



Amid chaotic times, farmers and ranchers want their voices heard

Work and way of life not well understood by majority of Americans

By Michael Standaert

North Dakota farmers and ranchers with several generations on the land want people to know that this success is the very definition of sustainability. Yet most are facing chaotic times that make it more difficult to operate and potentially pass their legacy on to their families. For some, like Tony Schneider, a farmer and rancher and a board member of the North Dakota Barley Council, its time producers take more action explaining to the public what they do, how they do it, why they do it, as well as their importance to the state and country as a whole.

“Maybe there’s a little hope for agriculture to get its message out, when I see things like this here,” Schneider said. “People are so removed from agriculture they don’t know where their food comes from. I think that education is really important.” Schneider spoke after an off-the-record agricultural roundtable at North Dakota State University on March 12 jointly organized

by the North Dakota News Cooperative along with Oakland, California-based PolicyLink.

The gathering of over a dozen farmers, ranchers and ag leaders was organized to get a better understanding of what challenges farmers in North Dakota face and how they see the future.

Livelihood impacts

What came out of the discussion was telling for those not steeped in the daily lives of farmers and ranchers.

Trade actions make long-term markets uncertain and volatile, inflation keeps input costs rising, a fresh war increases prices on petroleum products and strains fertilizer supplies, they say.

Trade stability and export markets are critical to that sustainability, particularly for a landlocked state like North Dakota. They want people to understand how foundational agriculture is to the economy, to food security, and to rural communities, but that it also remains widely misunderstood.

Public perception and misinformation about farming practices are rampant and create uncertainty. On the other end, policymakers on the coasts are often not directly engaged enough with agricultural producers,

leading to further misunderstanding.

PolicyLink, which cut its teeth trying to address urban food deserts in places like Pennsylvania two decades ago, initiated the discussions as part of a series of listening sessions nationwide. The organization aims to help build a country that works for everyone by grounding policy in real experience, reducing polarization and reconnecting urban and rural perspectives.

Josh Kirschenbaum, a senior advisor at PolicyLink who initiated the gathering, said the biggest “aha” for him was how long it takes to build markets and how easily they can be destroyed.

“Even for me, on this quest about how to deliver democracy for all, the thread about the interplay between the market and democracy and how that shapes governing, that was extremely enlightening and powerful,” Kirschenbaum said.

All the volatility impacts the generational transition of farming and ranching families across the state.

High land costs, debt, thin margins, and enormous financial risk can make it a daunting challenge to pass on a farm, leading to questions about who will continue farming in the future and

what that means to food security and the communities farming supports.

While their communities know this, the wider public does not: farmers and ranchers are key to supporting local businesses, churches, schools and civic leadership. When farms disappear or consolidate, communities lose population, leadership and economic activity.

Fertilizer, fuel, machinery, insurance, and labor costs have all increased significantly while commodity prices have stagnated or declined in recent years. These rising costs are steadily shrinking profit margins.

Attendees also raised concerns about rural health care access, rising health insurance costs, and the loss of rural hospitals, making it more difficult to sustain families in rural areas.

Policies like support for renewable fuels were cited as a major success but that growth had stalled and that policies need to evolve to support higher biofuel blends and new markets, while also addressing foreign competition.

Policies like crop insurance were also seen as essential, but incomplete. They provide a necessary safety net, but don’t cover enough of a producer’s potential revenue.

Telling their story

On the public misconceptions side, examples included confusion about GMOs, pesticides, fertilizers and organic farming, with producers saying they’ve struggled to tell their story and have allowed misinformation to fill the gap.

Most emphasize that they already prioritize stewardship and sustainability because their livelihoods depend on protecting soil, water, and land for future generations taking over their operations.

Schneider of Ashley said farmers need to get more active if they want their voices heard.

“If you’ve got grain or livestock and you’ve got a commodity in your operation that’s making you financially sound, you’ve got to get involved and get on boards,” he said.

“You’ve got to be at the table, not on the table, for that commodity and that makes a difference. That’s the most important thing they can do.”

Kirschenbaum said most people don’t think that deeply about food and connect that to the policies that impact the people producing it and the communities they live in.

“The vulnerability and the volatility that all the externalities can have on our food systems is tremendous,” he said. “I don’t

think Americans know that, and being able to tell that story is important.”

Other attendees included Carson Klosterman, a farmer and representative of the North Dakota Corn Council; Lance Gaebe of the North Dakota Farmers Union; Dallas Loff, a farmer and representative of the North Dakota Soybean Council; Dr. Greg Lardy of NDSU; David Boehm, director of the Northern Crops Institute; generational farmer and rancher Garrett Bladow; agricultural reporter Rusty Halvorson; Monte Peterson representing the Soybean Growers Association; Jed Brazier and Tony Richards of NorthHarvest Bean Growers Association.

The event was moderated by Cally Peterson, co-chair of NDNC, and NDNC CEO Sabrina Halvorson.

The North Dakota News Cooperative is a non-profit news organization providing reliable and independent reporting on issues and events that impact the lives of North Dakotans. The organization increases the public’s access to quality journalism and advances news literacy across the state. For more information about NDNC or to make a charitable contribution, please visit newscoopnd.org.

