

1-1-2008

# Defeating the Purpose of Multiculturalism: a Case of Hate on Campus

Laura Bettencourt  
*Ryerson University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.ryerson.ca/dissertations>



Part of the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Bettencourt, Laura, "Defeating the Purpose of Multiculturalism: a Case of Hate on Campus" (2008). *Theses and dissertations*. Paper 80.

This Major Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Ryerson. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Ryerson. For more information, please contact [bcameron@ryerson.ca](mailto:bcameron@ryerson.ca).

DEFEATING THE PURPOSE OF MULTICULTURALISM:  
A CASE OF HATE ON CAMPUS

by

Laura Bettencourt, BA (Hons.), York University, 2007

A Major Research Paper  
presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts  
in the Program of  
Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2008

© Laura Bettencourt 2008

Author's Declaration

---

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research paper.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this paper to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

---

Signature

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this paper by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

---

Signature

**DEFEATING THE PURPOSE OF MULTICULTURALISM:  
A CASE OF HATE ON CAMPUS**

© Laura Bettencourt, 2008

Master of Arts  
Immigration and Settlement Studies  
Ryerson University

**ABSTRACT**

This paper examines the student newspaper at two Toronto universities: Ryerson university and York university to uncover the manifestation of hate motivated activity on campus. The findings capture a striking contradiction between an articulated understanding of official multiculturalism in Canada and the reality of persistent and pervasive hate activity on campus. I argue that hate motivated activity impacts the social processes of exclusion for racialized students in Toronto universities. Using a social exclusion framework I examine how the nature and extent of hate motivated activity materialize as a means of constructing the ‘Other’ within university spaces. Moreover, these systems of meaning support patterns of domination and exclusion, all the while exposing the fallacy multiculturalism in Canada. In order to bring this to light, this study re-conceptualizes, contextualized and problematizes hate activity in the Canadian context, specifically in relation to the university.

Key words: hate motivated activity; multiculturalism, university, racialization, social exclusion

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Literature Review	4
▪ Re-conceptualizing “hate”	5
a. Definitional complexities	5
b. Scope of the problem	11
c. The roots of hate incidents	15
▪ Contextualizing “hate” on campus	19
a. Racism, Racialization and Education	19
b. Anti-racism and Education	24
c. Race and Space	26
d. Hate on Campus	29
▪ Problematizing multiculturalism in Canada	32
a. A critique of multiculturalism	32
b. Social Exclusion Theory	38
▪ Conclusion of Literature Review	41
Methodology	42
Findings	44
Discussion	49
▪ Explaining the prevalence of hate on campuses	50
▪ The implications of hate activity on campus	63
▪ Defeating the purpose: multiculturalism and hate activity on campus	67
Conclusion	73
List of news stories	76
Works Cited	77

## **List of Appendices**

List of news stories (Spreadsheet showing number of incidents and newspaper reports)	76
---	----

The processes of racialization and the subsequent manifestation of hate continue to intensify as a modern social problem. In Canada, the legal and discursive political commitment to multiculturalism is often presented as a guarantee for tolerance towards visible minorities. With the adoption of multiculturalism in 1971, Canada achieved official status as a multicultural country where all persons, irrespective of race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, gender, ability, or other forms of difference, are treated with dignity and equality. Overall, official multiculturalism is understood as a policy that forges unity from diversity (Fleras and Elliot, 2002). However, official multiculturalism has been contradicted by discriminatory trends that marginalize racialized groups in Canada. Hate motivated activity, including hate crime, is one example of the paradox of multiculturalism, where ‘Others’, due to their supposed difference are neither tolerated nor accepted, as Canadians. Thus, new research needs to explore the construction of identity, representation and affirmation in a multicultural society and the struggle against the power of a dominant culture that is still significantly influenced by the legacy of its Eurocentric heritage.

The onset of hate motivated activity in Canadian society, and hate crime in particular has been constructed as perpetuating individualized irrationality or ignorance and as an ‘exception’ typical of ‘backward’ parts of the country. In this sense, hate perpetrating individuals and groups are seen as outside the mainstream, which is rationalized by their lack of exposure to the diverse demographic of Canada. Moreover, the de-politization of hate motivated activity means that under multiculturalism, the state is unable to identify systemic or structural forms of racism, which contradict the goals of multiculturalism. In order to interrogate this notion, I propose to analyze racially motivated hate in university spaces – an environment, which is both cosmopolitan, erudite and brings a range of students from diverse urban, rural and regional

backgrounds together. In doing this I seek to answer the following questions: *Why is hate motivated activity manifesting on-campus and in what contexts do students become mobilized to partake in racist acts? What are the implications of hate in the university, and Canadian society? And last, is hate motivated activity evidence of the ‘fallacy’ of multiculturalism’?*

The university campus space is an important spatial context to analyze how racial power is produced, represented and challenged in multicultural Canada. Traditionally, the university campus is defended as a safe space for progressive thinking, equality and education on issues of diversity. Accordingly, the university has defined itself as an:

...institution of higher learning devoted to the academic quest for truth, stimulated by adherence to the most valid methods of inquiry; complete dependence on merit by those who engage in research and teaching; the creation and maintenance of standards of excellence, and the strict adherence to freedom of thought and expression (Henry and Tator, 1994, p.74).

