pressure canner. My husband had to build be a little shed in the back I canned so much, I had to store it out there. All kinds of jellies, you name it, go out the back and pick it and make a jelly.*” -Mary Shaw

Likewise, meat would be smoked and could be canned. During the spring, after the shearing, sheep could be slaughtered. In the fall, hogs would be rounded up from the range and slaughtered. While it was intensive work every part of the animal was utilized. Intestines were saved for sausage casings, feet were boiled with the head to make “hog’s head cheese”, organ meat such as the heart was ground into sausage, skin and fat were rendered into lard and cracklins, and brains were scrambled with eggs. Without refrigeration, to keep the meat from spoiling it needed to be salted and smoked.

“*Meat would be packed in the smokehouse and salted down. After so many days in the salt brine, the meat was then washed and hung on poles in the smokehouse. When smoking the meat, a constant check had to be made on the smokehouse to make sure the wood did not catch on fire and ruin the meat. Smoked meat was always hanging in the smokehouse. There was also sausage... Women would take the intestines of the hogs that were killed, wash them, and clean them out to be used as sausage casing. It was an extremely tiring affair.*” -Arthur Shaw

**Shaw Homestead as a Sheep Shearing Station:**

16 Gulf Coast Community Design Studio ibid. Homestead Booklet, p. 16.
17 Jar House, resource #5
18 Gulf Coast Community Design Studio ibid. Homestead Booklet, p. 20.
“There were several thousand sheep they’d bring though there. They’d get up before daylight, and get up on horses, a bunch of them, and they’d bring in a herd, and they’d shear them. At dinnertime, some of them would go out and bring in some more, and some of them would keep shearing. It’d go on until dark, and it was hot!” -Mary Shaw

Every spring, shortly after Easter, flocks of sheep from multiple homesteads would be systematically herded from the open range into the Shaw Homesteads barnyard area, sheared, marked and then run through the livestock dipping vat, a narrow, concrete channel that would be filled with water and chemicals to kill any parasites or mites that could otherwise infect the sheep. Homesteaders would work together to share the burdensome task of the roundup and dipping livestock.

---

20 Gulf Coast Community Design Studio ibid. Livestock & the Open Range Booklet, p. 16.
When rounding up the livestock on the open range it was necessary to find a way to identify ownership as roaming livestock will gradually mix together. To identify the ownership of different livestock out on the open range, some farmers elected to use brands, however in the Pearl River County, “earmarking” was more typically used. Before being released to the open range, a sharp knife would be used to notch distinct patterns out of the ears of livestock. When newborn calves or lambs were found on the range with their mothers, farmers would notch their ears to match those of their mothers, even if they were not his own stock as a courtesy.

![Chart depicting earmarks of the Shaw and Ladner family herds in Pearl River County, Mississippi.](image)

The shearing was an exhausting, a dawn-to-dusk activity for several weeks at a time and would require neighbors and friends to pitch in for the duration. When one farm’s sheep were sheared, the group would move on to the next herd of sheep until the season was over. The work was extremely hot and hard on the hands, especially before electricity made automatic shears possible. The wool from the herds was stomped down into sacks and taken by wagon to the Poplarville depot, where the wool would be sold for cash and placed on a train. The hot-climate wool fiber was not the best quality for spinning. Nevertheless, the wool provided families like the Shaws with their only real cash for the year, which was of vital importance.²²

---

²¹ Gulf Coast Community Design Studio ibid. Livestock & the Open Range Booklet, p. 7.
²² Gulf Coast Community Design Studio ibid. Livestock & the Open Range Booklet, p. 16.
A series of government programs introduced sweeping changes in rural lifeways but offered agricultural reformers an opportunity to improve the lives of poor farmers, which Pearl River County farmers eventually accepted, however grudgingly.

The Homestead Act of 1862

While the federal government had been distributing government lands since the Revolutionary War, these distributions had been a continuous political issue for reasons ranging from parcel size and cost, to a concern from factory owners that a mass departure of their cheap labor force, to Southern states worried that rapid settlement of western territories would give rise to new states populated by small farmers who would oppose larger farms and slavery.

After the Mexican-American War, in 1848 several developments supported the growth of the homestead movement. Unprecedented numbers of immigrants were immigrating to the United States, many of whom also looked to unsettled western lands for a new life. New transportation routes such as canals and roadways made possible transportation of goods grown on these western farms to markets in the eastern United States and even Europe. During this time England's repeal of its corn laws opened new markets to American agriculture.

