

## (CANADIAN) MULTICULTURALISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Monica Bottez

Professor, PhD, University of Bucharest

*Abstract:*The paper sets out to discuss the European retreat from multiculturalism- the cases of the Netherlands and Great Britain (presented in Christian Joppke and Ewa Morawska (eds)'s volume *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship*, 2003) against the contrary opinion put forth in Will Kymlicka's *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure and the Future* (2012). It also examines the case of Canada taking into account the threats that terrorism poses to this policy, as they are exposed in Stewart Bell's writings , particularly in "The spillover effect: Canadian diasporas and terrorism"(2009), concluding that Canada has taken new security measures , but has remained committed to the policy of multiculturalism.

*Keywords:* multiculturalism, terrorism, security, Islam, Native Canadians

Multiculturalism is a concept that can have several definitions. In its demographic acceptance it describes the existence of multiple ethno-cultural groups within a single country; as a philosophic concept it expresses the fair ideal of equality and mutual respect, but also a recognition of cultural difference and identity among a population's ethnic cultural groups (Charles Taylor: "The Politics of Recognition"); as a political concept it refers to a government's recognition of ethnic diversity and commitment of the nation to the preservation and promotion of the multicultural heritage of a country.

Will Kymlicka states that multiculturalism policies have been a greater success in Canada than in other countries, as attested by the higher level of public support for immigration and for multiculturalism in Canada in comparison with other countries (Kymlicka 2007:69).He identifies historical and geographical reasons for that but in my opinion an important reason for this success are also two aspects mentioned in the initial official formulation of this policy stated in 1971: the removal of cultural (and by the 1988 Multiculturalism Act, racial) barriers to full participation in Canadian society and official-language training for immigrants (*Canadian Encyclopedia*:multiculturalism). Therefore in the Canadian definition this policy involves both benefits (preservation of ethnic identity and legal removal of all discrimination), as well as obligations (the immigrants' contribution to the Canadian society and their knowledge of one official language, which means integration within a bilingual frame

Moreover, Canada has also stressed the value of multiculturalism as an element of Canadian identity, which appears in the notion of multicultural citizenship and, as Tariq Modood maintains in his book entitled *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea* multicultural citizenship is an ideal, as it marks a critique of cultural assimilation. In the 1990s multiculturalism was presented

in Canada not only as fair treatment of (immigrant) minorities but also as a wise policy that stimulates the economic and demographic growth (Bertheleu: 23).

On the other hand most scholars have referred to European governments' recent retreat from multiculturalism policies in the last 25 years in many countries, not only France (with its ban on headscarves), but also in Australia, Britain, and the Netherlands and of a return to assimilation (Brubaker:47-53). The case of the Netherlands is the most resounding. Thus in the 1970s and 80s the policies in the Netherlands were reminiscent of the tradition of 19<sup>th</sup> century model of institutionalized pluralism called "pillarization", which enabled communities to live lives enclosed in their values with minimal inter-community contacts. Consultative councils for ethnic minorities were set up at local and national levels and mother-tongue teaching was expanded. However, in the 1990s, when members of ethnic minorities had doubled their numbers but were largely unemployed, the Scientific council for Government Policy stated that "the government put too much weight on facilitating multiculturalism, and too little on promoting immigrant participation in society at large "(Entzinger:70) and mother-tongue teaching was "gradually put outside the core curriculum and its voluntary nature was accentuated"(71). In 1991 in his Address to the Liberal International Conference at Lucern (6 September) Frits Bolkerstein, a conservative liberal, affirmed (very much in the spirit of Huntington's book *Clash of Civilizations*, and of Giovanni Sartori's opinions) that Islam and Western values were irreconcilable, a statement that triggered a large support. This revealed that, in spite of firm contestation from some multiculturalists, most of the Dutch were weary of multiculturalism, and I think that this was because they had adopted an extreme form, not a balanced, clearly defined one as the Canadians. In the 1990s the official policy was focused on providing instruments for a fuller participation in society, rather than on the "caring approach of the 1970s and 1980s (Entzinger: 73). So we can say that "the objective of institutionalized multiculturalism has been replaced by an integration policy that in practice demands much more effort from the migrants than from the receiving population" (74). Therefore we can see that multiculturalism in the Netherlands had a different meaning from the Canadian policy which, as we have shown, implies integration and full participation in the host society , in addition to knowledge of one of the official languages.

