

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

"The Last Bastion of Colonialism": Appalachian Settler Colonialism and Self-Indigenization

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0wd9z381>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 37(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Pearson, Stephen

Publication Date

2013-03-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

“The Last Bastion of Colonialism”: Appalachian Settler Colonialism and Self-Indigenization

Stephen Pearson

The political discourse of contemporary White Appalachians has not yet been the subject of sustained analysis from the fields of Indigenous or settler-colonial studies, despite the importance of Appalachia in the history of what Adam Barker has called the northern bloc of settler colonialism. It has been the site of such pivotal events as the formation of trans-Appalachian frontier settler polities (such as the Watauga Association),¹ the genocidal Jacksonian population transfers—including the iconic Cherokee Trail of Tears²—and the founding of Carlisle Indian Industrial School, the first off-campus reservation school and model of eliminative assimilation.³ This lack of attention is also despite the White population’s preservation of distinct frontier identities—the yeoman farmer, the mountaineer—as sites of their own resistance to capitalist exploitation.

White Appalachians have engaged in an extensive project of self-indigenization. This paper will attempt a description—and a deconstruction—of White Appalachian settler-colonial discourse, focusing on its indigenizing aspects. I will first briefly outline the concept of indigenization as background for this discussion, placing it within the context of capitalist development and land ownership in Appalachia. Indigenization is explicit in the statements and theories of regional political activists and of an influential segment of scholars in the field of Appalachian studies. It is also a vital element of the prominent colonialism model of Appalachian exploitation, which maintains that White Appalachians—positioned as the region’s “Indigenous population”—are the victims of a form of colonialism analogous to that dominating American Indian nations. As such, the colonialism model of Appalachian exploitation calls for the

STEPHEN PEARSON is a settler Appalachian living on Shawnee land and a graduate student in the Department of Teacher Education, Ohio University.

“decolonization” of Appalachia. The work of Harry Caudill, Helen Lewis, Chris Irwin, and others—Appalachian studies scholars and activists who have advanced the colonialism model—will provide the main examples of settler indigenization I examine in this essay. Their creation of a White indigeneity for settler Appalachians, which disavows the late settler-colonial status of present-day Appalachia, reinforces and perpetuates the interwoven settler-colonial structures and genocidal processes that have characterized the region since the initial European invasions. This creation of a White indigeneity for settler Appalachians precludes the settler from engaging in decolonization efforts in solidarity with Indigenous peoples.

Philip Deloria has influentially described how settlers in America have, throughout history, practiced “playing Indian” to negotiate conflicts within settler society, to resolve crises of identity, and to forge politically and culturally convenient identities for themselves. During the prerevolutionary period and the American Revolution, colonists “used Indianness to create an identity psychologically attuned to resistance and, eventually, rebellion,” a process that culminated in the emblematic Boston Tea Party.⁴ In a similar manner, in the wake of global decolonization movements, Appalachians asserted their indigeneity—with its attendant anticolonial orientation and resistance—to critique coal mining industries. However, the cases of Appalachian indigenization I will describe are also dissimilar from those Deloria examines. In the cases he describes, settler agents act out and assert their appropriations of Indianness with physical marks and codes: The Tea Partiers dressed up as their (mis)conception of Indians, New Age practitioners engaged in their (mis)conception of Indian religious rituals, and so on. Though the Appalachian Whites I will examine did make comparisons between their situation and that of American Indians, impersonating American Indians or presenting an idealized conception of American Indian relationships to the land as alternatives to economic and environmental exploitation was not unusual.⁵ Instead, Harry Caudill, Helen Lewis, and others code features of White Appalachian culture as traditional, Native, and Indigenous in their own right, positioning these features as anticolonial alternatives to other settler cultures. These theorists and activists do not attempt to play Indian; indeed, they make a claim to Indigenous status for themselves and their culture without reference to Indianness. In these cases, settlers do not primarily assert indigeneity by associating their lifeways, culture, or political resistance with Indianness, but rather by the elision of Indianness. These discursive replacements of American Indians by settler Whites enact a separation of Indianness and indigeneity. Claims to Native status are often not intended to be metaphors but to be accurate descriptions of the settler Appalachian relationship to the land.

These indigenized settler identities provide Appalachian Whites with positive emotional and affective returns. The exclusionary devaluation of the “hillbilly” in wider settler society—coupled with economic and environmental exploitation—has had disastrous effects on the lives of many who live in the region. Indigenization provides settlers with identities that imbue their lives with meaning, render their situations sensible, valorize their existence, and provide models that increase their status within settler society. In viewing themselves as Indigenous victims of colonialism, even class-privileged White Appalachians are able to cast themselves in the role of Native

revolutionary intellectuals. This interpretation allows Appalachian Whites to maintain their whiteness while obscuring the privileges that whiteness bestows. Positioning themselves as Indigenous victims of colonialism allows Appalachian Whites to remove themselves from complicity in the capitalist economy and permits them to inhabit a romantic image of anticolonial struggle.

INDIGENIZATION IN SETTLER SOCIETIES

Speaking before a joint meeting of Congress on May 24, 2011, Benjamin Netanyahu, the prime minister of Israel, averred the following: “In Judea and Samaria, the Jewish people are not foreign occupiers. We are not the British in India; we are not the Belgians in the Congo. This is the land of our forefathers, the Land of Israel, to which Abraham brought the idea of one God, where David set out to confront Goliath, and where Isaiah saw a vision of eternal peace. No distortion of history can deny the four thousand year old bond between the Jewish people and the Jewish land.”⁶ With these words, Netanyahu sought to counter the increasingly popular contention on the part of critics that the Zionist national project in Israel—from its origins to the present—was a settler-colonial project aimed at expropriating the land of Indigenous Palestinian populations. Netanyahu’s rhetoric, however, illuminates the colonial nature of the Israeli state even in attempting to deny it; utilizing biblical stories as evidence for the indigeneity of Zionist colonizers has been a constant feature of Israeli settler discourse—a strategy epitomized in Ben-Gurion’s famous declaration before the Peel Commission that “the Bible is our Mandate.”⁷

The reification of biblical mythology as objective history serves as an excellent example of the settler-colonial process of indigenization and is a trend that Lorenzo Veracini views as fundamental to settler-colonial projects.⁸ Indigenization, “driven by the crucial need to transform an historical tie (‘we came here’) into a natural one (‘the land made us’),” seeks to establish the settler population as the present Indigenous population.⁹ As Veracini illustrates, to cultivate Indigenous status and thus to assert rights over land, settlers can appropriate “indigenous cultural attributes” (such as, in the Israeli case, Palestinian dress and food) “or even the very language of indigenous resistance.”¹⁰ “Opposition against native title . . . is recurrently based on a powerful mobilising set of images including ‘traditional’ (settler) lifestyles, and deep and long-standing, ‘ancestral’ (settler) connection to place”¹¹—the latter of which is the most important element of indigenization in Netanyahu’s speech. Implicit in the speech is a feature of Zionist indigenization narratives that Mahmood Mamdani highlights: the idea of a return from exile to Palestine. Jewish settlers are, in this discourse, returning Natives reclaiming their homeland.¹²

