establishing a comprehensive narrative of the CAP/Grand Canyon Dam saga. He is correct that many historians have given greater attention and credit to the environmental movement’s role in this successful battle. Water development in the American West is, and has been, a convoluted issue involving multiple players and interests. CAP legislation emerged at a time when opportunities for new projects were becoming increasingly difficult. Rising costs of the Vietnam War and the social programs of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations were making federal funds more difficult to secure. Moreover, change was in the air. As Pearson poignantly illustrates, Americans’ attitudes regarding their relationship with the natural world slowly began to evolve. Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring questioned society’s faith in technology, while novel environmental laws, such as the Wilderness Act (1964) and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (1968), were enacted. Public distrust and disenchantment with the workings of the federal government was also emerging, represented by protests over the Vietnam War and the civil rights movement. All these, Pearson argues, coalesced to aid the environmentalist cause. But as Pearson concludes, although environmentalists benefitted from these transformations in American thought and culture, it was old-fashioned political deal making that led to the eventual passage of CAP legislation, without dams within Grand Canyon.

—Andrew H. Gahan
Golden, Colorado

A Diné History of Navajoland
By Klara Kelley and Harris Francis

The authors of Navajo Sacred Places and Navajoland Trading Post Encyclopedia have written a unique history of Navajos and the Navajo landscape based on oral histories and archaeological research. For years, Klara Kelley and Harris Francis have worked as consultants for the Navajo Nation and Navajo-related federal programs. Their expertise includes lengthy interviews with hataalis, or Navajo traditional ceremonialists, and “more than 30 years of work on historic preservation projects in all of Navajoland’s 110 chapters (Diné communities and units of local governance)” (4). The result is a wide-ranging book of stories and accounts grounded in the concept that “by telling how we came to be who and what we are, oral tradition makes a bond between the land and the people” (4).

Extensive citations make this a scholarly work of great value with important concepts of sovereignty and a belief in Gerald Vizenor’s term “survivance,” which combines survival with resistance. The introduction details the Blessingway ceremony, the growth of clan systems, and resilience after forced incarceration at Bosque Redondo. The federal government and federal agencies are referred to as “Washindoon” not as Washington.

This is a book with a Navajo perspective including the belief, contrary to some archaeologists, that Navajos, or at least Athabaskan people, were in the Four Corners region concurrently with Ancestral Puebloans or prior to 1300 CE. The authors argue that “more Diné ancestors might have been some of the farmer-hunter-gatherers in the small extended family sites scattered in the backcountry around the big pre-1300 Anasazi ‘great houses,’” and that “most of the People today still seem to accept what their elders have said, that their ancestors were in Navajoland far back in pre-Columbian times” (42, 43).

Other chapters discuss traditional Diné maps with the idea that history and geography are inextricably linked. Chapter 4 titled “Diné-Anaasazi Relations, Clans, and Ethno genesis” describes how traveling Athabaskan bands emerged as distinctive Navajo clans united by songs, ceremonies, chants, and rock imagery. “Scholars have long recognized that ‘Dinétah’ (the upper San Juan region) was the scene of Navajos and Puebloans coming together,” explain Kelley and Francis (107).

The book’s strengths include chapters on Diné landscapes before the Long Walk and imprisonment, and on conflicts with Euro-American settlers and ranchers in the Checkerboard area of mixed-property ownership on the Arizona railroad frontier. The chapter on Diné traders at trading posts offsets conventional stories about trading posts and Anglo traders. Some of the oral histories focus on the livestock era
after the 1930s and before trading posts devolved into convenience stores. As the authors explain, “in the decades before 1950, schooling and knowledge of English were uncommon among the people” (205).

_A Diné History of Navajoland_ fills in important gaps with life histories of Navajo families. A fine sub-section of the book titled “Products from the Land and Goods from the Store” is a comprehensive look at Navajo families in transition with specific examples of what they produced to use, trade, and barter, and what they chose to purchase.

New information is brought to light about Navajo workers in underground coal mines near Gallup, New Mexico, but much of the northern Navajo reservation, including sections in Utah, is not well covered in the book. There is limited information on Navajo participation in World War II or employment in uranium mines during the Cold War, perhaps because those topics have been covered by other writers. The last chapter focuses on Diné land use and climate change and is innovative in its scholarship, though the disastrous ecological consequences of having over 30,000 feral horses on the reservation is not chronicled.

Kelley and Francis end the book as they began it—on a political note explaining that “Diné sovereignty has been damaged by colonizer hegemony” and that “a people’s accounts of their own history both critique and refute the self-serving stories of absence, ‘victimry’ and voicelessness that colonizers use to take Indigenous land and resources” (268). But if there is anger, there is also affirmation. “Political and cultural sovereignty are tied together through the land base of a people . . . as oral tradition protects the People’s hold on the land, the hold on the land protects oral tradition” (270).

The authors of _A Diné History of Navajoland_ have produced a valuable reference book reflecting their life’s work. Decades from now it will still be in use, and hopefully, still be taught.

It is an essential scholarly benchmark for a diverse, culturally evolving, sovereign nation.

—Andrew Gulliford
*Fort Lewis College*

---

**Gay Rights and the Mormon Church: Intended Actions, Unintended Consequences**

By Gregory A. Prince

_Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2019. 416 pp. Cloth, $34.95_

_Gay Rights and the Mormon Church_ has two primary objectives. The first is to supplement national LGBT histories with a focused history of Mormon/LGBT intersections. The second is to help LGBT Mormons by “chronicling the church’s attitudes and actions towards LGBT people” (4). Prince argues that these positions were informed by a now-discredited behavioral paradigm, and that when the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints fully accepts biological homosexuality it will “inevitably call for a systemic reevaluation of [its] policies” (4). While Prince largely succeeds in producing a history of the institutional church, he provides little support for his claim that a biological etiology for homosexuality will cause a watershed moment. Prince’s skill as a historian of Mormon Studies is on full display here, as is his inexperience in the discipline of queer history.

This book provides unprecedented insight into the private deliberations and decision-making of Mormon leadership in regard to the LGBT community. In addition to anonymous interviews with church employees, Prince accessed little-known documents such as Dallin Oak’s 1984 memorandum, which strongly influenced decades of LDS policy. Prince methodically walks the reader through each U.S. state’s attempt to legalize gay marriage, clearly explaining the political strategies employed on both sides of the debate. As a result, _Gay Rights and the Mormon Church_ is a useful reference for what was happening within the LDS hierarchy and how LDS political involvement played out on a regional level.

Prince also succeeds in documenting how the LDS leadership gradually transitioned from a behavioral paradigm that condemned homosexual feelings, to a semi-behavioral, semi-biological paradigm that accepted same-sex attraction – whatever its provenance – and only condemned homosexual behavior. However, Prince fails to convincingly argue that fully accepting a biological basis for homosexuality