

The Sociology of Southern Appalachia **David S. Walls and Dwight B. Billings**

Sociologists have been fascinated by the Appalachians ever since George Vincent of the University of Chicago took a four-day horseback ride through Breathitt, Perry, and Knott Counties in eastern Kentucky in 1898. Urging study of "this curious social survival ... now being modified so rapidly," Vincent concluded his descriptive and impressionistic account, "Let students of sociology leave their books and at first hand in the Cumberlands deal with the phenomena of a social order arrested at a relatively early state of evolution."¹ Setting aside questions about the accuracy of Vincent's characterization of the region as a retarded frontier, we can see in his article two themes which predominate in sociological studies of Appalachia from his day to ours: social change and social problems.

Vincent acknowledged his debt to such writers of the "local color movement" as Mary Murfree and John Fox, Jr., for being the first to recognize the Southern Mountains as a distinctive subcultural region. The "discovery" of the Southern Appalachians is itself a problem in the sociology of knowledge and has been addressed by historian Henry Shapiro in *Appalachia on Our Minds*,² a brilliant interpretation of the emergence of a national consciousness of Southern Appalachia in the period from 1875 to 1920. Herbert Blumer's comment could well apply to Vincent (and many others) in regard to Appalachia: "Sociological recognition follows in the wake of societal recognition, veering with the winds of the public identification of social problems."³

Theories of Social Change and Social Problems. The themes of social change, social problems, and the response of private and public social policy underlie the major social surveys of the Southern Appalachian region: John C. Campbell's *Southern Highlander and His Homeland* in 1921, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's *Economic and Social Problems and Conditions of the Southern Appalachians* in 1935, the section on the "Southern Appalachian Coal Plateaus" in the Study of Population Redistribution in 1936, the Ford Foundation supported study *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey* in 1962, and the various studies and annual reports of the Appalachian Regional Commission since 1965.⁴ These studies illustrate a major accomplishment of the sociology of Appalachia: the analysis of demographic data from census statistics, including population changes, fertility rates, incomes, unemployment, housing, health, and so on.

Surprisingly, little systematic attention has been devoted by sociologists of

Appalachia to fundamental theories of social change or models that explain regional poverty and underdevelopment. Tacit assumptions about the process of social change are more common than explicit models of the roots of regional problems and strategies to overcome the area's difficulties. Description, explanation, and prescription are intertwined in many studies and are not often clearly distinguished. Yet over the years a variety of arguments have been advanced to account for what is variously described as the backwardness, poverty, underdevelopment, and resistance to change of the Appalachian region and its people.

Genes vs. Environment. In the late nineteenth century, historian John Fiske implied a genetic basis for Appalachian poverty and backwardness by suggesting the poor class of mountaineers were the descendants of convicts and indentured servants. The argument of genetic deficiency was elaborated in the 1920's by Arthur Estabrook and Nathaniel Hirsch and revived recently by Harry Caudill.⁵ In contrast, the geographic circumstances of isolation and poor communication were emphasized at the turn of the century by William Frost and Ellen Semple.⁶ One objective of John Campbell in *The Southern Highlander* was to refute Fiske's argument by providing a correct record of the origins and current status of mountain people and by emphasizing an environmental explanation of mountain problems.⁷ In recent years genetic and geographical explanations have generally been superseded by sociocultural and economic theories. During the 1960's, three models were drawn upon to explain Appalachian poverty and underdevelopment: the subculture of poverty, regional development, and internal colonialism models. Each of these three current models was first developed in the context of underdevelopment in the Third World and applied by analogy to the Appalachian case.

Subculture of Poverty. The subculture of poverty model identifies the internal deficiencies of the lower-class subculture as the source of the problem. Oscar Lewis is the social scientist most closely identified with this model, and the most widely read exposition of the model applied to Appalachia is Jack Weller's *Yesterday's People*, which borrows an analytic framework from Herbert Gans.⁸ The subculture of poverty model suggests remedial programs of education, social casework, and clinical psychology. Other studies of Appalachian culture in these terms include David Loeff's *Appalachia's Children*, Norman Polansky's *Roots of Futility*, and various articles by Richard Ball.⁹

This model in general has been subjected to devastating criticism, and Steve Fisher has criticized Weller's application of this model to Appalachia.¹⁰ In an

empirical test, sociologist Dwight Billings has shown the model to be of little value in explaining the lack of economic development in the mountain section of North Carolina and the contrasting industrialization of the piedmont. Ironically, it was just when the distinctiveness of the Southern Appalachian traditional subculture was fading that the subculture of poverty model was popularized and applied to the region.¹¹

The pejorative viewpoint on Appalachian culture has been answered by an affirmative approach in works from John and Olive Campbell through Loyal Jones' essay on Appalachian values. Mike Maloney and Ben Huelsman have contrasted the affirmative and pejorative approaches in their essay, "Humanism, Scientism, and the Southern Mountaineer."¹² Within the humanistic tradition, in their terms, are Robert Coles, John Fetterman, Tony Dunbar, Kathy Kahn, and John Stephenson, who use their subjects' own words to characterize Appalachian life-worlds.¹³ Their descriptions of individuals and families manage to capture the strengths as well as the shortcomings of mountaineers and the diversity of personality types within some common subcultural themes.

The subculture of poverty model can be seen as only one approach within a broader framework of explanations rooted in the tradition of cultural idealism. Affirmative cultural approaches toward Southern Appalachia, as exemplified by Frost and the Campbells, are the obverse side of the coin from the pejorative tradition of the subculture of poverty school. The regionalism of the 1930's, as personified by Howard Odum and others, followed in the tradition of affirmative cultural idealism and looked to ties to the land and a sense of place, combined with planning, for regional revitalization. As John Friedmann points out, the new regionalism of the 1960's discarded the grounding in cultural idealism in favor of a regional development model resting within the contemporary technocratic image and ideology of science.¹⁴

Regional Development. Although the literature on development includes disciplines from social psychology to social ecology, the most influential stream derives from neo-classical economics as amended by central place theory.¹⁵ The resulting regional development model is concerned with providing economic and social overhead capital, training people for skills for new industrial and service jobs, facilitating migration, and promoting the establishment or relocation of privately-owned industries through a growth center. Niles Hansen is probably the best known academic proponent of this approach. The major attempt to apply the model within the United States is the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) and its associated programs.¹⁶

A major sociological contribution to the regional development model is the notion of a modernizing elite as the agent of the developmental process. H. Dudley Plunkett and Mary Jean Bowman elaborate this idea in *Elites and Change in the Kentucky Mountains*. They identify the "interstitial person" as the "cultural bridge" between traditional and modernizing groups and investigate such key occupational groups as bankers, lawyers, public officials, clergy, physicians, and schoolteachers to determine their relative commitments to change. In general, Plunkett and Bowman found the "ministering professionals" - clergy, physicians, and teachers - to have the most modern outlook; businessmen to be intermediate; and the local administrative elite, the "gerontocracy" of bankers, lawyers, and politicians to be the most traditional.¹⁷ The ARC strategy appears to follow the Plunkett and Bowman suggestion of cooperating with the modernizing professionals to coopt or outmaneuver the traditional business elites and the old county political machines. The basic structure for this strategy on the local level is the multi-county Local Development District, which serves as a mechanism for arriving at consensus among regional elites. Through the dual federal-state structure of the ARC, the interests of regional and national elites are reconciled.

