Vice President Dick Cheney paid a rare return visit to his hometown of Lincoln last month, but the purpose was anything but social. In town on purely partisan business, the Vice President was the 'guest of honor' at a June 18 $250-a-plate breakfast fundraiser for Republican congressional candidate Jeff Fortenberry. By the time Air Force Two had whisked him in and out of Lincoln for this money pitch, the Fortenberry campaign was $150,000 richer and the City of Lincoln $30,000 poorer (from the added security costs). As one astonished reporter noted after Cheney had come and gone, “He didn’t even try to meet the mayor.” But then, she’s a Democrat.

Not one to pass up such an opportunity, Nebraskans for Peace took the occasion of this partisan Republican visit (you could get your picture taken with the Vice President for another $2,000) to publicly detail the case for his impeachment. At a rally by the statue of the Republican namesake of our capital city, “Honest Abe” Lincoln, we cited Cheney’s pattern of deceit regarding the war in Iraq, his suspect business dealings with Halliburton, and his stonewalling of Congress over the fossil fuel and nuclear industries’ influence on our national energy policy.

The state Republican Party wasted no time lashing out at our “gimmickry” about impeachment, commenting that Nebraskans for Peace had “a history of distasteful and bizarre behavior.” But as Creighton University Law School Professor Michael Kelly stated in his remarks at the rally (the text of which is reprinted on page 3), the international legal arguments for impeaching Cheney are not only sound, but absolutely compelling.

Two weeks after Cheney’s visit to Lincoln, his crass retort to Sen. Patrick Leahy on the floor of the U.S. Senate was all over the news. He was roundly criticized for his incivility, his poor judgment and his lack of contrition (“expressed myself rather forcefully, felt better after I had done it” was the Vice President’s official response).

But it’s not his crassness that should be the issue; it’s his criminality. Thousands of people are unnecessarily dead, America’s reputation is in shreds and the terrorist threat is now greater than ever because of this man’s rash actions.

If ever an elected official was deserving of impeachment, it’s Dick Cheney. Rather than a ‘favorite son’ or ‘local hero,’ Dick Cheney is a ‘notorious native’. Who better, then, than people from his own home state to raise the call for his impeachment, before the man has a chance to do any more damage.

Will anyone hold this man accountable?
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Wall of Remembrance

For Our Fallen Soldiers in Iraq

This is the introductory plaque on the first section of the wall.

By this wall we remember and honor our soldiers who lost their lives in Iraq.

On March 21, 2003, the first day of invasion, six young Marines lost their lives.

We do not know when the last life will be lost nor who that person will be.

We believe the deaths of these young men and women need to be acknowledged and mourned, not just by their loved ones but by our entire community and nation.

The Wall of Remembrance is our way of doing this in a quiet and respectful manner.

The Central Nebraska Peace Workers proposed the idea of a Wall of Remembrance last winter to commemorate the first anniversary of the invasion of Iraq. Designed and constructed by Roy and Caryl Guisinger, members from Belgrade, Nebraska, it was completed in time for the day of international protest, March 20. Since then, The Wall has been displayed at the City Hall in Grand Island, the Peace & Justice Expo in Omaha and at the Adams County Courthouse. It is currently on display at the Howard County Courthouse through July 27.

Although the original intent was both to remember and protest the deaths of our soldiers, as the process unfolded, it seemed a more effective expression to simply hold them in memory. The numbers of dead alone, in and of themselves, provide a graphic awareness of the costs of war. The first showing had five double-hinged sections with introductions and up to 175 fallen soldiers on each section. This has expanded, sadly, to six sections because of the continuing loss of lives in Iraq. Each individual profile contains the soldier’s picture, name, age, hometown, date, place, and circumstances of death. Soldiers from the United States and all other coalition nations are shown. These include, of course, the 13 from Nebraska.

The Grand Island Independent and the Hastings Tribune have printed sympathetic commentary about the Wall.

Comments from the Independent included, “Their names and faces are silent reminders of the hundreds of coalition forces servicemen and women who have been killed in Iraq since the beginning of the war.” And from the Tribune: “The profiles of more than 800 men and women who have lost their lives in Iraq make up a sobering display at the Adams County Courthouse.”

For more information, including interest in hosting the Wall, contact Caryl Guisinger at caryl@designinsight.net or call 308-358-0400.
Impeachment on the Basis of International Law

Remarks Delivered at the ‘Impeach Cheney’ Rally June 9, 2004
by Associate Professor Michael Kelly, Creighton University Law School


I need to begin my remarks by stating that they are my own, not those of Creighton Law School nor of Nebraskans for Peace—but I hope that Mark [Vasina, NFP President] jumps up here after I’m finished to endorse them nevertheless.

So, what brings an otherwise centrist Democrat law professor from Omaha to a left-wing peace rally in Lincoln? Well, I’m angry. Angry at the direction the government is taking this country. Angry at the way the Bush Administration is mishandling the nation’s response to 9/11. And angry about all the bad policies it has undertaken that undermine what America is about.

Ninety percent of those bad policies, be they environmental, economic or foreign, are embodied by one man—Dick Cheney. For he is the grand architect. In the world of Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes, he would be the criminal mastermind, Moriarity.

Your organization is rallying today to impeach Vice President Cheney. Denying him re-election is the quicker way to get him out of office; and you know that if a sitting Republican administration has to send its V.P. out to shore up support in Nebraska, then it’s in trouble. I honestly don’t think we’ll have to endure another four years of the Bush/Cheney machine. However, since we’re talking about impeachable offenses today that others have drawn up, I will add some that reflect my own area of expertise: International Law.

I’ll first discuss the general picture, at least as it pertains to the situation in Iraq, and then get to some specific violations.

The Bush/Cheney Administration has consistently signaled for three-and-a-half years that international law does not matter. The American military and civilian personnel at Abu Ghraib prison in Baghdad apparently received that signal loud and clear. Not only did they fail to follow the requirements of the Geneva Convention on Treatment of P.O.W.s, but, according to the Red Cross, no copies of the treaty were to be found on site.

The list of high-profile treaties broken or withdrawn by this government is a long one that includes denunciation of the Rome Statute creating the International Criminal Court, pulling out of the Kyoto Protocol to diminish ozone-depleting gases, and unilateral withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty over initial Russian objections. An overwhelming majority of nations condemned each of these moves as irresponsible and self-serving, but Washington paid little heed—steadfastly pursuing short-term political gains instead of America’s long-term global interests. International law was undermined and flouted.

