Journal of Community Applied Research

National Leadership, Opposition Conduct, and Crisis Governance in Australia

A Comparative Analysis of Major National Shock Events (1996-2025)

Jason Masters, Sydney, Australia, 22 December 2025

OPEN ACCESS

Journal of Community Applied Research

Society, Ethics, Business

Journal of Community Applied Research

Independent Research Working Article.

Copyright Notice:

© 2025 Jason Masters. Published by Advocating for Humanity, a brand of Masters Le Mesurier (International) Pty Ltd. (ABN 35116254794)

DOI: http://**10.5281/zenodo.18009157**

0009-0001-5667-5416

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. You may share and adapt this material for non-commercial use with appropriate attribution.

Abstract

This study examines opposition conduct during major national crises in Australia from 1996 to 2025. Drawing on the established crisis governance literature, it develops a four-position typology for assessing opposition responses: Full Bipartisan Support, Qualified Support with Constructive Critique, Critical Engagement, and Active Politicisation. This study applies this framework to eight significant national shock events, with a particular focus on the Port Arthur massacre (1996), the Bondi Junction stabbing (April 2024), and the Bondi Beach Hanukkah massacre (December 2025). The analysis identifies concerning departures from the established norms of crisis bipartisanship in recent opposition conduct, including premature politicisation, factually contested claims regarding government responsibility, and advocacy for policy measures that threaten democratic freedoms. This study concludes with recommendations for strengthening crisis governance norms while protecting civil liberties.

Keywords: crisis governance, Opposition conduct, bipartisanship, antisemitism, terrorism, democratic freedoms, Australia

© 2025

1. Introduction

National crises test the resilience of democratic institutions. They reveal whether political actors prioritise collective welfare over partisan advantage. Australia has experienced several major shock events since 1996, each providing insight into how the government and opposition navigate moments of acute national trauma.

The Bondi Beach massacre of 14 December 2025 in which 15 people were killed at a Hanukkah celebration, represents Australia's worst mass shooting since the Port Arthur massacre in 1996. This attack has prompted intense debates about antisemitism, terrorism, immigration, and free speech. It has also raised questions about the appropriate opposition conduct during national emergencies.

This study develops an analytical framework for assessing opposition responses to national crises. It examines eight significant events between 1996 and 2025 and compares the patterns of bipartisan cooperation and political divergence. The analysis draws on crisis governance literature, democratic theory, and a detailed examination of political statements and policy positions.

2. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative case study design to examine opposition behaviour across eight national crises, enabling an in-depth analysis while identifying cross-case patterns (Yin, 2014). Cases were selected for their national significance, temporal diversity (1996-2025), and variance in crisis type (mass violence, international conflict, natural disaster, pandemic, and terrorism).

The theoretical framework draws on Birkland's (1997) concept of 'focusing events,' which views crises as windows of opportunity for policy change but also as moments of risk for political exploitation. Opposition behaviour is categorised using a four-position typology developed from crisis governance literature: Full Bipartisan Support, Qualified Support with Constructive Critique, Critical Engagement, and Active Politicisation.

Data collection drew on primary sources, including Hansard parliamentary records, ministerial statements, and official enquiry reports. Secondary sources include the Scanlon Foundation's Mapping Social Cohesion surveys, which provide quantitative data on public trust and the impact of social cohesion (Scanlon Foundation, 2024). Media archives and academic literature on crisis governance inform the contextual analysis.

Evaluations benchmark opposition conduct against normative standards: enhancing national welfare, protecting minorities from disproportionate harm, preserving institutional trust, and avoiding politicisation that undermines democratic norms (Dahl, 1989). The Scanlon Foundation surveys provide an empirical basis for assessing social cohesion, with data on trust in government, a sense of belonging, and attitudes toward minority communities.

© 2025

Limitations include reliance on public records, which can underrepresent behind-the-scenes dynamics, and the recency of some events, which limits long-term data. This study treats the findings as indicative of Australia's context rather than universally generalisable.

3. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

3.1 Crisis Governance Principles

Boin et al. (2017) identify five core tasks of crisis leadership: sense-making, decision-making, meaning-making, terminating, and learning. During acute crises, effective governance requires rapid coordination across institutional boundaries. Partisan conflict during these phases impedes the effectiveness of responses and erodes public trust.

Hart and Boin (2001) distinguish between 'routine' political competition and crisis modes that require the temporary suspension of normal adversarial dynamics. They argue that democratic accountability remains essential but must be exercised through appropriate channels and at an appropriate time.

