

riots are occurrences of the streets, to write history 'from the bottom up' " (p. vii). Thus Tuttle broadens the conceptualization of race relations from official positions and the statements of educated, articulate elites in the respective races to the deeply felt anger between black and white people who occupied no positions and were basically inarticulate—but who were the active participants in the riot.

Most earlier explanations of the riot sought the cause in the social friction in housing and amusements that resulted from the doubling of Chicago's black citizenry during the World War I migration. While giving attention to such struggles over housing and for control of the "turf," led by Irish "athletic clubs" like the Regan Colts, Tuttle is more impressed with the importance of labor friction in the Red Summer of 1919, the involvement of city ethnic politics, and the emergence of a militant "New Negro" psychology of self-defense. In the week of the riot 250,000 Chicago workers were either on strike or were threatening to strike; in the stockyard walk-outs ninety per cent of the white laborers were unionized, while only a quarter of the 12,000 black workers were. Repeated use of black strikebreakers by the packers and other Chicago industrialists had made the concepts of "Negro" and "scab" synonymous in the minds of many white workers.

Local politics had also exacerbated racial polarization during the late spring mayoralty campaign. The Republican incumbent, William "Big Bill" Thompson, had staved off defeat from a strong Democratic challenge based on white, ethnic Catholic voters by mobilizing solid bloc voting in the city's black South Side. Finally, a shift in the psychology of the "New Negro" in Chicago and other northern cities in 1919 turned earlier day lynchings into race riots when blacks fought back. As the author concludes, the surprising thing about the Chicago riot was not its outbreak, but rather that it had not occurred earlier and was not soon repeated considering the distressingly similar pattern in the city's subsequent ethnic relations.

*Indiana University, Fort Wayne*

Clifford H. Scott

*How Shall They Hear without a Preacher? The Life of Ernest Fremont Tittle.* By Robert Moats Miller. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971. Pp. xii, 524. Illustrations, notes, note on sources, index. \$12.50.)

It is an unusual package—a thick book about a parish minister by a university history professor and published by a university press.

Of course First Methodist Church of Evanston, Illinois, was not

the usual parish. It was the first church founded in Evanston. Closely linked with Northwestern University and with Garrett Biblical Institute, its 1918 membership of just over one thousand already included a substantial representation of the power elite of the Chicago area, the nation, and the Methodist Church.

In 1918 Ernest Fremont Tittle came to be pastor of Evanston's First Methodist Church. Tittle was hardly the usual minister. He was a high achiever with superb natural gifts and a passion for duty. Under his leadership the membership grew to well over three thousand. Attendance at Sunday worship came to average 1,500; some 5,500 gathered at First Church for weekday programs. Tittle was first and always a working minister. His major life investment was in preaching, in pastoral labors, and in leading worship. Because of his faithful ministry his members repeatedly rallied to support his right to a free pulpit. They wanted and needed him there even if he said what they were not glad to hear and led where they were not anxious to follow.

Tittle was a consistent liberal in theology; faced with Fundamentalism and with Neo-orthodoxy he matured, but he did not shift. He was a consistent pacifist in the very teeth of patriotic fervor and World War II. He was a prophet for racial and economic justice. He was a political activist, consistently voting for Norman Thomas for President. He was always hammering social pronouncements through ecclesiastical bodies, and in two major crises it seemed he must be driven from his post or die under the pressure of his opponents.

Such is the man Professor Miller takes as subject. Miller was determined not to produce "one of those moist memorials or effusive reminiscences or quaint anecdotal accounts that frequently masquerade as religious biography" (p. ix). He did not know Tittle and was under no emotional obligation; he was not under commission from the Tittle family. He aimed to produce a legitimate chapter in twentieth century social history.

It is a fascinating encounter. Tittle leads a very precarious life in the volume. Miller is always kicking Tittle off the stage to give his own homilies on theology, dancing, marriage, liturgy, sex, riding trains, singing, political endorsement, bombing, sin, preaching, and the like. When Miller gets high in his zeal for full historical context, Tittle is often completely lost from view for pages on end. Miller evidently forgets what he has said about Tittle and says it all over again—the same impressions, the same facts, sometimes the very same words or even the exact quotation.

In spite of everything it comes out good. The author is a professional historian who is also a professional writer; responsible eval-

uation of evidence and command of language are his marks. The subject, Tittle, will not be put down in life or in death; his story throbs with vitality and significance. In the interaction of the two most readers will find ground for thanks.

*Lilly Library,*  
*Indiana University, Bloomington*

L. C. Rudolph

*A History of Missouri. Volume I, 1673 to 1820.* By William E. Foley. *Missouri Sesquicentennial History.* Edited by William E. Parrish. (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1971. Pp. ix, 237. Illustration, notes, essay on sources, index. \$9.50.)

The *Missouri Sesquicentennial History* is a projected set of five volumes, each by a different author, designed as "a general survey of the broad political, social, intellectual, and economic trends, rather than a highly detailed study of each period" (pp. ix-x). In volume one William E. Foley deals with the nearly 150 years of Missouri's progress from a wilderness to the threshold of statehood. The treatment does indeed explore the broader aspects of the subject although it sometimes exhibits a certain shallowness due to an evident determination to keep the text short. Unfortunately, the author mars parts of the narrative, especially near the beginning, with a tendency to over romanticize and to fill in from his imagination literary transitions that his material could not provide: "As dawn broke amidst the dying echoes of the lively chants and the smoldering embers of the previous night's fires, a stillness settled over the fort high atop the Missouri bluffs" (p. 132). Such passages probably represent an attempt to avoid stilted academic prose, but they may tend to lessen the writer's credibility with some readers.

Accounts of the administrations of Governors James Wilkinson and Meriwether Lewis and of Missouri's earlier uncomfortable adjoining to Indiana Territory make up the heart of the book. Though only five years are involved, 1804-1809, Foley allots nearly one third of his text to a much fuller "general survey" of this period than he presents of others. He acknowledges, for example, that personalities "played an important role in shaping the political climate of territorial Missouri" (p. 204) but is usually able to provide only the barest introduction to even the most important figures. In the chapters on these five years, however, several characters, Wilkinson especially, emerge more completely as personalities. Similarly, politics takes short shrift elsewhere, but here Foley devotes much of his time to an enlightening treatment of the chaos produced by uncertain Spanish