

tray the psychological impact of an all-encompassing physical disability on mental and emotional growth" (xix). Her supportive family and reliance on spirituality and the appearance of "spirit guides" along the way help her persevere in a society that even in its kindest moments is wracked by ambivalence about chronic and multiple disability.

Webb was aware from early childhood that her internal identity was at variance with the way she was perceived by the outside world. Her family, though loving, could not shield her from, nor were they themselves immune to, the social pressure caused by Webb's inability to conform to many social and physical standards. They worried about what people thought. Webb constantly felt pressured, especially by her mother, to walk and speak clearly; these were frustratingly impossible objectives for Webb, but deemed necessary for social inclusion. At twelve, Webb entered a boarding school for children with disabilities. She never learned to walk or to speak easily there, but she got her course work done. Against great odds, unceasing and demoralizing institutional and social resistance, and despite almost universal inaccessibility, she eventually reached the objective she began to seek in childhood—a Ph.D. Ultimately, she became self-supporting, found meaningful and important work with mentally retarded people, and won the 1971 Handicapped Iowan of the Year Award. Thus, she fulfilled the key tenet of personhood as she defines it: "integrity, in my own eyes as well as in the eyes of others" (1).

Webb never politicizes disability. Indeed, she never even mentions the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). She does not share her success with other persons with disabilities. Her anger and resentment about discrimination and the demeaning treatment she receives is specific to her own experience. Even in conclusion, she asks "why?" of God instead of asking "why?" of the society that still limits and labels her and people like her. This is an important document, nonetheless. Memoirs of lifelong disability are rare, and unromanticized disability narratives are rarer still. Webb's autobiography provides insight into an American experience that does not "overcome" by idealized revisionism. Yes, she did succeed, but she did not "overcome" cerebral palsy to do it. She did it with cerebral palsy.

*Conserving Culture: A New Discourse on Heritage*, edited by Mary Hufford. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994. 264 pp. Illustrations, notes, index. \$37.50 cloth.

REVIEWED BY PATRICK NUNNALLY, LOUCKS & ASSOCIATES

This is an ambitious book about an ambitious subject. As Mary Hufford's introduction notes, the "central task of cultural conservation is

to discover the full range of resources people use to construct and sustain their culture" (4). This is a tall order, certainly, and one that is more than a little problematical. One of the book's notable strengths is that its essays explore many of those problems directly. There are essays on theoretical issues of resource definition and constituency identification as well as on bureaucratic obstacles to integrated resource management. On the other hand, one of the book's weaknesses is that the arguments never seem to progress beyond the foundational issues. Perhaps that is because the field of inquiry is simultaneously broad and new.

In the early 1980s the discourse that Hufford and her colleagues report on and contribute to crystallized around the term *conserving culture*. Although scholars and preservationists had worked in this area for decades, it was not until a decade or so ago that professionals began to unify—conceptually at least—what they formerly had recognized as three areas of conservation practice. These three—historic preservation, natural area conservation, and folklife study—all have been undertaken by federal government initiatives and programs since the 1960s, but all remain separated in different agencies, with different agendas, methods, and constituencies.

These essays take stock of both the theory and the practice of this emerging enterprise. The authors are varied and reflect the breadth of cultural conservation practice; scholars, researchers, museum professionals, and government workers all contribute. The National Park Service is especially well represented. Together, their interests cover a broad spectrum of disciplines, practices, geographical areas, theoretical frameworks, and methodological bases.

The book is organized into three sections. Part one, "Conserving History," contains some of the book's densest theoretical pieces, reflecting contemporary developments in historiography and social science. It also contains, however, strongly descriptive essays as well, such as Douglas DeNatale's discussion of Lowell, Massachusetts. Part two, "Protecting Biocultural Diversity," expands the geographical range of the book to include Asian and African locales, and explores important difficulties with the recent panacea of "heritage tourism." Finally, part three, "Encouraging Folklife," poses increasingly difficult problems about place, power, authenticity, and ideology. These thorny issues are both theoretical and programmatic/pragmatic. Perhaps because the roots of cultural conservation are in folklife and folklore programs, these essays pose the greatest challenges and the most fruitful explorations.

There is much here for public historians, whether they work in museums, in community history, or in historic preservation. Indeed, the struggle to establish links between differing professional practices, theoretical dispositions, and resource targets is a central theme of the

book. Hufford's introduction and Archie Green's conclusion speak directly to the problems of integration in a world and practice that is increasingly defined by specialization. One theme recurs throughout the book: resource-centered thinking and management requires stepping outside the comforts of one's training and expertise and assuming an air of humility. Reflective public historians have long known this, and it is an idea that bears repeating.

Recent events have made *Conserving Culture's* subject both more central and more controversial. With declining federal funding and a decreasing federal presence in the entire range of activity represented here, it is imperative that practitioners find ways to cooperate rather than replicate. There are still major concerns with some of the issues raised here—who defines "heritage" and how power relates to knowledge especially needs more attention. These essays, however, offer a wonderful beginning to anyone interested in the myriad ideas they raise. They deserve the widest possible audience.

*Quantitative Studies in Agrarian History*, edited by Morton Rothstein and Daniel Field. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1994. xii, 275 pp. Illustrations, graphs. \$34.95 cloth.

REVIEWED BY MARY ESCHELBACH GREGSON, KNOX COLLEGE

This collection of essays, eight by American authors and four by Russian scholars, is the product of a bilateral conference on quantitative methods in history held in 1987. The papers of the American agricultural historians cover broad themes: tenancy (Jeremy Attack), land values (Peter Lindert), emancipation (Roger Ransom and Richard Sutch), the politics of farmers (Morton Rothstein), and the evolution of the agricultural labor market (Gavin Wright). Two case studies of mechanization are included: Estonia in the mid-nineteenth century (Juhan Kahk) and California in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Alan Olmstead and Paul Rhode). The papers of the Russian agricultural historians (O. G. Bukhovets, L. V. Milov and I. M. Garskova, I. D. Koval'chenko and L. I. Borodkin, and N. B. Selunskaja) mainly use quantitative means to assess the extent and influence of capitalism in rural Russia. The thread tying the articles together is the process of inquiry: the scholars ask an important question about the development of agriculture, formulate a model to describe the historical process, and test the model with data and quantitative techniques.

Four of the American papers are of particular interest to scholars of the rural Midwest. Attack asks whether rates of tenancy were lower on the frontier than in the East, as Jefferson had hoped, or higher, as Gates would predict. Using a Bateman-Foust sample of households and

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.