Religious Diversity and Security in a Pluralistic Society:

A Canadian Research Approach

Kamal Dib

Dr. Kamal Dib is a manager of research at the Department of Canadian Heritage. This article is based on a presentation at the *Roundtable International Perspectives on Immigration, Immigrants and Hosts: Perceptions, Interactions, and Transformations*, (Using Research to Address Policy Issues), Toronto May 31-June 2, 2007. It describes research work that feeds into social policy development at public organizations, and has a Canadian focus, which may be relevant and useful in a comparative international context. This article has benefited from the generous comments of Dr. Margaret Adsett and Dr. Ian Donaldson (Canadian Heritage), and Mr. John Biles (Canadian Metropolis Project).

The views presented in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Government of Canada.

ABSTRACT

A multidisciplinary approach in social science research is essential to support public policy development in a multicultural country such as Canada. Such an approach is especially required for policies that walk the line between respect for citizenry in a religiously diverse society and maintaining national security. This article provides researchers and those interested in policy development with a multidisciplinary research method to tackle such a challenge.

1. INTRODUCTION

Religion plays an increasing role in the lives of individuals in most countries, with different levels of intensity and implications for public policy. The intensity varies from regions of the world, such as the Middle East, where religion takes premier position in the affairs of state and constitutions define states by the majority religion, and Europe, where the European Union is debating policy approaches towards the large Muslim minority and the attached security threat of Muslim radicals who committed crimes in Madrid and London.[1]

Recent religious issues in Canada are not of the same magnitude or intensity as experienced elsewhere in the world. They include clothing preferences (e.g., wearing a head cover for Muslim women, wearing a turban for Sikh men), faith-based arbitration, increased Anti-Semitism and Islam-phobia, etc. The low intensity of the religious experience should not be an invitation to downplay the importance of religion in Canadian society. If anything, Canada is becoming increasingly religiously diverse. There is therefore a need for secularizing policies or for State neutrality.

In this Canadian context, research has a role to inform policy development in the area of social policy and security. Understanding religious diversity in Canada and devising ways to harness the positive social capital of faith-based communities – and encouraging inter-faith dialogue – would serve both social and security policy development. Such policy development will benefit from taking lessons from recent developments on the world stage. The incorporation of a better understanding of the role of religion and faith-based communities in public discourse in Canada in public policy development can lead to better policies that foster social cohesion within a religiously diverse population, and to prevent victimizing individuals and or groups associated with certain faiths.

Overly stressing the negative manifestations of religion in the world may eventually lead to religious diversity being "securitized" in Canada. Which begs the question whether geopolitics at the world scale are using religion as the scapegoat for global competition for resources and power – as ideologies were used during the cold war – or if it is true that religions are experiencing a self-driven upheaval around the world and manifest tendencies to violence.

A multiculturalism policy perspective on this issue is that the preoccupation with national security can potentially lead to perceptions of racial and religious profiling, which may adversely impact on civil liberties and equality provisions for some minority ethnic or religious communities. Several faith-based communities felt the strain of the need to increase security precautions and provisions in a liberal democracy. Coupled with negative media portrayals of these communities,

this may lead to stereotyping and victimizing some minority Canadian communities. A multicultural approach towards this issue would maximize the satisfaction of security needs by viewing them more widely as "social" security, and by working with communities and keeping in mind the social aspects while factoring in the respect for public liberties and human rights.

In addition to the immediate security arrangements, approaches and strategies could be used to engage faith-based communities, foster public awareness, and combat religious discrimination. This approach becomes more relevant in the light of the 2017 demographic projections that show noticeable growth in minority non-Christian religions in Canada (from around 6% in 2001 to 10-12% in 2017). Such an increase would have an impact on economic, social, cultural, and political inclusion of minorities, especially if we see growing gaps with the majority in terms of income, employment, and education.

So far there is little consideration of this growing religious diversity in Canada in public policy development. However, many questions can impact on policy development. For example, is there religious extremism in Canada and what are its manifestations? What will the impact of religious diversity, if any, be on the future of Canada? What factors lead to Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia and religious intolerance in general? What is the place of religious issues in education and school curriculum, media coverage, public opinion, and the separate school boards? These questions and others should be answered through objective research before policies are developed, since only evidence-based research can lead to meaningful and useful policies.

2. MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACH

A multidisciplinary approach in research on security and religion is necessary to support social policy development. Such an approach responds to three realities:

1) The emerging complexity of issues and challenges in a globalized world. This complexity requires new thinking styles and forward looking approaches to research. The multi-disciplinary approach is necessary for dealing with complex and far-reaching issues such as immigration, multiculturalism and national security.
2) Public organizations, programs, and policies, even with apparently stand-alone mandates or functions, require horizontal cooperation that is based on a multi-disciplinary approach to research and policy and program development. Whether dealing with environmental issues, public health, religious diversity (i.e., "reasonable accommodation"[2]), the labour market, policing and justice, or immigrants and refugees, the variables in each case are such that acting solo is counter-intuitive. Judgements based on single factors are dangerous.
3) Emerging challenges in the 21st century for Canada include addressing the needs of a significant proportion of Canadians belonging to visible or religious minority groups. Such needs include having a level playing field without barriers to employment and social services, respect in the community, and full participation in society and politics.

Social, economic, religious, cultural and scientific issues are increasingly converging to the extent that researchers cannot conduct a study objectively without considering the wider context and the inter-relationships among various factors and other seemingly unrelated elements.

A large proportion of the world's population adheres to faiths with global reach, such as Christianity, Islam, and Judaism. The globalized dimension of religion requires careful attention from researchers and policy makers. The messages of these religions are universal in scope and are not to be confused with questions of national identities and belonging, not even with contemporary political issues and geopolitics. The simplest example is that the Vatican is the spiritual capital of all Roman Catholics in the world, but this does not make Irish or Spanish Catholics citizens of this spiritual place. At a socio-economic level, one cannot understand individuals of the Muslim, Christian, or Jewish faiths simply by referring to the Bible, the Talmud, or the Koran. Researchers respond to complex issues by deploying multiple skills.

Even within individual academic disciplines, one finds multiple sub-disciplines. For example, social psychology has crossovers with other disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, religious studies, history, statistics, econometrics, and the medical sciences. Being a solid social psychologist today requires several skills and exposure to many disciplines.


In the following sections, a description of the steps from research work to policy development in a public organization is presented, followed by a discussion of an approach to religion and security. A list of definitions of key concepts used in this article is found at the end.