Birkland (1997) conceptualises crises as 'focusing events' that create windows for policy changes. These events concentrate public and political attention, creating opportunities for reform but also the risk of exploitation. Policy responses depend significantly on how political actors frame events and whether they pursue collaborative or adversarial strategies.

3.2 The Rally Effect and Its Limits

Mueller (1970) documented the 'rally around the flag' phenomenon, whereby public support for leaders increases during international crises. Subsequent research has examined the domestic applications and limitations of these models. Hetherington and Nelson (2003) found that rallies depend on perceived threat severity and leadership credibility.

Importantly, rally effects are not automatic entitlements for the government. They reflect the public's desire for unity during genuine emergencies rather than blanket immunity from scrutiny. The Scanlon Foundation's social cohesion research demonstrates that trust in institutions correlates with perceptions of unified leadership during crises (Scanlon Foundation 2024).

3.3 Four Ideal-Type Positions for Opposition Conduct

Based on the literature, this study proposes four ideal-type positions for opposition conduct during national crises.

Position 1: Full Bipartisan Support. The Opposition offers unconditional public support for government crisis management. Criticism is suspended or channelled through private briefings. Policy differences are deferred until the acute phase is concluded. This position is appropriate for the immediate aftermath period (typically 48-72 hours) and when government actions align with established protocols.

Position 2: Qualified Support with Constructive Critique. The Opposition expresses solidarity while offering substantive policy alternatives or resource commitments. Criticism focuses on improving response effectiveness rather than assigning blame to the criticised party. This position balances democratic accountability and crisis unity.

Position 3: Critical Engagement. The Opposition acknowledges the severity of the crisis while publicly questioning the government's competence or priorities. Criticism is framed as holding the government accountable, rather than exploiting the tragedy. This position risks undermining the crisis response but may be justified by apparent government failures.

Position 4: Active Politicisation. The Opposition frames the crisis primarily through partisan electoral narratives. It assigns blame to the government for causing or failing to prevent crises. It uses the crisis to advance pre-existing policy agendas with a tenuous connection to the crisis's causes. This position undermines crisis governance norms and risks victim exploitation for political gain.

4. Historical Case Studies: Australian Crisis Events 1996-2024

4.1 Port Arthur Massacre (28 April 1996)

On 28 April 1996 a gunman killed 35 people in Port Arthur, Tasmania. This massacre remains the deadliest mass shooting in Australia. The Hon. John Howard OM AC, 25th Prime Minister of Australia (1996-2007), had been in office for seven weeks.

The Hon. Kim Beazley AC, 17th Leader of the Opposition (1996-2001), offered immediate and unconditional support for the government's response. Within 12 days, the government announced comprehensive gun law reforms that required cooperation from all states and territories.

Beazley's conduct demonstrates Position 1 (Full Bipartisan Support). He explicitly subordinated partisan interests to that of national unity. When the National Firearms Agreement faced resistance from some Coalition backbenchers and the Shooters Party, Labor provided legislative support, which proved essential to its passage.

The Port Arthur response established a benchmark for Australian crisis bipartisanship. Both major parties accepted that mass casualty events demand

the suspension of regular political competition, at least during the acute response phase. Polling showed 90% public approval for the reforms, reflecting the benefits of cohesive, unified political messaging (Chapman et al., 2016).

4.2 MH17 Disaster (17 July 2014)

Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 was shot down over eastern Ukraine on 17 July 2014 killing all 298 people aboard, including 38 Australian citizens and residents. The Hon. Tony Abbott AC, 28th Prime Minister of Australia (2013-2015), led the government response.

The Hon. Bill Shorten, 21st Leader of the Opposition (2013-2019), adopted Position 1 (Full Bipartisan Support). He appeared alongside Abbott at press conferences, endorsed diplomatic efforts to secure the crash site, and suspended parliamentary criticism during the repatriation period.

The bipartisan approach reflected the international dimensions of the crisis and the need for unified Australian representation in negotiations with Ukraine and the Netherlands, as well as at the United Nations Security Council. Public trust in the government's handling of the crisisremained high throughout the crisis period.

4.3 Lindt Café Siege (15-16 December 2014)

On 15 December 2014 a gunman took 18 hostages at the Lindt Chocolate Café in Martin Place, Sydney, Australia. The siege ended after 16 hours when the police stormed the café. Two hostages and the gunman were killed during the incident.

Opposition Leader Shorten maintained Position 1 throughout the crisis. He praised the police response, expressed condolences to the victims' families, and avoided criticism of security agencies and government decisions. The 'I'll ride with you' social media campaign demonstrated community solidarity against potential anti-Muslim backlash.

