



POLITICS ISLAM

rug II

Albanese's Royal Omission Commission

ALAN MORAN JAN 11 2026

We need real and well-analysed options to resolve the cancer in our society revealed by the Bondi massacre. The Royal Commission announced at long last by the Prime Minister comes nowhere near fulfilling that objective as evidenced by the language laying out its its major objective:

Tackling anti-Semitism by investigating the nature and prevalence of anti-Semitism in institutions and society, and its key drivers in Australia,

including ideologically and religiously motivated extremism and radicalisation.

Nowhere will you find the words “Islam”, “Muslim” or “jihadi”, which would seem to be fundamental terms in any genuine effort aimed at identifying “the key drivers” of Jew hate.

In operational terms, Albanese’s royal commission absorbs the previously established Richardson Review, which the government had provided terms of reference that were confined to the possible shortcomings of the security services in preventing the murder of Jews.

Since 1980, Australia has had 20 Royal Commissions. Whilst several proved useful, only two (Costigan into trade union corruption and Wood into financial services) are widely agreed to have brought about policy improvements. Problems with a Royal Commission approach are manifold.

First, there is its duration. Not scheduled to issue a final report until December 16, 2026, the anniversary of the slaughter, this means at least 1.5 years of action paralysis.

Secondly, there is the Commission head, Virginia Bell, who was selected by the Prime Minister and is predisposed towards ALP interventionism, with no experience in national security. Having commenced her legal career with the radical Redfern Legal Centre, she was previously selected by the PM to undertake a review of the supposed missteps of PM Scott Morrison for secretly swearing himself into multiple ministries.

And thirdly, Royal Commissions have a history of failing to unearth evidence they were tasked with addressing, and few have led to fundamental reform. “Never have a Royal Commission unless you already know the answer!” is an aphorism originally stemming from Sir Humphrey Appleby and is frequently cited by Australian authorities.

What the community requires of the government in the Bondi Royal Commission is assurances that it has fully analysed and understood the problem and has the tools not only to protect us all from further such dangers but to nip in the bud any such future crimes. This involves an understanding of

how realistic and extensive are concerns about Islamic terror, what has caused it, how best it can be diminished and the policy measures necessary for this to take place.

Undoubtedly, the government wishes to avoid its own culpability in tolerating during the past two years increased violence against Jews and endless demonstrations calling for their eradication from Palestine. Some of its most active supporters are vociferously anti-Israel, and key politicians have carefully nurtured and are dependent upon the Muslim vote. Moreover, they would not wish to see further light shone on the 3000 Palestinian visas granted – far more than in the rest of the world combined – with no real vetting of the recipients. Hence, the reluctance to call a Royal Commission or to instigate public inquiries into the Bondi murders.

Immediately after the shootings, a supposedly unfunded ad was widely televised calling for an end to hate. It bracketed together antisemitism and Islamophobia and displayed a swastika to infer that cosplaying Nazi youths were also related. In fact, unconfected cases of Islamophobia are non-existent in Australia – unlike synagogues and Jewish areas, there are no cases of non-Muslim intimidation at mosques or where large bodies of Muslims live.

Clearly, the vast majority of Muslims are peaceable and genuinely productive members of the community. But an important issue is how numerous are those *not* fitting this description?

Muslims, whether Shia or Sunni, can be characterised as focussed on the strictures of Mohammed, whether during his leadership of a minority sect in Mecca or during his later period in Medina, when he commanded the majority. In the former period, Mohammad called for tolerance and non-violence. In the latter, he called for the killing of non-Muslims or, at best, treating those who refused to convert as inferior citizens while prescribing death for the apostasy of any Muslim renouncing the faith.

The security agencies refuse to disclose the number of people they are monitoring. According to former ASIO director general Mike Burgess, out of the Muslims living in Australia, now totalling about one million, only 0.01 per cent (i.e. 1000) can be considered potentially dangerous to the community.

This quantification of what might be called the Medina Muslims' numbers is at odds with that of **Raymond Ibrahim**, an American historian specialising in the Middle East. Dr Ibrahim claims 10 per cent is the lowest credible estimate of Muslims calling for violent jihad. In Australia's context, that would mean 100,000. **Another** estimate is that 2000 AFP officers are monitoring around 25 people each, which would put the list at 50,000. Neither of the Bondi Beach killers was said to be on any watch list.

One thousand people living in Australia following a religion that calls for rejection of the current legal system and death to unbelievers is disturbing; 100,000 creates immense problems.

If the watch list were expanded to the 100,000 that Raymond Ibrahim suggests comprises the minimum number who favour harming unbelievers, and if it were better resourced (as the Royal Commission will surely demand), we could quite easily be looking at a vast increase in staffing. Grok reports that intelligence agencies like MI5 typically require teams of 12-20 officers per high-priority suspect and at least one for each low-risk target. All else aside, servicing this requires a colossal resource requirement – perhaps 100,000 people (considerably in excess of the number of serving Defence personnel) at an annual cost of over \$60 billion.

But for most of us, the implications for how we go about our daily lives are of greater importance. We have seen internecine strife – even violence – in the past, particularly among Yugoslav immigrants. Incidences of these have thankfully subsided but, in any case, the mutual acrimonies did not overflow to the community at large, as will be the case when violent Jihadists turn their attention to Christians, as they have in Africa. The Royal Commission will need to provide recommendations and options for how we should proceed.

It is doubtful that any non-Muslim Australians (and few Muslims) would want to see the proliferation of no-go areas that are evident in France, where Muslims comprise a growing 10% of the population or in Belgium and Germany, which also have high Muslim populations. Poland (0.1% Muslim) and Hungary (and arguably the US) have decided that the costs in terms of social tensions and finances outweigh the benefits of having significant increases in their Muslim

populations. In China, where Muslims account for perhaps two per cent of the population, a policy that many westerners regard as inhumane is followed, especially regarding the Uighurs, of whom 500,000 are in re-education camps.

At the very least, future policy must surely require rigorous testing of immigrant applicants to ensure they can seamlessly integrate, sifting out the Medina Muslims. Revisiting the background and current beliefs of those immigrants who are residents, or even citizens, would be a further step. Expulsion would need to be an option for those open to sectarian violence. A further issue is how to handle those Muslims (probably over 300,000, excluding young children) who were born here, especially since there is evidence that they often are more inclined to extreme views than their parents.

Australian governments have consistently refused to consider such issues as worthy of analysis. The Bondi murders, on top of other Islamic excesses, have convinced the vast majority of Australians that they do indeed need to be addressed. Will the Royal Commission do so, and even if it does, how will a government reliant on partisan Muslim support handle its findings?