

Useful Free Booklets Series

Manifesto For Justice

Brutal But Necessary

By Jean-Georges Estiot

This booklet has been created to encourage open discussion, thoughtful study and careful critical enquiry. It is intended as a resource that invites readers to question, reflect and explore ideas deeply, rather than accept them without consideration. Permission is given to reproduce the content of this booklet for any purpose.

My email is jgestiot@gmail.com and your feedback is welcome.

The death of justice

Justice is not dead in our society because that would be a relief. A clean, final death would mean we could bury it, mourn it, and start again. But our justice system, unfortunately, is still twitching on life support, kept alive by judges in robes who seem more interested in feelings than facts, and by lawmakers who think consequences are cruel. What once served as a shield for the innocent and a sword against the guilty has become a limp suggestion, a polite request that criminals behave better next time. The result is chaos wrapped in the language of compassion.

I know this well, having worked in the system for several years. This included giving expert assessments in court and doing follow-up work with offenders while they were in prison. My work also included working with diversion courts, which suspend sentencing while the offenders undergo a six-months program. At the end of the six months, success in their program would see them face a very lenient sentence, and never custodial. I worked with both men and women and this colourful world has taught me a few lessons.

Courts today are no longer courts. They are performance spaces. Offenders parade through them with rehearsed sob stories and the legal system plays along, nodding sympathetically while dispensing wrist slaps dressed up as sentences. The criminal who robs, assaults, or even kills walks away with therapy, a suspended sentence, or an early release date. The victim walks away with trauma, legal fees, and the nagging sense that their life matters less than the comfort of the person who destroyed it. This is not justice, it is appeasement. And appeasement is just cowardice in slow motion.

Modern justice has abandoned the concept of deterrence. Punishment, once the cornerstone of legal order, has been replaced by rehabilitation as a sacred principle. The idea is that every criminal is a misunderstood soul who just needs help. But reality does not care about sacred principles. Reality demands results, but crime is not falling and offenders are not reforming. The system is simply not working. If the goal of justice is to reduce harm, then modern justice is a complete failure.

Nowhere is this failure more visible than in the treatment of repeat offenders. Young criminals especially know the game. They know the system will spare them, excuse them, and hand them chance after chance. They commit assault, burglary,

robbery, even rape, and are given glowing reports about their “potential” and “difficult background”. The courts act like the offender’s social worker, not their judge. Every excuse handed out to a criminal is another blow to their victim. Every soft sentence is a message to society that laws are suggestions, not rules.

It does not stop with the criminals themselves. Entire industries have formed around the delusion that people only offend because they are poor, hurt, or misunderstood. Politicians exploit this thinking to virtue signal their progressive credentials. Journalists recycle it to fill columns without effort. Academics spin it into entire careers. All of it built on the fantasy that punishing criminals is somehow oppressive, while allowing them to ruin lives is somehow compassionate. This is not compassion, it is betrayal.

The decay of justice also stems from a deeper rot in modern civilisation, the inability to defend itself. Liberal democracies have become so obsessed with their own moral image that they are paralysed when it comes to defending the innocent or punishing the guilty. Criminals exploit the system and terrorists laugh at it. Illegal immigrants use it as a doormat and the people who play by the rules are the ones who suffer.

This booklet is not about reforming the current system. That would be like repainting a house infested with termites. This is about razing it to the ground and rebuilding justice with the two things it has lost: teeth and spine. Deterrence must return. Punishment must mean something again and the comfort of offenders must cease to be a priority.

We will go through the flaws of the current system one by one, and present a model of justice that is not just harsh, but effective. Because in a sane society, law-abiding citizens are protected, not preyed upon. Those who prey on them should not be pitied, they should be punished.

The cult of compassion

It is one of the great modern fairy tales, that deep down, every criminal is just a broken child who needs a second chance, and a third, a fourth, and as many more as it takes. This myth has taken over entire justice systems, worming its way into sentencing guidelines, probation programs, correctional philosophies, and judicial attitudes. The idea is that if we just understand the criminal well enough, we will see that his actions were not really his fault, and that real justice means helping him

become a better person. It sounds lovely, but it is also completely delusional.

Rehabilitation is a noble goal when it works, but it almost never does, especially when it is forced, unearned, or handed out like candy. We do not live in a fairy tale. In the real world, some people are violent because they enjoy violence, some steal because they are lazy and entitled, some rape for power, and some kill simply because they feel like it. The fantasy that these impulses can be “treated” through therapy and yoga is not just foolish, it is dangerous.

Worse still, this obsession with understanding the criminal has completely erased the victim from the picture. We now routinely see courtrooms where the criminal is surrounded by psychologists, welfare advocates, cultural advisors, and legal aid, while the victim sits alone, if they are even there at all. Judges read long statements about the difficult childhood of the offender but barely mention the shattered life of the person they harmed. The system has been flipped upside down, as we are now more interested in rescuing the guilty than protecting the innocent.

