

THE DAILY ASTORIAN

Founded in 1873



STEPHEN A. FORRESTER, *Editor & Publisher*
 LAURA SELLERS, *Managing Editor*
 BETTY SMITH, *Advertising Manager*
 CARL EARL, *Systems Manager*
 JOHN D. BRUIJN, *Production Manager*
 DEBRA BLOOM, *Business Manager*
 HEATHER RAMSDELL, *Circulation Manager*

Salem errs in cuts to police research

Oregon legislators say they want to curb and decrease the size of our prison population. Policing is part of that solution.

But Keizer Police Chief John Teague has exposed a gap in the Legislature's initiative. Speaking to a meeting of Oregon counties, Teague criticized legislators for not fully staffing the Center for Policing Excellence, which they created in 2013. Specifically, they have not funded the research position. Law enforcement professionals such as Astoria Chief Brad Johnston say that research is essential to improving and driving forward the concept of evidence-based policing, which is an element in preventing crime.

Johnston also points out that lack of funding forced the

Center for Policing Excellence to cut its leadership training programs, which certify new administrators, such as chiefs and deputy chiefs. "Astoria confronted this and had to find its own training in various places," said Johnston. "That lacked coherence and cost more." The other important thing about centralized leadership training, said Johnston, is that "You want everyone to get the same message."

In its funding cut at the Center for Policing Excellence, the Legislature has been exceedingly short-sighted. It's time to correct the error.

Death with dignity harder in rural areas

In 1997, the last time Clatsop County voters were asked about it, 61 percent favored keeping Oregon's law allowing terminally ill adults to obtain a lethal prescription. When Washington state authorized the same law in 2008, 64 percent of Pacific County voters supported it.

Despite these strong endorsements for the concept that rational adults deserve to control their own fates when it comes to end-of-life decisions, it remains stubbornly difficult for terminally ill residents of the Columbia estuary counties to obtain physicians' help in ending their suffering. In fact, this gap between the law and pragmatic reality is an issue throughout the rural Pacific Northwest.

Many of the Northwest's hospital systems are affiliated with the Catholic Church, which has strong doctrinal objections to suicide in any form. This takes Providence Seaside Hospital out of the equation. Columbia Memorial Hospital is Lutheran-affiliated and also opts out of participation. In other cases, many pharmacies, publicly owned hospitals and their medical staffs have chosen not to participate in "aid in dying."

This means, as a practical matter, that the ability to conveniently

obtain this form of help is limited to patients in urban areas with abundant healthcare choices.

As EO Media Group journalist Natalie St. John reported last week, a recent report found that in Washington state few minority, lower-income and rural residents have taken advantage of the law. According to the report, 92 percent of participants were white, 93 percent had some form of insurance, and 76 percent had at least some college education. More than half were married, and 95 percent lived west of the Cascades. In Oregon, participation trends have been very similar to those in Washington — white, well-educated, insured, west side. But only 7 percent were from Oregon's coastal counties in 2014.

A common challenge is that people who don't live in major cities may have to travel out of their area to have the two required consultations and pick up the medication. That can be a serious hardship for people who are low-income, don't have transportation or are too sick to travel.

It's time for rural healthcare providers to reassess their positions by expanding access to aid in dying. Measures supported by strong majorities of local voters deserve deference.

Good news on Amtrak's Willamette Valley route

The Amtrak Cascades has been a hit, with one exception — the Willamette Valley. For years, as ridership soared between Portland and Seattle, it languished between Eugene and Portland.

Oregon legislators were concerned about that dead zone, because Oregon buys train sets and funds that route, just as our neighbor Washington pays an even larger share. Legislators identified scheduling as the Willamette Valley route's main problem.

Hillary Borrud of our state-house bureau reports that after

moving the morning train's start time from 5:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., ridership jumped. And the on-time record of the Eugene-Portland train has improved markedly.

Rail must be part of the intercity transportation solution. The rail route between Portland Seattle has gained popularity over the past decade, and it is easy to see why. Interstate 5 between the two cities, especially into Seattle, is a nightmare.