In spite of this, a number of Toronto universities have reported a consistent rate of hate motivated activity on campus directed against individuals and groups because of their race, religion, ethnicity and/or other differences. Despite the fact that racism is a pervasive and systemic force in Canadian society, the university has denied the problem and resisted change in the name of academic freedom and the preservation of meritocracy (Henry and Tator, 1994). Today, hate incidents can be seen as endemic to academic institutions where freedom of expression is celebrated and incivility is often mildly penalized (Jackson and Heckman, 2002, p. 435). While this discussion can raise questions about existing forms of race relations on campus, it also reflects on the principles of multiculturalism and topics of integration, inclusion and belonging in Canada. Hate motivated activity is a major threat to the well-being of individual

---

<sup>1</sup> Canada’s Multicultural Act is a framework, which allows and insists upon equal opportunity and participation in all levels of society by all members, however these objectives have not been accomplished, as demonstrated by the persisting inequalities and discrimination experienced by racialized populations. The ‘fallacy of multiculturalism’ is understood as a way of exposing and problemizing the actual official policy application to the lives of racialized groups in Canada.

students, the university, and the community at large and, it is necessary to uncover and address these processes of exclusion in Canada.

Hate incidents have been prominent on university campuses for the last two decades but vary in their targets and severity. Most recently, Toronto's Ryerson University and York University have presented a definite urgency in this research with hate-motivated activity remaining an ongoing issue. In order to uncover hate-motivated activity on both campuses, I analyze two student newspapers. Both newspapers provide a means of mapping the forms of hate directed at racialized students and allows for a discussion of issues raised by those events, including questions about Canadian national identity, and democratic liberal values such as freedom of expression, individualism, and tolerance. The findings reflect an emerging crisis for racialized groups whose meaning and belonging to Canada are being redefined, as their supposed difference becomes the site of struggle within the university and the larger national identity.

Therefore, the broader purpose of this research project is to explore how hate motivated activity impacts the social processes of exclusion for racialized students in Toronto universities. Using a social exclusion theory, I will examine how the nature and extent of hate motivated activity materialize as a means of constructing the 'Other' and defining difference within university spaces. I will show how these systems of meaning support patterns of domination and exclusion, all the while exposing the 'fallacy of multiculturalism' in Canada.

## **Literature Review**

Although there is a growing amount of research on the subject of hate crime, little empirical analysis of hate motivated activity exists in Canada and more importantly, in the university campus context. The purpose of this section is to give an overview of the current discourse surrounding hate in order to bring to light the situation of hate motivated activity in Canada, particularly the campus context - a gap in the literature to which my research can contribute. Before engaging in a detailed analysis of hate motivated activity on two Toronto campuses, one needs to understand some of the pertinent issues at hand. The majority of research on hate motivated activity is American based in scope and centers on hate crime categorization and victimology. Yet, some vital considerations emerge from this literature that help to understand the discourse of hate and the onset of hate in Toronto universities. Therefore, this section will outline scholarship in three different parts. First, I will re-conceptualize hate by outlining the complexities involved in its definition, as well as the scope of the problem and finally, offer some explanations of the root causes of hate in Canadian society. Next, I will contextualize hate on campus with a review of literature on racialization and education, anti-racism, theories of race and space, and discussions of specific hate incidents on campus. Last, I problematize multiculturalism in Canada by presenting the critiques of official policy and discuss social exclusion theory. These broad themes all have a direct connection to my analysis and I will draw on convergences and divergences in the existing literatures. The gaps of knowledge will prove that research on hate in the university campus is important to consider and will enhance awareness to the field of study.

## Re-conceptualizing “Hate”

### A. Definitional Complexities

In order to understand *hate* on campus, it is vital to differentiate between the concepts of *hate crime* and *hate motivated activity* or *hate incidents*. Hate-motivated activity refers to any action taken against a specific or targeted individual or community based on prejudice (B’nai Brith, 2002). This classification of hate incidents includes harassment, vandalism and violence. Additionally, the concept of *hate group* is incorporated and refers to an organization advocating violence against or unreasonable hostility towards persons or groups identified by race, religion, ethnic/national origin, sexual orientation or disability, or disseminating historically inaccurate information regarding such persons or groups (B’nai Brith, 2002). Lastly, the definition encompasses the notion of *hate propaganda* which refers to ideologies or beliefs transmitted in written, verbal or electronic form to create or promote hateful or belligerent attitudes and actions against a specific group or groups of people (B’nai Brith, 2002). In contrast, hate crime is usually understood as an act committed to intimidate, harm and terrify the victim or the entire group of which the victim is a member, solely because of who they are (B’nai Brith, 2002). However, not all acts of hate, especially those occurring on university campuses are necessarily classifiable as hate criminal offences under federal legislation or under Canadian human rights codes. Thus, my research confronts the challenge of this definitional gap wherein the measuring of hate motivated activity remains the most inclusive way of naming hate on campus. On the other hand, there are critical insights from the literature on hate crime that give detail and can be applied to on campus hate activity as well.