Youth crime is perhaps the most absurd expression of this delusion, where young offenders are treated like endangered species and their actions excused on the basis of age, trauma, or social disadvantage. Courts go out of their way to avoid labelling them as criminals, as though the word itself would somehow damage them more than the violent crime they just committed. But ask any shopkeeper who has been robbed, or any elderly person assaulted in the street, and they will tell you: young criminals are not shy, scared kids, they are confident, calculated, and utterly unafraid of the law. And why should they be, when the law treats them like guests at a support group?

Even the term “compassion” has been twisted beyond recognition. Real compassion means standing up for victims, defending communities, and preventing future harm, but in today’s courts, it has come to mean one thing only, letting offenders off the hook. It is not compassionate to tell a violent thug that his actions were understandable, to release a serial thief because prison might upset him, or to let a paedophile walk free because of “mental health challenges.” That is not compassion; it is cowardice.

This cult of compassion has also become a political tool. Politicians use it to parade their moral superiority while doing nothing to fix the actual problem, setting up endless reviews, commissions, and task forces, all aimed at finding new ways to make the system even softer. Judges are encouraged to “diversify” their thinking, which usually means ignoring the law in favour of social trends. Media outlets gush over

reform programs that reduce prison numbers without ever asking whether they reduce crime. They do not.

The result of all this is simple: criminals feel empowered and the public feels abandoned. People see offenders walk free time and time again and stop believing in the system. They see violent teenagers treated like misunderstood poets and start locking their doors in daylight. They watch as drug addicts are given therapy instead of jail, only to have the same addicts steal their wallet the next week. Trust in the law is collapsing because the law has stopped doing what it is supposed to do, punish the guilty and protect the innocent.

The justice system has become a rehabilitation centre with delusions of grandeur. It is time to snap out of the fantasy and return to reality. Some people do not want help, some do not deserve sympathy, and some, once they have chosen the path of crime, must be treated not as patients but as threats. The law must stop pampering those who break it and start standing with those who live by it, only then can we begin to speak seriously about justice again.

Justice must hurt

If there is one concept that the modern legal system has thoroughly abandoned, it is deterrence. Courts now speak of rehabilitation, reintegration, “restorative justice,” and “alternatives to incarceration,” as though the idea of a sentence that actually frightens a criminal is somehow primitive. But the truth is simple: justice that does not scare anyone is not justice, it is just theatre. Deterrence, the raw fear of consequence, is the only thing that stops most criminals from committing more crimes.

In the real world, people respond to pain, not emotional discomfort, not stern looks, but actual pain. Financial, physical, social, or psychological pain. That is what creates deterrence. The justice system was once built on this understanding. Sentences were hard, conditions were brutal, and offenders who emerged from prison did so with a firm desire never to return. That was not a flaw, that was the point. But now, the system is a joke. Prisons offer television, internet, social activities, even fully equipped gyms. Some prisons are so soft they qualify as a lifestyle upgrade for the offenders, and you cannot deter someone by giving them a better life than the one they had outside.

How would you like to be in “prison” and enjoy the benefits of three meals a day, prepared by a qualified chef and approved by dieticians? Add to that free

medication, access to a doctor, dentist, counselling, and similar services. Did I mention weekend releases and conjugal visits? Who, in their right mind, would want to be out of prison? For many inmates, it is better than the life they had when they were free.

The effect is easy to see. Young people carry knives like accessories, rob, threaten, assault, and film it for social media clout. They know the system is too scared to punish them. If caught, they might be cautioned, maybe given a suspended sentence, possibly community service if the court is feeling bold. And if they are under 18, there is almost no chance of real punishment. They laugh at the courts, mock the police, and return to the street more brazen than before.

If you commit an “adult” crime, then you are old enough to serve time in an adult jail. No ifs, no buts. If you do not like the prospect of being sent to a real prison rather than a holiday camp, do not commit the crime in the first place.

Deterrence has collapsed, and with it, public safety. It is not just about youth crime. Home invasions are increasing because the risk-to-reward ratio favours the offender. Why fear a few months of supervised release if you can clean out someone’s house in twenty minutes? Why worry about jail time when the judge is more interested in your troubled background than the trauma you caused? Criminals are not idiots, they understand the odds and play them. Right now, the odds are in their favour.

Knife attacks, home invasions, and street assaults are especially telling. They are crimes that can be committed quickly and easily, with minimal planning and maximum impact. Yet they are met with astonishing leniency. This is how entire communities become afraid to walk alone, how shopkeepers begin arming themselves illegally, how trust in institutions collapses. Because people are not stupid, they know that when crime is not punished, it spreads, and when deterrence disappears, even the most stable societies begin to rot.

