

The Menace of Multiculturalism

Cameron McKenzie

December 1997

CREATING NATIONAL DISUNITY

Multiculturalism is an unsound political theory, advocated by liberals, academics, media personnel, social theorists, government officials, and politicians. While it is supported by a majority of those people, it is actually opposed by the overall majority of Australians.

It is a deliberate policy to actively maintain, support and **build**(1) foreign cultures in Australia, to the direct detriment of the Australian identity, culture and way of life.

Instead of allowing immigrants, and their native-born offspring, to naturally assimilate into the Australian culture, governments are knowingly creating bases of foreign culture in this country. These deliberately divisive policies are carried out in two areas.

First, through the multicultural policies themselves, whereby foreign cultures are sustained and encouraged. Large sums of money are granted to "ethnic" organisations, which boosts the abilities of such organisations to service and **perpetuate** their "ethnic culture". In schools, multicultural policies are actively pursued, whereby children are encouraged to identify with their "ethnicity", rather than to become "fully" Australian. Many, if not all, aspects of public life are touched in a myriad of ways by official multicultural policies, all of which actually encourage a "them and us" attitude between "new Australians" and "old Australians".

Secondly, immigration policies are based upon continuing mass immigration, which gives foreign cultures in Australia the ability to self-sustain their separate development.

These deliberately divisive policies are turning Australians against each other, and are creating a country populated by a collection of separate communities, instead of a nation populated by a nationally unified society.

Multicultural Australia has thus become a breeding ground for a whole range of "micro-nations", each with their own political and cultural agendas. Indeed, Geoffrey Blainey has warned that "multiculturalism ... is a new form of colonialism, in which we are the colony of every nation on earth".(2) As Australia struggles to encompass the many little Chinas, little Japans, little Italys, and little Croatias, all determined to preserve their own national, cultural and ethnic peculiarities (including not only "lovely" dancing and foods, but sometimes strange, if not barbaric, customs; as well as some extremely strong ethnic hatreds), it is very easy to see the disunity created among these ethnic communities; as well as between them and those who see themselves as "Australians", foremost loyal to Australia.

Large-scale immigration programmes run the risk that ethnic enclaves will develop, a risk that is heightened by multicultural policies which give immigrants "little incentive to learn English and become socially and economically integrated with those outside their group". Such ethnic ghettos can provide a stimulus to the creation of "ethnic gangs that prey on their own community". Another dark side of this situation is that such enclaves "provide ideal bases for groups to engage in politically motivated violence. Indeed, the conflict over the former Yugoslavia has in Australia resulted in several incidents, including 11 unsolved fire bombings". The ethnic and political rivalry

witnessed between the Greek and Macedonian communities in Australia involved "a demonstration outside Parliament House by 60,000 Greeks, a brawl at a soccer match and firebombings and vandalism", but such incidents are minor - compared with the potential for widespread inter-ethnic rivalry and violence. Such a situation is indicative of what multiculturalism can bring about.(3)

As Professor Blainey has stated: "Recent governments emphasize the merits of a multicultural society and ignore the dangers. And yet the evidence is clear that many multicultural societies have failed and that the human cost of the failure has been high. Many of our refugees actually come from multicultural societies that are faltering or in disarray". Also, Professor Loring Danforth has admitted that "Ironically, Australia's own commitment to multiculturalism may also encourage immigrants to involve themselves in the national conflicts of their homelands. This policy of multiculturalism ... defines people in ethnic categories and makes it possible for them to maintain their identities as Italians, Greeks, or Macedonians. Multiculturalism, with its emphasis on community languages and ethnic media, promotes the development of these ethnic identities and impedes the development of a strong Australian national identity."(4)

We do not need a crystal ball to see where multiculturalism will lead us. The future will bring a vast amount of inter-ethnic rivalry and resultant clashes, even leading to race riots reminiscent of those clashes in the UK and USA. Australia faces the spectre of being another disunified "multicultural" society like Sri Lanka, South Africa, Northern Ireland, Lebanon, the former Yugoslavia, Fiji, etc.; not to mention the USA and the UK, with their continually strained communities, and occasional race riots. The prospects of such a disunified nation are appalling.

QUESTIONABLE LOYALTIES

Disunity will also be shown in a lack of loyalty and patriotism, where ethnic groups owe allegiance to the country of their ethnic background, rather than to Australia. There are many examples of this question of multicultural allegiances, for instance, when Italy won the international soccer World Cup in July 1982, thousands took part in a huge celebration in the heart of Carlton (a suburb in Melbourne, Victoria, which for many years has been a strong base for ethnic Italians). This did not happen in Carlton when other countries won the World Cup in previous years; it was not a celebration for whomever would win the Cup: it was an Italian victory celebration; it was not a celebration by Italian tourists either, it was a celebration by ethnic Italians of multicultural Australia.(5)

When there was a furore in February 1994 over whether or not to recognise the name of the new Republic of Macedonia, 60,000 people took to the streets of Melbourne to demonstrate in support of Greece (the matter being in dispute because Greece contains an area already named Macedonia) and to demand the non-recognition of the name of the new Republic. These were not Greek tourists, who could be expected to owe allegiance to Greece, but were ethnic Greeks of multicultural Australia.(6)

In 1997 the British government "handed over Hong Kong" to China. This event was celebrated by thousands of ethnic Chinese in Australia. The celebration involved mixed feelings, because although Hong Kong was being returned to its motherland, it was being put under communist domination. It could only be assumed that if China was no longer under communist rule, and Hong Kong was being joined to China, that the ethnic Chinese of multicultural Australia would be celebrating in their droves. So, how is such "Chinese patriotic fervour" explained, unless these people are "Aussies of convenience", and actually owe their allegiance to their ethnic homeland, not Australia?(7)

Such questionable loyalties are inevitable in such a situation where the Australian establishment actually encourage immigrants (and their offspring) to be "ethnics", rather than Australians. This is reflected in the low take-up rate of Australian citizenship (as found by the FitzGerald Committee of Inquiry), as well as the retention of "dual nationality" by many of these "new citizens". Of special concern are those immigrants who maintain "a close interest in the problems of their former countries", especially where such interest involves close links with foreign governments.(8)

There will be times when the interests of Australia will clash with the interests of other countries, whether it be in the fields of trade, politics, or even in that rare danger of war. When that time comes, when Australian multicultural ethnics have to choose between Australia and their country of ethnicity, many will find it easy to make their decision, and Australia will be the loser. Multiculturalism can therefore be justly seen as a threat to our national security.(9)

ASSIMILATION, THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY, AND THE MULTICULTURALIST LOBBIES

Multiculturalists oppose the idea of assimilation (whereby immigrants would be encouraged to become Australian) as they want immigrants to retain their own cultures and pass those cultures onto successive generations. While it is understandable that immigrants would have an attachment to their place of birth and native culture, assimilation does not demand that immigrants should forget their origins; but asks that they, and their offspring, become part of Australia and adapt to the Australian culture and way of life; rather than give impetus to ghettos and ethnic divisions within the country.

Multiculturalism, however, demands that immigrants remain attached to their place of birth and native culture. In fact, this demand even extends to the offspring of immigrants: people born in Australia, of immigrant parentage, are told not to join "mainstream" Australian culture, but to become multicultural "ethnics".

Multiculturalism is a political policy to actively encourage the strengthening, building, and promotion of separate cultural units within Australia. **Multiculturalism is a political device to discourage immigrants, and their offspring, from becoming Australians.**

The aim of internationalist-thinking liberals, academics, and "lefties" is - in effect - to destroy the Australian national and cultural identity. This "aim" is not the design of some well-organised conspiracy, but is rather the "logical" outcome of the thought-processes of liberal-internationalists, whose actions will cause such devastation; however, since these "trendies" are, or should be, well aware of the effects their policies will have on our national culture, their actions can only be regarded as deliberate. This intended destruction of the Australian identity is being carried out by a two pronged attack:

Firstly, the Australian identity is denied. Many academics, trendies and "lefties" maintain that Australia does not have its own national and cultural identity. They argue that Australian culture is either "British", or a multicultural mish-mash; they tell us that Australia has no culture of its own.

Ignored are the poets like Henry Lawson, Banjo Paterson, Rex Ingamells, and Mary Gilmore; painters like Arthur Streeton, Frederick McCubbin, Sydney Nolan, and Russell Drysdale; architecture such as the Federation style; music from Waltzing Matilda, to the Seekers, to the

Bushwhackers, to Skyhooks; our heroes and heroines, for instance, Ned Kelly, Nellie Melba, Don Bradman, the ANZACs, and the men of the Kokoda Track; the Australian way of life, including the bush barbeque, Australian Rules Football, and games of Two-Up; Australian icons such as Vegemite, Goanna Oil, Hills Hoists, and Akubra hats; our entertainers and characters like Ginger Meggs, Chips Rafferty, Paul Hogan, Dame Edna Everage and Sir Les Patterson; our distinctive language, accent, and colloquialisms; the Australian character, styled as easy-going, fair and democratic, having a healthy disrespect for authority, and with a laconic humour; all shaped and influenced by the distinctive Australian landscape and our unique history.(10)

Secondly, the destruction of our identity is being carried out by multiculturalism itself. From politicians and academics comes the cry "we are all ethnics", no-one is an actual Australian - everyone is an "ethnic". The origin of your parents or forebears dictates what type of "ethnic" you are: if you have English parents then you're an English "ethnic", if you have Irish parents then you're an Irish "ethnic", German parentage produces a German "ethnic", and so on. If one parent is French, and the other Russian, then it could be assumed that you have to pick just one ethnicity, or perhaps you could become a multicultural schizophrenic? Australia's culture is being undermined by the effects of the continual push for multiculturalism (especially in our educational institutions); we are now being taught to see ourselves as "ethnics", rather than Australians, and this cannot help but to adversely affect our national cultural output and development.

The aim of this two-pronged attack is simple: no more Australians! Everyone becomes an "ethnic"; and the Australian identity and culture becomes treated as worthless and second-class, or gets twisted around to take on a multicultural slant. This destructive "aim" is the consequence of the actions of liberalistic internationalists of various shades; and, even if such destruction is not their actual intent, their ideology certainly manifests itself as an assault on our national well-being.(11)

As Loring M. Danforth, a Professor of Anthropology, has stated, "Multiculturalism, with its emphasis on community languages and ethnic media, promotes the development of these ethnic identities and impedes the development of a strong Australian national identity."(12) However, rather than being just an impediment, the long term results are actually destructive of the Australian national identity.

If this attack on Australia's heritage was being carried out by liberals, academics, and "lefties" only in their capacity as private individuals or groups, then we would not have too much to worry about as they are a minority opinion on the subject. But this is not how these people operate. They lobby and push their ideas through academia, the media, and the political machines; their ideas are then shoved into official acceptance, until they finally become "official policy". Once the "official policy" stage is reached, these lobbyists go into "overdrive"; "official policy" becomes the rationale to enable them to force their ideas onto the community: the public service is retrained and restructured to accommodate the new ideas; a veritable public service "industry" is created to build, promote, and propagate their ideology, encroaching as far as possible into other public service areas, as well as into private enterprise, and even affecting private individuals, becoming a self-serving, self-sustaining industry hell-bent on pushing its new ideology and justifying itself (they begin to wonder how we ever got along without them). In tandem with all this is the creation of new laws (enacted by self-serving politicians, assisted by the new "Multicultural Industry" and their allies) which sets up the new ideology as "right" and "respectable", whilst painting any opposing views as "wrong", "unworthy" and, in certain circumstances, "illegal". The new policy has now become "politically correct"; and with the media, academia, and the parliamentary political parties being full of small "I" liberals, the public receives the impression that such views are not only "correct", but are held by the majority of the people (when, in fact, these ideas are held only by the majority of journalists, academics, and politicians). In such a climate, it then becomes "politically incorrect" to hold opposing views, with active opponents being effectively labelled as cranks, if not downright criminals ("racial vilification" laws will see some opponents

jailed and/or scared off). Opponents in prominent positions are harassed; while those in the public service, self-employment, or any other assailable position, stand to lose their job or livelihood if they speak out.

