EAST OREGONIAN
Founded October 16, 1875

**KATHRYN B. BROWN**
Publisher

**DANIEL WATTENBURGER**
Managing Editor

**JENNINE PERKINSON**
Advertising Director

**TIM TRAINOR**
Opinion Page Editor

OUR VIEW

# Oregon primary kinda, sorta matters

*The Wall Street Journal* recently published a list of the remaining state primary elections. The *WSJ* failed to include Oregon's May primary. While it was wrong, the omission did reflect a certain truth — that the Oregon Primary has not mattered in presidential politics in quite awhile.

It is true that Barack Obama spoke in Pendleton in 2008. That same year former President Bill Clinton spoke here, too, to boost the fortunes of his wife Hillary.

But one must go back decades to find an Oregon primary that saw candidates criss-crossing the state. It is hard to believe, but in the spring of 1960 Sen. John F. Kennedy stumped in many locations across Oregon. An EO Media Group publisher saw JFK speak in Pendleton's Hawthorne Grade School cafeteria on that occasion. The elegant Jacqueline Kennedy stood in a receiving line in that humble setting.

"He cared enough to come" was Nelson Rockefeller's appeal to Oregon Republican voters in the 1964 primary. It worked, with Rocky beating Arizona Sen. Barry Goldwater among Oregon Republicans.

Bobby Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy made Oregon appearances in 1968. McCarthy prevailed.

Now that Ted Cruz and John Kasich have a strategy that involves Oregon and a few other states, we might see a lot of Kasich. Cruz has decided to stay away while Kasich has already announced stops in suburban Portland and Medford, on his way to California to compete for the big pot of delegates down there.

> Oregon prepares for presidency-seeking visitors.

We have not heard word from Donald Trump. Perhaps he would like to skip Portland — where protests would be guaranteed — and speak in more welcoming environment? Say a grass infield? Would certainly be fun to welcome a new kind of rodeo to town.

On the Democratic side, Bernie Sanders will likely win the Democratic vote and will try to recreate the Portland "put a bird on it" magic.

When we receive our ballots in the mail over the weekend, it will be a medium thrill. We have presidential races in both parties.

It will be fun to have a semblance of the presidential primaries in Oregon. So we kinda, sorta matter this time around.

**Unsigned editorials are the opinion of the East Oregonian editorial board of Publisher Kathryn Brown, Managing Editor Daniel Wattenburger, and Opinion Page Editor Tim Trainor. Other columns, letters and cartoons on this page express the opinions of the authors and not necessarily that of the East Oregonian.**

OTHER VIEWS

# Reclassifying marijuana is long overdue

*Corvallis Gazette-Times*

The federal government says it's reviewing marijuana's status as a Schedule 1 drug, a move that — regardless of what you think about the drug — is long overdue.

The U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency made the announcement in a memo to lawmakers and said it hopes to have a decision ready sometime in the first half of this year.

Marijuana has long been classified as a Schedule 1 drug, but the classification is as ludicrous today as it was back in the day. The Schedule 1 category is for substances which are not considered to have "any currently accepted medical use in the U.S., a lack of accepted safety for use under medical supervision and a high potential for abuse." By point of comparison, heroin also is a Schedule 1 drug.

> There's no reason for marijuana to continue to be listed as a Schedule 1 drug.

There's no reason for marijuana to be listed as a Schedule 1 drug — and, besides, that bit of business about not having any accepted medical use will come as a surprise to the millions of medical marijuana users in the United States.

There's another reason why the Schedule 1 listing is vexing: It has needlessly complicated important scientific research, not just into marijuana, but also into industrial hemp, potentially a very useful crop. (Industrial hemp, which can be used for a variety of purposes, has very low levels of tetrahydrocannabinol — the substance that gets pot users high.)

It was almost amusing to watch Oregon State University officials tip-toe around this issue last year before taking tentative steps to allow researchers there to work with industrial hemp. (To be fair, an institution such as OSU will be careful about working with a Schedule 1 drug, especially since it's potentially putting millions of federal research dollars at risk.)