Particularly appalling is the treatment of crimes against the vulnerable. When an old woman is mugged for her handbag, a child is assaulted, or a disabled person is targeted, the response should be immediate and severe. There is no excuse, no sob story, no psychological evaluation that should mitigate the sentence. These are acts of calculated cruelty, and the only appropriate answer is hard time, long, unpleasant, and unforgettable. Anything less is complicity.

The soft approach has created a feedback loop. As more criminals walk free, others see the pattern and follow. As crime rises, the courts respond with even more caution, terrified of overcrowding prisons or upsetting the ever-growing list of

protected feelings. Judges hide behind sentencing guidelines, governments hide behind commissions, and police are left chasing ghosts with their hands tied. Meanwhile, the public suffers.

Restoring deterrence is not about vengeance; it is about prevention. A justice system that does not frighten criminals is like a fire alarm with no sound. Justice must hurt, not to satisfy a thirst for pain, but to make the risk unbearable for the offender. Real deterrence requires sentences that bite, prisons that are feared, and consequences that follow offenders long after their release.

It is time to end the illusion that we can reason people out of crime. Some people only understand one thing, pain. And until justice delivers that pain, swiftly and publicly, crime will continue to rise, victims will continue to suffer, and the law will continue to be mocked. Deterrence works, but only if justice grows a backbone.

No crime should ever pay

There is a grotesque joke at the heart of the justice system, and it goes like this: a man robs someone, steals their money, spends it, gets caught, and then shrugs in court and says, "Sorry, the cash is gone." And the judge nods, lectures him gently, and sends him away with a reduced sentence. The victim is left broke, and the offender walks away with nothing to repay and nothing to fear. This is not justice, it is legalised theft.

One of the oldest principles of justice is restitution, the idea that if you damage someone, you repair the damage. It is not enough to say sorry or to do time. You pay back what you took, you fix what you broke, and if you cannot, then your time is not over. But this principle has all but disappeared from modern courts. Now, it is all about "moving forward," "closure," and "letting go." The criminal moves forward, and the victim is left behind.

Restitution should be automatic and absolute. If someone steals, they must repay the full amount, down to the last cent. If the money is gone, too bad. Work it off. Dig ditches, clean graffiti, break rocks, it does not matter. If it takes twenty years, so be it. If they refuse, back to prison. And prison should not be a holiday; it should be a labour camp until the debt is cleared. Crime should never pay, and yet today, it often does.

Some criminals become minor celebrities. They write books, give interviews, sell their stories, and profit from their crimes while the victims live in silence and debt. This should be illegal and in some countries it is. Any money earned by a criminal

from their notoriety must be seized and handed directly to the victims, every cent, no exceptions. Crime should not be a business model.

Then there is property crime. Burglars often leave behind not just financial damage but emotional devastation. The sense of violation does not go away, and yet courts routinely ignore this. Insurance companies are expected to cover the loss, as if that cancels the crime. The offender is fined a small amount or given community service. Sometimes they are ordered to pay “symbolic damages” of a few hundred dollars. It is pathetic.

Worse still are violent crimes where physical harm has lasting consequences. Victims are left with hospital bills, therapy needs, lost wages, and destroyed confidence. And what does the offender face? A few months in jail, maybe. The system rarely enforces long-term repayment. It is as if once the criminal has served their token time, their debt is erased. But the victim’s life is not reset, and their pain does not expire. Justice demands more.

There is also the question of family. If the offender’s family has knowingly benefited from the crime, living off the proceeds, spending the stolen money, enjoying the comforts it bought, then they are complicit, and if they aided in hiding assets, they should be charged. At the very least, they should face civil penalties. There must be no loophole where a criminal can stash money with relatives, serve a short sentence, then return to enjoy it later. That is not a punishment, it is a break.

This principle should extend to cases of fraud, identity theft, and online scams. These crimes are often seen as victimless or too complex to trace. That is a lie. Every scam ruins lives, and every fraud leaves a financial crater. Offenders must not only repay but be barred from positions of financial trust for life. They must carry the stain of their crime wherever they go. Reputation is part of the sentence.

The failure to enforce restitution sends a dangerous message: that crime is a gamble worth taking. If you win, you enjoy the spoils; if you lose, you get a slap on the wrist and a chance to do it all over again. This is not justice, it is encouragement.

There must be no clean slates for criminals until every victim is made whole. Courts must stop pretending that stolen money just disappears. It went somewhere, and it must come back. If that requires work, so be it. If that requires hardship, so be it. Justice must no longer protect the comfort of the offender, it must restore the dignity of the victim, and that starts with making crime not just a risk, but a lifelong cost.