Because of the vast amount of absentee land ownership that has characterized and continues to characterize Appalachia, we should contextualize the concept of indigenization before applying it to contemporaneous Appalachian cases. On this subject, Wilma Dunaway describes how, after the displacement and dispossession of Indigenous peoples in the region, “by 1810 three-quarters of [southern Appalachia’s] acreage was absentee owned, and distant speculators laid out towns, sold or leased

farms to settlers, and engrossed areas believed to offer wealth in minerals.”¹³ According to her estimation, over half of southern Appalachia’s settler population owned no land. The Appalachian Land Ownership Task Force (ALOTF), an activist research collective, found in 1981 that within the eighty counties and six states surveyed, 72 percent of land was absentee owned.¹⁴ These land ownership patterns have long served as one of the causes of regional poverty and comparative powerlessness—a point often made in the field of Appalachian studies.¹⁵ Thus, a large proportion of the White settler population remains destabilized; in the spatial realm, these settlers have achieved one of the foremost goals of the settler-colonial self—the possession of the land. That is, Whites physically occupy the majority of the region’s land, but not according to the standards of land ownership that justified Indigenous dispossession as part of the early American settler-colonial project.¹⁶

In light of these circumstances, it is not surprising that major concerns among the White settler population in Appalachia that identifies with the region are economic and, in a fundamental sense, based on the ownership and use of the land. As Alyosha Goldstein notes, settler colonialism “is not a relic of the past but a historical condition remade at particular moments of conflict in the service of securing certain privileges and often to symbolically negotiate inequalities among white people.”¹⁷ In attempting to gain (or regain) ownership of and power over the land, landless Appalachian settlers did and do not need to oppose just Native title, but the title of other settlers. In doing so, parts of White Appalachian settler society engaged in an extensive and deep project of indigenization, whose sheer range of methods rival those of other settler societies. Thus, the Appalachian case offers an excellent illustration of how settlers can employ indigenization in late settler-colonial contexts in order to negotiate land claims and other inequalities among White settlers. The name Appalachia itself is an indigenizing settler-colonial title, as is its uncritical application as an identity to Whites; it is a name appropriated from the Apalachee people, now located in Louisiana.

This process is distinct from other forms of indigenization that have taken place in late settler societies, such as the one in Anthony Moran’s description of how settler nationalism in Australia adopted a program of indigenization in order to undercut Aboriginal land and other human rights.¹⁸ At the same time, the Appalachian case shows that even in late settler colonies, Native presence remains an unsettling factor challenging the legitimacy of ongoing settler occupancy.

“THE LAST BASTION OF COLONIALISM”

The year 1962 witnessed a significant development in Appalachian politics and scholarship with the successful publication of *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, by Kentucky resident and lawyer Harry Caudill, a work that soon became a classic in Appalachian studies. With it came the first movements toward the colonialism model of Appalachian exploitation. In *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, which describes Appalachians in eastern Kentucky as an Indigenous group subjected to severe labor exploitation by a coal-managing industrial elite, Caudill makes a brief comment that would lead to new paradigm in the field, writing that this Appalachian area was “a

colonial appendage of the industrial East and Middle West.”¹⁹ Caudill would expand upon the contention that Appalachia was a classically or internally colonized subregion in America in his later works, as would supporters of his ideas, the most important of whom was Helen Lewis, a professor and activist known as the grandmother of Appalachian studies. Caudill would soon refer to Appalachia as “the last bastion of colonialism” and propose a path toward decolonization, contending that “we think the great wealth that was pilfered from our ancestors by shrewd and unprincipled men should be returned to the people of the mountains.”²⁰ Caudill’s appropriation of Indigenous political strategies is apparent in his identification of Whites with the land and in his construction of a narrative in which outside colonial forces steal Indigenous resources that must now be returned to their rightful owners.

Night Comes to the Cumberlands: *The Birth of the Colonialism Model*

In *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, Caudill constructs the White settlers of Appalachian Kentucky as Indigenous people in an explicit fashion, referring to Appalachian Whites as “indigenous mountaineers,”²¹ and personally claiming that “people of my blood and name have lived in the [eastern Kentuckian] plateau since the beginning.”²² Here, as is common in colonial narratives in general, the unqualified “beginning” signifies the point at which history begins—that is, with the arrival of Europeans. Caudill even provides a description of the development of the Native status of the Whites who settled in eastern Kentucky:

By the time of the Harrodstown (not Harrodsburg) settlement, much of the pioneer society in this mountainous region [of Kentucky] had resided in the wilderness for three or four generations. They had already become thoroughly adapted to their environment. They had acquired much of the stoicism of the Indians and inurement to primitive outdoor living had made them almost as wild as the red man and physically nearly as tough. . . . His “old woman” could endure hardships and privation as well as the Indian squaw, and was far more fruitful.²³

The white man became, almost, a pale-faced Indian. He ate the Indian’s corn and “jerked” meat. He wore the Indian’s deerskin clothes. He even adopted his tomahawk, and here only, on the rampaging frontier, the white border man collected scalps with all the zest of the Choctaw brave.²⁴

To Caudill, a member of the class elite in Kentucky himself, the development of the Indigenous nature of the Appalachian White was a descent into savagery—in no small part due to his intense anti-Native racism; throughout the text, American Indians are subjects of contempt and sources of settler anxiety, referred to as “redskins,”²⁵ “the childish, superstitious red man,”²⁶ “bands of prowling Indians,”²⁷ “simple savage[s],”²⁸ “Stone Age savage[s],”²⁹ and the “red foe.”³⁰ For their part, Native women are cursed as “squaws”³¹ and “dusky aborigine women . . . [who] bear broods of unruly half-breed children”³²—characterizations that perpetuate a trend in settler societies that Andrea Smith identifies as the ongoing sexualized and genocidal colonization of Native women’s bodies.³³

Fellow Appalachian studies scholars would criticize Caudill for his negative portrayals of poor Appalachian Whites. Rodger Cunningham, not mentioning Caudill's White supremacist and colonialist depictions of American Indians, argues that Caudill's "contemptuous view of the bulk of his neighbors is part of the worldwide colonial phenomenon of the 'nationalist bourgeoisie' that retains the idea of the 'lazy native.'"³⁴ Despite such condemnation, Caudill's promotion of Appalachia as a colony was viewed as a powerful antidote to the culture-of-poverty model of Appalachian poverty, the best known example of which is Jack Weller's *Yesterday's People*, which claims that Appalachian "traditionalism" and other features of its (White) folk society were to blame for the region's economic and societal problems.³⁵ Caudill's partial adoption of the culture-of-poverty model was abandoned by most of his successors as offensive, but the colonialism model was not; Helen Lewis, who characterized herself as a popularizer of Caudill, explained her support of the model as follows: "I wrote an article . . . titled 'Fatalism or the Coal Industry' to counter the 'culture of poverty' explanation which blamed the victim. I laid out the colonialism model instead."³⁶ Lewis was far more than a mere popularizer, however—she embedded Caudill's claims in existing theoretical scholarship on colonialism and anticolonial movements.

