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PREFACE

This research was supported by a grant from the Office of Water Research and Technology, Department of the Interior (OWRT Agreement Number 14-34-0001-0218; Project Number 8-131-ILL) to Professor Rabel J. Burdge and Roy E. Roper. The Water Resources Center of the Institute for Environmental Studies hosted the work and supplemented our funds at several critical times. Our deep appreciation goes to Drs. Ben Ewing and Glenn Stout. Drs. Frederick Fliegel, David W. Plath and Ms. Ruth Kelly have also provided generously of their time. Don Perrero, Business Manager at the Institute, deserves credit as a true facilitator of academic research. Last, but certainly not least, research assistants Cathy J. Goodzey and George A. Attig of the Anthropology Department have our (and respondents') gratitude for their yoeman service in transcribing the voice recordings.

A key finding of this research is the diversity of the continuing problems facing families subjected to land acquisition and relocation as a result of this water resources project. These problems were made intelligible by delving into each family's peculiar historical, geographical, and life-cycle situations. Thus, we have tried to keep our informants, their families and friends, from disappearing from view in the final product. Some colleagues would argue that the result is too particularistic—the broad scope is lost. We, however, prefer to think that unnecessary abstraction would obscure the compelling nature of the case materials. In Chapters 4 and 5 we have tried to serve as a medium for making our respondents' narratives available to a wider audience. Our sincere appreciation goes to the dozen or so key informants who fielded the telephone calls and visits, expected or not, with interest and kindness.

Mr. Ray Yantis, now deceased, was a country gentlemen from Okaw Township who knew what C. Wright Mills intended to be the real concerns of social scientists. We dedicate this report to him.
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ABSTRACT

This project assessed on an ex post facto basis selected impacts upon families and individuals due to the land acquisition program associated with the construction of the Shelbyville Reservoir in east-central Illinois begun in 1962. Research focused on Okaw Township, which borders Lake Shelbyville to the west in Shelby County. The in-depth, individual and family case studies indicated that farm family businesses are not the products of a single generation, or a single family. They are intimately tied to the inter-generational land transfer process which occurs among interconnected families living in close proximity. Thus, the time perspective in examining changes brought about by land acquisition and relocation must be extended on the generational level if the full range of impacts on the local cultural ecology is to be represented. Areawide changes in the availability and price of land made the difficult task of reestablishing a family farm even harder for selected families. The Corps' land acquisition policies in 1962 did not consider the generations involved in the establishment of family farms. Furthermore, local residents were critical of the Corps' policies and personnel during the land acquisition process. That historical complaint summarized by the quote, "the Corps is not a good neighbor," has even today hindered the Corps' ability to manage its relations with area residents and local government units. An understanding of the personal and family life-cycle perspectives on local cultural ecology, coupled with an appreciation of the degree to which rural social processes are bound in time, can strengthen State of Illinois comprehensive planning, decision-making, and review procedures for water and related resource development.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

STUDY DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Objectives

This project assessed on an ex post facto basis the social, social psychological, and economic impacts upon families and individuals of the land acquisition program associated with the construction of the Shelbyville Reservoir in east-central Illinois which began nearly twenty years ago. The goals of this study were: (1) to identify critical features of the acquisition program which had both positive and negative consequences for those affected; (2) to evaluate the explanatory and predictive utility of an historical, personal and family life-cycle perspective on the subsequent adaptation of individuals and households to land acquisition and relocation; (3) to suggest additional methodologies, theoretical perspectives and indicators to be included in comprehensive social baseline evaluations of water development projects where human population relocation is anticipated; and (4) to explore the implications of the model generated for environmental impact assessment in general.

A long-range consideration of this research was to strengthen State of Illinois comprehensive planning, decision-making, and review procedures for water and related resource development by using the Shelbyville Reservoir case to explore the utility of these alternative perspectives for assessing impacts upon human populations.

Background

Watershed and river basin development, community renewal, highway construction, gas and oil pipelines, public recreation, historical and cultural preservation projects, among others, require the dislocation of people from their lands and homes (Brink, Densmore and Hill 1977; Pimental 1976). Dislocation in turn means some restructuring of an individual's and family's network of friends and relatives, finding and moving to a new dwelling, and perhaps getting a new job to regain economic stability.
Dislocation may require only minor adaptations of existing social and economic routines. On the other hand, for persons and families without sufficient resources to adapt to the new conditions, the social, economic and even health implications may be severe (Cline and Chosy 1972; Fried 1963).

The ever-increasing need for land (rural, urban and urban fringe) to accommodate developmental projects reinforces the need to develop a comprehensive, flexible methodology for assessing social conditions in rural settings prior to notifying the public of the project (Honey and Hogg 1978). If we can make available to the decision-makers an accurate picture of what happens to individuals and families during and after land acquisition, a comprehensive package might be developed to mitigate adverse impacts.

Baseline social impact studies are performed with the assumption that key variables have been isolated and adequate measurement techniques exist. Virtually all of the impact assessment handbooks or guides are of the "checklist" variety, wedded to telephone or mail-in questionnaire survey research techniques. Evaluation agencies have been lulled into believing that these guides reflect the state-of-the-art techniques for understanding, describing, and predicting social impacts. These techniques, however, are not integrated with the multiple bodies of academic literature on stress, the accumulation of life-change units, relocation, personal and family life-cycle progression, and the long-term consequences of voluntary or forced relocation. For example, it has been well documented that even moving one's residence voluntarily is a stressful life event (Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend 1974). Case studies unequivocally demonstrate that mass forced migration has severe disruptive effects at the individual, family and community levels (Colson 1971). Consequently, these commonly employed evaluation techniques are patently inadequate for dealing with complex, localized social phenomena.

Our in-depth, individual and family case studies tested the utility of the personal and family life-cycle perspective in ex post social impact assessment using the case of the Shelbyville Reservoir. Lessons learned from this documentation will be valuable in designing future baseline studies of the activation of kinship support systems for emotional support, economic resources exchange, and information transfer in water resources development. This sensitizing information will also help us assure the
creation of more informed social mitigation plans tuned to local, particularistic needs.

Users of Research Results

The results of this research will be immediately useful to agencies considering any construction or administrative action which requires the purchase of land that might disrupt on-going individual and family activities. In this report, the events of project development, land acquisition, and relocation are used as a backdrop in discussing routine individual and family life-cycle progressions, and the resettling process of relocatees and others affected by reservoir development.

Relevance of Research

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) declares protection of the environment as a national policy, and requires all federal agencies to assess environmental impact before major actions are taken. It has been noted in a review of the impact assessment process and the Council for Environmental Quality guidelines that "while data needed to develop possible immediate physical effects of a proposed action are often lacking, such effects can generally be treated by established scientific methodologies." But, "an adequate methodology for treating economic and social impacts... is presently not available."

Such statements divert our attention from more basic issues. Social impacts are considered immeasurable primarily as a result of the perspectives brought to bear on the assessment. Research methodology is limited to gathering preexisting census and economic data at the town, city, county, regional, state, and national levels. Survey research of household heads is conducted by telephone or mail-in questionnaires by hired hands with scant understanding of the cultural, historical, or social contexts of the area. These interviews are necessarily restricted in length, and rarely are they open to discovering new issues. The resultant social impact assessments are superficial in detail and rarely helpful to those trying to work at the individual or family level of mitigation. Furthermore, these assessments are often prepared by self-justifying commercial consulting firms under contract with state and federal government agencies and thus, the impetus for quality control or improvement is lacking. In our opinion, codified
handbooks of the checklist variety so often used in assessment work have stifled the search for more productive methodologies and perspectives. Decision-makers need not and often, do not, attend to these social impact assessments because of their manifest weaknesses.

Social impacts, however, are very real for the human beings affected by land acquisition and relocation. Sensitive analyses of their life situations should be as integral to decision-making as the more easily quantifiable technical and economic considerations. Clearly, our series of individual and family case studies is a further step in improving the Environmental Impact Assessment process so that it conforms to the spirit as well as to the letter of the law.

HISTORY OF LAKE SHELBYVILLE*

Lake Shelbyville is a component of the comprehensive project of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' plan to manage the water resources of the Kaskaskia River Basin (Figure 1). The reservoir was billed as multi-purpose providing recreation in the form of fishing, boating, swimming, water-skiing, picnicking, wildlife preservation and flood control. The Kaskaskia River originates near the city of Champaign, in Champaign County, and flows southwest for 325 miles draining a basin of 5,840 square miles into the Mississippi River near Chester, Illinois; 118 miles north of the mouth of the Ohio River. Shelbyville Dam is 222 miles north of the mouth of the river, forming a water impoundment with a normal surface area of 11,100 acres in Shelby and Moultrie Counties. The reservoir is located about 20 miles southeast of Decatur, Illinois and about 60 miles southwest of Champaign, Illinois. It is about 16 miles in length from north to south (Figure 1). Another dam and reservoir is located at Carlyle, 107 miles above the mouth of the Kaskaskia River.

Authorization for Shelbyville Reservoir and Kaskaskia River development came with passage on July 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1958, which was the legislative result of the preliminary examination and survey of the Kaskaskia River submitted to Congress on August 23, 1957. Archeological

Figure 1: Location of Shelby and Moultrie Counties Within the Kaskaskia River Basin and the State of Illinois
surveys were begun in the Shelbyville vicinity in 1961 and by September, 1963 sixty-three sites had been located. The first land acquisition by the real estate office for the lake was on October 11, 1962. The first construction contract was let for a visitors' shelter and a radio antenna with buildings for construction equipment in April, 1963 (see Table 1). Ground was broken for the first construction on May 4, 1964.

The following table provides a chronology of events during the actual construction of Lake Shelbyville.

TABLE 1
THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD OF THE SHELBWILLE RESERVOIR:
1958 - 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lake Shelbyville</th>
<th>Other Related Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Construction of Lake Shelbyville approved by Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 (Oct.)</td>
<td>First real estate acquired at Shelbyville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 (Oct.)</td>
<td>Navigation project downstream approved by Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963 (Apr.)</td>
<td>First contract at Shelbyville let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963 (May)</td>
<td>Ground broken for first construction at Shelbyville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 (June)</td>
<td>Shelby County Hospital adds new wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 (June)</td>
<td>Work begins on canal excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>Shelbyville construction runs into problems of old mine shafts below river and a layer of bad shale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 (Apr.)</td>
<td>Carlyle Reservoir begins operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (Sept.)</td>
<td>Dedication Day for Lake Shelbyville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 (May)</td>
<td>Kaskaskia Canal ready for barge traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY AREA: OKAW TOWNSHIP AS A UNIT OF ANALYSIS

Research in this project has focused on one township, Okaw, which borders Lake Shelbyville to the west in Shelby County (Figure 2). The population of Shelby County has been quite stable for the last century. The county's population peak occurred in 1880, and then declined very slowly until 1960, increasing again in the 70's.

TABLE 2

POPULATION OF SHELBY COUNTY: 1870 - 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>25,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>29,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>22,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>22,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>22,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>22,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>22,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>23,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population density per square mile (in 1973) was 30. Shelby County shows a trend to fewer farms, but larger in size (Table 3).

TABLE 3

FARM SIZE IN MOLUSTRIE AND SHELBY COUNTIES: 1959 - 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Moultrie</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Shelby</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Farms</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Average Size</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. of Farms</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>439,000</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>2,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>439,000</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>2,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>189,440</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>429,589</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>1,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>197,861</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>415,004</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>196,437</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>427,843</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>1,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Okaw Township has primarily a scattered farmstead form of settlement, with German and Pennsylvania Dutch predominating in the early settlement period (Pooley 1908; Jensen 1978; Sutton 1975; Howard 1972). Within its boundaries, trade centers situated on railroad lines form the nucleus of the local rural communities with the hinterland consisting of open-country farmsteads (Edwards 1947). This scattered farmstead settlement pattern does not imply social isolation, however (also see, Kolb 1923, 1933, 1957; Kolb and Polson 1933; Kolb and Day 1950). The rectangular survey provision in the Land Ordinance of 1785 set the existing pattern for the division of the land surface (Clawson 1968). Farmsteads, over time, tended to line-up along major transportation routes, with narrow fields extending behind them, similar to "line villages" in France. The gradual abandonment of rail shipment in favor of trucks to transport grain to the elevators in Decatur has served to decrease the smaller villages abilities to serve as trade centers (Figure 2) (c.f., Bunker and Hill 1975; Due 1975).

Okaw Township (1960 population 884) is on the northern border of Shelby Township. The City of Shelbyville (1960 population 4,821) in Shelby Township, is the county seat. Okaw Township lost 8,838 acres of land to the project, one-half of the 16,856 acres total lost to all of Shelby County, and about one-third of the total acreage of the township itself. The 1950 plat map (Figure 3) can be compared with the 1977 plat map (Figure 4) to gain a perspective on the magnitude of the acreage lost, and the development of lake access points. The people of this township use different trade centers (e.g., Findlay, Shelbyville, Mattoon, Sullivan, Decatur, Windsor, Westerfelt) for different purposes (c.f., Hassinger 1978:127). The general pattern is for simpler services (groceries and gasoline) to be obtained at the closest centers (Findlay and Shelbyville). The more specialized services (clothing, restaurants, and automobiles) are usually sought at the larger, more distant centers (Mattoon and Decatur).

Okaw Township hosts a variety of economic pursuits (grain, cattle, and sheep farming, wage work at Caterpillar in Decatur, stores catering to recreationists, and ancillary farming services). Categories of people range from the elderly poor to the wealthy, country club set. The geography is varied, creating discernible socio-ecological niches where people of differing financial means and occupations live. High technology, flat-land farming can
Figure 2: Political Subdivisions of Shelby and Moultrie Counties
Figure 3: Plat Map of Okaw Township: 1950
be found only a few miles from the subsistence level, pastoral economies in the rolling hills near the lake. The tendency has been for modes of production to seek out suitable resources and locations where the costs of production (labor included) can be more easily met. Consequently, there are a variety of habitats, a variety of modes of economic utilization of these habitats, and a variety of cultural traditions (c.f., Bennett 1969: 27, 322). Indeed, one part of Okaw Township appears to be an extension of southern hill country cultural patterns (Kentucky, Tennessee and Virginia) into the midwest grain farm culture (c.f., Semple 1910; Bennett 1943).

In Okaw Township, as well as Shelby County as a whole, farming is the major occupational pursuit. The land acquisition program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers forced many of the smaller landholders out of farming altogether. Those families with larger acreages and greater financial assets, however, were able to continue in different locations. When payment was received from the Corps, many farmers were forced into the land market within a short period of time (1963-1965). The available land was snapped up at premium prices, squeezing the less fortunate out of the market altogether. Land acquisition thus served to magnify at the township level the national trends of decreasing land availability, increasing average size of farms, and technology's lessened need for labor in the agricultural sector (Perelman and Shea 1972; Barnes 1971). Even though farming was the vocation of choice for many younger men and women, the lack of land meant that even fewer people could seriously entertain adopting this career line (c.f., Beale 1964).
CHAPTER TWO

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND SAMPLE

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Steps

The exploratory nature of this research required that our approach be of sufficient breadth to assure inclusiveness and adequacy. Thus, the study programmatically employed over one and one-half years a combination of documentary analyses, exploratory and focused interviews, and field observations in order to isolate events which influenced individual and familial adaptation to land acquisition associated with reservoir development (Colson et al. 1976; Geertz 1963).

