

October 6, 2005 Editorial, Nebraska Journal Leader

Once again, the Editor of the *Nebraska Journal Leader* sets a new high for lies and distortion in his paper. Please understand, responding week after week to the fabrications and half-truths of this publication can get tedious; especially considering we have *real* jobs and family obligations that take precedence over correcting the Editor's glaring falsehoods and thwarting his machinations. Nevertheless, we will continue to do so as a service to this community. We welcome an open and honest debate of the issues. Only by doing so will we begin to heal the fissures that have beset this community and ensure a brighter future for our children. But while the *Nebraska Journal Leader* continues to spew its venom at us for the apparent dual purpose of trying to intimidate us and to sell more papers, we will continue to set the record straight.

Outright Falsehoods

And so it is with what we have discerned is an outsider Y2K Minnesota based philosophy that has coalesced a group of folks to oppose Ponca's school bond.

What, pray tell, is a "Y2K Minnesota based philosophy"? Lutefisk on New Years Eve? And when did this philosophy "coalesce" the local folk? Does the Editor remember the first bond failed quite some time ago? Who was "coalescing" the local folk back then? The way the Editor demonizes this unnamed individual week after week, he must be bigger than Paul Bunyon and have the powers of persuasion of Billy Graham, Charlie Manson and The Amazing Kreskin rolled into one.

The group continues to have a hard core that will oppose any new building, but they do not represent the whole group.

Just where did the Editor obtain the insight that any member of the ABCs will "oppose any new building..."? Of course, as we have seen in the past, whenever the Editor attempts to misstate our position, he is very careful not to name his source. The fact of the matter is the ABCs want all options on the table. We have asked the school to produce a feasibility study showing the current school can not be remodeled to meet our student's needs. To date, they have failed to produce any such study. In addition, we are willing to look at on-site and off-site proposals *providing* a budget is set and adhered to before any plans are made.

They might even have to refund donations to persons who were misled through omission about having their names revealed and published.

Editor, please! You're beginning to embarrass yourself. You know very well because it has been brought to your attention by members of the ABCs Committee officers, the public reporting requirements for donors is only for those donating over \$250.00. Please take the time and engage in a modicum of journalistic investigation and check the state website that is linked on this web site. Now, would you please stop trying to intimidate our donors? On second thought, go ahead and keep trying. Following your previous editorial where you attempted to intimidate our donors by publishing inaccurate facts, donations to the ABCs actually increased!

Finally, the Editor claims the meeting is being used by the ABCs to delay a vote "...all the way to the year 2020, ad infinitum" on the next bond issue. Frankly, we have

better things to do with our time than to attend meeting after meeting for the sole purpose of delaying the vote. We were encouraged when members of the School Board expressed a desire to meet with us and discuss how we might come together to resolve the needs of our students. We became less encouraged when they tried to pick the members of our group that would meet with them. We became even less encouraged when they tried to pack the meeting with a large number of PRIDE people making those who might seek to go back to the drawing board and realistically analyze all options an extreme minority in attendance. Finally, after reading the rhetorical bomb-throwing excesses of the Editor in the latest edition of the ***Journal Leader***, it became apparent to us that the School Board is using us to feign an attempt to meet with the opposition and listen to their concerns much as they did following the first bond vote. Those who attended the committee meetings after the first bond vote remember how the leadership pretended to listen to opposing points of view but when it came time to decide the final product, we ended up with the same losing proposal. History seems to be repeating itself. But fortunately, only those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it. In the words of the '70s song, "We won't get fooled again!"