The Homestead Act was only passed by Congress in 1862 after the Civil War had begun following southern secession. The act would continue in a variety of forms until 1988.

Open Range Laws and Livestock Dipping:

Because they were not engaging in large-scale agriculture, The Ladners, Shaws, and other homesteading families of Pearl River County saw little need for fencing, which served to keep livestock out of sensitive areas such as crops, rather than in a pasture. As time passed, and the populated areas of the state grew, urban residents and Mississippi’s northern counties (where ticks had been eradicated) were in favor of a stock law that would require fencing pastures. Newspapers such as the Hattiesburg American (Hattiesburg, MS) and the Picayune Item (Picyune, MS) were in favor of passing a stock law as they viewed it necessary to reduce the amount county government spent on tick eradication. There was a split in the county as urban residents viewed it fencing necessary to keep nuisance animals out of town and off roadways, while farmers saw the stock laws fencing requirements as a significant change to their way of life. Not only would they be required to fence their land, but they would also have to own enough land, with sufficient vegetative growth to support their herd. In 1927 the Mississippi legislature passed a statewide stock law; however, the act was not self-executing and county

governments were required to provide their own funds to enforce the state’s law. The law was amended in 1931 and allowed individual counties to vote on whether to adopt the law. While most of Mississippi’s northern counties adopted the laws, most of the southern counties chose to vote themselves out of the stock laws, which Pearl River County did in 1932. Open range laws persisted in Mississippi until 1956, when the state legislature passed a law aimed at getting cattle off busy highways. The 1956 law designated US highways off limits for roaming stock, and gave the open range counties 18 months, until July 1, 1957, to place fences along highways. Pearl River County residents found a way around the law’s requirement by voting down county tax proposals that would have paid for the installation of fencing along US 11 and Highway 26. The open range persisted in Pearl River County as late as 1966.

Since the open range style of ranching allows domestic livestock animals to roam as they pleased, chances that animals might encounter ticks, mites, flies, and lice is greatly increased when compared to fenced pastures that could be more closely monitored and controlled by a rancher. To combat these insects that could decimate a herd, agricultural reformers proposed dipping animals in a liquid formulation consisting of water, insecticide, and fungicide to protect livestock from an infestation of external parasites such as ticks, mites, flies, and lice.

By 1906, Mississippi was among fourteen other states and territories that were subject to a federal quarantine referred to as the Texas Fever Quarantine Line, instituted to limit the spread of a tick-borne fever, first identified in Texas cattle. Between 1906 and 1945, a series of federal tick eradication programs were introduced on both a national and state-wide level to address insect-borne illnesses that were a major drain on the health and profitability of the nation’s livestock. Dipping livestock in a tick-destroying agent such as arsenic was identified early on as the best and cheapest means of killing the ticks, over other methods such as spraying or applying by hand. The mixture of tick destroying agents suggested by the USDA consisted of mixing white arsenic, lye, caustic soda, sodium carbonate, and pine tar with water. In 1916, the State of

---

25 “TICK COUNTIES TO RAISE THE MONEY Boards of Supervisors Must Face the Question at Their September Meetings,” *Daily Clarion Ledger* (Jackson, MS), Sept. 6, 1927, p. 3.
29 Minor, ibid.
Mississippi passed a state-wide dipping law to eradicate Texas Fever from the state and lift the Federal quarantine on their cattle. The bill required farmers to dip their cattle every two weeks.\textsuperscript{34} It was not popular with the public, as the arsenic bath was thought to be dangerous to the cattle and the dipping a nuisance to the stockowners.\textsuperscript{35} The bill was met with determined opposition that sometimes turned violent, especially in South Mississippi. Dynamiting of livestock dipping vats was a regular occurrence, enough so that ads ran “by enterprising South Mississippians to the cause of a tick-free state” appear in newspapers stressing the futility of damaging the vats as a method of expressing displeasure with the government required act of dipping livestock.\textsuperscript{36}

