Persuade the community

editorial

Mayor Cathy Clark and some city councilors say they will hold community conversation meetings this year to get a sense of what Keizer's citizens want and what they may be willing

to pay for. Last month's budget committee meetings got heated over the issue of adding one officer to the police force. Witnesses and some committee members expressed frustration—and even anger—that the city would not be able to fund one new cop.

The Keizer Police Department has operated with three fewer officers than they say is necessary to do the job. City Manager Chris Eppley has said he doesn't want to add personnel not backed with sustained funding. The 2016-17 budget should be the last in which the city has to forgo beefing up the police department.

The 2017-18 budget cycle will benefit from tax payments from new development that is coming on line this year. Tax revenue won't start coming into Keizer's coffers until November; revenues in November 2017 should be rosier.

Operating a city is expensive, espeically when some expenditures are federally mandated. Add in ever-rising health care costs and PERS requirements and the budget is quickly allocated before a new cop or park maintenance can be added.

Keizer's tax rate has been frozen at \$2.08 per \$1,000 valuation since day one. Other selected Oregon cities of similar population have rates of

between \$2.95 and \$6.33 per \$1,000.

When a tax rate increase is not possible, new city revenue must come from fees. The general fund is what Keizer uses to pay for its operations. Separate sources of

money are used to pay for streets, water and sewer expenses. Homeowners are sensitive to any tax increases or

A large portion of Keizer voters think that the \$2.08 tax rate is fine and the city should live within its means. In other words: no new taxes. Those are words that the city's elected officials should not forget as they plan their conversations with Keizer.

If the need for new revenue is dire, the mayor and councilors need to convey that in a persuasive message of why the need is dire and where new money can come from. Increasing the city's tax base is a non-starter for now, which means new revenue will have to come from existing sources (i.e., new fees) or creating new sources (more commercial and residential development).

The cost of city operations will never go down. 'Live within your means' sounds nice on a bumper sticker but the reality is that it can result with cuts in services and possible city staff layoffs.

Until tax payments from millions of dollars of new development start rolling in, the choices are stark; but, a sunnier revenue day is on the horizon. We have to be patient.



Obama and Hiroshima's moral lessons

other

views

By E.J. DIONNE JR.

Unless you are a pacifist, you accept that evil acts—the destruction of other human lives—can be justified, even necessary, in pursuit of good and urgent ends.

But unless you are amoral, you also acknowledge the human capacity for self-delusion and selfishness. People are quite capable of justifying the utterly unjustifiable by draping their immoral actions behind sweeping ethical

And if you are a responsible political leader, you must recognize both sides of this moral equation and still not allow yourself to be paralyzed.

As a student of Reinhold Niebuhr, the great theologian who was at once a liberal and a realist, President Obama has spent many years pondering this tension. He has sought out occasions on which he could preach about the ironies and uncertainties of human action—and also our obligation to act in the face of them.

This habit can annoy those who prefer to see a world in which good guys with few flaws confront the bad guys. Obama is constantly being criticized for "apologizing" for the United States when he is in fact attempting to hold us to the very standards that make the U.S. the "exceptional" nation his critics extol. Judging ourselves by our own standards is the best way to prove that our commitment to them is real.

It is thus not at all surprising that Obama chose to be the first president of the United States to visit Hiroshima, where the United States dropped the first nuclear bomb—where, as Obama put it, "a flash of light and a wall of fire destroyed a city and demonstrated

that mankind possessed the means to destroy itself."

His speech powerwas ful precisely because of its moral realism.

He made no apology for Harry Truman's decision to use the bomb and instead put it into the context of all the destruction wrought by World War II: "Sixty million people would die. ... Shot, beaten, marched, bombed, jailed, starved, gassed to death." Inherent in these sentences, with their reference to forced marches and the death camps, was the explanation of why the allies fought the war in the first place.

Obama got at both why wars are inevitable ("We may not be able to eliminate man's capacity to do evil, so nations and the alliances that we form must possess the means to defend ourselves") and why we should nonetheless strive mightily to avoid them ("The irreducible worth of every person, the insistence that every life is precious, the radical and necessary notion that we are part of a single human family—that is the story that we all must tell").