With its emphasis on mainstream economic theory and the technical aspects of development, the regional development model lays claim to being a scientific, value-free, non-controversial approach. As such, it is an effective means of providing additional resources to the region without affecting the existing structure of resource control. Actions taken by regional and national planners are defended as technical decisions, rather than political choices among alternative courses of development. Political sociology calls attention to the possibility that the most important decisions may be the "non-decision": the questions that are never raised and the subjects that never make the public agenda. Examples include public ownership of the region's natural resources and worker or community owned and controlled industry.¹⁸

Internal Colonialism. The issues of power and privilege in Appalachia are seldom faced squarely by the subculture of poverty and regional development advocates. In reaction to this obvious shortcoming, academics and activists looked for a model that emphasized inequality and exploitation. They hit upon the internal colonialism model for reasons that had much to do with the focus of the New Left in the 1960s -- imperialism abroad and oppression of racial minorities at home. As applied to Appalachia, the internal colonialism model has been used to examine the process by which dominant outside industrial interests established control and continue to prevent autonomous development of the subordinate internal colony.

The model suggests the need for an anti-colonial movement and a radical restructuring of society, with a redistribution of resources to the poor and powerless.

In his best selling 1962 study *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, Harry Caudill makes only a passing reference to colonialism; by 1965 he begins to use the *internal* colonial designation. The theme was quickly picked up by activists and radical intellectuals in the Central Appalachian area, particularly the group associated with the Peoples' Appalachian Research Collective and its journal, *Peoples' Appalachia*.¹⁹

Helen Lewis and her associates have attempted a detailed application to Appalachia of Robert Blauner's model of the process of internal colonization of black Americans. In this analysis, such institutions as the Appalachian family and church emerge as not simply survivals of an earlier traditional subculture but also as defensive institutions whose "closed" characteristics are in part formed in resistance to the process of colonization. By emphasizing such values as "equality, non-competitiveness, and family-neighborhood solidarity," the family and the church resist the social change that would integrate the region into the American mainstream.²⁰

Much of the attraction of the internal colonialism model, including its application to Appalachia, derives from its powerful analysis of the destruction of indigenous culture in the process of establishing and maintaining domination over the colonized group. It has also performed a valuable service by focusing attention on the acquisition of the raw materials of the region by outside corporate interests and on the exploitation of the local work force and community at large resulting from the removal of the region's natural resources for the benefit of absentee owners.

Although the internal colonialism model has raised important questions about wealth, power, and exploitation in central Appalachia, it may not offer the most satisfactory characterization of the situation of the region. The analogy with racial minorities in America has serious limitations in any strict definition of internal colonialism.²¹ The involuntary entry into the United States of enslaved blacks from Africa or the conquered Native American tribes and the Mexican people of the Southwest presents a substantially different situation from that of most Appalachians. Barriers to the assimilation of Appalachians into mainstream society --prejudice against "hillbillies" -- are based on bias against the lower classes, not against all the people of the region. The historical development of Appalachia since the expansion of industrial capitalism may present a better example of class

domination than Colonial domination.²²

Toward a More Comprehensive Theory of Social Change in Appalachia. A comprehensive theory of social change in Appalachia must synthesize and integrate a humanistic approach to culture, the technical aspects of regional development, and an appropriate critique of domination at the present period. Some outlines of such a theory emerge from the work of Frankfurt School theorist Jürgen Habermas. For Habermas there are three fundamental conditions or media through which social systems are maintained: interaction, work, and power or domination. All human societies use these means to resolve the problems of preserving life and culture. Corresponding to each of these media are the human "interests" in mutual understanding, technical control, and "emancipation from seemingly 'natural' constraint."²³ A solution to the problems of Appalachian poverty and underdevelopment would have to be concerned with each of the three modes of culture, technique, and domination. Habermas' distinction provides a basis for viewing cultural adaptation, technical development, and redistribution of power as potentially complementary aspects of social development.

We suggest the history of the Appalachian region is best understood in the context of industrial capitalist development. Currently, Appalachia must be analyzed in the context of advanced capitalism in the United States. In some instances (analyzing the role of the Japanese steel industry in providing capital for opening new coal mines in the region, for example), we may have to expand our horizon to the framework of the world capitalist system. In a recent work Habermas analyzes advanced capitalist societies in terms of their economic, administrative (state), and legitimation systems and the resulting class structures. This framework prompts us to examine the competitive and monopolistic sectors of private industry, the role of state expenditures, the legitimation of the system and the containment of rebellion, and the full complexity of the class structure of the region.²⁴ It may be fruitful to view Southern Appalachia as a peripheral region, rather than an internal colony, within an advanced capitalist society.²⁵

"Middle-Range" Issues in the Sociology of Southern Appalachia. At a less comprehensive level of social theory, in the "middle-range" of sociological investigation, baseline studies have been made in several areas. We have substantial knowledge of kinship and community structures, cultural configurations, and demographic changes. We have much less complete knowledge of Appalachian patterns of social stratification and politics. It is useful to summarize these studies and to point out deficiencies in our knowledge.

Class, Status, and Power in Appalachia. As noted above, the subculture model and the regional development model of Appalachian change have both diverted attention away from certain aspects of social structure and politics and redirected attention to issues of cultural and psychological "modernity" -- this, despite the fact that Appalachia was born modern. Two misconceptions about the traditional subculture deserve comment. The traditional subculture of the Southern Appalachians should not be characterized as either a poverty subculture or as a peasant culture. The pre-industrial, pioneer way of life cannot be equated with a subculture of poverty as described by Oscar Lewis; there is no evidence that traditional mountain families felt helpless, dependent, or inferior.²⁶ The analogy to a peasantry has been used in two senses, both in reference to the traditional subculture and to the type of domination during the company town era.²⁷ Neither analogy is accurate. Nineteenth-century mountaineers were not descendants of a peasant people, but the children and grandchildren of eighteenth century colonists, most of whom had been landless wage-earners from an agricultural and mercantile capitalist country about to enter into the industrial revolution. In sharp contrast to the *Gemeinschaft* solidarity of traditional peasant society, the Appalachian mountaineer was already the quintessential modern individualist. Further, the situation of the miner in the company town is typical of social relations in the early stage of oligopoly capitalism and should be designated as such, not as a condition of peasantry.

