

**EAST OREGONIAN**  
Founded October 16, 1875

**KATHRYN B. BROWN** Publisher  
**DANIEL WATTENBURGER** Managing Editor  
**TIM TRAINOR** Opinion Page Editor  
**MARISSA WILLIAMS** Regional Advertising Director  
**MARCY ROSENBERG** Circulation Manager  
**JANNA HEIMGARTNER** Business Office Manager  
**MIKE JENSEN** Production Manager

**OTHER VIEWS**

**Wolves enter Klamath Basin**

*The (Medford) Mail-Tribune*

Four cattle confirmed killed by wolves last month in the Klamath Basin have ranchers on edge, but it does not appear any drastic changes in policy or wolf protection levels are warranted.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife biologists who examined the four carcasses said wolves were responsible, most likely the Rogue Pack, established by celebrity wandering wolf OR-7 and his mate.

Wolves are gradually increasing their presence in Oregon since the first animals wandered into the state from Idaho. They are numerous enough in roughly the eastern third of the state that they are no longer protected under the Endangered Species Act, which means they fall under the state's management plan and can be killed legally in some circumstances. West of Highway 395, wolves are still on the endangered species list and are therefore protected from being hunted or killed, even if a rancher sees them attacking livestock.

Ranching interests want to see the wolf delisted, which requires congressional action. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service supports that move as well, and the Klamath Falls office has proposed legislation to

delist the animals.

The move is controversial, because there are still relatively few wolves in the western two-thirds of the state. And as dramatic as the wolf kills are, they total just four animals.

Ranchers lose cattle to a variety of hazards, including disease, digestive problems, birthing problems and predators other than wolves. Wildlife officials say wolves do not pose a significant threat to humans.

The ranchers who lost cattle are being compensated by the Oregon Department of Agriculture after the

Klamath County Wolf Depredation Committee approved the payments. ODFW staff also are working with ranchers to employ non-lethal methods to discourage wolves from attacking livestock.

The immediate threat will diminish soon in any case, because the herds involved will be moved to winter pasture in California. Before the cattle return in the spring, the Depredation Committee hopes to have additional prevention measures in place, and will apply for state and federal grant funds to pay for them.

Meanwhile, ranchers need to adjust to the new reality of wolves becoming part of the ecosystem again as they were in the past.

**Ranching interests want to see the wolf delisted, which requires congressional action.**

**Investigation of UO law professor a teachable moment**

*The (Eugene) Register-Guard*

Defenders of University of Oregon law professor Nancy Shurtz will point to the context of her Halloween costume: She attended a private party dressed as Dr. Damon Tweedy, author of "Black Man in a White Coat: A Doctor's Reflections on Race and Medicine." Plainly, Shurtz did not intend to make any kind of racist statement by donning blackface as part of her costume.

But just as plainly, there's another context to consider: the context of a mainly white university that is struggling to make black students and faculty feel welcome, and the context of a long history of racist stereotypes communicated by blackface. At some point in the planning of her Halloween costume, Shurtz should have stopped to say, "Wait a minute — this is not a good idea." The fact that she didn't reveals a thickheaded cultural

illiteracy, not just in Shurtz but in her social and academic milieu.

UO President Michael Schill responded quickly and forcefully. Law school colleagues and others

have signed letters and petitions calling for the professor's resignation. Schurtz has been placed on administrative leave, and the UO Office of Affirmative Action and Equal

Opportunity is investigating.

Lesser reactions would condone offensive actions and imagery, and invite worse ones. But what the UO needs is not one fewer law professor, but more understanding. Shurtz's experience offers an opportunity to explore the lines between self-expression and hurtful messaging, between cluelessness and consideration, between privilege and vulnerability.

A university exists to teach students how to think, not what to think — and here's a chance to do just that.

**UO needs more understanding, not one fewer law professor.**

**YOUR VIEWS**

**Don't let politics divide neighbors and communities**

As I write, it is one day until the presidential election. There are other issues on the ballot, but the main one everyone is watching is the election of our 45th president.

The battle has been intense, loud, fractious, rude and ugly. It seems that everyone has an opinion on who is the best candidate ... and everyone believes the other candidate will bring the End Of The World. There are threats of anarchy if the election goes "the wrong way." Suggestions of rigged elections have been made. It's scary.

In many ways I am no different from those whom I've described. However, I am different in one way: I am hoping we can find a way through this in order to live and work together in the future. What kind of future this will be depends on us. Not on the candidates, not on the political parties, not on the press. It may not seem so now, but we — the people — as corny as it sounds, have the ability to direct this future. How we chose to do so is the question.

My husband and I have strong political feelings. Lifelong beliefs. Our neighbors have equally strong feelings. The difference is that they support "the other side." They even have a sign promoting their candidate. At first this annoyed us. We discussed putting up our own sign. We knew this would inflame feelings, but what the heck. This is war.

Then we thought a bit further. These are good neighbors. We are friendly; we inform each other when we go away and watch each others' property. Outwardly our lives are similar; we take pride in our homes, mow the lawn, wash our cars, pay our bills and obey the law. We love our family, our country and God. I trust them. I hope they trust us.

