

## SUBMISSION NO. 479

Chair  
Joint Standing Committee on Migration  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

### PLURALISTS' SUBMISSION TO MULTICULTURALISM ENQUIRY

The simple truth about multiculturalism is that its success and fairness is entirely predicated on demographics. There is justice in forcing a dominant majority culture to give way, to some reasonable extent, to a vulnerable and repressed minority culture. But positive discrimination, offending, as it does, the core principle of equality under law, must be exceptional. If, under policies of mass immigration, and excessive use of positive discrimination, the underlying power imbalance, and demographic and legal equation is changed, then multiculturalism, and cultural relativism, and positive discrimination that inform it, are no longer just. They simply amount to oppression of the formerly dominant majority by the now dominant minority; racism becomes reverse racism. One injustice is replaced by another. This is especially so when the imported culture offends core principles of international human rights law, as Muslim personal and criminal law does (according to the European Court of Human Rights in *Refah Partisi v Turkey*), and, as some of the cultural practices of other immigrant communities presently coming to Australia, do.

There is a simple choice to make: international human rights norms take precedence and are enforced effectively or they are not. Turning a blind eye and hoping for the best will not work. Any lawyer worth his or her salt knows this. Any politician or public servant, who cares for anything other than padding out his or her retirement package or clinging to office simply for the personal satisfaction of exercising political power, knows this.

Anyone who fails to recognise that the demographics of the world have changed, along with the rapidly radicalising Muslim world, and continues to misapply multiculturalism, cultural and legal relativism and positive discrimination beyond what is just, becomes morally complicit in all that this entails, and must stain his or her own conscience forever with all the blood and tears, and human rights abuses, that will inevitably result. Whoever takes part in implementing these disastrous policies should at least have the decency to read carefully the attached papers and watch all of these documentaries.

See: Panorama UK's 'White Teenage Sex for Sale': <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b009lykf>

Then look at the case of the underage girls brutally gang raped in:

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1374443/Police-hid-abuse-60-girls-Asian-takeaway-workers-linked-Charlene-Downes-murder.html>.

Committee members and readers should look closely at, and never forget, those girls' faces. Of course, many Muslim girls have also been subjected to brutal treatment - as the recent honour killing in Canada (the Shafia case) shows. The Australian Government should ask itself: does it really want to allow the creeping extension of a legal system, sharia law, that encourages the type of behaviours that can escalate into brutality and misogyny. Such misogyny may have allowed some men to target and murder non-Muslim girls and feed them back to English people as kebab! We only hope this did not happen. You will see in the documentary how the politicians, multiculturalists, Government and police tried to play down the race element, as they did in the rapes leading up to

the Cronulla riots. They were more intent on damage limitation and 'keeping a lid on things' than discussing and solving the underlying problems.

Then read someone who can tell the truth and not be called racist by the multiculturalists and morally rudderless only because she is an Indian woman:

<http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/yasmin-alibhai-brown/yasmin-alibhaibrown-asian-men-white-women-and-a-taboo-that-must-be-broken-2146251.html>:... 'Up in Bradford a few years back, I met Muslim pimps, some wearing mini Koran pendants on heavy, gold chains. 'Not our girls,' they reassured me, 'just them white girls from the estates, cheap girls. They love it man, all the money they make! What else will they do with their lives? We're helping them make a career.' Much laughter, until I asked them what they would do if a white pimp groomed their daughters. They would kill the pimp and the girls too, they said. They would too'... 'Miranda...who was repeatedly raped by a British Asian pimp in Rotherham said..: 'Ahmed told me I was making him do it because I was sinful, not a true believer. That he would never do it if I was a Muslim.'

Of course these men do not represent moderate Muslims' views or attitudes, many Muslims would be very appalled at this.

Then search Google or Youtube and watch UK Channel 4 Dispatches documentaries: 'When Cousins Marry', 'Divorce Sharia Style', 'Britain's Gang Rape Epidemic', 'Beneath the Veil', 'Undercover Mosque 1&2', 'Radical Islam: Britain Under Attack', 'Britain's Islamic Republic', 'Britain's Unholy War', 'Lessons in Hate and Violence', 'Women only Jihad', 'What Muslims Want', and Panorama 'British Schools Islamic Rules' and BBC's 'Generation Jihad 1&2'. US program: 'The Third Jihad' (<http://www.thethirdjihad.com/>) and the free report on sharia law: 'The Team B II report' at <http://shariahthethreat.org/>.

The Australian people have fought racism, fascism and Nazism and always will, and Pluralists strongly oppose all these, but who could fail to see the failure of feminism, multiculturalism and the left? Where is their moral outrage? No decent sensible person here in Australia, in the face of such clear warnings from leaders here and overseas, could take part in actually ramping up multiculturalism here in Australia now.

What a sad and sorry task it is to have to read all the submissions to the enquiry and to realise how wide the gap has grown between our Governments and the ordinary people of this country. How transparent and offensive were the submissions from the multiculturalism 'industry' which amount to little more than thinly disguised demands for cash. But who could fail to understand the message of radicals in the Muslim community, and others, whose ambit claims make them appear as professional immigrants. Some radical Muslims are clearly aware that demographics, mass immigration, democracy and muddle headed human rights lawyers and politicians, will soon give them all the power they need to dictate Government policy and effectively transform forever the legal and cultural identity of Australia as they are now doing in the UK and Europe. They, at least, understand the scope of history and the real world outside Canberra.

Yes, the Government has openly said there will be no sharia law here. But does the Government really think Australians are so ill-informed or stupid that they do not know, and deeply resent, the fact that many elements of sharia law are being applied daily right now? They know that they cannot choose not to eat Halal food, only because the Government, fearful of losing money, and violence

and terrorism, dare not introduce labelling. They know sharia finance will soon become entrenched, whether it funds terrorism or not. They watch and deeply resent the introduction of the seclusion and segregation that is happening every day. They are alarmed that their children are being asked to show deference to sharia law practices they abhor through the Government's insidious 'respect' agenda. They are alarmed at the loss of free speech inherent in Tribunals saying they cannot protest in the street against the burqa without risking prosecution. That much is clear from the submissions. And who could be so foolish as to ignore the conflict of laws inherent in allowing the welfare system to be used to finance and support polygamy? Having disavowed socialism, but confirmed herself as still a feminist, how could PM Gillard and her Government do this? Clearly, as in Britain, the Government intends to turn a blind eye, or act but only ineffectively, whilst Muslim women and girls are subject to, first cousin marriage, rape in marriage, genital mutilation, coerced and underage marriage, triple talaq divorce, domestic violence, honour killings, loss of custody and financial rights. Let them live in fear so long as they are out of sight? Provided the forced marriage takes place overseas who cares? Provided the men perpetrating these injustices are coloured we won't interfere, better not be called racist. Let them enjoy their own culture so long as they remain separate from our safe leafy suburbs. Is that how we will protect those we welcomed to our shores? Where is the Government scrutiny of these Muslim courts? There is none. Since their fatwas and judgments are backed by the sanction of crippling community pressure and the fear of brute force, they are effectively law anyway. They know that, and so do you, and so do most ordinary Australians.

Multiculturalism is poison at the waterhole for Indigenous people. Many will never forget the day when, having strived so hard to find the words to persuade a frightened judiciary to grant them some justice on the 'stolen generations', and having gained such a hard fought victory, PM Rudd took credit for an apology, but, conveniently busy pursuing his unwise UN ambitions, sent Julia Gillard MP, to dismiss their compensation claim. How effortlessly and enthusiastically she appeared to do it. That day many Australians came to believe that they knew her for what she is. Many Indigenous people and others were left feeling - how hard and barren her heart but how pregnant her ambition! Such a contrast with the tears wept by Kim Beazley that day in Parliament, when he read of their plight in the 'Stolen Generations Report' and made promises on behalf of the ALP to compensate them - more broken ALP promises that they have not forgotten. Beazley, Latham, Rudd - just stepping stones along the way - but for what? For multiculturalism? For poverty infested, welfare dependant, drug and religion fuelled, cultural ghettos that it encourages? For polygamy? For the burqa? Triple talaq divorce? Halal slaughter? Marital rape? Light beating? Genital mutilation? Gang rape?