Research for policy development in government organizations follows the steps identified in the schematic below, and these steps include:

1) Theme identification;
2) Setting the context and reviewing available literature to find a research topic;
3) Developing researchable questions;
4) Project design;
5) Collection and analysis of data; and
6) Answering the research questions.[3]

Projects also test a hypothesis. An example of a project without a hypothesis would be an analysis of the incidence of unemployment on Muslims in Canada compared to non-Muslims. A project with a hypothesis would test whether strong expressions of religiosity and of adherence to the rites of a faith could be interpreted as tendency towards extremism or at least, to non-belonging and alienation.

To produce useful and meaningful research products, researchers look at wide multidisciplinary contexts permitting new ideas and questions to be identified beyond existing practices and theoretical horizons. For example, research on crime that focuses on policing in a strict sense, but not on the socio-economic environment of crime, cannot help combat crime effectively and strategically.



Source: Keith F. Punch, Introduction to Social Research, 2nd edition, Sage Publications, 2005, pp.41-49.

Researchers in policy organizations have three basic functions:
1) Knowledge creation;
2) Knowledge dissemination; and
3) Networking/partnership.

They maintain working relationships with researchers in other public organizations, academics, researchers, and think tanks. They follow universal standards of academic work and respect for the goal of objectivity, and maintain a certain degree of independence in the advice they provide.

Non-research areas in a public organization – such as policy or program areas – are to be discouraged from conducting research activities. They would otherwise erode the research capacity of the organization by dispersing resources and would weaken the overall credibility of the research effort at the organization. Such *ad hoc* research may also be of questionable quality.

Research results inform policy recommendations. Policy development would benefit when the positions it recommends are evidence-based and supported by objective findings. Such findings add to the body of knowledge in the world and do not stop at usage in policy development. When properly conducted, the research fosters similar research among academic circles and external research bodies.

3. CONTEXT

Contextual parameters guide research and reinforce the research mandate and needs of the organization in a forward-looking approach to research.

Social and economic context

Canada, a country of almost 33 million people with a Gross Domestic Product of $1,400 billion and a member of the Group of Seven (G-7) largest industrial countries, appears frequently at the top of the United Nations *Human Development Index*, and has one of the highest standards of living in the world. Canada is viewed by many countries, especially members of the OECD,[4] as a leader in multiculturalism, human rights and diversity. Such wealth in human resource attributes has protected Canada from many of the adverse impacts of globalization and allowed it to compete for the scarce skilled workforce necessary for a sustainable knowledge-based economy. The promotion and preservation of Canada's multicultural character contributes to more productive workforces, stronger communities and an improved well being.[5] However, Canadian society is not immune to racial prejudices, discrimination practices against visible and religious minorities, and to social fragmentation. Accordingly, observing and researching the multicultural realities of Canada and their social and economic outcomes enhances policy development.

Legislative context

Public organizations are democratic institutions involved in the production of public goods, and derive their authorities, mandate and raison d'être from legislation and regulations and by extension, from detailed program and policy descriptions.

Canadian multiculturalism is broadly defined in the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*.[6] In 1971, the diversity of the population of Canada was relatively limited as far as visible and religious minorities were concerned (they represented at that time around 2% of the population), and multiculturalism as policy and as an idea was nascent. This should not diminish the importance of the types of diversity that existed before, such as the differences among the various Christian denominations (Catholic and Protestant) and European ethnic groups.[7]

Over the past 35 years, changing demographics have shown a growing relevance and need for multiculturalism policy. *The Multiculturalism Act*'s preamble cites the rights and freedoms enshrined in the *Constitution of Canada*, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*,[8] the *Official Languages Act*, the *Citizenship Act* and the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, the *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, and the *International Convention on Civil and Political Rights*.

The *Multiculturalism Act* states that "the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians and regards to race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada".[9]

Canada is signatory to six United Nations conventions pertaining to human rights and diversity.[10] The increasing complexity of social issues and the persistence of racism and discrimination, in old and new forms, have also emphasized the importance of human rights legislation.

4. PRIORITIES[11]

Research themes and questions are developed in the following chronological order: (1) literature reviews, (2) environmental scans, and (3) consultations with key players and stakeholders.

The following seven themes cover elements of research on security and religious diversity.

1) ***Social Exclusion:*** refers to multi-dimensional disadvantage of religious minority groups and individuals. The exclusion is of lengthy duration and involves dissociation from the major social and occupational milieu of society;
2) ***Demographic Projections:*** Canada's religious diversity has evolved between 1967 and 2008, and the outlook for the next 25 years predicts that non-Christian minorities may constitute at least 15% of the population;
3) ***Applied Research*** on existing policies and programs and whether they are addressing the current and future needs of a religiously diverse society;
4) ***Racism and discrimination:*** The issues of hate, racism and discriminatory practices on religious grounds, in access to public services, employment and civic participation.
5) ***Regional Dimensions:*** Researching regional particularities is essential for intelligent policy and program development for a religiously diverse society, especially in Canada where geography is intertwined with demographic differences in the population (linguistic, ethnic, religious, etc.). In the past ten years, the issue of reasonable accommodation is particular to Quebec, whereas the issues of religious arbitration and publicly-funded religious schools were particular to Ontario.

Religious diversity is increasing in contemporary western societies, but religion-related issues in Canada remain relatively minor compared to the U.K. or France. Recent religious issues in Canada range from clothing preferences (wearing a head cover for Muslim women, wearing a turban for Sikh men) and faith-based arbitration to increased Anti-Semitism and Islam-phobia, and secularists' attitudes towards religion-practising individuals. Articles and speeches abound where events in Europe are listed followed by – without transition – a description of the various sizes and growth rates of non-Christian religions, particularly Islam, in Canada and concluding with an implicit or an explicit warning that "it could happen here".

Understanding religious diversity in Canada and devising ways to harness the positive social capital of faith-based communities are important research questions to help develop programs and services. Hence the need for research on a balanced approach aiming to satisfy security needs in a pluralist democracy.

5. INTO POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Once themes, topics and questions are identified, research is undertaken either by contracting independent academics or private consultants. Some of the work could be conducted in-house. The ultimate purpose of research, or perhaps its primary objective, is to inform policy development. The following is a definition of policy in the Government of Canada:


> *A Policy is a clear goal and/or direction. It comes from the considered selection of one choice among competing choices. Policy directs, but does not consist of, operational programs and details. It is best expressed as vision and goals, with associated strategic objectives, work plan and a program of activities, resources and leadership to achieve that choice.*[12]

Similar to the schematic for research presented above, policy development also comes in a series of steps starting with an agenda building.

