Similarly, Cavallo links SDS’s view of decentralized political power and anti-authoritarianism back to Jacksonian democracy, the Populists, and the Antifederalists.

Cavallo notes with irony that most Americans “recoil from the radical implications of the freedom, autonomy and democracy” which Dylan, SDS, and the Diggers helped to revive and act upon (13). While Cavallo is no doubt correct, in the end the sixties he presents here is rather static. There is little sense of process, or the extent to which these democratic vistas were transmitted to or received by others. One wonders, for example, why others of the sixties generation, raised in the same middle-class comfort and exposed to the same media and myths, were not radicalized? Was Dylan’s approach to his work or the content of his music of greater significance? Might YAF’s libertarianism also fit into this scheme?

Both A Generation Divided and A Fiction of the Past make important contributions to our understanding of the 1960s and the cultural and political conflicts of the past thirty years. Rebecca Klatch points the way to future studies that consider the variety of experience among political activists and, as well, Americans of all stripes. Dominick Cavallo suggests how the sixties might be understood within a broader historical perspective, a direction scholars of the sixties would do well to heed.

University of Missouri-Columbia  Rusty Monhollon


Erika Doss’s study asks why the image of Elvis, more than a quarter of a century after his death, remains as visible as Jesus and Coca Cola? In posing this question, Doss, Director of American Studies at University of Colorado, joins popular music critic Greil Marcus, who looked at “Dead Elvis,” and cultural studies analyst Gilbert Rodman, who examined Elvis’s “posthumous career.” Yet Doss combines art historical training in her examination of visual Elvis culture with an emphasis on the consumption of Elvis artifacts. By examining the investments people have in consuming and reproducing the image of Elvis, whether in photographs, paintings, dolls, lipsticks, collages, or shrines or through full-body impersonations, Doss enlarges her view of material culture to include not simply artifacts but also consumers. Furthermore, as her study demonstrates, neither the artifacts nor the consumers are fixed or inanimate.

Describing and organizing visual Elvis culture in relation to such social categories as race, class, gender, sex, and religion, Doss argues that the multifaceted image of Elvis—“as a religious icon, a sexual fantasy, an emblem of whiteness, and a legally copyrighted commodity”—remains popular because of its ambiguity, which makes it a useful site of struggle over religious, sexual, and racial identifications. Her argument about the image of Elvis as a site of cultural struggle serves nicely to organize her richly detailed study and to explain the witty vitality of Elvis culture, but it does not sufficiently account for the fact that certain images of Elvis and certain types of consumers or fans prevail over others. I think this is because, in spite of her careful examination of Elvis fandom from the 1950s onward, Doss’s study loses sight of history and its impact on the meaning of images of Elvis. The unremitting, albeit cleverly ironized and contested, whiteness of Elvis offers a fitting example of the impact of history on the image of Elvis. Doss is not unaware of this, and in her chapter on whiteness she speaks about the backlash provoked among many Elvis fans by the marriage of Lisa Marie Presley to Michael Jackson. To explain how and why the image of Elvis and the bulk of his fans are propelled toward
whiteness, even though, as Doss illustrates, neither Elvis, the images, nor the fans were or are exclusively white, requires more attention to the history of racism, particularly in the South. More important, it requires a theoretical revision regarding the prevailing context in which contestation over the meaning of an image occurs. Such a context, for example, would offer Doss a broader view of the heavy-handed yet ineffectual efforts of Elvis Presley Enterprises to control the production of visual Elvis culture.

One strength of this study is that it considers images of Elvis in the context of the people who were and are, as Doss puts it, emotionally attached to them. To investigate the shape and intensity of Elvis fans, Doss interviewed an impressively wide array of Elvis fans. To understand their attachment to Elvis, Doss draws richly upon theories of fandom, yet apparently discards psychoanalysis as a way of theorizing the role of emotional attachment in popular culture. Instead, drawing organically perhaps on her exploration of the phenomenon of Elvis shrines, including the gravesite at Graceland, Doss concludes, at least in her subtitle, that fandom is a matter of “faith.”

Doss’s exuberantly detailed and illustrated study succeeds in demonstrating the complexity of Elvis culture and in showing that it thrives on a wide array of powerful emotional investments in his image. If it does not quite arrive at an answer to its own guiding question (namely, “Why Elvis?”), it absolutely compels us to take this fundamental question about popular culture to heart.

University of Kansas
Cheryl Lester


The lack of national health insurance is the most distinctive feature of the American welfare state, the prime example of a larger historic issue captured by the phrase “American exceptionalism.” During the 1940s, however, it was not at all apparent that the United States would become a welfare state “laggard.” The Social Security Act of 1935 had created a national social insurance system to protect against the risks of old age and unemployment as well as joint federal-state programs for the elderly poor and poor mothers and children. National health insurance had been excluded from the Social Security Act for political expediency. Then World War II put welfare state expansion on hold. When the war ended, President Truman delivered a message to Congress proposing a national health program. On the same day bills were introduced in the Senate and in the House calling for a program of national health insurance. Four years later Truman’s plan was in tatters and the issue of national health insurance was dead, seemingly forever. Then, in 1965 Congress enacted two new health care programs, Medicare, which provides national health insurance for the aged, and Medicaid, a federal-state program of health insurance for the poor. Why was Truman’s proposal so resoundingly defeated, and why, just 15 years later, was Congress willing to legislate not one but two new government health insurance programs?

These are the questions that Kooijman seeks to answer. In this detailed historical study, he traces the fate of various proposals for national health insurance from the Progressive Era through the 1960s. His objective is not only to explain why these proposals failed but also how the United States ended up with an employer-based system of health insurance.

Kooijman locates the history in the context of broader debates about why the United States is a welfare state “laggard.” In these debates the exceptional character is the Ameri-