

Terrorism: Dilemmas of Capitalism, Monotheism, Multiculturalism, Violence

Leo Driedger, Professor Emeritus in Sociology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

Abstract

To explore the nature of Terrorism, this author will deal with suggested points 6) the Sociology of terrorism, and 3) religion and ethnic hostility. In his presidential address at the Society for Scientific Study of Religion, sociologist Rodney Start (JSSR, 2004) exhorted delegates to broaden the theories of Durkheim, Marx and Weber, which I will do as well. So this paper will first deal with the *sociology* of terrorism, and then more specifically focus on *multiculturalism* and *religion*.

Durkheim was concerned with solidarity and the efforts of many minorities to solidify separate identities, important in promoting multiculturalism. Karl Marx was concerned that such multiple bounded identities would become targets and lead to much conflict. Max Weber focused on social psychological influences such as the Protestant “ethic” and the “spirit” of capitalism, which called for flexible ideological networks.

Durkheim thought religion was central to solidarity. Marx thought it was “an opiate” which stupefied humans into conflict and lack of concern for others. Max Weber thought Protestant individualism led to individual work “ethic”, and a “spirit” of capitalism. Bruce Chilton (2008) says the three monotheist religions (Jews, Christians and Muslims) all trace their roots back to Abraham, but as cousins constantly fight each other. Belief in one God, results in many individual interpretations, so freedom often leads to individualism and conflict. So what do you do when terrorists use methods of violence and sacrifice their lives, believing their God will reward them for it?

Terrorism: Dilemmas of Multiculturalism, Monotheism, Violence

The classical theorists, were deeply concerned with the impact of industry on society. They thought it promoted mechanical materialism and undermined social solidarity, relevant in our discussion of values such as culture, religion, consciousness of kind, a sense of being a People, and how we relate as groups. Marx was concerned with stratification, power, and the potential for alienation; Durkheim probed the role of social cohesion and sacred values.

Industrial capitalism, in the days of Marx, was designed to give individuals freedom to do business without government interference. Making a margin of profit was most important to the industrialist, so that often factory workers became mere tools in making money. The profits belonged to the owner, and he could pass them on as an inheritance to whomever he wished. Those individuals could freely compete in the marketplace, seeking to gain an advantage over others. In the fray of competition there was a tendency to focus on private gains so extensively that workers and other people often were of secondary importance. This excessive individualism was of great concern to the classical theorists; which undermines nurture of a consciousness of kind and a distinctive identity that focuses not on material but on human needs.

I. Sociology of Terrorism

To provide a basic social context for why terrorism exists, let us introduce the early fathers of sociology, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, and Max Weber, who wrestle with what happens when humans are faced with increased industrialism which tended to alienate and frustrate human relations and social institutions (Driedger, 2001).

Durkheim: Cohesion and Solidarity

In the midst of the European industrial revolution, scholars also searched for the factors that provide cohesion and solidarity during periods of social change. Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) devoted himself to looking at elements of social cohesion and sacralization. What are the sustaining ties of community during the decline of the religious dogma of the old Catholic world, and where will new guides for the future lie?

French society had for a long time been enfeebled by an excessive spirit of individualism which influenced Durkheim to seek the sources of social cohesion and solidarity. The social milieu and the industrial and political revolutions of Durkheim's time tended to weaken the structures of belief, authority, and community within which human beings had lived for centuries, even millennia (Nisbet, 1974:14). Durkheim was deeply concerned with the effects of the increasing emphasis on individualism. Individuals everywhere were dislocated from traditional associations and communities. Durkheim rejected this extreme individualism and saw it as leading to the destruction of community, values, and the social order. He focused on the coherence of society and the factors of collective solidarity. Alienation, anomie, and disintegration spelled non-society.

Durkheim saw the crises of the modern age basically in terms of a disintegration of the roots of stability and authority (Nisbet, 1974:9). The marks of conservatism are clear in Durkheim's life and work and may likely have sprung from his own Jewish heritage where the sense of community was strong. While scholars such as Gabriel Tarde and Herbert Spencer focused on individuals, Durkheim, in contrast, saw society as the most important centre of attention.

Ferdinand Toennies's *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, which Durkheim reviewed, was published in Germany in 1889. Toennies's discussion of community surely influenced Durkheim's thinking. Four years later (1893), Durkheim introduced the concepts of mechanical and organic solidarity in his first published work, *The Division of Labor*. These two polarities tend to convey the evolutionary trend of the time. He labeled labour in folk and rural societies *mechanical* solidarity; because adherents tend not to think about their structures very much, but follow tradition mechanically and without much evaluation. However, as industrial change sets in, societies are forced to develop new forms of social structures such as associations, which depend more on *organic* or cohesive values and norms more rationally agreed upon and adhered to in free association. Later his books such as *Suicide* (1897) and *Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (1912) continue the search for factors that support social solidarity.

The need for intermediate associations would act as a buffer between the traditional folk norms and values that had formerly been adhered to mechanically and the emerging rational bureaucratic institutions that were a result of the Industrial Revolution. These associations, often centering on occupation, would permit human beings to 'regain the reinforcing sense of membership in society—lost, as Durkheim so forcefully stated in *Suicide*, through the acids of modernity' (Nisbet, 1974:138). If Durkheim's argument holds, then 'the crowning need of contemporary society is for centres of authority and solidarity in which the present anomie and egoism leading to suicide and other forms of deviant behavior will be checked' (Nisbet, 1974:139).

Durkheim 'traces the idea of contract back to the aboriginal relationship between a people and its god, back to the overriding, overpowering condition Durkheim calls the Sacred' (Nisbet 1974:78). He focuses on some god or sacred things that are deemed antecedent to—and in control of—the contradictory parties. Solidarity becomes a contract between humans and the sacred realm. As humans later turned to agriculture, they added *land* and a sacred trust in their concept of sacred *descent*. Patriarchs eventually became trustees of the people, charged with perpetuating their sacred history.

The notion of force was expressed in religious terms, which are social terms in Durkheim's view. Primitive people began to feel the awesome force of the entire community to

create and hold a sense of loyalty and obligation, which in turn developed into rituals and rites as an expression of their relationships.

