

relatively late, an invention of a small, monied elite who exploited the myth of race to solidify its hold over the region. . . . Segregation was, in a word, reversible.”

Origins of the New South was Woodward’s answer to W. J. Cash’s *Mind of the South* (1940), which took the pessimistic view that for the region to give up white supremacy would mean renouncing tradition and nature, that the modern was just a continuation of the old. Three years after *Origins*, Woodward, at the invitation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, wrote a brief on Reconstruction for the plaintiff in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the landmark school desegregation case.

Then, in *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*, “talking,” as he said, “to white people back

home,” Woodward told them that segregation was rooted in the politics of the 1890s, not in ancient custom or tradition, and he argued that it was not worth preserving. That same year, 1957, Arkansas governor Orval Faubus sent the National Guard into Little Rock’s Central High School to thwart racial integration.

Decades of attacks and revisionist criticism have prompted Woodward to alter his view of Reconstruction somewhat. He “no longer disputes that ‘de facto segregation was very strong right after the war,’” says Rosengarten. “But after work and outside of church, he maintains, whites and blacks could be found together ‘in bars, at balls, in bed, everything.’” Just as Miss Sally and Miss Ida could be found in his grandmother’s parlor when he was a boy.

The ‘Hate Crime’ Chimera

“What’s So Bad about Hate” by Andrew Sullivan, in *The New York Times Magazine* (Sept. 26, 1999), 229 W. 43rd St., New York, N.Y. 10036.

There’s much talk these days about “hate crimes,” that is, crimes committed out of hatred for the victim because he or she is a homosexual or in some other way “different.” Many favor laws prescribing special punishments in such cases. This makes little sense, argues Sullivan, the gay author of *Virtually Normal* (1995) and a *New York Times Magazine* contributing writer.

Hatred, he argues, is a very vague concept—“far less nuanced an idea than prejudice, or bigotry, or bias, or anger, or even mere aversion to others. Is it to stand in for all these varieties of human experience—and everything in between? If so, then the war against it will be so vast as to be quixotic.” And if *hate* instead is restricted to “a very specific idea or belief, or set of beliefs, with a very specific object or group of objects,” then the antihate war will “almost certainly” be unconstitutional.

Proponents of hate crime laws usually have “sexism,” “racism,” “anti-Semitism,” and “homophobia” in mind as the varieties of hate that should win criminals extra punishment. But these advocates’ implicit neat division between “oppressors” and blameless “victims” is simplistic, Sullivan says, and “can generate its own form of bias” against particular groups, such as “white straight males.” This approach, like hate, “hammers the uniqueness of each

individual into the anvil of group identity.” It also ignores the fact that “hate criminals may often be members of hated groups.” According to FBI statistics, for instance, blacks in the 1990s were three times as likely as whites to commit “hate crimes.” And, writes Sullivan, “It’s no secret . . . that some of the most vicious anti-Semites in America are black, and that some of the most virulent anti-Catholic bigots in America are gay.”

“Why is hate for a group worse than hate for a person?” Sullivan asks. Was the brutal murder of gay college student Matthew Shepard in Laramie, Wyoming, in 1998 worse than the abduction, rape, and murder of an eight-year-old Laramie girl by a pedophile that same year? Proponents of hate crime laws argue that such crimes spread fear beyond the immediate circles of the victims. But all crimes do that, Sullivan says.

Proponents also claim there has been an “epidemic” of hate crimes in recent years, but FBI statistics, he notes, do not bear that out. In 1992, there were 6,623 “hate crime” incidents reported by 6,181 agencies, covering 51 percent of the population; in 1996, 8,734 incidents reported by 11,355 agencies, covering 84 percent of the population. Moreover, most of the incidents involved not violent, physical assaults on people, but crimes against property or

“intimidation.” Of the 8,049 hate crimes reported in 1997, only eight were murders.

“The truth is,” Sullivan says, “the distinction between a crime filled with personal hate and a crime filled with group hate is an essentially arbitrary one.” The government should fight crime, he concludes, but not pursue the utopi-

an goal of eliminating hate from human consciousness. “The boundaries between hate and prejudice and between prejudice and opinion and between opinion and truth are so complicated and blurred that any attempt to construct legal and political fire walls is a doomed and illiberal venture.”

Two Native American Paths

“Nineteenth-Century Indian Education: Universalism versus Evolutionism” by Jacqueline Fear-Segal, in *Journal of American Studies* (Aug. 1999), Cambridge Univ. Press, 40 W. 20th St., New York, N.Y. 10011-4211.

In the latter decades of the 19th century, Christian reformers built an extensive network of boarding schools to rescue Indians from “savagery” and make them the equal of any white man. Only after the turn of the century, scholars have held, when pseudo-scientific racism supplanted the reformers’ universalist ideas, was the goal of rapid assimilation forsaken. Fear-Segal, a lecturer in American history at the University of East Anglia, in Norwich, England, begs to differ. The pioneering reformers were not as united on this goal as they have seemed.

In 1878, just two years after General George Custer and his troops were annihilated by the Sioux at the Little Big Horn, General Samuel Chapman Armstrong welcomed the first Indians to the Hampton

Normal and Agricultural Institute, the Virginia school he had founded 10 years before for the education of blacks. (Booker T. Washington was an early graduate.) Armstrong, a missionary’s son who had commanded black troops during the Civil War, believed that Indians were at an earlier stage of evolution than whites. “The Indians are grown up children; we are a thousand years ahead of them in the line of progress,” he stated. The process of guiding them up the evolutionary ladder, he was sure, would take generations.

Captain Richard Henry Pratt, who founded the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania a year after Armstrong’s “Indian Program” began at Hampton, held a different view. He had no use for racial “types.” As a



At Carlisle Indian Industrial School, rapid assimilation to white society was the founder’s goal.