

<http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/mig/multiculturalism/index.htm>

Inquiry into Multiculturalism in Australia

The Committee is seeking written submissions from interested persons and organisations preferable sent by email to jscm@aph.gov.au.

Multiculturalism, social inclusion and globalisation

1. The role of Multiculturalism in the Federal Government's social inclusion agenda.

In connection with Multiculturalism involving the Lebanese, particularly Muslim, community I submit the interpretation below.

In order to give framework to that interpretation, I have taken recent news reports announcing the policy position held by the Government of Australia by Minister for Immigration, Chris Bowen.

It is not a submission made by a religious group or by a representative from a minority group distinguished by some exotic culture. It is a submission made as the result of examining the Lebanese, particularly Muslim, community in Australia and their interaction with people of the Australian mainstream over a period of nearly ten years.

The submission was compiled rapidly after information about the Inquiry came to hand.

<http://www.smh.com.au/national/labors-call-fear-extremists-not-migrants-20110216-1awmn.html>

Labor's call: fear extremists, not migrants

Kirsty Needham

February 17, 2011

THE federal government has re-embraced multiculturalism in a key speech by the Immigration Minister, Chris Bowen, tackling voter fear of Islamic extremism and outlining a new anti-racism strategy.

Labor's new multicultural policy was released amid accusations that the Coalition was "stealing sound bites from One Nation", and with the Opposition Leader, Tony Abbott, conceding attacks on asylum-seeker funerals had gone "too far".

Mr Bowen told the Sydney Institute last night **it had become fashionable to blame multiculturalism for terrorism**, but the Australian experience was different.

"It is right for Australians to be concerned about extremism - whether Islamic or otherwise ... [but] to cast all Islamic migrants or all members of any religious group as somehow unworthy of their place in our national community ... tars the many with the extremist views of the very few and does an injustice to all."

He said it was counter-intuitive to assume that most migrants wanted to change Australia. "Allegations of migrants wanting to come to Australia to convert the populace and turn it into a replica of their homelands ignore the truth."

Hazaras, who make up a large percentage of asylum-seeker boat arrivals, had fled religious extremism in Afghanistan, and "just like previous groups of migrants" **were attracted by Australia's values**, he said.

Mr Bowen outlined a new policy which he said promoted social cohesion and valued diversity.

The government will appoint a 10-person multicultural council which will have a wider scope than the existing advisory body, establish a national anti-racism strategy, and reinstate the word "multicultural" in Kate Lundy's title of parliamentary secretary for immigration.

A youth sports program will also promote people from ethnically diverse backgrounds mixing together.

Labor's new multicultural push comes after the opposition immigration spokesman, Scott Morrison, said on Australia Day that he was "reluctant to use the term", and multiculturalism should not be reduced to an "unrestricted licence to replicate your old culture in a new land".

The Howard government dropped official use of the term, and the last federal multiculturalism statement was issued in 2003.

But during last year's election, Labor also shied away from a multiculturalism policy, sensitive to voter perceptions in western Sydney of special treatment for migrants, and had dropped the term from Senator Lundy's title.

Mr Bowen said last night: "I'm not afraid to use the word multiculturalism."

He said **multiculturalism had worked and was a marker of a liberal society**. Australia differed from Europe in that it was not a guest worker society, and migrants were expected to become citizens. But **Australia could not accept the benefits of a diverse population and then shun the culture of migrants it had invited, or suspect they would not integrate**, he said.

"If people do not feel part of society, this can lead to alienation and, ultimately, social disunity."

Almost half (44 per cent) of Australians were born overseas or had a parent born overseas.

Mr Bowen said the government would counter extremism, and singled out sharia as inconsistent with multiculturalism. Where there is any clash between migrant cultures and the rule of law or freedom "traditional Australian values win out", he said.

The Australian Multicultural Advisory Council, set up by the Rudd government in 2008, recommended last year that an independent body be established to advise on a multicultural strategy.