When the invasion of Iraq became a front-burner issue, the world imploded Bush & Cheney not to do it, threatening everything from vetoes in the U.N. to political retribution. America again disregarded the objections and went forward. The Security Council was subverted in the process and a crazy pre-World War II theory of justified preemptive strikes was resurrected. Again international law was cast aside.

When questions arose as to whether Geneva Convention protections would be extended to those captured in Afghanistan, President Bush, encouraged by Rumsfeld and Cheney, dismissed the landmark 55-year-old treaty regime as a series of “legalisms” he would consider in making his decision.

This unapologetic pattern of discounting the importance of international law helped create an environment where it could easily be disregarded by those who were supposed to follow it. That subtle message is especially potent when coupled with the specific message to extract all information possible out of detainees to help further the War on Terrorism.

How can the privates and sergeants on the ground at Abu Ghraib be faulted for following the lead of their commander-in-chief? They can be faulted because they should be regarded as rational, thinking human beings—the same as those they tortured. The fact that international law was simply disregarded made the process easier, but no more excusable.

I believe that America has begun to reap the whirlwind of the Bush/Cheney policy—line of ignoring international law, with the lowest regard by foreign nations in decades and diminished standing worldwide. The abuses at Abu Ghraib are a particularly ugly gust in that whirlwind returning to Washington.

With regard to specific violations of international law, it must be remembered that Article VI of the U.S. Constitution makes international law, which includes the U.N. Charter, “Supreme Law of the Land” on a par with federal statutes. Thus, violations of international law sometimes constitute prosecutable violations of U.S. law.

Violations undertaken in Iraq include waging a war of aggression in contravention of the U.N. Charter, condoning direct military attacks on civilians and civilian installations, failing to protect cultural and religious facilities, and authorizing mass detentions of fighting-age males without charges and without P.O.W. protections.

First, on the illegal nature of this war, it must be remembered that Article 2 (4) prohibits use of force without the permission of the Security Council; the sole exception to this rule we drafted and agreed to is Article 51’s self-defense provision, which allows countries to use force in self-defense to repel an armed attack.

However, the Bush/Cheney team needed a legal fallback position to invade Iraq when it became clear that permission from the Security Council would not be forthcoming. Thus, they resurrected this pre-1945 doctrine, claiming that the wording “inherent right of self defense” in Article 51 meant that all the old laws of war in this area were preserved and bootstrapped into the Charter.

But they weren’t even honest about doing that. The original anticipatory self-defense doctrine, what we call the preemptive strike doctrine, required the state undertaking the action show that it was directly in response to an immediate and imminent threat. Realizing that use of this doctrine intact still wouldn’t help them, they changed it.

In the Administration’s 2002 National Security Strategy, President Bush and V.P. Cheney stripped the doctrine of this breaking mechanism and replaced it with a much lower threshold showing of only an “emerging threat.” Thus, even this old long-disused doctrine had to be altered to allow for an unprovoked invasion of Iraq.

But perhaps the most appalling violation of international law we’ve seen is the abuse of Iraqi prisoners that I’ve already referred to. I’d like to describe to you how the responsibility for those abuses travels backwards up the chain of command.

Torturing and humiliating prisoners constitutes grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions—both the P.O.W. treaty and the treaty protecting civilians. Numerous other human rights treaties, like that prohibiting torture, were also broken in the process as well.
What Impeachment Is
(and isn’t)

by Tom Cook

A professor of Criminal Justice at Wayne State College, Tom Cook provided this ‘primer’ on impeachment at the June 9 “Impeach Cheney” rally.

The concept of impeachment is one of our most ancient legacies from the British Common Law. In the aftermath of the Magna Carta, the British Barons claimed the right to impeach the king’s personal advisors and high-ranking appointees. Ultimately, this evolved into a two-part procedure whereby the House of Commons delivered the indictment and the House of Lords served as the trial court. Impeachments were especially important in the 17th Century when the Stuart monarchs claimed the divine right to do exactly as they pleased.

The founders of our country wisely modeled the two-part American impeachment procedure on the traditions of their mother country, with the House of Representatives serving as a kind of grand jury for drawing up the indictment and the Senate serving as a trial court. Although there have been no British impeachments since 1805, the concept is alive and well in the U.S. Under American constitutional law, the president, the vice president, the cabinet, the federal judiciary and a considerable variety of other officials are all subject to impeachment. Senators and representatives are not, because the Congress has other mechanisms for the censure and/or expulsion of its members. Most of the states also have impeachment clauses in their state constitutions and allow for the recall of some elected officials, such as governors. Over the years, there have been more than 60 impeachment inquiries conducted by the House of Representatives, but there have been only 14 actual impeachment trials in the Senate. Seven of these have resulted in convictions and removals from office, including the successful impeachments of three federal judges in the 1980s.

Because they are not subject to recall, re-election requirements or term limits, federal judges have been the main targets of impeachments over the years. Of course, everyone remembers the impeachment of President Clinton less than six years ago. Thus far in our history, two presidents have been impeached (neither of which was convicted) and one resigned under imminent threat of impeachment. No vice president has ever been impeached. But no vice president has ever been quite so powerful, or abused the power of this office quite so flagrantly, as our current vice president.

The permissible grounds for impeachment include treason, bribery and “high crimes or misdemeanors.” The latter are not specifically defined in the Constitution and are thus left largely to the discretion of the House of Representatives. From previous impeachments it is evident that they do not have to be indictable criminal offenses, so gross abuse of power is clearly somewhere among them. The writings of the nation’s founders, such as Madison and Hamilton in the Federalist Papers, indicate that they would heartily agree.

I will leave it to others to spell out the details of why our current vice president should be impeached. But if President Clinton can be impeached for lying about sex, clearly his successors can be impeached for lying about their reasons for preemptively attacking another sovereign nation, which was not directly threatening either our country or our allies, and unnecessarily expending hundreds of American lives, hundreds of billions of American dollars and much of the remaining credibility in the court of world opinion in the process, while simultaneously enriching some of their corporate cronies with sweetheart contracts and insider deals at taxpayers’ expense. The current vice president shares the responsibility for these offenses with the president, the secretary of defense and a variety of others who are equally eligible for impeachment.

Let me conclude by simply describing how the federal impeachment process works if a president or vice president is charged. First, the House Judiciary Committee conducts a preliminary inquiry. Then, the full House conducts a broader inquiry. Either or both can hold hearings if they wish. The Judiciary Committee draws up the articles of impeachment, and each article that goes forward to the Senate must be endorsed by a majority of the full House. The trial in the Senate is presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Each article must get a two-thirds majority to sustain a conviction on that article. If any articles achieve this goal, a conviction occurs. Then, by a simple majority, the Senate decides for each successful charge whether removal from office is the only penalty, or whether disqualification from future federal office also occurs.

