“The Mountain Problem Solved in One Generation”: Alice Lloyd’s Eugenic Settlement Program and the Cultivation of Citizenship in the Mountains

A note to readers: The following paper is taken from a portion of a chapter of my dissertation, titled “Americanizing Appalachia: Mountain Uplift and the Preservation of White Citizenship, 1890–1930.” Due to page limits I have removed details regarding Alice and Arthur Lloyd’s life before they arrived in Kentucky. In the year immediately preceding their move, the couple briefly worked as social reformers in a rural New Hampshire town before local residents’ discontent required them to move.

In November 1916, one year after arriving in the mountains of eastern Kentucky, social reformer Alice Lloyd reflected on what she understood as the sordid state of the region and its people. While turn of the century writers and interventionists typically followed Horace Kephart’s lead and spoke highly of the “Southern Highlander” and the picturesque romanticism of the Appalachian mountains, Alice Lloyd declared openly that she worked “in the heart of the worst region.”

“In remote Knott [County],” she said, there was “no romance about the Southern Highlander. It is just race decay, inter breeding, illiteracy, [and] filth. It is a great pity that such a people have been allowed by centralized agencies to come to such a pass.”

She conceded that the region’s many educational interventionists had collectively “done wonderful, wonderful work,” but believed that their efforts had ultimately fallen short. Classifying all previous reform in the area as purely academic or religious endeavors— as opposed to her new “civic” approach— Alice Lloyd set out to re-make the standard of social work in the Kentucky mountains by explicitly and unapologetically applying eugenic principles— both negative and positive— to social and educational reform.

Although ideas of “good breeding” and inherited genetic value pervaded all mountain work and affected reformers’ assumptions about white superiority and reformability, the extent to which eugenics shaped reformers’ selection process and agendas varied greatly. In Lloyd’s view, the application of eugenic principles was the crucial missing piece to successfully
integrating “backward” and socially isolated Appalachian mountaineers into the modern American fold. Like other social reformers in the region, Lloyd understood her work as part of the larger process of cultivating citizenship in America, and believed that her reform work with mountain whites was as important as to the nation’s future as the Americanization movement was in assimilating and welcoming immigrants into American culture and politics. But in Lloyd’s interpretation, missionary and social settlement work done without “a eugenic forethought” produced imperfect Americans. She believed that her eugenic community-level approach would achieve what other methods had failed to do. With it, she declared, “the mountain problem would be solved in a generation.”

Eugenic methods were therefore uniquely central to Lloyd’s work of “Americanizing” Appalachia. Although other reformers in the region similarly understood their work in a national context, and sought to preserve the purity of the white Anglo-Saxon heritage and aspects of their mountain culture, Alice Lloyd’s effort was exceptional for its emphasis on genetic heritage in cultivating ideal American citizenship and in her dismissal of certain families as beyond the reach of her civilizing efforts. Both mountain reformers and immigrant Americanizers debated the place of eugenics in their cultural and political assimilative work. But whereas the latter group’s infighting culminated in restrictive eugenic immigration laws and exclusionary policies, Lloyd’s selective eugenic program and blueprint for total cultural reform remained an outlying approach. Although she tried mightily to expand her eugenic settlements throughout the region and advance her narrow view of Americanism, other mountain reformers retained a more capacious view of the ideal American type. They also used eugenic language in their publications and propaganda when it served them well, or when they felt the ideology would help them advocate on behalf of their constituents, but the majority of mountain reformers
resisted sweeping negative characterizations of the people in favor of a view that accepted and appreciated Appalachian cultural difference as a laudable American ethnicity.

Hindsight shows us that Lloyd’s eugenic settlement proved an exception rather than a rule in Appalachian reform, but contemporary observers and competing reformers in Eastern Kentucky had no such clarity. They took her proposed interventions seriously, as the scope and direction of Appalachian reform were far from settled in the first decades of the twentieth century. And, although most local interventionists rejected Lloyd’s ideas about the place of eugenics in producing socially, culturally, and politically integrated Appalachian Americans, many Americans in urban northeastern circles remained committed to Lloyd’s project for decades. Considering her eugenic settlement, outlier though it is, alongside better-known and mainstream approaches therefore provides important contextualization of turn-of-the-century debates over scope, direction, and methodology of Appalachian reform.

“Constructive Plans” for Eugenic Settlement Work in Kentucky

Lloyd’s disappointment with the New Hampshire project did not deter her from taking a similar approach when she arrived in Kentucky. As in the first instance, Lloyd’s second reform effort consisted of a whirlwind campaign to create social change at multiple levels. Lloyd sensed she had landed in a more receptive environment. In letters to her friends and supporters in the northeast, Lloyd boasted that it had taken only a few months for Ivis residents to “cooperate gloriously” with the couple to construct a simple Community Center, public library, demonstration farm, and a dispensary. She assured them that the Ivis Community Center and Free Public Library was different from other social agencies in the area. Hers was not “an academic institution” like the nearby Hindman Settlement School, which Lloyd denigrated for providing education for select individuals rather than comprehensive uplift for the entire
community. Instead, Lloyd described the couple’s work as a “wholly CIVIC” one focused on “the rehabilitation of the family.”

She admitted that the Ivis Community Center’s dispensary replicated Hindman’s non-academic social services, but dismissed the parallel in the long term. Palliative heath care, she explained, was merely a temporary effort to meet residents’ immediate health needs. “Fundamentally,” she said, it would “take years to do the preventative work.”

What exactly did Lloyd mean by “preventative,” “civic” work? To her critics, it appeared that the Ivis Community Center offered services that were nearly identical to those of the social workers and missionaries who preceded them. They especially resented Lloyd’s assertion that earlier reformers had done “no constructive social work AT ALL” in their more than twenty years of working in eastern Kentucky. But the distinction between her work and other settlements made sense to Lloyd: in her view, early reformers had done valuable academic work but had failed to create lasting community change because they had not integrated eugenic principles in those efforts. In her view, traditional reform provided a short-term solution to the “mountain problem” – a situation she felt could only be solved through the “preventative work” of eugenically mediating mountaineers’ marriage patterns, reproduction, community interactions, and professional ambitions.

