

# MINERS, MILLHANDS, AND MOUNTAINEERS

*Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880–1930*



By Ronald D Eller

# INTRODUCTION

## *Industrialization and Social Change in Appalachia: A Look at the Static Image*

WE AMERICANS have faith in progress. Throughout most of our history we have assumed that the present is better than the past and that the future will be better still. This reassuring notion is periodically bolstered by statistical evidence of rising production and other measures of improvement in our standard of life. Progress, we believe, is occurring, and the future holds yet unrealized possibilities. For the historian, this faith in the inevitability of progress presents a problem. Since historians necessarily understand the past from the perspective of the present, our unconscious assumptions about the progressive present cast a shadow of contemporary condescension across our view of the received heritage. Our confident belief in progress leads us to depreciate the value of the past or to consider history as merely the ideological defense of the present.

Since the late nineteenth century, our idea of progress has become intertwined with the concept of modernity. We have come to believe that progress means technological development, industrial expansion, and growth in material wealth. Modernization has become synonymous with progress, and we tend to measure the improvement of any nation, society, or region in terms of its modernization. "Backward" and impoverished areas like Appalachia and the Third World are thought to exist because of a lack of modernization. The forces of growth and development appear to have passed by these regions. They seem to have been set off by history or geographic isolation from the rest of our progressive world.

The belief that time and geography somehow set the southern mountains off from the rest of the American experience has been part of our understanding of Appalachia for almost a hundred years. As early as the 1870s, writers for the new monthly magazines which flourished after the Civil War had begun to develop and exploit a literary image of the region. Initially drawn to the mountains in

search of the interesting and the picturesque, local color writers such as Mary Noailles Murfree, James Lane Allen, John Fox, Jr., and others were quick to turn the quaint and simple lives of the mountaineers into grist for the literary mill. Between 1870 and 1890, over two hundred travel accounts and short stories were published in which the mountain people emerged as a rude, backward, romantic, and sometimes violent race who had quietly lived for generations in isolation from the mainstream of American life.<sup>1</sup>

Implicit in this literary image was a sense of otherness that not only marked the region as "a strange land inhabited by a peculiar people" but defined that strangeness in terms of the process of American historical growth. To the urban middle-class readers of *Cosmopolitan*, *Harper's*, and *Atlantic*, the apparent persistence of pioneer-like conditions in the mountains seemed to reflect not merely the normal patterns of rural life but "an earlier phase of American development preserved, like a mammoth in ice."<sup>2</sup> Because metaphor was more interesting than reality, the Appalachian present came to be linked with the American past, and eventually the analogy was accepted as fact. By the turn of the century, according to historian Henry David Shapiro, the idea that Appalachia was "a discrete ethnic and cultural unit within but not of America" had become a popular convention.<sup>3</sup> For Americans of the progressive period who had witnessed the passing of the western frontier, Appalachia became "the frontier we have left within," and the mountaineers were "our contemporary ancestors."<sup>4</sup>

Succeeding generations have periodically rediscovered and reinterpreted the region in the context of their own day, but the static image has remained the standard perception of mountain life. In 1913, for example, Horace Kephart found "our Southern highlanders . . . still thinking essentially the same thoughts, still living in much

1. See Henry David Shapiro, "A Strange Land and Peculiar People: The Discovery of Appalachia, 1870-1920" (Ph.D. diss. Rutgers Univ., 1966), 250ff., Cratis Dearth Williams, "The Southern Mountaineer in Fact and Fiction" (Ph.D. diss., New York Univ., 1961), 1605ff.

2. Henry David Shapiro, "Introduction" to John C. Campbell, *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland* (Lexington, Ky., 1969), xxvi.

3. Shapiro, "A Strange Land and Peculiar People," v. See also Henry D. Shapiro's *Appalachia On Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness—1870-1920* (Chapel Hill, 1978).

