

# 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*

## A victory for smart, courageous citizens

*Some big opportunities are not worth it*

So this is how it ends. Oregon LNG representatives call the Smayor of Warrenton and email the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to say the company is dropping its long-standing proposal. That's what happened Friday. The company's dream of a liquefied natural gas terminal in Warrenton on the Skipanon suddenly died.

Community opposition may not have drove the company to call it quits. Perhaps the company's financial heads looked at the chessboard and saw the three ways their plan was blocked: by the county commission, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and by a Warrenton hearings officer's recommendation.

Money managers usually are who pulls the plug on giant energy projects. It was Wall Street — not Northwest environmentalists — who pulled the plug on the Washington Public Power Supply System nuclear plants in 1983 and generated the largest municipal bond default in U.S. history. The Bradwood Landing LNG project ceased in 2010 because of that company's bankruptcy.

If you lived in Clatsop County, it was hard to avoid the LNG debate. Opposition went from being lonely business to becoming the majority opinion. LNG was on the county ballot three times: in Dirk Rohne's 2008 election to the county commission, in Richard Lee's recall from the commission and in the election of Scott Lee and Peter Huhtala.

It was former Port of Astoria Executive Director Peter Gearin who brought the LNG juggernaut to Clatsop County by signing a lease on the Skipanon

property in 2004, which the Port leases from the state. It was an absurd lease, in which the Port gained nothing but a headache.

While Oregon's federal officials such as U.S. Sen. Ron Wyden, former U.S. Rep. David Wu and U.S. Rep. Suzanne Bonamici read the situation correctly and spoke for us, Salem was hopelessly slow. Former Gov. Ted Kulongoski had to be dragged into awareness. Former Gov. John Kitzhaber, during his 2014 campaign for a fourth term, incredulously asked if county public opinion opposed the Skipanon LNG project.

Neither LNG proposal — Bradwood or Skipanon — would have been good for this county. They carried enormous safety consequences. And like all such big energy projects, they were prone to the boom and bust cycle. Between the projects' launching and today, global fossil fuel supply has been transformed in a way that makes such terminals a very dubious proposition. Had Bradwood been built, for instance, it would now likely be a white elephant.

Whatever Leucadia National Corp. executives want to believe or say, this was an enormous victory for Clatsop County citizens who were smart enough and courageous enough to stand up against a lot of money.

**FYI:** Clippings from the press of the Pacific Northwest and the nation

### Veterans Days

Earl Warren once said that he read the sports section of his newspaper first because it recorded man's accomplishments, whereas the front page reported only failures. That was certainly true during his tenure as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and it's true in the Obama-Trump era of polarized politics. Fortunately, Americans can turn their eyes to an inspiring group of aging professional athletes.

This week, Kobe Bryant of the Los Angeles Lakers retired after 20 seasons in the National Basketball Association, but not before scoring

60 points in his final game, including the game-winning shot. ...

On the baseball diamond, 42-year-olds Bartolo Colon of the New York Mets and Ichiro Suzuki of the Miami Marlins are still productive players and fierce competitors. And Peyton Manning of the Denver Broncos won a second Super Bowl in February. He retired last month only weeks before turning 40.

Not since last year's mania over the dad bod have middle-aged guys had such reason for simple, nonpolitical optimism.

— *The Wall Street Journal*

### Bernie's Israel Heresy

David Ben-Gurion, Israel's founding father, said, "Peace is more important than real estate." Yitzhak Rabin came to the same conclusion and, derided by Netanyahu, was assassinated by a messianic Israeli fanatic. Netanyahu's government is a don't-give-an-inch government.

"There comes a time," said Bernie Sanders, "when if we pursue justice and peace, we are going to have to say that Netanyahu makes mistakes."

A growing number of Americans believe that time is now.

— *Roger Cohen in The New York Times*

## Clintonism of the '90s, rest in peace

By CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER

Washington Post Writers Group

WASHINGTON — How far they've come. And I'm not talking about the GOP, whose front-runner representing 37 percent of the Republican electorate has repudiated post-Reagan orthodoxy on trade, entitlement reform, limited government and Pax Americana (and possibly abortion, but who knows?).