Impeachment is merely the process of bringing the case for an official’s removal and/or disqualification to trial. It does not presume a conviction. But if a conviction, removal and/or disqualification should occur, this does not preclude future criminal prosecution, with much more than one’s job in jeopardy and without the power of high position or the convenient shields of executive privilege and alleged national security to protect the defendant. When the offenses are as grave as the ones we are facing today, perhaps that is the goal we should eventually seek.

Having fought a War of Independence to squelch the “divine right of kings,” we should be equally vigilant against the divine right of presidential administrations. In this case, impeachment may be viewed as a patriotic duty.

Contacting Politicians

The White House
Washington, DC 20500
Comment Line: 202-456-1111
202-456-1414
202-456-2993 (FAX)
president@whitehouse.gov

Sen. Chuck Hagel
346 Russell Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20510
202-224-4224
202-224-5213 (FAX)
402-476-1400 (Lincoln)
402-758-8981 (Omaha)
308-632-6032 (Scottsbluff)
hagel.senate.gov/email/contact.html

Sen. Ben Nelson
720 Hart Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510
202-224-6551
202-228-0012 (FAX)
402-391-3411 (Omaha)
402-441-4600 (Lincoln)
bennelson.senate.gov/email.html

Rep. Doug Bereuter
1st Congressional District
2184 Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-4806
202-225-5866 (FAX)
402-436-1598 (Lincoln)
www.house.gov/bereuter

Rep. Lee Terry
1524 Longworth HOB
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-4155
202-226-5452 (FAX)
402-397-9944 (Omaha)
leeterry.house.gov/contact.asp

Rep. Tom Osborne
507 Cannon HOB
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-6435
202-226-1385 (FAX)
308-381-5555 (Grand Island)
www.house.gov/writerep/

Capitol Hill Switchboard
202-224-3121

State Capitol Switchboard
402-471-2311

State Senator, District #
State Capitol
PO Box 94604
Lincoln, NE 68509-4604

Governor Mike Johanns
PO Box 94848
Lincoln, NE 68509-4848
402-471-2244
402-471-6031 (FAX)
mjohanns@notes.state.ne.us
**Impeachment on the Basis of International Law**

According to the doctrine of “Superior Orders,” the underlings that carried out the physical abuses cannot claim that they were merely following orders and thereby escape liability for what they did.

Likewise, under the doctrine of “Command Responsibility,” the superiors that authorized such treatment cannot escape liability for what they either authorized or allowed to happen if they reasonably knew it was happening.

These very principles are those that emerged from the Nuremberg and Tokyo Trials after World War II. They were used by American prosecutors to try political and military leaders and ascribe criminal liability to them. They are being used now at the international criminal tribunals for Yugoslavia and Rwanda to try the leaders in those countries for crimes against humanity and war crimes. So surely, they apply to what we have done here.

Mr. Cheney, Mr. Bush and Mr. Rumsfeld at most authorized the illegal treatment of Iraqi prisoners in order to extract information or at least knew or had reason to know it was happening—either way, they become liable for what occurred. They have said time and again that the priority with regard to those detained in the “War on Terror” should be the extraction of information, and legal memos now emerging from the Justice Department and White House Counsel’s office confirm that Geneva Convention protections should be given a back seat to that priority.

In fact, the New York Times reported yesterday that Vice President Cheney’s own counsel, David Addington, was involved in the deliberations which produced that legal determination in the case of al-Qaida detainees at Guantanamo Bay over the sole objections of the State Department Counsel, William H. Taft IV, who warned that such a position would undermine our ability to demand that American prisoners be treated according to Geneva protections.

These memoranda constitute the legal equivalent of an evidentiary “smoking gun.” They literally justify abusive interrogation techniques as proper exercises of presidential power under his commander-in-chief authority during wartime and as necessary to avoid further harm to the U.S., and they demonstrate that those in the highest levels of government, like Mr. Cheney, knew what was going on.

Interestingly, the memo that was drafted with regard to abuses at Guantanamo Bay argues that the domestic Anti-Torture Statute does not apply to abuses carried out there because the statute’s provisions only proscribe such abuses carried out “overseas” and the base at Guantanamo is under American legal jurisdiction.

That position is diametrically opposed to the position taken by the Justice Department before the Supreme Court last month that U.S. federal courts have no jurisdiction over detainees in Guantanamo precisely because it falls outside American legal jurisdiction.

This administration is outcome-driven: they will say whatever they need to say in order to arrive at their desired destination. Sadly, the unilateral disengagement of America from the rules of international law that the Bush/Cheney team is now undertaking forsakes the work of countless leaders who came before them—who worked in the best interests of the United States and often with the long-term effects of their policies in sight.

The U.S. joined the world 60 years ago in outlawing preemptive strikes against other nations precisely because we didn’t like the preemptive strike we received at Pearl Harbor and because we wanted to help forge a safer, more predictable world community. The U.S. worked on and adopted the Third Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War precisely because we didn’t like the way American P.O.W.s were tortured during the Second World War.

The Bush/Cheney Administration has cavalierly cast such considerations aside, arrogantly relying upon our status as the most heavily armed superpower to do what they want in the world, whenever they want to do it, in pursuit of short-term political gains with their far-right constituency.

Long-term consequences simply do not factor into this calculus. Nor do the opinions of our Allies who disagree. The only important considerations are the next election and the well-being of their corporate cronies.

Behind me stands Abraham Lincoln, namesake of this state’s capital. As a founding member of the 19th-century Republican Party, he would be ashamed of what his party’s current leaders are doing.

Two years into the Civil War, President Lincoln commissioned the promulgation of General Army Order No. 100, commonly known as the Leiber Code, which delineated the customary law of war on such things as humane treatment of prisoners, avoidance of civilian casualties and care of those caught up in the conflict.

Lincoln’s Leiber Code was the forerunner to the Hague Conventions, negotiated and adopted by fellow Republican Theodore Roosevelt, and later the Geneva Conventions, brought into law by another Republican: Dwight Eisenhower. I think they would all look upon the approach of the current Republican administration of George Bush and Dick Cheney as anathema to what they believed in and fought to guard against.

Vice President Cheney, I hope when you come home to this city, you visit this monument and read the words on it. I hope you can find peace with yourself after it’s all over, for that may turn out to be the hardest road you’ve traveled if you do indeed have a conscience.

