that Mormon polygamy emerged there due to social anxieties produced by "severe environmental changes" (p. 131) and to the Saints' unwavering loyalty to Joseph Smith. Equally valuable is the study, contributed by Valeen Tippetts Avery and Linda King Newell, of the bitter conflict between Brigham Young and Emma Smith and its impact on the Mormons' last days on the Mississippi. Likewise, editor Launius's account of the lessons Joseph Smith III learned in Nauvoo, and later applied in launching the Reorganized Church, is a penetrating analysis of leadership.

Particularly helpful as well are forays into the nature and meaning of the prophet's vision of a political kingdom of God by two of Mormonism's leading historians. Klaus J. Hansen reminds us that "in history beliefs are as important as facts" (p. 63) and proceeds to demonstrate how the Mormon belief structure led to an inevitable, and sometimes hazardous, intertwining of politics and religion. Flanders agrees, artfully describing a "politics of utopia" that ran amok because the prophet "was simultaneously in the temple, . . . in the seat of government, in the land office, and on the stump" (pp. 155-56). Another renowned Mormon scholar, though, is not as convincing. In his investigation of whether there was "much that was religious in Nauvoo," Marvin S. Hill contends that everything "of social or political nature" in the town was "essentially religious" (pp. 120-21). Hill unfortunately applies a rather narrow definition of religion, however, seeing it only as a quest for security and social control—a startlingly negative assessment of religion's role in society and one inadequately supported.

Kingdom on the Mississippi Revisited is what a solid historical anthology should be: topically and historiographically balanced, carefully constructed, and highly readable. As a bonus, it includes an eminently usable bibliographical essay. In short, it is a laudable contribution to our understanding of Mormon Nauvoo.

LLOYD A. HUNTER is professor of history and religion at Franklin College of Indiana. A student of the interplay of church and culture, he is working on a study of that phenomenon in the post–Civil War South.


Daniel Nelson's Farm and Factory provides a much-needed synthesis of scholarship on the history of work and working people in the Midwest. Moreover, Nelson not only synthesizes this scholarship but also uses it to advance several arguments about the distinctive character of the Midwest. A volume in the Midwestern History and Culture series, edited by James H. Madison and
Thomas J. Schlereth, this book should inform historians of work, working people, and the Midwest for years to come and thus is a welcome contribution. At the same time, it leaves the reader wanting a bit more.

Nelson is very clear about his geographical and topical focus. He wishes to explore work broadly defined, including—as his title indicates—labor in agriculture and industry; he also devotes significant attention to white-collar workers. Though he says that he “arbitrarily defined the Midwest as the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa” (p. vii), this sensible definition will seem arbitrary to very few readers. Most important, Nelson presents a convincing thesis: “the essential feature of the region’s labor history that set it apart from other American regions was the sustained, simultaneous growth of agriculture and industry, a feature that produced notable patterns of individual mobility and that left a distinctive and inescapable heritage” (p. vii).

The rapid, simultaneous growth of agriculture and industry, Nelson argues, created two work forces: one primarily native and agrarian, the other primarily urban and immigrant. The shift of labor from farm to factory, a feature of the economic and social history of other regions, did not occur in the Midwest until after World War II. A combination of resources, location, and opportunity made the region a center of innovative practices in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Another distinctive regional feature was the strength of workers’ “voice.” Through unions, politics, and farmers’ groups, working people played an unusually large role in the region’s economic history. Together, these factors created in the Midwest a unique pattern of work and employment that produced prosperity and stability. By the post–World War II years, however, the innovative methods of scientific agriculture and mass production, upon which the region’s prosperity was built, had ceased to be new, and no comparable innovations succeeded them; the relatively underdeveloped service sector failed to provide sufficient alternative economic opportunities to compensate. The collapse of industry and agriculture in the region from the 1960s on represented both a consequence of this pattern and an end of it. By the 1980s the region was suffering its most severe crisis since the Great Depression, and there were visible only the barest outlines of a new, emerging structure of work and opportunity.

Clearly a brief review cannot do justice to an interpretation of such complexity. Nelson builds his arguments on an impressively broad reading of the literature on midwestern history; historians will find his notes a rich resource. The reliance on secondary sources means that those who have studied the history of workers
or agriculture in the Midwest will find much that is familiar, though they often will see familiar stories integrated into new patterns. Suggestions for further research abound, as, for example, in the treatment of company unions as more varied, and at times more influential and reflective of the worker's voice, than conventional explanations allow.

Of necessity, a work of this type must omit much. Perhaps of necessity, the texture and drama of the lives of working people are largely invisible here. Aside from a handful of national figures, few individual lives appear (and those only briefly). While Nelson effectively integrates the findings of the past generation of labor and social historians, treating briefly such topics as ethnic communities and workplace culture, there is little discussion of the efforts of working people to create meaningful lives. Even events like the region's major strikes come across as surprisingly colorless. Nor is the devastation brought by the past generation's economic changes really evident. Few readers new to the history of work and working people will sense the drama and excitement of the field.

Less of necessity than by choice, Nelson does not address some broader questions. The book tells the story of a region whose people played the game properly. Hard-working and innovative, the generations described in this book created a regional economy of incredible productivity: midwestern fields and factories were the envy of the world, bringing prosperity to millions and playing a crucial role in the nation's economic development. Yet just a generation or so after this system had reached maturity, it fell apart. While Nelson offers some interesting tentative thoughts about the region's future prospects, he provides little comment on what one is to make of the midwestern experience. From industrial heartland to rust belt in a generation—how could such a seemingly solid economic base turn out to have been so fragile? What does this region's experience offer to those who want to build stable, sustainable economies? Indeed, what is one to make of an economic system that devastates regions in this way? Given Nelson's deep understanding of economics, work, and workers, one wishes he had chosen to offer the reader his thoughts on these matters.

In fairness, though, in a book of this type the author is not obligated to address such questions. *Farm and Factory* fulfills its purpose admirably: it provides an insightful, wide-ranging look at work and workers in the Midwest. It will certainly be a basic resource on regional history for years to come, as well as a book that adds to our broader understanding of the nation's labor and economic history.

Gary L. Bailey is associate professor of history at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where he teaches public, labor, and recent American history.