The phases of the research and summaries of accomplishments are presented below. This order allowed us to become informed of the historical, ecological, and social contexts in an iterative fashion. Only later did we move into the interviewing of persons affected by the project (see Honey and Hogg 1978:13-15).

(1) Tracing the project's history from the first announcement until the present and documenting the groups and key individuals that influenced the course of the project. We reconstructed the project's background using locally available materials, and reports of others working on the Shelbyville Ex Post Fact Study at the Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Illinois (Burdge and Opryszek 1981).

(2) Brief interviews with key or informed individuals in the area and representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. We developed contacts with citizens holding such key offices as township road maintenance supervisor, township tax assessor, trustees to township government, and representatives of the Corps such as the Rangers and the Lake Manager. We also interviewed at length six businessmen in Shelbyville who were concerned with the income-producing potential of the local recreational facility.

(3) Preliminary interviews of relocatees and others affected by the project as a result of land acquisition. In this phase of the fieldwork, we spoke with several dozen people about their personal and family life-cycle progressions, past and expected future, and the intergenerational transfer of land and land use rights as these were influenced by the course of the reservoir project's development.
(4) Main interviews with relocatees and others affected by the project as a result of land acquisition. We attempted to capture the fullest range of the respondents' subjective accounts of their lives, those of their families, and the project-specific events as they were intertwined with personal and familial developmental histories. To this end, we employed photography, tape recording, detailed genealogies, and residential, occupational, and land transfer histories.

(5) Integration and analysis of materials. The post-field work phase of the research included tape transcription, slide cataloging, and telephone reinterviewing of respondents to fill in missing information. We developed a cross-referencing scheme for the field notes, interviews, tapes, and photographs. The personal and family case materials were further organized according to an index system based on acquisition tract number and township section as indicated in Corps' records. This integration of materials has facilitated our case-by-case analysis of persons and families and allowed for easier follow-up with local historical materials, plat maps, and rural residence directories.

Ethnography and Field Notes

We chose to focus ethnographically on a relatively small number of those affected by the project. We draw our sample mainly from within Okaw Township for two reasons, the second of which is discussed in the section on Selection of Informants. The primary rationale was that ethnography provided us with the contextual information required to understand how people function within long-occupied socio-ecological niches, and how the land acquisition policies of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers changed local ways of life. Survey research, although well-suited for a variety of problems, could not develop the kind of in-depth information we sought. Indeed, other questionnaire surveys from the Ex Post Reservoir Study Project obtained the routine economic, and demographic data needed for comparison and project evaluation (see Roseman and Ives 1981; Suwanamalik 1978:68).

Consequently, we attempted to develop field notes that had the quality of a diary, although much more detailed. These notes give a comprehensive account of what has been observed, heard, said, with whom and on what day and what time. The format even allows for a running account of time of day and mileage on the car. The goal was to preserve the original "context of discovery"—the socio-spatial-temporal relationships arising from the day-by-day fieldwork. The cross-referencing system and categories of notes "emerged" from the needs of the study (Pelto and Pelto 1973:246-268).
Use of Photography

The "context of discovery" was further preserved with another mnemonic device—photography. We recorded events which fell into two comprehensive categories. The first was the emotive fabric of human existence such as interpersonal relationships of authority, friendship, labor exchanges, auctions and funerals. The second category was of technology, man-environment transactions, and patterns of habituation to ecological niches by residents, past and present. We also included items specific to the reservoir such as litter, Bureau of Land Management survey markers, land boundaries, subdivisions, boat docks, and housing styles.

These photographic images had several interrelated functions, all serving to extend and temper visual and cognitive discrimination and recall of themes and events (Gardner 1957:344; MacDougall 1968; Weis 1977). First, photography served as a mnemonic device, as noted above. Secondly, in time-limited situations such as farm auctions, photography captures a wealth of detail that can be elaborated later (Sorenson 1974). Lastly, color slide projection has already allowed us to detail to several audiences the research area's geography, conditions of roads, home types, farm equipment and so forth.

The following is an abbreviated list of photographic themes we considered essential in providing adequate context to our field notes and interviews:

1. Distinctiveness of Corps' signs; signs' intrusions into city residential areas; use of sign style by commercial interests as means of identifying with notions of progress and influence.

2. Corps' boundary markers surrounding government properties; markers breaking traditional forms of boundary maintenance once served through common knowledge, respect for neighbor's property, and mutual surveillance.

3. Ecological/habitability variance between flat prairie and rolling hills by the river; types of agribusiness operations to include grain, cattle, and sheep farms; riverbottoms; visual attributes of population density differences; scattered settlements and rural villages.

4. Campgrounds; recreation centers; boating facilities; boats; docks; access roads; camp showers; family reunions at campgrounds.
(5) Old schools and churches; photographs of original schools and churches; compartmentalization of geographical areas by location of schools and churches and evolved social networks.

(6) Sacred areas such as cemeteries; defacing and profaning of sacred area; homesteads; century farms; family cemeteries versus township and country maintained sites; "together in life and death" themes displayed on tombstones; gradual return to nature of older cemeteries; cemeteries for the living, not the dead; field stone markers; the aged as repositories for information on the deceased, families, and social structure; "crowding" of cemeteries by farming.

(7) Social patterns and work relations; task assignment within families; "thrashing ring" notion and voluntary associations emergent from seasonal labor needs.

(8) Entrepreneurial activity—failed and successful; boat and bait shops; landscaping and housing developments; marinas; boat rentals; coffee shops; restaurants; motels; hotels; bars—places for socializing.

(9) Busing arrangements for transporting segments of local workforce to Firestone and Caterpillar plants in Decatur; work outside county of residence; assembly areas for workers in Shelbyville and along route to Decatur.

(10) Juxtaposition of recreational developments and farm lands; road surfaces and road styles; surface degradation and repair; dirt and gravel surfaced road maintenance teams; grading and hauling; tree and brush clearing; litter.

(11) Water towers; old bridges; roads; fences; old equipment; shack or shanty homes typical of low-income residents relocated from banks of river; other features of the built environment.

(12) Socio-economic differences in Okaw Township; country club road subdevelopment contrasted with "Dugout" areas—homes, automobiles, trucks, farm equipment, clothing styles, lake-related purchases of personal property such as boats, RV's, and campers.

(13) Villages as residential havens for retiring/invalid farmers, widows, and early displacees; stores remaining open and those closed; services offered; centrality of railroads to service centers; points of grain accumulation, storage, and shipping; extinct towns on rail lines; rural ambulance service and fire protection facilities.

(14) River flood level water-marks on trees; river bank erosion and destruction of crop land and trees; crops destroyed because Corps unable to manage water drawdown properly; lack of levees and soil erosion consequences; bottomlands which stay wet rather than drying after flooding; damage of trees around periphery of lake due to high water levels; rotted root systems; steep wooded banks and erosion; covers; root systems in lake.
(15) Resurvey of boundaries by BLM; stakes and markers; damage to trees by markers.

(16) Comparison of farm/cattle operations now and then; descriptive photographs of comparable lands and homes for use as referents.

**Use of Tape-Recordings**

Interviews were tape-recorded with the verbal consent of the respondents, but only after several contacts had established enough rapport to make the medium relatively unobtrusive. Transcriptions of these recordings facilitated our attempts to use the respondents' own words to reveal the long-term personal and familial consequences of social change (see Sudnow 1972). Tape transcription rates varied from six to nine hours for each hour of recorded conversation depending on the complexity of the materials, the quality of the transcribing equipment available, and the skill of the transcriber. We reviewed each tape and its transcription in order to discern themes, topic salience, and even respondent avoidance of select issues under repeated probing. The transcriptions also helped us discover the contextual ties of personal and family events with project events. The transcription procedure is, of course, tedious and expensive. The transcriptions were physically integrated with the interviews and field notes.

**SELECTION OF INFORMANTS**

Our initial plans called for near saturation sampling of the relocated families either through direct contact or by accumulating inferential data from their kin or friends. According to figures supplied by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to other university researchers, about 110 families would have been interviewed for the entire project area (see Roseman and Ives 1981). Our earliest fieldwork, however, indicated that the list was filled with errors of omission and commission far beyond our estimates of how much "slop" would be found in this referral system. In response to this problem we decided to focus on a single township, using a technique known as snowball sampling, i.e., taking information supplied by one person to locate others. Within Okaw Township, we managed the verification of relocatee and land acquisition statuses by systematically cross-referencing people and their kin's past and current addresses with information from the following sources:
(1) Army Corps' topological maps with acquisition tract numbers;
(2) Two lists obtained from Corps by a University geographer;
(3) The geographer's refined list;
(4) A 35-year series of plat maps for Shelby and Moultrie Counties;
(5) Available telephone and city directories;
(6) Rural residents' directories; and
(7) A 75-year history of land-transactions in Okaw Township generated by analyzing plat maps.

With saturation sampling of affected families within the limited geographical area the goal, informant selection was simple. We endeavored to contact and interview anyone mentioned as being affected by the reservoir project. Probability sampling techniques would have been meaningless in this form of investigation. We were surprised to find many more people affected by the project than suggested by the Corps of Engineers list of 110 families. The Corps' list did not include families which had land acquired, but were not themselves displaced.
CHAPTER THREE

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF LAND ACQUISITION

Water development projects are typically based on exhaustive technical feasibility studies. Often, however, there is inadequate provision for the evaluation of the human and social problems associated with land acquisition and relocation. This chapter views the land acquisition and relocation process in a cultural ecology frame of reference (Bennett 1974; Johnson and Burdge 1974; Honey and Hogg 1978; Steward 1968; Netting 1965, 1972, 1974). A series of vignettes is offered to demonstrate how the lives of various groups of people were influenced by the reservoir project.

SELECTED EFFECTS ON THE CULTURAL ECOLOGY

Networks of Kith and Kin

The immediate family and extended kin network provide the basic institution for social organization in this rural Illinois area. The extended kin network is defined as a social system of organizing adults and children who are related by birth and marriage. Kinship serves as the template that helps people shape the social arrangements through which they collaborate with each other in exploiting their total environment. This environment includes natural, social, economic and cultural resources. Here, as elsewhere, people naturally turned to their kith and kin in times of need. Financial problems were buffered by reliance on the economic resources of other units of the overlapping networks of extended family, neighbors, and friends (Sussman 1959; Adams 1970).

This larger social reality is familiar to anthropologists, rural sociologists, extension agents and others who work in agricultural communities. The interconnections in this social world are not considered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the acquisition of land and the relocation of people to new residences. Rather, an atomistic model based on the

current legal requirement for dealing with each family as an independent unit is employed. The model assumes that all families are equal in their abilities to survive forced relocation. The application of the model in land acquisition programs, such as the one at Lake Shelbyville, creates inequalities in the resources families have at their disposal. For instance, those families who lived close to the river had either part or all of their property acquired. The atomistic model assumes that these families were compensated adequately for their properties, and that they relocated to other areas using their own resources. In most cases, however, these families extended networks of kith and kin provided resources to cushion the requirements of relocation. The package of resources available to most families included cash gifts, loans, use of cars, trucks or other machinery, and labor.

The crunch came when the economic resiliency of this larger grouping of interlocked families was reduced because many of the constituent units were also forced to relocate. Related families tended to be closely clustered geographically, often within contiguous sections of a single township. Thus, their combined ability to aid their close relatives was reduced because many were in similar straits (c.f., Stoffle, Smith, Rasch and Duschak 1981). In contrast, some families' networks were located at least a few miles away from the acquisition lines, remaining relatively unaffected by the project. When forced to move, these latter families were able to rely on a "healthy" network of kith and kin for social and economic support.

Marginal Farms

All people were not equally vulnerable to the social and economic problems created by land loss and relocation. The groups routinely identified in the literature as particularly vulnerable were those living on fixed incomes; namely, the elderly and the retired. These people often encounter transportation difficulties, decline in health, loss of a home or farm and a land base which serves as a source of financial and social security. The changes associated with land loss and residential relocation often inflict additional, severe pressures on their limited resources (Kasl 1972; Donnermeyer and Korsching N.D.; Hogg 1968; Burdge and Johnson 1973; and Llewellyn 1974).
Those families who owned and operated the so-called "marginal farms" are rarely considered in the social impact literature, and not at all in the previous research on Lake Shelbyville (c.f., Bunker and Hill 1975). The use of the term, marginal farm, belies the larger reality that these people had established themselves in a distinct ecological niche within the agricultural community (Bennett 1943). "Marginal farm land" is not resource poor, however. It only means that the rolling hills and bluffs near the river were not suited for extensive row cropping because of difficulties in plowing the slopes. For some, a near-cashless style of living was the norm. For example, twenty acres of rolling timbered hills bordering the river constituted an environment which supplied most of their basic needs: wood for fuel, water for livestock and sheep, river for recreation and fishing, woods for hunting, and small gardens for vegetables. Raising livestock was a good way of using lands not suitable for row crop machinery. When machinery was needed for construction, clearing debris or brush or other improvements, often as not it could readily be obtained by activating a relationship within an existing personal network. These neighborly exchanges contributed important cash savings. Furthermore, the homes of these marginal farmers were usually owned outright. Their small operation had little financial overhead from year to year. Labor inputs were nearly cost-free since the family provided all but very specialized services such as veterinarians. Within these ecologically constrained situations, these families achieved considerable economic and social autonomy, even though they accumulated little wealth over a lifetime.

Many of those who worked the small, marginal farms accumulated prestige equal to or greater than their neighbors on the flatlands who farmed ten to twenty times the acreage. The life-style historically associated with farming permeates Shelby and Moultrie counties. Farming per se is a valued, respected occupation regardless of one's rung on the agricultural ladder. Prestige is given to the individual who is able to wisely utilize available technology and land resources to produce goods which provide adequately for his family regardless of the number of acres owned or farmed. It is not the size of operation, "level-of-living" or tenant versus owner-operator status that primarily determines prestige within local, rural communities. Rather, it is the farmer's perceived independence--his ability to make his own way without over-reliance on others, or going on the "dole" that leads to higher community prestige and, indirectly, to his own sense of self-esteem. Good stewardship of farmland
as well as sound technical and managerial skills elevated farmers to social and political prominence within local communities (see Hicks 1946; Schuler 1938; Vogt 1947).

These marginal farmers, because of historical factors, lived in economically specialized niches, the rolling, wooded lands along the river. Early migration into Illinois from Kentucky and Tennessee brought an independent breed of people into the area. Later, the introduction of shallow coal mining northeast of Shelbyville spurred further increases in migration. These wooded lands were considered too poor for the intensive techniques of flatlands agriculture. Many of these families continued to live on marginal land in small, face-to-face communities consisting of a half dozen households, at least until the date that land acquisition began (c.f. Erikson 1976).

The historical development of these marginal areas along the river was carried out within wider kith and kin networks and settlements satellite to small trade centers such as the Village of Findlay or the City of Shelbyville (see Figure 2). The present settlement names often reflect the earlier days when the particular settlement possessed a variety of social institutions, greater occupational diversity and larger populations: Duvall in Okaw Township and Middlesworth in Shelbyville Township, for example. Social organization was centered around the life-style of nonspecialized farming, where production was geared more toward home consumption needs of the farm family rather than those of the national or world markets. Cooperation, friendliness and mutual exchanges of labor and equipment were commonplace. For generations, these people remained residentially stable, and perceived themselves as distinct from others in the region.