Subsequent coronial enquiries and reviews raised questions regarding police tactical decisions and the gunman's prior interactions with law enforcement. These accountability processes occurred through appropriate institutional channels rather than through immediate political exploitation. The Scanlon Foundation's 2015 survey indicated that social cohesion metrics remained stable, with attitudes toward Muslim Australians softening rather than hardening after the unified political response.

4.4 Counter-Terrorism Legislation (2014-2015)

The Abbott government introduced extensive counterterrorism legislation following the rise of the Islamic State and domestic threat assessments. This included the retention of metadata, foreign fighter provisions, and expanded ASIO powers.

The Opposition adopted Position 2 (Qualified Support with Constructive Critique). Labor supported most measures while negotiating amendments to oversight mechanisms and sunset clauses. This approach balances security concerns with the protection of civil liberties.

The legislative process demonstrated that bipartisanship need not imply uncritical endorsement. Constructive engagement improved legislation while maintaining unified public messaging on counterterrorism commitment. The Scanlon Foundation surveys from this period showed declining trust among Muslim Australians due to perceptions of profiling, indicating the costs associated with heightened security policies, even with qualified opposition support.

4.5 Black Summer Bushfires (2019-2020)

The 2019-2020 bushfire season caused unprecedented destruction: 33 deaths, over 3,000 homes destroyed, approximately 19 million hectares burned, and an estimated one billion animals killed. The Hon Scott Morrison, 30th Prime Minister of Australia (2018-2022), faced criticism for holidaying in Hawaii during the crisis.

The Hon. Anthony Albanese, 22nd Leader of the Opposition (2019-2022), adopted Position 3 (Critical Engagement). He visited affected communities, criticised the government's climate policies and emergency preparedness, but avoided personalising attacks during the acute firefighting phase.

The bushfire response illustrated the tensions between crisis solidarity and legitimate policy critique. Some government ministers dismissed discussions on the scientifically established connections between climate change and fire severity as inappropriate during emergencies. The Opposition's position balanced accountability with restraint. The Scanlon Foundation's 2020 survey showed declining trust in the federal government, with 40% of respondents expressing dissatisfaction with the government's crisis response.

4.6 COVID-19 Pandemic (2020-2022)

Australia's COVID-19 response involved unprecedented peacetime restrictions on movement, economic activity and civil liberties. The National Cabinet, comprising federal and state leaders, coordinated policies across jurisdictions.

Opposition Leader Albanese generally maintained Position 2 (Qualified Support with Constructive Critique). He endorsed lockdowns and vaccination programs while criticising vaccine procurement delays and quarantine failures. This approach avoided fundamental challenges to public health measures while maintaining policy differentiation.

State-level dynamics varied considerably, with the Victorian and Western Australian Labor governments facing sustained criticism from federal Coalition figures. This selective application of bipartisanship norms undermines claims of principled crisis conduct. The Scanlon Foundation's pandemic-era surveys documented fraying social cohesion, with trust varying significantly by state and political affiliations.

4.7 Russian Invasion of Ukraine (February 2022)

Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine commenced on 24 February 2022 with missile strikes and ground advances, resulting in thousands of civilian deaths

and massive displacement. The crisis affected Australia through alliance commitments, economic disruptions due to sanctions, and support for the Ukrainian diaspora.

Prime Minister Morrison condemned the invasion on 24 February and imposed sanctions on Russian banks and Russian elites. He provided $91 million in military support, $65 million in humanitarian aid, and expedited visas for Ukrainians fleeing the conflict.

Opposition Leader Albanese adopted Position 1 (Full Bipartisan Support), condemning the invasion as a 'grave moment' and supporting sanctions without any qualifications. Despite the crisis occurring during the election campaign, both major parties maintained unified messaging on Australia's response.

The bipartisan approach protected Ukrainian Australians through visa priorities and supported Russian Australians by emphasising the distinction between the Russian government and the Russian people. Polling showed 80% approval of the government's handling of the pandemic. Aid continued and expanded under the Albanese government following the May 2022 election, reaching over $1.5 billion by 2024.

4.8 Bondi Junction Westfield Attack (13 April 2024)

On 13 April 2024 a lone attacker killed six people and injured twelve others at the Westfield Bondi Junction shopping centre. The attacker was shot dead by police. The victims included five women and one man, with evidence suggesting that the attacker specifically targeted women.

Prime Minister Albanese and NSW Premier Chris Minns led the immediate response to the crisis. The Hon. Peter Dutton, 23rd Leader of the Opposition (2022-2025), adopted Position 1 (Full Bipartisan Support) in the immediate aftermath, expressing condolences and praising the police response.