Agenda building: The public policy agenda is a list of subjects or issues to be addressed by government and stakeholders. Not all research outcomes get into the policy agenda. Research is one among several competing elements that inform public policy development. These competing elements include media reports, election platform commitments, interest group submissions, ideology, etc. The process leading to building the policy agenda includes how issues are recognized and framed/reframed as problems to be addressed, and how these problems are placed on an agenda for discussion.[13]

Two factors affect agenda setting:

- Participants (who are they and who do they represent? if they are persons from a religious group, are they



Source: based on details from Glen Milne, Making Policy – A Guide to the Federal Government's Policy Process, Ottawa, 2002.

coming forward as individuals or do they represent the community? What is the size of their community in Canada's population, etc.?). Participants include government elected officials and public servants, community and interest groups, media and academics.

- Process: the process would identify limits on participation, circulation of documents, and lists the stages of approval, and whether the issue is an item for Cabinet, etc.

Agendas are built in three ways:

- Mobilization from the outside (community and public pressure);
- Engagement process (initiated from within the government but quickly attracting the public); or
- From the inside (initiated from within the government, but was not on the public agenda).

Stating the problematic: Stating the problematic that the policy being developed is trying to resolve is the most visible step in policy development. It generally revolves around a critical event. Recent events related to religious diversity suggest that multiculturalism policy can also be part of the public agenda due to critical events (reasonable accommodation, ethnic enclaves, incidents related to religious diversity, security and pluralism, racial profiling, violence, etc.). Stating the problematic is vital to a policy development process, but this has to be based on facts and objective research independent of biased influence.

Policy options: This step deals with providing elected officials with options/alternatives to addressing the problematic.

Policy statement, legislation, etc.: This is the role that elected officials play on behalf of the government: i.e., making policy decisions, sending bills to Parliament, etc.

6. RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY AND SECURITY[14]

In the remainder of this article, I shall explore how one social science discipline, i.e., social psychology, may approach research on religious diversity and security in a pluralistic society.

Some social psychologists like to be called "cultural psychologists" or "inter-cultural psychologists", a title that fits them neatly in multiculturalism/diversity research. Therefore, the potential of using their expertise is obviously there. Social psychologists study how social conditions affect human beings, using individuals and groups as their units of analysis. Despite the similarity with other social sciences (primarily psychology and sociology), the discipline of social psychology tends to differ in the respective goals, approaches, methods, and terminology, as well as in separate academic journals and societies. Therefore, social psychology is in fact interdisciplinary, which is precisely the approach needed for the purpose of conducting research for public policy development to address the complex issues of religious diversity and national security.

Social psychology focuses on the individual, and attempts to explain how other people influence the thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of this individual. In other words, it emphasizes the immediate social situation, and the interaction between person and situation variables. They also focus on group behaviour, and thus examine such phenomena as interactions and exchanges at the micro-level, and group dynamics and crowds at the macro-level. They are interested in a variety of demographic, social, and cultural phenomena, including social inequality, group dynamics, social change, socialization, social identity, and symbolism in inter-personal dynamics.

Social psychologists use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, such as surveys and statistical regressions. Research presented in the Toronto roundtable tended to be highly empirical and quantitative.[15] This is half a compliment, as quantitative exercises should not replace wider literature reviews and a deeper intellectual research of the significant and the truism of the findings of a regression. The idea that "if it is not quantifiable, it is not research" is an extreme approach to objective research. The deductive approach should not be discounted and is useful to supplement quantitative or qualitative methods.

How can social psychology research be relevant to public policy discussions in Canada and other pluralist democracies? I will divide the answer into two sets of issues: how-to issues and thematic issues, in both cases of relevance to multiculturalism and diversity.

Here is a list of "how-to" questions, such as using research in policy:

- What policy issues seem most open to the contributions of social psychological research, and what special information can social psychologists provide that other social science areas cannot?
- What level of proof or scientific certainty is required or recommended for social psychological data to be used in policy debates?
- What are the difficulties and obstacles to using scientific knowledge in the context of political decisions? And what channels and processes can be used to transfer such knowledge to political decision makers?

Some presenters at the roundtable also asked about the framing of the topics, as this may influence the way groups in society are viewed.

The second list includes issues directly related to multiculturalism:

- Are there limits to multiculturalism in terms of what host societies are willing to accept, and what are the situational factors that may influence the definition of these limits? What type of research would be useful from the perspective of researchers and policy makers for addressing these questions?
- How do current events, such as the Madrid train bombing or September 11, 2001, influence the perceptions and policies toward immigrants? Are there ways for researchers to understand these events?
- From the perspective of immigrants, what strategies can a host community employ that would most likely improve the "warmth of welcome" that they perceive prior to and upon entering the host community?
- What are essential factors for promoting a sense of national identity and inclusion for first – and later – generation immigrants? Is it possible for immigrants to adopt a new national identity and still maintain loyalty to the country of origin?
- What factors in the history of immigration in your country seem particularly relevant to perceptions of contemporary immigrant groups and the policies that are in place to deal with immigration?

As for the multiculturalism angle on this topic, questions would include:

- Are there adverse impacts of perceived linkages among religion, ethnicity/race and/or security/policing issues (e.g. racial profiling)?
- What can be done to address the issue of racial profiling?
- How can government work with all stakeholders to raise awareness about racial profiling and the impact of the heightened sense of security?

Turning to the thematic questions, I will use a case study project that potentially collapses the research themes into one.

This project requires a multidisciplinary approach and requires:

- Economists and statisticians to review the incidence of racism and discrimination at work and in the community, and the economic conditions of affected persons or groups;
- Sociologists to study the symptoms of stratification and segregation of victims of racism;
- Historians to provide a wider context of the issues to discourage the temptation of seeing it as "emerging" or as a media story;
- Anthropologists who review ethnicities and origins and patterns among communities and groups; and
- Social psychologists to study the impact of racism and discrimination on children and youth and the social-psychological origins of racist mind frames, etc.

The research project would include elements such as labour market outcomes of the different religious groups, the adverse impact of discriminatory barriers on the maximization of the workforce of Canada, the low-income cut-off and poverty amongst affected groups, etc. Researchers will study groups affected by racism and discrimination and in what ways does racism touch the lives of religious minorities.

Controversy could arise as to whether poor labour market outcomes are explained by racism or by other variables, such as age, skill level, experience, education, language proficiency, etc.;[16] or whether poor labour market outcomes for visible minorities and recent immigrants is a failure of the mainstream or the host society in accepting and integrating minorities and recent immigrants, or that these minorities and immigrants "do not want to integrate".