**Acquisition of the Marginal Farms.** The Corps' policy for compensation in land acquisition only considered "fair market value" of individual properties, as established by an assessment process. The policy did not take into account, nor compensate, other tangible losses. This issue has been addressed by others (e.g., Druker, Smith and Turner 1972; specifically, Higgins 1967:48):
"One possible source of tangible cost to the owner is the loss of direct benefits derived from the property. These benefits may come in the form of cash income or subsistence gardening depending on the kind of property and its use...value received for which he does not have to pay."

"A farmer who sells an acre of land has lost the benefits derived from that land. Although he is paid for the fair market value and, therefore, should be able to buy a similar acre of land restoring him to his original position, this is not always possible. He may not be able to obtain a similar acre of land and be forced to change to another type of farming with which he is less familiar, shift to an occupation which he enjoys less to support himself, or move to a distant community."

Being forced out of resource-rich albeit "marginal" farm lands and into neighboring towns and villages created financial strains and changes in life-style, as well as a reduction of access to their networks of kith and kin. People who moved from a relatively isolated, self-sustaining and largely barter economy to a market-dependent, money system were transformed from being possessors of the means of production and subsistence into either wage-workers or welfare clients. For some, even these wage-labor opportunities were restricted because of age and lack of marketable skills. The positions open to them, e.g., janitors and watchmen, were low in potential for savings, and factory wage-labor was considered repugnant to many. Not only were their tangible resources lost, therefore, but their individual and family bases for community prestige were often undermined.

The larger issue is that the Corps of Engineers acquisition policies were based on the concept of individual ownership and exploitation of the array of natural resources (water, soil, minerals, grass, woods, and wildlife). Individual ownership, however, was not necessarily equated with private exploitation. As noted previously, within the social network there was a sharing of labor and commodities, tools and information on land availability. By the same token, there was a sharing of natural resources since these were not evenly distributed in time or place. One aspect of the broad-based resource extraction strategy is the hunting of game. Neighbors hunted with each other not only for the recreation, but also to contribute directly to their household economies. The territory was "out back," or "up the road" or in the "hollow." The long-established patterns of exploitation crossed private property lines. Thus, the relocation of these people disrupted not only the individual's own use of resources on privately-owned grounds, but also mutual exploitation of resources shared by a number of people who were
not greatly concerned with to whom the land belonged. The residents' complex of broad-based resource extraction strategies within their effective environment did not necessarily coincide with the legal schemes of ownership employed by the Corps of Engineers in their land acquisition program (c.f., Rhoades and Thompson 1975).

Reduction in Economic Diversification

The data for Shelby, Okaw and Windsor Townships reveal that the Corps of Engineers land acquisition policies also resulted in the dispossesssion of at least a dozen undersized, economically insecure grain farm units, forcing them to abandon farming altogether. These were families without large, privately-owned acreages and sufficient unencumbered capital to be able to restart in new locations. Thus, land acquisition led to further decreases in land availability and concentration of farm lands in the hands of larger landowners (c.f., Perelman and Shea 1972; Barnes 1971). A less obvious impact occurred among some families who lived close to the site of the future lake. The rolling ground, timber, and hillsides were more suited to livestock than grain production. As indicated below, the partial acquisition of these lands sometimes forced the sale of a livestock operation, leading to a reduction in the economic diversification of the farm unit.

Typically, the farms nearest the river depended upon a diversified operation (grain and livestock) to provide an economic buffer in case of crop failure. The feeder-calf and milk cow operations, though not as capital intensive as a strictly grain farm enterprise, provided work chores throughout the year, and a sense of independence, control and pride. In this area of large grain farms, cattle often became a valued symbol of a person's separate mode of existence. This diversified operation contrasts with energy intensive grain farming with its specialized machinery, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and skilled labor inputs. Small cattle operations could make good use of limited natural resources without serious depletion.

For a variety of reasons, these units have adaptive persistence in this county and elsewhere. These people are able to exploit "marginal" farm land. By coupling frugality with an apparent curbing of high-risk ambition
to expand into large scale farming, they make comfortable lives for their families. Their specialized niche exploitation kept these operations from being subjected to the extreme pressures of competitive replacement in the agricultural sector. They were not undergoing a process of devolution as were smaller, strictly grain farmers. Indirectly, they were symbiotic with the large scale enterprises because they provided a readily available pool of trained manpower during the seasonal squeeze on labor resources. At a more abstract level, these units were also a significant symbolic link to the nonspecialized farming of the past and its valued way of life.

The loss of these hillside lands meant that farmers had to either hold productive farm ground out of tillage to create grassland, or sell their livestock, resulting in a reduction in the economic diversification of their operation. For the less lucky, selling off the herd decreased their ability to provide adequately for their families, in addition to changing a valued life-style. This form of impact is not significant at the country level of data aggregation, but for the small number of families who depended upon this multiple resource extraction strategy, it was significant. At the township level, this loss of the small, multi-enterprise farms, and the concomitant reduction in the variety of economic pursuits, reinforced trends of social and occupational destratification. The loss of the adaptive advantages of being diversified meant that local economies (township and extended family networks) became more susceptible to changes in product demands and production costs.

SUMMARY

The major findings in this series of vignettes are as follows:

(1) Land acquisition disrupts social networks upon which families, relocated or not, are dependent for financial, social, and informational resources. The resiliency of large groupings of interlocked families was lessened when constituent units lost land or were forced to relocate. The greater the scope of acquisition, the more strain on these resources.

(2) "Marginal farms" lying close to the river were purchased, and their owners forced to move. Marginal farm land does not, however, mean resources poor, only that the rolling hills and bluffs near the river were not suited for expansive row cropping. The near cashless style of life could
not be replicated in neighboring towns or villages because of the loss of
direct personal and community benefits from the acquired properties.

(3) Acquisition of the marginal farms, and their owners ability to
restart due to severe pressures for land, served to decrease the economic and
cultural diversity of the townships studied. The trend toward fewer and
larger farms was accelerated.
CHAPTER FOUR

COPING WITH RELOCATION:
MUTUAL CAREER CONTINGENCIES IN REESTABLISHING A FARM

SOCIAL PROCESSES ARE TIME-BOUND

There is a need to view the land acquisition and relocation processes in a wider, more inclusive frame of reference. Not only is an understanding of the local cultural ecology required, an appreciation of the degree to which rural social processes are bound in time is necessary. The changes to families and communities wrought by the reservoir (e.g., reduction in available lands which support different activities, residential relocation, reduction in economic diversification, and life and recreational-style changes) persist for decades. The extension of the time perspective in examining these changes is central to the understanding of agrarian settlements. A farm family business is not the product of a single generation, but is intimately tied to the intergenerational land transfer process (e.g., Salamon and O'Reilly 1979; Berkner 1972; and Rohwer 1949).

This chapter demonstrates the utility of extending the time scale in evaluating the social ramifications of water resource development. The research perspective is the juxtaposition of life events such as birth, marriage, parenthood, retirement and death with the unexpected life events of relocation and loss of occupation induced by land acquisition (see Baltes and Brim 1979; Datan and Ginsberg 1975; and Hultsch and Plemons 1979). Analyzing the outcomes of these interrelated events is one key to understanding the long-term personal and familial consequences of social changes associated with reservoir development. The analytical goal of this chapter is not, however, to separate changes imposed by outside powers from those emanating from routine social processes of people living in this rural, agrarian environment. Such a separation is impossible without experimental or quasi-experimental control anyway. Rather, the goal is to describe the family's

adaptive processes within a matrix of local conditions influenced by the Lake Shelbyville development and time-frames conditioned by the complexities of rural life.

The notion of mutual career contingencies, i.e., the interactions of people and their families across generational lines over time, is used here to integrate the case-level data on occupational transfer, retirement, land availability, rental and purchase. These data are further interwoven with the personal and family life-cycles and occupational careers of others living in the area when the reservoir was built, and the time-tables of reservoir development itself. It is important to note that although the mutual career contingencies of these family members are routine features of rural, agricultural social life, they are not included in the social impact assessment process because their significance is not understood or the data considered costly to gather.

One family's life-history unfolds in the subsequent paragraphs. The information has been simplified to reveal only the major relationships between these family members' ages, occupational and family life-cycle stages, critical events, and amounts of land formed over time. Table 4 reflects this simplification, depicting major events of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and family life-cycle along with breakdowns of the amounts of land farmed between 1960 and 1979.

A FAMILY CASE STUDY: SELECTION CRITERION

From the over eighty case studies, family materials from one extended farm family were chosen for this chapter because they are illustrative of three issues. First, older tenant farmers in Illinois may be faced, as in this example, with a disruptive life-event—removal from a farm by the landlord's agent, the farm manager, through lease termination. Their farming occupation itself may be curtailed if they are unable to rent other ground following lease severance. The situation is akin to unexpected forced retirement without pension benefits. The event, by itself, has nothing to do with lake development. When this life-event co-occurs with a severe shortage of rental properties—a direct effect of land acquisition—the chances for reestablishing a viable farming operation are reduced, however. The consequences of these events ramify for decades throughout the rural social structure, often with profound impact on those caught in the heightened competition for arable lands. This family experienced these events. Second,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANT EVENTS</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>DISCRETE PARCELS</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th>RATIOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>Acres Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY LIFE-CYCLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of 235 Acres</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease termination, William marries</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Land Purchases</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie's maternal grandfather dies</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie's paternal grandfather dies</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie's father retires</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>320*</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>320*</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Land Controlled by Julie's Family, William's Father and/or William and Julie

TABLE 4: Events and Lands Farmed for Smith Family: 1960-1979
the people presented in these case materials were not classified as relocatees, since only their rental properties were acquired by the Corps. This extended family is representative of others whose tenuous legal attachment to the land, due to rental or tenancy agreements, has kept them from being identified in the literature as strongly impacted. Lastly, the significance of the complex intertwining of the careers (life-cycle and occupations) of these family members as it relates to the reestablishment of a farm emerges clearly from the ethnographic data.

Area Background

As pointed out in Chapter One, the population of Shelby County in 1960 was a little over 23,000. Most of the people lived in the City of Shelbyville which provided household, educational, health, and farm services to rural people in the county. Okaw Township's agricultural service center was Findlay, a village with only 430 people in 1960 (Figure 2). The majority of rural residents were native born and had been raised there, living in a typical open-country neighborhood pattern based on the checkerboard land survey (grid system). Variances to this scheme were found along streams and rivers. The county's demographic trends were unremarkable: gradual loss of farm population due to mechanization, an increase in average farm size, and the lack of non-farm employment opportunities. The county had retained basic economic and demographic stability for decades, at the price of a static economy.

THE FIRST LOSSES

Background

The relevant family history begins in 1962 when the land acquisition program of the Corps of Engineers was beginning to gain momentum. Mr. Ray Smith, then a 51 year old tenant farmer, was renting both his home and nearly all his farm and pasture lands from Mrs. Wallis, an absentee landlord. Ray had rented these grounds for 14 years; his father had rented them for 32 years previously (see Haase 1958; Loomis 1938; Roan, Harris and Timmons 1959; and Galpin and Hoag 1919). The farmstead, located nearly two miles west of the Corp's acquisition lines in Okaw Township, was (and still is) the site of a classic two-story rural home now over 100 years old.
Ray's relationship to the land and its owner went deeper than the landlord-tenant dichotomy implies. Ray's parents had lived their adult lives on the part of these lands nearest to the Kaskaskia River. Indeed, in the earlier part of this century, both Mrs. Wallis' husband and Ray's father were given the opportunity to purchase the land from a St. Louis bank. However, the senior Mr. Smith's bitter experience of losing ground after World War I kept him from taking the plunge. Therefore, his son, Ray, was destined to inherit only land rights from Mr. Wallis, his father's life-long associate and friend (c.f., Wehrwein 1932; Inman 1947).

Ray's rented lands were not contiguous, but separated by about three miles of country road. The 235 acre parcel was near the river, so-called "bottom land," and the 560 acre parcel was in central Okaw Township. He farmed the bottom land in partnership with his brother, Jack, who by then was living in the senior Mr. Smith's homestead, also near the bottom land. Ray also farmed about 50 acres of his father's land north of Shelbyville, now held in an estate for him and his siblings. Thus, Ray was like many older tenant farmers, satisfied to own only a small percentage of the total acreage he farmed (Table 4) (Lee 1947; Barlowe and Timmons 1950; Lyson 1979; Strohbehn and Timmons 1960). He was, however, satisfied with the 50-50 crop share arrangements with the family friend, Mr. Wallis, and later Wallis' widow (c.f., Reiss 1980).

Ray prided himself on the improvements he and his father had made on the properties during their long tenure. Most of the farm machinery was Ray's and all of the equipment was well maintained. The home, barn, and equipment sheds were painted regularly. Preventive maintenance was his key to performing less work in the long run. He was careful to rotate the crops properly, fertilize as necessary, keep his share of the road open in bad weather, and plow so as to reduce soil erosion. He had even built a farm pond on a hillside near the bottom land to hold water for the 80 or so head of cattle he and Mrs. Wallis, in partnership, owned. The pond also helped to control soil erosion even further. Ray stated:

"That bottom land area with those hills and hollows represented a big investment by Mr. Wallis before he died. Too hilly for farming; he spent a lot of money there clearing the land and getting a good pasture. We had to get the brush off it so we could disk it, plow it and seed it to get good ground, good pasture. The natural drainage, why, it was real good pasture land there."
The pond also served as a center for family and neighborhood recreation (picnics, swimming, camping, fishing and even a bit of beer drinking now and then). Ray treated the land with respect, as though it were his own. He looked with disdain on those few tenant farmers who were content to spoil the land, taking without giving in return. Ray built the diversified operation (grain and cattle farming) with the intention that his son (and only child), William, would obtain the right to be the next tenant, just as he had inherited the right from his father (Henderson 1948; Parsons 1948). The river bottom farm land, near which stood their original homestead, meant much more to them than its actual value on the open market.5

"I don't care how much money real estate appraisers or the Corps feel it correct to give to people in exchange for this land. Money is just not the point. You can't replace things like people's life-long homes, or the styles of life people had (and treasured) when they lived near the river. I know. It was totally different because my grandma and grandpa lived down there. We'd go down and spend a lot of time on the river when we were kids."

"Lord have mercy. Every evening in the summertime we'd sit down at the river near our old place and watch the mist move across the bottoms. That was really something to see. It was really beautiful especially in the fall. I was lucky to have enjoyed it."

A similar theme emerges in Ray's reminiscences:

"My wife and I have only been back to the area once since the Corps bought it, and we had to move our stuff. We used to have a campground and picnic table. We used to have a lot of good times down in that area; it was very pretty, especially in the fall of the year when the leaves would turn."

Critical Stage in the Family Life-Cycle

Ray's farm family was edging toward a critical life-cycle stage. William was nearly old enough to assume major responsibility for the farm operation, relieving Ray of some of the burden (Long and Parsons 1950). Ray even considered expanding the total acreage he had under tillage by renting another 60 acres. This expansion would help integrate William into the operation. Ray expected in the next decade reap the rewards of his lifetime effort. With the grain and cattle operation running smoothly, he could devote more of his time to improving the cattle through selective breeding,
a physically less-demanding job. His son could spend more hours farming during the seasonal bursts of activity. In these and other ways, Ray was already preparing for his gradual retirement from farming (c.f., Smith 1950: 50).

The Loss

Ray's long-range plans for the intergenerational transfer of the tenancy, or land-use rights, were altered in the spring of 1962. The Corps purchased from Mrs. Wallis all the river bottom land that Ray worked. With this purchase, Ray lost about one-third of this total acreage and all his pasture lands; the latter were essential to the support of the cattle and feeder calf operation (see Table 4). His gross income was also reduced by more than one-third. Mr. Smith's diversified operation had served him well:

"In 1954 when the drought came, the only thing that kept me afloat was the cattle operation."

