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This interesting collection of studies considers as "Midwestern" the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Its nineteen contributors, authorities in state politics and government, achieve an overall consistency among their chapters by adhering to the editors'
outline of the volume’s subject matter. Although published in 1994, much of the book’s research was done in the 1980s.

Chapter 1, “Understanding Interest Groups in Midwestern Politics,” and Chapter 15, “The Changing Nature of Interest Group Activity in the Midwestern States,” (prepared by editors Hrebenar and Thomas respectively) are valuable contributions to the study of Midwestern pressure groups. Their titles clearly indicate these chapters’ contents. Likewise the “Methodological Guidelines” given to the contributors, which appears in the Appendix, is a document Midwestern politicians, government officials, and scholars of interest group activities are likely to value. The various chapters demonstrate that in the 1980s interest group politics among these thirteen states thrived in great diversity. In most states education groups exercised substantial influence in pressure group politics, while in others their influence was overshadowed by professional groups of a different stripe, such as bankers and the medical profession.

Deciding which states to define as “Midwestern” in itself presents an interesting problem. Some people might question including both Michigan and Oklahoma in this grouping. Similarly North Dakota and Ohio have a great number of differences as well as “geographical spread.” Obviously, more research material was available about interest groups in certain states. For example, the South Dakota chapter has only twelve footnotes while Illinois has 65.

Students of politics in the designated states will find this book valuable for a number of years. Its editors and contributors should be commended for their efforts. Russell Ross, Department of Political Science, University of Iowa.