

O P I N I O N



Letters to the Editor...

The Nugget welcomes contributions from its readers, which must include the writer's name, address and phone number. Letters to the Editor is an open forum for the community and contains unsolicited opinions not necessarily shared by the Editor. The Nugget reserves the right to edit, omit, respond or ask for a response to letters submitted to the Editor. Letters should be no longer than 300 words. Unpublished items are not acknowledged or returned. The deadline for all letters is noon Monday.

To the Editor:

I am writing in regard to an item published in last week's "City Snapshot."

Readers were encouraged to look at a list of FAQs concerning the February 8 hearing on the airport's request for an upgrade in status as an appendix "M" category Airport of State Concern. That list of FAQs was recently posted on the ODA website in response to some of the questions community members have been asking for months.

Unfortunately, several responses raise additional questions or are at odds with information the airport and governmental entities have provided. Several questions regarding future implications remain unanswered. There is, for example, conflicting information regarding boundary expansion and funding. Both of which carry the potential to increase noisy activities such as skydiving.

I base some of my observations from reading ODA's FAQs and the "Land Use Compatibility

Handbook" referenced in those FAQs.

For example per the FAQs: "Would this designation allow the airport to apply for and possibly receive any grants or other Government funds they cannot apply for under their current designation?" ODA's response: "No, not at this time." Yet in the January 18 issue of *The Nugget*, the airport is reported as saying that they are seeking listing as an Airport of State Concern in Appendix M in order to help qualify for funding.

I am not anti-airport. I come from a flying family with airplanes, not cars, in the garage. I am however deeply concerned about the quality of life in Sisters Country, and the potential for increased noise and lack of privacy above our homes. It seems the airport is pursuing changes that could negatively impact us all. Noise created by more skydive planes, helicopter tours is not a positive addition to our

See **LETTERS** on page 14

Sisters Weather Forecast

Courtesy of the National Weather Service, Pendleton, Oregon

Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday
Rain 42/35	Rain likely 45/32	Chance showers 41/24	Mostly sunny 40/20	Sunny 43/20	Sunny 47/na

The Nugget Newspaper, Inc.

Website: www.nuggetnews.com

442 E. Main Ave., P.O. Box 698, Sisters, Oregon 97759

Tel: 541-549-9941 | Fax: 541-549-9940 | editor@nuggetnews.com



Member

Postmaster: Send address changes to
The Nugget Newspaper,
P.O. Box 698, Sisters, OR 97759.
Third Class Postage Paid at Sisters, Oregon.

Publisher - Editor: Kiki Dolson
News Editor: Jim Cornelius
Production Manager: Leith Williver
Classifieds & Circulation: Teresa Mahnken
Advertising: Karen Kassy
Graphic Design: Jess Draper
Proofreader: Pete Rathbun
Accounting: Erin Bordonaro

The Nugget is mailed to residents within the Sisters School District; subscriptions are available outside delivery area. Third-class postage: one year, \$45; six months (or less), \$25. First-class postage: one year, \$85; six months, \$55.

Published Weekly. ©2017 The Nugget Newspaper, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without written permission is prohibited. All advertising which appears in The Nugget is the property of The Nugget and may not be used without explicit permission. The Nugget Newspaper, Inc. assumes no liability or responsibility for information contained in advertisements, articles, stories, lists, calendar etc. within this publication. All submissions to The Nugget Newspaper will be treated as unconditionally assigned for publication and copyrighting purposes and subject to The Nugget Newspaper's unrestricted right to edit and comment editorially, that all rights are currently available, and that the material in no way infringes upon the rights of any person. The publisher assumes no responsibility for return or safety of artwork, photos, or manuscripts.



Rachel Marsden

American Voices

PARIS — As someone living in France, a country subjected to multiple Islamic terrorist attacks over the past couple of years, I'd be the last to criticize the spirit of President Trump's initiative to secure American borders through extreme vetting. I've witnessed firsthand the result of creeping insecurity and cultural disintegration directly attributable to Europe's insistence on treating its borders as mere suggestions rather than enforceable boundaries. If Trump fails to get a handle on the situation, America will look a lot like Europe.

The problem isn't limited to dangerous radicals who might commit terrorist atrocities — it also expands to include those communities hiding these individuals from authorities, protecting them, harboring them via a code of silence. Police sources have told me that these areas are, in essence, no-go zones where the police are at high risk of attack. This is the endgame of a national immigration policy that fails to take into account security and cultural compatibility.

Entering America is a privilege, not a right. Every country that has succeeded in maintaining its cultural identity has a selective system in place that rejects or approves entrants based on country of origin.

The civil rights crowd that whines about arbitrary screening should welcome reliable vetting. Anything less would subject immigrants to ongoing suspicion. The problem for civil rights advocates, however, is that proper government vetting requires intelligence work, which these proponents typically reject in favor of personal privacy protections.

Trump should keep in mind the lesson of Napoleon Bonaparte. A grand strategist, Napoleon nonetheless failed in 1812 to pay attention to the logistics of forcing his foot soldiers to rely on the sparse Russian landscape for food and water (rather than supply wagons) during the attempted conquest of the country. This defeat was instrumental in his downfall and eventual exile. As the old adage goes, amateurs talk about strategy, professionals talk about logistics.

And talking about logistics, whoever implemented Trump's order to temporarily

ban "immigrants and non-immigrants" from seven Muslim-majority countries — Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen — from entering the U.S., should be drop-kicked into a black hole. The logistical implementation of Trump's executive order was just about as effective as Napoleon's Russian Campaign, minus the frostbite and starvation.

On Saturday morning, former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani told Fox News: "(Trump) said put a commission together, show me the right way to do it legally. I put a commission together ... and what we did was we focused on, instead of religion, danger — the areas of the world that create danger for us."

If we're talking about terror-sponsoring nations, why are Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain, Pakistan and other nations omitted? Moreover, what act of terrorism has Iran committed or sponsored against the United States?

The selection of the seven countries is interesting unto itself. So is the fact that Giuliani attended the 2012 Paris rally of the Mujahedeen-e-Khalq, or MEK, an Iranian dissident group that was on the U.S. State Department's list of foreign terrorist organizations. The MEK and the Islamic State share a common sponsor — Saudi Arabia. In 2007, the Associated Press reported that Saudi Arabia was one of "Giuliani's law and lobbying clients..." Is that why they were not targeted?

The ban has caused needless chaos for law-abiding travelers worldwide. Legal permanent residents of the U.S. were detained at airports, not sure if they would be allowed to return home, dual passport holders were confused as to whether the directive applied to them and international airlines employing foreign cabin crew, already vetted six ways from Sunday, scrambled mid-flight. There's no excuse for this.

You asked someone to build you a sleek new skyscraper and provided them the overall vision. But someone didn't check the angles, and what you got back was the Leaning Tower of Pisa. That leaning monstrosity, like this administration, now has your name on it.

© 2017 Tribune Content Agency, LLC.

Opinions expressed in this column are solely those of the writer and are not necessarily shared by the Editor or The Nugget Newspaper.