Robert Nisbet (1974:164-5) succinctly summarizes Durkheim's treatment of religion and its function in society: 1) religion is necessary to society as a vital mechanism of integration for human beings and as a means to unify symbols; 2) religion is a seedbed for social change, which both Durkheim and Weber say in their discussions of Protestantism; 3) more important than creed or belief, religion's most enduring elements are in ritual, ceremony, hierarchy, and community; 4) there is a link between religion and the origins of human thought and reason. Religion stimulates the search for knowledge and answers to deep questions. Durkheim saw religion as a consecration of community, a respect for society.

Some scholars saw religion as a crutch for primitives who had not yet separated empirical reality from myth, but Durkheim thought that the sacred would remain for all time, that it would vary from age to age, and that it would manifest itself differently among the different peoples. It is in this larger sense of the sacred that ethnicity can be viewed as 'sacred' in modern society. Religion may be an important distinctive element, as being Anglican can be for Anglo-Saxons, or it may be a more pervasive, undifferentiated whole linking religion as the defining factor of community, as it is for Hutterites. But ethnicity for secular Jews, non-religious Ukrainians, or other groups may still carry many non-religious elements of sacredness: their attachments to a heritage, a culture, a myth, a set of norms, a consciousness of kind, or values with a particular cultural, social, and communal focal point.

Durkheim suggests that morality based on a system of rules of conduct is crucial. The mechanical rules of the past cannot be forgotten as traditional baggage, enslaving the individual, as some proponents of individualism such as Spencer have advocated. Rather, norms of obligation and duty must always be present, albeit often in changed and sometimes new forms. The preeminent attribute of morality is its capacity to inspire the individual to a sense of obligation. Here we shall see to what extent ethnicity has played, and still plays, such a role of obligation and sense of morality. Is it disappearing in the rise of industrialization? Is it adapting and changing? To what extent is it and will it remain a driving force in Canadian society?

Family, religion, and socialization are integrating forms of solidarity. In this study we propose that ethnicity, especially in North America, can also be a form of identification with a heritage, culture, language, religion, or race. Both Durkheim and Marx were concerned with the effects of industrialization on the quality of human existence. Durkheim observed the decline of social solidarity and cohesion when the sacred became profane, and how the threat of anomie increased with industrialization. Marx observed increased stratification, alienation, and misuse of power, and suggested that the power relationships and the social structure must be totally changed.

Marx: Conflict and Stratification

It is important to focus on materialism and stratification, two concerns of Karl Marx in the industrial process. Marx spent his early years in Germany, and the latter part of his life in Britain. Marx (1818-83) was among the first to be concerned with the capitalist industrial scene in England, Germany, and France. Industrialization was greatly enhanced by steam power: the exploration of new lands had resulted in the emergence of numerous colonial powers in Europe, and raw materials from these colonies were increasingly processed in north European factories. More and more peasants were moving off their lands into urban areas where factories gobbled up their labour skills. Both Marx and Durkheim were profoundly influenced by industrial change,

and both were greatly preoccupied with analyzing what was happening to the human factor during this social upheaval. The various social theorists turned to different parts of the problem. Marx was preoccupied with the effects of economic materialism and its resulting human alienation; he saw a solution only in a complete restructuring of the political economy. According to Fromm (1956:xv), the often-mistaken interpretation of Marx's works—that he was a materialist interested in promoting satisfaction in material goods—is opposite to Marx's concerns.

Marx viewed not only the product, but also the process of production under the capitalist system as alienating. Workers who had only their labour to sell tended not to identify with the end result; in the process of producing the product, they took little pride in their work because, aside from their wages, the profits they generated benefited only the bourgeoisie, the owners of the capitalist process. Industry also tends to focus attention on machines, schedules, and the mechanical process, distracting from concerns of human fulfillment, creativity, and pride in the product of individuals' skills. As a result the worker feels homeless, work becomes external to him, and he does not fulfill himself in his work. 'His work is not voluntary, but imposed, forced labour. It is not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs' (Marx, 1844:85-6).

Work for someone else does not belong to the worker but to the owner. Spontaneity is lost. Marx thought that as the person becomes poorer in himself, he feels he belongs less to himself than to someone else, or he is dependent on machines which are not emotionally satisfying. In the process, money becomes the object of all work because it alone will buy the necessities of life. As a result of the worker's alienation from this work, money tends to have more and more power over him. Thus, Marx concludes that 'all human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all types of servitude are only modifications or consequences of this relation' (Marx, 1844:92-3).

Marx was also concerned that industrial materialism not become an alienating factor for humans, He was also concerned with the way in which industrial capitalism stratified humans into the rich and the poor, the powerful and the powerless, the bourgeoisie and the working proletariat. While Hegel used this dialectic in philosophical terms, Marx gave it a concrete empirical context in which the economic classes of the bourgeoisie were pitted against the proletariat masses. The owners of capital, whose major interest was a margin of profit, the accumulation of capital, and investment in more industry, came into conflict with the labourers, who needed to labour in order to earn wages to subsist. Thus, Marx thought, the struggle between the two opposites, the two classes, was inevitable. The process promoted 'the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, and exploitation; but with this too grew the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers' (Marx, 1867:801-4).

Thus, Marx concluded that capitalism and its alienating processes were the villains. Thus, it must be exterminated by a structural overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the proponents of capital. Through the ages, the economically and politically powerful had often enslaved the masses, and capitalists enslaved the proletariat in his day. There was but one way to root out this cancerous plague, and that was to overthrow the bourgeoisie by the revolt of the masses. Ironically, communist experiments in eastern European countries, which were designed to replace oppressive capitalist systems, also became oppressive and have been toppled recently. Marx spent much time analyzing the failures of capitalism, but too little time developing effective alternatives.

Max Weber and Ideology

Max Weber (1864-1920) in Germany examined values, leadership, religion, ethnicity, and other non-economic factors that were crucial in the rise of industrialization to understand the role and importance of values, ideology, and symbols in shaping the industrialization process. He left an outline on ‘Ethnic Groups’, which is useful in providing a conceptual frame (Weber, 1978:379-98). Weber saw race, culture, tribe, nationality, and religion as the central foci that define ethnic identity; outlined in five points.