Terrorism and the problem of fanatics

Of all the failures of modern justice, none is more dangerous, or more wilfully blind, than the way it handles terrorism, particularly religiously motivated terrorism. These are not petty criminals or desperate men. These are ideologically driven fanatics who do not fear prison, do not fear death, and do not believe they are doing anything wrong. They believe they are soldiers in a war, acting under divine instruction, destined for eternal reward, and our courts, astonishingly, treat them like confused young men who just need a bit of rehabilitation.

The entire concept of rehabilitation collapses when applied to terrorists. Rehabilitation assumes the offender made a mistake, that they can be reasoned with, and that they have regrets. But religious terrorists do not regret. They believe their crimes are righteous, that their victims are infidels or enemies, and that martyrdom is their ticket to paradise. There is nothing to rehabilitate. There is only ideology to confront and dismantle, but the justice system, too scared to appear “Islamophobic” or “culturally insensitive,” plays along with the farce.

This is why terrorists who commit unspeakable acts often sit in court smiling. They know the system cannot touch what they really care about. They believe they will be rewarded in the next life and that the suffering of their victims is a price worth paying. They have no shame, no remorse, and certainly no fear of a Western prison system that serves halal meals, offers legal aid, and permits them to preach their poison from behind bars.

The reality is this: the standard tools of justice do not work on fanatics. Fear of punishment is meaningless to someone who wants to die. Therapy is meaningless to someone who believes they are chosen by God. Early release is not a benefit, it is a strategic advantage. And yet Western justice systems continue to treat terrorists as if they were misled teens caught shoplifting. It is idiocy.

The penalties for terrorism involving injury or death must be severe to the point of unforgiving. Life must mean life, no parole, no negotiation, no daylight beyond prison walls. If the act involved mass murder or targeted civilians, execution should be considered. Justice must be final, because terrorism is not simply a crime, it is an attack on civilisation itself. It is war disguised as martyrdom, and the law must treat it as such.

And this is where the justice system must evolve, because the problem is not just

the terrorist, it is the network behind him. The preachers, the donors, the recruiters, and the families who provide emotional, financial, and ideological support. These are not innocent bystanders. They are enablers. And until the system starts targeting the entire ecosystem of terrorism, deterrence will remain a fantasy.

Too often, families of terrorists are presented as victims. But the uncomfortable truth is that in many cases, they knew, they supported, they cheered. They may not have carried the bomb, but they helped build the mind that did. They must not be immune to consequences. Justice must look beyond the individual when ideology runs in bloodlines and household conversations. Terrorism is not just a lone act, it is often a family business.

The argument that this goes against the principles of individual responsibility is valid, on paper. But it ignores the reality of ideological warfare. These are not men who care about themselves. They care about legacy, family, honour, reward. So if justice is to deter them, it must strike where they feel it, not just their freedom, but their future; not just their body, but their bloodline. That is the only language they understand.

Targetting the individual as well as his family may sound extreme, that is because the problem is extreme. Civilised societies are being attacked by people who despise civilisation, and we are responding with paperwork. While innocent people die in markets, concerts, churches, and trains, the system congratulates itself on respecting human rights. But the rights of the dead are never discussed. The justice system must exist first to protect the living, not to comfort the killers.

Terrorism will not be stopped by compassion, reason, or the promise of early parole. It will only be stopped when it fears the consequences, and that fear must be absolute, personal, and permanent.

The extended penalty

There comes a point when the usual boundaries of justice, boundaries that protect individual rights, preserve fairness, and prevent tyranny, become the very tools that enable evil. Nowhere is this clearer than in the case of religious terrorism, especially suicide terrorism. These individuals do not care about themselves, that is their entire strategy. They embrace death as victory, walking into marketplaces, stadiums, train stations, and blowing themselves up with full awareness and approval of their own annihilation. In their eyes, they win, and we let them.

The problem is simple and devastating. If the terrorist fears nothing, then justice has no leverage. No pain, no cost, no punishment can touch a man who believes he will be greeted in paradise by virgins and glory. And so he presses the button. His body vanishes, the victims are buried, the families mourn, and the courts are left holding ashes, both literal and legal. That is not justice.

But what if justice did not end with the terrorist? What if it reached further? What if it targeted the only thing these fanatics still value, their community, their families, their descendants, and their legacy? Most of them do not act in a vacuum. They often act with the silent support of a mother who praises them, a father who excuses them, a brother who helps fund them, or a community that celebrates them as martyrs. And even if their family is not directly complicit, they are still central to the offender's thinking. He imagines them proud. He sees his actions as honouring them. This is where the system must strike.

