

# Editorial and Opinion Page

## Editorially Speaking

# The Question for Mike McIntyre: What Business have you got in our Business???

Congressional Candidate Mike McIntyre has confirmed, in print, what we said last week. He knows nothing about Lumbees. In the October 21 issue of the *News and Observer* (Raleigh), it says: "McIntyre said he has always supported Lumbee recognition, but can't support the bill Rose introduced because it lists LRDA as the governing body. A second entity, the Lumbee Tribal Council, is challenging LRDA in court for the right to govern the Lumbee tribe."

And then Mike said: "Once that conflict is resolved I'll introduce a Lumbee recognition bill."

On Sunday, in the same newspaper Mike is given credit for this: "McIntyre said that if elected, he will introduce a bill for Lumbee recognition. But first, he said, the tribe must achieve unity within its own ranks."

Come on, Mike, either you have always supported recognition, or you will support it when we Lumbees all think and act the way you think we should.

Our recognition has nothing to do with internal affairs, Indian business, or who the government is. The issue of recognition for us is a matter of what is morally right. You introduce a recognition bill or support the one already in the House, if you're elected, because it is the right thing to do. If you know anything about Indian business, you would know that even when we are federally recognized, some of us will remain Baptist, some will remain Methodists, and some of us will continue in the traditional way. We editorially ask you, Mike, what business have you got in our business?

We believe that you have always supported recognition. You come from a county with a long history of whites who recognize Lumbees as Indians. We have been discriminated against because of it. We have sharecropped the farm land because of it. Yes! Mike you have, in our opinion, always recognized us as Indians. Now, it seems you want to tell us how we are to behave. We ask you again: what business have you got in our business?

If you were more informed about the Lumbee tribe, although you're only

ten miles from Pembroke, you would know that in 1984 the Lumbee people, by referendum, voted to allow LRDA to serve as interim government for the purposes of federal recognition. In 1992, Mike, we the Lumbee people, voted again on our own constitution to govern ourselves. I don't recall, Mike, that you voted either on the 1984 referendum or on the 1992 Constitution. Why? Could it be that it was none of your business? What has changed. Our "internal affairs" were none of your business then. And it remains none of your business. Do you believe in democracy, Mike? Or do you presume to take it upon yourself to decide what is best for us? Our advise to you is this. Continue to campaign and if federal recognition is the right thing to support, then do it for the right reason. And if you are not going to support it, assuming you're elected, then be courageous enough to say so. Don't play games with us. And don't insult our intelligence. The conflict between LRDA and the tribal council is a matter in the courts. Let the court decide. That's the democratic way. You are an attorney. You should know that when an issue is in court, it should be decided in the courts. After the courts have decided. We will still disagree on some issues. That is our right and none of your business. When it comes to our government, let us decide. That's the democratic way. And that issue also is none of your business.

Unity in the ranks, you say? When did you become an expert at unifying? Was the Democratic party unified when you attacked Rose Marie Lowry-Townsend in the primary? Are you whites unified? Do you all believe the same things? Have the same philosophy? Do you all have the same mind set on all issues? We are not a herd of sheep. We do not all move in the same direction. There are over 40,000 of us. That means that we have over 40,000 minds. We think individually, as you all do. Unity? Shall we all drive Fords? Shall we all attend the same church? Belong to the same social clubs? The same political party? Exactly what do you mean by unity in the ranks? Unity of Indians, Mike, is a figment of the white man's imagination. It is an excuse

you all use to avoid doing what you know is right. Federal recognition, again, is a distinct and separate issue from any "internal conflicts" in the tribe. Unity, you say? Unify your own people, your own political party and then talk to us about unity. Let us assure you, we are unified. We all recognize a "cop-out" no matter how well disguised you think it is.

Our recognition is a matter of principle...Be honest about it. Support it or don't support it. But don't hide behind a smoke screen of unity in the tribe. We won't buy that or be fooled by your lame excuses. We are convinced that if federal recognition meant placing us on a reservation whereby we could be "fenced in" and kept in our proper places (as you perceive that place to be), you would wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support that, no matter how much conflict in the tribe you thought there was. We believe that any progress we make as a tribe makes you and some of your associates nervous.... We believe that true unity of Indians at the polling places, which you've seen before, scares the bejabbers out of you. Perhaps that is why you did not call Lowry-Townsend and ask for her support. Maybe you assumed, as one of your associates has been rumored to say, that the "Indians will vote the right way." You are correct in that assumption. Some of us will vote right. Some of us will vote against you!

