



POLITICS ISLAM

sussan sinks

The Evil of Two Lessers

ALAN MORAN JAN 22 2026

The cause and effect of the Bondi Beach murders have long been percolating. The deterioration of public safety as a result of anti-Semitism was evident long before the carnage of December 14 in the security barriers and personnel Jews have had to build and organise to protect areas where they congregate and their children are schooled. Labor governments have been unable and unwilling to counter this intensifying menace because of the voting coalitions they rely upon. Having built and populated their Muslim voting blocs, incurring their electoral wrath by acting contrary to their wishes is unthinkable.

Australia's century and more of successful immigration rested upon a common set of values and customs. From a British heritage, refugees and people seeking a better life came from the Continent and Asia, integrating into and enriching the Australian lifestyle. With immigration from Islamic countries and war-shattered failed states, we are learning that assimilation is no longer a basic expectation.

This helps to explain why the response of the Albanese government to the Bondi massacre has been akin to erasing the whale from *Moby Dick*. Backed by most of Sussan Ley's Liberals, Labor has now banned "offensive" speech (to be identified both subjectively and retrospectively!) and further tightened what were already some of the world's most stringent gun laws. As a response to the cold-blooded slaughter of 15 innocent beachgoers this non-approach approach to Islamic mayhem is being widely and rightly ridiculed.

Beyond Ley's collaboration, Albanese & Co were able to rush through the legislation because those who opposed it produced only an incoherent and often conflicted clamour of disparate voices. These views range from those of the main Islamic bodies, which argued there is no need to outlaw hate organisations but only, perhaps, certain of their actions, to those of the Jewish organisations demanding hate speech be made illegal. Others talked of banning inflammatory preaching of the Koran's exhortations to smite infidels in general and Jews in particular while simultaneously demanding more groups and organisations – Hizb ut-Tahrir, for instance – be added to the register of the 31 already listed. Yet a further body of opinion deemed existing laws sufficient for purpose if only government and the authorities would enforce them.

For the sake of "balance" and appearance the government has sanctioned the pitiful idiots who enjoy playing Nazi dress-up games in public places. Now Tony Burke will be able to tell his Lakemba constituents that are not being singled out for special treatment while also noting that the words "Islam" and "Muslim" appear nowhere in the rushed-through legislation. Yet almost everybody who doesn't find it expedient to turn a blind eye recognises the real danger is from those Muslims opposed to the entire Western lifestyle. Society's vulnerability is to the Islam that refuses to reject the later Mohammedan scripts – those hadiths which authorise forced conversions in Allah's name and demand the

death of those who refuse to convert or are apostate. While other religions have exhortations to violence within their sacred texts, only Islam has a significant number of adherents who quote with menace and approval such invocations.

The rogues' gallery of 31 fringe groups already banned in Australia demonstrates a willingness by government to act against bodies that mean us harm. There are precedents for proscribing bodies far more mainstream than fundamentalist Islam that promote views which, were they to prevail, would undermine our way of life. Prime Minister Menzies during the 1950s sought to abolish the Communist Party, a bid that narrowly failed when put to a referendum. Many regard this ballot-box judgement as consistent with democracy, but it's worth noting that communism was banned in many democracies, including during the Cold War in the US, in Germany, and that it remains banned in most Eastern European countries.

In *Liberty in the Age of Terror*, A. C. Grayling addresses the paradox of tolerance, arguing that a society, "must not tolerate intolerance if it is to protect itself" and how it is "an ethical demand that everyone should respect everyone else's rights and liberties."

It may be claimed that Muslims are only a tiny part of our population and therefore pose no threat of overturning our institutions. But real-world evidence belies that claim. In Europe, Islam's enclaves are often no-go areas even for police, this same separatism also demonstrated by ostentatious prayer assemblies in public spaces, loud speakers booming the call to prayer five times a day, and the full-body veiling of women and girls. The message could not be more clear: a parallel society happy to accept the benefits of its host polity while adamantly refusing to be part of it. This and more has driven the consensus in Europe, and increasingly in Australia, that we must be less welcoming of immigrants whose views, beliefs and customs are antithetical to our values.

But perhaps we need to go further and require affirmation from all citizens, and to retract citizenship (and residency) from those who hold dual citizenship and refuse to respect and uphold traditional democratic norms. If we truly believe, and almost all of us do, that those of us living here have won life's

lottery, we ought to insist this be taught without qualification or parental exemptions in our schools. It would make a pleasant change from a curriculum that fills young minds with guilt for “living on stolen land”.

The butchery at Bondi has dynamited a political establishment whose first instinct was to bow to both the Left and alien minorities. In the maelstrom that followed the slaughter the Albanese government wasn't one to let a crisis go to waste, cynically seizing upon the massacre as a golden opportunity to institute its dream of expanding censorship that can be used to target its enemies. Albanese has crowed about his contempt for Tories – always hated them, always will – so silencing and legally harassing them fits perfectly with the sensibility of an overgrown student activist chanting ‘by any means necessary’. In Albanese’s opportunism we see that war cry means exactly what it says.

As for Sussan Ley and the Liberal drones, they wanted catharsis and demanded an immediate recall of Parliament. But once that was accomplished she had no ready plan, strategy, nor course of action. Politics, like nature, abhors a vacuum and it was into this void on the Opposition’s front bench that Albanese’s sly gambit was sucked and took root by default. Yes, the Liberals managed with the help of The Greens to wring a concession in having part of the bill removed, but in the grand scheme of things it was a pitiful and pathetic victory in what has otherwise been a self-inflicted rout.

Meanwhile, disgusted and dismayed by the two major parties’ inability to address Islamic terror, voters are flocking to the banner of a One Nation, which whatever its faults is willing to call a spade a spade. Barring a miracle involving the sudden re-discovery spine and principle the outcome is terminal for the now archaic Coalition.

But a potential phoenix is rising from its ashes – a prospective new coalition of One Nation, the Nationals, non-woke Liberals and others the Left establishment mischaracterises and vilifies as “far right”. Taken together these players now constitute a majority. In addition, huge swathes of Labor supporters are ripe for recruitment. We’re not talking here about the party’s elite cadre but of those Australians who feel, as Ronald Reagan once put it, that the Left has left them. If you accept there is no future for the Liberals, nor

the slightest reason to believe they retain any faith whatsoever in what once were core principles, whatever new coalition emerges needs to be built around these foundations:

- ◆ Freedom of speech for and tolerance of all Australians
- ◆ Requiring immigrants and all who call this nation home to respect, adopt and support Australian values
- ◆ Elimination of preferences for any groups, be they racial, religious or sexual, and the dismantling of the social-engineering machinery funded by taxpayers that has nurtured and promoted division and separatism
- ◆ Defunding partisan pressure groups in the environment, arts and social industries while re-targeting welfare to assist those in genuine need
- ◆ Dismantling energy regulations that have replaced fossil-fuel supplies with the high-cost and unreliable renewables that are undermining national productivity and living standards

Do any of these bullet points strike you as “far right”? Old fashioned good sense more like.