Thank you.
The Coming of the Sacred White Buffalo

Farther up the road from all the misery in Whiteclay, on the reservation side of the border, lies a ranch on White Clay Creek that’s become the site of a Lakota miracle.

In the spring of 1996—in a span of just 13 days—two sacred white buffalo calves were born on tribal member Joe Merrival’s Pine Ridge ranch. They were the first white buffalo calves ever born to an Indian-owned herd on Indian land, and only the third and fourth such calves to be born in the last century.

For the Oglala Sioux Tribe, this was a momentous spiritual occurrence. The white buffalo calf is the most rare and sacred of animals to the tribes of the Great Sioux Nation, symbolic of hope, rebirth and unity and central to their greatest story—the tale of White Buffalo Calf Woman. Its appearance on the reservation, Lakota medicine man Floyd Hand Looks for Buffalo said that spring in 1996, was equivalent to modern-day Christians witnessing Jesus lying in the manger.

The significance of these events to the Great Sioux Nation though can only be fully understood in connection with the story of White Buffalo Calf Woman, for the story of White Buffalo Calf Woman is the story of the salvation of the Lakota Tribe. Nebraska’s Poet Laureate, John Neihardt, recounted the tale of this spiritual visitation in his now classic book, Black Elk Speaks. What follows is a summary of this tale from oral tradition, of which there are many versions.

…A long time ago the Great Spirit sent the White Buffalo Calf Woman to the People. During a time when the Lakota were starving, two scouts were sent from the village to look for food. From a hill they saw a lone figure, approaching from the west. At first they thought it was a buffalo, but as it came closer they saw that it was a beautiful woman. One of the men had lustful thoughts and said he would go meet her. His companion warned him not to.

‘This is a sacred woman,’ he said. ‘Throw all bad thoughts aside.’ The scout ignored the advice, and when he tried to embrace her, a cloud enveloped the two of them. Soon the cloud disappeared and the other man saw the beautiful woman standing beside the skeleton of his companion.

The next day, the beautiful holy woman came to the scouts’ camp and gave the People the Sacred Pipe. She taught them how to pray with it and told them how to live virtuously with the four great virtues: courage, wisdom, generosity and fortitude. She also gave the Lakota their seven sacred ceremonies. When she departed, the people raised their eyes and saw a white buffalo calf leaving in a cloud heading west.

The coming of the white buffalo calves that spring in 1996 was seen as the fulfillment of a long-awaited prophecy and universally regarded as a great blessing. Joe Merrival, the owner of the herd, was almost at a loss for words to describe what it all meant: “The truth is I don’t know what is happening. I can’t understand or explain any of this. I think only that it is a great gift that must now be used to try and help as many people as possible.” Medicine man Floyd Hand Looks for Buffalo saw a direct correlation between Merrival (who folks commonly refer to as “Poker Joe”) and the births on his tiny ranch. “Here is a man, a poor farmer, who has been kind to animals all his life and now there is a white buffalo calf here. These are omens and they are happening in the most unexpected place—among the poorest people in the country. They are good omens if we pay attention to them.”

Even a blessed event like this though is not without its difficulties and disappointments. The first white buffalo that was born on April 27—which they named “Rainbow” to honor all the different peoples on the earth—lived only one day. Weak and sick at its birth, it developed scours (a diarrhea-type condition) and died 25 hours later. Lakota medicine men attributed the death to the fact that the people themselves were weak and divided, that they were as yet unprepared to receive such a blessing.

This heartbreaking news, however, was followed just 11 days later by the birth of yet a second white buffalo calf, who was given the name “Medicine Wheel” for the unity of the Four Directions. Unlike the earlier calf, Medicine Wheel was strong and healthy and overnight became a popular attraction for both Indians and tourists.

The second calf, medicine men said, was a symbol for unity, a message to Indians—and people everywhere—that we must repair life’s Sacred Hoop and stop the destruction of Mother Earth. For the Lakota in particular, though, the appearance of the white buffalo calf offered the prospect for tribal unity and renewal beyond the strictly spiritual. On a reservation plagued with more than 80 percent unemployment and a dangerous propensity for diabetes and alcoholism, the buffalo could be a source of physical support and nourishment. The buffalo, Joe Merrival liked to point out, had “fed, clothed and sheltered our ancestors. They could still do that for us now.” Restoring the herds could provide jobs and opportunity for a young generation of Lakota and improve the tribe’s overall health with the eating of low-fat, low-cholesterol buffalo meat. Spiritually, culturally and physically, the omens associated with the white buffalo calf’s return did indeed appear good.

According to a version of the sacred prophecy, a calf is born white but will change color four times—going from white to black, to yellow, to red and back to white again as it matures to adulthood. Through this evolution, it is said to represent the four different colors of the peoples on the earth. A sacred buffalo isn’t expected to reach the final stage and become white again as a full-grown adult until about age 12. Medicine Wheel had thrived for nearly four years on the Merrival ranch and was in his “black” phase when tragedy suddenly struck.

Through either accident or mischief, the Merrival herd got out of its fenced-in pasture sometime Sunday March 26, 2000. Medicine Wheel, who in his “black” phase now looked just like any other buffalo, got separated from the others in the herd and was spotted running down a road near Red Cloud community. Chased by a neighbor and tribal law enforcement officer, the buffalo allegedly charged his pursuers and was in turn shot “for the safety of the community.”

As might be expected, Medicine Wheel’s death shocked the reservation. Medicine man Floyd Hand Looks for Buffalo said that the animal’s death was a sure
There are three subspecies of bison: the Plains bison, Wood bison, and the European Wisent.

The Plains bison is the largest land mammal in North America since the end of the Ice Age. Estimates of the pre-European herd size vary from 30,000,000 to 70,000,000 animals and they ranged over most of North America.

Unregulated killing of bison led to the many millions of animals being reduced to no more than 1,500 individuals in the mid to late 1800s. However, today there are an estimated 350,000 American Bison in the United States and Canada, and that number is growing.

Bison often live well into their thirties, reaching maturity at 6 or 7 years of age. A mature buffalo bull will measure 6’ tall at the hump and will weigh up to 2,000 pounds. Bison can easily run 35 miles per hour, with enough stamina to outrun a horse.