Race and Biological Inheritance

Race, Weber’s (1978:386) first ethnic identity factor, is based on heredity and endogamous conjugal groups, depending largely upon social and regional settings and values. All kinds of visible differences can serve as sources of repulsion and contempt, or affection and appreciation. Biological physical differences can be the focus of consciousness of kind. But there is the all-too-human tendency to emphasize and exaggerate differences as well. Racial categories often do not remain neutral. Their social relevance then lies not in themselves, but the use to which they are put by those in power to differentiate. (Henry et al., 2000:14). When you travel in Europe, what are all these castles, walls, locks about? They are walls to separate from others, to wall-in “ours”, to protect and separate safely.

Culture and Consciousness of Kind

Cultural differences in clothing styles and grooming, food and eating habits, and the division of labour between sexes can all be the focus of a consciousness of kind that can become either shared characteristics of identity or barriers between groups.

Heimatsgefühl, or feeling at home in a culture, is a key factor because humans want to live by habit rather than decide constantly what to do next. It is comfortable to sense a ‘consciousness of kind’ where you are accepted as you are. Belief in common ethnicity often delimits social circles where shared sentiments of likeness emerge. The idea of a chosen people permits anyone to claim this right, no matter what the quality of his or her identity may be, and encourages differentiation into ingroup and outgroup categories. Any cultural traits—including beards, hats, hairdos, etc.—can then become differentiating symbols of the ingroup. Hutterites, Lubavitcher Jews, and the Amish are but a few examples of groups who use clothing as symbols of identity. These distinguishing features are often used as blood disaffinity (*Blutsfremdheit*) symbols, or a shared culture as *Kulturgemeinschaft* as a central feature of ethnic group identity.

Tribe: The Emergence of a ‘People’

Many tribal groups simply refer to themselves as The People, and the Inuit are our best Canadian example. Isolated in the Arctic, far away from other humans, they were The People, there were no others until the Europeans came. Tribe implies the emergence of political organization on a small scale, usually a subdivision of a larger whole. The 12 tribes of Israel became subparts of The People of Israel. Divisions can soon be symbolized as analogous to blood relationships, that create feelings of affinity akin to blood relationships.

Tribes have been formed by families banding together in the past, engaged in common political action to defend themselves or to get some work done. Thus, the memory of their Tribe having lived through common political experiences becomes a social construct, or a memory of cohesion and solidarity that they identify with, develop a sense of moral duty to other members of their People. The tribe represents an elementary stage of organization around symbols and

memory that is more diverse than family blood relationships. When the Europeans came to North America, aboriginals had formed many tribes, they feel special obligations toward each other because of a felling of affinities that began in the past.

Stories, a form of oral history usually told by the tribal elders, where written language has not yet been developed, are an important part of perpetuating the shared memory of their origins. It is all central to preserving memories that are all part of the collective memory of The People as a tribe. Religion and shared religious beliefs are important because questions of origin—where they began, why they began, and what sustained their cohesion as The People—are difficult to answer so that beliefs in being a chosen People show the helps solidify a logical progression of symbolism.

Nationality: The Notion of a ‘Volk’

Urban industrial humans share the same need for nationality and cohesion on a larger scale, which likewise perpetuates the symbols of common descent. People living in modern nations have even less claim to blood relations, but according to Weber (1978:395), they also promote the ‘vague connotation that whatever is felt to be distinctly common must derive from common descent’. They perpetuate the concept of ‘Volk’, or People, on a much larger national scale.

A shared common language is pre-eminently considered the normal basis of nationality. . . . In reality, modern states usually have different language groups within them, so that often nationalism is seen to include an insistence on one common language so that a national identity (*Nationalstgefühl*) can be perpetuated. In Canada, French Canadians are a problem for nationalists, even though Canada is now officially a bilingual country. Many Ukrainians, Germans, Italians, Chinese, and aboriginals still speak their own languages at home; thus multilinguistic tendencies survive. The various languages then take on their own prestige rankings.

Weber defines nationality as being oriented toward a common language and culture, which is a problem when applied to multiethnic societies like Canada and the United States. He admits that feelings of identity subsumed under the term *national* are not uniform but may derive from diverse sources including customs, shared political memories, religion, language, and race. In Canada we can no longer assume, as they did in Europe, that people of one nation share a common language, religion, or customs. Canada does not have a state religion, but allows freedom of religious expression in many forms. Canada has wrestled and continues to wrestle with how to govern such a pluralistic people. What does ‘The People’ mean in Canada, or is it still possible to think in such terms? What is Canadian national identity, and how can this diversity be ordered?

Religion: An Ideological Symbol System

Weber wrote a half-dozen volumes on the role of religion in society; it deserves special discussion as a fifth focus in his characterization of ethnic identity. It is important to see the place of religion in the industrial urban setting that he dealt with extensively. Weber’s emphasis on ideas had already become apparent in his early studies of the Junkers in eastern Germany. Ideas and actions were not simply the product of their economic interests, as the Marxists had maintained, but a part of a larger social value system.

Weber spent enormous time and energy writing his well-known volume, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, as well as his volumes on religion in China, India, and Palestine, and a general sociology of religion. Like Durkheim, he sensed that religion played an

important part in society; unlike Marx, who dismissed religion as ‘an opiate of the people’, Weber placed ideology—whether religious or political—in an important place. In his discussion of ethnicity, Weber included religion along with language, race, tribe, and culture as one of five important characteristics in the formation of ethnic identity.