Recent research on the *Ethnic Diversity Survey* resulted in three different interpretations of the EDS' responses by visible minority youth and the sense of belonging. The interpretations have led to controversial front-page headlines and feature articles in a major Canadian daily.[17]

The differences in these interpretations were about whether there is a racial gap in belonging and cultural identity, where some have argued that "rootedness" does not necessarily lead to greater attachment of second generation youth, citing the example of Aboriginal peoples who are the most rooted group in the country but who have their own views about belonging.

Moving along the schematic shown earlier in this article, I will assume here that researchers have already established the socio-economic context which helps address some of the themes. I will now introduce more complexity with the themes of religious diversity and security in a pluralist society. This complexity requires opening a wider spectrum on issues confronting Canadian multiculturalism, and allows me to demystify the perceived usefulness of mono-disciplinary research approaches to security and policing that are conducted in isolation of the wider social contexts.

Factoring in the assumption that this case study will be conducted by cultural psychologists or inter-cultural

sociologists, I will present the hypothesis to be tested through which I will address the thematic questions:

Hypothesis: Whether culture can explain terrorism

In 2006, media reports and anti-multiculturalism circles have criticized/attacked Canadian multiculturalism, stating that it encourages segregation and apartness in society. Criticism also held that the multiculturalism policy impeded the integration of ethnic or religious communities, some of which follow extreme ideologies that are prone to violence and terrorism. Such generalized criticism requires careful attention to deconstruct what is a useful exercise in questioning applied policy for the sake of improvement, from the more ideological interest of sending the wheels of social progress backwards to gain uniformity and the coercive integration of the past.

The case study will contextualize the hypothesis and covers the first half the research schematic, up to the point of validating the hypothesis to be tested. Once this task is completed, the topic would be ready to be commissioned as work by independent researchers.

Principles of research

Let us first return to *Research 101*, which students ought to acquire in high school:

- That the aim of research is the investigation of phenomena;
- That all phenomena, including domestic crime and international terrorism, have explanations;
- That the business of research is *explanation and investigation*, and that this business should not be confused with *justification* (neither justifying the criminal acts themselves nor the methods used to combat them);
- That the requirement to analyze factors, intentions and root causes of criminal behaviour through research should not limit the necessity of deterrence against crime, although research findings may modify the application of such deterrence and make it better-informed, more effective and successful;
- That security and policing issues are complex, with far reaching impacts on the domestic Canadian scene and individual communities. If not addressed properly, such issues have the potential of targeting specific ethno-racial/cultural or religious minority groups of Canadians;
- That the application of deterrence is part of a package that includes education/awareness, dialogue with and links to communities, as well as preventative, mainly positive, social measures.
- If a permanent prevention of crime, within a context of social cohesion and harmony, is the desired outcome of policy making, then this is not possible if one remains ignorant of the complex factors that lead to crime (i.e., research should be dealing with causes not only manifestations of criminality, etc.).

Definitions of concepts

With these research principles in mind, the research exercise proceeds to a definitional drill. In fact, defining concepts is a prerequisite to framing the research questions of any topic.

Safety and security involve two pieces, national security and domestic crime. National security includes various elements such as the challenges of global terrorism in the 21st century. Domestic crime is a more obvious area where a deep understanding of social issues such as segregation, racism, poverty, etc, is needed.

Media portrayals and public discourses should not cloud the search for the right approaches to combating crime. For example, in the United States, policy would be ineffective if it relied on anecdotal reports and Hollywood stereotypes that portray Blacks as prone to violence and associate them with crime and drug dealing, etc. Two American professors conducted a thoughtful analysis of data gathered from inner-city Chicago drug-dealing gangs and found a world of poverty where only the top drug bosses make money. The research showed that scores of underlings in these gangs still live at home with their parents, earn below subsistence wages, run a high risk of being shot-gunned, do not have a social security card or a bank account, and are condemned to a life of poverty.[18] Clearly, a social program would be the right approach here.

If improperly researched, causes of domestic crime could be confused with issues of national security. For example, academics and politicians sometimes list the Paris riots as one of the flares of international terrorism in recent years. This characterization would immediately imply a certain type of response and the application of deterrence. However, a French professor has discovered, after two decades of investigation, that the mono-dimensional research he has been doing on employment did not yield useful findings for tangible or permanent solutions to the problem of ghettos in French cities;[19] that sending in the police to control riots is simple-minded, that the historical factors of the development of the French ghetto and the wider societal responsibility for such misery falls on everyone.

The portrayal of the residents of ghettos in France and their riots in 2005 as an extension of "the war on terrorism", or that the riots provide further evidence of a people "who do not want to integrate", can only mislead public policy. It not only establishes a premise that generalizes such events as somehow proof that "immigrants are a menace", but also insinuates that policymakers should do something about them, especially through security-driven policies, whereas the real main area of responsibility falls on the shoulder of social policy and social services.

Several participants at the Roundtable, especially from Europe, apply a misnomer when they say "immigrants and second generation immigrants". How can one still be an immigrant in the country of his/her birth? Here, the Canadian approach differs from the European approach, to the extent where the word "immigrant" is applied very narrowly to someone who is foreign-born and is a permanent resident in Canada but did not yet receive Canadian citizenship; which is not to deny the importance of the experiences of the second generation as an indicator of integration success. When we explore this subject we speak of second generation *Canadians,* which is an important semantic distinction.

Also some participants used the word "foreigner" to refer to immigrants or minorities, such as in the presentation

about Germany. This is not a word in use in Canada; even students from other countries studying at Canadian universities are called international students and not foreign students. The word *Auslander* may not have the same meaning as the word "foreigner" in a North American context, as it may mean who is an ethnic German and who is not, which may exclude German-born citizen of Turkish origin in popular usage.

"Culture" of terrorism?

I will now focus on whether culture can explain terrorism. An immediate difficulty for the researcher is that an agreed-upon definition may not be allowed. The idea that "terrorism" as a concept is self-contained, politically-charged, and evokes high emotionalism, forbids attempts of inspection and analysis. The word becomes a boxed approach and counterintuitive to the principles of research listed above. The difficulty here is that the absence of a definition yields a situation where "terrorism" becomes a monologue among "security experts", and a pretension that everyone knows what they are talking about, but without a definition.

Even if a definition of "terrorism" is provided, most often it will define it by its outcomes – such as providing a number of groups and organizations and listing their violent beliefs and statements and the amount of heinous crimes that they have committed. Thus, based on the analysis of symptoms – not causes – such research may lead to simplistic policy recommendations: that this violence (and for that matter any social violence, because the issue becomes symptoms or outcomes) is terrorism and is deserving of the amount of coercion deployed against it.