In Britain the critique of multiculturalism grew stronger after the terrorist events of the 11 September 2001, but after the 7 July 2005 London Bombings it was directly attacked as a failed policy. It was accused of having been a main cause for the British-born Muslims of Pakistani background carrying out suicide attacks in the metropolis. Such critics as Melanie Phillips argued that the British establishment had "allowed the country to turn into a global hub of the Islamic jihad (182)" and led it to "sleep-walking into cultural oblivion" (191), that is into oblivion of British culture and therefore identity. Whereas Maleiha Malik takes the opposite stand, suggesting that "the appropriate state response to the new security risks from extremism is more not less multiculturalism and its liberal pluralist variants"(Malik:58) and he quotes Tariq Modood's *Multiculturalism* in support of this position (Modood, 2007:139)

The conservative position was officially voiced by David Cameron who criticised "state *multiculturalism*" in his first speech as prime minister (5 February 2011) when he dwelt on radicalization and the causes of terrorism. He declared that "state *multiculturalism* has failed", warning that it was fostering extremist ideology and directly contributing to home-grown Islamic terrorism. He announced a radical departure from the strategies of previous governments, saying that Britain must adopt a policy of "muscular liberalism" to enforce the values of equality, law and freedom of speech across all parts of society. He warned Muslim groups that if they failed to

endorse women's rights or promote integration, they would lose all government funding. All immigrants to Britain must speak English and schools will be expected to teach the country's common culture ("My war on multiculturalism"). More recently, one of the important Brexit issues refers to the immigrants' question, therefore to an aspect of multiculturalism.

Even after this brief discussion it is surprising to see Christophe Bertossi's conclusion to his *European Multiculturalism Revisited* where he states there never was a "a European multicultural model" even in countries like Britain or the Netherlands which reputedly implemented multiculturalism (Bertossi: 236).

However in his article *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure and the Future* (2012) Will Kymlicka convincingly demonstrates on the basis of Canada's, and other states' experience, that integration and multiculturalism policies can be perfectly compatible. On the other hand he also maintains that the much vaunted retreat from multiculturalism is more an avoidance of the word "multiculturalism" rather than a banning of multiculturalism policies (15)

## **Multiculturalism in 21<sup>st</sup> century Canada**

### **Multiculturalism as a national security risk**

After the events of 9/11, multiculturalism was perceived as a national security risk. It was pointed out that it enables immigrants not only to maintain their cultural practices but also to retain strong ties with their original homelands and even their allegiance to it, in parallel with their full participation in all aspects of Canadian life. The Bush government accused Canada of being "too liberal, lax, lenient and tolerant, thus a security risk" (Gilbert: 22), and thus beginning to be perceived as "a hotspot for terrorism and international criminality" (Gilbert:22). Consequently multiculturalism has been linked to national security, and this acted as a pressure to limit the scope of multiculturalism policies. Thus it was now that Canada implemented its first national security policy, "concerned with the U.S.-Canadian trade and multiculturalism" targeting people and activities that pose a threat to national security (Gilbert: 24). The result was that there cases when both Muslim citizens and recent Muslim immigrants were discriminated as they were viewed as a security risk (Gilbert: 25).

There appeared new Contestations of multiculturalism such as Allen Gregg's article "Identity crisis: Multiculturalism. A Twentieth century Dream Becomes a Twentieth-First century Conundrum" (2006), which considers that the official policy is trying to blind people to growing ethnic divides and animosities in Canadian society(Kymlicka 2010:13).

Another objection to multiculturalism is that it encourages immigrants to live in as an underclass in ghettos , but Walks and Bourne point out to another cause, namely that Aborigines and recent immigrants from Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Caribbean are more likely to live in ghettos because they were discovered to have very low income level (Walks, Bourne: 275).

In Kymlicka's opinion the critics of multiculturalism are wrong when they accuse it of producing the balkanization in Canada and homegrown terrorists. When considering this common issue in all western democracies, he states in his 2008 report commissioned by the Harper government, that the fact that in Canada the small number of such Islamic extremists is due to the fact that Canadian Muslims are not treated with hostility, which makes their loyalty to Canada increase (Kymlicka 2010: 15). Nevertheless, historian Roger Riendeau remarks

that, although they boasted about their multicultural society “Canadians increasingly worried about the impact of immigration on their national identity” (Riendeau 360).

We may also notice that, even though the recognition of diversity creates greater social unity within the cultural group in Canada, it did increase conflicts nation-wide at the same time because, while favouring equality with the other ethno-cultural groups the multiculturalism policy did not provide both the Aboriginal peoples and Quebecers the special status they wanted. Thus Aboriginal peoples consider that since the multiculturalism policy did not recognize their cultures, languages, forms of government, and was indifferent to their land claims and treaty rights, this policy is irrelevant to them (Gilbert: 16).

Quebeckers are also worried that their culture and language are threatened by immigrant groups and thus, in 2008, because of the tensions created by the recognition and legitimation of the equality rights of minority groups, Quebec government created the Bouchard-Taylor Commission concerned with reasonable accommodation of immigrants (adjustments or modification of general rules that ensures minorities the fundamental freedoms in terms of religion, employment, schooling because of the cultural differences). The Parti Québécois and Action Démocratique du Québec wanted thus to decrease the immigration level considered to be “the main factor in the decline of the use of French on the island of Montreal” (Grubel: 186). Moreover, Pauline Marois, the then Premier of Quebec and leader of the Parti Québécois, introduced a new legislation that required immigrants to sign “integration contracts” in order to demonstrate their capacity of integration in the Québec society (Grubel: 186).