Since open prairie farm land was too valuable for pasture, Ray was forced to sell the cattle the next spring. The Corps' land acquisition had restricted him to grain farming, and thus lessened his economic diversification. William notes:

"In fact, Mr. Wallis has just put in a sileage bunker at the river place. Dad had just invested in a sileage blower, plus a chopper and other things—we had to sell to get out from under the debt load. We even tore out all the fences we had."

Ray is even more to the point:

"When they ran Wallis and I off down there I had a herd of cattle and I had to get rid of all those." The only thing I got paid for was three trips down there to move stuff out. And that is the only thing I ever got paid for. I got no damages of any kind for having to sell my herd. And then they didn't do anything with the pasture land which we needed!

The cattle always made me good money and after I got rid of them, I was out that much money."
This loss of river bottom ground had a ripple effect in William's extended family as well:

"The Corps even bought the farmstead where my Uncle Jack lived, my grandparents' old home. He moved his house to Findlay. Since he farmed the bottom land with Dad, he was forced into retirement when the Corps bought the land."

THE SECOND LOSS

Lease Termination

Ray was a farmer of pioneer stock and prided himself on his resiliency in the face of adversity. He decided to intensify his grain farming operation by expanding to "eight row" equipment which was large by the standards of the mid-1960's. In the fall of 1967, Ray also changed from wide to narrow rows and bought a larger tractor and a new plow. This expansion of equipment paralleled a search for additional grounds to rent, enough to make up for income lost as a result of the bottom land acquisition. Ray's revised long-range plans for the intergenerational transfer of tenancy were shattered in the spring of 1968. In the early 1960's, the aging Mr. Wallis had decided to turn managerial control of his lands over to a farm manager representing a Decatur bank. In 1968, the bank assigned a new farm manager to oversee Mrs. Wallis' lands rented to Ray. This farm manager telephoned Ray at home one afternoon requesting permission to visit him within the hour. Ray and William knew that something was amiss for the visiting pattern was not typical.

The farm manager and senior bank official soon arrived. They gave Ray no choice but to sign the papers terminating his lease. Ray was given one year to move. The reasons for the lease termination were never made clear; likely it was a combination of several factors. The farm manager, a non-farmer, was young and inexperienced. It was rumored that he wanted to prove himself by "shaking things up, looking good on paper." Also, Ray had made a mistake in judgment the year before which cost both Mrs. Wallis and he some income. Local politics combined with other farmers' wishes to establish their own children on local, although rented, grounds as a first step up the agricultural ladder, may also have played a part. A more
plausible reason is that Ray was 56 years old and in the opinion of the new farm manager, it was time to bring in fresh blood to increase the farm's margin of profit.

Reactions to Lease Termination

Whatever the reasons for the lease termination, its impact was brutal. It had occurred at a most inopportune time. Ray had just invested in the equipment necessary to expand his grain operation, and good land was scarcer than normal because the Corps had been purchasing land for the reservoir for about six years, forcing other farmers onto the land market as well (c.f., Klinefelter 1973). These farmers had already picked up the scraps available throughout Shelby County. Within a few short minutes, Ray's plans for his family were destroyed, as were William's own emerging plans:

"Dad and I wondered what we were going to do with all this great equipment since all we had left was the 50 acres of my grandfather's estate north of Shelbyville to farm. We didn't even have the cattle as an economic buffer anymore. This lease termination made me get out and work harder than hell, because I don't ever want to be in a situation where somebody can kick me off the land. Can you imagine how it felt to have someone come in and just tell us to get out? No thank you, no kiss my ass, or nothing. Just get out."

Both were reminded that Mr. Smith, at age 58 and this stage of the life-cycle, did not even control the place where he and his family lived (c.f., Loomis 1936; Speare 1970; Rappoport and Cvetkovitch 1968). It was small consolation for them that this farm manager was fired soon after this. Mr. Smith was confronted by failure, according to his personal standards and those in the wider culture (see Easterlin 1976:63-70). His control of their joint economic future was lost as well; the loss of what they considered the family farm was the sign of failure (c.f., Rower 1950; Parsons and Wapler 1945; Salter 1943; Timmons and Barlow 1949).

Interrupted Transitions

Ray had considered gradual retirement from farming with William stepping into his shoes as a normative life transition. Ray's "retirement"
plans included continued farm work, since he enjoyed his daily rounds of outdoor activities. In retirement, though, he would be constrained more by functional ability and interest and less by economic necessity. His "retirement farming" was designed to defray expenses for the travels which he and his wife had long planned (Sewell, Ramsey, and Ducoff 1953). To these ends Ray had even purchased a trailer home, moved it to the farmstead, and began living there with his wife. William and Julie, William's new bride and high school sweetheart, were given the large house in which to live and raise a family. But lease termination and the severe land shortage interrupted the routine life-cycle transition, and transformed it into a crisis for both generations of the family. Both families were forced to pool their efforts in order to build anew a stable farm enterprise.

OPTIONS AND STRATEGIES

Available Work and Housing Options

The enhanced scarcity of land subsequent to the Corps' acquisition made this family's (and neighbors') attempts to relocate into areas physically contiguous with their current residences difficult. Indeed, the land hunger spurred rivalry among neighbors as they competed to acquire new properties. Ray and William were determined "not to go under" and this pluck proved invaluable in the subsequent resettlement work. They perceived that only the intensive renting out of their labor and equipment--custom farming--would offset the overhead payment and maintenance on tractors, trucks, spreaders, pickers and so forth (c.f., Smith and Zopf 1970:165). For some of their neighbors in similar situations, the economic crunch which followed the loss of a land base, whether due to Corps acquisition or lease termination, led to their working at low-paying jobs as, for example, night janitors or watchmen, while their wives labored as check-out clerks at grocery stores.

In the fall of 1969, Ray and his wife moved off the long-rented farmstead and onto the 50 acre estate north of Shelbyville, taking his newly purchased trailer home for he and his wife to live in. Here too, Ray's housing options were limited, since few homes were being built in the area, and he was still saddled with the trailer payments. William and Julie's marriage in early 1968 had followed their graduation from Findlay High School the previous year. Their first child was born in the fall of 1968.
Fortunately, at this time Julie's family began to play an important role in the reestablishment of William's young family onto the land. In the fall of 1969, William and Julie purchased a small, used trailer home. They located it on Julie's parents farmstead in Pickaway Township of Shelby County, six miles west of the Okaw homestead (Figure 2).

"We purchased the trailer, which took about all the money we had. And, you can imagine, we couldn't quite get our belongings from the farmstead into it. Things were stored here and there all over the place."

For William and Julie, the housing and work problems were solved, at least temporarily. William's life situation was unstable; he was not yet 21, but had the responsibilities of marriage and parenthood without the economic base of tenancy on the Wallis ground. William and Julie knew that they had to decide on wage-work or farming as a way of life, and soon.

Adaptive Strategies

As noted earlier, Ray and William decided to seek custom work in order to survive. In early 1970, William and Julie deliberated the choice between wage-work in a Decatur factory and resettlement work designed to build a viable, self-owned family farm operation and homestead for their emerging family. Wage-work as a career path meant never returning to farming, but it was also the low-risk alternative (see Burchinal 1960; Heady, Dean and Loftsgard 1957). They knew that land prices were increasing at a rate outstripping interest on savings or other investments. Both regarded the input of time, energy, and money—their lives—in land and farm equipment as an extremely risky "now or never" decision. Their friends counseled them to take the safe alternative, lest they lose everything. William and Julie decided, however, to defy the odds and started their decade long trek up the agricultural ladder, first integrating custom work with renting and then acquiring lands of their own.8

William and Ray began by advertising their custom farm services in local newspapers and farmers' bulletins. Most importantly, they let their families and friends pass the word along through their respective networks. In return, they received abundant custom work. William said the following of his decision to remain in the agricultural production sector of the economy:
"We like to think that (loosing the rented farm) was the best in the long run, because it really forced my hand. I had to get out and really work and scrounge. Sounds like I am bragging but I am not. I had to go out and decide to commit myself to farming. I had plenty of people advise me against it at that point. I finally knew that if I was going to farm, I'd better get busy and farm. Someday I was going to farm my own land. I was not going to get caught in the position we were then in. So even though it was a shock, it got us off rented ground. (Julie adds bluntly:) Yeah, onto nothing!"

William reports that he still lays awake nights worrying about those early days of choosing to be a farmer and the massive debt load he had to incur as a result. Land, farm equipment, seed, fertilizer, herbicides, silos, and cattle are expensive.

The first year of custom work was tough on both families because the land scarcity kept them from finding any rental grounds, and the 50 acres in estate were far from adequate to bring them to the break-even point (see Hanson and Spitze 1974). "We went that first year with nothing, zilch."

The Corps' land management procedures intersect once more with William's life:

"I have a comment which maybe I should not make. And maybe this is typical of my feelings about what the Corps has done to this country...but we were really hurt that year. WE HAD NO LAND. I started inquiring about how I could rent some of the ground the government had acquired, but was still leasing out. Since there seemed to be some for rent (including our old ground near the river bottom). I went to see about it. And do you know what I found out? I found out that I was not voting properly. I found out that I was on the wrong side of the political fence. I didn't lease the land back from the Corps because it would have made me, us, lose more personally than the money involved."

MUTUAL CAREER CONTINGENCIES IN RESETTLEMENT

From 1970 to the present, William and Julie labored to rebuild a land base in pursuit of their two major life goals: (1) becoming successful grain and cattle farmers, and (2) building a land estate so that their children would never be forced from their homes, their land, or farming, as were William's parents. William admits that his father's loss of the lease was the major factor in his beginning to climb the agricultural ladder. William also believes that even a year's hesitation would have severely
diminished his chances of making his dreams for his family come true. His success, however, was not due solely to perseverance, but to the fortuitous intersection of his and the varied career progressions of other farmers. As will be shown, William and Julie's consolidation of a farm on contiguous grounds in a mere decade was contingent upon the retirements and deaths of others in their extended families and other members of the community (Table 4 depicts the major relationships).

William's move from his father's farmstead to that of his wife's parents signified a shift in the relative influence Julie's parents had on the couple. Her parents and ancestors had controlled the lands around their home for over 120 years. Ray's resources were now so few—an insignificant amount of land rights which he could pass to his son and daughter-in-law—that it was only natural for Julie's parents to assume the greater burden. The two young adults may have equally divided their loyalties between respective parents initially; now, however, Julie's parents' influence increased.

**Rebuilding**

William and Julie began their rebuilding process by renting, then buying, whatever small parcels of land became available within a reasonable commuting distance of their place of residence. Often, other farmers had rejected these parcels as either too small or scattered. In 1971, William finally located 100 acres of rentable land near Henton, about 20 miles from their trailer home. With 120 more acres rented in the river bottom southwest of Shelbyville the following year, they became financially stable for the first time in years. The outline of these gradual increases in properties, broken down by rented versus owned properties, are displayed in Table 4.

The renting of non-contiguous lands placed a heavy burden on William; however. "I'm telling you, we worked. I hope I never work that hard again." He was forced to drive the heavy equipment many miles to work a relatively small number of acres. At 15 miles per hour top speed, the 20 mile trip to Henton took several hours each day, forcing William to work longer hours than his neighbors. In 1972, the death of Julie's maternal grandfather, a life-cycle contingency, brought to William and Julie an additional 320 acres of rental farm land, allowing them to terminate most
of the custom work. This new acreage was located only a mile from their home. Its proximity signaled the consolidation of available local lands into their farm operation.

In 1973, they moved from the trailer home, now crowded by the addition of another child the preceding fall, to a small farm house only 2 miles from Julie's parents' home. In 1975, again against the advice of many of their friends, William and Julie purchased 100 acres northwest of Shelbyville, only six miles from their new home. Ray and his wife moved their trailer home to this location. Since this 100 acre acquisition was close to their center of business, William gladly gave up the 120 acres of rented river bottom ground south of Shelbyville. In December of 1975, Julie's other grandfather died, creating a social (and physical) niche which they soon occupied. In 1976, William was able to rent an 80 acre parcel of land only a short distance from their home.

Most of the rental and purchased lands opened up as a result of either the death or retirement of another farmer. In 1977, William began buying cattle. In the same year, he was able to terminate his rental agreement on the distant Henton acreage, much to his relief. That fall, Julie's mother deeded them 40 acres of land nearby. The land was originally a part of one of Julie's grandfather's estate. In the spring of 1978, Julie's father decided to retire from farming, allowing William and Julie to rent a 280 acre parcel, again very close to their home. By 1979, Julie's mother had deeded them 5 additional acres upon which were located the home they were living in and the outlying buildings. Additionally, another 60 acre tract located next to the 40 acres deeded to them in 1977 became available. This new acreage was not controlled by a direct relative, but was bought at a public auction where favorable community sentiments kept the competitive bidding to a minimum so that William and Julie could establish themselves ever more firmly. The purchase was not necessary from a contemporaneous economic standpoint. William's expanding family, and his concern for its future, provided the impetus:

"Julie and I discussed, cussed, and discussed and finally decided to purchase more land because of boozo over there (viz., their new child). We didn't know until last month what we would do but the child, a boy, will need land too and you just can't procrastinate nowadays. And this was right across the road. No more 40 mile trips on a picker for me."
By the latter part of 1979 then, William and Julie had consolidated the lands they farmed into the area close to their farmstead. They owned only 200 acres, but rented 600 that were controlled by Julie's mother. Only 80 rented acres were controlled by a non-family member.

As the young couple controlled more and more acreage through rental, inheritance, or purchase, they were able to operate even larger equipment. By 1979, they farmed a total of over 900 acres, not including the custom work to defray overhead on investments. Custom farming acted as a hedge against the variability in crop yields from year to year. Since 1977, William continues to purchase cattle. He views his total enterprise as a reestablishment of a traditional farming operation, one which was disrupted by the loss of pasture and farm lands years earlier. William and Julie, as farmers, have replaced five other farmers in their efforts to expand their acreage. They know they must expand even further to gain a competitive advantage in today's agricultural marketplace. William knows that there can be no let up if they want to remain successful:

"I'm expanding. I'm always trying to expand and so is everybody right now. The only way we can stay in farming is to expand. It is like the White Queen in Alice in Wonderland, I have got to run as fast as I can to stay still, especially with 'junior' over there. In fact, I just bought a new tractor and a 12 row planter. A major expense but we need it if we're going to handle this much land."

But the rewards are sweet; and several of their life goals appear in reach:

"And even though I have to get in debt over and over again, unlike those people who work at Cat in Decatur, I'm the master of my ship. In fact, out of the 20 guys to graduate with me from Findlay High School, I'm the only one farming now. With this land we just bought, we are trying to plan to pass it along right now, and I am only 30. We are trying our damndest to have something to pass along to our children."

If status and respect are rewards, then William has earned both from his neighbors who see his climb from the near bottom of the agricultural ladder as indicative of hard work, guts, and a progressive honing to a fine
edge his managerial skills and techniques. Some people are gratified to observe a member of the younger generation "getting a taste of what it used to be like." William's success has won him what simple control of land, being a "big farmer," could not. The value is on highly dynamic achieved status in lieu of ascribed status.

