

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

OUR VIEW



AP Photo/Greg Wahl-Stephens, file

In this 2003 file photo, Portland Mayor Vera Katz, right, and County Chair Diane Linn celebrate a lead in a Multnomah County election. Katz, who broke gender barriers to become Oregon's first female House speaker, and also won three terms as Portland mayor, died at 84.

Katz: A pioneer

Oregonians always knew where Vera Katz stood. There was nothing wishy-washy about her.

That was part of the appeal of this outgoing, opinionated politician who shattered gender norms to become the first female speaker of the Oregon House and later served three terms as Portland mayor. In both roles, Katz had profound influence throughout Oregon.

She died Monday at age 84.

Sometimes it's difficult to realize how far Oregon has come since the 1970s,

when men received preference over women at lunchtime restaurants — because men worked, their time was valuable and, after all, they had to get back to work! Vera Katz came of political age in that era.

But it's heartbreaking to recognize how far we have to go, as sexism endures in the 21st century. We long ago should have recognized, as was demonstrated by Katz and such legislative contemporaries as fellow Democrat Betty Roberts and Republican Norma Paulus, that women are just as competent and capable as men in political life and public leadership.

Those women's tough-minded leadership stands in sharp contrast to Kate Brown, who has yet to establish her *raison d'être* for being Oregon's governor, and to Portland's one-term mayors — Tom Potter, Sam Adams and Charlie Hales — who followed Katz.

Katz was a bold leader but also a deft politician. In the Legislature, she found common ground with Denny Jones, a conservative retired rancher from Eastern Oregon. She and Senate President John Kitzhaber were aligned so closely that “Katz and Katz” determined years of public policy in Oregon.

Not everything Katz did was successful, or even a good idea. She pushed education reforms that included the much-maligned CIM and CAM for students — certificates of initial and advanced mastery. Depending on your point of view, they were either an ineffective, time-wasting requirement or a decent reform that was poorly implemented.

The backlash over CIM and CAM stands today as a warning against mandating onerous, top-down regulations that lack statewide understanding, let alone grassroots support. The governor and legislative leaders should remember that history before shoving one-sided environmental or tax bills through the 2018 Legislature.

Leadership is a mix of failures and successes — and the ability to understand both. Katz had the courage to lead, the boldness to act and the confidence to stay in the public eye, even when things did not go her way.

That is leadership. Which makes us wonder: What will be the legacy of today's leaders?

Katz had the boldness to act and the confidence to stay in the public eye.

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

Craft beverage industry critical to Oregon

Corvallis Gazette-Times

Here's something to ponder the next time you're sipping on one of Oregon's microbrews:

The craft beverage business has become so important to the state's economy that an Oregon city is offering incentives to a brewery to open an establishment there.

The city in question is Madras, 40 miles to the north of Bend. Madras officials are weary of losing all that beer business to Bend, so they're on the hunt for an enterprising brewery to open in their city. According to a recent Associated Press story, Madras officials say they'll assist in site selection and costs of architecture, engineering, permits and building renovation. The city also offers expedited permitting, technical assistance and the opportunity for a startup loan.

In other words, all an applicant need do is bring brewing skills. The city will help take care of everything else.

“Madras is ready for a brewery or brew pub to call its own,” Madras Mayor Royce Embanks says in the appeal from the Madras Redevelopment Commission. “The vision is for a vibrant community gathering place and an inviting destination for friends, family and tourists.”

Leaving aside for a second the

fact that Madras has 6,300 residents compared to the 91,000 souls who occupy Bend, the notion that an Oregon city or town isn't complete without its own brewery is interesting.

Certainly, the numbers confirm the booming business in Oregon craft beverages: Consumption of craft beer in the United States in 2016 rose 6.2 percent, to 24 million barrels, according to the Brewers Association. (This doesn't even take into the account the growing business in distilleries.)

Vermont has the most craft breweries per capita in the nation, with 10.8 per 100,000 adults. Oregon isn't far behind: It ranks fourth in the nation, with 8.1 breweries for every 100,000 adults.

And if you're looking to document the economic impact from craft breweries, consider this: The Oregon Brewers Guild says that the state's brewing establishments employed more than 9,000 people in 2016 and that the rate of job growth from 2015 to 2016 was 8.3 percent.

No wonder Madras wants its cut of the action.

Maybe it's unreasonable to assume that every Oregon nook and cranny can have its own brewpub. But it sounds as if communities are willing to give it a shot. That's good news for fans of good brew — not to mention their designated drivers.

OTHER VIEWS

Former top spy rethinks attacks on new president

“Mr. Trump continues to exhibit paranoia about American intelligence agencies,” wrote the NeverTrump conservative Max Boot in the *New York Times* a week or so before the president took office.

“Consumed by his paranoia about the deep state, Donald Trump has disappeared into the fog of his own conspiracy theories,” declared *The Times*'s Maureen Dowd.

“Paranoia seizes Trump's White House,” reported Politico, noting the suspicion that “career intelligence operatives are working to undermine the new president.”