Although the bill was not sponsored by Governor Theodore Bilbo, he did sign it. When Bilbo ran for reelection in 1920, his opponent, Judge Paul B. Johnson of Hattiesburg, used the cattle dipping bill against him. When Bilbo lost the campaign, he was quoted as saying, “I was crucified on a cross of ticks.”\textsuperscript{37} The \textit{Farmers’ Bulletin 1057} published in 1919 by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), included a map indicating that by December 1, 1917, the federal quarantine was no longer required for the entire state of Mississippi. In March 1919, the USDA documented 5,553 dipping vats located in Mississippi. While the federal quarantine was lifted, the fever-inducing ticks had yet to be eradicated, and by 1923 twenty-one counties in southeast Mississippi had been placed back under federal quarantine.\textsuperscript{38} Livestock dipping continued to take place as long as livestock would roam an open range in Mississippi. While officially “ending” in 1957,\textsuperscript{39} variants of the open range law persisted in Pearl River County as late as 1966.\textsuperscript{40}

Local farmers’ reaction to the construction of dipping vats was quite violent. “In the early 1920s dipping virtually reached a standstill in Amite County [in southwest Mississippi] because foes dynamited the dipping vats, and enforcement efforts led to gun battles.”\textsuperscript{41} In 1933, in Pearl River County alone, it was reported that as many as twenty-four dipping vats were dynamited, although only two could be verified as having been destroyed by explosions. An argument put forth by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Pasquill, ibid. p. 58.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Pasquill, ibid. p. 287.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Pasquill, ibid. p. 58.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Pasquill, ibid. p. 287.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Pasquill, ibid. p. 291.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Minor, W.F. “Open Range Counties Face Fencing Deadline But Little Action,” \textit{The Daily Herald} (Biloxi, MS), May 27, 1957, p. 13.
\item \textsuperscript{40} “Motorists up in arms about cows on road,” Hattiesburg \textit{American} (Hattiesburg, MS), Aug. 16, 1966, p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Strom, Claire, “Cattle Tick Eradication,” \textit{Mississippi Encyclopedia}, p.187.
\end{itemize}
Pearl River County residents against dipping livestock was that range-raised animals were not healthy enough to be dipped and that dipping them in poison would lead to their demise.\(^{42}\)

Federal agents were meticulous in site selection for dipping vats and primary consideration was taken in locating them close to water (although not every vat was next to a water source) and close to the farmers within the boundaries of an established population center. The Forest Service objected to placing vats on public land as the impact of large herds of livestock would disrupt tree growth, so agents would collaborate with private landowners for placement.\(^{43}\) The last government-mandated dipping vat was closed in Pearl River County on Oct. 22, 1937.\(^{44}\) As Claire Strom notes in her article on tick eradication in Mississippi, the federal tick eradication programs “helped the state’s farmers establish a more profitable dairy and beef industry,” but they “infringed on individual and local rights, reducing yeoman power.”\(^ {45}\)

The livestock dipping vat at Shaw Homestead offers tangible evidence of this era of tick eradication. While the concrete dipping vat and draining race floor remain, wooden elements such as loading chutes, pens, and vat cover supports have almost entirely disappeared. Currently, only two other livestock dipping vats, both located near Waynesboro, Wayne County, are included in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History’s Historic Resources Inventory.\(^{46}\)

**Rural Electrification Act:**

By the 1930s, 90% of urban dwellers had electricity while only 10% of rural dwellers did and roughly 9 out of 10 farms were not electrified.\(^ {47}\) Private companies hadn’t been interested in building costly electric service lines into the countryside and assumed the farmers would be too poor to buy the electricity once it was there. Under the New Deal’s Rural Electrification Act, the Rural Electrification Administration encouraged the creation of electricity cooperative companies. It then channeled funding through these co-ops through low-interest loans to finance the construction of generation and distribution facilities and power lines to bring electricity to farms.

---


\(^{43}\) Hogs and other livestock were considered a menace to young pine trees used for pulp wood. “Mill Depends on Pulp Wood: Protection Afforded Young Trees to Be Considered Before Establishment of Paper Mill,” The Daily Herald (Biloxi, MS), Dec. 31, 1927, p. 1.

\(^{44}\) “Blooded Bovine Beauties Replace Tick Ridden Scrubs In State,” Hattiesburg American (Hattiesburg, MS), Feb. 17, 1939, p. 10.


\(^{46}\) Per the MDAH Historic Resource Inventory Database, accessed July 18, 2018.