4. Woodrow Wilson, "Our Last Frontier," *Berea Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (May 1899), 5; William Goodell Frost, "Our Contemporary Ancestors in the Southern Mountains," *Atlantic Monthly* 83 (March 1899), 311.

the same fashion as did their ancestors in the days of Daniel Boone. The progress of mankind from his age to this," he claimed, "is no heritage of theirs."<sup>5</sup> James Watt Raine traveled the "land of saddlebags" in 1924 and again in 1942, and a decade later North Callahan made a similar journey into what he believed was the "happy" but "static society" of the Smoky Mountains country.<sup>6</sup> With the outbreak of the War on Poverty in the 1960s, the mountaineers became simply "Yesterday's People"—part of that "other America" of which Michael Harrington wrote.<sup>7</sup> More recently, the rise of the new ethnicity and the counterculture movement have brought attention to the mountain people as just plain "down home folk," and a flourishing minor industry has developed to fabricate such oddities as dulcimers, quilts, log cabins, and "Hillbilly Chicken." Of late, we have also seen the introduction of courses in Appalachian studies and the proliferation of symposia aimed at diagnosing the "unique" qualities of mountain life. But this revival of interest has done little to alter our traditional views. According to one leading student of the region, Appalachia can still be seen "as a vanishing frontier and its people as frontiersmen, suspended and isolated, while the rest of the country moves across the twentieth century."<sup>8</sup> Marooned on an island of hills, the mountaineer has seemed shut off from the forces that have shaped the modern world. He has lived, we are told, in a land "where time stood still."<sup>9</sup>

Arnold Toynbee may have offered the most callous assertion of this view when he suggested that the mountain people of the South were little better than barbarians. "They have relapsed into illiteracy and witchcraft," he wrote. "They suffer from poverty, squalor, and ill health. They are the American counterparts of the latter-day white barbarians of the Old World—Rifis, Albanians, Kurds, Pathans, and

5. *Our Southern Highlanders* (New York, 1913), 211.

6. Raine, *The Land of Saddle-Bags: A Study of the Mountain People of Appalachia* (New York, 1924) and *Saddlebag Folk: The Way of Life in the Kentucky Mountains* (Evanston, 1942); Callahan, *Smoky Mountain Country* (Boston, 1952), 74.

7. Jack E. Weller, *Yesterday's People: Life in Contemporary Appalachia* (Lexington, Ky., 1965); Harrington, *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* (New York, 1962).

8. Cratis Dearth Williams, "Heritage of Appalachia," address to the Southern Appalachian Regional Conference (13 May 1974), reprinted in *The Future of Appalachia* (Boone, N.C., 1975), 128.

9. Bruce and Nancy Roberts, *Where Time Stood Still: A Portrait of Appalachia* (New York, 1970).

Hairy Ainus." But whereas these latter seemed to be the belated survivals of an ancient barbarism, "the Appalachians," Toynbee argued, "present the melancholy spectacle of a people who have acquired civilization and then lost it."<sup>10</sup>

Cast in the static role, mountain people have thus rarely appeared as conscious actors on the stage of American history, and almost never on center stage. They are acknowledged to exist somewhere in the background, as subjects to be acted upon, but not as people participating in the historical drama itself. As a result, our efforts to explain and deal with the social problems of the region have focused not on economic and political realities in the area as they evolved over time, but on the supposed inadequacies of a pathological culture that is seen to have equipped mountain people poorly for life in the modern industrial world. Having overlooked elements of movement and change that have tied the mountains to the rest of the American experience, we have blamed the mountaineers for their own distress, rather than the forces which have caused it.<sup>11</sup>

Blaming the victim, of course, is not a uniquely American phenomenon. Rather, it is a misreading that takes international form. French intellectuals talk about the Alps and Spanish intellectuals talk about the Pyrenees in much the same simple if condescending way as urban Americans talk about Appalachia.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, all over the world, the terms applied to rural people by urban people have implied either contempt and condescension, or—and this is the opposite side of the same attitude—a romantic admiration for the simple, hardy virtues of rural life.<sup>13</sup> Since the southern mountains were among the most rural areas of eastern America, the Appalachian people have suffered exceedingly from this type of urban provincialism.

Ironically, it was during the same years that the static image was emerging as the dominant literary view that a revolution was shaking

10. *A Study of History*, II (New York, 1947), 312.

