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To prepare for class, please read Lynda Mapes, “Killing cormorants to save salmon: 11,000 in crosshairs of controversial program.” [ <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/environment/killing-onne-species-intended-to-save-another-11000-birds-in-cross-hairs-of-multiyear-program>]

And Nicole Pallotta, “Federal Judge Rules Mass Killing of Cormorants can Continue,” <https://aldf.org/article/federal-judge-rules-mass-killing-of-oregon-cormorants-can-continue/>

Consider these questions:

1. Ask yourself, if you were a member of a panel charged with deciding if this program was *morally* right or wrong, what would you rule? Now the important question: What reason(s) would you give?

2. Ritchie Graves, chief of Columbia hydropower branch, NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region, [said] “It certainly is not something we are taking any joy in. It’s a responsibility, something we think we need to do. We certainly are not doing it because we think it’s fun.” What if he did think that killing cormorants was fun? – yeehah! Bam! Bam! – do you believe that would make a difference to whether it was right or wrong?

2. The judge decided that the program could continue because the benefits to salmon override the harms to cormorants. Wait. What!? Does one animal’s life count more than another’s?