

d. Restricting Law Enforcement

Under liberal influence, many judges or legislative agencies deliberately curtail the legitimate power of law enforcement, effectively turning a blind eye to crime. The communist specter's aim in doing this is to paralyze the state apparatus in order to stir up social turmoil, which in turn creates excuses either for the expansion of government, or the necessary conditions for a coup or revolution.

Many states have passed far-left laws, a typical example being “sanctuary” policies. Among other provisions, sanctuary cities often prohibit federal immigration officials from arresting illegal immigrants in local prisons, including those with outstanding warrants for arrest. Local police are barred from cooperating and communicating with federal agents to enforce immigration laws.

This poses a serious security risk for the public. In July 2015, illegal immigrant José Inez García Zárate shot and killed a young woman who was walking along a pier in San Francisco. Zárate had a history of crime: He had been charged with seven felonies involving drugs and robbery, and possession of weaponry, and had been deported five times. Under San Francisco's sanctuary laws, officials released Zárate from custody three months before the fatal shooting, rather than transferring him to federal immigration authorities, who had requested custody of him for deportation.

When a criminal stands trial, extremely strict standards are placed on the prosecution. This is ostensibly to protect the legitimate rights of the suspect, but often the result is that criminals are able to take advantage of loopholes in the law. Cunning suspects — or those who enjoy status or privileges, who understand the law and regulations, or who hire capable attorneys — can drag out the legal process, at great cost to the judicial system. It can be very difficult to bring guilty suspects to justice.

Influenced by the spread of “sexual liberation,” verdicts in cases involving sex crimes often cite findings in research by Alfred Kinsey or activists who follow him to argue that the damage caused by sex abuse is little or nonexistent. Many cases have been settled by reducing the sentences of sexual predators. [32] Many ordinary criminals also have had their original sentences reduced, ostensibly owing to budget shortages or on account of prisoners' rights. The real motivation, though, is to use political correctness to weaken the power of the law,

disturb social order, and pave the way for further expansion of government.

For the law to be fair, it must administer strict punishments to those who commit unpardonable crimes. Since antiquity, murder has been punishable by death. But today, some countries and territories have abolished capital punishment on such grounds as “humanity,” “tolerance,” or a supposed respect for life.

Under the influence of twisted liberalism and progressivism, some people give undue weight to prisoners’ rights — no matter the severity of their crimes — while remaining strangely silent regarding the victims. If a murderer is fed and housed by taxpayer money, his loss of freedom is hardly a fair trade for the death of the victim and the trauma it causes for loved ones.

Many researchers in the United States have found that capital punishment is effective in deterring crime. In the 1990s, three professors, including Paul Rubin at Emory University, examined 20 years of crime statistics from 3,000 cities and towns across the United States and concluded that “each execution results, on average, in 18 fewer murders — with a margin of error of plus or minus 10.” [33]

Even scholars who are against capital punishment must concede that it has a deterrent effect. By pushing the concepts of freedom and legality to extremes, the Left has distorted the law and robbed it of its sanctity.

e. Using Foreign Laws to Weaken US Sovereignty

When liberal judges can’t find wording in the US Constitution to support their personal opinions, they use laws passed in other countries to sustain their arguments.

For instance, in the Supreme Court case of *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003), the liberal justices wanted to repeal a Texas statute banning consenting homosexual adults from engaging in sexual acts, but they could not find anything from the Constitution to support this case. They then quoted an “authoritative” agency outside of the United States as saying that homosexuality was “an integral part of human freedom in many other countries,” and successfully repealed the law. This case resulted in repeals of similar statutes in thirteen other states. [34]