Lloyd described herself as a social engineer, a reformer whose interventions methodically shaped the entire community rather than supporting “exceptional child[ren]” for a short time, as other settlement schools did. She believed that her method of social engineering was superior to conventional reform efforts since she “stud[ied] the conditions of each community” and then “treat[ed] those conditions as a unit, by the people and with the people and for the people.”

What good was it, she asked scornfully, if settlement schools like Hindman educated students in arithmetic, reading, and writing, only to return them to an environment where they would sit “in
silk stockings on the porch of a log house” that had “not the slightest trace of sanitation” and was rife with typhoid, tuberculosis, and other ills? In her view, those educated students quickly slipped back to their old ways and became “victim[s] of euthenics,” unable to escape the reality and confines of an unhygienic environment. If her method of eugenic “civic education ha[d] been started in the mountains 20 years ago,” she lamented, then “the mountains would now be ready to take their rightful place in the nation.”

Unlike other Appalachian reformers who saw certain aspects of mountain culture as valuable and worthy of preservation, Alice Lloyd loathed much of the region’s culture and social practices. She especially despised the people’s “isolation, ignorance, [and] inter-marriage” and declared that these ills had reduced the quality of Knott County residents so much that they had sunk “lower and lower in the scale of human types… until in this generation many [were] not bodily clean.” Rural Kentuckians were so “infested with fleas and other vermin” and lacked “regular habits,” she scoffed, that they had become “more akin to hibernating animals than twentieth century human beings.” In her view, fifty-percent of the “race [was] decayed past rescue.”

But while Lloyd declared bluntly that there were “certain stocks” she and her husband “[did not] touch” because of generations of intermarriage and race-decay, she also believed other genetic lines were the “glorious remnants” of the nation’s first settlers and were of pure Anglo-Saxon descent. Lloyd was unequivocal that her community work was for the latter group, and she explained to Boston press sources in the fall of 1915 that her efforts were designed to halt the “deterioration of the Kentucky Anglo-Saxon” and preserve the remaining peoples’ “physical, mental and spiritual vigor.” Mountaineers’ racial “deterioration… [could] hardly be afforded” she explained, since the group had “inherent qualities that [were] greatly needed in the United
"States." Especially in the decades defined by ethnic immigration, Lloyd’s statement appealed to contemporaries threatened by America’s increasingly diverse racial and cultural landscape. In their view, Lloyd’s efforts to uplift a selected cadre of Kentucky mountaineers seemed not only a noble cause of helping America’s “forgotten citizens,” but also one in which they might cultivate their ideal standard of white citizenship.

Lloyd framed her work in that nationalistic and patriotic context often. She insinuated that her community-level approach to social engineering would produce lasting regional change that would allow Appalachians to become culturally and politically integrated in mainstream American culture. Referencing Galatians 5:9, Lloyd explained how she planned to “leaven,” or uplift, the Ivis and nearby communities through eugenic selection and cultivation. By selecting the best Anglo-Saxon families and providing them with comprehensive social, cultural, and political reforms, Lloyd believed that her Community Center approach would furnish the region with the leaders and productive American citizens it needed. Just “a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,” Lloyd explained, her student-leaders would eventually return to their home communities and join her in the work of rescuing its population for “capable citizenship” through example and influence. Guided by the right combination of inborn independence and the center’s lessons on purposeful living, Lloyd predicted that her mountain leaders would eventually make outside intervention obsolete. One day, she said, they would “cast us all out and reach their own citizenship themselves.”

The Lloyds spent their first fifteen months in Kentucky methodically collecting data on local people and their living conditions to determine where the most salvageable families lived. They traveled from home to home making a “census of the creeks” around Ivis and the
community of Caney Creek, about six miles away. By the spring of 1917, the couple had enough
data to turn observation into action. Focusing primarily on the eugenic promise they saw in
select mountain families, Alice Lloyd compiled their findings into a dense nine-page, single-
spaced document to explain to their friends and supporters how the couple would work in the
region. They would first select the best genetic material in the mountains, restore those persons’
health, and inspire their interest in civic matters, she explained. Then, selected mountain families
be able to “develop.... [a] home life and environment that through its own uplifting influence
would rescue to health and citizenship a race that (under present conditions) [was] gradually and
painfully dying.”

Lloyd was prone to hyperbole, but in this case her concern with mountaineers’ poor
health and sanitation were warranted. Hookworm, typhoid, and trachoma were serious problems
in the eastern Kentucky mountains, and the couple understood they could not address the
region’s social issues without first making basic improvements in health care and sanitation.
But Lloyd focused less on the public health consequences of a dirty environment than she did on
what she saw as the social degeneracy wrought by those circumstances. The couple’s plan, she
explained, was “not a sedative to ease a dying race… but a cure” for the racial decline of the
region. Ever the sensationalist, she described how the interrelated and “devastating evils … [of]
…. isolation, ignorance, and intermarriage” led to mountaineers’ mental and physical
“degeneration.” Left unchecked, she warned, these “Three Is” and “Three D’s” always
culminated in “disease and death.”

Lloyd painted a dire picture indeed when she explained how racial decay in Kentucky
threatened the future health and prosperity of the region, and by extension, the nation. She
intoned that “When a race of people in ISOLATION, led by IGNORANCE” married “its own
double and twisted cousins for a century, it is not any wonder that a single strain has deteriorated into producing as its sole asset to the nation: ‘One-blind-Fit.’ a 28 year old idiot, blinded by red-sore-eyes, stiffened into a perpetual fit by congenital handicaps. Sickly individuals, like the man in her anecdote, threatened the nation’s health because they could not properly carry out the gendered responsibilities of American citizenship. Degenerated mountain men, Lloyd scorned, were apathetic, worthless citizens who preferred to spit tobacco and whittle all day rather than engage in politics or other intellectual pursuits to improve their communities. Diseased and fallen mountain women were just as responsible for the repugnant state of the people in the region; as Lloyd’s anecdote made clear, she felt that mountain women failed at their primary democratic obligation when they reproduced unhealthy citizens. Most seriously of all, though, was that unhealthy mountaineers of both sexes threatened to contaminate and negatively influence the genetically sound mountaineers in their vicinity, and failed to understand their role in the larger social order.