Weber clearly delineates race as having a biological base, including the social consequences of biological diversity in the human population. Weber’s second, third, and fourth categories (culture, tribe, nation) represent three parts of ‘ethnicity’. Culture includes the languages citizens speak, the food they eat, the fashions they wear, and the way they behave socially. Tribe and nation are two social organizational features. Tribe has to do with the smaller more intimate *Gemeinschaft* of family and kinship organization. Nation involves organization related to larger macro political and economic activity of more diverse and heterogeneous populations. Religion, the last of Weber’s five dimensions of identity is ideological. Jewish, Hutterite, Mormon, Mennonite, and Quebec Roman Catholic religious groups represent distinct ideological, cultural, and organizational life in Canada. Thus, biological, cultural, organizational, and ideological bases for social behaviour are clearly present in the Canadian population. It is clear, that Weber (1904) wanted both lines of inquiry—values and materialism—examined, as he clearly stated later in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

To summarize the three classical sociological theorists, I have plotted them in Figure 1 (see page 18 below), and have added major contributing factors (capitalism, monotheism, multiculturalism and violence) which follow. All of these macro influences can lead to terrorism if individuals choose to do so. Hopefully the thirty papers which follow, will expand related variables and influences, so we have more details on the enormous complexity which we face in unpacking the nature of terrorism, and its causes.

II. CONTRIBUTING FORMS OF HOSTILITIES

To illustrate sociological solidarity, ideologies and social conflict in the sociology of terrorism, we turn to a discussion of capitalism, monotheism, multiculturalism and violence, as major factors which contributed to emergence of terrorists. We begin with individualist capitalism.

A. INDIVIDUALIST CAPITALISM

If the dilemma of juggling opposites like multiculturalism and monotheism is not enough, add an individualist economic system like Capitalism to the mix, and it gets even harder to keep all the balls in the air, not to mention societies which contain fragile sinful humans, who are all too often prone to “miss the mark.” So let us briefly outline the basic ingredients of private enterprise, profit motive, competition and accumulation of capital, to illustrate the complexity of it all, which of course adds to the dilemma. We do this, because basically, western nations in Europe and North America have now tried for several centuries, to sort all this, including modified capitalism and the like.

Private Property

The early fathers of capitalism assumed that the best economic system was one where individuals owned finances and property, over which they had sole control to do with as they wished. Individuals could live in as much housing as they deemed necessary, invest in commercial enterprise, join partners to work with, hire specialists and workers who did the work. Whatever assets could be acquired belonged to the one who owned the capital and spearheaded the enterprise. Farmers owned land, and farmed it; business entrepreneurs setup businesses;

professionals trained to become teachers educators, medical doctors, service workers, CEOs and the like.

Competition

When individual entrepreneurs buy and sell a house, they may make profits, and whatever assets they gain in property, finances, etc. belong to the individual as private property. In order to sell houses and property, they need to compete with others in the market, to buy as cheaply as possible, and sell for as much as possible, to gain the largest margin or profit possible, so as to accumulate capital to reinvest. The market provides rules-of-the-game, where entrepreneurs try to present superior products which buyers want, and deem more worthy than other offers. Those who buy smartly and cheaply, can sell these products at greater return than the purchases, as part of the entrepreneurial game or competition.

Profit Motive

The major goal of private property and enterprise, is to accumulate capital in the form of buildings, farms, businesses, institutions, vehicles, etc. needed to live and survive. Basic individuals need shelter, food, protection, recreation, which each person is responsible to initiate, buy and sell. Whatever profits ensue, the differences between cost and income, are profits, which the individual may keep to accumulate as capital, to be used at the discretion of the owner as private property. We the world is now in a major depression, and we wonder what happened! Major capitalist Madoff accumulated 65 billion business assets, fraudulently (now jailed), and Americans are sorting what happened there. CEOs were paid bonuses in the millions, while their companies were in the tank, asking for bailouts from governments, flying in their multi-million dollar jets, with little care for bottom-lines. “How much can I get” seems to be the major drive, without concern for others losing their jobs and livelihoods. The whole world has been terrorized, and will be for years.

Accumulation of Capital

To obtain private property, sell it for more than the cost, provides the profit or capital as it is called, which benefits the entrepreneur in fair competition. This capital, which may take the form of land, buildings, goods, services, institutions, networks of various kinds, is what capitalism is all about. It is the economic enterprise and system which has emerged in the last few centuries, especially in western European and North American countries, and others elsewhere seem to be following as well. Excesses like Madoff have contributed to the recent “great crash” (Altman, 2009).

What is interesting is that the various social, religious, political and economic systems of the world, seem to be engaged in a variety of methods. Multiculturalism tries to follow many aspects of Durkheim’s concern for solidarity, identity and social cooperation of individuals and groups, while economic capitalism, centers much more on the entrepreneurs and individual pursuits. While religion in the form of monotheism, focuses more intensely on the individual rather than concerns for others, like capitalism, it nevertheless is concerned with supernatural kingdoms, and less on material concerns like capitalism. So in multiculturalism, monotheism and capitalism, we have many competing foci, concerns, methods for life and human institutions. It is not that easy for individuals who are born into these competing networks and systems, to find their own foci, commitments, and guides to meaningful lives.

B. MONOTHEIST IDEOLOGIES

All three early classic sociologists had important views on the role of religion in society, which need to be recognized (Stark, 2001, 2003, 2004). Durkheim (1897; 1912) wrote the *Elementary forms of Religious Life*, where he recognized the importance of religion in forming morals and beliefs in supernatural beings, which he thought added much to social solidarity. He found that religion was an important part in early societies and later as well. Karl Marx on the other hand, thought religion was an opiate which lulled humans into lethargy, and often became a target for conflict between the various forms of belief. Max Weber (1904/1958; 1919/1966) wrote a half dozen books on many religions, of which *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* became the most influential. As “ethic” and “spirit” imply, he took discussions into social psychological areas, exploring cause and affect of ideologies. Let us examine religious ideologies more.

While multiculturalism seeks to bridge many cultures, so they can coexist in one space together democratically, monotheism is the belief in one God who is supreme around which everything exists. While the first tries to be inclusive, the latter is often exclusive. The three monotheist religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, all trace their origins to the patriarch Abraham, who left the first urban civilization in the middle East to begin belief in one God isolated in the desert. It is of course a glaring contrast.

Judaism: Offerings and Sacrifice

Judaism traces its origins to Abraham and Sara who grew up in the first urban civilization in the Tigris-Ephratis valley which is now southern Iraq. Genesis 12 begins by saying that “The Lord had said to Abram, Leave your country, your people and your father’s household and go to the land I will show you. . . .So Abram left, as the Lord had told him, and Lot went with him. . . . He took his wife Sara. . . .and they set out for the land of Canaan” which is presently the country of Israel (Eidelberg, 1977).

