Sociology & Criminal Justice Theses & Dissertations

Sociology & Criminal Justice

Summer 2017

The Devil Is in the Details: Representations of the Rural Appalachian Deviant

Stephen T. Young
Old Dominion University

THE DEVIL IS IN THE DETAILS: REPRESENTATIONS OF THE RURAL

APPALACHIAN DEVIANT

by

Stephen T. Young
B.A. December 2010, Marshall University
M.S. December 2012, Marshall University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
August 2017

Approved By:

Randy Myers (Director)

Mona J. E. Danner (Member)

Travis Linnemann (Member)

ABSTRACT

THE DEVIL IS IN THE DETAILS: REPRESENTATIONS OF THE RURAL APPALACHIAN
DEVIANT

Stephen T. Young
Old Dominion University, 2017
Director: Dr. Randy Myers

Every year, it seems, a new film makes its way through theaters across America
demonstrating a new variant of the rural Appalachian deviant. These films play a major role in
continuing to shape societal perceptions of rural white populations in Appalachia. Drawing on
theoretical insights of Cohen, Hunt, Simon, and Lupton this dissertation examines how film
depictions of the rural white Appalachians supports the continued construction of the rural
Appalachian deviant. This study finds that films support said construction by demonstrating this
population through themes about tainted blood, intimate partner violence, and drug addiction.
Moreover, these films camouflage the facts behind the constructions of this modern "white trash"
sub caste and play into the cultural distancing of proper white populations. Finally, this study
provides insights into the socio-historical reasons for this continued construction of this deviant
as a means to exploit, abandon, and criminalize this sub caste population.

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother and father, Fran and James Young. I could not have done this without your support and I love you very much.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed to the successful completion of this project. I extend my gratitude to all of my committee members for their support and patience as they guided me through this research. Specifically, I thank Dr. Randy Myers for the numerous hours he spent editing this manuscript along with the motivation he provided on days were I struggled to collect my thoughts. I cannot say enough how much I appreciate all of your guidance over the past few years. I thank Dr. Travis Linnemann for listening to my rants and supporting my ideas very early on in this process before I was even focusing on the dissertation. I appreciate your determination to force me outside of my normal 'comfort' zone. I must also make a particular note to thank Dr. Mona "Mama" Danner for all of her support over the last four years. I owe much of my success to your guidance and cannot thank you enough for all that you have done. Finally, I thank Dr. Sam Dameron. I can honestly say that I would not be where I am today without your mentorship. I owe you more than I can put into words. Thank you, once again, to everyone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORY

Introduction

One hot Saturday afternoon I walked into a local coffee shop. Upon entering the door, it was noticeable how empty the space was other than the busy baristas working behind the counter and a single female patron sitting near the front door. Unwarranted, she appeared to become uneasy with my presence and immediately shifted in her seat once the door closed. She appeared to me as a young woman, with well-kept hair, nicely manicured nails and clothing seemingly ripped from the front pages of a New York magazine. She embodied a perfect representation of the high status of being white, sitting in her chair sipping her seven-dollar cup of coffee. I, of course, a six foot three large bearded man with grease under my nails from working on my loud automobile stood out as something out of place to her in this space of proper white status. I felt as if she saw me as a representation of something or someone who did not belong. To her, my existence embodied a relic of the out skirts of society. I believe that my presence made her uneasy, as to her, it represented something separate from the standard white population. In that space, in that time, and in her mind I was the living representation of the white trash she has come to fear. In that moment, to her, my whiteness and perceived rurality became the living and breathing villain or monster of any movie based in the rural backwoods of the Appalachian region.

This type of fear surrounding marginalized white ethnicities continues to be largely present within society. Media representations, especially films, continue a recursive process to define what a rural Appalachian deviant is and why it appears that a sentiment exists that these individuals need to be at a constant arm's reach and controlled. The importance, however, lies in

the impact these films have as cases of a broader issue on how the population views and thusly treats those living in rural Appalachia. These films support the creation and recycling of particular caricatures of backwoods monsters, welfare dependent leaches, and/or drug addled drains on society overshadowing the truth behind the culture and residents of the region. Similarly, these films have also taken a strange change in "artistic" direction over the past few decades in supporting these caricatures. For years, individuals from Appalachia played the role of the poor town idiot or drunk. They have since then shifted to something more akin to a Hollywood monster and more recently have morphed into the image of a drug user/dealer in modern portrayals (see Williamson 1995).

Today, this change brings up a few important issues to explore. First, what historical social and economic processes led to early social constructions of the rural Appalachian deviant and how have these constructions been adapted over time? Regardless of these reproductions, why do specific innate deficiencies commonly associated with Appalachia continue to be present within films? How does this overall process stem from and support the continued cultural distancing that is implicitly beneficial to "proper" white populations? Finally, how do these reproductions support our understanding of the possible creation of regulatory mechanisms furthering the catastrophic levels of social abandonment and criminalization faced within area?

These questions while important do create a conundrum concerning a discussion of practical answers. Due to this, the following draws from a rich history of multiple frameworks situated within criminological theory. Specifically, while drawing on moral panic literature (see Cohen 1972), elements of racial history, and later conceptualizations of moral regulation theory (discussed at length), the following will predominantly track the data present within the sample films to discuss the creation and reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant. The purpose of

this "grounded" theoretical approach stems from the importance of not relying solely on a single theoretical construct to fuel future understandings of the overall exploitation and criminalization of this population. Moral panic, for instance, does provide a useable foundation for how particular events have continued and draw upon the fear, exclusion, and punishment of the Appalachian people when focusing on a singular film or event. However, the process leading to this continual fear and exclusion is rooted much deeper than a single representation or a singular "event" case study. Like other populations who have been otherized in the past (see Said 1985), Appalachians continue to face such a process of cultural exclusion. Analyzing this issue through a more data centric lens provides a better understanding of how the continued creation and reproduction of the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant exists more as a constant expression instead of the standard flash of deviance within film. More bluntly stated

> Representations cannot and should not simply be dismissed as instances of ideological misdirection or 'false truths,' but should instead be taken seriously as socially situated and contextually relevant forms of sense-making that both reflect and shape our shared world views. It is precisely in their resonance with common existential and moral concerns that they find their purchase in the imaginations of their audience and offer us an important window into collective sensibilities (Yar 2016: 194).

These individuals receive constant attention as a people of innate deficiencies due to the perception of their moral, racial, and cultural resistance. This resistance represents a boundary to the placement of proper white populations within society and thusly requires a form of distancing from said group (see Young 2007). Paired with the idea of moral regulation or the control of a particular group based on their perceived immorality, risk, and criminal propensity, this separation provides further justification for the pursuit of cultural distancing by proper white society. This process is accomplished through the adaptation of the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant from tainted blood, to violent actor, and finally to drug user/dealer for the purposes of social casting, exclusion, abandonment, and criminalization. Overall, this data driven

conceptualization supports scholarly understanding of the intra-racial casting, distancing, and regulation as a foundation for understanding how this creation continues to be recycled to ensure support of the belief of this rural Appalachian deviant. The typology reproduction acts not only as a tool of exclusion but also as a method to continue the power differential between those considered "trash" and proper whites.

Films provide useful cases for understanding this process as they show character development demonstrating this recycled and ever-changing typology of the rural Appalachian deviant. Analyzing films, in this sense, also provides a clearer understanding of how audiences consume these depictions and rationalize the "warranted" fear, exclusion, and criminalization of this population as a part of the overall depiction of a lower white caste or white trash in society. As discussed by Jeff Ferrell, Keith Hayward, and Jock Young (2008), taking this cultural criminological standpoint is important and films provide an appropriate medium for such a process. Media and film shape moral values and social norms around particular topics, groups, and individuals while also playing a role in the construction of crime and deviance for said populations (Ferrell, Hayward, and Young 2008). Acceptance of this cultural viewpoint and the importance of films in such research will assist scholars in answering the above questions. This viewpoint will also provide a better understanding of how this reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant leads to social inequalities stemming from exclusion, abandonment, and criminalization based on how myth, fear, and the pursuit of cultural distancing affect the way very real populations live their day-to-day lives.

Painting Appalachia

To begin, it is imperative to provide contextualization of the history and current placement of the Appalachian region and its people. Historically, the Appalachian region has

faced multiple socioeconomic and social issues. Many scholars (see Batteau 1990) continue to disagree about the proper way of defining the area because of such issues. Some have even argued that the area is a continued misrepresentation and even doubt that the Appalachian region is something more than a construct made by society (Williams 2002). Some have even gone as far as to describe it as "a territory only of the mind, an *idee des savants*, a place that has been invented, not discovered, an 'alternate America' projected onto the mountains and mountain people by reformers who's real purpose is to critique or change things in the nation at large" (Williams 2002: 9). This concept is of course more philosophical in nature because, just like the struggles the area faces, a true Appalachian region does exist. However, a strain of this idea still rings true with the continued pursuit of defining the area either through the early settlements of the Indigenous populations, the land arguments between the Spanish, French, and later British, or the more postmodern conceptualization of the region. Each of these definitions include a strong urge to connect the land with the people (Williams 2002) as a means of continuing this cultural tie of the area.

With this said, post-industrial Appalachia consists of zones where diverse populations interact with each other and a set of both regional and sub-regional environments exist (Williams 2002). These regions have both geographical and cultural boundaries. Geographically, the Appalachian region takes up a large portion of the eastern United States. Overall, the area covers nearly 205,000 square miles following the Appalachian Mountain range (Appalachian Region Commission 2015). This range alone covers and dominates nearly 1,000 miles from the northern to southern tip of the vast area. The furthest northern point of the region begins in southern New York and the area runs as deep into the south as the northern areas of Mississippi (Appalachian Region Commission 2015). In total the region includes the entirety of West Virginia and pieces

of 12 states; New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi (Appalachian Region Commission 2015).

Various cultures dot this area arguably representing a consensus of two separate identities within the American consciousness. This stems from the fact that the area is nearly an equal mix of both urban and rural areas. Nearly half, 42%, of the population identifies themselves as rural, and 17.1% identifying as racial minorities (Pollard and Jacobsen 2016). This particular fact makes the region more representative of rural culture than most others at the national level where only 20% of individuals identify themselves in this way (Appalachian Region Commission 2015). This fact is also important based purely on the number of individuals who live within these boundaries. As of 2015, over 25 million individuals lived within the region, making up a large portion of the population between the eastern seaboard and the Mississippi River throughout the Mid-Atlantic region of the country (Appalachian Region Commission 2015).

Sadly, the people of this region have long faced and continue to face a number of issues concerning both socioeconomic and social abandonment. Traditionally, the area developed from a mass of trading routes and commerce organized around agriculture (see Billings and Blee 2000; Williams 2002). Over time, more industry related jobs in mining, forestry, chemical and heavy industry settled into the region (Appalachian Region Commission 2015). However, despite these changes in industry and economic dependencies, the majority of the area has struggled with economic plight that continues today. During the early part of the 1960s, 31% of the population fell under the national poverty line (Appalachian Region Commission 2015). Realistically, this number was much higher during this time do to the overall 'rurality' of some

of the areas. Many individuals facing homelessness and far less than par economic conditions more than likely did not receive representation in these early reports (see Williams 2002).

These hardships remain. As of 2014, 17.1% of the Appalachian population still fall below the poverty line. Despite continued efforts by multiple regional activist groups and attempts to diversify the area economically, many still fall well below this 17% (see Billings and Blee 2002; Appalachian Region Commission 2015). Some areas face numbers nearly double 17% demonstrating little change between the 1960s and today. A result of these issues is the fact that two very contrasting economic models are now present in the area. Those areas that have been able to diversify (for reasons to be discussed later) economies that resemble "modern America", whereas areas still highly reliant on small amounts of labor industry still resemble the older 1960s "alternate America" discussed above (see Appalachian Region Commission 2015). These "alternate" areas still face massive issues concerning the well-being of the population. Many still lack basic services provided to the rest of the United States. It is not surprising, for a native of the area, to see many small towns and "hollers" plagued by basic infrastructure issues such as roads, lack of running water, and proper sewage systems (Appalachian Region Commission 2015). Similar health related issues are present in high poverty areas, with many areas within the region boasting higher than average health concerns (including cancer, heart disease, and diabetes) for both children and adults (Appalachian Region Commission 2015).

However, how does such an area still exist within the boundaries of the modern United States? How was this "alternate America" created and what historical social processes allowed such a region to exist? These are all questions that deserve proper answers. Answers needed not only for a better understanding of the area but also for understanding how and what affects broader society's labels have on these individuals. These 'hollers' and the 'deviants' whom

inhabit them continually face social inequalities, abandonment, and exclusion based on the same historical processes that have allowed many to still lack basic necessities in 2017. In fact, all of these issues, as will be shown, are partially a result of the continued construction of the rural Appalachian deviant as a piece of the cultural separation by proper whites.

To understand the effects of the socioeconomic strain in this area and its effects on those labeled within, scholars must step back to tackle the historical creation of this culturally and economically excluded region. Such an in depth look will provide examples of how the two contrasting stereotypes of this area have become a part of the American imaginary (see Linnemann 2016). This will provide an understanding of how the "Appalachian mountaineer, noble and stalwart, rugged and independent, master or mistress of the highlands environment" morphed into the "profligate hillbilly, amusing but often also threatening, defined by deviance and aberration, a victim of cultural and economic deprivation attributable to mountain geography" (Williams 2002: 17).

Understanding Poverty in Appalachia

It has been over a generation since the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty brought attention to the overwhelming difficulties millions of rural Americans faced. The numbers of impoverished individuals in rural areas was reaching an all-time high and this renewed focus on the population led to a new title: "the people left behind" (Billings and Blee 2000). Sadly, many of the areas of Appalachia still face the same levels of poverty and resemble the very same images documenting President Lyndon Johnson calling for "War on Poverty" in 1964 on a tattered porch in rural Kentucky (Billings and Blee 2000). The complete origins of the long term-institutional levels of poverty in this area are still disputed. More recent welfare reform programs, focus on the changing of poor people behaviors (often through work programs)

gloss over the history of how these areas have come to be poor and while failing to address the systemic problems leading to continued poverty (Billings and Blee 2000). To understand these underlying causes we must first gain a better understanding of the history of the institutionalization of such poverty in the Appalachian region.

Theories of Poverty

Two principal explanations exist for the high level of poverty within the Appalachian region. The first is known as the Culture-of-Poverty theory (Billings and Blee 2000). This theory focuses on how families and individuals learn to cope with the daily issues they face living under the strain of poverty. This theory gained popularity in the 1960s despite the fact its application is dependent on traditions of "Appalachianography" during the later parts of the 19th century. Writers and political leaders, such as James Lane Allen and William Goddell Frost, played key roles in the construction of the Appalachian region during the post-civil war period through storytelling and the creation of regional based caricatures. Much of this early attention focused on the culture and lives of those labeled as "Appalachian Americans", linking mixed labels of steadfast traditional citizenry with high levels of poverty and some backwoods nature characteristics such as inbreeding, low IQ, and deviancy (see Pudup, Billings, and Waller 1995). Later writers such as Henry Shapiro, John C. Campbell, and Samuel Wilson contributed to the highly selective view of the region in the preindustrial period that has continued to shape the modern discourse of contemporary thinking. Such thinking aligns with the continued image of the region as separate from the rest of the United States or a region inhabited by a distinct group of others (Billings and Blee 2000).

This early social construction of the region as a distinct sociocultural world continued to receive additional reinforcement through the creation of urban-based strategies (such as

benevolence and education) to connect the Appalachian poor with the rest of the American culture (Billings and Blee 2000). This reformation vision gained additional strength through distinct efforts to preserve preferred pieces of the region's folk culture such as music (hymns, 'fiddle music', etc.) and specific types of paintings and other crafts (Whisnant 1980). Such early programs during this period allowed for a mass of sociological based research in the region resulting in the creation of a region without any true history or an area where time simply stood still. This research perpetuated the construction of the label of the poor "fatalism" enriched society (see Ford 2015) unwilling to fight the poverty beset upon them and advances towards modernity. At the time of this theory construction and construction of the area as a whole, these more fatalistic sentiments seemed logical to social scientists and policy makers. This culture of poverty theory was set in a history of allowance and acceptance of high levels of poverty especially during its revival in the 1960s due mostly to the fact that more than half of the population of region fell under the poverty line (see Couto 1984).

In sum, efforts that explained the history of Appalachian poverty went hand in hand with early efforts to push for economic development in the early part of the 1960s. At the root of the culture of poverty theory, was the idea that the poverty in Appalachia was/is simply an extension of the region being isolated or "a region apart" from the national "free enterprise orbit" (Billings and Blee 2000). This central tenant of cultural isolation led to two additional theories bolstering this conceptualization. Firstly, central place theory provided an understanding of how the settlement of particular areas discouraged the provision of certain services. Secondly, neoclassical economic theory provided a better sense of the continued demand for particular supply and the ability of those within the region to maximize utility and profit. This above social research guided the strategies of the above-mentioned Appalachian Region Commission and its

mission to overcome economic isolation (Billings and Blee 2000). This theoretical combination

continues to push the ARC's mission to provide federal funded services such as early projects

with VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), transportation, education, and health care as a

means to overcome continued economic isolation and stimulate growth through cultural

modernization for the region (Billings and Blee 2000). Albeit these services have made

somewhat of a difference, the full extent of ARC's original goal is still seemingly far from

obtainable after multiple decades of programming.

The theory of internal colonialism represents the second major theory used to understand

the persistence of poverty within the Appalachian region. This theory focuses attention on the

structural causes of poverty. Overall, the theory is rooted in the spread of capitalism,

globalization, and the processes of nation building (Robinson 2015). Internal colonialism

describes the concept of those in power exploiting minority groups for the purpose of economic

benefit. Specifically, this theory focuses on the extent to which land and mineral resources in the

Appalachian region fall under the ownership and control of non-local corporate investors (see

Lewis and Johnson 1978; Billings and Blee 2000; Robinson 2015).

Coal companies represent the prominent focus of the theory based on research

demonstrating the:

> Economic exploitation by the mining industry to the region's residents, the violence of the coal mining industry on humans and the environment (leaving vulnerable, unstable, isolated population), outside ownership of local land/minerals/resources and the dependency of the region on this singular, institutionalized, corporate sector including the political arena (dependent on coal industry donations) (Robinson 2015: 76-77).

The historical presence of internal colonialism, from early agriculture related industry to the

domination of the coal industry in the region, has left the population in a position of forced labor

for survival. This economic domination has not allowed wealth to accumulate in the Appalachian

region due to the overwhelming control of the companies and their interests that funnel money away from the region to benefit the companies (Lewis 1993; Miller and Sharpless 2003). This process has allowed for generation after generation of Appalachian populations to become a part of the institutionalized creation of poverty within the area. This institutionalization continues with more emphasis from corporate investors to continue such subjugation through a variety of means to maintain the cheap labor force for further exploitation. Both of the above theories also supported and continue to support the early stages of cultural distancing through both liberal and conservative means by proper white society (see Young 2007). Such a foundation provided support for the earliest arguments that the Appalachian people are a perverse and unnatural group deserving of "otherization" and social exclusion for the general purpose of supporting those in society above them from the tribulations of late modernity (Young 2007). These same sentiments continue today with the ever-shifting typology of the public's imaginary of the rural Appalachian deviant.

Poverty and the Perpetuation of a Label

The perpetuation of poverty is also a major factor in the labels and misconceptions that have shaped the persona of the Appalachian region (Robinson 2015). The same traits of isolation that sustain poverty also contribute to the popular images of the hillbilly or backwoods natives that dominate the cultural identity of the area and serve as the reasoning for suspicions by outsiders (Slocum 2012). This nationally known rural Appalachian deviant label is deeply rooted within the area and is an exclusionary force used historically in society. These labels still haunt many within Appalachia, especially the rural areas, and presently still provided justification to exploit and abandon these populations along social, economic, and penal lines (Eller 2008).

Much of the other, white trash, or overall deviant label beset upon Appalachia comes from deeply seated racial tensions in the United States. However, the idea of "white" being used in the terms of an insult represents somewhat of a historical anomaly. Wray (2006) discusses the idea of intra-racial tensions within white populations as far back as the early colonial periods of the country. For the most part the historical idea of whiteness has represented order and power within the racial context. However, in this use, the term "white" represents the power a derogatory label possesses over those who fall outside the relationship of whiteness. Wray (2006) demonstrates that the use of "white" in this sense creates a group of individuals whose existence threatens the social order obtained as a part of being white. A group of individuals exist that now represents others as they lack the standard qualities of what it means to be white in modern culture. The group becomes dangerous to the broader power of white populations as a part of "backwoods" groups who relate more with minority groups than popular white society (Wray 2006).

This fear and overall vilification of this "white" label mirrors other forms of racism. While of course, racism predominantly affects those of communities of Color, poor whites receive similar treatment both for cultural distancing and for exclusion. Concepts like symbolic racism (see Kinder and Sanders 1996) help us understand the ideology behind the belief of societal controversies such as welfare abuse, crime, family deviance, and drugs for poor rural whites in similar ways as communities of Color. As similar forms of intra-racial definitions persist, lower caste whites become a cog in the process of socialization and of both cognitive and emotional responses made by the broader "proper" society (see Kinder and Saunders 1996). The construction of the rural Appalachian deviant also provides support for the creation and continuation of the structures used to maintain proper white status and privilege in ways that are

similar to the "othering" of communities of Color (see Sears, Sidanius, and Bobo 2000; Young 2007).

In this sense then the use of the word, in the slur, creates further justification for their exploitation. This exploitation historically effected poor Appalachian settlers and continues today (see Billings, Norman, and Ledford 2000; Drake 2001; Massey 2007; Fisher 2009). The lazy label pushed the idea of the town imbecile and drunk in early literature and news. Over time, this label spread to other areas of the country allowing for a broader acceptance of this caricature for the population of the area (Wray 2006).

During this time, society exploited and abandoned Appalachians based on the broad belief that they would not work and represented something more of a vagrant nuisance population. Like other labels of the time, this caricature gained popularity in early films. Films began exposing larger audiences to images of these stereotypical Appalachian natives drinking from their moonshine jugs marked by the XXX logo. These caricatures always caused trouble for the cast and for the most part became another obstacle for the lead character to overcome (Williamson 1995). Then, same as now, these portrayals exacerbated early policy creation on how to deal with not only the economic issues of the area but also the "vagrant" style inhabitants that caused them. These images allowed for the issues plaguing the real Appalachian inhabitants to go unnoticed for multiple decades as the country continued to modernize (Billings, Norman, and Ledford 2000; Drake 2001; Massey 2007; Fisher 2009).

This issue with the inhabitants of the area provides more contexts for the use of "trash" in many of the derogatory terms. Just as "white" is used in a racial context to create a labeled other, the term "trash" represents a division through the context of class. Particular images come to mind with the use of the term "trash". Many probably think of filth or a mess. The term also

has the power to represent the poor when used in the social context to represent a particular "trash" class. The use of "trash" to represent class in this sense causes some theoretical confusion. The term becomes something like Marx's lumpen proletariat or the unpolitical and unorganized lower caste in society (Wray 2006). "White trash", when discussed in this manner, becomes something more similar to a caste left behind through modernization than a class. This process allows for the disregard of "white trash" populations, as they possess no real social worth in the eyes of modern society (Wray 2006). In fact, the term allows broader society to blame this population for their own political and social issues due to their own perceived inferiority as a lesser group (Bonilla-Silva 2014). This sentiment of fear and hatred for this lower caste is still thriving today. Murray (2013), for instance, recently warned proper white society within the United States of the coming "white trash" scourge furthering the cultural distancing, abandonment, and criminalization for this lower caste.

These definitions for the Appalachian area again center on the isolation of the area through the decades**.** Surveyors, traveling preachers, and authors of fiction provided the majority of the early descriptions of the Appalachian people in the early 18th and 19th century (Massey 2007). More recently, five specific works have furthered our understanding of what represents Appalachian culture and the stereotypes that have been created based on continued misconceptions (see Shapiro 1986; McNeil 1995; Billings, Norman, and Ledford 2000; Engelhardt 2003; Harkins 2003). These five scholarly works

> Share the same concern for the history and negative functions of Appalachian identities as literary subject, images, and stereotypes; all point out the negativity as particular to images of Appalachians, noting that the pervasiveness and persistence of these "icons" over time are particular to stereotypes of Appalachia (Massey 2007: 125).

Specifically Engelhardt (2003) and Harkins (2003) demonstrate the causation of the internal colonial relationship between the Appalachian area and America in terms of the creation and

perpetuation of these stereotypes. Engelhardt (2003) points to the linkage between female activists in the area during the twentieth century and the prevailing belief that the isolated region was full of sorrow and in need of attention from the outside world. Overall, this allowed the justification for the exploitation of the environment and economy of the area as a means of social oppression (Engelhardt 2003) through the allowance of industry related advancements in the region.

Harkins (2003) extends on the ideas of Engelhardt to show how the images of the region also function at a deep psychological level for many Americans. This process allows many to construct these rural labels of "internal other" as a way to rationalize a sense of national identity, make sense of the Appalachian region, and to justify the continued exploitation of its inhabitants and natural resources (Harkins 2003). This level of rationalization stems from the codependence of whiteness and class in the United States. In a way, the Appalachian label acts as a canvas that many Americans can use as a means to project anxieties of social uneasiness and precariousness within modern markets (Massey 2007; Young 2007). In turn, this label becomes a projection of the anxieties of the parts of society many wish to reject such as laziness and deviance. The label becomes an amalgamation of all things the majority of the nation, particularly whites, wish to expel from their world (Harkins 2003).

This tension reveals itself with terms such as "hillbilly" and "white trash". These terms represent something beyond simple insults to the poor rural inhabitants of Appalachia. The terms rely on the conjuring of images of an early poor white's weapon to stigmatize and stereotype a social group of others from themselves for both social and economic advantage (Wray 2006). In a sense, the terms in themselves help in the creation of dividing the Appalachian people from the rest of society. The terms help in separating or excluding Appalachians from economic markets, civil society, and support the ever-expanding exclusionary processes of the criminal justice

system (Young 1999). Using such terminology creates significant cultural distance between Appalachians and those perceived as proper whites for the benefit of continuing the power dynamic using exclusionary and punitive based policy creation.

These stereotypical labels significantly serve social and political functions, by providing justification for exclusion from governmental support, harsher punishments, and the isolation of Appalachians from the rest of the world (Massey 2007). This is evident in the continued belief that Appalachians are unfit to join the urban world because of the assumption that "their acculturation, values, education, and training failed to prepare them to adapt to a rapidly changing, highly technological, urban America" (Sarnoff 2003: 124). This has forced many to choose between leaving the region or to live in an isolated existence in poverty (Sarnoff 2003).

Overall, the labels perpetuated in Appalachia visually establish whiteness when the subject is "sociably corrupt" by falling outside of the necessary qualifications of being white. In a sense, the abuse of these populations is an attempt to hide the whiteness of the obverse racial white and the continually powerful economic majority (Massey 2007). This process, over time, has become a part of various mediums within popular society. Evolving from simple stories of travelers to characters in movie theaters, these stigmatizing labels now define the cultural boundary for the Appalachian region. The perpetuation of such a process continues social isolation of the struggling region and deserves greater attention from scholars. Specifically, scholars should focus on how the film medium provides examples of these stereotypes justifying public support for the continued exploitation of Appalachians based in depictions of black and white justice with an emphasis on the needs to exploit, abandon, and criminalize those portrayed as villain or deviant.

The Power of Films

Research continues to focus on the extent of influence media can have on the opinions of the viewing audience (see Wimmer and Dominick 2003; Weitzer and Kurbin 2004; Soulliere 2003). This understanding is helpful in "teasing" apart ideas presented by television, film, and news media to clarify the message presented to the intended audience. Over the years, this analysis has become an integral part of politics and more recent focus now pursues the power media has on opinions of crime, delinquency, and the overall fear of crime (see Dowler, Fleming and Muzzatti 2006). Scholarly work in this area is imperative, as the United States, with much of the rest of the world, experiences saturation with media. Particular attention to how the media affects the audience's perceptions is key in understanding the construction of particular groups. Specifically, the media, including films, act as a socializing agent and play a major role in the transfer of cultural knowledge to the public. However, before discussing research on the exact effects the media has on the publics' opinion of crime, deviance, and those who commit said acts, it is important to understand the key concepts of how the media has the ability to shape public perception.

Communication studies focus predominantly on three specific models; agenda setting, priming, and framing for understanding how the media shapes public perceptions. The first of these models revolves around the idea of agenda setting. Agenda setting refers to the strong correlation between the emphasis placed on certain issues by the mass media and the importance attributed to these issues by the viewing audience (Scheufele and Tewksbury 2007). As an extension of this idea, priming occurs when media content suggests to an audience that they should use said 'important topics' as an evaluating tool for leaders and government. This point is especially important due to the ability of these processes to not only tell the audience how they should see crime/groups, but ultimately the decisions they should make towards said topic. By

making certain issues more salient in the audience's mind, through agenda setting (alongside priming), media can also shape what individuals take into account when choosing political candidates or deciding how to deal with said issue (Scheufele and Tewksbury 2007).

The third model, framing, differs significantly from the other two models. This model suggests that the media's characterization of a particular issue can influence how audiences perceive the social parameters and meanings of the said issue (Pan and Kosicki 1993). Much of framing has roots in sociology and psychology. Specifically, Goffman (1974) suggested that individuals are incapable of understanding the world fully and constantly struggle to interpret life experiences and make overall sense of the world around them. To process all this new information provided to them, individuals apply 'primary frameworks' to classify the information so that it can be interpreted meaningfully (Goffman 1974). Due to this, framing represents both a macro and micro level construct (Shoemaker and Reese 1996). At the macro level, framing refers to the use of different presentations by media outlets to present information in a particular way that activates existing underlying schemas held by the audience towards particular actions or groups. As a micro-construct, framing describes how an individual uses the presentation and actual information provided to them as a way to assist them in forming impressions towards the issue, action, or group presented (Scheufele and Tewksbury 2007). However, it is worth mentioning that the media does not use this tool as a means to spin a particular topic. The media instead attempts to condense much more complex issues for the audience to consume (Gans 1979).

So, how do representations of Appalachians in film condition individual perceptions on deviance and crime? The answer is quite a bit. Deviance is still a major societal focus in the United States and North America as a whole. Most citizens see crime and deviance as

newsworthy. Due to this, media coverage presents the topic as part of an informative package. However, more recently, the media packages act as a discussion of crime/deviance through more entertaining lens (Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006). Together these two, in some ways, now represent a part of television, movies, internet forums and even literature. Now more than ever, the boundary of the realities surrounding crime and deviance as information or entertainment is beginning to blur (see Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006).

One major issue with the blurring of boundaries is the idea that many shows/movies meant for entertainment come wrapped in a "realistic" package. This results in the categories of fiction and reality blurring for the common viewer. Some of the films to follow demonstrate this "packaging" as they present characters in a gritty realism that lead audiences to perceive them as true representations of the population represented. It also leads to large misconceptions about crime, criminals, and the fear around crime and deviance in general (Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006). The new form of "infotainment" provided by traditionally informative based mediums (Surette 2007) further compounds this issue. Under this new format, crimes (especially violent crime) receive a more entertainment-based treatment while still being presented as completely factual. However, this "factual" presentation is often distorted leading to misrepresentations of facts, individuals, and possibly even communities (Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006) like the depictions of Appalachians in most modern films. This new format may explain emerging data that shows citizens fear crime and particular deviant populations regardless of the fact that crime rates seem to be leveling off or decreasing (see Roberts 2001).