\(^{47}\) “When our program [REA] was set up in 1935, only one farm in ten had electricity. Now only one in ten does not.” Coast Electric Power Association advertisement in The Daily Herald (Biloxi, MS), Aug. 24, 1951, p. 14.
At Shaw Homestead, electric service was installed at the farm during 1951. A ceiling-mounted light fixture was installed in each room. Only two outlets were installed in the house since plug-connected appliances were expensive and uncommon. Wiring was performed using type NM (nonmetallic sheathed cable), insulated with asbestos-reinforced rubber covered with jute and tar.

**CRITERION C: DESIGN / CONSTRUCTION**

The Shaw Homestead consists of four log structures and two plank frame structures. The main house, a three-bay, single pile, log dog-trot house, took its overall form c1890 when Jule Ladner replaced an earlier structure with the current house. In 1902, Ladner deeded the house to his daughter and son-in-law, Melvina and Gilbert Shaw. The Shaws made modifications as their needs and finances allowed, but the house has maintained its log dogtrot form. The most significant addition came in the first decade of the Shaws’ ownership when the existing sash windows were added to the house, two cabinet rooms were built on the back porch, and a wall was built enclosing the west end of the dogtrot. The homestead grew slowly over the years, with only minor changes and additions: a Livestock Dipping Vat (c. 1910), a Kitchen, Jar House, Smoke House, Corn Crib, Gristmill and Tractor Shed. Structures such as a barn, an outhouse, a well, a potato shed, and a garage were also constructed but are no longer extant. All the buildings contributed to sustaining life on the homestead. The overall design of the homestead buildings is strictly utilitarian. The only concerns of the builders were the functionality of the space and what materials they had at their disposal.

The Shaw Homestead reflects a cultural landscape and building typology that was once common, not only in Mississippi but across the frontier west of the Alleghenies. The form and the construction of the dogtrot typology arise from two groups of immigrant traditions combined to create a uniquely American housing type. The linear building plan comes from Tidewater South tradition that was developed because of climate. The log construction techniques of these houses come from the midland folk tradition influenced by immigrants from heavily timbered areas of central and northern Europe. As native-born Americans of European decent and new European immigrants migrated westward, these two distinct building traditions would meld to create the log dogtrot form. Shorter logs being easier to maneuver determined a typically smaller size to log housing and led to the utilization of “pens.” The dogtrot form was especially adapted to log construction because the length of a manageable log would determine the length of a pen. One pen could be built at a time, and as the jointed corners of the pen were not adaptable to expansion, the second pen could be built several feet from the existing pen and a single roof would cover both, creating a porch or open hallway between the two pens. It has been documented that by the early nineteenth century, housing constructed with this type of material and in this form was quite common amongst yeomen farmers in the eastern United States as the
houses have been found ranging from Georgia to Illinois. By the mid-19th century, these buildings almost universally had full-width porches or galleries. The 1938 WPS Guide to Mississippi describes the Mississippi log dogtrot as a common house type, with a wide hall running through the center and with the cook house in the rear. It further described that as means became available the dogtrot would be enclosed and a porch along the front elevation would be added. In her 1976 exhibit on the folk architecture of Mississippi’s Piney Woods region, Patti Carr Black states;

‘Because of the availability of trees, log houses were the most common type of house built in the Piney Woods during the 19th century. The typical style, still found today, is the ‘double-pen” construction, also called “dogtrot” or “two-pens-and-a-passage.”’

The building method and materials were preferred for those who did not have the access to or the funds for milled lumber. This latter reason speaks to why logs were still popular during the later nineteenth century, even as Mississippi was in the midst of its greatest timber boom, and railroads had brought manufactured goods to every part of the state. Homestead famers who lacked cash to pay for milled lumber, did, however, have access to pine trees on their property that they could fell and hew themselves. Early photographs of the Shaw dogtrot show the house with a wood shingle roof. The front porch protected the original entrances to the pens. These doorways show evidence that their openings were created in part with a hatchet, rather than the saw-only marks that are seen on later doors and the windows.

Shaw Homestead

Name of Property

Pearl River, Mississippi

County and State

C. 1909 Photograph of Gilbert and Melvina Shaw with three of children: Alfred, Monroe, and Stella in front of the Shaw homestead dogtrot. Photo shows the wood-shingled roof and the open central passage between the two log pens.