The most serious aspect of all this is that of education. It is during the formative years of our young children that they are heavily indoctrinated by the education system into believing in multiculturalism (such indoctrination being made by both subtle means and overt means). No opposing viewpoints are given any credible airing (if given any "airing" at all), and multiculturalism is presented as a fact, rather than as a particular biased political viewpoint. As in the days of Galileo Galilei, our school children now believe that "the sun revolves around the earth", and that it is "dangerous heresy" to believe otherwise; in our modern context, that "multiculturalism is good for us", and that to oppose it is "dangerous" and "wrong", perhaps even "illegal".

The ultimate aim of the internationalist liberals is to destroy the Australian national and cultural identity (whether this aim be deliberate or incidental). The general idea is that Australia will have no national identity of its own; that all of the population will be "ethnics" who owe their cultural allegiance to cultures all over the world; creating a situation where, en masse, the people will be loyal to all nations and, paradoxically, will therefore be collectively loyal to none; that Australia will become an internationalist state (maybe even a building block, or a springboard, for an internationalist world). It would seem that Australia has become a multiculturalist experiment, as the place to create the United Nations' vision of the "brown man": a human creature belonging to no identifiable race, nation, or culture; the new citizen of the cosmopolitan internationalist multicultural world.

That most, if not all, multiculturalists are actually internationalists is beyond doubt. As an example, the government-sponsored document, *Australia as a Multicultural Society*, saw fit to propagate the belief that Australia's interests may have to be overridden by so-called international interests: "we also wish to emphasise that questions of immigration policy (like many other questions) are embedded in a much wider concept of social cohesion than this: namely, the 'social good' of humanity as a whole. From this point of view, Australia may be a sectional group in a wider international system and the good of the wider system **may override the well-being of Australia** considered in isolation" (emphasis added).(13)

What began as a trendy liberalistic idea, and was picked up and carried along as a "migrant vote winner" for politicians, has become a huge menace to Australia's society and culture.

THE ORIGIN OF "THE CULT OF ETHNICITY" (MULTICULTURALISM)

The birth of the concept of multiculturalism can be traced back to the writings of Horace Kallen, who advocated a policy of "cultural pluralism". Kallen, a German-born Jewish-American philosopher, first published his ideas in 1915. He attacked assimilation and the melting-pot theory, and instead proposed that America should become a "commonwealth of... nationalities". Ignoring the potential threats to the ideal of a unified society, Kallen encouraged a philosophy of ethnic separatism, despite warnings that cultural pluralism would "result in the Balkanisation of the United States".(14)

In his critique of the "cult of ethnicity", *The Disuniting of America*, Arthur Schlesinger relates how "The gospel of cultural pluralism was at first largely confined to academics, intellectuals, and artists" but that, after the Second World War "The civil rights revolution provoked new expressions

of ethnic identity by the now long-resident 'new migration' from southern and eastern Europe". He notes that the pressure for the new cult of ethnicity came not from the ethnic minorities en masse (who saw themselves as Americans), but "from their often self-appointed spokesmen". Schlesinger says that the ethnic upsurge "began as a gesture of protest against the Anglocentric culture", but became a "cult", and now threatens the unity of America.(15)

The fatally flawed concept of cultural pluralism eventually took hold in other countries. The term "multiculturalism" was coined in Canada in the 1960s, and was used by the Trudeau Government to try to promote harmony between the predominant French-Canadian and British-Canadian cultures, as well as with the various minority cultures.(16)

Largely made possible by "nearly three decades of large-scale heterogeneous immigration", the ideology of multiculturalism took root in Australia during the late 1960s, where it became the rallying cry of various academics, liberals, and "lefties". One of the prime movers of this "cult of ethnicity" was the Polish-born Professor Jerzy Zubrzycki, who has been described as the "architect of multiculturalism in Australia". Of Zubrzycki, it was reported that "He was one of the first Australian academics in the late 1960s to put forward multiculturalism as an alternative to the then social policy of assimilation. He says nobody took the proposal seriously until 1973, when he pursued the policy as chairman of the Social Issues Committee of the Immigration Advisory Council to the Whitlam Government. The committee argued Australia had to move towards a recognition of cultural pluralism". Later, as Chairman of the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, and then as Chairman of the Ethnic Affairs Task Force, he had a guiding hand in presenting two "landmark" reports to Malcolm Fraser's Liberal Government: *Australia as a Multicultural Society* (1977) and *Multiculturalism for all Australians* (1982). It has been said that the commitment of successive governments to the multicultural ideal was due "thanks principally to Jerzy Zubrzycki".(17)

However, the rise of multiculturalism in Australia was due to the operations and lobbying of an entire movement and network of people (many now part of the "Multicultural Industry") who pushed for the adoption of multiculturalism as official government policy. James Jupp has admitted that "There is, then, no doubt that a small, mainly politically-involved minority ushered in multiculturalism as public policy". Zubrzycki claimed that "the major breakthrough" came in 1972 when Jean Martin (who largely wrote the 1977 report) gave her Meredith Memorial Lecture on the subject, followed by Grassby's "much publicised address" on multiculturalism in 1973. Indeed, "Australia's public debate about 'multiculturalism' really developed during 1973 with the then Minister of Immigration, Al Grassby".(18)

The advent of the Whitlam Labor Government (December 1972 to November 1975) was the vehicle via which multiculturalism "exploded onto the political scene". It was Grassby who, with the backing of the new government, pushed multiculturalism as far as it could go. It was a concept popular with the liberalistic academia and "migrant intellectuals ... [who] found the idea of multiculturalism attractive". Not only was the concept "a popular idea with the new intelligentsia, but more important, it had clearly struck a responsive chord with many immigrant communities, particularly those from southern Europe".(19)

Multiculturalism was one of the few Whitlam programmes not jettisoned by Malcolm Fraser's incoming Liberal Government in 1975. Voting patterns had by then emerged which showed that "while voters from northern Europe had a similar voting pattern to the Australian-born and the eastern Europeans tended to support the conservative parties, southern Europeans were supporting the ALP". The Fraser government decided that a "commitment to multiculturalism ... could offer something to the southern European electorate". Support for multiculturalism came to be seen as a way of "buying the ethnic vote". As part of this political strategy, "Organised ethnic groups were recognised, funded and listened to. Politicians hoped that sections of the electorate

could be reached if ethnic leaders were cultivated, and cultivation and funding helped to strengthen the position of ethnic leaders". Indeed, in 1976, the then Minister for Immigration, Michael MacKellar, admitted "that his Government intended to pursue multicultural policies because the Liberal/National Country Party coalition appeared to be unpopular with migrant voters".(20)

Raymond Sestito has revealed the vote-chasing nature of multiculturalism; how the political parties introduced such policies, not "responding to organised pressure but rather as the initiators of the new policy". He explained that "By the early seventies a great deal of Italian and Greek migrants who had arrived from the mid-1950s onwards had become citizens and so gained the vote. Between January 1965 and June 1979, 188,640 Italians and 150,208 Greeks were granted Australian citizenship. This was too large a group of votes to be ignored by the major political parties. The migrant vote would become especially important to the Victorian ALP since there was a heavy concentration of Greek and Italian votes in the inner suburban area of Melbourne; attracting the migrant vote would be a way of keeping these seats ... Multiculturalism is so appealing to the parties because there are votes to be gained by promoting it. In this case we can say that Australia's political parties have been the initiators of multiculturalism, rather than responding to group pressure."(21)

Sestito further explained the political dilemma of multiculturalism: "Once an issue is established, the bargaining process begins. This is where the parties are caught in a political bind. Once they have articulated the needs of groups, then it becomes hard for them to pull back. Groups which were previously unorganised become stronger and make increasing demands which the parties cannot ignore if they are to gain their vote. Political parties become locked into a situation where one tries to outbid the other in the promises each makes. Thus while in the 1960s one would be mistaken in thinking that migrants hardly existed, we now have a situation where parties compete to see who can promise the most to migrants."(22)

"The first move to buy into the ethnic vote was made by the Federal ALP Government and its Minister for Immigration, Mr Al Grassby", whereby Whitlam's ALP Government (1972-1975) set up various migrant and ethnic services and infrastructures. "If the ALP was first off the mark, the Federal LCP coalition [Liberal Party and the Country Party] was quick to follow. In August of 1975 the coalition issued a detailed policy on immigration and ethnic affairs which was not only an extension of the ALP policy, but was radically different from previous coalition policies in this field. Introducing the policy, the shadow Minister for Immigration, Mr Michael MacKellar, said he 'did not believe that Gough [Whitlam] had the migrant vote all tied up' ... Whereas in the 1960s there was a bi-partisan policy of ethnic assimilation and integration, it seems that multiculturalism has now become the policy of both major parties."(23)

Thus, multiculturalism came to be "endorsed in various ways in the policy statements of both major political parties", due to political agitation, misguided idealism, ethnic lobbying, and especially because of political dishonesty and "vote-grabbing".(24)

It is interesting to note the results of a 1994 survey of voting support, by voters' country of birth: (25)

Voter support (% by country of birth):

	Total	Australia	Greece	Italy	Other Europe	Asia	New Zealand	North America
Other								
Aust. Labor Party 51	41	40	52	61	44.5	60.5	33.5	28.5
Liberal-National 31	45	46	36.5	33	44.5	33	52	54.5
Democrats 8.5	6	6	1.5	4	5	1.5	5	5
Green 5	3.5	3.5	3.5	1.5	2	2	4	7
Independent/Other 4.5	4.5	4.5	6.5	0.5	4	3	5.5	5

This Time Morgan survey was based on face-to -face interviews with 14,712 electors throughout Australia, January 1994 to mid-April 1994.

In light of information given in the preceding paragraphs, it would be interesting to see this survey with Europe broken up into North, East, West, and South.

A MOVING TARGET: THE SLIPPERY IDEOLOGY

Multiculturalism is a slippery ideology, in that there is a myriad of variations to the concept. This wealth of definitions is actually a great advantage to the supporters of multiculturalism, as it is easy for them to deflect any attacks upon their viewpoint, by saying "Oh no, that's not the kind of multiculturalism that I'm talking about"; they can swap, merge, and confuse definitions, and therefore dodge valid arguments by avoiding "being pinned down" to one definition. Various commentators have spoken on the issue of the various definitions of multiculturalism:(26)

Lois Foster and David Stockley, in their study of the multicultural concept, talk of "the various ideologies of multiculturalism which have competed for official acceptance and dominance in Australia", and have said that "there has been a growing body of theoretical criticism of the ambiguity and confusion surrounding the use of the term `multiculturalism'."