The extended penalty is a radical idea. It proposes that when someone commits an act of terrorism involving death or mass injury, especially suicide terrorism, justice should extend beyond the individual. The family should be held accountable, not always, not automatically, but where there is evidence of ideological support, celebration, or financial benefit, the response must be severe. It can include life imprisonment, asset seizure, banishment, and yes, in extreme cases, full removal from the host nation. Deportation, exile or whatever it takes to destroy the illusion of heroic legacy.

This is not about punishing people for the crime of having a relative. It is about destroying the incentive system that terrorists operate under. A man who believes his name will be remembered, that his children will be praised, that his family will be honoured, this man is dangerous. But a man who knows his actions will lead to disgrace, suffering, and the permanent ruin of his bloodline? That man may hesitate. That man may choose differently. Because for many, family matters more than life.

Some will say this is collective punishment, that it breaches the principles of justice. But these are not ordinary crimes. This is ideological warfare, and the people who commit these acts are not operating by our moral code. They exploit it, hide behind it, and laugh at it. The extended penalty is not a betrayal of justice, it is a defence of it, one that reflects the reality of who we are fighting and what they value.

Of course, the courts must have discretion. The penalty must not be automatic or indiscriminate. The risk of misuse is real and an offender who despises his own family

may commit a crime just to harm them. That is why evidence of ideological alignment, support, or complicity must be established. But when it is, there should be no mercy. Justice must make it clear that martyrdom will not be rewarded, that paradise will not be paved with the ruins of civilised law, and that anyone who encourages such acts will pay, not just with their freedom, but with everything they hoped to preserve.

How about striking at the community that enabled the terrorists? What about demolishing their place of worship? That would make them think twice about randomly stabbing the innocent or drive a car into a crowd. I dare say this punishment already exists. Ask the Hamas supporters who danced in the streets after Oct 7, 2023. They are not dancing anymore. They have been running around going from one rabbit hole to another.

The extended penalty is not a call for barbarism, it is a demand for realism. We live in a world where enemies are not soldiers in uniform but fanatics with smartphones and homemade bombs. They are not after territory, they are after collapse, collapse of our culture, our freedoms, our legal systems, and they are using our own principles against us. If we do not adapt, we will lose. If that means justice must reach further than it ever has before, then so be it.

Let justice become something to fear again, not just for the man who acts, but for the entire network that enables him. Let the cost be unbearable. Let the legacy be erased. Because the only thing more dangerous than a fanatic with a bomb is a justice system that is too timid to stop him.

Exploiting Europe: Justice in retreat

Europe has become the continent of loopholes, loopholes in immigration, in asylum law, and in justice. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the farce playing out every day on the streets of France, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Illegal migrants, mostly young men from North Africa, enter Europe with no papers, no skills, and no respect for the countries they now demand to live in. Some declare themselves as minors to avoid prosecution. Others move freely across borders, claiming benefits in one country while committing crimes in another. This is not migration, it is exploitation.

Take France. A young man from Morocco enters illegally, perhaps via Spain. He claims to be sixteen, no documentation, no birth certificate, just a story. The young 16yo child looks suspiciously like a 25yo. The courts, terrified of violating “rights,” take

him at his word. If there is any doubt, they order bone scans to estimate his age, yes, literal bone scans, because Europe now runs on wishful thinking and medical guesswork. Meanwhile, the same individual might be stealing, assaulting, or worse, but the law treats him like a lost child. Judges apologise to him, police are told to be gentle, and victims are expected to be understanding.

Or take Sweden, once the nicest and safest country in Europe, now dealing with an explosion of gang crime, knife attacks, and sexual violence. The common denominator is clear, a disproportionate number of offenders are migrants or descendants of migrants. The integration experiment has failed. Entire districts are now effectively no-go zones, policed by gangs, not governments. Still, the justice system clings to the fantasy that more compassion will fix it. So more programmes are introduced, more taxpayer-funded schemes, more excuses.

The UK is no different. Illegal migrants land on its beaches and are placed in hotels at public expense. Some commit crimes, disappear, reappear under a new name, and repeat the process. The courts are overwhelmed, the prisons are full, the police paralysed by fear of being labelled racist. While all this is happening, citizens are told to be tolerant, to embrace diversity, to understand the trauma of those who defecate on their streets, steal from their stores, and assault their women.

This is what happens when justice retreats, it leaves a vacuum, and that vacuum is quickly filled by opportunists. And let us be clear, these are not refugees fleeing death camps. Many are economic migrants, young, able-bodied men who saw Europe as a soft target. They saw the benefits, the weak courts, the endless appeals and loopholes, and they came. Not to contribute, not to integrate but to take.