Strong objections to multiculturalism are made from the political point of view as well, since it encourages trans-nationalism by allowing migrants such as the Canadian Tamils to become political activists and support war efforts and terrorism. Another objection is that minority groups may demand the right to observe and impose illiberal practices. For instance, the member states of the organization of Islamic Countries try to restrict free speech on Islamic topics in Canada and instead of opposing this demand Canada tries to conciliate this view (Grubel: 206) as multiculturalism is considered by the media and Canadian politicians an “untouchable pillar of the modern Canada” (Grubel: 207) on account of the voting power of the immigrant population. As Joseph Wong emphasizes, multiculturalism policy became a political tool immediately after it had been adopted (Wong: 211).

Another objection to multiculturalism policies is that, together with its asylum laws (Canada is the only country in the world that allows everyone who submits refugee claims to enter), it facilitates the possibility that a great number of terrorists enter Canada as asylum seekers. In Canada, illegal refugee claimants are not detained because the refugee process is completed after a long period of time, fact that poses a threat to Canada’s national security. In many critics’ opinion, the result of the extended immigration system shaped by its multiculturalism policies is that Canada is becoming a safe base camp for terrorist operations in some critics’ opinion, although it is not directly targeted, which made the United States consider it, as we have seen, “the weak leak in North American security concerns, an uncertain and uncommitted ally” (Bisset : 75).

We may conclude that especially since the 9/11 events Canada has been viewed by many as a safe gateway for terrorists as its multiculturalism policy and its immigration system ensure the priority of civil liberties and individual rights rather than that of national security. In addition to the security issue, Canadian multiculturalism has also been viewed as a factor that weakens the construction of national unity as identities overlap thus generating the fragmentation of Canadian society. Consequently, multiculturalism in Canada has been highly criticized because it poses a

number of challenges. It can therefore be viewed as a source of national tensions, since many regard it as a security risk related to terrorism.

### **Response of Canadian Government**

The Canadian government has kept responding to the need to accommodate diversity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century while at the same ensuring Canada's national security, by establishing new policies, programs and institutions that coordinate the management of Canada's diversity. It has developed methods to manage diversity and cultural differences by simultaneously both providing housing, employment, the possibility of political leadership, education but also police controls or racial profiling. In 2001 after the 9/11 events, the Chrétien government passed the Bill C-36 or **the Anti-terrorism Act**, allowing Canadian law enforcement and intelligence agencies to detain anyone they suspected of terrorism without a warrant. The Bill was however also criticized for not respecting civil liberties.

In Canada, there was not even a fixed definition of terrorism before the 9/11 events, but after that the Criminal Code began to contain references to terrorism, which was defined in the 2001 Anti-terrorism Act as follows:

“an act [...] that is committed [...] for a political, religious or ideological purpose [...] with the intention of intimidating the public [...] or compelling a person, a government or a domestic or an international organization to refrain from doing any act and that intentionally (A) causes death or serious bodily harm to a person by the use of violence [...] (B) endangers a person's life [...] (C) causes a serious risk to the health or safety of the public.” (Barrett: 49)

According to Tiefenbrun, the intention to produce “serious harm” is mandatory when it comes to consider a disruptive activity to be terrorist, supporting the “view that the element of intent is implied in the definition of terrorism under Canadian law”. Terrorist activities are treated in Canada as criminal offences, so that their perpetrators are to be prosecuted (Tiefenbrun: 381-382).

This definition of terrorism has allowed Aboriginal acts of protest and resistance to be labelled as terrorist and prosecuted. And thus the notion of **First Nations Terrorism** has appeared. The indigenous peoples initiated resistance movements in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century and the early 21<sup>st</sup> century which are the result of centuries of struggles for land and sovereignty. Now, under the 2001 legislation they are to be considered acts of terrorism as, according to Tom Flanagan in an article written for the Canadian Defense and Foreign Affairs Institute in 2009, they obstruct the development of Canadian industry through sabotage. Alan Borovoy, the former General Counsel of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association (from 1968 to 2009) is of a contrary opinion, stating that because the Anti-terrorism Act defines terrorism too broadly, it can be “applied to Aboriginal blockades of highways” (Roach: 58).

The Oka crisis (1990), the Gustafsen Lake standoff (1995) are famous examples of Aboriginal protest and resistance acts that can be now categorized as “terrorist”. Even then the RCMP named the Native protesters terrorists, criminalizing the group and spreading the image of violent Natives, while the journalists were denied access and thus the RCMP reports “biased the tone against the people in the camp” (Lambertus: 152).