The more serious approaches of social science – and science in general – require that a proper relational connection exist between a concept – such as terrorism or culture – and something else outside it. This is necessary because no phenomenon, social or natural, is self-defined or self-contained. This is precisely what Plato, 2400 years ago, had criticized Parmenides for, where Plato blamed the latter for "concentrating exclusively on Nature"[20] and on nothing else.

The case at hand should not be any different; otherwise research, let alone a multidisciplinary one, would have no business addressing such issues.

Having established the importance of the relational factor in understanding, and thus better addressing undesired phenomena such as terrorism and crime in general, no research on security in a pluralist society is possible without a workable relational definition of concepts. Even when proper social science methodologies are applied, the outcome may be of poor quality, but may nevertheless be taken as an objective inquiry and used in policy development. Many reports, articles and books have focused on "culture" as a possible "midwife" of terrorism, that a "culture of terrorism" is central to the psyche of some societies or ethnic or religious groups. This approach has opened the door over the past 15 years to an avalanche of literature and dissertations, and has led to a flourishing of disciplines such as religious studies and anthropology to study the cultural "traits and basic "characteristics" of certain ethnicities and societies. There is also the Samuel Huntington[21] approach, which prophesizes the coming violent warfare of the clash of cultures ("civilizations", as he calls them).

In the above example, we can see that a "relational definition" is provided, but it is one based on culture, without a clue as to whether policy development can get far with such an approach. The problem with the term "terrorism as founded in cultures", and by extension, making multi-"culturalism" responsible, is that it is basically racist. This definition assumes that communities (ethnicities or societies) are prisoners (or in anthropological parlance, "sedentary creatures") of "basic cultural traits", which is a racist classification of individuals' behaviour, motives, and energies, as having foundations in biological certainties. Unfortunately, research reports that use this vein would conclude that individuals, as belonging in a racial or religious group as a closed community, are indistinguishable from one another and are similar to the teeth of a comb - one is bad, all are bad.

What would be the impact of such research on policy development? Placing entire groups as hopeless anthropological cases buried in behavioural uncertainties, would not allow for a window of opportunity for public policy to assist behavioural change (upbringing, mainstreaming, liberal education, socializing, etc.) nor would they give hope for a better future outside violence and deterrence. Moreover, such "anthropological certainties" feed into stereotyping, racial profiling, and, again, to talk that "these people do not want to integrate".

Explanations for terrorism should be much larger (geopolitics, socio-economic, etc.) than the simple bashing of other cultures or of multiculturalism policies as breeders of terrorist behaviour.

Framing questions

By deconstructing the simplistic approach of using "culture" as an explanatory of terrorism, and by emphasizing the importance of relational factors, the next stage would be framing the research questions based on what we have learnt so far:

Would all acts of violence qualify as terrorism (for example, is it accurate to make a sweeping statement about "terrorism" in Europe to include the socially-induced riots in Paris and the bombings in London in 2005)? If terrorism is the conscious targeting of the innocent to sow seeds of fear in the general population, then the London bombing qualifies as terrorism. This should be distinguished from the Paris riots which would qualify as social or political violence.

There is a heavy emphasis on religion to describe and analyze contemporary terrorism. In the quest for a generalized academic approach, how can religion or anthropology be used to describe and analyze the left wing terrorism that proliferated over 35 years ago in industrial societies (and included the American *Black Panthers*, the *Bader-Meinhof Faction* in Germany, the *Japanese Red Army,* the *Basque Liberation Front*, the *Irish Republican Army,* etc.)? How would this western "home-grown" terrorism since the late 19th century from Russia to France differ from leftist Middle Eastern variety of the 1960s and 1970s, where radical movements were modeled along Marxist lines? In

fact, these Middle Eastern leftists considered Islamic fundamentalists as their archenemies.

Is religion a factor in terrorism and why? Today's global terrorism is associated – more or less – in public discourse, the media and a large number of books – with Islam and Muslims, which implies the culpability of the "Muslim culture". By extension, if religion is an explanatory of terrorism, would the "Christian culture" provide a relational definition of terrorism in Europe in the late 19th century and much of the 20th century?

Research becomes inconsistent when religions and cultures are triggered at convenience to explaining terrorism (that one culture/religion is superior, and that another religion is inferior, backward, barbaric, etc.) and at another time are not. Granted, terrorist minds could use religious and non-religious elements in their ideologies, but this is equally true of several religions. Voltaire has said that "intolerance is the *maladie* of Catholicism" in France. By extension (what another writer has added), if Fascism is the *maladie* of Europe, then religious fundamentalism is the *maladie* of Islam.[22] This would be a more balanced approach of seeing how religious dynamics are at play in world geopolitics today.

Simple cultural interpretations of terrorism, favouring one religion and demonizing another, may, intentionally or unintentionally, contribute to the backdrop of some policy responses:

- It was unthinkable to bomb West Belfast when the IRA wreaked havoc and killed innocent civilians in London; it was equally unthinkable to attack Boston, which was the source of funding for the IRA. In both instances, authorities treated incidents as crimes by individuals and pursued and arrested the perpetrators, and then engaged in thinking about permanent peaceful solutions.
- In the Oklahoma bombing in May 1995, the perpetrator was a member of a white supremacist militia, many of which have proliferated in the United States over the past 25 years. There was no thought of bombing militia strongholds in Montana or Idaho. Instead, Timothy McVeigh was arrested and an enquiry was launched to understand and deal with the sources of hatred that breed violence in American culture, especially among young men. It is interesting that no anthropological approaches were applied here, and not even a consideration that American society, and for that matter every society, is dynamic and would change over time, and where mores and behaviours are not etched in stone.[23]

The research approach towards IRA terrorism and supremacist terrorism was not applied when analyzing terrorist incidents since 2001. Instead, we have seen an avalanche of literature about a major world religion that "hates us", and louder talk about the menace of coloured immigrants. There were TV talk shows featuring "authoritative" specialists who said:

> "We should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity. We weren't punctilious about locating and punishing only Hitler and his top officers. We carpet-bombed German cities; we killed civilians. That's war. And this is war."[24]

To this biased research backdrop, the policy response in the post-2001 world was military, and war was waged on a series of countries. The impact on minority visible and religious groups in Europe and North America is far from positive. There, hitherto popular individuals and communities were perceived as suspect and unpopular, and community members may be voicing the cry that it is not pleasant to be, for example, of Muslim or Arab origin.