Some even return to their home countries and only come back to Europe to collect payments. They live in Morocco but cross the border to Spain to claim welfare. They know the system better than most Europeans. And why not? It is not a legal system, it is a vending machine. Press the right button, say the right words, “asylum,” “minor,” “victim,” and the rewards flow.

Meanwhile, honest citizens suffer. Their taxes pay for the legal charade, their communities bear the brunt of the crime, and their children are told that objecting to any of this is racist. The courts, paralysed by ideology, cannot cope. They hand out lenient sentences, release repeat offenders, and pretend it is all under control.

Europe’s justice systems were not designed for this. They were built on trust, trust that people would tell the truth, respect the law, and accept the rules of their host

country. That trust has been shattered. What remains is a system easily exploited by people who see it as a joke, and until that changes, the chaos will continue.

The answer is not more understanding, not more programmes. It is punishment, swift, certain, and brutal enough to end the fantasy that Europe is a playground for criminal migrants. If you enter illegally and offend, you should be removed. If you lie about your age, you should be prosecuted. If you harm someone, you should be jailed, not pampered. And if your presence is a constant threat to order, you should lose all rights to remain.

Europe is not a borderless utopia, it is a civilisation. And civilisation only survives when it defends itself. The justice system must remember that, before it becomes just another relic of a world that was too polite to survive.

Illegal immigration: Rewarded with luxury

In what twisted version of reality does a person break into a country and receive better treatment than its own struggling citizens? Welcome to the modern justice system, where illegal immigration is not punished, it is upgraded. Shelter, food, legal aid, healthcare, entertainment, handed to people who began their journey by ignoring your borders. What if they commit crimes? That is treated as a minor inconvenience, not a fundamental breach of national trust.

The logic is stunning in its stupidity. Illegal migrants, many of whom come from impoverished or unstable regions, are arrested after breaking laws, sometimes violently, and are then placed in conditions far superior to anything they knew back home. European prisons become retreats: three meals a day, clean beds, legal representation, recreational time. They have more rights inside the system than victims do outside it. Why would they be deterred?

Prisons were once places of consequence. Today, they are viewed as rehabilitation centres, especially for migrants. There is no pain, no hardship, and for some, no shame. In fact, for many, a European prison is safer, cleaner, and more comfortable than their home country. Why fear justice when justice improves your life?

This is not just a policy failure, it is moral rot. Illegal immigrants who offend should not be welcomed into the arms of a welfare state. They should be placed in detention centres designed not for comfort, but for consequence. Forced labour should be mandatory. Every meal, every bed, every legal service should be paid back in work. Build roads, clean streets, plant trees, it does not matter. They must contribute and if

they refuse, they go into isolation. Not cushioned cells with books and television, proper isolation. Real deterrence.

Some will howl at this as cruelty but what is cruel is allowing justice to be mocked. What is cruel is handing out resources to criminals while law-abiding citizens struggle. What is cruel is telling victims that their attackers are being treated with dignity while they themselves are told to move on. The current model is not compassionate, it is obscene.

The idea of luxury imprisonment is particularly offensive when you consider the crimes involved. Illegal migrants are not just loitering without papers, many engage in theft, assault, drug dealing, and even sexual violence. And still, the system bends over backwards to shield them from deportation or serious punishment. Judges cite “mental health” or “cultural background” as mitigating factors, as if culture excuses criminality. The rule of law is no longer enforced, it is negotiated.

The problem gets worse with repeat offenders. Some illegal migrants cycle through the system multiple times, using false identities, exploiting data protections, and slipping through bureaucratic cracks. Their records are scattered across agencies, their cases dragged out for years, and during that time, they commit more crimes, create more victims, and cost the state a fortune. Yet deportation is rare, and punishment is soft. It is madness.

The solution is not complex. Illegal immigrants who offend must face automatic detention, not in luxury, but in strict, controlled, cost-effective facilities. No television, no mobile phones, no privileges. Only basic rights and structured labour. If they want release, they must earn it. If they commit further crimes, they are removed permanently, no hearings, no delays, no appeals. There must be a clear, non-negotiable line: offend, and you are gone.

We are often told that this approach is too harsh, that it risks violating international conventions. But what about the rights of the citizens who are being robbed, assaulted, raped, and murdered? Why are their rights always second to the criminal's comfort? The justice system was not created to make lawbreakers feel welcome, it was created to protect the society that obeys the law. If that breaches international conventions, let's withdraw from them.

A country that rewards illegal behaviour with comfort and opportunity is no longer a country, it is a convenience store with no security and everything free. If we want justice to mean something, then comfort must no longer be the reward for criminal

conduct. The message must be unmistakable: enter illegally, offend, and your life gets worse, not better. Anything else is an invitation to be exploited again.