In 2006 when the Aboriginal group of Haudeno Six Nations started their protest against Henco Industries that was developing a residential subdivision of the Douglas Creek Estate on a land in Caledonia that they claimed to be theirs, news regarding the Grand River land dispute presented the Aboriginal protesters as a “splinter group”, a “group of ‘rebels’ against the backdrop of a normally peaceful co-existence of Natives and Canadian citizens” (Wood: 278), becoming part of the discourse of domestic terrorism imprinted in Canadians’ consciousness since the 9/11 attacks. By creating the image of the Aboriginal peoples as the “homegrown terrorist, the internal threat to the Canadian state” ( 283) the media put in a favorable light the government’s acts against Aborigines and its attempt to delegitimize the protesters’ land claims .

Likewise, because the Algonquins of Barriere Lake erected barricades on Highway 17 in 2008 to demand the recognition of their traditional election, blockaded logging trucks in 2009 and 2011 to protest against mining exploration, they were listed as a “hot spot” in the Indian Affairs and Northern Development Act’s “Hot Spot Reporting System” as it had been appointed to spy on the Natives because of the continuous land protests so that potential First Nations further land claim movements be monitored and managed (Crosby, Monaghan:432-433).

We can see that the Aboriginal movements are officially considered to represent a serious threat to Canada’s national security as since 2006. Aboriginal communities have been placed under government surveillance as they are believed to continuously engage in civil disobedience, having the power to shake up Canada’s economy as Derek Nepinak, the grand chief of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, warned in January 2013: "It can stop Prime Minister (Stephen) Harper's resource development plan and his billion-dollar plan to develop resources in ancestral territories. We have the warriors that are standing up now that are willing to go that far. So we're not here to make requests" (Sims: “Our warrior problem”).

But we should also emphasize that statistics reveal that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century there is still a disparity between Aboriginal peoples and non-Aboriginal regarding their social-economic situation. Moreover, although the federal government apologized to the Aboriginal peoples for their experience in the residential schools in 2008, making the promise to correct the injustices, very few changes have been made. The unresolved land claims represents an important cause of the rising amount of tensions between the Natives and the government, resulting in violent clashes with law enforcement agencies. Therefore in order to redress this situation the Provincial Aboriginal Liaison Team was created in 2007 to enhance police-Aboriginal relations in a multiculturalism spirit. And in 2012 Susanne Decok, Commander of the Ontario Provincial Police Aboriginal Policing Bureau appreciated it as being very effective (Christmas: 43).

## **National Security Measures**

Canada has taken important steps towards ensuring national security. One such step is the Safe Third Country Agreement on refugee protection between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, which came into effect in 2004: This agreement has led to a “decrease of 23 percent in the number of refugee claims made in 2005” (Noble:166). Nevertheless according to Jeffrey Simpson, a *Globe and Mail* columnist, the Canadian refugee system is permissive (qtd in Noble:168). The consequence of this situation, was that the government was forced to impose visas on all visitors from some friendly democratic countries, such as Costa Rica, Chile and some countries in Eastern Europe ( Noble: 169).

Another important change in the interest of security issues is the introduction in 2002 of the 2001 Immigration and Refugee Protection Act which tightened the criteria for asylum application

processing, including more thorough screening, reduced rights of appeal and more explicit detention.. In addition to Immigration and Refugee Protection Act /IRPA, the federal government created in 2005 the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness that includes a Border Services Agency to consolidate border functions from various government agencies with intelligence components through one chain of command” Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness .

Canada has tended to open its doors less wide as it begins to view immigrants as potential threats, that can bring over the conflicts from their countries of origin. Nowadays, despite Canada’s multiculturalism policies, the new immigrants are viewed as an important security concern and the Canadian government considers that they may abuse the system or engage in terrorist activities. In 2008 The Government reconfirmed the Security certificates mechanism (1990) by which it can detain and deport foreign nationals and all other non-citizens living in Canada as a method to ensure the security of both Canada’s territory and people, but it can also deport immigrants, whether they are citizens or non-citizens, if they are suspected of violating human rights or represent a security risk, particularly in view of the “spillover effect”.

**The “spillover effect”** was first defined by Gus Martin as a form of international terrorism that represents violent overseas conflicts that “spill over” the borders of a certain country into the international scene, specifying that they occur in countries that are not connected to those conflicts (Martin: 248). Stewart Bell underlines that Canada has such a history of spillover effects quoting Ward Elcock, the former director of The Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), who declared that there are foreign terrorist organizations in Canada almost as much as the United States. Because Canada is a migrant-receiving state, it is an important base camp in the eyes of terrorists as they can easily launch attacks (Bell 2009: 41). Stewart Bell argues that in Canada, because it encourages them to keep their culture and beliefs, immigrants are “vulnerable to terrorist indoctrination and recruitment” as the more one identifies with those like him, the more they become conscious of that fact that they are different from the mainstream society, this causing their alienation and thus, the growth of homegrown terrorists (Bell 2004: xi). In addition to the policy of multiculturalism, the open-door immigration policy facilitates the threats to Canada’s national identity and security as immigrants keep their transnational concerns bringing over to Canada the violent conflicts of their countries of origin.

