

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*

Our best benefactors

A scholarship is a vote of confidence

Financing a college education is no small undertaking. While the rate of inflation has remained low, college tuition has ramped up considerably over the past two decades. Young people and their parents often cobble together an assortment of funds and loans to make it work.

In this environment, Astoria High School Scholarships Inc., is a miraculous benefit. Established in 1976, the fund holds a principal of about \$7 million. At this year's graduation, AHS Scholarships gave away about \$250,000. Coupling scholarship money with financial aid from colleges, students left with about \$1.5 million. Three members of the AHS class of 2016 received in excess of \$100,000. One of them received close to \$200,000.

AHS Scholarships Inc., is a collection of more than 50 funds that have been established by a variety of alumni and friends of the school. Another 12 companies give scholarships annually. One of this year's achievements was inclusion of the Ed and Eda Ross Scholarship. Established

in 1959, the Ross scholarships predate the founding of the AHS scholarships fund.

Younger funds at Knappa and Warrenton high schools also awarded funds this spring. Established in 1997, the Knappa High School scholarships fund has a principal of over \$1 million. Coupling scholarship money with financial aid, Warrenton High School grads took away \$250,000.

No matter how big the scholarship, a financial gift to a deserving graduate is a vote of confidence. Sometimes, it is the nudge that moves a young man or woman in the direction of post-secondary learning.

At a time when our nation depends on an educated work force and citizenry, those who give scholarships are some of our best benefactors.

Dying forests are emergencies

There is a tendency among many in the environmental community to regard salvage logging and forest thinning as thinly veiled ways to allow unacceptable harvest levels in U.S. national forests. Long-term drought in the West coupled with related factors like insect damage should force a reassessment of this attitude.

The U.S. Forest Service spent 56 percent of its budget last year on firefighting, compared to 16 percent in 1995, according to a June 23 story by the *Christian Science Monitor*: Sixty-six million trees have died in California alone since 2010 due to drought, higher temperatures and an infestation of beetles that are ravaging forests from Mexico to Alaska.

The Forest Service is begging Congress to address firefighting expenses as a separate budget line item, in order to avoid starving the agency of funds desperately needed for other purposes. There isn't enough money left to pay the substantial costs of restoring burned areas and keep up with the many other priorities that deserve to be top-of-mind for our manager of more than 300,000 square miles of America — the size of the nation of Turkey.)

Twenty-first century fires are a natural disaster of the

first order and deserve to be treated as such. This means finding federal funds specifically to fight them. The \$2.6 billion spent by the Forest Service in 2015 could have a dent in long-deferred property maintenance.

Logging is the logical way to generate funds for firefighting, as well potentially being useful in creating fire breaks around residential areas that have encroached upon forestland. Forest thinning, although not an efficient way of commercially harvesting, might also improve forest health while reducing fire danger.

Logging opponents are understandably skeptical when it comes to Forest Service harvest plans. For decades, wild-fire prevention served as a convenient excuse for timber sales. In many cases, these sales cost taxpayers more than they brought in. The Reagan administration was particularly notorious. It was the backlash against its malfeasance that ushered in forest management crafted by litigation.

But it now is time to treat dying forests as the emergencies they are. Reasonable, scientifically sound harvests can improve forest health while providing funds for fire suppression. It's time for a meeting of minds on this complex and emotionally fraught issue.

Bachelor named Britain, looks for love

By FRANK BRUNI
New York Times News Service

It has been forever since Britain was single, and there will be many lonesome and disorienting nights ahead.

Maybe we should fix it up with Switzerland.

Not immediately, of course. The divorce from the European Union was just announced. The paperwork hasn't been filed. There could be a loss of nerve, a relaxing of conjugal rules, tulips from Holland, chocolates from Belgium. Greece and Portugal could promise to stop leaving dirty dishes in the sink, Germany to quit hogging the remote.

But as things stand now, Britain will soon stand apart, and we all know how that goes: exhilaration, followed by panic, leading to an age-inappropriate Tinder account. Oh, look, here's Iceland, flashing its most voluptuous volcanoes. Nah, too stony and lugubrious, and you can listen to only so much Bjork. Swipe left.

Britain on its own is unfathomable. Think of its relationship history: epic trans-Atlantic romances, audacious trans-Pacific affairs, flings in this jungle, hookups on that dune. It was usually dominant, occasionally submissive but always coupled — if not tripled, quadrupled or quintupled. It had a lust for entanglement if no talent for fidelity.

But it's not the overlord it once was. Those imperial pheromones are gone. Where a crown once rested, a bald spot spreads. Britain's going to need primping, prodding, perhaps a prescription.

And introductions. So: Switzerland? If marrying rich is the goal, marrying Switzerland is the jackpot. And Switzerland won't do what Britain loathed in its current spouse and encourage poorer, darker people to drop in for fondue.

But it's so worryingly petite. So wearily standoffish, resisting the EU even while enveloped and protected by it. And it's sure to insist on a prenup longer than all of the Harry Potter novels combined. Britain needs freer and easier love than that, especially as its jowls sag and its pound droops.

Maybe that means Albania, Montenegro or Macedonia. They're the



Frank Bruni



Ian West/PA

Supporters hold a banners during a pro-EU rally in Trafalgar Square in London, after some of the pro-EU events organized in the aftermath of last week's historic referendum have been canceled at short notice over safety concerns on Tuesday.

Maybe we should fix Britain up with Switzerland.

mail-order brides of the continent, dreaming of an "I do" from the EU. Surely they'd settle for Britain.