These issues led to a great expansion in the study of media portrayals over the past 30 or so years, beginning with the British media studies of the 1970s (see Cohen 1971; 1972; Cohen and Young 1981; Chibnall 1977; Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, and Roberts 2013). This

research has expanded to include ideas of who has the power to produce such stories and the overall representation of crime and deviance in media (see Jerin and Fields 1994; Chermak 1995; Duwe 2000). Much of this research focuses on a renewed fascination with the "other side" of society and a distorted concern of crime and deviance emerging with an oddly Lombrosian overtone (Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006). This process all flows from the perceived need for society to see certain groups as others through a distortion based on a believed active participation in criminal cultures (see Reiman and Leighton 2015). This past research provides justification for using similar methods in understanding the effects of film representations of the rural Appalachian deviant.

The majority of this theoretical framework stems from the work of Gerbner and his colleagues work on Cultivation Theory in the mid-seventies (see Gerbner and Gross 1976; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, Morgan, and Jackson-Beeck 1979). Cultivation theory posits that a high level of media exposure (particularly television but applicable to other forms) results in significant misconceptions of "real" world conditions, often leading the audience to construct the world as more dangerous or "mean" than it truly is (Gerbner and Gross 1976; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, and Shanahan 2002). Regardless of some criticisms of the theory, such as lack of the inclusion of variables that may lead to a spurious relationships (see Hughes 1980; Hirsch 1980), cultivation theory has found support with regards to a general relationship between media representations of deviance and public fear and overestimation of crime/criminal prevalence (Gilliam and Iynegar 2000; Gross and Aday 2003). However, this theory does not truly address whether the media persuades us to view things in a particular way or if we use the media as a tool to understand the world around us. This issue warrants further disentanglement for two specific reasons. First, it is beneficial to our understanding of the continuous

reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant in film. Secondly, it demonstrates how this process acts in a cyclical manner following the labeling of the population, their representation in film, and further labeling as a part of the overall social abandonment and criminalization of Appalachians.

Overall, the permeation of crime into our lives through numerous media outlets has led to a larger debate on whether this saturation may be a cause of crime (Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006). This has led scholars to be more specific on what audience and mediums they select when trying to understand this process. Specifically, scholars now focus on how the news, television, music, and films have an effect on societal perceptions of crime and deviance, including the fears that follow (Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006). Hence, the need for a particular focus on the representation of Appalachian populations in film. Overall, understanding the correlation between the interplay of media and those in power of the construction of new forms of crime narrow our focus on the social abandonment, distancing, and regulation to reinforce the creation of docile bodies (see Foucault 1977) in Appalachia.

The Effects of Films

Films play a pivotal role in shaping societal perceptions of particular groups in the United States. As a cultural medium, films usually mirror dominant attitudes already present in society but also have enormous power to shape new perceptions and ideas (Welsh, Fleming, and Dowler 2011). This is particularly important, as social inequalities, regulatory mechanisms, criminal elements, crime, and perceived deviance become larger themes within most films. However, just like other forms of media, film representations of crime and marginalized groups are often unrealistic and usually exaggerated (Surette 2007). Multiple studies have found that films represent a significant source of information involving crime and deviance, especially crimes

that are relatively infrequent (see Hickey 2012; Rafter 2006). The way in which "justice" plays out in films also has much to do with how public perceptions are shaped. The majority of crime-oriented films possess a pervasive sense of retribution. In this way, films mirror the dominant cultures belief that a fundamental need for justice in social exchanges is paramount (see Lerner 1980; Darley and Pittman 2003; Gromet and Darley 2006) including the exclusion of particular groups of 'others' from social groups.

The majority of research on the topic shows that audiences display a strong preference for story lines that evaluate the idea of justice with punishment (Raney 2005). Research also shows a need for strong attention on films based on the assumption made by Rothe and Ross (2007) that the public identifies more with images than other forms of media such as printed text. This is further strengthened by the idea provided by Kappeler, Potter, and Blumberg (2005) that mass media acts as a "convenient mortar" for the public to fill the gaps in their knowledge of unfamiliar social phenomenon by offering oversimplified explanations for complicated events and processes. These results also show strong implications that media representations of crime and justice have strong influence over viewers' judgments related to policy (Kleck 2001; Robbers 2005). Numerous studies support the idea that the media depictions of crime, especially more violent crimes, have the ability to lead viewers to accept more conservative views on criminal justice responses (Altheide 2002; Weitzer and Kurbin 2004).

These studies relate to how scholars describe retribution as a populist form of ideology due to its large public appeal (Finckenauer 1988; Phillips and Strobl 2006). According to Rachels (2007), if the audience perceives that punishment does not exist within the resolution of the story then the film lacks a sense of true justice. Research supports this further with evidence showing that audiences appear to be attracted to media entertainment containing justice-oriented

themes (Zillmann 2003). Mostly grounded in structural affect theory, or the theory that the emotions of the audience become systematically determined based on plot points and character development (see Jose and Brewer 1983), most of this literature argues that individuals exhibit a preference for types of media that affirm their broader beliefs, such as the deviance of the rural Appalachian deviant.

This preference spills over into their beliefs about justice leading audiences to show preference for films, television, and news that affirm their retribution based beliefs (Lerner 1980). Viewers appear to conceptualize the restoration of justice with punishment as righteous defeats evil, which again affirms the broader societal belief of justice (Schmitt and Maes 2006). More specifically, these processes affect the way audiences view justice for particular populations and cultures across the nation. Some warrant more "justice" (see Bell 1997; Welch, Price, and Yankey 2002; Harkins 2003; Welch 2007, Rafter and Brown 2011; Linnemann 2013) and are watched closely.

Distorted Images and the Public

As mentioned, many scholars have discussed the ability of films to shape societal views of certain areas, groups, and even cultures (Guastaferro 2013; Dowler, Fleming, and Muzzatti 2006; Hall 2009; Entman 1994; Garofalo 1981). Films have the potential to shape how some view the real individuals of these areas. Many of these representations of groups within films start by drawing on already established stereotypes. However, films can amplify these stereotypes by portraying these characters in a more dramatic light. This then becomes a cycle. Early stereotypes drive films, films dramatize the stereotypes, and then the public takes on these new characters to replace the original stereotype. Over time, this process adapts, creating a new

character from the earlier stereotype. All rooted in the deep historical overall fear, exclusion, and criminalization of the stereotyped group.

This cycle is clear in modern portrayals of Appalachians in films. As discussed, early depictions of Appalachia characterized residents as lazy, drunk, and inbred. These depictions continued up to early horror films in the seventies. Movies like *Deliverance*, a film in which a group of proper white campers encounter and are believed to be hunted by inbred hill people of Georgia (Harkins 2003), marked the transition from this character. This change again falls around stereotypes of the time. In the early days of the War on Poverty, President Johnson visited the Appalachian region. Images of these visits began to circulate to those outside of the region, especially proper white populations across the country. The images of poor families sitting on the front porches of run down houses brought earlier stereotypes of poverty and laziness back to the forefront. However, at this time it started a new stereotype of the area. Many across the country were not aware that areas showing this level of rurality and poverty still existed within the United States. This fear of the unknown allowed for the reproduction of the "tainted blood" monster that lurks within the shadows of the mountains. A new version of the rural countryside was born in the American consciousness. A new "anti-idyll" perversion of what many saw as the idyllic peaceful rural mountain country (Bell 1997). This new image sparked a variety of new horror films, such as the generic description earlier.

More recently, propelled by a new set of images coming from documentaries and other media outlets, the character of the area is beginning to change. Films now portray the "trash" of the Appalachians as violent abusers and drug users. Images of "backwoods" drug users, pushers, and violent enforcers across Appalachia now exist as a part of society's imaginary. Appalachian film characters are now taking on part of the mantle once only reserved for communities of Color

based on images stemming for the War on Drugs (Alexander 2012; Chiricos and Eschholz 2002) and the "immoral family" structures of those outside of white society. These combined images may have the largest effect on the representation of this area, the inhabitants, and further social abandonment and criminalization policies.

The Panic and Need to Regulate

One could argue that the subjugation of the rural Appalachian deviant stems from periods of moral panics spurred by their behaviors. Instances such as the early mine wars of the late 1800s and early 1900s in which miners fought violently against coal companies and their hired guns for the right to unionize would probably fit this description. However, the rationalization for the treatment of those within this area falls under a more veiled racial and classist sense of superiority. The data from the films shows how the representation of the rural Appalachian deviant continues to reproduce and how such a process plays a part in the exclusion, social abandonment, and perceived criminalization of the population. This allows a more complex picture to reveal itself within the complete context of the films, societal tensions, and representations of Appalachians.

It also encourages scholars to explore the historical and current processes that allow such social inequalities to continue within the area while moving away from specific case studies of particular events. Specifically, this grounded approach demonstrates the continued vilification of this rural "white trash" caste by proper white populations. To accomplish this, it is important to underline the concepts of both moral panic and moral regulation as they represent valuable tools understand the rural Appalachian deviant representations in films as a part of the process of said exploitation, cultural distancing, and criminalization.

A History of Panic

The moral panic framework helps us understand the social construction of crime. The theory is especially useful for explaining how newer forms of lawlessness emerge as perceived threats. Recent examples of crimes described as moral panics include freeway violence (Best 1993) muggings (Hall, et al. 1978) and super-predators (Brownstein 2000). The origination of the term however has some dispute. Even though Jock Young first used the term in 1971, many argue that Stanley Cohen's work on the infamous folk devils he identified as the Mods and Rockers led to the clearest explanation of moral panic. According to Cohen (1972)

> Societies appear to be subject, every now and then, to periods of moral panic. A condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interest; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking people; socially accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions; ways of coping are evolved or (more often) resorted to; the condition then disappears, submerges or deteriorates and becomes more visible. Sometimes the object of the panic is quite novel and at other times it is something which has been in existence long enough, but suddenly appears in the limelight. Sometimes the panic passes over and is forgotten, except in folk-lore and collective memory; at other times it has more serious and long-lasting repercussions and might produce such changes as those in legal and social policy or even in the way the society conceives itself (9).

With this definition, Cohen created the first discussion of a sequential model (Critcher 2008). Accordingly, based on the definition, a sequential model demonstrates that particular piece of the panic are not necessarily inevitable and can become sidetracked at various stages. Cohen provided an account of the key agents within a particular moral panic and a model to explain its overall trajectory, the processual model of moral panics (Critcher 2008). This model embodies his views on the key agents, the dynamics of moral panic, what creates a panic, and the consequences of their creation (Critcher 2008).

The mass media, moral entrepreneurs, the control culture, and the public make up the four key agents crucial to the development of a moral panic. According to Cohen, the media is the most important of the four. Due to this, Cohen emphasized the importance of "understanding the role of the mass media in creating moral panics and folk devils" (1972: 17). The media play a particularly important role during the early "inventory" stage of social reaction by producing images of the deviant and their deviant actions (Cohen 1972). Cohen addressed this stage by discussing the three important ways in which the media support such creations. The first involves an overall exaggeration of the actions and rhetoric surrounding a particular subject. Second is the supposed consequence of what will happen to society if there is a failure to act. The final process is symbolization or the defining of the actions/words of the group (Mods and Rockers) as signifying a threat to society (Cohen 1972). These steps are a part of the normal news making process based on the media's focus on individuals and events that seemingly disrupt the social order. The media use 'inferential structures' or an implicit explanation of what constitutes the behavior, the individuals who perpetrate it, and the causes of such behavior to interpret such events (Crithcer 2008). Components labeled as orientations, images, and causation by Cohen.

The second agents required for the creation of a moral panic are the "moral entrepreneurs". This group represents individuals and/or groups who push for the eradication of immoral or threatening behavior from society (Cohen 1972). This group consists of politicians, bishops, and other prominent members of the community who see themselves above the immoral actions taking place. Cohen (1972) puts emphasis on understanding why such actors would demonstrate particular motivations and tactics towards immoral behaviors as a part of defining how such actions effect their placement in society. The third vested group, the "societal control

group", is comprised of those with institutional power (Cohen 1972). This includes groups such as the police, courts and both local and national level politicians.

The social control group becomes overly sensitive to the perceived moral panic over time and can decide to pursue the believed cause of the widespread deviance. As this process continues, the concern for said deviance may expand from a local to national level. Finally, this group advocates new control measures or "innovations" to snuff out the deviance and eradicate the immoral behavior (Cohen 1972). This process occurs in the name of appeasing and persuading the fourth group of moral agents: public opinion (Critcher 2008). The complex interplay between these four groups defines the problem causing the moral panic and the produced remedies to solve the problematic group. The interplay between the four agents can have long lasting consequences while also providing the foundation for future fears, exploitation, abandonment, and criminalization over a longer period.

The "common" consequences of an established moral panic are normally changes in either the law or enforcement as seen with the creation of stricter drug law changes with the Mods and Rockers (Cohen 1972). However, Cohen suggests that most of these measures are usually more of a ritualistic process geared towards satisfaction rather than solving the "problem". This stems from the idea of the cause of moral panics. According to Cohen (1973), panics fulfil a function of reaffirming already established moral values in society. Every so often, society produces a deviant that it must condemn. Over time, this process has become endemic as apiece of continuing overall control for society. Society continually creates a deviant, generates fear of their deviance, and then relinquishes said fear through the creation of 'innovations' to condemn the deviant group (Cohen 1972). This process, as discussed by Durkheim (1938), is natural as deviance and its creation carries a normal role in society.

Films, specifically, play into this overall process of generating a deviant group and sustaining such fear over long periods. The actors represented within films also take on similar roles as the moral entrepreneurs and social control group as a part of many story lines. Overall, such depictions provide the foundation for a long lasting folk devil within societal imaginary. This process supports further "real" rhetoric surrounding the above discussion of the history of social inequalities and mistreatments within the Appalachian region while also supporting for the creation of further regulatory mechanisms that criminalize the population.

Moral Panic and Moral Regulation as Stepping Stones

The Moral Panic literature of course goes much further as arguments within the field broke out surrounding the construction of particular terminology and concepts as many theories face. Specifically, scholars such as Spector and Kitsuse (1997) criticized the theory's inability to define a social problem. To combat this, scholars pushed the definitions and conceptualizations of moral panic through the work of Goode and Ben-Yehuda's important text *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance* (1994). While of great importance for moral panic theory and the field as a whole, it is not necessary to delve deeper into the expansions of the theory. As stated, the moral panic literature is a useful tool to support our understanding of the creation of the rural Appalachian deviant. It is, however, not the crux of such an understanding, as the issue, like most, warrants the greatest attention to the data at hand.

The most obvious issue with the moral panic literature is the objection to the term moral panic itself (see Miller and Kitzinger 1998; Cornwell and Linders 2002). Scholars argue that the use of the term 'moral' pulls the focus away from other issues separate than those based in moral ideology. Secondly, the term panic denotes an aura of irrationality. The term provides the appearance that those involved react purely on an emotional level to mythical fears. It does not

provide a clear image of how placement and meaning provide rationality to determine the creation and outcome of a specific panic (Critcher 2008).

A second key issue with the current models pertains to the role of the public as media audiences or a body of opinion (de Young 2004; Cornwell and Linders 2002). The current models imply that individuals believe and react purely on the message they receive from the media. Scholars believe this is an erroneous representation of the role of the media and the public in creating panics. The public is involved in a much more active role and understanding how the media, while facilitating the panic, does not have a full control over the public. Data collected from public opinion polls provided to explain the strength of the media in the panic process are a poor source of evidence due to know issues with polling data and should be revisited (Critcher 2008).

Thirdly, scholars argue that the present analysis denies any real agency for the actors. In the current models, the main actors seemingly follow a predetermined script in the creation of the panic (see Miller and Kitzinger 1998; Cornwell and Linders 2002; de Young 2004). The models in some way take into account the protestation of the panic in theory, especially by those labeled as the folk devils fighting back. However, this protestation, while discussed in theory, is often times ignored in the practice of applying the models to particular issues (Critcher 2008). This issue revolves around the idea that the igniters of moral panic are extremely complex. However, more coherent understandings of the how, where, and when events end are necessary for moving forward our understanding of how the moral panic process works.

Scholars argue that emphasizing legal reactions distracts from other social effects that may be unintended or ambiguous in nature (de Young 2004). In addition, many scholars argue that the effects on public discourse are habitually underrated effecting the way the entirety of the

panic should be analyzed (Watney 1988). Overall, many scholars argue for a renewed way of discussing moral panics and have pushed for different ideas about the relationship between the media and politics. This has led to the creation of new ideas towards how to adapt and apply moral panic (see Ungar 2001; Cornwell and Linders 2002; Jewkes 2015).

Finally, the concept struggles to explain lasting occurrences of "panics" that affect certain groups over time. The moral panic literature shows weakness in only pointing out particular short-term panics that generate quickly and then dissolve out of the public's mind. Despite the fact Cohen (1973) refers to the concept of social memory in his definition, many scholarly works ignore the long-term fear and panic surrounding particular groups. Due to this, an entire piece of continued subtle moral panic or social exclusion becomes lost. This is evident in understanding the treatment and fear of the rural Appalachian deviant. Films reproduce this group as something beyond a brief moral panic. Of course, certain instances in history of the creation of this group arguably represent an instance of moral panic but the majority of the historical creation of this "other" involves something more subtle. Instead, these others represent a group of dehumanized individuals worthy of fear, exploitation, abandonment, and possible criminalization, something more akin to a slow burn of moral subservience instead of the bright flash of control established by a moral panic. In other terms, this group represents a caste needing continued distancing based in a society concentrated on the governance through differences and crime.

The moral regulation literature helps us understand the construction and reproduction of this lesser caste. This concept emerges from the work of Alan Hunt (1999). Essentially, Hunt dismisses moral panics in the traditional sense. He argues that the moral panic concept is pejorative and often relies on biased case study research for support. Instead, Hunt (1999) argues that moral panic falls in line more with the concept of regulation already seen in economics

and/or politics. Under moral regulation, moral regulators disagree with behaviors of populations they wish to control as immoral. These regulators then use such objections as a means to garner control over these populations through legal or other means (Hunt 1999). Similar to the moral panic model, moral regulations have five elements known as agents, targets, tactics, discourses, and political contestation. Similar to early theorists, Hunt sees moral panics as extreme forms of moral regulation that come about at times of perceived cultural crisis (Hunt 1999).

Through Hunt's concept, proper whites look to control lower caste "trash" whites for more than safety reasons. Instead, much of the regulation of their behavior, through regulatory mechanisms, falls in line with the need for cultural distancing as a means to carve a safer place within a precarious society for proper whites (Young 2007). In fact, much of the punishment and believed reasoning, as shown in the data, are the product of the need to separate the two "castes". The demonstrated inferiority of rural Appalachian deviants ensures the continued separation, exploitation, abandonment, and criminalization of the region and people. The combination of these two theoretical conceptualizations provide a more stable footing for a better understanding why the rural Appalachian deviant exists and how films reproduce such a stereotype to the masses. As discussed above, these groups receive viewing as different or lesser to others in the dominant society and are in need of continuous concern due to their perceived inferiority to proper white society.

Discourse analysis is another lens for understanding the effects of film. Discourse analysis focuses on the terminology used, why, and by whom when directed towards a particular group, individual, region, or social problem. According to Critcher (2008), this perspective relies on two important ideas discussed by Michel Foucault (1977). The first of which is known as discourse formation where "in particular times and places there emerge ways of speaking about

social problems that assume dominance and privilege their terms and conditions over others" (Critcher 2008: 1139). The second piece involves the concept of governmentality whereby the controlling of those seen as criminal, mentally ill, or sexually deviant becomes synonymous with how normal populations exercise control over themselves in the day to day world. In a sense, this idea of discursive formation determines "who has the right to speak, on what terms to which ends" (Critcher 2008: 1139).

Another way to understand the rural Appalachian deviant is through the idea of risk. Scholars such as Lupton (1999) provide the "risk society thesis" that characterizes modern society as a society with heightened consciousness of risk. Two causes drive this heightened sense of risk. The first is the breakdown of older once stable cultural identities and practices that ensured some sense of continued stability (Lupton 1999). The second is the advent of new forms of risk. Risk involving scientific and environmental causes now appear beyond the control of normal societal controls but still represent a continuous threat to society's integrity. Overall, modern individuals and society as a whole worry more about risk on both the micro and macro level.

The creation of "otherized" groups is a symptom of the concern with risk itself (Lupton 1999). This risk again applies to the subtle distancing of the rural Appalachian deviant. As discussed above, the group represents a perceived risk to the dominant white and capitalist driven society in America. Due to this, these individuals represent a failing of the once strong and stable cultural identity of the United States. Just as society as a whole is facing issues with the governing through crime phenomena (see Simon 2007), the fear of risk allows for a new form of governance within the Appalachian region. A form of governance that focuses on the

subtle and continuous distancing, abandonment, and criminalization of a group of inhabitants based on the fear of the lower caste they are said to occupy.

Altogether, these conceptualizations are helpful in understanding the subjugation and exploitation of particular minority groups, including the creation, reproduction, and treatment of the rural Appalachian deviant. It also lends credence to the use of films to understand how particular discourses, images, and stereotypes provide justification for the overall mistreatment of this group. Specifically, this combination allows the films to demonstrate such exploitation as a part of a historical legacy, but it also supports understandings of the "allowance" of such reproductions as a part of a larger more objective pursuit of the cultural distancing by proper whites within the current precarious societal condition.

In short, this research will use the term moral regulation as integrated term to describe the combination of the discussed theoretical concepts to support the understanding of the link between rural Appalachian deviant reproductions in film and the context of cultural distancing, exploitation, and criminalization. As Hunt (1999) describes, regulation is a means of distancing a perceived group from political support and power. Specifically, the creation of the rural Appalachian deviant furthers the cultural distancing of proper whites from the deviant "trash" of the lower white castes. This separation and regulation is achieved through the creation of a sustainable "other" reproduced in films, providing another piece to the continuance of a new form of folk devil that does not come burning through the social consciousness in a single flash. Instead, this devil is hardened and waits in the hills of a forgotten place for the right time to deviate from the moral fabric of broader society and the standard definition of what it means to be "white".

Contribution and Chapter Outlines

Using the above framework and historical contextualization of the Appalachian region, the following provides examples of the creation and reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant typology within films. Doing so provides further understanding of how this reproduction continually builds on the exploitation of this particular group while also demonstrating how these labels provide justification for social abandonment and criminalization. In particular, this research provides a new area of interest to criminological scholarship. While more and more research focuses on rural populations, little exists within the criminological realm, especially concerning the Appalachian people. As the following will show, the history of oppression, societal controls, and overall representation of deviance in the region provides ample justification for why such research is needed. As concerns about drug abuse and other forms of perceived deviance continue to "spread" throughout the region, it becomes paramount that criminologists understand the creation of the myth behind the rural Appalachian deviant. Specifically, this research demonstrates how this creation/reproduction provides justification for a system of carceral and social oppression of rural Appalachian people through a large project of cultural distancing.

Secondly, the creation and reproduction of this "deviant" provides further understanding of how films influence the perceptions of particular populations. The vast number of films portraying these myths intertwined with subjective realities of the situations these individuals face support further use of juxtaposing such representations against the realities of the area and how such representations affect the real social regulatory mechanisms placed against those within the region. Films also provide a sense of "historical analysis": they draw a jagged line from early representations to modern reproductions to provide better insight into the continuation of how and

why this particular group continues to face a label of deviant. Such a timeline provides scholars with a map of historical oppression to demonstrate broader society's willingness to perpetuate the carceral state as a means of both exploitation and further cultural separation from proper white populations external to the region. The following chapters outline the history of and continuance of this process while also providing insight into the reality these individuals face as a part of the reproduction of what society labels as the rural Appalachian deviant.

Chapter Two discusses the overall analysis method and sample of the research study. Each of the subsequent chapters demonstrate how films provide case material on the creation and reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant rooted in fears and other cultural depictions of white trash. Chapter Three discusses the early creations of the rural Appalachian deviant based mostly in early literature transferred to the movie script. These early depictions show this population as a backwoods, lost to the wilderness, inbred, tainted blood type of group. Film adaptations use such characters as the idiotic or inferior character who requires constant supervision and/or control by other characters. This character regulation not only ensures their safety, but also subsequently safeguards the victory of the protagonist within the film.

This characterization pushed for suppressive laws under the guise of public nuisances regulation while in reality allowing for the creation of industry related environment around these early trash populations for extensive exploitation. Such representations laid the foundation for industry, specifically coal companies, to move into these areas and setup totalitarian like governance over the population. These individuals were seen as a simple-minded and disposable labor force under the control of the company. This process allowed for numerous state related crimes against this population with zero recourse. This construction of the group still exists today with consistent reproduction in film. Despite the plot of the film, the Appalachian populations in

films today still have an underlying subtext of this tainted blood native warranting distancing and abandonment. This same subtext consistently finds representation as justification for not only the creation of detrimental policies against this group but is a major factor in the rationalization and allowance of crimes by the state/industry within these areas.

Chapter Three also includes a discussion on how this tainted blood characterization changed over time to create a villainous monster living within the hills of impoverished Appalachia. This change began the transition to more severe punishments for those within the region grounded by the myth that these monsters represented an extreme danger to society. Films such as the *Wrong Turn* series, based around the idea of an inbred monster like family living in the heart of the Appalachian Mountains, continue this characterization. The once idyllic mountains of the region now hold something vile in the public conscious, and because of this, support continues for the creation of more exclusive and punitive policies in the area.

This group, once seen as harmless, now represents abusive and violent trash that inhabits the U.S. rural areas. These individuals now embody something more akin to an animal instead of human and the social space where some (very little) supportive policies were once attempted has now been replaced by representations of literal folk devils deserving further abandonment and criminalization. In a sense, with every violent or horror film, this version of the typology solidifies the Appalachian other as the villain who must be stopped or put down.

Chapter Four discusses an extension of this violent attitude found within the Appalachian tainted blood. By demonstrating the level of intimate partner violence within the region, this chapter focuses on how films reproduce the image of the indecent and inferior relationship within the populous. Films portray such abuse as the standard within the rural Appalachian community and suggest that these traits pass down from one generation to the next. These said

representations, however, rarely consider the true cultural and structural issues that cause this level of violence. Chapter Four discusses how such violence, albeit comparative to urban intimate partner violence, is portrayed by films as a part of the nature of these individuals and that swift punishment is the only means for controlling such behavior. Finally, the chapter shows how the lack of support for non-punitive based policies merely exacerbates intimate partner violence within the region. Realistic countermeasures receive little attention, as they would interrupt the status quo of punishing as a means to continue the cultural separation of the Appalachian people.

Chapter Five discusses the most current form of regulation of those within the region. This chapter provides examples of how more recent films help paint these individuals as violent predators controlled by drug use and sales. This chapter provides the most current piece in the typology that allows societal and governmental support to continue to push for new methods to excluded, discard, and ultimately distance those pinned by these labels. Specifically, this chapter will discuss how the idea of drug use and sales perpetuate a hyper-violent area and the actions of those considered as completely morally reprehensible while ignoring the true empirical data behind the "epidemic" within the region. Such representations perpetuate the idea that drug users are only of the "bad guy" variety and again deserve criminalization and societal abandonment. This chapter will frame how the national debate on the War on Drugs has shaped film representations of the rural Appalachian deviant and how such representations have been a key factor in limiting the number of resources provided to help communities dealing with high levels of drug addiction. Instead of portraying these individuals as addicts, films demonstrate these individuals as again being "backwards" creatures that use drugs out of laziness, again supporting the myth that these individuals are violent and that the drugs enhance this violence.

Chapter Six pulls each of these pieces together to provide an overarching understanding of how this reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant rooted in white trash rhetoric has and continues to hurt this population. This provides a space for scholarly and societal recognition to help alleviate the level of exploitation these individuals face due to the overarching use of a label for cultural distancing. It ends with a brief discussion of the need for future research alongside a short discussion how particular distancing practices continue in both films and society.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Methods Literature

To demonstrate how films reproduce the rural Appalachian deviant typology, the following involves both critical discourse analysis and specific attention to the imagery (using cultivation theory) present within the films. Utilizing both of these methods of analysis creates a fuller understanding of how films represent these populations through imagery and the linguistics used between characters/interviewees within the sampled films. As discussed earlier in the document, using such a medium is important to the field of understanding within criminology. Specifically, taking a cultural criminological stance to understand the constructions provides a direct line into understanding why we continue to punish these others (Ferrell, Hayward, and Young 2008). It is vital that research focuses on the collective meaning and identities these labels play in the exclusion and punishment of this population.

Films, based on their role within the modern landscape, provide significant insight into how these meanings came to be and continue to change, constructing a space for the creation of supported punitive policies. However, to break down the meaning represented in these films goes beyond simple viewing. Scholars must continue to use sound methodology to relieve the burden of pure subjectivity (see Lincoln and Denzin 2003) and to ensure the consistency of an objective scientific method to understand these constructions. In this case, the following applied both critical discourse analysis and cultivation theory to describe the constructions presented within each of the films. Again, to ensure the presence of objectivity both analytic tools deserve further description before the discussion of the sample of films used for the current research.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) provides a unique way to analyze the language, metaphors, and overall speech patterns within the films. CDA stems from the overlapping of three particular intellectual traditions emphasizing the more recent recognition of the linguistic turn in social sciences (Rogers, Malacharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui and Joesph 2005). This new form of analysis draws from discourse studies (see Benveniste 1971; Derrida 1974; Foucault 1972), critical linguistics (see Fowler, Hodge, Kress, and Trew 1979; Halliday and Hassan 1989; Hodge and Kress 1993; Pennycook 2001), and feminist post-structuralism (see Butler 1990; Davies 1993). The focus of critical discourse analysis revolves around how language, as a cultural tool, shapes relationships of both privilege and power in social interactions, bodies of knowledge, and institutions (see Bourdieu 1977; Luke 1996; Gee 1999).

Critical discourse analysis flows from the early work of a group of scholars from the Frankfurt School. These scholars focused primarily on changing the nature of capitalism and while discussing its relation to Marxist theories dealing with economic determinism (Rogers et al 2005). Specifically, these scholars, "engaged with critical theory and attempted to locate the multiple ways in which power and domination are achieved" (Rogers et al 2005: 367). Essentially, these scholars opened a debate centered on whether language belongs to the cultural superstructure or the economic base, while also considering whether language determines material conditions or if material conditions create the language (Ives 2004). Scholars who identify themselves within the critical discourse analysis tradition often separate themselves from "non-critical" works by arguing that their research moves beyond simple description and interpretation of language in the social world. Instead, these scholars focus on interests in

understanding conditions of inequality and locate and define power within language as a social

practice (Roger et al 2005).

The second key piece to critical discourse analysis stems from the term discourse. CDA

tradition defines discourse as language used as a means of social practice (Roger et al 2005).

Specifically, scholars believe that discourse moves back and forth between constructing and

reflecting the social world. In this sense, one should never consider language as neutral because

as it is continuously caught in social processes such as politics, religion, cultural, and economic

formations (Roger et al 2005). In particular, CDA sees language as a social construct. CDA also

views language dialectically, meaning that language influences the context in which it occurs

while the context contributes to language production. Lastly, CDA strongly emphasize the

historical and cultural acts that play into meaning making (Young and Harrison 2004).

Finally, CDA combines elements of both social theory and textual analysis (Roger et al

2005). Scholars who use CDA to research the world around them follow eight succinct tenets as

outline by Fairclough and Wodak (1997). The first of which is, simply, that discourse does

ideological work. Second, discourse establishes society and culture. Discourse is both situated

and historical. All power relations are in some way partially discursive. A mediation of power

relations demands a more socio-cognitive based approach. CDA is a paradigm developed to

address social problems. Discourse analysis is explanatory, interpretive and descriptive. Finally,

the role of analyst is to study relationships between language and everyday social practices

(Roger et al 2005).