Bell refers to many instances when the spillover effect was manifest in Canada; thus in 1985 Armenian extremists assassinated a Turkish diplomat in Ottawa, in 1985 Sikh extremists placed bombs on two Air India Flight 182 planes, killing 329 people. He also underlines that the Canadian Tamil Tigers is a notable terrorist organization posing big problems for Canadian national security as the Snow Tigers network illegally raise money in order to create an independent state in northern Sri Lanka. The Lebanese Hezbollah also began to be supported by the Lebanese community in Canada in the 1990s which laundered money through Canadian banks, purchased military equipment, stole luxury cars from Canada and shipped them to Lebanon (Bell 2009: 43-46). Likewise, the organizations of the Sunni Islamic extremism, represent the most recent major focus of Canadian counter-terrorism investigators, the Ressam case (1999) having changed the perception of Sunni Islamic threat in Canada. Intelligence had considered Canada a terrorist safe haven but the Ressam case proved it to be “ an active operational environment” (Bell 2004: 4). Ahmed Ressam is an Algerian al-Qaeda member who received extensive terrorist training in Afghanistan and lived for a time in Montreal. He was convicted in 2001 for planning to bomb the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) on New Year's Eve 1999.

As already shown multiculturalism policies stimulate Canadian diasporas to preserve their transnational concerns frequently contributing to the nationalist struggle in their countries of origin by influencing the foreign policy of Canada because they have been perceived by policy-makers as important voting tools. The diasporic communities also help by fundraising and by engaging in criminal activities, recruitment, training and attack planning thus making Canada a base camp for major terrorist groups. Bell points out that this renders Canada's fighting with their type of terrorism more difficult as counter-terrorism agents do not easily find informers and terrorists are helped to hide from CSIS. Thus terrorist activities are concealed within the institutions of the Diaspora communities, which can easily manipulate international images through the use of propaganda and lobby that have the power to get the attention and even the support of Canadian decision-makers who can also put pressure against governments in their original homeland (Bell 2004: 55). He gives the example of the Tamil Tigers who used cultural events to gain support from the Tamil diaspora in Toronto, which is the largest Tamil community outside South Asia, or who collect money by going door-to-door in Canadian Tamil communities. He also gives the example of the separatist Sikh Babbar Khalsa International group from British Columbia that raised regular funds and to which the Canadian government gave charity status, allowing its donors to claim that their donations be deducted from their income taxes (Bell 2009: 43). Bell also underlines how the Tamil diaspora has become a great influence on Canadian electoral politics due to the increase of the number of Tamil immigrants to Canada. Consequently, Canadian Liberal politicians are reluctant to deal with terrorist groups because they don't want to lose their voters in the Tamil communities, while loudly accusing the opposition of racist and anti-Canadian attitudes (Bell 2004: 12). Such criticism emphasizes that, due to the fact that Canadian multiculturalism policy can contribute to the ghettoization of ethnic groups because it allows their ethnocentric community to be self sufficient and preserve strong ties with their families in their origin countries, members of these groups still perceive their host country as foreign, and they fail to integrate, which makes them easy targets and preys to extremist activists.

As we have seen after 9/11, the Canadian government took harsh measures to defend itself from becoming a sponsor of terrorism, passing the Anti-terrorism Act, giving bigger financial support to the security and intelligence agencies, increasing airport security, enhancing armed forces and passing a new National Security Policy in 2004 (Bell 2004: 17). But Canada has also remained committed to multiculturalism policies, while many public commentators are turning against multiculturalism in response to fears about militant Islam. But despite the new more drastic approaches to the management of ethnocultural diversity after 9/11 determined by the fact that fighting terrorism became a priority, the federal government made the point that an important step towards an efficient security is the civic engagement, the National Security Strategy paper explaining that the "Government needs the help and support of all Canadians to make its approach to security effective" (Lehmkuhl:92), as the 2004 National Security Policy supports the key Canadian values such as "pluralism, openness, diversity and respect for civil liberties" (Lehmkuhl: 99). Consequently the Canadian government created in 2004 the Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security in order to establish a "broad exchange of information between the government and diverse ethno-cultural communities on the impact of national security issues" (Lehmkuhl: 93), particularly "the communities that may feel caught in the 'front lines' of the struggle against terrorism"(Lehmkuhl: 92):



Our commitment to include all Canadians in the ongoing building of this country must be extended to our approach to protecting it. We reject the stigmatization of any community and we do not accept the notion that our diversity or our openness to newcomers needs to be limited to ensure our security. (Lehmkuhl:92)

Lehmkuhl considers that the Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security is “the expression of the government’s recognition that immigrants are part of Canada’s multicultural mosaic” and opposes any act or policy that may undermine the immigrants’ “sense of belonging” (93). To the same effect of preserving good relations with Canada’s diverse ethnic and racial communities, this organism has committed itself to the review of the RCMP’s activities as this institution has been criticized for its racial profiling.