An Ethnic Affairs Council report admitted that "There are many kinds of multiculturalism and some are grossly incompatible with Australia's political and social system."

Dr. Franco Schiavoni (of the Victorian Ethnic Affairs Commission) said that "In the Australian context the term `multiculturalism' has been used to refer to a variety of policies and theoretical perspectives".

Dr. Ralph Pervan (then Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission of WA) prophesied that "in the 21st Century ... we will still be debating the meaning of multiculturalism."

Paolo Totaro (of the Ethnic Affairs Commission of NSW) said "Multiculturalism - notwithstanding the widespread use of the word - is still a very imprecise, albeit very useful concept."

The Ethnic Affairs Task Force has told us that "the concept of multiculturalism has lacked precise formulation and wide public acceptance."

As Professor Lauchlan Chipman said, "years ago when the term 'multi-cultural' had not been long in vogue, I was inclined to dismiss multiculturalism as, at best, an irritatingly muddled way of trying to represent the whole range of life-styles to be found among Australian residents ... In terms of the spectrum to which I earlier referred, ranging from Millian liberal pluralism ('soft' multi-culturalism) through to anti-assimilationism, ethnic separatism, and non-hierarchical apartheid ('hard' multi-culturalism), I was inclined to interpret it at the soft end. Today it is clear that advocates of multi-culturalism are operating in the middle and harder divisions of the spectrum; the soft end - which has no essential connection, in origin or in justification, with ethnicity - is reserved simply for astounding the shallower critics who, in expressing doubts about multi-culturalism, are made to look like racists, or illiberal and intolerant bigots. Fast footwork through the spectrum is frequently necessary in debates with multi-culturalists."

In summing up this "trendy" ideology, Chipman was later to describe multiculturalism as an "intellectually degenerate and practically corrupt social philosophy".

Government officials, and other multiculturalists, have even been apparently contradictory as to whether Australia actually is multicultural (supposedly) or not.

On some occasions, we're told that Australia **isn't** multicultural:(27)

"The major recurring themes of the position most clearly associated with the Fraser government can be summarized as: 1) Multiculturalism was an attitude to be encouraged, not a present reality ..." (This says that we're not multicultural).

"Australia has been developing towards a multicultural society for nearly 200 years". Prime Minister Bob Hawke, 1984. ("Developing towards" infers that we're not multicultural).

"... the widely shared goal of a multicultural Australia". Dr. Andrew Theophanous, MHR for Burke, 1982. ("Goal" infers that we're not multicultural).

"Thanks to migration our Australia today is a multicultural nation in the making." Bishop of Bathurst, A.E. Thomas, 1978. ("In the making" infers that we're not multicultural).

"Government assistance is a necessary factor in achieving a multicultural society." Ethnic Affairs Task Force, 1982. ("Achieving" infers that we're not multicultural).

On other occasions, we're told that Australia **is** multicultural:(28)

"Australia has been multicultural in nature throughout its history, both before and after European colonization". The New South Wales Department of Education's Multicultural Education Policy, 1983.

"The crux of our argument is that Australia is already a society of multiple cultural identities, or a multicultural society". The Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, 1977.

"In a descriptive sense multicultural is simply a term which describes the cultural and ethnic diversity of contemporary Australia. We are, and will remain, a multicultural society. As a public policy multiculturalism encompasses government measures designed to respond to that diversity. It plays no part in migrant selection. It is a policy for managing the consequences of cultural diversity in the interests of the individual and society as a whole." Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989.

"In a descriptive sense Australia is likely to remain multicultural well into the twenty-first century." Office of Multicultural Affairs. 1988.

The apparent contradiction lies in the use of two differing assertions of multiculturalism. First, that of Descriptive Multiculturalism, whereby a claim is made "about the pluralistic nature of society" (i.e. that Australia consists of many different cultures). Secondly, that of Prescriptive Multiculturalism, whereby an assertion is made "about an ideal type of society to be achieved some time in the future." The way that many multiculturalists can so easily swap between these two differing assertions of their ideology can make their arguments "as slippery as an eel" to pin down. As has been noted by Anne Seitz, "The descriptive and prescriptive definitions of multiculturalism are seldom used consistently and accurately. Very often there is a confusion or a 'sliding' between the two concepts. Frequently this 'slippage' is deliberate -- a convenient tactic to confuse the issue under debate."(29)

As another example of the selective use of the term; it could be asked why some other "multi-ethnic" societies are not normally (if ever) called "multicultural" (even in the "descriptive sense"). For example, Fiji, the former Yugoslavia, Northern Ireland, Lebanon, and Sri Lanka; let alone apartheid-era South Africa. The truth is, multiculturalists use the term as it happens to suit them at the time.

The effects of the introduction of multiculturalism into Australia have been enormous, with the results being mostly divisive and destructive. In 1989, in what amounted to an expensive attempt to rehabilitate the general public's view of "multiculturalism", the government produced a widely-publicised document: *The National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia*. This was the government's opportunity to give its version of multiculturalism. However, to believe a pro-multicultural government's public definition of multiculturalism would be as naive as believing Joseph Stalin's public definition of communism, or Adolf Hitler's public definition of nazism: their explanation would be a "whitewash", avoiding the real disadvantages and negatives inherent in the system, and ignoring the "reality" of their ideology (i.e. **what it means in the "real world"**). **The introduction of multiculturalism in the 1970s has given a "concrete" impetus to, and a "moral" justification for, a wide range of pro-ethnic machinations and anti-Australian practices** from those multiculturalists in government, the public service, various institutions, the education system, and in general (whether such practices arose from ideology, group "needs", or self-interest is immaterial).(30)

So, what is this ideology called "multiculturalism" **really** all about?

WHAT IS MULTICULTURALISM?

The defining of multiculturalism can be fraught with difficulty, as there are several aspects to this ideology, as well as a myriad of views and perceptions concerning it. Even the advocates of this policy talk of the "different concepts of multiculturalism" and admit to "difficulties in defining ... 'multiculturalism'".(31)

However, upon investigation, it can be seen that there are four basic aspects to multiculturalism:

- 1) Demographic Multiculturalism
- 2) Prescriptive Multiculturalism
- 3) Holistic Multiculturalism
- 4) Political Multiculturalism

As each of these aspects are interrelated, it is therefore necessary that each of these four strands should be looked at, to understand the overall ideology.(32)

1. Demographic Multiculturalism.

Also known as Descriptive Multiculturalism; this is an assertion that because a society has people from different backgrounds that therefore such a society, as a whole, should be described as multicultural; applicable whether that society be a nation, a city, or even a small town.

On the surface, there would seem to be little to disagree with in this concept. However, there are two angles to be considered.:

Firstly, to look at it as a matter of scale, or of proportion. For instance, if a single German, and a single Russian were to take up residence in a far flung, isolated, culturally homogeneous village in China, does that village automatically become multicultural? Of course, one could become pedantic and say that as that village now contains people of several cultural backgrounds, that the village has now become "multicultural". It could then be said that everywhere in the world is "multicultural" as in every place you will usually find someone who belongs to a different culture, whether it is a national culture, a regional culture, or even the "culture" of a different family. The whole concept becomes nonsensical. Or, if it is a matter of scale, at what stage does a society become "multicultural"?

Secondly, to look at it as a matter of cultural commitment. For example: Should Norway be considered a "Norwegian" country; or should it, by reason of recent migration, be considered a "multicultural" country? If one is granted the privilege of migrating to Norway (and it is a privilege, not a "right"; as no-one has the "right" to migrate to a foreign country), shouldn't one make a commitment to learning the Norwegian language and adapting to the Norwegian culture? Or does one say "Well, I'm here now, your country had better start adapting to suit **me**"?

The point is, if a nation has a mainstream or predominant culture, that "culture" can be a matter of commitment: from the nation to the immigrant, and from the immigrant to the nation. When immigrants, and their second and third generations, become part of a nation and its culture, demographic statistics of "ethnic background" lose their relevance. Cultural divisiveness (multiculturalism) arises when home-grown agitators (academics, liberals, "lefties", etc.) and self-appointed migrant "representatives" ("Well, I'm here now, your country had better start adapting to suit **me**") become active in the pursuit of their own political and social agendas.

Therefore it can be seen that a country which houses a minority of people from different cultural backgrounds (i.e. "ethnic minorities"), and a "multicultural country", are not the same thing. The difference lies in Political Multiculturalism (defined later in this section).

2. Prescriptive Multiculturalism

This is the aspect most commonly, and often deliberately, confused with Demographic Multiculturalism; that is, to confuse a descriptive phrase (a demographic "what is") with a prescriptive phrase (an idealistic "what should be"). Prescriptive Multiculturalism is the aspect of the ideology which provides "prescriptive assertions about an ideal type of society to be achieved some time in the future", hence the multiculturalist's talk of "Australia is not yet a multicultural society", or their yearning to create "a truly multicultural society".(33)

Petro Georgiou (then Director of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs) believes that "Multiculturalism in essence symbolises a determination to secure the rights of individuals of all ethnic backgrounds to equal access to programs and services - to economic, social and political opportunities, and - to tolerance and understanding of diversity". Others have claimed "that a truly multicultural society would make provision for the use of all languages in everyday affairs, including official transactions".(34)

As Lorna Lippman commented, "To contend that Australia is a multicultural society is a dubious proposition, since this would assume that the different ethnic groups are (according to the Commonwealth Education Portfolio definition) "equal in their access to resources, services and political power" and this, though it may be a social ideal, is not a reality in Australia today."(35)

Professor Jerzy Zubrzycki has laid down the "three aims of multiculturalism", namely "ethnic cultural identity", "a more socially cohesive nation", and "equal access to social resources"; this opinion being echoed by the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council's 1977 report, *Australia as a Multicultural Society*. In reinforcement, John Menadue (then Secretary of the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs) said "These principles of cultural identity, social cohesion and equal opportunity have become generally accepted as pre-requisites for a multicultural society."(36)

Brian Bullivant relates how these three "aims" have "dominated official statements" about multiculturalism, to which he says is sometimes added a fourth, "equal responsibility for, commitment to and participation in society" (an addition which has been supported by the Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs), the exact meaning of which he has called "obscure"; although, nonetheless, multiculturalism's supporters hope "that a multicultural Australia will achieve all these features and more". Bullivant then adds that "It is at this point that anyone with a sense of history and philosophy must begin to doubt the rhetoric of multiculturalism. Can it really be that the Australian version will solve the pluralist dilemma that has resisted resolution by philosophers and politicians for centuries; will the multicultural golden age dawn over antipodean skies?". Faced with such "romantic" multiculturalism, Bullivant says that even "Jean Martin, the late doyenne of Australian sociologists, has put an opposing view based on a more accurate sense of history that such assumptions 'defy the weight of historical experience'".(37)

Prescriptive Multiculturalism can be seen to be a "fairy tale" that supporters can easily cite as an argument for multiculturalism as, being an "Utopian" ideal, it cannot be immediately disproved; yet it is often used to support (and supposedly prove???) the multiculturalist ideology. In fact, like all other aspects of multiculturalism, upon a closer examination, it actually proves to be dangerous and divisive in its implementation.