William and Julie are not, however the aforementioned narrative sounds, drudges. They both maintain close involvement in church and community activities, are concerned about the quality of their children's education, and strive to expand their own personal horizons. Their older children attend Sunday school and the 8 year old girl enjoys ballet lessons. Their owner-operator status allows them to develop their human potentials through education and community involvement within this agricultural setting (c.f., Hassinger 1978:171-174).

**Familial Networks**

Julie's family played a central role in William and Julie's resettlement process. Julie's parent's networks aided in finding housing and co-signing the initial loans. Her mother even served as a babysitter when Julie took a job in Shelbyville for several years to help make payments on the equipment. As noted above, William and Julie's recent land acquisitions have been from members or friends of Julie's family, or from their estates. Consequently, Ray Smith's influence over his son and daughter-in-law has waned. Ray now spends every winter in Florida and returns to Illinois every spring to help them farm. Everyone, however, realizes that Ray's loss of the farmstead has left William and Julie the decision makers in his family.

"Ray is slowly being phased out, to his satisfaction. He has some health problems and knows that he should have quit years ago as he had planned. His brothers have passed on and he is beginning to feel the years."

Ray and William's disparate levels of financial well being are also apparent. William and Julie live very comfortably in her grandfather's homestead, a stately two-story, 10-room farm house. Ray has two old trailer homes, and about 50 acres of land. William and Julie, by contrast, own, rent, and custom farm a combination of over 1000 acres of prime Illinois
black soil. Ray's continued involvement in farming was first necessitated by loss of the farmstead. With both families economically stable once more, Ray is gradually retiring, reinstating a life pattern interrupted many years ago.

Looking Back

William and Julie have much for which to be thankful. They unabashedly relate the tough times they have experienced together over the last decade and one-half. They fought, and won, now surpassing most farmers in their region in material prosperity (see Lancelle and Rodefeld 1980). They vow to keep the family property intact so their children will not have to climb from the absolute bottom of the agricultural ladder (c.f., Parsons and Wapler 1945). They strive for independence, carefully maintaining a balance between acreage, production, cash flow and labor inputs needed to maintain an efficient family farm (see Hassinger 1978:187-194; Smith and Zopf 1970:186-194; Motheral 1951; Brownstone 1958). With his present equipment, William can perform the plowing, planting, and harvesting operations with only limited help from his father or wife. The continued renting of some of their lands year-by-year gives them the "flex" to vary input and labor contingent on cash flows, without becoming "land poor" (i.e., synonymous with "house poor" for urbanites) (Reiss 1972; Downing 1977; Heady 1947).

Major developments take place regularly in plant and animal breeding, chemical pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, and he does his best to keep on top of them. He is already planning to experiment with solar energy to dry grain, replacing (he hopes) the expensive forced air and propane methods now employed. He does specialized farm tasks himself (mechanical repairs, plumbing installation, building construction, and welding) to remain as busy and self-sufficient as possible across the seasons. Recent home improvements include insulation and weather-stripping. For William, it is a matter of pride (and life-style choice) not to need supplementary income from non-agricultural employment (c.f., Hassinger 1978:194-196; Fuguitt 1965).
They are also fatalistic about the prospects of their offspring keeping the land intact once they have passed away (Parsons and Wapples 1945). Any one of the children could force the sale of the entire estate should sibling rivalry appear. Such rivalry does occur as even a brief look at the underlying causes of many farm auctions attests (Sussman, Cates and Smith 1970; Titus, Rosenblatt, and Anderson 1979). Nonetheless, they will continue to build for the future, and hope the wisdom of their investments are recognized. Estate planning is a current concern of theirs:

"I think the time to do estate planning is when you're our age (33) because when you get older you don't like to think about dying. I've got to have control of land if I'm going to farm in the future because farming is changing. I want to pass the farm along to my children (and there is a good possibility that both boys might want to farm). But to do that I'm going to have to control a certain power base and a certain amount of land. I can rent land too. But to be secure to have sufficient capital and to be able to borrow capital I've got to have land--owned, not rented."

"The only way I've been able to maintain our standard of living without really sacrificing and still buy land is I just replace my neighbors as they retire. I just farm more land and that's got to stop within the next ten years."

Their oldest son is now 11 years of age and is receiving invaluable training from his father in farming procedures. William Jr. knows that he is heir apparent, slated to inherit a large share of his father's business, but still too young to understand the implications of this. During the interviews when William recalled the lean years of resettlement, his posture communicated the single purposeness of mind that enabled him to reconstruct a homestead and heritage for his wife and children. William and Julie know that in spite of their hard work and careful planning, they are one of the few young families in the area lucky enough to overcome the national trends, exacerbated locally, toward reducing the number of people able to pursue farming as an occupational career. William is the only one of his high school class to succeed in staying in farming. The lands (and home) becoming available to them was contingent upon relatives, neighbors and friends transitions in the life-cycle (death), and occupational-cycle (retirement). The lives and careers of the various actors merged, and William and Julie took advantage of the opportunities to expand their holdings in order to ensure future economic stability (c.f., Attig 1981).
A farm family business is not the product of a single generation, or single family. It is intimately tied to the intergenerational land transfer process amongst many interconnected families. Thus, the time perspective in examining changes wrought by land acquisition and relocation must be extended if the full range of impacts is to be represented. Area wide changes in land availability and land prices made the already tough task of establishing a land base and family farm even harder for some, as indicated in the family case study.
In reconstructing the histories of families affected in one way or another by land acquisition, a pattern of criticism of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' policies and personnel by local residents emerged. This criticism has had an enduring effect on the Corps' ability to manage its relations with area residents and local government units.

This section on land acquisition and perception of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was engendered by the observation of several respondents that "the Corps is not a good neighbor." According to rural Illinois residents, a good neighbor takes the time to understand others and their particular social and economic situations. The offer of labor or equipment exchanges when needed occurs almost automatically among good neighbors. If a combine or picker breaks down at a crucial time or someone becomes seriously ill, a good neighbor may "just drive up and pick your beans for you." This give and take occurs on many dimensions, sometimes averting economic disaster, but more often serving to help kith and kin meet the daily challenges of making better lives for themselves and families (c.f., Hoffer 1938; Kimball 1949). Even though one does not have to "love thy neighbor," the unspoken rule is to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Residents are quick to criticize those who are not neighborly, and slow to forget. The fact that the Corps is not a good neighbor will fade only gradually, if at all.

LAND ACQUISITION PROCEDURES

The process of land acquisition invariably draws criticism. It is often the most highly charged issue in a reservoir project. To date, the academic focus has been on policies and levels of compensation. Only rarely has the issue of the land acquisition agents' relations with relocatees been addressed. Shelby and Moultrie county residents' first personal contacts

---

with the Corps of Engineers was through these agents, and many lingering hostilities stem from these first days of land acquisition. A number of instances where the acquisition agents were grossly callous was verified by the interviews with others knowledge of the events. Even if only a handful of negative experiences occurred between the Corps of Engineers and land owners, their stories are told and retold. In local communities with their complex cross-cutting extended family networks, such treatment of any single person is viewed as an affront to the self-respect and dignity of the collective. In fairness, it should be noted that nearly everyone who recited a story of perceived injustice in the land acquisition phase of the project was quick to point out that the present "bunch" (resident rangers and lake manager) is not like the first "bunch" (transient acquisition agents, surveyors, and technicians). These initial contacts, however, have tarnished the public image of the Corps among this segment of the local population.¹⁰

Perception of Agents

The personal and professional characteristics of the appraisers and negotiators are central to the long-term image of Corps of Engineers and, in turn, to the Corps' ability to develop water resources locally in the future. Among persons contacted in this study, most negotiations apparently proceeded smoothly, without animosity from either side. A few residents even remember how considerate some agents were: "nice, polite men; I've no quarrel with them." There were other cases, however, where negotiators took few pains to be friendly or courteous. These negotiators alledgedly threatened some families with immediate condemnation, invoking references to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Federal Marshalls who would "come and carry them out" if they were not more cooperative. Other instances of alleged intimidation were explicit threats to "just have the land taken and give nothing in return" if the offered price was not agreed to immediately.

Agents' Biases in Negotiation

Word of preferential treatment by the land acquisition agents quickly spread in the rural communications networks. One problem area was the differential assessment of lands which, to local residents, were of similar value. It was a common belief that appraisal values were not consistent
from parcel to parcel, with some land-owners getting "lucky" while others
were not so fortunate. This perceived bias became the grounds for further
suspicion of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' intentions as expressed
through its agents.

It was normal practice for the Corps to initially underbid fair
market values, letting people negotiate up to the level established as
"fair" by Corps-designated appraisers. It should be noted that the negotia-
tions for property in this reservoir, and in other studies, occurred before
the implementation of the Uniform Relocation and Real Properties Policy Act
of 1970 (Public Law 91-646). An agent, acting on his own, apparently out
of concern for the welfare of the resident, knew that registering a
rejection of the offer for the first several contacts would lead to higher
bids on each return visit. Consequently, the agent so informed select
residents. Although most we talked with tried to be open-minded about an
agent's "coaching" of some people not to accept the first or second bids,
there is still decreased trust between a half-dozen community members as a
result.

These perceived biases increased the anxiety of the residents (relo-
catee or not), harmed the Corps' public image, and are still being talked
about as personal insults fifteen years later. This suggests that the Corps
was not able to place controls on the behavior of its agents during the
negotiation process. Dissatisfaction with the Corps' acquisition process
and resettlement payments may stem less from the payments and subsequent
housing conditions per se than from resentment towards the negotiators.12

Cemeteries

Small cemeteries were relocated to larger cemeteries when the level
of the impounded waters posed a threat. In the study area, respondents felt
that this relocation, too, was conducted in a clumsy manner from a cultural
standpoint. For the most part, rural cemeteries are the resting places for
members of interrelated families who have lived within a few sections of
each other for a long time. The relative positions of the graves and
markers to each other carries significance for the living. Social history,
from the early days of settlement to the present, was encapsulated within
these "silent cities." The Corps, in accordance with standard procedures,
relocated many of the endangered cemeteries in Okaw and Windsor Townships to Quigley Cemetery, now part of Wolf Creek State Park (Figure 5). In doing so, no apparent care was taken to maintain the individual boundaries of the smaller cemeteries, nor the relative positions of the stones to each other. A few residents were outraged at this treatment of their "family," while most others more calmly viewed it as an indecency—an affront to the dead, as well as the living. In one case, a man systematically destroyed his own family gravesite in order that it not be profaned by the Corps.

River Recreation

People from the Village of Findlay and across Okaw Township had, for many generations, enjoyed both fishing and swimming in the nearby Kaskaskia River. The Corps (and the state) has restricted most public access to the lake; in Okaw Township, all access is controlled. This loss of free access to these water resources has been an enduring source of irritation to many local residents. Fishing and swimming sites were considered shared resources, places to cool off on hot afternoons, and to socialize.

"I don't care how much money real estate appraisers for the Corps feel it correct to give to people in exchange for this land. Money is just not the point. You can't replace things like people's life-long homes, or the styles of life people had (and treasured) when they lived near the river. I know. We used to spend many enjoyable hours on the river when we were young."

"Lord have mercy. Every evening in the summertime we'd sit down at the river near our old place and watch the mist move across the bottoms. That was really something to see. It was really beautiful in the fall. I was lucky to have enjoyed it."

The construction of an unrestricted facility south of Sullivan has been regarded by Okaw residents as preferential treatment. Some term it "the swimming hole that Corps built for Sullivans' businessmen."

Symbolic Losses

The loss of the old, one room schoolhouses (some converted to homes), roads, churches, cemeteries, and even river-recreational sites troubled more than a few long-term residents, young and old. The loss of physical structures, and even the vacant spaces was hardly a major economic blow, but
Figure 5: Lake Shelbyville Reservoir
served to further remove residents from their past symbolically. Moreover, the schools were a source of pride for contemporary generations, serving as reminders of the social distance they have traveled since the days when six grades were merged into one room. The Corps took no care to maintain these local landmarks. Those not underwater are either covered with brush, inaccessible, torn down, or relocated to the towns.

Attributing Death to Land Acquisition

In this research, as in other water resources development literature (see Smith 1970; Drucker, Smith and Reeves 1974), we noted the appearance of attributions that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had a role in bringing about people's "early deaths because of all the worry." The attribution is made exclusively by middle-aged and older people, mostly widows. This line of perceived causation may account for some of the negativism attached to the Corps in post-impact communities:

- Corps responsible for project
- project responsible for worry
- worry (land acquisition/relocation)
- responsible for premature death.

While only an intricately designed psychosocial epidemiological study could disaggregate the direct and indirect effects of the host of relevant variables, the moral terms which many rural families use in dealing with the social world leads them to regard the Corps not only as unfair, but as evil. Again, however, the attribution is specific to the institution, not to people now working for the Corps at Lake Shelbyville.

Boundaries

Acquisition Boundaries. The rationale behind the setting of acquisition boundaries still mystifies many area residents. For example, one farm chosen for comparative photographic study clearly shows why the Corps' not acquiring a home per se was not viewed by residents as a particularly salutory act. In this instance, the acquisition of 36 of the 40 acre spread damaged the diversity of economic pursuits. The cattle were sold, the farm pond and water well were lost, and even access roads were cut. This farmer was unable to maintain a combination grain and cattle operation when the Corps acquired the pasture and farm land, and one-half of the barn.
The St. Louis District Office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers apparently drew acquisition boundary lines on their master maps with little, if any, regard to the specific consequences in each case. No attempt was made to keep enough flexibility in the acquisition system to respond to variations such as home placement and water needs. Acquiring a well needed to furnish drinking water for a home and for a cattle operation just because it is four feet over a straight line drawn some three miles long on a north and south axis suggests that little personalized negotiation occurred. One farmer was faced with two expensive alternatives; the first was to redrill a well on his remaining land, and the second was to hook up to the city water supply. This farmer, and his neighbors, viewed both actions as unnecessary since a minor variation would have taken care of the problem.

Many respondents were quick to relate how the Shelbyville Country Club remains sited at the edge of the lake. They suggest that in this case the Corps' acquisition boundaries demonstrated a logic for maintaining the functional integrity of access roads, land use, and club siting. The relevant section of the topological map used by the Corps in the land acquisition program is depicted in Figure 6. The zig-zag pattern of boundary lines surrounded by straight lines is ample demonstration to residents that the Corps was primarily responsible to the prodevelopment forces of wealth and power.

Resurvey of Acquisition Boundaries. Many locals hold the Corps and State responsible for "taking" people's lands. This terminology implies that the acquisitions were morally wrong, arbitrary, or worse, capricious. On the boundary issue, there is a reemergence of hostility focused on the Corps because it has commissioned the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to resurvey the lake area. This is leading to new changes in existing boundary lines. The rationales for these actions are not understood by residents.

The original survey on which the Corps based the land acquisitions was apparently in error. The Bureau of Land Management crews who came into the area in late fall of 1980 have retired for the winter, but hold reservations for the early spring at the local motel. When surveying, they put in new stakes and flags, drive heavy metal BLM markers into the ground, uproot and destroy old survey markers without regard to their being private or public, and casually inform locals that they are gaining an extra 10 acres here or loosing 10 acres there. The Corps' Lake Manager is aware of the
Figure 6: Corps Topological Map.
Corps' legal responsibility for reimbursing farmers for crops lost when land was erroneously taken out of farm production. It is no surprise that the Corps has not spent any time or monies informing people of this since 15 years worth of lost productivity on Illinois cropland amounts to a significant figure.