Very few sites comparable to the Shaw Homestead remain intact. The nearest documented site that most closely compares to the Shaw Homestead is the Meador Homestead (NR, 2010) in Hattiesburg, Forrest County Mississippi. In 1884, F.M. Jones applied for a land grant and prior to 1887, constructed a two-pen log dog trot house to comply with the land grant’s requirement that the applicant must settle on and farm the land for at least five years. The Meador Homestead retains a water well from its homestead period, however the dog trot house has been modernized, and the site contains two modern non-contributing outbuildings. The Shaw Homestead retains a much higher level of integrity to its period as an operating homestead, both in historic fabric making up the log dog trot house, but also in that it retains a majority of the out buildings.

Twentieth Century Alterations to the Dogtrot

-Introduction of windows, doors

While the exact succession of doorway and windows is unknown, they can be approximated by the cuts made into the log walls to accept them. The two doors that enter the pens from the front porch show signs of hatchet marks having aided in creating the opening. In contrast, the six window openings and the two door openings that face into dogtrot were cut with a hand saw. One five panel door enters the right pen from the porch. It is the only door that appears to have been made off-site. The rest of the doors at the homestead are board-and-batten doors that appear to have been made on-site. It is unknown when the five-panel door and the 4/4 wood
double hung windows were added to the property, but they were all likely installed at the same time. They were probably added prior to the addition of electricity in 1951, more specifically to the late 1900s or the 1910s, based on the style of the door and windows as well as the materials used and the method of assembly.

-Introduction of the brick chimney

It appears from examining the architectural remains that the original north and south chimneys were made of wood, with brick hearths and fireplace enclosures. The wood chimneys would have been stick framed and covered with a clay slurry to make them fire resistant. Evidence of the wood chimneys remains at location of the south chimney, and there are likely similar remnants of the wood chimney on the north elevation that is hidden behind the tongue and groove siding. The reminance of the wood chimney on the south elevation shows evidence of charing, indicating that a chimney fire might have destroyed the wood chimney. Brick, if an available option, would have been preferable for a new chimney.

The replacement brick chimney dates to the mid-twentieth century. This chimney flue was built with a curved geometry to fit the house’s south elevation. The bricks are a random collection of type and color but are roughly the same size. A brick chimney for the kitchen appears to have been original, however it was disassembled and reconstructed in 2013.

-Introduction of electricity

The presence of electric service appears to be minimal, with only the basic requirements of electric service provided by the Rural Electrification Act. A ceiling-mounted light fixture was installed in each room, usually controlled by a single switch mounted near a door. At most, one outlet was installed per room, since plug-connected appliances were expensive and uncommon. Wiring was performed using type NM (nonmetallic sheathed cable), insulated with asbestos-reinforced rubber covered with jute and tar. The intrusion of the system is minimal, with holes drilled to allow the wire to pass from room to room. It is held in place with a combination of staples and straps.

The wiring from the building emanates from a service distribution panel mounted on the north wall of the left pen. A single electrical circuit strings from one room to the next, with the kitchen being the room on the end of the circuit.

-Introduction of appliances

Electric washer

In an oral history, Mary Shaw, the daughter-in-law of Gilbert and Melvina Shaw, who lived in the cabin with her husband stated that,

“When I heard they were getting electricity, I made my husband go out and get me a washing machine. I’ll be darned if I’m going to keep going out with that wash pot. Had to boil water, put the clothes in that water with that lye and lye soap. We had a log we’d put water in to rinse clothes. We went outside the yard to wash.”

Mary Shaw indicated that the wash log was located directly west of the Corn Crib. Water would have been drawn from the well near the Kitchen.

Gas Stove

A mid-20th-century gas range is in the kitchen, its gleaming enamel and chrome stand in stark contrast to the rough reality of the surrounding kitchen. The stove likely dates to after Hugo and Mary Shaw moved from the site. With Melvina Shaw living at the homestead by herself, cutting the required amount of wood for cooking her meals may have been deemed excessive when an alternative that would require significantly less labor was available.

The log dogtrot is an increasingly rare type of a once common form, because the structural members of the building, the logs themselves, are exposed to the elements. Historically, to avert the susceptibility to deterioration, log structures would often be sheathed in clapboard siding, when means and access allowed. Despite the Shaw Homestead not receiving this treatment, and years of neglect following its abandonment after Hurricane Camille, the Shaw Homestead is a unique and special survivor of a once plentiful building type in Mississippi.