The final piece of CDA falls under the term "analysis". There are multiple approaches to

the analysis of CDA (see Foucault 1972; Van Dijik 1993; Kress and van Leeuween 1996;

Wodak, Meyer, Titscher and Vetter 2000; Kress 2003). CDA differs from sociolinguistic and

discourse analysis due to its movement from description to an extended focus on explaining how discourse constructs versions of the social world (Roger et al 2005). Additionally, CDA focuses on the subject's power rather than analysis of the languages ability to describe the individual's skills, intentions, or motivations (Luke 1996). However, multiple approaches have all developed different tools to analyze certain sets of problems.

Gee (2005) uses seven "building tasks": significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections, sign systems, and knowledge, to demonstrate how language is a major piece in the "creation and maintenance of social norms, the construction of personal and group identities, and the negotiation of social and political interaction" (Starks and Trinidad 2007: 1374). This process, similar to the one used in the current project, traces the historical evolution of language to examine how it has both reflected and shaped social, political, and cultural practices within in particular groups, areas, and cultures (Gee 2005).

Analyzing Imagery

Cultivation Theory, as discussed in the literature section, is a useful tool for analyzing and interpreting media to understand how they shaped public perception. This project uses cultivation theory to analyze Appalachian centered films to investigate whether and how particular long lasting themes within said films have the ability to reproduce the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant. However, beforehand, a more in depth discussion of cultivation theory is necessary to provide ample reasoning for the use of such a method.

George Gerbner (1976) developed cultivation theory throughout the 1970s as a tool to test the hypothesis that long-term exposure to stable and repetitive messages produce through television programming can have aggregate consequences on the viewing audiences (Wilson, Longmire and Swymeler 2009). Specifically, cultivation theory focuses on how viewing media

with consistent imagery can gradually lead the audience to adopt particular beliefs about the

social world conforming to the already established stereotyped imagery found within the media

(Woo and Dominick 2003). Specifically, cultivation analysis involves two distinct steps:

> First, descriptions of the media world are obtained from periodic content analyses
> of large blocks of media content. The result of this content analysis is the
> identification of the messages of the television world. These messages represent
> consistent patterns in the portrayal of specific issues, policies, and topics that are
> often at odds with their occurrence in real life (Wimmer and Dominick 2003:
> 414).

Many have debated and criticized cultivation theory but, over the past few decades,

research shows these criticisms to be faulty or altogether disproven (see Van den Bulck 2003).

Current research has found strong support that consistent viewing of television effects the

audiences perceptions of social reality (see Shrum and O'Guinn 1993; Morgan and Shanahan

1997; Wimmer and Dominick 2003). Along with the support found in more recent research, is the

renewed push to expand the use of cultivation theory beyond the analysis of television and into

further mediums of media portrayals (see Vergeer, Lubbers and Scheepers 2000; Williams 2006;

Wilson, Longmire, and Swymeler 2009). According to Hendriks (2002): "Gerbner formulated his

theory in the late 1960s when three major networks and a public broadcast service dominated the

television. The invasion of cable and satellite has likely altered the accuracy of the assumption

that all television content is equal" (112). Further, scholars such as Hawkins and Pingree (1981)

have shown that effects of cultivation theory grow stronger when audiences watch a narrowed

version of genre or subject matter. This point is where the current research fits. The findings in the

following extend cultivation theory's ability to analyze the effects of continued viewing of

particular genres and mediums and their ability to move or reinforce public perceptions on the

information, group, or area shown. Using this theory allows the researcher to analyze how

continued imagery of the Appalachian other assists in supporting and shaping the public

perceptions of this area and people. Such an analysis demonstrates the connection between the lasting aftermath of such opinion modeling and the continued moral regulation of this area resulting in the creation of both socially exclusive and regulatory policy.

Methodology and Sample

This form of critical discourse and film analysis resembles anthropological methods. Similar to anthropological field research, this type of research takes a deep look at the culture examined and produced through the films to determine how such representations create the rural Appalachian deviant. To achieve this, multiple films from multiple genres were analyzed to tease apart how the images and language used within each created the overall typology for the viewing audience.

Sample

According to Morse (2001), the determination of samples for a qualitative research study depend on the nature of the study, the scope of the research, the quality of the data, and the study design. This criterion provides the justification for the use of a purposive sample of the films analyzed. In this dissertation, films set among and discussing the Appalachian area, people, and culture provide such a sample. Three different comprehensive lists exist providing numerous films meeting these criteria. The first is the list created by J. W. Williamson (1995) in his book *Hillbillyland: What the Movies did to the Mountains and what the Mountains did to the Movies*. This list provides a number of films of multiple genres from early nickelodeon one-reel cartoons to films released in 1995. The second list, a continuous list, created by Rob Baker (2016), carries on the listing of films set in the Appalachian region past the last of Williamson's 1995 list. Currently Baker's (2016) list stops in 2013. Completing a search of the Internet Movie Database (IMDB) in addition to the two lists ensured that current films are included in the sample. All three

lists include television representations of the Appalachian region and people, however due to the scope of this research these shows were not included in the current project.

Overall, twenty films were selected that explore and present in some detail the outlaw behavior, criminalization, and/or moral failings of Appalachian people. Ten of these films represent high revenues (adjusted for inflation) indicating films widely seen that specifically discuss the above themes within the Appalachian region through either plot devices or character representations. Their selection for inclusion stems from the total gross revenues reported by IMDB with the amounts adjusted to the 2016 standard dollar using an inflation calculation. An additional ten films are also included that directly demonstrate the sought after themes but were not as successful in the box office. These films include documentaries and "cult classics" that represent important examples of these themes that do not follow the problematic typical measure of success within the Hollywood film culture[1]. This number of films and the decades they cover is necessary to comment on the social-historical context of the Appalachian people and region while also providing sufficient data to discuss the number of present themes. By looking at films over multiple decades, the following can move beyond the flash points of the traditional moral panic and help to show the continual exclusion and cultural distancing of this area and people. Exploring the extent of persistent imagery and discourse surrounding this group is key in providing this level of depth to the analysis. Viewing a small number of films would of course provide a substantial level of information but could easily fall into the issue of watching films that purposively show particular flashpoints of panics instead of demonstrating the more subtle and consistent process of creating the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant.

---

[1] The author understands that documentaries possess a differing level of subjectivity compared to other films (see England 2004). However, the inclusion of these films is important in demonstrating the full representation of Appalachians in all variations of films.

Categorizing films based on four separate and specific genres further helps with viewing films. The first of these categories is the horror film. Gelder (2000) defines horror films as films designed to frighten and induce panic through representation of the audience's worst fears. The second category consisted of fictional films or films set in the Appalachian region with Appalachian characters that have no factual tie to true events. The third category includes films described as "based on true events". These films base stories and characters on real events/individuals but provide fiction to fill in story gaps and character development. The final category represents documentary films or films that document real life occurrence of individuals and the world in which they live through filming their everyday lives.

Analysis

The researcher viewed each film multiple times. The first viewing did not include the taking of notes as to allow certain prevalent themes to appear without undue subjectivity. Subsequent viewings included note taking on both imagery and language used by characters, narrators, etc. Specifically, the researcher viewed fifteen-minute blocks of each film multiple times. This process of breaking the films down into smaller segments provided a more stable procedure of viewing, note taking, and analysis of the films to ensure that quotes, images, and any other pertinent materials received proper documentation. Again, this style of analysis is similar to that of an anthropologist, wherein the research observes the productions of information within the film and documents all noticeable aspects of the creation of this particular typology.

Due to this, some level of criticism of the subjectivity of the work is expected. However, multiple qualitative researchers argue that even though qualitative research does require some subjectivity, the reflexivity of the researcher is as a part of the analytic realism. This reflexivity not only acknowledges the postmodern and constructionist views but also grounds the research in

the insurance of reliability, generalizability, and validity (see Lincoln and Denzin 2003). Keeping this in mind, specific images, quotes, and other pertinent information received time markings to ensure the ability to recreate and validate this study. Finally, the researcher combined and reviewed all materials related to the films. Again, distinct images and language/quotes were used to demonstrate the present themes in the film list to assist in demonstrating how films support the reproduction of the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant.

CHAPTER III

THOSE OF TAINTED BLOOD

Introduction

Many continue to see the rural Appalachian culture constantly at war with a begrudging need to sustain the days of the older more romanticized periods in rural United States and societal pressure to enter modernity (Peine and Schafft 2012). This perceived conflict continues to create myths about the Appalachian people and shapes the cultural distancing and exploitative measures used against them. The root of this conflict and disdain by the outside society revolves in a large degree around the concept of the "tainted blood" believed to be prevalent within the Appalachian culture. Authors since the late eighteen hundreds (see Vincent 1898) portrayed the area as a frontier inhabited by those of lesser intelligence or suffering from retardation. Many have even pursued the idea that the people of the area are in fact a result of multiple (and continued) generations of inbreeding leading to a population of illiterates (see Sherman and Henry 1933; Wray 2006).

Due to this continuous belittlement and labeling, the population within the Appalachian area represents a world within the United State that continues to exist outside of the traditional ideals and values of white society (Batteau 1983). Such a large societal belief creates an acceptance that the area as a whole is incapable of caring for and guarding its own population. Broader society sees the area as populated by a group of corrupted blood fueled dependents whom need the protection and control of the government to not only sustain the area (see Eller 2008) but to protect the larger society from those within.

This representation of the Appalachian people is now a major part of the understanding of the area and continues to be the main emphasis for cultural reproduction in society (see Algeo

2003; Harkins 2003; Massey 2007). As discussed in earlier chapters, one of the largest mediums for this reproduction results in the character examples demonstrated in mass audience produced films and documentaries. Criminological scholars now accept the idea that films have the ability to shape audience views on groups of people and the crimes related within their culture (see Tzanelli, Yar, and O'Brien 2005; Rafter 2006). This criminological acceptance opens the door for using films as an explanation of the reasoning behind the reproduction of particular themes in films and the societal abuse of such representation of Appalachian populations.

However, it is important to note that these films simply play into a larger cultural production of society's fear of rural Appalachians. Similar, to Linnemann's (2016) discussion of the Meth Imaginary, society has constructed an understanding and belief of what rural Appalachians represent based on myths and false ideals of the issues within the area. This "Appalachian Imaginary", to steal the phrase, allows for the continuation of representations without examination of the social and economic issues facing those stereotyped as such. This process provides fertile ground for the belief of the moral superiority of outsiders and the need to subjugate and abandon those living within the area. To shine a light on how films continue the creation and reproduction of this imaginary typology then, it is important to discuss the origins of where all other stereotypes of the Appalachian people originated.

The idea of the tainted blood within the region, while not new, is ever adapting. The following will show how films continue the said reproduction by providing fuel to cultural distancing through means of abandonment and criminalization of this population. Films demonstrating the backwoods nature of the inbred "monsters" that live within the region hints at the supposed violence and promiscuity of Appalachians that led to the eugenics movement. Altogether, then, these demonstrations and reproductions provide support for the overall

"housing" of the rural Appalachian deviant. Providing a link from earlier social structural inequalities to creation of the modern prison system currently taking control of the area's economy and separates this lower caste of whites from the power and resources provided to proper white society.

Blood is Thicker than Reason

It is easy to imagine the stereotypical landscape of a film set in Appalachia. In the opening shots, mountains fill the frame with a sense of beauty and awe of the wonders of nature. However, for many films, this image is soon cut short or diluted by the use of ominous music and early images of the population that inhabit these areas. Films such as *Wrong Turn* represent this cliché in their opening scenes. The intro to the film follows a gruesome murder of two "proper white" mountain climbers in some remote area of West Virginia. Following the cliché, the film begins with images of a rural landscape from an aerial view. The camera rolls over a beautiful area of mountains with small country roads winding through like man made rivers. In any other film, this setting would represent the peaceful and calm representation of nature or the once held belief of the idyllic within rural areas (see Bell 1997). However, following the same cliché, the film drowns out these images with the deep groan of the "canned" ominous music of horror films.

The camera then turns to the two climbers, struggling up the surface of a steep rock face. The two obviously represent a "proper white" couple enjoying an "adventurous" vacation in the rural mountains. The man quickly climbs to the top of the face and watches as his female companion struggles until her hand slips allowing her to fall before her safety harness catches her. This is a subtle demonstration of the dangers of the idyllic rural space (see Bell 1997), but what follows is a much clearer demonstration of the imaginary surrounding why people should

fear rural Appalachia. After checking on the woman, the male character moves off camera into the tree line at the top of the face. Then without warning, you hear the man make a guttural noise as someone or something attacks. Suddenly, his body slings lifeless over the side of the cliff so that his partner is able to see his bloodied face as she still struggles to climb.

Following her horror, her male companion's body flies over her head as if tossed from the cliff above. Suddenly, something possessing inhuman levels of strength jerks her harness towards the top of the face. She cuts the harness and struggles to climb until she finally falls to the bottom of the short cliff where she lands on top of her companion. At this point, the existence of the "anti-idyllic" monster becomes even stronger as the camera turns to show the trees above swaying back and forth, as if a large animal is moving through them. This vicious thrashing, as to drive the point home, becomes even more menacing as the jovial shriek of something mimicking human laughter echoes through the hills. The woman runs towards her vehicle, with a look of utter fear on her face, when suddenly, a barbed wire trap entangles her foot, dropping her to the ground. Finally, with her screams echoing into the "cut" of the black screen, the woman's life ends violently as she flies off screen with the sound of a sickening thud following seconds later. This three-minute intro sets the stage of what is to be feared in the movie and demonstrates that the mountains of Appalachia harbor unnatural creatures created through the historic inbreeding of the area.

The film could have easily stopped here with setting the stage for what the audience is to expect of the tainted blood monster waiting for them in the future. However, to drive home the stereotype and fear, the film goes one-step further. The following minute of intro credits flash with images relaying the area, the horrors, and the villain to the audience. A mixture of old newspaper clippings referring to West Virginia and the "Mountain Men" legend combines with

images of murdered bodies and photos of individuals gruesomely deformed from generations of inbreeding. Within the first four minutes of the film, the audience rediscovers the imaginary of the evil lurking in the rural areas of Appalachia along with the reason for their existence: the tainted blood that infects the population. These images reproduce the familiar fears of this imaginary and support their already held beliefs for the exploitation and abandonment of these individuals.

Films, however, do not stop with imagery to get this point across. In many cases, specific dialogue ensures that the audience is very aware of the fear they should have of those living within these rural areas. A perfect example of this tainted blood dialogue comes from two quotes made early in the film *Deliverance* as the main characters make their way into the mountains for their camping trip. The plump suburban white businessperson Bobby delivers the first when he says, "Drew look at the junk….I think this is where everything finishes up…we just may be at the end of the line" (Boorman 1972). This quote and the individual saying it sets the tone for the audience to see this area of the country as the end of what it means to be a proper white and the beginning of the deviance of the improper whites. His following quote, a few moments later after the iconic scene of the boy playing the banjo against one of the main characters (Drew), further solidifies this image to the audience by openly demonstrating the disdain of those considered to be the proper white compared for those of the atavistic nature: "Talk about genetic deficiencies" (Boorman 1972).

While these comments seem mundane and many would not explicitly notice them while watching the film, they likely shape how the audience perceives and understands what the inhabitants of the rural Appalachian area represent. As Roger et al. (2005) discuss, the language used by Bobby within the film moves back and forth between the construction and reflection of

the world around those engaged in the language. This, along with the weight of Bobby's position within the film as a main character and a more prominent white identity, gives his language strength. His position as the proper white and the politics that play behind the power structure of the construction of discourse and meaning making of the people in Appalachia builds upon earlier historical-cultural acts (see Young and Harrison 2004) and imaginary. His words, and the images of the scene, allow the audience to sit back as observers of these backwards actions and fuel beliefs about the need for distancing. Simply, these images and discourse play into the audience's ability to take part in the punitive spectacle and make moral judgements about these individuals from a distance (see Brown 2009).

This form a distance-meaning making and discourse lends itself to the creation of social and moral regulatory measures. This process of defining those within the region simply as dangerous provides fuel to idea of the need to protect society from their vile tainted blood. The verbiage and the imagery displayed harkens back to early beliefs within the eugenics movement of the late 1800s and early 1900s. For the audience, they connect the now filthy, sinister eyed rural Appalachian with the idea of deviance and immorality through attacking the concept of their very physiognomy (Massey 2007). By doing so, the rural Appalachian becomes an additional "other" in which proper whites can distance themselves during a period of unstable life in late modernity. Using both, more so a conservative demonization than liberal, these images and words produce the inferior within the rural Appalachian region and provide a preamble for the excuse to pursue programming to make them "more like us" or to designate them as perverse and unnatural (see Young 2007).

One can easily draw comparisons to the treatment of rural Appalachians to that of other communities of Color unjustly stigmatized and controlled by the state. Specifically, drawing on

Wacquant (2001), Appalachians have fallen victim to their own form of "ghetto" formation through the isolation and overt control measures placed upon them by the state. Similar to that of African-Americans, individuals in rural Appalachia face a continuous segregation from the broader society through both a classist and racist sense. Wray (2006) discusses the issue of what it means to fall outside of the proper "white" power structure in the United States. For multiple generations, an intra-racial tension has existed within varying white populations. As a part of this tension, groups of higher authority and greater social power have pursued the creation of a lower caste of whites as a means to garner further power within these upper divisions (Wray 2006). This caste creation exists within the Appalachian community as those labeled as "white trash", "backwoods", and "hillbillies". Such formation of a group at its root, or in this case blood, plays into the popular imaginary that such a population is unfit of the proper white mantle and must be controlled to ensure further division of power to those from above (see Young 2007).

This sentiment falls theoretically in line with some of the changes seen within criminology concerning broader ideas of racism within society. Obviously, the driving force behind the idea of racism is the treatment of communities of Color by white structures; however, these same concepts can easily explain how rural poor whites receive similar levels of exclusionary treatment. Similar to the concept of "symbolic racism" (see Kinder and Sanders 1996), the defining of rural white populations as 'trash' by the predominant society has fueled controversies such as welfare, crime, family, and drugs. Arguably, this prejudice against this caste of whites, similar to other minorities, is now part of the process of socialization and engrained in the daily cognitive and emotional responses of broader society (see Kinder and Sanders 1996).

Secondly, this view of rural white Appalachians and the tainted blood contained within the area structures how proper whites defend their privilege against "lesser" groups (See Bobo, Kluegel, and Smith 1997; Sears, Sidanius, and Bobo 2000; Young 2007). This form of racism slowly over time, especially during the 1950s and 1960s, transformed itself into a laissez-faire form of racism (see Bonilla-Silva 2014). Laissez-faire racism gained strength through this period as the ideology of the United States began pushing for more of the modern nationwide concepts of post-industrial free labor and the politics surrounding it, allowing whites to blame communities of Color and other subjugated groups for their own political and social issues resulting in a perceived inferiority of these groups (Bonilla-Silva 2014). This form of racial construction, which proper whites traditionally gear towards communities of Color, results in actions and beliefs towards poor rural whites across the country but especially within the Appalachian region. Such sentiments of the fear and disdain for a lower class population still exist within society. For example, authors such as Murray (2013) warned the "proper white" culture of the United States of the coming "white trash". Thusly, similar to the treatment of others, the overall belief of the rural Appalachian people's cultural inferiority and tainted blood advances the cultural distancing, abandonment, and criminalization measures present within the area.

Much of this control started similarly to that of African-Americans as discussed by Wacquant (2001). To begin, it is clear that rural Appalachians did not experience the great atrocities stemming from slavery. However, many did face extreme societal controls and state punishment, as they existed as unworthy in the white caste during the early generations of the United States as a part of internal colonialism structural effects. Through the experience of nation building, capitalism, and later globalization, the State separated individuals within the

area from the resources needed to thrive as a means for overall broader economic advancement (Lewis and Johnson 1978; Billings and Blee 2000; Robinson 2015). This, like discussed by Wacquant (2001), led to a similar situation of two separate classes of whites living within the area, with the bourgeoisie white class living on the perimeters away from that of the tainted blood proletariat class working as forced manual labor for the exploitative capitalist industries (Robison 2015). This process provided and still provides justification for the policing of these individuals and communities and the creation of a new subset of lesser poor whites equivalent to the ghetto poor (see Chambliss 2001: 1995).

This separation, based on exploitative measure of economic and social dominance, again was justified through the ideas of the diluted genetics believed to exist within the poverty ridden subservient whites. The film *Matewan* strongly demonstrates such justifications. *Matewan*, a movie that focuses predominantly on the early years of the mining unionization wars in West Virginia through the "based on true story" telling of the labor strikes within the region, demonstrates the exploitation of rural whites in Appalachia by the state. This film, in particular, acts as a historical representation of the representation of those within the region while also disseminating similar reproductions to "newer" audiences that use these representations as the foundation for continued exploitation. The movie states on multiple occasions that due to their tainted blood and uselessness in society, outside that of cheap labor, they represent nothing less than that of animal or even equipment. "Didn't care no more for a man than they did a draft mule (Narrator)", "They don't give a damn if we live or die….as long as we get coal out of the ground (Union Organizer)", and "You ain't men to that coal company…you are equipment (Joe)" (Sayles 1987). Such beliefs about these individuals, like other minorities, perpetuated an ever-growing rural proletariat class used only for labor. This resulted in the creation of a vulnerable

population of individuals for the recruitment of the carceral institution through the lack of gainful employment and educational programs.

This process of exploitative behavior towards the rural whites of Appalachia continues to follow a similar path of African Americans through the replacement of communal institutions with regulatory oriented state institutions. As discussed above, the majority of the Appalachian area has and continues to fall under the control of the interests of the state through mostly industrial means. This control, over generations, has diminished the communal apparatus within these rural spaces and replaced them with measures of state implemented social control programs. One could argue that this process began with the large agricultural and coal related company owned housing supported by the state in the early generations of the country (see Williams 2002; Billings and Blee 2002). However, as time went on and the economic plight of the area continued, national attention led to significant investments by the federal government in the 1960s (Williams 2002). The fact that 31% of the population fell beneath the national poverty line at that time allowed for state sponsored programs to enter the area.

These programs, arguably meant as good will, stripped away a large portion of the communal environment, replacing it with the early measures of the carceral state apparatus to come. During this time, measures, such as early employment programs, swift changes of laws in the region, and the believed sense of the deconstruction of cultural values of the area, pushed the level of exploitation (Billings and Blee 2002) and believed "deviance" into the mainstream and allowed state sponsored programs to take root in the area. This "rooting" worked similarly to the institutions within other minority communities where the emerging "government of poverty" provided fertile ground for the punitive iron fist of the carceral-assistential complex to enter the region (see Wacquant 2001).

This process again, was fueled by the argument that Appalachian people possess tainted blood making them worthy of control by "civilized" groups. The area received the label of an "alternate America" and due to this has subsequently followed a similar path of ghetto creation seen in communities of Color (see Wacquant 2001). Contained in trailer parks instead of housing projects, the rural poor areas of the Appalachian region have gone through similar ecological changes as the ghetto through the devolution of more public institutions and the withdrawal of markets from the area (see Wacquant 1998). This change clearly shines through in almost every image of the Appalachia region within the films. Either through the realistic lens of series after series of dilapidated housing shown in *Oxyana*, *Wonderful Whites of West Virginia*, or *Harlan County, USA* or in any of the scenes shown within the fictional films such as *Out of the Furnace*, *Deliverance*, *Big Business, October Sky*, or even the earlier landscapes presented in *Molly Maguires*.

The dialogue within the films also conveys this sentiment by describing the area (and its people) in a deplorable manner. Such conversations and descriptions produce a space for the audience to understand this population as distraught and disposable because of their tainted blood. Again, *Matewan* demonstrates this clearly with the response by the train conductor when talking to the protagonist Joe about where he is going. "You don't want to go their mister, ain't nothing but crazy people" (Sayles 1987). The Baldwin Felts (the antagonists of the film) agent reinforces this idea later in the film when he states, "As for hell…..We've been to West Virginia" (Sayles 1987).

Other films demonstrate this on a more personal level for the audience. Characters (whether pro or antagonist) use specific terminology about the heritage of main characters as a way to demonize them for the audience. Dr. Hannibal Lecter uses the weakness of tainted blood

as a way to put down Agent Starling when he states, "You're not more than one generation from poor white trash" (Demme 1991) in the famous interrogation scene from *The Silence of the Lambs*. Lastly, the use of such terminology is seen during the conversation between the private detective (former police officer) Claude Kersek and Max Cady in the film *Cape Fear*. During a conversation where Max Cady, a recently released convict on a mission of revenge against his attorney, is being told to leave the protagonist family alone, this minor character, who is anointed with much power due to his position in society, states "Well, gee golly gosh. I sure am sorry I offended you, you white trash piece of shit" (Scorsese 1991).

The use of this language and the imagery associated with it provide evidence to the audience that the individuals inhabiting these areas are morally inferior and thus require control for the protection of the outside world from the contagion that they represent. The creation of such a group acts similar to the ghetto for African Americans. Rural Appalachian towns and counties become places purely for containment and warehousing of these individuals away from society as the sentiment and typologies created/reproduced within the film overflow into popular political imaginary. These rural white Appalachians represent the discards of the rest of society (see Harkins 2003; Massey 2007). They embody the derelict and dangerous providing ample rationale for their punishment not only socially and economically but also along penal lines (Eller 2008). Men, as will be shown, come to represent the violent mythos that so strongly entices filmmakers, while the women, even though sometimes represented as violent, become the next piece in the adaptation of the inferior welfare class. Altogether, the violent atavistic rural Appalachian deviant men and promiscuous, lazy, genetically deficient breeding women illustrate a fear that can only be contained by further distancing, abandonment, and criminalization.

Controlling the Contagion

Early forms of punishment outside that of the social and economic realm for Appalachians began very similarly to that of other minority groups. Much of the early control measures put in place to regulate the "morally reprehensible" within the area consisted of a variety of vagrancy laws. These laws relied on the image of the tainted blood and trash caricature produced in the area. Similarly, these laws also provided a means to divide whites within rural areas similar to African-Americans during the Jim Crow Era (see Wacquant 2001). One significant law put in place to control such behavior stemmed from the creation of moonshine within the Appalachian region and the tie between its creation and the deviance of those who produced it.

One can trace these initial laws for moonshine production back to the early period of the Civil War and thusly a pinnacle time in the creation of the tainted blood white for social stratification. During this time, the Confederacy outlawed the use of grain for anything other than food (Miller 1991). Over time, the laws began to be strongly enforced and during the post-Civil War period of Reconstruction, the federal government placed a steep income tax on the creation of home-distilled alcohol. As enforcement of this tax became more prevalent, Appalachian moonshiners began to fight back (Miller 1991). Moonshining clans formed to take control over entire counties resulting in regular "shootouts" with tax collectors within the areas (Miller 1991). These clans would also take part in violence against each other and playing off the established stereotypes in the area garnered greater focus from the authorities to control these deviant blooded individuals.

These regulations and control measures continued through Prohibition in the 1920s. During this time, the production of moonshine had the potential to be extremely profitable

(Wilkinson 1985). This boom in business continued well into the Great Depression and due to this carried extra weight for those who took part in its creation in the Appalachian region. These individuals fell right into the popular caricature of the lazy deviant white trash hillbilly who did not want to work but instead wanted to be a nuisance to society by making money illegally. Film characters set during this time reproduce these same ideas. The images surrounding Tommy Lee Jones's character early in the film *Coal Miner's Daughter* provide examples of the belief of deviance and the violence of the backwoods nature involved with those of tainted blood who produced moonshine. Lee's character Dew, a former solider, gets involved with a moonshiner to make easy money upon his return to the small coal-mining town in Kentucky. This involvement leads to outward displays of dissatisfaction shown by his father through his quote "He'd be laying right beside him…but of course he would at least be working somewhere" (Apted 1980) when it is discovered that the shiner is found dead. It also ends with a demonstration to the audience of how those who produce moonshine in these areas are of a lesser importance than other proper white population with the unceremonious killing of the friend that Lee's character had planned to work with to produce the moonshine.

This label and thusly control of the violent lazy moonshiner continued(s) to be strengthened through the general idea of violence within these communities. Harkins (2003) discusses the label of the violent feudist within the Appalachian people. The Hatfield and McCoy feud represent the seemingly ever-persistent example of this stereotype. These two families, especially "Devil Anse" Hatfield, the patriarch of the Hatfield family, represented(s) a strong violent tendency within the Appalachian people. Portrayed in magazines and newspapers of the time, similar to his continued portrayal in movies of today, as a tall man with evil eyes carrying a shotgun, "Devil" embodied the fear of the idealistic rural space that many in the urban proper

white society would come to have. His representation as the overt masculine stereotype of the

mountaineer tied with the stories of the violent actions taken by both families during the feud

created a large amount of mythos around the violent people within the Appalachian region (see

Massey 2007). This stereotype still plays a significant role in the perceptions for the need/excuse

for cultural distancing, abandonment, and criminalization.

   A large portion of the justification for these labels stem from research of the violent

culture within certain groups or areas. Specifically, the use of the Southern Violence Construct

(see Hawley and Messner 1989) or the Southern culture of honor (see Hayes and Lee 2005) feed

directly into the argument, that by nature, certain groups are prone to be more violent. Similarly,

these ideas can easily be adapted to the views of individuals within the entire Appalachian

region. Understanding that the Appalachian region begins in southern New York (see

Appalachian Regional Commission 2015), it is not much of a theoretical leap to make the

argument for the application of either of the stated theories to the area as a whole. Both theories

argue that high levels of violence exist within rural white males. This population, as discussed

earlier, dominates a large portion of the Appalachian region, even those outside the area

commonly referred to as the South. This distinction then makes it understandable for the

historical application of these theories to large areas of the southern Appalachian region while

also providing solid foundation for their application to the rural areas of the region as a whole.

   Almost all of the research surrounding the idea of the violence within this area cites

describes a prevailing sense of violence in southern culture (see Corzine, Huff-Corzine, and

Whitt 1999). Many scholars such as Cash (1941) argue that these populations demonstrated large

amounts of violence both pre and post-Civil War based on a strong connection to a cultural

belief. This scholarly belief has also found support at both the micro and macro levels and due to

this has consistently fed into the wider belief that rural tainted blood whites demonstrate a significant affinity for violence and therefore must be feared and regulated. In the late 60s and early 70s, scholars stated that these cultural variables could explain high levels of homicide rates within these areas/populations (see Hackney 1969; Loftin and Hill 1974). Research conducted by Messner (1983) further demonstrated that cultural factors in these areas had a significant effect on the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) homicide rate. Despite some debate within this research concerning the effect of the SVC compared to poverty (see Hayes and Lee 2005), it is easy to argue that this macro-level research has had a substantial effect on how society imagines these groups and thusly on policies based around their regulation for the protection of the greater good.

Research at the micro-level also shows some support of the idea that rural whites within this region are more prone to violence than the rest of society. Much of the research shines more of a light on the violence of rural whites instead of the overall generalization of the Southern Violence Construct. Specifically, Dixon and Lizotte (1987) found that violent attitudes did not seem to differ significantly from those socialized within the South when compared with individuals socialized in other areas. However, their research did conclude that violent attitudes were significantly more likely within populations consisting of rural whites (Dixon and Lizotte 1987). Despite the fact that later researchers, such as Ellison (1991), would refute these claims, recent research has again demonstrated that rural white populations (specifically males) are more inclined to use violence in scenarios than other comparable groups (Hayes and Lee 2005). This idea of the violent rural white aligns with the construction of caricatures to support such claims.

This sentiment holds true of films of any generation and genre even when the Appalachian characters settle away from their rural homes. The film *Next of Kin* follows the

story of an Appalachian native named Truman Gates (played by Patrick Swayze) who leaves his

rural home to become a police officer in Chicago. The plot of the film revolves around the idea

of revenge and violence as Gates tries to retaliate against the mob for the killing of his younger

brother while also trying to stop his "backwoods" family from taking the law in their own hands.

