

# TRAVIS THORNTON

---

American Citizen and Patriot  
travisthornton@yahoo.com

28 April 2010

Mr. Eric Holder  
Attorney General of the United States  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Holder:

Yesterday, as our nation's top law enforcement officer, you said in response to the passage of Arizona Senate Bill 1070, now the "Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act," that you believed Arizona's law would be "subject to potential abuse," and, "That law is an unfortunate one." Section 1 of the law, entitled "Intent," reads in full:

"The legislature finds that there is a compelling interest in cooperative enforcement of federal immigration laws throughout all of Arizona. The legislature declares that the intent of this act is to make attrition through enforcement the public policy of all state and local government agencies in Arizona. The provisions of this act are intended to work together to discourage and deter the unlawful entry and presence of aliens and economic activity by persons unlawfully present in the United States."

Arizona's law, in fact, sets out to do what the federal government refuses to do; that is, enforce federal law. Section 287(g) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRAIRA) of 1996 - a federal law - authorizes state and local law officials to enforce the Act, including the deportation of individuals living in the United States illegally, with the support of US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

This past July, your colleague, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano - the bureaucrat responsible for the implementation of Section 287(g) - standardized the partnership between federal and state officials, stating, "This new agreement supports local efforts to protect public safety by giving law enforcement the tools to identify and remove

dangerous criminal aliens.” Now she’s singing a different tune, saying she has “deep concerns” about the law of Arizona, the state of her former governorship.

Yesterday you said, “The Justice Department, along with DHS, is looking at the law to decide exactly how we are going to react to it. We are considering all possibilities including the possibility of a court challenge.”

President Obama responded in kind today, saying, “Our failure to act responsibly at the federal level will only open the door to irresponsibility by others. That includes, for example, the recent efforts in Arizona, which threatened to undermine basic notions of fairness that we cherish as Americans, as well as the trust between police and their communities that is so crucial to keeping us safe.” Does this ‘basic notion of fairness’ apply to the enforcement of laws in this country?

I understand your concerns regarding Arizona’s decision. The issue is highly politicized, and you are a political appointee. Additionally, the federal government will have difficulty invoking the Supremacy Clause – as it so often does – against a state law when the state law simply upholds federal law. I understand the Administration does not want to get bogged down in the Constitutional process of changing the law through Congress; there are too many risks of failing in that regard.

While you and your colleagues might not like the law, it is, after all, federal law. The Attorney General’s role is apolitical. Your job is to enforce the law. That is, it used to be.

To be clear, I don’t have a dog in this fight. I personally support bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform. I am contacting you with a tangential request. As we transition from the rule of law to a rule of dictation, I wanted to request a pardon – a written waiver, a wave of the hand, whatever now passes for ‘legally binding’ – with regard to Virginia state traffic laws.

I know liberals love sob-stories, so here’s mine.

I currently live 17 miles from where I work; I am withholding my address for obvious reasons. It took me an hour-and-a-half to drive in to work this morning. However, if I were to drive in the

High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane, I could have arrived at work in much shorter time, but would have run the risk of a \$75 fine. I chose to obey the law this morning, and, in the parlance of the Grail Templar from *Indiana Jones: The Last Crusade*, "I chose... poorly."

I drink coffee on the way into work to stay awake, which is the equivalent of setting a one hour time-bomb on my bladder. I nearly had an accident – not vehicular, but physiological – which would have been embarrassing as I am now a grown man. Although this is probably covered in President Obama's mammoth Health Care overhaul, I'd rather not do damage to myself that could have otherwise been avoided.

My request is simple: If I get ticketed for riding in the HOV lane, can I send all tickets to your office? Should I send all tickets to Secretary Napolitano instead? Will the fact that I am a native-born American citizen hinder my chances of having the laws ignored on my behalf? Keep in mind, this is a state law; I'm sure you could evoke the Supremacy Clause. I would expect nothing less from a soft tyranny such as this.

Prudence Indeed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Travis J. Thornton', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Travis J. Thornton