And in good Niebuhrian fashion, he urged that even those who believe they are fighting for justice be wary of "how easily we learn to justify violence in the name of some higher

Remaining aware that even the righteous can do both good and evil is central to Niebuhr's project. Back in 2007, Obama greatly impressed my friend and fellow columnist David Brooks with this off-the-cuff statement of what he had learned from Niebuhr. It was remarkably true to the theologian's core insights:

"I take away the compelling idea that there's serious evil in the world, and hardship and pain. And we should be humble and modest in our belief we can eliminate those things. But we shouldn't use that as an excuse for cynicism and inaction. I take away ... the sense we have to make these efforts knowing they are hard, and not swinging from naive idealism to bitter realism.'

Obama's critics typically see him as setting too high a bar for American intervention or argue that he is far more a realist than an idealist. The simple truth is that moral realism is hard because it means being hard on ourselves and accepting tragedy. Actions undertaken in the name of legitimate goals and actions avoided for prudential reasons can both have appalling outcomes.

Niebuhr himself was deeply ambivalent about the bomb, initially signing a Federal Council of Churches statement declaring that the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been "morally indefensible," but later concluding that he and his colleagues were perhaps too harsh on "statesmen ... driven by historic forces more powerful than any human decision."

It's not hard to identify with Niebuhr's moral reticence. A humble ambivalence may be the proper response to a horrifically destructive act undertaken in the name of avoiding even more destruction.

(Washington Post Writers Group)

Hill's emails: lying in plain sight

opinion

By DEBRA J. **SAUNDERS**

Speaking in San Francisco last week, Hillary Clinton told supporters that Donald Trump is not fit to be president. "He roots for himself," the former Secretary of State

proclaimed, "and that's the type of person who should not be president of the United States." By that standard, Clinton herself has no business running to win the White House.

Recently the State Department's independent watchdog, the Office of the Inspector General, issued a report on Clinton's "email records management." The report includes information that shows that practically everything Clinton has said about her use of a private server is

Last year, Clinton said that she used the private server "for convenience." She talked as if she had not given the matter much thought. That claim was unbelievable at the time. Given the family's extensive history of being under investigation, she of all lawyers had to know that government correspondence belongs to the people, not the place holders. As the Washington Post editorialized, the new report shows that Clinton's decision "was not a casual oversight." The Secretary of State was so busy trying to protect her self-interest that she repeatedly ignored warnings about cybersecuritv risks.

Even after the inspector general's report was released, Clinton continued to spin lies. She told ABC News and CNN that her use of a private server was "allowed." It was not. Indeed, the report found that her modus operandi presented "significant security risks." State Department officials warned of hacking attempts, which she did not heed. In an email she explained, "I don't want any risk of the personal being accessible." So she risked national security. According to the report, when staff spoke up about those risks, a staffer was

guest

told "never to speak of the Secretary's personal email system again."

Last week, the Associated Press reported that Clinton claimed, "I have provided all my work-related email." Wrong again. Clinton handed over some

30,00 emails—the rest she said were personal. But the IG report found that she handed over no emails received in her first two months in office and no "sent" messages for the first three months. In addition, investigators discovered no copies of 19 emails, provided by the Department of Defense, exchanged between Clinton and then-Gen. David Petraeus. What else is missing? It is impossible to fathom.

Clinton misled the public when she said that she would cooperate fully with investigators. "I'm more than ready to talk to anybody anytime," she said in May. But through her lawyers, Clinton declined to be interviewed by Inspector General Steve Linick or his staff. Thus Californians probably will vote in the June 7 primary without the benefit of knowing what Clinton has to say for herself on the legal record-and with an FBI criminal investigation pending. That's how little regard she has for Democratic primary voters.

Hillary Clinton roots for herself. She clearly saw the State Department as a private fiefdom, hence her use of a private server. She put national security at risk. She lies even when there is abundant evidence that she is not telling the truth. Confront her with contradictory evidence, and she continues to make fantastic assertions. She relies on her supporters' willful gullibility. In many ways, Hillary Clinton is not all that different from Donald Trump. (Creators Syndicate)

Share your opinion

by noon Tuesday.

Email a letter to the editor (300 words)

Email to: publisher@keizertimes.com

SUBSCRIPTIONS

\$33 outside Marion County

Publication No: USPS 679-430

\$45 outside Oregon PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

Keizertimes Circulation

Periodical postage paid at

Keizer, OR 97303

gene h.