Nutritional Information

Buffalo is an excellent red meat source low in fat, high in protein, rich in flavor. Research done by Dr. M. Marchello, University of North Dakota, has shown that buffalo is a highly nutrient-dense food because of the proportion of protein, fat, minerals and fatty acids to its caloric value. Comparisons also show that buffalo has a greater concentration of iron as well as some of the essential fatty acids.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Fat Grams*</th>
<th>Calories</th>
<th>Cholesterol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USDA Handbook 8-5; 8-10; 8-13; 8-17* Per 100 grams of meat

A long time ago the Indians and frontiersmen who ate mostly buffalo had great endurance, agility and stamina. Research is currently being conducted on buffalo to help us better understand the reasons for this. Due to their independent natures, buffalo are handled as little as possible. They spend their lives on grass, much as they always have, and very little time in the feedlot. Because of this, there is no need for artificial growth stimulants or sub-therapeutic use of antibiotics.

Comparisons of the nutritional values of buffalo have shown that buffalo meat is low in fat and calories and high in protein and nutrients. In short, with buffalo you are paying for a red meat source that is high in protein, low in fat, low in calories, and a red meat that fits into the federal government’s dietary recommendations. This allows you to enjoy more by eating less!

His latest proposal would create a non-profit slaughterhouse on the reservation (which currently has none), that could be jointly used by the 13 separate buffalo herds on Pine Ridge. And he’s already drawn up plans for a “Lakota Wildlife Refuge” that would provide a large enough tract of grazing land to sustain a major packinghouse operation for an on-reservation market for buffalo meat.

He had these ideas before, and he’ll have others in the future. But there’s no doubt that having two white buffalo calves born on his small 485-acre ranch on White Clay Creek left its mark on him. Asked what he made of the tragic, seemingly ironic way Medicine Wheel died, he answers, “Like the medicine men say, maybe as a people, we weren’t ready. We weren’t prepared.”

If that’s indeed the reason, Poker Joe has—if possible—redoubled his resolve to do whatever he can for the Lakota people as his way of getting ready. So that the next time the white buffalo calf returns, it will stay.

While Medicine Wheel was buried in the pasture on White Clay Creek, Rainbow was preserved and mounted and rests in a case on the Merrival Buffalo Ranch just three miles northwest of the town on Pine Ridge on Highway 18. Visitors are welcome, and if you stop by, you might just get to go out to the field with Joe to feed the buffalo by hand.

It’s one of the most unbelievable and wonderful experiences you’ll ever have. There’s no requested admission, but you’ll want to show your appreciation by making a nice donation when you visit. For more information contact: Merrival Buffalo Ranch, Box 353, Pine Ridge, SD 57770 605-867-5038.

In the picture above, Poker Joe’s grandson Joseph, who the family calls “Cornbread,” is “kissing” a bull named “Tokala” by holding a supplement pellet between his lips and letting the buffalo eat it from his mouth.
On July 1, 2004, the leadership of the Stop Big Business Subsidies—Repeal LB 775 petition campaign held a news conference in the State Capitol Rotunda to announce that they had failed to collect the 76,000 valid signatures necessary to place the measure on the November ballot. In fact, not one of the volunteer-circulator, low-budget campaigns qualified for ballot status. The only successful petition drive, ironically enough, was a casino gambling proposal by Big Business that employed paid circulators, demonstrating once again the power of money in politics. Reprinted below is the statement Mark Vasina, Treasurer of Stop Big Business Subsidies—Repeal LB 775, delivered to the media.

Last August, when NAPE/AFSCME (the state employees union) and Nebraskans for Peace kicked off an initiative petition drive to repeal LB 775, we knew we were taking on a colossal task. We were tackling the most expensive business tax incentive program in the state…and quite possibly the most expensive state business tax incentive program in the country. We were taking on Big Business, which successfully lobbies state legislators and other elected officials here and in other states (1) to develop and expand state tax subsidy programs designed to enrich Big Business, (2) to maintain a blanket of secrecy over the true benefits to the taxpaying public regarding these programs, and (3) to thwart public challenges—in this state for 16 years—for evidence of their effectiveness and affordability. And, we knew we were presenting to the voting public a complicated issue of tax policy around which it would be difficult to mount a public groundswell.

But we felt we had no choice but to forge ahead and try. Since the budget crisis began in the spring of 2001, K-12 education had been cut four (now five) straight legislative sessions. The University and state college system had been cut four (now five) straight sessions. Public services and the state employee workforce had been cut four (now five) straight sessions. In fact, the only significant state programs not to have gone under the budget knife were LB 775 and its Big Business tax break "child" known as the Invest Nebraska Act. Meanwhile, our real children were paying the price for corporate subsidies that had already cost the state as much as $1.5 billion, and can be expected to cost another $1.5 billion as current subsidy contracts play out.

Our intent was simply to send a clear message to our legislators: Take a serious look at LB 775, the so-called "centerpiece" of our state’s economic development policy; keep what is effective and affordable; reject what is wasteful and harmful.

Our efforts to educate Nebraskans about the need for truthful evaluation of LB 775 and economic development programs were as important as our efforts to secure the signatures needed to place our initiative on the November ballot.

NAPE/AFSCME and Nebraskans for Peace were joined in this effort by sixteen other organizations. Unions like the Steelworkers at Goodyear and the Communications Workers at Altel, that had seen their workforces downsized even as their corporate employers collected LB 775 benefits, quickly joined our ranks. Nebraska Farmers Union, Nebraska Common Cause, Nebraska Sierra Club, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Nebraska Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, the Nebraska United Methodist Board of Christian Social Witness (and another United Methodist organization, Sowing the Seeds), the Young Democrats, four county Democratic Parties and the Nebraska Green Party swelled our numbers.

We recruited volunteer circulators in dozens of counties across the state. We established volunteer coordinators in over forty counties. State coordinators volunteered their time, always with no compensation. And always, our efforts to educate Nebraskans about the need for truthful evaluation of LB 775 and economic development programs were as important as our efforts to secure the signatures needed to place our initiative on the November ballot.

The number of petitions returned to us, particularly in the last several weeks, has been enormous and increasingly so. And we expect many more notarized petitions to continue to arrive still today and tomorrow. Regrettably, however, today we must announce that we will fall short of our goal. This goal of 90,000 signatures was set to ensure that we would have the 76,000 valid signatures necessary for ballot placement. We believe that by tomorrow we will be no more than two-thirds of the way toward reaching our signature goal.

While this situation represents a failure to achieve our coalition’s principal short-term goal—a November citizen referendum on the soundness of LB 775 the Chamber’s promise not to fund Ed Jaksha’s campaign for a constitutional amendment requiring a public vote on every future tax increase (which would have added incredible chaos to the challenge of funding K-12 education in this state). Unfortunately, our campaign’s unintentional but worthy role in the failure of this other petition drive may have been the major contributor to the failure of our own.