11. See Dwight Billings, "Culture and Poverty in Appalachia: A Theoretical Discussion and Empirical Analysis," *Social Forces* 53 (Dec. 1974), 315–23; Stephen L. Fisher, "Folk Culture or Folk Tale: Prevailing Assumptions About the Appalachian Personality," in J. W. Williamson, ed., *An Appalachian Symposium: Essays Written in Honor of Cratis D. Williams* (Boone, N. C., 1977), 14–25; David S. Walls, "Internal Colony or Internal Periphery? A Critique of Current Models and An Alternative Formulation," in Helen M. Lewis, et al., eds., *Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case* (Boone, N. C., 1978), 319–50.

12. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Annette Lavers (New York, 1972), 74–76.

13. Robert Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture* (New York, 1960), 38.

the very foundations of the mountain social order. In Appalachia, as in the rest of the country, the decades from 1880 to 1930 were years of transition and change. What had been in 1860 only the quiet backcountry of the Old South became by the turn of the century a new frontier for expanding industrial capitalism. The coming of railroads, the buildings of towns and villages, and the general expansion of industrial employment greatly altered the traditional patterns of mountain life and called forth certain adjustments, responses, and defenses on the part of the mountaineers. This transformation varied in scope and speed, but by the end of the 1920s, few residents of the region were left untouched by the industrial age.

The effects of this transition were great. Mountain agriculture, for example, went into serious decline. While the size of the average mountain farm was about 187 acres in the 1880s, by 1930 the average Appalachian farm contained only 76 acres, and in some counties the average was as low as 47 acres.<sup>14</sup> This decline occurred throughout the region but was most pronounced in the coal fields and other areas of intense economic growth. Significantly, while the total number of farms increased during these years, the total amount of land in farms actually decreased almost 20 percent as a result of the purchase of farm properties by timber and mining companies and for inclusion in national forests and parks.<sup>15</sup>

Farm productivity and income also changed. While farm production had been the major (and usually the sole) source of income in 1880, by 1930 most mountain farms had become part-time units of production, and the major source of income had shifted to nonagricultural employment—mining, logging, textiles, and other forms of public work.<sup>16</sup> In Knott County, Kentucky, for example, the income per farm from farming in 1930 averaged only \$215, while the income per farm from nonfarm enterprises averaged over \$342.<sup>17</sup> In 1880,

14. U.S. Department of Interior, Census Office, *The Tenth Census: 1880, Agricultural Statistics*, III; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930: Agriculture: The Southern States*, II, Pt. 2.

15. U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Economic and Social Problems and Conditions of the Southern Appalachians*, Miscellaneous Publication No. 205 (Washington, D. C., 1935), 16; Lewis Cecil Gray, "Economic Conditions and Tendencies in the Southern Appalachians As Indicated by the Cooperative Survey," *Mountain Life and Work* 9, no. 2 (July 1933), 9.

16. U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Economic and Social Conditions*, 3, 16.

17. Gray, "Economic Conditions in the Southern Appalachians," 10. See also W. D. Nicholls, "A Research Approach to the Problems of Appalachia," *Mountain*

the mountains had been a major producer of swine in the South, but by 1930 swine production in the region had declined to only 39 percent of its former level.<sup>18</sup> Such data suggest that the traditional image of the preindustrial mountain farm must be altered, and that the small, marginal farm usually associated with the stereotyped picture of Appalachia was in fact a product of modernization—that is, a more recent development not associated with the purported isolation of the region.

Along with the decline of agriculture came subtle changes in demographic relationships as well. Whereas mountain society in the 1880s had been characterized by a diffuse pattern of open country agricultural settlements located primarily in the fertile valleys and plateaus, by the turn of the century the population had begun to shift into nonagricultural areas and to concentrate around centers of industrial growth. Between 1900 and 1930, the urban population of the region increased fourfold and the rural nonfarm population almost twofold, while the farm population itself increased by only 5 percent.<sup>19</sup> A few of the burgeoning urban centers were destined to be temporary communities, such as the big timber towns of Sunburst and Ravensford in the Great Smoky Mountains, but most were permanent settlements that had a lasting impact upon mountain life. It is important to point out, moreover, that the majority of these new industrial communities were company towns. In fact, over six hundred company towns were constructed in the southern mountains during this period, and in the coal fields they outnumbered independent incorporated towns more than five to one.<sup>20</sup>

This rising urban population provided a base for the emergence of a more modern political system in the mountains, one increasingly dominated by corporate interests and business-minded politicians.