Lloyd’s hope— in the mist of the region’s ill health and poverty— was her belief that eugenic selection and environmental management would bring to the surface mountain whites’ Anglo-Saxon inherited traits that pre-disposed them for civic contribution in a republic. It is “hard to kill a pure-blooded Anglo-Saxon!” she exclaimed, and avowed that even generations of poor hygiene, intermarriage, and isolation could be resolved through benevolent eugenic oversight. She therefore designed Caney Creek’s educational offerings, model homes, district nursing, and eugenic instruction in courtship and marriage to restore her chosen families’ racial pride and preserve the American system of democracy. She believed that their “sensitive eager faces” contained the “hope for the training of leaders so badly needed in our society today.” If it were not for those “pioneer [families] in whom the ancestral spark [was] not yet quenched,”
Lloyd admitted, the couple would “withdraw from Caney Creek and leave its cabin people to their losing battle for mere survival.”

“A Sociological Laboratory for the Testing of Mountaineers”

Between the end of 1916 and beginning of 1917, the Lloyds shifted their primary focus and residence from Ivis to Caney Creek. Ivis residents had been increasingly uncooperative and Alice was personally excited by the opportunity to work in the more remote Caney section. A local man by the name of Abisha Johnson granted Lloyd a small piece of un-farmable land on which to build a small shack, and the Caney Creek Community Center was born. Arthur Lloyd’s background as a carpenter and real estate broker proved useful as the couple started basic construction on settlement buildings and the center’s model “Dream Houses.” But his influence in the couple’s project was always secondary to Alice’s, and even critical observers admitted that she was “surely the queen of the settlement.” That unofficial title took on greater meaning after February 1918, when Arthur Lloyd abruptly left Caney Creek after falling in love with one of the center’s social workers. Lloyd divorced him swiftly but amicably, and continued to steadily increase the scope of her eugenic work and maintained its management firmly.

Like other eugenicists of the 1910s and 1920s, Lloyd understood the value of negative eugenic selection to limit the reproduction of the “unfit,” but she applied those principles to her work only when she felt it was absolutely necessary. In larger cities, state and benevolent workers often institutionalized those persons—and sometimes forcibly sterilized them—to prevent unfit members of society from contaminating those who were more “fit.” But in a resource-scarce region like eastern Kentucky, Lloyd could not rely on benevolent homes to house the unfit, except in extreme cases. Instead, she most often applied the principles of negative
eugenics to her work by intentionally withholding support from families she considered “too far
gone” so that they would have fewer opportunities to reproduce and contaminate mountaineers
whom she planned to cultivate according to her eugenic plan.45

As Louise Moody Merrill discovered when passing through Caney Creek on her way to
work for Hindman’s summer school in the summer of 1924, Lloyd was content to leave
mountain families she determined to be unfit in utterly deplorable living conditions. Although
Merrill did not fully understand what she witnessed, the family she described in her diary that
night was almost certainly one that Lloyd had determined was beyond rescue. Merrill noted that
her encounter with “a small tumbledown cabin with just openings for windows”—just a half-
mile away from Caney Creek—was something she could “never forget.”46 From her horse, she
could make out the “dirty beds” and the “many children” crawling over them, children who
“seemed ill and hungry.” The cabin was “just filled with big black flies,” and when the
grandmother of the home came to the fence with a child in her arms, Merrill noticed its “pinched
face was covered with sores.” The grandmother seemed to be alone in caring for the brood of
children, as “the mother was working in the field and there was no father visible.” Merrill
admitted that she was “much surprised to find this condition so near Caney” in light of her
pleasant experience with Alice Lloyd at her settlement earlier that day.47

But as adherents to Lloyd’s method proudly explained, the Caney Creek Community
Center was not primarily interested in “teaching the ABCs and 2x2’s to a multitude.”48 Rather,
the institution was openly committed to cultivating “citizenship and leadership [in] the chosen—
carefully chosen—few.”49 Lloyd and her supporters assumed that helping families whose genes
were “badly off” hindered the development of good stocks, and concluded it was best to allow
the deleterious effects of intermarriage to run their course.50 “In short time,” she explained,
eugenically unsound Kentuckians would “die out, as did our American Indian, thru racial decay with its intermarriage, illiteracy, social segregation … et cetera.”

Segregating the worst human products from Knott County’s was an important aspect of Lloyd’s project, but negative eugenic selection alone would not improve the race or produce American citizens. To do those things and prove that the region’s isolation and intermarriage had not yet “caused irretrievable deterioration,” Lloyd turned the majority of her attention and efforts to positive eugenic practices that encouraged the intellectual, cultural, and biological reproduction of those families whom she determined were most fit. Like many progressives who found eugenics a useful tool in their search for efficiency and a better social order, Lloyd was frustrated with the slowness of natural selection and declared it a “tedious and unsatisfactory” method. She and other Progressives believed human-driven artificial selection improved on the concept of natural selection and prudently ensured “the most efficient route to better heredity.”

Lloyd was proud of her experimental eugenic project and was excited about its civic implications. For over four decades, Caney Creek’s letterhead proclaimed that it was a “sociological laboratory” where “Anglo-Saxon Mountaineers” joined in the “civic work” of rescuing themselves and “the 4,000,000 mountaineers of the Southern Highlands... from isolation, ignorance, and race-decay” so that they might “become economic assets and leading citizens of the United States.” Even after the eugenics movement declined in popularity in the mid-1930s, Lloyd continued to frame Knott County mountaineers’ racial heritage and American birth as valuable national assets worthy of interventionists’ consideration. “‘The wealth of a nation,’” she proclaimed, lay not in its “‘land or gold,’” but in its “‘cleanness of blood and soundness of the hearts of its sons and daughters.’” Caney Creek strove to preserve that blood
by “select[ing] mountain boys and girls who [were] physically fit, mentally capable, and spiritually righteous” and training them “to become actively efficient and morally consecrated leaders of their own mountain people.”