My point is that if politics were removed from the picture, there would be no issue. We have decided to not let politics dictate our relationship.

When I think about the day after the elections, I wonder how we will survive. Can we return to normal? Will Congress function? Will as we know it be replaced with anger and tension and distrust in all our dealings? Then I think about our neighbors. Nothing has really changed. They are still the people they were before this started and so are we. The power rests in all of us to make the hate go away and move on.

Therefore, I am asking each of you who reads this to reach out to someone who is different, who voted for the "wrong person." I truly believe this is the only way we will survive: If we each — alone and together — resolve to make the effort. Start small. Speak or wave when you pass. Hold a door open, ask about their kids. Resolve to remember the 99 ways in which you are alike rather than the one way you are different. Make peace.

Nancy Rees Duff  
Helix

**OTHER VIEWS**



**Let's not do this again**

If I had to sum up the election of 2016 in one clause, I would say it has been a sociological revolution, a moral warning and a political summons.

Sociologically, this campaign has been an education in how societies come apart. The Trump campaign has been like a flash flood that sweeps away the topsoil and both reveals and widens the chasms, crevices and cracks below.

We are a far more divided society than we realized. The educated and less educated increasingly see the world and vote in different ways. So do men and women, blacks and whites, natives and immigrants, young and old, urban and rural.

We like to think of democracy as a battle of ideas and a process of individual deliberation, but this year demography has been destiny. The campaigns have pushed us back into our tribal bunkers. Americans now seem more clannish, and more incomprehensible to one another.

This year a legitimate social uprising has been twisted to serve destructive means. During the past 50 years, most of us have benefited from feminism, the civil rights movement, mass immigration, the information age and the sexual revolution. But as Charles Murray points out, one class has been buffeted by each of these trends: white workers.

The white working class once sat comfortably at the core of the American idea, but now its members have seen their skills devalued, their neighborhoods transformed, their masculinity delegitimized, their family structures decimated, their dignity erased and their basic decency questioned. Marginalized, they commonly feel invisible, alienated and culturally pessimistic. This year the workers overthrew their corporate masters and grabbed control of the Republican Party.

That would be progress and even inspiring, but — maybe because of the candidate who is leading it — the working-class revolt has been laced with bigotry, anti-Semitism, class hatred, misogyny and authoritarianism that has further rent the American fabric.

Our partisan divides now menacingly overlap with our racial and class divides, threatening to form a trinity of discord with horrendous consequences.

The moral health of the polity is in even scarier shape. Any decent society rests on codes of etiquette and a shared moral ecology to make cooperation possible, to prevent economic and political life from descending into a savage war of all against all.

But this year Donald Trump has decimated the codes of basic decency without paying a price. With his constant, flagrant and unapologetic lying, he has shredded the standards of intellectual virtue — the normal respect for facts and truth that makes conversation possible. With his penchant for cruelty, bigotry, narcissism, selfishness and



DAVID BROOKS  
Comment

even his primitive primate dominance displays, he has shredded the accepted understandings of personal morality that prevent the strong from preying on the weak.

Most disturbing, all this has been greeted with moral numbness. The truest thing Trump said all year is that he could shoot someone on Fifth Avenue and not lose any votes. We learned this year that millions of Americans are incapable of being morally offended, or of putting virtue above partisanship.

**This year a legitimate social uprising has been twisted to serve destructive means.**

And that brings us to the summons. The events of 2016 represent a watershed and a call to do politics differently.

Personally I've always disdained talk of a third party, mostly because the structural barriers against such parties are so high, no matter how scintillatingly attractive they seem in theory. But it's becoming

clear that the need for a third party outweighs even the very real barriers.

The Republican Party will probably remain the white working-class party, favoring closed trade, closed borders and American withdrawal abroad. The Democratic Party, meanwhile, is increasingly dominated by its left/Sanders wing, which offers its own populism of the left.

There has to be a party for those who are now homeless. There has to be a party as confidently opposed to populism as populists are in favor of it.

There has to be a compassionate globalist party, one that embraces free trade while looking after those who suffer from trade; that embraces continued skilled immigration while listening to those hurt by immigration; that embraces widening ethnic diversity while understanding that diversity can weaken social trust.

There has to be a patriotic party that understands that the world benefits when America serves as the leading and energetic superpower.

There has to be a party that unapologetically emphasizes public character formation. It's not clear that our political culture is producing individuals capable of exercising freedom wisely. But citizenship is a skill that can be nurtured — by a party that insists on basic standards of decency in its candidates; that practices politics in humble, honest ways; that strengthens trust and institutions by playing by the rules, by confirming appointees and the like.

The problems go deeper than the jobless rate and the threat of ISIS. The underlying social and moral foundations of the nation have been weakened. Yesterday a rancid chapter ended. Let's start with fresh ground and a new party.

David Brooks became a *New York Times* Op-Ed columnist in 2003. He is currently also a commentator on PBS.



**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.