The Colonialism Model beyond Caudill: Refining Indigenization

The colonialism model and its construction of Appalachian Whites as an Indigenous people was expanded on and refined in the late 1960s and early 1970s into what Lewis, Edward Knipe, and other Appalachian scholar-activists would label the colonialism model, which applies Robert Blauner's theory of colonization and the insights of anticolonial thinkers such as Albert Memmi, Frantz Fanon, and Pierre Jalee to the region.³⁷ The model achieved paradigmatic status and lasting influence in the field, and even the much-maligned Weller would come to adopt the colonialism model and denounce his earlier work.³⁸ Important articles advancing this thesis were collected and published in 1978 as part of an edited volume titled *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*, regarded to this day as one of the most important texts published in Appalachian studies.

The volume's articulations of the model, even more than Caudill's work, forcefully portray White settlers as the Indigenous people of Appalachia. In the flagship essay of the anthology ("The Colonialism Model: The Appalachian Case"), Lewis and Knipe argue, "When the outside [coal mining industry] colonizers came to the Appalachians in the latter part of the 19th century, they found a society approximating an Asian or African country in its economic foundations. The outside speculators bought land, mineral, and timber rights from illiterate, simple mountain farmers."³⁹

Lewis and Knipe proceed to refer to these farmers and others as "the indigenous population."⁴⁰ Residents of the region who align themselves with the coal companies are classified as "natives who become colonizers of their own people."⁴¹ Moreover, the authors construct distinctive elements of White settler culture as "the ways of natives," which are described as quilting, storytelling, and traditional music.⁴² In one of the most strained sections of the essay, Blauner's criterion that colonizers manifest racism

against an Indigenous population is claimed to be fulfilled (despite the fact that the authors can cite no example of racism), eliding the whiteness of the settler population identified as the colonized.⁴³ In closing, Lewis and Knipe maintain the possibility that Appalachia is in a state of late colonialism, and compare regional development organizations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with poor Whites “living on the Appalachian Reservation”—a comparison also made by other White Appalachian scholars.⁴⁴

In a later essay in *Colonialism in Modern America*, Lewis, Sue Easterling Kobak, and Linda Johnson characterize the formation of coal industries in Appalachia as an “invasion [which] was well planned and well executed almost before the natives knew what had happened.”⁴⁵ They describe “traditional mountain culture” as a decolonizing site of resistance, a description that evokes Veracini’s previously noted comments on the role that appeals to “traditional” (settler) culture serve in settler discourse.⁴⁶ One example may be seen in the kinship conception of the family as a refuge against colonization that functions as a “bulwark against the loss of native culture.”⁴⁷

According to Lewis and her coauthors, the efforts of the coal companies have occluded the past and the very heritage of the Indigenous White Appalachian: “The Appalachian takes on the myth perpetuated by the industrialist that there was nothing here until coal came in to develop it.”⁴⁸ Citing activist James Branscome, the authors claim that colonial powers seek the “annihilation of the hillbilly,”⁴⁹ which he calls the literal “extinction of the Appalachian people.”⁵⁰ Like other Indigenous peoples undergoing colonization, then, Appalachians are claimed to have been victims of genocide. Moreover, Branscome privileges White Appalachian suffering above that of all other groups:

Not too long ago, CBS television featured, back-to-back on Tuesday nights, three of America’s most popular TV programs: “The Beverly Hillbillies,” “Green Acres,” and “Hee-Haw.” This combination has to be the most intensive effort ever exerted by a nation to belittle, demean, and otherwise destroy a minority people within its own boundaries. . . .

If similar programs even approaching the maliciousness of these were broadcast on Blacks, Indians, or Chicanos, there would be an immediate public outcry from every liberal organization and politician in the country and a scathing editorial in the New York Times about the programs’ “lack of taste.”⁵¹

Here, the alleged genocide of White Appalachians—the weekly consecutive airing of regionalist comedies—exceeds in significance and measure all other genocides not only in American but also in world history. The patent ridiculousness of Branscome’s contention that no other group is subjected to a comparably destructive degree of negative stereotyping in popular media has remained a constant in Appalachian activist rhetoric. Barbara Smith discusses how “[t]he argument that mountaineers constitute an oppressed minority is a direct outgrowth of the internal colony perspective,” noting how these exceptionalist accounts of White Appalachian suffering “exhibit a chilling resemblance” to White supremacist rhetoric.⁵²

Lewis and others often erase American Indians from their narratives of the origin of Indigenous Appalachian Whites. In the Lewis and Knipe article, White invasion of

Appalachia is treated as a benign settlement, not as a form of colonial violence. We are told first that “the area [of Central Appalachia] was late being settled,” then of “early settlers” residing in the region during “a period of virtual isolation (80–100 years) in the 19th century,” when “traditional mountain culture” developed.⁵³ This isolated landscape parallels the desert of Zionist discourse and the *terra nullius* of settler Australian discourse. The lack of mention of an Indigenous presence erases original genocidal violence, and American Indians are imagined as legitimating White occupation, with settlers inheriting indigeneity and the land. Edward Guinan, for example, eulogizes an exploited “Appalachia whose indigenous Cherokee integrated, educated, and nursed the exiled Celtic arrivals into maturity, wisdom, and community.”⁵⁴ Similarly, prominent anti-mountaintop removal [MTR] activist Julie “Judy” Bonds argues that “we’re a distinct mountain culture, and our culture means something. This is a culture that has been handed down to us all the way from the Native Americans.”⁵⁵ These brief narratives afford the settler culture an Indigenous nature via its links to mythical processes of integration; indeed, Guinan sees “Celtic” Appalachians as adoptees of the Cherokee, whereas Bonds imagines American Indians identifying the settlers as their heirs.

The colonialism model developed its own category for Appalachian scholar-activists. David Whisnant has characterized his academic role as being one of Fanon’s “native intellectuals in a colony going through decolonization,” stating that his ambitions were, accordingly, to “use my skills in a way that the system never intended, and help reverse to some degree the collusion of intellectuals and the power elite that has brought so much grief to Appalachia.”⁵⁶ Rodger Cunningham has similarly claimed that “all native Appalachian scholarship, including mine, is like that of other colonized peoples in being engaged with history and praxis” in order to overthrow oppressive structures.⁵⁷ The colonialism model has allowed White liberals within the region to valorize themselves as Indigenous leaders in a struggle for decolonization—a supersedionist settler-colonial fantasy come to fruition. A similar maneuver is performed in James Cameron’s film *Avatar* (2009), in which a heroic White colonizer indigenizes (first by occupying the body of a Na’vi, then by being ceremonially inducted into their community) to save the Na’vi from colonial exploitation. In the formulations of Cunningham and Whisnant, however, the White settlers do not need to cast off their whiteness to join an alien Other in order to assert an Indigenous and anticolonial identity—their White kin (and their whiteness) *are* Indigenous.

