

4B 5-5-19  
**Proposed development not our business**

Disclosure: I have no relationship of any kind with Hayden Homes or the Bachtolds, and if the company develops the Bachtold property, I will be neither negatively nor positively impacted.

It would be beneficial to read similar disclosures in letters to the Union-Bulletin. One could read, "I live across the street from the Bachtold property, so in order to conceal my true motivation for arguing against the proposed development, I can portray myself as selfless, or even virtuous, by spewing emotionally charged buzzwords like 'traffic,' 'flooding,' 'safety' and 'tourism.'"

Eager to provide fodder for Hans-Hermann Hoppe's assertion below, many residents desperately plead for government intervention, further proving correct the content of my previous letter.

"Majority rule and private property protection are incompatible. The idea of democracy must be ridiculed: It is nothing else but mob rule parading as justice."

If we own neither the Bachtold property nor Hayden Homes, we shouldn't have a say in the proposed development. No, it's not "a good idea for the city to undertake an economic study," as a recent letter described, because Hayden Homes already conducted the study via market research and financial planning and analysis. Just because one "used input-output models" nearly half a century ago does not mean some third party — the city — should attempt the same bureaucratic nonsense today.

Hayden Homes, wishing to remain in business, has no incentive in poorly developing the Bachtold property.

It's odd to see homeowners act as if their surroundings are guaranteed to remain constant for the life of their mortgage and beyond. The ability to vote away someone's right to their property proves why democracy is a farce. Space doesn't allow me to enumerate the countless ways in which statist thinking is flawed, so if you've enjoyed my letters, you'll enjoy my blog at [uncleNap.com](http://uncleNap.com).

Casey Carlisle  
Walla Walla