How could it be, that those who once spoke of themselves as socialists or feminists could excuse, and now fund, the misogynistic practices of Islamists and others coming from third world male dominated cultures. How could they ignore the fact that their failing policies are feeding the growth of right wing extremism? Perhaps it is because they have the same common intent? Feminists, Islamists, multiculturalists and economic Darwinists effectively assign the same role to immigrant women - baby making machines. Western feminists, who are now highly influential in Government agencies that formulate and implement multiculturalism and immigration, bring immigrants here in large numbers, salving their own guilt and pretending that this is compassion, and will address third world poverty, when it simply makes poverty worse. Third world countries are encouraged now to implement a new form of colonialism: they now colonise themselves, by sending their youngest and

most skilled here to benefit our economy. If they are an economic asset to us they are a loss to their own country. If their remittances benefit their home country, then they are a drain to our economy. Better to train and employ our own unemployed and underemployed; and help them train, employ and retain their own. It is always cheaper to spend money helping them in their own countries where much more aid can be provided for each dollar spent, than encouraging them to leave their family, community and culture and provide expensive lifetime assistance and welfare to a select few immigrants here. Do you imagine that the poor in their former country, through cheap international communications, are not made aware of how this select few are living such an opulent life here whilst they suffer back home? How much worse it makes their poverty.

As vulnerable young refugees and immigrants (no contraception or family planning advice for them - that would be culturally insensitive) they are encouraged by Government policy to spend their lives breeding large permanently welfare dependant families - leaving the Western feminists and multiculturalists free to pursue the lofty career ambitions that their talents should not allow. They appear happy to outsource breeding to poor immigrant girls and women. Let them provide the human raw materials that big business demands so as to let the ALP and the Greens continue in Government a little longer, and to keep house prices, consumer demand and profits high, and wages low, in an endless Ponzi scheme. Immigrant males and females, often young, uneducated or culturally or religiously programmed to have large families, that they will never be able to support financially, willingly oblige. The Government's failed housing and welfare policies make child bearing a commodity, a lifetime welfare ticket. Such immigrants are being lured into an endless welfare trap. Islamists realise what stupidity this is, and, on their websites brag about how their rapidly raising numbers and the drain they place on Western economies, will destroy the Western nations they hate, and intend to conquer. So these are the bitter fruits of misplaced Western feminism and multiculturalism? Is this what our Governments now stand for? Is this the sisterhood our Governments have in mind for these refugee and immigrant women? Simply walking wombs - to enable the sophisticated, guiltless, lifestyle choices of our elites?

The attached submission, including the letter to the PM and all former PMs was sent to you. Did you receive it? If so, then why has it not been published on the website along with the other submissions? Please provide the written reasons as a matter of urgency. If you claim not to have received it, please receive it now. Please publish our submission in full, particularly the letter to all PMs on your website but without the reference to my name or address. The public record should show that Australia's highest leaders were warned as clearly as they could be of the dangers ahead, so that they bear full moral responsibility for the damage that multiculturalism will do, if they ignore the warning. Of course they should always remain completely safe, no individual is personally responsible in this way for the outcome of the Government policy of multiculturalism, and must never be threatened or hurt in any way, but their consciences should be haunted by argument and example.

If the submission and especially the letter to the PM is not published, depending on your reply, we may need to approach Cory Bernardi, Andrew Bolt, Greg Sheridan, the Australian, and other media people and invite them to hold the Government to account for its decision to deliberately suppress it. Perhaps they will see the importance of this, perhaps not. But does PM Gillard really want to take the risk? Is her Government ready to make the out-dated and dangerous doctrine of multiculturalism one of the defining policies of a failed Government?

The future of Australia, and human rights, are too important for loyalty to party politics. Move away from multiculturalism, re-embrace human rights and start enforcing them. Find another way to purchase the votes that this misshapen coalition needs. We need to act now before we face what the UK and Europe are facing.

We need compulsory family planning for immigrant women, limits on welfare to remove the incentive for overly large families, and no more baby bonuses. We need a suite of laws to ensure sharia cannot be implemented here. We need criminal laws that specifically prevent sharia courts or Imams from operating in conflict with Australian family law and criminal law, then we need to prepare to face terrorism when we rigidly enforce them; laws banning the burqa, or at the very least, proscribing compulsion; halal labelling laws; and laws that ensure sharia finance is not misused to fund terrorism. We need to stop allowing segregation or, at the very least, no public money should fund it. We need to retain the sedition laws and start enforcing them against the hateful and dangerous material being distributed daily in mosques and elsewhere. We need to outlaw Hizb ut Tahir and completely remove the platform and funding from Islamist groups. We need to be very vigilant about what is taught in religious schools (a serious regime of standards, and random inspections) and to ensure there is not one cent of funding to those who teach hate. We need laws that substantially increase the penalty when any element of 'honour' is involved in serious criminal offences or domestic violence. We need to be prepared to deport those who would sow the seeds of division and religious violence in our society. We need stern citizenship tests, pledges and probationary periods to ensure those who come here understand that they cannot practice sharia or other illegal cultural practices here, and will genuinely comply with our laws. Those who do not must face deportation, and be deported. We must stop immigration of people whose attachment to outdated cultural practices will eventually seriously damage or destroy our own culture.

Pluralistsforareferendum - 20 May 2011

**The above letter with some minor changes was sent to the Committee Secretary on 20 May 2011 in order to ensure that the attached submission was not censored. It was subsequently published on the Website, remained there for some time, but was then taken down for technical reasons. Pluralists have asked for it to be put back on the Website. It will appear again if our request is successful.**

**Since it was written in April 2011 there have been a number of disturbing developments including the Anders Brevic terrorist attack which we utterly deplore and condemn.**

**Pluralistsforareferendum are peaceful, moderate, non-racist, non-religious, organisation who is not aligned with any political party (we are equally critical of both wings of politics) and who welcome moderate Muslims or minority groups. We define terrorism to include any form of violence or threat against civilians or civilian property by people or Governments. We utterly condemn terrorism.**

**We sincerely believe that even the most sensitive and controversial aspects of multiculturalism should be bravely and openly addressed, since this is the only way to resolve serious problems. The documentaries and events we describe are very sensitive and we are very concerned to ensure that our arguments and material are not used to incite racism or public disorder. No-one should use our material, or material we refer to, to incite or justify racism, violence or disorder. In November 2011 the UK Channel 4 program released a new documentary 'Britain's sex gangs'**

**(<http://www.channel4.com/programmes/dispatches/episode-guide>). This documentary shows clearly how moderate Muslim men and women, and mainstream moderates willing to address the failures of Government policy and multiculturalism, can unite to address these issues and demand effective Government action. The recent SBS documentary 'Once Upon a Time in Cabramatta' highlighted how far Governments and Police Managers (not rank and file police) will go to deny the problems inherent in their vote buying multiculturalist polices, and how violent and drug infested they will allow our communities to become, before taking action. Only when minority groups, and mainstream groups, were brave enough to oppose multiculturalism and unite to demand effective action, and the drug, gang and crime problems became impossible to ignore any longer, was any action taken. We must unite and stand together, minority and mainstream moderates, to stop multiculturalism now. We cannot wait until Australia becomes a series of ghettos like Cabramatta was. We must move to a policy of plural diversity based on a genuine commitment to Australian law and human rights and responsibilities.**

**Pluralistsforareferendum - February 2012**

Prime Minister, Julia Gillard  
Parliament House, Canberra, ACT 2600

cc Leader of the Opposition, Tony Abbott  
Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Chris Bowen MP  
Shadow Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Scott Morrison MP  
Parliamentary Secretary for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Senator Kate Lundy  
John Howard, Former Prime Minister of Australia  
Paul Keating, Former Prime Minister of Australia  
Bob Hawke, Former Prime Minister of Australia  
Malcolm Fraser, Former Prime Minister of Australia  
Gough Whitlam, Former Prime Minister of Australia  
Rupert Murdoch, Media Proprietor  
Paul Kelly, Editor of the Australian  
Andrew Bolt, journalist

### **AN OPEN LETTER TO PRIME MINISTER GILLARD ON MULTICULTURALISM**

The hallmark of a true democracy is how it responds when faced with serious challenges, such as Islamic extremism, which threaten its peace, security and its fundamental beliefs. Australia is a relaxed, tolerant, moderate, peace-loving nation. This is both its strength and its weakness.