Though the expression *hate crime* is often used today, there is little consensus to its precise

definition. Some believe that the explanation lays in the fact that defining crime in general, particularly hate crime varies based on cultural diversity, social norms and political standpoints (Petrosino, 1999). Another reason for the confusion around the understanding of hate is due to the fact that most research defines it differently and academic disciplines have distinct paradigms in naming acts of bigotry (Janhevich, 2001)<sup>2</sup>. For example, some elucidate hate as acts ranging from ethnic cleansing (Hamm, 1994) and right wing terrorism (Bjorgo, 1994) while it can also pertain to other criminal behavior. Under some circumstances hate is may be viewed as juvenile acts committed by youth seeking a thrill or peer approval (Levin & McDevitt, 1993), whereas other types of hate are regarded as political acts with consequences that exceed the harm to the victim (Perry, 2001).

Hate crime and activity is identified as acts *motivated* by intolerance towards an identifiable group (Janhevich, 2001). Though this may seem clear, the idea of ‘motivation’ alone is complicated and continues to be a central issue surrounding the problem of defining hate as crime (Jacobs, 1993; Berk, 1994; Jacobs & Potter, 1998). For instance, on average most crimes have a number of motives that trigger any one incident (Janhevich, 2001). As Roberts (1995) explains, an exclusive definition would classify a hate crime as a act solely motivated by *hate* of the victim’s status, which would likely result in fewer reported offences, while other definitions which only require that an act be motivated in whole or in part by hate will generate a greater number of reported hate crimes (p. 11). Regardless of this inconsistency, the main distinction of hate as an offense is that it not only affects individuals explicitly targeted by the perpetrator, but it also indirectly hurts entire communities (Landau, 2006). Surprisingly, there is no agreement

---

<sup>2</sup> Some scholars analyze hate crime objectives, which include the intent to subjugate the victim and his or her community to an inferior social and political standing. The efforts of these scholars provide contextual features to hate crime, which includes motive, and provides an understanding into what distinguishes hate crimes from other criminal acts (Boeckmann and Turpin-Petrosino, 2002, p. 209).

with regard to which groups are included in the hate discourse and characteristics of purported “protected groups” vary across jurisdictions according to police hate crime units (Dauvergne *et al.*, 2006). On the other hand this is changing as approximately thirty countries in North America and Europe have identified the distinctiveness of hate crimes and have adopted hate crime legislation (McClintock and LeGendre, 2007).

One of the tools in defining and taking action against hate crimes in Canada is criminal law. There are two classifications of hate-motivated crimes; those that fit within the parameters of the hate propaganda section of the Criminal Code, and all other offences where there is evidence of hate as a motivating factor (Toronto Police, 2005).<sup>3</sup> These distinguished sentencing provisions allow for harsher penalties when hate is determined to be an aggravating factor. According to Landau (2006), it is clear that hate crime legislation has tried to draw the line between one’s freedoms to hold prejudice thoughts, while placing limits on how far one may go in acting on those feelings (p. 110). While progress has been made in the law recognizing hate as a criminal offense, there is still work to be done around ensuring the rights of victims and preventing hate progression.

Notwithstanding these limitations, there are other complexities with the law, which are problematic in the context of hate crime. First, the function of law forces us to respond to individual victimization when on the contrary hate is not about single persons (Perry, 2001; Roberts, 1995):

[Hate crimes] is less about any one victim than about the cultural group they represent. Hate crime is, in fact, an assault against all members of stigmatized and marginalized communities...It does not occur in a social or cultural vacuum;

---

<sup>3</sup> Hate propaganda is defined as any communication that advocates or promotes genocide or makes statements, other than in private that promotes hatred against an identifiable group. An identifiable group is defined by the Criminal Code as “any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, religion, ethnic origin, or sexual orientation” (Toronto Police Service, 2005, p. 2).

rather it is a socially situated, dynamic process, involving context and actors, structure and agency. (Perry, 2001, p. 1)

Furthermore, there are limits in the wording of the criminal law with hate crime, and should be re-termed as “hate-motivated activity” (Jeffrey, 1998). In the context of the gay and lesbian community, Faulkner (1997) uses “anti-gay/lesbian violence” because the term extends beyond the *Criminal Code* definitions to include harassment and other forms of discrimination (Landau, 2006, p. 111). Landau also shows that the League of Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada (B’nai Brith) (2005) uses the term “anti-Semitic incidents” when referring to hate against the Jewish community, which includes non-criminal forms of attacks such as racial slurs (p. 111). Even with the social significance in criminal terminology, the legalistic definitions of hate still “fails to encompass grievous violations, and minimizes the oppressive nature and intent of bias-motivated attacks” (Perry, 2001, p. 3). This in turn excludes some intolerant acts from being taken seriously, especially those on campus settings.

In resistance, some scholars (Perry, 2001; Mason, 2005) argue that what is conventionally defined as *hate crime* needs to be expanded to include subtle and structural forms of discrimination by linking larger accounts of bigotry that lend themselves to various forms of hate motivated activity in society. Mason (2005) suggests that it is the sense of ‘estrangement’ that separates ‘insiders’ from ‘outsiders’ where hate crime portrays a form of ‘stranger danger’ (p. 587). This creation of difference or ‘Othering’<sup>4</sup> can, whether actual or perceived, in itself, form targets for hate incidents and/or crimes (Mason, 2005, p. 587). Similarly, Levin (2002) explains that, “the seeds for recognizing and eventually protecting on the basis of status are

---

<sup>4</sup> Othering is an approach to talking about people in such a way that implies foreignness, marginality, and being different than the taken for granted assumptions we make about ‘normalcy’. In effect, it implies that racialized groups are something other than human and is therefore central not to racism but also with violence and hate activity.

found in history, that often and conversely, used status as a pretext for unfair treatment and the deprivation of rights” (p. 230). Further, Levin and McDevitt (1993) make note that the same atmosphere of fear and/or exclusion surrounds hate motivated activity today and can alter community cohesion and social integration. While it is true that belonging to a minority group can give strength in terms of identity and solidarity, it can also mark individual members out as ‘different’ in society.