Lloyd also borrowed liberally from the contemporaneous Americanization movement and its efforts to culturally and politically assimilate recent immigrants. In 1919, she devised a motto that at once situated her work within the context of that movement and addressed the need for parallel reform in Appalachia. Her center, she proclaimed, worked for the “The Americanization of Americans by Americans.” She frequently scoffed that early-twentieth century Americans were “neglecting to a criminal extent” their “native sons and daughters” when they prioritized international relief and immigrant education over Appalachian reform. Why was it, she asked in the midst of WWI, that mountaineers seemed to be “of less value to the nation at this crisis… than hyphenated Americans”? Was not her work “of Americanizing these Americans” at least as “patriotic… a service” as aid work in France? She warned that America would be ill advised to forget about the “the 11,000 real Americans” in Knott County “in the midst of the present vast stir of national patriotism.” She urged them to join her in her work of “Americanizing these Americans” who had simply “miss[ed] their highest” potential because of a lack of opportunity. Outsiders’ support, she insisted, would pay off quickly in democratic dividends, since “the material [was] there for … making … Americans that would easily rank among the best in our great country.”

Lloyd’s call to “Americanize” individuals endowed with both whiteness and citizenship – the two most important categories of social privilege in America–seems striking to modern readers. But early twentieth century Americans were abuzz with that debate: was Americanism guaranteed by country of origin? Was there an authentic American “race?” Could one “learn” to
become American, or were naturalized Americans “less” American than native-born Americans? Most importantly, what specific behaviors and actions demonstrated that one was, in fact, “Americanized,” acculturated, and appropriately dedicated to the preservation of American democracy?\footnote{66}

Lloyd’s motto therefore situated her regional work within national debates about immigration, Americanism and citizenship, as well as the potential for white racial decline in unhygienic and primitive environments.\footnote{67} Her efforts to “Americanize” a group of people who were both white and native-born American citizens indicated that she understood “Americanism” as importantly rooted in race and country of origin, but not guaranteed by it. She hoped that Caney’s “sociological laboratory,” guided by her eugenic oversight, would teach “Americans of American birth” the behaviors and civic ideals she felt they currently lacked.\footnote{68} In providing her selected mountaineers with an environment that instructed them in the principles of eugenic living and civic engagement, Lloyd believed she would create ideal American citizens: people who were, importantly, native-Americans by birth, of “pure” American stock, and who daily carried out the behaviors she felt were required to preserve American democracy.

****

Lloyd’s ideas about social reform reflected an outdated understanding of heredity and genetics. By the time she arrived in the Kentucky mountains in 1915, Darwinism had replaced late nineteenth century concepts of Lamarckian inheritance and recapitulation theory, but Lloyd continued to cling to those earlier views. Her focus on improving unhygienic environments— in order to raise living standards and affect biological change in the region’s descendants— suggests her devotion to Lamarckian principles, and her continued defense of the people with whom she worked as “timid,” “child-like,” “elemental,” and “primitive” bespoke her belief in Ernst
Haeckel’s recapitulation theory.\textsuperscript{69} That model argued that all social groups went through an “evolution” in the course of their lives, and made it easy for Lloyd to frame her subjects as embryonic Americans, beings who had not yet fully developed into idealized American selves.\textsuperscript{70}

She sharply rejected Darwinian ideas about natural selection and the omniscience of the survival of the fittest in favor of reformer-guided “social selection” that “improved upon nature.”\textsuperscript{71} Kentucky mountaineers’ poverty, poor health, and social-ills, she said, were both a “sad commentary upon” and a “convincing denial and refutation” of Darwin’s theory that humans would “assert and manifest [their] better qualities” when isolated.\textsuperscript{72} On the contrary, she believed that the region’s people “show[ed] the toll” of “ignorance and superstition” when the “the bright light of civilization [was] dimmed.” In her view, Knott County’s degradation was evidence enough “that the human race” held “no patent, through heredity or antecedents, upon intellectuality or fitness to lead.”\textsuperscript{73}

Lloyd thought that education and modernization for a hand-selected group of mountaineers were the evolutionary catalysts the group needed. Only through these efforts, Lloyd explained, would Kentuckians be “brought up to the twentieth century” and made “as modernly American in thought as they [were] in descent.”\textsuperscript{74} Referring here to “thought” synonymously with “cultural and political practice,” Lloyd designed the Caney Creek Community Center to provide that instruction.\textsuperscript{75} She explained her distinctive approach to a prospective donor in 1917, saying:

“…[W]e start with [where] the mountaineer IS. We progress with him-in the way of sanitation and prevention of disease and eradication of illiteracy and model homes and responsibility toward the nation- one inch. If he keeps abreast with us during that inch, we start with him another inch. If he does not, we go right back where he was before we move him another inch. This … way, little by little, we have improved the environment; \textit{and we are finding that through the influence of an improved environment nearly every resident is exceptional- because, given the right kind of a chance, the race is exceptional.} We believe … that it is civic work
that will save the mountains—better living, safer living, higher community ideals.”  

The Caney Creek project therefore married the concepts of nature and nurture within its overarching eugenic frame and represented both a challenge to and synthesis of contemporary ideas about heredity and social reform. Some contemporaries, like embryologist Edwin G. Conklin, also wondered about human plasticity and debated the role education could play in bringing out a population’s “potentially present” qualities. But that view was increasingly disputed after 1914, when hardline hereditarians Roswell Johnson and Paul Popenoe took over the leadership of the leading eugenics journal and changed the name of the magazine from the American Breeders Magazine to the Journal of Heredity to reflect that stance. Ultimately, Lloyd’s philosophy fell somewhere in between moderate eugenicists like Conklin and hardline hereditarians like Johnson and Popenoe, who insisted that heredity fundamentally accounted for the direction of human evolution as well as criminality, pauperism, and alcoholism.

