ABSTRACT
On November 29, 1864, troops from the 1st and 3rd Colorado Regiments attacked an Arapahoe and Cheyenne peace camp along the banks of Sand Creek in southeastern Colorado Territory. The soldiers killed some 200 or more Native people, razed what remained of their village, and desecrated the bodies of the dead. Initially celebrated by Colorado settlers as a heroic battle, in time the violence came to be known nationally as the Sand Creek Massacre. Almost a century and a half later, on April 27, 2007, the National Park Service opened its 391st unit: Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site. This essay explores the politics of memory surrounding the Sand Creek Massacre, focusing on the impact of the historic site in reshaping official and popular recollections in the 16 years since it opened to the public.
Nobody just happens upon Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site. You have to make a real effort to get there. If you’re traveling from Denver, you leave the city heading east on I-70, driving out onto the vastness of the Great Plains, which, depending on the time of year, will either be a sea of emerald green or golden brown. No matter the season, though, once the urban forest is in your rearview mirror, there are, but for a stand here and there, lonely sentinels in creek bottoms, almost no trees. By contrast, there is an abundance of cows looking for food or shade in what seems like an endless expanse of ranchland.

About 45 minutes outside the city, at the town of Strasburg, the highway meanders in a more southerly direction before returning to an easterly course a few miles from Limon, another hour into the journey. In Limon, you’ll merge onto Highway 287 for sixtyish miles, passing through the settlements of Hugo, Boyero, and Wild Horse—blink and you’ll miss them—before turning due south at Kit Carson, from which point it’s a straight shot of twenty minutes to Eads. Careful on that stretch of highway. You can see to the horizon. Speed will tempt you. But the road is well patrolled. Tickets are common.

Although Eads serves as the gateway community to the national historic site, as you drive on Highway 287, you still have quite a ways to go before arriving at your destination. Eads, for its part, looks like many other struggling communities that dot the Great Plains: railroad tracks run parallel to a towering grain elevator on the edge of town; a wide main street, including a movie theater and other small businesses, has seen better days; a modern hotel waits adjacent to the highway, offering weary motorists a place to rest. A bit more than two miles outside of Eads, Highway 287 continues south, and you keep going east on Highway 96. Another ten minutes down that road sits what looks like a ghost town—Chivington, Colorado, named for the officer who perpetrated the Sand Creek massacre—where you’ll turn sharply left onto County Road 54. After driving five more miles under a huge sky, make a right at a T junction. The gates of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site are visible a short distance away. You’ve arrived at your destination.

At this location on November 29, 1864, approximately 700 federal troops commanded by Colonel John Chivington attacked a Cheyenne and Arapaho camp along the banks of Sand Creek. Some 1,000 Native people, who believed their leaders—known as peace chiefs, they included Black Kettle, White Antelope, and Little Raven—had recently forged a ceasefire with White authorities, were stunned when the 3rd and part of the 1st Colorado Regiments launched an assault before dawn. The soldiers ignored signs they were attacking a peace camp, including white and American flags flying over Black Kettle’s lodge. The violence lasted all day. When the bloodletting finally ended, the lifeless bodies of some 200 Arapahos and Cheyennes lay on the ground. Most of the dead were women, children, and the elderly. Chivington’s men burned the village, sundering a site of refuge for Native people, and took from the killing field grim trophies: scalps, fingers, and, witnesses later testified, genitalia hacked from their victims. The soldiers then marched to Denver, where they were greeted as heroes in an existential fight with savages. In time, the slaughter would be known as the Sand Creek Massacre.1

