

contemporary isthmian crisis is but the latest in a long series of Central American crises dating back over many generations. This particular study, however, contains little of the essential background information which would place the current crisis in its appropriate historical perspective. While the FMLN and the Sandinistas, for example, receive extensive coverage throughout the work, one looks in vain for substantive or even nominal consideration of either Agustín Farabundo Martí or Augusto César Sandino. A historical overview chapter would have provided an important foundation for the volume's assessment of recent events on the isthmus.

Western Kentucky University

RICHARD V. SALISBURY

*U.S.-Mexican Relations, 1910-1940: An Interpretation.* By ALAN KNIGHT. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, 1987. Notes. Graph. Figure. Pp. 149. Paper.

In this succinct and well-written work Alan Knight asks and answers the question, "How did the United States come to terms with the Mexican Revolution . . . and how . . . did the Mexican Revolution come to terms with the United States?" (p. 55) The argument that U.S. interests suffered enormous losses during the revolution is rejected as part of a "xenophobic myth" (p. 25).

Knight challenges the argument put forth by Lorenzo Meyer and Josefina Zoraida Vásquez that nationalism was embraced by the "popular classes" and that it was anti-American (pp. 25-26). He argues that, on the contrary, most anti-American agitation was the work of the counterrevolutionaries during the revolution and that economic nationalism was shared by only a narrow minority (p. 55). He asserts that "contemporaries and historians have conspired to create a great edifice of economic nationalism on the basis of remarkably little concrete data" (p. 54).

Knight recognizes what is wrong with our understanding of the economic nationalism of the revolution. He calls on us to demonstrate "the evidence of Americans being attacked, molested, mulcted and denounced," and then to analyze it, remembering the distinctions between economic nationalism and patriotism (p. 26). Citing production statistics, Knight claims that "the major U.S. interests were far from ravaged," and "emerged . . . more powerful" than ever after the revolution (p. 25). He presents a well-argued picture of the nationalizations of the 1930s as a "national jamboree" (p. 141) and minimizes them as a real challenge to the United States.

I disagree with Knight on the degree of economic nationalism during the revolution, the amount of U.S. economic penetration during the Porfiriato, the extent of U.S. losses, and the importance of the nationalizations during the 1930s. Knight is correct, however, in that the profession must turn to the sources (which he does not use) available in company archives, the records of the Claims Commissions