At the heart of Lloyd’s reform project lay the challenge of re-shaping a long-standing trait of the region’s people, and one they took great pride in: their individualism. Self-sufficiency and independence were, of course, desirable traits for settlers making their homes in an isolated and harsh environment, but Lloyd worried that those strengths had become weaknesses over time. Hundreds of years of isolation had produced a people who “hardly realize[d] that they [were] a part of the United States,” and who assumed their homes were “an island separated by water from ‘Ameriky.’” They were, in her view, generally unaware of national affairs and seemed apathetic about progress, “content to work [just] three months out of the year.” To a Progressive like Lloyd, who viewed society as a social organism, such views seemed self-centered, unprogressive, and ultimately un-American. Like her role model Jane Addams, Lloyd metaphorically envisioned society as a living, breathing body and conceived of the nation’s
health as related to the health and aptitude of its people—its “cells.” As they were, sickly and culturally backward mountain whites seemed a cancerous threat to the vitality of the white race and to the American nation.

Although Kentucky mountaineers currently weakened the social body more than they supported its growth, Lloyd held fast to her belief that mountain whites preserved a certain amount of ideal Americanism because of their race and country of origin. She believed they could be easily reformed, and felt called to select the best members of the community for what she described as the dual “restoration” of the race and “redemption” of the nation.” She believed that Caney Creek’s positive eugenic program would simultaneously restore white racial hegemony in America and cultivate civically and socially engaged citizens for the nation. Through her sociological laboratory’s benevolent eugenic oversight, Lloyd declared, Caney Creek’s mountaineers would learn— in just one generation—how to “assert… their rightful heritage of leadership.” By acting with purpose and awareness of the larger social order, and by abandoning the habits of intermarriage and excessive individualism of their forefathers, Caney Creek’s student-leaders would represent to the nation true “undefiled Anglo-Saxon Americanism.” Her graduates—her “Americans of American birth”—would solve the mountain problem themselves as they became modernized, culturally Americanized, and engaged in the democratic process and social organism of the American state.

Training Leaders for Capable Citizenship: The Purpose Road and Dream Houses

Lloyd believed that selected families and students could be made into ideal American citizens, but doubted their ability to do so without constant supervision. She tried a remote approach to social reform in her first year in Kentucky, and sent twelve Ivis area-students to Berea College for vocational training with the understanding that they would join her in the
Caney work upon graduation.\textsuperscript{87} One such student, Guerney Baker, successfully trained as an agriculturalist at Berea and later worked with Lloyd at the center’s model farm and community cannery.\textsuperscript{88} But in a matter of months, Lloyd became angered with his over-confidence and unwillingness to work under her command. She dismissed him after a short tenure because he “thot (sic) he knew it all” and did poor quality work.\textsuperscript{89}

Just one year later, in the spring of 1917, Lloyd embraced a comprehensive and hands-on approach to her Kentucky work that integrated her conglomerate ideas about Progressivism, eugenics, and citizenship. Central to that model was the development of an institutional philosophy for Caney Creek that became known as the Purpose Road. To better represent that idea to illiterate or minimally educated mountaineers, Lloyd developed a visual diagram to accompany its message and then intertwined the philosophy in all aspects of education and domestic life at Caney Creek.\textsuperscript{90} She printed, displayed, and shared her Purpose Road diagram in almost all of the Center’s printed media for the next forty years, and discussed how it taught Caney students to live with “ethical forethought” in their lives.

Based heavily on Harvard philosophy professor George Herbert Palmer’s ideas about childrens’ innate goodness, and contemporary notion of balancing the spiritual, mental, physical, and social aspects of one’s self, Lloyd designed the Purpose Road to motivate her students to live their lives with direction.\textsuperscript{91} Unlike their forefathers who drifted meaninglessly through life, trapped in a permanent child-like state she termed “thinghood,” Lloyd taught Caney students to move through life with a specific
goal in mind. She demanded they think and act with awareness of how their individual behaviors supported the larger work of “world service.” Guided by “conscience,” “duty,” “action,” “courage,” and a sense of sacrifice and dedication to a goal that Lloyd summarized as “consecration,” Lloyd’s students learned the “Christian ethics” they needed to succeed at “the science of living.”

People who abided by the Purpose Road became part of the Caney Creek “family,” and stood in sharp contrast to earlier generations of mountaineers, whom Lloyd scored as apathetic and self-centered “drifters.” The “ditch” of life, she warned, was “filled with … drifters [who] aim not, dare not, care not, try not, will not, do not and can not.” She rejected their laissez-faire lifestyle and contrasted it with the purposeful approach to living that Caney’s “trained leaders” took as they traveled intentionally through life as balanced “human machines.” Her students, she intoned, were mindful of their place in the larger social order and acted at all times with ethical “forethought.” This consideration for “for the age unborn” was central to the lessons Lloyd taught her students, and reflected her belief in the importance of eugenics in social reform. In later iterations of the Purpose road, Lloyd added a spiritual dimension to remind students that an “all supply[ing]” being gave Earth and all life its existence. It was for this being, as well as for the health and safety of future generations she explained, that humans worked.

The Purpose Road philosophy provided Caney Creek students with a new way of thinking about themselves, their communities, and their relation to the American nation– but it did little to change the overall region’s poverty, poor sanitation, and sub-par housing. In order to create long-term and comprehensive change in the region, Lloyd resolved that entire mountain families needed “some counteracting, enlightening influence” to show them “the way out” of
their bad habits. Based on their observation of mountain homes in the 1916 eugenic survey of the area, the Lloyds concluded that providing better living conditions was “the only method of saving the waste of life at present going on unchecked.” Concurrent with their move from Ivis to Caney Creek, Arthur and Alice had spearheaded a housing project to eventually build ten model homes, called “Dream Houses,” so they could supervise and instruct families according to their eugenic and civic standards. The homes were simple and cost $300 to construct; Lloyd described them as functional but modern two-three room homes with plank sides, windows, and proper ventilation. They met a real community need, as most log cabins in the area had dirt floors and lacked windows or other ventilation for chimney smoke. Hygiene and sanitation were especially bad, as families polluted their own water supplies with poorly located wells, privies, and hog-pens. It was not uncommon to find families of eight or more in these small spaces, and numerous travelers reported meeting young girls who had married before the age of fifteen, and/ or to their first or second cousin.