Many in Congress want to see Amtrak fail. We out here cannot afford that.

Terrorists want us to fear fear itself

By PAUL KRUGMAN

New York Times News Service

Like millions of people, I've been obsessively following the news from Paris, putting aside other things to focus on the horror. It's the natural human reaction. But let's be clear: It's also the reaction the terrorists want. And that's something not everyone seems to understand.

Take, for example, Jeb Bush's declaration that "this is an organized attempt to destroy Western civilization." No, it isn't. It's an organized attempt to sow panic, which isn't at all the same thing. And remarks like that, which blur that distinction and make terrorists seem more powerful than they are, just help the jihadis' cause.

Think, for a moment, about what France is and what it represents. It has its problems — what nation doesn't? — but it's a robust democracy with a deep well of popular legitimacy. Its defense budget is small compared with ours, but it nonetheless retains a powerful military, and has the resources to make that military much stronger if it chooses. (France's economy is around 20 times the size of Syria's.) France is not going to be conquered by ISIS, now or ever. Destroy Western civilization? Not a chance.

So what was Friday's attack about? Killing random people in restaurants and at concerts is a strategy that reflects its perpetrators' fundamental weakness. It isn't going to establish a caliphate in Paris. What it can do, however, is inspire fear — which is why we call it terrorism, and shouldn't dignify it with the name of war.

The point is not to minimize the horror. It is, instead, to emphasize that the biggest danger terrorism poses to our society comes not from the direct harm inflicted, but from the wrong-headed responses it can inspire. And it's crucial to realize that there are multiple ways the response can go wrong.

It would certainly be a very bad thing if France or other democracies responded to terrorism with appeasement — if, for example, the French



Paul Krugman



were to withdraw from the international effort against ISIS in the vain hope that jihadis would leave them alone. And I won't say that there are no would-be appeasers out there; there are indeed some people determined to believe that Western imperialism is the root of all evil, and all would be well if we stopped meddling.

But real-world examples of mainstream politicians, let alone governments, knuckling under to terrorist demands are hard to find. Most accusations of appeasement in America seem to be aimed at liberals who don't use what conservatives consider tough enough language.

A much bigger risk, in practice, is that the targets of terrorism will try to achieve perfect security by eliminating every conceivable threat — a response that inevitably makes things worse, because it's a big, complicated world, and even superpowers can't set everything right. On 9/11 Donald Rumsfeld told his aides: "Sweep it up. Related and not," and immediately suggested using the attack as an excuse to invade Iraq. The result was a disastrous war that actually empowered terrorists, and set the stage for the rise of ISIS.

And let's be clear: this wasn't just a matter of bad judgment. Yes, Virginia, people can and do exploit terrorism for political gain, including using it to justify what they imagine will be a splendid, politically beneficial little war.

Oh, and whatever people like Ted Cruz may imagine, ending our reluctance to kill innocent civil-

ians wouldn't remove the limits to American power. It would, however, do wonders for terrorist recruitment.

Finally, terrorism is just one of many dangers in the world, and shouldn't be allowed to divert our attention from other issues. Sorry, conservatives: when President Barack Obama describes climate change

Terrorism can't and won't destroy our civilization, but global warming could and might.

as the greatest threat we face, he's exactly right. Terrorism can't and won't destroy our civilization, but global warming could and might.

So what can we say about how to respond to terrorism? Before the atrocities in Paris, the West's general response involved a mix of policing, precaution, and military action. All involved difficult trade-offs: surveillance versus privacy, protection versus freedom of movement, denying terrorists havens versus the costs and dangers of waging war abroad. And it was always obvious that sometimes a terrorist attack would slip through.

Paris may have changed that calculus a bit, especially when it comes to Europe's handling of refugees, an agonizing issue that has now gotten even more fraught. And there will have to be a post-mortem on why such an elaborate plot wasn't spotted. But do you remember all the pronouncements that 9/11 would change everything? Well, it didn't — and neither will this atrocity.

Again, the goal of terrorists is to inspire terror, because that's all they're capable of. And the most important thing our societies can do in response is to refuse to give in to fear.

