

Dear Sir/Madam,

Sometime between the late Nineteen Seventies and the early Nineteen Nineties, every "Western" nation around the world (and this did not include wealthy "non Western" countries such as Japan) decided to implement a previously unheard of doctrine known as multiculturalism. This policy had no groundswell of public support, and in most cases considerable opposition (anti immigrationist Le Pen was polling 10% in France at the time). Any one who thinks that this may have been a coincidence is either politically naïve, willfully ignorant or worse. In the interests of keeping this as brief as possible this is not a comprehensive examination of all of the flaws and likely consequences of multiculturalism but only a few of the most basic ones.

Almost all of the problems and contradictions which have arisen from this policy can be traced back to a single misconception on which the whole charade is based, namely the refusal of the supporters of this doctrine to adequately define the concept of culture itself. After all, how can you possibly debate the subject of "multiculturalism if you cannot correctly define what culture actually is?

If you have ever been to a "cultural" festival or celebration, you would most likely have found it full of exotic spicy foods, ethnic people doing lively, interesting dances and wearing unusual and brightly colored clothing etc. When we hear the term "culture," these days, this is what immediately springs to most people's minds. If this were truly all that existed beneath the term "culture," then it is quite possible (although given human nature, not necessarily certain) that a multicultural human society could exist in peace and harmony (and with great Thai restaurants open till late.)

Sadly for all of those well meaning and trusting people who have bought into this fantasy, there is an elephant sized fly sitting right in the middle of the ointment jar. You see "culture" has a much deeper meaning, one far less visible, which will never be on display at any "multicultural" festival, but one which is far more important at a more fundamental level. The word "culture," in its deepest sense, refers to the set of values which are used by a society to determine its ethics. In simpler terms, it is those things which a society, as a whole, considers to be right and wrong.

As a simple example, Hindu's consider it to be very wrong to kill a cow whereas; most Westerners enjoy a nice rump steak. Therefore India may have a law outlawing the killing of cows, whilst the UK has no such law. This has nothing to do with ethnicity or race. Pakistani's who were Hindu before being conquered by Islam will now happily eat beef. If you or I had grown up in a Hindu family in India then we would probably also consider killing a cow to be morally wrong. This is the basis of any culture, a set of shared beliefs in what constitutes right and wrong which are shared by one group but not another. This is what is meant by different cultures, i.e. they are not the same, each culture has a different concept of what constitutes right and what constitutes wrong although there is often some overlap. Now this is not to say that all westerners will agree with killing cows to eat or that no Hindus will ever have a sneaky spare rib and because of this fact, the politically correct have insisted that stereotyping people is not just wrong, but pointless. Now it's true that stereotyping cannot tell us with 100% accuracy how a person will behave, and in some circumstances can in fact have no basis in fact. It is also true however that in a statistical sense, we can make predictions with a reasonable degree of accuracy about how individuals

from different cultures will behave. For instance, if you find that someone has taken a bite out of your steak sandwich when you weren't looking and the only people who could have done it were four Hindus or a Texan named Hank then, although you can't be 100% sure it was Hank you can still probably be at least 98% sure (which is still pretty good odds.)

Now this is all fine and dandy when Indians are living in India and English people are living in England but when people of different cultures start living in one country, we run into a number of problems. I don't have intend to examine them all right now but there are a couple of fundamental flaws which have, amazingly, never had any discussion of which I am aware and this is what I would like to talk about now.

The doctrine of "multiculturalism" as opposed to "multi ethnicity," is that groups of people with different cultures will live in one society and retain their culture, rather than trying to assimilate into the culture of the host (invariably "Western") nation. The first problem with this lies in the fact that the laws which a society makes and agree to be governed by, are simply an extension of the culture of that society. This is obviously true of a democracy, but even holds true in a dictatorship to a point as even a dictator needs to retain a degree of support to hold power.

So what happens when two separate cultures live under a single set of laws? It's hard enough to make laws that suit everyone when you have a homogenous "monoculture". Unfortunately when you have a nation with more than one culture it becomes impossible. How can you keep the Hindus happy if you allow the killing of cows and yet how can you ban it without upsetting the westerners?

So what are the options in this situation?

1. Override the Hindus and upset the westerners.
2. Override the westerners and upset the Hindus.
3. Make two or more sets of laws for people depending on their particular culture.
4. Separate the two groups and put a border between them with separate rules for each.

Now the first two options are really only one, the majority overrides the minority in a democracy, although whilst there is a huge majority of one particular culture the smaller one has to "fit in" or "assimilate" into the host culture. The doctrine of "multiculturalism" however views this as wrong and as the minority increases to significant size, they will inevitably begin to assert their rights and demand either changes to the law, or else special exemptions from it for members of their community (see rule 3.) This is the route which the UK seems to be intent on going down at the moment with all sorts of special exemptions, particularly for Muslims who now have Sharia courts all over the UK. The problem with this "solution" is that it violates two of the most important principles which are the bedrock of our entire society, namely the rule of law, i.e. one law for all, and the equally important principle of equality. Without these principles, people will rapidly lose any and all respect for both the law and the government and the society becomes unviable (which seems to be the way that the UK is heading). At this point it is likely to revert to option four, reverting to separate communities with borders between them, but isn't that where we started from? All we will have achieved will be the "Balkanisation" of what were once great, prosperous and peaceful societies. I can't say for sure but it

looks like this is the ultimate goal of those who are behind the whole "multicultural" experiment. The amazing thing is that the people who are paid to (and expected to) question and debate policies such as these have all been intimidated into silence or sycophantic agreement by the threat of being branded as racists (and then being subsequently sacked and vilified for the rest of their days)

