Jack Venrick

From: <>
To:
Cc: <columnists@kitsapsun.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2005 3:30 PM
Subject: [Capr-discussion] Critical Areas Ordinance by Quitslund

Mr. Quitslund:

Your recent article on the CAO supports the twisted logic of the "extremist environmentalists" who want to squeeze everyone into planned communities in Seattle and "save" the rural area for the animals and the very rich.

FALLACY 1
In your article, you state that: "What people do on their property affects us all, therefore, we should ALL have a say in the decision [in the use of your property]." [Huh?] I have heard that line of reasoning so often from "those who have theirs" that it has become hackneyed.

If that is a universally logical principle, then it applies validly to all citizens and to all property. For example, what you do with your children (and other possessions), affects all of us; therefore, the government should have control over your children (and other possessions). Likewise, what you do with your speech affects us all; therefore, the government should have control over it. What you eat affects us all, etc. ad infinitum.

In 1991, the Sensitive Areas Ordinance decreed very stringent rules and regulations for the rural areas. Since that time, no owner in the rural area could do anything at all with his property without a permit. Consequently, the King County Growth Report 2004 specifies that the rural area is very "clean." So does the U.S. Geological Survey 2003. It is the urban area that must be cleaned up, and the County will not do that by crowding all future development into that urban space.

In particular, for the past thirty years, I have kept my thirty acres pristine and beautiful, using my money and my own physical labor. Now, the government says that I MIGHT do something to my land that will harm others so it overreaches to antecedently judge, convict and sentence me to non-use of my property.

Applying that same logic--all citizens should be judged, convicted and punished whenever it is possible that they MIGHT steal, lie, cheat or murder. Is that what you are suggesting by your support of this kind of reasoning?

FALLACY 2
Recently, an assistant to Ron Sims told a meeting of Democrats that "People who buy land in the rural area do so because they want to live among trees on undeveloped land. That means that the County is only taking land that would not be used anyway. Therefore, taking those properties do not impact the owners." [Huh?]

If the underlying logic is a valid, universal principle, then it is validly applied to other possessions, also. For example, if you are not going to use that extra car you have, the government should be able to take it away. EVERYTHING you are not using should be taken away from you, including money. [Which the communist regiimes do.]

Don't you Democrat/environmentalists ever follow your casuistry to its logical conclusion?

Edwina Johnston
Saintedw@AOL.com
(206) 365-7754