The former Liberal prime minister Malcolm Fraser was credited with institutionalising multiculturalism as policy, but Mr Bowen said it was uncertain it would remain "above the fray of the daily political football match".

Yesterday the government put the cost of flying 21 Christmas Island detainees to Sydney this week for the funerals of relatives who died in the December boat tragedy at \$300,000.

And

<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/politics/what-makes-multiculturalism-great-is-mutual-respect-20110216-1awik.html>

What makes multiculturalism great is mutual respect

Chris Bowen

February 17, 2011

Less than a month ago, millions of Australians celebrated our national day. Among the most enthusiastic participants were our newest Australian citizens.

Thirteen thousand **people enthusiastically took the pledge of commitment to this nation**. I've seen people, wearing the national dress of their homeland, clasping an Australian flag and welling-up with tears as **they promise to uphold and obey Australian values and laws**. They serve as a reminder of what I term "**the genius of Australian multiculturalism**".

It is presently fashionable to declare multiculturalism dead or to blame it for crime and terrorism. Germany's Chancellor, Angela Merkel, recently declared multiculturalism in her country had "utterly failed".

To some, multiculturalism is simply a diverse population, and a non-discriminatory immigration policy. These are the foundations of Australian multiculturalism, but it consists of much more.

Firstly, our multiculturalism is underpinned by respect for traditional Australian values.

Those who arrive in Australia are invited to continue to celebrate their cultures within a broader culture of freedom but, more importantly, with respect. However, **if there is any inconsistency between these values and individual freedom and the rule of law, then these Australian values win out**. They must.

This is related to **the second element of the genius of Australian multiculturalism. Ours is citizenship-based; to enjoy the full benefits of Australian society, it is necessary to take a pledge of commitment.**

The third element of the genius of Australian multiculturalism is political bipartisanship, particularly at its creation. The first Australian politician to publicly refer to multiculturalism as an aspiration was Al Grassby, immigration minister in the Whitlam government. But it was Malcolm Fraser who made it national policy.

Furthermore, the **Australian model of multiculturalism is different**. In Germany a requirement for "guest-workers" has driven an economic immigration policy.

Australia's postwar immigration policy was originally driven by economic imperatives, but governments came to recognise the benefits of inviting full community participation by our

immigrant populations in return for a respect for, and embracing of, the cultures and customs they brought with them.

Many countries in Europe have nations within nations: significant communities living "parallel lives", perpetuating segregation based on ethnic, religious or cultural divides.

This seems to underline the benefits of the Australian approach.

Australian governments do not defend cultural practices and ideas inconsistent with our values of democracy, justice, equality and tolerance. Nor should we.

We have tried to instil a sense of belonging in Australia while encouraging the participation of all people. If values are not articulated, not put into practice and people do not feel part of society, this can lead to alienation and, ultimately, social disunity.

It seems to me, if you accept the benefits of a diverse population, you then have a choice: do you respect, embrace and welcome the cultures of those you have invited to make Australia home or do you shun them?

Do you invite their full participation or do you treat them as guest workers and hope they integrate - while all along suspecting they won't?

Multiculturalism is about inviting every individual member of society to be everything they can be and supporting each new arrival in overcoming whatever obstacles they face as they adjust to a new country and society and allowing them to flourish as individuals.

It is a matter of liberalism. A truly robust liberal society is a multicultural society.

During our multicultural journey, every wave of migrants has had its challenges. Each generation expresses some anxiety about the new, the unfamiliar.

Just like previous groups of migrants, the vast majority of the present group of migrants to Australia come here not to change our values, but because of them.

Bearing that in mind, it is right for Australians to be concerned about extremism - whether Islamic or otherwise. **Intolerant interpretations of religion do not align with Australia's values, principles or laws.**

It is counter-intuitive to assume that the majority of migrants want to change Australia. Allegations of migrants wanting to come here to convert the populace and turn it into a replica of their homelands ignore the truth: people come to Australia because, to them, Australia represents something better.

The last thing they want is Australia to change, to become less free, to become less democratic, to become less equal.