While all Caney homes would therefore benefited from modernization and improved sanitation systems, Lloyd offered the Dream Houses to select families whom she believed had eugenic promise and were willing to abide by the Center’s strict rules. She was vocal about her intention to eugenically shape residents’ “mental conceptions” and “physical activities” through the homes and lessons on the Purpose Road philosophy. Lloyd reasoned that this benevolent oversight, or “rehabilitation,” would teach mountain families how to act with civic and social responsibility, and cultivate hundreds of leaders for American citizenship.

Dream House residents sacrificed a significant measure of their personal freedoms and traditions in exchange for their new homes and educational opportunities. Lloyd required all tenants to sign a detailed contract for the duration of their five-year lease that reduced them to
tenant laborers under her panoptic eye. Dream House residents—children and adults—were required to attend Caney’s day or night schools and clubs, and pledged not to drink or make liquor, spit on the floor, swear, fight, curse, carry a gun on campus, or engage in any contact with members of the opposite sex. They consented to at-will inspection of their homesteads, outhouses, and barns, as well as thrice-daily check ins from social workers who made sure occupants abided by middle-class standards of hygiene, dress, and domestic science. All prospective mothers were required to use the center’s nurse for pre and post-natal care (as opposed to the traditional reliance on midwives and grannies,) and agreed to in-house domestic science lessons and instruction on the “proper” way to care for their children. In terms of economic pursuits, women and children in the Dream Houses were required to learn a marketable craft to sell at the center’s exchange store, while men returned 20% of their annual wages to the center, gave 50% of their products to the Industries Building, and donated 33% of any crops cultivated in a year in lieu of rent. If a Dream House family displeased Lloyd by not living up to her expectations, she could— and did— evict them with little notice.

Although she left no clear record of the program’s eugenic criteria— other than firm admonitions she would not work with “worn out stocks”— it is clear that Lloyd’s conception of fitness differed from local residents. Ivis and Caney area families were perplexed, for example, when she offered a Dream House to Sam Slone and his seven children, since most people considered him a poor provider for his family and rather “hopeless.” Locals were particularly disgruntled by Lloyd’s association and support of Jo Jones, who was “a perfectly lawless soul” and “good for nothing” man who was known for his cruelty to women. He had been married three times and divorced twice, and in the second year of Lloyd’s Caney experiment, was in the process of suing his ex-wife for desertion of her children. Rather than
spurn Jones, Lloyd made him the chief manager of Caney Creek and worked closely with him for years. Her decision to give the notoriously disreputable man a second chance was no doubt inspired by the fact that her twenty-two years old Massachusetts-born nurse, Miss Polly Stickney, became intimately involved with him about six weeks into her Kentucky stay. Stickney quickly became Jones’ third wife and the couple had a son nine months later, in mid-1916.116

Lloyd’s criteria for selecting Dream House families seems more rooted in their public devotion to her program and willingness to abide by the center’s strict rules than in scientific data. Vague conceptions of eugenic promise allowed her to choose families whom she thought could be reformed—because of some measure of genetic “sturdiness,” as she called it—and who would be reformed—as a consequence of their willingness to change. The families of Abisha Johnson, Rufus Owens, Alec Jacobs, and “Preacher Billy” met this rather arbitrary standard, and were among the first Caney residents to receive Dream Houses.117 Little information about Dream House inhabitants remains, but we know these families lived in close proximity to the center in the decades prior to the Lloyds’ arrival and that they were particularly instrumental in helping the couple establish themselves in the region. Collectively, they offered land, free labor, or public support for their cause: Abisha Johnson sold 150 acres of his land to the Lloyds and encouraged them to develop a school in the area, and Preacher Billy proved to be an out-spoken advocate for Lloyd when an angry mob accused her of being a German Spy and planned to blow up the newly-constructed community center.118 No information about the Owens’ family has survived, but medical records indicate that Lloyd’s interest in the Jacobs family stemmed from one of its children; she believed that seventeen-year-old Napoleon Jacobs showed unique “mental promise.”119 He was “worth it,” she explained to a fellow reformer, even though he had “defective eyes” produced by two generations of first-cousin marriage. Lloyd hoped simple
medical attention would solve Napoleon’s eye troubles enough for him to become a local teacher and support his family.\textsuperscript{120}

The eugenic selection and surveillance of the Dream House program—combined with the ethical and moral lessons of the Purpose Road—supported Lloyd’s agenda of perfecting the race for the sake of national improvement. Her plan ensured mountain whites’ racial uplift and cultivated what were, in her view, ideal American citizens by teaching them progressive ideas about morality, sacrifice, and service to the greater good. Her belief in the work of race perfection to save the republic reflects what historian Beryl Satter has identified as “evolutionary republicanism,” and explains why Lloyd felt comfortable linking the homesteading project to American nation building.\textsuperscript{121} In describing the program to prospective donors in the midst of WWI, for example, Lloyd spurned critics who encouraged Appalachian reformers to abandon their work in favor of international aid. Lloyd averred that she \textit{was} involved in America’s wartime effort: just as “the foreign committees [were] fighting to save the shattered families abroad,” she explained, Caney Creek was “fighting in this wilderness… to save a race of vanishing men to citizenship in the United States.”\textsuperscript{122} In her view, deserting the mountain work was unpatriotic and inconsistent with the war’s aim of spreading democracy.\textsuperscript{123} It was “merely a question of priorities,” she mused, “as to whether an entire family of pure-blooded Americans [was] worth half as much as one French baby.”\textsuperscript{124} Funding Caney Creek’s work, she declared, was an easy way to a make patriotic investment in real American citizenship.\textsuperscript{125}

***

Lloyd advertised the Dream Houses to donors as simple, modern homes for mountaineers to begin a new hygienic and civically minded life. Her financial requests were tremendously successful, especially in northeastern circles. In 1918, Lloyd issued a special Dream House
Christmas leaflet to 25,000 people that raised $6,000 in personal donations and secured a $5,000 annual pledge from Colgate’s Soap. This support, while notable, was not an unusual event. Lloyd had three extensive files of backers’ contact information at Wellesley, Smith, Vassar, Mt. Holyoke, Radcliffe, and Oberlin colleges, and she spent hours a day writing appeals to those friends and acquaintances from her Olivetti typewriter. Her previous experience as a melodramatic journalist prepared her well to write compelling, if not hyperbolic accounts, that allowed her to collect between $400 and $500 a day when she was heavily involved in a financial campaign for the center. Without a doubt, Lloyd’s method and intention appealed to hundreds of northern middle-class Progressives.