However, the plot alone is not the only important representation of how violent Appalachians

can be. Again, one need only watch the first few minutes of the film for the message to shine

through that something is unnatural about those from rural Appalachia that leads them to be

violent.

The film opens with two detectives sitting in their vehicle outside of a rundown motel on

the streets of Chicago. Through their dialogue, the audience becomes aware that this location

seems to be a safe haven for those fleeing rural Appalachia into the city for work and that such

an establishment is a large nuisance for the city as a whole. The officers, however, do not exit

their vehicle due to the fact they are waiting on Gates to arrive to help them arrest an

Appalachian native who recently was involved in a brutal bar fight. At this point, one of the

detectives drives home the point that Appalachians are nothing but violent, saying: "God damn

hillbilly whacko tore up two men in a bar. Practically took the head off one guy with a bottle and

the other guy was dead before he even hit the floor" (Irvin 1989). The following line then points

this stereotype directly at Gates, again by a proper white detective who does not understand why

one group of people could be so violent. "What the fuck gets into those people of yours Gates?"

(Irvin 1989). Again, the status of the officer in society being, a proper white from a natural urban

space, makes this point stand out for the audience. It also shows another dimension of the

supposed violence surrounding the tainted blood of the Appalachian people. The officer's remark

and the fact that they wait for Gates to apprehend the suspect shows that they are not only

frightened by these individuals but also that they believe the best people to handle their violence is someone equally as unnatural from the same area.

Despite the villains of this film being violent, only the Appalachians receive such a label. Despite the fact that Gates is the protagonist, he and his family are still shown in a light as atavists even while the "proper" white antagonist are similarly violent. This acts as a striking example of bias towards displaying one group as naturally morally deviant while excusing the other's behavior as an aberration of the dominant white caste. This demonstrates the double standard of many actions taken by proper whites. Within the power vacuum, this group enjoys the powers of meaning making and represents these rural Appalachian deviants as backwoods and a group warranting fear, even while they commit similar levels of deviancy. Such productions provide further support for the governing of "white trash" (see Linnemann and Wall 2013) as a means to provide further cultural distancing to those of proper white status as a means of continued power consumption (see Young 2007).

This sentiment, however, is not a new one. Again, heralding back to the feudalist nature of the Appalachian people (see Harkins 2003), the imaginary around the area has been that proper society should not soil their hands with attempting to control their violent tendencies. Instead, the government should handle this job, and when this fails, another "former" Appalachian must be found to help temper the unnaturalness of the population for control. This is one of the major plot points for the film *Kissin' Cousins*. *Kissin' Cousins*, with all of its nostalgia with Elvis as the lead in 1964, tells the story of how an army officer named Josh Morgan receives orders to return to his home in the Smoky Mountains to convince a rural Appalachian family (the Tatums) to sell their land to the U.S. Air Force. The Air Force is pursuing this land because they believe that it represents "prime real estate" for the construction

of a missile silo. In the opening scene, the commanding officer describes the overall mission to Morgan. The commanding officer states that the military attempted multiple other encounters with the Tatums. The officer however states that all attempts failed and that "They were forced to leave under fire" (Nelson 1964). This conversation and the shootout that follows in the later scene when the military approaches the mountain again, demonstrate the unnatural violent tendencies of these individuals. It is not until Morgan speaks with the Tatums, a conversation in which they stereotypically discover their familial relations that they allow for any real communication. This imagery and dialogue again demonstrates that the backwoods nature of these individuals pushes them towards violence and that someone of tainted blood is the only one who can deal with them directly.

However, in some representations, the protagonist of the films have no choice but to deal with the threat of those corrupted by such inbreeding and monstrous characteristics. In these instances, they themselves must become monstrous to defeat such evil. Multiple films demonstrate this form of resolution, however, *Deliverance* and *Cape Fear* stand out the most. In both films, the protagonists take on many of the traits of the rural villains they face as a means to defeat them. Specifically, Ed Gentry (played by Jon Voight) in *Deliverance,* becomes the hunter as he has once been hunted by the violent atavistic rapist of the area. Nearing the ending of the film, the main characters believe they are once again under threat after they were able to subdue and kill one of the attackers during the infamous rape scene from earlier in the film. The paranoia of the cast grows when one of their party members, Drew, decides to drown himself for taking part in the killing of human beings. The remaining three convince themselves that Drew's death is the result of a shot from above by one of the hunting inbred villains feeding into their fear.

After a severe canoe accident, Ed decides to "hunt down" those who are believed to be hunting them. To do this he takes on characteristics of those they fear and finally kills a local rural inhabitant who was merely out hunting for wild game. The importance here does not lie solely on the death of the innocent hunter but the acceptance of his death by the audience based on the belief that even if he was not hunting the main characters, he still was expendable due to his genetic placement in white society. Ed, who receives no punishment for his actions, receives praise for saving the group, which suggests to the audience that sometimes for the anti-idyllic monster to be defeated the proper white must soil their hands with similar behaviors. The actions taken by Sam (the father and main protagonist of the film) during the end of *Cape Fear* transform him into a literal representation of an atavistic Neanderthal to defeat Max Cady, resulting in similar levels of support to Ed. With multiple guttural growls and an attempt to smash Cady's skull in with a large rock, Sam becomes the same atavistic hunting monster that Cady represents throughout the entire film. Sam, like Ed, is met with praise and is shown to be of a better status as he does not follow through with his actions, but instead allows Cady to sink into the rising waters to meet his demise.

These two moments, in iconic films set within the region, drive home the idea that those of the tainted blood are unreasonable and do not hold the same standards of proper white society. Instead, they must be distanced and abandoned within their region by proper whites who hold power. Their existence is that of a stain on the larger society and when the simple taking of their lives (as seen in the films) is not an option, their containment and control is necessary. However, it is not only important to regulate their moral existence and control their behavior, but instead both of these processes must occur while simultaneously containing them within their "alternate America". Again, this process shows eerily similarities to the treatment of other minorities

discussed by Wacquant (2001). However, much of the theoretical understanding to this point has focused on the fear, regulation, and control of corrupted blood of males within rural Appalachia. It is imperative that we understand how similar beliefs of the tainted blood of female Appalachians is portrayed before discussing how such regulation and control measures become a part of the everyday exclusion and housing of this population.

Unnatural Femininity in the Mountains

Women during the period of early labeling and criminalization of the Appalachian population were not immune to the effects and exclusion of the time. The idea of the tainted blood shown both in the film and in practice led to the recurrence of maltreatment towards the females due to their "unnatural" masculine identities (Massey 2007). The women were portrayed as hypersexual and show an affinity for sexual deviance. Due to this, they represent a threat to the ideals of what it means to be a proper white female within society and thusly receive more masculine control measures. The representation of these white trash women as overly aggressive usually comes because of their need to take on the duties of the lazy drunk men within the community.

The women in *The Wild and Wonderful Whites of West Virginia* provide an example of such a stereotype. The women in the film are crass and vulgar in nature and in many scenes are depicted as hyper-masculine and violent. One such scene revolves around Mamie White's predilection to handle conflicts violently while hidden in the West Virginia hills. Mamie in her overly raspy voice damaged by years of drug use and drinking states clearly and confidently that "I'll chop a son of a bitch up and throw him in a goddamn mine shaft up there in a garbage bag" (Nitzberg 2009). This one quote and the overall stereotypical image of Mamie provides all the evidence needed for the audience that the women of rural Appalachia are dangerous and require

regulation. This is also powerful because it appears in a documentary wherein this is a real person, whether prompted or not, providing such a statement.

These misconceptions about a central piece to the typology of rural Appalachian women comes from a long history of their fear the tainted blood could have on society. Rural women continue to be seen by society as backwoods breeders, "rural welfare queens", unqualified to raise children under the proper standards of the broader white society (see Young 2016). They essentially represent a continuing familial relation to the Kallikak Family studies that played a significant role in motivating the early eugenic movements in the United States (see Goddard 1912). The same eugenics movement, popularized in Europe, that made its way to the United States in the late 1800s and was active in the states across the nation, and particularly so in the Appalachian region (see Bashford and Levine 2010).

The eugenics movement, credited to Francis Galton in 1883, began gaining popularity in Europe during this time and shortly thereafter transitioned to the United States as more concern focused on the level of civil "stock" being bred within American society. Eugenics, by definition, is concerned with the genetic composition of the human race and strives to ensure the betterment of society by controlling the blood lineage of citizens to weed out those deemed genetically insufficient. As this movement gained momentum in the United States, multiple states began to adopt pro-eugenic style laws to control the increasing population of immigrants and to tamper any militant reaction by groups who had continually been exploited for labor (see Bashford and Levine 2010).

Supporters of the movement feared the overpopulation and consequences of the poor compared to the slower rate of reproduction by the wealthy in society. During this time, in the late 1800s and early 1900s, wealthy Americans believed that the working class poor, especially

immigrants of certain racial makeups and rural poor whites, were reproducing at a rate that could threaten the wealthy's place in society. To combat this, lawmakers began pushing for policies that advocated the sterilization of particular members of society who demonstrated deficient "genetic traits". These traits included feeble-mindedness, alcoholism, rebelliousness, nomadism, prostitution, and criminality (Bashford and Levine 2010). Arguing that their "germ plasm" was defective, Eugenics supporters were able to shift society's attention enough to support the creation of compulsory sterilization laws and deepen the fear of these genetically deficient individuals in society.

Arguably, this process created a lasting fear of the population within the Appalachian region. As discussed above, much of the inbred violent monster has roots in these same eugenic beliefs. However, films continue to push this same fear and need for distancing of these individuals through the representation of female characters in films. These films continue to present females as not only violent, but unable/willing to control their sexual deviance resulting in the continued breeding of multiple generations of tainted blood.

This idea comes to the forefront with one of the secondary plot lines revolving around the scantily clad women known as the Kitty Hawk family in the film *Kissin Cousins*. These women chase any male character who visits Tatum's Mountain as they seemingly represent the desperate need of sexual attention and the desire to mate within the rural Appalachian imaginary. This highlights the sexual deviance of the Appalachian women and the consequences that the spreading of their tainted blood might have on society. In the same film, the backwoods nature of this sexual desire comes through even more through the actions taken by the two main female characters, Azalea and Selena Tatum, as they fight for the same man. However, to drive the tainted blood reference home even further, the single man the women so desperately fight over,

is in fact their known cousin, calling forth the inbreeding habits of the rural Appalachian

population again to the forefront.

The women of the *Wild and Wonderful Whites of West Virginia* provide a more

"realistic" image of this same fear through the actions of both Sue Bob and Kirk White who

show promiscuous behavior multiple times throughout the documentary. Both of them flash the

camera on more than one occasion while also discussing the idea of sleeping with multiple men

from the area. Specifically, the story of Kirk provides validity to this image of the sexual deviant

rural white trash woman. Kirk, again shown as being sexually promiscuous in multiple scenes,

has children from multiple fathers and at one point during the movie has her child taken by CPS

due to her drug addiction. These events, even though caused by her addiction, demonstrate the

broader white fear that these genetically deficient sexual deviant women of Appalachia will only

spread their tainted blood and then be incapable of caring for their children.

Not only does society view rural Appalachian mothers as unfit moral authorities, but also

many in pop culture blame them for continuing the cycle of the violent men that "we" fear

through their lack of parenting ability. Their typology includes their propensity to use corporal

punishment as their only device to deal with misbehaving children instead of traditional "middle-

class" child rearing skills (see Fish, Amerikaner, and Lucas 2006). This then plays into the fear

of the eugenics ideals that these individuals are not only breeding at a higher rate, but also are

breeding children they cannot care for, putting strain on society to care for children they believe

to be deficient.

Sadly, society has some legal precedent to support the belief that women in the

Appalachian region warrant sterilization due to their backwoods nature outside of the films.

Drawing off the State's victory in the Bell vs. Buck Supreme Court case of 1927, many in the

area still have a lasting belief of the usefulness of sterilization on rural heathen Appalachian women as a means to socially distance and abandon them in society. Carrie Buck, a young poor rural woman from Virginia, received a conviction for feeble-mindedness and promiscuity by the State. This decision resulted in her admittance to the Virginia State Colony for Epileptics and Feebleminded under the control of Dr. Albert Priddy (see Cohen 2016). Priddy, curious to see if a newly formed law granting the state power to sterilize "feebleminded" individuals would hold up to legal scrutiny, filed for the Board of Directors to sterilize Buck. The case slowly worked its way to the United States Supreme Court, where the court decided that the forced sterilization of the "unfit" for the protection and health of the state is constitutional under the protections of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution (Cohen 2016). Moreover, even though other eugenics cases have been found unconstitutional in other states, at the time the Virginia law acted as the model to circumvent such decisions (many in the Appalachian region) and to this day has never been officially reversed by the United States Supreme Court (Cohen 2016).

The findings of this case and the eugenics movement created a lasting belief of the moral and even possibly genetically corruptness of rural Appalachian women that still shines through in films today. Returning to the case of Mammie White, her actions and quotes during the described scene play directly into the continued creation of this real life genetically deficient feebleminded woman from rural Appalachia. Playing strongly into the fear of their backwoods nature as addicted, violent, women with criminal blood, Mammie, as she sits on the steps of her dilapidated rural home embodies similar images to Carrie Buck herself posing on porches for propaganda photos for the continued use of the control and thusly-societal deletion of the corrupted blood of the rural Appalachian female. Such images, quotes, and conversations continued in films perpetuate this imaginary and give further credence to the moral regulation

and control of all those living within the Appalachian region. These individuals, both male and female, are genetically corrupted by their tainted blood and must be contained within their "alternate America" to protect broader society from their corruption while also providing the same means of cultural distancing under the guise of "protection" to other whites in society as they did so many years ago with Ms. Buck.

Housing the Contagion: From Labor Camps to Prisons

As discussed above, this fear of tainted blood continues to lead to the production of similar criminal justice containment like practices as discussed by Wacquant (2001). Using similar methods as the earlier discussed peculiar institutions, the predominant society continues to "ghettoize" communities within the Appalachian area based on similar fears around their ability to socially control those housed within. Movies, again, continue to reinforce these processes. This process has, just as for minority populations, evolved over time and continues to adapt to ensure such social and cultural regulatory mechanisms of the population.

As already mentioned, historically the rural Appalachian population took part in some of the most severe economic and social control measures created during the beginnings of the United States. Much of this control began through serf labor during the early colonial periods of the United States but slowly adapted along with social policy changes (see Billings and Bees 2000). The creation of particular laws, such as vagrancy laws during the convict leasing period of the United States effected poor rural whites within the area and contracted them to work assignments (Isenberg 2016). Similarly, the use of company control by both agricultural and mining companies continued this social control while also perpetuating the label of tainted blood within the population (see quotes from *Matewan* above). These "work camps" disguised as coal camps controlled not only the economic means of survival for many of the white rural poor in

the Appalachian region, but also similarly, social controlled their bodies and morally regulated their existence by perpetuating the atavistic eugenics like belief of the people within.

Over time, with the help of film and other popular culture outlets, this containment and regulation has shifted to new economic and social policies. As discussed above, the creation of the War on Poverty initiative did little more than bring attention back to the perceived backwoods nature of the Appalachian populous and provide ample space for the stripping of Appalachian culture through the continued advancements of the peculiar institutions within the area. Similar instances continued with the War on Crime and the War on Drugs, all programs masked as societal support, which instead provided more destruction and control over rural Appalachia. These processes, again with the support of films, provided a face to the rural Appalachia deserving control. Similar to the discussion by Linnemann and Wall (2013) concerning the effect the campaigns on the War on Drugs had on individuals in the Midwest, the programming that followed these initiatives created a space for the idea of governing through "white trash" and in particular in this region "governing through Appalachian tainted blood". With the decline of some economic institutions, such as coal and agriculture, these control measures have become more blatant in creation and purpose.

Like many other rural areas across the country, Appalachian states are drawing on prisons to act as the economic savior for chronically economically depressed communities (see Yanarella and Blankenship 2006; Schept 2014). This, unlike other controlling institutions, now has a much clearer connection to the criminal justice system and creates a space where the institutions act as the physical control of the bodies of rural Appalachians through both an economic and punitive means. With the "race to incarcerate" (see Mauer 2006) still a belief for economic advancement, many communities are turning to these institutions. However, this again is providing a two-fold

means of control of these rural Appalachian communities. As demonstrated by continued research, these institutions do little to provide significant increases to the economy of these areas (Blankenship and Yanarella 2004) and actually have the propensity to hurt the local communities through the continued confinement of local individuals (Yanarella and Blankenship 2006). According to Yanarella and Blankenship (2006):

> With regards to its impact upon civic culture and social capital, most research suggests that on balance the sitting of prisons in a small town or rural locale tends to erode, not buttress, community spirit and social bonds…….while at least short-term economic boon, tends to heighten urban-rural antagonisms, mobilize fears over public safety, foster commercial and residential growth patterns that undercut the traditional town structure and indigenous enterprises of communities, and over the long run supplant traditional social and economic leaders indigenous to the area by non-native modernizing elites brought in by the prison (128).

As these institutions continue to grow in the area, the presence of prison walls creates a visual representation of the only way to control rural Appalachia and the population within. Films perpetuate this stereotype of the tainted blood character but also disembody the stereotypes from the reality of the area.

Rural areas historically represent a dumping ground for society. Broader society's continuation to dispose of many unwanted by products such as garbage and now in most recent time's people, clearly demonstrates this. The Appalachian region is possibly one of the "brightest" examples of this continued process. Kentucky, for example, represents one of the fastest growing carceral states in the country. From 1980 to 2010, Kentucky's number of incarcerated bodies grew an overwhelming 442% (Schept 2014). The state also continues to show one of the fastest rates of growth since the early 2000s. Showing a 45% growth compared to only a 13% growth at the national level (Schept 2014). This growth, as mentioned above, literally takes the place of previously controlling industries as a means of economic advancement

and replaces them with structures that provide a clear sense of moral and social control of the area's population.

For generations, the population of rural Appalachia has viewed their own economic and social control in the process of their day-to-day lives through their jobs and their representation within media sources. The idea of tainted blood shapes the area and the people so strongly that physical manifestations of control replaced earlier economic and social control measures. Films support the stereotype of the tainted blood imaginary, leading to a history of unacceptance, cultural distancing, social/economic abandonment, and criminalization. However, as these processes take the next step in controlling these populations, all residents need do is look out their window to view a prison sitting beneath a rusted coal tipple to understand that their perceived tainted blood will continue to be contained within their hills and hollers. All of which, as they know too well, will result in more box office hits and another generation lost with little support in their "alternate America."

CHAPTER IV

A DIFFERENT KIND OF LOVE IN THE MOUNTAINS

Introduction

It is a cold winter day in the hollers of Eastern Kentucky. Loretta (played by Sissy Spacek), a soon to be famous country singer, is attempting to make dinner for her newlywed husband Dew (played by Tommy Lee Jones). She is struggling to make a new life for herself and the ever-dissatisfied Dew. She is new to being a wife and in all truth is new to being an adult. Loretta chose to marry Dew, at the behest and beating of her father, at the age of 14. Now, she stands in a run-down coal camp house, with little heat, working over an old worn out stove in an attempt to make her husband happy (in her eyes) by cooking him a warm meal. However, Loretta, expectedly, fails. Dew, the stereotypical Kentucky hillbilly coal miner, grabs the plate, marches to the front porch of their dilapidated house, and tosses the contents into the front yard.

He belittles her for her inability to cook and begins to bring up all her failings, in general, as a wife. This is not the first, or last time Dew will act out violently and abuse Loretta. In multiple scenes, Dew hits and aggressively grabs her when he is displeased. This violence is not limited to physical altercations however. Following their wedding night earlier in the film, Dew, with his stereotypical overly aggressive sex drive forces the young Loretta to engage in intercourse with him. To many an act considered rape, but to Loretta an act of normalcy as part of her duties as a wife. Overall, the summation of Dew's abuse comes during an early scene, where he provides Loretta with a book about sex and how to please "her man". He states, "You need a little more time to learn how to cook, more time to learn how to clean house, and more time to learn how to love your man right" (Apted 1980). Again, a signal of how he believes

Loretta should act as a wife and the level of abuse, both physical and psychological; he will use to achieve what he wants.

These scenes make up a large portion of a biographic drama called *Coal Miner's Daughter*. The film, set throughout the early life of the main characters, follows Loretta Lynn's journey, as she became a world famous country singer. The film however, as discussed earlier, also demonstrates another piece to the typology of how broader society views rural Appalachian deviance and plays a major part of supporting cultural distancing, abandonment, and criminalization of the population. This film, along with others, demonstrates the common stereotype of intimate partner violence within the rural Appalachian community. Films such as this suggest that actions like Dew's are commonplace in these communities and are simply a part of the backwoods nature of the population of the Appalachian region.

Such depictions provide fuel for policy makers to pursue the continuance of further regulatory measures, while also ignoring the historical cultural effects that lead to such levels of abuse. This perpetuates the lack of alternative based policies within the region. The following, of importance, is not an attempt to argue that intimate partner violence does not occur within rural Appalachia at a significant rate or that society and criminal justice policy makers should not take such violence seriously. In reality, the following will show how much of the behavior demonstrated within the films fall in line with the scholarly literature discussing intimate partner violence. However, the purpose is to demonstrate the lack of scholarly work in both academia and mainstream media used to point out the severity of the issue in rural areas. This lack of work also plays a part in the continuing belief of the need to distance those within the region as a piece of the reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant imaginary.

The purpose of the following is to show another significant piece, as stated, in the ever-adapting typology of the Appalachian deviant within the public imaginary, one that provides further pretext for the continuation of exploitative policy decisions in place of more supportive community based options. As this piece of the typology reinforces the existing imaginary, with little attention paid by broader society to the literature and possible causes of such behavior, it again plays into the perpetuation of the image of what rural white trash Appalachia represents. This process carrying on the foundation of the tainted blood, then, merely provides a form of rationalization to the exploitation and social control of these individuals through escalating regulatory means instead of policy creation to alleviate the underlying issues. This process also becomes a piece of the continuing cultural separation of proper whites from their "tainted blood" minority as a means to garner further control within society. The normalization of such behaviors act as a moral tool to condemn those within the region despite similar behaviors perpetuated outside of this "contained" region. Specifically, the ability for broader society to view these individuals as a threat or a security issue towards each other, and outsiders, provides many opportunities for their governance through the idea of the moral regulation of the behavior while also providing a further distance for proper whites who in reality take part in similar activities.

Intimate Partner Violence: From Factory to the Creek

Research related to intimate partner violence is a major topic of concern within criminological literature (see Heimer and Lauristen 2008). However, as with many other areas of criminology, this research is still lacking, in understanding the impacts and ways of dealing with IPV in rural areas (see Lanier and Maume 2009; Grama 2000). Criminology, taking into account the "place based" differences of rural crime (see Weisheit, Falcone, and Wells 2006; Weisheit and Donnermeyer 2000), pays little attention to the reasoning behind and the effects of intimate

partner violence within rural areas (Grama 2000). Much of this literature focuses on rural

isolation and the structural issues relating to finding support services due to such isolation

(Lanier and Maume 2009). Research, however, rarely delves into the overall differences in the

causes of violence in rural areas nor does it focus on the overarching discourse within society

(perpetuated by films) and the effect such discourse plays into policy creations to combat IPV.

I Can't Read This Book

Public opinion, then, can be shaped by media representations and lasting

stereotypes/typologies due to this lack of research and general understanding in broader society.

Much of the stereotypes of the treatment of rural Appalachian women are based on their

supposed mental fatigue. As will be shown, the films show women as tools for breeding and their

only purpose in life is to stay within the narrow tract of their culturally defined gender roles.

Analysis will show that stepping outside of these roles is dangerous and often leads them to

experience punishment. However, what is the root for such a basis for control? As Chapter Three

demonstrates, women are also seen to have tainted blood and because of this evoke fear and the

need of social control through the moral regulation and breeding folk devil myth. This same

demonstration of women as backwards also plays into their casting as victims within rural

Appalachian films. Specifically, their representations in films present the audience with an image

of characters who are the stereotypical moron, in constant trouble for ruining situations, and thus

receiving abusive punishments from their husbands.

Bridey Mae (played by Nancy Mette), a female character in the film *Matewan*, embodies

this depiction of the simple-minded woman who because of her ignorance receives punishment.

Bridey, the widow of a deceased coalminer, endures manipulation throughout the film to provide

intelligence and to spread lies for one of the films villains. Bridey, in every scene of the film

represents the stereotype of the ignorant abused Appalachian woman. She often wears a dirty and tattered dress and struggles to carry on conversations with multiple men throughout the film. During the film, as she perpetually searches for a new husband to "take care of her", she is belittled and demonized through quotes such as "best looking mountain trash I've seen in a long while" (Sayles 1987). Bridey's ultimate manipulation comes when she is convinced by C. E. Lively (played by Bob Gunton) to tell the other miners that the main protagonist Joe Kenehan raped her. C.E.'s use of her ignorance as an attempt to get Joe killed demonstrates one of the root depictions of why rural Appalachian women receive abuse. Their ignorance and backwoods nature pushes them to make mistakes. This overly patriarchal view of women leads to their abuse throughout many of the films.

Matewan is not the only film to demonstrate such depictions of rural Appalachian women. Again, Lorretta from *Coal Miners Daughter* represents this stereotype. Dew, in multiple scenes, calls out Loretta for her lack of intelligence and backwoods nature. One scene early in the film, demonstrates this concept as Dew arrives in Butcher Holler following his military tour. Trying to impress everyone, he arrives driving a new Jeep 4X4. When Lorretta first sees the vehicle, she states, "That aint no car….looks like something from mars" (Apted 1980). Dew of course then ridicules her for not understanding what the modern vehicle is. However, scenes depicting her lack of intelligence as "support" for her abuse continue throughout the film. As mentioned above, when Dew buys her the book on "how to please her man", she is chastised by an already upset Dew after she states that "I can't read this book…..it's got all them big damn gone words" (Apted 1980).

Similar treatment continues later in the film when Lorretta makes her first appearance at the Grand Ole Opry. As she stands, obviously frightened by the size of the crowd and the weight

of the situation, she seeks solace in Dew. Following both of their stereotypes, as Loretta asks for support in her normally depicted childish manner, Dew responds with his status quo abusive tone; "If there's one thing I can't stand Loretta…it's a nervous damn woman" (Apted 1980). Here again this film, like others, separates and in some ways excuses the abuse women in these areas receive as a result of their ignorance. Their continued treatment as illiterate children, in some ways, may encourage a level of "victim blaming". Depictions of events such as these in films make it much easier for the viewing audience to accept the connections between female roles within the culture and their subsequent abuse. Such a connection also allows the deflection of the abuse that takes part within the proper white caste. By creating the base of the ignorant woman in Appalachia, society creates a separate scapegoat in addition to the male abuser represented in the films. This process provides not only the cultural distancing for the purpose of criminalizing the population but also provides some form of psychological support for overlooking the abuses that take places in other environments onto this region.

This version of the ignorant backwoods rural Appalachian woman provides the groundwork for further depictions of cultural ideals within the region that lead to abuse. The demonstration of women as helpless is a central piece to the creation of the idea that they must stay within their gender roles to receive protection from men. It also demonstrates that their decision to step outside of said roles or to be responsible for inconveniencing male characters will lead to further abuse.

To the audience, these depictions provide a level of layering to the reasoning and the cultural identities of abuse in the region. Like the tainted blood stereotype, this layer acts as a subtle support for idea that these individuals are lesser than the rest of the white population. This also lays the foundation for an extension of moral regulation (Hunt 1999) because not only are

the men seen as irreprehensible for their abuse as a means of proper white deflection of abuse outside of the region, the women still represent an issue to broader society based on their ignorance that leads to such abuse. This subtle, however versatile, form of victim blaming facilitates the cultural distancing of proper whites from this lower caste of abusers and victim.

What the Hell are You Good for Anyway?

Depictions of women as ignorant perpetuate the idea that women are merely possessions and should not exist outside of their gender roles within rural Appalachian culture. *Norma Rae*, shows specific examples of how society and films demonstrate the treatment of women within rural Appalachia when they attempt to step outside of these boundaries. Norma (played by Sally Field), is a young woman fighting to unionize a textile mill in a small town in North Carolina. Her actions and the actions of others towards her demonstrate the common ideas of a woman's place within rural Appalachia. Specifically, she deals with a work environment mired by sexism alongside physical and psychological abuse from her two love interests.

Norma Rae, near the beginning of the film, is taking part in a sexual relationship with a traveling businessperson. A specific scene in a shady rundown hotel demonstrates the common belief of the moral and sexual inferiority of white trash women in rural Appalachia. The same scene also provides another example of how men see and treat these women based on such a label. Following their sexual encounter, Norma questions the man about their relationship, which visibly irritates him. He states, "You're here to make me feel good" and later after her rebuttal, "What the hell are you good for anyway" (Ritt 1979). Then, again after her display of displeasure, he smacks her across the face, drawing blood. This scene ends with her newfound friend Reuben, the union organizer played by Ron Leibman, coming to her rescue with a bag of ice and a warm place for her to calm down. His appearance, another common trait in the films,

demonstrates the idea that women in this area need men to protect them and are incapable of handling certain situations themselves, an issue warranting further analysis.

The combination of this scene with this sentiment that women need men to control their lives produces and continues the idea that the only purpose for women in rural Appalachia is to take care of the home and children. This sentiment is strengthened further later in the film when Norma's fiancé Sonny (played by Beau Bridges) gets angry with her for not fulfilling her duties as a mother and partner (see scene at 1:10:00 in the film). His anger that she is focusing on something outside of her normal gender roles finds further support in the idea that male union members do not want Norma to play a part in the union mission. To them, she is stepping too far outside of her traditional gender role and due to this is hurting the union's reputation. Her attempts to be something more than her stereotype has labeled her as a "loose white trash woman" (Ritt 1979) and it makes it difficult for her to accomplish her goals of supporting the unionization of her mill all through the film.

This arc following the treatment of women as lesser and as promiscuous if they step out of traditional gender roles is evident throughout most films set in rural Appalachia. It is also clear in the films that the same standards for actions are not held for men within the area and it is almost viewed as a positive (a subjective point of view of the character) that women are to be treated as objects. In a scene in the movie *A Single Shot,* the protagonist John Moon (played by Sam Rockwell) is searching for his separated wife and their child. He comes upon Obadiah (played by Joe Anderson) in his wife's house with another woman. Obadiah and the woman are supposed to be there to baby sit John's child but instead are having sex while watching pornography in the living room. John, angered, confronts Obadiah about his actions. Obadiah argues that he cannot control himself and states, "My dick's a Bassett hound. I'm just the poor

son of a bitch holding its chain" (Rosenthal 2013). This statements shows the perception that men, because of their gender roles and overall belief of masculinity in rural spaces (see DeKeseredy, Donnermeyer, Schwartz, Tunnell, and Hall 2007), are allowed to act in such a manner that women are not.

The film *Molly Maguires* draws this stereotype out even further. This film, a drama based in a Pennsylvania coal town in the late 1800s, tells the story of a group of miners who fight for their rights through sabotaging the mine of their employer's company. This film, with actors such as Sean Connery, shows multiple stereotypes of the placement of women in rural Appalachian culture. However, one particular scene, however quick, drives the point home very clearly. During a scene late in the film, the conspirators are sitting in one of the run down coalhouses discussing their next move in dealing with the company mine. The wife of Frazier (played by Art Lund) is in and out of the conversation. It is clear that the men somewhat accept her presence but do not necessarily want her to be a part of this discussion "for men". Abruptly during the scene, Frazier's child begins to cry, providing a chance for him to push his wife from the room. He screams at her and forces her (violently) to care for the child, which in his eyes are her duties and not the duties of the issues warranting discussion. This scene is simple and quick but it strongly portrays the wives of rural men, as simply there to serve, strengthening the stereotype that rural Appalachian women are merely objects meant for the purpose of pleasuring men, taking care of the home, and having already established tainted blood children.

