

## Standard online reader survey



A doctor recently examining President Trump said he's like most Americans in that he doesn't exercise.

**Q: Do you exercise on a weekly basis?**

YES	39 percent
NO	61 percent

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

### We need to fully fund efforts to fight opioids

#### TO THE EDITOR:

Recent articles and letters in the *Southern Standard* have fine pointed the crisis of opioid addiction.

As a general practitioner of medicine, I have always been concerned about narcotic addiction except in patients with terminal conditions. I was cautious in prescribing narcotics in lowest relieving doses and for the shortest periods of time.

To my knowledge, none of my patients developed addiction from my prescriptions. Some physicians prescribe too many narcotics. This practice must be more firmly addressed.

Addicted people and their families are subject to loss of earned income, medical expenses, disappointment, grief and ruin. Recovery from addiction requires expensive and comprehensive scientific therapy lasting many months.

Good recovery programs may have recovery results as high as 85 percent. A great number of addicted patients do not have insurance or

finances to get needed care. Without recovery from this crisis, the nation continues to have lost taxes because of unemployment, medical expense of addiction, losses through crime to support addiction and law enforcement cost.

I remind you that time in jail costs about \$40,000 per year. Recovery programs are cheaper.

A vast number of people, including governmental leaders at all levels, recognize the crisis and the need for treatment. Many say they are concerned but their proposed budgets show insignificant amounts for adequate treatment.

The best route for funding is the expansion of Medicaid but their plans show reduction rather than increase. Resistance to funding may show belief in false information or financial and political greed. To me, adequate financing shows good sense and compassion.

Wallace Bigbee Sr., M.D.  
Oak Hill Drive  
McMinnville



THE STOCK MARKET WALL

## Those 'attacks' on the FBI

The news is filled with reports that Republicans in Washington are "attacking" the FBI over the Trump-Russia investigation.

*The Washington Post* recently compiled a collection of statements by GOP lawmakers under the heading, "Republicans launch attack after attack on the FBI." *The New York Times* ran a news analysis headlined, "Trump's Unparalleled War on a Pillar of Society: Law Enforcement."

Those words have been echoed many, many times by various talking heads on TV. But have Republicans really been attacking the FBI?

A more accurate way to describe what Republicans are doing is that they are condemning the FBI leadership's handling of two of the most heavily politicized investigations in years — the Trump-Russia probe and the Hillary Clinton email investigation. All that proves is that when law enforcement wades into politics, it becomes the target of sometimes intense political criticism.

The FBI does enormously valuable, sometimes heroic things. It breaks up terrorist rings and catches killers and bank robbers and kidnappers and embezzlers and all sorts of bad actors in our society.

The FBI has a Hall of Honor that recognizes agents who have been killed in the line of duty. Thirty-six agents have been killed "as the result of a direct adversarial force or at or by the hand of an adversary." The most recent was murdered in 2008 while executing an arrest warrant on violent drug traffickers in Pennsylvania.

Another 30 FBI employees are honored for having died in the performance of their duty, although not nec-

essarily in direct confrontation with a criminal. That kind of selflessness and dedication is clearly not what Republicans are criticizing.

What Republicans are condemning is the FBI leadership's conduct in the Trump and Clinton probes. For example, in the case of the much-discussed House Intelligence Committee memo released last week, Republicans (accurately) portrayed an FBI leadership that made common cause with an opposition research project paid for by the Hillary Clinton campaign right in the middle of a 2016 presidential election — and then ferociously resisted

congressional oversight. An agency that does that can expect some criticism, if its actions ever come to light.

For all the good it does, the FBI has made some horrendous mistakes. After the post-9/11 anthrax attacks, for example, the bureau focused its search for the perpetrator on an Army scientist named Steven Hatfill. But Hatfill was innocent. Nevertheless, the FBI chased him relentlessly, destroying his reputation and ability to make a living. Only after years did the FBI turn toward another suspect, who killed himself before charges could be filed. The FBI paid Hatfill millions in damages.

So the FBI has deserved its share of criticism over the years. And that goes double when the bureau intrudes into politics. But when the nation's premier investigative agency, with all its formidable law enforcement powers, jumps in the middle of hot political disputes, no one should be surprised when things get political.

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

#### COLUMNIST

BYRON  
YORK



#### FAMILY MAN

DUANE  
SHERRILL



## You need all the eyes you can get

I've been in the newspaper business for right at 28 years, garnering more writing experience than all but the most grizzled reporters, having written thousands of stories over the course of my career. However, with that said, my writing still stinks.

Now, before you start burning your R.D. Sherrill books and fast turning past my byline in the newspaper, let me explain that my self-critique has to do with those little grammatical mistakes that, left unedited, can add up and make an article or novel tough to read. Frankly, until I started writing novels back in 2013 with the publication of "Red Dog Saloon," I never realized how many grammatical errors there were in the first draft of any of my writings. If truth be known, I was pretty cocky about my ability to write quickly and self-edit with just a glance. I didn't really consider what my editors were catching after it left my desk.

