

RIGHTS

Democrat for all New England '24

www.stewartforliberty.com



603-277-3117

Independent for Hartford (Mayor '23)



EDUCATION

E.P.I.C. Party for America epic-party.us

for "Every Politically Independent Citizen

Avoid Big Losses. ENFORCE against low-level crime.

Enforce laws. Do not accept low-level crime. This IS a solution to urban crime. Small crimes, even for first time offenders, deserve short, scary punishments. Prisons were once called "reformatories", under the still valid idea that a harsh environment would make at least some criminals reform their tendencies and be better citizens once released.

Reforming, using the very good tool of fear, is an especially good goal of the justice system for juveniles. Juveniles scoff at receiving a modern "notice to appear". And almost nobody fears "community service". Actual prison time MAY deter future crime.

Locking up criminals on first offense convictions, if not a complete solution, is one that should be invoked IRRESPECTIVE of deterrence. Though we might expunge their records, locking up juvenile thieves for a week or two just might produce "scared straight" reform. Even if reform fails, we all get mildly relived when one less predator is on the streets to steal, vandalize, or cause domestic violence.

The on-duty officer killed recently in Hartford by a speeding motorist would likely be alive today if his killer had spent some time behind prison bars. We can say this because it's a certainly that this was not the first time the 18 year old perpetrator had sped down city streets. It was likely not the first time he ran brazenly through a red light. Se'Cret Pierce, the 12 year old who was killed in crossfire lost her life to shooters who, though young, had extensive criminal records. And 17 year old Alondra Vega-Martinez was murdered this summer by a culprit who should have been locked up for prior crimes in Pennsylvania. Any ONE of these killings justifies a change in policy; three in less than five months NECESSITAES less-forgiving policies.

Connecticut's prisons have ample room to house young convicts for two weeks or more. Should prisons hit capacity, we should build more. Spending \$2,000,000 a year to detain 200 to 500 short term prisoners is a very good investment of public funds.*

Even as an inefficient investment, spending on public safety is most compelling because it's the number one reason for people to form governments. Housing, health care, job security, and even education are far subordinate to the basic function of protecting one another from crime. Even if most residents aren't touched by violent crime, we are almost all leery of theft, and most of us feel compelled to take precautions when walking alone in urban areas at night.

For the few who are not fazed by the predations many of us experience and the insecurities MOST of us experience, bit of CIVICS is in order: letting wrongdoers get away with crime is uncivil. It thwarts all Western, Eastern, and Southern Civilization, and makes societies worse. It may make the perpetrators worse too, giving them little reason to get straight.

I have three groups that all deserve to reform, and with it truly combat criminality:

- 1) **Judges.** They must carry out fair sentences, and "fair" keeps the community in mind. A convict getting less than a maximum prison sentence means a community of hundreds spending the differential time more threatened by an unreformed ex-con.
- 2) **School administrators.** The continuing bad educations that they abide by for urban students gives many of them too few prospects for upstanding employment. Dropping out and making money on the streets becomes more tempting. Dropping out, or attentively staying in but without career ambitions, festers when administrators let teachers instill a hopelessness that "the system is rigged against you; racists are going to thwart you".
- 3) **Us**. Urban residents, workers, and business owners can all be more alert to crime and more willing to call out criminality. Reporting shoplifters, reporting vandals, drug-dealers, and domestic abusers will quell criminality. We become "force-multipliers" for the police.

The force-multiplier is not new. In 1860, an alert group of Hartford Connecticut voters called themselves the "Wide-Awakes". They fervently opposed slavery and were on the lookout to fight the "Slave Power" wherever those officials abused their power. The Wide-Awakes escorted little-known candidate Abraham Lincoln when he traveled from New York to Hartford following his first big speech, and Wide-Awakes spread to almost every northern city. They are widely credited with helping Lincoln to a plurality in the November elections.

Please note why "police" are not among the groups I mentioned needing to do more. Urban police do what they can. They can't be on every street block (and we wouldn'r want them to be). They are constrained by judges, who don't want to adjudicate when they and prosecutors have come to deem "minor". Police are stymied by we who are unwilling to speak. (If someone fears retaliation, reporting without revealing yourself is STILL helpful. Police will be able to stake out a suspect based on an anonymous tip.). And of late, very good police officers are subordinated by outspoken "progressives", typically elite White woke people who live in safe places and then demand departments be stripped of funding and officers be convicted for doing heroic work that at times has collateral "rights abuses".

Together with good policing, we in Hartford can greatly reduce the mayhem. Stand strong!

^{.*} In sterile computing, if one in one thousand offenders locked up for a short time is scared enough to take a straight path and NOT murder, then the \$4,000,000 expense to incarcerate him and 999 others is a bargain compared to "financial" saving (\$11,000,000 is the actuarial "value" of a young American). Emotionally, it's priceless.