The Colonialism Model and Grassroots Activism

The colonialism model has been utilized in a significant number of works pertaining to Appalachia. Its influence endures within academic scholarship,⁵⁸ and the application of postcolonial theory to the settler residents of the region has also begun.⁵⁹ Some scholars and activists, however, have objected to the use of postcolonial thought in the Appalachian context, protesting that the “native population” is still colonized.⁶⁰ The colonialism model has also had continuing significant influence on regional grassroots activism. For example, activist Marie Cirillo, locating “indigenous” Appalachians in “hinterlands” and other rural areas, has called for regional development projects to

“develop a plan that starts with indigenous people with knowledge of the Earth that has been passed down through families living and learning over many generations.”⁶¹ John Gaventa, who served as a researcher for the ALOTE, has described one of its shortcomings as its lack of interaction with the “indigenous knowledge” of the settler communities in the region.⁶²

Bo Webb and Judy Bonds, perhaps the two most influential environmental activists in the region, have also utilized the colonialism model and other indigenizing rhetoric. Bonds stresses the length of White land tenure, invoking Euro-Christian divine providence as proof of legitimate settlement: “The people in my family were mountaineers before they were coal miners. We have been managers of the land for centuries. In the mountains here, God gave us everything we need. It wasn’t until the rest of the country realized that there was coal in them there hills that they came and stole and conned our ancestors out of the land.”⁶³ Webb criticizes the MTR industries for their dehumanization of Appalachians, identifying their method as the same tactic used by all colonial powers to justify robbing, displacing, or massacring the natives. He explains, “The industry is presently committing genocide in Appalachia, destroying a people more ancient than the nation, and hiding it behind the ecocide that so many Americans have come to accept as the cost of doing business. . . . We are being forced off our land and our mountain communities are being destroyed.”⁶⁴

Larry Gibson, another popular activist, has also called MTR an Appalachian genocide and claims that settler Appalachians have “lived in these mountains forever,”⁶⁵ while Junior Walk, member of Coal River Mountain Watch and recipient of the 2011 Brower Youth Award, recalls the idea that generational settler occupancy justifies possession of the land: “My family has been in these mountains for generations, so to me this place is my birthright.”⁶⁶

“1000 Years of Resistance”

Chris Irwin, cofounder of Mountain Justice Summer and United Mountain Defense (where he also serves as the staff attorney), two of the forefront grassroots anti-MTR organizations, issued a statement that locates White settlers both outside the region and Indigenous to it, reflecting the internal contradictions in settler-colonial identities.⁶⁷ It is one of the most fascinating and bizarre examples of the indigenization narrative that I am aware of emerging from Appalachia. Irwin, who identifies as Scotch-Irish, begins his statement by noting a challenge he received from a coal company spokesperson he confronted, who accused him of being an outsider to the region. He then reflects on the origins of the Appalachian landscape: “At one time all of the continents formed one mega-continent called Pangea. You can look at how all the continents on a globe would fit together like pieces of a puzzle and see what Pangea once looked like. And since the Appalachia mountain chain is one of the oldest in the world it ran through Pangea—and when Pangea broke up so did the Appalachia mountains. Where did the other half of the Appalachia mountains end up? Ireland and Scotland partially.”⁶⁸ This geological tidbit, along with the discovery that the land of both Appalachia and Scotland/Ireland contain the mineral Serpentine, shocks the

author and transforms the Appalachian landscape from a wilderness to be settled (which, as he notes before, his descendants did) to the Indigenous homeland of the Scotch-Irish:

For those of us who are Scotch/Irish our relationship with the Appalachian mountain chain goes back for literally a thousand years. The genetic history (as well as the cultural history) which pounds in the veins of the Scotch/Irish is inseparately [sic] interwoven into the Appalachian mountains. We belong to these mountains. The irony of being called a “outsider” for defending these mountains against a rapacious corporate carpetbagging coal company from Florida in the face of these facts is amazing when you think about it. Our people lived and loved in this mountain chain before there were corporations, before there were empires and indeed even before there was an English language.⁶⁹

The Appalachian Mountains are free of an Indigenous people in this narrative, as they are in the narratives of other colonialism model supporters. Here, however, the unreal landscape of settler imagination is also emptied of forces that the author views as presently challenging Appalachian settler ownership of the land, such as corporations and imperialism. The anxieties provoked by the accusation—from another settler—of being an outsider are wholly dissolved by the author’s assertion of rights to the land extending back even before the European invasion of the region. The Scotch-Irish settlement is pure, both in race and intention—not an extension of empire but a journey to a space that is frontier and homeland at once.

The mountains of Europe are not just used as a basis for White settler affinities for the Appalachian mountain; the mountains are identical and, with the arrival of the Scotch-Irish, finally being inhabited by their true Indigenous people. Irwin thus justifies present residence and past settlement in one fell swoop. As Stephen Turner puts it, for settlers “history ‘re-enacts’ the idea that this was always the home of the second settlers.”⁷⁰ Here, the idea of the settler-as-returning-Native present in Zionist discourse appears in a contorted context. Unlike Zionist discourse, which asserts settler indigeneity by linking the settler to a people who once occupied the land, Irwin asserts settler indigeneity by linking the land being colonized to the land the settler has left. According to Irwin, upon arrival, the Scotch-Irish “made a beeline trekking hundreds of miles by foot and horse to make it to these mountains which we later generations now call home. Did they know about Pangea and the mineral Serpentine? No, but somehow instinctively they knew that these mountains were home and that they belonged to these mountains—and that’s amazing.”⁷¹

Appropriating the Native slogan “500 years of resistance,” the author holds to the pattern of exceptionalizing White experience, doubling the number by registering a call of “1000 years of resistance,” and ending the essay with the pledge to fight against “colonialist destroyers” for possession of the Appalachian mountains for another thousand years.⁷²

KEEPERS OF THE MOUNTAINS

Another element of indigenization prominent in White Appalachian political activism is the positioning of past and present settlers as protectors, caretakers, or stewards of the land. This trope emerges, for example, in statements such as the one previously cited from Judy Wood (“We have been managers of the land for centuries”) and in the names of regional environmentalist organizations, such as the Keeper of the Mountains Foundation and the Southern Appalachian Mountain Stewards. Such self-positioning originates in the settler-colonial dynamics of Appalachian society, specifically in settler-settler conflict over the land, and in the drive toward the indigenization of White Appalachians.