The attack prompted discussions about mental health services, police training, and security at public venues. These discussions occurred without significant partisan conflict, reflecting the non-ideological nature of the incident and the absence of apparent policy failures.

5. The Bondi Beach Hanukkah Massacre (December 2025)

5.1 The Attack

On 14 December 2025 two gunmen opened fire on approximately 1,000 people gathered at Bondi Beach to celebrate the first night of Hanukkah. The attack killed 15 people aged between 10 and 87 years. The victims included Holocaust survivors, two rabbis, and members of multiple families. Approximately 40 people were wounded, with many requiring ongoing hospitalisation.

The attackers were identified as Sajid Akram (50 years old) and his son, Naveed Akram (24 years old). Sajid was killed in an exchange of gunfire with police. Naveed was seriously wounded and later charged with 59 offences, including 15 counts of murder and one count of committing a terrorist act.

Two homemade Islamic State flags were found in the attackers' vehicle, along with makeshift explosive devices. Prime Minister Albanese stated the attack was 'motivated by ISIS ideology.' The attack represented Australia's worst mass shooting since Port Arthur and was the deadliest antisemitic attack in Australian history.

5.2 Acts of Heroism

Ahmed al-Ahmed, a Syrian-born fruit shop owner, tackled one of the gunmen and was shot in the process. His intervention prevented additional casualties. Al-Ahmed received widespread praise and donations totalling more than $2.5 million in support of his recovery. His actions demonstrated that the attack represented a threat to all Australians and not a conflict between communities.

5.3 Background of the Attackers

Sajid Akram arrived in Australia in 1998 on a student visa during the Howard government. He transferred to a partner visa in 2001 and subsequently obtained a resident return visa after overseas trips. Indian authorities confirmed that he was originally from Hyderabad. His son, Naveed, was born in Australia and is an Australian citizen.

In October 2019, during the Morrison government, the ASIO investigated Naveed Akram for approximately six months due to his associations with other persons of interest. The investigation concluded with an assessment that there was 'no indication of any ongoing threat or threat of him engaging in violence.' ABC reported that the investigation involved an Islamic State cell.

Sajid Akram held a firearms licence issued in 2023. He first applied in 2015, but the application lapsed in 2016. The police seized six firearms registered to him following the attack.

Philippine immigration records confirmed that Sajid and Naveed Akram travelled to the Philippines from 1 to 28 November 2025. They listed Davao City on the southern island of Mindanao as their destination in the advertisement. Mindanao has a long history of Islamist insurgency and is home to groups, including Abu Sayyaf, which has pledged allegiance to the Islamic State.

ABC reported that Australian counter-terrorism officials believed the pair underwent 'military-style training' during this trip. Philippine authorities denied evidence of training, with National Security Adviser Eduardo Ano stating that there was 'no indicator or any information that they underwent training' in Mindanao. Hotel staff in Davao reported that the pair rarely left their room and received no visitors during their stay.

Security analyst Rommel Banlaoi, chairman of the Philippine Institute for Peace, Violence and Terrorism Research, noted that while major militant groups had been degraded since the 2017 Marawi siege, 'there are still many active training

camps in central Mindanao' and these groups maintained connections' locally and globally online.'

5.4 Government Response

Prime Minister Albanese described the attack as 'an act of pure evil, an act of antisemitism, an act of terrorism.' He visited Bondi Beach on 15 December, laid flowers, and met with community leaders. The National Cabinet met on 16 December and unanimously agreed to strengthen gun laws.

On 18 December, the government announced the formal adoption of the recommendations of the Segal Report on antisemitism, released in July 2025. The government also announced a national gun buyback scheme and declared 21 December as a Day of Reflection.

5.5 Opposition Response

The Hon Sussan Ley, 24th Leader of the Opposition (2025-present), issued an initial statement on 15 December expressing solidarity with the victims while stating that the government had allowed antisemitism to 'fester' in Australia.

On 17 December, Ley appeared at the Bondi Pavilion and adopted a significantly harder line. She announced the establishment of a Coalition Taskforce on Antisemitism, Extremism, and Counter-terrorism. She stated, 'Every single day for the last two years, Jewish Australians have watched the rising tide of antisemitism. And they have looked to their leaders in Canberra, and they have looked to Prime Minister Albanese, and he has failed them.'

Ley maintained a physical presence at Bondi for three days and attended the victim's funeral. She called for the immediate implementation of all Segal Report recommendations and criticised the government's focus on gun control as insufficient.

5.6 Other Political Interventions at the Memorial Site

The memorial site at Bondi became a venue for multiple political interventions beyond the Opposition Leader.