Nearly a century and a half later, on April 27, 2007, the National Park Service opened its 391st unit: Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site. At a public ceremony, politicians, Park Service employees, and descendants of Sand Creek’s victims and survivors all shared their sense of what memorializing the massacre could mean. The historic site’s creation, some speakers suggested, represented the culmination of efforts at healing a centuries-old rift between Native Nations and the federal government. They pointed to the participation of the descendants of Arapahos and Cheyennes killed
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by United States soldiers at Sand Creek in the recent effort to locate and memorialize the land upon which their ancestors had been murdered. Other speakers demurred, insisting that process had not been so simple. Competing claims to authority over interpreting the past, struggles over incommensurable narratives, and disputes over disparate methodologies and epistemologies had divided the people engaged in the memorialization effort, they noted. But in the end, the Sand Creek descendants, as they typically called themselves, had worked with representatives of the Park Service to preserve the massacre site.²
The Sand Creek memorial, now more than 15 years old, looks much as it did when it opened in 2007. Other than the occasional interpretive placard punctuating the landscape, the site remains an undisturbed prairie of undulating mixed grasses. Visitors can walk along rough paths from a simple welcome center across parts of the facility, which encompasses more than 12,500 acres. Uninterrupted viewsheds are subtly spectacular. The grounds throughout the facility are relatively pristine by design rather than default. The Arapaho and Cheyenne descendants who participated in the memorialization process have continued to exert a great deal of control over the site’s management, authority vested in them by Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell—in addition to being the only Native person in the Senate at the time, also a member of the Cheyenne Council of Forty-Four, the civilian branch of the tribe’s governing structure—who wrote the memorial’s enabling legislation. Laird Cometsevah, a Southern Cheyenne Chief, remarked that he preferred to keep the Sand Creek site “as free of Park Service ‘improvements’ as possible. What the Park Service may call ‘progress,’ my people might think of as ‘pollution.’” A cemetery, accessible only to the Arapaho and Cheyenne descendants, serves as a burial site for human remains repatriated from museums and repositories around the United States.3

One of the most heavily trafficked trails in the historic site leads to a rise known as the monument overlook. From atop that vantage point, rare high ground on the plains, onlookers can gaze down upon a large bend in the creek, the location where Black Kettle’s village stood on November 29, 1864. Sand Creek’s bottom, which is now filled with mature cottonwood trees, hosted some of the massacre’s most brutal violence. The area is off limits to the public. As Steve Brady, a Northern Cheyenne headman who participated in the memorialization process noted, “Our ancestors...
were killed there in cold blood. They still lie on that sacred ground. We cannot have them disturbed by thoughtless sightseers. And so we’re insisting that the Park Service not open that area to outsiders of any kind.” Once the backdrop to unspeakable acts of violence and brutality, the monument overlook now offers visitors a place for quiet contemplation.4

Although the Sand Creek site is remote, its impact has been far-reaching. In the years since the memorial opened its doors to the public in 2007, the state of Colorado has engaged in a wholesale reconsideration of the massacre’s place in the landscape of official and vernacular memory. Alexa Roberts, the site’s first superintendent, believed that the memorialization of Sand Creek could foster broader discussions of genocide, spurring people, in her words, to “do better in the future, to set aside violence as a tool of oppression, and always to respect human rights.” As she counted down to the grand opening, Roberts worked with the Sand Creek descendants to start a research center and archive that would house tribal resources alongside historical materials generated by non-tribal peoples. In 2007, she, Steve Brady, and Brady’s brother, Otto Braided Hair, who at the time served as director of the Northern Cheyenne Sand Creek Descendants Committee, wrote up a proposal for a non-profit entity. Three years later, the United Methodist Church, grappling with its own role in the massacre—John Chivington had been a Methodist minister, and John Evans, Colorado’s Territorial Governor in 1864, had been a church elder—provided seed funding for the research center as a “gesture of repentance.”5

The Park Service, intrigued by the center’s potential impact, provided additional funding for renovations and an operating budget for the facility, which would be housed in a historic structure in Eads. The town, eager to embrace economic development projects, hoped to encourage young people, who often fled to the Front Range’s fast-growing cities, to remain at home. In 2012, the United Methodist Church pledged another gift to the facility. Seven years after that, the Sand Creek Massacre Foundation, the “official philanthropic partner” of the national historic
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site, incorporated as a non-profit organization and opened its doors. “By promoting initiatives to understand the relevance of the Sand Creek Massacre in the contemporary world,” the foundation and research center would “honor the legacy of those lost at Sand Creek,” while “minimizing the chances of similar atrocities in the future.” Roberts implores visitors to “learn, remember, and heal,” explaining that, “we wanted to make sure that Native voices would guide us, because our goal is to ensure that nothing like Sand Creek ever happens again.”