Inappropriate cultural models -- as they fix attention on "rich Appalachia" and "poor Appalachia," on "traditional Appalachia" and "modern Appalachia" -- obscure the region's complex pattern of social stratification. The expansion of state expenditures has helped create sizeable intermediate groupings of public workers (in education, local government, and public services) and workers in industries heavily subsidized by public funds (health services particularly). These elements of the "new working-class." have taken their places alongside such long-established groups as coal miners, workers in small factories, small farmers, country merchants, county-seat retailers, bankers, professionals, independent coal operators, and managers for the nationally-based coal companies in the monopolistic sector, in addition to household workers, the welfare poor, and others outside the standard labor force. The occupational structure is obviously complex, and its changes need to be analyzed over time, particularly in relation to changes in the coal industry and the growth of state expenditures.

We have no studies of industrial communities in the mountains and, consequently, we have few accounts of stratification in mining communities and

county-seat towns. Rural stratification has frequently been overlooked as well,²⁸ but some good studies have been made. John Stephenson has pictured a four-level structure in "Shiloh," and Schwarzweller, Brown, and Mangalam²⁹ have identified a clearly developed stratification system in "Beech Creek," despite the fact that they were studying poor families. Social status differences in Beech Creek were manifested in family reputation, visiting, marital exchanges, and territorial locations. Lower status people retained their ascribed family status-in the authors' words, their "inherited stigma"-despite personal achievements. This suggests that social factors which influence interaction in mountain communities across status boundaries have not been sufficiently studied. Such factors have important consequences for power and participation in local communities and thus for social and economic mobility.

One of the authors of this essay (Billings) first encountered the *process* of stratification when he attended grade school in a Southern West Virginia county-seat town. School property included two buildings and students were segregated by their fathers' occupations. "Coal Camp" students were routinely assigned to an annex, ostensibly because of "special learning difficulties," although every year two or three were assigned to the main building. In the fourth grade, Billings observed that one of these children always turned red and buried her face in her hands when the teacher called on her to participate in class. This same child was once stood up before the class and her chapped hands were shown to her schoolmates. The teacher explained that her father could not afford to buy her handcream and, in missionary language, she asked if one of the other children would share her bounty and bring her some cream. The undertaker's daughter did. Later, in her absence, the class was told that this was the same child who brought lice into the classroom.

This story suggests that being poor involves a social identity which is learned early and enforced by informal relationships in the local community. We know little about the rule-governed interactions -- in the school, the work place, the welfare office, the voting place -- which condition the performances of those defined as "the poor" in the mountains. Nor do we know much about the group with whom they have the most direct contact, the mountain middle class, for the latter have been rarely studied. Sociologists who have studied the middle class, such as Plunkett and Bowman, have been chiefly interested in their attitudes. The mountain middle class is typically viewed as a "cultural bridge" between the rural community and mass society. Their role as "gatekeeper," a better functional analogy, has been ignored and their influence on education, social services, political participation, and the economy has not been fully grasped. In fact,

community power structure studies in Southern Appalachia are practically non-existent, although we have had Floyd Hunter's work as an exemplar for over 20 years, and a vast amount of subsequent literature.³⁰

Richard Ball reported on the power structure of a northern West Virginia mining county; Rod Harless reported on a county in southern West Virginia.³¹ Harless found that the county political elite, consisting of bankers and lawyers, were also on retainer for absentee corporations. Harless, however, used only the positional study method, not the reputational or decision-making case study methods. His work is of limited use for understanding the actual exercise of power and influence although it suggests a political structure similar to those found in other economically peripheral or dependent regions.³² The middle-class role in county politics has also been discussed by Harry Caudill, Richard Couto, Tony Dunbar, and in Huey Perry's *"They'll Cut Off Your Project,"* a description of confrontation in West Virginia during the War on Poverty.³³

Scholars who developed the colonial model have focused attention on another social group, absentee owners, who are influential in the life of the region, and in the politics of natural resource development. For example, Harless tried to identify a West Virginia ownership establishment and Richard Diehl³⁴ described an "Appalachian Energy Elite." A field of growing importance is the sociology of natural resource use. The social impact of the Army Corps of Engineers' dam building is beginning to be studied. The social and economic costs of Appalachian coal production have been explored in a series of reports by the Appalachian Resources Project at the University of Tennessee. Si Kahn has opened a discussion of the impact of Forest Service policies on the region.³⁵ Sue Johnson and Rabel Burdge have outlined a methodology for sociologists making contributions to Environmental Impact Statements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Another avenue for investigating the social impact of a disaster is explored by Kai Erikson's study of the destruction of community in the wake of the Buffalo Creek Flood.³⁶

For the most part, these studies, like the community literature, fail to analyze the actual use of power and influence by absentee owners. An important exception is John Gaventa's analysis of the American Association, an English land-holding corporation in eastern Kentucky and Tennessee.³⁷ On a related theme, the increasing coordination of government and business in resource development has been described by David Whisnant and by Harry Caudill in the *Watches of the Night*.³⁸

Surprisingly little attention has been paid to racial and ethnic minority groups, a shortcoming which has bolstered the old stereotype of Appalachia as a bastion of Anglo-Saxon stock. Racial minorities in Southern Appalachia include blacks, Native Americans, and mixed-race groups. Blacks numbered approximately 1.3 million of the total Appalachian population of 18.2 million according to the 1970 census, some 7.3 percent of the population in the 13-state region as defined by the ARC.³⁹ The few studies that have been made concerning black Appalachians have been concerned primarily with their participation in the coal industry.⁴⁰ Blacks composed a substantial proportion of the work force in coal mining in the Southern states between 1890 and 1930. Since that time the proportion of black miners has declined. The mechanization of the industry that began in the 1950's hit particularly hard at the black miner, who did not receive an equal share of the jobs operating continuous-miners and other heavy equipment. As employment in the coal industry declined, blacks were laid off in disproportionate numbers. The increase in strip mining also worked against blacks, who rarely obtained jobs with stripping firms. Black Appalachians have been migrating out of the region at a greater rate than whites.

The Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians is the only organized group of Native Americans living in the Southern Appalachian region. Until recently, the only thorough study of the Eastern Cherokees had been conducted in the late 1950's by the Cross-Cultural Laboratory at the University of North Carolina. The Special Cherokee Issue of the *Appalachian Journal* in 1975, edited by Burt Purrington, has added considerable new material on the Eastern Cherokees.⁴¹ The four counties in western North Carolina which include the Eastern Cherokee reservation lands had a total Indian population of 3,937 in the 1970 census. Several hundred additional Indians live in the North Carolina Piedmont and eastern Tennessee.