For Canadians issues regarding national security became very important in the aftermath of 9/11. They soon preferred “the government to place emphasis on protecting public security rather than guaranteeing civil liberties” (Grave: 13), considering that the police and intelligence agencies intrusion into their privacy is necessary to ensure their safety. The Canadian government passed its first official national security act in April 2004. It secures an Open Society asserting at the same time the need for the maintenance of the social cohesion in case of religious terrorism. However, in 2005, 51 percent of Canadians disapproved of this measure and they began to be less fearful of potential terrorist attacks (Grave: 12) and as a result, they view diversity in a more positive light, even as “a crucial component of a long-term solution to terrorist threats” (Grave: 12-13).

Six years later, as the 2010 Environics data show, only 27 percent of Canadians consider that multiculturalism is the most important reason for celebration on Canada’s 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary (2017), although it is not considered the most important characteristic of Canadian identity (Soroka and Robertson: *A Literature Review*). But 65 percent of Canadians aged 18 to 34 agree that the “growing variety of ethnic and racial groups in Canada” is a good thing and only 31 percent consider that “too much diversity can weaken a society and it would be better if we all subscribed to the same values and culture” (Soroka and Robertson: *A Literature Review*). According to the above mentioned data we can conclude that Canadians have mixed feelings regarding diversity: most of them support integration and multiculturalism, and not full assimilation, but some of them perceive visible minorities, particularly Muslims, as a threat to the cohesion of their society and its support of Western democratic values.

Consequently, since 2001, Canadian news media has naturally focused its attention on Muslims, portraying them mostly as radicals. Representations of Muslims in Canadian news media have been marked by a continuous obsession with violence, terrorism and illegal immigration constructing an Islamophobic discourse (e.g. Mark Steyn’s article, “The future belongs to Islam”). Such discourse stresses the Muslims’ external invasion by immigration and their internal explosion by high birth rate. The 2011 census shows that this visible minority make up 19.1 % of the population, that it has become the largest religious group, with the exception of Christians and that by 2031 they will represent 30.6 percent of Canada’s population.

In his article of July 4 2016 Nicholas Keung writes that while many respondents had favourable views of immigrants, three-quarters of respondents said “we need to focus on caring for people ‘here’ instead of spending resources on refugees” (“Ontario facing ‘epidemic of Islamophobia’”). This epidemic has now gone beyond the verbal level and buildings vandalism to the terrorist attack of Jan. 29, 2017, which caused six dead and eight injured in a shooting incident at a Quebec City mosque. The terrible incident triggered strong reactions on both sides.

In March the same year Canadian politicians passed a non-binding motion, M-103, introduced by liberal MP, Iqra Khalid that condemns Islamophobia and all forms of systemic racism and religious discrimination, and requests that the government recognize the need to quell the public climate of fear and hate. But the parliament was divided as the conservatives opposed it in the name of freedom of expression. Therefore attitude to Muslims is a definitely divisive issue in Canadian society

As Premier Justin Trudeau assured Donald Trump, Canada continues to be open towards refugees, but without compromising security. Trudeau's "immediate priority after he took office in late 2015 was to drastically accelerate the entry of refugees from Syria. From that point to early January, the latest available figures, his administration has admitted 39,671 refugees (Austen: "In Canada, Justin Trudeau Says Refugees Are Welcome"). But we could also see that, when new cases of terrorism appeared, such as the shootings on October 22, 2014, at Parliament Hill in Ottawa (when Michael Zehaf-Bibeau fatally shot Corporal Nathan Cirillo, a Canadian soldier on sentry duty) the government felt compelled to broaden the powers of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) and it introduced Bill C-51 that became Anti-Terrorist Act 2015, which, naturally, received many criticisms from a civil liberties perspective.

In conclusion we can say that Canada's post-9/11 national security strategies have changed and strengthened in order to protect its people from the threat of terrorism. But Canada has never ceased to show an awareness of the importance of multiculturalism policies as a tool for ensuring social cohesion and solidarity and has therefore continued to fight against allowing stereotypes to dominate the ideological discourse. Thus it remains committed to respect of difference and diversity but it stresses at the same time the need to protect the security of its citizens. Its support of integration and multicultural citizenship go hand in hand with its commitment to liberal values, to democracy and the rule of law.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austen, Jan . "In Canada, Justin Trudeau Says Refugees Are Welcome", New York Times JAN. 28, 2017; [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/28/world/canada/justin-trudeau-trump-refugee-ban.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/28/world/canada/justin-trudeau-trump-refugee-ban.html?_r=0).