The integration lie

For decades, politicians and academics have repeated a comforting story. Given time, effort, and compassion, migrants, legal or illegal, will integrate. They will embrace the values of their new society, obey the law, contribute economically, and become part of the national fabric. It is a nice story, but it is also a lie, and like all lies, it collapses under scrutiny.

The evidence is everywhere: entire communities within European cities that live by their own Sharia rules, speak their own language, have their own media, ignore national laws, and reject the culture of the country that took them in. Generation after generation grows up in these enclaves, not with gratitude or loyalty, but with hostility. From these communities emerge the crime waves, the gang violence, the radicalisation, and the contempt for law enforcement. Integration is not happening. It has not happened. In many cases, it was never wanted.

The justice system pretends not to notice. Judges speak of “cultural misunderstandings” and “different value systems” as if this excuses assault, theft, or intimidation. Offenders claim to not understand the laws they break. Some even argue that their religion or upbringing forbids them from respecting the authority of a secular court. Instead of punishing this arrogance, the courts indulge it. They reduce sentences, recommend sensitivity training, and call for more “community engagement.”

The result is clear: repeat offenders with no fear of consequence. Men who beat their wives and claim it is tradition. Gangs who target women and say they were “provoked.” Youths who knife each other and laugh about it online. And all the while, the system bends, apologises, and funds more outreach programmes. The law becomes something optional, a suggestion, a custom of the host society that can be ignored by those who prefer their own rules.

And it is not just the first generation. The problem runs deeper. By the third or fourth generation, there is still no integration. These are not people freshly arrived, still adjusting. They were born in the country, educated there, given every opportunity. But the same patterns repeat: crime, unemployment, cultural hostility, and in some cases, open hatred of the very society that fed and protected them. What

excuse is left at that point?

Integration does not fail because society refuses to accept migrants. It fails because certain migrants refuse to accept the society. They do not want to change. They want to live in a modern, free, secular state while keeping the habits and hierarchies of their ancestral culture. That is not integration. It is colonisation. The justice system, far from resisting this, now actively facilitates it.

Try to raise this issue and you will be accused of racism, as if pointing out facts is a moral crime, as if describing reality is dangerous. But the numbers do not lie, the crime statistics do not lie, and the victims do not lie. Integration has failed where it was never truly attempted, and a justice system that refuses to recognise this is not just failing to do its job. It is aiding the collapse of its own civilisation.

This does not mean all migrants are criminals. It means that when a group, over generations, produces disproportionately high rates of crime, radicalism, and non-compliance with the law, something is very wrong. That is not a coincidence. It is the consequence of refusing to enforce the expectation that living in a country means respecting its laws and values.

Justice must no longer excuse cultural difference as a shield for criminality. It must demand assimilation as the price of acceptance. Break the law, and culture is no defence. Harm others, and background is irrelevant. Courts must stop handing out reduced sentences to offenders who “did not know better.” They must stop pretending that integration is automatic. It is not. It must be demanded, enforced, and proven.

A society that gives legal protection to those who despise its values is not virtuous but suicidal. Integration is not a myth because it is impossible. It is a myth because we have stopped requiring it. Until that changes, justice will be mocked, laws will be broken, and the dream of a peaceful, united society will remain exactly that, a dream.

Migration as escape

There was a time when migration meant starting over. People left their countries to build a better life through work, discipline, and respect for their new home. That era is over. Migration today, especially into Europe, is increasingly seen as a shortcut, a way to escape failure rather than fix it. The countries being fled are collapsing under corruption, overpopulation, poverty, violence, and incompetence. Instead of solving those problems, millions now treat migration as a replacement for responsibility.

Europe, Canada, or Australia are expected to take them in, feed them, house them, and never ask why they are here. It is assumed that because their home countries are dysfunctional, the West owes them refuge. This idea is both lazy and toxic. It treats successful countries as lifeboats and failed ones as abandoned wrecks, forgetting entirely that lifeboats have limits. The more that climb aboard without contributing, the faster the whole thing sinks.

This is no longer about war refugees. It is about economic migration. And now, we are being sold a new category: climate refugees. As if every hurricane, drought, or hot day justifies packing up and heading for the West. The planet warms, so borders must open. Crops fail, so taxpayers in Sweden must pay. A flood destroys a village, so France must give housing and welfare. There is no limit to the justifications. The new logic is that suffering anywhere entitles you to comfort everywhere.

The truth is harsher. Most of the countries being fled are in trouble because their people, blinded by medieval ideology, failed to build functioning societies. Their leaders are corrupt, their institutions are broken, and their cultures often reward tribalism, violence, and superstition over progress, stability, and science. Instead of staying to fight, to improve, or even to take responsibility, millions walk away. They look for a better life by stepping into someone else's.