These examples, however, are not consigned to fictional films. Certain scenes in documentaries demonstrate similar discourse and imagery surrounding the ideas of the violence perpetrated against and the believed roles of women in rural Appalachia. While multiple scenes exist, one scene in the film *Dancing Outlaw*, stands out the most. *Dancing Outlaw* is a

documentary originally meant to follow the recent fame of Jesco White. Jesco, a native of rural West Virginia, had recently gained fame for his tap dancing ability at the time of filming. However, the documentary, moving from its original purpose, demonstrated some of the major plights facing rural Appalachians. It also introduces to the world to the unbelievable caricature that is Jesco.

The scene in question takes part halfway through the film during an interview with Jesco as he sits outside his rundown trailer by a murky creek at the edge of his property. The interviewer is asking about his home life and discussing his relationship with his wife. Jesco, unprovoked, tells a story about putting a kitchen knife to his wife's throat because of her inability to cook his eggs properly. Jesco states that after putting the knife to his wife's throat he stated, ""I'm tired of eating them sloppy slimy eggs" (Young 1991). This statement and the imagery of Jesco himself, represents to the audience what rural Appalachian life is and how individuals, specifically women, live their daily life within in it. The imagery of the rundown and depressed landscape behind him does nothing but provide subtle support that this is "real" and creates a lasting image of the way of life within these areas. Without any real understanding of the social or historical context of Jesco's life, he becomes the model of the caricature (see Reinarman 1994) tainted blood rural Appalachian deviant from the previous chapter. This of course then provides further support for the moral imperative to distance these individuals as the only means to fight the commonality of such actions within a population.

This "realistic" picture of life in these areas also provides another tool for the separation and "otherization" of the Appalachian population from proper white society. Using imagery and examples such Jesco, Frazier, Dew, and Obadiah provides credence to the argument of the 'natural' difference between these "trash" minorities and those situated in power above. Such

representations allow for regulatory policies because they again create cultural distance to provide more insurance for those viewed as proper white. This separation provides them again with another means to gain ontological security during periods of social and economic instability while additionally fueling conservative means of demonstrating the perverse unnatural nature of those within the region (see Young 2007).

The Fruit is Ripe and the Pickers are Here

The scenes above demonstrate the never-ending level of control that the stereotypical rural Appalachian male forces on women of the area. The demonstration of such control falls in line with much of the scholarly literature revolving around intimate partner violence. Feminist theorists argue that much of the issues resulting in IPV relate to overall macro-level gender inequalities and particular patriarchal attitudes present within society (Giordano, Copp, Longmore, and Manning 2016). Specifically, violence against women in these situations provides an avenue for men, and thusly society, to maintain continuous control over female partners (see Jackson 1999; Boonzaier 2008). To this extent, men, as their place in society, receive socialization that demands them to maintain their dominance within broader society. As a point, a level of socialization that is arguably, equally, if not more present within rural areas. To accomplish this control, men turn to violence and other regulatory behaviors to establish and control their position of dominance within the relationship (as described in the scenes above) (see Giordano, Johnson, Manning, Longmore, and Minter 2015). These actions, of course, stem from learned behaviors. Films based in Appalachia, to some extent, make a point to demonstrate that this type of behavior is generational and in some twisted since of irony push for the idea that such behaviors represent a "passed down" tradition.

Multiple examples of the belief of this learned behavior exist within the films. Whether it be Loretta's siblings seeing her being whipped by her father (and more than likely being beat themselves) for wanting to marry Dew or the behaviors that John Moon's child will learn from growing up in an environment stricken by continuous abusive individuals. However, some scenes demonstrate that the behavior is more subtle then the witnessing of physical altercations. In the film *Shenandoah*, Charlie (played by James Stewart) represents the stereotypical southern hardheaded worker of the late 1800's. Charlie, as the main character of the film, is attempting to find ways to keep his family out of joining either side during the Civil War. This initial calm minded persona represents him as possibly a higher moral authority to the audience through both his actions and discourse. In contrast, Charlie, a man barely outside of the realm of the working class poor white trash, represents something akin to an honest worker with "traditional southern tendencies". This gives his actions more weight to the audience, as his representation in the film is something closer to proper white. However, as the film continues, his actions become more purposeful and the subtle reminders of his possible tainted blood as a rural male (as discussed in the previous chapter) become more prevalent; he is never able to escape his actions as perpetuating the cycle of control of rural Appalachian women to his sons.

In multiple scenes, Charlie discusses with his sons how his oldest daughter is different. One such conversation with his son affectionately named Boy (played by Philip Alford) is of important note. Charlie explains to Boy that, "Your sister is ripe and the pickers are here" (McLaglen 1965). Charlie is explaining to Boy that his sister is now at the age to be married and to begin having children. However subtle, this conversations reiterates the idea that the women in rural Appalachia represent nothing more than objects for reproduction and control once they hit a certain age for the "pickers" to come calling. Charlie also, as a stereotypical Appalachian male,

does not waste an opportunity to explain to other "learning" males that women have little control of their emotions and thus need a man. Later in the film, while talking with his new son-in-law Sam, Charlie explains that women like his daughter do not understand their emotions and will get upset without reason. He explains this by saying that "She doesn't know why she is crying" (McLaglen 1965). Again, this discourse represents a subtle use of language to show that women need men in their lives not only for physical support/control but also for emotional stability, as they are not able to control their own emotions.

These examples, while subtle, demonstrate how the need for control over women represents a common passed down trait within rural Appalachian cultures. In addition, such examples of discourse carry great weight to the audience due to Charlie's status of being on the cusp of moving out of the stereotype of traditional rural white trash. This creates a sense that these behaviors and teachings take part at all levels below the status of proper whites within the Appalachian region. This fact, while some could argue draw the cultural divide closer, actually allows further separation from the proper whites as they are allowed to continue to single themselves out in society as the only true morally superior and all those who fall beneath their "status" should be controlled as they, regardless of effort, are still seen as unnatural and perverse.

However, such examples of this generational abuse do not stop after the viewing of fictional films. The movie *Oxyana* also purposively demonstrates the fear of generational violence towards women through the discussion with a young pregnant wife of one of the drug users. Throughout the documentary the young women discusses the fact that her drug-addicted husband can be mean and tends to have a temper (both physically and verbally) towards her when he is dealing with his withdraws. She openly admits that she is concerned with how he will treat their child and herself in the future. These statements also have ramifications for what the

child will see and learn as it grows, creating a situation where said tendencies will again be "passed down". Her words carry considerable weight to the audience (as they should) due to her status as a vulnerable, pregnant young woman.

However, her appearance is not the only factor that suggests such behaviors are commonplace in these areas. The areas in which she is interviewed paint the image of what these individuals, actions, and places represent to broader society. Her interviews, whether it be on the top of a rocky hill with her husband and friends drinking beer while four wheelers zoom around in the background or in the bedroom of her rundown trailer with "debris" strung out about the floor, construct the complete image of those contained within Appalachia, the area itself, and their deviant actions. Altogether, her words, along with the images and dialogue described earlier, play into the image or believed representation of what the contained rural Appalachian population represent, namely the "rural Appalachian deviant imaginary" (see Linnemann 2016). These images also support the drawing of further divisive lines between these individuals and proper whites. The striking contrast of the locations provide evidence of the backwoods nature and thus trash like behavior of those within the films that separate them from normal IPV. Despite the fact that IPV still is and always has been an issue in proper white urban environments (Edwards 2014), these rural landscapes fuse gendered violence and the area together for the viewer. Essentially, the images wash out the logical assumption that these behaviors occur outside of rural Appalachia, and instead tie the idea of IPV to the imaginary similar to other cultural identity markers of the region such as hunting and fishing.

These images and overall discourse, again feed right into the scholarly literature surrounding intimate partner violence. Much of the literature agrees, that early exposure to violence within the family, such as witnessing violence between parents and being abused as a

child, result in major risk factors for perpetuating such violence later in life (see Gomez 2011;

Cochran, Sellers, Wiesbrock, and Palacios 2011; Simons and Barr 2012; Cui, Ueno, Gordon, and

Finchman 2013). Such exposure to violence does not only translate into the perpetration of such

violence but also in the likelihood of becoming a target of such violence, which is also

demonstrated in the films. Victims of IPV have a higher rate of originating from a family of

violence that lead to experiencing high levels of either direct or vicarious aggression/violence

(see Walker 1984; Heyman and Slep 2002; Cochran et al. 2011). Specifically, the literature

discusses the role of anger in such incidents and how exposure to such violent events as a child

can lead to issues with expressions of anger later in life (see Wolf and Foshee 2003).

Falling in line with such sentiments then, the scenes above demonstrate both the process

of becoming a victim and a victimizer. By demonstrating both the advert and subtle

demonstrations of such behaviors and the generational effects, films set in rural Appalachia

continue to construct the Appalachian deviant represents. Again, however, this reproduction of

the imaginary comes without any real understanding behind the prevalence and causes of such

violence within the region or rural areas in general. This allows for the continued creation of

punitive social control policies based on the ideals of moral superiority of both broader society

and those considered proper white. This superiority, in effect, draws attention away from the

same behaviors perpetuated by proper whites by facilitating their cultural distancing and

sidestepping any real consideration of the effects such policies have on preventing violence or

the overall health of the people within the region.

Rural IPV and the Cost of Punitiveness

Once again, it is important to state that intimate partner violence is a major issue in both

rural areas and rural Appalachia alike. However, film depictions of such violence only justify the

status quo punitive measures in place. Instead, the films show the moral inferiority of

Appalachians and need for strict social regulatory measures. The films, whether purposively or

not, provide little context for the causes of intimate partner violence in this region and provide

even less support for pursuing programs of a more rehabilitative nature (to be discussed later).

Before discussing such alternative measures, it is important to situate the reality of the

prevalence of intimate partner violence within these rural areas.

The level of impact intimate partner violence continues to have on this country is

staggering. Cooper and Smith (2011) state that despite the fact that the overall homicide rate in

the U.S. has declined, the rate of intimate partner homicide has actually increased by 5% for

women between 1980 and 2008 making it one of the major risks to safety faced by women in this

country (see Fox and Zawitz 2007). However, little evidence, comparatively, exists on how these

trends vary between place (see Dugan, Nagin, and Rosenfeld 2003). Specifically, few scholars

tend to focus their attentions on the difference rural areas demonstrate concerning the prevalence

of violence compared to urban areas. Gallup-Black (2005) however, found that counties defined

as rural demonstrated higher rates of both family and intimate partner violence when compared

to metropolitan areas.

Research demonstrates that women filing protective orders in rural areas experienced

higher levels of both severity and frequency of abuse compared to urban women. Specifically,

50% of rural women reported severe violence prior to their seeking a protection order and 100%

reported that the said incident was not the initial occurrence of violence perpetrated against them

by their partner (see Logan, Walker, Cole, Ratliff, and Leukefeld 2003). Of importance,

however, is the fact that women in rural areas report higher rates of violent acts such as hair

pulling and torture by their abuser (see Websdale and Johnson 1998) and a higher likelihood that

a weapon became involved during the incident (see Logan et al. 2003; Websdale and Johnson 1998). Websdale and Johnson (1998) specifically point to data from interviews with women in rural areas that demonstrates a higher likelihood that the abuser will fire a weapon at their victim compared to urban areas.

This, of course, is of important note because firearms are the weapon most likely used during an intimate partner homicide (see Zeoli, Malinski, and Turchan 2016). It is also important due to the prevalence of gun owner ship and dominance of gun culture in rural, especially Appalachian, areas (see Bellesiles 1996). The Pew Research Center (2014) found that individuals living in rural communities were twice as likely to report gun ownership when compared to urban respondents. Overall, recent research on this topic supports the idea that violence against women in rural areas surpasses that of urban areas (see Rennison, DeKeseredy, and Dragiewicz 2012; 2013) and that policy makers need to focus more creative attention to these areas to help alleviate these area-specific issues.

The rural isolation and culture of these rural communities also plays a large part in the prevalence of intimate partner violence. The overall geographic isolation and lack of available resources due to said isolation plays a major factor in a victim's ability to find proper services to help deal with intimate partner violence (Websdale 2002). As demonstrated in some of the films above, some rural Appalachians, like many rural inhabitants in general, live in isolated and impoverished small communities where social structural support resources are lacking. Secondly, the isolation of rural communities results in socio-cultural isolation (Websdale 2002). This socio-cultural isolation promotes social efficacy within an area concerning the presence of crime in general while also masking certain IPV related issues in the region. Specifically, DeKeseredy and Joseph (2006) argue, that while rural isolation supports collective efficacy that

diminishes crime in the general sense, it also may contribute to an increased level of intimate partner violence perpetrated against women. Websdale (2002) argues that this cultural isolation creates a sense of rural life and gender roles based on traditional patriarchy that leads to specific vulnerabilities allowing high levels of intimate partner violence. This cultural isolation also plays into a fear of seeking support by rural Appalachian victims.

Specifically, Appalachian ideology supports the concept of keeping personal issues private, which results in the unlikelihood of victims seeking particular public resources (see Billings and Bee 2000). Women in Appalachia, especially, believe in the concept of self-reliance, which further reduces their likelihood of seeking support (Webb 2004). Many women in these rural areas believe seeking support would be an embarrassment to themselves and family, leading to community stigmatization (see Logan et al. 2003). This again plays into the overall traditional conservative values seen in Appalachia (see Bush and Lash 2006). Similarly, these patriarchal values allow for the belief that women will receive little, if any, protection from men as a part of the gendered belief of the common good within rural areas (see DeKeseredy and Schwartz 2008).

Overall, the comparatively small amount of research on this topic in rural areas highlights the magnitude of the issue. However, as of important note, it bares stating that mixed findings of this research exist (see Edwards 2014), playing directly into the construction of the deviant. Mixed findings provide power to proper whites in placing the blame on 'rural inferiors' while allowing the sidestepping of inward attention as a means to maintain power. This rarely discussed research also supports the overarching typology of the abuser within rural Appalachia reproduced within the films. Due to this combination, little is done on the policy side to support the combating of such behaviors other than status quo punitive measures that show little sign of

alleviating the issue (as demonstrated above). This lack of concern for the social forces that place these individuals in such isolation and vulnerability goes unnoticed and instead another example of the imagined deviant Appalachian is adapted, produced, consumed, and used as fuel to support further punitive polices.

Turn off the Film and Turn on Real Life

As the above has shown, intimate partner violence within the United States is still a pervasive issue. This issue is prevalent in all walks of life, including Appalachia. Films, telling certain stories, demonstrate these issues as part of the reproduction of the Appalachian deviant imaginary. It is true that intimate partner violence is a major issue within rural Appalachia and, films, to some degree, play a part in bringing these issues to popular culture. However, while such cultural reproductions have the possibility of being useful, with regards to intimate partner violence in rural Appalachian populations, these reproductions do little more than reinforce the popular imaginary of pathological rural Appalachian culture, people, and violence. Simply put, without real context and understanding behind the relationships and hardships that these individuals face, films simply provide fertile footing for the continued use of regulatory social control measures as means of continuing the status quo of moral regulation over the region.

The continued use of such control measures does nothing to support the needs of the victims of crime within the region and within the country as a whole. Due to this, scholars continue to discuss the need for alternative methods of dealing with such crimes in informal forms that institute true justice for offenders, victims, and the overall community in which they reside (see Chesney-Lind 2002; Belknap 2007; Van Wormer and Roberts 2009). Intimate partner violence, specifically, represents an area of criminal justice that has promise for the use of alternative measures such as restorative justice. Women who have experienced IPV state that the

traditional criminal justice measures continue to fail them (see Erez and Belknap 1998; Grauwiler and Mills 2004). Victim satisfaction surveys following the conviction of an offender show that few victims believe that the outcome of the status quo punitive process results in the meeting of their needs (see Van Wormer and Bartollas 2007). Research also demonstrates that status quo court processes such as plea bargaining in these cases also fall short of meeting the community's needs (see Van Ness and Strong 2002). Due to this, IPV victims continue to face many hardships when dealing with the traditional criminal justice system.

These hardships involve low prosecution and conviction rates while also heightening the possibility of re-victimization during and after the proceedings (see Hudson 2002). Scholars hold the opinion that many of these cases also fail due to a lack of evidence because most incidents take place in private, leading to a lack of witnesses. In cases where evidence is present, such as sexual assault or rape, the level of burden is very high and can lead to situations were victims experience repeat victimization through reliving the experiences through intense interviews (Hudson 2002). These cases also seemingly fail due to the public style of bringing these issues forward and the consequences they may have on the victim if the abuser is not confined (Hudson 2002). Even after the rare conviction and confinement of the abuser, many victims fear the financial and emotional consequences such punitive measures might have on their family.

The issues stemming from the traditional criminal justice means of handling IPV have little hope of being resolved due to laws that force individuals into taking part in these failing procedures. Many states, following the Duluth Model, continue to use mandatory arrests, jail terms, and policies where accusers are unable to drop lawsuits after filing them, forcing victims to take part in the standard criminal justice policies of punitive resources. Seen as a progressive ideas during the 1990s (see Presser and Gaarder 2004), these laws now force victims into taking

part in official procedures that may lead to re-victimization. As a result, only one fourth of physical assaults end with a report to the authorities (see Tjaden and Thoennes 2000) and as an unexpected result, victims themselves may face arrest as a part of the dual arrest policies derived from this model (Chesney-Lind 2002). Overall, these policies strip power and support from women when dealing with these cases (see Belknap 2007) and because of this stand in clear contention to the feminist standpoint of self-determination for women (Bui 2007).

The failure of standard punitive social control measures to IPV reveals the need for approaches that places resolution at the forefront for all parties included (see Van Wormer 2004). Scholars from various fields continue to support the argument for such policy shifts (Van Wormer 2004). Many argue for the push of restorative justice models that provide better support for the victims of such abuse while also supporting the community in which the victim and abuser live. Restorative justice, then, in this usage, represents a separation from the standard punitive policies seen within the criminal justice system to a more victim-centered approach that provides specific attention to female needs.

Multiple models for restorative measures exist that represent useful tools for dealing with IPV issues within rural Appalachia that receive very little attention due to the existing punitive policies. Two specific models demonstrate particular possibilities within this population. First, the restorative conference model would be of use as it identifies participants as victims and offenders rather than simply shifting some of the blame from the abuser by using terms such as disputant (Press and Gaarder 2004). Secondly, the family group conferencing model provides additional support to a victimized mother by bringing together extended family members to support childcare responsibilities while the IPV issues work towards resolution (Burford and Hudson 2000). This technique shows promise in small close-knit communities of Color in which

a strong extend family presence is common, similar to many of the rural Appalachian communities seen in both the films and in reality. Specifically, this method centers on the needs of female victims and provides options for family and community supports instead of official state involvements (Burford and Hudson 2000).

Of course, restorative justice measures come with their own set of important critiques (see Hudson 2002 for an extensive review). However, the point of this discussion is that such measures will never be possible within the rural Appalachian community due to the perceived necessity for distancing regulation and social control measures. As discussed in the previous chapter, individuals within this area, due to many historical happenings, continue to be seen as possessing tainted blood. Due to this and the examples given above of varying demonstrations of IPV situations in popular films, the Appalachian imaginary will never allow such progressive measures to be attempted. Instead, films and the imaginary they produce provide further support for punitive measures to control this population.

These policies, in turn, play into the ideas of "governing through white trash" or in this case "governing through rural Appalachian deviance". As long as proper white society can continue to find means of separating rural Appalachian whites from the broader society, they will do so. This separation as a means of otherizing becomes easier when a moral issue such as IPV becomes a piece of the imaginary. By feeding into the tainted blood construction and demonstrating how rural Appalachians know nothing more than such abuse, proper whites create a scapegoat to shield themselves from the reality of their own position in society. They do this by constructing a "devil" to demonize in order to expand this cultural separation through the societal imaginary.

The typology of the abusive male and abused wife in rural Appalachia is now a common trope within popular society. Many conversations with colleagues, friends, and even family members of individuals from this area provide anecdotal evidence of this sad fact. Tied in with the similar trope of the "did you date your sister or cousin as kid", this trope produces a sour note for many within the area. The engraining of the Appalachian deviant is so deeply rooted in the American dialogue that having a conversation of any substance with the public is difficult at best. Jesco represents the actions of men in the area and Loretta and Norma provide a clear image of the women. Both groups, taught by the elder statesmen Charlie, know their place in society. The imagined rural Appalachian deviant is seen everywhere in the community when a "proper white" visits the area. The screams of a domestic dispute seem as much of a part of the landscape as do the shrieks of the backwoods monster (see previous chapter). Women, already seen as lesser in this area, face a double edge sword of when they experience IPV. Society will continue to view them and their abusers as deviant, not allowing for anything beyond mandatory policies that simply lead to further victimization. In the name of containing the Appalachian deviant within the "alternate America", thousands of victims will not receive the opportunity to take part in a system outside of the already established social control that does nothing but punish. As so famously noted, "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (see Lorde 1984: 11). In this vein then, the State uses the typology of the abuse within the rural Appalachian population to maintain control and cultural separation for proper white populations. Caricatures of such violence allow for the expansion of the carceral apparatus into rural spaces. As discussed in the previous chapters, the state must continue the control of both the body and economy of the rural Appalachian area. Abuse, as a part of the imaginary, provides justification such control.

As mentioned above, the conviction of an abuser is not always the best support for the victim (Hudson 2002; Belknap 2007). It leaves victims, families, and even the communities of the family in a disadvantageous position. Yes, the state separates the abuser from the victim. However, in many of these instances, this separation results in the loss of necessary resources needed by the victim and their family members to survive. As previously mentioned, the rural Appalachian area is one in dire economic need (Billings and Blee 2000; Lichter and Campbell 2005). Recent shifts in the organization of welfare, transformed the war on poverty, long seen as a support program in the area, into a war on the poor, many of whom relied on public assistance programs (Thorne, Tickamyer, and Thorne 2004). The areas most affected by these transformations are the areas facing rural isolation, destructive politics, and uneven development (Billings and Blee 2000).

These areas are also those most likely shown in films, such as Loretta's home in Butcher Hollower Kentucky. These economic facts play a special role to the discussion of the incarceration of abusers following instances of IPV within the region. Married families in Appalachia show higher levels of poverty when compared to families outside the region. The differences in poverty become more apparent when one considers children (Lichter and Campbell 2005). Of greatest importance, however, is the fact that families headed by single females face up to six times higher rates of poverty when compared to dual headed households. Now, these rates, as well as the national rates, show a greater disparity towards communities of Color. However, white females in the region still face higher levels of poverty than the national average, with the average income of any individual in Appalachia only consisting of 74% of the national average (Appalachian Regional Commission 2010). Subsequently, then, when reviewing the process of taking the abuser completely out of the picture, the victim and family members,

receive subsequent punishments that do nothing more than support the generational hardships that continued regulatory social control measures produced in these areas. Altogether, to reiterate, this continued lack of family oriented social supports provide further space for continued abuse and merely support the generational "logic" of choosing to stay within the relationship due to financial need.

Again, this argument is not in support of IPV or in any way in favor of the abuser in such instances. It is however, an attempt to broaden our discussion on how punitive policies within the area in the context of minimal support systems affect victims of abuse and how films demonstrating the theme of IPV in the region provide cultural rationale to the already established imaginary of the rural Appalachian deviant. How does one provide widespread dispelling of long held beliefs about a particular population? This is a question for future research. However, this present research suggests scholars should focus on how to combat continued regulatory policies fed by such representations of the region. The imagined rural Appalachian deviant plays directly into the overall belief for continued regulatory control measures within society as a whole. Every scene described, reproduces the deviant and act as a nail for the 'master's' tools to hammer into submission. They provide incentives for more bodies to be controlled and further economic plight to be positioned within the region, and feed into the further isolation of the region as an "alternate America", while proper white society gains further cultural distance in the seemingly never ending race for stability during late modernity (Young 2007).

Understanding what cultural isolation does to a community is at the forefront of this research. Specifically, how films further such isolation and support regulatory policies for IPV victims and abusers is paramount. Understanding how IPV continues to be used as a marker of moral regulation for the rural Appalachian community is extremely important in combating the

seemingly never-ending pursuit of cultural distancing by proper white society. By creating the

gullible but dangerous victim along with the violent abuser, proper white society can view these

individuals as a greater risk (Lupton 1999) and further support their need to govern this

population through the fear of their deviance (Simon 2007). The construction of the morally

reprehensible villain deserving of fear also creates a scapegoat for the abuse that happens in

other higher castes of white society.

CHAPTER V

NOTHING BUT DRUGS IN THESE HILLS

Introduction

Standing in front of the camera, in a drug-induced haze, the nameless drug addict in *Oxyana* holds a shirt emblazoned with a large Insane Clown Posse logo. Insane Clown Posse, a band that in some regards represents the music of some 'white trash' communities, represents an obvious prized possession to the man. This shirt, however, is not a souvenir from a concert. It instead is a totem or an artifact of the interviewees lost loved one. Another lost soul who fell victim to addiction to OxyContin. "I put this on his coffin. It was his pride and joy. Still smells like him. It sucks man, when it's all you have left of your family" (Dunne 2013). Immediately after this comment, in a sudden, less than 2 second glance to the camera, the audience becomes aware of drug addiction and death. The interviewee's face, still blank with little emotion, glances at the camera holding the favorite shirt of a loved one. Not unlike Jesco White before him, he becomes the drug addled and dangerous white trash rural Appalachian living in the hills of West Virginia. His glance, through the subjective lens of a documentarian, solidifies the idea of the rural Appalachian deviant, and shows the cost of the distancing and abandonment brought on by regulatory control measures within the area.

His glance is not the only tool the documentary uses to draw the public's attention to the connection between this man, his addiction, the death of his family, and rural Appalachia. The following two minutes and twenty seconds of film tries to connect the dots of the depressing nature of one small community in the middle of Appalachia. A town, through its hardships, clearly and undoubtedly represents the moral failings of those within the region. Whether it be the shot of the mountains depressed by thick fog or the shot of the country road surrounded by

dark green trees with a single tractor trailer steaming towards the camera, this town becomes living moving shots of Appalachian moral failings. The landscape alone accomplishes such a cultural production, but with a keen eye and a seemingly sense of understanding behind society's view of this imaginary, the director slowly brings the presence of human life into these shots. The image of a rundown trailer nestled deep within a grouping of large trees. A small town sign with vehicles driving by. A dystopian shot of a coal site with trucks sitting out front and finally a shot of a man dancing with nervous anxiety while speaking on a payphone (bringing forth the thought of his need and search for drugs) pull the entire image back together. The interviewee, the landscape, and the seemingly always slightly out of focus spectral like figures of the small town become the living rural Appalachian imaginary.

Whether purposively or not the director also places a small image of the search for hope from those within the community in the middle of this collage of images. As the camera pans down a road, from the inside of a car, the audience witnesses a small group of people standing on a creek bed. These individuals are not there to fish or camp. Instead, they continue to seek support through their baptisms within the toxic waters of the creek. These individuals subtly, but surely, represent the message of the film, the need for help. They also, it seems, represent the type of help that is out there. However, help will not come to those within the community. Not from the state. The history of society's view of them as morally inferior, backwoods, and usable continues to teach them this. They seek forgiveness for the "epidemic" facing their home, not the abandonment of their past and present.

It would be easy to carry on with image after image and essential dialogue within this film, as well as others, that connect drug use to rural Appalachia. However, it is important to note that the following is not a tribute to the filmmakers, no matter how laudable, for their

willingness to take on such a topic. These films, like others reviewed in previous chapters, regardless of their purpose, provide continued support for distancing measures against these individuals. The following will discuss the prevalence behind the drug "epidemic" within Appalachia while also demonstrating how films continue to pursue such a narrative.

It will also discuss how such beliefs in the epidemic continue to perpetuate policies that do nothing more than strip these communities of their resources and damage generations of rural Appalachians due to the need of proper whites to distance and contain this population. The overarching fear generated from these depictions play directly into further marginalization of this unworthy white class. A new piece of the typology appears. Now morally reprehensible due to their drug use, these films support the continued pursuit of security and crime rhetoric while continuing the production of cultural distancing for proper white populations from this otherwise subservient caste. Finally, this chapter will conclude with a discussion of programs and initiatives championed by local Appalachians outside the traditional hold of the state. These programs, as will be shown, represent the hope of the people on the creek and like those individuals, show the resilience of this population as it continues to face unfair labeling and mounting pressure to deal with drugs within their homes.

PSA: Let's Talk about Drugs

Sitting in a chair with rows of hospital examining beds behind him, a local dentist from the small town of Oceana explains, from a proper white perspective, the overwhelming issues of drug use within the area.

Oceana is just an extremely complex contradiction. It is this is incredibly beautiful place, with a huge population of amazing people with big hearts and so much love to go around. There's this darkness that has come over it that has effected all of those things. I mean, I think in a way it's even affected the natural beauty of this place, because, as a person that lives here, I almost can't look at it the same. Um…because of… and people don't trust each other like they used to, because

there's now…there's more crime and there's more…you're getting this much more "us against them" mentality, and it's incredible and amazing and awful all at the same time (Dunne 2013).

No other quote better captures the imaginary present within rural Appalachia. The dentist touches on the once strong and vibrant community that is a part of the beauty of the rural idyllic. He also taps into the overall fear and desire to control the area by discussing the "us against them" situation that is not only referring to those outside the community but also those insiders that fear the rural Appalachian deviant. However realistic the stories and backdrops are from the film *Oceana*, one must wonder how accurate this believed scale of drug abuse is throughout rural Appalachia. One also must wonder how the perception and constant chatter of the drug "epidemic" in the area plays into the reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant and thusly punitive social control policies. Before tapping into the second of these questions, it is important to place the scale of drug abuse within the area into context.

Shortly over a decade ago, Tunnell (2005) discussed the presence, prevalence, and level of prescription pill abuse in rural Kentucky and other surrounding Appalachian communities. Specifically, he researched how the media and other government sources played into the creation of the drug-crime connection caused by an increasing level of prescription pill abusers. His findings, in 2005, suggested that much of this drug-crime connection, pushed by the media and other sources, did not take into account empirical facts (Tunnell 2005). However, as noted, this research, while very important in demonstrating how such media sources play into the reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant, is over a decade old. As news reports, including one about twenty-six overdoses in less than four hours in Huntington West Virginia (Joseph 2016), continue to capture the public's attention, what is the real level of drug abuse within the Appalachian region?

To begin this discussion, let us look at the overall level of prescription drug use in the United States, as prescription pill abuse arguably plays the largest role in this piece of the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant. According to the National Center for Health Statistics (see Gu, Dillon, and Burt 2010) the usage of prescription pills nationally has increased significantly from 2000 to 2008. To be more specific, the report shows an increase of 10% for those who use at least one prescription a month, a 20% increase in those who use two prescriptions a month, and a 70% increase for those who used five or more prescriptions a month. By 2008, fifty percent of Americans used at least one prescription and one out of ten were using five or more (Gu, Dillon, and Burt 2010). Prescription pill use increased with age, women were ten percent more likely to use prescription drugs than men, and non-Hispanic white populations had the highest prescription drug use with usage rates being ten percent higher than Blacks and nearly twenty-one percent higher than Mexican Americans (Gu, Dillon, and Burt 2010).

