



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 21, 2019

## The MultiCult: Paper Asks if UK Champagne Celebrations Should be Ended to Please Muslims

[https://media.blubrry.com/1462062/mcdn.podbean.com/mf/web/5k32c3/The\\_MultiCult\\_Paper\\_Askes\\_if\\_UK\\_Champange\\_Celebrations.mp3](https://media.blubrry.com/1462062/mcdn.podbean.com/mf/web/5k32c3/The_MultiCult_Paper_Askes_if_UK_Champange_Celebrations.mp3)

Podcast: Play in new window | [Download](#) ()  
Subscribe: Android | RSS | More

Multiculturalism is a belief under which all cultures are equal — but some are more equal than others.

The latest example is a newspaper that asks, in deference to Muslims, are “champagne celebrations outdated in multicultural Britain?”

The issue arose after England’s cricket team won the 2019 World Cup, at Lord’s Cricket Ground in London, after a dramatic tied final against New Zealand on July 14. In accordance with tradition, players happily sprayed champagne at the awards ceremony, prompting the *Telegraph* to instigate some bubble trouble.

As the paper tweeted:

Two of England’s Cricket champions were forced to walk away from the champagne celebrations because they are Muslim and therefore choose not to drink. But in a multicultural Britain should this be happening? And are champagne celebrations outdated in multicultural Britain? [pic.twitter.com/aD1anCZsSI](https://pic.twitter.com/aD1anCZsSI)

— The Telegraph (@Telegraph) [July 16, 2019](#)

Now, do note, it doesn’t appear that the two Muslim players complained; rather, this is another example of (presumably) white liberals trying to foment unrest, and their wording certainly serves that end. Forced? No one was *forced* to do anything.

This doesn’t stop the *Telegraph* from trying to force the issue, with, for instance, the video below.

Of course, champagne celebrations are a relatively small matter. The larger issue is that, [writes](#) *Jihad Watch* proprietor Robert Spencer, the “principle is always and everywhere the same: in Muslim countries, one should conform one’s behavior to Islamic sensibilities. And in non-Muslim countries, one should conform one’s behavior to Islamic sensibilities.”

While Islamic nations often don’t even allow freedom of religion, the West can’t bend over backwards fast enough for newcomers. In deference to Muslims, some English schools have [stopped serving pork](#); nearly 200 Subway restaurants in Britain have [nixted pork](#) and now serve only halal meat; and a [report indicates](#) that an increasing number of public canteens, daycare centers, and schools in Germany have stopped serving ham, bacon, and sausages.





Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 21, 2019

---

{modulepos inner\_text\_ad}

For the same reason, a British city [stopped celebrating](#) an important holiday, St. George's Day. Moreover, a Spanish soccer team [removed](#) the Christian cross from its logo to avoid "offending" Muslims, and, motivated likewise, a Church of England school [struck a cross](#) from its uniform. Then there was the [Swedish church](#) that not only removed crosses to make Muslims feel welcome, but also intended to mark the direction of Mecca so they could pray toward it (video below).

So, tragically, it's not just that the West is dying because, as columnist Bret Stephens once put it, they believe "in shallow things, shallowly"; they also believe in deep things (e.g., faith) shallowly — and their culture is being deeply buried because of it.

Pointing out the MultiCult's hypocrisy, a commenter under Spencer's *Jihad Watch* article asked, "Isn't part of being multicultural enjoying the differences? If you must accommodate and change to become the same then you are eliminating the multiculturalism you said you were trying to create. Where is the logic?"

Yet as even immigrationist German chancellor Angela Merkel and an ex-"equality" minister in Britain [admitted](#) some years ago, multiculturalism has "failed"; it couldn't help but do so because it's wholly unrealistic.

There are only two kinds of societies: Those united by a common culture — and divided ones. Every civilization must create laws, both governmental and social, with the latter being traditions and customs. Yet different religions/philosophies and cultures (and culture is shaped by "First Things") have different conceptions of what these should be.

For example, Christians believe that [ensoulment](#) occurs at conception, Muslims [maintain](#) that this happens only 120 days afterwards, and atheists claim it doesn't happen at all because they don't believe in the spirit (thus, people would just be organic robots). Obviously, this will lead to very different desires for what prenatal-infanticide law should be, and we witness continually the conflict surrounding this issue.

The point is that it can't be settled in a multicultural/religious society to all groups' satisfaction, and if it is put to bed, it can only be via complete suppression of dissenting views.

Then consider modesty in dress. How much should women cover up? Should the standard be secular, Islamic, or Christian, bikini or burka or in-between? Should men and women swim together at pools as is the Western norm or be separated as Muslims insist? Should this be mandated by law or left to social pressure?

What of sex roles in general? Should the standard be (so-called) modern equality or some paradigm prescribing some inequality? If so, which one?

What about sex and marriage? Christians consider marriage to be one man and one woman, Muslims accept polygamy, and our sexual devolutionaries insist that even two men can "wed"? Speaking of which, should homosexuality be celebrated, stigmatized socially, or outlawed? There are very different views on that.

Then there's that Muslim proscription against alcohol — it's completely banned in Saudi Arabia — yet many Christians use sacramental wine for religious ceremonies.

The point is that if multiculturalism is considered a model in which everyone just does his own thing



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 21, 2019

---

and gets his own way, this is impossible. Laws and social codes are, by definition, the imposition of values, and in their creation there are winners and losers. Various groups may be allowed to indulge a subculture to an extent within their own spheres, but insofar as this occurs, there will be division. Regardless, a dominant culture will always develop and, to an extent, suppress what's contrary to it.

This is why we've had blue, decency, and anti-sodomy laws and why Christian businessmen today can be persecuted for not servicing faux (same-sex) weddings. It's why people lose jobs, positions, and titles for being unfashionable, with the 20-year-old beauty pageant winner just [stripped of her crown](#) for refusing to don a hijab and for posting politically incorrect tweets being a good example.

The lesson here is simple: Multiculturalism is bunk. Either you control the culture or, eventually, the culture will control you. Take your pick.

*Photo at top: AP Images*



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.