

about limited, decentralized governance within a constitutional republic and who would rally to Duncan's blend of front-porch antiwar patriotism, Scots-Irish Presbyterian rectitude, East Tennessee pride, and taxpayer-watchdog populism. He laughs. "I'm not going to get in any race that I don't have a good chance of winning. I would certainly be one of the most unusual candidates," he allows, "but I would get slaughtered." Oh well. Duncan in '08 still sounds mighty good to me.

When it comes time to retire, Jimmy Duncan will not whore himself out as a lobbyist, one of those pathetic specters who haunt the halls of Congress dunning favors from colleagues who will cross the street to avoid them. "I want to go home to Knoxville and play with my grandkids," he says. Wanna bet that he follows through?

Duncan is a great American because he is a great Tennessean. Healthy patriotism is rooted in the love of the local, of the small, of the particular, be it East Tennessee, West Kansas, or Greenwich Village. Thus Duncan eschews think-tank clichés and offers, in one sentence, the most concise analysis I have ever heard of Al Gore's malady: "None of his four kids went to school one day of their lives in Tennessee." (Adds Duncan: "One thing I'm proud of is all of our four kids have gone to school every day of their lives in Tennessee.")

This kind of regional patriotism, this feeling for one's home state, is so far outside the experience of the Washington neoconservatives as to make a man like Jimmy Duncan seem as foreign to them as, well, minor-league baseball and small farms. But Congressman Duncan's America is still out here. And some of those boys in the minors can hit. ■

*Bill Kauffman's most recent book is Dispatches from the Muckdog Gazette. His Look Homeward, America is due from ISI Books in Spring 2006.*

## What's in a Name?

Fighting Irish, yes. Fighting Sioux, no.

By Steve Sailer

ALTHOUGH SPORTSWRITERS like to present themselves as bluff, call-'em-as-they-see-'em regular guys, they are remarkably prone to forming high-tech lynch mobs when a sports figure violates the reigning norms of political correctness. For example, Fighting Irish football legend Paul Hornung suggested in 2003 that to compete better with less academic colleges, the University of Notre Dame should offer black athletes more affirmative action. A firestorm of journalistic indignation cost Hornung his radio job.

Yet the National Collegiate Athletic Association's recent *diktat* that college "mascots, nicknames or images deemed hostile or abusive in terms of race, ethnicity or national origin" be banned from NCAA tournaments (such as the big money March Madness basketball tourney) was so laughable that many sportswriters dared snipe at it in print.

For example, scribes pointed out that the NCAA's *pronunciamento* only applied to 18 colleges with American Indian team names, such as the Florida State Seminoles. Yet the council of the Florida Seminole tribe had given formal permission to the university in return for scholarships, a Seminole museum on campus, and other benefits.

Some columnists noted that proscribing the team name of the runner-up in the 2005 basketball tournament, the Fighting Illini, could cause problems since the entire University of Illinois's name stemmed from the tribe, not to mention the state itself.

By this logic—such as it is—isn't "Indiana University" inherently offen-

sive? And while I don't exactly know what a "Hoosier" is, it sure sounds like it must be hostile or abusive to somebody.

More than a few sportswriters observed that the most beloved nickname in college sports, the Fighting Irish of Notre Dame, a university so popular that the NCAA had contractually awarded it uniquely favorable treatment in football bowl game bids, is a blatant ethnic stereotype. Indeed, Notre Dame's famed mascot is a hostile and obviously alcohol-abusive leprechaun putting his dukes up. Irish-American comedian George Carlin once observed that he had the feeling Notre Dame had come close to naming its teams the "Drunken, Thick-Skulled, Brawling, Short-D\*\*\*\*\* Irish." Still, Notre Dame's appellation is A-OK with the NCAA.

Nonetheless, from the NCAA's institutional perspective, its ban on Indian team names might actually turn out to be a rather clever bureaucratic ploy.

As *Sports Illustrated's* S.L. Price noted, "Although Native American activists are virtually united in opposition to the use of Indian nicknames and mascots, the Native American population sees the issue far differently." A 2002 poll of 352 Native Americans found that 81 percent approved of college and high-school sports programs using Indian nicknames.