3. Holistic Multiculturalism

This stresses the idea of cultural pluralism: that the maintenance of many, or "plural", cultures housed within a nation's "ethnic groups" is valuable, both to the ethnic group (to the ethnic group itself, as well as to its individuals) and to the host nation (as a whole). It says that the nation should

value such cultural diversity; although these cultures should co-exist "within an overall framework of unity" (paradoxically, this "framework" is usually that of the predominant culture). This is how multiculturalism is usually portrayed in the "current" or "operative" sense; indeed, it has been said that "Multiculturalism has come to be a shorthand term for a form of cultural pluralism.".(38)

Cultural pluralism is said to be "a mode of living which enables everyone to maintain his or her culture or whatever segments of it they may desire, without prejudice or disadvantage". Of course, the practical difficulties of such a theory are enormous, considering the many "weird and wonderful" cultural practices that exist around the world, many of which would not be welcome in a "Westernised" society.(39)

Closely linked to the idea of cultural pluralism is that of cultural relativism, i.e. "that each culture is of equal value, and should not be judged from the cultural perspective of others". Again, in a practical sense, this concept is so ridiculous that it can only be considered an exercise in futility.(40)

Also, it has been noted that "the full expression and the maintenance of cultural pluralism would need to be supported through and by ethnic-specific structures -- that is, by structural pluralism."(41)

But, like Demographic Multiculturalism, Holistic Multiculturalism is irrelevant without the mechanics of Political Multiculturalism.

4. Political Multiculturalism

This is the **active promotion** of cultural pluralism, so that rather than encouraging migrants to adapt to the national culture, or even leaving them to their own devices, the government will deliberately encourage migrants (and their offspring) to remain within society as separate "ethnic" groups. It actually opposes the assimilation of immigrants into the nation's culture.

In the normal course of events, immigrants would've been able to adapt to the national culture, and their children and grandchildren could become fully part of the nation's mainstream culture. Instead, all of these people are now being told not to adapt, but to retain a separate identity from that of host nation, thus ensuring divisiveness.

An important tactic employed in this process, related to cultural pluralism, is that of structural pluralism whereby it is believed that "rather than leaving migrants to engage in their own cultural practices or not, as they please, Governments should actually encourage migrant groups, by explicit funding and other policies, to maintain their own institutions, their own kind of ... languages, news media, clubs, societies, schools, sporting and other recreational groups, and, possibly, economic institutions like shops and professional services. This should be done, not to help provide a stepping stone into the wider society, but because it is a good thing in its own right and an end in itself". It is this "trend to institutionalise cultural distinctiveness through organisations" that enables the government to artificially "enable all cultures brought to Australia by migrants to be maintained and developed". As one commentator noted, "In its extreme form, structural pluralism entails an apartheid-like separatism and carries the potential for dividing rather than unifying society."(42)

An integral part of political multiculturalism is for the government, and other pro-multiculturalists, to force their views upon the entire population, thus making it the "official ideology" of Australia. For their purposes, it is seen as imperative that multiculturalist ideas are forced upon children in

their formative years, so as to shape the views of the coming generations. Thus, Lorna Lippman (then Director of the Victorian Office of Community Relations) has demanded that "Social institutions and **particularly educational institutions**, have to contribute to multiculturalism" and that they "retain the term 'multicultural' as being an official ideology in Australia with widespread adherence, **particularly from education authorities**". It is seen that "the education system must play an active role in bringing about ... a stable multicultural society". To this end "General education at primary and secondary level now includes multicultural study programmes", for which it has been recommended that "general curriculum be re-examined and that **Multicultural emphasis be reflected in all subject areas**" (emphasis added).(43)

It is through political agitation and action, via the power of government policies and resources - and supported by liberal-internationalists in the media and the education system, that multiculturalism has become the dominant ideology, which is now being forced upon modern Australia.

Multiculturalism needs to be recognised for what it is: a **political** ideology.

CULTURAL RELATIVISM

Many multiculturalists promote the idea of cultural relativism, i.e. "that each culture is of equal value, and should not be judged from the cultural perspectives of others". This actually means that no-one can pass judgement on another culture as that person's "value judgement" will be made on the basis of their own cultural values. In this manner of thinking, all cultures are therefore equal; and its adherents maintain that it cannot be said that other cultures, or certain cultural customs, are "wrong" or "inferior", as to do so would be to act as "culturally superior" or, at worst, even "racist".(44)

This half-baked notion would have us believe that the culture of a tribe of New Guinea cannibals is equal to the culture of the Ancient Egyptians. The "good" multiculturalist would maintain that this is so, while the rest of us may laugh at this ridiculous idea, pointing out the Ancient Egyptians' advances in mathematics, astronomy, transport, irrigation, architecture, etc., etc., etc. It would then be pointed out that, in our ignorance, we would've been making a "value judgement" based on our own culture, which is the "wrong" thing to do, and "politically incorrect" to say the least. Maybe we should never hold any opinions, nor judge any matter, ever again? But, of course, if we were ever to point out that it is part of **our** culture to hold such opinions, and form "value judgements", then wouldn't that be a great dilemma for the multiculturalists? You know the answer already: our cultural values are to be ignored; because, despite their ever-ready claims of cultural equality, multiculturalists place Australian culture a distant second to any other "ethnic" culture.

The absurdity of the argument of cultural relativism is also self-evident to anyone who thinks it through in its **practical** context. For instance, there will be times when the cultural practices of some ethnic minorities in Australia will be held to be against the law, which itself has been basically produced by, and is usually reflective of, the mainstream Australian culture. Cultural relativism is thus shown to be contradictory and unworkable.

In terms of the law, there are two matters to be pointed out. One, that a multiculturalist who says cultures can be maintained, but only subject to the law, has accepted a basic principle of assimilationism. Two, that there are multiculturalists who advocate that there should be "respect for cultural diversity reflected in the operation of the law by granting some multicultural minorities special consideration in the legal treatment of their otherwise illegal cultural and religious practices". In fact, legal decisions based on cultural considerations are already being enacted,

from lighter sentences in some cases, to the allowing of Aboriginal law to operate instead of Australian law (such as the Northern Territory court which released an Aboriginal man, found guilty of a "stabbing manslaughter", on a good behaviour bond, partly in recognition that "under customary law ... [he] ... could expect to be speared through his thighs as a pay-back for the killing").(45)

Jan Pettman, an "anti-racist" lecturer, has pointed out some questions that cultural relativism avoids: "if values or interests conflict, whose should prevail? What happens if there are some values and practices we do not want in Australia? What is it that will ultimately hold us all together?".(46)

Cultural relativism is not only sheer folly, it is plain idiocy.

It is also interesting to note the words of Rush Limbaugh (publicised as "America's #1 radio talk-show host"): "One of the main vehicles used by liberals to attempt to de-legitimize "all that remains of national culture" for America is multiculturalism. By its very nature, multiculturalism holds that no civilization, no moral code, no way of living, is better than another. In general, it finds fault with little in most cultures - the exception being the actual nation of America, which is usually portrayed as an oppressive, racist, sexist, homophobic nation with few redeeming qualities."(47)

Much the same can be said for Australia: Multiculturalists continuously denigrate and attack Australia's way of life - our culture - (as well as attacking that of other Westernised countries, in particular those of the English-speaking world) but rarely do they attack the cultures of foreign peoples (especially those of the Third World). Most multiculturalists seem to view criticism of such foreign cultures as "politically incorrect", or even "racist"; but have no such qualms over attacking the Australian way of life. They fail to realise that this double standard shows them to be fools and hypocrites. What they also fail to realise is that such double standards help to reveal the actual mentality evident behind the ideology of multiculturalism in this country, that of being anti-Australian, if not a form of anti-White racism (for many multiculturalists, this seems to be some sort of perverse self-hatred).

To further explain about their mentality being anti-Australian: For many multiculturalists, rather than their main driving force being to seek some form of "equality" for other cultures, their main driving force is to attack the Australian nation, its culture, way of life, institutions, its British/European population, and - most telling of all - its wealth. The fact that Australia is a wealthy nation, while many Third World countries are very poor, produces a style of thinking evident within the mentality of multiculturalism; a form of what has been termed "the White guilt complex".

It should be realised from this that multiculturalism is not pro-culture (foreign or otherwise) as it purports to be, but is actually anti-culture.

THE REALITY OF MULTICULTURALISM

Multiculturalists advocate the right for other cultures to practice their own cultural traditions and "unique" ways of life, and feel that this liberalistic view is a fair and just position to take. How ironic, therefore, that we find that some of the cultural ways and traditions subsequently practiced are considered to be far from "liberal", "just", or "fair".

Professor Lauchlan Chipman has exposed multiculturalism as containing a wide spectrum; from "soft" multiculturalism (the "food and dances" justification, used so often) to the realities of "hard" multiculturalism: "It is imperative that we realise that this is what hard multi-culturalism is about.

It is not about folk dancing, interesting food, and free-flowing wine. Nor is it about experiments in living and the open-minded and sensitive quest for improved or alternative life-styles. It is not just about reinforcing the 'nice' or the 'cute' or the 'exotic' aspects of these cultures as perceived by widely read, widely travelled middle-class Australians. Rather, it is about the preservation of 'ethnic integrity', the reinforcement and imposition on the new-born of sets of traditions, beliefs, and values which include, as well as those which are noble and enlightened, some which are at least as inhuman, as grotesquely ignorant, and as racist, as sexist, and as bigoted as any that can be squeezed from even the most appalling of ockers." Also looking at the consequences of multiculturalism, Dr. Frank Knopfmacher warned that "It entails permanent class war with an ethnic dimension -- the worst kind of class-war, and in the end, terrorism and civil war."(48)

The reality of the multicultural ideology (despite what any of its promoters might claim) is that it actually encourages and supports various distasteful ethnic customs:

- Treatment of women as second class citizens, including a "sheltered, separate, limited and thoroughly sexist upbringing for daughters" that exists among fundamentalist Muslims.(49)
- Female genital mutilation (also known as female circumcision) by Africans.(50)
- Girls raised in strict Muslim or Mediterranean households, not being allowed to associate socially with Australian classmates.(51)
- Extremely rigid, and almost blindly obedient, patriarchal family structures.(52)
- Arranged marriages, whereby brides (and sometimes grooms - depending on which culture is involved) have no say in the choosing of their partner. Indian and Australian Aboriginal arranged marriages can involve girls as young as eleven to fourteen being married to middle-aged men.(53)
- The notion of the duty to kill to preserve family or blood honour.(54)
- Aborigines being speared in the leg by other Aborigines, as tribal punishment for crimes, in line with their customary law (other types of punishment also occur).(55)
- Ethnic hatreds, and traditional anti-Semitism.(56)

To try to encompass all cultures (and their various aspects and realities) within one nation is blatantly ridiculous; but to try to change, or to try to ban, certain cultural traditions is to "discriminate", to act "culturally superior", and to be "racist". Of course, some cultural demands cannot coexist in the same country; for instance, some cultures demand that monogamy be the only legal marriage, while some want polygamy to be legal. It is a direct contradiction: You can't have it both ways.

It also needs to be asked as to whether most Australians have thought about the implications of a "truly multi-cultural society"? At the moment many Australian traditions are based upon our Christian heritage; but in a truly non-discriminatory multicultural society these traditions will lose their official standing so as not to discriminate against, or offend, other religions; especially when the population base for other non-Christian religions, such as Islam, grow enormously. For instance, it is "discriminatory" for Australian governments to recognise, and allow public holidays for, Christian religious festivals, such as Christmas and Easter. It is a "logical" demand of multiculturalism to demand that such "discriminatory" practices cease. In such an event, there are two basic "non-discriminatory" options: 1) to recognise, and declare public holidays for, **all** religious festivals (a political and economic nightmare), or 2) to ban official support for **all** religious festivals (this latter scenario being the more likely choice). Do Australians really want government recognition of, and public holidays for, Christian festivals (such as Christmas and Easter) banned?