If Australia is to be free and equal, then it will be multicultural; but if it is to be multicultural it must remain free and equal.

Chris Bowen is the Minister for Immigration. This is an edited version of a speech he delivered last night at the Sydney Institute.

COMMENT

Islam has been in the news a lot recently, particularly in connection with revolutions in the states of the Muslim belt stretched across North Africa and into Arabia.

Questions are raised.

Are Muslims killing Muslims after Friday prayer? Is Islam the religion of peace?

What is it all about? Islam or democracy?

Who is it between? Subjects or citizens?

What is the choice?

Meanwhile, 'Multiculturalism' has been reinvented in Australia.

What does Chris Bowen, Minister for Immigration, have to say?

I summarise the key points below for appraisal:

- It had become fashionable to blame multiculturalism for terrorism
- Hazaras were attracted by Australia's values
- Multiculturalism had worked and was a marker of a liberal society
- Australia could not accept the benefits of a diverse population and then shun the culture of migrants it had invited, or suspect they would not integrate
- People enthusiastically took the pledge of commitment to this nation
- They promise to uphold and obey Australian values and laws
- It is presently fashionable to declare multiculturalism dead
- Australian model of multiculturalism is different -
 1. Firstly, our multiculturalism is underpinned by respect for traditional Australian values and if there is any inconsistency between these values and individual freedom and the rule of law, then these Australian values win out.
 2. The second element of the genius of Australian multiculturalism is ours is citizenship-based; to enjoy the full benefits of Australian society, it is necessary to take a pledge of commitment.
 3. The third element of the genius of Australian multiculturalism is political bipartisanship, particularly at its creation.
- Intolerant interpretations of religion do not align with Australia's values, principles or laws.

Multiculturalism?

The policy is now one reinvigorated, designed to appeal to mainstream Australia and incorporate proponents and practitioners of Islam as Australians while still allowing them those proponents and practitioners of Islam in Australia to conduct themselves as they are.

“It seems to me, if you accept the benefits of a diverse population, you then have a choice: do you respect, embrace and welcome the cultures of those you have invited to make Australia home or do you shun them?”

I had thought that “Multiculturalism” was a vague term. Bowen works to give the term ‘Multiculturalism’ definition.

It does incorporate one, particularly critical, word: “respect”.

The question is asked: “do you respect, embrace and welcome the cultures of those you have invited to make Australia home [proponents or practitioners of Islam] or do you shun them [proponents or practitioners of Islam]”?

Bowen asserts only the former can be tolerated. As Australians, we must embrace those proponents and practitioners of Islam. We must not revile them.

What if Australians feel antagonised by proponents and practitioners of Islam?

Bowen stipulates: “(M)ulticulturalism is underpinned by respect for traditional Australian values and if there is any inconsistency between (those) values and individual freedom and the rule of law, then () Australian values win out”.

That is supposed to console people of mainstream Australia compelled now to ‘respect’ proponents and practitioners of Islam.

It is inferred mainstream Australians make up the mob. The mob lacks sophistication. The mob does not understand. The mob lacks compassion and the will to comprehend. The attitude of the mob is the latent cause for the isolation of proponents and practitioners of Islam. The mob must make room.

But, Bowen must placate the mob.

How does he do that?

“Australian values win out”.

Any insight about proponents and practitioners of Islam made by mainstream Australians does not carry weight because the mob of mainstream Australia simply does not understand!

So Bowen gives the mob back its values.

Australian values in Australia are dominant. Proponents and practitioners of Islam in Australia - who live by the tenets of their ‘religion’ - must both accept and respect Australian values.

When a value of a proponent and practitioner of Islam comes into conflict with an Australian value, the Australian value dominates.

Yeah, right....

“Intolerant interpretations of religion (Islam) do not align with Australia's values, principles or laws”.

Where did intolerant interpretations of religion come from in Australia in the first place?

I see how Multiculturalism works for proponents and practitioners of Islam.

Bowen deduces "to enjoy the full benefits of Australian society, it is necessary to take a pledge of commitment" to Australia.