Barrett, Danny. "Canada and Terrorism :A Case Study ", *AGORA*, vol I (2011)

[http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/ps\\_sandbox/article/view/10090](http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/ps_sandbox/article/view/10090)

Bell, Stewart. *Cold Terror: How Canada Nurtures and Exports Terrorism around the World*. New York: Wiley, 2004.

----- "The Spillover Effect. Canadian Diasporas and Terrorism", *The Radicalization of Diasporas and Terrorism*, CSS Züricher Beiträge no 80,2009,41-62  
<http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?ots591=0c54e3b3-1e9c-be1e-2c24-a6a8c7060233&lng=en&id=113555>

Bertheleu, Hélène. "Multiculturalisme, citoyenneté et conflict:Une approche sociologique", *l'anam* no 42/2009, 19-37.

- Bertossi, Christophe. "Mistaken models of integration? A critical perspective on the crisis of multiculturalism in Europe" *European Multiculturalism Revisited*, Ed. Alessandro Silj. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, 235-251.
- Bisset, James "Refugee Policies", *Immigration policy and Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States*. Eds Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott. Vancouver, Toronto : The Fraser Institute, 2008, 75-94. [https://www.google.ro/?gws\\_rd=cr,ssl&ei=PkJYVcTgMMf7ywOckYGABw#q=Moens+on+terrorism](https://www.google.ro/?gws_rd=cr,ssl&ei=PkJYVcTgMMf7ywOckYGABw#q=Moens+on+terrorism), 17May 2015
- Bolkerstein, Frits. *Address to the Liberal International Conference at Lucern* (6 September 1991). The Hague: VVD
- Bouchard Gerard and Charles Taylor. *Building a Future :A Time for Reconciliation, Report*. Quebec: Government of Quebec, 2008 <https://www.mce.gouv.qc.ca/publications/CCPARDC/rapport-final-integral-en.pdf>
- Brubaker, Rogers. "The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives in France, Germany and the United States, Joppke & Morawska, 39-58.
- Cameron, David. "My war on multiculturalism" <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/cameron-my-war-on-multiculturalism-2205074.html> 11May 2015
- Canadian Encyclopedia, The*. Marsh, James (editor in chief). Second edition, Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1988
- Christmas, Robert. *Canadian Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Frontline Officer on Challenges and Changes*. Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013.
- Crosby, Andrew and Jeffrey Monaghan "Settler Governmentality in Canada and the Algonquins of Barriere lake", *Security Dialogue*(2012),421-38, <http://people.stfx.ca/x2010/x2010mbm/DEVS%20401/Devs520401520Term520Paper/Security%20Dialogue-2012-Crosby-421-38.pdf>
- Entzinger, Han. "The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism: The Case of the Netherlands", *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship. Immigrants in Liberal States*, Ed. Joppke and Morawska, .Houndmills, Hampshire and New York :Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, 59-86
- Flanagan, Tom. "Resources Industries and Security Issues in Northern Alberta". Calgary: Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, 2009 . <http://www.cdfai.org.previewmysite.com/PDF/Resource%20Industries%20and%20Security%20Issues%20in%20Northern%20Alberta.pdf>
- Gilbert, Liette. " Legitimizing Neoliberalism Rather than Equality :Canadian Multiculturalism in the current Reality of North America" , *Red de Revistas Cientificas de America Latina* (2)1 (2007) 11-35. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=193715169002> 17May 2015
- Government of Canada." <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/citizenship.asp>
- Grave, Frank *Threat Perceptions in the United States and Canada: One Issue, Two Voices*, vol 4,.Canadian Institute, Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars, 2005, 1-20. <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/threats.pdf>
- Grubel, Herbert. *The Effects of Mass Immigration on Canadian Living Standards and Society*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute, 2009.
- Joppke, Christian and Ewa Morawska. "Integrating Immigrants in Liberal Democracies" in *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship. Immigrants in Liberal States*, Joppke and Morawska, eds. Houndmills, Hampshire and New York :Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, 1-36.