In the late 1800s and after, outside commentators and missionary movements assigned new identities to poor Appalachian Whites, a process that has received much attention in Appalachian studies scholarship.⁷³ Poor Appalachian Whites were racialized in these portrayals, as is common in the description of impoverished Whites—but they were also indigenized. Since this period, Appalachians have been described by outsiders to the region as savages, barbarians (or no better than), and—in the words of Arnold Toynbee—“a people who have acquired civilization and then lost it.”⁷⁴ Notably, however, these characterizations do not dispute their whiteness. (Toynbee, for instance, made it clear his Appalachians were *White* barbarians.) One group of authors even saw in the White Appalachian the presence of “pure Anglo-Saxon” frontier culture,⁷⁵ with these Appalachians having “our best blood in their veins.”⁷⁶ This depiction is in line with Emily Satterwhite’s observation that “the idea of Appalachia as racially distinct, rural, and premodern has served to reassure white Americans of the persistence of an indigenous white national culture.”⁷⁷ Indeed, the construction of White Appalachians as “our contemporary ancestors,” as William Goodell Frost (in)famously put it in 1899, did not just serve the purpose of denigrating poor Whites in the region; in locating Appalachians as White indigenes, the actual Indigenous people (subjected to genocide) were removed from the land’s past, thus justifying White ownership, occupation, and control of the land for both regional outsiders and insiders.⁷⁸ And, as this article demonstrates, outsiders or agents of a dominant and dominating culture (to which White Appalachians are not presumed to belong) are not the only ones who have associated settler Appalachians with indigeneity for these and other purposes.

I have mentioned how poor Whites living in the region, a great number of them landless, were unable to exercise control over the land in a manner that fit the settler-colonial ideal. Comparing the situation of these settler Appalachians to J. M. Coetzee’s description of Boers in order to explain the emergence of Appalachian stereotypes, Katherine Ledford points out how, in South Africa, “invested in a system that privileges the colonizer as a ‘better steward of the earth than the native,’ travelers through the region see the Boers’ contentment to ‘scratch no more than a bare living from the soil’ as a betrayal of the colonial mission.”⁷⁹ In the present, the settler Appalachian activists and scholars I have described reject this charge, arguing that rival settler groups (such as the capitalist controllers of coal companies) have failed the land. Thus, the new White Native is the keeper of the mountains and their rightful heir.

REMOVING MOUNTAINS, REMOVING SETTLER STATUS

Rebecca Scott is one of the few Appalachian studies scholars to discuss White Appalachian self-indigenization and the sole author to do so critically and at significant length. In her *Removing Mountains*, a recent book on MTR and Appalachian identity, she cites several examples of the indigenization rhetoric (including the usage of the colonialism model, which Scott seems to support in some form) she encountered during her research on regional activists, also noting Caudill's use of the term *indigenous mountaineers*.⁸⁰ Of this phenomenon, she writes that

The claim to nativelylike status is entangled in a colonizing logic at the same time as it expresses an aspiration to another way of life. If deployed casually, it erases the original presence of Native Americans in the area and the colonial history of the region. Claims to white victimization can serve as a reassertion of centrality and universality, especially when a near-exclusive focus on white injuries suggests that this suffering is "uniquely" wrong. From another angle, however, these comparisons also reflect the inherent instability of identity categories. Instead of insisting on a "politics of purity," recognizing the contingency of identity formations opens movements up to emergent coalitions and the possibility of change.⁸¹

As my above discussion of other examples of indigenization discourse illustrates, even "sophisticated" claims to White indigeneity by Appalachian studies scholars erase American Indians in the region and perpetuate a settler-colonial logic. Regrettably, Scott does not provide examples of what she believes are casual versus noncasual claims to Indigenous status. Problematic as well is Scott's consignment of American Indians to the past, noting just their "original presence" and "colonial history," eliding the settler-colonial present and the erasure performed on Indigenous people now living in the region. What her final sentences intend to indicate remain unclear; the idea of indigeneity is not called into question when settler Whites claim to be Indigenous, and Scott does not describe how such claims would destabilize Indigenous identity. As Devon Mihesuah argues, "Many people 'self-identify' as Indian, but this is not a legitimate classification," and the same logic applies to Appalachian Whites who claim to be Indigenous.⁸² Scott's reference for criticizing the idea of a "politics of purity" is Andrea Smith, but Smith's argument in the passage cited—that movements for social change should not isolate themselves but rather should form strategic alliances that include groups with diverging identities and ideologies—does not (and does not intend to) problematize the distinction between settler and Indigenous or destabilize indigeneity, and thus serves to make settler claims to Indigenous status legitimate.⁸³ Smith instead holds that an "an indigenous-settler binary . . . certainly exists," and she has vigorously opposed the White settler state.⁸⁴

Scott does not believe that White Appalachian claims to indigeneity are necessarily colonial. Instead, Scott offers, "these metaphors of indigeneity can represent injurious 'trophies' of colonialism, but they might also demonstrate the potential for a different relationship to the land and other human communities, an alternative to the one exemplified by MTR."⁸⁵ Making much the same point in an endnote, Scott writes

that these assertions “can represent a claim to territory or they can be used to mark an alternative way of life or a noncommodity orientation to the land.”⁸⁶

However, within a settler-colonial framework, there is no need—logical or practical—for the dichotomies Scott presents to her readers. As I have described, settler Appalachian activists claim to be the rightful controllers of the land due to their stewardship of the land, a self-perception they contrast to the destructive nature of MTR. According to the Appalachian activist model, one does not need to choose between trophies of colonialism or the signification of a more respectful and less environmentally destructive relationship with the land. Their self-indigenization allows Appalachian settlers to utilize a noncommodity orientation as legitimating evidence for their claim to the land over other settlers, reinforcing the settler-colonial structure and continued expropriation of the actual Indigenous population. After all, Chris Irwin’s settler-colonial manifesto ends with this declaration: “These mountains do not belong to us, we belong to them, and that is why we fight.”⁸⁷

UNSETTLING THE MOUNTAINEER

In her discussion of the pillars of White supremacy, Andrea Smith writes that the logic of genocide—the second pillar—mandates the disappearance of Indigenous peoples:

In fact, they must *always* be disappearing, in order to enable non-indigenous peoples’ rightful claim to land. Through this logic of genocide, non-Native peoples then become the rightful inheritors of all that was indigenous—land, resources, indigenous spirituality, and culture. Genocide serves as the anchor of colonialism: it is what allows non-Native peoples to feel they can rightfully own indigenous peoples’ land. It is acceptable exclusively to possess land that is the home of indigenous peoples because indigenous peoples have disappeared.⁸⁸

Here, Smith connects indigenization (as inheritance) to the process of genocide, a connection that holds true in the Appalachian case—Appalachians indigenized in the wake of genocidal events such as Indian removal. Important as well is her insight that for settlers, Indigenous people must “*always* be disappearing,” a trend evident in the narratives of settlement provided by supporters of the colonialism model and other activists, whereby the past of the region begins with European settlement or with the peaceful inheritance of land and indigeneity. For supporters of the colonialism model, the presence (physical or otherwise) of Indigenous peoples their predecessors raped, massacred, and dispossessed as part of their colonization of the region threatens their claims to being a colonized people with an unproblematic, Indigenous claim to the land. This elision of original violence supports the narrative of peaceful settlement in an untouched wilderness and legitimates their challenges to other settlers.⁸⁹

