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tray the psychological impact of an all-encompassing physical dis-
ability 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 mo-
ments 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 im-
possible objectives for Webb, but deemed necessary for social inclu-
sion. 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 demor-
alizing 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 ful-
filled 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 spe-
cific 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 re-
visionism. Yes, she did succeed, but she did not “overcome” cerebral
palsy to do it. She did it with cerebral palsy.
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This is an ambitious book about an ambitious subject. As Mary Huf-
ford’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.
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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 Atack), 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. Atack 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