*Life and Work* 7, no. 10 (Jan. 1932), 5–8, U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Economic and Social Conditions*, 41–57.

18. U.S. Department of Interior, Census Office, *The Tenth Census: 1880, Agricultural Statistics*, III; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930: Agriculture: The Southern States*, II Pt. 2.

19. Gray, "Economic Conditions in the Southern Appalachians," 8; U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Economic and Social Conditions*, 120–21.

20. U.S. Congress, Senate, *Report of the United States Coal Commission*, Sen. Doc. 195, 68th Cong. 2nd sess. (Washington, D.C., 1925), Table 14, p. 1467; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910: Population*, II and III.

Where the traditional political order had relied largely on kinship, personal contacts, and a broad-based party structure, after the turn of the century the level of citizen participation declined, and the average farmer or laborer became isolated from the political process. As early as the 1890s, industrialists such as Stephen B. Elkins in West Virginia and H. Clay Evans in Tennessee had begun to gain control of the political organizations in the mountains and to turn the powers of state and local government toward the expansion of commerce and exploitation of the region's resources.<sup>21</sup> As a result, there emerged in Appalachia a constricted political system based upon an economic hierarchy—those who controlled the jobs also controlled the political system, and those who controlled the political system used their power to exploit the region's natural wealth for their own personal gain. This loss of local political control naturally distressed many mountain people and plunged the region into prolonged industrial violence and social strife.<sup>22</sup>

Behind this transition in political culture lay the integration of the region into the national economy and the subordination of local interests to those of outside corporations. Nowhere was this process more evident than in the concentration of large amounts of mountain land in the hands of absentee owners. Beginning in the 1870s, northern speculators and outside businessmen carved out huge domains in the rich timberlands and mineral regions of Appalachia. By 1910, outlanders controlled not only the best stands of hardwood timber and the thickest seams of coal but a large percentage of the surface land in the region as well. For example, in that portion of western North Carolina which later became the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, over 75 percent of the land came under the control of thirteen corporations, and one timber company alone owned over a third of the total acreage.<sup>23</sup> The situation was even worse in the coal fields. According to the West Virginia State Board

21. See John Alexander Williams, "The New Dominion and the Old: Antebellum and Statehood Politics as the Background of West Virginia's 'Bourbon Democracy,'" *West Virginia History* 33 (July 1972), 322; Gordon Bartlett McKinney, "Mountain Republicanism, 1876–1900" (Ph.D. diss. Northwestern Univ. 1971), 170.

22. See Gordon B. McKinney, "Industrialization and Violence in Appalachia in the 1890's," in Williamson, ed., *An Appalachian Symposium*, 131–144.

23. Map, "North Carolina Portion of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Showing Individual Ownership," Western Carolina Univ., University Archives, Hunter Library.

of Agriculture in 1900, outside capitalists owned 90 percent of the coal in Mingo County, 90 percent of the coal in Wayne County, and 60 percent of that in Boone and McDowell counties.<sup>24</sup> Today, absentee corporations control more than half the total land area in the nine southernmost counties of the Mountain State.<sup>25</sup>

The immediate effect of this concentration of landholding was to dislodge a large part of the region's people from their ancestral homes. A few former landowners managed to remain on the land as sharecroppers or tenant farmers, and occasionally a family continued to live temporarily on the old homeplace, paying rent to absentee landlords.<sup>26</sup> But a great number of the displaced mountaineers migrated to the mill villages and mining towns, where they joined the ever-growing ranks of the new industrial working class. In the Cumberland Plateau, less than a third of those employed in 1930 remained in agriculture. The rest had moved to the mines or into service-related jobs.<sup>27</sup> Uprooted from their traditional way of life, some individuals were unable to reestablish permanent community ties, and they became wanderers drifting from mill to mill, from company house to company house, in search of higher pay or better living conditions. Most dreamed initially of returning to the land after a few years of public work, but the rising land values that accompanied industrial development soon pushed land ownership beyond the reach of the average miner or millhand.