All this is to say that research on religion and security is not being done properly, as much research is essentializing culture with respect to the impulse of terrorism. Of course, there are cultural and religious influences in explaining terrorism and improving security, but there are other influences as well.

Mono-disciplinary explanations focusing on culture, anthropology and religion[25] are therefore harmful or at least not useful, when done in isolation of the socio-economic analysis and the wider geopolitical circumstances and events in the world. Such mono-disciplinarily approaches run contrary to the social structures of Canada and the United States, which are both societies of immigrants and are multicultural nations in principle and in demographic reality. Social psychology has a lot to contribute to the themes explored in this article, such as on the situation of individuals and the typology of those at risk.

Only in good solid research will effective policy be possible. Leave a knowledge vacuum and decisions will still be made, decisions we may all have cause to regret in the future.

Multicultural terms

Multidisciplinary research covers a wide spectrum of social, economic, civic, and cultural issues that have implications for Canada, in the present and in the future. This annex provides a compilation of terms and their definitions. While these terms and their definitions do not constitute a legal opinion or government policy, they do help in understanding current notions and concepts used in multidisciplinary research on Canada. They may also apply to other multicultural societies.

BIGOTRY: Dislike or hatred of persons because of her/his membership in a particular group.

BULLYING: Bullying is characterized by repeated physical or verbal interactions that are meant to be hostile, cause distress, and involve a power differential between bully and victim. Bullying can occur in many forms across the lifespan, from playground interactions to dating violence, workplace harassment, and elder abuse.

CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS: The *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, which forms Part I of Canada's 1982 constitution, sets out most of the rights and freedoms that the federal, provincial and territorial governments of Canada must respect. It includes certain fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of religion, expression and association, as well as certain democratic, mobility, legal, equality, linguistic and Aboriginal rights. The courts enforce the Charter, not human rights commissions.

CULTURAL RELATIVISM: The use of one's own culture as a yardstick for judging the ways of other individuals or societies would generally lead to a negative evaluation of the values, norms, and behaviours of these other individuals or societies.

DISCRIMINATION: Discrimination involves formally and informally classifying people into different groups with the intent or effect of according the members of each group unequal treatment, rights or obligations. The criteria delineating the groups determine the kind of discrimination. For example, there can be discrimination on the grounds of race (racism), gender (sexism), religion (religious discrimination), height, ethnic background, national origin, disability, or sexual orientation, among others. However, there is also discrimination based on grounds that are not reflected in laws and these include preference or behaviour, results of IQ testing, age or political views, among others.

DIVERSITY: The term diversity when associated with human diversity, relates specific social, economic, cultural, and political contexts. It is a term that applies to a range of human perspectives, backgrounds and experiences as reflected in characteristics such as age, class, ethnic origin, race, gender, nationality, physical and learning ability, Aboriginal status, region, religion, sexual orientation, marital status, education, employment, as well as cultural values, beliefs, and practices. The idea of diversity is passive, while multiculturalism includes notions of respect and recognition, equality and social justice as regards diversity, as well as integration and participation.

ETHNIC: Of or relating to people grouped according to a single or a combination of common racial, national, tribal, religious, linguistic, and/or cultural origin.

ETHNIC ENCLAVE: Ethnic enclave is a neutral term meaning a geographic concentration of an ethnic group. Impartially, unlike a ghetto, they tend to exist by conscious choice, not by coercion or poverty. The development of such enclaves is related to the history of immigration and settlement in Canada (i.e., where the Irish, French, Ukrainians, Poles, Germans, etc., chose to settle). Large Canadian cities have neighbourhoods with certain concentrations, such as so-called Chinatowns and Little Italy, etc.

ETHNIC ORIGIN: In 2001, Canadians reported over 206 ethnic origins, with roots in all parts of the world, mostly in Europe (English, Irish, French, Polish, Italian, Hungarian, etc.), but also in Asia (Pakistani, Afghan, East Indian, Japanese, etc.), Africa (Ugandan, Nigerian, Ghanaian, Ethiopian, Somali, etc.), Latin America (Chilean, Brazilian, Argentinean, etc.), Caribbean (Haitian, Jamaican, etc.), and the Middle East (Iraqi, Turkish, Egyptian, Iranian, etc.). Ethnic origin is one of the 11 prohibited grounds of discrimination in the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, referred to in the legislation as "national or ethnic origin".

ETHNOCENTRISM: The attitude of prejudice or mistrust towards outsiders that may exist within a social group; a way of perceiving one's own cultural group in relation to others. An attitude that one's own culture, society, or group is inherently superior to all others. Ethnocentrism refers to the inability to appreciate others whose cultural attributes may include a different racial group, ethnic group, religion, morality, or language, hence, the tendency of a host culture or a mainstream culture to dismiss other perspectives as inferior or irrelevant.

Recent religious issues in Canada are not of the same magnitude or intensity as experienced elsewhere in the world. They include clothing preferences (e.g., wearing a head cover for Muslim women, wearing a turban for Sikh men), faith-based arbitration, increased Anti-Semitism and Islam-phobia, etc.

EUROCENTRISM: The practice of consciously or unconsciously privileging the cultures of Europe over other cultures. Euro-centrism is a belief in the superiority of European-based moral thoughts and practices, and treats them as a norm that provides the standard by which others are judged and interpreted. Some geographic terms that place Europe at the centre of the world should be avoided, such using *Orient*, *Far East* and *Middle East* to refer to Asia, a continent with billions of people, as east of Europe. Or using the New World (which ignores the ancient civilizations of the Americas), the Old World (referring to Europe), the Third World (suggesting somehow that Western Europe is first, Eastern Europe is Second and developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America are Third), the Orient, and "the Western World" (suggesting a certain mythical homogeneity of the countries of Europe, North America, Australia, and New Zealand).

FOREIGN NATIONAL/FOREIGNER: A person who is neither a Canadian citizen nor a permanent resident. Such a person could be a visitor or a student. The word "foreign" is discouraged in use, and is viewed similar to the term "alien nationals".

GHETTOIZATION: The conscious or unconscious phenomenon of segregating members of a group from the larger community, that confines them to specific geographic location, deprives them of the elements of social, economic and political participation of the wider mainstream society, and abandons them to face poverty and need. Ghettoization, as a social process, is coercive and not a question of choice for the residents of the ghetto.

HUMAN RIGHTS: Human rights refer to fundamental rights regarded as belonging to all people. Human rights are defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948. In Canada human

rights are entrenched in the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and in the *Canadian Human Rights Act* at the federal level and in provincial human rights codes.