Of course, the NCAA hardly cares what the average American Indian thinks. What plagues the organization are the Native American activists, led by the National Coalition on Racism in Sports and Media, which is a subsidiary of the

old 1970s radical organization, the American Indian Movement.

Although individual universities like Florida State can work out deals with local tribal governments for naming rights, the NCAA is pestered by free-floating ideologues like the NCRSM. I suspect the NCAA leadership thinks it's double-crossing those annoying Indian activists, rendering them irrelevant by abolishing the offending Indian nicknames. As Stalin might have said if he'd been an NCAA functionary, "No mascot, no problem."

The sad fact is that getting rid of Indian team names won't improve the cultural standing of Native Americans, which has been fading since the 1960s.

Protestors often argue, "Think how shocking it would be if some school had been calling its teams the Negroes since, oh, 1911!" It would be surprising if some college had long cheered for, say, the Fighting Fulanis precisely because anti-black racism was once so monolithic. In contrast, whites, on the whole, long held profoundly mixed emotions about American Indians.

## MODERN BOYS SUBJECTED TO **SCHOOLROOM CANT** ASSUME THAT AMERICAN INDIANS MUST HAVE BEEN TOTAL WIMPS AND GO BACK TO LISTENING TO 50 CENT.

The more conservative politicians, such as King George III's ministers before the Revolution and the Federalist Chief Justice John Marshall in the 1830s, somewhat sympathized with the Indians against the settlers. The more democratic politicians, though, such as Andy Jackson, who waged the first two Seminole Wars, wanted to give the common man what he desired: the Indians' land. Yet even white settlers were alternately outraged and impressed by how bravely the Indians resisted their onslaught.

While "one drop of black blood" made a part-white-part-black person subject

to enslavement or later Jim Crow, millions of Americans boasted of Indian ancestors, such as Herbert Hoover's vice president, Charles Curtis, who spoke the native Kansa language before learning English.

After the Boy Scouts of America began in 1910, Indian Lore quickly became one of the most popular merit badges, and the most dedicated boys were rewarded by membership in the Scouts' honor society, the Indian-themed Order of the Arrow.

Of course, back then whites admired Native Americans for virtues that are now suspect: manliness, ferocity, bravery, stoicism, self-sacrifice, taciturnity, and dignity. The feminist and civil-rights revolutions introduced new social ideals that made Oprah Winfrey—emotional, glib, self-absorbed, and shameless—the prototypical modern American. In this new cultural environment, where Bill Clinton promised to "feel your pain," American Indians, whose elders taught them to try not to feel even their own pain, grew increasingly irrelevant. The role models of today's American youth

are rappers, who embody the verbosity and braggadocio that Indians abhorred.

Since we pay so little attention to the real merits of Indians anymore, it's been easy for us to invent fantasies depicting them as fashionable Noble Savages. Schools try to propagandize kids into believing that Indians were ecologists and, hilariously, feminists. (Tellingly, the secretary-treasurer of the activist NCRSM is Anita Hill of the Clarence Thomas confirmation brouhaha.)

For true believers in the new conventional wisdom about Indians, nicknames like the University of North Dakota's

"Fighting Sioux" sound like racist stereotypes. Who could imagine a Sioux ever doing something so patriarchal and dead-white-European-male-ish as fighting? Well, Crazy Horse and George Armstrong Custer could.

Not surprisingly, modern boys subjected to schoolroom cant assume that American Indians must have been total wimps and go back to listening to 50 Cent rap about how many millions he's making. Thus, in at least a small way, the linkage of Indians with widely idolized sports teams helps preserve the otherwise evaporating glamour of Native Americans.

One way to mobilize the elected leadership of the Indian nations against the NCRSM radicals would be for Congress to assign the intellectual property rights in tribe names to formally recognized Indian tribes such as the Seminoles. It's reasonable for them to profit from the valuable reputation their ancestors earned through their bravery and fierceness.

A grandfather clause for existing trade names like the Florida State Seminoles or the Jeep Grand Cherokee could apply for, say, a decade. After that, marketers would have to negotiate royalty payments with the tribe's council. Indian nations could deny their trademarks to sleazy operators. Conversely, to attract desirable licensees, some tribes would no doubt hire talented PR firms to promote and polish their forefathers' images. This would enhance awareness of America's ancient Indian heritage, whereas the NCAA's ban threatens to stuff it further down the memory hole.