Nevertheless, many, many leaders in K-12 and higher education aligned themselves with our efforts and fought hard in support of our campaign. We are confident that the ongoing collision between our state’s constitutional commitment to public education and the self-serving ambitions of Big Business for a priority claim on public revenues will forge even stronger alliances among educators and advocates for reform of our state economic development programs. Moreover, we have good reason to believe that today many business leaders throughout the state are searching for ways to reshape LB 775 into a more effective, equitable and affordable program.

The leaders of this campaign are not folding tents and decamping. The sense of urgency that propelled us to forge ahead with the petition drive last August is now greater than ever—if for no other reason than that the mortgage on our state has increased and we’re just that much more in the hole. We will spend the next year working to build an even stronger coalition for reform. Already, as evidence of the greater prominence LB 775 has gotten in response to our efforts, we are pleased that the Nebraska Democratic Party, for the first time ever, has gone on record calling for greater disclosure and accountability for the program. The 2005 legislative session will address yet again—and perhaps more effectively—the need to reform this program.

In closing, we want to thank all of those volunteers who worked to place this issue before the voters in November. We know your disappointment. We feel it ourselves. It is hard to witness the failure of an effort that is so important to the wellbeing of our state.

But we also feel our strength. This issue is far from over. We will persevere, because we must, and because we owe it to ourselves and to our children.
An Intelligence Debacle... and Worse

by Ray McGovern

A CIA analyst for 27 years, Ray McGovern is co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS). In addition to his work as an intelligence watchdog, Ray McGovern is also a good friend of Call to Action-Nebraska, the Catholic reform organization, and spoke to CTA in Lincoln in 1997. The article below was first published on TomPaine.com and a shortened version appeared in the July 13, 2004 edition of the Omaha Herald under the title “Intelligence Failures—Abandoning tradition of honesty, CIA now panders to power.”

In our various oral and written presentations on Iraq my veteran intelligence officer colleagues and I took no delight in sharply criticizing what we perceived to be the corruption of intelligence analysis at CIA. Nothing would have pleased us more than to have proven wrong. It turns out we did not know the half of it.

Several of us have just spent a painful weekend digesting the report of the Senate Intelligence Committee on prewar intelligence assessments on Iraq. The corruption is far deeper than we suspected. The only silver lining is that the corruption-in-chief, George Tenet, is now gone. The Senate committee determined that “Joe” deliberately skewed data to fit preconceptions regarding an Iraqi nuclear threat. “Who could have believed that about our intelligence community, that the system could be so dishonest?” wondered the normally soft-spoken David Albright, a widely respected veteran expert on Iraq’s work toward developing a nuclear weapon.

I share his wonderment. I too am appalled—and angry. You give 27 years of your professional life to an institution whose main mission—to get at the truth—is essential for orderly policy making, and then you find it has been prostituted. You realize that your former colleagues have lacked the moral courage needed to stave off the effort to enlist them as accomplices in deceiving our elected representatives into giving their blessing to an ill-conceived, unnecessary war. Even Republican stalwart Sen. Pat Roberts, chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has conceded that, had Congress known before the vote for war what his committee has now discovered, “I doubt if the votes would have been there.”

Pandering to the “Powers That Be”

It turns out that only one U.S. analyst had met with the now-infamous Iraqi defector appropriately code-named “Curveball,” the source of the scurrilous about mobile biological weapons factories. This analyst, in an e-mail to the deputy director of CIA’s task force on weapons of mass destruction, raised strong doubt regarding Curveball’s reliability before Colin Powell highlighted his claims at the UN on Feb. 5, 2003. I almost became physically ill reading the cynical response from the deputy director of the task force:

“As I said last night, let’s keep in mind the fact that this war’s going to happen regardless of what Curveball said or didn’t say, and the powers that be probably aren’t terribly interested in whether Curveball knows what he’s talking about.”

(Reading this brought to consciousness a painful flashback to early August 1964. We CIA analysts knew that reports of a second attack on U.S. destroyers in the Tonkin Gulf were spurious but were prevented from reporting that to policymakers and to Congress. The then-Director of Central Intelligence explained to us condescendingly that President Johnson had decided to use the non-incident as a pretext to escalate the war and that “we do not want to wear out our welcome at the White House.” So this kind of politicization, though rare in the past, is not without precedent—and not without similarly woeful consequences.)

With respect to Iraq, George Tenet’s rhetoric about “truth” and “honesty” in his valedictory last week has a distinctly Orwellian ring. Worse still, apparently “Joe Centrifuge,” the above-mentioned deputy director, and other co-conspirators will get off scot-free. Sen. Roberts says he thinks “It is very important that we quit looking in the rearview mirror and affixing blame and, you know, pointing fingers.” And Acting Director John McLaughlin has told the press that he sees no need to dismiss anyone as a result of what he portrayed as honest, limited mistakes.

Tell It To The Families

I would like to hear Roberts and McLaughlin explain all this to the families of the almost 900 U.S. servicemen and women already killed and the many thousand seriously wounded in Iraq.

Roberts seemed at pains to lay the blame on a “flawed system,” but a close reading of the Senate committee report on page 10
IRAQ, conclusion

The committee report yields the unavoidable conclusion that CIA analysis can no longer be assumed to be honest—to be aimed at getting as close to the truth as one can humanly get. For those of you cynics about to smirk, I can only tell you—believe it or not—that truth was in fact the currency of analysis in the CIA in which I was proud to serve.

Aberrations like the Tonkin Gulf cave-in by CIA management notwithstanding, the analysis directorate was widely known as the unique place in Washington where one could normally go and expect a straight answer unencumbered by any political agenda. And we were hard into some very controversial—often critical—national security issues. It boggles my mind how any president, and particularly one whose father headed the CIA, could expect to be able, without that capability, to make intelligent judgments based on unbiased fact.

It is said that truth is the first casualty of war. Sadly, in the case of Iraq, even before the war took a back seat to a felt need to snuggle up to power—to stay in good odor with a president and his advisers, all well known to be hell-bent on war on Iraq.

Caution: Don’t Be Fooled

The Washington Times lead story on July 10 began: “Flawed intelligence that led the United States to invade Iraq was the fault of the U.S. intelligence community—a report by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence concluded yesterday.” From the other end of the political spectrum, David Corn of The Nation led his own report with, “The United States went to war on the basis of false claims.”