But would Britain settle for them? The bloated pride that brought it to this juncture won't allow for a significant other that's too other and insignificant, and most outsiders can't locate Albania on a map. (Go south to the heel of Italy, turn left, cross the Adriatic, hope for the best.) There are better charted, more ego-salving corners of Europe that haven't bedded down with Brussels and are still on the market.

Like Norway. It and Britain have plenty in common — they're both wintry, watery, fishy, boozy — but also bring different, complementary assets to the table. In Norway's case, oil. In Britain's, Adele. If that's not a recipe for global domination, what is?

Britain isn't a bachelor like most. It has been married so many times that it has pretty much run through the available options.

Its predicament reminds me of the movie "What's Your Number?" which I saw so that you wouldn't have to. Anna Faris plays a Bostonian who believes that she has reached her maximum allotment of sexual partners and that her only hope for a husband is to circle back and reconnect with someone she disconnected from previously.

For Britain that could be India. Australia. Much of Africa. Some of the Middle East. Its exes are every-

where, though approaching any of them would require a new humility, as the Britain of yesteryear wasn't a particularly modest or accommodating suitor. It typically got the better end of the deal, until the EU came along and the arrangement wasn't so lopsided.

America is Britain's most prominent ex of all: the Elizabeth Taylor to its Richard Burton. Should our one-time colonial master become our 51st state? If we acted quickly enough, Boris Johnson could be tapped as Donald Trump's running mate, creating a tandem of tresses so perversely dazzling that it alone makes the case. This may have been Johnson's plan all along.

Britain is no more geographically nonsensical for us than Hawaii or Alaska, though it's probably too long a cultural stretch. It simply lacks the requisite prevalence of gun ownership.

Which makes it a better fit for Canada. Canada is saner, except about ice hockey. It's Britain's obvious match: comparably affluent, sufficiently English-speaking. Together Britain and Canada can laugh at the crudeness of us Americans, a favorite shared pastime and an understandable one.

Britain is suddenly leaderless, while Canada suddenly has a leader, Justin Trudeau, who's an international heartthrob. He can expand his portfolio to two continents, and has tidy hair. Sorry, Boris.

And the monarchy survives! Canada never ceased its ceremonial fealty to it, and bows before Queen Elizabeth II much as Britain does. It's a source of puzzlement, but it's a bridge to Britain, which is going to need the love.

Brexit shows you break it, you own it

by THOMAS L. FRIEDMAN
New York Times News Service

The British vote by a narrow majority to leave the European Union is not the end of the world — but it does show us how we can get there.

A major European power, a long-time defender of liberal democracy, pluralism and free markets, falls under the sway of a few cynical politicians who see a chance to exploit public fears of immigration to advance their careers.

They create a stark binary choice on an incredibly complex issue, of which few people understand the full scope — stay in or quit the EU.

These politicians assume that the dog will never catch the car and they will have the best of all worlds — opposing something unpopular but not having to deal with the implications of the public actually voting to get rid of it. But they so dumb down the debate with lies, fear-mongering and misdirection, and with only a simple majority required to win, that the leave-the-EU crowd carries the day by a small margin.

Presto: the dog catches the car. And, of course, it has no idea now what to do with this car. There is no plan. There is just barking.

Like I said, not the end of the world yet, but if a few more EU countries try this trick we'll have quite a little mess on our hands.

Attention Donald Trump voters: This is what happens to a country that falls for hucksters who think that life can just imitate Twitter — that there are simple answers to hard questions — and that small men can rearrange big complex systems by just erecting a wall and everything will be peachy.

But I digress. Because although withdrawing from the EU is not the right answer for Britain, the fact that this argument won, albeit with lies, tells you that people are feeling deeply anxious about something. It's the story of our time: the pace

of change in technology, globalization and climate have started to outrun the ability of our political systems to build the social, educational, community, workplace and political innovations needed for some citizens to keep up.

We have globalized trade and manufacturing, and we have introduced robots and artificial intelligent systems, far faster than we have designed the social safety nets, trade surge protectors and educational advancement options that would allow people caught in this transition to have the time, space and tools to thrive. It's left a lot of people dizzy and dislocated.

At the same time, we have opened borders deliberately — or experienced the influx of illegal migration from failing states at an unprecedented scale — and this too has left some people feeling culturally unanchored, that they are losing their "home" in the deepest sense of that word. The physical reality of immigration, particularly in Europe, has run ahead of not only the host countries' ability to integrate people but also of the immigrants' ability to integrate themselves — and both are necessary for social stability.

And these rapid changes are taking place when our politics has never been more gridlocked and unable to respond with just common sense — like governments borrowing money at near zero interest to invest in much-needed infrastructure that creates jobs and enables us to better exploit these technologies.

"Political power in the West has been failing its own test of legitimacy and accountability since 2008 — and in its desperation has chosen to erode it further by unforgivably abdicating responsibility through the use of a referendum on the EU," said Nader Mousavizadeh, who co-leads the London-based global consulting firm Macro Advisory Partners.



Thomas L. Friedman

The future belongs to those who build webs not walls.

it's hard work.

Yet in an age when technology is integrating us more tightly together and delivering tremendous flows of innovation, knowledge, connectivity and commerce, the future belongs to those who build webs not walls, who can integrate not separate, to get the most out of these flows. Britain leaving the EU is a lose-lose proposition. I hope the "Regrexit" campaign can reverse Brexit and that Americans will dump Trump.

Never forget, after the destruction of World War II, the EU project "emerged as a force for peace, prosperity, democracy and freedom in the world," noted Eric Beinhocker, the executive director of the Institute for New Economic Thinking at Oxford. "This is one of humankind's great achievements. Rather than let it be destroyed we must use the shock of the Brexit vote to reimagine, reform, and rebuild a new Europe."