Ten major mixed-race or triracial (white, black, and Native American ancestry) groups have been identified in the eastern United States. Two of these, the "Melungeons" and the "Guineas," reside within the Southern Appalachian region. The Melungeons of Tennessee continue to give rise to a considerable quantity of mythology, despite the sober scholarship of Edward Price in the early 1950's. There is little up-to-date information on either group, although a study is underway on the Guineas of West Virginia.⁴² An attempt was made to count the mixed-race peoples in the 1950 census, but the figures are highly suspect.⁴³ Research is needed to determine to what extent these groups have been maintained or have been assimilated.

As with blacks, studies of European ethnic groups in Southern Appalachia have

been conducted mainly in terms of their association with the coal industry.⁴⁴ And with the notable exception of Kathy Kahn's *Hillbilly Women*, little systematic attention has been given to mountain women.

Finally, in the last few years some excellent theoretical work on social movement organization has been done by sociologists, and we have two exemplary case studies of CORE and SDS.⁴⁵ But for Appalachian social movements, social scientists have not kept up with the journalists in describing how occupants of class and status positions organize for cooperative and political action. Brit Hume's *Death and the Mines* provides information on the Mack Lung Association and the Miners for Democracy movements. The War on Poverty in Appalachia has prompted many books.⁴⁶ David Whisnant has provided historical interpretations of the Council of the Southern Mountains and the Congress for Appalachian Development, and Frank Adams has written a history of the Highlander Center.⁴⁷ Most of the literature on the Tennessee Valley Authority written since Philip Selznick's classic *TVA and the Grass Roots* has been historical rather than analytical.⁴⁸ Little evaluative research has been done on either the War on Poverty programs or the Appalachian Regional Commission. Attempts by community organizers to create an Appalachian identity among unemployed out-migrants in urban contexts and to adapt their communities to the model of inner-city ethnic group politics also deserve more attention.⁴⁹

Culture and Community in Appalachia. Since the time of Frost and the Campbells, students of the Southern Appalachians have been attempting to characterize the subculture of the region. In the major effort to survey the extent to which the traditional subculture has persisted, Thomas Ford in 1962 defined four themes: individualism and self-reliance, traditionalism, fatalism, and fundamentalism. Of these, the people questioned showed a significant difference from national norms only in the direction of greater fundamentalism.⁵⁰ It is not clear whether subcultural differences that still persist are distinctive of Southern Appalachia rather than of the rural South, of the rural United States generally, or, as a cultural geographer has suggested, of the Upland South.⁵¹

Too often, social scientists have erroneously sought to measure Appalachian culture against some standard of urban, middle-class values. This is especially a problem when the former is pejoratively pitted against the latter which is seen as an indicator of "modernity" and, implicitly, of moral health. This prevents an understanding of Appalachian culture in its own terms. In Eugene Genovese's *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, an analysis of slave culture in the American South, and in Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb's *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, an analysis of ethnic,

working-class culture in contemporary Boston, we have exemplary treatments of the dialectical relationship between class position and culture in history.⁵² Unfortunately we lack such a comprehensive historical study of Appalachian culture and society, although James Brown and Helen Lewis have provided much insight.

Brown summarizes the orientation of the pre-industrial Appalachian culture in three themes: familism (social interaction), puritanism (belief system), and individualism (personality system).⁵³ In *Mountain Families in Transition* the authors abstract cultural traits from their behavioral expressions which exactly counter the pathogenic qualities so often attributed to the culture of "yesterday's people." In a brilliant article entitled "Family, Religion and Colonialism in Central Appalachia; Or: Bury My Rifle at Big Stone Gap," Helen Lewis, Sue Kobak, and Linda Johnson interpret more recent developments in Appalachian culture as a response to "the process of colonialization as it occurred in the Central Appalachians."⁵⁴ Family and church institutions, in particular, "became defensive and reverted inward in order to protect members from the sudden influence which came with the development of industrialization." Their work suggests that seen in this context, as a localized response beginning at the turn of the century to the national mobilization of population and resources in America to achieve maximum capitalist industrial development, contemporary Appalachian culture can no longer be seen as that of an "arrested frontier." Rather, one sees functional parallels between contemporary Appalachian culture and other such reactive movements as populism in the South, the emergence of ethnic communities in the industrial Northeast, the flight of the white middle class to suburbia in the 1950's in order to preserve the values of small town and family living,⁵⁵ the emergence of a "counterculture" among their children in the 1960's, the subsequent flight of many of these children underground or to Canada to avoid the Vietnam War, the recent protest among working-class communities against busing, and even the opposition to imposed textbooks in the rural sections of West Virginia's Kanawha Valley industrial region. All these may be seen as responses to centralizing tendencies of mobilization and massification.

Studies of communities in Southern Appalachia are less advanced than is first apparent. We have some excellent studies of isolated agricultural communities: Marion Pearsall's *Little Smokey Ridge*, Brown's "Beech Creek." But we also have studies of very poor communities presented as typical: Rena Gazaway's "Duddie's Branch" and Bill Surface's *The Hollow*.⁵⁶ And then we have three studies of Celo, North Carolina, done in the early and mid-1960's which make little or no reference to each other.⁵⁷

Studies by John Stephenson, Helen Lewis, and others demonstrate the variety of occupational groupings and life-styles within rural communities.⁵⁸ Art Gallaher has suggested a typology of communities ranging from extremely isolated rural, less isolated rural with some stores and services, company towns, county seat towns, and major urban areas.⁵⁹ The diversity of family, life style, and community types is apparent, in contrast to the stereotypes of the uniform subculture of poverty on the one hand, and the polarization of Appalachian society into the rich and the poor on the other.⁶⁰ Among aspects of Appalachian culture and community, family organization has received much attention. The importance of the extended family and kinship groups has been noted in most studies of rural regions in Appalachia, in comparison with the relative isolation of the nuclear family in mainstream society. Brown's study of "Beech Creek" over a thirty-year period has made the greatest contribution to the study of mountain families during the great migration out of the region between 1940 and 1970.

