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The chapter on the agricultural assessment of the Southern Appalachians, a study area broadly defined as between northern West Virginia and northeastern Alabama, has been based mainly, if not entirely by its authors, on the United States Census of 1950, and the Agricultural Census of 1954. The data for 1960 was not available at the time of the preparation of the manuscript. Comparisons, to show trends, are made with the 1930 Census statistics.

It is unfortunate, geographically, that the regional divisions of the southern hill and mountain country are overlooked; the reader who is unfamiliar with these is at a loss in certain interpretations, even though there is the statement that topography seems to be a major factor causing differences in land classification and use. For example, deeply eroded extreme southeastern Kentucky, a hill country of fine-textured drainage with ravine-like narrow valleys and inverted-V interfluves, is completely unlike some of the rolling uplands of coarse-textured drainage in eastern West Virginia, or the flat-topped section of the Cumberland Plateau in portions of Tennessee — yet all three of these units lie on the so-called Cumberland Plateau. Thus a statement such as « cropland as a percentage of land in farm varied from a high of 51.2 per cent in the three most eastern counties of West Virginia to a low of 17.6 per cent in the Blue Ridge of Georgia » needs geographic interpretation — in this case because most of the mentioned three-counties of West Virginia are in the eastern « panhandle » of that state, and most of their farm land is within the rich Shenandoah Valley and other linear valleys of the Folded Appalachians.

Despite shortcomings recognized by the geographer, and the almost complete reliance on census data, the authors have gathered and recorded much valuable information, and have added certain interpretations. As might be expected the chief strength of agriculture is mainly within the Great Valley of the Folded Appalachians and other linear valleys of this Ridge-and-Valley countryside. Here are the broader flatish lands, the presence of certain limestone-floored valleys, and the markets furnished by the chain of small to medium-sized cities within this subdivision of Appalachia. Unfortunately the agricultural situation in some of these better areas is masked by the use of county data — the counties stretching into more than the Great Valley proper, some of them including areas of the Blue Ridge, others extending from the parallel valleys into the Plateau. This detriment does not exist in the counties of the fine-textured dendritically-drained units of the hill country, as in eastern Kentucky, because here the county-unit is within the same terrain and physical setting, and the farm lands are confined to narrow valleys.

The agricultural chapter is but one within the entire survey. The book probes the people of the Appalachians, their social habits, folklore, education, churches, literature and other aspects of the life of the region. In general these sociological factors are less regionalized, although they are affected by the division of the region into parts of states. Thus the other authors, granted, faced less of a subregional problem than the writers on the agriculture.

It is to be hoped that further study and elucidation of the farming will be based in larger amount on field work to sharpen the picture derived from the census statistics.
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