Some scholars have taken on a slightly different interpretation. Jacobs and Potter (1998) argue that hate crime is not really about hate, but about bias. Alongside this interpretation, the assertion of prejudice is said to be universal and based on a socially inherited belief system of common historical and cultural heritage in which racism played and still plays a dominant role (Levin, 2002). In contrast, Blee (2005) proposes new definitions of racial violence to further understand hate motivated activity, by directing attention first towards victims and audiences. She explains that views “tend to rely heavily on the perpetrator’s intent and motivation to define racial violence, and establish whether an interracial interaction is essentially violent or not” (p. 600). Furthermore, Blee (2005) argues that a reliance on notions of perpetrator intent to define hate creates analytic problems including an individual focus, the naturalization of race, an inadequate linkage between violence and context and a restricted definition of racial violence (p. 601). A intent-based definition does not consider whether hate motivated activity is about establishing ‘race’ rather than being an effect of a performed racial category (Blee, 2005, p. 602). This approach challenges the mainstream definition of hate crime, by introducing a new perspective based on both the victim and the perpetrator while still linking the harm it has on society at large (Iganski, 2001).

Closely related to this discussion is the debate around hate speech. Hate speech is understood as any form of prejudiced expression directed at objects that perpetrators use to denigrate their victim (Boeckmann and Turpin-Petrosino, 2002). Leets (2002) describes that the motivation of hate speech is the aim to target because of perceived differences, whereas Boeckman *et al.* (2002) discuss the social psychological and political complexities of speech. Most articles refer to Lawrence *et al.* (1993), which see hate speech as a message of racial inferiority and is directed against a historically oppressed group, which can be persecutory, hateful, and degrading. Importantly, Cowan *et al.* (2002) contend that the main importance of the value of 'freedom' is associated in this context with an emphasis on the harm of censorship, ignoring the central values of equality that should be emphasized in the harm of hate speech (as quoted in Boeckmann and Turpin-Petrosino, 2002, p. 209).

In Canada the meaning of both criminal and non-criminal hate activity is also complicated with ideas of freedom of expression protected under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. These traditional notions reflect a laissez-faire, neo-liberal ideology in which the "state should not interject with any expression short of criminal solicitation" (Israel, 1999, p. 101). Thus, traditional thinking of the Charter protects any form of expression from government control – including hate speech (Roberts, 1995). In response, some scholars have argued that Canadian laws need to be amended to protect the human rights of people from minority groups, explaining that prohibiting hate is a legitimate limitation on freedom of expression (Kallen and Lam, 1993; Li, 1995; McKay-Panos, 2004). As Kallen and Lam (1993) argue, "despite the debate between the ideological positions of libertarianism (granting priority to free speech) and egalitarianism (placing certain limits on free speech), hate speech represents an affront to target the basic human rights of minorities in Canada" (p. 10). This debate therefore does hold some

weight when associated with the university – as it is difficult to draw the line between notions of academic freedom, censorship, hate and freedom of speech.

First impressions of hate-motivated activity are considered rare and atypical in the opinions of mainstream Canadians. However, Perry (2001) argues that hate motivated activity is “not an aberration associated with a lunatic or extremist fringe, but a normative means of asserting racial identity relative to the victimized ‘Other’ or an enactment of the racism that allocates privilege along racial lines” (p. 89). Therefore, hate should be seen as a coherent racial project<sup>5</sup> (Omi & Winant, 1993) in that it “connects the structural meanings and organizations of race with the cultural construction of racialized identity” (As quoted in Perry, 2001, p. 89). Notably, these constructions occur within the educational institutions that inform groups where they “belong” in Canada’s multicultural society, based on an inherited power and privilege.

Thus, the literature makes clear that there is a vague understanding and inconsistent definition between hate crime and hate motivated activity. Kelly and Maghan (1998) explain that this is because both concepts are fluid and internally conflicted. Although the definitions have at their core the symbolic status of the victim (Hamm, 1994), the motives responsible for the act are not found uniquely among perpetrators. Rather people make invidious distinctions between “us” and “them” based on dissimilar social norms and politics. Also, in terms of punishment and prosecution, the parameters of hate crime are so clearly set out in the law, that open interpretations of hate motivated activity have not been as extensively studied. These challenges combined by issues to consider on campus, including youth engagement and academic freedom further complicate the notion of hate motivated activity.

---

<sup>5</sup> According to Omi and Winnant (1994) “a racial project is simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines. Racial projects are located within a socio-historical process where the understanding of race is politically determined. Thus, racial projects are an effort to create, maintain, destroy, or alter the existing prevailing racial groupings and their structural relations” (p. 56).