That pledge will keep proponents and practitioners of Islam under control. It circumvents their intolerant interpretations of religion.

Proponents and practitioners of Islam will respect 'traditional Australian values'. Thereby, those intolerant interpretations of religion will simply just evaporate and proponents and practitioners of Islam will succumb. Those superior Australian values will reign supreme!

Why?

Multiculturalism will work for proponents and practitioners of Islam:

- Because "(they) enthusiastically took the pledge of commitment to this nation";
- Because "they promise(d) to uphold and obey Australian values and laws", and;
- Because the model has "political bipartisanship".

Bowen's necessary conditions are met.

To prove the case, Bowen has proof:

"Hazaras [practitioners of Islam] were attracted by Australia's values".

Wow.

'Multiculturalism' for proponents and practitioners of Islam does work.

That was easy!

There will never be any conflict between those proponents and practitioners of Islam and the mob.

When social pressure to conform is increased through time, proponents and practitioners of Islam will be asked to shrug off the teachings of Mohammed the Paedophile and embrace Australian values.

That includes the beach, bikini, beer, barbecue, cricket and football!

That includes a general mistrust of religious nutters.

Proponents and practitioners of Islam will willingly comply. Proponents and practitioners of Islam will not assert their values in or over Australia.

But, how does it account for the deep-seated anti-Australian sentiment held by members of the Lebanese Muslim community resident in the Jihad Belt?

"By turning their backs on this flawed way of life, it is testament of the superiority of Islamic values over Western values."

[Post No. 202 PRONOUNCEMENT AT PARRY PARK]

How could it be made to work in Australia?

The mob of mainstream Australia could be policed!

“(A) 10-person multicultural council which will have a wider scope than the existing advisory body (and will) establish a national anti-racism strategy”.

An oligarchy will make “Multiculturalism” work for proponents and practitioners of Islam in Australia.

The “Multi-Kulti” oligarchy will remove any potential for conflict.

Anybody who disagrees will be tarred, tarred with the racist brush!

The Multi-Kulti oligarchy will mandate respect for proponents and practitioners of Islam.

What does that mean?

Complain about proponents and practitioners of Islam and be branded a racist low-life. You will be dismissed from the debate! You have not shown respect!

So, there.

How could Multiculturalism be used by proponents and practitioners of Islam?

“(I)t is right for Australians to be concerned about (Islamic) extremism.”

“Mr Bowen said the government would counter extremism, and singled out (Sharia Law) as inconsistent with (M)ulticulturalism.”

Sharia Law is extremist?

It is inconsistent with Multiculturalism?

We have a problem then Mr Bowen.

Why?

Sharia Law is part and parcel of Islam.

Proponents and practitioners of Islam adhere to Sharia Law as something fundamental. Proponents and practitioners of Islam everywhere work to implement Sharia Law.

The hijab, burka and niqab are part and parcel of Sharia Law and are part and parcel of Islam.

Hence, “The veil’ or ‘hijab’ () represent(s) more than just the veil itself, or the concept of modesty embodied in (Islam)”.

“(It) includes (all such descriptions of) ‘face-covering clothing such as the burqa, chador, boushiya, or niqab’”.

And,

“We dress like this [with the bhurka] because it is the command of Allah”.

[Post No. 202 PRONOUNCEMENT AT PARRY PARK]

By Bowen’s assertion then all Muslims, all proponents and practitioners of Islam, are extremists if they follow Sharia Law.

Does Bowen really know what he is talking about?

The implementation of Sharia Law is part and parcel of Islam.

Does Bowen’s embrace of proponents and practitioners of Islam confront that incongruence?

Does Bowen even recognise the conflict he exposes?

Does Bowen recognise the potential for violent conflict between peoples who cling to competing values?

What does Bowen’s appeal to the mob of mainstream Australia effectively do?

Bowen’s appeal demarcates. He has mapped out the ground for conflict.

As Bowen tries to embrace, he works to exclude. If Australia’s values are to dominate, proponents and practitioners of Islam are by definition therefore excluded.