Anyone who has lived in these United States can be excused if they agree that there has been a general deterioration in American morals and related behaviors. There are, arguably, many reasons for the decline in our ability to enjoy our lives free of bullets flying everywhere, rampant drug addiction, the inability to trust anyone save those who have proven they are honorable people. There is also a lack of consideration for the property and safety of our fellow citizens due to the willingness of others who choose to steal rather than work.

One can believe that a chief contributor to these negative changes in American society is due to what all of us who view television and see movies have as influences. Almost everything possible human behavior is nowadays presented on the screen with evermore sex, drugs, violence and murder. An individual can escape the personal effects of these matters by avoiding theatre of all kinds but is never safe any longer from what his neighbor, the couple down the street, the unsupervised children raising themselves and the wandering legions of persons doped up or unwilling to be responsible citizens who live to take from someone else.

An old argument reads 'life imitates art,' with its counter argument that 'art imitates life.' There's very little to debate when it comes to how much influence art has had on American life in our time. People see movies and TV shows that display behaviors not in their personal experience and make decisions as to whether what they see is a fit for them. With the number of children and youth these days without guidance, it can add up to terrible consequences for all with mcintyre

whom they impose their will in what's apparently become the new order of things.

Over more

than 200 years our forefathers and mothers from early American times viewed the theatrical profession without respect for it. After the Revolutionary War, some states went so far as to ban theatrical performances while those who wrote plays most often used pen names to avoid shame to the family name. Puritans in the newly-formed nation rose up and closed theaters while church leaders looked upon theaters as competition with their teachings.

At that time laws were passed in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island banning the performance of plays. Preachers spoke of theaters as "the Devil's Synagogues," places where fabricated human emotions were on display. This level of contempt continued well into the 1800s, a time when many religious leaders forbade dancing in public while acting was considered a vile form of expression and one step down from public drunkenness.

Then, too, acting was not helped by Abraham Lincoln's murder. After all, Lincoln was shot by an actor. Meanwhile, and even long thereafter, minstrel shows, burlesque and vaudeville were considered the lowest forms of entertainment and viewed by clergy and their congregations as "hotbeds of hedonism." When a theatre in Brooklyn burned down in 1873 with the fiery death of 300 patrons, a preacher proclaimed it as evidence that "God punished them for being in an evil

Art should reflect the good of society place" where actors were con men

> and actresses were prostitutes. I believe that modern theatre has significantly contributed to many forms of waywardness and criminality that threaten life, limb and property. The whole matter however is like Pandora's Box, once opened, the damage has spread far and wide. The steadfast acceptable behaviors of yesteryear have been replaced by much that many of us regret while so much money and fame is now granted the makers of modern art through films and presentations of all kinds that, like what's become of sports and most all "entertainment," amateur and professional, it would seem accurate to predict, though it's wished it were otherwise, that corruptions by money, money, and more money will only get worse.

> A total reversal of these trends is unrealistic while much theatre is uplifting and positively instructional and moderating influences could prevail in this country. If the U.S. stopped sending billions of dollars to rebuild Afghanistan, Iraq and other dead end "investments" overseas, we could build summer and school year programs for our children throughout the country, including, perhaps, most importantly, the neighborhoods in our inner cities, where young and old find it more "fun" now to join gangs and shoot up neighborhoods. There are countless ways we could do better at raising our young, just one is to establish ethics-building summer camps and after-school winter activities that build bodies and minds for mental health above and beyond being voyeurs, smoking pot and shedding blood.

(Gene H. McIntvre's column appears weekly in the Keizertimes.)

Keizertin

Wheatland Publishing Corp. • 142 Chemawa Road N. • Keizer, Oregon 97303 phone: 503.390.1051 • web: www.keizertimes.com • email: kt@keizertimes.com



NEWS EDITOR

editor@keizertimes.com **ASSOCIATE EDITOR**

ADVERTISING advertising@keizertimes.com POSTMASTER

PRODUCTION MANAGER **LEGAL NOTICES**

BUSINESS MANAGER Laurie Painter billing@keizertimes.com

publisher@keizertimes.com RECEPTION

Salem, Oregon

facebook facebook.com/keizertimes

twitter twitter.com/keizertimes