Not so. This is precisely the spin that the Bush Administration wants to give to the Senate report; i.e., that the president was misled; that his decision for war was based on spurious intelligence about nonexistent weapons of mass destruction.

But the president’s decision for war had little to do with intelligence on Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. It had everything to do with the administration’s determination to gain control of strategic, oil-rich Iraq, implant an enduring military presence there, and—not incidentally—eliminate any possible threat from Iraq to Israel’s security.

These, of course, were not the reasons given to justify placing U.S. troops in harms way, but even the most circumspect senior officials have had unguarded moments of candor. For example, when asked in May 2003 why North Korea was being treated differently from Iraq, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz responded, “Let’s look at it simply…The country [Iraq] swims on a sea of oil.”

And basking in the glory of “Mission Accomplished” shortly after Baghdad had fallen, Wolfowitz admitted that the focus on weapons of mass destruction to justify the attack on Iraq was “for bureaucratic reasons.” It was, he added, “the one reason everyone could agree on”—meaning, of course, the one that could successfully sell the war to Congress and the American people.

The Israel factor? In another moment of unusual candor—this one before the war—Philip Zelikow, a member of the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board from 2001 to 2003 (and now executive director of the 9/11 commission), pointed to the danger that Iraq posed to Israel as “the unstated threat—a threat that dare not speak its name…because it is not a popular sell.”

Last, but hardly least. It was not until several months after the Bush White House decided to make war on Iraq that the weapons-of-mass-destruction-laden National Intelligence Estimate was commissioned, and then only because Congress needed to be persuaded that the threat was so immediate that war was necessary. Vice President Dick Cheney set the main parameters in a major speech on August 26, 2002, in which he declared, “We know that Saddam has resumed his efforts to acquire nuclear weapons.”

The estimate Tenet signed dutifully endorsed that spurious judgment—with “high confidence,” no less.

Is There Hope?

If hope is what is found at the bottom of Pandora’s box, it can be found here too. That there are still honest, perceptive analysts at CIA is clear from the analysis that Anonymous sets forth in his excellent book, Imperial Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror. (Note to Condelezza Rice: Anonymous’ name is Michael Scheuer; he is an overt employer; you can get his extension from the CIA operator—just call 703 482 1100.)

As long as analysts of Scheuer’s caliber hang in there, there can be hope that, once the CIA is given the adult supervision it has lacked for the last two dozen years, it can get back on track in performing its critical job for our country.

Bad News on Bullying

Bullying is no longer trivial issue

Any doubts that bullying has become a serious problem in Nebraska ought to be erased by the recent death of a 16-year-old girl in Omaha last week.

Chastity Wright died after she was attacked by a group of girls outside a fast-food restaurant in South Omaha.

Witnesses told police that the group of girls pushed Wright and a friend, Portia Loyd, to the ground. The attackers kicked them in the face and stomped them, Loyd told police. Loyd sustained a broken nose and bruises.

Wright was taken to the Nebraska Medical Center, where she was pronounced dead. Wright was affected by severe asthma, which might have played a role in causing her death. Initial autopsy results were inconclusive. Wright reportedly had not had an attack for several years.

Wright’s parents said she had been a frequent target of bullies at Omaha South High School. Authorities said a student at the school was suspended for two months after the bullying was reported.

The young victim was described in an Omaha World-Herald story as a happy girl who stirred jealousy because she dressed in the latest clothes, shoes and accessories, paid for with money she earned by working two jobs.

In the high school hallways, other girls would purposely bump her, relatives said. Sometimes a group would circle her, hurling taunts.

Similar stories have surfaced too often for them to be dismissed as isolated incidents or typical teenage behavior. In Malcolm, classmates said 17-year-old Joshua Magee, who was arrested outside school with a loaded rifle and bomb materials, had been subjected to verbal bullying.

In La Vista, 13-year-old Kayla Brengman was attacked by six girls. She was slapped, struck and kicked while she lay in the snow. In Millard, 15-year-old Ryan Drews was beaten by two boys while a group of other youths watched. Police later confiscated a videotape made by an onlooker.

Bureaucratic efforts are under way to change teen attitudes toward bullying. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services this March kicked off a campaign to educate Americans on how to prevent bullying and youth violence.

In making the announcement, Secretary Tommy Thompson made the excellent point that the entire community must be engaged in preventing bullying.

It’s not enough for people to point fingers just at school authorities, for example, and expect them to solve the problem. Certainly school officials can do more to address the problem—and they are working on it—but parents, aunts, uncles, grandparents and responsible adults also need to put a stop to it. So do teens themselves.

Our culture has become too tolerant of bullying. The upsurge in violence literally is ending lives. Everyone has to help to stop it.
world. When big energy companies enter into partnerships with our public power districts or REAs and build a 100-megawatt wind field, their profit goes to investors, most out-of-state. Leases of $2000-4000 annually for turbines will do little to “stabilize” farm or ranch income, even where the land is not purchased outright.

But if 100 farmers and ranchers each put a 1-megawatt turbine on one of a hundred sections scattered across the state, the result is radically different. Local ownership means dollars circulate back into the economy to local construction companies, crane operators, electricians, maintenance technicians and others, multiplying through wages many times to support local businesses, taxes, churches, roads and schools. The pie gets bigger. Or higher. Your call.

I am not blowing smoke, not even wind. In nearby states (with less actual wind resource than Nebraska), landowners are partnering with tax-credit-hungry investors (polluters, etc.) to finance 1- and 2-megawatt turbines, in a win-win scenario. Corporations pay themselves off up front and receive tax credits, and landowners retain rights to paid-off turbines which generate six-figure incomes for 10 or 20 years to come.

Dispersed generation is also a good idea, if what you want is to “firm” wind as a reliable source of power. Opponents of wind development argue wind is “intermittent.” Proponents contend wind is “variable.” Two downsides of big wind fields are variability and transmission. When the wind is blowing at a big wind field, generation is huge, requiring heavy (sometimes new) transmission capacity. When the wind doesn’t blow, the turbines just sit there, and other energy has to be found to meet customers’ needs.

Two upsides of wind-farming by independent farmers and ranchers are variability and transmission. Scattered (dispersed) generation means less pressure to build new transmission, as 1-2 megawatts can feed into mid-sized power lines. And in Nebraska, as you very well know, the wind is ALWAYS blowing—somewhere!

What are the most immediate obstacles to the development of wind-farming in Nebraska? Today, wind-farmers lack both a market and the modest federal tax incentives that this young industry must have to grow. How can you help? I’m glad you asked.