Some multiculturalists may deny this scenario; but, giving us a taste of things to come, appeared this news item in *The Age*: "The English city of Birmingham has banned Christmas symbols such as Santa Claus, church bells, angels, nativity scenes and 'Merry Christmas' messages from its

street lighting decorations in case they upset non-Christians". There should be no doubt in our minds that this is only the **start** of such matters.(57)

STOP PRESS:

Since the first edition of this publication, the point being made above has been borne out. Newspaper reports revealed that "Nativity plays and overly religious activities have been scrapped in many Melbourne kindergartens concerned about their culturally diverse proteges". The reality of multiculturalism brings forth a situation where Australian children are denied part of their traditional upbringing simply because a minority within their midst belong to other cultures. One kindergarten teacher ignored such "political correctness", and made a statement of common sense: "If we went to Japan or China, would they stop their shinto festivals, or moon festivals because of one or two children? Of course they wouldn't".(58)

The reality of multiculturalism is that elements of Australian culture will slowly be forced from the public sphere, leading to the destruction of our national culture and identity.

The point made previously bears repeating:

*"There should be no doubt in our minds that this is only the **start** of such matters."*

THE COST OF MULTICULTURALISM

Another reality of multiculturalism is the cost to the Australian community, not only in social terms, but also in economic terms. Stephen Rimmer, an economist and author, has made a estimate of the monetary effects of multicultural policies as being "more than \$7.2 billion a year ... in addition to the \$7 billion or \$8 billion a year which immigration is estimated to add to the annual deficit on the current account of the balance of payments" and that "The gross cost of multiculturalism amounts to about 2% of Australia's Gross Domestic Product of \$369 billion", while stating that these "estimates are conservative ... The real economic cost of multiculturalism is likely to be higher".(59)

The costs involved with multiculturalism are astounding. Some selected quotes from Rimmer's writings give a broad outline:(60)

- "Costs associated with multiculturalism are caused primarily by its impact on Australia's substantial immigration program. Costs are increased through the importation of large numbers of migrants who cannot speak English and through the covert use of ethnicity and country of origin as important criteria for choosing migrants".
- "According to government reports, the lack of English language skills is costing Australia over \$4.8 billion annually. The OMA says additional communication time in the workplace costs \$3.2 billion. Lost output due to unemployment, caused by the lack of language skills, costs \$1.6 billion. Migrants have more workplace accidents which cost \$13 million, while the costs of higher welfare expenditure is at least \$25 million".
- "The taxpayer pays for multiculturalism in the form of greater expenditure on multicultural programs, welfare and crime prevention. Commerce and industry pays in the form of reduced productivity and output, lost markets, greater industrial disputation and increased expenditure on

language training. Migrants lose out themselves, because of their lack of English, in workplace accidents and lower productivity".

- "Governments spend about \$2 billion dollars each year on multicultural programs, most of these are left unidentified in larger government programs". "Funds go to English language courses; assistance for disadvantaged schools and students; language and multicultural studies; employment education for the disadvantaged; settlement and ethnic affairs; the Office of Multicultural Affairs; the Special Broadcasting Service and the arts". "The Federal Government alone spends more than \$200 million annually on English language training".

John Mohajer, an economist and social researcher, has pointed out how multiculturalism created Australia's current problem of a large non-English speaking population: "During the 1950s and 1960s a modest proportion of migrants arriving in Australia did not have good language skills ... during the late 1970s and early 1980s the multicultural lobby claimed that requirements that migrants speak English were 'discriminatory' ... Consequently, the weight attached to English language skills in immigrant selection was significantly downgraded by the Federal Government in the early 1980s. English language testing was partially reintroduced in the late 1980s and early 1990s, as the economic costs imposed by this policy became apparent to governments and policy makers. However, since 1979 large numbers of migrants have entered Australia with little or no language skills ... Thus, in 1991 over 410,000 Australians could not speak English effectively. It is important to note that many workers who could not speak English effectively and who had arrived in Australia in the 1950s and 1960s were leaving the labour force by the 1980s and early 1990s, often due to retirement. Thus, if large numbers of migrants with poor English language skills had not been allowed into Australia in the 1980s, the problem of lack of English language skills could have been stabilised and even diminished over the last decade".(61)

Rimmer has clearly stated the unavoidable facts: "There is a growing body of evidence which suggests that multiculturalism is the key cause of Australia's relative economic decline. Despite receiving hundreds of millions of dollars each year, the multicultural lobby has been unable to show even one economic benefit for Australia. Australia's poorly run immigration program is clearly contrary to the interests of all Australians. While English language training should be retained, the policy of multiculturalism should be abandoned immediately. There should be a public inquiry, possibly a royal commission, into the costs and benefits of multiculturalism".(62)

ASIANISATION

Yet another reality of multiculturalism has been cited by Stephen Rimmer, that of the eventual Asianisation of Australia: "Multiculturalism serves as a cloak for the undeclared policy of Asianisation which involves linking Australia economically, ethnically and culturally with the nations of North-East Asia. As part of Asianisation, Australia's non-discriminatory immigration policy has been abandoned. Migrants and refugees are now selected on the basis of ethnicity ... Resources are spread unevenly and migration applications from North-East Asia are dealt with more quickly than applications from Europe".(63)

Following Rimmer's arguments, it is all too easy to see a definite bias towards Asia from politicians, government officials, and various people in prominent public positions (especially in the business sector). Many of these people, such as Bob Hawke (then Prime Minister), have told us (contrary to geographical realities) that "Australia is a part of Asia"; as well as asserting, like Al Grassby, "that Australia's destiny lies in Asia and the Pacific".(64)

In 1983, Bill Hayden (then the ALP's Foreign Minister) gave a remarkable speech alluding to Australia's future: "Australia is changing. We're an anomaly as a European country in this part of the world. There's already a large and growing Asian population in Australia and it is inevitable in

my view that Australia will become a Eurasian country ... I happen to think that's desirable. That means we are becoming part of the mainstream of this region". He also said: "[we] should welcome the process of gradually becoming a Eurasian-type society ... we will not just become a multicultural society - which seems to me to be a soft sort of terminology anyway - we will become a Eurasian society and we will be the better for it". Even though his views were widely reported, no politician or government official condemned his comments, leading many to believe that the government generally concurred with his views. Hayden further compounded his statements the following year, when he revealed his "vision" that Australia should have a population of 50 million, predicting an upsurge in migration from "the obvious Asian populations around us ... [and the] ... large Polynesian and Melanesian population in our near region".(65)

Several big-business executives have called for a large increase in Australia's population, as they perceive such a rise as beneficial to the economic prospects of large companies; for instance, Hugh Morgan (Chief Executive of Western Mining) has proposed a figure of "about half a million migrants annually". Also, many people have come to realise that there is a political side to Australia's immigration policies; indeed, Ralph L. Harry (then Director of the Australian Institute of International Affairs) has noted that immigration has been described as a "concrete way of developing relations between governments"; and Alan Renouf (former Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs) has said that "immigration can be a useful diplomatic tool" and has advocated "a larger flow of Asian peoples" on the basis that such an action "could cement materially Australia's ties with such countries".(66)

The Australian Population and Immigration Council has stated that "The Asian region has immense potential as a source of migrants for Australia". It would seem that it is Asia that both politicians and businessmen are looking towards to provide the "future" for Australia. Some observers have commented that it would seem that there is an implicit "trade-off" involved: in return for being enabled to economically enmesh Australia with the growing Asian economies, Australia will in turn demographically enmesh itself with Asia's populations. As one government Minister is reported to have said, "we are part of Asia and our economic development, our future is inextricably intertwined with Asia - tourism, trade and economic development".(67)

Australia's most respected demographic expert, Charles Price, has already published his projections: "the year 2020 would see some 2.7 million persons of unmixed Asian origin and about 3.9 million persons of part Asian ancestry; a Total Descent figure of 6.6 million persons of whole or part Asian origin; that is, 26.7% of the total Australian population". Phillip Ruthven, Director of Ibis Business Information, has forecast a "neo-Eurasian nation" by 2010, turning "Eurasian" by mid-century, and becoming "Asian" at the end of the next century (only three to four generations away).(68)

It would appear that our cultural future may be determined by the levels of Asian immigration we are likely to receive over the next few generations; that Australia may well end up with an "Asian Future", which ironically may preclude the "Truly Multicultural Future" envisioned by some.

THE MUSLIM THREAT

Australia has a large and growing Muslim population. Continuing mass immigration from those countries with large Islamic populations is building up the numbers of Muslims already here. Indonesia, our closest Asian neighbour, has one of the world's biggest Muslim communities.

The fundamentalist Muslim countries raise the spectre of:(69)

- Crimes punishable by whippings.

- Thieves having their hands chopped off.
- Adulterers being stoned to death.
- Fatyahs (death sentences) for those who say, or write, anything construed as anti-Muslim (e.g. Ayatollah Khomeini's fatyah upon Salman Rushdie for writing the Satanic Verses novel).
- Women grabbed from the streets and re-clothed (to cover up any "unseemly" exposed flesh) by the roving patrols of hardline Muslim women.
- In law courts: Two women witnesses being required to counter the evidence of one Muslim man; rape victims only being able to prove their cases if they can produce four male Muslim witnesses.
- Females being barred from higher education and from most occupations.
- Teenage girls being given up to 70 lashes for not covering their hair in public.
- Jail for drinking alcohol.

With the already sizeable Muslim presence in Australia; with continued mass immigration; with Muslim recruitment of their fellow "ethnics": it is not hard to picture a scenario where a future Australia has become a Muslim country. In such a scenario, where Islamic fundamentalism reigns, the "liberalistic" practices of multiculturalism would disappear (by natural and enforced means), to be replaced by the unbending, autocratic, and sometimes barbaric practices of the fundamentalist Islamic state.

Although this terrible scenario may seem a remote prospect, it is one that multiculturalism could help bring about.

THE GREAT "UTOPIA" (WHERE THE LOGIC OF "MULTICULTURALISM" WOULD EVENTUALLY LEAD US)

Multiculturalism is not just a theory/experiment confined to Australia and North America; in many Western-style democracies, multiculturalism (in numerous variant styles) is being forced upon the people of the host nations. Its advocates see it as eventually covering the entire globe.

The long term consequences that are inherent in such a world-wide ideology are frightening. The foreseeable scenario would appear to be, spread over the next millennium, something like this: Australia, Canada, and North America become fully multicultural, followed soon after by the other Western democracies, then over a longer span of time all of the remaining countries of the world are slowly pushed into the multicultural abyss:

- Ethnic integration eventually becomes total integration. With no ethnic base to support cultural traditions, all cultures merge; this means that while many cultural traits survive, in a conglomerate style, most cultural traditions totally vanish.
- Just as has happened with cultural mergers in the past: unique cultures and languages are lost forever, existing only in the records and archives of academia.(70)
- Thanks to centuries of modern travel technology, ever-flowing very easy mass migration, and world-wide communications systems, the entire planet becomes the domain of the modern technological consumer society miracle: the teeming masses of the United Nations' stylised "brown man".