This leads us to the next and arguably most important principle which has been destroyed by multiculturalism, namely freedom of speech. One of the most successful arguments used by promoters of multicultural and indeed multiracial societies has been that anyone making opposing arguments will stir up a firestorm of racism which apparently lurks just beneath the surface of all white people (a highly racist view point in itself). Coming from a multiracial family myself I understand fully that racism is not something anyone would want to encourage, however this argument has far reaching ramifications for our entire society which have been totally ignored by the academic world but which I would like to discuss now as it is highly relevant to this whole debate. This approach, when we boil it down to its simplest form is one of breathtaking arrogance and conceit. It is saying that the Government has decided upon this policy and they are so sure that it is right that provided no one questions it, that it is 100% guaranteed to give a great result for our societies. Firstly, since there was no meaningful discussion or investigation of this subject (that I am aware of) it is hard to see where this confidence springs from. Secondly, human history tells us that when two groups have different ideas about right and wrong there will be frictions at a minimum and massacres more commonly. Though there may be examples of groups of differing culture existing in peace and harmony for an extended period of time I can't think of any off hand.

More important than the specific possible problems (however potentially disastrous) is the destruction of the freedom of speech. Before multiculturalism came along, every idea or policy put forward by the Government was subject to intense scrutiny and often even ridicule before coming into law. After its implementation, it would then be scrutinized for its effects on society and if considered unsuitable the Government would come under pressure to repeal it. This is the heart of the scientific method which is yet another pillar of our society. This springs from the principle of free speech and has advanced Western societies above all others until recently.

So now we can see the choice that lies at the heart of this debate. On the one hand we can have multiculturalism, or we can have freedom of speech, equality, the rule of law, scientific enquiry and critical thinking. These are the very principles which transformed our societies from the kind of hell holes which currently make up the majority of the "Third World" into the relative paradise to which so many of the citizens of those countries naturally wish to come to. By destroying these principles we will inevitably plunge our societies back into the chaos, poverty and instability which, ironically are the exact kind of things people of other cultures are usually trying to escape from.

Although I am running out of time I would like to touch briefly on why "our" culture is different and, I believe in many respects superior to any other of which I am aware. "Western" culture has its roots in two main sources. Firstly, the logical, scientific thinking of the ancient Greek philosophers and secondly the ethical frame work of Christianity which itself flows to a large degree from Judaism. These influences

are the framework on which the principles mentioned above are built. There is a commonly held belief that all cultures are rooted in the same ethical standards and beliefs but this is patently not true. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, it is the difference in these ethical standards which define different cultures.

So what are the ethics which set aside Christian based (ie "Western") societies from the others (please note: I am an atheist). Firstly, the basis of all Christian ethics lies in the statement made by Jesus that his followers should "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Whilst this might sound like a universal truth to anyone who has grown up in a Christian based society, it is not. This statement is the basis for the idea of equality for all and when we look at other societies we see that they do not have this principle. Let us start with Judaism which is the closest we have to Christianity. Jews believe that they are Gods chosen race. With such a distinction it is hard to see how Jews would be expected to rally for equality for Gentiles and Jews although Israel is a fairly close approximation of a liberal democratic society. In comparison, Hindu society is far worse with Hindu's themselves split into "castes" at birth, meaning that Hindus have no commitment to the principle of equality at all. In Islam, the situation is far worse with severe inequality hardwired into the religion for women, slaves (slavery is not only permissible in Islam but actually considered advantageous) and particularly Kaffirs (the Arabic word for infidel) who are the most hated of all Allah's creatures. Sharia Law, which a majority of Muslims aspire to (even in Western countries according to polls) is in fact highly discriminatory. Women's testimony is only given half the importance of a man's and Kaffirs are unable to testify against Muslims at all. Another key difference between Christianity and the rest is in its commitment to the truth. The Ten Commandments tell us to "not bear false witness against our neighbor" (ie tell the truth) and the gospels tell of Jesus telling Peter he would deny knowing him three times. This led to Peter feeling great shame at having lied, even though it saved his life. The message in the bible is an unequivocal commitment to the truth even when it runs contrary to your own personal interests and incentivizes this behavior by offering heavenly reward/eternal damnation in the afterlife.

In contrast, no other religion I am aware of has this commitment to telling the truth. Islam in particular actively encourages it's adherents to deceive and confuse Kaffirs, especially when attempting to advance Islam. There are even Arabic words (Taquiya and Kitman) to describe these religiously sanctioned lies.

With a superior commitment to truthfulness you would expect this to show up in lower levels of official corruption in Christian based societies. In fact we do find this to be the case with Western countries scoring highly in tables such as those prepared by Transparency International which measure a broad level of corruption in different countries. As expected Islamic countries are amongst the worst performers in these tables.

I could go on and on but even with this short and simple analysis we can clearly see that multiculturalism is a disaster for our society. The only reason that this is not more glaringly apparent is the voluntary destruction of freedom of speech by our elites through the Orwellian doctrine of so called "Political correctness". It is simply no longer possible (and hasn't been for many years) to make these simple common sense arguments without being shouted down and vilified

as an evil racist despite the fact that race has no part in this debate. Finally however the consequences are becoming so bad that people are finally beginning to figure out what the government elites have been desperately trying to conceal all these years. There are far more aspects to this debate but until people are allowed to participate in a free and well informed discussion, there is little chance of the meaningful change which is so badly needed to save our society from the disaster which awaits in the not so distant future.
Regards,