The discursive replacement of American Indians with a new Native—the White Appalachian—is part of the same genocidal process that culminated with the Trail of Tears. Indian removal, it should be remembered, was never removal alone. It was also replacement. Patrick Wolfe outlines the connections among Cherokee removal, frontier expansion, and the development of the Southern slave-plantation economy.⁹⁰

The histories of settler-colonial societies undermine the very attempt of the settler to assert a relationship with the land equivalent to that of its Indigenous inhabitants. This relationship, and attempts to figure the settler as inheritor of the Indigenous, is contradicted by the realities of settlement—exploitation, expropriation, conquest, and genocide. For Guinan, Cherokee removal was the original moment of colonial violence, but this violence was not at the hands of his Celts. He explains, “Appalachia whose tragic violation by Messiahs was given birth with the ‘trail of tears’ that expelled a great and gentle Cherokee nation, and has formed an unbroken link with those who came to ‘redeem’ these ignorant, backward hillbilly people.”⁹¹ Guinan’s Celtic exiles are co-victims with the Cherokee, sharing the same oppressors, even inheriting their legacy of suffering. Indigenization thus occurs here not by the omission of violence, but by its invocation—with the White Appalachian conspicuously removed from the sphere of perpetrators. Branscome and Peggy Matthews appropriate the Cherokee nation’s experience with genocide as well, calling the building of condominiums amid widespread poverty in Appalachia a “paleface ‘trail of tears.’”⁹²

Erasures and appropriations also illustrate the challenge that Indigenous presence, both past and present, poses to Appalachian settler colonialism. Perhaps the most widespread element of indigenization in the region is the claim to “Indian blood,” an often-mythic claim (including among those who assert Melungeon identities) as much meant to indigenize the White who claims it as to obscure evidence of African/African American ancestry.⁹³ As Vicki Whitewolf-Marsh remarks on her experiences as a student and instructor, “Everyone [in Ohio] had a great-grandmother who was a Cherokee, and no one was listening to the contemporary problems of [American Indian] culture.”⁹⁴ Indigenous concerns must be ignored, as the presence of Indigenous peoples must be denied or marginalized in order to protect the interests of the settler majority. Despite the supposed respect for the American Indians of their imagination (to which White Appalachians often confess), challenges to the settler majority are greeted with incredulity, dismissal, disdain, and even violence, as Whitewolf-Marsh describes from her own experiences: “This spring [in 2003] when I protested at the Cincinnati Great American Ball Park, I took my daughter. It was her first protest. She was spit on and told to ‘go back where you came from,’ that she was too stupid to know that Chief Wahoo [the racist Cleveland Indians baseball team mascot] was an honor.”⁹⁵

Supporters of the colonialism model and other settler Appalachians do not usually view themselves as colonizers. Until this norm changes, true collaboration with Indigenous peoples to decolonize the region is impossible. In considering what decolonization would mean, Helen Lewis asks, “Where is the ‘homeland’ of the exploiters? How can one ‘throw the bastards out’ and take over the resources when one is part of the same national system?”⁹⁶ Such a perspective, which constructs Appalachia as the rightful possession and homeland of one group of settlers (but not another), is an assault against the possibility of justice for Indigenous peoples now living in the region—and for those who were forced out of the region. The construction of Whites as the Indigenous population of Appalachia forbids the land restoration and repatriation that Indigenous theories of justice and decolonization, such as those advanced by

Wazyatawin and William Bradford, require.⁹⁷ Such a conception precludes even truth-telling about the Appalachian settler's acquisition and occupation of the land. As Lewis's words above, Walk's birthright assertion, and others demonstrate, White settlers oppose injustice in the region (such as capitalist absentee landownership and MTR) in large part because they want the land of Appalachia to be under their control, not because they want to restore it to its rightful Indigenous inhabitants. Settler occupation and ownership of the land are repositioned as decolonization.

The colonialism model and other indigenizing trends in settler Appalachian discourse must be challenged for their reliance on the logic of settler colonialism. The settler desire to possess Indigenous land (and Indigenous culture) must be abandoned if settler Appalachians are to participate as allies in decolonization and not as contributors to structures of genocide and colonial domination.⁹⁸ Settler Appalachians need to make Indigenous perspectives, interests, political aspirations, and critiques—including critiques of the settler self—central to the construction of their own identities and politics. Instead of working to “save the mountains” for themselves, settler Appalachians ought to work to give them back.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Patrick Wolfe and my two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and helpful suggestions. I am most indebted to Eden Almasude for her comments during every stage of the research and writing of this article.

NOTES

1. Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 62–63.

2. Ben Kiernan treats removal within a settler-colonial framework in his *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 330–34, as does Patrick Wolfe in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387–409.

3. On American residential schools in general (and Carlisle in particular), see David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875–1928* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995).

4. Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 26.

5. Of course, I do not mean to claim that settler Appalachians do not play Indian. Fraudulent tribes, White powwows, offensive sports mascots, appropriated American Indian spirituality, and other forms of playing Indian are present in the region.

6. The Globe and Mail, “Transcript of Prime Minister Netanyahu's Address to U.S. Congress, May 24, 2011,” <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/Americas/transcript-of-prime-minister-netanyahus-address-to-us-congress/article2032842/>.

7. Quoted in Avi Baker, *Chosen: The History of an Idea, and the Anatomy of an Obsession* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 135. On the settler-colonial usage of biblical texts in Zionist discourse in general, see Nur Masalha, “Reading the Bible with the Eyes of the Canaanites: Neo-Zionism, Political Theology and the Land Traditions of the Bible (1967 to Gaza 2009),” *Holy Land Studies: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 8 (2009): 55–108.

8. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 22.
9. *Ibid.*, 21, 46.
10. *Ibid.*, 46. Examples of Zionist appropriation are described in Basem L. Ra'ad, "Appropriation: Zionist Cultural Takeover," in *Hidden Histories: Palestine and the Eastern Mediterranean* (New York: Pluto Press, 2010), 123–41.
11. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 46.
12. Mahmood Mamdani, "Text of Talk at the Divestment Teach-In," *Columbia University Divestment Campaign* (November 13, 2002), <http://columbiadivest.org/pdfs/MamdaniDivestment.pdf>.
13. Wilma A. Dunaway, "Speculators and Settler Capitalists: Unthinking the Mythology about Appalachian Landholding, 1790–1860," *Appalachia in the Making: The Mountain South in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Mary Beth Pudup, Dwight B. Billings, and Altina L. Waller (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 67.
14. Appalachian Land Ownership Task Force, *Land Ownership Patterns and Their Impacts on Appalachian Communities: A Survey of 80 Counties*, report submitted to the Appalachian Regional Commission.
15. The most influential of the studies exploring the connections between land ownership and power in Appalachia is probably John Gaventa's *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).
16. On the American settler ideology of land in general, see Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, 216–19, 311–18. Kiernan draws attention to the "Eastern intellectuals and gentleman agriculturalists who favored intensive cultivation over what they considered the extensive, wasteful practices of frontier yeoman [but] still saw the latter as a necessary stage in the historic improvement of the land from wilderness and Indian neglect" (317).
17. Alyosha Goldstein, "Where the Nation Takes Place: Proprietary Regimes, Antistatism, and U.S. Settler Colonialism," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107, no. 4 (2008): 835.
18. Anthony Moran, "As Australia Decolonizes: Indigenizing Settler Nationalism and the Challenges of Indigenous/Settler Relations," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25, no. 6 (2002): 1013–42.
19. Harry M. Caudill, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands: A Biography of a Depressed Region* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1963), 325.
20. Quoted in James C. Millstone, "East Kentucky Coal Makes Profits for Owners, Not Region," *Appalachia: Its People, Heritage, and Problems*, ed. Frank S. Riddel (Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt, 1974), 270. In "Misdeal in Appalachia," *Dissent* 14 (1967): 715–22, Caudill claims that "the colonialist sway in the rest of the world has ended. Only in our Appalachia does it proceed unchecked" (719). These statements are similar to one often attributed to—and perhaps originating from—Caudill calling Appalachia "the last unchallenged stronghold of Western colonialism," first quoted in Helen M. Lewis and Edward E. Knipe, "The Colonialism Model: The Appalachian Case," in *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case* (Boone, NC: The Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978), 15. Lewis and Knipe refer the reader (without providing a page reference) to *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, which contains no such quotation.
21. Caudill, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, 125, 177, 222, 224. The settler's close connection to the land is used alongside this label to explain refusals to leave the region: "The indigenous mountaineer coal miner was so deeply rooted to the country that he felt a powerful attachment to the familiar hills, valleys and institutions surrounding him. This in itself was a powerful factor inducing him to remain where he was" (177).
22. *Ibid.*, xi.
23. *Ibid.*, 8.
24. *Ibid.*, 14.

25. Ibid., xi.
26. Ibid., 13.
27. Ibid., 8.
28. Ibid., 31.
29. Ibid., 13.
30. Ibid., 15. Caudill is also the author of the racist novel *Dark Hills to Westward: The Saga of Jenny Wiley* (Ashland, KY: The Jesse Stuart Foundation, 1994). James Gifford's preface to this edition even attempts an apologetic for Caudill, writing that he "did not write the book as an historian, but as a storyteller, and his goal was to tell Jenny's story as she experienced it" (xii). Despite this suggestion, the novel's racism and contempt for American Indians is Caudill's own, as *Night Comes to the Cumberlands* clearly demonstrates.
31. Caudill, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, 8. "The flagrant, popular use of such a degrading word to designate Native women is most certainly the legacy of a coordinated campaign by the colonizer to denigrate the colonized." Barbara Alice Mann, *Iroquoian Women: The Gantowisas* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), 22.
32. Caudill, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands*, 16.
33. Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005).
34. Rodger Cunningham, "The View from the Castle: Reflections on the Kentucky Cycle Phenomenon," in *Back Talk from Appalachia: Confronting Stereotypes*, ed. Dwight B. Billings, Gurney Norman, and Katherine Ledford (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1999), 304. Critics of Caudill within Appalachian studies have generally not cared to critique his treatment of American Indians, only poor Whites, as is reflected in two influential critiques: Steve Fisher, "As the World Turns: The Melodrama of Harry Caudill," *Appalachian Journal* 11, no. 3 (1984): 267–73, and Ronald D. Eller, "Harry Caudill and the Burden of Mountain Liberalism," in *Critical Essays in Appalachian Life and Culture: Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Appalachian Studies Conference*, ed. Grace Edwards, Ronald D. Eller, and Joan Moser (Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1982), 21–29.
35. For his remarks on Appalachian "traditionalism," see Jack Weller, *Yesterday's People: Life in Contemporary Appalachia* (Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press, 1993), 33–37.
36. Quoted in Bill J. Leonard, "Telling Our Stories, 1999–2000," in *Helen Matthews Lewis: Living Social Justice in Appalachia*, ed. Patricia D. Beaver and Judith Jennings (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 2012), 188. Also quoted is Lewis's 2007 partial renunciation of the colonialism model, which characterizes the model and the presentation of a settler-constructed frontier utopia as "helpful myths at the time in efforts to confront stereotypical images of the region" (188).
37. Patricia Beaver, "Breaking New Ground, 1955–77," in *Helen Matthews Lewis: Living Social Justice in Appalachia*, ed. Patricia D. Beaver and Judith Jennings (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 2012), 46.
38. Jack Weller, "Appalachia's Mineral Colony," in *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*, ed. Helen Lewis, Linda Johnson, and Donald Askins (Boone, NC: The Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978), 47–55.
39. Helen Lewis and Edward Knipe, "The Colonialism Model: The Appalachian Case," in *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*, 17.
40. Ibid., 17.
41. Ibid., 22.
42. Ibid., 23.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid., 25–26. David Whisnant, "Ethnicity and the Recovery of Regional Identity in Appalachia: Thoughts Upon Entering the Zone of Occult Instability," *Soundings* 56 (1973): 124–38

also refers to the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) as “merely a new Bureau of Indian Affairs” (26).

45. Helen Lewis, Sue Easterling Kobak, and Linda Johnson, “Family, Religion and Colonialism in Central Appalachia or Bury My Rifle at Big Stone Gap,” in *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*, 117.

46. *Ibid.*, 131.

47. *Ibid.*, 133.

48. *Ibid.*, 133.

49. *Ibid.*, 134.

50. James Branscome, “Annihilating the Hillbilly: The Appalachians’ Struggle with America’s Institutions,” in *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case*, 226.

51. *Ibid.*, 211. Compare: “If ‘entertainments’ such as the Beverly Hillbillies, or Disney World’s Hillbilly Bears (shades of the Hairy Ainu indeed!), were offered for national consumption at the expense of any other ‘ethnic’ group—including, by now, any other white group—they could hardly survive the storm of ‘enlightened’ protest.” Rodger Cunningham, *Apples on the Flood: Minority Discourse and Appalachia* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1987), 115. Judy Bonds, “We’re the only ethnic group you can still get away with making fun of,” quoted in Silas House and Jason Howard, *Something’s Rising: Appalachians Fighting Mountaintop Removal* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 143.

52. Barbara Smith, “De-Gradations of Whiteness: Appalachians and the Complexities of Race,” *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 10, no. 1–2 (2004): 51, 53.

53. Lewis and Knipe, “The Colonialism Model,” 11.

54. Edward Guinan, “Ashes to Ashes, Dust to Dust,” in *Redemption Denied: An Appalachian Reader*, ed. Edward Guinan (Washington, DC: Appalachian Documentation), 10.

55. Quoted in House and Howard, *Something’s Rising*, 144.

56. Whisnant, “Ethnicity and the Recovery of Regional Identity in Appalachia,” 134. Similar comments are made in David Whisnant, *Modernizing the Mountaineer: People, Power, and Planning in Appalachia* (Boone, NC: The Appalachian Consortium Press, 1980), x–xi.