In Genesis 15 it describes how Abram had a vision, where God said to Abram: “I am the Lord, who brought you out of Ur of the Chaldeans to give you this land to take possession of it.” Here he was told to make an offering to seal the covenant he and the Lord made that he should receive a son, and his descendants would live there ever after (Davis, 1978, Delaney, 1998; Krindart, 1998). Males were circumcised to seal the covenant between God and Abram, where his name was also changed to Abraham. Jews, Christians and Muslims all trace their origins to Abraham. On the basis of these promises and covenant, Jews in the twentieth century, continued these claims, and set up the nation of Israel in the region which was largely Muslim by now, to continue the claims of God’s promises to Abraham. Israel’s presence as a nation occupied by believers of Judaism in finite space located in what is now Israel however, has not been accepted by most Islamic nations which surround them for more than sixty years. This continues to be a basic problem of conflict and violence to this day. More needs to be said about that later.

Christianity: Juggling “one” God and the Trinity

Christians have included many sacred writings of the Jews such as the Torah, Prophets and Psalms, including the origins of Abraham as their patriarch who began monotheism in their sacred bible called the Old Testament. However, they added the New Testament which includes four gospels which introduce the birth, life and death of Jesus, who they have designated as “Christ,” who is special (Molmar, 2002). Christians believe that Jesus was sent by God to show the world more about what the invisible God who no one has seen is like, and how “the Way,”

“the truth,” and “the life” should be led on this planet. Various Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant versions attribute “God-like” attributes to Jesus, such as the virgin birth, which borders on being divine, “sitting at the right hand of God,” or “rising from the dead in resurrection,” or “Coming again.” Jesus is seen as a “savior,” as “Lord,” as “a Son of God.”

When Jesus was crucified, died and rose again, and then was raptured, the Holy Spirit came to earth, to be with humans in a living, ever-present way. Thus, Christians claim to believe in one God, manifested in three ways, called the Trinity, which is included in the Apostles’ creed. Few Jews, Jesus and the Holy Spirit are not included, and for Muslims, the trinity is not accepted. So it is clear that belief in monotheism means different things in the three major monotheist religions. Even internally, in each of the three, there is also a range of expressions as to what the essence and attributes of “God” really are (Bibby, 2002).

Islam: Essence and Attributes

Jon Hoover (2009:57-82), in his recent article “Islamic Monotheism and the Trinity,” shows that Christians and Muslims both believe in monotheism, but profoundly disagree on what it means. “Muslims justify their conviction that the Trinity violates God’s unity in a number of ways. . . .such as Qur’anic criticism, corruption of the message of Jesus, and rational deficiencies. . . .” (Hoover, 2009:58). They think the doctrine of the trinity which includes God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit as part of one God, does not differentiate the attributes and the essence of the unity of God, and believes that associates are not allowed. There should be an exclusive worship of one God, where God’s essence is one, and God’s attributes are many. This is not the place to enter into the complexity of these arguments, but hopefully, other papers will enlarge on the complexity of monotheism, and the different interpretations in both Islam and Christianity. It is clear that beliefs in Monotheism and complex, varied, and the potential for strong conflict are legion.

More literature is increasingly available on Muslim variations (Cragg, 2001; Hoover, 2004, 2009; Bonney, 2004; Firestone, 1999; Kessler, 2004; Lewis, 2003; Moucarray, 2001; Peters, 1996; Philips, 1997; Qureshi, 2003; Thomas, 2004). Hopefully many of you who are experts here will enlarge on the variations.

C. MULTICULTURAL IDENTITIES

While capitalism is a very individualist economic system, and monotheism tries to focus on one God, multiculturalism is concerned with many cultures living together in one space or geographic area. Countries like Canada and the USA, have always included peoples of many cultures; Europeans increasingly are faced with similar challenges. Peoples in other countries as we become more mobile, are increasingly part of the larger plural global community, also wrestling with the complexities of many cultures living peaceably closer and closer together.

Aboriginals and First Nations

Mislabelling of the first peoples of Canada as “Indians”, illustrates the early colonial mentality of white Europeans, where they thought they were in India near the spices they desired. They also found “Eskimos” (meat eaters), when in fact they were Inuit (The People). White “Christians” in those days considered themselves industrial and superior, especially blessed by their monotheistic GOD. Status was a major factor, and newfound coloured peoples didn’t have it. These European colonial “palefaces” first settled in the east, of the new continents they found and slowly possessed the “empty” land, turning lush hunting grounds into agricultural kingdoms, “rescuing” land and people for “better” purposes, destroying and polluting as they went. Early

European censuses in upper and lower Canada did not include the “heathen” and “food gatherers”, because they lived in the unorganized northwestern wilderness with whom they traded to promote the latest fur fashions in “civilized” Europe. Aboriginals were often terrorized by Europeans who used their fire arms.

First Nations people must be placed in context, to appreciate the complexity and range of the peoples we are dealing with. There were roughly one million Indian, Metis and Inuit Canadians of aboriginal origin in 1991. Their national leaders (Georges Erasmus in 1990, and Ovide Mercredi in 1991), strongly stated that the Aboriginals are the First Nations, not the British and French, and the myth of the European bilingual and bicultural founding of Canada must be challenged (Boldt, 1993; Ponting, 1997). In 1991 the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was established to hold hearings in more than a hundred communities across Canada, with the following aims: 1) to forge a new relationship between aboriginals and non-aboriginals, 2) give more control to aboriginals over their future, 3) help move them from subsistence to self-sufficiency, and 4) promote physical, emotional, and spiritual healing after decades of mistreatment and neglect (Hiller, 2000:242).

Anthropologist H.B. Hawthorne (1966, 1967), was among the first to study the rich and diverse aboriginal cultures in British Columbia, founding and developing one of the best multi-million dollar museums on the University of British Columbia campus, as well as Jean Elliott’s *Native Peoples* (1971), were among the earliest social science studies of aboriginals. The best known sociological study by James Frideres, *Canada’s Indians* (1974, 1983, 1988, 1993, 1996) has gone through many editions. These studies clearly show that aboriginals before the Europeans came, were mostly food-gathering, oral societies, and profoundly diverse linguistically and culturally.

