Quantitative Studies in Agrarian History
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. Kovalksenko 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
farms from the 1860 manuscript census, Atack finds that midwestern tenancy rates were indeed higher than eastern rates. Atack uses logit regression to show that midwestern tenants were younger and less affluent than their eastern counterparts. Atack concludes that a tight credit market (not federal land policy, as Gates would argue) was the likely cause of higher tenancy rates in the Midwest.

Rothstein provides a useful summary of research on agrarian organizations of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His data are compiled from various sources, mostly from local studies of farmer participation in the Grange, the Alliance, the Non-Partisan League, and other groups.

Wright argues that the development of an American rural proletariat was not a matter of stripping farmers of land. Wright argues instead that by the early twentieth century an underclass of mainly itinerant farm labor became the American proletariat. Traveling from state to state and working crops that could not be handled efficiently by machine, the American proletariat was isolated from industrial progress, an experience unlike that of the European proletariat.

The Russian contributions are also of interest. Bukhovets distills economic, political, and social variables from two hundred resolution documents drafted by peasants during 1905–1907. He searches for correlations between complaints of poverty (and other economic/social variables) and political pleas such as request for land rights, personal liberties, and government structure. He finds that revolutionary economic requests are often coupled with conservative political opinions.

Milov and Garskova reach the surprising conclusion that patrimonial estates had an economic advantage over estates granted in return for political favors. Using principal components (factor) analysis, the authors show that patrimonial estates were able to recover from the Time of Troubles more quickly (ca. 1720–1730), in part because of the presence of untaxed peasant workers.

Koval’chenko and Borodkin use cluster analysis of social and economic variables to distinguish provinces that developed along the “American path” from those that retained the manorial system at the turn of the twentieth century. Regions following the American path appear to have higher levels of economic and social development.

Finally, Selunskaja shows that there is a strong positive correlation between intensity of agricultural production and the existence of a capitalistic peasantry in 1917. Using census data, she shows that peasants cultivated more land and owned more draft animals than squires, who held a large proportion of pasturage and woodland.

The volume is especially useful for faculty and graduate students seeking to do truly interdisciplinary work. The diversity of topics
covered by the papers is impressive, as is the diversity of sources and techniques. More importantly, however, the authors give testament to the value of the process of quantitative history: identify the important historical questions and seek answers using appropriate data and methods.