Caught up in the social complex of the new industrial communities, many mountaineers found themselves unable to escape their condition of powerlessness and dependency. By coming to a coal mining town, the miner had exchanged the independence and somewhat precarious self-sufficiency of the family farm for subordination to the coal company and dependence upon a wage income. He lived in a company house, he worked in the company mine, and he purchased his groceries and other commodities from the company

24. West Virginia, State Board of Agriculture, *Fifth Biennial Report of the West Virginia State Board of Agriculture for the Years 1899 and 1900* (Charleston, W. Va., 1900), 371.

25. Tom D. Miller, "Absentees Dominate Land Ownership," in *Who Owns West Virginia?*, reprinted from the *Herald Adviser* and the *Herald-Dispatch* (Huntington, W. Va., 1974), 1-3.

26. James Lane Allen, "Mountain Passes of the Cumberlands," *Harper's Magazine* 81 (Sept. 1890), 575; Herbert Francis Sherwood, "Our New Racial Drama: Southern Mountaineers in the Textile Industry," *North American Review* 216 (Oct. 1922), 494; Campbell, *The Southern Highlander*, 87, 314.

27. U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Economic and Social Conditions*, 3.

store. He sent his children to the company school and patronized the company doctor and the company church. The company deducted rent and school, medical, and other fees from his monthly wage, and, under the prevailing system of scrip, he occasionally ended the month without a cash income. He had no voice in community affairs or working conditions, and he was dependent upon the benevolence of the employer to maintain his rate of pay.

Socially, if not physically, the working-class mountaineer was more isolated in his new situation than he had been on the family farm, for industrialization introduced rigid class distinctions into the highland culture.<sup>28</sup> Traditional status distinctions had always existed, but there were few economic differences within the rural population. With the coming of the industrial age, however, the separation between employer and employee became all too apparent. In the company town, the miners lived in small dwellings in the hollow near the tippie, while mine superintendents often built palatial structures high on the hillside overlooking the town.<sup>29</sup> Surrounded by elegant trees and well-kept grounds, these homes clearly defined the operator's social rank. In some communities, the railroad track literally divided the town in two, separating the more substantial residences of the managing class from the miners' shacks. The social gap between the classes increased, moreover, as managers and professional personnel developed lifestyles and formal institutions different from those of the working class.

By 1930, most mountaineers, whether they remained on the farm or migrated to the mill villages, timber towns, or coal camps, had become socially integrated within the new industrial system and economically dependent upon it as well. To say the least, this dependence was not on their own terms—that is to say, it was a product not of mountain culture but of the same political and economic forces that were shaping the rest of the nation and the western world. The rise of industrial capitalism brought to Appalachia a period of rapid

28. See Edward E. Knipe and Helen M. Lewis, "The Impact of Coal Mining on the Traditional Mountain Subculture," in J. Kenneth Moreland, ed., *The Not So Solid South: Anthropological Studies In a Regional Subculture* (Athens, Ga., 1971), 28.

29. Mack H. Gillenwater, "Cultural and Historical Geography of Mining Settlements in the Pocahontas Coal Fields of Southern West Virginia, 1880 to 1930" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Tennessee, 1972), 87; R.G. Lyman, "Coal Mining at Holden, West Virginia," *Engineering and Mining Journal* 52 (15 Dec. 1906), 1171.

growth and social change which those who hold to the static image have chosen to ignore. The brief prosperity brought on by the bonanza of modernization broadened the mountaineer's economic horizon. It aroused aspirations, envies, and hopes. But the industrial wonders of the age promised more than they in fact delivered, for the profits taken from the rich natural resources of the region flowed out of the mountains, with little benefit to the mountain people themselves. For a relative handful of owners and managers, the new order yielded riches unimaginable a few decades before; for thousands of mountaineers, it brought a life of struggle, hardship, and despair. Considered from this perspective, the persistent poverty of Appalachia has not resulted from the lack of modernization. Rather, it has come from the particular kind of modernization that unfolded in the years from 1880 to 1930.