- Keung, Nicholas . “Ontario facing ‘epidemic of Islamophobia’, *The Star*, July 4 2016 .  
<https://www.thestar.com/news/immigration/2016/07/04/ontario-facing-epidemic-of-islamophobia-survey-finds.html>
- Krikorian, Mark.”Mass Immigration Defeats Homeland Security” ”, *Immigration Policy and Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States*. Eds Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott. Vancouver, Toronto : The Fraser Institute, 2008, 37-51.
- Kymlicka, Will. “The Canadian Model of Diversity in a Comparative Perspective”, *Multiculturalism and the Canadian Constitution*, ed. Steven Tierney. Vancouver, Toronto: University of British Columbia Press, 2007, 61-90.
- .....*The Current State of Multiculturalism in Canada and Research Themes on Canadian Multiculturalism 2008*. Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2010
- “Multiculturalism: Success, Failure, and the Future”, 2012, PDF  
<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/.../TCM-Multiculturalism-Web.pd...>
- Lambertus, Sandra. *Wartime Images, Peacetime Wounds: The Media and the Gustafsen Lake Standoff*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- Lehmkuhl, Ursula. “Canada’s Post 9/11 Homeland Security Policy. An exercise in multilevel governance, private sector involvement and civic engagement”  
*Zeitschrift für Kanada-Studien* 1/2007, 78-102 ;[http://www.kanada-studien.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/04\\_Lehmkuhl\\_Homelandsecurity.pdf](http://www.kanada-studien.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/04_Lehmkuhl_Homelandsecurity.pdf)
- Mackey, Eva. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Malik, Maleiha. “Progressive Multiculturalism: The British Experience” in *European Multiculturalism Revisited*. Ed Alessandro Silj. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, 11-64.
- Martin, Gus. *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2012.
- Mickelburgh, Ron “Harper Defends Canadian Diversity”, *The Globe and Mail*, June 20, 2006. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/harper-defends-canadian-diversity/article711236/>
- Modood, Tariq. “Remaking Multiculturalism after 7/7”, *openDemocracy*, 28 September 2005, [www.opendemocracy.net/conflict-terrorism/multiculturalism\\_2879.jsp](http://www.opendemocracy.net/conflict-terrorism/multiculturalism_2879.jsp)
- *Multiculturalism* .Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- Monaghan, Jeffrey and Kevin Walby.” Making up ‘Terror Identities’: Security Intelligence, Canada’s Integrated Threat Assessment Centre and Social Movement Suppression”, *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy* ,Volume 22, Issue 2, 2012  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10439463.2011.605131>
- Noble, John. ”A Secure Border? The Canadian View”, *Immigration Policy and Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States*. Eds Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott. Vancouver, Toronto : The Fraser Institute, 2008, 161-82.
- Phillips, Melanie. *Londonistan*. New York, London: Encounter, 2006.
- Reitz, Jeffrey , Breton, Raymond Breton, Karen Kisiel Dion, Kenneth Dion. *Multiculturalism and Social Cohesion : Potentials and Challenges of Diversity*. Toronto : Springer, 2009.

- Riendeau, Roger. *A Brief History of Canada*. New York: Facts On File, Inc. An imprint of Infobase Publishing, 2007.
- Roach, Kent. "National Security, Multiculturalism and Muslim Minorities", *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies* (2006), 405-38/U Toronto, Legal Studies Research Paper No 938 451 Oct 2006, [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=938451##](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=938451##)
- Sims, Kris. "Our warrior problem: Militant Natives are causing trouble, and they aren't going away", *Toronto Sun*, November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013. <http://www.torontosun.com/2013/11/01/our-warrior-problem-militant-natives-are-causing-trouble-and-they-arent-going-away>
- Soroka, Stuart and Robertson, Sarah. A Literature Review of Public Opinion Research on Canadian Attitudes towards Multiculturalism and Immigration, 2006-2009, 2010. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/research-stats/2012-por-multi-imm-eng.pdf>
- Steyn, Mark. "The future belongs to Islam", *MacLean's magazine*, October 20, 2006 . <http://www.macleans.ca/culture/the-future-belongs-to-islam/>
- Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition", in David Theo Goldberg, *Multiculturalism. A Critical Reader*. Oxford, UK&Cambridge, USA: Blackwell, 1994 , 75-107.
- Tiefenbrun, Stephen. *Decoding International Law: Semiotics and the Humanities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Walks, Alan and Larry Bourne. *Ghettos in Canada's Cities? Racial Segregation, Ethnic Enclaves and Poverty Concentration in Canadian Suburban Areas*, <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Walks-Bourne-2006-Ghettos-in-Canadas-Cities1.pdf> , 17May 2015
- Winter, Elke. *Us, Them and Other: Pluralism and National Identity in Diverse Societies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.
- Wong, Joseph. "Philanthropy and the 'New Canada': The Response of the United Way of Greater Toronto"(1991) <http://thephilanthropist.ca/original-pdfs/Philanthropist-10-1-61.pdf>
- Wood, Marty. "Constructing the Aboriginal Terrorist :Depictions of Aboriginal Protestors, the Caledonia Reclamation and Canadian Neoliberalization", ). *Engaging Terror: A Critical and Interdisciplinary Approach*. Eds. Vardalos, Marianne, Guy Kirby Letts et al Boca Raton, Florida, USA: Brown Walker Press, 2009, 275-86.