To understand the level of drug abuse in the Appalachian region, one must also examine the overdose rates. According to Center for Disease Control (2007), poisoning deaths were second to only motorcycle deaths as the leading causes of unintentional deaths in the United States during the year 2004. Prescription and illegal drug abuse made up the majority of the poisoning deaths during this time. Specifically, these drug deaths accounted for 19,838, or nearly ninety five percent, of all unintentional poisoning deaths. During a five year period from 1999, the poisoning immortality rate increased by nearly sixty three percent due to prescription pill abuse. Most notably, the largest increase noticed was among females (103%), individuals between the ages of 15-24 years old (113.3%), and whites (75.8%). The report describes that states that saw more than a 100% increase during this time were more than likely to be rural

(82.4%) rather than urban (11.8%) or suburban (41.2%) (CDC 2007). Specifically, West Virginia, the heart of rural Appalachia and setting for the film *Oxyana*, saw a five hundred fifty percent increase.

This trend, sadly, did not stop in 2004 and continues to increase as independent organizations continue to release demonstrative reports. A report released by the National Center for Health Statistics in 2011 states that poisoning became the leading cause of injury death in 2008 and that nine out of ten poisoning deaths found during the study were a result of drug overdoses (see Warner, Chen, Makuc, Anderson, and Minino 2011). According to this more recent report, drug poisoning deaths increased by six times from 1980 (6,100 deaths) to 2008 (36,500 deaths). Of important note, this report, along with others, shows a steep increase in the number of opioid analgesic deaths from pills such as OxyContin since 2000. Specifically, the report states that opioid analgesic deaths more than tripled from 4,000 in 1999 to 14,800 in 2008 (Warner et al. 2011). In total, opioid analgesics were involved in over forty percent of all drug-poisoning deaths in 2008, an increase of twenty five percent since 1999 nationally.

The report, consistent with others, demonstrated that rates of deaths were higher amongst Whites and inhabitants of rural areas (Warner et al. 2011). During the overall time of the study, opioid drug poisoning deaths accounted for more deaths than any other drug, including both cocaine and heroin. The most recent reports demonstrate similar levels of opioid drug poisoning deaths nationally, and within the rural Appalachian region. According to the Prescription Drug Abuse Subcommittee (PDAS) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2013), opioid overdose deaths accounted for 60% of all overdose deaths by 2010. Of important note, this report delves deeper into the demographic statistics of those who fall victim to these deaths. The report states that Whites in rural areas report some of the highest rates of nonmedical opioid

use and continue to show some of the highest rates of overdose related deaths. The report also mentions that individuals eligible for Medicaid, or people of lower socioeconomic status, are more likely to abuse opioids. Rural Appalachians, again due to the history and continued economic distress of the area, are often in need of Medicaid (see Billings and Blee 2000). This fact plays a large role in the continued prescribing of higher dosages of opioid analgesics for longer periods to this population (PDAS 2013). Finally, and of most importance to this conversation, the report concludes that the highest rates of sales, nonmedical use, and rates of death are clustered in the Appalachian region.

This trend of opioid death in the Appalachian region seems to be on a steady increase as demonstrated by reports throughout the last decade. In addition, this trend does not seem to be slowing down. According to Rudd's (2016) report for the Center for Disease Control, eight Appalachian states saw a significant increase in overdose deaths between 2014 and 2015. More specifically, five of these states, Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland saw increases of at least twenty percent during this time. Three of the original eight states listed saw some of the highest rates of death due to drug overdose nationally: West Virginia (41.5 per 100,000), Kentucky (29.9 per 100,000), and Ohio (29.9 per 100,000) (Rudd 2016). Again, opioid deaths seemed to be the driving factor in these increases as they accounted for over 63% of the drug overdose deaths (33,091) nationally.

It is difficult to argue that drug use in Appalachia is not a major issue facing the people of the region. However, the overall abuse and deaths within the region are a single part of the overall image. A connection between drug use that is on the rise nationally and within the region and the overall crime rates represent the second piece of the believed rural Appalachian deviant. Does the level of crime within the region empirically match the imaginary of the rural

Appalachian deviant or is this drug crime connection still falling victim to the social construction

by the media and other sources as discussed by Tunnell (2005)? To understand this, we must turn

to the Uniform Crime Report to conclude the rates of both violent and property crime within the

region.

Some argue that outside drug use and welfare fraud, the overall crime rate in Appalachia

is very low, possibly as low as two-thirds of the rest of the nation (Williamson 2014). However,

not to discredit those reports, it is important to support such an argument with official statistics.

Using the Uniform Crime Report's data tool, the estimated national violent crime rate in 2012

was 386.9 offenses per 100,000 (Uniform Crime Report 2017a). Eight of the 13 states included

in the Appalachian region fell below this national level of violent crime. In addition, seven states

included in the region fell below the national rate for property crime (2, 859.2 per 100,000) in

2012 (UCR 2017b). Of greatest importance, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia,

the states mostly commonly referred to when broader society speaks of Appalachia, made up

four of the states in both categories. With West Virginia, the state discussed in the film above,

the only state to have every county included within the region falling significantly below both

national rates (UCR 2017a: 2017b).

Here again, there appears a disconnect between drugs and crime present the Appalachian

region. As found by Tunnell (2005), drug abuse in rural Appalachia still represents a significant

problem, and building off his original data, this problem is increasing significantly. However,

when compared with the rest of the country, this region does not see higher than national levels

of crime even when using the often-criticized Uniform Crime Report. In fact, the data shows that

drug abuse is an ever-growing national problem, even though opioid abuse seems isolated within

the Appalachian region. Why is the myth of the drug addled criminal still so strongly associated with Appalachia and not connected to other drug using whites in other parts of the country?

The Deadly Scourge of our State: From the Monster of Our Dreams to Real Life Monsters

The answer to the above question is both simple and complex. Society's, especially proper white members, view of the Appalachian region has changed little in the past few centuries. The reproduced images of the area have subtly changed over time. However, little overall differences have emerged in how society views the rural deviants housed within the region. The myth of the drug-crime connection plays right into the long-standing imaginary of the population's inherent deviance. More specifically, the continued reproduction of this piece of the typology within films perpetuate the overall belief of the need for cultural distancing and stricter regulatory measures to fight a drug-crime problem that does not exist. A process, sadly, that only exacerbates the social inequalities Appalachians face and likely encourages the use of drugs as an escape. However, to understand this process it is necessary to answer a few remaining questions. Why does such a belief continue despite continued demonstrations of empirical facts? How do films continue to play a role in this reproduction? Finally, what are the consequences of support for these depictions?

Drug use and addiction play a significant role in almost every film analyzed for this project. In some way, drugs touch one of the character's lives during the story, through either blatant abuse or more subtle understandings that the level of drug abuse is high within their region. This shapes the descriptions of characters to the audience while also supporting specific plot points to explain some of their behaviors. Mostly, drug abuse provides an explanation of worthlessness or signals the moral failings of an evil violent character. Woody Harrelson's

character Harlan DeGroat from *Out of the Furnace* provides a perfect example of the latter characteristic.

Monster of Our Dreams

Out of the Furnace, a film mired by dark and depressive overtones, follows Christian Bale's character Russell Baze as he tries to avenge his brothers killing while also walking the line of a moral authority within an amoral world. The film set in the heart of Appalachian steel country, shows many references to the bleak and daunting life that many poor Appalachians face. However, it makes a point to demonstrate that one of these issues is the overall villainy of those drug-abusing characters that live within these populations. Harlan DeGroat is this stereotypical villain. DeGroat represents everything society fears about the Appalachian people. He is the literal embodiment of the rural Appalachian deviant. His actions are primal, violent, and somewhat atavistic, harkening back to the belief of inbreeding in the region. He runs his "gang" with an iron fist and uses his violence and thick rural accent to intimidate multiple characters throughout the film. He is high while taking part in most of these actions. His abuse of himself and others provides evidence for the audience of the danger that continues to lurk within the Appalachian region. Sadly, however, many will never pay close enough attention to realize that his character is not from the region. Instead, as mentioned briefly during the film, he resides in an area further north. Nevertheless, because of his villainous demeanor, cliché accent and look, he will automatically embody the imaginary, the horrifying, and the morally inferior that walk the world in rural Appalachia.

One specific scene, outside of the many violent scenes, demonstrates this behavior while also connecting the overall fear of individuals like DeGroat and to the imaginary of the area. DeGroat is shown sitting in a rundown house in the middle of a rural landscape as officers

attempt to track him down. The house, in shambles, resembles something more akin to a shack than a home. The walls are worn with peeling paint and splintering wood providing a sense of defeat as he sits in a collapsing chair. The structure, like the man, represents the backwoods: dilapidated and drowned out through neutral colors of gray and black. The connections between the area and the drug-addled villain solidify. Images flash in sequence from inside the home to the sight of law enforcement encroaching across the rural landscape in which it rests. A single "narc" detective bangs on the frail front door. These images, like the house itself, are of great importance. They are a moving embodiment of the securitization and policing of the rural and the rural Appalachian deviant. Similar to hunters stalking an animal, the tainted blood Degroat awaits the iron fist of moral regulation as he sits in his backwoods sanctuary. Officers with automatic weapons and SWAT brightly tattooed across the backs of their military style vests become the hunters as the clearly addicted DeGroat becomes the "deer in the drug light" prey.

The connection between the space, the inhabitants, and the need for control become even clearer as the scene progresses. However, one more message shines through to the audience during this scene. As DeGroat sits within the room, he prepares to get high from injecting himself with his preferred drug. He does not inject himself in the arm or the top of the hand as many drug users shown in other films. Instead, DeGroat injects the drug into the hidden veins between his toes. The film here brings the image full circle. The drugs, the violent man, and the police that must regulate his behavior to protect society are about to meet. Tension builds as he slowly pushes the plunger of the syringe, expelling the chemical into his body. Juxtaposed against images of the officers breaking into the house, guns ready, the audience now begins to feel the end of the mountain villain. This is when the final piece of the new rural Appalachian deviant snaps into focus. DeGroat, wild eyed, leans back in his chair, as the chemical rush

sweeps over him. The officers in the house continue searching, room by room, but in the end, they find that their villain is gone. The undercover narc officer, in his cliché' white trash clothing, turns to his fellow officer and states "The guy was expecting us" as he sweeps drug paraphernalia across a worn table with the barrel of his gun (Cooper 2013).

The scene switches back to DeGroat as he stands as the rush of the drug provides him with a burst of energy. The audience becomes aware that he, the backwoods drug-addled villain, is not the moron of earlier depictions. Instead, this modern monster of the mountains has outsmarted the police. He jumps around, almost boxer like, as he revels in both his accomplishment and the euphoria provided by the drugs. The scene ends, with DeGroat pounding on his chest, like the monster or beast of other movies, and running out of the worn out shack in which he is hiding. Barefoot, worn "wife beater", and tattered trousers, he becomes more of the embodiment of the modern rural Appalachian deviant. Embodying the atavistic, the violent, and the drug-addled, he now adds another dimension of fear. He is intelligent. The early depictions of the simpleton, sex-crazed, backwoods, and monstrous are now replaced for the audience by the new fear of the evil within our dreams. No longer a bumbling backwards drunk, the modern Appalachian deviant is a more worthy villain of greater threat. An individual deserving of security, punitive control, and one that now challenges the standard of the early beliefs of lower white caste that is the rural Appalachian deviant.

Real Life Monsters

Returning to the documentary films, the White family, put on full display in The *Wild and Wonderful Whites of West Virginia,* represent another, more realistic demonstration of how broader society views the reproduction of the drug addled rural Appalachian deviant. The family's drug use is rampant throughout the film. Drug use takes place in almost any scene

including a member of the White family. This fact even includes a scene in which one of the female members of the family, Kirk, snorts crushed pills off a hospital bedside table shortly after giving birth. Jesco, the patriarch, is seen smoking and discusses a life of being addicted to drugs, while other family members are seen consuming drugs while partying throughout the night. These images move the audience away from compassion for this family who seem to care only about the consumption of drugs and the lifestyle that surrounds it. They become the face of the rural Appalachian family, and unlike the face of the Clampetts, the original media face for rural families, this family embodies the inbred, violent, and drug abusing stereotype they now represent.

One particular scene demonstrates this "real" representation of this piece of the typology. The introduction of the family members show them acting in stereotypical ways. Discussion of violence, sex, and drugs make up the beginning minutes of the introduction of the family in the film. Again, drugs are of important note. A particular scene, with Bo and her son Derek, drives this point home. These two members of the family come to fame through their conversation about what type of drugs they prefer. Again, they are nestled on a worn couch in a rundown trailer, just as other images before them, connecting the area, the drugs, and the people of rural Appalachia. Bo states that she "use to try a little coke here and there" and "I've smoked a little crack" (Nitzberg 2009). However, it is her son, Derek, who makes comments about the real "epidemic" of drug users with his list of favorites. "I'll tell you straight up what I like. I prefer Roxicontin, Lorcet, Norco, a Vicodin ES, a Percoset 10, a Xanax, especially a Xanibar" (Nitzberg 2009).

Now this scene, again, constructs the drug-addled rural Appalachian that deserves regulation. However, just like DeGroat, these individuals receive a label beyond just drug addict.

They spark greater fear and warrant control because of their ability to think as a part of this new era reproduction of the typology. This point becomes clear a few scenes later as multiple city officials, law enforcement, and attorneys make comments about the nuisance that is the White family. However, one attorney, defense attorney Peter Hendricks, drives home the point that they are not the standard drug addict from early depictions but instead represent the new form to the drug typology do to their ability to think. "They're clever. They're not educated necessarily. But they are very clever, crafty in what they do" (Nitzberg 2009). Like DeGroat then, the real White family, puts a new spin on the old atavistic, violent, drug-addled typology that now, because of their ability to "outwit" law enforcement, they deserve further distancing and more control.

The Deadly Scourge of Our State

Both of these examples, through both their imagery and dialogue, come to represent the common imaginary of what rural Appalachian deviants are. They also continue to provide fuel for the drug-crime "epidemic" within the region. Both inside and outside the films analyzed, the term "epidemic" becomes the normative description for the drug abuse issue within the Appalachian region. Now arguably, based on the figures above, the use of such terminology has some merit. It is important, however, to discuss the connotation that the term epidemic provides to any outsider. To many, the term epidemic represents something that requires an immediate response, which in most cases is strict and punitive. Buer (2013) takes this terminology head on when discussing the media's discourse involving drug abuse and women in rural Kentucky. In multiple articles reviewed, terminology such "scourge", "blight", and "corrosive evil" represent the drug epidemic in the area. The comments continued with statements calling on citizens of the state of Kentucky, "We must use every tool available to attack this deadly scourge on our state" (Buer 2013: 89). Of great importance, is who is using these terms. In this case, these terms, as a

part of the epidemic lexicon, flowed through the office of former Governor Steve Beshear. Buer (2013) also, finds that other politicians found additional ways to call on the punitive nature of the "epidemic". Specifically, both former State Attorney General Jack Conway and former Speaker of the Kentucky House of Representatives Greg Stumbo provide terminology such as "protecting Kentucky families" and "reduce the destructive impact" along with the "every tool possible" discussed above to further the safety rhetoric around this population.

Such terminology promote strict social control measures to deal with the "epidemic". Calling on buzzwords such as evil, these words portray those who use these substances as immoral and criminal. Labeling these individuals provides further support for drug raids and arrests rather than more supportive measures such as rehabilitation, health services, or jobs programs. The terminology also draws on society's seemingly permanent sense for the need for protection (see Simon 2007). By stating that we must protect Kentucky families, the speakers further delineate a separation between Appalachian drug using families and non-Appalachian families (Buer 2013), continuing the notion that these "other" Appalachian families must be contained "using every tool possible".

Also of great importance, is the language used when describing this epidemic. As discussed throughout this research, the concept of power plays directly into creating the "truth" of the "epidemic" and "scourge" as it reinforces the credibility and cultural distance of proper whites. In this small example, all actors hold some level of political power over the community they are addressing (Buer 2013). Moreover, all the actors providing the above quotes are white. These speakers then, in every aspect of life, provide a moral superiority to their position as proper white individuals trying to "save" their citizens from the "blight" that is rural Appalachian drug use.

Proper white speakers also support the rationale behind the distancing and control of the Appalachian region. Buer (2013) suggests that the media continues to support these claims by making statements such "the problem spread from its Appalachian roots" (90). These words again, provide ample excuse for filmmakers, the citizenry, followed by policymakers, to support the continued separation of the Appalachian region from the rest of society. This drug "epidemic", harkening back to language used for moral panics (see Cohen 1972; Goode and Ben-Yehuda 1994), started and must be contained within the Appalachian region to avoid any unnecessary casualties of real importance. In reality, this language provides an Appalachian "scapegoat" for society to rally against as a common devil (see Cohen 1972).

As whites within the area, regardless of class, continue to see themselves within a precarious position in society, providing such a scapegoat allows for the exclusion of this "other". This exclusion further widens the gap between this rural Appalachian deviant and proper white society as means to protect the social status and identity of the latter (see Young 2007). Further, this is the same logic discussed in earlier chapters, where it becomes a moral imperative to contain the tainted blood and violent tendencies of the individuals within the region. The moral authorities use language such as lazy, foul, and abusers of government support (Buer 2013), just as their predecessors did, to justify regulatory measures and protect their own precarious place within society.

Films provide additional examples of this same language while placing them in visual form and bringing them to a broader audience. Images in *Dancing Outlaw* of the destitute rural areas of southern West Virginia or the rolling hills of Butcher Holler in *Coal Miner's Daughter* act as moving examples of the "other" Appalachian areas where these deviants find their roots. Jesco White and his family from the *Wild and Wonderful Whites of West Virginia* or *Dancing*

Outlaw represent the living embodiment of the lazy, foul, and welfare abusing population of this area. Their 'otherness' is driven home by quotes such as the one provided by a local official when he asks "Nobody works, everybody just lays around and parties and they've always got money so what are they doing?" (Nitzberg 2009). His language, and obvious position as a proper white authority within the community, harkens back to the idea of stealing money from welfare while also selling drugs to support their own habits. Finally, Harlan DeGroat, from *Out of the Furnace*, represents the embodiment of what non-Appalachian communities should fear. His violence and constant drug abuse provide credence to the idea that "we must protect families…..with every tool possible" (Buer 2013: 89). For the purposes of the imaginary, and the perceived need for the moral regulation and social control of this population, DeGroat represents the perfect drug infused nightmare that lurks within rural Appalachia. He represents, to the audience, the "destructive impact" (Buer 2013: 89) that politicians continually say we must reduce.

Already Dead but Alive to Tell About It

As discussed, the imagery and dialogue present in the films analyzed justify the use of punitive measures against those suffering in the Appalachian region. By continuing the reproduction of the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant, films support punitive public discourse by providing examples of individuals broader proper white society fear. Films provide justification for the lack of progress in addressing the vast inequalities experienced within the region. By providing images of the drug addled Jesco or the violently high DeGroat, films allow for continued reproduction of the dangers of the drug "epidemic" within Appalachia. This continuation allows not only for political discourse to stay grounded in the cliché "tough on

crime" rhetoric but it also provides an avenue for political leaders and the public alike to ignore

roots of the social and economic "epidemic".

This response by proper whites also provides them much needed psychic relief. The use

of such language and imagery provides the proper white class with some level of cultural

distance between themselves and the created non-respectable rural Appalachian deviant (see

Young 2007). By creating such a separation and then turning to punitive measures to enforce a

continued widening of cultural standing, proper whites gain more and more footing within social

life during periods of instability in later modernity. This is more than beneficial, as society under

the ideas of neoliberal capitalism becomes more competitive (Young 2007). As this work

continues to show, drugs use/abuse and an attempted connection with crime simply continue the

separation by providing a folk devil to blame, escape, and abandon.

As shown above, there is little credence to the idea of the drug-crime connection within

the Appalachian region. However, based on the punitive swing in the United States (see

Alexander 2012; Simon 2007), this connection is easier for the public to consume then the

understanding that the same vast inequalities still exist in the Appalachian region that were

demonstrated in the 1960s by President Lyndon Johnson. Targeting, "epidemics" such as the

prescription pill abuse in the region allows the state to ignore the structural inequalities seen for

decades (Beur 2013). By focusing on the need for "protection" of those non-Appalachian

communities, policy makers can hide the fact that a large number of the population using these

drugs are stricken by poverty. They have the ability to deflect questions centering on the lack of

welfare and unemployment benefits in the region. It also becomes easy for them to steer the

conversation away from dangerous working conditions, severely damaged roads, lack of access

to manageable healthcare, lack of access to drug treatment centers, and severe environmental harm that play into the addiction of those warranting fear (Beur 2013).

In reality, this failure to fix such real "blight" may lead to more individuals who use drugs in the region. The Appalachian region, as discussed throughout this research, has endured centuries of economic and social inequality (see Billings and Blee 2000). Over time, naturally, this level of inequality effects the outlook individuals within the region have towards themselves, others, and life in general. Scholars now understand that this outlook, known as Appalachian Fatalism, plays a large role in some of the continued social issues seen within the area (see Phillips 2007; Young 2016). Appalachian Fatalism is the idea or ideological belief that one living within the Appalachian region who has experienced generations of these inequalities must live in the singular moment or from day to day. This belief stems from the understanding that no real end is in sight for the continued social and economic processes that exploit them. Based on their family histories, Appalachians understand and often expect that said exploitations have the potential to kill them the next day (Phillips 2007). Harkening back to discussions in earlier chapters, this same level of fatalism befalls communities of Color (see Bourgois 2003) and again fuels the continued exclusion of both groups. In many ways, the exclusion of one group fuels further exclusion for the other, as both are a means to continue the cultural separation by proper white society. Both groups become "devils" in their own rights and deal with the day-to-day consequences of such a label.

This fatalistic belief leads to a lack of regard for their safety, wellbeing, and overall advancement in life. In a similar way to the process of institutionalization of inequalities prisoners face, Appalachians develop their own dire institutionalization of their everyday lives. Jesco, the living poster child for the rural Appalachian deviant reproduced within films, explains

this himself. In a solemn scene, standing amongst the graves of lost family members, Jesco reminisces about what life is like for him and his family. With an almost philosophical calmness and surprising moment of clarity, Jesco explains how individuals in this area have come to see their lives and why they partake in activities such as abusing drugs. As Jesco turns to the camera, with a worn appearance from years of alcohol and drug abuse, he states calmly, "It seems like our lives have just been a party, it's a story, and we are already dead but alive to just get to tell about it" (Nitzberg 2009).

"We are already dead", a powerful quote from an individual that continues to experience the social inequalities discussed throughout this research. Sadly, however, regardless of how powerful the statement may be, the truth that falls behind these words will be lost to the audience. This again plays directly into the ideas of truth creation and Jesco's position in society. Regardless of his understanding of how the drug problem in the area affects his family, his constant portrayal as the quintessential image of the rural Appalachian deviant will win the battle of truth making. His actions of taking the drugs and his vulgarity will, for most, cheapen his understandings of the real communities that need "protection". Rhetoric, as discussed in the earlier section, will overpower Jesco's words, as Jesco is the "blight" discussed by former Kentucky Governor Shear. A fact that Jesco understands all too well and one that will only continue the use of regulatory means for this population as a means to culturally distance and control the "scourge" of the Appalachian Mountains.

This is What Got Me Here

Social programs to fight the blight of the Appalachian region have come and gone in the years following President Johnson's visit. Some of those programs have helped some residents find jobs and afford an education. I, myself, am a product of some of these programs.

Scholarships, like the Promise Scholarship, provided me a tool to attend a four-year university that led to the continuation of my education. These programs also help alleviate some of the structural inequalities that promote drug abuse within the region. However, many of these programs do little for those most in need. In addition, many programs never receive an opportunity to reach these areas because they originate from doctrines outside of the standard regulatory control measures that dominate the region.

Programs such as Workforce West Virginia came into being in southern West Virginia to help extremely impoverished and often addicted individuals find jobs (Escoria 2016). Programs like this make participants attend classes that can take up to seven hours a day for five days a week. Participants receive financial compensation for their attendance; however, in many cases the payment is just enough so that the individual does not qualify for any form of housing voucher (Escoria 2016). These programs, again due to their traditional "pull yourself up from your bootstraps or be punished" mentality, do not take into account many of the problems those in most need face to even participate. They do not take into account the fact that many are ill due to their addictions; have dependent children that they are unable to afford day care for; or the fact that some of these individuals are so poor they cannot afford to own a vehicle to transport themselves to the meetings.

Individuals like Kirk, from *Wild and Wonderful Whites of West Virginia*, have few resources available to them to enter let alone get to treatment/training programs to help them fight their addiction. In a sobering scene during this film, Kirk discusses some of her aspirations to get her children back through attending court ordered drug treatment following her drug usage in the hospital. The film does not directly discuss the inequalities, but they are present through the imagery of the scene. Who is going to drive Kirk to the treatment facility? How is she going

to pay her bills while gone? When and how is she going to be able to see her other kids? These are all issues that poor users face when trying to get clean. Of course, some programs, when appropriately administered, are beneficial. However, these programs still only act as a band-aid over a broader wound etched within the landscape of the Appalachian region.

Other alternatives exist outside of programming alone. Drugs like Suboxone, introduced in 2002, exist to help addicts within the region deal with coming off prescription pill or heroin abuse (Escoria 2016). Suboxone, a prescription meant to deal with many of the problems patients face when detoxing from OxyContin, is a drug that many health professionals prefer over methadone (see Finch, Kamien, and Amass 2007). Research supports some claims that Suboxone is more successful in dealing with opioid addiction in comparison with the earlier drugs such as methadone and naltrexone (Anish, Young, and Vieira 2014). However, this drug, like any other pill that state authorities and special interests push as a miracle, comes with severe side effects. The drug itself can be addictive, as it is an opiate. It is also very expensive for most people to purchase (Escoria 2016). The drug is not terribly effective without counseling and group therapy to help the individual recover from their addiction. Both of these facts, the cost, and the need for supplemental therapy, again shine light on the fact that the social inequalities in the Appalachian region make it difficult to address the social problems of the area only at the individual level.

This lack of resources for those facing addiction often leads them back into the actions seen within society's imaginary. *Oxyana* demonstrates this well during a conversation with a former coal miner. The man, covered in tattoos and with a map of the world style weathered face, tells those interviewing him of his problems. He was a coal miner, a profession that he states, "Makes good money", but he lost his job due to his addiction. His addiction led to him becoming violent and he wound up in prison. During later scenes, he also demonstrates the proper way to

use his Suboxone prescription to deal with addiction. He discusses his level of dependence on the

new drug.

This is one thing that I can honestly say that turned me around to being a better person…..What I do of the mornings, I'll take and I bend this in half…some people take the knife, but I just…close enough. I'll tear it in two. I'll save that one. But I'll take that, and….which, I got dentures. It's hard to do with dentures. But I'll fold it up, just like I am right here, and all I do with that is lay it under my tongue and that's it. It takes all the craving from drugs away. I don't want OxyContin no more, but I crave these. If I ain't got one of these a day, I'm just as dope-sick as if I didn't have a shot of dope (Dunne 2013).

His conversations and the overall imagery of his life show the need for supports outside of these

status quo individual level programs and traditional punitive measures.

Specifically, his imagery, with little explanation, tells the truth of how drug abuse,

punitive social controls, and the larger social inequalities combine to make living and recovering

from addiction so difficult for the people in the region. The imagery is so powerful because of its

location. The man, wandering back and forth, as he speaks to the camera, is located under a

bridge. This bridge, however, is of great importance to the man. This bridge, for a period, was

this man's home. As he paces through the dirt and steps over the small creek beneath the middle

of the bridge, he explains how he would sleep on dirty old pillows and place his belongings

along the concrete supports holding up the black top above. He goes on to explain how he and

his wife then moved on to a "two-man tent" that they placed on the highest point below the

bridge. "But my wife would use the bathroom in this gutter right here. This is where she'd get up

of a morning, come out of the tent, come right there to pee" (Dunne 2013). This man's story and

the imagery of the bridge, cold and dark, above his head demonstrates how the reproduction of

the imaginary of the rural Appalachian deviant shapes society's way of supporting individuals in

the area addicted to drugs.

He, in no romantic way, represents literal white trash slung underneath a bridge of a country road in the heart of Appalachia. His lost years, a result of not only his own misguided choices, but also a ramification of the meager resources available to individuals like him to fight their addiction and the broader structural inequalities within the region. In this scene then, the bridge acts a useful representation of the need for the cultural divide proper whites push for through the imaginary. As he lay in the dirt, battling for his life through addiction and poverty, he loses an additional step of social status within society. The bridge, then, represents both a physical and metaphorical barrier to his success in society, as he becomes a rural Appalachian deviant "other" who must be contained for protection but also held down to support those above him.

Fighting Back in Appalachia

The above conversation paints a bleak outlook for any real relief from the drug problem in the Appalachian region. This, of course, is somewhat true. There seems to be very little relief on the horizon as programs and laws continue to pursue the same "tough on crime" and "tough on drugs" rhetoric as before. These punitive means of dealing with the rural Appalachian deviant as a means to draw clear cultural divides of power. However, there is some form of hope for the individuals in the region. This symbol of hope does not come from jaded state run programs or false promises made by rich politicians. The hope comes from inside Appalachia and the people who understand these issues the best.

Programs across the Appalachian region now exist that represent shining examples of grass-roots community driven solutions to the drug problem in the area. Specifically, programs such as Recovery Point in Huntington West Virginia take on the mantle of helping those dealing with drug addiction while steering them away from the punitiveness of other systems. Recovery

Point is a special rehabilitation facility that continues to be possible through private grants and from money rewarded through a pharmaceutical settlement (Escoria 2016). The center understands the social blight that many of these individuals face. This is possible because successful graduates who understand the social issues these addicts face predominantly operate the center. In contrast to your standard detox or Suboxone clinic in the area, the center provides a long-term measure of support and the necessary training and community programming to do so. The idea behind the programming is to focus on job and life skills along with the daily emotions and shame that come from being an addict (Escoria 2016). In short, the program uses tools to help alleviate the trauma of those who experience many, if not all, of the Appalachian social and economic inequalities, while also directly supporting a mental framework to combat the Appalachian Fatalism many residents suffer from.

This center in particular, continues to see success. As of 2016, the center boasted an astounding sixty eight percent-success rate. In other words, sixty-eight percent of their clients stay sober for a least one full year (Escoria 2016). The program is also free to clients and operates at a twenty-five dollar per day per person expense rate, making it much cheaper than most other programs and significantly cheaper than jail or prison. The level of success seen of the program, and the support of the community, has led to the decision to open other centers across the state. Recently, a sister programing center known as the Four Seasons Recovery Center opened in Bluefield West Virginia and a Women's Recovery Point in Charleston West Virginia (Escoria 2016).

These non-medical community based centers continue to appear across the entire Appalachian region. Project-Lazarus in Wilkes County North Carolina follows the same community based treatment approach as Recovery Point and continues to be successful.

However, of even greater importance, is the fight these programs are having with legislatures to make the non-narcotic Naloxone available without a prescription. Naloxone, a drug formulated to help prevent both heroin and prescription drugs overdoses, is integral in families dealing with addicts as it provides a means for helping a family member who may be experiencing an overdose (Lilly 2015). Kentucky now allows the dispersion of drugs to individuals without prescriptions and other Appalachian states allow families to purchase the drug through a prescription to help an addicted family member in danger of overdosing (see Lilly 2015; Marra 2015).

Finally, these grassroots programs and centers are not without support from groups who possess the social capital to adjust legislative and state centered punitive controls. Groups such as the Coalition on Appalachian Substance Abuse Policy or CASAP use these example programs as proof that such rehabilitation measure works, and fight for policy changes at the federal, state, and local level. Specifically, the organization states "We believe that addressing the health care disparities with greater economic self-sufficiency at individual and community levels can make a difference in the quality of life in Appalachia……CASAP presents a call to examine substance use in Appalachia as a serious social, economic, health, and personal problem with far-reaching implications for the future. CASAP relates to federal, state, and local governments and to community citizens as well as substance use and health provider systems" (Coalition on Appalachian Substance Abuse Policies 2016: para 5-6). This coalition, made up of members from Kentucky, Ohio, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, lobby pushes for real legislative measures that address the roots of addiction.