Those who fail to recognise that the world has changed, and learn from history, are condemned to repeat it. It is time to put aside old political enmities and work together. We owe it to those who courageously gave their lives in war to defend this nation from extremism, never to let any form of extremism (religious, nationalist, or any other) take hold in this country.

The sacrifice of so many brave Australians before us demands that we face the most painful political dilemma that there is - the paradox of tolerance. To tolerate beliefs and practices which are themselves extreme and intolerant, is to betray that trust. Our forefathers faced the same dilemma. They overcame it by reaffirming what they stood for - Australian law and culture. They stood strong in the face of danger. The defeat of extremism requires not only courage, but humility. We must be humble, admit mistakes, learn from others, and take action to prevent problems in their early stages.

The simple truth is - the majority of Australians, when it is explained honestly to them, *do not* support multiculturalism. They know that, in the real world, it has failed. They *do* support pluralism.

To continue to pursue the failed policies of multiculturalism without a clear mandate is deeply undemocratic and a breach of trust. To allow complacency, greed, false compassion or foolish pride to damage or destroy the Australia we now know is dangerous folly. There is enormous wisdom in the common sense of ordinary people. Listen to them speak. Attached is a paper that outlines their case against multiculturalism and reflects the views of the majority of Australians of all races and religions.

Wealth and power are simply borrowed. The greater the power one holds, the greater the responsibility. Those who hold that power and fail to address these issues courageously, now, will leave an indelible stain on their own conscience and a bitter legacy to the next generation. Have the courage, and statesmanship, to be honest, and to provide the leadership Australia needs.

The truth is that, at present immigration rates, multiculturalism will completely change the fundamental demographic, cultural and legal identity of this nation in one generation. Australians demand their say at a referendum before this goes any further. They want you to seek a proper democratic mandate for multiculturalism, subject spending on multicultural and harmony policies and programs to a proper cost benefit analysis, including opportunity costs, and stop implementing these failed programs until you do.

An ordinary Australian of behalf of the silent majority - March 2011

## **Pluralists for a referendum**

### **Why we oppose multiculturalism but support pluralism**

Australia is changing rapidly because of its very high rates of immigration in the last few years. As of June 2010 the net overseas migration rate (generally people coming in less those going out) was about 200,000. This was down from the high in 2009 of around 300,000. The 2010-2011 migration program is set at about 168,700. But even at this lower rate, Australia is likely to grow to meet Kevin Rudd's population 'target' of a 'big Australia' consisting of about 36 million people by 2056. Almost double its present size.

Australia's demography (racial, cultural and religious make up) is changing rapidly as a result. At present rates, Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Celt Australians will no longer be in the majority by 2056, that is, in one generation. To illustrate, in recent years, Australia's Indian, Muslim and African populations have grown very rapidly.

Very recently the leaders of the UK, France, Germany and Holland have made speeches saying that multiculturalism does not work. Many experts and leaders throughout Europe and the world have come out and said it does not work. The head of the UK Commission on Human Rights, Trevor Phillips, a black man, has said it does not work. But here in Australia our Prime Minister has recently 'ramped up' the failed policy of multiculturalism and increased funding for it. The Government says 'Australian multiculturalism' is different when it is not.

#### **The problems with multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism misleads people by encouraging them to believe that all cultures are equal and therefore all cultural practices are allowable. Pluralism celebrates and respects other cultures, and allows people to enjoy their culture freely, but does not permit cultural practices that conflict with Australian law and culture. Pluralists make the limits clear.

Multiculturalism confuses people. After spending billions of dollars on harmony programs and multiculturalism, very few people really know what it means. The Government never explains it properly. When ordinary people know what it means, they reject it. Newcomers to Australia cannot understand why, if all cultures are equal, a cultural practice that they support, but the majority of Australians do not support, should be stopped. They are also being misled.

Pluralists are open and honest about cultural differences and what they expect. They respect other cultures but make clear that, here in Australia, not all cultural practices are equal.

Not many cultural practices are against Australian law and culture, but some are, such as: punishment of, or death penalties for, adultery or apostasy (leaving one religion for another), taking the law into your own hands to punish blasphemy (offending a religion), discrimination against women and homosexuals, 'honour' killings, domestic violence (such as chastising wives), marrying close family members, forced marriage, female genital mutilation, bigamy (marrying someone when you are already married - leading to polygamy - having more than one wife or husband at the same time), animal cruelty, and marriage and sexual relations with minors. There are some others.

Cultural practices that breach important rules of Australian law and culture (which are consistent with international human rights law) are not equal under our law – they are not allowed. This applies to everyone. This is not aimed at any particular culture, race or religion.

In such cases, pluralists would enforce Australian law in a fair way, but firmly and effectively. Pluralists want people to enjoy and celebrate their culture, but require people to change some of their cultural practices so that they fit in with Australian culture. They offer a strong, modern, national identity which everyone is welcome and encouraged to join. Pluralists are not extremists.



Multiculturalists want to be popular and gain votes by saying that we are all alike and there are no differences between cultures. Because they say that all cultures are equal, or because they might offend or lose the votes of some ethnic communities, multiculturalists tend to ignore cultural practices which break Australian law or important cultural rules. They ignore difficult problems, such as the rise of Islamic extremism, and do not enforce Australian law properly. If violence is threatened they give in. Instead pluralists want to help and support moderate Muslims to resist Islamic extremism by effective policing and addressing difficult issues courageously and honestly.

In the real world, multiculturalists expect the majority of Australians to adapt and give way. Under multiculturalism, the majority are forced to change to accommodate practices which are against Australian law or culture. This causes a conflict between the majority Australian culture and minorities. It causes confusion, disharmony, conflict and racism in the community. Spending money on harmony programs will not fix this.

In the real world, multiculturalism does not work. The leaders of UK, France, Germany and a range of other countries have openly admitted it recently. Multiculturalism promises greater integration and harmony but actually delivers greater separation and conflict.

By giving the impression that all cultural practices are allowable here in Australia, multiculturalism encourages people to behave in certain ways. If people feel their law or culture is equal to Australian law and culture, and everything is allowed, they do not try to adapt and fit into Australian culture. They live as they did in the country they came from in isolated communities. Isolated communities are often poorer, and have greater gang, crime, health and unemployment problems. This is very costly to the Australian community. They give rise to extremism and terrorism. This has been the experience in the UK and Europe and will be the case here.

Multiculturalists think that community harmony is achieved by allowing cultures greater freedom, and hope that they will integrate over time. But this may never happen or may take a very long time. Multiculturalism actually results in greater separation. In short, *multiculturalists want more harmony by giving more freedom, which actually results in more separation*. Pluralists want people to be free to choose where they live but try to discourage the formation of separate problem communities by encouraging greater integration with the wider community. *Pluralists want greater harmony through greater integration*.

Pluralists want to solve the problems in minority communities. The Government spends over 450 million dollars per year on harmony programs. Pluralists will take the money wasted each year on unnecessary multicultural and community harmony programs (they often benefit mainly the rich or politically powerful), set that money aside, and use it specifically to solve the root causes of problems in those communities and the wider community such as much better and stronger policing, measures to solve unemployment, improve health, education and housing, and so on. Pluralists want to make immigrant and low socio-economic communities safer and better.