Roberts believes contemporary debates in Colorado suggest the impact of memorializing the massacre is simultaneously vast and difficult to calculate. “When I think about all of my collaborations with the descendants, the work we’ve done together, it’s hard to know what to make of it, but I do feel good about the way we’ve changed the conversation about Sand Creek in Colorado. I think our work has inspired some people to think more deeply about some of the darkest chapters in the state’s history.” On the sesquicentennial of the massacre, she notes, Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper issued an apology for the violence at Sand Creek. A huge crowd gathered around Hickenlooper on the capitol steps in Denver, including Arapahos and Cheyennes who had just completed a three-day spiritual healing run from the massacre site to the city. The governor addressed “all indigenous people ... on behalf of the loving people of Colorado.” He said he was “sorry for the atrocities of our government that were visited on your ancestors.” Otto Braided Hair, who attended the ceremony, “encourage[d] people to visit the Sand Creek site and learn about the events of that day.” The descendants hoped that by experiencing the historic site, Coloradans would build a “deeper understanding” of the past and imagine a “brighter future.” The site, in this view, could heal the wounds of historical trauma.

Hickenlooper’s remarks cast an unsparing eye on the state’s history while still opening the door to reconciliation. He acknowledged John Evans’s “deep moral failure,” before focusing on righteous witnesses to the atrocities at Sand Creek. Reading a letter composed by Captain Silas Soule, who refused to commit troops serving under him to the slaughter, Hickenlooper reminded his audience that not all Colorado settlers relished killing Indians. Soule’s
correspondence, Steve Brady noted, ultimately reached officials in Washington, DC, leading to federal investigations into the violence. Those inquiries all labeled Sand Creek a bad act; one called it “a massacre,” a conclusion most Coloradans dismissed as politicized. Regardless, Brady looked at Soule’s writing as a key document in efforts to remember Sand Creek accurately: as a bloodbath. The Park Service, he noted, would never have memorialized Sand Creek had it not been for Soule. “It’s one thing when an Indian talks about terrible things from the past,” Brady explained. “White people say, ‘Well, Indians complain all the time.’ But it’s something else again when an American soldier, a white man like Silas Soule, says Sand Creek was a massacre.” Before arriving at the capitol to hear Hickenlooper’s apology, the Arapaho and Cheyenne healing runners had performed graveside ceremonies at Riverside Cemetery in Denver, venerating Soule’s memory.8

Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site later shaped Denver’s response to the Black Lives Matter movement. In 2020, with observers around the United States confronting the origins and impacts of commemorative canvasses, including the ways White supremacists inscribed structural racism onto the nation’s landscapes of memory, activists in Denver focused on a Civil War memorial located on the state capitol steps—the same spot where Governor Hickenlooper had offered his apology to Arapahos, Cheyennes, and other Native Peoples in 2014. Early in the 20th century, the Colorado Pioneers Association, eager to shape the way the state’s participation in the Civil War would be remembered, commissioned a statue of a Union cavalrymen gazing from the state’s seat of government toward the Rocky Mountains. A plaque affixed to the statue’s plinth listed the “battles” in which Coloradans had fought during the war. Sand Creek was included in that honor roll, a way of carving John Chivington’s memories into stone and casting the service of Colorado volunteer soldiers in a positive light. The Pioneers Association statue also obscured the massacre’s repercussions for Native Peoples.9

In 2002, with the Sand Creek memorialization effort underway, Colorado lawmakers pondered the Civil War memorial in front of their place of business. They initially voted to remove the massacre from the statue’s base, suggesting that its inclusion represented an “insult to the memory” of the “Native Americans who were killed at Sand Creek” and also to the “Colorado Civil War veterans who fought and died in the actual Civil War battles that are listed on the memorial.” But then the descendants, working with Colorado Chief Historian David Halaas, said the plaque should be reinterpreted rather than erased.
Laird Cometsevah “appreciated that those Colorado politicians finally understood that Sand Creek was a massacre and not a battle,” but he thought “it was silly to fight to remember Sand Creek in one location and forget about it in another.” Cometsevah “respectfully request[ed] that the words ‘Sand Creek’ presently engraved on the Civil War memorial be retained.” He then suggested that “signage be placed around the Civil War statue that would inform and educate the public about the holocaust of Sand Creek.” On November 29, the state unveiled a new plaque contextualizing the list of Civil War “battles,” noting: “Protests led by Native Americans and others throughout the twentieth century have since led to the widespread recognition of the tragedy as the Sand Creek Massacre.”