The emerging clash between land owners and the Corps centers on a series of interrelated issues, some more important than others. These issues included boundary shifts which threaten to disrupt new housing subdivisions, trespass and verbal abuse by BLM crews, destruction of existing private survey markers, and defacing of trees and destruction of timber resources. These events projected the attitude to local residents that the government "thinks it can get away with anything just as it has done in the past." Together, these events resulted in conflict, and in these rural social networks most people are informed of new happenings almost instantaneously. We will briefly discuss each of these four issues in sequential order.

First, a boundary shift has threatened to disrupt a new housing subdivision in southern Okaw Township. The developer is engaged in a legal dispute with the Corps over the shifting boundaries. The Corps has already informed one new homeowner ($100,000+) that it owns half of the resident's property, to include part of the house. The Corps has set an example of graciousness by offering to allow the property owner to buy it from them. Citizens are grouping to protest these actions.

Secondly, BLM crews routinely trespass on private property without first informing someone in the area of their intentions. One BLM crew entered the backyard of a family while the husband was at work—only a young housewife and her children (preschool) were present. They began surveying, driving stakes into the backyard, and placing metal tags on trees. When the confused (and scared) housewife confronted them, she was "tactfully" informed by the BLM representative that in addition to being within their legal bounds of not needing to see or acquire permission to work on private properties, that she, the wife, "could go ahead and trespass on them for awhile to use the charcoal broiler and kid's swing set." The BLM representative noted that over half of her backyard was actually Corps' land. This verbal abuse has stirred people up more than the legal issue.
Third, the BLM workers have been uprooting existing public and private survey markers on private lands. These crews are perceived to be going out of their way not only to destroy the old markers, but also to hide all indication of where the old markers were. Few residents are fooled for more than a minute since they know precisely where all the boundary and survey markers are located.

Fourth, trees are being defaced, exposed to disease which will eventually destroy them. Patterns of indigenous exploitation of timber resources by several generations of families were disrupted by the original land acquisitions and water impoundment. The wooded areas provided plentiful timber for firewood, building, and even folk crafts. The BLM crews tag any convenient object (fences, trees, brush, stakes) with small red flags as part of their survey efforts. Two practices in particular anger farmers and other residents. The first is the use of a 3-5" spike to anchor these flags to trees. This exposes the tree to disease. The spike can also lead to serious damage of sawmill equipment. The second practice is the BLM crews' placing both wooden and metal stakes into fields of corn or soybeans near harvest time. These stakes are hard to see under optimal daytime conditions. At night, they are impossible to detect. Mechanical pickers can be damaged when they encounter stakes rather than the more pliable corn or soybean plants. Some farmers routinely comb their fields after BLM crews have been seen in the area, taking the stakes from the ground and using the wooden ones as kindling for the home fireplace. The BLM personnel are perceived to show little courtesy, respect or understanding for the farmer's occupation or other aspects of his way of life.

Colson (1971) noted that hostility toward the government and its officers lasted about five years in the Kariba Dam project. In the townships subjected to resurvey by the BLM crews, hostilities are reemerging after fifteen years. Significantly, it is a younger generation that is voicing its pique. These people had heard stories of how their parent's generation was poorly treated during the acquisition process, but many were skeptical since, by and large, they favor change and development more than do their elders. But outrage has replaced patronizing skepticism when, for example, the BLM crew stakes off backyards, tells others that part of a new home actually belongs to the Corps, and shows little sympathy for those they are working among. In these areas where official agencies are viewed as
wrecking or threatening to wreck people's lives, even the facade of promises of fair treatment is no longer maintained by those agency representatives who contact residents about boundary shifts. As noted in other reports, the subjective perception of arbitrariness combined with ambiguity is devastating to people trying to plan for their own and families' future security (Roper 1978). The Corps may be in for trouble in this emerging dispute since the residents of the subdivision are politically and economically more powerful than, for example, the aging tenant farmer with small holdings. And, many are well-connected to the Shelbyville financial power structure. Indeed, the sub-development is very near the country club, perceived by most as the party place of Shelby County's business elite.

PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFITS PROMISED BY RESERVOIR DEVELOPMENT

The respondents from the townships studied, by and large, feel that the Corps misrepresented the lake project as an economic stimulus to the region. Data reported elsewhere indicate that their perceptions are correct. Expected industrial development has not materialized (Suwanamalik 1981a). The population of both Shelby and Moultrie Counties has not substantially increased (Opryszek 1981). Only very limited recreation oriented development occurred (Gramman and Buchanan 1981). Lake-induced sources of income have been few, and local townships are stuck with the clean-up costs of the visitor population (Suwanamalik 1981b; also see Scott and Chen 1973; Summers and Clemente 1976). Expenditures made by recreationists attracted to the lake have been far less than predicted (Gramman 1981).

These unfulfilled expectations of the benefits to be derived from the lake have resulted in negativism and frustration. Residents now hesitate to go along with even reasonable suggestions, especially when they are based on projections by the Corps. The Corps is viewed as either intentionally misleading them in order to gain support for the project, or is regarded as incompetent—unable to project accurately the project's future. This is in spite of the recognition by most that the difficult technical hurdles of reservoir construction were overcome in grand fashion. Specific cases of the Corps' perceived incompetence are presented below.
Lost Revenues

Local township governments have found that Lake Shelbyville has not brought the expected large increases in revenue to local governments derived from recreation-related development. Local governments have become over-extended financially trying to provide services (police and fire protection, ambulance service, and road maintenance) to recreationists. The property tax loss associated with land acquisition is still a major problem in Okaw Township. During the fall of 1980, inadequate township revenues nearly forced a closing of the sole access road to Coon Creek (Figure 5). Only the threat of lawyers working on the behalf of the Corps delayed this action by the township road commissioner. The road issue continues to be one of the most controversial for Okaw Township since many residents do not consider the levels of financial contribution of county, state and federal government as adequate for correcting road problems caused by the recreationists. Thus, township governments elsewhere around the lake are hesitating to deal with the Corps on a cooperative basis. These governmental bodies see the Corps as raising public expectations unrealistically at the beginning of the project, only to saddle them with the financial burdens when reality does not match promises.

Flood Control Management

Residents—especially those downstream—felt that the technical management of the water releases was poor in the years immediately following the impoundment. During the wet years of 1973 and 1974, damages to agriculture and recreation in the region were very high because the Corps was unable to balance the annual cycle of water release and impoundment. The water was initially withheld from the river because of the fear of downstream flooding which, in turn, raised the lake level to dangerous heights. In the end, the Corps lowered the lake level, causing the downstream damage. Many bottomland farmers were angry about the resultant flooding, since flood control was one of the major purposes of the Shelbyville Dam. Subsequently, the Corps conducted a comprehensive reanalysis of their operating policy. Many residents continue to doubt that the Corps can react appropriately to future unseasonally heavy rainfalls in spite of numerous successes since 1974. Their attitude is that the "Corps failed the first time; why should we believe they will succeed the next time."
SUMMARY

The presence of a governmental agency which is not responsive to local populations has created enduring conflicts.

(1) A pattern of criticism of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers policies and personnel emerged, focused on the "Corps is not a good neighbor." The Corps continues to use bureaucratic, compartmentalized approaches to its daily relations with area residents. Such issues as agent rudeness and favoritism in past land acquisition continue to serve as convenient foci for criticism of the Corps.

(2) The Corps is felt to have misrepresented the lake project as an economic stimulus to the region. Expected revenues and development have not been produced, and flood control management is perceived as poor. More symbolically, the Corps has shown little regard for the social significance of cemeteries, and other historical markers such as old schools.
WEEKEND RESIDENTS: TAKING WITHOUT CARING

The Lake Shelbyville reservoir was built to ease flood damage on the Kaskaskia River and to aid barge navigation on the Mississippi River. Well over half of the benefit of the reservoir is recreational, however (Gramann and Buchanan 1981). The opening of the reservoir in 1972 created water-based recreational opportunities for people in Shelby and Moultrie Counties, and other parts of Central Illinois. An overview of the recreational use patterns can be found in Burdge, Gramann and Buchanan (1979), and description of the economics of the recreational features of the project can be found in Gramann and Buchanan (1981), and Gramann (1981). The use of the lake facilities have also lead to enduring impacts on Shelbyville residents and those other townships surrounding the lake.

Conflicts among recreationists have long been recognized, in both the popular and scientific literature. Gramann and Burdge (1980) have analyzed survey data from Lake Shelbyville recreationists (water skiers and fishermen) to determine the influence of recreation goals on conflicts between recreationists and local residents. This chapter focuses on several themes of conflict arising from the interactions between resident populations and the resources transient users.

One aspect of this study was documenting residents' perceptions of themselves and their families and farms, local governments, and the wider social and natural environments. Residents invariably mentioned conflicts they and their neighbors had with "weekend residents." This section uses anecdotes obtained primarily from Okaw Township residents to illustrate these conflict themes. Okaw Township residents' level of exposure to recreationists cannot be considered representative of everyone who lives within the 16-mile reservoir corridor. Because Okaw Township contains four of the nine major lake access areas (Opossum Creek, Coon Creek, Lithia Springs Marina, and Eagle Creek State Park), miles of lake access road, and the most land acquired of any Shelby County township, nearly 9,000 acres (see Figure 5),
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the township's residents are exposed to the recreationists more than residents of other townships in the region. The issues around which the conflicts center appear the same in other townships, namely, Shelbyville, Windsor, Rose, Pickaway and Ridge.

Residents observe the annual increase in trailers, boats, and recreational vehicles which accompanies the April opening of the lake access areas as marking the start of the six to seven month tourist season. On busy weekends during this time, "cities" of several thousand develop overnight in local campgrounds.

"To be right here close to a park area, you get to see them flock in just like a whole town moving in next door. Rangers told me how they can get almost 5,000 people into one of those place in a short afternoon. We hardly have any police protection as it is, then all these people pile in for a good time. We are left on our own to contend with them. We have had a lot of small stuff stolen: cider press, lumber. Somebody even dismantled our old hay rake. So we got a good dog and haven't been bothered much since."

"Ninety-nine percent of the out-of-area people are just fine. It is the one percent that really causes us to resent them all; it is this small group that seems to cause all the trouble. Mind you, a lot of people around here really like the lake. It has put boating recreation and fishing right in our backyards. But everyone is turned off by the rudeness of many of the people who come through here, and we are going to have to deal with it in one way or another, either now or later."

Accompanying the increase in people is an increase in the litter, the first conflict theme. Litter is one of the most emotionally laden issues noted in interviews with Okaw Township residents.

LITTER

Recreationists' littering habits are viewed as degrading to the locals.

"I have seen these campers pull off the road and drain their holding tanks. I can't understand why they can't use the facilities the Corps and the state have in the parks. Others just drive down the road tossing their beer cans out as they go. And you'll see papers from McDonalds and stuff like that, and there is not a McDonalds for miles--the nearest are Decatur and Mattoon. I resent it. In the spring, after it rains hard, the rising water floats the beer cans up from the ditches. In some places, the debris is so thick you could walk and step on a can every step."
There are numerous other cases where operators of recreational vehicles dump their holding tanks in front of homes as they leave on Sunday afternoons and evenings. Some dispose of their accumulated trash, neatly packed in a plastic garbage bag, out of their vehicle windows, occasionally in front of oncoming cars.

**Financial Costs**

To the local residents who earn their livelihoods from working the land, litter is more than an aesthetically unpleasing memorial to merry weekenders. Litter is a serious financial liability when it finds its way into mechanical pickers and other farm equipment. During critical planting or harvest times, beverage cans and bottles thrown into grain fields can wreak havoc on expensive machinery, forcing costly and time-consuming repairs. Routine roadside maintenance activities such as grass mowing and ditch clearing are also ladden with financial costs due to the litter.

"Last April, a friend and I went to one of the access roads, walked along the edges of the road and counted cans: 1,980 on one road! During winter, you don't see nearly as many, but when spring comes, you find them again."

"In Okaw Township, we have 4-5 miles of lake access road, and it is really a messy job to mow the roadsides and clean the ditches for field drainage. The Corps will fine people they catch littering in the parks, but they have no jurisdiction and really don't give a damn once the recreationists leave the park. Since you can't pick all those cans and bottles up, you just close your eyes and mow them down. The tractor's power take-off turn the mower blades so fast that the stuff becomes shrapnel. The biggest problem is that when the broken materials get stuck in the dirt, they can cut just like razors, tearing up grader and tractor tires when we are fixing the roadsides. You can see the tire damage wherever you go around here."

Farmers know that litter can be a serious hazard to their health and to their equipment. Additionally, damages to the equipment cost real dollars to repair, and these impacts repeat, year after year.

For these reasons, and others that are listed below, a general dislike for tourists has developed among local residents. This tension between the locals and the weekenders is rekindled each spring—renewing smoldering hostilities toward the Corps which is seen as responsible for bringing these people into the area.
The second theme of conflict is the recreationists' invasions of residents' personal and property boundaries. These invasions are viewed by residents as disrespectful. Boundary invasions reveal differences between rural and urban residents' sense of space. The acreage involved in rural Illinois farms leads farmers to develop an expanded sense of personal territory. A farmer's "front yard" is not only the small green spot in front of the house. Rather, it may include the ten acres east of his house toward the lake and be considered every bit as private as an urbanite's front walk. Conversely, the recreationists may view the unplanted farm lands as "public ground."

"These people from the cities come in here thinking this farm land is open range. But every piece of ground around here that I farm, and even some I don't, I feel is in my back-yard."

Personal Boundary Violations

A number of respondents take precautions such as staying away from campsites and roadside fish-and-bait stores in order to decrease their interaction with recreationists. Personal boundary violations still occur with great frequency, however.

"We've got friends who live south of Findlay. People stop by there at all hours in the morning, asking directions to the parks, and wanting to use the bathroom. God, the whole earth is out there to use as a bathroom. These campers will come up and honk and honk, or sit outside with the engines running waiting for us to go outside and see what's up. I know a lot of people who find it frightening because you don't know what to expect. They could be thieves or worse."

The violations can be personally degrading and indicative of the recreationists' perceptions that farmers are of a lesser social status than they.

"One guy even thanked us for giving him directions, which were clearly marked anyway, by saying, 'Thank you, Mr. Farmer.' My daughter is a biochemist, and my son is one of the engineers designing the tiles for the space shuttlecraft. I pay more taxes each year than most people make as gross income. Mr. Farmer! Mr. Hick is what he meant."

"Another guy just yelled at my kid to come here 'boy.' I stuck my head out of the machine shed and told him if you want to talk to us, you come over here. Which they did then, see."
These boundary violations can be hazardous to farmers. Farm equipment is often repaired in machine sheds or near the roadways, access to which is not as controlled as in a mechanic's garage.

"One time I was off my combine, setting its speed— a dangerous operation. Everything is running wide open, and I have to have my arm down inside. And this woman walks up behind me yelling, wanting to know how to get to Lone Point. God, it could have been bad news. No damn sense of what's going out here at all."

Property Invasions

Some instances of property invasions have become humorous in the telling and retelling. In one case, a farmer was telephoned by his neighbor because unrecognized cars were parked near an old barn the farmer rented as part of his operation. The farmer arrived at the scene to find campers festively pulling up turnips and radishes from his small garden plot behind the barn. One woman noticed him standing nearby. She offered him a shopping bag so he "could get some" for himself. The farmer strongly "suggested" that they all leave. No one challenged his request.

Still another instance of property boundary invasions contribute to the locals' aversion toward recreationists. Campers drive their cars across farm land to a campground rather than using the road, steal corn from the stalk, and even burn stacked lumber for campfires. Hunters target practice on trees, signs, equipment, and even livestock, and are a particular source of conflict.