## B. Scope of the Problem

To better understand the scope of hate motivated activity in Toronto universities, it is necessary to explain the current data that accounts for the prevalence of hate crime in Canadian society at large. Some argue that hate motivated activity on campus is a direct microcosm of society (Henry and Tator, 1994). Still, finding current statistics is not always easy, especially because the measuring of hate incidents in Canada reflects the full range of methods. Both criminal and non-criminal forms of hate-motivated activity are measured with varying degrees of accuracy by a variety of tools (Landau, 2006). This section will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the main tools and additional considerations that emerge when measuring hate-motivated activity on campus.

Until recently there has been limited statistical evidence on hate in Canada. To date, only a few Canadian studies have examined the statistical level of hate crime at the national level. A 1995 Department of Justice study estimated that there were over 60,000 incidents of hate crime in Canada in 1994, with 61 percent directed toward racial minorities (Roberts, 1995). Findings have proven that hate crime activity aimed at groups identified by race, ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation were more likely to be violent in nature, where religious groups were mainly the target of vandalism (Neilson and Kiefl, 1995). More than ten years later, Dauvergne, Scrim and Brennan (2008) found:<sup>6</sup>

- In 2006, Canadian police services, reported 892 hate-motivated crimes. These represented a rate of 3.1 incidents per 100,000 populations (Dauvergne *et al.*, 2008).
- Police-reported data show that the vast majority of hate crimes were motivated by race/ethnicity (61 percent), religion (27 percent) or sexual orientation (10 percent) (Dauvergne *et al.*, 2008).

---

<sup>6</sup> This study is focused on 2006 data obtained from the Hate Crime Supplemental Survey, a special survey of hate crimes reported by police services across Canada, approximately covering 87 percent of the Canadian population.

- Half of all racially motivated hate crimes reported by police in 2006, targeted blacks and nearly two-thirds of religiously motivated hate crimes were directed at the Jewish faith (Dauvergne *et al.*, 2008).
- Among census metropolitan areas, the highest rate of police reported hate crime was in Calgary (9.1 percent), Ottawa (6.6 percent), London (5.9 percent) and Toronto (5.5 percent). (Dauvergne *et al.*, 2008).

Hate motivated activity in Canada can also be measured through the General Social Survey (GSS) victimization data which highlights perspective of respondent's personal accounts of victimization, rather than police reported figures. There are certain similarities between the two tools, for example, in both race and ethnicity emerged as the most common motivation for hate incidents. While both police reported data and self-reported victimization data show that the percentages of hate incidents is relatively small, the volume of hate-motivated acts is collected and counted differently for a variety of reasons (Gannon and Mihorean, 2005). Predictably, self-reported victimization surveys yield higher incident counts than police-reported surveys. For instance, the 2004 GSS, counted over 260,000 incidents of hate-motivated crime in the 12 months preceding the survey (Dauvergne *et al.*, 2008). It is clear that self-reported data on victimization is highly subjective, whereas police interpretations are restrictive to the law (Landau, 2006). Seemingly the entire system of hate crimes seems too far dependent on policing as a source for action. Significantly, not all hate activity gets police attention for other reasons, including feeling that the incident was not important enough or that police could not help (Landau, 2006; Dauvergne *et al.*, 2008). As such, hate activity is under-counted by police and over-counted by victims making it difficult to analyze the level of hate in Canadian society.

Last, some community organizations undertake the recording of hate activity. One example is B'nai Brith, an organization that collects data on hate crimes across Canada, and audits of annual incidents of anti-Semitism (Landau, 2006). According to Janhevich (2001), the data collected by

B'nai Brith provides the strongest available data on anti-Semitic incidents in Canada in the last 18 years due to its definitional consistency however it is still underestimated (Landau, 2006). This shows that despite efforts to collect data, it is difficult to determine the degree of hate motivated activity in Canada because either incidents are not reported or coded in an incoherent manner.

It is clear that, while we have some tools for measuring hate in society, it is necessary to specifically explore the unique manifestations within university settings. Consequently, acts fuelled by anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and other discrimination marginalize particular groups, force them into feelings of isolation and fear, segregate spaces on campus and damage relations between different ethnic and social groups. The best data to date on the scope of ethnic violence on campus has been conducted by the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence (NIAPV) in the United States. Alarming, the NIAPV estimates that 20 percent to 25 percent of minority students are victimized by acts of ethno-violence annually<sup>7</sup> (Pinkow *et al.*, 1989; Ehrlich, 1990). Ehrlich (1990) suggests,

The evolving ethnic composition of the population, changing forms of prejudice coupled with the stability of institutional discrimination, economic and political insecurities, increasing levels of public violence, and the political climate of the nation contribute to a hostile and intimidating campus climate for minority students (p. 6).

Coincidentally, these findings directly reflect the Canadian context, evidenced by the data collected by the Toronto Police Service Hate Crime Unit (HCU)<sup>8</sup>. In 2006, HCU reported that there was an 23 percent increase (162 occurrences) in the number of reported hate crimes in

---

<sup>7</sup> The NIAPV uses the term ethno-violence when discussing incidents of hate on campus, which includes any act or attempted act, motivated to do both physical and psychological harm to individuals because of their ethnic identity (Ehrlich, 1990).

