

Before addressing the terms of reference, it may be worthwhile examining what we're actually discussing.

What then is culture?

One definition comes from Edward Taylor, an English anthropologist who defines it as "the complex whole which includes *knowledge, belief, art, law, morals, custom*, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as *a member of society*." (my emphasis) Culture gives a society an IDENTITY, which makes them UNIQUE and different from people of other cultures.

Further, when people of different cultures migrate and settle in another society, the culture of that society becomes the DOMINANT culture and those of the immigrants form the SUBCULTURE of the community. Usually, people who settle in other nations imbibe the new culture, while at the same time strive to preserve their own. (Part of an article by [Deepa Kartha](#))

Given a culture what then is multiculturalism?

From the Web the definition of multiculturalism is "the doctrine that several different cultures (rather than one national culture) can *co-exist peacefully and equitably* in a single country".

So, knowledge, belief, art, law, morals and customs of several different cultures are to co-exist peacefully and equitably.

Is this actually possible? I presume the answer to that determines the ability of a government to actually make multiculturalism part of the social inclusion agenda.

The main question is that for the co-existence of several different cultures then certain things must take place:-

1. The current culture must be demoted. So that the inherent Christian-Judeo morals, beliefs and so forth have to be dismantled and replaced with some other "watery" morals and beliefs to encompass the co-existence.
2. Notions of "truth" must be thrown out. As truth is based on a particular set of morals, which are themselves based on a set of beliefs, multiculturalism must dismantle these.
3. The Legal system must also change. As multi cultures will have different values and different views, the system must be rewritten to bring the various cultures to equity.
4. The idea of offending must be eliminated. The cause of offense implies that one culture's ideas are superior/better than another's. Hence when the second one does what they believe is right for them, the first subsequently will be offended. This will lead to disharmony defeating the co-existing peacefully definition. Is this a possibility in a democratic society which values free speech?
5. Consequently, the issue of free speech comes to the fore. Can we in fact have free speech? Well, not on all areas. Obviously the limited areas where there are overlaps, well these are OK to speak about as no-one will be offended (even though this must be eliminated).

That's just some ideas on the destructive nature of multiculturalism on a culture.

I don't see that the inclusion will work. Already, in the society, we see places like shopping centres and schools a regression when religious festivals take place such as Christmas and Easter, the major culture's festivals as it has to give way to the "minorities" to have peacefully co-exist and to not offend them. Obviously the government has not asked the voters if that's what the people want for this country.

What is the contribution of diaspora communities?

Obviously, the contribution of immigrants to a country provide the basis of better communications with the immigrants home land with one consideration – Why did they immigrate out here? If they were being persecuted or if they were criminals in their home countries, then these countries would see us as their enemies and would not create any goodwill with these home countries – rather a political barrier could be established. However, most immigration produces positive results. BUT this does not imply that we should throw out our sovereignty and our culture to appease anyone.

Settlement and participation

Despite our size, there is little "good" land in Australia, however there is land, but the government needs to build in infrastructure before proper settlement and participation can come about.

When my family came out, life was tough for them, but they survived because:-

1. we had existing family in Australia. This is essential and any person wanting to come to this country must have a family support system.
2. Although language was difficult, there were employment opportunities available and so those who were essentially lazy just didn't survive. In fact their own communities ostracized them via social outcasting.
3. There was a willingness to assimilate with those already in this culture. My father deliberately chose an area where his fellow countrymen did not live, claiming that he left his homeland for a better place. A condition of entry should be a willingness to assimilate into the society – multiculturalism, by definition opposes this. The final outcome would be "sectorisation" of the whole country into little mini communities without the need to do assimilate. This ultimately would fracture the whole system of administration.
4. The major of the immigrants in the 1950's were from Europe and as such assimilation was made easier as the main belief system was Christian-Judeo. This common basis should not be ignored as this gave all the peoples a common basis of standards and a great sense of this country's culture. The current flow of immigration comes from mainly non-Christian-Judeo faiths with the moral standards being varied leading to friction, and ultimately it will lead to violence and isolation of communities.

Therefore the immigration policy should be Christian-Judeo with an emphasis on assimilation and the need to communicate in English (being the national language). It appears to me that we are too pampering to our immigrants. Help them – Yes, but remember who the taxpayers really are.

National productive capacity

It is good that immigrants work in this country, like my father did, and subsequently his children. But all this can happen without multiculturalism. In fact looking at the French method, you need to be French to survive. This attitude needs to become the basis of our culture – you need to be Australian to survive.

People are coming to this country for many reasons, let's not make it that we're chumps. Let us be attractive to them offering them a strong culture, strong infrastructure, safety and employment. The end result will be an Australia that they and their children will want to be. Multiculturalism in fact opposes this, as it essentially tries to deny the need to be an Australian, just be Chinese, Hindu, Arabic or whatever but live in Australia. Let this go to the limit is only destructive to Australia. I for one love this country, but for how long!