



11390 MARKAB DRIVE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92126-1325
E-MAIL: dtp@she-philosopher.com

14 November 2017

TONI G. ATKINS, CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT 39
STATE CAPITOL
ROOM 4072
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4900

Dear Senator Atkins,

I am writing you today — and sending this formal printed letter to your Capitol Office by way of registered mail — in order to ensure that your office receives it, and there will be no excuse for not replying. I hope, by such means, to draw your attention, so that you respond in a timely manner, rather than continuing to ignore my concerns & requests for representation.

This letter is my fourth communication with your office. My prior e-mails of 2/1/2017, 2/15/2017, and 8/20/2017 are all available for public review here:

<http://she-philosopher.com/SCCase/comments-on-AB1404.html>

(click/tap on the links for Follow-Up No. 19, No. 21, and No. 22), with additional documentation (including a unique historical overview of the issues) here:

<http://she-philosopher.com/studies/California-AB-1404.html>

(all URLs are case-sensitive). For what it's worth, I will continue to update and actively maintain both Web pages until California's flawed "Good Neighbor Fence Act of 2013" is fixed.

Because I have not yet received an answer to my query of 20 August 2017 (Follow-Up No. 22):

“[...] is Senator Atkins going to lead the charge in Sacramento on fixing California's 'Good Neighbor Fence Act of 2013' [...] or not? [...] yes? or no?”

I am asking it again now, specifically in regards to the upcoming legislative session of 2018:

Will you enact, in 2018, the legislative reforms empowering me to regain control of my private property through small claims court, or not?

As I have argued several times before, this is one of those rare bipartisan issues with true cross-over appeal. Fencing and enclosure issues touch all of us where we live, and have a profound *daily* impact on quality of life and psychosocial well-being. Whether we be of high or middle or low social status — rich or moderately affluent or poor, upwardly-mobile or downwardly-mobile, when it comes to family finances — Republican or Democrat or independent/other in our political affiliation — right or middle or left in our values and vision for our government and country — most of us do not believe that it is right or fair that we can be forced, because of a bad state law, to give up our personal-property rights without just compensation, or that we can be forced to subsidize a predatory neighbor's home ownership. As I have documented already at

<http://she-philosopher.com/studies/California-AB-1404.html#founding-rights>

widely-held beliefs today about the sanctity of private property accord with natural law principles, which feature not just in private & public jurisprudence, but also when it comes to securing civil liberties undergirding the democratic experiment on which this nation was founded in the 17th century.

When I voted for you in November 2016, I assumed you shared with the majority of your constituents this traditional belief in natural law categories of rights & duties, coupled with the capitalist creed (e.g., as described by the 18th-century political economist, Adam Smith) that it is the proper function of government to protect property. After all, the political classes must deal with predatory neighbors, just like the rest of us.

What I did not expect was that a woman of the people, such as you profess to be, would evince the political establishment's contempt for voters, which has enraged so many of us these days. When your office ignores a simple yes?/no? question from a constituent for months at a time, you show the same disregard for regular folk as other policy-making "elites" whose behavior feeds what Katherine Cramer calls, in her 2016 title of that name, "the politics of resentment."

So, once again, I will ask you for an unequivocal answer to a simple question:

Will you fix the “Good Neighbor Fence Act of 2013,” so that I can regain control over my private property, and more Californians don’t lose control of theirs? Or not?

Please send your answer either through the post, to my residence, or by way of e-mail (dtp@she-philosopher.com) — whichever communications medium you prefer. I will post a copy of your reply, whatever form it takes (“snail mail” or e-mail), to

<http://she-philosopher.com/SCCase/comments-on-AB1404.html>

so that there will be a lasting record, available for public scrutiny — thus ensuring transparency & accountability — well into the future.

I look forward to finally hearing from you on this matter of pressing importance to me.

Sincerely,

Deborah Taylor-Pearce

Resident & voter

California State Senate District 39 & California State Assembly District 77