LEGAL

SUMMONS

TURTLE MOUNTAIN TRIBAL COURT - CIVIL DIVISION
TURTLE MOUNTAIN RESERVATION
BELCOURT, NORTH DAKOTA

State of North Dakota and
Brittany L. Laducer
Petitioner(s))
VS)
SUMMONS)
CASE#)
CS# 25-7011)
Kevin L. Morin,
Respondent(s))

[s.] The State of North Dakota to Kevin L. Morin: YOU ARE HEREBY summoned and required to appear and defend against the Petition in this action, which is or will be filed with the Clerk of Court of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, and which is herewith served upon you by serving upon the undersigned an Answer or other proper response within forty (40) days after the service of the summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgement by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the petition. The nature of this claim, the requested relief, and the amount are set forth in the petition and incorporated herein by reference.

Dated this 25th day of April, 2025

/s/Vincent N. Knuth
Special Assistant Attorney General
ND Bar I.D. Number: 09274
TMTC Bar I.D. Number: ATT-013-24
1820 Walnut St. E. Ste. #4
Devils Lake, ND 58301
Phone: (701) 328-5440
devilslakece@nd.gov
Attorney for the Child Support Program

Dated and filed by the Court on: 5/2/20254
/s/ Kathleen Turcotte
Turtle Mountain Tribal Court

TURTLE MOUNTAIN TRIBAL COURT - CIVIL DIVISION
TURTLE MOUNTAIN RESERVATION
BELCOURT, NORTH DAKOTA

State of North Dakota and
Brittany L. Laducer,
Plaintiff(s))
VS)
Affidavit for
Publication)
Civil No.#)
CS# 25-7011)
Kevin L. Morin,
Defendant)

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA)
COUNTY OF RAMSEY)

1. Vincent N. Knuth, being first duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:
2. I am the attorney for the Regional Child Support Field Office of Devils Lake, North Dakota, representing the State of North Dakota. I make this affidavit to satisfy the requirements of service by publication.
3. I am familiar with the facts of this case.
4. This matter involves an action against the defendant to address issues of child support and medical support.
5. A Complaint commencing this action has been filed with the Clerk of Court in Turtle Mountain Tribal Court, North Dakota.
6. After diligent inquiry, personal service of the Summons cannot be made upon the defendant in the State of North Dakota to my best knowledge, information and belief.
7. The Court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction of this matter over the parties pursuant to Title 2, Judicial Procedure, Civil.
8. The defendant’s last reasonably ascertainable address is:
Kevin L. Morin
PO Box 262
Rolette, ND 58366-0262
9. I declare, under penalty of perjury under the law of North Dakota, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed on the 19th day of February, 2026, at Devils Lake, North Dakota, United States of America.

/s/Vincent N. Knuth
Special Assistant Attorney General
ND Bar I.D. Number: 09274
TMTC I.D. # ATT.109-05-26
1820 Walnut St. E. Ste. #4
Devils Lake, ND 58301
Phone: (701) 328-5440
devilslakece@nd.gov
Attorney for the Child Support Program

(# 25, 26, 27)

~~ We the People ~~

“Trump Unilaterally Slips the Dogs of War: What Lies Ahead?”



Adler

By David Adler

President Donald Trump’s unilateral decision to plunge the United States into war against Iran is a war of his own making, not a war of necessity, but a war of choice. He has yet to explain, in a clear, coherent fashion, his reasons for going to war, either to Congress or to the American people. Five days after initiating war, striking more than 2000 targets in Iran, with six U.S. servicemen killed and three fighter jets downed, Trump should, by now, have explained to the American people, in a nationally televised address, what his objectives are, what his theory of victory is, and on what legal authority the administration believes it is waging this war, which Congress has neither declared nor authorized.

It is demonstrably clear that this war is illegal and unconstitutional. Few grieve the death of Iran’s Supreme Leader, a cruel, monster of man who has, for decades, repressed and executed Iranian citizens, and nobody wants Iran to possess nuclear weapons, but the Constitution requires governmental officials, including the president, to obey its allocation of powers and responsibilities. The War Clause—Article 1, section 8, vests the sole and exclusive authority to “Declare War” and order lesser military hostilities in Congress, not the president. The framers of the Constitution, in the words of James Madison, denied to the executive the authority to “decide on matters of war and peace.” Congress, alone, Madison explained, has the power to “commence, continue and conclude war.” Trump has usurped that authority and insists, imperiously, that “it is too late for talks.”

This war is without legal scaffolding. The War Powers Act of 1973 does not afford a legal basis for Trump’s War. A war of choice, by definition, cannot be justified by statutory language that permits the introduction of troops into “circumstances” where “hostilities are imminent” when it is the president who initiates the hostilities.