But there's a lot of research yet to be done into the medicinal qualities of marijuana as well, and pulling pot off the Schedule 1 list would be a substantial step forward for that work.

A recent interview in *The Oregonian* with Dr. Colin Roberts, a pediatric neurologist and director of the Doernbecher Childhood Epilepsy Program at the Oregon Health and Science University, illuminated some of the issues researchers face. Roberts is working with a pharmaceutical company on a drug made with pure cannabidiol that has shown promise in treating patients with a form of epilepsy.

One big problem with the Schedule 1 designation is that it requires researchers to undergo a cumbersome approval process before working with a drug on the list. In the case of marijuana, researchers must use pot grown at a government-run facility at the University of Mississippi.

Researchers can't just go out and buy pot at a dispensary, because there's no way to verify precisely what they're buying — and remember that different strains of marijuana have very different properties. Taking pot off the Schedule 1 list would allow researchers to obtain the sort of independent verification that's essential for meaningful research.

"What we really need in the medical community is really good data," Roberts told *The Oregonian,* "because if we don't have that we will never understand the impact of these products good and bad."

Pulling marijuana from the Schedule 1 list would be a first step toward getting that kind of good data. What's the holdup?

## LETTERS POLICY

**The East Oregonian welcomes original letters of 400 words or less on public issues and public policies for publication in the newspaper and on our website. The newspaper reserves the right to withhold letters that address concerns about individual services and products or letters that infringe on the rights of private citizens. Submitted letters must be signed by the author and include the city of residence and a daytime phone number. The phone number will not be published. Unsigned letters will not be published. Send letters to Managing Editor Daniel Wattenburger, 211 S.E. Byers Ave. Pendleton, OR 97801 or email editor@eastoregonian.com.**

OTHER VIEWS

# The cult of sore losers

FRANK BRUNI
**Comment**

Bernie Sanders isn't losing. Just ask many of his backers or listen to some of his own complaints. He's being robbed, a victim of antiquated rules, voter suppression, shady arithmetic and a corrupt Democratic establishment. The swindle includes the South's getting inordinate sway and the poor none at all. If Americans really had a voice, they would shout "Bernie! Bernie! Bernie!" until too hoarse to shout anymore.

Donald Trump isn't winning. Just ask Ted Cruz, by whose strange and self-serving logic it is "the will of the people" (his actual words) that he and John Kasich collude to prevent Trump from amassing a majority of delegates so that some runner-up with less demonstrable support can leapfrog past him to become the Republican presidential nominee. Democracy in action!

> The election process has never been smooth and the defeated seldom docile.

I agree that Trump's nomination would be frightening. I disagree that Cruz's would be better. It certainly wouldn't be more justified, but such rational thinking has gone missing in this year of losing gracelessly.

And in this era of irresolution. All too often, contests don't yield accepted conclusions and a grudging acquiescence by those who didn't get their way. They prompt accusations of thievery, cries of illegitimacy and a determination to neuter the victor, nullify the results or reverse them as soon as possible.

Elections don't settle disputes, not even for some fleeting honeymoon. They accelerate them, because there's a pernicious insistence that they're not referendums on the public mood but elaborate board games in which the triumphant player used the wickedest skulduggery.

When you honestly believe or disingenuously assert that you've been outmaneuvered rather than outvoted, why declare a truce, let alone cooperate, in the aftermath?

The process has never been smooth and the defeated seldom docile. To pluck just one example from the annals of acrimony, Teddy Roosevelt formed the Progressive Party in 1912 as a revolt against the Republicans' nomination of the incumbent president, William Howard Taft, rather than him.

But an epoch of unrelieved mutual suspicion between competitors — and especially between Republicans and Democrats — took hold somewhere on a timeline that runs through Watergate; the confirmation hearings of Robert Bork and Clarence Thomas; the serial investigations into the Clintons; and Mitch McConnell's vow to thwart President Barack Obama at every turn.