Immigration and Migration

The point system established during the Trudeau years changed immigration to Canada from largely North European newcomers, to mostly “visible minorities”. By the 1990s, the federal government needed more information to evaluate their immigration policy. It made available a total of \$8,000,000, two million dollars each for research centres on immigration in Montreal, Toronto, Edmonton and Vancouver, under the larger Metropolis Project organization headed by Meyer Burstein. Large groups of both academic researchers at universities, and heads of various immigrant organizations joined at each of the four centres to hold conferences, provide funds for research, read papers and publish their works. The *Journal of International Migration and Integration* edited by Baha Abu-Laban came out with several issues by 2000, another avenue for publication of research on immigration, the most recent trend. The Metropolis Project Team has expanded internationally, where Metropolis conferences are held annually in various centres in Europe, Israel, U.S.A. and Canada. These are designed to develop research policy, bringing together researchers and persons working in the field.

“As the response to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism broadened to include residents of Canada who were neither British nor French, it became clear that it would no longer be prudent for government policy to ignore the wide range of other ethnic groups represented in the country. The 1971 federal governmental declaration of a policy of bilingualism within a multicultural framework, soon turned into a 1988 Multicultural Act which established the right of Canadians to identify with a cultural heritage” (Hiller, 1996:244).

Freedoms and Rights

Anthropologists David Hughes and Evelyn Kallen (1974), Robin Winks (1971), Anthony Richmond (1972), and Frances Henry (1973) all published on race in Canada in the 1970s. By 1982 Evelyn Kallen was ready to do a volume on *Ethnicity and Human Rights in Canada* (1982), which came out as a second edition in 1995. Her 1995 work is the most recent attempt at conceptualizing human rights in countries of diversity, dealing with the vertical mosaic, social stratification, ethnic integration, minority protest movements, protection of minority rights, and the legal ramifications of these new developments.

Frances Henry and associates published *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society* (1995, 2000), which is the latest attempt at integration of the field dealing with the ideology of racism. Carl James and Adrienne Shadd published *Talking About Identity* in 2001. Edited collections of readings by Victor Satzewich, *Deconstructing A Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and Racism in '90s Canada* (1998), and Leo Driedger and Shiva Halli *Race and Racism* (2000), includes papers presented at special conferences.

Constitutions and Charters

After many meetings, and epic federal-provincial battles, much debate culminated in the proclamation of the Constitution Act in 1982, which officially separated Canada from the BNA Act and British colonialism (Reg Whitaker, 1988). It entrenched a Charter of Rights and Freedoms which declared Canada a bilingual nation, and included individual rights. While most of the charter outlines the rights of two charter groups, it does include individual rights, aboriginal rights, and the right to a multicultural heritage of other Canadians. The queen and nine premiers signed; unfortunately, Quebec did not. Quebeckers felt a strong sense of betrayal at the hands of Trudeau and Chretien. Bringing home the constitution 1) was culmination of a study by a major Royal Commission which opened up discussions on ethnic diversity, 2) the languages of two founding groups were again officially recognized, 3) individual rights and freedoms were entrenched, 4) aboriginal rights were included, and 5) multicultural heritages were recognized. All this provided a fertile launch for research and policy-making of many peoples, which spawned a huge avalanche of study and research.

The new Charter of Rights and Freedoms, outlines mostly (90%) the language and cultural rights of the two largest founding European charter groups, which shows how pervasive imperial colonialism is. But it does mention multicultural rights of others, and in the end (although last and begrudgingly) it includes aboriginals' rights as well. It is focused on preservation of group heritages, designed for white Europeans who before the 1970s, represented 95% of the Canadian population. Changes in immigration policy in the 1970s had opened up to worldwide immigration so that by 1990, two decades later, the 5% non-white population had doubled to 10%, and projections are that that will double again to 20% by 2020. These demographic changes, noticeably changed the focus of ethnic and racial studies in Canada, from ingroup preservation to rights and equal treatment of all. Foci of research interest have moved from bilingualism to multiculturalism to equal rights for all.

III Method: Violence or Non-violence?

If managing individualism, monotheism, and multiculturalism is not enough, add methods of operation such as violence or non-violence (take your pick). Neither method is easy for less-than-perfect beings who often find it hard to survive, let alone be "perfect" as their religious "master" demands.

Why Blood and Violence?

Bruce Chilton (2008) in his recent book *Abraham's Curse: The Roots of Violence in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, interestingly makes the case, that the Aqedah where Abraham believed that he should sacrifice his first son Isaac on mount Marish, to show that he was totally loyal to the one God, and committed to serve him. This strangely demonstrates how later sacrifice and martyrdom became basic issues in Judaism, and continued in Christianity and Islam. Abraham and Sara did not have any children for most of their life, and were deeply worried how God's promise of loyalty to their covenant and promise of the land of Israel would continue. Thus, when Sara was already of old age, she still bore Isaac, their first son and heir. So the Aqedah, where Abram believed he must sacrifice this only heir to show loyalty to the one God who promised perpetual inheritance of the land, seemed like an impossible contradiction (Chilton, 2008, Carter, 2003; Davis, 1978, 1979; Delaney, 1998). It was of course a great relief, when God intervened with an angel, and provided a lamb for sacrifice instead, saving the heir's life. Nevertheless, a life had to be sacrificed to satisfy the promise. This all raised the question why must a living creator die and be sacrificed? Why is violence necessary? Why this one God deserved this?

Chilton (2008) also suggests that Christianity and Islam seemed equally determined that shedding of blood was needed. Jesus became the Christ who needed to die for the sins of the world, where the cross became the symbol of sacrifice for others. Indeed, Roman Catholics display the suffering Jesus hanging on the cross, with the crown of thorns on his head in prominent places everywhere. "The Aqedah exemplified the martyr's zeal in both Judaism and Christianity, while Christianity took the additional step of having God carry out the sacrifice of the son that Abraham did not complete in Genesis 13, making martyrdom a central virtue, literally a divine activity that believers were to imitate" (Chilton, 2008, 143).