But assistance to minority communities must not work to the disadvantage of people in the wider community who have been here longer as citizens, residents and taxpayers and who need help. This simply causes racism and resentment. Their needs are as important and should receive priority too.

Pluralists think that by having the courage to enforce the law and address problems (rather than just give up and let minorities get on with their lives in isolation) we offer a strong identity which will help minority community members to change some of their cultural practices. This will help them join the wider Australian community. It will enrich both them and the Australian community.

Pluralists are not racists. A racist is someone who thinks that one race is superior to another. We totally reject this. Pluralists do not support the old 'white Australia' policy. Australia is a racially and culturally diverse nation now and always will be. Pluralists prefer to move on from these tired old debates. Australia and the

world have changed. We welcome diversity that will make Australia better. We welcome change for the better. Multiculturalism guarantees rapid change for the worse.

Pluralists support Indigenous Australians. Our arguments are consistent. We expect those who come to Australia to respect Australian law and culture because we are the majority and have lived here longer. This is only fair. But we acknowledge that Indigenous people were here before us for much longer and therefore they should have a special place in our laws, and Constitution if they choose. Again, this is fair. Indigenous people are not immigrants or another minority culture, but first peoples and traditional owners. As such, they are entitled to special measures to bring them up to equality as a matter of urgent priority.

Money saved from stopping wasteful harmony and multicultural programs should also be directed to Indigenous peoples' housing, health, education, employment and other needs. They should be urgently assisted to become self-sufficient and equal members of our community. Under multiculturalism their needs are given insufficient priority and they are treated the same way as any other cultural community, or worse. They should be welcome, encouraged and strongly supported to integrate (not assimilate) if they wish.

The debate about multiculturalism is the most important debate that any nation can have. It is about whether a Government, by using its immigration powers and multiculturalist policies and funding, can completely change the fundamental demographic, cultural and legal identity of a nation without seeking the appropriate mandate and changes to its laws and Constitution. It is about whether we live in a genuine democracy or merely a sham.

**We demand our say at a constitutional referendum. If the Government wishes to transform our nation through multiculturalism, then they should seek to insert a reference to it in the Commonwealth Constitution. At the very least, we demand that the Government seek proper legal authority for its expenditure on multiculturalism by introducing a Multiculturalism Bill before the Federal Parliament. We demand our democratic right to vote directly in a referendum or, failing that, through our representatives.**

**Until it seeks proper legal authority by securing passage of a Multiculturalism Bill through Parliament, along with a comprehensive cost benefit analysis of all past and future 'harmony' and other multicultural programs (taking account of the opportunity costs of spending the same money on policing, housing, and better measures to solve unemployment), then the Government should abandon multiculturalism and stop the current spending on multiculturalism now.**

Copyright - Pluralists for a referendum - February 2011 - [pluralistsforareferendum@hotmail.com](mailto:pluralistsforareferendum@hotmail.com)

If you want to help, and agree with the views expressed, contact us. Please send a signed copy of this flyer by mail to Prime Minister Julia Gillard, Parliament House, CANBERRA ACT 2600. Alternatively, or in addition, you can send an email saying that you support the demands of pluralists for a referendum (she will know what you mean) to her at <http://www.pm.gov.au/contact-your-pm>. Drop a signed copy (and email) to Tony Abbott, Parliament House, CANBERRA ACT 2600 <http://www.tonyabbott.com.au/ContactTony.aspx>. Send a signed copy to your local MP. Demand a referendum and a vote. Get as many people as you can to do the same. Sign petitions and send them to the PM and opposition leader. If you want a copy of our paper, 'The case against multiculturalism' email us at the above address. Watch the UK Channel 4 Dispatches documentaries 'Undercover Mosque 1&2', 'Britain's Islamic Republic', 'Britain's Unholy War', 'Generation Jihad 1&2' 'Britain's Gang Rape Epidemic', and 'When Cousins Marry' and Panorama UK's 'Muslim First, British Second,' and 'British Schools, Islamic Rules'. Use Google and YouTube. Warning: these depict the actions and views of Islamic extremists and not moderate Muslims who also oppose extremism. You must not discriminate against Muslims or anyone else. Do not use these programs to justify or incite racism. Inform yourself about what multiculturalism really means and the difference between 'multiculturalism', and 'interculturalism' and 'pluralism'. Explain it to your friends and colleagues. Scan, copy and send this article by post and email to as many people as you can. Express your views on blogs, discussion groups and twitter. Read Wiki and read the criticisms of multiculturalism referred to there. We all have a civic duty to make sure that the Australia we leave to the next generation is stable, harmonious, prosperous and united. We, formerly the silent majority, can stop multiculturalism. Yes we can. You are welcome to copy and send this flyer for free to anyone you wish, provided that you use it responsibly, don't misrepresent it or quote from it selectively or use it to incite racism. If you wish to make money by using the article, you must get copyright permission.

Date:                      Signed:

Address:

## Pluralists for a referendum

### The case against multiculturalism

Most Australians, if asked, 'Is Australia a multicultural nation?' would say 'Yes'. To the question: 'What does 'multiculturalism' mean?', most would reply: 'I don't really know - different cultures living together harmoniously?'... 'Should all cultures be treated equally?' 'Yes'. But if asked: 'Should anyone be allowed to adopt cultural practices that are not legal here or that the majority find very offensive?' They would overwhelmingly say: 'No, that's not fair. Australian law applies equally to everyone. They should fit in'.

In short, Australians wholeheartedly embrace diversity and legal equality, but reject 'multiculturalism' when they realise what it really means - legal and cultural separation. They tend towards religious and political moderation, and instinctively feel that putting minority rights above majority rights is undemocratic and unfair. But the wishes of the vast majority are ignored.

Asked the same questions at any time over the last 50 years, the vast majority of ordinary British people would say the same. They never imagined they would be where they are now.

Eighty 'sharia courts' staffed by Imams now effectively enforce important aspects of sharia family law (but technically, excluding divorce or matters concerning children) in parts of Britain today. These courts are secretive and largely unsupervised. As the *Civitas* and *AHA Foundation* reports reveal, the published fatwas upon which their rulings are based, clearly conflict with British, European and international human rights law. For example, they prohibit Muslim women from marrying non-Muslims, authorise polygamy, allow a man to demand sex with his wives and prohibit them from refusing, oblige wives to seek a husband's permission to go outside, give women lesser rights than men on the dissolution of marriage, and make a woman's testimony half that of a man in civil cases. Although the UK sharia courts cannot, technically, enforce criminal sharia law, the fatwas authorise the death penalty for homosexuality and blasphemy, and stoning to death for adultery, and worse.<sup>i</sup>

The impact of multiculturalism on the UK has been graphically illustrated in a number of Channel 4 'Dispatches' documentaries such as 'Undercover Mosque.', 'Britain's Unholy War', 'Britain's Islamic Republic', 'When Cousins Marry' and 'Britain's Gang Rape Epidemic'; the BBC's 'Generation Jihad' and Panorama UK's 'Muslim First, British Second,' and 'British Schools, Islamic Rules'.<sup>ii</sup> We all have a duty to see these and to understand how sharia law conflicts with our own law. A number of Imams, the group Hizb ut Tahrir (banned in many Middle East counties but legal here), and the group 'Sharia4australia' have openly demanded that sharia law be allowed here.<sup>iii</sup> As 'Undercover Mosque' and 'British Schools, Islamic Rules' revealed, what is said behind closed doors is very different from what is said in public. Mosques, Islamic schools and colleges would never openly admit it, but many who pray and learn there, want sharia law, or key aspects of it, to apply here in Australia.

Of course, many UK and Australian Muslims would never use these 'courts' and strongly disagree with their rulings. Many Muslims came to Australia to escape sharia. They are extremely concerned to ensure that it does not take hold here. Moderate Muslims are very concerned by the rise of Islamic extremism which defeats their efforts to integrate into Australian society. The documentaries should be viewed with this in mind and not used to discriminate or justify racism here.

