

More ‘Gun Control’ Is Not the Answer

Tragedy struck down under—and once again, the political class has reached in its immediate aftermath for the same tired, dishonest prescription.

In the immediate aftermath of the horrific December 14 massacre at Bondi Beach, where Jewish families had gathered for a Chanukah candle-lighting ceremony, Australia’s elites wasted no time dusting off their favorite hobbyhorse: more gun control. The blood was barely dry before the all-too predictable calls came—tighter restrictions, broader bans, new powers for the state. The implication, as always, is that if only law-abiding citizens had fewer rights, this evil might somehow have been prevented.

This reflex is not merely wrong. It is perverse.

Australia is already world-famous—indeed, it is infamous—for its draconian firearms regime. For nearly three decades, Australians have lived under some of the most restrictive gun laws in the Western world. Semi-automatic firearms are largely banned. Licensing is onerous. Mass confiscation already occurred nearly three decades ago. Entire categories of weapons are prohibited outright. If gun control were the panacea its advocates endlessly promise, Australia should be a model of perfect safety.

And yet here we are. The uncomfortable truth, which polite society desperately wishes to avoid, is that gun control did not fail at Bondi Beach because it was insufficient. It failed because it was never the relevant variable to begin with. Laws aimed at inanimate objects are all too often powerless against raw human evil.

This attack, like so many others across the West in recent years, is due to the metastasis of radical Islamist ideology—a totalitarianism that weaponizes Islamic scriptural language to justify mass murder. Western governments have now spent decades refusing to forthrightly confront this existential threat.

That refusal has consequences. For years, Australian authorities—like their counterparts in Europe and North America—have preferred euphemism to clarity. “Lone wolf.” “Mental health incident.” “We’ll never know the true motive.” Anything, it seems, to avoid naming the problem: Islamism.

The Left’s gun control obsession serves a convenient political purpose. It allows elites to morally posture while avoiding the far harder and more pressing questions: Why are radical Islamist networks able to freely operate within Western societies? Why are known extremists so often on law enforcement’s radar before they strike? Why does border and immigration policy consistently prioritize “openness” and “inclusivity” over basic national security? Why is any scrutiny of Islamic extremism still instantly dismissed as “hate”?

These are the questions that might actually save lives. And these are precisely the questions gun control advocates down under, and also here on the home front, are desperate not to ask.

(...) History teaches a clear lesson: Disarmament does not disarm the wicked. It disarms the decent, the law-abiding¹. The problem is not that Australians have too many guns. It is that the West has too little courage to confront radical Islamism with the seriousness it demands—through aggressive intelligence work, immigration enforcement², ideological clarity, and unapologetic defense of civilization over barbarism.

¹ Law-abiding : qui respecte la loi

² Enforcement : application de la loi

By Josh Hammer, Newsweek editor-in-chief **17 December 2025**