Remember?

“EVERY Australian school student would be taught positive aspects about Islam and Muslims - and that Australia is a racist country - under a proposal by an education think tank.

“The plan is outlined in the Learning From One Another: Bringing Muslim Perspectives into Australian Schools booklet, published during the week by the Australian Curriculum Studies Association and the University of Melbourne’s Centre for Excellence in Islamic Studies.

“It says there is a ‘degree of prejudice and ignorance about Islam and Muslims’, and Australian students must be taught to embrace difference and diversity.”

“It seems the ‘National Centre for Excellence for Islamic Studies (NCIES)’ under the auspices of the University of Melbourne’s Centre for Islamic Studies is all about propagating Islam through any and down every channel possible.”

(Underline added)

According to NCIES,

“() Sharia Law can co-exist in Australia on an equal footing with Australian Law and, in fact, it is of the same tenor and has as a much value both historically and morally. () (T)he Islamic way should be adopted. () (T)he depredations of Islam like slavery, discrimination against non-Muslims, child marriage etc () through Sharia Law [will thereby become] () acceptable, sound normal. “

[Post No. 201 INSIDIOUS ISLAM IN SCHOOLS]

Hence, the push for the implementation of Sharia Law in Australia is made to sound normal. It should be accepted. But, that is the disposition held by “moderates”, per se, not extremists.

Those “moderates” have influence in Australian schools!

According to Bowen, that is the ‘right’ disposition for proponents and practitioners of Islam. But, that disposition is at odds with Bowen’s Multiculturalism!

Bowen has asserted:

“Where there is any clash between migrant cultures and the rule of law or freedom ‘traditional Australian values win out’”.

But, Bowen has not confronted the logic problem faced by proponents and practitioners of Islam.

Thus,

“(Shariah Law) [] is the code of conduct or religious law of Islam. Most Muslims believe Sharia is derived from two primary sources of Islamic law: the precepts set forth in the Qur'an [Koran], and the example set by the Islamic Prophet Muhammad in the Sunnah [stories about his life]. Fiqh [Islamic] jurisprudence interprets and extends the application of Sharia to questions not directly addressed in the primary sources by including secondary sources. These secondary sources usually include the consensus of the religious scholars [], and analogy from the Qur'an and Sunnah through qiyas [that is, analogical reasoning as applied to the deduction of juridical principles]”.

(Underline added)

[<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sharia>]

Proponents and practitioners of Islam must conduct themselves according to Sharia Law. That is by definition being Muslim.

Yet, for Bowen:

“Our (M)ulticulturalism is underpinned by respect for traditional Australian values and if there is any inconsistency between these values and individual freedom and the rule of law, then these Australian values win out.”

That is inconsistent with Sharia Law. That is inconsistent with Islam.

Bowen cannot reconcile his vision of Islam with Australian values.

If Australian values dominate then proponents and practitioners of Islam are excluded when their religious beliefs cannot be reconciled with Australia’s values.

What will result?

Look at another reversal Bowen's stance incorporates.

"The proponent and practitioner of Islam convicted of terrorism wanted Sharia law to prevail throughout Australia.

"That terrorist was an extremist?

"(But,)... moderates want the same thing:

"Addressing an open day at Lakemba Mosque on Saturday, the president of the Australian Islamic Mission, Zachariah Matthews, said parts of Sharia could be recognised as a secondary legal system so that Muslims were not forced to act contrary to their beliefs. 'Sharia law could function as a parallel system in the same way that some traditional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander law was recognised in the Northern Territory,' Dr Matthews told the Herald after the session."

[Post No. 171 CALL FOR SHARIA LAW IN AUSTRALIA]

[Posts No.s 148 & 149 THE CONVICTION OF PROPONENTS AND PRACTITIONERS OF ISLAM]

Bowen's model creates a construct that will generate conflict or, at best, a parallel Islamic society, one that is allowed to thrive where members conduct themselves as part of someone else's interpretation of Multiculturalism. Proponents and practitioners of Islam would ostensibly live in isolation and fail to integrate.