Those who wrote the Constitution feared the unpredictable twists and turns of war, the chaos, destruction and tragedy that may result when a government, to borrow from Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar, decides to “let slip the dogs of war.” Thomas Jefferson, in a September 6, 1789 letter to Madison, praised the shackles that the Constitutional Convention had imposed on unilateral executive warmaking. “We have already given one effectual check on the Dog of war, by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the Legislative body.” But the constitutional wisdom summoned by the framers to render an “effectual check” on presidential warmaking can be rendered ineffectual by a recalcitrant executive.

The framers of the Constitution—to a man—agreed that the president should be barred from initiating war and military hostilities. They carved this unanimous commitment into the War Clause: “Congress shall have power to declare war.” George Mason spoke for the Convention when he declared that he was “against giving the power of war to the Executive because he was not safely entrusted with it.” Elbridge Gerry said a “motion to empower the executive” to “declare war” was antithetical to the premises of republicanism. James Wilson summed up the constitutional system for going to war. It is “calculated” to prevent a “single man” to “involve us in such distress.”

The framers’ wisdom on the assignment of the war power is as compelling today, indeed, likely more so, than it was in 1787. The founders were keenly aware of the calamitous consequences of warfare, but they could not have glimpsed the horrific effects of nuclear war. In a world in which a “single man” may “involve us in such distress,” the president, alone, may incinerate the planet. If, for one moment, you allow your imagination to contemplate the planet set afire by the intemperate judgment, erratic behavior and whims of a single person, you will recognize the wisdom of the framers in denying to the president the authority to take the nation to war.

President Trump’s choice to initiate hostilities, which he likened to the swift attack on Venezuela and the capture of President Maduro, what he called his “model” for Iran, crumbled in the first days of his strikes. Already, the broader Middle East War has engulfed 12 nations, killed more than 800 civilians, and caused the price of natural gas and oil to spike. Who knows how to predict what chaos, destruction and tragedy will afflict the world when the dogs of war have been slipped.

NOTICE TO BIDDERS School District – St. John School State of North Dakota

Sealed bids will be received by the School District of St. John School, Rolette County, North Dakota, at the office of the Superintendent, 400 Foussard Ave., St. John, ND, 58369, starting March 2, 2026 (8:00 am) and closing March 19, 2026 (4:00 p.m. CST) for furnishing one (1) new 65-passenger school bus with a Cummins gas engine, in accordance with the specifications described below. Bids will be opened and publicly read aloud at that time and place.

I. DESCRIPTION OF EQUIPMENT

The bus shall meet or exceed the following minimum specifications:

1. Passenger Capacity: 65 passengers.
2. Engine: Cummins Gas Engine (2026 or 2027).
3. Transmission: Automatic.
4. Brakes: Hydraulic power braking system.
5. Heating & Defrost Systems: Includes driver defroster, adequate interior heating, and stepwell warmer.
6. Safety & Lighting:
 - o LED stop arms and warning lights meeting North Dakota school bus standards.
 - o Reflective markings and required emergency exits.
7. Additional Equipment:
 - o Engine block heater.
 - o AM/FM radio (as specified).
 - o Seating and seat belts as required by applicable state and federal regulations.
8. Compliance: Must comply with all current North Dakota Administrative Code and North Dakota Century Code requirements for school buses, including applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

II. TRADE-IN

St. John School intends to trade in a 2016 International bus, 65-passenger, diesel engine, in good condition with 150,000 miles. The trade-in offer will be considered as part of the bid award. Bidders shall state the trade-in allowance offered in their bid. The trade-in allowance will be considered in determining the lowest responsible bidder

III. BID REQUIREMENTS

1. Sealed bids must be plainly marked on the outside of the envelope: “**BID – 65-Passenger School Bus (Cummins Gas Engine) – St. John School**”.
2. All bids must include a detailed description of the unit offered, including the engine model, delivery date, warranty provisions, and trade-in allowance.
3. Bids must include delivery cost to St. John School, and delivery shall be made by **December 15, 2026**.
4. Bids shall be accompanied by any manufacturer’s specifications and warranty information.

IV. AWARD OF BID

The School District reserves the right to:

- Reject any and all bids or waive any informalities in the bidding process.
- Award the contract in the best interest of the district, taking into account the trade-in value, specifications, delivery schedule, and total cost to the district.

V. PUBLICATION & BID OPENING

This Notice will be published in the official newspaper of the district on **Turtle Mountain Star and Turtle Mountain Times on March 30, 2026**. Bids will be opened publicly at **10:00 a.m. (CST) on March 23, 2026**, at the **St. John School District Office**.

VI. CONTACT FOR SPECIFICATIONS

Questions or requests for specifications should be directed to:
Keith LaVallie, Superintendent
Phone: 701-477-5651
Email: keith.lavallie@k12.nd.us

Dated: **February 23, 2026**.

BID FORM — 65-Passenger School Bus (Cummins Gas Engine) School District: St. John School

Item	Description
Base Bid Price	\$ _____
Trade-In Allowance (2016 International Bus)	\$ _____
Net Bid Price (Bid – Trade-In)	\$ _____
Engine Model/Specs	_____
Delivery Date	_____
Warranty (Years/Miles)	_____

Bidder: _____
Address: _____
Phone: _____
Signature: _____
Date: _____