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Logan's two case studies are interesting, but as he explains the differences between Tucson and Albuquerque it is easy for the reader to miss the point that they are variations on a common theme—not two different themes. A concluding chapter brings the pieces together but does not fully develop the implications of this work. There are important lessons here about growth and efforts to control it, but they are mostly implicit in the two case studies. Boosters in both cities apparently failed to realize that the growth they sought might detract from the very factors that made their city appealing.

Juxtaposing growth in Tucson and Albuquerque against the midwestern experience is enlightening. Sprawl is here, too. However, the circumstances are different, for with only a few exceptions—such as Des Moines, Indianapolis, and Columbus—our larger cities are surrounded by incorporated suburban municipalities. They have long been unable to annex fringe areas in the way that Tucson and Albuquerque did, and they have blamed their problems on that inability. *Fighting Sprawl and City Hall* illustrates, however, that annexation is not without costs. It also reveals the important role state governments can play (a neglected area of research). Finally, it indicates that the forces supporting growth are complex and strong. Iowans fighting to save farmland and villages from sprawl have their work cut out for them.


REVIEWED BY TOM MORAIN, STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF IOWA

*History Outreach* is a collection of eleven essays that, in the words of their editors, "examine the philosophical background of public history as community outreach, especially within the context of larger professional responsibilities." Public history has no one standard definition throughout the essays. All would agree that it involves in some way historical programming to an out-of-classroom audience. One essay, however, promotes the concept that public history is defined by the techniques it uses, such as oral history. Yet all historians, regardless of their subject or audience, could profitably incorporate such techniques into their research. The basic American history survey course, for example, would be involved in public history by this definition if students went into the community with tape recorders to find out how local residents experienced the trends discussed in lectures and
readings. The focus of the essays in this collection, however, remains on projects in which public audiences are engaged in consideration of past events.

If the goal is to examine the philosophical background of public history, the essays are uneven. Some do delve into the philosophical issues involved in out-of-classroom history programs for whom the general public is the intended audience. Others, however, are better at describing specific efforts than at analyzing the larger issues involved. There are, indeed, philosophical issues raised by the articles, and one might wish that some of them had been addressed more specifically. Begging for comment is Todd Shallat's article that public history is a "policy science," by which he means that "history can move beyond the telling of stories to policy recommendations." One tradition promoting public history, Shallat argues, grows from the radical New Left of the 1960s and 1970s and stresses "the scholar's responsibility to protest social injustice and activate for change." Neither Shallat nor the editors ever address the possibility that these crusading historians may mix the functions of the news story and the editorial page, the former trying to remain objective in the reconstruction of key events and the latter freely expressing personal values and opinions. Can the historian wear both hats simultaneously? While Shallat seems comfortable with the prospect, I know of at least one reader who has serious reservations. In a similar way, Hans Houshower's description of American House, Inc., in Lima, Ohio, raises issues that need to be addressed. When an organization is committed to "blending a community's heritage with [economic] revitalization and redevelopment," one might legitimately ask what happens to those parts of a community's past that do not encourage tourism or investment. Stephen Recken's essay on ethnic heritage projects in Astoria, Oregon, addresses that issue. While the programs on the Finnish community were very popular and well received, Recken honestly notes some of their shortcomings, including the omission of social problems and conflicts with other ethnic groups. The admission, in my opinion, heightens rather than diminishes the usefulness of his account.

The authors represented in the collection are battle-trained soldiers—dedicated, resourceful, resilient. What is missing is the vision that integrates their individual experiences and welds their discrete efforts into a coordinated assault on the topic.