<sup>8</sup> HCU is a sub-unit of Intelligence Services created in 1993. It collects and publishes data on reported hate/bias crime in Toronto. HCU reports are useful because of the ability to define victim groups most targeted, the location of hate crime offences with the breakdown by victim group and offense, arrests and sentencing details, and other patterns of hate crimes in Toronto.

Toronto<sup>9</sup>, to which the most commonly targeted locations include educational facilities representing 29 incidents reported in 2006, the second highest rated location affected after business retail (Toronto Police, 2006). These results also highlight the fact that young people commit the majority of hate offences. Whether acts of hate occur on campus or not, youth aged 12 to 17 are more likely than an older age group to be accused of hate crime and hate activity in Canada. Specifically, Statistics Canada reports that the 120 youth accused in 2006 accounted for more than one-third (38%) of all persons accused of committing a hate crime (Dauvergne *et al.*, 2006). Thus, the data reveals that hate in Canada is a pressing problem and deserves more attention. More than ever the results indicating that young people are most likely to be involved in hate activity is an issue that is vastly overlooked and for the most part excused or ignored.

### **C. The Roots of Hate Incidents**

There is an ambiguity about the factors that lead to hate activity in society. Such vagueness makes it difficult to categorize or explain hate. In this sense it is vital to explain how and why ordinary Canadians partake in hate motivated activity. For one, behavioral scientists studied how inter-group hostility escalates as a result of increasing inter-group contact, especially in the form of competition for resources and power (Levin and Rabrenovic, 2001; MacGinty, 2001). In white settler societies such as Canada, minorities have reached a critical mass, causing the white nation-born population to feel threatened by the influx of newcomers (Levin and Rabrenovic, 2001; Mason, 2005). For instance, Mock's (1993) study of racially motivated crime in Toronto reports that most communities view hate as part of a broader problem of racism, to which issues of immigration and welfare policies are systematically linked.

---

<sup>9</sup> The 2006 numbers show that the 'race' category was the most victimized by hate, with 36 percent of total occurrences. The victim groups most targeted in 2006 were the Black community (48 percent). The Jewish community (28) was the next most targeted, followed by the homosexual community (18 percent), the Muslim community (15 percent), the Pakistani community (13 percent) and the Chinese community (6 percent) (Toronto Police, 2006).

Also some claim that hate has increasingly grown over the past 20 years due to inter-group competition, which has been triggered by a range of factors including the dramatic increase in interfaith or inter-race dating, migration, newly integrated neighborhoods, schools and workplaces (Olzak *et al.* 1996). This seems to be the point at which hate sentiments escalate.

However to fully understand hate is to “unpack the concept itself, to look at it through ways in which it interacts with, and takes its meanings from, these other kinds of feelings” (Mason, 2005, p. 586). Mason (2005) suggests that the sense of ‘rupture’ that separates mainstream Canadians from ‘Others’ is one of the circumstances that makes hate possible (p. 586); in that hate becomes a form of ‘stranger danger’.<sup>10</sup> In addition, Bauman (1991) argues that when ‘Others’ enter the territorial or symbolic space of insider groups they threaten the established order of power relations. Green *et al.* (1997) explain that hate occurs most often in ‘defended’ white neighborhoods that have experienced an in-migration of minorities and occur wherever their ‘protected’ status is threatened. Under such conditions, perpetrators seek to reduce a perceived threat by attacking ‘Others’, and escalate their attacks until they have achieved their objective (Levin and Rabrenovic, 2001, p. 577). For the outsider group, estrangement is experienced as a feeling of ‘social isolation and spiritual loneliness’ (p. 120). Simply put, hate solidifies the boundaries that separate insiders from outsiders in society.

Hate becomes understandable in this broader context as the primacy of whiteness<sup>11</sup> can be recreated and in which boundaries between what is and is not “Canadian” can be reaffirmed. Intolerant violence is especially discriminating with respect to people of colour who are

---

<sup>10</sup> A hate incident that takes place between a perpetrator and a victim who do not know each other.

<sup>11</sup> Based on Frankenberg’s (1993) interpretation, “Whiteness” is a set of linked dimensions including a location of structural advantage, of race privilege; it is a “standpoint” where white people can look at themselves, others and at society; and last, a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked or unnamed (p. 1). This interpretation is applied to the analysis of hate on campus as it captures the dominant role whiteness plays in creation of hate activity on campus and the implications for social exclusion for racialized populations on campus.

perceived as foreigners and will never become “Canadian”. But, as Perry (2002) questions: “*What is the basis for such exclusionary conceptions of Canadian-ness and belongingness? And why and how are racialized ‘Others’ distinct from the white Canadian?*” (p. 79). The answers to these questions lie in a realm of naturalized stereotypes and popular images that justify the hostile treatment of racial minorities. For instance, Dei (1996) conducted interviews with more than 200 African Canadian and non-African Canadian students to ascertain how dominant institutional norms inform understandings of belonging, equal expectations, and, ultimately dropout rates among black/African-Canadian students. Dei (1996) finds that “perceived biases in the curriculum, intermeshed with an educational environment characterized by pervasive stereotyping, prejudice, and the devaluation of black/African students’ worldviews” contribute to the exclusion of racialized students (Hier and Walby, 2006, p. 91). Stereotypes function in order to distinguish the racialized ‘Other’ and help distance the white from the non-white (Perry, 2002). Racialized groups are systematically feared and loathed for their differences in mainstream discourses, with stereotypes loaded with disparaging associations, suggesting inferiority (Perry, 2002). As a result, these messages provide both the motive and rationale for unequal access to opportunities and privilege in Canada, while simultaneously legitimating hate violence on racialized groups (Perry, 2002).