But even today, as 'Britain's Unholy War' shows, converts from Islam in the UK, and their children, are threatened with murder for simply changing religion. The British police, constrained by multiculturalism, and fearful of terrorism, take no effective steps to stop this.

How did this happen? Slowly, and by degree, but particularly over the last 20 years, as demography changed, multiculturalist policies were confidently applied, ghettos formed, threats of violence from extremists and terrorists increased, and policing became ineffective.

The debate about multiculturalism is the most important debate that any nation can have. It is about whether a Government, by using its immigration powers and multiculturalist policies and funding, can completely change the fundamental demographic, cultural and legal identity of a nation without seeking the appropriate mandate and changes to its laws and Constitution. It is about whether we live in a genuine democracy or merely a sham.

### **How quickly will Australia change?**

Each year many people come to Australia hoping to make Australia their permanent home. The net overseas migration rate (generally, the number coming in minus those going out) has fallen off in recent times. As of June 2010 - about 200,000 per year came in - down from the recent high in 2009 of around 300,000.<sup>iv</sup> The 2010-2011 migration program is set at about 168,000.<sup>v</sup> But even at this lower rate, Australia is likely to grow to meet Kevin Rudd's population 'target' of a 'big Australia' consisting of about 36 million people by 2056.<sup>vi</sup> Reportedly, Australia now takes in more people from Muslim countries than UK migrants.<sup>vii</sup> The majority of refugees are Muslims. Each year, Australia accepts about 13,750 'refugees' (ie including humanitarian visas). These refugees are then allowed to bring in their close family members. The birth rate of newly arrived refugees is much higher than native born Australians. This makes the rise in Australia's population from each year's refugee intake much larger in real terms and over time.

Australia's demography is changing as quickly as the UK's did, or quicker. At present rates it is likely to lose its dominant Anglo-Saxon derived Australian identity over the next 10-50 years, that is, in one generation. Credible experts agree that, in the United States, the current 'minorities' (essentially non-white) will be the majority by 2050, in the UK by 2060. For example, Australia's African and Muslim populations are currently much smaller than that in the UK, France or Germany but are growing rapidly.

In 2001 there were 281,000 Muslims in Australia, by 2006 there were 340,000 (1.7% of the population then). But the old 2006 census (now 5 years out of date) on which the ABS figure is based, made it optional whether or not to answer the question on religion and 2.4m did not, or inadequately described it.<sup>viii</sup> Because of this, the Government does not know accurately how many Muslims there are here in Australia. It is highly likely, given recent controversy, that many more Muslims will not answer the 2011 census question. The Government may use this to underestimate their numbers in future. There are certainly many more Muslims now than in 2006. This is not meant to single them out but as illustration of the rate of change.

### **The difference between multiculturalism and pluralism**

The crucial difference between 'multiculturalism' and 'pluralism' is that the former encourages the belief that all cultures should enjoy absolute equality, despite the fact that Australia's legal system

technically does not allow this. 'Plurality' makes the limits very clear and applies the law effectively so that a clear line is maintained.

The leaders of Germany, Britain, France and the Netherlands (and many other experts in other countries) have all recently acknowledged that 'multiculturalism' in their countries has failed. Trevor Phillips, Head of the UK Commission on Equality and Human rights, a proud black man, is an opponent of multiculturalism. But here in Australia this failed policy is being 'ramped up'. Australia's Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Chris Bowen, recently gave a speech to the Sydney Institute announcing Government support and increased funding for 'multiculturalism'.<sup>x</sup> In doing so he tried to create a false distinction between some overseas models of multiculturalism and ours. This was simply a clumsy attempt to 'rebadge' a failed idea, sell it again to an unwilling public and buy the 'ethnic vote' at the next election.

Although there is an obvious difference between Australian and German history, and immigrant history, there is no real difference between German multiculturalism and that applied here. Germany had a temporary guest worker scheme for many years, but a large number of those brought in were allowed to stay permanently. Germany abandoned its guest worker scheme in the mid 1980's and applied multiculturalism. Both the guest worker system and German multiculturalism fostered, encouraged and achieved separation in precisely the same way that multiculturalism does here.<sup>x</sup> The British and Australian systems are essentially the same. France's constitution theoretically emphasises secularism, *laïcité*, but in practice its multiculturalism encourages the formation of isolated cultural communities by using government support and funding.

Like Germany, Australia now has a large 'temporary' migrant workforce. In recent years there has been a large increase in the number of temporary migrant workers.<sup>xi</sup> For example there are probably about 450,000 international students here - many working part time. One expert put the total number of temporary migrant workers in 2010 at around 830,000.<sup>xii</sup> Many temporary migrants will stay permanently - legally, or illegally hoping for an amnesty.

Apart from the false notion that Australian multiculturalism is somehow different and unique, Minister Bowen also used a number of other devices to try to sell his ideas. He slipped in an important proviso. He effectively said that multiculturalism was subject to Australian law and some cultural norms that he carefully selected.<sup>xiii</sup>

He was forced to add this proviso because he knows that the Australian legal system does not presently allow absolute cultural equality. In Australia in circa 2011, the Federal and State Constitutions of Australia, and Federal, State and Territory statute law, do not confer a positive right to absolute cultural equality in all respects. Where a cultural norm is illegal, technically it must give way. Canada, the only western democracy to include multiculturalism in its Constitution, has a Multicultural Act and a reference to multiculturalism in its Constitution. But these do not confer absolute cultural equality in any real legal sense. No alternative legal system is technically allowed in Canada either.

Why else did Minister Bowen add this proviso? Because he knows that Australians would not accept their Government openly acknowledging that other immigrant cultures should be paramount or the same as Australian culture. But his intended constituency, the culturally and linguistically diverse

(CALD) communities, heard only the reaffirmation of their right to enjoy their culture separately and equally, and to be given extra resources not given to other Australians. That was what they were meant to hear in order to secure their votes at the next election.

### **Multiculturalism is a social engineering experiment that has never succeeded**

The Government has never openly acknowledged the truth about multiculturalism. No nation state in the history of the world has successfully hosted a diverse population, and afforded each within, absolute cultural and legal equality. Many experts believe such a state is highly likely to fracture and fail.<sup>xiv</sup> Multiculturalism, which at its extreme allows different legal systems at once in the same nation, such as presently in the UK, is an exercise in social engineering without historical precedent. Social cohesion in the UK, France, Germany, the Netherlands and many other European nations is beginning to fail. This poses very real dangers.

Since neither, 'multiculturalism' or 'pluralism' can allow absolute legal and cultural equality without changes to Australian law, the difference appears unimportant. It is not. The truth is that, when it comes to law and policy, the *emphasis itself is crucial*.

Multiculturalism, with its emphasis on rights and permissions afforded to minority cultural groups encourages a specific set of behaviours. It encourages and financially rewards difference. Informed by the notion of 'cultural relativism' (in context here, that international human rights are 'western' and should not override other 'non western' cultures), it appeals to a false notion of absolute cultural equality. It also gives the false impression that giving absolute cultural equality to cultural minorities affords them justice, at no expense to the host community or the majority. In short it appears to be a 'win-win'. Instead it is a 'win-lose', or worse, a 'lose-lose'.

Highly educated, but foolish, human rights lawyers, policy makers and commentators, can easily find sophisticated arguments to confuse, patronise and dismiss those in the majority community who say: 'But that is not fair. Our Australian law and culture should be more important and our laws should be respected'.

But in truth, a hierarchy of rights based on occupation of territory and expression of culture over time has a very firm foundation in international and domestic human rights law and has been confirmed repeatedly by the High Court in cases such as *Mabo v Commonwealth*. Australia was not 'terra nullius' (a legal and cultural vacuum) with respect to Indigenous culture, when whites arrived. So it is not a legal and cultural vacuum for those who arrive now. But in practical terms, this is how policies of 'cultural relativism' and 'multiculturalism' treat Australia.