We suggest that you attend to YOUR business and we will handle ours? After all, we have survived for over five hundred years in spite of people of your mentality who insist that we be the kind of Indians you want us to be. There's one thing you could have learned from Charlie Rose since your desire to replace him in Congress. He introduced the Lumbee Bill over and over again because, apparently, he felt that it was long overdue; and he kept his nose out of the affairs of the tribe. Or perhaps it was a good political football to ensure that he kept the Indian vote. Nevertheless, he knew that our government was our decision. When the time comes, we will decide. Until that time, again we ask you: what business have you got in our business?

## The Way I See It

by Dr. Dean Chavers, President  
Native American Scholarship Fund  
Albuquerque, NM



(c) copyright, 1996  
**INDIAN COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS ARE INFLATED**  
There are more untruths, half-truths, misstatements of fact, and misunderstandings about Indian college enrollments than anything else except about Indian gaming, I think. (Let's talk about gaming next month.) These lies and distortions hurt. They hurt in both direct and indirect ways. One example: In 1981, as a Member of the Advisory Panel on Minority Concerns of The College Board, I was the only person of 18 to vote against release of racial and ethnic data of SAT test takers to the public.  
My reason: I knew release of this information would hurt Indian people. There are too many Wannabes. That is, too many non-Indian people want to be Indians, and pretend they are Indians, distorting data collection by the colleges, the U.S. Census, and other agencies.  
Sure enough, two years later the "Los Angeles Times" reported (12/19/83) that "Only Asian students and Native Americans attend college at rates greater than their numbers in the general population. Native Americans represent 0.6% of the nation's population and 0.7% of higher-education enrollment..."  
Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is, Native people have always been under represented in the colleges of California. The data which includes anyone claiming to be Indian greatly distort the "facts."  
We learned that the Financial Aid proposal for Cal State Hayward, where I was teaching in 1974, had

reported there were 153 Indians on the campus. At the next meeting with students, we made up a list of all the ones we knew; it came to 13. Thus the Financial Aid proposal was 1176% too high!  
When The College Board got its first report of the ethnic data in 1982 or 1983, I played "I told you so" with George Hanford, the President. I greatly admire George, for a variety of reasons. But I still disagree with him and the Panel for releasing the Indian data.  
When I looked at the tables, showing breakdowns of Indian students, they were alarming. The 1980 Census showed that Indian families had made \$12,000 on the average. The ethnic data showed them with \$23,000.  
The data also reported that most of the alleged Indians taking the SAT were located in Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and other nearby states. Since Indians have almost been wiped out of these states, I told George and the Panel "These are some funny Indians. They make twice as much money as real Indians. And they live in places where it is hard to find an Indian."  
Then, four years ago, in 1992, the New York Times reported, using similar wrong "data" from the U.S. Department of Education, that "about 103,000 Indians were enrolled in college in 1990..." The truth is that only about 55,000 Indians were enrolled in college. The rest of the 103,000 were wannabes.  
So the results are insidious and indirect. The results seem to indicate that Indians are over represented in college enrollments. In fact, Indians

are under represented in college enrollments.  
Only 17% of Indian high school graduates are going on to college, according to BIA figures, totals from tribes, and totals from other sources. The BIA figures are more accurate than the Census or Education figures, because the BIA only counts people who are one-quarter or more Indian, and enrolled in a tribe.  
To take another example: About the same time we were compiling the numbers for call State Hayward, Wanda Doty and Carter Blue Clark were doing the same thing for Cal State Long Beach. The Financial Aid proposal at CSLB had stated that 470 Indian students were enrolled on that campus.  
When Wanda and Carter finished their census, they found only 70 students. Thus the Financial Aid numbers were 671% too high!  
In 1979, I cross-checked the numbers for a variety of colleges with the data reported in the "Chronicle of Higher Education". I found that the data reported by the colleges through the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) were on the average 100% too high.  
The way I cross checked them was to contact the Indian faculty persons on a couple of dozen campuses to get their total Indian student enrollments, then compare their totals with the totals in the "Chronicle". The range of inflation was from 25% to 300%. The overall inflation factor was almost exactly 100%.  
Alexander Astin in a book a few years later on minorities in higher education reported that the inflation factor overestimating the numbers of Indian college students was about