"Hunters see those small, white boundary markers of the Corps, and to get to the government ground, they cross my land, not respecting the fact that it is private ground. If they stop and ask permission, I will even tell them where the deer run, but few stop and ask, very few. I chase those that don't ask or ask politely, right out."

"During deer season last year a kid killed a deer near here but got tired of dragging it, I guess, since he drove his car right across the field I just plowed. It probably won't hurt anything right now, but the next guy through will see the tracks and go right on across. And bingo, you've got a road in the middle of the field. So that is what you gotta watch."

Another boundary invasion, demonstrating the hunter's perception that all is fair game in the country, was intentional and extremely dangerous. It takes only several such instances for residents to develop a strong dislike of the out-of-area hunters.
"I had been feeding a pheasant in the hedge row near my house. You might say it was almost like a pet. It was tame enough not to run when I came out, but still kept its distance. A guy came by the front of the house in his car, stopped, jumped out, and blasted the pheasant with his shotgun. There I am, grain still in my hand! Man, did I chew on him. I gave him notice that if I ever saw him again, I would have him in jail. He had Mt. Zion license plates."

Because recreationists are unfamiliar with the local road systems, some are unable to negotiate the turns at T-intersections. A few of the resultant boundary intrusions are thought of as hilarious by locals, especially when a recreationist's expensive leisure equipment is wrecked in a ditch. Other invasions are hazardous to the lives of residents.

"With the nice pavement out south of Findlay, these recreationists speed up to 50-60-70 miles an hour. And travel right out into my corn field since the T-intersection is not marked ahead far enough to allow them time to stop. We had to call the Findlay Fire Department to get one guy's boat and trailer upright again and out of my corn. When the lake first went in, I'd always lend a helping hand, pull people out of the ditches with my tractor or whatever. Now, I either make it a cash transaction or tell them to call a tow-truck from someplace."

"In the 9 years I've lived here, about 20 cars a year have ended up in my front yard, almost all during the tourist months. Most don't read the road signs or are so drunk they can't. That'd be their business if they kept their antics to themselves. But my mother lives in a trailer home on the corner where they always miss the turn at the T. I have erected a barricade now--big posts dug 4 feet into the ground, with heavy gage steel between them. If someone misses the turn now, so much for their car. Won't get my mom though."

ROAD MAINTENANCE

Road maintenance is a vital aspect of rural social and economic life. The township road commissioners are responsible for the upkeep of select roads within the township. Due to the frequency of travel by recreationists, the lake access roads degrade more quickly now than ever in the past. Repairs are often necessary by mid-summer and almost certainly by fall. The road commissioners' efforts to work on the roads are inhibited by intentional boundary invasions.
"The road commissioner can't even keep the road closed long enough to get it repaired after all the vehicles have put big holes in it. The campers either go around the road closed signs in order to get to the park, or just get out of their car, throw the signs into the ditch, and take off down the middle of the road. You name it, these people do it. No respect for us at all. But we get back at them when the signs are to keep them off the freshly oiled surface. Boy, you ought to see their cars and campers then."

FARM MACHINERY ON THE ROADS

The third set of conflicts revolve around the contacts on the roads between the recreationists and the residents driving farm machinery. Farm machinery must be moved from field to field along the public roads. The harvest season is especially crowded. The highway laws clearly state that farm equipment be given the right-of-way. Recreationists' hazardous driving has earned a bad reputation among farmers.

"Farmers have to be on the roads at times to get their equipment from one field to another, but the campers seem to resent us being there. The only thing out-of-area traffic will heed is if you have a six row picker with the real sharp snouts. You put it up eyeball height to them, then they'll kind of slow down and get over to the side. They don't seem to pay attention to anything else."

"Farmers will pull over when they get a chance but people don't realize that we've got to be careful of the road shoulders because of the potholes. They can tear the equipment up if you aren't careful, even kill you."

"Our equipment is getting so big. My planter is 35 feet wide and then some, and, on some of these roads, there is only a 40-foot right-of-way. Sometimes we'll send someone up the road a quarter mile or so to stop everyone, but some don't listen and come barreling down on us anyway. Ninety-five percent know its for their own safety--ours too for that matter. But about five percent don't and they've given everyone else a bad name."

On a few occasions matters have escalated to fist fights. Subtle warfare prevails most often. Several farmers now delight in not allowing any tourist automobile to pass them on one particularly long stretch of road in Okaw Township. They gear their farm machinery to crawl at 5-7 miles per hour, holding eager recreationists back from the lake site for at least an extra 15-20 minutes. Friends and neighbors, all of whose cars are recognized by these farmers, are allowed to pass at the earliest opportunity. Friends
usually recognize the game, and take a quick detour down a side road around the equipment. Few farmers like to see the recreationists unduly angry over delays due to farm equipment travel. As a group, however, farmers consider these delays justified.

One farmer cited an intriguing cause for the heavy traffic loads during the peak of the recreationists season.\textsuperscript{13}

"The traffic is bad partly because the kids who come with their parents become bored. Then they get into the cars and drive around, back and forth to town. The campsite and lake recreation seems to be oriented toward the older people at times. But for the teenagers, there are no local movies, no game places, few restaurants and the like. They have virtually no place to go, and a lot of them do not want to be with their parents for an entire weekend."

LIFE-STYLE DIFFERENCES

The fourth and last set of conflicts deal with perceived differences in life-styles between residents and recreationists. These differences were mentioned in conversations with respondents, but only infrequently appear in standard survey research.

Personal Characteristics

Many residents who live near campgrounds or along lake access roads have developed an aversion for recreationists as a category of people. The recreationists are considered to talk excessively loud, their voices often carrying for great distances on a quiet fall night after harvest has removed the natural sound barriers of row crops. Even body odors and cigarette smoke offend some residents. These items are especially disagreeable to rural residents who experience an environment not as routinely polluted by smoke or noise.

The excessive use of liquor by the recreationists is another issue dividing the two populations. The Shelby County rural areas are "dry;" liquor is not sold except in a couple of facilities along the lake and within the city of Shelbyville. Local residents consume alcohol, of course, but nearly always within the confines of their own home. Teenagers hold an occasional party or "beer-blast" but the sin seems not as great as when the offender is from out of the area. Locals view drunken drivers, no matter
what age, not only as a danger to others on the road, but also as people who are somehow morally unfit. Even more disturbing than the noise and liquor consumption is the licentiousness perceived in the clothing styles and physical embraces of campers. Not everyone is so conservative, but conservatism is at least a highly respected social posture.

"We own a small lot on which we allow people to park their campers and RV's. But we learned early not to advertise. We just let word-of-mouth bring us people like those we have already let stay here, and who we know to be alright. That way we aren't deluged with the drunken riff-raff--those rowdy people. It keeps our small park nice, quiet and respectable; a place where you can bring your whole family to and know you don't have to worry about things."

Even perceived differences in the ways considered appropriate to take care of children become grist for the local rumor network and a focus for further social separation between locals and recreationists. One mother told us how disgusted she was with people who bring children to the lake area, leaving them unattended while parents venture onto the lake in a boat. Since many areas along the shore have precipitous drop-offs only a few feet from the water's edge, a child can be in danger of drowning if left unattended for only a few minutes. Our respondent had noticed several small children playing along the water's edge on Corps property adjacent to her home. She was angry at the parents for leaving them alone and frightened over the children's safety. She admonished the children to stay away from the water and left to call a ranger. Later, she returned to find no trace of the camping equipment or children. To this day, she feels guilty over leaving the children by themselves and is furious with parents who do not adequately monitor their children in the course of recreational activities.

Sport Hunting

The difference in perceptions about hunting is also significant. Recreationists oriented toward sport hunting often come into conflict with local residents. One issue is the boundary violations which occur so frequently.

"Hunters trespass on us, tear up our cattle fences to get their cars in, and even shoot from the car or truck. It is illegal as hell, as well as dangerous. They're from Decatur."
The second issue is moral in tone, focused on using snowmobiles to hunt coyotes and wild dogs. Interestingly, locals are banded together in "clubs" to curb the coyote population as a means of protecting their stock. They use the same equipment and hunting techniques but their activities are not legitimated by most other locals.

"All these guys on these damn snowmobiles found that coyotes and wild dogs range out of the park areas during winter, often into the fields. They found this out, and killed a bunch of them by running them down, tiring them, hitting them with their snowmobiles. Yeah, I'd sure like to get my hands on one of these brave hunters. God, all I need is for some hunted coyote to attack one of these fools, then they'll all come out to hunt down the menace. Probably kill all of my cows."

"I like to hunt, but this snowmobile hunting is not hunting--it is not sport. It is murder. They use their CB's to coordinate the hunt, running the animals down with the snowmobiles. There is no justification for it."

Display of Wealth

The last perceived life-style difference is the ostentatious display of wealth. Local residents realize that a recreational vehicle costs 15-35 thousand dollars, a large investment by anyone's calculations. Locals view it as extravagant, when used for only a few days a week, a few weeks a year, and a few miles from home. When this display is coupled with a deprecating attitude toward local "farmers," it is little wonder that some residents avoid associating with the weekenders.

"I can't see what possible motivation there could be to come down from Decatur and cram yourself into one of those little spaces. God knows it can't be comfortable. You walk out your door and hang yourself on somebody else's clothes line."

IMPLICATIONS

"To me, all these lake projects that are put in, no matter where... those sponsors of the project are not explaining the full facts to these people that have to live in the area after it goes in--the people who have to live with it year after year. If these sponsors would explain the facts to the residents and all the trouble with taxes, roads, outsiders and so forth, fewer lakes would be approved. Or least we would know what to expect and carve out a more equitable arrangement."
The varied impacts considered in this chapter are neglected in most social projections of user-impact on recreation areas. Some of the impacts are attitudinal, primarily the negativity toward outsiders in general. Not to be neglected, however, are the quantifiable impacts such as equipment damaged because of litter, costs associated with cleaning up the roadsides, damaged fences and crops, and health risks or increased road hazards. Even the inability to attempt road repairs without risking contempt of the recreation user population is an impact. The sum of these conflicts is greater than each constituent issue. We will briefly examine one consequence of these conflicts for Okaw Township.

Okaw Township residents perceive the influx of recreationists to severely tax limited emergency and law enforcement services, as well as degrading the lake access roads. Until very recently, the voters of this township steadfastly refused to increase their own tax burden to maintain the roads. Current costs of providing the minimal level of maintenance to one mile of road is about $5,500. With 35 miles of road to maintain, the total is well over $190,000. Only $60,000 in 1981 has been budgeted for road repairs, however. While the state and federal governments have spent many thousands of dollars on select roads within the township, this was a one-time affair.

In the case of Okaw Township the County and Corps administrators seem to feel that the local populace's reticence to increase tax rates for road maintenance is an evasion of legitimate fiscal responsibility. The township feels that roads are important, but not for the weekend visitors to tear up. An insignificant amount of monies are received from recreationists to help alleviate user costs in the township county area. Locals view the township's attempts to shift road costs back onto the county, state, and federal government as a way of regaining control over outside powers. These attempts help locals maintain self-respect in spite of having little choice but to host weekend residents who exploit the environment--taking without giving in return.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study focused on the social changes emanating from the development of a reservoir in Shelby and Moultrie counties, located in east-central Illinois. The ethnography of relocatees and their neighbors in Okaw Township provided the contextual information to understand how these people live, now and in the past. Intersecting their individual and family life-style progressions was the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' land acquisition program and the development of Lake Shelbyville.

In the previous chapters, we discussed such topics as road maintenance, boundary surveys, and negotiations for acquisition as related to long-term perceptions of Corps' fairness and equity treatment toward locales. We also reviewed how large-scale land acquisition lead to shortages in arable lands consequently disrupting intergenerational transfers of land use rights. These events, in turn, affected families and peoples own progressions through family life-cycles and occupational careers. Another focus was the impact of the temporary visitors to the impoundment.

APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCE AND IMPACT MITIGATION

The remainder of this chapter deals with applied social science's contribution to the mitigation of social impacts of water resource development. We take it for granted that mitigation will be unsuccessful when the social and economic impacts of a federal project are not understood. We also assume that most contracted technical or feasibility reports prove to be inaccurate once applied in a field setting. Furthermore, an important contribution of this report is not one of specific methodology, where either survey research, geneology, or photography is exclusively applied. Rather it is the holistic perspective that emerges from trying to make sense out of people in their natural setting.

We further assume that responsible federal, state and local agencies want to and are prepared to allocate time, money and personnel for careful study of the socio-ecological impacts from the earliest stages of planning through project implementation and operations. In the Lake Shelbyville project, planners did not consider the socio-cultural history of the region,
and ignored the contemporary circumstances of those most directly affected by the project. Corps planners proceeded with community development skewed to the interests of a limited number of local residents to the exclusion of the total two county population. Such "top down planning" set the stage for serious disruption of established rural traditions which could easily have been avoided. Over 30 years of accumulated literature citing similar problems and pitfalls was either bypassed or not known in planning for human relocation in the Lake Shelbyville project.

Water resource agencies charged with relocation programs in conjunction with reservoir development must recognize that a river basin is settled by diverse social, cultural and occupational subgroups. Planners must understand the heterogeneity of rural populations on the dimension of life cycle stages affected. Secondly, they must understand the impact of land acquisition and land use changes on the local social structures. Thirdly, developing a basin-wide strategy to mitigate the impacts of relocation will allow linkages with state, county and local social service agencies. Planning for mitigation, based on the notion of diversity of cultural types, would allow decision makers to be aware of possible impacts.

**Heterogeneity of Relocated Populations**

Urban and rural societies in the U.S. are linked through the larger society, but they are not equivalent in culture or social organization. The terms "rurality" and "farmer" also are not equivalent, both being quite heterogeneous. For instance, one type of farmer may have his livelihood dependent upon ownership of agricultural land. Another type of farmer may be only tangentially dependent upon land ownership for security of livelihood, as in the cases of the part-time and/or subsistence farmers. The assumption of homogeneity stems, in part, from the agrarian ideology, as Hassinger (1978:85) notes:

"A more subtle effect of the agrarian ideology is to homogenize the perception by the American public and their potential representatives so that all farmers tend to be regarded as having similar problems... that a single national policy is seen as applicable to agriculture."
An undimensional view obscures the problems of the small farmer, farm labor, single versus diversified operations, and the varied uses to which land is put. Just as surely, it has obscured the need to develop a variety of means to aid the various categories of farmers and other rural residents in adapting to the changing social and economic conditions brought about by such water resource developments as reservoirs.

Identification of Impacted Populations

The certain identification of persons who lives are affected by any project needs to be accomplished. The case presented in Chapter V was for a family not identified by the Corps as a "relocatee." The "impacted population" in the past has meant "relocatees" who apply for moving costs. These data show that a number of people simply do not apply for assistance, either because of lack of need, unwillingness to deal with an agency viewed as hostile, or because of not being informed of their rights. How many people and families, then, are slipping through the analytical net because there is no systematic identification program?

Existing tax and land ownership records at the county and township levels may be used to identify the population of areas to be affected by a proposed reservoir. Certainly, it is more acceptable financially to use such information. However, the only sure means of tracing everyone in and near a project is by using the section-by-section, plot-by-plot, house-to-house census traditionally carried out by Extension Agents and other U.S.D.A. agencies located in each county. These people are used to working within limited geographical areas and know that existing records are frequently incomplete. An intensive census would identify for planners those they need to deal with as the project develops, as acquisition of land occurs, and as the resources in the mitigation package are allocated.