In Islam both father (Called Ibrahim in the Quram) and his older son Ismail (born of Sara's slave Hagar) loom large as they have to choose between Allah and Ismail. Muslims still sacrifice thousands of sheep, cows, camels in Mecca today at the Feast of Sacrifice, which demonstrates that shedding of blood for all three classic monotheist religions, still is done in many forms of offerings today.

Terrorist Examples Today

One of the most puzzling examples today is the *Middle East*, between Israel and the surrounding Arab countries, which are mostly Muslim, both followers of patriarch Abraham. Many attempts have been made to solve these conflicts, but without success. As we write, Israel is bombing Gaza, from which Hamas was launching missiles into Israel. To establish Jewish Israel in a now mostly Muslim area some fifty years ago, is of course a provocative move, and many countries there do not recognize the legitimacy of that move. Israel and its allies, claim that this land was promised and given to Jews since Abraham, and they are just reclaiming a right from which they were forced by Muslims occupations. Much violence has occurred and recently happened again. New envoys were sent to try to negotiate peace which is not successful (Panitch and Lays, 2009).

In Ireland and northern Ireland, conflicts between the British Church of England, and Roman Catholic Irish rebels occurred for decades with much fighting, destruction of property, terrorism and violence. Envoy Holbrook was sent, and a peace agreement was signed, which does seem to be beholding. Why was Holbrook successful in creating peace, and what were the factors which helped in a successful non-violent treaty so far. This time the enemies were both

groups which laid claims to the Christian religion, where “brothers” needed to settle daily matters. Can we learn anything from what was done there?

Osama Bin Laden, son of an Oil capitalist, grew up in Saudi Arabia, benefited greatly from these economic windfalls, and is now set up what is believed to be in northern Pakistan, from which he is threatening terrorist action. He has laid claim to organizing and engineering the Nine-Eleven bombings of the New York Trade Center a few years ago, where they flew several airplanes into skyscrapers in Manhattan. An individual businessman, now terrorist, seems to be holding the richest country, the United States at bay, threatening new terrorist activity, which many countries in the western world are defending against. Bin Laden is a Muslim faith, fighting western capitalist Christians who he thinks are leading our globe into chaos. The Americans do not seem to be able to get him, and President Obama has vowed to root him out of his hideouts. There is little talk of negotiations, and both sides seem intent on violence.

The factors of capitalism, monotheism, multiculturalism and violence which we outlined in our sociology of terrorism, all seem to be very much in play (O’Sullivan, 1986; Richardson, 2002). How can we come up with some comprehensive model which will focus where all this leads, and begin to solve some of the violence. How can we gain insights and learn to enhance our commitments to religion, and develop new identities which are effective in a multicultural world, where it is possible to live together in a shrinking space, with more and more humans piled up all the time? Others have sought to explore other peacemaking and multicultural ways of operating (Driedger, 1994, 2008).

There are numerous examples of violence displayed over the last centuries, such as the crusades where Christians fought Jews, slavery, where African countries were raided largely by Christian Europeans and brought to Christian America where they lost their cultural identities, and were forced to survive. *Nonviolent* models have emerged, demonstrated by leaders like Mahatma Ghandi, Martin Luther King and more recently by Nelson Mandela, who do give us hope that violence can be conquered by new ways of love (Redekop, 2008).

CONCLUSIONS

The early classical sociologists were concerned that the individualist capitalist system of modernization was eroding general social cohesion and concern for others, focusing too much on private property, profit motive, competition and accumulation of capital for self consumption. Emile Durkheim focused on the need for social solidarity, Karl Marx dealt with conflict and the need for more communal sharing, and Max Weber expanded on the rise of individual ideologies such as Protestantism, which lead to a “spirit” of capitalism.

In this paper we developed some of the contributing factors to hostilities, such as individualist capitalism, and monotheist religious ideologies, which have contributed much to hostilities. On the other hand we propose that multiculturalism has the potential for much more cooperation, sharing and developing concerns for each other, which emphasizes races living together, peoples of various cultures working on a consciousness of kind and bridging differences. Ties and networks as “people” or “Volk”, are needed more to promote human rights and community, than building walls of separation and isolation.

Methods of non-violence, rather than violence are increasingly needed. We are fast moving toward another great depression at this time, which demonstrates that selfish accumulation of capital fraud by entrepreneurs such as Bernie Madoff can harm the world economy and human welfare. This is systemic world economic terror, where thousands lose their jobs, and life savings, because of selfish bonuses of millions for a few.

It is striking that the three monotheist religions (Jews, Christians and Muslims) in the middle east cannot agree on whose God is best, so try to separate themselves from each other like Palestinians and Jews as the bombings in Gaza also demonstrate. In the meantime monotheist Osama Bin Laden cannot forget the Christian crusades and slavery of the past, and seeks to terrorize Christians in America by huge bombings like Nine-Eleven. Violence seems to be the major means of negotiation, rather than non-violent debate. All this hopefully adds to the social context needed to understand better why individual terrorists bomb and threaten, because social systems and networks facilitate such actions too much.

All this suggests that “terrorism” within institutions, or individual terrorists who bomb, will likely be with us always, as long as humans are sinners (missing the mark). We have explored some of the factors which enter into the equation which is really a balancing act. Can our economic individualist capitalism be monitored, balanced by more “socialist” sharing, without government becoming a terrorist also? Can western monotheist religions with their varied theologies and focus on “one” God who is creator and ruler, be increasingly shared and debated, especially as Jews, Christians and Muslims intertwine socially? Can we increasingly develop multicultural national and international communities where many cultures can interact and share democratically? And can we increasingly lay aside fast violent wars, where power gets its own way at the expense of others, and work together? In the meantime there will always be deviant individuals, terrorists both internally, and externally, which is part of the adjustment? Can we keep such violence to a minimum? Can non-violence finally gain the upper hand?