On-site visitors were less impressed. Social reformers John C. and Olive D. Campbell visited Caney Creek at Alice’s invitation in November 1917, and Olive remarked that the settlement was “lovely [but] very primitive.” The buildings were scattered over the very steep hillsides, “huddled together without flare or furnish.” When Alice proudly showed the Campbells her newly constructed Dream Homes and hospital, Olive was surprised by their crudeness and poor quality. She found that the homes were “built on an exceedingly steep edge” of the hillsides, lacked suitable farm land for each plot, and had only bracket pipe chimneys. The interior walls were made of “raple (sic) board covered with heavy-tarred paper,” and “looked chill[y] and uninsulated (sic).”

Although they never admitted it in pleas for financial support, the Lloyds clearly knew their Dream Houses were hardly a dream to live in. They freely admitted to the Campbells that the homes were created as cheap temporary residences to incentivize tenants to move out and build their own homes after a period of years. Furthermore, Olive remarked, the Lloyds “did
not believe in building any substantial building” because they “planned to work in each place a
while and then move on to another needy spot.”

But the Lloyds’ plans to migrate deeper into the mountains never came to fruition, and
Caney’s temporary buildings became permanent residents. The quality of Dream Houses built
after Arthur Lloyd’s departure in early 1918 was almost certainly poor, as his carpentry
background had been useful in early construction efforts. After he left, Alice had to rely on
twenty-five untrained volunteers to build the homes. They were constructed at a rapid pace:
Caney Creek had only a handful of cabins when the Campbell’s visited in late 1917, but that
number had risen to six model homes a year later.

Lloyd was more far more concerned with selling the concept of the Dream Houses to her
donors than she was in providing adequate housing for the people she served. Critics accused her
of developing a settlement that “support[ed] and fit[ted] the pride of the head rather than …
actually perform[ing] a service to the people of the mountains.” That indictment seems fair in
light of the fact that she spent considerable time, money, and effort making a short silent film
about the Dream Houses in the midst of real financial struggles at the center. Footage from her
1919 film *The Hope of the Hills* has not survived, but descriptions of the production describe it
as a combination of social propaganda and advertising for the center. Harry Levey of
Universal’s educational division co-directed the film onsite with Lloyd, and local actors Sam
Slone, Elizabeth Stacy, and Jo Jones played the mountaineer roles while Jean Armour stood in as
a fictional Mrs. Lloyd. The American Multigraph Company also donated to the film’s
production since their addressograph, which was crucial to Lloyd’s publicity pleas, was
advertised at two different points in the six-reel film.
The *Hope of the Hills* was surprisingly popular outside of Kentucky and received a good amount of press attention. Attendees at the February 1919 Semi-Annual meeting of the Association of National Advertisers (ANA) enjoyed a private screening, as did a select group of New York City donors later that year. Tim Thrift of the American Multigraph Company personally supported Lloyd’s work (enough so that she named a Dream House after him) and his colleagues at the ANA enjoyed the film and its premise. It reinforced negative stereotypes about the region while depicting Lloyd’s Dream Homes as the “Hope of the Hills” that would regenerate 11,000 Knott County residents into respectable American citizens. At the time of its release, viewers found Lloyd’s model compelling, and indicated that there was a real possibility her unique approach to “physical and mental” reform would spread throughout the Appalachian region.

Locals, on the other hand, were shocked by Lloyd’s brazenness and condemned the film as exploitative. Even Jo Jones, who acted in the film, chastised fellow cast member Sam Slone for “wearing rags” in the picture and making Caney’s circumstances appear worse than they were. Hindman observers were entirely frustrated with the production and Lloyd’s general penchant for the theatrical. One Hindman affiliate mused with disgust that Lloyd was so intent on framing the Dream Houses as the answer to the mountain problem that she moved Preacher Billy’s family into his Dream House before it was completed— simply so she could film his old cabin burning and have the new home dramatically rise out of the smoke.

*Hope of the Hills* was the tip of the iceberg when it came to local animosity for Lloyd. Lucy Furman, of the Hindman settlement school, considered her a pathological liar “incapable of real reform,” and the school worked hard to distance itself from Lloyd’s approach and negative characterization of the region and its people. Olive Campbell described Lloyd as “fanatic”
who “believe[d] that the means justify the end” and remarked that she thought Caney’s leader was “clearly at the edge of a breakdown, if not actually unbalanced at times.” 150 John spoke with similar candidness to Lloyd about the need to work more slowly, carefully, and compassionately with local people, and urged her visit a Sanatorium in Nashville. Although Lloyd admitted to friends that she was at the point of extreme exhaustion due to the Caney Creek work, she does not appear to have followed Campbell’s advice.151

Instead, Lloyd coped with the emotional toll of her divorce and husband’s departure by working more vigorously to expand her sociological laboratory’s work. She had long-envisioned her eugenic settlement’s method of community regeneration and character development spreading through Knott and surrounding counties—even through the seven southern Appalachian states.152 At times, she voiced her desire for the federal government to take up her work in the form of six Civic Centers scattered throughout the mountains, while at other times seemed unable to give up control of the work.153 In her private writing, Lloyd spoke about the possibility of controlling the reform efforts of hundreds of schools through small outposts which she referred to as little “Macedonias.”154