There would be no point in travelling to Paris to experience a lively, vibrant, French culture; or to

the Congo to see the exotic unusual cultures of the dark jungles of Africa; because everywhere is the same:

- Multicultural restaurants: a poor mix of several styles. Lots of the cheap plastic-like food variety; some "classy" venues, but none are distinct.
- Multicultural language: Esperanto. All the old languages died out years ago, everyone now speaks the same. However, some universities offer courses about the old obsolete languages.
- Multicultural dancing: the "techno age" version of "disco". No-one actually does any of the old dances, but they can be viewed on CD-video units in the cobweb covered archives of academia.
- The same multicultural culture: an American-style cosmopolitan, media-based culture.

That is the logical long-term result of multiculturalism: a world-wide American TV-style culture (presumably administered by a global government).

In 1992, Australia's then Governor-General, Bill Hayden, said "Indeed, I sometimes speculate whether there might not come a time - not too many generations hence - when we may be talking about a truly international culture, with local variations on a common theme".(71)

It is people like Bill Hayden that are trying, not only to destroy Australia's culture (in the name of multiculturalism), but who are also trying to destroy the culture of every nation on earth.

It is time that everyone realises that "Multiculturalism Means No Culture".

THE GREAT MULTICULTURAL FRAUD

To call Australia "multicultural" is a misnomer. To illustrate the point we can compare culture with language. Australia's language is English, both in the official sense and in the practical sense. There are, however, some people in Australia who speak another language as their "first" language, so in a pedantic sense the country could be termed "multilingual" (but which would infer that most Australians are everyday speakers of foreign languages). Yet, only an idiot would seriously describe Australia as "multilingual": it is an "English speaking country" which happens to have a small minority of people who speak other languages (with only an extremely small minority who can't speak English at all). So it is with culture: the vast majority of Australians adhere to the Australian culture (even fewer are those who adhere solely to another culture).

Don't be misled by statistics of "ethnic background": the vast majority of the Australian-born (second generation, third generation, or whatever) are Australians, who are part of the Australian culture; some may be raised in such a way as to be imbued with aspects of another culture, but that does not change the overall picture: we share (broadly) the same way of life; speak the same language; relate to the same national icons; operate under the same cultural mode of everyday behaviour; and we live in, and enjoy, the same country. Culturally, most Australians are just that: Australian.

A survey conducted for the Office of Multicultural Affairs revealed some interesting results: that only 9% of Australians considered themselves to belong to a non-Australian ethnic or cultural group (2% of which were "British"), with only 3% actually being members of "an organised group with ethnic affiliations". It was also shown that "only a quarter of the second generation sample saw themselves as belonging to an ethnic group as did just under a third of the first-generation group. The only sub-sample where more than half identified with an ethnic group was the recent arrivals."(72)

Thus, most migrants can be viewed in a different light to that being shown by the multicultural

lobbyists, that despite being statistically classified as being of "ethnic background", many have adopted the Australian culture as their own and often have become virtually indistinguishable from the native-born. Of course, many are unable to assimilate so easily, either because they come from a culture that cannot adapt readily to ours, or because they have fallen into the clutches of Political Multiculturalism which demands that they don't assimilate.(73)

The fact is that Australia is not a multicultural country. To use an analogy, it can readily be seen that a white dog, with a pink tongue and black paws, would only seriously be described as "multicoloured" by an idiot, or someone with an ulterior motive; so it is with multiculturalism: there is an ulterior motive behind the push to call Australia "multicultural". The reasoning is that if Australia is called "multicultural" (which would imply that most Australians are everyday practitioners of foreign cultures), that the entire country will be perceived to be, as a whole, "multicultural" (no matter what the reality is); that, if this country is "multicultural", we therefore need "multicultural policies", that therefore we need "multiculturalism", which will then be used to turn Australia "on its head" to produce a multiculturalist, internationalist society.

The phrase so often used by multiculturalists, that "Australia is a multicultural society" is a cleverly constructed **political phrase** that is used to justify **Political Multiculturalism**. Despite its pretensions to moral grandeur; multiculturalism is simply a **political ideology**, pushed by internationalists and small "I" liberals, that is dangerous and destructive, and promises only one end for our country: the death of the Australian culture and our national identity.

Australia is not a "multicultural society", it is a monocultural society with some ethnic minority cultures at its edges, or to be more succinct, Australia is a "core-culture society". The term "multicultural society" implies that the entirety of our society is multicultural, which is far from the truth, and is a term used in support of a political ideology. The term "core-cultural society" is a far more accurate and truthful description of the Australian nation.

As Brian Bullivant has warned, "We have become so accustomed to the regularly parroted assertion, 'Australia is a multicultural society', that there is a considerable risk of assuming that such a society exists."(74)

CONCLUSION

Multiculturalism is not just a concept whereby first generation immigrants can keep their culture (they could've kept it anyway), but one which wants to ensure that immigrant cultures are passed from generation to generation, rather than anyone becoming "Australian".

Multiculturalism means:

- The destruction of the Australian culture and national identity.
- The internationalisation of all cultures.

Therefore, multiculturalism means no culture.

All in all, multiculturalism is:

- Costly
- Contradictory
- Dangerous

- Divisive

Multiculturalism is not a "fact": it is a liberalistic political ideology, which is being forced upon Australians by politicians, "politically correct" academics, "lefties", and other "social engineers".

It is a destructive concept, posing as a "nice" cosmopolitan idea, that needs to be vigorously opposed by all thinking Australians, until it is eventually defeated.

Multiculturalism is not just the stupid folly of today, it is the disastrous mistake of tomorrow.

REFERENCES

1. For example: "The Objectives of Multiculturalism and the Existing Broadcasting System" made a recommendation "to assist Australian residents from all ethnic groups to maintain their language and develop their cultures, to pass them on to their descendants" (emphasis added). Ethnic Television Review Panel, Programming for the Multicultural/Multilingual Television Service -Objectives and Policies, AGPS, Canberra, 1980; cited in: Stephen Alomes; Catherine Jones, Australian Nationalism: A Documentary History, Angus and Robertson, North Ryde, NSW, 1991, p. 371.
2. Blainey, Geoffrey. Blainey: Eye on Australia: Speeches and Essays of Geoffrey Blainey, Schwartz & Wilkinson, Melbourne, c1991, p. 193.
3. Daly, Martin. "Canberra Bows to Greeks in Macedonia Name Row", The Age, 12 March 1994, pp. 1, 6.
Daly, Martin. "Cultures Clash in the Name Of Macedonia", The Age, 12 March 1994, pp. 15, 20.
Daly, Martin. "My Enemy, My Brother", The Age, 12 March 1994, pp. 15, 20.
Mohajer, John. "Counting the Cost of Multiculturalism", The Record, Spring 1995, p. 8.
"The Problem of Hates in a New World" (editorial), The Age, 12 March 1994, p. 23.
Willox, Innes. "Labor Faces a Battle For Votes Over Macedonia Row", The Age, 5 March 1994, p. 28.
4. Blainey, Geoffrey. All For Australia, Methuen Haynes, North Ryde, N.S.W., 1984, pp. 170-171.
Danforth, Loring. "A New Tack Needed to Resolve Old Conflicts", The Age, 5 March 1994, p. 28.
5. Haley, Ken. "A Day Later and They're Still Dancing", The Age, 13 July 1982, p. 3.
6. Hutchings, Ben; Taylor, Lenore. "Kennett Blasts Macedonia Move, The Australian, 28 February 1994, p. 2.
Phelan, Matthew. "Greek Vote Blow To ALP", Herald Sun, 28 February 1994, p. 5.
"The New Republic of Macedonia" (editorial), The Australian, 28 February 1994, p. 8.
7. Hickman, Belinda; Honeysett, Stuart. "Nation Shares Historic Moment", The Australian, 1 July 1997, p.2.
Miller, Claire; Jackson, Andra. "Generations Show Mixed Feelings", The Age, 1 July 1997, p. 5.
"Patriotism Misplaced" (letter), Herald Sun, 8 July 1997, p. 20.
8. Mohajer, John. "Counting the Cost of Multiculturalism", The Record, Spring 1995, p. 8.
Harry, Ralph L. "Ethnic Minorities in Australia and Foreign Policy", World Review, April 1982, p. 57-74.
9. For example:
"The age-old and cliched test of patriotism, "Would you fight for your country?", just might bring out some surprising answers, not because of the pacifist beliefs of these adolescents, but

because of their choice of country. These young adults, although holding Australian citizenship, all seem to prefer their country of origin, even though some have never even stepped on its soil." Maksimovic, Andrea. "The Legacy of Lingering Hatreds", in: Healey, Kaye (ed.) *An Australian Identity*, The Spinney Press, Balmain, NSW, c1995, pp. 31-32.

"But hard as I've tried, I've never been able to forget the country of my birth, where we were taught and encouraged never to forget our nationality. I've realised after much confusion in my mind that no-one can belong to two countries, I asked myself the question that if ever they called and needed me to support either, I believe I wouldn't know which of the two to choose".

Sophocleous, M.A. (ed.) *The Endless Journey of Stefanos Kastamonitis*, Elikia Books, Box Hill, Victoria, 1988; cited in: Alomes; Jones. *Australian Nationalism: A Documentary History*, p. 371.

10. For those interested in some broad reading on the Australian national and cultural identity, the following books may prove useful:

Baker, Sidney. *The Australian Language*, Currawong, Milsons Point, NSW, 1978.

Cozzolino, Mimmo (ed.) *Symbols of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1987.

Fearn-Wannan, W. (Wannan, Bill) (ed.) *Australian Folklore: A Dictionary of Lore, Legends and Popular Allusions*, Lansdowne Press, Melbourne, 1970.

Gard, Stephen. *Inventive Australians*, Jacaranda, Milton, Qld., 1990.

Gard, Stephen. *Our Bright Ideas*, Jacaranda, Milton, Qld., 1990.

Lindesay, Vance. *Aussie-Osities*, Greenhouse Publications, Richmond, Vic., 1988.

Meredith, John; Anderson, Hugh (eds.) *Folk Songs of Australia: And the Men and Women Who Sang Them*, Ure Smith, Sydney, 1979.

Meredith, John; Covell, Roger; Brown, Patricia (eds.) *Folk Songs of Australia: And the Men and Women Who Sang Them: Volume Two*, New South Wales University Press, Kensington, NSW, 1987.

Scott, Bill (ed.) *Complete Book of Australian Folk Lore*, Ure Smith, Sydney, 1976.

Towle, Alexandra (ed.) *Made in Australia: A Sourcebook of All Things Australian*, William Heinemann Australia, Richmond, Vic., 1986.

Wannan, Bill (ed.) *The Australian: Yarns, Ballads, Legends and Traditions of the Australian People*, Australasian Book Society, Melbourne, 1954.

Ward, Russel. *The Australian Legend*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1966.

Wilkes, G.A. (ed.) *A Dictionary of Australian Colloquialisms*, Sydney University Press, Sydney, 1978.

11. "The Ethnic Communities and the ALP", Australian Labor Party: National Committee of Inquiry: Discussion Papers (APSA Monograph No. 23), Australian Political Studies Association, p. 93.

Quirk, Tricia. "Aussie Mix "Has Too Much British"", *The Sun*, 19 October 1983.

