

without prescribed limitations on style or expressions of ethnic identity.

While the neighborhoods of the 1920s may have bred security, a sense of stability, and even provincialism, the Jewish world was shattered by the Great Depression and the Holocaust. In the 1930s radical movements embracing universal values at the expense of Jewish concerns flourished, while the ideological, political, and religious divisions of the 1930s and 1940s blocked a consensus about wartime activism and, later, the founding of the Israeli state. In the postwar years, urban decline, racial polarization, and turf wars disrupted the security and stability of Jewish neighborhoods. Some Jews fled the city for the suburbs, while others who stayed were divided along class lines in their responses to racial conflict, exemplified by the liberalism of Leonard Bernstein versus the militant rhetoric of Rabbi Meir Kahane.

Despite the urban malaise of the 1960s and 1970s, Gurock points to discernible signs of renewed vitality among the city's Jewry, manifested in new political movements that originated in New York but that transcended local politics to form national "communities of solidarity" (vol. 3, p. 209). Mobilized for transnational causes such as the movement to free Soviet Jewry, these communities brought their demands onto the streets of New York City in defiance of traditional politics. Similarly, Jewish feminists fought for universal women's liberation outside traditional Jewish political models. Gurock notes, however, that the legacy of Jewish radicalism established by the labor activist Clara Lemlich and socialist youth organizations inspired a new generation of Jewish feminist activists such as Bella Abzug and Betty Friedan, who in turn inspired Jewish women's organizations committed to extending the gendered boundaries of Judaism. Gurock concludes volume 3 on a note of optimism, pointing to the renewed confidence of middle-class Jewish professionals, who helped revitalize the city as a global financial power and established it once again as a Jewish cultural, economic, and political center.

Despite its vast canvas of scholarship, *City of Promises* is a compelling read, thanks to clearly delineated main themes, visual material, and vivid sketches of individuals, many of whom would not appear in conventional histories. The authors succeed admirably in demonstrating the many ways Jews remained distinctly Jewish—albeit with

multiple identities and diverse affiliations. At the same time, Jews were always part of an evolving city that provided a social laboratory in which Jews could build institutions and construct new secular and religious identities that did not preclude bitterly divisive conflicts and schisms. On occasion, however, when the authors stress the self-generating dynamics of Jewish identities and portray the Jewish universe as self-sufficient, the ethnic and racial diversity so characteristic of the city is not always taken into account. Nevertheless *City of Promises* is a comprehensive and ambitious work that contributes to the fields of urban and immigration studies as well as to Jewish history; it will be indispensable to scholars and students for years to come.

Hadassa Kosak
Yeshiva University
New York, New York

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jat443

A Misplaced Massacre: Struggling over the Memory of Sand Creek. By Ari Kelman. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013. xvi, 363 pp. \$35.00.)

Ari Kelman's *A Misplaced Massacre* tells the remarkable story of the incorporation of one of the most nefarious episodes of U.S. history into the National Park Service (NPS). In November 1864 Col. John Chivington led an attack on an encampment of Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians in present-day eastern Colorado who believed that they were under the protection of a nearby federal fort. Chivington's men killed more than 150 Cheyennes and Arapahos, and in the aftermath the soldiers publicly displayed trophies of scalps, ears, and even genitals. The violence shaped the social landscape of the plains for decades and reverberated throughout the United States. As the Civil War neared its conclusion, multiple congressional committees conducted investigations into what was frequently called Chivington's massacre, and Chivington's name became a byword for excessive violence even among officers of the U.S. military.

A Misplaced Massacre describes the tortuous path toward national commemoration of these events from the 1990s to the 2007 opening of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site—the first NPS unit to use the word *massacre* in its

name. As Kelman explains, NPS officials saw in the events at Sand Creek the possibility of continuing their efforts to incorporate Native American voices and to model federal-tribal cooperation. Therefore, when the site was inaugurated, the dominant rhetoric was one of optimism about the healing power of memorialization. However, the process that led to the site's creation did much more to expose deep and painful divisions between the various stakeholders than to heal them. "Rather than improving federal-tribal relations, creating the memorial had laid bare two centuries of conflict between the U.S. government and the Cheyennes and Arapahos," Kelman writes. "As it had during the era of the Civil War and the Indian Wars, a struggle over control of the landscape had ignited modern disputes" (p. 19).

Kelman's argument that the commemorative struggles of the twenty-first century are rooted in nineteenth-century histories is one of the many strengths of *A Misplaced Massacre*. Another is his surefooted storytelling, featuring a cast of characters that includes tribal descendants of the victims of Sand Creek, NPS officials, professional and amateur historians, a casino operator, area landowners with their own complicated set of motives, and politicians and government officials at the state, tribal, and national levels. The book tells a story of shifting alliances, political compacts, historical sleuthing, and deep emotion. It is, finally, a story of the West—and Kelman's sensitivity to the complexity of regional politics makes him an astute and compelling guide. He notes, for instance, the deep and abiding mistrust of the federal government that unites the rural communities of the West, whether they are populated by white ranchers or Native Americans. Kelman also understands the traditions of military service that join those communities, as well as the climate of patriotic militarism that dominates the post-September 11, 2001, landscape of the latter part of his tale. *A Misplaced Massacre* makes clear that what is most surprising about the National Historic Site is not that it took so long to establish, but that it ever opened at all.