57. Rodger Cunningham, “The Green Side of Life: Appalachian Magic as a Site of Resistance,” *Appalachian Heritage* 38, no. 2 (2010): 60.

58. Some have even argued that the model has grown in strength: “The colonial relationship remains intact in the sense that poverty in Appalachia stems from the region’s integration with, rather than isolation from, mainstream America. In fact, many features of West Virginia’s twenty-first-century economy lend even more credence to the arguments made by Lewis and others thirty years earlier.” Bryan T. McNeil, *Combating Mountaintop Removal: New Directions in the Fight against Big Coal* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2011), 90.

59. For example, see Rodger Cunningham, “Appalachian Studies among the Posts,” *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 9, no. 2 (2003): 377–86.

60. Joel Watts, “The Appalachian Hermeneutic: Decolonizing Appalachia,” *Unsettling Christianity*, June 28, 2010, <http://unsettledchristianity.com/2010/06/the-appalachian-hermeneutic-decolonizing-appalachia/>.

61. Marie Cirillo, “Naming the Successes of Mountain People: Remembering the Rural Past for a Rural Future,” n.d. n.p., <http://appalachiantransition.net/essays>.

62. John Gaventa, “The Political Economy of Land Tenure: Appalachia and the Southeast,” paper commissioned for the *Who Owns America? Land and Natural Resource Tenure Issues in a Changing Environment* conference hosted by the Land Tenure Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, June 1995.

63. Quoted in Daniel Stone, "Slaves to Industry," *The Daily Beast*, April 20, 2009, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/04/20/slaves-to-industry.html>.
64. Bo Webb, "Appalachian Apocalypse: The Human Face of Mountain Justice Summer," *The ACTivist Magazine*, January 17, 2005, http://www.activistmagazine.com/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=205.
65. Quoted in Andrea Hopkins, "Mountain Mining Called 'Genocide' of Appalachia," *Reuters*, September 27, 2007, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2007/09/27/us-usa-mining-environment-idUSN1845484320070927>.
66. Junior Walk, "Statement of Junior Walk," *RAMPS*, n.d., <http://rampscampaing.org/statement-of-junior-walk/>.
67. Chris Irwin, "1000 Years of Resistance or Why We Fight," *deepecology2 Yahoo! Group*, May 31, 2005, <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/deepecology2/message/540>. An edited version of this essay was published in the Mountain Justice Summer newsletter, available at <http://www.mountain-justicesummer.org/tennessee/TMD.pdf>.
68. *Ibid.*, n.p.
69. *Ibid.*, n.p.
70. Stephen Turner, "Make-Over Culture and the New Zealand Dream of Home," *Landfall* 214 (2007): 83.
71. Irwin, "1000 Years of Resistance," n.p.
72. *Ibid.*, n.p.
73. The most important studies include Henry D. Shapiro, *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), David E. Whisnant, *All That Is Native and Fine: The Politics of Culture in an American Region* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983), and Allen D. Batteau, *The Invention of Appalachia* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990).
74. Quoted in Cunningham, *Apples on the Flood*, 108.
75. *Ibid.*, 112.
76. Quoted in Brandon M. Stump, "From Reconstruction to Obama: Understanding Black Invisibility, Racism in Appalachia, and the Legal Community's Responsibility to Promote a Dialogue on Race at the WVU College of Law," *West Virginia Law Review* 112 (2010): 1107.
77. Emily Satterwhite, "'That's What They're All Singing About': Appalachian Heritage, Celtic Pride, and American Nationalism at the 2003 Smithsonian Folklife Festival," *Appalachian Journal* 32, no. 3 (2005): 306.
78. Rebecca Scott, *Removing Mountains: Extracting Nature and Identity in the Appalachian Coalfields* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 33, points out how this assertion of White Appalachian indigeneity enabled outsiders to claim the land as their own, yet it allowed residents to do the same.
79. Katherine Ledford, "A Landscape and a People," in *Back Talk from Appalachia: Confronting Stereotypes*, ed. Dwight B. Billings, Gurney Norman, and Katherine Ledford (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1999), 64.
80. Scott, *Removing Mountains*, 228n5.
81. *Ibid.*, 212.
82. Devon A. Mihesuah, *So You Want to Write about American Indians?: A Guide for Writers, Students, and Scholars* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 28.
83. Andrea Smith, *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 252.
84. Andrea Smith, "Indigeniety, Settler Colonialism, White Supremacy," *Global Dialogue* 12, no. 2 (2010): n.p., <http://www.worlddialogue.org/content.php?id=488>.

85. Scott, *Removing Mountains*, 214.
86. *Ibid.*, 228n5.
87. Irwin, "1000 Years of Resistance," n.p.
88. Andrea Smith, "Indigeniety, Settler Colonialism, White Supremacy," n.p.
89. Lorenzo Veracini, "Settler Collective, Founding Violence, and Disavowal," *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29, no. 4 (2008): 365–69, describes the need for disavowal of violent conquest in settler societies.
90. Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 391–92.
91. Guinan, "Ashes to Ashes, Dust to Dust," 10.
92. James Branscome and Peggy Matthews, "Selling the Mountains," in *Redemption Denied: An Appalachian Reader*, ed. Edward Guinan (Washington, DC: Appalachian Documentation), 67.
93. John Alexander Williams, *Appalachia: A History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 81. The term *Melungeon* originated as an ethnic slur, but has become a term of self-identification for some. It has been applied to a diverse range of mixed-race peoples in Appalachia. Melungeons have claimed American Indian, African, Amazigh, Turkish, and Mediterranean descent. Melissa Schrift, "Melungeons and the Politics of Heritage," in *Southern Heritage on Display: Public Ritual and Ethnic Diversity within Southern Regionalism*, ed. Celeste Ray (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003), 128, has attributed the upswing in Melungeon self-identification to the cultural climate of the previous few decades: "Inheriting a notorious legacy of racism, southerners cannot easily sidestep the cultural politics of the late twentieth century. Contemporary Melungeonness offers a culturally convenient detachment from whiteness without the political and social burdens of blackness."
94. Vicki Whitewolf-Marsh, "Ohio Is Not without Its Share of Problems," *American Indian Quarterly* 27, no.1–2 (2003): 452.
95. *Ibid.*, 455.
96. Helen M. Lewis, "Fatalism or the Coal Industry?" *Appalachia: Social Context Past and Present* (3rd ed.), ed. Bruce Ergood and Bruce Kuhre (Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1991), 226.
97. See, for example, Waziyatawin, *What Does Justice Look Like?: The Struggle for Liberation in Dakota Homeland* (St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press, 2008), and William Bradford, "Beyond Reparations: An American Indian Theory of Justice," *Ohio State Law Journal* 66, no. 1 (2005): 1–105.
98. Scott Morgensen, "Un-Settling Settler Desires," in *Unsettling Ourselves: Reflections and Resources for Deconstructing Colonial Mentality*, ed. Unsettling Minnesota collective (n.p., 2009), 156–57, <http://unsettlingminnesota.org>.