

tionally popular. The success pattern, which parallels the rise of other American musics—minstrel music, ragtime, jazz, rock and roll, rhythm and blues, and soul music—is all too familiar: a “folk” music with limited appeal accumulates stereotypic elements, a star performer is added, an entrepreneur publicizes his client via the mass media, and the original product changes in character and becomes a highly marketable commodity.

To this reviewer Malone’s work is not so much an in depth or perceptive socioeconomic historical document as it is an important reference work highlighting the performers, entrepreneurs, scholars, events, and forces of history which have played a major role in the rise and dissemination of the music. An excellent bibliography-discography, a detailed general index, and an index of song titles all help in locating references in the main body of the work. Photoreproductions of the outstanding performers in the history of the music add an extra dimension to the literary documentation.

Malone’s definition of country music is interesting, and it may serve to crystallize the terminology used in referring to this music. For many years only the devotees and some performers and writers could describe the essential qualities of such styles or genres as hill-billy, old time(y), string band, bluegrass, western swing, and country western music; these terms will undoubtedly continue to be used by many purists, performers, and academicians. Malone includes all these styles under the general term country music, defined as a commercialized music which “developed out of the folk culture of the rural South. . . . created and disseminated largely by rural dwellers [only a generation or less away from a farm background] within the mainstream of the white Protestant Anglo-Celtic tradition” (p. viii).

Country Music, U.S.A. is an important scholarly work documenting a part of America’s rich musical heritage. This reviewer hopes that it serves to give academic status and respectability to the study of other forms of American music.

Indiana University, Bloomington

Frank J. Gillis

Blueprint for Modern America: Nonmilitary Legislation of the First Civil War Congress. By Leonard P. Curry. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1968. Pp. ix, 302. Notes, appendices, bibliography, index. \$8.50.)

To find a book with such an unprepossessing title and subject informative is not unusual; to find it interesting is rare. Curry’s description of the Thirty-Seventh Congress of the United States (1861-1863) and the nonmilitary legislation it considered is both. The

strength of the volume lies in its distillation from personal papers, newspapers, and, particularly, the *Congressional Record*, of the legislature's actions in regard to slavery, the Negro, public lands, transportation, taxation, banking, and currency. The work's interest stems primarily from the author's ability to write.

Despite the book's value and appeal, questions concerning it begin with the title. Curry's definitions of blueprint and modern America are not those of this reviewer. While—as the publisher's news release states—the Thirty-Seventh Congress may have “established the framework for many of our contemporary national attitudes, practices, and problems,” a framework is not precisely a blueprint. Furthermore, the author himself says that “no historian in full possession of his faculties would suggest that the history of the early years of the Civil War present us with any specific guidelines for solving the problems of the present” (p. 6). Throughout the text Curry suggests that the blueprint prepared by the first Civil War Congress would be followed “for the remainder of the century” (p. 180), during “the Gilded Age” (p. 148), or in “the decades following the Civil War” (p. 99). Undoubtedly he is correct, but such is hardly modern America.

Almost every state historian will quibble with Curry's inclusion of various politicians in the categories of radical, moderate, and conservative. Hoosiers may wonder, for example, that Daniel W. Voorhees is not considered an ultraconservative. And exactly what is a Unionist, as Joseph A. Wright is called? The author realizes the limitations of such labels as ultraconservative and advanced moderate; indeed, he so hedges his own classifications that he makes them somewhat meaningless. Yet, for a work of this kind some vehicle for handling opinions, attitudes, and votes is necessary; and, with Curry's qualifications, his categories serve as well as any.

There are a number of additional problems. In considering the Homestead Act Curry seems overly severe on a Congress which, in 1862, “fostered the illusion that the United States was a nation of sturdy, independent yeoman farmers . . .” (p. 248). Only in the introduction does the author draw the parallels between the 1860s and 1960s which the reader is led to expect throughout the book. Chapters 9 and 10, discussing the move toward congressional dominance of the government, are less satisfactory than the rest. Curry's analysis of the voting records merely whets the appetite: one would like to know why certain legislators voted as they did.

But none of the preceding points negates the value of the book. Curry's work is scholarly, comprehensive, and interesting. For state and regional historians particularly it provides the “other side” of issues discussed in general assemblies, local newspapers, and state

political meetings. As reviewers are wont to say, this volume is a valuable contribution to the history of the Civil War period.

Indiana University, Bloomington

Lorna Lutes Sylvester

The Australian Ballot: The Story of an American Reform. By L. E. Fredman. ([East Lansing]: Michigan State University Press, 1968. Pp. xii, 150. Notes, bibliography, index. \$5.75.)

In this slender volume Professor L. E. Fredman of Newcastle University discusses early American election abuses and the development of the political reform known as the "Australian Ballot." Basing his study on a wide variety of primary sources and secondary works, the author has distilled the material to produce a succinct but interesting and informative account. He traces election practices from the old open ballot system with its accompanying violence and intimidation. For example, in an early San Francisco party primary, "Knives were drawn and freely used, revolvers discharged with a perfect recklessness . . . The police had they interfered would have stood a chance of being annihilated" (p. 20). By the later decades of the nineteenth century most responsible Americans, seeking a workable reform in the ballot system, became interested in the method pioneered by Australia and adopted by Great Britain in the 1870s.

Persons as dissimilar as Henry George, E. L. Godkin, Richard Henry Dana, Ignatius Donnelly, and Grover Cleveland supported the Australian ballot and urged its adoption. The reform found a prominent place in the demands of the Mugwumps of the eighties, the Populists of the nineties, and the Progressives in the twentieth century. Basically the Australian ballot included four features: "The ballots were printed and distributed at public expense. . . . They contained the names of all the candidates duly nominated by law They were distributed only by the election officers at the polling place There were . . . arrangements to ensure secrecy in casting the vote" (p. 46).

Fredman discusses the passage of the Australian ballot in Massachusetts and New York, the first states to adopt the reform, in some detail. To provide some balance he then traces the reform in California in the far West, and in Louisiana in the South. In California the form of the ballot encouraged "independency." In Louisiana the new election laws reflected the religious differences, widespread poverty, and the racial preoccupations of the state. Other reforms, such as the direct primary, corrupt practices legislation, and preferential voting are all based on the Australian ballot.

No claim is made that the widespread adoption of the Australian ballot has ended corruption. In many places its success is still ob-