References

- Altman, Roger C. 2009 *The Great Crash, 2008: A Geopolitical Setback for the West*. *Foreign Affairs* 88:2-14.
- Bibby, Reginald. 2002. *Restless Gods: The Renaissance of Religion in Canada*. Toronto: Stoddart.
- Bonney, Richard. 2004. *Jihad: From Qur'an to bin Laden*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carter, Jeffrey (Ed.) 2003. *Understanding Religious Sacrifice: A Reader, Controversies in the Study of Religion*. New York: Continuum.
- Chilton, Bruce. 2008. *Abraham's Curse: The Roots of Violence in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. New York: Doubleday.
- Cragg, Kenneth. 2001. *Jesus and the Muslim: An Exploration*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Davis, P.R. and B.D. Chilton. 1979. “The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40:514-546.
- Davies, Philip. 1979. “Passover and the Dating of the Aqedah.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 30:59-67.
- Delaney, Carol. 1998. *Abraham on Trial: The Social Legacy of Biblical Myth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Press.
- Driedger, Leo and Donald B. Kraybill. 1994. *Mennonite Peacemaking: From Quietism to Activism*. Scottsdale, Pa: Herald Press.
- Driedger, Leo. 1996. *Multi-Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Driedger, Leo and Shiva Halli (eds.). 2000. *Race and Racism: Canada's Challenge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Driedger, Leo. 2003. *Race and Ethnic Relations: Finding Identities and Inequalities*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Driedger, Leo. 2008. “Multiculturalism: Bridging Ethnicity, Culture, Religion and Race.” *Forum on Public Policy*.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1897/1981. *Suicide*. Translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1912. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Translated by W.S.F. Fields. New York: Free Press.
- Eidelberg, Shlomo. 1977. *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Elliott, Jean L. and Augie Fleras. 1999. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race and Ethnic Dynamics in Canada*, Third Edition. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall.

- Firestone, Reuven. 1999. *The Origin of Holy War in Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fleras, Augie and Jean L. Elliott. 1992. *Multiculturalism in Canada: The Challenge of Diversity*. Toronto: Nelson Canada.
- Frideres, James. 1996. *Native Peoples in Canada: Contemporary Conflict*. Fifth Edition. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall.
- Halli, Shiva and Leo Driedger (eds.). 1999. *Immigrant Canada: Demographic, Economic and Social Challenges*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hawthorne, H.B. et al. 1966. *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada*. Two Volumes. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Henry, Frances, Carol Tator, Winston Mattis and Tim Rees. 2000. *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Second Edition. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Canada.
- Hoover, Jon. 2004. "Revelation and the Islamic and Christian Doctrines of God." *Islamochristiana* 30:1-14.
- Hoover, Jon. 2009. "Islamic Monotheism and the Trinity." *The Conrad Grebel Review*. Winter:57-82.
- James, Carl E. 1990. *Making it: Black Youth, Racism and Career Aspirations in a Big City*. Oakville, ON: Mosaic Press.
- James, Carl E. 1999. *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Culture*. Second Edition. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- Kallen, Evelyn. 1995. *Ethnicity and Human Rights in Canada*, Second Edition. Toronto: Gage and Toronto University Press.
- Kessler, Edward. 2004. *Bound by the Bible: Jews, Christians and the Sacrifice of Isaac*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kundert, Lukas. 1998. *Die Opferung, Bindung Isaaks*. Neukirchener: Neukirchen/Vluyn: Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 78 & 79, Volume 2.
- Lewis, Bernard. 2003. *The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*. New York: Modern Library.
- McMillan, Alan B. 1995. *Native Peoples and Cultures in Canada*, Second Edition. Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Molmar, Paul D. 2002. *Divine Freedom and the Doctrine of the Immanent Trinity: In Dialogue with Karl Barth and Contemporary Theology*. London: T & T Clark.
- Moucarry, Chawkat. 2001. *Faith to Faith: Christianity & Islam in Dialogue*. Leicester, UK: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Obama, Barack. 2006. *The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream*. New York: Random House.
- O'Sullivan, Noel. 1986. *Terrorism, Ideology and Revolution: The Origins of Modern Political Violence*. Great Britain: Wheatsheaf Books.
- Panitch, Leo and Colin Leys (eds). 2009. *Violence Today: Actually Existing Barbarism*. Toronto: Fernwood Books.
- Peters, Rudolph. 1996. *Jihad in Classical and Modern Islam: A Reader*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Series on the Middle East, Markus Werner.
- Phillips, Abu Ameenah Bilal. 1997. *The Fundamentals of Tawheed (Islamic Monotheism)*. Riyadh: International Islamic Publishing House.
- Ponting, Rick. 1997. *First Nations in Canada: Perspectives on Opportunity, Empowerment and Self-Determination*. Toronto: McGraw.
- Qureshi, Emran and Michael Sells (eds). 2003. *The New Crusades: Constructing the Muslim Enemy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Redekop, Paul. 2008. *Changing Paradigms: Punishment and Restorative Discipline*. Waterloo, ON: Herald Press.
- Richardson, Jacques. 2002. *War, Science and Terrorism: From Laboratory to Open Conflict*. London: Frank Cass.
- Stark, Rodney. 2001. *One True God: Historical Consequences of Monotheism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stark, Rodney. 2003. *For the Glory of God: How Monotheism led to Reformations, Science, Witch-hunts, and the End of Slavery*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stark, Rodney. 2004. "SSSR Presidential Address, 2004: Putting an End to Ancestor Worship." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 43:465-476.
- Thomas, David. 2004. "Tathlith." *The Encyclopedia of Islam*. Leiden: Brill 10:373-375.
- Vallee, Frank G. 1981. "The Sociology of John Porter: Ethnicity as Anachronism." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 8:639-650.
- Weber, Max. 1904/1958. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Weber, Max. 1919/1966. *General Economic History*. New York: Collier.
- Winks, Robin. 1971. *The Blacks in Canada: A History*. Montreal: McGill/Queen's University Press.

Published by the Forum on Public Policy
Copyright © The Forum on Public Policy. All Rights Reserved. 2009.

Figure 1: Terrorism: Dilemmas of Capitalism, Monotheism, Multiculturalism, Violence.