The presentation and analysis of census data on the Appalachian region has long been used to describe the characteristics of the population, the differences within the region, and its lag behind the rest of the nation. Campbell presents data from the 1910 census in *The Southern Highlander*; the USDA study presents data through the early 1930's; the Ford study analyzes the data from 1940 to 1960, and Brown has analyzed the 1970 census.⁶¹ Gordon DeJong has made the most detailed analysis of fertility decline in the region.⁶² The *Annual Reports* of the ARC bring the income and employment figures up to date. Recently efforts have been made to assess changes in the "quality of life" in the region.⁶³

The study of migration out of and into the Appalachians has been developed in considerable detail. Migration from the region has been a feature since the early 1800's; overlooking this pattern contributes to an exaggerated sense of the isolation of the region during the mid-1800's. People left the mountain areas of Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Carolinas and made their way to the Ozarks, southern Illinois, Texas, and Oklahoma.⁶⁴ A longstanding migration stream from two sources in the Southern Appalachians to two areas of settlement in western Washington state, two thousand miles away, has been described in detail by Woodrow Clevinger.⁶⁵ The migration began around 1880, in connection with the timber industry, hit a peak between 1900 and 1917, and continues to a limited extent even to this day. During the 1930's the central Appalachians experienced a net in-migration stream.⁶⁶ The work of Clevinger, Brown, and others has demonstrated the importance of the family system in the migration process. While the major migration streams from the region are known, much remains to be done to identify the streams on a

detailed, local, or county level. Related to the literature on Appalachian migration is a variety of material on occupational adjustment to industrial work.⁶⁷

An obvious deficiency in the sociological literature on the Appalachian community is the analysis of work. Despite the growing literature on the "single industry community," we have no good studies on industrial communities in the mountains. The only study of a coal mining community in the United States in Herman Lantz's "Coal Town" in southern Illinois.⁶⁸ With the exception of the work of Lewis and Knipe, and studies by Ronald Althouse and Keith Dix, little has been done on the industrial sociology of the coal industry by social scientists. Investigative journalists have accomplished far more in analyzing developments in the coal industry, mine disasters, and the everyday life of coal miners.⁶⁹ A fascinating problem in this area of industrial sociology is explaining the success of unionization in the coalfields and its failure in the textile mills. No comparative studies of coal and textile communities have been made, despite the assertion that both share similar subculture and situation of domination.⁷⁰

Toward a Sociology of the Appalachian Future. Much of the research on Southern Appalachia has sought either to discover a romantic past or to proclaim "the eve of an astonishing development."⁷¹ Instead, we need hard sociological thinking about an Appalachian future. For this we need a more adequate historical sociology in order to recover an authentic mountain past and to gain a critical perspective on current developments. We also need a more comprehensive sociology of culture in order to articulate the values and goals of Appalachian people, especially those who otherwise lack an institutional basis from which to be heard. Such people have not often been listened to by missionaries, developers, and bureaucrats. Finally, we urgently need a study of the landowning and energy-getting elites in Appalachia whose plans, about which we are always so ignorant, often seem inexorable. The likely emergence of a national energy policy and the importance of coal in that policy make this research agenda and the timely voice of Appalachian people all the more imperative.

¹ George E. Vincent, "A Retarded Frontier," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 4(July 1898), 20.

² Shapiro, *Appalachia on Our Minds* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1978); the book is a revision of his dissertation, "A Strange Land and Peculiar People: The Discovery of Appalachia, 1870-1920" (Rutgers, 1966). Shapiro's thesis is summarized in his "Introduction" to

the reprinted edition of John C. Campbell, *The Southern Highlander and His Home/and* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1921; rpt. Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1969).

³ Blumer, "Social Problems as Collective Behavior," *Social Problems*. 18 (Winter 1971), 299.

⁴ See USDA Miscellaneous Publication No. 205 (1935); Frederick G. Tryon and Bushrod W. Allin, "The Southern Appalachian Coal Plateaus," Ch. 2 in Carter Goodrich, et al., *Migration and Economic Opportunity* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1936), pp. 54-123; *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1962).

⁵ John Fiske, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbours* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1897), II, 177-89; Arthur Estabrook, "Presidential Address: Blood Seeks Environment," *Eugenical News*. II (August 1926), 106-14; Nathaniel D. M. Hirsch, "An Experimental Study of the East Kentucky Mountaineers," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 3 (March 1928), 183-244; Harry M. Caudill, *A Darkness at Dawn: Appalachian Kentucky and the Future* (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1976), Ch. 1.

⁶ William Goodell Frost, "Our Contemporary Ancestors in the Southern Mountains," *Atlantic Monthly*. 83 (March 1899), 311-19; Ellen Churchill Semple, "The Anglo-Saxons of the Kentucky Mountains: A Study in Anthropogeography," *The Geographical Journal*, 17 (June 19(1), 588-623, rpt. *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society*, 42 (August 1910), 561-94.

⁷ Campbell, *Southern Highlander*, Cbs. 3 and 4, Appendix B.

⁸ Oscar Lewis, *The Children of Sanchez* (New York: Random House, 1961), pp. xxiv-xxvii; Jack E. Weller, *Yesterday's People: Life in Contemporary Appalachia* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1965); and Herbert J. Gans, *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans* (New York: Free Press, 1962).

⁹ David H. Loeff, *Appalachia's Children: The Challenge of Mental Health* (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1971); Norman A. Polansky, Robert D. Borgman, and Christine DeSaix, *Roots of Futility* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972); Richard A. Ball, "New Premises for Planning in Appalachia," *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 2 (Fall 1974), 92-101; and "The Southern Appalachian Folk Subculture as a Tension-Reducing Way of Life," in *Change in Rural Appalachia*. ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwarzweller (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), pp. 69-79.

¹⁰ For example, Jack L. Roach and Orville R. Gursslin, "An Evaluation of the Concept 'Culture of Poverty,'" *Social Forces*, 45 (March 1967), 383-92; Charles A. Valentine, *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1968); the comments on Valentine in *Current Anthropology*, 10 (April-June 1969), 181-201; and the essays in *The Culture of Poverty: A Critique*, ed. Eleanor Burke Leacock (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971); see Stephen L. Fisher, "Folk Culture or Folk Tale: Prevailing Assumptions about the Appalachian Personality," in *An Appalachian Symposium: Essays Written in Honor of Cratis D. Williams* (Boone: Appalachian State Univ. Press, 1977), a revised and somewhat

shortened version of "Victim-Blaming in Appalachia: Cultural Theories and the Southern Mountaineer," in *Appalachia: Social Context Past and Present*, ed. Bruce Ergood and Bruce E. Kuhre (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 1976), pp. 139-148.

¹¹ Dwight Billings, "Culture and Poverty in Appalachia: A Theoretical Discussion and Empirical Analysis," *Social Forces*, 53 (December 1974), 315-23; and Thomas R. Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," Ch. 2 in *The Southern Appalachian Region*.

¹² Loyal Jones, "Appalachian Values," in *Voices from the Hills*, ed. Robert J. Higgs and Ambrose N. Manning (New York: Ungar, 1975), pp. 507-17; Mike Maloney and Ben Huelsman, "Humanism, Scientism, and Southern Mountaineers," *Peoples' Appalachia*, 2 (July 1972), 24-7.