How will they conduct themselves when they need to interact with mainstream Australians?

Where will that lead?

I think this case study will provide an indication:

"A SYDNEY couple has withdrawn their two children from a public primary school, claiming their 11-year-old son was bullied by Muslim students because he ate a salami sandwich during Ramadan.

"Andrew Grigoriou said yesterday he complained to the school and to police after his son Antonios was chased and later assaulted by Muslim students after a confrontation over the contents of his lunch.

"Antonios, a Year 5 student of Greek-Australian background at Punchbowl Public School in Sydney's southwest [Jihad Belt], said he and a friend had to be locked inside the library for an hour after being chased by a group of Muslim boys offended by his choice of food while they were fasting."

[Post No. 151 THE YOUNG JIHADISTS]

That is an example of the religious persecution that Bowen's Multiculturalism has provided and will provide.

Where there are "(i)ntolerant interpretations of religion (that) do not align with Australia's values, principles or laws" how do "Australian values win out"?

Proponents and practitioners of Islam cannot accept the ascendancy of "the rule of law or freedom" over Sharia Law where "'traditional Australian values win out'".

The 'Hazara Defence' will not do: "Hazaras were attracted by Australia's values"! In Islam, Hazaras are viewed as outsiders because they accept certain parts of the Koran and interpret it differently to other, mainstream Muslims: Sunni and Shiite, particularly.

"Hazaras are predominantly Shia Muslims, mostly of the Twelver sect and some Ismaili [esoteric sect of thought in Islam]. Since the majority of Afghans practice Sunni Islam, this probably contributed to the discrimination against the Hazaras".

(Underline added)

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hazara_people)

Hence, Hazara people given freedom away from persecution in Afghanistan in Australia would rightly appreciate what Australia has to offer.

But, does that mean they reject Sharia Law?

While Bowen might regard the implementation of Sharia Law in Australia as something connected to "extremists" alone, he does not appreciate that Sharia Law is fundamental to Islam.

The "moderates" want exactly the same thing as the "extremists".

Bowen's model does not accommodate any dissension between 'traditional Australian values' and proponents and practitioners of Islam.

Bowen's assertion that 'traditional Australian values win out' is not well-tested. Matched up against Islam, it sounds like a pipe dream.

As demonstrated by "the 'Call for Sharia Law' broadside () [proponents and practitioners of Islam work] to plant [their delusion] into our communal consciousness () until we agree to accept it in some form [and permit its implementation]. [After all,] that is the flexible, democratic, compassionate, conciliatory Christian thing to do to help our neighbour."

[Post No. 171 CALL FOR SHARIA LAW IN AUSTRALIA]

Remember?

1. Proponents and practitioners of Islam are prepared, willingly, to conspire to pursue the Muslim delusion, the imperative that Islam is to dominate society and polity.

[Posts No. s 148 & 149 THE CONVICTION OF PROPONENTS AND PRACTITIONERS OF ISLAM]

'Multiculturalism' will be used as a tool to meet that end.

9. Proponents and practitioners of Islam can appropriate concepts and words from their contemporary environment as tools to defend, protect and pursue the Muslim delusion.

[Posts No. s 148 & 149 THE CONVICTION OF PROPONENTS AND PRACTITIONERS OF ISLAM]

Does Bowen seriously believe that 'traditional Australian values' will always "win out"?

How does that account for Fautmeh Ardati's pronouncement at Parry Park on "the superiority of Islamic values over Western values"?

[Post No. 209 PRONOUNCEMENT AT PARRY PARK]

While Bowen's appeal might be a reply to Ardati's blithe assertion, it is pretty bloody naïve.

Mainstream Australians might continue to assert the dominance of the 'Australian Way', but the 'Australian Way' under 'Multiculturalism' will be required to adapt to and therefore become increasingly amenable to the 'Islamic Way' until the two blur and by deception the 'Australian Way' is subsumed and seconded.

Is there an example?