When they arrive, it does not end. Many show no interest in adopting the values of the country they enter. They live in cultural bubbles, speak their own language, follow their own customs, and ignore the laws that do not suit them. Some even import the same chaos they left behind: gang violence, honour killings, religious extremism, crime. It is not migration but a displacement of problems from one society to another.

The justice system cannot continue pretending this is compassionate. It is not compassion to import criminality, to reward laziness and abandonment, or to strain your own country to the point of collapse just to feel morally superior. The primary duty of any justice system is to protect the citizens who already live within its borders, not to babysit those who have fled their own failures.

A person who leaves a collapsing state should be grateful for entry. They should accept the laws, learn the language, and contribute quickly. But instead, many arrive with demands. They claim victimhood, expect benefits, and riot when things do not go their way. When they offend, the courts make excuses. When they fail to integrate, society is told it must try harder. When they fail completely, we are told it is our fault for not being welcoming enough.

No society can survive this level of delusion. Migration must not be treated as a right. It is a privilege. And if the price of that privilege—obedience to the law, respect for the culture, and meaningful contribution—is not paid, then it should be revoked. Quickly, clearly, and with no apology.

Justice must stop being afraid to say what everyone knows. If you flee a broken country, you do not get to break the one that takes you in. If you want peace, build it where you are. If you want stability, create it where you live. Migration cannot replace courage. It cannot replace effort. And it cannot continue to be a global dumping ground for failed states.

Fix your country or stay and suffer. Do not expect to be welcomed indefinitely by societies you have no respect for, no loyalty to, and no intention of helping. Justice begins with boundaries, and it is long past time to enforce them.

Rebuilding justice

A justice system that does not deter, does not punish, and does not protect is not a justice system. It is a failure dressed in ceremony. That is what most Western countries are living with today: a set of institutions pretending to do their job while criminals laugh, victims suffer, and the public loses faith. It is time to stop pretending. The system is broken. It has been hijacked by ideologues, paralysed by cowardice, and twisted by compassion that borders on lunacy. If justice is to be restored, it must be rebuilt from the ground up.

This is not about minor reforms. It is not about tweaking sentencing guidelines or holding more public consultations. This is about tearing out the rot: the idea that punishment is cruel, the fantasy that all criminals can be redeemed, the obsession with protecting offenders while ignoring victims. These ideas have made a mockery of the law. They have made crime a viable lifestyle. They have turned courtrooms into therapy sessions and prisons into holiday camps. That ends here.

Deterrence must return as the foundation, not as a theory, but as a reality. Sentences must be harsh, prisons must be feared, and consequences must be swift. Crime should not just feel like a bad decision. It should feel like the worst decision a person could make. That is what stops people and what prevents harm. That is what justice is supposed to deliver.

Restitution must be absolute. No more shrugging from thieves and fraudsters who claim the money is gone. No more victims left in ruin while the offender gets a

reduced sentence. Every crime that causes damage must be followed by lifelong repayment, down to the last cent. If that means the offender works for the rest of their life to pay it off, then so be it. Justice is not supposed to be convenient for the criminal. It is supposed to repair what they broke.

Terrorism must be treated as war, not deviance. No more fantasies of rehabilitation. No more tolerant courtrooms bending to the feelings of fanatics. Punishment must be final, severe, and public. And when martyrdom is the goal, the only deterrent left is legacy. The extended penalty must become part of the legal arsenal by targeting families, removing honours, seizing assets, and erasing any illusion of pride. If a terrorist wants to die, let him die knowing he will be forgotten, disgraced, and that his name brings only suffering to those he cared about.

Illegal immigration must stop being rewarded. Offend in a country that gave you a second chance, and that chance is gone. You work, you pay for your stay, or you are removed. No luxury, no excuses, no endless appeals. Borders mean nothing if justice does not protect them.

Finally, integration must be enforced. You do not join a society by demanding it adapts to you, you join by adapting to it. The justice system must drop the fantasy that cultural difference excuses criminality. Obey the law or leave, contribute or be removed. If you are born in a country and still reject it, you are not part of it.

These are not extreme views. They are the bare minimum for a functioning society. Justice must stop being ashamed of itself. It must stop hiding behind compassion and start enforcing consequence. Because the alternative is already here: soaring crime, public fear, institutional collapse, and the steady erosion of everything that once made the West civilised.

There is no virtue in letting criminals walk free. There is no wisdom in tolerating chaos. There is no justice without punishment. Rebuilding justice begins with saying what needs to be said and doing what needs to be done. It is not about kindness, it is about order. Without order, there is no peace, no trust, and no civilisation. Just noise and decay, a slow, quiet death of everything worth protecting. That is what we are fighting to stop. It begins now.

More free booklets can be found at:
https://github.com/jgestiot/free_books/blob/main/README.md

Revision 1.3