The most revealing debate yet

By CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER

Washington Post Writers Group

WASHINGTON — The Republican debate on CNBC was riveting, the way a train wreck is riveting — you can't take your eyes off it. The Fox Business Network debate was merely satisfying. A serious political discussion requires a bit more work, but it repays the effort.

The CNBC affair was a contrived food fight during which substance occasionally broke out (such as the brief exchange between Chris Christie and Mike Huckabee on entitlement reform). FBN, on the other hand, conducted a meaty debate during which a tomato or two was occasionally tossed. John Kasich came itching for a fight. Donald Trump pitched back with his usual high-mindedness, responding at one point to Kasich with "I've built an unbelievable company worth billions and billions of dollars. I don't have to hear from this man."

Despite such exceptions, the FBN debate marks the point at which the GOP campaign begins leaving the entertainment phase and entering the serious season. The moderators' modesty and straightforwardness created an atmosphere of transparency that allowed the candidates to reveal themselves, advertently or not.

Kasich did. Unfortunately, it was an irritable self-righteous Kasich who showed up, doing himself no good. At the other end of the podium, Rand

Paul had his best night. He certainly deserves credit for courage. His noninterventionist foreign policy is far outside the GOP mainstream, which is why Marco Rubio won the room in their exchange on defense spending and intervention. But Paul defended his minority view stoutly, regardless. Give him points for principle.

In a year when showmanship is king, however, principle won't help him much to get out of single digits. You could almost see Paul on the far right of the stage and Kasich on the far left dropping through a trapdoor, leaving six finalists.

Or perhaps not six. Jeb Bush, too, had his best night. He was competent and solid but, unfortunately, still inarticulate. You almost feel sorry for the travail he is about to endure on his increasingly long-shot campaign.

Carly Fiorina, strong on stage but weak on campaign infrastructure, showed herself tough as nails — the perfect VP. She can say things about Hillary Clinton that no man can. And she knows it.

Tuesday's best performers, unsurprisingly, were Rubio and Ted Cruz, the 44-year-old, silver-tongued, Cuban-American, first-term senators. Imagine them as a ticket. In 1992, Bill Clinton's choice of Al Gore was as strategically brilliant as it was counterintuitive. Instead of balancing that ticket — old with young, Northern with Southern, experience with energy — Clinton doubled down with his own mirror image. The "Young Guns," as Newsweek memorably dubbed them on its cover, proved irresistible. (Others called it "Double Bubba.")



Charles Krauthammer

Which leaves the two outsider front-runners. Ben Carson had an awful night — the Chinese intervening in Syria? But it was book-ended and thereby saved by two good moments: his first answer, the pre-emptive "Thank you for not asking me what I said in the 10th grade," and his closing statement about the suffering in the country being overcome

by America's inner strength. Trump shares with Carson the GOP's vast anti-politics constituency, now fully half of the Republican electorate. Carson's antidote to the nation's failed politics is moral strength. Trump's is unapologetic brute strength.

Trump did not have a particularly good night, either. He was again at sea on foreign policy. And when asked about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the 12-nation trade deal he opposes root and branch, Trump did his riff on the Chinese economic menace — to which Rand Paul calmly pointed out that China is not party to the TPP. Indeed, the main strategic purpose of the TPP is precisely to contain China by binding its Pacific neighbors to the United States, thus blunting Beijing's reach for regional hegemony.

Never mind. As long as the anti-politics mood prevails, neither Trump nor Carson is even dented by such policy misadventures.

Tuesday night did not radically alter the trajectory of the Republican race. But it will hasten the winnowing of the field. If you narrow the viewfinder, the debate stage shrinks from eight to six to a possible final four: Cruz, Rubio, Carson, Trump. (Chris Christie, who shone in the undercard debate, has the best outside shot at crashing this group.)

On Tuesday, all the contenders were required to show their hand. We saw character and we saw policy. Substance is never sizzling, but the FBN debate was both revealing and sobering: Which one of these can you actually see inhabiting the Oval Office?

The CNBC affair was a contrived food fight during which substance occasionally broke out.