

[< Back](#) | [Home](#)

Letters to the Editor

Posted: 2/6/06

Proud Michigamua member responds to group's critics

To the Daily:

As a proud member of the Michigamua tribe of 1951, I found the viewpoint *Michigamua has troubled past* (02/02/2006) inaccurate and narrow. One example was the reference to the term "squaw." The article indicated the word was abrasive, not spoken aloud in many native communities and referred to female genitalia.

Searching the Internet, I found the following definition repeated in different terms as supportive of my criticism. The comment at www.tomjonas.com/squawpeak/squaw.htm is: "'Squaw' has a perfectly acceptable definition: it means 'woman,' or 'wife' in the Algonquian language where it originated. The radical American Indian Movement has fairly successfully attached a false meaning to the word and spread the lie nationwide."

I also noted the term "squaw" is unknown in the languages of Native Americans of the southwest United States. There was no founded reference to indicate it referred to "female genitalia." I compliment the facts so well stated in the viewpoint of the Michigamua Class of 2006 (*Looking to the future by learning from the past*, 02/02/2006).

Especially note that the occupiers in the 2000 break-in removed articles that were deep in storage since 1989 to display for a false image to manipulate public opinion.

Charles "Buffalo Calves" Murray
Alum

Daily's portrayal of former VP of NAACP inaccurate

To the Daily:

Upon hearing of the resignation of the former vice president of the NAACP, Alex Moffett, I was somewhat disappointed upon the resignation for various reasons, yet I accepted this movement as a personal decision made by the former vice president and not by pressure from outside forces.

What really grabbed my attention, however, was how the Daily portrayed Moffett's character (*Amid Controversy, NAACP VP resigns*, 01/30/2006), presumably without any type of contact with Moffett beforehand. The manner in which Moffett was portrayed, especially in regards to her affiliation with the NAACP, seemed unjustly biased; the Daily failed to highlight any of the positive actions Moffett took during her stint as vice president.

Is it safe to say and assume that the author of the article had no previous knowledge of Moffett other than what was posted on a private website? Is it safe to say that assumptions were made based upon hearsay and a few events that took place? Why didn't the Daily mention any positive facts about

Moffett? I believe that the Daily clearly allowed an inaccurate portrayal of a campus political figure to be published in its pages, wrongfully tarnishing someone's public image. If there has ever been any point where the Daily has lost its credibility and respectability as a newspaper, it is now.

Erika Purcell-Williams

LSA junior

© Copyright 2006 Michigan Daily