I'm talking about the Democrats. The center-left, triangulating, New Democrat (Bill) Clintonism of the 1990s is dead. It expired of unnatural causes, buried — definitely, if unceremoniously — by its very creator.

The final chapter occurred last week when, responding to Black Lives Matter hecklers denouncing his 1994 crime bill, Bill Clinton unleashed an impassioned defense. He accused the protesters of discounting the thousands of lives, mostly black, that were saved amid the crack epidemic of the time because gang leaders and other bad guys got locked up.

Yet the next day, the big dog came out, tail between his legs, saying he regretted the incident and almost wanted to apologize. It was a humiliating, Soviet-style recantation obviously meant to protect his wife's campaign, which depends on the African-American vote to fend off Bernie Sanders.

You know Bill Clinton still believes his crime bill was justified. One cannot definitively prove causality, but it certainly contributed to one of the most radical declines in crime ever recorded in this country.

Moreover, the Black Lives Matter charge that the 1994 law was an inherently racist engine for the mass incarceration of young black men is belied by the fact that it was supported by two-thirds of the Congressional Black Caucus (including civil rights pioneer James Clyburn, D-S.C.), justly panicked at the time by the carnage wrought by the crack epidemic ravaging the inner cities.

It's one thing to argue that the law overshot and is due for revi-



Charles Krauthammer



AP Photo/Steven Senne

Former President Bill Clinton poses for a photograph with people from the audience after speaking in support of his wife, Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, Thursday, at the Community College of Rhode Island in Warwick, R.I.

sion with, for example, a relaxation of its mandatory-sentence provisions. It's quite another to claim, as does Black Lives Matter, that it was a vehicle by which a racist criminal justice system destroyed the lives of young black men. Hillary Clinton, catching up to Sanders, has essentially endorsed that view, demanding an end to "the era of mass incarceration" and the underlying maltreatment of blacks by police and the courts.

For the man who changed the image of the Democratic Party 25 years ago by daring to challenge the reverse racism of Sister Souljah to have to bow to this new — false — orthodoxy, symbolizes perfectly how far the Democratic Party has traveled since the Clinton era.

But the 2016 undoing of classic Clintonism hardly stops there. Take trade. It was Bill who promoted and passed NAFTA. Although Hillary criticized NAFTA when she ran in 2007-2008, as secretary of state she returned to her traditional free-trade stance, promoting and extolling the Trans-Pacific Partnership as trade's "gold standard."

Now dross, apparently. She came out against the TPP, once again stampeded by Sanders and the party's left, i.e., its base. She may not have sincerely changed her view, but there are only so many times you can flip-flop. She's boxed into the party's new anti-trade consensus.

Other pillars of her husband's internationalism were already toppled, pre-2016, by the Obama pres-

idency, often with her active collaboration. At the core of Bill Clinton's foreign policy lay the notion of America as the "indispensable nation." It is today quite dispensable, indeed a nation in retreat — from (Hillary's) reset with Russia to the Iranian nuclear negotiations (which Hillary initiated with secret meetings in Oman in 2012) to the disastrous evacuation of Iraq in 2011.

As has happened with another of Bill's major achievements: welfare reform. President Obama has essentially dismantled its work requirements (with Bill Clinton's acquiescence, a sign of things to come). No need for Hillary to repudiate her husband's legacy. It's been done for her.

**There are only so many times you can flip-flop.**

How far has the party moved left? Under Bill Clinton, it gave up on gun control after stinging defeats in the 1994 midterms. Today, Hillary Clinton delights in attacking Sanders for being soft on gun control. Malleable she is. And she sure knows her party.

It is nothing like her husband's party. Which is why she campaigns as Bernie lite — they share the same goals, she says, but she can get things done. Hence the greatest irony of all: For the last decade and a half, the main propellant for the Hillary-for-president movement has been the rosy afterglow of Bill's 1990s, the end-of-history era of peace, prosperity and balanced budgets.

Want it back? Vote Hillary. That's the tease. Yet a Hillary victory would yield a Clinton Redux animated not by Bill but by Bernie.