Best of all, this reform would defuse racially divisive political controversies by turning them into simple business propositions. ■

*Steve Sailer is TAC's film critic and the Monday morning columnist for VDARE.com.*

# Beyond Abortion

Pro-lifers branch out to poverty, health care—and war.

By W. James Antle III

OPPONENTS OF ABORTION have grown accustomed to ridicule from the other side. While placard-sized taunts like “get your rosaries off my ovaries” are easy to dismiss, Congressman Barney Frank’s famous quip that antiabortion activists “believe life begins at conception and ends at birth” stings. Charges of indifference to life outside the womb have helped force a debate on what it truly means to be pro-life.

Pro-lifers often face hostile questions about the depth of their commitment to the unborn children they wish to protect from abortion. Do they favor free prenatal care? Do they support using their tax dollars to provide health insurance for mother and child? A similar litany of questions comes up when discussing opposition to euthanasia at the other end of life. Who is going to care for all these sick old people—the National Right to Life Committee?

The interrogation inevitably turns to the movement’s alliance with proponents of low taxes and limited government on the Right. Syndicated columnist Mark Shields, a pro-life liberal, complained to *U.S. Catholic* magazine, “We’ve got people who are against abortions, but, given a choice between funding Women and Infant Care (WIC) and cutting taxes, would choose to cut taxes.”

Some pro-lifers have concluded that the best answer is to get new allies. The case against abortion and euthanasia rests on certain premises about the intrinsic value of the human person that are applicable to other issues as well. Those engaged in rethinking the right-

to-life label range from antiabortion liberals to neoconservatives making a pro-life case for war.

Thus, Mark Noll and Carolyn Nystrom, writing in *Books and Culture* (essentially an evangelical *New York Review of Books*), concede “pro-life is often shorthand for a stand against abortion” but contend that “thoughtful pro-life Christians (both evangelical and Catholic) also advocate care for the aging, medical care for the poor, adequate housing for all, and compassionate standards for immigration.” The group Consistent Life lists poverty and racism as pillar concerns alongside abortion, advocating “a coherent social policy which seeks to protect the rights of the weakest and most vulnerable in our society, the unborn, the infirm, the refugee, the homeless, and the poor.”

Immigration, housing, and health care aren’t issues usually associated with the conventional Left-Right abortion debate, but some see them as cutting-edge topics for a new pro-life movement shorn of its conservative image. Feminists for Life—an organization in the news lately because Supreme Court nominee John Roberts’s wife has been an advisor—promotes the idea that women’s equality and public compassion are necessary to move the debate beyond “making abortion illegal to making it unthinkable.”

Many pro-lifers who seek to expand their focus beyond abortion subscribe to what is called the “consistent life ethic,” which folds antiabortion views into a larger context of nonviolence, espousing “social justice” and opposi-

tion to most wars. Its adherents include columnist Nat Hentoff, actor Martin Sheen, and the Dalai Lama.

The late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin in 1983 began arguing that opposition to war, capital punishment, euthanasia, and abortion fit together in a “seamless garment” of pro-life issues. The seamless garment concept was popular with Catholic and Protestant thinkers who mixed theological conservatism with political liberalism but has not gained universal acceptance within the pro-life movement. One of the rare politicians who championed the idea was the late Pennsylvania Gov. Robert Casey, an economically progressive Democrat who argued that protection for the unborn was consistent with the “widening circle of democracy” that extended rights to the poor, women, and racial minorities. Some more socially liberal seamless-garment exponents would include gay rights in this list.

As a practical matter, it is easy to see how such views would drive a wedge between pro-lifers and their conservative allies. Critics of the seamless garment ideal argue that it gives liberal Democrats a pass on abortion by elevating other issues. Therefore, the argument goes, pro-life Catholics would still feel justified in voting for pro-choice Ted Kennedy because of his opposition to the Iraq War and the death penalty.

Perhaps the most audacious and improbable attempt to re-brand the pro-life movement was undertaken by Joseph Bottum in *First Things*, the high-brow religious-conservative journal of which he is now editor. Bottum inverted