It is when the minority culture conflicts with the majority culture that multiculturalism is so damaging. For example, if an orthodox Jewish, Anglo or any other religious group, demands the right to practice polygamy which is presently illegal, multiculturalism encourages the belief that such a right should be allowed. Multiculturalism either forces the majority to give way or, through a lack of policing, allows the practice anyway. It encourages the false belief in the minority that it is somehow legitimate to make this demand. The result is greater conflict between the two. Ineffective or non-existent law enforcement is probably the most important single tool used to implement multiculturalist policies.

For example, it is illegal to marry in Australia if you are already married to someone else (bigamy). The vast majority of Australians probably do not support polygamy (having more than one wife or husband at the same time). Most people would therefore be shocked to know that our Government, whose leader acknowledges she is a feminist, effectively encourages and supports polygamy and allows taxpayers' money to be spent supporting polygamous families.

A man who wants to claim welfare payments for any number of 'wives' and children in Australia can simply live in a polygamous relationship blessed by his or her community here, but without formalising it under our law by marriage, then claim welfare payments.

Some representatives of Muslim women have called for welfare support for polygamy to stop. But, constrained by multiculturalism, the police and Centrelink both refuse to take effective action to stop it or to make sure that our welfare system does not encourage and support it.<sup>xv</sup> Most Australians would consider this improper and unfair.

Conflicts between minority cultures and Australian culture presently arise (or will arise) around issues such as: harsh punishments for, and intolerance of, blasphemy, adultery and apostasy, gender equality, child marriage and sexual relations, rape, rape within marriage, forced marriages, female genital mutilation, wearing of orthodox religious dress, 'honour' killings, homosexuality, consanguinity (marrying cousins), halal, kosher or other religious prohibitions on food and methods of slaughter of livestock, classifying some animals (dogs, pigs etc.) as 'dirty' or 'unclean', democracy versus theocracy, and so on.

Again, this is not simply a conflict between majority Australian culture and any one single race, culture or religion. Ironically, despite the obvious clash with human rights norms, many human rights lawyers and feminists, informed by notions of cultural relativism, and fearful of being branded racist, or being brought before Government anti-discrimination tribunals, have remained silent.

Over time, behavioural change resulting from multicultural policies encourages cultures to live separately rather than join a cohesive whole. This leads to 'ghettos' which historically tend to have lower rates of employment, drug problems, gang problems, poorer health, more crime and violence. There are 751 'sensitive urban zones (ZUS)' in France where policing is problematic. Many are essentially 'no go' zones for police. UK and Australian police, aware of political sensitivities and fearful of multiculturalism have not nominated such zones openly, but police here know where they are.

Violence, especially terrorist threats, often leads to reflexive promises from weak Governments of more concessions and resources. This produces an escalating set of demands for greater resources, and rights. In the UK and France this has culminated in demands for separate legal systems and separate policing of immigrant ghetto communities. This further encourages the growth of terrorism. This is one explanation for the 2005 French race riots. We had the Cronulla riots here.

Multiculturalism has an important 'chilling effect' on policing. Police, fearful of losing their job or promotional prospects if falsely accused of racism, fail to carry out their policing tasks properly. Multicultural community leaders are often politically connected and powerful. Lacking support from senior managers, whose promotional prospects often depend on being seen to implement the Government's multicultural agenda, they prefer to let ghetto or immigrant communities police

themselves or they apply the law half-heartedly. Informed by multiculturalism and cultural relativism, judges acquit offenders or apply lenient sentences, which further demoralises the police.

By failing to police its ghetto communities properly, the UK, French, German and other Governments have effectively given in to their demands to police themselves. There has been a marked rise in recent years in the size, level of violence, and scope of activities of, immigrant gangs (Middle Eastern, African, Asian, and Eastern European) in these areas. Anglo dominated gangs have also been very active.

But the same phenomenon, of poor law enforcement due to multiculturalist constraints, is currently at work in ghetto, low socio-economic, or concentrated immigrant communities, here in Australia today. Cultural elites rarely live in or near such areas and are often ignorant of the problems, or are careless about them, since they or their family are rarely affected. They often have a vested interest in their 'solution' (which ironically also gives them a vested interest in the problems continuing - hence the tag 'multicultural industry'). Irresponsible politicians just seek votes. Irresponsible businessmen or private investors simply want to sell or rent houses, products, or services, and want more people no matter who they are or what the cost to society.

The separateness that multiculturalism fosters, both diminishes the majority whole, by denying them the freedom to enjoy a closer relationship with the now separate minority, and diminishes the minority who never enjoy the feeling of being part of, and accepted by the majority, or the socio-economic benefits this affords.

By contrast, 'pluralists', think that people should be allowed to enjoy their culture with a considerable degree of tolerance and freedom. But they *explicitly* acknowledge that those cultural freedoms must be enjoyed within the framework and limits of the laws and culture of the group who are in the numerical majority and have lived in the country longest. In Australia's case, Australian culture and Australian law with its norms, such as rule of law, religious freedom, free speech, gender equality, legalised homosexuality and the concepts of a moderation, tolerance, and a plural liberal democracy. Australians hold very dear the principle that rewards should be gained through hard work and on merit. When people are in genuine need they want them to get a 'hand up', so they can quickly become self-sufficient, not a 'hand out', so they become dependent for life.

When there is a conflict between Australian law and culture and minority cultural norms, pluralists demand that *Australian law is properly and vigorously enforced* to ensure that a clear line is drawn. Accordingly, if the overwhelming community opinion is that a particular cultural practice is abhorrent, such as forced marriage, punishing apostasy or homosexuality, and so on, then that practice must give way to the majority and be vigorously prosecuted under the criminal law.

'Pluralists' think that by making abundantly clear that majority legal and cultural norms are paramount, and by *applying the law effectively and equally to all*, we discourage a false impression that another legal system is allowable or acceptable. We thereby confirm in the strongest terms what legal and social norms we subscribe to - Australian law and culture.

We think such a clear, transformative, modern identity based on a proper balance of human rights and social responsibilities will attract many people from other cultures, especially the young, and, hopefully, many Muslims.



## **Multiculturalism is a set of policies that fail minorities too**

Perhaps the most damaging aspect of multiculturalism is that it is informed by ideas and policies on 'affirmative action' and 'positive discrimination' but misapplies them. Any lawyer worth his or her salt knows that these measures, which essentially contradict the central norm of equality, have an important place, but should be applied as an exception, kept constantly reviewed and should never be allowed to evolve into 'reverse discrimination'. Instead of being exceptional, under multiculturalism, these policies become commonplace - the first rather than last resort. They are allowed to evolve into reverse discrimination. One injustice is simply replaced with another injustice. Antiracism simply becomes reverse racism.

Positive discrimination, when misapplied, creates resentment in the wider community which further isolates minorities and fosters dependency in them. When misapplied, these policies favour the elite in the minority community who do not really need help, degrade the valuable social norms inherent in the work ethic, merit principle and equal treatment of all, destroy social cohesion and stigmatise the beneficiaries.<sup>xvi</sup>

Well informed and responsible immigrants know that multiculturalism fails them. Multiculturalism, stereotypes and patronises minority communities by assuming that they all think alike (when they often have very different cultural practices), want to live separate from the majority, that their votes can be purchased with multicultural funding, and they do not wish to abandon some of their cultural practices in favour of an Australian identity and culture.

Those who wish to abandon the more extreme religious practices in their own culture feel themselves undermined when Australian authorities, lacking courage and conviction, allow cultural practices which breach Australian laws to go unpunished or receive weak punishment. How can a woman in a minority community refuse the unwanted sexual advances of a husband, or refuse her father's direction to marry, or speak out against practices she abhors, if she knows that because of multiculturalist thinking her husband or father would be unlikely ever to be prosecuted or would receive a light punishment?

