

**Browse by Category**

- [Arts & Culture \(247\)](#)
- [Politics & Legal \(3\)](#)

**Sanctuary - Part 2****August 28, 2007 / by [jimbeers](#)**

## SANCTUARY – PART 2

Politicians never fail to disappoint. No matter how little regard we have for them, they retain the capacity to disgust us with their personal lust for the power they believe they hold despite the Constitution and the rights and freedom of their fellow citizens.

Last night I answered a question from a reader about my recent mention of the Sanctuary Movement in several articles. I told him I mentioned this phenomenon by urban Counties and cities and political machines and politicians to bring to the attention of those folks the paradox of these same factions spawning and forcing Federal and State environmental and animal rights laws on rural people under pain of severe punishment. These same groups then absolve themselves from recognizing Federal Immigration law violators or cooperating with Federal authorities with which they disagree for a variety of reasons from political power expansion to the mundane.

When I decided to share this response to the reader, who was considering running for County elective office on a platform of working to make that county a “Property Rights Sanctuary” or “Animal Ownership Sanctuary” or “Practical Environmental Management Sanctuary” or some such notion, with other readers it was late in the evening and I thought that was the end of it. Little did I know the future that lie only hours away. I had mentioned in the answer that, “It is a fact here in Virginia and in many other urban-oriented states like MD and NY and MA and IL and CA the state governments quietly acquiesce in these declarations of non-compliance and non-cooperation by urban Counties and Cities regarding laws they disagree with”, which was correct as far as I knew at the time. Then I went to bed and after getting the coffee going the next morning, I went out and picked up the paper. As I walked back to the house the first article I began to read on the front page began:

“Virginia Gov. Timothy M. Kaine does not want to create a statewide partnership with federal immigration officials that would allow state agencies to identify illegal aliens and begin deportation procedures, despite calls from the state’s attorney general and anti-illegal-immigrant groups.”

Say what?

So even a Governor (such as he or she may be) has the “power” to cooperate or not cooperate with “federal officials”? A Governor can instruct “state agencies” NOT “to create a statewide ‘partnership’ with federal” “officials”? A Governor can do all this “despite calls from the state’s attorney general and” other “groups? Well if this is so and there is now every reason to believe it is so (Lord help us): why isn’t this newfound power for state and local elected officials a priority issue in elections?

Why aren’t we asking and politicians answering concerning their “position” on not cooperating (i.e. instructing every agency and bureaucrat under their control) with “federal officials” or other politicians (i.e. attorneys general for instance) or to form any “partnerships” with certain “groups” or other such specified entities regarding:

Federally introduced and protected predators.

Federal land acquisition.

Federally subsidized easements on private property.

Federal laws that infringe on the private property rights of animal owners.

Federal laws or regulations or policies that restrict management and use of renewable natural resources.

Federal laws that restrict hunting, fishing, or trapping.

Federal laws that restrict logging or grazing.

Federal laws that diminish game and/or sport fish populations?  
 Federal restrictions on access or use of any public lands.  
 Federal laws that “take” private property without compensation.  
 Federal laws that affect the right to own or use fur.  
 Federal laws that restrict the use of animals for medical experiments.  
 Federal laws that restrict horse owners from selling their horses to slaughter houses or for slaughter houses to sell horsemeat to willing buyers.  
 Federal laws that facilitate forest fires or restrict the ability to control forest fires.  
 Federal laws that aim to destroy dams or stop developments approved locally.  
 (I could go on for days, but you get the picture.)

State officials, like their local anti-immigration-law cousins, should be asked about these things. If they can forbid any enforcement or “cooperation” or data sharing (censuses, data collections, information, etc.) or anything else with other government “officials” or “groups”: we need to know their position. WE NEED to defeat those politicians who either will not fight for OUR RIGHTS or are helping to eliminate our rights. It is a simple and straightforward as that!

All this applies to gun control as well. Later in the morning I read an editorial about the “Anti-gun media culture” by Robert Knight. His analysis of the Urban/anti-gun-zealot “partnership” was right on. In mentioning the Philadelphia theory about how “rural sensibilities continue to rule the gun debate” by saying the reason Philadelphians kill each other is because of guns purchased elsewhere, he made the following observation about urban perceptions of rural values:

“Rural people, bad. Rural people with guns, worse. Rural people with guns cause Philadelphians to shoot each other.”

Substitute animals or trees or simply rural values for guns and “worry about imaginary bogeymen” for “shoot each other” and I couldn’t have said it better myself. What is YOUR politician’s view on SANCTUARY status for your values?

Jim Beers  
 28 August 2007

- If you found this worthwhile, please share it with others. Thanks.

- This article and other recent articles by Jim Beers can be found at <http://jimbeers.blogster.com> (Jim Beers Common Sense)

- Jim Beers is available for consulting or to speak. Contact: [jimbeers7@verizon.net](mailto:jimbeers7@verizon.net)

- Jim Beers is a retired US Fish & Wildlife Service Wildlife Biologist, Special Agent, Refuge Manager, Wetlands Biologist, and Congressional Fellow. He was stationed in North Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York City, and Washington DC. He also served as a US Navy Line Officer in the western Pacific and on Adak, Alaska in the Aleutian Islands. He has worked for the Utah Fish & Game, Minneapolis Police Department, and as a Security Supervisor in Washington, DC. He testified three times before Congress; twice regarding the theft by the US Fish & Wildlife Service of \$45 to 60 Million from State fish and wildlife funds and once in opposition to expanding Federal Invasive Species authority. He resides in Centreville, Virginia with his wife of many decades.


## 1 comment on Sanctuary - Part 2

- [soultrawler](#) said 7 months ago  
 Hey, how about a sanctuary for illegals? I kid you not! Here in Mexifornia, the Chicano mayor of "National City" (nothing more than a suburb of San Diego) last Spring declared his city an official "safe house" for illegals of any stripe. Since that time, the population in greater San Diego has risen to about 90% Mexican, and 90% of those don't speak English.

I foresee a civil war not too far down the line. And it didn't HAVE to happen.

## Add a comment

To add comments without entering your email and image verification, you must be logged in. [Login](#) or [Join Blogster](#)

- Your Name
- Email Address
- Image Verification  *Type the words in the box below the image.*
- 

😊
ABC
ABC
↔
👁

## Email this blog post to a friend

To email posts to friends, you must be logged in. [Login](#) or [Join Blogster](#)

## Friends

-  [soultrawler](#) 3 weeks
-  [fowlnews](#) 8 months
-  [beckerella](#) 9 months

## [View All](#)

- [Home](#)
- [About](#)
- [Join Blogster](#)
- [Image Hosting](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Terms of Services](#)

- [Help](#)

© Copyright 2007-2008 Blogster.com