The Hon. Josh Frydenberg, former Treasurer and Deputy Liberal Leader (2018-2022), delivered an emotional address at Bondi on 18 December. He stated: 'It is time for [Albanese] to accept personal responsibility for the death of 15 innocent people, including a 10-year-old child.' He called for a royal commission into antisemitism and demanded a ban on 'hate preachers.'

Frydenberg criticised the government's focus on gun reform, stating: 'Guns may have stolen the life of 15 innocent civilians, but it was radical Islamist ideology that pulled the trigger.' He called for an end to pro-Palestinian rallies, describing them as 'incubators of hate.'

One Nation Senator Pauline Hanson and The Hon Barnaby Joyce, former Deputy Prime Minister (who had just joined the One Nation party), appeared together at the Bondi Memorial site. Commentators described their statements as 'laced with

racist comments about restricting immigration from Muslim nations.' Hanson suggested wearing an Israeli flag into the Senate to compare reactions with her previous wearing of a burqa.

Columnist Crispin Hull described the scene as 'a Punch and Judy show' and 'a disgraceful political puppet show,' contrasting politicians' conduct with the dignity of surfers and swimmers who continued using the beach.

5.7 Factual Context for Political Claims

Several claims made at the Bondi memorial site warrant examination against factual records.

Immigration responsibility: Sajid Akram entered Australia in 1998 on a student visa during the Howard Coalition government (1996-2007). His transition to a partner visa occurred in 2001, also under the Coalition. Claims that the Albanese government 'let people into the country' who committed this attack are factually incorrect.

ASIO investigation: Naveed Akram was investigated by the ASIO in 2019 and cleared as presenting no ongoing threat. This investigation and clearance occurred during Morrison's Coalition government (2018-2022). Claims of intelligence failure under the current government misrepresent this timeline.

Hate speech legislation: The Coalition attempted to repeal or weaken Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act in 2014 (Abbott government, with Attorney-General George Brandis famously declaring that people have 'a right to be bigots') and again in 2017 (Turnbull government). However, the Labor Party, the Greens, and crossbench senators defeated both attempts. The 2017 Senate vote was 31-28 against the proposed changes.

In contrast, the NSW Minns Labor government introduced religious vilification protections in November 2023 and further hate speech legislation in February 2025. The Federal Albanese government passed the Criminal Code Amendment (Hate Crimes) Bill 2024, creating new offences for advocating violence against groups based on race, religion, or other protected attributes.

6. The Segal Report and Democratic Freedoms

6.1 Report Overview

Jillian Segal AC was appointed as Australia's Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism in January 2024. Her report, released in July 2025, contains 13 recommendations and 49 key actions. The government announced the formal adoption of the report on 18 December 2025 four days after the Bondi attack.

The report's central recommendation is the adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) working definition of antisemitism across all levels of government, educational institutions and civil society organisations.

6.2 The IHRA Definition: Structural Problems

The IHRA working definition states: 'Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews.' This core definition is supplemented by 11 illustrative examples, seven of which relate to criticism of Israel rather than hatred of Jewish people.

Kenneth Stern, the lead author of the IHRA definition, has publicly opposed its use as an enforcement mechanism. Stern has described adoption efforts as a 'disaster' and an 'attack on academic freedom.' He states that the definition was created solely for data collection, not for regulating speech or determining what constitutes an acceptable discourse.

In November 2025, nine Australian Jewish organisations wrote to the government, urging it not to adopt the IHRA definition, citing concerns about the conflation of antisemitism with criticism of the Israeli government's policies.

6.3 Federal Court Precedent

In July 2025, the Federal Court of Australia ruled in the Wertheim v Haddad case. Justice Stewart held that criticism of Israel, Zionism, and the Israeli military is not antisemitic. This ruling established a binding precedent that contradicts several IHRA illustrative examples.

This ruling creates tension between the judicial interpretation of discrimination law and the executive adoption of the IHRA definition. Organisations penalised under IHRA-based policies may have grounds for legal challenges based on this precedent.

6.4 Threats to Democratic Freedoms

The Segal Report recommendations extend beyond combating genuine antisemitism to areas that threaten core democratic freedoms:

Academic freedom: The report recommends withdrawing funding from universities that fail to address antisemitism, as defined by the IHRA criteria. This would enable government intervention in academic discourse on Israel and Palestine, potentially chilling legitimate scholarly enquiry and student activism.

Media freedom: The report positions the Special Envoy as a 'media monitor' ensuring 'fair and balanced reporting.' This represents government oversight of press coverage of Israel-Palestine issues, contrary to the principles of press independence.