Leaders in the police force, sensitive to the impact that exposing their ineffectiveness would have on their reputation and career, prefer to play down or deny problems, deliberately distort crime statistics and try to 'spin' or 'manage' the problems away. The Government, and police managers who are rewarded for implementing multiculturalism, prefer not to collect statistics on the level of crime committed by certain racial and religious groups.

Weak policing has a terrible 'chilling effect' not just on people in the majority community but also in minority communities. What person, especially a vulnerable woman or child, can speak out in such a community against cultural practices they abhor? Gangs, terrorists and religious extremists wield more effective power in many of these immigrant communities in Australia than law enforcement.

Perhaps more than others, people in minority communities are the victims of crime, outlaw gangs and drug abuse, as traditional policing is weakened or abandoned. The more responsible members

of minority communities are angry at policies which effectively encourage the rise of lawlessness and extremism in their own communities or which bring them into conflict with the majority. They look in bewilderment at the weakness of Government and police, and then quickly lose respect.

### **How multiculturalism creates long-term welfare dependency**

For example, Governments, informed by multicultural thinking, and respect for the minority cultural norm of having large families and having different gender relations, fail to provide proper advice on contraception, family planning or resisting unreasonable male demands. Encouraging small families that can be self-supported is considered to be culturally offensive or racist.

*Dominated by multiculturalist thinking, poorly designed policies (on housing, welfare, and baby bonuses), encourage young and poorly educated or unskilled newly arrived immigrants, especially refugees, to have families which are much larger than they can afford without Government assistance. Since, when they arrive, they are unemployed and in need, they are progressed ahead of Australians (many of whom have been waiting in low paid jobs for many years and are never housed) into heavily subsidised public housing. If you have a large or very large family you are often rewarded with a large (sometimes brand new) family home. Weak Governments may even sell their public housing to you later on, or give it to you for free.*

Once they have such a large welfare dependant family in public housing (which effectively offers lifetime security of tenure), return to low paid work becomes impossible or uneconomic. Failed policies which make small changes to remove some disincentives to work, but do not address the most prized and valuable welfare support, lifetime tenure in heavily subsidised public housing, will never change this.

The affirmative action and multiculturalist policies which give them advantages also bring minorities into conflict with the majority culture who resent the special treatment they receive and which the Government dishonestly denies. The corrosive effect that these failed policies has on the work ethic of the whole community does untold economic and social damage. With some of the highest house prices in the world, over 100,000 Australians homeless, and 2 million unemployed or underemployed, this is a toxic mix.<sup>xvii</sup> Multiculturalism and harmony programs and anti-racism campaigns will only exacerbate the problems. Aside from generating enormous resentment, these programs soak up resources which could be used to address the root causes of racism.

Many immigrants never experience the dignity of work, of being self-sufficient or commanding the respect of the majority community. They are often unable to pass on these behaviours to their children. They are therefore lured into a welfare trap that they and their children never escape from.

Responsible members of immigrant communities feel angry at being treated merely as units of consumption simply to boost demand for housing (to keep house prices high), consumer products, and government services, and to keep wage rates low. They seek the dignity of well paid and meaningful employment, which they have earned through study, hard work and merit based appointments rather than positive discrimination. They want the guidance that Australian majority legal and cultural norms can offer, strong law enforcement and a strong national identity.

## **What we stand for and what we demand – the right to choose**

Almost no-one in modern Australia wants to live in a country with only one culture or return to the old 'white Australia' policy. Australia is now a highly diverse country and always will be. Diversity is welcome provided that it results in a stable, harmonious society.

But diversity is not the same as multiculturalism. Pluralism accepts more than one cultural identity, diversity, but places one, our identity as Australians, clearly above any other. In real world practice, government multicultural policies put Australian identity at the same level as any another identity, or in second place.

Pluralists think that, by setting clear boundaries, we offer a single strong identity with which to identify. In real world practice, multiculturalism treats all cultures as equals. Therefore it cannot offer a single strong identity.

The argument is about what level of diversity is best, and what the rules are, so as to maximise the welfare of the people in the nation. It is about how quickly demographic change should be allowed to happen, what the immigration intake should be, who should form that intake and the nation, and the content of the compact between citizen and state. It is about how far multiculturalism should be allowed to change our core values and identity.

We demand our right to responsible free speech just as we demand it for those who disagree with us. Racism breeds quickest when people are forced to keep silent about legitimate grievances.

We refuse to be stereotyped as backward thinking, racist or xenophobic. We are not. Racism is thinking that one race is superior to another. We reject this. But we do not think that all cultural practices should be treated equally here in Australia. Australian culture should be paramount. Some migrant cultural practices (such as intolerance of homosexuality, or harsh punishment of blasphemy or adultery) are illegal, breach our human rights laws and offend our basic values. We reject the notion that such practices are equal to, or superior to, ours.

We recognise that modern societies and international relations are complex and interrelated. We want Australia to portray itself as a modern diverse plural democracy in the international arena. We do not ask for an onerous, unreasonable or unfair loyalty to Australia, but we do expect loyalty.

Yes, there are some racists in Australia, but probably no more than anywhere else. All countries have regrets. Yes, our past is marred by our treatment of Indigenous and other people. We have yet to make proper redress to Indigenous Australians and have much work to do.

### **Indigenous Australians**

Our arguments are consistent. Just as we demand primacy for Australian majority culture by virtue of occupation of land, numbers and cultural expression over time, so we recognise that much longer periods of occupation of this land and enjoyment of culture have given Indigenous people special rights and status as first peoples and traditional owners. They must not be treated merely as another minority or equated with an immigrant group as some multiculturalists do. They should be afforded a special place in our laws and constitution if they so choose. But they should be welcome, encouraged and strongly supported to integrate (not assimilate) if they wish. Their position must be

benchmarked against the majority, and special measures should be taken, so that they are quickly brought up to a position of substantive equality, not left further behind by wave after wave of immigration. Money wasted on multiculturalism and harmony programs should be directed to this.

Pluralists understand and adapt to the enormous cultural change that recent mass immigration has brought but we want to make sure that any future changes are achieved with full understanding and clear direction, not achieved by stealth or mistake, in response to fear that we will lose money, threats of violence, or by catering only to some noisy electorate or an obvious attempt to buy votes.

Pluralism is above party politics. To date, our politicians have proved themselves incapable of leading us wisely and courageously. All current political parties have supported multiculturalism when they think it attracts votes and gives them political advantage, and have put short-term financial and political interests above the long-term national interest. Sadly, politicians mostly prefer to defend their record rather than admit mistakes. They put ego above public service. They are all likely to strongly resist a democratic vote. If they are allowed to continue to do so, they will damage the fabric of Australian society beyond repair. We demand more of them.

We should all understand that if our Australian cultural identity is lost, as multiculturalism is implemented, there is no logical reason for a country such as Australia to retain: the name Australia (an Anglo construct), the Australian flag (with the Union Jack), English as the dominant language, the monarchy, a special place for Christianity; or to afford primacy to the Australian legal system, which is a British hybrid. Different legal systems and different cultural practices which are not currently legal, and which many would find abhorrent at present, are likely to apply. Is that the legacy the current generation will leave to its children?

Some Australians have always tried to define Australia in a negative way, by expressing dislike of its Anglo heritage or making false claims of superiority for their own brand of multiculturalism. No nation can ever define itself by denigrating the culture upon which it is based or another culture or by making false claims that their brand of multiculturalism is different or a world leader. Such claims are likely to make Australia, and the people who make them, look foolish in future years as the true impact of multiculturalism becomes apparent and large parts of Australia start to resemble parts of the UK and Europe now.

Multiculturalism guarantees rapid, complete, and probably irreversible, change. This may be superficially attractive to some. But those who choose multiculturalism should be fully aware of what such profound changes might mean for social stability. They should make a sober and realistic assessment of whether any national identity, based on multiculturalism, and separate and different from the current Australian one, is strong enough to make a cohesive and successful nation in the world as it will be. We think it cannot.