IMMIGRANT: At the more technical level, refers to a person who is, or has been, a landed immigrant in Canada. A landed immigrant is a person who has been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by the immigration authorities. Recent immigrant refers to a person who immigrated to Canada in the 5 years preceding the census, excluding the census year itself (e.g., recent immigrants in 2001 were those who immigrated from 1996 to 2000). In more general use, an immigrant in Canada is someone who was born somewhere else. In contrast, in most European countries the term immigrant may be used to describe those who do not belong to the national ethnic group, even if they were born in the country and hold its citizenship.

INTOLERANCE: An unwillingness to consider, endure and/or respect the beliefs and practices of an individual or group. Racial intolerance refers to an unwillingness to permit equal opportunity and full societal participation to members of other racial groups; religious intolerance is the unwillingness to accept, endure or respect those of other religious beliefs.

MARGINALIZATION: This occurs when individuals or groups end up in positions of minor importance and influence or power because they have been excluded from decision-making, or have not had an equal opportunity to participate. Marginalization exists when the voices of a group are separated and contained apart from the problem-solving and central decision-making process of an institution or a society. Marginalization refers to the experience of certain groups, which do not have full and equal access to and cannot participate in the social, economic, cultural and political institutions of society.

MEMBERS OF VULNERABLE GROUPS: groups who are socially excluded from the benefits and privileges enjoyed by the mainstream society. Social inclusion could be a laborious and lengthy process that occurs at a later stage once socially excluded groups and individuals gain access to the mainstream. Any group or sector of society that is at higher risk of being subjected to discriminatory practices, violence, natural or environmental disasters, or economic hardship, than other groups within the State; any group or sector of society (such as women, children or the elderly) that is at higher risk in periods of conflict and crisis.

MINORITIES: A minority may be considered to be a group of people which is numerically smaller in size to the rest of the population of a country or a community, where such a group is in a non-dominant social position, whose members possess ethnic, racial, religious or linguistic characteristics, which differ from those of the rest of the population, and who, if only implicitly, maintain a sense of solidarity directed towards preserving their group's culture, traditions, religion or language.

MINORITIES, VISIBLE: According to Statistics Canada, a member of a visible minority group in Canada is someone (other than an Aboriginal person) who is non-white in colour/race, regardless of place of birth. This includes persons from the following visible minority groups or origins: Black, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, South Asian/East Indian (including Indian from India; Bangladeshi; Pakistani; East Indian from Guyana, Trinidad, East Africa; etc.), Southeast Asian (including Burmese; Cambodian; Laotian; Thai; Vietnamese; etc.), Non-White West Asian, North African or Arab (including Egyptian; Libyan; Lebanese; Iranian; etc.), Non-White Latin American (including indigenous persons from Central and South America; etc.), Person of Mixed Origin (with one parent in one of the visible minority groups listed above); other visible minority group. Visible minority persons could be first generation Canadians (i.e., born outside Canada) or second and more generations (Canadian born). The term 'visible minority' is not a synonym of 'immigrant' and vice versa.

MULTICULTURALISM (AS POLICY): The Canadian multiculturalism policy as stated in the federal *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* affirms the value and dignity of all Canadian citizens regardless of their racial or ethnic origins, their language, or their religious affiliation, and promotes public sphere transformation to reflect Canada's diversity. The Act also confirms the rights of Aboriginal peoples and the status of Canada's linguistics duality. Canadian multiculturalism is fundamental to the belief that all citizens are equal, and citizens might have different cultural identities and take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging to Canada. Acceptance gives Canadians a feeling of security and self-confidence, making them more open to, and accepting of, diverse cultures. The Canadian experience has shown that multiculturalism encourages racial and ethnic harmony and cross-cultural understanding, and discourages ghettoization, hatred, discrimination and violence.

MULTICULTURALISM (AS IDEOLOGY): Multiculturalism is a condition of cultural pluralism. It promotes tolerance and cross-cultural understanding and strives to the ideal of equality and mutual respect in a society with a diversity of racial, ethnic, religious or cultural groups. Multiculturalism recognizes that diversity is a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and of its national character. It also attempts to foster full participation in all aspects of Canadian society for all Canadians regardless of culture, ethnic or national origin, religion, race and colour.

MULTICULTURALISM (AS DEMOGRAPHIC REALITY): Multiculturalism is used to characterize a society with ethnic or cultural heterogeneity. It has been used in Canada as an attribute of Canadian society for at least the last four decades. Canada has become a multi-ethnic, multi-racial and multi-religious society, and is expected to become more diverse in the coming decade. Statistics Canada predicts that visible minorities will represent 20%-25% of the population of Canada in 2017, and religious minorities will represent 10%-12% in the same period.

NORMS/VALUES: Norms are rules for accepted and expected behaviour. Norms prescribe "proper" behaviour. Values are culturally defined standards held by individuals, groups or organizations about what is desirable, proper, beautiful, good (or bad), that serve as broad guidelines for social life. Many norms and values are incorporated into laws. Norms should not be confused with national values, such as respect for law and order or the embrace of parliamentary democracy which exist at the level of political culture.

PLURALISM: An approach in which some degree of cultural, ethnic, linguistic, religious, or other group distinction is maintained and valued by individuals. A concept used to express the notion of a society in which groups can remain voluntarily apart from each other when it comes to traditions, cultural practices and beliefs, while sharing a set of commonly held principles and consensus on social and political values.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION: According to the *International Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* (1965), to which Canada is a signatory, the term racial discrimination means any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has had the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.

RACIAL PROFILING: Judgments about an individual or group based solely on their ethnicity or color of their skin; racial profiling also refers to actions based on such judgments. Often defined in a law enforcement context, the Ontario Human Rights Commission defines racial profiling as "any action taken for reasons of safety, security or public protection that relies on stereotypes about race rather than on reasonable suspicion, to single out an individual for greater security or different treatment".

PREJUDICE: Prejudice is an unjustified, usually negative attitude directed toward others because of their social category or group memberships.

SEGREGATION: The economic, physical, political, and social separation of diverse groups or individuals, particularly referring to ideological and structural barriers to civil liberties, equal opportunity and participation by minorities within a majority ethnic, linguistic, racial, religious, or social group.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION: Social exclusion refers to multi-dimensional disadvantage which is of substantial duration and which involves dissociation from the major social and occupational milieu of society. It is a shorthand term for what can happen to people or areas from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, bad health, and family breakdown and/or racism.

SOCIAL INTEGRATION: Integration in the context of multiculturalism is not the mild equivalent to "assimilation". Social integration refers to the creation of a society that respects cultural diversity and at the same time promotes the goal of equal opportunity across private and public domains.