Charitable sector: The report recommends a review of tax-deductible status for organisations deemed to support antisemitism.' This could affect human rights organisations, Palestinian advocacy groups, and bodies critical of Israeli government policies.

Immigration: The report recommends visa screening for 'antisemitic views or affiliations.' This politicises immigration decisions and could exclude journalists, academics, and activists based on political positions rather than on security threats.

6.5 The Jerusalem Declaration Alternative

The Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism, developed by over 200 scholars of antisemitism studies in March 2021, offers an alternative framework to the IHRA definition. It defines antisemitism as 'discrimination, prejudice, hostility or violence against Jews as Jews.'

The Jerusalem Declaration explicitly states that the following are not antisemitic: supporting Palestinian rights, including self-determination; criticising Zionism as a form of nationalism; evidence-based criticism of Israel as a state; comparing Israeli policies to other historical cases, including settler-colonialism or apartheid; and participation in boycott, divestment, and sanctions campaigns.

6.6 International Context

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu publicly blamed the Albanese government for the Bondi attack, linking it to Australia's September 2024 recognition of Palestinian statehood. This intervention by a foreign leader in domestic crisis response is unusual and potentially inappropriate for several reasons.

Netanyahu faces International Criminal Court arrest warrants and International Court of Justice proceedings regarding conduct in Gaza. The adoption of IHRA definitions that classify criticism of Israeli government actions as antisemitism serves to delegitimise reporting on these proceedings.

7. Analysis

7.1 Assessing Opposition Conduct

Applying the four-position framework developed in Section 3, the Opposition's response to the Bondi Beach massacre warrants careful consideration.

Opposition Leader Ley's initial statement on 15 December contained elements of both Position 1 (solidarity expressions) and Position 4 (blame attribution). The statement that antisemitism had been allowed to 'fester' under the current government, made within 24 hours of the attack, represented early politicisation.

By 17 December, Ley had firmly moved toward Position 3 (Critical Engagement) with elements of Position 4. The establishment of a parallel taskforce sustained physical presence at the memorial site, and explicit statements that the Prime Minister had 'failed' the Jewish community represented significant departures from the bipartisan crisis norms.

© 2025

Table 1: Summary of Opposition Responses to National Crises (1996-2025)

Crisis Event	Prime Minister	Opposition Leader	Assessed Response
Port Arthur (1996)	Howard	Beazley	Position 1: Full Bipartisan Support
MH17 Disaster (2014)	Abbott	Shorten	Position 1: Full Bipartisan Support
Lindt Café Siege (2014)	Abbott	Shorten	Position 1: Full Bipartisan Support
Counter-Terrorism (2014-15)	Abbott	Shorten	Position 2: Qualified Support
Black Summer (2019-20)	Morrison	Albanese	Position 3: Critical Engagement
COVID-19 (2020-22)	Morrison	Albanese	Position 2: Qualified Support
Ukraine Invasion (2022)	Morrison	Albanese	Position 1: Full Bipartisan Support
Bondi Junction (Apr 2024)	Albanese	Dutton	Position 1: Full Bipartisan Support
Bondi Beach (Dec 2025)	Albanese	Ley	Position 3/4: Critical Engagement with Active Politicisation

7.2 Comparison with Historical Precedents

The contrast with Port Arthur is instructive and revealing. Kim Beazley's 1996 response demonstrated that effective Opposition conduct during mass casualty events involves genuine subordination of partisan advantage to national unity. Beazley did not establish parallel taskforces, maintain physical presence at the massacre site, or publicly declare that Prime Minister Howard had 'failed' Australians.

The Lindt Café siege provides a closer temporal comparison. Bill Shorten's 2014 response maintained Position 1 throughout the acute phase, with accountability questions addressed through subsequent institutional processes rather than immediate political exploitation. The Scanlon Foundation's post-siege surveys confirmed that a unified political message contributed to social cohesion.

The Ukraine 2022 response demonstrated that bipartisanship is achievable, even during election campaigns. Anthony Albanese's support for the Morrison government's sanctions and military aid showed that national security crises should transcend electoral considerations.

Even during the Black Summer bushfires, when there were legitimate grounds for criticising government preparedness and climate policy, Anthony Albanese's

opposition maintained restraint during active firefighting operations. The 2025 opposition response escalated more rapidly than these precedents.

7.3 The Frydenberg Intervention

Josh Frydenberg's demand that Prime Minister Albanese accept 'personal responsibility' for the deaths represents an extreme departure from crisis governance norms. No Opposition figure made equivalent claims following Port Arthur, the Lindt Café siege, or other terrorist attacks.