The name of these bases reflected Alexander the Great’s reliance on checkpoints to manage the affairs of his empire, and indicates her emphatic belief in the Caney model. But her efforts to expand eugenic settlement work were met with limited success.155 In 1919, Lloyd invited Grace Hatch, a social worker at Hindman, to visit her center to discuss the value of sociology, economics, eugenics, and eugenics in reform work.156 We do not know how Hatch responded to Lloyd’s request, but her 1922 attempt to convince Berea’s President Hutchins to offer a teacher-training course on social engineering, and her 1923 publication Suggestion Book for Mountain Teachers, failed to expand the Caney School model.157 Lloyd had a moderate, but
short-lived accomplishment in the fall of 1919, when she formed a confederation of settlement and civic centers in the area around Caney Creek under the auspices of the Knott County Community Improvement Association (KCCIA). For a short time at least, the schools at Hollybush, Vest, Topmost, and Ball’s Fork, were under Lloyd’s control. She rejoiced at that achievement and declared Caney Creek the “capitol of the Civic Conscience of Knott County,” the “the Mecca toward which” the “awakened County” faced.158

Very few records of the KCCIA have been preserved, but it is clear that the organization disbanded a few years later, sometime in 1921.159 Poor record keeping was ironically one of the primary criticisms Lloyd’s detractors offered in explaining their reluctance to work with her, but they also seriously disagreed with her selective eugenic methods, tedious micro-management, and negative publicity about mountain people.160 Kentucky reformers ultimately found partnership with Lloyd impossible for a variety of reasons, and rejected her methods by refusing to work with her.161 W.T. Francis, for example, a respected local minister and ex-county clerk in Knott County, believed earnestly that “mountain children… need[ed] every educational and religious advantage possible,” but denounced Lloyd’s approach after she failed to uphold her terms of the contract to help build a school at Carr Creek, fifteen miles from Lloyd’s center.162 “I would not speak a word to hurt any work that I thought was good,” Francis confessed, but said that “Mrs. Lloyd’s system and theories” were not “what the mountain people need.” After working with her briefly, Francis declared that he would not endorse Lloyd “for anything.”163

The majority of support for Lloyd’s work therefore remained outside of the region. William Goodell Frost averred that the Lloyds should be allowed to carry out their experimental methods but stridently avoided association with Caney Creek, and only William D. Funkhouser, a zoology professor at the University of Kentucky with overtly eugenic views, supported
Caney’s method. 164 Despite limited local support, Lloyd continued to bring in funds for her settlement from the northeast. 165 When the school’s finances were especially strained in 1923, Lloyd launched a two-decade long program of “Forgotten Children’s Crusades,” which sent a handful of her star-students on well-attended lecture tours throughout the east and northeast. She estimated that the first tour group addressed more than 200,000 people over the course of their several month trip, and their fame grew: President Hoover even hosted Caney’s crusaders at the White House twice in the late 1920s. 166

A Distinctive Voice in Appalachian Reform

Lloyd’s critics were consistently flummoxed by her ability to “get… into all kinds of prominent places” and tried with no avail “to head her off.” Lloyd, they said, was “too canny for” them. 167 But because they did not share her views, Lloyd’s Kentucky-based critics failed to understand the broad appeal of Lloyd’s approach and end goal. Her interpretation of and solution to the mountain problem was appealing to many northeasterners who shared Caney Creek’s concerns about Appalachians’ “premature and needless [race] decay” and agreed that eugenic settlement work was useful in cultivating culturally American citizens. 168 Especially for northern urban elites persuaded by nativistic sentiment in the mid-1920s, Lloyd’s plan for “regeneration” of “Anglo-Saxon Americanism” was immensely appealing, and even seemed to some an answer to the ethnic “pollution” of immigration. 169

Like those individuals, Lloyd embraced a narrower vision of Americanization and Americanism than did the majority of her Kentucky peers. Guided by her personal belief in the value of eugenic living and Appalachians’ stunted evolution, Lloyd believed that Knott County residents were like children who needed “elementary instruction” in modern ways. 170 As Caney Creek’s motto made clear, Lloyd worked for the “Americanization of Americans by Americans”
and operated on the assumption that its eugenic selection and support of a people who were white, native-born American citizens of the best genetic material would, with proper training, also become the country’s best citizen-leaders. Appalachians, as she found them, hardly lived up to the expectations of the race or nation, but she believed they could. Through her work at Caney Creek, Lloyd worked to cultivate ideal Americanism by strengthening the clout of Appalachian whiteness and citizenship. Eugenics was, of course, an important tool in her arsenal for the cultural reform of a people for political ends.

Lloyd’s critics were similarly persuaded by contemporary ideas about Appalachians’ racial purity, but Lloyd understood the consequences of that heritage in a different light. She placed greater emphasis on the value of race and country of origin than they did in her interpretation of ideal Americanism, and worried that the power of the white race and American civilization would decline if eugenics were not explicitly applied to reform work. Caney residents, she explained, were “groping blindly for the light of clean, civilized living” and deserved immediate attention because they were “not naturalized, but native American citizens.” America had forgotten about Appalachians and thoughtlessly referred to them as “poor white trash,” but Lloyd considered Caney Creek mountaineers vitally important to the America’s future. She understood their racial heritage and country of origin as fundamental prerequisites for ideal American citizenship, but not as guarantees. Put another way, Lloyd believed that Caney Creek’s beneficent instruction in Progressive ideas about Americanism and citizens’ duty to social service via the Purpose Road was the crucial missing link in their Americanization. In her view, the philosophy provided mountaineers with the cultural lessons they needed to become active and engaged American civic and social leaders to guide the nation in the new century.
Lloyd failed to remake the standard of reform in the region, but as her fundraising success demonstrates, her ideas resonated with Americans in urban northeastern circles for decades. Many Americans who shared Lloyd’s concerns about white racial decline were highly persuaded by her overtly eugenic appeals and selection process for the purpose of cultivating ideal American citizens. As they debated to the scope and nature of American citizenship, and the role of race and genetic heritage in that equation, many Americans considered Lloyd’s distinctive approach appropriate and necessary to produce socially, culturally, and politically integrated Appalachian Americans.
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