So, when I began writing full-length novels (most having 75,000 words as opposed to the 300 to 500 words most newspaper stories and columns have) I went into it the same way, believing I could self-edit and catch the errors. Boy, was I wrong. Let me tell you this before I begin my confession — any writer who thinks they can find their own errors without benefit of an editor is fooling themselves and will soon see their work torn up by critics or simply go unread.

This coming Monday, I will release my sixth novel during an event at Magness Library, up on the second floor. It will be from 5:30 to 7 p.m. and there will be donuts and the public is urged to attend. The book, "Mad Justice," marks the longest time between the releases of R.D. Sherrill books, taking over a year since I released "Paradise Ranch." It had some folks wondering if I had run out of books, but nothing could be further from the truth. My next book, "Second Floor," is already written and the one after that is partially done. Then what's the hold up?

Editing. It takes as long to properly edit a book as it does to write it from scratch. Is this because I'm inexperienced? Over a quarter of a century of articles says otherwise. The issue is that what begins in your head sometimes doesn't come out exactly the same when it leaves your fingers on the keyboard.

Sure, I can read over it all I want but my brain still holds me hostage because it will cause me to fly right by those mistakes. That's where editing and the use of beta readers is important. Beta readers are the ones who read the paperback book before it's published but after it's edited. In the case of "Mad Justice," beta readers found over 70 mistakes in the EDITED copy. You can never have too many eyes.

It goes to show you, even the most experienced writer is fallible. It's a pretty humbling thing. Now, run out and get you a copy of "Mad Justice."

Standard reporter Duane Sherrill can be reached at 473-2191.

## It's a fairy tale beginning

Meghan Markle is engaged to Prince Harry! I can barely contain myself. I suppose my invitation will come in the mail any day now. What should I get them for a gift? A candle snuffer? A juicer? Some nice towels?

Just because I had to Google Markle's name so I could spell her name correctly, and have no idea why she is famous, doesn't mean I can't get all game-show-contestant excited that she's going to marry a prince! And not just any Prince, but the spare one! And an English one, not one of those dime-a-dozen princes from Bavaria or Greece who have names longer than the phone book, but no money.

Of course, I have never met Prince Harry. He's not a member of my family, he's not a childhood friend. I'm not even Facebook friends with him. In short, it would not be possible for me to care less about this impending wedding. Except in the sense that any increase in the world's happiness is probably a good thing, so I wish the couple the best.

I'm not saying it's not news. What I'm saying is that it's not personal. Now, compare that to the average morning-show host, who acts as if it's one of their own children getting married and that they expect to be in one of the pews on the wedding day. They don't know Meghan or Harry, either of them, any better than you or I do. But no one could be more over-the-moon about the wedding than morning-show hosts, except maybe the actual participants.

It's easy to see why. Covering Israel and Palestine is complicated. You have to know what you're talking about. North Korea is complicated.

Red states and blue states are complicated. Oh, but a Royal Wedding!! That's easy to report because, after all, we all know something about weddings. We don't have to study anything, we don't have to be an expert. We already know — we've been to a lot of weddings before. Several of them our own. How did he propose? What will she wear?

And now the royal family has announced another wedding: Princess Eugenie! To some random guy who doesn't look like a meth addict! Ooo, maybe they'll have babies and then we can talk about their babies as if

they're our own family! Now, remind me, who is Eugenie again? Oh, she's the daughter of that one who got divorced from that other one. Fergie. No, not the singer, the one who's not royal anymore. Or is she? Let's ask a "royal watcher."

Now, there's a job. "Royal watching." Can you get a college degree in that, or do you have to be in the union? Are there degrees of royal watching, like "Royal Watcher, 1st Class?" or is it experience that counts?

If there's an opening for "commoner watcher," can I apply for it? After all, I know so many of them and, hard to believe, I am one myself. I could blend in and tell the audience what it's like to work for a living, how much things cost in what they call "grocery stores," maybe visit a "car wash" or explain how to "wash dishes."

Anyway, what's the happiness track record for British royal weddings? Well, I guess you could ask Anne Boleyn how it worked out.

Contact Jim Mullen at [mullen.jim@gmail.com](mailto:mullen.jim@gmail.com).

#### VILLAGE IDIOT

JIM  
MULLEN



Established 1879

## Southern Standard

Publication No. 506-840

Patricia Zechman, Publisher  
James Clark, Editor

Phyllis Vanatta, Business Manager  
Jeffery Simmons, Advertising Director

Phone: 473-2191  
105 College St., McMinnville, TN 37110  
FAX: 473-6823  
Email: [standard@blomand.net](mailto:standard@blomand.net)  
Website: [www.southernstandard.com](http://www.southernstandard.com)

Copyright Standard Publishing Company,  
All Rights Reserved

2018 PRESS MEMBER

A PRIDE-WINNING NEWSPAPER

UT-TPA Press Awards 2016