been promoted by the media, by cultural "rebels," by "lower order parochials" (what others might call working-class Americans), and especially by the "immoderate" and "reckless . . . profit seeking" of a "minor vice industrial complex," which has been responsible for turning "American values . . . upside down" by the late twentieth century.

Burnham tells this tale of moral declension through a series of detailed case studies, which are packed with sometimes fascinating details and are rooted in an impressively wide reading in primary and secondary sources. Despite all the details as well as the frequent repetition of his basic thesis, there are many seemingly obvious gaps in his argument. For example, do these six deadly sins and their "proponents" constitute a single subject? Burnham's own evidence makes clear the very different histories of, say, drinking, which has been the object of moralistic disapproval since the early nineteenth century, and smoking, which has only become socially unacceptable in recent years. Moreover, it takes some stretching to show that the greedy "minor vice industrial complex" has played quite the same role in the spread of smoking, drug taking, and swearing. At times Burnham's insistent search for the economic underpinnings of changing codes of behavior verges on might be called "vulgar moralism." (Burnham even seems to include the ITT Corporation in the "minor vice industrial complex," because they used to make Twinkies, which are consumed by stoned people.) Burnham tends to lump behaviors, ideas, and individuals into undifferentiated and unchanging categories. Thus, just as the economic forces of evil seem all-powerful here, Burnham's other chief villain—"lower order parochials"—show little sign of changing in composition or world view between 1890 and 1990.

An even more obviously neglected question is what exactly Burnham thinks is "bad" about these "bad habits." Is it a single drink, a drinking habit, or alcoholism that is bad? The closest he comes to spelling out his objection to these habits is his complaint that they reflect a "lack of restraint"—a problem that is hardly confined to these particular "bad habits." At least at times, Burnham seems unaware that this is a socially and morally constructed category rather than a timeless set of moral imperatives. As a moral statement, then, *Bad Habits* is written with an admirable passion and certainty. As a work of historical analysis, however, it could use less preaching and more subtlety, complexity, and, yes, irony.

Roy Rosenzweig
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Mexico and the United States: Ambivalent Vistas. By W. Dirk Raat. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992. xviii, 277 pp. Cloth, $45.00, ISBN 0-8203-1456-0. Paper, $18.50, ISBN 0-8203-1457-9.)

W. Dirk Raat's book should become the standard work on United States–Mexican relations, despite its brevity. Its succinct narrative is tied to persuasive arguments that place Mexican–United States relations in a world setting. Of prior studies of United States–Mexican relations, only Josefina Zoraida Vázquez and Lorenzo Meyer's fine study, *The United States and Mexico,* can compare.

Nationalistic historians on either side of the border might criticize Raat's balanced view of United States–Mexican relations. He examines the pre-columbian civilizations and the geography of North America to explain the impact that place, climate, and human culture have had upon the region. Throughout the book, he introduces the reader to geographical place theory, dependency theory, and the world-systems approach in his search for a wider perspective. For example, several brilliant pages at the beginning of chapter 5 connect Mexico in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the world economy.

Raat argues that the victory of the United States in 1848 marked the start of its rise to world hegemony in Latin America, the Pacific Basin, and ultimately Western Europe. Yet, the colonial wars had all been for land and empire, as had the American Revolution and the War of 1812. It is difficult to separate the Founding Fathers as colonial leaders of an expanding empire from their children who sought to fulfill the vision of their fathers.

Raat argues that Porfirio Díaz made concessions that were attractive to United States entrepreneurs because, for decades, the metro-