"The Proclamation at Parry Park was a bold assertion that 'We (Muslims) are here, we are going to do things our way, and like it or not, you should steer clear of us doing what we want'.

"Why?

"Because we Muslims are better than you!"

[Post No. 209 PRONOUNCEMENT AT PARRY PARK]

In conclusion, I proffer two examples of the application of Islamic Law in Australian society by deception.

1. In Melbourne proponents and practitioners of Islam have already triumphed implementing Sharia Law.

Muslim women wanted an exemption from equal opportunity laws and they got it.

Hence, the 'Australian Way' was subsumed and seconded.

Thus,

"RATEPAYERS could be stung up to \$45,000 to install curtains at a public pool so Muslim women can have privacy during a female-only exercise classes.

"The City of Monash has won an exemption from equal opportunity laws to run the sessions outside normal opening hours.

"The council says the privacy screen is needed for 'cultural reasons'."

(<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/victoria/hefty-bill-for-muslim-womens-privacy-at-public-swimming-pool/story-e6frf7kx-1226004006696>)

Is that insistence on "privacy during () female-only exercise classes" not used to rationalise the demand "to install curtains at a public pool so Muslim women" can swim?

Is that insistence not consistent with the demands of Sharia Law?

A call for courtesy has been used to shield the implementation of Sharia Law.

And,

2. "(T)he Islamic Council of Victoria (said) that Australian society did not respect religious diversity and that Muslim migrants congregated in suburbs such as Lakemba [Jihad Belt] because of fear of racism and housing affordability, not to create enclaves."

(<http://www.smh.com.au/national/look-to-nsw-for-multicultural-utopia-hatzistergos-tells-federal-inquiry-20110404-1cym1.html>)

The Islamic Council of Victoria does not have a grasp of Australian society and how it functions, yet they are prepared to judge?

How is their experience any different from that of other, earlier immigrants who have integrated?

Settling by Muslim immigrants in the Jihad Belt has had very little to do with a lack of respect for religious diversity by mainstream Australians. In fact, the reverse is true. Proponents and practitioners of Islam want to live in isolation according to Sharia Law amidst people of similar thinking and cultural or religious heritage.

That claim about a "fear of racism" is pap. It is used to shield Muslim immigrants from criticism. It allows proponents and practitioners of Islam to play the victim. It perpetuates the right for proponents and practitioners of Islam to live as they do and speak as they speak and resist integration. The creation of enclaves is typical behaviour for proponents and practitioners of Islam, despite the assertion otherwise.

They are practicing deception called in Islam al-Taqiyya.

"Taqiyya is a practice in () Islam whereby adherents may conceal their faith when they are under threat, persecution, or compulsion"

[<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taqiyya>]

Taqiyya permits lying, dissimulation, and dissemblance in order to protect Islam (which includes the Muslim community) from criticism.

The actual position held by proponents and practitioners of Islam in Australia as cited from an arbitrary source is:

"The Islamic identity of Muslims in Australia is rapidly being dissolved in the melting pot of this society. Clearly our identity is under threat as we see our ideologies, beliefs and manners give way to the ideologies, beliefs and manners of the Kuffar (non-Muslims). The preservation of the Islamic identity has become a challenge rather than something we can take for granted".

(<http://www.missionislam.com/knowledge/preserveident.htm>)

Essentially, Muslim immigrants seek to live in isolation, in enclaves, to preserve their identity. Proponents and practitioners of Islam are in effect working to colonise Australia. They do not respect Australia or Australian values. They do not respect Multiculturalism in the true spirit. They appropriate Multiculturalism as a tool to further their own cause.

We have the choice now how we handle the Lebanese Problem. But, the problem is more difficult now than at its inception and will be more difficult to manage as time goes by unless it is addressed.

I think proponents and practitioners of Islam bring with them a mix of wreck and rancour.

To get away from it all now how about a free holiday to Libya or Bahrain or Syria? Any takers?

References:

<http://orb.mogkat.com/viewforum.php?f=6>

At Extreme Measures.