Actually, they were. “It's no mystery why Trump doesn't trust U.S. intelligence agencies,” Bloomberg's Eli Lake wrote last month. “As the old saying goes: Just because you're paranoid doesn't mean they're not out to get you. Trump understandably believes the intelligence agencies are out to get him.”

Of course, leaders in the intelligence community would deny they are out to get the president. But in an extraordinary new interview, one CIA veteran who served in the agency from 1980 to 2013, who briefed presidents on the most sensitive issues of the day, and is still a prominent voice in intelligence matters, is at least conceding that he can understand why the president feels the way he does.

Michael Morell stayed out of politics when he served as the CIA's number-two official. He was the classic nonpartisan operative who served the office, and not the man. “I worked at this nonpolitical agency, bright red line between intelligence and policy, and intelligence and politics,” Morell told Politico's Susan Glasser this week.

Until Trump. In August 2016, the retired-but-still-active-in-intelligence-matters Morell decided to abandon decades of non-partisanship and come out in support of Hillary Clinton. In a *New York Times* op-ed, he praised Clinton's experience and called Trump a danger to the nation, a threat to its “foundational values,” and an “unwitting agent” for Russia.

“I was so deeply concerned about what a Trump presidency might look like from a national security perspective, and believed that there was such a gap between Secretary Clinton and Donald Trump with regard to how well they would protect the country, that I thought it extremely important to come out and say that,” Morell told Glasser.

Some of Morell's former colleagues in the intelligence community took the same step. Gen. Michael Hayden, a former CIA director, blasted Trump as Russia's “useful fool.” Another former top CIA officer, Michael Vickers, pronounced Trump unfit. And the agency's then-director, John Brennan, openly clashed with Trump.

These were all men who came out of the non-political tradition of American intelligence. And all chose, for the first time, to publicly take sides in a presidential campaign.

Of course, it's safe to say that each



BYRON YORK
Comment

assumed Clinton would win. But when Trump prevailed, amazingly enough, he thought the intelligence agencies were against him.

“Let's put ourselves in Donald Trump's shoes,” Morell said to Glasser. “So what does he see? Right? He sees a former director of CIA and a former director of NSA, Mike Hayden ... criticizing him and his policies. Right? And he would rightfully have said, ‘Huh, what's going on with the intelligence guys?’”

“And then he sees a former acting director and deputy director of CIA criticizing him and endorsing his opponent,” Morell continued. “And then he gets his first intelligence briefing, after becoming the Republican

nominee, and within 24 to 48 hours, there are leaks out of that that are critical of him and his then-national security adviser Mike Flynn.”

“And so, this stuff starts to build, right? And he must have said to himself, ‘What is it with these intelligence guys? Are they political?’”

The answer to that was simple: Yes, they were political. But the astonishing part of the

Morell interview is his admission that at the time he did not stop to consider what was happening from Trump's perspective, even as the leaks continued when Trump took office. “He must have thought, ‘Who are these guys?’” Morell said. “Are these guys out to get me? Is this a political organization?”

The first time Trump met the FBI's then-director, James Comey, was when the intelligence chiefs chose Comey to tell Trump, then the president-elect, about a collection of “salacious and unverified” (Comey's words) allegations about Trump, compiled by operatives working for the Clinton campaign, that has since become known as the Trump dossier.

That surely got Trump off to a good start with the FBI's intelligence-gathering operation. It was also a clever way for the intel chiefs to push the previously secret dossier into the public conversation, when news leaked that Comey had briefed the president on it.

And on and on it went. Could anyone blame the new president for believing the intelligence agencies were after him?

Trump's fellow New Yorker, Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer, warned the president against messing with the spy organizations. “Let me tell you: You take on the intelligence community, they have six ways from Sunday of getting back at you,” Schumer said in January.

Indeed, they did. And now, Michael Morell admits he went after the new president without even considering what that might mean. “I think there was a significant downside to those of us who became political,” he told Glasser. “So, if I could have thought of that, would I have ended up in a different place? I don't know. But it's something I didn't think about.”

Byron York is chief political correspondent for *The Washington Examiner*.



YOUR VIEWS

NORCOR stories a reminder of need to protect children

Phil Wright's article “Juvenile jail accused of inhumane methods” (*EO*, Dec. 5) enraged me. It is vital that we begin closely examining our juvenile detention centers, as they care for our most vulnerable children. Many of these kids have suffered abuse and mental health challenges beyond belief.

The article notes that according to Disability Rights Oregon, children in NORCOR are penalized through isolation. How can children grow and learn social skills and behavior management skills if they are restricted from human contact?

The article also states that sometimes during

discipline, the children were not allowed to receive phone calls or visits from family. This is a waste of a useful resource. The families of the children can help the detention centers rehabilitate our kids. Because, after all, they will probably be in the children's lives much longer than any detention officer.

Our juvenile detention programs need to work harder to engage families for our youth. Parenting courses, family counseling and legal support are just some programs that our detention centers could implement. If we want our world to be a compassionate place, we need to start by showing our children and their families humanity.

Charlotte Hechler
University City, Mo.

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.