This statement is particularly problematic, given the factual record. The elder attacker entered Australia under a Coalition government. The ASIO investigation that cleared the younger attacker occurred under a Coalition government. Coalition governments have repeatedly attempted to weaken the hate speech protections defended by Labor.

Columnist Crispin Hull observed that Frydenberg, 'no doubt gutted and shattered in the heat of the moment and therefore should be given leeway, should seriously now consider what he said.' Hull suggested Frydenberg should 'pick up the phone' to Albanese, not apologise, but just say sorry, recognising the human impact of such accusations on Prime Ministers.

7.4 The Memorial Site as Political Venue

The transformation of the Bondi Memorial site into a venue for political speeches represents a concerning development. Traditionally, memorials serve as spaces for collective grief rather than partisan contestation.

The appearances by Hanson and Joyce, with statements characterised as containing racist content, further degraded the memorial's function. Their presence alongside Opposition Leader Ley created associations that may not have been intended but were difficult to ignore.

The contrast with community responses is significant. Ordinary Australians, including surfers and swimmers who continued to use Bondi Beach, demonstrated a quiet dignity. The 'I'll ride with you' spirit that emerged after the Lindt Café siege was harder to sustain when politicians used the tragedy for partisan purposes.

7.5 Policy Advocacy and Crisis Exploitation

The demand for the immediate implementation of all Segal Report recommendations raises questions about the exploitation of the crisis. The Segal Report was released in July 2025, five months before the attack. Its recommendations have been subject to ongoing policy deliberations, reflecting legitimate disagreements about their implications for democratic freedom.

Using a terrorist attack to override these deliberations represents a form of 'shock doctrine' politics, consistent with Birkland's (1997) analysis of how focusing events create opportunities for policy entrepreneurs to advance pre-existing agendas. Measures that threaten academic freedom, press independence, and civil liberties require careful consideration, not emergency adoption driven by grief and outrage.

The irony is that the attack was committed by individuals motivated by Islamic State ideology, not by academics discussing Israel-Palestine, journalists reporting on Gaza, or activists supporting Palestinian rights. The Segal Report recommendations address a different phenomenon than that which produced the massacre.

7.6 Social Cohesion Implications

The Scanlon Foundation's research on social cohesion provides a framework for assessing the likely consequences of politicised crisis responses in Australia. Their surveys consistently show that trust in institutions correlates with perceptions of unified leadership in crises.

The Opposition's approach risks eroding social cohesion through several mechanisms. Blaming the government for terrorist attacks that it did not cause undermines its institutional legitimacy. Linking attacks to immigration policy risks stigmatising Muslim communities. Demands for restrictions on protests and academic freedom threaten the civil liberties underpinning democratic participation.

The contrast with the Lindt Café siege response is instructive. In 2014, unified political messaging contributed to stable or improved attitudes toward Muslim Australians. The 2025 response, with its emphasis on immigration and cultural threats, risks the opposite outcome:

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Summary Findings

This analysis finds that the Opposition's conduct during the Bondi Beach massacre departed significantly from established Australian norms of crisis bipartisanship. The response combined elements of Position 3 (Critical Engagement) with Position 4 (Active Politicisation), representing a more adversarial approach than historical precedents.

The intervention by former minister Frydenberg and the appearances by Hanson and Joyce further degraded the quality of crisis discourse. The transformation of the memorial site into a political venue represented a departure from the norms of dignified collective mourning.

The policy demands advanced during the crisis, particularly the immediate implementation of all Segal Report recommendations, which would have significant negative implications for democratic freedoms. Using a terrorist attack to override careful deliberation on measures affecting academic freedom, press independence, and civil liberties represents a concerning crisis exploitation.

8.2 Recommendations for Crisis Governance Norms

Recommendation 1: Opposition leaders should observe a minimum 72-hour period following mass casualty events during which public statements focus exclusively on solidarity, condolences, and support for the emergency response. Policy critiques should be deferred to allow acute grief to subside.

Recommendation 2: Attribution of political blame for terrorist attacks should be avoided unless supported by clear evidence of specific government failures. General claims about 'allowing' conditions to develop are insufficiently precise for responsible crisis discourses.

Recommendation 3: Memorial sites should be treated as spaces for collective mourning, rather than venues for political speeches. Politicians visiting memorials should limit their public statements to expressions of solidarity and condolence.

8.3 Recommendations for Protecting Democratic Freedoms

Recommendation 4: The IHRA definition of antisemitism should not be adopted for enforcement or regulatory purposes. The Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism provides a more precise alternative that does not conflate hatred of Jews with criticism of Israeli government policy.

Recommendation 5: University funding should not be conditional on adopting any particular definition of antisemitism or compliance with speech codes that could chill legitimate academic enquiry.

