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authority over the marketplace were ignored in favor of new, more rational methods of production and distribution. While the county agent, the university, and the Republican Party gained legitimacy through the traditional cooperatives, they also bled much of the intensity from the concept by the 1910s. Keillor believes that “when experts sold rural school consolidation to farmers as ‘co-operation,’ they showed an ability to make it a testimonial for almost any proposal” (263). As a result, much of the economic reform initiated in the 1920s and 1930s lacked a firm connection to the historical precedents of rural cooperation.

Finally, Keillor also demonstrates how ethnicity and changing market conditions affected, but did not control, rural Minnesotans’ behavior. The large percentage of Scandinavian immigrants in the region, and the “Old Stock” biases against them, certainly helped the fortitude of some local cooperatives. Still, in no case was it clear that ethnicity had any lasting effect on the nature or direction of cooperation. Keillor concludes that “ethnicity facilitated cooperation, but the gradual assimilation [of ethnic families] . . . did not bring a cooperative crisis after World War I” (341). Similarly, regional farmers’ collective traditions facilitated their adroit shift from wheat and corn production to dairying. Although Progressive advocates of the more influential cooperatives, such as the Land O’Lakes Creameries, largely forgot this legacy, its roots penetrated deep into the region’s local history.

In sum, Steven Keillor has written an important and, one can hope, influential book. In keeping with positive trends in recent rural studies—including works by Hal Barron, Victoria Woeste, and Sally McMurry, to name only a few—Keillor clarifies and connects local rural behavior and associations in ways that animate the larger debates of rural history. By compelling us to resolve the meaning of “cooperatives” anew, Keillor has illuminated new paths toward a more elegant understanding of rural America.
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Until recently, neither women’s historians nor political historians had shown much interest in women’s partisan activities. It has been widely assumed that women played no significant role in party organizations
before the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment and that, with the exception of a few noteworthy figures such as Eleanor Roosevelt and Molly Dewson, their involvement with party politics after 1920 represented a lamentable (or not very interesting) choice. This collection of 17 short essays is part of a growing literature challenging such views. Including studies that are national in scope along with local and regional examples, these essays explore women as officeholders, candidates, and party activists in the two major parties as well as third parties.

One of the editors’ goals is to further break down what Nancy Cott has identified as the notion that a “great divide” separated women’s political participation before and after 1920. Women’s enfranchisement was a gradual process; decades before national suffrage, women could vote in some states and localities. Even in places where women could not vote, there were advantages (especially for third parties) in pursuing women’s support. Several essays in this collection demonstrate the effects of the unevenness of women’s enfranchisement on party politics. For example, women campaigners for Woodrow Wilson in 1912 and Charles Evans Hughes in 1916 grappled with questions of how to organize national campaigns targeting women at a time when not all women could vote. Indeed, the Women’s Committee for Hughes alienated many women voters by trying to avoid the suffrage question in its campaign, a strategy they wrongly hoped would avoid divisiveness.

These essays also help illuminate the process of becoming partisan by exploring the conflicts that many women had over the very meaning of partisanship. Women tended to understand partisanship and party loyalty differently than did many men. Should one be loyal to a party or, rather, to a set of issues and principles? In the late nineteenth century, Iowa’s Judith Ellen Foster worked simultaneously as a partisan (organizing women for the GOP) and a non-partisan (opposing fellow leaders of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union who sought an affiliation between that organization and the Prohibition Party). Decades later, in the 1920s, former suffragist Mary Hay chose to campaign against a fellow Republican she “detested” (103) and was pushed out of Republican Party leadership for her efforts. On the other hand, her contemporary, Emily Newell Blair, managed to work around the faction of her state party organization that opposed her (and her fellow Wilson Democrats) and served for several years as a Democratic Party official and national organizer of Democratic women.

Although most of the essays conform to a picture of women as progressives and reformers, this portrayal is complicated by the inclu-
sion of studies of two women who do not easily fit those categories. At a time when female political activists were typically associated with peace issues, Congresswoman Florence Kahn of San Francisco (R-CA, 1925–1936) successfully campaigned for a military base in her district. And Nancy Beck Young’s study of the dubious political career of two-term Texas Governor Miriam “Ma” Ferguson demonstrates that women politicians were by no means above corruption.

Many of the essays revive important stories of individuals and events that are today largely forgotten; others specifically attempt to challenge prevailing interpretations of political history. For example, Drew E. VandeCreek’s study of Philadelphia reform politics in 1911 contends that men’s and women’s Progressivism were not as strictly dichotomous as they are often presented. And Paula Baker, whose essay explores women’s grassroots party work from the 1930s through the 1950s, suggests that parties did not disappear or decline in the twentieth century, but rather became feminized, as also occurred in many parts of the economic sector at the same time.

Geographically, the essays cover all regions of the country except the Southeast. With the exception of an essay on African American women in Chicago before World War I and one comparing three Hispanic women activists in New Mexico, the subjects of the book are white. We still know very little about the partisan activities of non-white women. Perhaps their participation has come, for the most part, more recently. Although they ostensibly span the period from 1880 to 1960, the essays in this collection are weighted toward the decades just before and after national enfranchisement. As of yet, there remains very little work by historians on women’s participation in party politics since World War II.

American women who entered party politics in the early twentieth century did so with a variety of goals, varying degrees of gender consciousness, different strategies for ensuring their effectiveness in party politics, and different degrees of success. They did not simply abandon the effectiveness of separate female institutions to become marginalized within all-male political parties. This book reveals the complexities and nuances of these women’s choices and helps restore partisan women to the history of women and American politics.