¹³ See Robert Coles, *Migrants, Sharecroppers. Mountaineers*, especially Chs. 5, 6, 9, and 12, and *The South Goes North*. Ch. 6 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971); John Fetterman, *Stinking Creek* (New York: Dutton, 1967); Anthony Dunbar, *Our Land Too* (New York: Random House, 1969), Part II; Kathy Kahn, *Hillbilly Women* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1973); and John B. Stephenson, *Shiloh: A Mountain Community* (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1968). The methodological basis of the humanistic approach is sketched in John R. Staude, "The Theoretical Foundations of Humanistic Sociology," in *Humanistic Society: Today's Challenge to Sociology*, ed. John F. Glass and John R. Staude (Pacific Palisades: Goodyear, 1972), pp. 262-70.

¹⁴ John Friedmann, "Poor Regions and Poor Nations: Perspectives on the Problem of Appalachia," *Southern Economic Journal*, 32 (April 1966), 465-7.

¹⁵ On regional development theory, see Harvey S. Perloff et al., *Regions. Resources. and Economic Growth* (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1960); E. A. J. Johnson, *The Organization of Space in Developing Countries* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1970); Harry W. Richardson, *Regional Growth Theory* (New York: Wiley, 1973); and *Backward Areas in Advanced Countries*, ed. E.A.G. Robinson (New York: St. Martin's, 1969).

¹⁶ Niles M. Hansen's works include *Rural Poverty and the Urban Crisis* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1970); *Intermediate-Size Cities as Growth Centers* (New York: Praeger, 1971); and an edited volume, *Growth Centers in Regional Economic Development* (New York: Free Press, 1972). On the ARC, see Donald Rothblatt, *Regional Planning: The Appalachian Experience* (Lexington, MA: Heath, 1971); and Monroe Newman, *The Political Economy of Appalachia* (Lexington, MA.: Lexington Books, 1972).

¹⁷ Plunkett and Bowman, *Elites and Change* (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1973). Two good critical reviews of this work are by Billings in the *American Journal of Sociology*, 79 (May 1974), 1572-4; and Helen M. Lewis in *Social Forces*, 53 (September 1974), 139-40. The notion of a "cultural bridge" is borrowed from Harry K. Schwarzweller and James S. Brown, "Education as a Cultural Bridge between Eastern Kentucky and the Great Society," *Rural Sociology*, 27 (December 1962), 357-73, rpt. in *Change in Rural Appalachia*, ed. Photiadis and Schwarzweller, pp. 129-45.

¹⁸ The idea of "non decisions" is developed in Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, *Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970), Ch. 3, pp. 39-51. See also

Matthew Creason, *The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decisionmaking in the Cities* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971); and Roger W. Cobb and Charles D. Elder, *Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Building* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972).

¹⁹ Caudill, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1963), p. 325; "Misdeal in Appalachia," *The Atlantic Monthly*, June 1965, p. 44; and his "Appalachia: The Dismal Land," *Dissent*, 14 (November-December 1967), 718-19. See also the entire fourth issue of *Peoples' Appalachia* (August-September 1970), organized around the theme "The Developers: Partners in Colonization."

²⁰ Robert Blauner, "Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt," *Social Problems*, 16 (Spring 1969), 393; revised and reprinted as Ch. 3 in Blauner, *Racial Oppression in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). The Appalachian analogy is first developed in Helen M. Lewis and Edward E. Knipe, "The Colonialism Model: The Appalachian case," an unpublished paper, revised draft, October 1970 (forthcoming in *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*, ed. Lewis *et al.*, from The Appalachian Consortium Press); and an expanded version by Lewis, "Fatalism or the Coal Industry? Contrasting Views of Appalachian Problems," *Mountain Life & Work*, 46 (December 1970), 4-15; rpt. in *Appalachia: Its People, Heritage, and Problems*, ed. Frank S. Riddell (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1974), pp. 221-38, and rpt. in *Appalachia: Social Context Past and Present*, ed. Ergood and Kuhre, pp. 153-62. The application is further developed in Helen Lewis, Sue Kobak, and Linda Johnson, "Family, Religion and Colonialism in Central Appalachia; Or: Bury My Rifle at Big Stone Gap," in *Growin' Up Country*, ed. Jim Axelrod (Clintwood, VA: Council of the Southern Mountains, 1973), pp.131-56.

²¹ See, for example, Pablo Gonzalez-Casanova, "Internal Colonialism and National Development," in *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 1 (1965), 27-37, rpt. in *Latin American Radicalism*, ed. Irving Louis Horowitz *et al.*, (New York: Random House, 1969), especially pp. 130-2; and Pierre van den Berghe, "Education, Class and Ethnicity in Southern Peru: Revolutionary Colonialism," in *Education and Colonialism: Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Philip G. Altbach and Gail P. Kelly (New York: McKay, forthcoming).

²² The critique of the internal colonialism model applied to Appalachia is developed at greater length by Walls in "Central Appalachia: A Peripheral Region within an Advanced Capitalist Society," *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 4 (November 1976), 232-47; "Internal Colony or Internal Periphery?" forthcoming in *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*, ed. H. Lewis, *et al.*; and the paper "Three Models in Search of Appalachian Development: Critique and Synthesis," August 1974, revised May 1976, ERIC no. ED125806.

²³ See particularly his Frankfurt inaugural address of June 1965, published as "Knowledge and Human Interests: A General Perspective," in the appendix to Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*, trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), pp. 301-17, quoted phrase from p. 311; and the brief explication of Habermas in the epilogue to Joachim Israel, *Alienation: From Marx to Modern Sociology* (1968: Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 343-7. See also Habermas' essay "Technology and Science as 'Ideology,'" in *Toward a Rational Society* (Boston: Beacon, 1970), pp. 81-122.

²⁴ Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (1973; Boston: Beacon, 1975), pp. 33-41; see also John Kenneth Galbraith, *Economics and the Public Purpose* (1973; New York: Signet, 1975), pp. 38-50; and James O'Connor, *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* (New York: St. Martin's, 1973), especially Ch. I, "An Anatomy of American State Capitalism," pp. 13-39; and Ralph Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society: The Analysis of the Western System of Power* (New York: Basic Books, 1969).

²⁵ Immanuel Wallerstein, "Dependence in an Interdependent World: The Limited Possibilities of Transformation within the Capitalist World Economy," *African Studies Review*, 17 (April 1974), 1-26; and his "Class Formation in the Capitalist World-Economy," *Politics and Society*, 6 (1975), 367-75.

²⁶ To the contrary, careful observers have described this traditional culture as a driving force in the lives of mountain people. Reporting "an urge toward self-improvement" and "a great desire to amount to something" among Beech Creekers, Harry K. Schwarzweller, James S. Brown, and J. J. Mangalam observe that "the omnipresent dissatisfaction of Beech Creek people with their present lot, their inability to be satisfied with the present situation, in a word, their emphasis upon 'becoming' rather than upon 'being,' was a manifestation of their puritan philosophy." See *Mountain Families in Transition: A Case Study of Appalachian Migration* (University Park: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 1971), p. 63.

