

“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.

young army officer, he had commanded both black soldiers and Indian scouts, and he had concluded that any apparent racial differences were due simply to environment, not to anything innate. He believed, writes Fear-Segal, that like immigrants, Indians just “needed to be absorbed into American society to achieve full participation.” And the assimilation should be rapid.

Though the two schools had many similarities (including their emphasis on work and the military atmosphere), this was a clear difference. While Armstrong encouraged his students to write about their different tribal traditions, practice their native arts, and return to their reservations to live, Pratt encouraged his pupils not to go back to their reservations. “Pratt wanted to bring Indians into direct competition with [white] Americans and show they could win,” Fear-Segal says. His Carlisle football team became famous (as did Olympic gold medalist Jim Thorpe, a Carlisle graduate). Pratt was strongly opposed to what he called “race schools,” which he believed were bound to

fail because they ignored the individual, binding him instead to “race destiny.”

Their debate—which Pratt effectively lost, even at his own school, particularly after the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek in 1890—seems to echo in today’s disputes about multiculturalism. On assimilation, Fear-Segal points out, “Pratt seems more ‘tolerant’ (as we might put it) than Armstrong; but in their attitudes to tribal cultures the position is reversed. Pratt’s ‘brotherhood of man,’ in its universalism, was not receptive to difference.”

Ironically, the 19th-century Indian boarding schools turned out to have an effect that both men might have applauded (at least in part), Fear-Segal observes. By the early 20th century, boarding school attendance had become a common experience among Indians. While most students returned to their reservations, they did so as “English-speaking Indians whose identity was no longer exclusively tribal.” And many were eager to find “a new place for the Indian” within the larger American society.

PRESS & MEDIA

Sex and the Women’s Magazine

A Survey of Recent Articles

Back in the sexual dark ages, feminist pioneer Betty Friedan cast a stern eye on the pap to which women were being subjected in the glossy pages of the magazines addressed to them. In *Ladies Home Journal*, *McCall’s*, *Redbook*, and the like, she scornfully observed in *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), there was a superabundance of drivel: an article on overcoming an inferiority complex, a short story about a teenager who doesn’t go to college winning a man away from a bright college girl, and much, much more.

“The men who run the women’s magazines,” Friedan said, seemed to have a low opinion of women.

“Where is the world of thought and ideas, the life of the mind and spirit?”

It’s still a good question, observes Hal Colebatch, author of *Blair’s Britain* (1999), now that women’s magazines in the English-speaking world are edited not by men but “overwhelmingly or entirely by women.”

At his local newsstand, the cover of *Cosmopolitan* offered these enticements: “Should I stay or should I go now? Take our ditch-or-hitch test” and “The Big Bang: How to Be a Show-Off in Bed.” On *Marie Claire*: “Women Who Kidnap Their Own Children,” “Are you sleeping with the Right Man?” and “I had sex lessons to save