-Introduction of the metal roof

The wood shingle roof was replaced with a sheet metal roof in 1951. The reason behind the replacement of the wood shingle roof is unknown. It is possible that the wood roof was damaged in the fire that destroyed the wood chimney. When the five V-crimp metal roof was replaced in 2009 by the current five V-crimp metal roof, it was documented that the previous metal roof was constructed with Inland Steel TI-CO Galvanized Steel Sheet metal. The use of the product would date the replaced metal roof as having been installed no earlier that c.1950.

CRITERION D: INFORMATION POTENTIAL

51 Gulf Coast Community Design Studio ibid. Homestead Booklet, p. 32.
Archaeological Resources Present at the Shaw Homestead

According to a 2015 Federal Emergency Management Agency report titled *Cultural Resources Investigation of the Shaw Homestead Survey Area in Pearl River County* “As a result of the Shaw Homestead Survey, the archaeologists were able to define the boundaries of the homestead and confirm the period of its occupation, in addition to discovering a small aboriginal site, which has the potential to improve our understanding of both Native American and historic occupations of this region. Because of this, we recommend the Shaw Homestead Site (22Pr 961) be considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D (NPS 1997).”
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10. Geographical Data  

Acreage of Property ___1 acre +/-__________  

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates  

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates (decimal degrees)  
Datum if other than WGS84: ________  
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)  
1. Latitude: 30.697070  
   Longitude: -89.350227  
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**Verbal Boundary Description** (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northwest Quarter of Southeast Quarter of Section 13, Township 4 South, Range 14 West, Pearl River County, Mississippi; thence run South 5.52 chains for a Place of Beginning; thence South 3.16 chains; thence East 3.16 chains; thence North 3.16 chains; thence West 3.16 chains to the Place of Beginning. The above being In the Northwest part of above said Northwest Quarter of Southeast Quarter and containing one (1) acre, more or less.

**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

Selected boundaries contain the extant homestead buildings. The boundaries are also the extent of the Land Trust for the Mississippi Coastal Plain’s land ownership.
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**Additional Documentation**

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.
- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)
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Current Shaw Homestead Property & National Register Boundaries.
Shaw Homestead General Location.
Shaw Homestead
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Pearl River, Mississippi
County and State

This site plan depicts the layout of the Shaw Homestead c.1950. Objects and buildings outlined in red are no longer extant. The garden, crop fields, and old driveway are no longer extant.

Photograph log of Shaw Homestead.
Photographs
Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

Photo Log
Name of Property: Shaw Homestead
City or Vicinity: Poplarville vic.
County: Pearl River State: MS
Photographers: Jeff Rosenberg, Ron Miller
Date Photographed: 2011, 2013, 2017, 2018

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:

1 of 19. West façade of Dogtrot, view to east
2 of 19. East façade of Dogtrot, view to northwest
3 of 19. Dogtrot interior of northern pen, view to north
4 of 19. Dogtrot interior of southern pen, view to south
5 of 19. Dogtrot center passage, view to west
6 of 19. Interior southern cabinet room, view to north
7 of 19. Interior northern cabinet room, view to north
8 of 19. South façade of Kitchen, view to northwest
9 of 19. North façade of Kitchen, view to southwest
10 of 19. Interior of Kitchen, view to northeast
11 of 19. East façade of Jar House, view to northwest
12 of 19. West façade of Jar House, view to southeast
13 of 19. West façade of Smoke House, view to northeast
14 of 19. West façade of Corn Crib, view to northeast
15 of 19. Interior of Corn Crib, view to east
16 of 19. North façade of Tractor Shed and Grist Mill, view to southwest
17 of 19. Livestock Dip Tank/Vat, view to east
18 of 19. East facades of Dogtrot, Kitchen, Jar House and Smoke House, view to northwest
19 of 19. South facades of Dogtrot, Smoke House, and Corn Crib, view to northeast
M5 PEARL RIVER COUNTY SHAW HOME STEAD 0002
Ms. Pearl River County - Shaw Homestead 0006
MS_ PEARL RIVER COUNTY _ SHAW HOMESTEAD_008
MS - PEARL RIVER COUNTY - SHAW HOMESTEAD_0012
MS - PEARL RIVER COUNTY - SHAW HOMESTEAD _ 0013
MS - PEARL RIVER COUNTY - SHAW HOMESTEAD_0014
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