

Committee Secretary

Joint Standing Committee on Migration

PO Box 6021 Parliament House Canberra ACT 2600 Australia

Dear Secretary,

A Submission to the Committee of inquiry into Multiculturalism.

An enquiry into multiculturalism in Australia is long overdue and certainly warranted for

- The policy has been imposed on the Australian public without the electorate being given the chance to deal with it as an election issue.
- The policy has the potential to disturb the laudable Australian spirit of harmony and tolerance which has always been distinguished Australian society.
- Overseas experience has recently led some political leaders – viz., the British Prime Minister, the German Chancellor and the French President – to admit that multiculturalism has been a failure. Respected Australian correspondent, Greg Sheridan, who has always supported our immigration policies and multiculturalism, says he has now lost faith in multiculturalism. (*The Australian*, April 2). This statement is significant in that he has lived for many years in one of Sydney's suburbs distinguished by its migrant population.
- To date Australia has the fortunate history of generally good relations with all sorts of ethnic groups. It has had little experience of social dislocation and conflict due to ethnic issues. But all this could change and the probability is that this will change unless we prevent it. This fact alone should make us all the more wary as we consider multiculturalism. So any inquiry into multiculturalism should be done with transparency, and with the national self-interest to the fore. Australia belongs to Australians. Others who come here should understand that their acceptance is conditional on their adaptation to our way of life, so that the long history of social harmony we enjoy is not in jeopardy.
- The presuppositions of multiculturalism should be examined. They are open to serious challenge. The view that all cultures are of equal value cannot be sustained. Can anyone seriously argue that Australian culture, drawing so heavily on the western tradition is not of a higher standard than that of non-Western cultures? After all which culture has been the engine for scientific, cultural, medical and humanitarian qualities. The fact is that it is the West not the East which is responsible for the greatest advances in all areas of life. Many will resent this point, but it is hard to deny the obvious. Therefore, any dilution of Australian cultural values by the admission of other cultures is not in our national interest. Theologically, multiculturalism is a form of political polytheism, whereby all gods or

objects of worship are deemed to be of equal worth. Muslims and Christians reject that view. Buddhism, with no concept of a personal god, may not object. Hinduism with its myriad of deities would certainly object. However, of these four religions it is Islam which mounts the greatest challenge of all. Islam simply rejects all other peoples and religions as being unacceptable.

- As an Australian, now in his seventies, I am inclined to hark back to “the good old days.” I recall a time when Australia was a vastly different – and I believe happier – place. However I have also spent considerable time in Kenya, Cyprus, India, Singapore, China, and the USA plus visiting other countries from Europe to the UK. I can say that rubbing shoulders with peoples of different races and cultures has never been a problem to me. I take people as I find them. However I do expect them to reciprocate in the same way, especially those who have come from elsewhere to make a life in Australia. Where migrants show they are not willing to adapt to Australia and to assimilate into our society, then I see fertile soil for the germination of anti-Australian attitudes.

Given that observation I therefore make the point that any discussion of multiculturalism must seriously address the fundamental truth that a world of difference exists between *multi-culturalism* and *multi-racialism*. Australia has always been a multi-racial society; only more recently has it moved towards being a multicultural society. Between the two is a great difference.

Australia’s multi-racial character has involved the migration of peoples, largely from the United Kingdom and European countries. They have assimilated well into Australian life because as peoples of western society, they have similar cultural values. Unwelcome as it may be to some, the fact is those same cultural values were shaped by Christian faith handed down over several centuries.

The same cannot be said for Australia’s multicultural experience. Peoples whose cultures are non-Western and non-Christian in character and heritage have been drawn to Australia. They have brought with them their own distinctive cultures. These are chiefly Buddhist, Hindu and Muslim. Australians do not protest at that. They hold no demonstrations against these cultures. Yet many know that a naive acceptance of multiculturalism without some conditions is a precursor to social tensions.

The fact is that within a multicultural society there are serious differences. This is specially true if one compares Buddhists and Hindus with Muslims. Buddhists and Hindus assimilate – Muslims segregate. Buddhists and Hindus make no special demands of Australia. Muslims do. On this point two things must be said:

- Muslims demand special recognition and clamour for Muslim-only toilets in public facilities such as universities. They clamour for female-only segregated swimming pool areas in some places; they seek to promote halal food in food outlets; they wish to see sharia-compliant arrangements made for them.
- Where social conflict has occurred Hindus and Buddhists are conspicuous by their absence. Muslims are not. Who were significant in the gang rapes in Sydney? In the

Cronulla riots? In calling Australian women, “meat”. It may be argued that these are aberrations, and certainly many Muslims are horrified by such events.

Apologists for Islam seek to defend Muslims as being victims of racial hatred. John Masanauskas and Anne Wright, in the [Herald Sun](#), April 4 reported that Victorian Islamic Council president Hyder Gulam said Muslims did not set out to create enclaves. He told the joint standing committee on migration a fear of racism was a key reason many Muslims congregated in certain suburbs.

I do not believe this accurately represents the true situation. Australians (with some exceptions) are not racist. I believe that some Muslims claim to be victims of prejudice but will not face the fact that much that they do and promote is offensive to the Australian way of life.