Arnold Toynbee blamed the social conditions of Appalachia on the barbaric culture of mountain people, but one native mountaineer found another kind of barbarism at work in the region. Writing in *The Hills Beyond*, Thomas Wolfe lamented the tragic changes that had come over his beloved homeland in the years after Reconstruction. "The great mountain slopes and forests of the section," he wrote,

had been ruinously detimbered; the farm-soil on the hillsides had eroded and washed down; high up, upon the hills, one saw the raw scars of old mica pits, the dump heaps of deserted mines. . . . It was evident that a huge compulsive greed had been at work: the whole region had been sucked and gutted, milked dry, denuded of its rich primeval treasures; something blind and ruthless had been here, grasped, and gone. The blind scars on the hills, the denuded slopes, the empty mica pits were what was left. . . . Something had come into the wilderness, and left the barren land.<sup>30</sup>

This book attempts to describe the economic and social revolution that swept the mountains at the turn of the century, creating modern Appalachia. It is a study based on the premise that the socioeconomic conditions that have emerged in southern Appalachia are in fact a product of the modernization of American life. As used in this study, "modernization" refers not only to the transition from a traditional to a modern society but to a specific set of changes that have accom-

panied that transition in America since the late nineteenth century: the growth of urbanization and industrialization, the rise of corporate capitalism and the bureaucratic state, the development of a national market economy, the concentration of political and economic power, and a weakening of cooperative life and work in local communities and family life. It is within this context of modernization, I believe, that one must turn for an understanding of the paradox of Appalachia—a rich land inhabited by a poor people.

Historians and social scientists have long studied the phenomenon of modernization, but their efforts have generally concentrated on urban industrial centers. Little attention has been focused on the surrounding rural areas or on the impact of modernization on peripheral communities that provide labor and resources to the modernizing core. While the modernization of Appalachia was part and parcel of the modernization of America and was spurred by a small group of indigenous elites, the transformation of Appalachia was brought about by the diffusion of change from the developing industrial centers outside the mountains. Indeed, there is considerable evidence that modernization, as an urban industrial process, begins in core areas and spreads outward, extending employment opportunities into the outlying or peripheral areas but essentially using those areas to the core's advantage. Thus, a peripheral area like Appalachia may experience short-term growth without development and suffer the long-term consequences of dependency, inadequate social services, absentee ownership, and a colonial economy.<sup>31</sup>

It is important to note, moreover, that modernization does not affect all areas of the periphery with equal intensity. In Appalachia, industrialism altered some communities more dramatically than others, and throughout the region many aspects of the traditional or premodern culture remained intact long after they had disappeared in the rest of the country. The coal miner in West Virginia experienced the impact of modernization in a manner quite different from the hillside farmer in North Carolina, and some residents of southwest Virginia witnessed the arrival of the machine age more than thirty years before their neighbors in eastern Kentucky. But by the eve of the Great Depression, all were bound together by their common loss of autonomy and by their common relationship to the new order.

30. *The Hills Beyond* (New York, 1941), 236–37.

31. See Eugene A. Conti, Jr., "The Cultural Role of Local Elites in the Kentucky Mountains," *Appalachian Journal* 7, no. 1–2 (Autumn–Winter 1979–80), 51–68.

This larger, shared impact of modernization in the mountains is examined in the pages which follow. The communities and experiences I have selected reflect the basic issues confronting the whole region. The focus of this study is the patterns of economic and social change that made miners and millhands out of mountaineers. These patterns are most clear in the coal mining towns and lumber mill camps of the region, but they also underlay the experience of the mica pits, paper mills, and textile towns.<sup>32</sup>

The story of the transformation of Appalachia is more than an historical quest for the roots of poverty and powerlessness in one American subregion, since that quest challenges the very assumptions of progress upon which our contemporary society is built. The failure of modernization in the mountains raises the fundamental questions of our time—questions of power, greed, growth, self-determination, and cultural survival. In the answers to those questions lie our fragile hopes for the future. We in America must be driven to search for those answers for, as the mountaineers have learned, progress may not be inevitable.

32. The migration of thousands of mountaineers to the cotton mill districts of the piedmont South is an important chapter in the modernization of the mountains. But because the cotton mills lay largely outside the mountains and because their story is similar to that of the coal mining towns, it will not be examined in detail here.