Times of economic instability, structural changes, or political turmoil also instigate hate in society when members of the majority group often react by turning against members of minority groups. In extreme forms, such conflicts can lead to expelling and executing minority group members for the purpose of creating ethnically homogenous societies (Levin and Rabrenovic, 2001; MacGinty, 2007). In recognizing the political functions of hate, it is vital to understand the connection of hate as a political act. MacGinty (2007) provides examples of

deeply divided societies such as Northern Ireland, South Africa, and Israel/Palestine to compare 'ethno-national- conflicts' with individual acts of hate. In turn, MacGinty (2007) explains that "conflicts can develop in deeply divided societies, which no matter the scale, complexity, intensity, longevity, the actors involved, or tactics used, are still characterized by low-level violence and segregation, which is similar to other forms of hate" (p. 640). Further, MacGinty argues that:

Ethno-national conflicts are also found in stable societies as the United States, where violence can assume a mantle of political legitimacy through connections with organized groups or causes articulated in a specific manner. As a result, incidents of hate crime are often interpreted at the individual and personal, rather than political, level. (p. 642).

Thus, hate activity is not common in ethno-national conflict situations, but it is the structural factors, including the dynamic of the conflict, high levels of ethnic segregation, and paramilitary monopolization, that help rile its level and visibility (MacGinty, 2001, p. 642).

Another explanation of hate escalation is around "thrill-hate crimes", wherein groups of young offenders gain a sense of their own importance to their peers by victimizing members of minority groups (Levin and Rabrenovic, 2001). Though unsophisticated with respect to the ideology of hate, the feeling of power and belonging is gained when young people commit hate violence. Most importantly, the literature suggests that teenagers who commit racial violence are protected by their youth, and that hate in general is handled informally as childish pranks rather than serious offences (Levin *et al.*, 2007). This rationale is vital to keep in mind when applied to the university context, where young students can perform hate without serious penalties.

Therefore, the factors motivating hate activity cannot be reduced to a singular context. Mason (2005) argues that the "fear of difference, a sense of one's own inadequacies, disgust at the other's desires, envy of the other's lifestyle, love for one's own privilege, belief in the other's inferiority, conflict with the other's values, and so on" fuel hatred along ethnic, religious, racial,

sexual and gendered lines (p. 588). It is also vital to acknowledge that all acts of hate are closely tied to hierarchies of interpersonal alterity, which emerge and reinforce the exclusionary logic through which difference is constructed (Dyer, 1997). Such logic values certain identities over others and is deeply dependant on typecasting groups of people, and communities (Winborne and Cohen, 1999). Thus as Mason (2005) points out “it is the material symbolic proximity of the ‘Other’, rather than physical distance that engenders negative reactions such as hate” (Mason, 2005, p. 588). Despite the appearance of multiculturalism in Canada there is still a dominant group from which the ‘Other’ is formulated and hate is legitimized. It is important to acknowledge that the scope of this paper does not allow for a definitive discussion of the causes of hate in society and only scratches the surface of many other theorizations.

### **Contextualizing “Hate” on Campus**

#### **A. Racism, Racialization and Education**

Visible minority students are exposed to discriminatory educational practices which, like a multitude of timeless voices, tells them loudly and softly that they are intellectually, emotionally, physically, and morally inferior (Thornill, 1984, p. 3 as quoted in Henry *et al.*, 2000)

From the perspective that views ‘race’ as an organizing principle in society, the racial discourse in the university provides the ideological link to how the institutional dynamics serve white privilege while disadvantaging and racializing ‘Other’ groups (Omi and Winnant, 1994). Bannerji (1991) uses the expression ‘unsettling relations’ as a process that “disrupts the social relations of power and knowledge in universities” (p. 6), and is maintained by the majority group, which “enjoys a disproportionately larger share of wealth, power, and prestige whereas the minority group shares a disproportionately smaller portion of these resources” (Yang, 2000, p. 62).

Similarly, The Henry Report (2003)<sup>12</sup> points to the dominant institutional culture of whiteness in the University. For instance, faculty of colour feels detached, alienated and marginalized from the dominant white mainstream culture that has largely defined the University (as quoted in Henry, 2006, p. 146). The report goes on to describe the University as an old WASP school dominated and shaped by attitudes, beliefs and values of White men. In other words, the University still appears to be seen by some minority faculty as a culture defined by white power and privilege. Henry (2003) explains that core values, beliefs and attitudes of many of its individual's members reflect patterns of Anglo-Eurocentric dominance (as quoted in Henry, 2006, p. 147). Also, the report proves that the core problem is not so much interpersonal relations with colleagues, students and administrators, but rather the dominant hegemonic institutional culture of the University.