²⁷ See Inhof Vogeler, "The Peasant Culture of Appalachia and its Survival," *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*, 5 (March 1973), 17-24; and Edward E. Knipe and Helen M. Lewis, "The Impact of Coal Mining on the Traditional Mountain Subculture," in *The Not So Solid South: Anthropological Studies in a Regional Subculture*, ed. J. Kenneth Moreland, Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings, No.4 (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1971), pp. 25-37. The concept of peasant is limited to a particular historic type in George M. Foster, "Introduction: What is a Peasant," in *Peasant Society: A Reader*, ed. Jack M. Potter, May N. Diaz, and George M. Foster (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), p. 7.

²⁸ The only study of a similar (though non-Appalachian, technically speaking) community which purports to have discovered no social stratification is Elmora Messer Matthews, *Neighbor and Kin: Life in a Tennessee Ridge Community* (Nashville: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1965). She probably didn't ask the right question; compare her "Questionnaire," pp. 153-8, with Stephenson's approach in *Shiloh*, pp. 49-51.

²⁹ *Mountain Families in Transition*, pp. 48-58, 165-74.

³⁰ Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1953); Willis D. Hawley and James H. Svara, *The Study of Community Power: A Bibliographic Review* (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio, 1972).

³¹ Richard A. Ball, "Social Change and Power Structure: An Appalachian Case," in *Change in Rural Appalachia*, ed. Photiadis and Schwarzweller, pp. 147-66; Rod Harless, *The West Virginia Establishment* (Huntington: Appalachian Movement Press, 1971).

³² For example, see Susanne Bodenheimer, "Dependency and Imperialism: The Roots of Latin American Underdevelopment," *Politics and Society*, I (May 1971), 327-57.

³³ Caudill, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*; Richard A. Couto, *Poverty, Politics and Health Care* (New York: Praeger, 1975); Huey Perry, "They'll Cut Off Your Project" (New York: Praeger, 1972).

³⁴ Richard A. Diehl, "Appalachia's Energy Elite: A Wing of Imperialism?" *Peoples' Appalachia*, I (March 1970), 2-3.

³⁵ See Joseph F. Donnermeyer, Peter F. Korsching, and Rabel Burdge, "An Interpretative Analysis of Family and Individual Economic Costs Due to Water Resource Development," *Water Resources Bulletin*, 10 (February 1974), 91-100; F. Carlene Bryant, *The Social Impact of Surface Mining in a Rural Appalachian Community*, ARP Publication No. 46 (June 1976); Robert B. Cameron, *An Estimation of the Tangible Costs of Black Lung Disease*, ARP Publication No. 47 (June 1976); Si Kahn, *The Forest Service and Appalachia* (Mineral Bluff, Ga.: Cut Cane Associates, 1974).

³⁶ Johnson and Burdge, "Sociologists and Environmental Impact Statements: What Are We Doing Here?" (August 1975), available from Sue Johnson at the Center for Developmental Change, Univ. of Kentucky; Kai T. Erikson, *Everything in Its Path: Destruction of Community in the Buffalo Creek Flood* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976).

³⁷ Gaventa, "In Appalachia: Property is Theft," *Southern Exposure*, I (Summer/Fall 1973), 42-51; and his *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1980).

³⁸ Whisnant, *Modernizing the Mountaineer: People, Power, and Planning in Appalachia* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1980); Caudill, *The Watches of the Night* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976).

³⁹ U.S. Census, *General Population Characteristics, 1970*; State Volumes, Table 34: Race by Sex for Counties. The statistical reports on black Appalachians done by NAACP Legal Defense Fund (1971) and the National Urban League (1972) relied on advance census data which contained numerous minor errors in the figures for the black population in eight of the 13 Appalachian states; the figures were corrected only in the final census reports. Figures on minority groups remain one of the least reliable areas within the census.

⁴⁰ Darold T. Barnum, *The Negro in the Bituminous Coal Mining Industry* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1970); Paul Nyden, *Black Coal Miners in the United States* (New York: American Institute for Marxist Studies, 1974).

⁴¹ John Gulick, *Cherokees at the Crossroads* (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, Univ. of North Carolina, 1960), reissued in 1973 with an epilogue by Sharlotte Neely Williams; *Appalachian Journal*, 2 (Summer 1975).

⁴² A popular discussion of mixed-race groups is Brewton Berry, *Almost White* (New York:

Macmillan, 1963). For a mixture of fact and fiction, see Bonnie Ball, *The Melungeons: Their Origin and Kin*, 4th ed. (privately printed, 1972); for the facts, see Edward T. Price, "The Melungeons: A Mixed-Blood Strain of the Southern Appalachians," *The Geographical Review*, 41 (April 1951), 256-71. An on-going study is announced in Avery Gaskins' "An Introduction to the Guineas: West Virginia's Melungeons," *Appalachian Journal*, I (Autumn 1973), 234-7.

⁴³ Calvin L. Beale, "American Triracial Isolates: Their Status and Pertinence to Genetic Research," *Eugenics Quarterly*, 4 (December 1957), 187-96; his most dubious figure is a count of 2,420 Melungeons in Knott County, Kentucky!

⁴⁴ Kenneth R. Bailey, "A Judicious Mixture: Negroes and Immigrants in the West Virginia Mines, 1880 - 1917," *West Virginia History*, 34 (January 1973), 141-61.

⁴⁵ August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, *CORE: A Study in the Civil Rights Movement, 1942-1968* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973); Kirkpatrick Sale, *SDS* (New York: Random House, 1973). See John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, *The Trend of Social Movements in America* (Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1973).

⁴⁶ See the articles in *Appalachia in the Sixties*, ed. Walls and Stephenson (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1972), pp. 161-209; Hume, *Death and the Mines* (New York: Grossman, 1971); Bill Peterson, *Coaltown Revisited* (Chicago: Regnery, 1972).

⁴⁷ David E. Whisnant, "Controversy in God's Grand Division: The CSM," *Appalachian Journal*, 2 (Autumn 1974), 7-45; and "The Congress for Appalachian Development," *Peoples' Appalachia*, 3 (Spring 1973), 16-22. A chapter on the Appalachian Volunteers is also included in his collection of essays, *Modernizing the Mountaineer*. Two doctoral dissertations may lead to books on Appalachian social movements: Paul Nyden on the Miners for Democracy (Columbia, 1974), and Bennett M. Judkins on the Black Lung Associations (Univ. of Tennessee, 1976). On Highlander, see Frank Adams, *Unearthing Seeds of Fire* (Winston-Salem: Blair, 1975).