Of course, if that is what the people of this new 'country', or more properly, 'federated nations', choose as their future, when properly informed, following a properly constituted referendum, then so be it.

Pluralists choose a modern Australian identity based on our current system. Pluralists believe that the tried and tested formula of encouraging immigrants to identify as 'new Australians' was always the best approach. A cultural identity can never be demanded or forced but can be supported and

encouraged through policies and funding. But all such funding should be subject to rigorous cost benefit analysis and open and honest accounting.

Pluralists believe that no cultural group should be singled out or treated unfairly. We genuinely welcome Muslims, Jews, Christians and other religious groups, who wish to practice a moderate form of their religion. But we strongly resist religious extremism of any kind. We welcome moderate and mature nationalism and reject extremist nationalism. We reject all forms of racism, including reverse racism.

It is an insult to the collective intelligence of the community to think that the Australian people cannot understand the difference between 'multiculturalism' and 'pluralism' and either reject multiculturalism or choose between the two. In a democratic nation they would be allowed to.

Some have even argued that to debate multiculturalism is racist, divisive or damaging. They fear democracy. They do not trust the wisdom of ordinary Australians. If social cohesion or harmony in this country is presently so fragile that we cannot have an open debate and democratic vote on multiculturalism then, clearly, the many hundreds of millions of dollars spent so far on community harmony programs (over \$450 million annually) and multiculturalism have been wasted – even more reason to seek a proper mandate before going any further.

We demand, in addition, a proper comprehensive accounting, and cost benefit analysis of, all multiculturalism and harmony programs. We demand accurate analysis of the opportunity cost of using this money instead on more effective policing, and better programs on health, housing and measures to solve unemployment. We believe that multiculturalism is divisive and that this has an enormous cost in itself. We suspect that, on a proper accounting, multiculturalism simply creates the problems that it purports to solve at great expense to the ordinary taxpayer.

We, the silent majority, are tired of being disenfranchised and silenced by insults in favour of noisy minorities and cultural elites who have a vested interest in the multiculturalist industry, whilst the very identity and legal system of our nation is changed by stealth at our expense and that of future generations.

**We demand our say at a constitutional referendum. If the Government wishes to completely transform our nation through multiculturalism, then they should seek to insert a reference to it in the Commonwealth Constitution. At the very least, we demand that the Government seek proper legal authority for its expenditure on multiculturalism by introducing a Multiculturalism Bill before the Federal Parliament.**

**We demand our democratic right to vote directly in a referendum or, failing that, through our representatives.**

**Until it seeks proper legal authority by securing passage of a Multiculturalism Bill through Parliament, along with a comprehensive cost benefit analysis of all past and future 'harmony' and other multicultural programs (taking account of the opportunity costs of spending the same money on policing, housing, and measures to solve unemployment) then the Government should abandon multiculturalism and stop the current spending on multiculturalism now.**

Copyright Pluralists for a referendum – March 2011 - [pluralistsforareferendum@hotmail.com](mailto:pluralistsforareferendum@hotmail.com)

If you want to help, and agree with the views expressed, please write to your local MP (you can sign and attach a copy of this article or flyer), and demand a referendum and a vote. Get as many people as you can to sign petitions. Watch the Channel 4 Dispatches documentaries from the UK. Inform yourself about what multiculturalism really means and the difference between 'multiculturalism', and 'interculturalism' and 'pluralism'. Explain it to your friends and colleagues. Scan, copy and send this article by post and email to as many people as you can. Express your views on blogs, discussion groups and twitter. Read Wiki and read the criticisms of multiculturalism referred to below. We all have a civic duty to make sure that the Australia we leave to the next generation is stable, harmonious, prosperous and united. We, formerly the silent majority, can stop multiculturalism. Yes we can. You are welcome to copy and send this article for free to anyone you wish, provided that you use it responsibly, don't misrepresent it or quote from it selectively or use it to incite racism. If you wish to make money from publishing the article you must get copyright permission. All websites last accessed 2 March 2011.

<sup>i</sup> [www.civitas.org.uk/pdf/ShariaLawOrOneLawForAll.pdf](http://www.civitas.org.uk/pdf/ShariaLawOrOneLawForAll.pdf) 2009; Denis MacEoin and David Green, 'Sharia law or one law for all?', The Institute for the Study of Civil Society, London 2009.

<http://www.theahafoundation.org/AHA%202010%20European%20Best%20practices.pdf>; European Best Practices, The AHA Foundation, Hirsi Ali, New York, 2010

<sup>ii</sup> See <http://www.channel4.com/programmes>; <http://news.bbc.co.uk/panorama/hi/default.stm>

<sup>iii</sup> <http://www.hizb-australia.org/hizbut-tahrir/draft-constitution>.

<sup>iv</sup> <http://www8.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/3101.0>; Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 3101 June 2010

<sup>v</sup> <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/20planning.htm>; Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIMC) Fact Sheet 20 Migration Program Planning Levels July 2010.

<sup>vi</sup> <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/15population.htm#a>; DIMC Fact Sheet 13 Population Projections October 2010.

<sup>vii</sup> <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/too-laid-back-about-immigration/story-e6frg6zo-1225901965765>; Hirsi Ali, 'Too laid-back about immigration', The Australian, 7 August 2010

<sup>viii</sup> [http://www.hreoc.gov.au/racial\\_discrimination/isma/consultations/facts/fact\\_muslim.html](http://www.hreoc.gov.au/racial_discrimination/isma/consultations/facts/fact_muslim.html)  
<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/3416.0Main%20Features22007?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=3416.0&issue=2007&num=&view>; ABS 3146 Perspectives on Migrants 2007.

<sup>ix</sup> <http://www.katelundy.com.au/2011/02/17/minister-for-immigration-and-citizenship-chris-bowen-multiculturalism-in-the-australian-context/>.

<sup>x</sup> [http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20101018\\_germany\\_and\\_failure\\_multiculturalism](http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20101018_germany_and_failure_multiculturalism). Friedman, G., 'Germany and the Failure of Multiculturalism', October 19 2010

<sup>x</sup> <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/3101.0Feature%20Article2Jun%202010?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=3101.0&issue=Jun%202010&num=&view> ABS 3101 June 2010 Australian Demographic Series, Temporary Migrants

xii <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/opinion/migrant-spending-a-great-stimulus-to-economy-during-crisis/story-e6frg9if-1225823060974> ; David Uren, 'Migrant spending a stimulus to the Economy', The Australian, 25 January 2010

xiii ".....However, if there is any inconsistency between these cultural values and the values of individual freedom and the rule of law, then these traditional Australian values win out. They must. This has been the case since multiculturalism was introduced as Australian policy in the 1970s. Later he said: 'Australian Governments do not defend cultural practices and ideas that are inconsistent with our values and ideals of democracy, justice, equality and tolerance. Nor should we be expected to.' Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Chris Bowen's, speech to the Sydney Institute, 17 February 2011

xiv For criticism of multiculturalism see eg [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism\\_of\\_multiculturalism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism_of_multiculturalism). For some useful background see Research Policy Paper 6, Parliamentary Library, Commonwealth, 2010 'Multiculturalism: a review of policy statements and recent debates in Australia and overseas ' by Elsa Koletch. <http://www.aph.gov.au/library/pubs/rp/2010-11/11rp06.pdf>

xv <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/growing-number-of-muslim-men-and-multiple-wives-exploiting-loophole-for-taxpayer-handouts/story-e6frf7jo-1225837150560>

xvi Many experts criticise affirmative action. See for example, Sowell, Thomas, 'Affirmative Action Around the World: An Empirical Study', Yale University Press, 2004.

xvii <http://www.smh.com.au/national/pm-shares-frustration-of-2m-who-crave-more-work-20110201-1acgw.html> Phillip Coorey, 'PM Shares frustration of 2 million who crave more work', SMH, February 2, 2011.