

Submission

Multiculturalism has become so politically correct that people are scared to discuss it for fear of being accused of racism. But cultures and religions are not races, despite the recent attempts of some politicians to conflate these concepts. Not being allowed to criticize cultures and religions is an attack on the right of free speech. I therefore welcome this parliamentary inquiry as a step towards redressing this injustice.

As a former supporter of multiculturalism, I have recently come to the view that multiculturalism should now be abandoned as a government policy, for the following reasons.

- 1) I fully support the positive aspects of multiculturalism, such as diversity in art, music and food; but not its negative downsides as discussed below. I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the negatives of multiculturalism outweigh the positives.
- 2) Just all beliefs are not true, all arguments are not equally valid, and all opinions are not equally correct; all cultures are not equal either – despite the current postmodernist intellectual fashion to the contrary. My view is that it can be objectively demonstrated that western civilisation is more advanced and successful than other civilisations, especially since the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.
- 3) Under multiculturalism, the majority Australian culture, based on western civilisation, is treated as merely one of many amongst equals. The policy of multiculturalism dilutes almost universally agreed Australian core values of democracy, pluralism, the rule of law, separation of church and state, gender equity, free speech, religious tolerance, free association and equal treatment of all citizens and residents regardless of racial or ethnic background. In particular, Islamic culture is incompatible these Australian core values.
- 4) All Australians must be free and equal before the law. Therefore I object not only to discrimination, but also to favouritism based on ethnicity, gender or cultural/religious identification. Everyone is entitled to peacefully and lawfully practice any religion or spiritual belief, chosen of free will. However, we draw a line when a religious and/or socio-political dogma seeks to discriminate and impose rituals and customs upon others; when followers of an ideology perceive their own laws and customs to be superior to the Constitution of Australia and above the laws of the land; and when such followers demand apartheid and special dispensation incompatible with our democratic, free and egalitarian Australian Nation.
- 5) I'm not against immigration per se. But it needs to be managed so that the immigration rate does not exceed the integration rate. Immigrants need to adjust to the country they are immigrating to, rather than us having to adjust to them. In western democracies, immigrants need to accept and adjust to our abovementioned core values.
- 6) All immigrants need to learn the language of their new country, to participate in employment and other aspects of citizenship, including accepting and adjusting their new countries core values (see above). I used to be in favour of multi-lingual information. I now think this is misguided and counter-productive. In fact, the ability to English should be an eligibility criterion for all immigration applications, except for genuine refugees.

I emphasise that these are not arguments against a non-discriminatory migration policy. That is a separate issue which should be examined on its own merits. Nor is the above an argument against members of ethnic groups freely associating with one another and funding their own law abiding activities.