Public History Readings
creation and triumph of the community. History, properly understood and taught, could lead the community in an orderly way to a prosperous and stable future, according to pageant proponents. Orderly progress, a staple of Progressive thought, was a conscious goal of pageant promoters. During World War I, however, the zeal began to fade. When it was time to entertain the troops in camp, lighter entertainments were thought more appropriate than serious pageants with their themes of sacrifice, patriotism, and duty. After the war, pageants took on more and more aspects of entertainment. The conviction that the pageant was a tool for cultural uplift faded.

Glassberg does an excellent job of relating the pageant movement to the larger intellectual and political currents of the time. He uses the pageants as a window into the deeper convictions of the Progressive movement. He shows how faith in pageants to effect a spiritual transformation of the community reflected a deeper faith in the promise of progress in all aspects of American life. If the artistic aspirations of the pageants today seem quaint, so does that faith in the inevitability of human progress.

Bodnar and Glassberg survey how America has viewed its history in public commemorations. In another fifty years, historians will be using Iowa's celebration of its sesquicentennial as an insight into the values and aspirations of Iowans at the end of the twentieth century. It would be interesting to know how they will judge us.


REVIEWED BY REBECCA CONARD, WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

**Public History Readings** is the companion volume to **Public and Academic History: A Philosophy and Paradigm**, also authored by Phyllis K. Leffler and Joseph Brent and published by Krieger in 1990. **Public History Readings** will make little sense to a reader who is not familiar with its predecessor. Some comments about **Public and Academic History** are therefore in order.

**Public and Academic History**, a slim book of 97 pages, put to rest any lingering questions about whether public history constitutes a different type of historical inquiry. In the final analysis, it doesn’t. However, relatively recent interest in public history, and the accompanying growth of graduate programs, has stimulated a reexamination of the nature of history as a discipline and the place of public history within the discipline as a whole. Leffler and Brent
demonstrate that "a common method is used for all human inquiry," and they propose a paradigm for teaching both public and academic history based on "the fundamental historical processes of research, analysis, and presentation" (4). The settings in which academic and public historians ply their craft may be different, and the range of potential public history audiences is vast, but all historians go through the same intellectual processes in order to organize and interpret historical data from disparate sources.

The paradigm for teaching the process of historical inquiry, then, is to focus on research, analysis, and presentation. These broad categories, divided into subsections, organize the articles contained in Public History Readings. Some subsections are followed by suggested "applications," such as classroom exercises, field trips, or microresearch projects.

The first chapter, "Historical Methodologies: Modes of Thinking," includes subsections on "Conceptualizations of Order and Time," "The Historical Perspective Over Time and Its Effects," and "The Goals of Public History." Some of the articles in this chapter cover the same territory presented in Leffler and Brent's earlier book. As such, these articles provide a bridge between the two volumes, but on the whole, chapter one is probably longer than it needs to be.

This is also the chapter where Leffler and Brent introduce professional ethics. The choice of articles is a good one, Ronald C. Tobey's "The Public Historian as Advocate: Is Special Attention to Professional Ethics Necessary?" However, I question the effectiveness of encouraging a classroom discussion of ethics when it is divorced from an understanding of the kinds of settings and issues that have provoked recent concern for professional ethics. I would have preferred to see ethics placed near the end of the book and treated in greater depth. Historians may have grown tired of this issue, but students need to understand that clients will cause them to examine their ethical standards in ways they cannot imagine, regardless of whether one defines "client" as a museum board of directors, the department head in a government agency, or a private corporation.

Chapter two, "Historical Processes: Research," is divided into "The Written Record," "Material Culture," and "Oral Sources." This may be the most useful section of the book. Simple as it seems, students do not automatically understand that historical information can come from a variety of sources, that these sources are fundamentally different in nature, that each type of information source has inherent limits, and that evidence must be weighed in concert.
Chapter three, "Historical Processes: Analysis," is subdivided into "Conceptualizations," "Policy Analysis: The Public Sphere," and "Analysis: Cultural Resource Management." Here the editors seem to lose track of where they are going. Public historians surely provide analyses for more than two purposes—policy decision making and cultural resource management—but these are the only two areas explored in any depth. Moreover, the articles chosen to exemplify cultural resource management all focus on museums, a very narrow definition of the field and one which is unfathomable given the available literature from *The Public Historian* alone.

The muddle continues in chapter four, "Historical Processes: Presentation." Three of the five articles included in this chapter continue the focus on museums, the fourth article takes on visual media presentations, and the fifth is devoted to historical editing. What about the legal briefs, environmental technical reports, administrative histories, National Register of Historic Places nominations, and other forms of obscure "gray literature" that public historians are producing in such abundance? The subtle message, once again, is that these forms of documentation don't really count for much in the discipline.

What I miss in *Public History Readings* is an acknowledgment of the myriad settings in which public historians practice. I hope that when Leffler and Brent prepare the second edition of *Public History Readings*, they will consider revamping chapters three and four to reflect a broader range of settings and work products. This is to say that I also hope there will be future editions, because Leffler and Brent's first book, *Public and Academic History*, is a readable, incisive critique of the discipline as a whole. It works in the classroom. Students like it, and they need an equally meaty book of readings to chew on.