Recommendation 6: Government monitoring of media coverage of Israel-Palestine should not be established. Press freedom requires independence from the executive oversight of political content.

Recommendation 7: Charitable status should not be withdrawn from organisations based on political positions regarding Israel-Palestine. Human rights advocacy, including criticism of government actions, is a legitimate charitable purpose.

8.4 Recommendations for Addressing Genuine Antisemitism

Recommendation 8: Security resources for Jewish community sites should be maintained and enhanced according to threat assessments. Physical protection is more effective than speech regulation in preventing terrorist attacks.

Recommendation 9: Counter-terrorism efforts should focus on identifying and disrupting individuals and networks planning violence rather than regulating political speech. The Bondi attackers were motivated not by academic articles or media reports but by jihadist ideology.

© 2025

Recommendation 10: Education about the Holocaust and Jewish history should be enhanced in the school curriculum. Understanding the historical manifestations of antisemitism is more effective than criminalising contemporary political speech.

End or Article

References

Australian Broadcasting Corporation. (2025, December 16). Bondi Beach shooting: What we know about the attack.

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2025). Explainer: New national and NSW hate crime laws.

Birkland, T. A. (1997). After disaster: Agenda setting, public policy, and focusing events. Georgetown University Press.

Boin, A., ’t Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2017). The Politics of Crisis Management: Public Leadership Under Pressure (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

CBS News. (2025, December 17). Bondi Beach suspects reportedly trained in the Philippines.

Chapman, S., Alpers, P., & Jones, M. (2016). Association between gun law reforms and intentional firearm deaths in Australia, 1979-2013. JAMA, 316(3), 291-299.

CNN. (2025, December 16). Who are Sajid and Naveed Akram? Australia shooting suspects were driven by Islamic State ideology.

Dahl, R. A. (1989). Democracy and its critics. Yale University Press.

Dreyfus, M. (2021). Standing up for 18C. Australian Parliament.

Federal Court of Australia. (2025). Wertheim v Haddad.

Hetherington, M. J., & Nelson, M. (2003). Anatomy of a Rally Effect. PS: Political Science and Politics, 36(1), 37-42.

Hull, C. (2025, December 18). Josh Frydenberg’s comments out of line. Canberra Times.

Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism. (2021). https://jerusalemdeclaration.org/

Mueller, J. E. (1970). Presidential Popularity from Truman to Johnson. American Political Science Review, 64(1), 18-34.

NSW Government. (2023, November). New religious vilification laws commence today.

Prime Minister of Australia. (2025, December 15). Press conference, Sydney.

SBS News. (2025, December 18). Frydenberg lashes Albanese and says Bondi terror attack’ greatest stain on the nation.’

Scanlon Foundation. (2024). Mapping Social Cohesion 2024. Scanlon Institute. https://scanloninstitute.org.au/mapping-social-cohesion-2024/

Segal, J. (2025). Report of the Special Envoy to Combat Antisemitism. Commonwealth of Australia.

Stern, K. (2019). I drafted the definition of antisemitism. Rightwing Jews are weaponising it. The Guardian.

© 2025

The Conversation. (2025, December 18). Albanese not invited to rabbi's funeral, as Frydenberg calls for ban on 'hate preachers.'

Hart, P., & Boin, A. (2001). Between Crisis and Normalcy. In U. Rosenthal, A. Boin, & L. Comfort (Eds.), Managing Crises. Charles C. Thomas.

Times of Israel. (2025, December 18). Albanese 'abandoned' Australia's Jews, ignored 'alarm bells,' charges ex-treasurer.

Wikipedia. (2025). Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975.

Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Conflicts of Interest

The author serves as Co-Convenor of Uniting Network Australia, the LGBTIQA+ advisory network within the Uniting Church in Australia, and is involved in advocacy for inclusive community policies. No financial conflicts exist. This analysis was conducted independently using established research methodologies and publicly available data sources.

Ethics Statement

This community research analysis employs publicly available data and documented policy information. No human subjects research was conducted requiring ethical approval.

Use of AI Technologies

During the preparation of this work, the author used the following tools

- SciSpace: generate a literature search
- Grok, Claude, Perplexity, Gemini, DeepSeek, and Manus to assist with research, brainstorming structures, and language improvement, etc.
- Grammarly, Open PaperPal to improve the sentence structure, grammar of
- the manuscript, readability, and proofreading

After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the publication's content.

Word Count: 6100 approximately

This analysis synthesises authoritative evidence sources to provide a community-accessible assessment of Australia's housing crisis. Data current as of December 2025.

End of Paper