First, call and fax and write and visit the offices of your U.S. Senators and tell them to help pass the McCain/Lieberman Climate Stewardship Act. That means Hagel, too. (We’ve been over this before. Just because the Team Bush guy is unresponsive does not mean he should not feel political heat.)

The pleasant folks who answer your call will tell you that this bill is too costly for farmers who cannot meet particulate matter standards. This is hogwash. The incentives for renewable production (for wind, ethanol, biodiesel and so on) will more than offset costs to farmers, while helping to reverse the effects of global warming. Tell them so.

Next, call your rural electric or public power board and your state senator and tell them net-metering isn’t just a good idea, it’s the law. In the late 1970s, Congress passed the Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA) to encourage the promotion and development of renewable energy alternatives to burning fossil fuels or building new power plants. PURPA requires electric utilities to buy electricity generated by small-power producers who qualify. Utilities must pay a posted rate, set by the state commission. This rate, sometimes called “avoided-cost,” is the lowest cost to the electric utility if it had to generate the power or buy it from another source.

As we go to press, the Nebraska Attorney General has been asked by the Nebraska Power Review Board to give an opinion on a request by a Pilger farmer to sell excess energy from his small turbine to his local utility.

Net-metering for farmers and ranchers is a no-brainer, a way to make the pie bigger for rural Nebraska. It is a bi-partisan issue on which we should all be able to agree. And if the AG guesses wrong in his opinion, it is likely that federal authorities will remind Nebraska that public power, though admirable, is not above the law.

| Nebraskans for Peace Chapter & Local Affiliate Contact Information |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Crete Chapter         | Pat Wikel           | 402-826-4818         |
| Lincoln Chapter       | State Office        | 402-475-4620         |
| Omaha Chapter         | Cary Vigneri        | 402-453-0776         |
| Scottsbluff Chapter   | Byron Peterson      | 308-783-1412         |
| Southwest Nebraska Chapter | Dennis Demmel     | 308-352-4078         |
| Wayne/Wayne State College Chapter | Sayre Andersen | 402-375-3794         |
| Central Nebraska Peace Workers | Charles Richardson | 402-462-4794         |
| (Grand Island, Hastings, Kearney) |                 |                     |
| Contact the NFP State Office for information on the UNL, UNO, UNK, Creighton and Nebraska Wesleyan University and Hastings & Doane College Chapters |

Make a tax-deductible gift to the Nebraska Peace Foundation
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Change-of-Command at StratCom

Admiral James O. Ellis, who ended his three-year tenure as StratCom Commander July 9, oversaw the dramatic expansion of StratCom’s power and reach in the wake of 9/11. The “new StratCom,” in addition to controlling the nation’s nuclear arsenal, serves as the global planning headquarters for all branches of the U.S. military to confront the threats posed by terrorists and rogue states. As Ellis’ successor, Marine Lt. General James E. Cartwright, frankly stated at his Senate confirmation hearing, StratCom’s immediate challenge is to “recruit and retain bright people to work on offensive and defensive nuclear and non-nuclear planning” (emphasis added).” Nicknamed “Hoss” by his peers, Commander Cartwright was jokingly described at the change-of-command ceremony as “the new sheriff in town.” When these guys say “town” though, they don’t mean Omaha. Or even America. They’re talking about ‘The World’ (and the space above it).

Biggering the Pie

Let us say, for the sake of argument, that the Republicans have got it right on greed. Despite the Christian principles of the Right (whose first care should surely be laying up treasure in heaven), their motto is right there on the bumpers of their SUVs, next to the fish: He who wins, he who dies with the most toys wins.

Let’s admit that it takes a lifetime for most people to understand the kind of big lessons—less is more, we’re all in this together—that would enable a kinder, gentler way of going about our human business on earth. Many, maybe most, folks aren’t very reflective. Blame it on the struggle to survive. The truth is it takes a certain amount of leisure to think things through, and leisure costs money.

The fellow who came to be the Buddha, with a lot of advantages like education and time to think things through (see above).

Admonish that fact that, worldwide, efforts to change peoples’ hearts—to end war, famine, poverty, pollution, deforestation and destruction of wetlands, etc.—are, put kindly, not going well. Maybe the only way to achieve peace, much less sustainability, is to make the pie, to paraphrase George W. Bush, bigger. (The President actually said “Make the pie higher.”)

If the Right is correct that human beings are not inclined to share and cannot be made to do so, the Republican answer (unbridled winner-take-all monopoly capitalism, with trickle down benefits IN TIME for the rest of us) to making the pie bigger is, put kindly, problematic. “Free trade” and the “new global economy” are making the pie SMALLER, actually, as non-renewable resources are consumed (in the case of fossil fuels) and fouled (in the case of water). Multinationalist culture is increasing the divide between rich and poor, not bridging it, and as that gap increases, war (now often called “terror”) is nationless and everywhere, just like the great corporations themselves.

If only there was some inexhaustible resource, which we could harness to create economies which could support creature comforts for everyone! Not some pyramid scheme like the money market or grain futures or selling nutritional supplements out of your garage—all sucker’s games which depend on losers to create the winners. I’m talking about making lead into gold, here. I’m talking about making water into wine.

I’m talking about making the wind into energy. If you’ve followed my column, you know I’ve BEEN talking about wind for years. It was my privilege to serve on Governor Johanns’ Wind Energy Task Force a few years back. Our task was to discover the barriers to wind energy development in Nebraska and ways to overcome those barriers. In my opinion, the chief obstacle at the time was a short-term view of “costs” (ignoring decommissioning and pollution costs of fossil and nuclear energy) which our power boards held and a lack of input from Nebraska power consumers (who own the companies and elect the boards) directing them to increase investment in renewable energy in the interest of the public good.

Some of that seems to have changed today. Deliberative polling in Nebraska shows consumers ARE willing to pay more for cleaner generation. As the real costs of the combustion and decommissioning of coal and nuclear energy (five words: Low Level Nuclear Waste Compact) become clearer, and as wind technology has improved, the cost of wind energy has become increasingly competitive. Federal tax credits helped, until they expired. And wind has no fuel costs. Ever. More than one large-scale wind field is operating in Nebraska and more are planned.

This is a good thing. Every wind turbine on the Great Plains that displaces coal generation means less acid rain to our east. In the long run, these wind fields will mean a more secure and sustainable energy supply for public power customers in our state.

However, the effects of big wind fields by large-scale developers will have a negligible effect on the Nebraska economy, compared with what wind-farming could do for our state, and for the continued on page 11

From the Bottom by Sally Herrin

The real political spectrum isn’t right to left... it’s top to bottom.