## The Pastrami Principle of real Americans

By PAUL KRUGMAN

New York Times News Service

A couple of months ago, Jeb Bush (remember him?) posted a photo of his monogrammed handgun to Twitter, with the caption "America."

Bill de Blasio, New York's mayor, responded with a picture of an immense pastrami sandwich, also captioned "America."

Advantage de Blasio, if you ask me.

Let me now somewhat ruin the joke by talking about the subtext. Bush's post was an awkward attempt to tap into the common Republican theme that only certain people — white, gun-owning, rural or small-town citizens — embody the true spirit of the nation. It's a theme most famously espoused by Sarah Palin, who told small-town Southerners that they represented the "real America." You see the same thing when Ted Cruz sneers at "New York values."

De Blasio's riposte, celebrating a characteristically New York delicacy, was a declaration that we're also Americans — that everyone counts. And that, surely, is the vision of America that should prevail.

Which is why it's disturbing to see Palinesque attempts to delegitimize large groups of voters surfacing among some Democrats.

Quite a few people seem confused about the current state of the Democratic nomination race. But the essentials are simple: Hillary Clinton has a large lead in both pledged delegates and the popular vote. (In Democratic primaries, delegate allocation is roughly proportional to votes.) If you ask how that's possible — Bernie Sanders just won seven states in a row! — you need to realize that those seven states have a combined popula-

tion of about 20 million. Meanwhile, Florida alone also has about 20 million people — and Clinton won it by a 30-point margin.

To overtake her, Sanders would have to win the remaining contests by an average 13-point margin, a number that will almost surely go up after the New York primary, even if he does much better than current polls suggest. That's not impossible, but it's highly unlikely.

So the Sanders campaign is arguing that superdelegates — the people, mainly party insiders, not selected through primaries and caucuses who get to serve as delegates under Democratic nomination rules — should give him the nomination even if he loses the popular vote. In case you're rubbing your eyes: Yes, not long ago many Sanders supporters were fulminating about how Hillary was going to steal the nomination by having superdelegates put her over the top despite losing the primaries. Now the Sanders strategy is to win by doing exactly that.

But how can the campaign make the case that the party should defy the apparent will of its voters? By insisting that many of those voters shouldn't count. Over the past week, Sanders has declared that Clinton leads only because she has won in the "Deep South," which is a "pretty conservative part of the country." The tally so far, he says, "distorts reality" because it contains so many Southern states.

As it happens, this isn't true — the calendar, which front-loaded some states very favorable to Sanders, hasn't been a big factor in the race. Also, swing-state Florida isn't the Deep South. But never mind. The big problem with this argument should be obvious. Clin-



Paul Krugman

ton didn't win big in the South on the strength of conservative voters; she won by getting an overwhelming majority of black voters. This puts a different spin on things, doesn't it?

Is it possible that Sanders doesn't know this, that he imagines that Clinton is riding a wave of support from old-fashioned Confederate-flag-waving Dixiecrats, as opposed to, let's be blunt, the descendants of slaves? Maybe. He is not, as you may have noticed, a details guy.

It's more likely, however, that he's being deliberately misleading — and that his effort to delegitimize a big part of the Democratic electorate is a cynical ploy.

Who's the target of this ploy? Not the superdelegates, surely. Think about it: Can you imagine Democratic Party insiders deciding to deny the nomination to the candidate who won the most votes, on the grounds that African-American voters don't count as much as whites?

No, claims that Clinton wins in the South should be discounted are really aimed at misleading Sanders supporters, giving them an unrealistic view of the chances that their favorite can still win — and thereby keeping the flow of money and volunteers coming.

Just to be clear, I'm not saying that Sanders should drop out. He has the right to keep campaigning, in the hope either of pulling off huge upsets in the remaining primaries or of having influence at the convention. But trying to keep his campaign going by misleading his supporters is not OK. And sneering at millions of voters is truly beyond the pale, especially for a progressive.

Remember the pastrami principle: We're all real Americans. And African-Americans are very definitely real Democrats, deserving respect.

**Who's the target of this ploy?**