In the midst of that came Bush v. Gore, in which a majority of Republican appointees on the Supreme Court decided a presidential election in the Republican candidate's favor.

All trust, most etiquette and many rules went out the window. And while Republicans have been more audacious than Democrats, the manifold accusations made by Sanders supporters show that the effort to delegitimize winners is a pan-partisan tic.

Pro-Sanders actor Tim Robbins fired off a tweet this week with the charge that "this election is being stolen," the hashtag #VoterFraud and the insinuation that *The Times* and CNN were essentially conspiring with Hillary Clinton's campaign.

The Sanders camp is right to raise questions about voting irregularities in a few places, including New York, where there's an investigation underway, and about the odd patchwork of closed and open primaries across the country.

But all of the candidates knew about that patchwork going in, and Clinton's successful navigation of it — she has a multimillion-vote lead over Sanders — is more persuasive than any dark claims of dastardly tricks.

On the Republican side, Trump and Cruz have each bellowed about the other's supposedly unfair advantages at a volume that's hardly constructive. It's self-promotion with a side of cynicism.

The graceless losing of 2016 owes something to this election's particular characters. When you're not just a man but a revolution (Sanders), you can never quit the fight or flee the front.

When you're the Don Quixote of extreme conservatism (Cruz), you can never ditch your armor. And it's easy to tell yourself — because it's easy for all of us to tell ourselves — that surrendering to Trump is surrendering your patriotism.

But there's more at work. The refusal to grant victors legitimacy bundles together so much about America today: the coarseness of our discourse; the blind tribalism coloring our debates; the elevation of individualism far above common purpose; the ethos that everybody should and can feel like a winner on every day.

Our system for electing presidents is indeed a mess. It estranges voters and is ripe for reform. I explored that last week.

But pushing for change is different from rejecting any unwelcome outcome as the bastard fruit of a poisoned tree. If grievances are never retired, then progress has no chance. If everything is rigged, then all is fair, not just in love and war but on the banks of the Potomac, where we can look forward to four more years of inertia and ugliness.

■

*Frank Bruni, an Op-Ed columnist since June 2011, joined the New York Times in 1995.*

YOUR VIEWS

## A vote for Morehouse is a vote for Pendleton council change

If we didn't know who the elite and the "good-old-boys" club want for the city council, we do now. My opponent Scott Fairley has been endorsed by Mayor Houk, Councilor Chuck Wood and the *East Oregonian.*

I did not expect to be endorsed by anyone tied to the present administration. I knew it would be a long shot for the *EO* to endorse anyone outside of government. The *EO* has been critical of the present city administration and council in the last two years. Why would they endorse someone who is part of this administration? If you want change this is the wrong way to achieve it.

I will leave it up to the voters to decide, families who are buying a home, paying taxes, raising children, trying to save a little money for kids' college and their own retirement, retired people like myself and the many residents who live in apartments. Can we afford another four years like the last two years?

It may be many years until we have another chance to make a big change in our city government. If elected I will work with whoever the voters choose. I am a conservative but am willing to listen to any idea that will help Pendleton move forward. We have had enough bad ideas already.

If you want change, vote for me. If you like the status quo, vote for the other guy.

**Rex J. Morehouse, Ward 2 candidate**
**Pendleton**

## Wolves appreciate tasty humans

I have heard that some of your readers believe that our pack won't attack and eat them. Human flesh isn't our first choice because it doesn't have the same kick as a wild animal, but our human kills have been reported. My Canadian cousins killed a youngster on Sept. 24, 1963. In another attack a 32-year-old teacher, Candice Burner, was killed March 8, 2010. These kills were documented by the authorities.

My point is that we don't want people who love us and vote for non-lethal control to get on our case. Certainly bears and cougars are bad actors and should be eliminated, but if you are out skipping along in your new spandex gnawing on some delicious fried chicken, we may have to surround you for sharing time. Be aware cause we are there.

**Alfa Wolf, Eastern Oregon packmaster**
**(As told to Mike Mehren, wolf -listening docent)**
**Hermiston**