Clearly many Muslim are fine people who only want to be able to enjoy Australia and get on with their own lives. It would be foolish however to disregard those who having left Islam warn us as to the true nature of textual, dogmatic, Koranic Islam.

Nonie Darwish in her book, *Cruel and Usual Punishment: The Terrifying Global Implications of Islamic Law*, says that “To live under Islamic Sharia law is to live in the world’s largest maximum-security prison, and I for one don’t want to be incarcerated again.” Darwish says she wrote the book to warn Western nations about the threat of Islamic law. The warning is apposite. Let British experience be noted. Already the UK has allowed sharia-compliant arrangements to take effect.

These matters are pertinent to any discussion of multiculturalism.

Now a society, comprising Hindu, Buddhist and Islamic cultures added to a host nation, which historically is of a Christian origin and heritage is bound to experience some cultural clashes. But it must be said that there is no evidence of conflict being caused by Hindus and Buddhists. Unwelcome as the truth is at times, it must be said that central to any debate over multiculturalism is the role of Islam in Australia. We do not see community protests over the building of Hindu or Buddhist temples, but we do when plans for a new mosque become public knowledge. Councils refuse building permits and sometimes legal action follows. The question must be asked, Why do Australians object to the erection of mosques? Of course this is an unwelcome question. It is not politically correct, but honesty requires it to be asked.

There are many reasons why responses to Muslim building plans and those of other cultures differ so markedly. One reason is that a vast difference exists between Islamic culture and Buddhist-Hindu cultures. Islam due to its history – and especially its theology – has a missional perspective on life which Hindus and Buddhists do not. Australians, Hindus and Buddhists are aware that the Koran condemns non-Muslims as infidels and calls upon non-Muslims to become Muslims, or else, take the consequence of not doing so. Islam is first an ideology and only secondly a religion, a fact which many ignore, and one which aims at the subversion of a host culture and its subjugation to Islamic interests. Some Muslim representatives deny this; others blatantly admit it. There is ample evidence to support the view that Islam seeks to dominate where it achieves critical mass in any society.

The archbishop of Izmir, Turkey, Giuseppe Bernadini tells of a conversation he had with a Muslim leader, who said to him, “Thanks to your democratic laws, we will invade you. Thanks to our religious laws, we will dominate you.”¹

Of course many Australian Muslims are only interested in the freedom and openness of our way of life, and do not actively pursue Islam’s mission. But for all Muslims who take their faith seriously they will seek ways and means to promote their ideology, and as they grow in numbers to demand more and more privileges in the host country. The same cannot be said for Hindus and Buddhists, who live happily in Australia.

One word typically describes the Muslim *modus operandi*: **segregation**. This explains the demand for separate toilets in certain public places, i.e., universities; separate, women-only arrangements at publicly funded swimming pools; and the availability of halal food in university cafeterias and other eating-places. The wearing of the burka is another instance of this – it reduces the integrity of personal communication and increases the risk for the improper use of face coverings. Some Imams denounce aspects of Australian society and parliamentary democracy. There is no evidence of other non-Muslim cultures behaving in this manner. Another word also describes Islam’s *modus operandi*: **adaptation**. Serious Koranic Muslims demand that Australian society adapts to its ways; they are not prepared to adapt to our ways.

Islam is a totalitarian way of life, and for that reason will never be able to blend with Australian society easily. Its policy of segregation hinders its assimilation into Australian society.

Any talk therefore, as the preface to this inquiry says, of the government having a “social inclusion agenda” must take seriously the concerns I raise.

The Government’s first responsibility is to preserve the highest degree of social harmony, law and order and liberty of choice. Along with this there must be the preservation of that great Australian quality – tolerance – and this must include tolerance in the area of public discussion, debate about and between different cultures in Australia.

Sue MacAllen, (July, 2007,) a journalist with Family Security Matters calls attention to some serious developments in Denmark since she lived there in the late 70’s. (www.familysecuritymatters.org) Denmark has changed, due to its very generous immigration policies. Large numbers of Muslims moved to Denmark. Social unrest developed. She says that “Muslim leaders openly declare their goal of introducing Islamic law once Denmark’s Muslim population grows large enough, a not-that-remote prospect. If present trends persist, one sociologist estimates, every third inhabitant of Denmark in 40 years will be Muslim.”

As a result Denmark has toughened up its immigration policies. It now requires migrants to meet certain conditions for citizenship. These include three years of language classes, a test on Denmark’s history, culture, and a Danish language test. Furthermore, one must live in

¹ Onward Muslim Soldiers, Robert Spencer, page 55

Denmark for 7 years before applying for citizenship, demonstrate an intent to work, and have a job waiting.

This is indicative of changing immigration policies designed to produce a more authentic multicultural society. These are all issues Australia must take seriously.

It is regrettable that much of this submission seems to focus on the Islamic factor. It is hard to escape the conclusion that a broad survey of the theology, history, character and modus operandi of Islam in host countries warrants this.

Yours sincerely,

April 7th 2011