Altogether, these grassroots programs, with the support of organizations such as CASAP, are beginning to make a dent in the drug abuse epidemic within the Appalachian region. By

demonstrating that alternative methods work, they are slowly weakening the argument for the continued use of punitive social controls as the standard practice. In addition, as they gain popularity throughout the region, they directly fight the ideas reproduced in the films of the imaginary around the rural Appalachian deviant. The Appalachian region, as history shows, constantly is in search of new ways to eradicate the social inequalities generations have faced. Much of this fight stems from programs within the region itself and continues to find pursuit by those who believe in the region the most, the inhabitants. Programs like these shine a bright light on the region's continued battle against the reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant imaginary and the unequal social and economic reality that Appalachians face on a daily basis. As drugs become more and more an issue within the region, these Appalachians, whether of tainted blood or not, will fight the stereotype and fight the oppression they continue to experience, in hopes of creating a better life for future generations. This battle allows these individuals to regain some ground lost over generations of "otherizing" and gives them a voice in dealing with the continued distancing that is so predominant in such a precarious time.

The willingness to take on such roles allows these community programs to fight the cultural separation created through the moral regulation of the area. By pushing back against securitization (Lupton 1999) and crime governance (see Simon 2007) within the region, they provide the population a model for fighting against the stratification of the white castes. Redefining the "epidemic" in a way that benefits those dealing with it, instead of those in control, provides tools for a cultural backlash against the generations of oppression the area continues to receive, on the grounds they are an unnatural form of white caste meant to provide stability for the proper white population (see Young 2007). Programs, in a sense, turn the ideas of moral regulation on their head. These programs eliminate some of the policies that perpetuate

the moral regulation and control of the populous by providing them the ability to get clean and find employment, while also alleviating some of their contact with the varying structures within the criminal justice system. This task, specifically, takes some of the social capital and power away from those inclined to regulate the population and reverses the power to the region. It is also clear by both their success and the support shown by the Appalachian community that these programs will not quit. This fact is certain because there is one thing the reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant continues to get correct. Those within the region, regardless of the level of fatalism present, will always do one thing, fight.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

From time to time, I find myself in the same coffee shop as the one mentioned in the opening pages. It is different in some ways. Wearing a dress shirt and jeans with my hair properly combed while reading books for my graduate courses hides the tainted blood of my roots within the proper white veneer of the space. It is clear to me that coming from this background, along with the privilege provided through my education, will always lead to such juxtaposition. When the subject comes up, the place of my birth and background always prompts stereotypical comments in line with the clichéd tropes that films continue to reproduce. Do you sleep with your cousin? Is it as violent in the hills as everything in the media? Do you know anyone on drugs? Now of course most of this is mildly annoying and I easily brush it off through changing the conversation or laughing with the joke. However, it still displays the constant pressure of the creation and reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant and the lingering effects this creation has on society's view of the people within the region.

Continuing to understand the combination of these two elements, films and their ability to create/reproduce reality is a significant piece of this research. The purpose of this research was and still is to search for answers to a few important questions. First, what historical social and economic processes led to early social constructions of the rural Appalachian deviant and how have these constructions been adapted over time? Regardless of these reproductions, why do specific innate deficiencies commonly associated with Appalachia continue to be present within films? How does this overall process stem from and support the continued cultural distancing implicitly beneficial to "proper" white populations? Finally, how do these continued

reproductions support scholarship geared towards understanding the possible creation of regulatory mechanisms as a part of the catastrophic levels of social abandonment and criminalization faced within area? These questions, while seemingly simple, rest on the shoulders of the complexity of the creation and treatment of an entire region. Understanding that this work is a foundational piece to further research, it hopefully created the beginnings for criminological research to dig deeper into this meaning making, cultural distancing, and the continued effects the relationship between films and the abandonment and criminalization of the Appalachian people.

The Picture is Painted

The Appalachian region and people still face many of the hardships discussed earlier in this work. The poverty level is still high and in some areas increasing (see Billings, Norman, and Ledford 2000; Drake 2001; Massey 2007; Fisher 2009). Many hollers and hill towns still display the same characteristics of the Kentucky porch visited by President Johnson in the 1960s (see Billings and Blee 2000). The region's plight is still significant because it continues to makes up a large portion of the land area east of the Mississippi River (Appalachian Regional Commission 2015). These socio-historic and economic facts contribute to the answering of the first research question. The area and the hard statistical facts about the population, economy, and social inequalities still resemble, in many ways, the original descriptions provided by early Appalachian writers (see Williams 2002) and continue to support the expanding construction of the rural Appalachian deviant.

Falling in line with this sentiment, the stereotypes of the people, sadly, remain as well. As discussed by Wray (2006) the insult of being "white trash" is still predominantly associated with the region. Despite advancements, much of the social and economic control of the region (see

Billings and Blee 2000) comes from the intra-racial tension present within white culture. As is the nature of being white, many in the class still seek power and class dominance through the term. However, films and the public perceptions they shape, still produce an image of the Appalachian rural white population as a populace who fall outside of this power dynamic (see Wray 2006). Like other minority groups, rural Appalachian whites, as reinforced by films, fall victim to the treatment of the dominate society as a means to secure control and resources. Similar symbolic racism (see Kinder and Sanders 1996) provides reinforcement for the belief of societal controversies within the area such as, welfare abuse, crime, family deviance, and drugs as it would in any stereotypical discussion about the issues in larger cities. Rural Appalachian deviant whites become a cog in the construction of emotional and cognitive responses by proper white society (see Kinder and Saunders 1996).

Discussed throughout this research through the third research question, this process and cultural distancing through the reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant is not by happenstance. It is similar to the distancing seen with other communities of Color from dominant white populations. Such cultural distancing occurs as "modern" society becomes more precarious and groups search for means to provide further security to their societal positioning (Young 2007). Therefore, the overall creation and reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant provides support for the creation and maintenance of structures that provide proper white status and privilege against lesser groups (see Sears, Sidanius, and BoBo 2000; Young 2007). However, this distancing requires support through the perpetuation of societal acceptance of such processes.

For obvious reasons, the label of the rural Appalachian deviant and the overall sub-caste require sustainability for the continuation of the exploitation of the region through both social

and economic means. To accomplish this, those with proper white status must reproduce the image of the deviant in the area and support the already existing public imaginary (see Linnemann 2016) of the region. Films are one tool that supports such a process. While not necessarily explicit, films provide a way for the audience to make sense of the world around them (see Goffman 1974) and research continues to support the influence of films on individual perceptions about groups, crime, and deviance (Dowler, Fleming and Muzzatti 2006).

Three specific models: agenda setting, priming, and framing (discussed at length earlier) provide films with the power to construct a certain reality for the viewing audience and to shape their views on particular topics/groups (Scheufele and Tewksbury 2007). Specifically, the implementation of cultivation theory demonstrates that a high level of media exposure results in a significant level of misconceptions regarding "real" world conditions and leads the audience to construct the world as more dangerous or "mean" than it truly is (Gerbner and Gross 1976; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, and Shanahan 2002). The subtle power of films to draw the audience into creating these "real" beliefs based on discourse and imagery is the foundation for the perpetuation of the rural Appalachian deviant. Overall, this process allows films to function as a cultural force for normalizing the continued exploitation, abandonment, and criminalization of this population.

As films play a large piece in supporting the imaginary of the area, they also help create morally inferior Folk Devils (see Cohen 1972). This process has and continues to promote punitive regulatory mechanisms and exacerbate the social harms the population experiences due to the exclusion of needed services. While, moral panic theory is a small piece of the creation of the rural Appalachian deviant, it is vital in our overall understanding of the construction of this sub-caste. Specifically, films like *Wrong Turn* or *Matewan* demonstrate societal fears of specific

groups and times within the Appalachian culture. Moral panic, despite many issues (as discussed earlier) still provides a fundamental piece in understanding the construction and "otherizing" of the rural Appalachian deviant. The creation of these "devils" provided early incentive for cultural distancing by proper whites. These early constructions still play a part in societal perceptions of the nature of these individuals as a part of white trash constructions demonstrated through films discussing the inbred nature of the populous.

However, moral panic theory, due to the discussed issues, does not fully explain the construction and continuance of the rural Appalachian deviant. To do so, it is important that scholars, as done above, continue to integrate varying theoretical paradigms. Hunt (1999) discussed the use of moral regulation in the political realm. According to Hunt (1999) the group seeking to maintain economic and political power would pursue moral regulations against the lesser group as a means to ensure continued dominance. This use of the moral regulation concept provides scholars with an understanding of both the historical and continued use of exploitation against rural Appalachian whites as a means to garner further political and economic stability for proper white populations. By establishing the rural Appalachian deviant within the societal imaginary, proper whites find support for further exploitative, abandoning, and regulatory measures against the rural Appalachian people. These actions, using internal colonialism and the culture of poverty theory, insulate proper whites during precarious periods while also creating an "otherized" lesser for the purpose of a place-holding scapegoat.

However, for the rural Appalachian deviant, the fear of crime and the need for safety play just as much into such regulation as any other factor. As the above analysis chapters have shown, the use of a governing through crime mindset (Simon 2006) and a need for security (see Lupton 1999) continues to fuel the rhetoric and reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant.

Continued reproduction of particular behaviors provide basis for the belief that this population, specifically, is dangerous, tainted, and incapable of caring for itself. Such representations help to isolate and exploit rural Appalachians as a means to enforce economic dominance and continue cultural distancing sought after by proper whites.

Combined these theoretical paradigms provide a more functional understanding of the construction and continuation of the rural Appalachian deviant. Moving forward, it is imperative that scholars continue to use this integrated approach in understanding the rural Appalachian region. This conceptualization of the regulatory measures set upon the region answers the above research questions by situating the socio-historic and economic blight of the region as a part of the continued cultural distancing of proper whites. Such an integrated conceptualization provides evidence for the construction of the rural Appalachian deviant as a continued devil worthy of distancing, criminalization, and securitization. Proper whites insure this separation through regulatory mechanisms as a means to garner further stabilization in the ever-increasing precariousness of society.

By framing the rural white Appalachian populous as dangerous, those with power justify further exploitative and criminalizing methods while discouraging needed rehabilitative programming and social supports. Films play into the historical creation of the tainted blood inbred within the region, who is at risk of breeding sexual deviant and monstrous males while also generating the breeding imbecilic female. Secondly, films further support the violence believed to occur in the region by depicting intimate personal violence in a way that deflects the issue from proper whites as proof of their moral superiority. Finally, depictions of drug use/abuse and addiction in the region demonstrate the inability of the region to care for its own citizens. Drugs also provide another example of the believed violence of the population while increasing

the fear for the proliferation of the sub-caste characteristics outside of the region as a part of the drug-crime myth.

Shown throughout each chapter, the rural Appalachian deviant represents a tool that has and continues to provide as a means to further cultural distancing for proper white populations. Whether it be through their innate physiological failings, their propensity for violence, or their substance abuse, each chapter demonstrates how proper whites use the rural Appalachian deviant as a means to socially abandon, culturally distance, and criminalize the people of the Appalachian region. Film depictions of the regions tainted blood, violence, and drug use overall represent the continued encroachment of the carceral apparatus in the region as a means of justifying the regulation and criminalization of this population.

Veins of Blood and Minerals

In any story, it is paramount that the audience understands that the villain or the antagonist is purely at fault. The easiest way to accomplish such a task is through the demonstration of the innate moral failings that construct the character. This is exactly the process demonstrated in Chapter Three. Storytelling in any form, but especially in films, continues to display an inherit tarnish within the Appalachian population. Specifically, the stereotypes of inbreeding, immoral sexual behavior, and a population of lesser intelligence within the region calls out through multiple depictions. Such depictions, obviously, do not bode well for how the general population will view the region and support the continued cultural distancing of the population. Specifically, films provide an outlet to demonstrate that those within the region originate from a form of tainted blood, which by its nature, leads them towards deviance. This construction of the populous' physiology provides proper white populations an innate deficiency to consistently draw from as a means of abandoning, distancing, and criminalizing this

population. As discussed in the second research question, creating this foundation of innate

deficiencies is the basis and the continued building block for the reproduction of the rural

Appalachian deviant imaginary. Chapter Three discusses the origins of this trope. Monster films

provide the foundation for understanding the perceived violence in the area (see *Wrong Turn*)

while other films, more realistic in nature, demonstrate that this population, due to its inherent

backwards nature, deserve to be exploited as a form of cheap labor (see *Matewan*).

Like other minority groups within society, such demonizing and label making provides

pretext for the exploitation of any group (see Wacquant 2001). This process within the

Appalachian region continues to fuel such feelings. Earlier depictions provide the basis for

understanding the values of proper white society. As a part of the continuation of cultural

distancing, these depictions provide an excuse for industrial exploitation of the area and its

people. Their resemblance of 'something lesser' justifies the stripping of the area's resources and

the plundering of its work force and economy by proper outsiders (see Billings and Blee 2000).

Over time, however, these individuals required further regulation. Like structures built to

ghettoize urban areas in the United States (Wacquant 2001), similar structures began popping up

within the region as a means to control both the economy and the bodies of the tainted blood

rural Appalachians who were increasingly superfluous to it.

Over time, the stripping of the economy drove beliefs of the inbred monster and sexual

deviant women within the region. Stories of moonshiners and feuds perpetuated the mythology

of the violence in the region (see Harkins 2003; Wilkinson 1985). During this time, the eugenics

movement began to gain strength, providing more 'evidence' of the tainted blood of the women

in the area. Both of these concepts continue to provide the foundation for the seemingly never-

ending pursuit of the immoral physiological failings of the rural Appalachian deviant in films. To

a degree, much of this process continues purely as a means of cultural distancing and as a means for proper white populations to secure their position. Yes, many of these tropes did provide evidence for the early creation of laws targeting the control of this population. Of greater importance, however, is the slow creep of the carceral apparatus (Wacquant 2001) into the region. This expansion of further regulatory support is a long-term effect of reproductions that continue today as a means to contain these individuals within their region and caste as separate of proper white populations.

The economic stripping of the area allowed for the carceral apparatus to take hold physically in the region. As a means of believed profit generation (see Schept 2014; Yanarella and Blankenship 2006), politicians and stakeholders in Appalachia allowed the building of large prisons. These prisons, which did not provide the economic boost hoped for, represent a shining example of the firm grasp that the criminological apparatus now has within the region. Films, as discussed by Brown (2009), provided a space for spectators to take part in the understanding of the deviance within the Appalachian region. The audience continues to see the vilification of the Appalachian people. Through blatant movie tropes such as *Deliverance* and *Cape Fear,* or the more "realistic" depictions in documentaries such as the *Dancing Outlaw*, films allow audiences to take part in the punitive spectacle and make moral judgements of the area from afar. The images and rhetoric, while still similar, provide new linking images for the audience of what the people and the area represent. To society, the once tranquil idyllic rural landscape, (see Bell 1997) is now mired by fear and perceived deviance. This perception subtly supports the furthering of the carceral apparatus for continued cultural separation of rural Appalachian whites from proper society.

All in all the images of the region in films, as discussed in Chapter 3, hint at inherit moral failings of the region that other stereotypes build upon. Specifically, films continue to demonstrate the tainted blood of the region and provide ample ideas for the "history" of bad blood. Men in the region are still depicted as inbred, violent, and of lesser intelligence, and women are depicted as sexual breeders for further generations of tainted blood deviants. Industrial labor markets provided the moral regulation for this population along with the mineral and labor extraction of the region. As seen in similar urban areas, these processes led to a form of ghetto formation that excluded rural Appalachian whites from needed resources within the proper white society. Similarly, these processes allowed for the slow movement of the carceral apparatus into the region. Laws, including eugenics castrations and others, fueled similar reproductions and subsequent policies through the generations. Rural communities of the region now resemble poor inner cities of large urban areas, trading housing projects for trailer parks. The region also seems dark and depressed, as generations of resource extractions has left both the environment and the people barren and sick. Finally, and arguably most important, the continued reproduction of the rural Appalachian deviant as a means for cultural distancing allows for the creep of the carceral apparatus to the region. The spaces in which there once stood tall structures of mineral-based industries now stand prisons. These prisons now contain the perceived tainted blood seen in films.

Jack and Jill's Love in the Hills

Chapter Four branches out to take on how the Appalachian imaginary perpetuates the idea of intimate partner violence within the region and how proper white society uses such depictions to continue separation from the deficient white populations. Building on similar tropes of the tainted blood and overall violence in the region, films provide imagery and discourse

demonstrating that intimate partner violence is a regular occurrence within the region. Now, as shown, this chapter does not dispute the fact that intimate partner violence is not a major issue in rural areas and the Appalachian region (see Grama 2000; Weisheit and Donnermeyer 2000; Weisheit, Falcone, and Wells 2006; Lanier and Maume 2009). It instead demonstrates how the use of particular tropes geared towards all genders within the region fuel the belief that it is more a part of life in the region than faced by proper whites. This process deflects resources from the region, continues cultural distancing, and justifies the expansion of the carceral apparatus further into the area.

The imagery in films provides such support in a variety of ways. The first is the depiction of the gender dynamics between male and female characters. Female characters are depicted as being dumb, backwoods, and behind on the basic understandings of how the world around them functions. Such representations perpetuate the myth that women act in three main roles within the region. As Loretta and Bridey Mae demonstrate, women only need to be attractive (something also attacked in films), work within the home, and provide children to the family. As a part of these roles, the women represent something childlike and rarely seem to possess natural intelligence or common sense. This pushes for the belief that abuse is commonplace due to their ignorance and supports a particular type of abusive character as a means to protect the women of the region.

However, when a woman steps out of these roles as Norma Rae does throughout her story, they receive deep levels of harassment. In her case, she receives the label of a "whore" and later in the film; her husband continually chastises her for being a poor spouse and mother because of her unwillingness to fit within her stereotype. This again depicts intimate partner violence as the norm within the region and normalizes male dominance. Men, then, become the

archetype of the abuser within the region. Their representation comes off as a group who cannot control their behavior, such as Obadiah, and act purely out of their masculine roles as reproduced by the imaginary of the region. Furthermore, this trait of "controlling" and "guarding" the women of the area appears to be a tradition moving from male patriarchs in the family to younger generations, as seen in *Shenandoah*. This passed down tradition acts as another means of showing that such physical and mental abuse is the norm and expected within the region as a whole: it is in their blood.

Altogether, such representations provide little more than another piece to the existing imaginary of the rural Appalachian deviant. Subsequently, while understanding that IPV is a major issue in the area, these depictions separate the Appalachian population from proper white society. Such separation then plays a part in the continued abandonment and exclusion of the area through defining those within Appalachia as morally reprehensible and a risk to security. Over time, this process contributed to a lack of suitable programming within the region to deal with real issues related to IPV. Falling in line with other punitive measures, individuals in the area, just as in other parts of the country (especially women), receive a double dose of punishment as a result of the current means of dealing with IPV violence in rural landscapes (see Erez and Belknap 1998; Grauwiler and Mills 2004). These reproductions and the continued pursuit of more conservative means of regulatory controls ignore possible restorative justice practices that have the potential to actually help the area and hinder the region's ability to deal with the issues outside of the continuing cultural divide created by said reproductions.

Final Piece of the Puzzle

Chapter Five concludes the analysis of how films provide support to the reproduction of the typology of the rural Appalachian deviant by adding in the "newer" layer of drug use and

abuse to the overall imaginary. This chapter focuses on the persistent display of rural

Appalachians as addicts who are a menace to the protagonist, themselves, and an overall danger

to society as they continue to morph into a more complex villain. Recent films demonstrate

Appalachian addicts as something more than the standard lazy drug user that once fulfilled this

piece of the myth. With families like the Whites and characters like Harlan DeGroat, the

Appalachian drug user now encapsulates the tainted blood, lazy, violent, and now intelligent

criminal living within the region that must ultimately be criminalized to protect proper white

society.

Specifically, however, this chapter attacks the standard belief and continued rhetoric that

the region faces a large drug-crime connection because of the overall issue of addiction. CDC

data does demonstrate that drug use, especially opioids, continues to be a major issue within

Appalachia, as it does nationally. However, the overall data indicating an increase in usage does

not support the rhetoric connecting such usage/abuse to other levels of crime. In reality, when

using UCR data, many of the states hit the hardest by the drug "epidemic" demonstrate lower

levels of both property and violent crime when compared with the national rates. However,

continued representations of the region's populations in films, especially as villains or willing

users, perpetuates this myth and continues to allow policy makers to use such rhetoric as a means

to push punitive policies that do nothing more than harm those in the area trying to battle said

addiction.

The chapter ends with a discussion of independent groups within the region whom

continue to fight this connection and overall representation of the area. These programs,

discussed at length in the chapter, strive to provide resources to and legislation for those battling

addiction outside of the normal conservative policies. Said programs continue to show success

and demonstrate a means to realistically combat the drug 'epidemic' within the region, while also supporting the populace in a manner that does not damage their lives and the economy of the region. However, with characters such as Jesco White becoming the face of the region for the rest of society, this battle against punitive measures will become more and more difficult. Jesco, in pure form, represents the overall fear of the drug problem in the region and provides support for the rural Appalachian deviant to the overall imaginary. His actions as the 'poster boy' for the region and the fight against drugs supports further exclusion and criminalization through the overall continuance of cultural distancing in the region to maintain the status quo control of the region by outside forces, with vested economic interests.

What is the Next Scene?

Overall, this research plays a part in demonstrating the continued effect films have on the public imaginary of what constitutes the rural Appalachian deviant. Films play a key role in the continued abandonment and criminalization of the area. By highlighting the moral deficiency, security issue, and supposed criminality of the Appalachian region, proper white society is able to find support to extend its control within the area for both resource and political extraction. However, understandably, this research is merely laying a foundation for work to pursue the effects rural Appalachians face due to similar processes.

As scholars continue to focus on the exploitation and incarceration of communities of Color, it is imperative that research pays attention to the Appalachian region. The size, history, and continued exploitation and abandonment of the population demonstrates the necessity for such attention. The truth of the region is lost as films, along with rhetoric, define the area placing an entire culture and people in danger. Understanding the racial, capitalist, and overall cultural effect such representations have is necessary to not only combat it in this region but all

regions of society. As entertainment continues to pursue particular typologies of the rural

Appalachian deviant, it is important to pay attention to the historical context and minor details

that fuel such a reproduction, especially as conservative ideologies emerge within society.

Recent political repercussion make this sentiment even clearer as the White House currently

pushes further exploitative and abandoning policies such as the elimination of one of the few

support systems within the region, the Appalachian Regional Commission (Godfrey 2017).

Overall, the need for further scholarly activity is paramount in fighting the complete extraction

of an entire culture. This sentiment is also very clear for those already living in the region. The

Appalachian people are already attuned to the fact that the devil does not live in the hills or

hollers of their homeland but instead resides in the details of their misrepresentation in film.

REFERENCES

Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. The New Press.

Algeo, Katie. 2003. "Locals on Local Color: Imagining Identity in Appalachia." *Southern Cultures*, 9(4): 27-54.

Altheide, David. L. 2002. *Creating Fear: News and the Construction of Crisis*. Transacti Publishers.

Anish, Shah, James Young, and Karen Vieira. 2014. "Long-Term Suboxone Treatment and Its Benefits on Long-Term Remission for Opiate Dependence." *Journal of Psychiatry*, 17:6.

Appalachian Regional Commission. 2015. *Socioeconomic Overview of Appalachia 2010*.

Appalachian Regional Commission. 2015. *The Appalachian Region*.

Apted, Micheal. 1980. *Coal Miner's Daughter*. TV/DVD. Universal Pictures.

Baker, Robert. 2016. *Appalachian Film List*. The Historic Struggle: History and the Mountains. https://historicstruggle.wordpress.com/appalachian-film-list/

Bashford, Alison, and Philippa Levine, eds. 2010. *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*. Oxford University Press.

Batteau, Allen. 1990. *The Invention of Appalachia*. University of Arizona Press.

Batteau, Allen, ed. 1983. *Appalachia and America: Autonomy and Regional Dependence*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Belknap, Joanne. 2007. *The Invisible Women: Gender, Crime and Justice*. Belmont, CA: Thomson.

Bell, David. 1997. "Anti-Idyll: Rural Horror." Pp. 94-108 in *Contested Countryside Cultures*, edited by P. Cloke & J. Little. New York: Routledge

Bellesiles, Michael. A. 1996. "The Origins of Gun Culture in the United States, 1760-1865."
    Journal of American History 83:425.

Benveniste, Emile. 1971. "Subjectivity in Language." Pp. 223-230 in *Problems in General
    Linguistics*, edited by E. Meek. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.

Best, Joel. 1993. *Threatened Children: Rhetoric and Concern about Child-Victims*. Chicago, IL:
    University of Chicago Press.

Billings, Dwight. B, and Kathleen M. Blee. 2000. *The Road to Poverty: The Making of Wealth
    and Hardship in Appalachia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Billings, Dwight. B., Gurney Norman, and Katherine Ledford eds. 2000. *Back Talk from
    Appalachia: Confronting Stereotypes*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Blankenship, Susan. E. and Ernest J. Yanarella. 2004. "Prison Recruitment as a Policy Tool of
    Local Economic Development: A Critical Evaluation." *Contemporary Justice Review*,
    7(2): 183-198.

Bobo, Lawrence, James R. Kluegel, and Ryan A. Smith. 1997. "Laissez-Faire Racism: The
    Crystallization of a Kinder, Gentler, Anti-black Ideology." *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s:
    Continuity and Change*, *15*: 23-5.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2014. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence
    of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield
    Publishers.

Boonzaier, Floretta. 2008. "If the Man Says You Must Sit, Then You Must Sit: The Relational
    Construction of Woman Abuse: Gender, Subjectivity and Violence." *Feminism and
    Psychology*, 18(2): 183–206.

Boorman, John. 1972. *Deliverance*. Warner Brothers Entertainment.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bourgois, Pierre. 2003. *In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio* (Vol. 10). Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Michelle. 2009. *The Culture of Punishment: Prison, Society, and Spectacle*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Brownstein, Henry. H. 2000. *The Social Reality of Violence and Violent Crime*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon

Buer, Lesly-Marie. 2013. "Is There a Prescription Drug "Epidemic" in Appalachian Kentucky?: Media Representations and Implications for Women Who Misuse Prescription Drugs." *Recovery, Renewal, Reclaiming*, 85.

Bui, Hoan. 2007. "The Limitations of Current Approaches to Domestic Violence." Pp. 261-276 in *It's a Crime: Women and Justice*, edited by R. Muraskin. Upper Saddle River, NJ Prentice Hall.

Burford, Gale, and Joe Hudson. eds. 2000. *Family Group Conferencing: New Directions in Community-Centered Child and Family Practice.* New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Bush, Kevin. R. & Sheryl Lash. 2006. "Family Relationships and Gender Roles." Pp. 170-171 in *Encyclopedia of Appalachia*, edited by R. Abramson and J. Haskell. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion Identity*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cash, Wilbur. Joseph. 1941. *The Mind of the South*. New York, NY: Vintage

Center for Disease Control and Prevention. 2007. "Unintentional Poisoning Deaths—United States, 1999-2004." *MMWR: Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *56*(5): 93-96.

Chambliss, Williams. J. 1995. "Crime Control and Ethnic Minorities: Legitimizing Racial Oppression by Creating Moral Panics." Pp. 235-258 in *Ethnicity, race, and crime: Perspectives across time and place*, edited by D. F. Hawkins. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chambliss, Williams. J. 2001. *Power, Politics, and Crime*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Chermak, Steven. M. 1995. *Victims in the News: Crime and the American News Media*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Chesney-Lind, Meda. 2002. "Criminalizing Victimization: The Unintended Consequences of Pro-Arrest Policies for Girls and Women." *Criminology and Public Policy*, 2: 81-90.

Chibnall, Steve. 1977. *Law-and-Order News: An Analysis of Crime Reporting in the Britain Press*. London, UK: Tavistock.

Coalition on Appalachian Substance Abuse Policy. 2016. *Overview and History*. Retrieved from http://cdar.uky.edu/casap/overview.html

Cochran, John K., Christine S. Sellers, Valerie Wiesbrock, and Wilson R. Palacios. 2011. "Repetitive Intimate Partner Victimization: An Exploratory Application of Social Learning Theory." *Deviant Behavior*, *32*(9): 790-817.

Cohen, Adam. 2016. *Imbeciles: The Supreme Court, American Eugenics, and the Sterilization of Carrie Buck*. London, UK: Penguin Press HC.

Cohen, Stanley. 1972. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. St. Albans, U.K.: Paladin.

Cohen, Stanley. 1971. *Images of deviance* (Vol. 1293). London, UK: Penguin Books Ltd.

Cohen, Stanley and Jock Young. 1981. *The Manufacture of News: Social Problems, Deviance and the Mass Media*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cooper, Alexia and Erica L. Smith. 2011. *Homicide Trends in the United States, 1980-2008*. Annual Rates for 2009 and 2010, NIJ 236018. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Cooper, Scott. 2013. *Out of the Furnace*. TV/DVD. Appian Way.

Cornwell, Benjamin and Annulla Linders. 2002. "The Myth of "Moral Panic": An Alternative Account of LSD Prohibition." *Deviant Behavior*, *23*(4): 307-330.

Corzine, Jay, Lin Huff-Corzine, and Hugh P. Whitt. 1999. "Cultural and Subcultural Theories of Homicide." *Homicide: A Sourcebook of Social Research*, 42-57.

Couto, Richard. A. 1984. "Appalachia: An American Tomorrow." *A Report to the Commission on Religion in Appalachia on Trends and Issues in the Appalachian Region.* Knoxville, TN: Commission on Religion in Appalachia.

Critcher, Chas. 2008. "Moral Panic Analysis: Past, Present, and Future." *Sociology Compass*, *2*(4): 1127-1144.

Cui, Ming, Koji Ueno, Mellissa Gordon, and Frank D. Finchman. 2013. "The Continuation of Intimate Partner Violence from Adolescence to Young Adulthood." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 75: 300-313.

Darley, John M. and Thane S. Pittman. 2003. "The Psychology of Compensatory and Retributive Justice." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *7*(4): 324-336.

Davies, Bronwyn.1993. *Shards of Glass: Children Reading and Writing Beyond Gendered Identities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

DeKeseredy, Walter. S. and Carolyn Joseph. 2006. "Separation and/or Divorce Sexual Assault in Rural Ohio: Preliminary Results of an Exploratory Study." *Violence Against Women*, 12:301-311.

DeKeseredy, Walter S., Joseph F. Donnermeyer, Martin D. Schwartz, Kenneth D. Tunnell, and Mandy Hall. 2007. "Thinking Critically about Rural Gender Relations: Toward a Rural Masculinity Crisis/Male Peer Support Model of Separation/Divorce Sexual Assault." *Critical Criminology*, *15*(4): 295-311.

DeKeseredy, Walter S. and Martin D. Schwartz. 2008. "Separation/Divorce Sexual Assault in Rural Ohio: Survivors' Perceptions." *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 36(1-2): 105-119.

Demme, Johnathan. 1991. *The Silence of the Lambs*. TV/DVD. Orion Pictures.

Derrida, Jacques. 1974. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

de Young, Mary. 2004. *The Day Care Ritual Abuse Moral Panic*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company.

Dixon, Jo and Alan J. Lizotte. 1987. "Gun Ownership and the" Southern Subculture of Violence"." *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(2): 383-405.

Dowler, Ken, Thomas Fleming, and Stephen L. Muzzatti. 2006. "Constructing Crime: Media, Crime, and Popular Culture." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice 48*(6), 837-850.

Drake, Richard. 2001. *A History of Appalachia*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Dugan, Laura, Daniel S. Nagin, and Richard Rosenfeld. 2003. "Exposure Reduction or Retaliation? The Effects of Domestic Violence Resources on Intimate-Partner Homicide." *Law & Society Review*, 37: 169-198.