Consider the simple question that drives much of the drama in Kelman's book: Where was the precise location of the Sand Creek massacre? The enabling legislation for the site required that the NPS determine the exact terrain where the violence occurred so that the land could be purchased. For decades, local residents and tribal groups had

believed that they understood the location of the massacre, but archaeological efforts in the 1990s generated more questions than answers. As a result, both the NPS and tribal groups engaged oral histories, historic maps, and contemporary archaeology in a long and often-fractious search for the correct ground on which to commemorate the massacre.

Kelman's account of a 1999 archaeological dig that included NPS officials and representatives of tribal descendants is one of the most revealing episodes of the book. Even as the archaeological team assembled by the NPS celebrated a dramatic find of physical objects, the team's emotional response left the tribal representatives distressed at the "whooping and hollering" that accompanied each find. Kelman quotes a Northern Cheyenne observer to the scene, who remembered that the NPS archaeologists "were jumping up and down, doing cartwheels and back flips when they found something. But the Cheyennes, they just walked off" (p. 129). It would be years before the groups could agree on an interpretation of the evidence that proved acceptable to all.

Here and elsewhere Kelman is a deft interpreter of the cultural conflicts at the center of this process of commemoration. He understands that they result from the incommensurability of the agendas that brought the parties to the table. For many of the tribal representatives involved in the process, the creation of the National Historic Site was only a means toward restorative justice, particularly through the payment of reparations that were promised—but never paid—to the survivors of Sand Creek in the 1865 Treaty of the Little Arkansas. For the NPS, the very act of commemorating the dark history of Sand Creek is an achievement—a testament to the ability of the United States to face its own troubling history, to overcome the divisions of the past in the hope of a better future. Kelman never tries to gloss over these differences, and he is forthright about their consequences.

The sheer difficulty of creating the Sand Creek National Historic Site is what makes *A Misplaced Massacre* essential reading. Kelman is alive to the thick emotion of historical commemoration and its political reverberations. The easy path for him would have been to tell a story of victory over division—of bridging gaps and mending fences to work for the common good. But Kelman refuses to replicate nineteenth-century

triumphalism in his account of twenty-first-century memory. Sand Creek was a “misplaced massacre” because it disturbs so many stories that Americans have told themselves about their nation, and it cannot be found through a simple tale of reconciliation.

Michael A. Elliott
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jar439

Representation and Inequality in Late Nineteenth-Century America: The Politics of Apportionment. By Peter H. Argersinger. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. x, 340 pp. \$95.00.)

Political observers have been entertained—or appalled—by recent reapportionment battles, such as the story of the Democratic members of the Texas House of Representatives who departed for Oklahoma to deny Republicans a quorum and prevent their redrawing of congressional districts to their liking. Clearly, since *Baker v. Carr* (1962) and *Reynolds v. Sims* (1964) the federal courts have overcome their traditional shyness about overturning the most basic political work done by the branches of government. Familiar, too, is the story of the origin of the term *gerrymander*, which commemorates a snaking state senate district drawn to benefit the Democratic-Republicans that was approved by Massachusetts governor Elbridge Gerry in 1812. That strong party organizations and voter loyalties were characteristic of the late nineteenth century also counts as common knowledge, as does the disfranchisement of the vast majority of African American voters in the South.

Until Peter H. Argersinger’s splendid book, we (or at least I) did not know how contentious and common partisan apportionment battles were between Gerry’s redistricting and the “one man, one vote” principle, nor how the major parties outside of the South often succeeded in minimizing the effective meaning of the right to vote. Focusing on the Midwest (Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois in the greatest detail) in the highly partisan 1890s, Argersinger relates a history that is at once startlingly new and depressingly familiar. Using a deeply researched series of cases, he demonstrates how partisan and sometimes-factional politics often created grossly malapportioned state legislative districts calculated to make

the votes of minorities worthless. Without the benefit of modern mapping software, politicians calculated how best to pack their opponents in the smallest number of districts without hurting the prospects of local chieftains or shaving margins elsewhere so close as to create dangerously competitive seats. Republicans took advantage of their numerous opportunities; Democrats did the same when they had their chances; and both parties used and then froze out third-party legislators. Apportionment mattered, as politicians who poured significant time into it understood. The process determined the spoils of office, but it also silently shaped other decisions. Midwestern gerrymanders influenced prohibition and tariff policy, determined U.S. Senate delegations, and magnified the large Republican gains in the 1894 election because Democrats had optimistically cut their expected majorities in too many districts in 1892.

Argersinger’s mastery of late nineteenth-century election law—his 1989 article on anti-fusion ballot laws that targeted third parties remains a classic—shows in the clarity of his presentation of complicated material (“The Value of the Vote: Political Representation in the Gilded Age,” *JAH*, June 1989, pp. 59–90). The heart of the book is a detailed description of how apportionment fights usurped time and energy from other legislative business. “Fights” were sometimes literal brawls—involving fists, revolvers, and chairs. The apportionment battles spilled out of the legislatures to the executive and judicial branches. In divided state governments, the executive tried to block redistricting advanced by the opposite party. The side losing seats played all available angles. State constitutions provided guidance on when and how districts should be drawn, with timing keyed to new federal or state census counts and rules directing that districts be as evenly populated as possible while remaining compact and, in one state, within county lines. Since states had taken responsibility for elections by using the Australian ballot system, challengers argued that state courts could order that ballots reflect older district boundaries. The courts could oversee what had once been understood as a purely legislative decision—a political problem fixable by the voters, if they wished to do so. How, after all, could voters who were arranged in gerrymandered districts correct gerrymanders? If the courts claimed authority, tricky questions remained, such as who had legal standing.