On June 25, 2020, exactly a month after police in Minneapolis lynched a Black man named George Floyd, protestors in Denver tore down the state’s Civil War memorial and spray-painted slogans, including “No Peace, No Justice,” on its empty plinth. A person who helped topple the statue, a local example of a nationwide movement to destroy edifices of White supremacy, explained: “We figured what better way to get rid of a statue that represents racism.” An eyewitness to the event noted, albeit with some confusion: “I know that [soldier] is one of many men who were part of the Sand Creek Massacre and many other genocidal acts that happened throughout Colorado’s early history.” Governor Jared Polis responded with “outrage at the damage to a statue that commemorates the Union heroes of the Civil War who fought and lost their lives to end slavery.” He suggested “those responsible” were “hooligans” or perhaps “white
supremacists, Confederate sympathizers, or drunk teenagers.” He ignored activists who insisted they were expressing fury over the murder of people of color, whether in the past at Sand Creek or the present in Minnesota, by engaging in acts of resistance and symbolic violence.¹¹

Leading up to the anniversary of the massacre in 2020, Colorado’s legislature announced that it would once again revise Denver’s commemorative landscape, replacing the Union cavalryman with a memorial to the victims of Sand Creek. The new figure would be a Native woman mourning the dead, explained artist Harvey Phillip Pratt, a Sand Creek descendant whose earlier commissions included the Smithsonian Institution’s National Native American Veterans Memorial. The soldier who had stood for over a century as part of Colorado’s Civil War memorial would move to History Colorado, the state’s historical society. It would be included in an exhibit titled, “This Is What Democracy Looks Like,” focused on “differences in how various groups have interpreted its meaning, including tribal anger that the same cavalry units memorialized by the statue for heroism in the Civil War also perpetrated the Sand Creek massacre two years later.” A museum curator noted, “We view this as a teachable moment. That’s how we’d present it—not as an erasure or reinstallation, but as a chance to consider monuments and how we value them.” He also suggested, “we know some of the stakeholders we’re interested in working with are military veterans and their families, tribal representatives of those victimized in the Sand Creek massacre and their descendants, and those advocating for more social justice today.”¹²

A year later, Governor Polis made news again, underscoring Alexa Roberts’s contention that the Sand Creek National Historic Site would have ripple effects statewide, yoking public policy to shifting public memory. On August 17, 2021, Polis rescinded an order, originally issued by Governor John Evans, to capture and kill hostile Native Americans in Colorado. The order’s point of origin was a gruesome episode in which Native people murdered the Hungate family, settlers on the plains east of Denver, on June 11, 1864. Two and a half weeks after the so-called Hungate Massacre, Evans issued a proclamation to the “friendly Indians of the Plains.” He directed them to come in to “places of safety,” military installations where authorities would “protect” them. Despite the governor’s entreaties, violence spiraled out of control in Colorado Territory. Evans, terrified of a general Indian war, issued a second proclamation on August 11, empowering “citizens of Colorado, either individually or in such parties as they may organize, to go in pursuit of all hostile Indians on the plains.” State-sanctioned vigilantes, he suggested, should spare peaceful Indians. “All good citizens,” he implored, “are called upon to do their duty for the defense of their homes and families.” The next day, the War Department authorized Evans to raise a regiment, the 3rd Colorado, to “pursue, kill, and destroy all hostile Indians.” Those volunteer troops would descend upon the peace camp at Sand Creek on November 29, 1864.¹³

For more than a century and half, Governor Evans’s proclamation remained in place—a bloody thread...
connecting Colorado’s past and present—until Governor Polis signed his own executive order. Polis admitted that “we can’t change the past,” while still promising to make amends. He would “honor the memories of those who we lost by recognizing their sacrifice and vowing to do better.” Rick Williams, a member of the Lakota and Cheyenne Tribes, suggested that Polis’s actions should be read as marking the “end of the Colorado–Indian wars.” Press coverage tied Polis’s order to work done at the national historic site, suggesting the memorial’s creation had prompted state officials to reconsider the past, reshaping how the public would recall the historic mistreatment of Colorado’s Native Peoples. Alexa Roberts measured the moment, noting that the “work the Park Service did with the descendants, [was] really led by the descendants,” that it was “a starting point.” She added: “there’s more work to be done, more sites of violence that have been lost, erased, or misinterpreted. We’ve only taken the first steps of a long journey.”