Dunne, Sean. 2013. *Oxyana*. TV/DVD. Cadillac Hash.

Durkheim, Emile. 1938. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Duwe, Grant. 2000. "Body-Count Journalism the Presentation of Mass Murder in the News
     Media." *Homicide Studies*, *4*(4): 364-399.

Edwards, Katie. M. 2014. "Intimate Partner Violence and the Rural–Urban–Suburban Divide
     Myth or Reality? A Critical Review of the Literature." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*,
     16(3): 359-373.

Eller, Ronald. 2008. *Uneven Ground: Appalachia Since 1945*. Lexington, KY: University Press
     of Kentucky.

Ellison, C. G. 1991. "An Eye for an Eye? A Note on the Southern Subculture of Violence
     Thesis." *Social Forces*, *69*(4): 1223-1239.

Engelhardt, Elizabeth. S. D. 2003. *The Tangled Roots of Feminism, Environmentalism, and
     Appalachian Literature*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

England, Jennifer. 2004. "Disciplining Subjectivity and Space: Representation, Film and Its
     Material Effects." *Antipode* 36(2): 295-321.

Entman, Robert. M. 1994. "Representation and Reality in the Portrayal of Blacks on Network
     Television News." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 71(3): 509-520.

Erez, Edna. and Joanne Belknap. 1998. "In Their Own Words. Battered Women's Assessment of
     the Criminal Processing System's Responses." *Violence and Victims*, 13: 251-268.

Escoria, Juliet. 2016. "The Hard Times, Struggles, and Hopes of Addicts in Appalachia". *Vice
     News*. Retrieved from https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/the-hard-times-struggles-and-
     hopes-of-appalachian-addicts-ang

Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis." Pp. 258-284 in *Discourse as Social Interaction*, edited by T. van Dijk. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Ferrell, Jeff, Keith J. Hayward, and Jock Young. 2008. *Cultural Criminology*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Finch, James W., Jonathon B. Kamien, and Leslie Amass. 2007. "Two-Year Experience with Buprenorphine-Naloxone (Suboxone) for Maintenance Treatment of Opioid Dependence within a Private Practice Setting." *Journal of Addiction Medicine*, *1*(2): 104-110.

Finckenauer, James. O. 1988. "Public Support for the Death Penalty: Retribution as just Deserts or Retribution as Revenge?" *Justice Quarterly*, *5*(1): 81-100.

Fish, Margaret, Martin J. Amerikaner, and Conrae J. Lucas. 2006. "Dispelling the Stereotypes: Rural Appalachian Mothers Talk about Physical Punishment." *Journal of Appalachian Studies*: 26-39.

Fisher, Stephen. L. 2009. *Fighting Back in Appalachia: Traditions of Resistance and Change*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ford, T. R. ed. 2015. *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Fowler, Roger, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Tony Trew. 1979. *Language and Control*. London, UK: Routledge.

Fox, James. A. and Marianne W. Zawitz. 2007. *Homicide Trends in the US: Intimate Homicide*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Gallup-Black, Adria. 2005. "Twenty Years of Rural and Urban Trends in Family and Intimate Partner Homicide: Does Place Matter?" *Homicide Studies*, 9: 149-173.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. *Deciding What's News*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Garofalo, James. 1981. "NCCD Research Review: Crime and the Mass Media: A Selective Review of Research." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 18: 319-350.

Gee, James. P. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, James. P. 2005. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Gelder, Ken. 2000. *The Horror Reader*. London, UK: Psychology Press.

Gerbner, George. and Larry Gross. 1976. "Living with Television: The Violence Profile." *Journal of Communication*, *26*(2): 172-194.

Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, Nancy Signorielli, and James Shanahan. 2002. "Growing Up with Television: Cultivation Processes." *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*, *2*: 43-67.

Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Nancy Signorielli, Michael Morgan, and Marilyn Jackson-Beeck. 1979. "The Demonstration of Power: Violence Profile NO. 10." *Journal of Communication*, *29*(3): 177-196.

Gilliam Jr, Franklin. D. and Shanto Iyengar. 2000. "Prime Suspects: The Influence of Local Television News on the Viewing Public." *American Journal of Political Science*: 560-573.

Giordano, Peggy. C., Jennifer E. Copp, Monica A. Longmore, and Wendy D. Manning. 2016. "Anger, Control, and Intimate Partner Violence in Young Adulthood." *Journal of Family Violence*, *31*(1): 1-13.

Giordano, Peggy C., Wendi L. Johnson, Wendy D. Manning, Monica A. Longmore, and Mallory D. Minter. 2015. "Intimate Partner Violence in Young Adulthood: Narratives of Persistence and Desistance." *Criminology*, *53*(3): 330-365.

Goddard, Henry. H. 1912. *The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness*. London, UK: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Godfrey, Elaine. 2017. "Trump's Proposal to Scrap the Agency Devoted to Developing Appalachia." *The Atlantic*. March 17, pp. 1.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gomez, Anu. M. 2011. "Testing the Cycle of Violence Hypothesis: Child Abuse and Adolescent Dating Violence as Predictors of Intimate Partner Violence in Young Adulthood." *Youth and Society*, 43: 171 –192.

Goode, Erich. and Nachman Ben-Yehuda. 1994. *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Grama, Joanna. L. 2000. "Women Forgotten: Difficulties Faced by Rural Victims of Domestic Violence." *American Journal of Family Law*, 14: 173-189.

Grauwiler, Peggy and Linda Mills. 2004. "Moving Beyond the Criminal Justice Paradigm: A Radical Restorative Justice Approach to Intimate Abuse." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31: 49-62.

Gromet, Dena. M., and John M. Darley. 2006. "Restoration and Retribution: How including Retributive Components Affects the Acceptability of Restorative Justice Procedures." *Social Justice Research*, *19*(4): 395-432.

Gross, Kimberly and Sean Aday. 2003. "The Scary World in Your Living Room and Neighborhood: Using Local Broadcast News, Neighborhood Crime Rates, and Personal Experience to Test Agenda Setting and Cultivation." *Journal of Communication*, *53*(3): 411-426.

Gu, Qiuping, Charles F. Dillon, and Vicki L. Burt. 2010. "Prescription Drug Use Continues to Increase: US Prescription Drug Data for 2007-2008." *NCHS Data Brief*, (42): 1-8.

Guastaferro, Wendy. 2013. "Crime, the Media, and Constructions of Reality: Using HBO's The Wire as a Frame of Reference." *College Student Journal* 47(2): 264-270.

Hackney, Sheldon. 1969. "Southern Violence." *The American Historical Review*, *74*(3): 906-925.

Hall, Alice. 2009. "Film Reviews and the Public's Perceptions of Stereotypes: Movie Critics' Discourse about the Siege." *Communication Quarterly* 49(4): 399-423.

Hall, Stuart, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts. 2013. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Halliday, Michael A., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1989. *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language as a Social-Semiotic Perspective.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Harkins, Anthony. 2003. *Hillbilly: A Cultural History of an American Icon*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hawkins, Robert and Suzanne Pingree. 1981. "Using Television to Construct Social Reality." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 23(4): 347-364.

Hawley, F. Frederick and Steven F. Messner. 1989. "The Southern Violence Construct: A Review of Arguments, Evidence, and the Normative Context." *Justice Quarterly*, *6*(4): 481-511.

Hayes, Timothy and Matthew R. Lee. 2005. "The Southern Culture of Honor and Violent Attitudes." *Sociological Spectrum*, *25*(5): 593-617.

Heimer, Karen and Janet L. Lauritsen. 2008. "The Importance of Studying Trends in Violence against Women." *Criminologist*, 33: 3-6.

Hendriks, Alexandria. 2002. "Examining the Effects of Hegemonic Depictions of Female Bodies on Television: A Call for Theory and Programmatic Research." *National Communication Association*, 19(1): 105-123.

Heyman, Richard and Amy M. Slep. 2002. "Do Child Abuse and Interpersonal Violence Lead to Adulthood Family Violence?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64: 864-870.

Hickey, Eric. 2012. *Serial Murderers and Their Victims*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Hirsch, Paul. 1980. "The "Scary World" of the Nonviewer and Other Anomalies A Reanalysis of Gerbner et al.'s Findings on Cultivation Analysis Part I." *Communication research*, *7*(4): 403-456.

Hodge, Robert and Gunther Kress. 1993. *Language as Ideology* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Hudson, Barbara. 2002. "Restorative Justice and Gendered Violence: Diversion or Effective Justice?" *British Journal of Criminology*, *42*(3): 616-634.

Hughes, Michael. 1980. "The Fruits of Cultivation Analysis: A Reexamination of some Effects of Television Watching." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *44*(3): 287-302.

Hunt, Alan. 1999. Governing Morals: *A Social History of Moral Regulation*. Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Irvin, John. 1989. *Next of Kin*. Lorimar Film Entertainment.

Isenberg, Nancy. 2016. *White Trash: The 400-Year Untold History of Class in America*. London,

UK: Penguin Books.

Ives, Peter. 2004. *Gramsci's Politics of Language: Engaging the Bakhtin Circle and the

Frankfurt School*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Jackson, Susan. 1999. "Issues in the Dating Violence Research: A Review of the Literature."

Aggression and Violent Behavior, 4(2): 233–247.

Jerin, Robert and Charles B. Fields. 1994. "Murder and Mayhem in USA Today: A Quantitative

Analysis of the National Reporting of States' News." *Media, Process, and the Social

Construction of Crime: Studies in Newsmaking Criminology*: 187-202.

Jewkes, Yvonne. 2015. *Media and Crime*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications.

Jose, Paul and William F. Brewer. 1983. "The Development of Story Liking: Character

Identification, Suspense, and Outcome Resolution." *Center for the Study of Reading,

Tech. Rep. No. 291*.

Joseph, Andrew. 2016. "26 Overdoses in just Hours: Inside a Community on the Front Lines of

the Opioid Epidemic." *STAT*. August 22nd. Retrieved from:

https://www.statnews.com/2016/08/22/heroin-huntington-west-virginia-overdoses/

Kappeler, Victor, Gary W. Potter, and Mark Blumberg. 2005. *Mythology of Crime and Criminal

Justice*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Kinder, Donald and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic

Ideals*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kleck, Gary. 2001. *Armed: New Perspectives on Gun Control*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Kress, Gunther. 2003. *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London, UK: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther, and Theo Van Leeuwen T. 1996. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London, UK: Routledge.

Lanier, Christina, and Michael O. Maume. 2009. "Intimate Partner Violence and Social Isolation Across the Rural/Urban Divide." *Violence Against Women*, 15(11): 1311-1330.

Lerner, Melvin 1980. *The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Lewis, Helen, and Linda Johnson. 1978. *The Colonialism Model: The Appalachian Case*. Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press.

Lewis, Ronald L. 1993. "Appalachian Restructuring in Historical Perspective: Coal, Culture, and Social Change in West Virginia." *Urban Studies,* 30: 299-308.

Lichter, Daniel T., and Lori Ann Campbell. (2005). *Changing Patterns of Poverty and Spatial Inequality in Appalachia*. Washington, DC: Appalachian Regional Commission.

Lilly, Jessica. 2015. Inside Appalachia: Rising Above Heroin Addictions in Appalachia. *West Virginia Public Broadcasting.* Retrieved from http://wvpublic.org/post/insideappalachia-rising-above-heroin-addictions-appalachia.

Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Norman K. Denzin. 2003. *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief* (Vol. 2). Lanham, MD: Rowman Altamira.

Linnemann, Travis. 2013. "Governing Through Meth: Local Politics, Drug Control and the Drift Toward Securitization." *Crime, Media, and Culture,* 9 (1): 38-60.

Linnemann, Travis. 2016. *Meth Wars: Police, Media, Power*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Linnemann, Travis, and Tyler Wall. 2013. "'This is Your Face on Meth': The Punitive Spectacle of 'White Trash' in the Rural War on Drugs." *Theoretical Criminology*, *17*(3): 315-334.

Loftin, Colin, and Robert H. Hill. 1974. "Regional Subculture and Homicide: An Examination of the Gastil-Hackney Thesis." *American Sociological Review*: 714-724.

Logan, T. K., Robert Walker, Jennifer Cole, Stephanie Ratliff, and Carl Leukefeld. (2003). "Qualitative Differences among Rural and Urban Intimate Violence Victimization Experiences and Consequences: A Pilot Study." *Journal of Family Violence*, 18: 83-92.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.

Luke, Allan. 1996. "Text and Discourse in Education: An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis." *Review of Research in Education*, 21: 3-48.

Lupton, Deborah. 1999. *Risk: New Directions and Perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Marra, Ashton. 2015. Governor Signs Opioid Antagonist Bill into law. *West Virginia Public Broadcasting*. Retrieved from http://wvpublic.org/post/governor-signs-opioidanatagonist-bill-law

Massey, Carissa. 2007. "Appalachian Stereotypes: Cultural History, Gender, and Sexual Rhetoric." *Journal of Appalachian Studies*: 124-136.

Mauer, Marc. 2006. *Race to Incarcerate*. New York, NY: The New Press.

McLaglen, Andrew V. 1965. *Shenandoah*. TV/DVD. Universal Pictures.

McNeil, William K. 1995. *Appalachian Images in Folk and Popular Culture*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Messner, Steven. F. 1983. "Regional and Racial Effects on the Urban Homicide Rate: The Subculture of Violence Revisited." *American journal of Sociology*: 997-1007.

Miller, David, and Jenny Kitzinger. 1998. AIDS, the Policy Process and Moral Panics. *The Circuit of Mass Communication: Media Strategies, Representation and Audience Reception in the AIDS Crisis*: 213-222.

Miller, Donald L, and Richard E. Sharpless. 2003. *The Kingdom of Coal: Work, Enterprise, and Ethnic Communities in the Mine Fields*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Miller, Wilbur R. (1991). *Revenuers and Moonshiners Enforcing Federal Liquor Law in the Mountain South, 1865-1900.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Morgan, Michael, and James Shanahan. 1997. "Two Decades of Cultivation Research." Pp. 1-47 in *Communication Yearbook*, edited by B. R. Burleson. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Murray, Charles. 2013. *Coming Apart: The State of White America, 1960-2010*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.

Nelson, Gene. 1964. *Kissin' Cousins*. TV/DVD. Four-Leaf Productions.

Nitzberg, Julien. 2009. *The Wild and Wonderful Whites of West Virginia*. DVD. Los Angeles. Dickhouse Productions.

Pan, Zhongdang, and Gerald M. Kosicki. 1993. "Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse." *Political Communication*, *10*(1): 55-75.

Peine, Emile K, and Kai A. Schafft, K.A. 2012. "Moonshine, Mountaineers, and Modernity: Distilling Cultural History in the Southern Appalachian Mountains." *Journal of Appalachian Studies*, 18(1-2): 93-112.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2001. *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pew Research Center. 2014. *Pew Research Center 2014 Political Polarization and Typology Survey Final Topline*. Retrieved online:

    http://www.peoplepress.org/files/2014/06/APPENDIX-4-Typology-Topline-forRelease.pdf

Phillips, Nickie D., and Staci Strobl, S. 2006. "Cultural Criminology and Kryptonite: Apocalyptic and Retributive Constructions of Crime and Justice in Comic Books." *Crime, Media, Culture*, 2(3): 304-331.

Phillips, Tommy M. 2007. "Influence of Appalachian Fatalism on Adolescent Identity Processes." *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 99(2): 11.

Pollard, Kevin, and Linda A. Jacobsen. 2016. *The Appalachian Region: A Data Overview from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey*. Appalachian Regional Commission.

Presser, Lois, and Emily Gaarder. 2004. "Can Restorative Justice Reduce Battering?" Pp. 403-418 in The Criminal Justice System and Women: Offenders, Prisoners, Victims, and Workers (3rd ed.), edited by B. Price and N. Sokoloff In B. Price. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Pudup, Mary Beth, Dwight B. Billings, and Altina Laura Waller. (Eds.). 1995. *Appalachia in the Making: The Mountain South in the Nineteenth Century*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Rachels, James. 2007. *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (4th ed.). Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill.

Rafter, Nicole H. 2006. *Shots in the Mirror: Crime Films and Society*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, USA.

Rafter, Nicole, and Michelle Brown. 2011. *Criminology Goes to the Movies: Crime Theory and Popular Culture*. New York, NY: New York University

Raney, Arthur. A. 2005. "Punishing Media Criminals and Moral Judgment: The Impact on Enjoyment." *Media Psychology*, *7*(2):145-163.

Reiman, Jeffrey, and Paul Leighton. 2015. *The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison: Ideology, Class, and Criminal Justice*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Reinarman, Craig. 1994. "The Social Construction of Drug Scares." *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction:* 92-105.

Rennison, Callie M., Walter S. DeKeseredy, and Molly Dragiewicz, M. 2013. "Intimate Relationship Status Variations in Violence Against Women: Urban, Suburban, and Rural Differences." *Violence Against Women*. DOI: 10.1177/1077801213514487

Rennison, Callie. M., Walter DeKeseredy, and Molly Dragiewicz, M. 2012. "Urban, Suburban, and Rural Variations in Separation/Divorce Rape/Sexual Assault: Results from the National Crime Victimization Survey." *Feminist Criminology*, 7: 282-297.

Ritt, Martin. 1979. *Norma Rae*. TV/DVD. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation.

Robbers, Monica LP. 2005. "The Media and Public Perceptions of Criminal Justice Policy Issues: An Analysis of Bowling for Columbine and Gun Control." *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, *12*(2): 77-95.

Roberts, Julian. 2001. *Fear of Crime and Attitudes to Criminal Justice in Canada: a Revie Recent Trends: Report for the Ministry of the Solicitor General Canada*. Solicitor General Canada.

Robinson, Cara. 2015. "An Exploration of Poverty in Central Appalachia: Questions of Culture, Industry, and Technology." *KOME International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, 3(2): p. 75-89.

Rogers, Rebecca, Elizabeth Malancharuvil-Berkes, Melissa Mosley, Diane Hui, and Glynis O'Garro Joseph. 2005. "Critical Discourse Analysis in Education: A Review of the Literature." *Review of Educational Research*, *75*(3): 365-416.

Rosenthal, David. M. 2013. *A Single Shot*. TV/DVD. Unified Pictures.

Rothe, Dawn. L., and Ross, Jeffrey. I. 2007. "Lights, Camera, State Crime." *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, *14*(4): 330-343.

Rudd, Rose. A. 2016. "Increases in Drug and Opioid-Involved Overdose Deaths—United States, 2010–2015." *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *65*.

Said, Edward. W. 1985. "Orientalism Reconsidered." *Cultural Critique*, (1): 89-107.

Sarnoff, Susan. 2003. "Central Appalachia–Still the Other America." *Journal of poverty*, *7*(1-2): 123-139.

Sayles, John. 1987. *Matewan*. TV/DVD. Cinecom Entertainment Group.

Schept, Judah. 2014. "(Un)Seeing like a Prison: Counter-Visual Ethnography of the Carceral State." *Theoretical Criminology*, *18*(2): 198-223.

Scheufele, Dietram. A., and David Tewksbury. 2007. "Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models." *Journal of Communication*, *57*(1): 9-20.

Schmitt, Manfred, and Jirgen Maes. 2006. "Equity and Justice." *Psychology of Entertainment*: 273-289.

Scorsese, Martin. 1991. *Cape Fear*. TV/DVD. Amblin Entertainment.

Sears, David. O., Jim Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo. 2000. *Racialized Politics: The Debate about Racism in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Shapiro, Henry. D. 1986. *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920*. Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press Books.

Sherman, Mandel, and Thomas Henry. 1933. *Hollow Folk*. New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Shoemaker Pamela, J., and Reese Stephen, D. 1996. *Mediating the Message. Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content (2nd ed)*. Ottawa, IL: Caroline House Publishers.

Shrum, Larry, and Thomas O'Guinn. 1993. "Process and Effects in the Construction of Social Reality." *Communication Research*, 20(3): 436-471.

Simon, Johnathon. 2007. *Governing Through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Simons, Ronald L., and Ashley B. Barr. 2012. "Shifting Perspectives: Cognitive Changes Mediate the Impact of Romantic Relationships on Desistance from Crime." *Justice Quarterly*, 31:793–821.

Slocum, Audra. J. 2012. "Exploring Community Through Literature and Life: Adolescents Identity Positioning in Rural Appalachia*." PhD. Dissertation,* Department of Education*,* The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Soulliere, Danielle. M. 2003. "Prime-Time Murder: Presentations of Murder on Popular Television Justice Programs." *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, *10*(1):12-38.

Spector, Malcolm, and John I. Kitsuse. 1987. *Constructing Social Problems*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Starks, Helene, and Susan Brown Trinidad. 2007. "Choose Your Method: A Comparison of Phenomenology, Discourse Analysis, and Grounded Theory." *Qualitative Health Research*, 17 (10): 1372-1380.

Subcommittee, P. D. A. 2013. *Addressing Prescription Drug Abuse in the United States: Current Activities and Future Opportunities*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Surette, Ray. 2007. *Media, Crime and Criminal Justice: Images and Realities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Thorne, Deborah, Ann Tickamyer, and Mark Thorne. 2004. "Poverty and Income in Appalachia." *Journal of Appalachian Studies*, 10(3): 341-357.

Tjaden, Patricia, and Nancy Thoennes. 2000. *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* (NCJ 183781). Washington, DC: US, Department of Justice.

Tunnell, Kenneth. D. 2005. "The OxyContin Epidemic and Crime Panic in Rural Kentucky." *Contemporary Drug Problems*, *32*(2): 225-258.

Tzanelli, Rodanthi, Majid Yar, and Martin O'Brien, M. 2005. "Exploring Crime in the American Cinematic Imagination." *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(1): 97-117.

Ungar, Sheldon. 2001. "Moral Panic Versus the Risk Society: The Implications of the Changing Sites of Social Anxiety." *The British Journal of Sociology*, *52*(2): 271-291.

Uniform Crime Report. 2017a. *Estimated Violent Crime Rate*. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from

https://www.ucrdatatool.gov/Search/Crime/State/RunCrimeTrendsInOneVar.cfm

Uniform Crime Report. 2017b. *Estimated Property Crime Rate*. U. S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from

https://www.ucrdatatool.gov/Search/Crime/State/RunCrimeTrendsInOneVar.cfm

Van den Bulck, Jan. 2003. "Is the Mainstreaming Effect of Cultivation an Artifact or Regression of the Mean?" *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*. 47(2): 289-295

Van Dijik, Teun A. 1993. "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis." *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2): 249-283.

Van Ness, Daniel W., and Karen H. Strong. 2002. *Restoring Justice* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Van Wormer, Katherine, 2004. *Confronting Oppression, Restoring Justice: From Policy Analysis to Social Action*. Alexandria, VA: Council on Social Work Education.

Van Wormer, Katherine, and Albert R. Roberts. 2009. *Death by Domestic Violence: Preventing the Murders and Murder-Suicides*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Van Wormer, Katherine, and Clemens Bartoilas. 2007. *Women and the Criminal Justice System*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Vergeer, Maurice, Marcel Lubbers, and Peer Scheepers. 2000. "Exposure to Newspapers and Attitudes Toward Ethnic Minorities: A Longitudinal Analysis." *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 11: 127-143.

Vincent, George. E. 1898. "A Retarded Frontier." *The American Journal of Sociology*, 4: 1-20.

Wacquant, Loic. 2001. "Deadly Symbiosis when Ghetto and Prison Meet and Mesh." *Punishment & Society*, *3*(1): 95-133.

Wacquant, Loic. 1998. "Negative Social Capital: State Breakdown and Social Destitution in America's Urban Core." *The Netherlands Journal of the Built Environment*, 13(1): 25-40.

Walker, Lenore. 1984. *The Battered Woman Syndrome*. New York, NY: Springer.

Warner, Margaret, Li Hui Chen, Diane M. Makuc, Robert N. Anderson, and Arialdi M. Miniño. 2011. "Drug Poisoning Deaths in the United States, 1980-2008." *NCHS data brief*, (81):1-8.

Watney, Simon. 1988. "AIDS,'Moral Panic'Theory, and Homophobia." *Practices of Freedom: Selected Writings on HIV/AIDS*: 3-14.

Webb, James H. 2004. *Born Fighting: How the Scots-Irish Shaped America*. New York, NY: Random House, Broadway Books

Websdale, Neil. 2002. *Rural Woman Battering and the Justice System: An Ethnography.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Websdale, Neil., and Byron Johnson. 1998. "An Ethnostatistical Comparison of the Forms and Levels of Woman Battering in Urban and Rural Areas of Kentucky." *Criminal Justice Review*, 23: 161-196.

Weisheit, Ralph A., David N. Falcone, and L. Edwards Wells. 2006. *Crime and Policing in Rural Small-Town America* (3rd ed.) Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

Weisheit, Ralph A., and Joseph Donnermeyer, J. 2000. "Change and Continuity in Crime in Rural America." Pp. 309-357 in *The Nature of Crime: Continuity and Change, Criminal Justice*, edited by G. LaFree (Ed.). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Weitzer, Ronald, and Charis Kubrin. 2004. "Breaking News: How Local TV News and Real World Conditions Affect Fear of Crime." *Justice Quarterly*, *21*(3): 497-520.

Welch, Kelly. 2007. "Black Criminal Stereotypes and Racial Profiling." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23(3): 276-288.

Welch, Michael, Eric A. Price, and Nana Yankey. 2002. "Moral Panic Over Youth Violence Wilding and the Manufacture of Menace in the Media." *Youth & Society*, *34*(1): 3-30.

Welsh, Andrew, Thomas Fleming, and Kenneth Dowler. 2011. "Constructing Crime and Justice on Film: Meaning and Message in Cinema." *Contemporary Justice Review*, *14*(4): 457-476.

Whisnant, David. E. 1980. *Modernizing the Mountaineer: People, Power, and Planning in Appalachia.* Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press.

Wilkinson, Alec. 1985. *Moonshine: A Life in Pursuit of White Liquor*. New York, NY: Alfred A Knopf, Inc.

Williams, Dmitri. 2006. "Virtual Cultivation: Online Worlds, Offline Perceptions." *Journal of Communication*, 56: 68-87.

Williams, John A. 2002. *Appalachia: A History*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Williamson, Jerry. W. 1995. *Hillbillyland: What the Movies did to the Mountains and What the Mountains did to the Movies*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Williamson, Kevin. D. 2014. "The White Ghetto." *National Review*. January 2014, pp. 1.

Wilson, Franklin T., D. Longmire, and Warren Swymeler. 2009. "The Absence of Gay and Lesbian Police Officer Depictions in the First Three Decades of the Core Cop Film Genre: Moving Towards a Cultivation Theory Perspective*." Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 16 (1).

Wimmer, Roger D., and Joseph R. Dominick. 2003. *Mass Media Research: An Introduction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Wodak, Ruth, Michael Meyer, Stefan Titscher, and Eva Vetter. 2000. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London, UK: Sage.

Wolf, Kimberly A., and Vangi A. Foshee. 2003. "Family Violence, Anger Expression Styles, and Adolescent Dating Violence." *Journal of Family Violence*, 18: 309 –316.

Woo, Hyung-Jin, and Joseph R. Dominick. 2003. "Acculturation, Cultivation, and Daytime TV Talk Shows." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 80 (1): 109-127.

Wray, Matt. 2006. *Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness*. Durham, NC:
Duke University Press.

Yanarella, Ernest J., and Susan Blankenship, S. 2006. "Big House on the Rural Landscape:
Prison Recruitment as a Policy Tool of Local Economic Development." *Journal of Appalachian Studies*: 110-139.

Yar, Majid. 2016. "Imaginaries of Crime, Fantasies of Justice: Popular Criminology and the
Figure of the Superhero." *The Poetics of Crime: Understanding and Researching Crime and Deviance Through Creative Sources*: 193.

Young, Jacob. 1991. *Dancing Outlaw*. TV/DVD. MovieFish Productions.

Young, Jock. 1999. *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late
Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, Jock. 2007. *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, Lynne, and Claire Harrison (Eds.). 2004. *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical
Discourse Analysis: Studies in Social Change*. New York, NY: Continuum Press.

Young, Stephen. T. 2016. "Wild, Wonderful, White Criminality: Images of "White Trash"
Appalachia." *Critical Criminology*: 1-15.

Zeoli, April M., Rebecca Malinski, and Brandon Turchan, B. 2016. "Risks and Targeted
Interventions: Firearms in Intimate Partner Violence." *Epidemiologic Reviews*, 38: 125-139.

Zillmann, Dolf. 2003. "Theory of Affective Dynamics: Emotions and Moods." Pp. 533-567 in
Communication and Emotion: Essays in Honor of Dolf Zillman, edited by J. Byrant, D. Roskos-Ewoldsen, and J. Cantor. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

APPENDIX A

FILM LIST

Films	Year	Gross	Genre
Deliverance	1972	$264,001,932	Adventure
Coal Miner's Daughter	1980	$232,001,868	Bio-Drama
The Silence of the Lambs	1991	$229,646,642	Crime Drama
Cape Fear	1991	$139,387,325	Crime Thriller
Shenandoah	1965	$131,167,354	Drama
Walking Tall	1973	$123,941,509	Action
Big Business	1988	$81,204,105	Comedy
Norma Rae	1979	$73,254,731	Drama
October Sky	1999	$46,648,462	Bio-Drama
Next of Kin	1989	$30,761,686	Action
Kissin Cousins	1964	$21,610,670	Comedy
Wrong Turn	2003	$20,048,213	Horror
Out of the Furnace	2013	$11,633,349	Crime Drama
The Molly Maguires	1970	$6,783,172	Drama
Matewan	1987	$3,550,155	Drama
A Single Shot	2013	$10,333	Crime Drama

APPENDIX B

DOCUMENTARY LIST

Documentaries	Year	Awards
Harlan County, USA	1976	Academy Awards: Best Documentary (1977)
		Grand Prix de I'UCC (1979)
Dancing Outlaw	1992	Emmy Award: Best Documentary (1992)
		AIF: Best Documentary (1993)
The Wild and Wonderful Whites of West Virginia	2009	Melbourne Underground Film Festival: Best Foreign Film (2010)
Oxyana	2013	Tribeca Film Festival: Best Documentary Feature (2013)

VITA

Stephen T. Young
Old Dominion University
Department of Sociology & Criminal Justice
Norfolk, VA 23529

Education

Ph.D.   Criminology and Criminal Justice, August 2017
Old Dominion University
The Devil is in the Details: Representations of White Trash in Rural Appalachia.
Randy Myers (chair), Mona Danner, & External Member Travis Linnemann

M.S.   Criminal Justice, December 2012
Marshall University Huntington, West Virginia

B.A.   Criminal Justice and Psychology (Summa Cum Laude), December 2010
Marshall University

Publications

Peer Reviewed Publications

Young, S. (2016). "Wild, Wonderful, White Criminality: Images of White Trash Appalachia."
Critical Criminology. DOI: 10.1007/s10612-016-9326-7.

Selected Papers and Presentations

Pitman, B. & Young, S. T. (Under review). "Counting the Forgotten: Examining the History,
Politics, and   Power of Policing to Strive for Reductionist Alternatives".

Young, S. "Do We Really Want to Go Down that Path": Social Exclusion of Rural Appalachia
and the Cost of State Corporate Crime."

Danner, M., Young, S., & Lynch, C.G. *"The State of Professional Development Coursework in
Criminology and Criminal Justice Doctoral Programs".

Young, S. "From the Coal Camp to Trailer Park: The Ghettoization of Rural America. Critical
Intersections of Crime and Social Justice Conference. Norfolk, Virginia USA.

Young, S. "The Reality of Some: How Films have shaped the Rural Appalachian "Other".
Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology. New Orleans, Louisiana, USA.