Impact of Land-Use Change on Rural Communities

Changes in land-use patterns caused by land acquisition ramify socially for generations. People's occupational careers and family life-cycles are intertwined with the availability of agricultural land. When the arable land in a region is reduced, farming will be less of a life-chance for the existing and future pool of farmers. Some will be forced out of farming altogether. Others, if successful in their climb up the agricultural ladder, will require more than the usual amount of personal
and extended family resources. Rural social sciences recognizes these features as normative for rural, agricultural areas.

In the case example reported in Chapter V, Julie's extended family lives away from the areas where land-use patterns were most severely disrupted. The continued strengths of her family, socially and economically, provided the resource base necessary for William and Julie to begin rebuilding a viable farm operation. For other families caught under similar circumstances, the stories do not have happy endings. The adaptive capacity of a bilaterally extended family can be severely reduced when the residentially separate households are all adversely affected by land acquisition. This is what happened in the Shelbyville Reservoir project. Those units which were located nearest to the river were acquired totally, while those on the periphery of the project were taken only in part. But as a set of interconnected families (households), the ability to muster needed financial and labor resources were lessened in a community where many people were impacted.

The most difficulty occurs for those who enter the acquisition/relocation net of the change agency with the fewest economic and social resources--i.e., the elderly widowed without control of arable lands. The outcomes are of less status and power, through loss of natural resources required to ensure a livelihood, and control over the younger generations through inheritance or bequest. A loss of position within the community, and even negative changes in self identity can also result. Overlooked too, in the repeated focus on the larger specialized grain farms are the general, non-specialized farms and rural homesteads with small acreage. These are located along the banks of the Kaskaskia River, often occupied by older, less educated people. These units were at a subsistence level of operation using the few cattle, milk cows, pigs, dogs, garden plots, river, fish and wildlife resources to ensure basic needs. Although these units were viable, they were delicately balanced economically. The operators had few alternatives for ensuring financial stability, and thus, their resources were insufficient for them to rebuild their lives and personal estates after relocation.

Planners need to be aware that routine changes in land-use patterns (land transfers through deed, bequest, inheritance, and rental) are closely
related to personal, family and occupational life-cycle transitions (births, deaths, parenthood, grandparenthood, and retirement). Establishing a farm is a complicated balancing of strategies for locating land, securing financial backing, and adjusting for seasonal shifts in climate, machine and manpower availability. These actions are invariably anchored in intergenerational kinship and friendship networks. The isolated rhythms of the extended farm family thus determine how land will be allocated to future generations. But this sequence is not recognized when land acquisition occurs, thus, land purchase disrupts land-use patterns and desynchronizes these complex life-cycle transitions upon which land-use changes are based.

**Mitigation: Lease-Back Arrangements**

One element of a comprehensive mitigation package is a lease-back clause with right of first use given to the tenant or owner, who lost arable or pasture lands. This clause would be a step toward recognizing that land-man relationships exist through time, that natural changes in land use are interwoven with the multiple careers of the persons that occupy the lands. At present, the acquisition process suddenly throws people onto the open land market, irrespective of their career plans, financial status or their position in the family life cycle. What little time they are conceded to reestablish a farm operation is by default--caused by the slow moving bureaucratic process. It is not normal policy to recognize the need for years rather than months to find a different farm.

A brief review of Ray's early situation is instructive as Ray could have maintained his cattle operation if he were given priority to lease the bottom pasture lands from the Corps without a disruption of ongoing business. A period of 2-3 years might have been sufficient for Ray to locate new ground with good drainage. With a few years to adjust other parameters of the operations (links to markets, elevators, health services and financial resources), he could have relocated the cattle operation. This would have kept a diversified income-making operation thriving. Ray's eventual lease termination would not have engendered hard times if the cattle operation could have served as an economic buffer. Some farmers,
given little time to move or adjust, were squeezed out of business permanently and into an unexpected form of retirement. We suggest that between two to eight years is required to reestablish a suitable land base, depending on local conditions. Furthermore, it may be years or a decade after purchase that the land would be subjected to impoundment.

Mitigation: Creating Linkages

Those caught in the forced social changes emanating from water resources development could be linked with established social service networks and services. This linkage could be accomplished by using the case-work approach where each individual and family identified remains in contact with a case-worker before, during and after acquisition. This worker coordinates the referral of these people to existing public and private agencies. Financial supports in the forms of cash payments, low interest loans, and such could be adjudicated at the case level. Many real estate agencies provide multiple services for their clients. Such a courtesy could easily be incorporated in the Corp's relocation procedures.

Mitigation: Control of Resources?

The last, and perhaps most important element in this mitigation package is: "Who controls the administration of the resources?" In our opinion, the smallest units of local government could be given significant powers for creating and operating the resource allocation program. At either the county or the township level of government, the participants have greater stakes for ensuring the well-being of their friends and families. The past experiences of the Tennessee Valley Authority demonstrates that a relocation service can function effectively as a coordinating and referring agency for families in need of assistance (Satterfield 1937; cf., Reynolds 1963). A relocation service overseen by local government might overcome the problems of finding suitable housing, moving, and reestablishing a land-base most equitably.

Following this line of reasoning, humane experimentation with social programs could be conducted by those directly in the path of water resources projects. Creative problem solving would be based on a recognition of local, particularistic realities of individuals' lives, careers, and families. This would be a step away from the impersonal, clumsy apparatus now only sporadically utilized. A feature related to the township control
over the package of resources is a supervisor of the acquisition agent's contacts with residents. Insultingly low financial compensation demeaningly negotiated is not the way to create long-term amnity of the local population.

Local control over the mitigation package would return to those most directly affected by projects real control over their lives. This may be the most important feature of the program. These actions would continue for the time required to see each family through the problems created by the development, not to an artificially established cutoff point. A heightening of perceived social justice may well ensue. If the premise that even one failed case is unacceptable, we are confident that locally controlled resources would constitute social progress. One failed case is an indictment to all who continue to disrupt lives and careers of people using the guilt-allaying phrases, "in the interest of progress" and "the greater benefit to many."
1. Using Hassinger (1978:180) as a ready source for the national trends, "the amount of land in farms has not changed much in the past two decades. Size of farms, however, increased sharply. In 1870 the average size of farms was just over 150 acres, a figure that remained quite stable up to the Agricultural Census of 1935 (155 acres). In the four decades, 1935 to 1975, the average size of farms increased by more than two and one-half times to about 385 acres." Also see, Heady (1958).

2. We do not imply that all ethnography is "good" or even suited to all research problems. Indeed, the technique holds numerous pitfalls for the quality of research data and the ethnographer himself (see, for example, Miller 1952; Hatfield 1973; Jones 1973; Gutek 1978; Morris 1973). However the early ethnographic accounts of population relocation in water projects continue to be the standard references. For example, see Shelton Davis' lucid documentary of the genocidal programs of Amazon development among the native Indians of Brazil (1977), the description by Elizabeth Colson (1971), of the immense social disruptions of the Kariba dam in Africa, the resettlement schemes in tropical Africa by Chambers (1969), and others (see Brokensha and Scudder 1968).

3. This finding is not new by any means. It has been replicated time and time again since the prototypical studies of reservoir development in Africa. Most sociologists seem unaware of this international literature: David Brokenshaw (1962); Elizabeth Colson (1971); Gary Palmer (1974); Thayer Scudder (1968, 1973); Thayer Scudder and Elizabeth Colson (1972); and Oladejo O. Okediji (1965).

4. Becker (1961:240) defines "careers" in a very general way as "the patterned series of movements a person makes through the network of institutions, formal organizations and informal relationships (Hall 1948:327)," specific to the type of career (e.g., life career, occupational career, socioeconomic career, see also Stebbins 1970; Hughes 1973; Peterson 1978; Form and Miller 1949; Slotkin 1954). Career movements dependent upon one another can be said to be mutually contingent. Becker uses the dictionary definition of contingency: "an event possible, but dependent on another uncertain event" or chain of events (1961:241). Becker (1961:254) provides an early, selected bibliography on careers. Foote conceptualized the family as a set of mutually contingent careers (1961:277-278):
"A career can be regarded as a "progression of statuses and functions which unfold in a more or less orderly though not predetermined sequence in the pursuit of values which themselves emerge in the course of experience" (Foote 1956:31).

"Success is achieved by moving from one to another of these positions that the social structure of the occupation makes available" (Becker 1961).

"The career contingencies of an occupation have as their counterpart in family life critical events that upset expectations, norms and values at any time."

The academic literature on the "family life cycle" has grown exponentially since the early works of Glick and others (1947 and 1955; e.g., Collver 1963; LaMontagne and Falardeau 1947; Loomis 1936). Very elaborate typologies exist (e.g., Duvall 1957:5-21; see Goody 1958; Fortes 1958; Berkner 1972) on the related notion of developmental cycles of domestic groups). Duvall (1958:337) succinctly summarizes our intentions in employing these concepts:

"Whatever schema for defining family life cycle stages is used, it is merely a convenient division for study of something that in real life flows on from one phase to another without pause or break. The genesis of the concept is the implicit awareness that each stage has it beginnings in the phases that are past and its fruition in development yet to come. Being cyclical by definition, the family life cycle and each of the stages within it has no beginning and no end. No matter where you start to study family life, there are always relevant roots in the near and distant past that must be considered. Whatever you are at the moment, you have grown out of the stages, just before and are heading into the stage just ahead."

Other attempts to capture patterning through time have been made (e.g., Peterson 1978 on socioeconomic life cycle; Roth 1963).

5. Smith and Zopf (1970:165-166) discuss the major classes of farm operators who run the farm business: owner-operators, farm managers, and renters. "Renters do not own land but pay in one way or another for the use of the farmsteads." The share-renter or tenant

"is the entrepreneur who secures the right to use the land in return for a specified share of the crop. Under a share-renting arrangement there is the greatest division of risks of production and chances of profit or loss between the landlord and the renter. The landlord shares the changes inherent in both price fluctuation and crop failure; and frequently the respective spheres of responsibility of landlord and tenant are unclear in this type of arrangement."
As Hassinger notes (1978:183), "under certain conditions, the use of capital to buy machinery and other production input rather than to use it to acquire land may be a good choice." On the whole, however, tenants only are in a disadvantaged economic position compared with owners and part-owners with the same scale of operation. In terms of major life-style characteristics, tenants are difficult to distinguish from owner-operators: they live and work on the farms they rent and maintain the operations much as they would their own. Many have excellent relations with their landlords. In one case, the landlord's father first rented to the present tenant's father, their kids grew up together. This generation's landlord and tenant continue their rapport as evidenced by the landlord sending his mischievous son to the tenant's farm to live for several years. He instructed them to raise the youth as they would their own, especially regarding "pulling his own weight around the farm." The landlord trusted the tenant to make the youth "understand the basics of life and how lucky he really was."

6. The meaning of land to Illinois grain farmers is complex, and certainly not limited to its value at open-market liquidation. The possession of land and its transfer intergenerationally are tied to self, family and community respect, power, family welfare and security for the future, and even the independent survival as a widow. The works of Salamon and others on a community of central Illinois farm families hint at these meanings (Keim 1976; Salamon 1978, 1980; Salamon and Keim 1979; Salamon and Lockhart 1980; Salamon and O'Reilly 1979). It is not an exaggeration to state that land becomes an extension of a farmer's ego, much as it does for a peasant's (see Berg 1975).

7. Evident in Ray's use of the phrase, "run us off" is Thomas Jefferson's agrarian ideology. As Hassinger (1978:83) notes, "Jefferson's ideas on property in land stem directly from John Locke who held that the earth is a common stock and natural right and it is the natural right of those who labor in it to possess it. Locke believed that the main function of government was to protect rights, especially the property rights of individuals" (also see Mark 1963; Freund 1948). The necessity of land acquisition for the public good often stumbles over the high valuation placed on private ownership, the "proper" role of government, and the close association of farm family, farm business, adequate land-base, and
life-cycle progressions (also see Hargrove 1980; Radosevich and Sabey 1977). Similar problems with water appropriations are addressed by Gopalakrishnan (1971 and 1973).

8. As Smith and Zopf (1970:478-479) note with reference to the agricultural ladder in the mid-twentieth century, "it has changed markedly...a (young man) is more likely to enter into a partnership with his father on the family farm (with) eventual operatorship of the farm (coming through) the gradual acquisition of control." The change from the young man purchasing a separate unit has been wrought by dwindling acreage in the flux of availability of land, and the trend toward larger farms.

9. Their mode of adaptation to the new circumstances was open to William in part because its steps (agricultural ladder), his age, and family life-cycle stage were compatible. The existence of a well-defined adaptive strategy (also a popular channel for vertical mobility) cannot be underemphasized as a factor contributing to their success under adverse conditions (c.f., Graves and Graves 1977). The ability to mobilize resources bilaterally, thus capitalizing on Julie's friends and kin network is also a significant predictor of their success (c.f., Carr 1957; Holler and Quesada 1977; Netting 1974:31-32). And her role in the corporate enterprise will lead her to enjoy significant decision-making powers late in life, as well as ensure her financial security (Salamon and Keim 1979, Salamon and Lockhart 1980; Keim 1976). A subsidiary analysis of the evolution of Julie's powers would enhance our knowledge of the status enhancement processes of rural farm women (See Sanday 1973; Friedl 1967; Fulton 1975).

10. The academic literature is replete with similar instances of the Corps botching its contacts with the rural populations in a reservoir area, and how this leads to the characteristic attitudes of distrust and dislike of the Corps which prospective dislocates and others develop. For example, see John W. Bennett (1974), Rabel J. Burdge and K. Sue Johnson (1973), John M. Higgins (1967), and Philip Drucker, Charles Smith, and Edward B. Reeves (1974).

11. Section 301(3) of the law clearly states that the initial offer be equal to or greater than fair market value. The Corps is prohibited from offering less than appraised fair market value. Studies of the Corps' behavior have indicated, however, that landowners were not told the
appraisal fair market value, and the 1970 Act contains no provision for this value to be revealed to landowners; see Robert F. Goebel, Donald K. James, Lyle G. Robey, and Joel V. Williamson (1970), Rabel J. Burdge and K. Sue Johnson (1973).


"The findings for the open-ended questions revealed severe negative attitudes toward physical relocation and treatment by the government among the affected people. One-hundred fifteen of the relocated people responded to the open-ended question regarding their attitude toward physical relocation and approximately 75 percent indicated that they had developed extremely negative attitudes about being removed from their established homes. Of the 112 relocated people who responded to the question concerning treatment by the government during the land acquisition, 64 percent indicated that they had been treated unfairly."

13. Recreational opportunities for young people was cited as the top problem for Shelby County in a recent statewide study of community needs: Rabel J. Burdge, D. James Brademas, Harvey J. Schweitzer, Ruth M. Kelly, Linda Keasler and Anita Russelmann (1978).

14. See David L. McLaughlin (1977) Tables 4-5 and 4-11 of McLaughlin's thesis indicates that in spite of the increased demand for services and the associated pressures to increase the taxes within the township, the 36.38 miles of road served had only $9,200 of the road tax revenues available—an average of $253 per mile. These are extremely low figures for a township with four of the nine major lake access areas. Additionally, the rule of thumb increase in total road revenues per mile of road served for both impacted and nonimpacted townships for 1965 to 1975 was two-fold, except for Okaw which went from $814/mile to $980/mile. It is little wonder that road quality has suffered.
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