⁴⁸ Selznick, *TVA* (1949; New York: Harper and Row, 1966); Whisnant's controversial chapter on TVA has been published in *The Elements*, Nos. 24 and 25 (November and December 1976).

⁴⁹ See Todd Gitlin and Nanci Hollander, *Uptown: Poor Whites in Chicago* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); and Tommie Miller, "Urban Appalachians; Cultural Pluralism and Ethnic Identity in the City" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Univ. of Cincinnati, 1976), summarized in the *Research Bulletin* (November 1976) of the Urban Appalachian Council, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁰ Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*. For a methodological critique, see Billings, "Culture and Poverty in Appalachia," *Social Forces*, 53 (December 1974).

⁵¹ Wilbur Zelinsky, *The Cultural Geography of the United States* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973), pp. 117-25.

⁵² Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordon, Roll: The World the Slaves Math* (New York: Pantheon, 1974); Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb, *The Hidden Injuries of Class* (New York: Vintage,

1973).

⁵³ See *Mountain Families in Transition*, pp. 58-67; these themes reflect the society-culture-personality schema developed by Pitirim Sorokin and Talcott Parsons, with whom Brown studied at Harvard.

⁵⁴ "Family, Religion and Colonialism," in *Growin' Up Country*, ed. Axelrod.

⁵⁵ See Roland Warren, *The Community in America*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972), pp. 75-85, for an interpretation of the move to suburbia "as an attempt to preserve and restore [personalistic and familistic] values threatened with destruction" by the constellation of forces he calls "the great change."

⁵⁶ *Little Smokey Ridge* (University: Univ. of Alabama Press, 1959); Gazaway, *The Longest Mile* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1969); *The Hollow* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1971). See John Photiadis, *Community Size and Social Attributes in West Virginia*, Appalachian Center Research Report 5 (Morgantown: West Virginia Univ., n.d.), for a comparative study.

⁵⁷ Stephenson, *Shiloh*; Berton Kaplan, *Blue Ridge* (Morgantown: West Virginia Univ., 1971); George L. Hicks, *Appalachian Valley* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976).

⁵⁸ Stephenson, *Shiloh*; Knipe and Lewis, "The Impact of Coal Mining," in *The Not So Solid South*, ed. Moreland, pp. 25-37.

⁵⁹ Art Gallaher, Jr., "The Community as a Setting for Change in Southern Appalachia," in *The Public University in Its Second Century*, ed. Lloyd Davis, Public Affairs Series No.5 (Morgantown: West Virginia Center for Appalachian Studies and Development, 1967), pp. 17-32; rpt. in *Appalachia*, ed. Riddel, pp. 291-304.

⁶⁰ On the "two Appalachias," see Harry Caudill, "O, Appalachia!" *Intellectual Digest* (April 1973), 1619; rpt. in *Appalachia*, ed. Riddel, p. 275; and in *Voices from the Hills*, ed. Higgs and Manning, pp. 524-5. The same conclusion is reached in the face of contrary data in Roman B. Aquizap and Ernest A. Vargas, "Technology, Power, and Socialization in Appalachia," *Social Casework*. 51 (March 1970), 131-9.

⁶¹ See John C. Belcher, "Population Growth and Characteristics," and James S. Brown and George A. Hillery, Jr., "The Great Migration, 1940-1960," Chs. 3 and 4 in *The Southern Appalachian Region*; James S. Brown, "A Look at the 1970 Census," in *Appalachia in the Sixties*, pp. 130-144.

⁶² Gordon F. Dejong, *Appalachian Fertility Decline* (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1968).

⁶³ See C. Milton Coughenour, "Measuring the Quality of Life for Rural Families," *Appalachia*, 9 (February-March 1976), 1-9.

⁶⁴ Estabrook, "Presidential Address," *Eugenical News*, 11 (August 1926), 106-14; Josiah Henry

Combs, *The Kentucky Highlanders from a Native Mountaineer's Viewpoint* (Lexington: J. L. Richardson, 1913), p. 43.

⁶⁵ Woodrow R. Clevinger, "The Appalachian Mountaineers in the Upper Cowlitz Basin," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, 29 (April 1938), 115-34; and "Southern Appalachian Highlanders in Western Washington," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, 33 (January 1942), 3-25. See also his *Cascade Mountain Clan: The Clevengers and Stiltners and Related Families* (Seattle: Seattle Univ. Bookstore, 1971). David Loeff notes his first contact with Appalachian mountaineers as a boy in the Cascades in Ch. I of *Appalachia's Children*, pp. 4-8.

⁶⁶ Tryon and Allin, "Southern Appalachian Coal Plateaus," in Goodrich, *Migration and Economic Opportunity*, p. 66; Jerome Pickard, "Appalachian Population Estimated at 19 Million," *Appalachia*, 9 (August-September 1975), 1-9.

⁶⁷ See Schwarzweller et. al., *Mountain Families in Transition*, Chs. 7-9; John Photiadis, *Migration and Occupational Adjustment of West Virginians in the City* (Morgantown: Office of Research and Development, West Virginia Univ., 1974).

⁶⁸ See, for example, Rex A. Lucas, *Minetown, Milltown, Railtown: Life in Canadian Communities of Single Industry* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971); Lantz, *People of Coal Town* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958).

⁶⁹ Althouse, *Work, Safety, and Life Style among Southern Appalachian Coal Miners* (Morgantown: West Virginia Univ., 1974); the articles in *Appalachia in the Sixties*, pp. 69-119; Thomas N. Bethell, *The Hurricane Creek Massacre* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972); Tom Nugent, *Death at Buffalo Creek* (New York: Norton, 1973); the semi-fictionalized biographical sketch of a coal miner by George Yecsey, *One Sunset a Week* (New York: Dutton, 1974); and Meade Arble, *The Long Tunnel; A Coal Miner's Journal* (New York: Atheneum, 1976). See also the studies by Keith Dix in the Research Series of the Institute for Labor Studies at West Virginia University, and J. Davitt McAteer, *Coal Mine Health and Safety: The Case of West Virginia* (New York: Praeger, 1973).

⁷⁰ See the work of Broadus and George S. Mitchell in the 1920's and 1930's; Liston Pope, *Millhands and Preachers* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1940); Glenn Gilman, *Human Relations in the Industrial Southeast* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1956). Billings is currently working on such a comparison, having just completed an historical analysis of textile industrialization in the Carolina piedmont; see his *Planters and the Making of the New South* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1979).

⁷¹ See John Stephenson's insightful discussion of this second theme in "Appalachia and the Third Century in America: On the Eve of an Astonishing Development -- Again," *Appalachian Journal*, 4 (Autumn 1976), 34-8.