12. Danforth, Loring M. "A New Tack Needed To Resolve Old Conflicts", *The Age*, 5 March 1994, p. 28.

13. Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. *Australia as a Multicultural Society*, AGPS, Canberra, 1978, pp. 4, 14.

14. Devine, Frank. "Take It From the Irish, Assimilate Or Perish", *The Australian*, 31 March 1994, p. 11.

Gordon, Milton M. "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality", in: Meister, Richard J. (ed.) *Race and Ethnicity in Modern America*, D.C. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts, c1974, pp. 90-91.

Kallen, Horace M. "Democracy Versus the Melting Pot", *The Nation*, 18 and 25 February 1915 (reprinted in: *Race and Ethnicity in Modern America*, pp. 53-61).

Meister, Richard J. "Introduction", in: *Race and Ethnicity in Modern America*, p. XIII.

Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur M. *The Disuniting of America*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1992, p.36-37.

15. Schlesinger. *The Disuniting of America*, pp. 36-43.
16. Bostock, William W. "Ethnicity, an Issue of the Eighties and Beyond", in: Sherwood, John(ed.). *Multicultural Education: Issues and Innovations*, Creative Research, North Perth, WA,1981, p. 32.
- The Penguin Australian Encyclopedia, Viking, Ringwood, Victoria, 1990, p. 344.
17. Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs. *Multiculturalism For All Australians: Our Developing Nationhood*, AGPS, Canberra, 1982. (Produced by the EthnicAffairs Task Force of the ACPEA).
- Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. *Australia as a Multicultural Society*, AGPS, Canberra,1978.
- Foster, Lois; Stockley, David S. *Multiculturalism: The Changing Australian Paradigm*,Multicultural Matters, Clevedon, England, c1984, p. 49.
- Lipski, Sam. "Somehow, Our Melting Pot Seems To Be Working", in: *An AustralianIdentity*, p. 24.
- Mcphee, Ian. "The Benefits of Cultural Diversity", in: Goodman, David; O'Hearn, D.J.;Wallace-Crabbe, Chris (eds) *Multicultural Australia: The Challenges of Change*, Scribe,Newham, Victoria, 1991, p. 95.
- Milburn, Caroline. "Father of Ethnic Mix Queries the Result", *The Age*, 19 March 1994,p. 1.
- Milburn, Caroline. "The Fraying of Multiculturalism", *The Age*, 19 March 1994, p. 15.
- Zubrzycki, Jerry. "Address by Professor Jerzy Zubrzycki AO, CBE, FASSA", in:Proceedings of the First National Congress, Sixth National Conference and Annual GeneralMeeting of the Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia Inc.: 3 -9December 1984, FECCA, (Melbourne?), (1984?), pp. 133-135.
18. Jupp, James. "Upwards, Downwards or Just Round and Round: Multicultural PublicPolicy in Australia", in: Hocking, Brian (ed.) *Australia Towards 2000*, Macmillan, London,1990, p. 125.
- Stefanou-Haag, Soulla; Lumb, Peter. *Culture in Teaching: Perspectives and Alternatives*,Clearing House on Migration Issues, Richmond, (1983), p. 1.
- Zubrzycki, Jerzy. "Address by Professor Jerzy Zubrzycki AO, CBE, FASSA", pp. 134-135.
19. Betts, Katharine. *Ideology and Immigration: Australia 1976 to 1987*, MelbourneUniversity Press, Carlton, 1988, pp. 84, 141.
- Foster, Lois; Stockley, David. *Multiculturalism: The Changing Australian Paradigm*, pp.56-57, 61.
- Martin, Jeanie. "Multiculturalism and Its Critics", in: Roger Bell (ed.) *MulticulturalSocieties: A Comparative Reader*, Sable, Sydney, 1987, p. 125.
20. Betts. *Ideology and Immigration: Australia 1976 to 1987*, p. 141.
- Betts, Katharine. "Australia's Distorted Immigration Policy", in: *Multicultural Australia:The Challenges of Change*, pp. 160, 175 (note 40).
- Foster; Stockley. *Multiculturalism: The Changing Australian Paradigm*, p. 68.
- Garcia, Luis M. "How Parties Are Chasing the Ethnic Vote", *The Sydney Morning Herald*,15 February 1983, p. 14.
- King, Madonna. "Cabinet Split On Migrant Reunions", *The Sun*, 19 November 1988, p. 4.
- Kyriakopoulos, Vicki. "Chasing the Multicultural Rainbow", *The Bulletin*, 17 October1995, pp. 14-16.
- Sestito, Raymond. *The Politics of Multiculturalism*, The Centre for Independent Studies,St. Leonards, NSW, 1982, pp. 2, 14-15, 16-22, 23.
21. Sestito. *The Politics of Multiculturalism*, pp. 2, 14.
22. Sestito. *The Politics of Multiculturalism*, p. 15.
23. Sestito. *The Politics of Multiculturalism*, pp. 17-18, 22.
24. MacKellar, M.J.R. "Foreword", in: *Multiculturalism and Its Implications for ImmigrationPolicy*, AGPS, Canberra, 1979, (p.III).

25. "Migrating to the Poll", Time, 2 May 1994, p. 8.
26. Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs. Multiculturalism For All Australians, p. 12.
- Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. Australia as a Multicultural Society , p. 5.
- Chipman, Lauchlan. "The Children of Cynicism", in: Robert Manne (ed.) The New Conservatism in Australia, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1982, p. 26.
- Chipman, Lauchlan. "The Menace of Multi-Culturalism", Quadrant, September 1980, p.4.
- Foster; Stockley. Multiculturalism: The Changing Australian Paradigm, pp. 1, 3.
- Pervan, Dr. Ralph. "Opening Address By Dr. Ralph Pervan, Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission of Western Australia Given at the 7 December 1984 Session of the FECCA National Congress", in: Proceedings of the First National Congress, Sixth National Conference and Annual General Meeting of the Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia Inc.: 3 -9 December, 1984, p. 138.
- Schiavoni, Franco. "The Case for Linguistic Pluralism", in: Multicultural Australia: The Challenges of Change, p. 38.
- Totaro, Paolo. "Multiculturalism for Some Australians: A Personal View", Meanjin, March 1983, p. 68.
27. Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs. Multiculturalism For All Australians, p. 24
- (Ethnic Affairs Task Force quote).
- Catholic Leader, 26 February 1978 (A. E. Thomas quote), cited in: Dique, Dr. J.C.A. Immigration -A Policy of Perfidy, The Australian League of Rights, (Brisbane?), (1988?), p. 62.
- Hawke, Bob. "Immigration and Multiculturalism", in: John Cook (ed.). National Reconciliation: The Speeches of Bob Hawke, Prime Minister of Australia, Fontana, Sydney, 1984, p. 154.
- Foster, Lois; Stockley, David. Australian Multiculturalism: A Documentary History and Critique, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, England, c1988, p.31 (quote re. Fraser government), 34-35 (Bob Hawke quote).
- Theophanous, Dr. Andrew. "A Multicultural Prejudice", The Age, 23 November 1982.
28. Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. Australia as a Multicultural Society, p. 4.
- Foster; Stockley. Australian Multiculturalism: A Documentary History and Critique, p.60 (N.S.W. Department of Education quote).
- Office of Multicultural Affairs. Multiculturalism and Immigration, AGPS, Canberra, c1988, p. 11.
- Office of Multicultural Affairs. National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia: ...Sharing Our Future, AGPS, Canberra, 1989, p. vii.
29. Bullivant, Brian. "Australia's Pluralist Dilemma: An Age-Old Problem in Disguise", Australian Quarterly, Winter 1983, pp. 137-139.
- Seitz, Anne. "A Hitchhiker's Guide", in: Multicultural Australia: The Challenges of Change, op. cit., p.106-107.
30. Office of Multicultural Affairs. National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia ...Sharing Our Future, AGPS, Canberra, 1989.
31. Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. Australia as a Multicultural Society, p. 7.
- Betts. Ideology and Immigration: Australia 1976 to 1987, p. 207-208.
32. Betts. "Australia's Distorted Immigration Policy", pp. 157-159.
- Bullivant. "Australia's Pluralist Dilemma: An Age-Old Problem in Disguise", p. 138-139.
- Foster; Stockley. Multiculturalism: The Changing Australian Paradigm, p. 66.
- Lippman, Lorna. "Multiculturalism and Its Implications for Education", in: The Teaching of Human Rights, AGPS, Canberra, 1984, pp. 125-126.
- Pettman, Jan. "Racism in Australia", in: Anti-Racism: A Handbook for Adult Educators, AGPS, Canberra, 1986, pp. 16-18.

Seitz, Anne. "A Hitchhiker's Guide", pp. 106-109.

33. Bullivant. "Australia's Pluralist Dilemma: An Age-Old Problem in Disguise", p. 137.

Jayasuriya, Laksiri. "The Facts, Policies and Rhetoric of Multiculturalism", Australian Society, 1 July 1983, p. 27.

34. Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs. Multiculturalism For All Australians, p.19.

Georgiou, Petro. "Speech on Multiculturalism by Mr. Petro Georgiou: Director, Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs: 6 December 1984", in: Proceedings of the First National Congress, Sixth National Conference and Annual General Meeting of the Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia Inc.: 3 -9 December 1984, op. cit., pp. 133-135.

35. Lippman. "Multiculturalism and Its Implications for Education", p. 113.

36. Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. Australia as a Multicultural Society, pp. 4-5.

Menadue, J.L. "Towards Multicultural Australia", German Times, 1 September 1981, pp.1, 11.

Warneke, Ross. "Do We Really Want a Multi-Culture?", The Age, 2 October 1981, p. 13.

37. Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs. Multiculturalism For All Australians, p. 12.

Bullivant. "Australia's Pluralist Dilemma: An Age-Old Problem in Disguise", pp. 137-138,146.

38. Jayasuriya. "The Facts, Policies and Rhetoric of Multiculturalism", p. 25.

Pettman. "Racism in Australia", p. 16.

39. Lippman. "The Multicultural Society and Its Implications for Education", p. 21.

40. Pettman, Jan. Racism and Education: Lessons From Britain, Clearing House on Migration Issues, Richmond, Victoria, (1984), pp. 6, 8.

41. Seitz. "A Hitchhiker's Guide", p. 109.

42. Betts. "Australia's Distorted Immigration Policy", pp. 158-159.

Jayasuriya. "The Facts, Policies and Rhetoric of Multiculturalism", p. 25.

Lippman. "The Multicultural Society and Its Implications for Education", p. 22.

Kefala, Antigone (ed.) Multiculturalism and the Arts, Australia Council, North Sydney, c1986, p. 7.

43. Cigler, M.J. "Multiculturalism", in: The Australian Encyclopaedia, Australian Geographic, Terrey Hills, NSW, 1988, Vol. 6, p. 2027. AGM:23146.

Lippman. "The Multicultural Society and Its Implications for Education", pp. 22-23.

Stefanou-Haag; Lumb. Culture in Teaching: Perspectives and Alternatives, p. 5.

44. Pettman, Jan. "Anti-Racist Teaching", in: The Teaching of Human Rights: Proceedings of the Conference Held by the Human Rights Commission and UNESCO in Adelaide, 25-27 August 1983, AGPS, Canberra, 1984, p. 26.

Pettman. "Racism in Australia", pp. 16-18.

45. "Crime and Culture", The Independent Monthly, September 1993, p. 45.