That journey would lead back to History Colorado. Beginning years before the start of what some observers have called the nation’s racial reckoning, the institution considered the best way of recounting the story of Sand Creek, a process complicated by its own relationship to the settler colonial project in Colorado. In 2012, History Colorado opened a Sand Creek exhibit, but then, after receiving outraged feedback from the descendants, who believed they had not been appropriately consulted, quickly took it down. Seven years later, the organization’s leaders decided to try again, rooting their efforts in the principle that “every constituency, and especially the Sand Creek descendants, needed to have the opportunity to weigh in on the exhibit from start to finish.” One staff member suggested: “We learned from our own mistakes and also from the successes of the national historic site. The Park Service collaborated with the tribes—true partners, really—and we had to do the same.” Working with federal funding agencies, History Colorado put together enough grant money to cover a robust consultation process.

A preliminary meeting, focused on planning, took place in January of 2020. The group intended to reconvene in March, but the COVID-19 pandemic threw their efforts—among other things—into chaos. After that, work on the
exhibit moved in uncomfortable fits and starts for a year, with some of the descendants, surveying the losses of Elders within their communities, wondering if it made sense to continue. By the summer of 2021, though, in-person meetings resumed. Early the next year, History Colorado curators were “getting into the nitty-gritty of the exhibit,” focusing not only on the horrors of Sand Creek but also on how the Arapaho and Cheyenne peoples had transcended the ordeal and lived in the years since. The group discussed how best to balance the horrific realities of persecution with what Native scholar Gerald Vizenor calls “survivance … an active sense of presence,” including Native stories that feature “renunciations of dominance, tragedy and victimry.” As one curator noted of the descendants, “They are tired of being depicted only in the frame of victimhood. They wanted some focus on what happened after Sand Creek, on the way they fought for decades, and then on how they lived on during a period of peace, how they thrived or at least survived despite the odds.”

In October of 2022, the Sand Creek descendants “went through every single element of the exhibit, from the color of the walls to the consistency of the carpet. They lingered on every word of interpretation and every artifact that would be displayed.” As Gail Ridgely, a Northern Arapaho descendant noted, “We needed to make sure every visitor would understand our stories, would learn that our land was stolen from us, that our people were butchered by Chivington and his men, but that we’re still here. We’re still here.” Ridgely explained that though the United States, “including the State of Colorado,” hoped to “assimilate us completely, we’re still Arapahos, we’re still Cheyennes, we’re still Native. We haven’t gone anywhere, and this exhibit tells that story.” Exhibit labels include Arapaho and Cheyenne language translations. Kiosks allow visitors to hear Sand Creek stories relayed by tribal Elders as well as dramatic readings of Silas Soule’s correspondence about the massacre. Finally, Ridgely said, “the exhibit was ready.”

History Colorado coordinated the public opening of its Sand Creek exhibit with the massacre’s anniversary in 2022. Displays drew tight connections for visitors between what they were seeing and the national historic site in southeastern Colorado. Gail Ridgely observed, “Our work on the Sand Creek site prepared us to tell our story
at History Colorado. We learned what we wanted to say and how we wanted to say it.” A curator agreed: “Our collaboration with the descendants, who had experience working with the National Park Service, allowed us to narrate the massacre story from an Arapaho and Cheyenne perspective. We were able to place Sand Creek in an appropriate context: as one terrible part of the tribes’ and the state’s history, but not as the entirety of those histories.” Conrad Fisher, who served as dean of cultural affairs at Chief Dull Knife Tribal College on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation in Lame Deer, Montana, noted: “These kinds of collaborations are very challenging. But we’re committed to making sure that people understand our history. People have to know what happened at Sand Creek.”

When Alexa Roberts surveys the state of Sand Creek memory, she remains simultaneously cautious about the importance of her own contributions and cautiously optimistic about the future. “Thinking about the History Colorado exhibit,” she says, “I suppose it wouldn’t have happened if the National Historic Site hadn’t blazed a trail. But in the end, it’s so important to understand that the credit goes to the descendants, who, no matter how hard the work is, keep showing up.” She adds: “When we started working on Sand Creek, people were still calling it a battle. Some people still insisted that Chivington was a hero. That’s now a fringe perspective.” She laughs and concludes: “I do take comfort in thinking that the site will be preserved for future generations, that people will be able to visit there and learn about their history, even if it’s uncomfortable.” Getting to a Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site was not easy. Traveling there today requires commitment. What awaits visitors is an untrammeled landscape and an unvarnished depiction of the past. The trip, as Roberts suggests, is worth the effort.
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