



American Indians and National Forests. By Theodore Catton. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2016. 373 pages. \$39.95 cloth and electronic.

The author of previous works on Native Americans in national parks in Alaska and Mount Rainier National Park, in this book Theodore Catton turns his attention to the complicated relationship between Native Americans and the National Forest Service. While it is an administrative history primarily from the perspective of the National Forest Service, this book also makes a good starting point for readers to explore other issues that it touches upon. The first half of *American Indians and National Forests* contains chronologically ordered chapters of events familiar to scholars of public lands and Native American studies. Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot create national forests; the Dawes Act Allotment era gives way to the Indian New Deal, followed by the termination period, self-determination, and the American Indian Movement. This half ends by covering recent debates over sacred sites and cultural resource management. The second half of the book covers the past thirty years of deepening relations between the Forest Service and Native Americans, including case studies on the Nez Perce and Alaska that utilize a number of interviews conducted by Catton.

Catton highlights areas where the histories of the National Forest Service and Native Americans converge. For example, conservationists would often hail the creation of national forests even though they came at the expense of Indians who lost access to tribal forests that served multiple cultural and historical purposes. Catton discusses the Klamath Indian forest, which was transferred to the Forest Service in the termination era as the tribal government was dissolved. Focusing on the Forest Service, Catton traces how Forest Service personnel gradually recognized Native Americans as stakeholders and partners, culminating in the creation of the Office of Tribal Relations.

Catton's work includes many elements of administrative history, with legal cases, legislation, and governmental bureaus making for a brew of terminology and acronyms. Useful summaries at the end of each chapter return to major themes and help the reader transcend sometimes tedious, but important details. A frequent theme is that of agencies at cross-purposes: over time, the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs all see their roles differently in regard to forests and their use by Native Americans. Moreover, individual tribal governments may desire to use forested lands in different ways than professional land managers in federal agencies might suggest. For example, Indians often refer to treaty rights and legal precedents based on them to argue that "Indian lands were set aside for the exclusive use and occupancy of Indians, not to be managed for general public benefit" (8). When Indian forests became integrated into the National Forest system, what happens to that idea? Catton delves into these controversies in the second half of the book including when sacred site concerns arise such as with the

Mt. Graham Observatory and the Snowbowl ski resort in Arizona, or the Medicine Wheel in Wyoming.

Importantly, at the outset Catton notes places where Indians and Forest Service officials both generally agree and disagree about land management. Both would see using resources as an “integral part” of maintaining them for the future and Indians often see that “if tribal members are not using the resource, then they are not respecting it, or fulfilling the sacred bargain” (6). Thus, as Catton notes, Native Americans find the Forest Service philosophy—responsible use—more palatable than the preservationist outlook of the National Park Service. Differences arise on issues of access to resources and also memory. Tribal memories and those of the Forest Service vary dramatically in terms of deep time. For the Forest Service, events and relationships are seen in terms of recent institutional history, while for tribes, meanings are drawn from generations of occupation, use, story, and sacred connection to place. In his conclusion, Catton argues that moving forward, the challenge for the Forest Service will be to further utilize use of this Native knowledge (304).

Though increased exploration of Native knowledge is certainly important, pointing to it as a strategy for future development within the Forest Service reveals one of the book’s weaknesses. While Catton refers often to Indian ways of knowing and using the land, and how the Forest Service embrace of ecosystem management seemed to be closer to Native views, these discussions are fairly cursory. One will not find any deep discussion of Native views of land use here. To be fair, that is not the thrust of Catton’s work. But given the title, a potential reader should be aware of what is, and what isn’t here. Arguably, Catton’s title should have been “The National Forest Service and American Indians.” One might expect in a work like this more attention to the transfer of knowledge about fire and forests from tribal forests to the Forest Service (most notably from Oregon). There is no discussion of the importance of Native American hotshot fire crews. Still, in a single volume *American Indians and National Forests* covers a great deal of ground, chronology, and content. While at times a reader might want more from the Native vantage point, Catton’s work is certainly very worthwhile for readers interested in the history of federal public lands as well as federal-Indian relations.

Jay Antle

Johnson County Community College

An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846–1873. By Benjamin Madley. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. 712 pages. \$38.00 cloth.

Historian Benjamin Madley has succeeded brilliantly doing what no other scholar has yet done: writing a comprehensive account of the genocide against California Indians from 1846 to 1873. *An American Genocide* is the product of years of careful research and a thoughtful consideration of how California’s long history of racist views, policies,