McLean, Lisa. "Law Plan Embraces Black Customs", The Australian, 3 November 1994, pp. 1-2.

Pettman. "Racism in Australia", p. 17.

Polman, Dick. "Murder Isn't So Bad In America If You're Foreign", The Herald, 20 July 1989, p. 13.

Rodell, Susanna. "Coming to Terms With Other Laws", Australian Society, 22 October 1982, pp. 15-16.

Seitz. "A Hitchhiker's Guide", pp. 111-112.

46. Pettman. Racism and Education: Lessons From Britain, pp. 6, 8.

Pettman. "Racism in Australia", p. 17.

47. Limbaugh, Rush. See, I Told You So, Pocket Books (Simon & Schuster), New York, 1994, p. 309.

48. Chipman. "The Menace of Multi-Culturalism", pp. 4-5.
 Warneke. "Do We Really Want a Multi-Culture?", p. 13.

49. Bone, Pamela. "Multicultural Home Truths", The Age, 2 September 1988, p. 20.
 Bordewich, Fergus. "A Holy War Heads Our Way", Reader's Digest, January 1995, p. 21.
 Chipman. "The Menace of Multi-Culturalism", pp. 3-6.
 Legge, Kate. "Living Two Lives", The Australian, 3-4 September 1994, magazinesupplement pp. 20-23, 26-27.
 "The Most Beautiful Women in the World", Cleo, October 1993, pp. 32-36.
 Seitz. "A Hitchhiker's Guide", pp. 111-112.
 Smolowe, Jill. "All For One?", Time, 11 September 1995, pp. 48-52.
 Srinath, M.G. "Vicious Dowry System Leads to Slavery and Death", The Bulletin, 28 April 1981, pp. 85-86.
 Walsh, James. "Born To Be Second Class", Time, 11 September 1995, pp. 52-55.
 "Women May Become Half the Worth of a Man in Pakistan", The Australian, 9 August 1984.

50. Beyer, Lisa. "Thou Shalt Not Mutilate", Time, 16 October 1989, p. 57.
 "Female Circumcision: The Unkindest Cut of All", Cosmopolitan, January 1993, p. 124.
 Scott Gregory, Sophronia. "At Risk Of Mutilation", Time, 21 March 1994, pp. 60-61.
 Magazanik, Michael. "Wade May Place Ban on Female Circumcision", The Age, 17 February 1994, p. 6.
 "The Most Beautiful Women in the World", Cleo, October 1993, pp. 32-36.
 West, Rosemary. "Education Better Than Bans, Say African Women", The Age, 17 February 1994, p. 6.

51. Chipman. "The Menace of Multi-Culturalism", pp. 3-6.
 Legge. "Living Two Lives", p. 22.

52. Bone, Pamela. "Multicultural Home Truths", The Age, 2 September 1988, p. 20.
 Chipman. "The Menace of Multi-Culturalism", pp. 3-6.
 Haley, Ken. "Multi-Cultural Mix a Myth, Seminar Told", The Age, 26 October 1981.
 Legge. "Living Two Lives", pp. 20-23, 26-27.
 Ranstead, Donald D. "Ethnic Confusions in Australia", Quadrant, February 1980, pp. 44-47.

53. "Blacks Beaten If They Oppose Marriages: Claim", The Age, 8 February 1982.
 "English Sisters "Sold As Slaves"", The West Australian, 22 December 1987, p. 4.
 Legge. "Living Two Lives", pp. 22.
 "Of Marriage and Money", Asiaweek, 20 September 1991, p. 36.
 Robinson, Peter. "Father Spares the Runaway Child Bride", The Sun, 30 January 1982.
 Rudolph, Barbara. "Wives Before Their Time: An Indian Debate About Child Brides Turns Ugly As Muslim Immunity From Certain Civil Laws Is Challenged", Time, 7 October 1991, p. 59.
 Sturgess, Garry. "Inquiry To Start On Blacks and the Law", The Age, 16 March 1981.
 "Tribe Will Scar Girl", The Sunday Press, 24 January 1982.
 Wilson, Bruce. "Trapped In Cultural Bondage", The Advertiser, 29 December 1987, p. 19.

54. Chipman. "The Menace of Multi-Culturalism", pp. 3-6.
 Legge. "Living Two Lives", p. 22.
 Rodell, Susanna. "The Shock of the New Society", Australian Society, 22 October 1982, p. 17.
 Seitz. "A Hitchhiker's Guide", pp. 111-112.

55. "Blacks Want To Keep Tribal Spearing Law", The Age, 14 May 1981.
 Brouwer, G.E. "Aboriginal Justice is a Complex Issue", The Age, 18 December 1980.
 Foster, David. "Bloody Justice", The Independent Monthly, May 1994, pp. 30-36.
 Hughes, Peter. "Report of Spearing Punishment", The Age, 23 June 1990, p. 13.

Jamrozik, Wanda. "White Law, Black Lore", *The Independent Monthly*, May 1994, pp. 37-38.

Legge. "Living Two Lives", pp. 22.

McLean. "Law Plan Embraces Black Customs", pp. 1-2.

Raffaele, Paul. "Tribal Punishment: The Brutal Truth", *Reader's Digest*, July 1994, pp.17-22.

Rickard, Maurice. "Multiculturalism, Minorities and the Law", *Current Affairs Bulletin*, November 1991, pp. 27-29.

Rodell. "Coming to Terms With Other Laws", pp. 15-16.

Ryan, Chris. "Aboriginal Elders in Push to Punish Own", *The Age*, 21 June 1997, p. 2.

Seitz. p. 111.

Sturgess, Garry. "Inquiry To Start On Blacks and the Law", *The Age*, 16 March 1981.

"Tribal Beating, Now Man Faces Jail Term", *The Age*, 7 November 1981.

Zdenkowski, George. "Violent Justice", *The Bulletin*, 29 March 1994, p. 46.

56. Chipman. "The Menace of Multi-Culturalism", pp. 3-6.

Ranstead, Donald D. "Ethnic Confusions in Australia", *Quadrant*, February 1980, pp. 44-47.

Warneke. "Do We Really Want a Multi-Culture?", p. 13.

57. "Odd Spot", *The Age*, 9 December 1993, p. 1.

58. Brady, Nicole. "Away From the Manger in an Inclusive, Kinder Christmas", *The Age*, 28 November 1996, p. C1.

Coslovich, Gabriella. "Religion Kicked Out of the Kindergarten", *Herald Sun*, 20 December 1996, p. 15.

59. Rimmer, Stephen. *The Cost of Multiculturalism*, S.J. Rimmer, Belconnen, ACT, c1991.

Rimmer, Stephen. "The High Cost of Migration", *The Bulletin*, 28 May 1991, p. 78.

60. Rimmer, Stephen. "Counting the \$7 Billion Cost of Multiculturalism", *The Age*, 30 June 1991, p. 15.

Rimmer. "The High Cost of Migration", p. 78.

61. Mohajer. "Counting the Cost of Multiculturalism", p. 5.

62. Rimmer. "Counting the \$7 Billion Cost of Multiculturalism", p. 15.

63. Rimmer. "Counting the \$7 Billion Cost of Multiculturalism", p. 15.

64. Blainey, Geoffrey. "The Immigration Debate: Blainey vs Business", *Australian Business Monthly*, July 1992, p. 31.

Grassby, A.J. *Australian Ethnic Affairs Policy for the 80's*, Clearing House on Migration Issues, Richmond, Victoria, (1982?), p. 27.

The Sunday Mail, 23 June 1985 (Bob Hawke quote), cited in: Dique, Dr. J.C.A. *Immigration - A Policy of Perfidy*, *The Australian League of Rights*, (Brisbane?), (1988?), p. 61.

65. "For Australia, a "Eurasian" Role", *Asiaweek*, 19 August 1983, p. 7.

McClusky, Leigh; Merrigan, Ken. "50 Million Aussies: Hayden's Aim", *The Sun*, 24 March 1984, pp. 1-2.

Smark, Peter. "Hayden Hope for a Eurasian Australia", *The Age*, 11 May 1983.

66. Blainey. "The Immigration Debate: Blainey vs Business", p. 32.

Renouf, Alan. *The Frightened Country*, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1979, p. 538.

Harry, Ralph L. "Ethnic Minorities in Australia and Foreign Policy", *World Review*, April 1982, p. 57.

67. Australian Population and Immigration Council. *Immigration Policies and Australia's Population: A Green Paper*, AGPS, Canberra, 1977, p. 47.

Pervan. "Opening Address By Dr. Ralph Pervan, Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission of Western Australia Given at the 7 December 1984 Session of the FECCA National Congress", p. 139.

68. The Macquarie Dictionary, Second Revision, The Macquarie Library, Macquarie University, NSW, 1987, p. 733.
- Maslen, Geoffrey. "Prophet of Gloom", The Age Good Weekend Magazine, 3 September 1994, pp. 15-16.
- Price, Charles A. "Australia As Intermediary With Asia: A Demographic View", Journal of Intercultural Studies, Volume 14, Number 1, 1993, p. 31.
69. Aznam, Suhaini. "Spouses and Suitors: States Differ On Approach To Polygamy", The Far Eastern Economic Review, 22 August 1991, p. 18.
- Bordewich, Fergus. "A Holy War Heads Our Way", Reader's Digest, January 1995, p. 21.
- Burns, John. "Afghanistan Buckles Under Islamic Iron Fist", The Age, 22 February 1996, p. 8.
- Dowell, William. "Life in the Slow Lane: By Formally Banning Saudi Women From Driving Cars, Conservatives Hope To Brake Any Further Efforts At Liberalization", Time, 26 November 1990, p. 35.
- Emerson, Tony; Le Vine, Steve. "Bhutto Vs. the Mullahs: Pakistan Faces a Bitter Debate Over Islamic Law", The Bulletin, 7 August 1990, p. 58.
- "Islamic Rape Laws", Signs of the Times, Vol. 107, No. 6, June 1992, p. 3.
- "Khomeiny's Little Green Book of Living", The Age, 5 March 1980.
- "Pre-Marital Sex", The Age, 18 April 1980.
- Rodell. "The Shock of the New", p. 17.
- Smolowe, Jill. "All For One?", Time, 11 September 1995, pp. 48-52.
- "Women May Become Half the Worth of a Man in Pakistan", The Australian, 9 August 1984.
70. Dorian, Nancy C. "Tradition's End: A Threatened Language and Culture", Philological Quarterly, Summer 1979, pp. 249-262.
- "Catalans & Castilians", Encounter, July 1981, p. 14.
- Pedersen, Daniel. "The Cornish Comeback", The Bulletin, 30 October 1990, p. 80.
- Vines, Gail. "Death of a Mother Tongue", New Scientist, 6 January 1996, pp. 24-27.
71. Hartcher, Peter. "Hayden Backs Asian Ties", The Sydney Morning Herald, 5 March 1992, p. 3.
72. Betts. "Australia's Distorted Immigration Policy", pp. 165-168.
73. Wakefield, Kerry. "Many Migrants Do Not Favour Cultural Pluralism: Report", The Age, 27 June 1983.
- Cooray, L.J.M. "Multiculturalism In Australia: Who Needs It?", Quadrant, April 1986, pp. 27-29.
74. Bullivant. "Australia's Pluralist Dilemma: An Age-Old Problem in Disguise", p. 137.

Second edition

December 1997