STEREOTYPE: Stereotype is a false or generalized conception of a group of people, which results in the unconscious or conscious categorization of each member of that group, without regard for individual differences. Stereotyping may relate to race or age; ethnic, linguistic, religious, geographical, or national groups; social, marital or family status; sexual orientation; physical, developmental or mental abilities; and/or gender.

TOLERANCE: The term tolerance suggests agreement to disagree and acceptance that others have different opinions or preferences even if you do not agree with them. While tolerance is an element of respect, it has been considered in the multiculturalism discourse as a passive, or even grudging, acceptance of diversity (e.g., quiet resentment of the presence of members of visible minority or Aboriginal groups in the workplace).

REFERENCES

Abdelwahab Meddeb. (2005). *La Maladie de l'islam*, Seuil, Points essais.

Banting, K., Courchene, T. and Seidle, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada.* The Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP).

Berg, B. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Berry, J.W., and Annis, R.C. (1988). *Ethnic psychology: Research and practice with immigrants, refugees, native peoples, ethnic groups and sojourners: Selected papers from a North American Regional Conference of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V.

Cheung, L. (2005). *Racial status and employment outcomes.* Canadian Labour Congress, Research Paper.

Huntington, S. (1996). *The clash of civilization and the remaking of the world.* New York: Shuster.

Jedwab, J. Workshop on religious diversity held by the Association for Canadian Studies, *25th Anniversary of the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms Conference*, University of Ottawa, April 2007.

Jurgensmeyer, Mark. (2000). Terror *in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence.* Berkley, University of California Pres.

Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,.

Levitt, S. D., Dubner, S. J. (2006). Why do drug dealers still live with their mom? In *Freakonomics: A rogue economist explores the hidden side of everything* (p. 79). William Morrow.

Maurin, E. (2004). *Le ghetto français : Enquête sur le séparatisme social.* Paris : La République des idées, Seuil.

Miller, D. (1991). *Handbook of research design and social measurement.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Milne,G. (2002). *Making policy: A guide to the federal government's policy process.* Ottawa.

Palmer, D. (2006, Spring). How different are they. *Canadian Diversity*, Volume 5:2, 44-46.

Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to social research*, 2nd edition. Sage Publications.

Notes

1 Not to mention the major obstacle that Turkey is facing regarding its membership in the European Union, which is its Muslim religion.

2 *Reasonable Accommodation* refers to the accommodation of persons with disabilities, women, visible minorities, and Aboriginal peoples in the workplace as stated in the federal *Employment Equity Act*, and to the "accommodement raisonnable" in the Quebec Charter of Human Rights.

3 The use in policy will be discussed later.

4 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

5 Several issues of *Canadian Diversity*, *Our Diverse Cities*, *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, and work conducted by researchers of the Metropolis centres of excellence, contain information on the benefits of multiculturalism and diversity to society.

6 See terminology at end of this article.

7 For example, differences among Catholics, Baptists, Anglicans, etc., as well as among English, Scottish, Irish, French, Polish, etc., were important and figured prominently in earlier manifestations of multiculturalism in Canada. Today, these differences are less prominent where categorizations of simply "European" and "Christian" are utilized, but distinction remains at least between Orthodox Christians and other Christians.

[8] *15. (1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.*

(2) Subsection (1) does not preclude any law, program or activity that has as its object the amelioration of conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups including those that are disadvantaged because of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

27. This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians".

[9] From the *Preamble.*

[10] The *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,* the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*, the *Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*, the *Convention on the Rights of the Child.* In addition to these established conventions, the U.N. is developing a *Disability Convention*.

[11] For a detailed description of research priorities, including themes and questions, see Jedwab, J. (2006, Spring). Thirty-five years of Canadian multiculturalism 1971-2006: Research themes and questions. *Canadian Diversity*, Volume 5:2, 11-15.

[12] Milne,G. (2002). *Making policy: A guide to the federal government's policy process.* Ottawa.

[13] Soroka, S. (2002). *Agenda-setting dynamics in Canada.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

[14] The remainder of this article was presented at the second day of the Roundtable *International Perspectives on Immigration Immigrants and Hosts: Perceptions, Interactions, and Transformations*, which was attended by 42 academics from Canada, the United Kingdom, Belgium, and Germany; Toronto May 31-June 2, 2007.

[15] Social psychologists are interested in such topics as attitudes, social cognition, cognitive dissonance, social influence, and interpersonal behaviours such as altruism and aggression. Two influential journals for the publication of research in this area are the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, and the *Social Psychology Quarterly*. There are also many other general and specialized social psychology journals. Information accessed on May 29, 2007, from:http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_psychology.

[16] Cheung, L. (2005). *Racial status and employment outcomes.* Canadian Labour Congress, Research Paper.

[17] See Reitz, J., and Banerjee, R. (2007). Racial inequality, social cohesion and policy issues. In K. Banting, T. Courchene and L. Seidle (Eds.). *Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada* (pp. 489-546). The Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP); Palmer, D. (2006, Spring). How different are they. *Canadian Diversity*, Volume 5:2; Jedwab, J. Workshop on religious diversity held by the Association for Canadian Studies, *25th Anniversary of the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms,* University of Ottawa, April 2007; Jimenéz, M. (2007, January 12). How Canadian are you? Visible-minority immigrants and their children identify less and less with the country, report says. *The Globe and Mail.*

[18] Levitt, S. D., Dubner, S. J. (2006). Why do drug dealers still live with their mom? In *Freakonomics: A rogue economist explores the hidden side of everything* (p. 79). William Morrow.

[19] Maurin, E. (2004). *Le ghetto français : Enquête sur le séparatisme social.* Paris: La République des idées, Seuil.

[20] Rhoads, P. (2001, January-February). Down with the Dark Ages. *Cosmopolis*, 13, pp. 1-4.

[21] Huntington, S. (1996). *The clash of civilization and the remaking of the world.* New York: Shuster.

[22] « Si, selon Voltaire, l'intolérance fut la maladie du catholicisme, si le nazisme fut la maladie de l'Allemagne, l'intégrisme est la maladie de l'islam », in *La Maladie de l'islam*, Abdelwahab Meddeb, Seuil, 2005, Points essais.

[23] Mark Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, Berkley, University of California Press, 2000.

[24] Coulter, A. (2001, September 14). *Town Hall.*

[25] Such as the suggestion that to understand the "Muslim mind", it was sufficient to analyse the Koran, a 14 centuries old holy book.