33% too high. I had alerted Sandy a few years earlier. He apparently did not want to believe the full extent of the inflation.  
I invite anyone who doubts the accuracy of what I did to repeat it, or to use any other method they choose. They will find that Indian college enrollment figures as reported by federal and state governments are way too high.  
What none of the reports so far indicate either is that the dropout rate for Indian college students is over 80%. We have data at the Native American Scholarship Fund from 22 college and university programs showing dropout rates. They range from a high of 93% for one college with a huge Indian enrollment to a low of 12% for one of the Ivy Leagues.  
Only four of the 22 have dropout rates below 50%, and at least two of these have small enrollment totals. The 11 with the highest rates, ranging from 1,000 to 1,500 Indian students per year. Their overall dropout rate is 81%.  
The seven colleges with rates between 50% and 68% have moderate-sized total enrollments. Thus it appears that the colleges with the largest Indian enrollments have the highest dropout rates.  
If we look at the two figures in terms of production of graduates, it is clear that Indians are never going to catch up to the general population in terms of college graduates. In the U.S., 80% of students finish high school, 40% go on to college, and 54% of them graduate in six years. Thus 17.3% of them are earning college degrees.  
For Indians, only 50% finish high school, 17% go on to college, and only 19% of them graduate. Thus only 1.6% of Indians are earning college degrees. The discrepancy is huge. Non-Indians are earning 10.8 degrees for every Indian who earns a degree.  
At this rate, Indians will continue to be under represented in the profes-

sions, in education, in the sciences, and in all other fields forever. We will have non-Indians running our schools, our roads, our courts, our social services, our hospitals, our colleges, our casinos, and our businesses forever.  
It is this reason that I have decided to devote my life to promoting the highest quality education for Indian students. We have to develop systems to get students ready for college, and systems at the colleges to retain them once they are enrolled.  
More and more people in Indian Country are starting to realize this reality. Unfortunately, not enough of them are moving fast enough to upgrade their high schools, their scholarship programs, their internships, and the other systems which impact on college enrollment and graduation.

tems to get students ready for college, and systems at the colleges to retain them once they are enrolled.  
More and more people in Indian Country are starting to realize this reality. Unfortunately, not enough of them are moving fast enough to upgrade their high schools, their scholarship programs, their internships, and the other systems which impact on college enrollment and graduation.

**The Democratic Party in Robeson County, especially, has proven time and time again that it is the party of oppression.**  
**Let's Create History**  
**November 5th**  
**VOTE FOR**  
**BILL CASTER,**  
**Republican Candidate for the Seventh Congressional District**  
*Paid for by Rev. James D. Dial*

**"HAPPY HEARTS" OF**  
**ROBESON, HOKE, AND SCOTLAND COUNTIES--DISTRICT 87**  
**WELCOME "ALL PEOPLE" TO A**  
**"GOSPEL-THANKSGIVING CELEBRATION"**  
**FOR**  
**THE HONORABLE FRANCES MCARTHUR CUMMINGS**  
**SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1996 -- 3:00 P.M.**  
**W. H. KNUCKLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CAFETERIA**  
**1520 SOUTH MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DRIVE**  
**LUMBERTON, NORTH CAROLINA**

**MCKEITHAN JONES -- ROWLAND, NC**  
**ALFRED DIAL -- PEMBROKE, NC**

**SPONSORED BY**

**ADMISSION AND DELICIOUS REFRESHMENTS ARE "FREE"**  
**FREE FINANCIAL HEAVENLY BLESSINGS--**  
**(\$200; \$150; \$50 PLUS OTHER GIFTS)**

**Thinking About Car Loans Lately?**

**Give Some Thought To This ...**  
**New Car Loans 7.75%**

Our 36 month new car loan from 7.75% puts you in the drivers seat. You'll find our hassle free service a pleasant alternative to the haggling that goes on in the dealer showroom. And think of negotiating power you'll have when you have money in hand.

With your loan pre-approved, you can really wheel and deal when you find the car of your dreams. So stop in today and ask how our new car loans can put you in touch with the car of your dreams.

**In Touch with You**

**LUMBEE GUARANTY BANK**

PEMBROKE • LUMBERTON • ST. PAULS  
HOKE MILLS • MAXTON • ROWLAND • RED SPRINGS

MEMBER FDIC

\* Rates based on automatic draft from Lumbee Guaranty Bank checking accounts. Other rates start at 8%.