At the center of this discourse, one discovers the assumptions of what it is to be 'Canadian', which for the dominant majority invariably suggests whiteness<sup>13</sup> (Razack, 1998; Perry, 2002). Racialization<sup>14</sup> is a social process inscribed by power relations that tend to center whiteness as a position of 'no race', consequently claiming dominance in society. Some scholars describe whiteness as a historical, relational heterogeneous construct (Hartigan, 1997), which includes a set of cultural practices that are usually unnamed as a position of material and

---

<sup>12</sup> The Henry Report (2003) was an outline on "understanding the experiences of visible minority and aboriginal faculty members at Queen's University in 2003 by Frances Henry from York University. The reporting was based on 270 respondents. Findings included that approximately 53 individuals identified as visible minority and 109 of the total sample of respondents said they had experiences discrimination at Queen's. Among the most frequently cited forms of discrimination were double standards, stereotyping, isolation/exclusion, derogatory language or condescension, and other cases of physical violence (as quoted in Henry, 2006).

<sup>13</sup> Refer to page 16: "Whiteness becomes another socially constructed identity, but one which has held the dominant position in perpetuating social inequity. The concept of Whiteness shifts the onus in studies of institutionalised racism, racism in popular culture and racism in society generally from the disadvantaged groups of colour to those who are white and privileged and whose views are considered natural, normative and basically raceless. Whiteness studies racializes this group and critically examines their role in fostering exclusion" (Henry Report, 2003, p. 158).

<sup>14</sup> The concept of racialization in this paper aligns with Miles's (1989) interpretation that it is "a process of categorization, a representational process of defining the 'Other' usually, but not exclusively somatically" (p. 75).

structural advantage (McIntosh, 1988, p. 249). These theorizations can significantly be applied to minority students on predominately white campuses.

A number of Canadian scholars have argued that the dominance of whiteness as ideology and pedagogy continue to permeate the learning environments of universities (Henry and Tator, 1994; Ng, 1994; James, 1994, 2003; Dei and Calliste, 2000; Dua and Lawrence, 2000). One study of racism on campus explored the confluence between racism, privilege, whiteness and perceived liability, while showing white student responses to hate on campus (Jackson and Heckamn, 2002). Jackson and Heckman (2002) uncover that white oblivion is still relevant in universities (p. 448) and will remain protected as a position of power and normalcy as long as it goes unnoticed by the majority of whites as a privileged position. Comparatively, the central narratives that emerge from the results of the survey and focus groups in the Henry Report (2003) suggest that:

Queen's, like most other North American universities, is still struggling to overcome deeply entrenched cultural beliefs, values, norms and structures that preserve the continued dominance of Whiteness and maleness. Minority faculty members are faced with a multitude of experiences that reinforce their sense of "otherness", marginality and exclusion from the mainstream of University life. It is important to note that the sources of their isolation, humiliation, and vulnerability, are found in multiple sites. White privilege and power continues to be reflected in the Eurocentric curricula, traditional pedagogical approaches, hiring, promotion and tenure practices, and opportunities for research. It is reflected in the everyday interactions between minority faculty and their White students, who challenge their expertise, authority and competence. It is manifested in the normative discourses of colleagues, hiring and tenure committees, University administrators, who commonly employ the discourses of reverse discrimination, loss of meritocracy, political correctness, colour-blindness, neutrality, and freedom of expression - all of which act as a cover for the persistence of racial bias and differential treatment (as quoted in Henry, 2006, p. 156).

However, as predominately white campuses have their share of racial tensions, studies have revealed that:

...even on relatively calm campuses there are differences in students' racial attitudes and considerable social distance among students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Alienation from the mainstream campus life is also reported to be particularly acute among minority students on White campuses (Hurtado, 1992, p. 541).

For example, in the United States racism remains sizeable towards black students at majority white universities, with overt racism being usual (Torres, 2008), and where black students come to feel estranged from mainstream campus life (Feagin *et al.*, 1996). Additionally, Torres shows (2008) that the black community continues to be stereotyped as 'special admit' students and treated as 'second-class citizens' who are not ready to compete with white students on an intellectual level (p. 3). In response, scholars like Zamudio and Rios (2006) have argued that these contemporary colourblind discourses<sup>15</sup> are part of an ongoing race project centered on the maintenance of white privilege. In concurrence, Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000) argue based on interviews with college students from three American universities that white racial attitudes have systematically underestimated the extent of prejudice on campus. In this study, white respondents are proven to be more prejudiced, use a new race-talk to avoid appearing 'racist', and reveal a liberal and pragmatic rhetoric of colourblind racism<sup>16</sup>, which defends white supremacy in a nonracial manner<sup>17</sup> (Jackman, 1994; Bobo and Hutchings, 1996; Bonilla Silva and Forman, 2000). Consequently, the university space functions in ways that privileges whiteness, so that "it persists as what is worth knowing and as identification worth performing"

---

<sup>15</sup> Colourblind discourses reflect the contemporary race project in its attempt to perpetrate existing structural inequality by obscuring the structural dimension of racial inequality (Zamudio et al., 2006).

<sup>16</sup> Colourblind racism in this context allows Whites to appear 'not racist', preserve their privileged status, and criticize any institutional approach, which attempts to ameliorate racial inequality (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000).

<sup>17</sup> Henry (2003) explains that "as unfortunately, the fact that certain institutional measures against racism are in place means that it is too easy for White faculty to believe that racism does not, indeed cannot, exist in the liberal university setting of the 21st Century. As a result, their very belief in the absence of racism blinds them to the experiences of faculty of colour and Aboriginal faculty. And their very whiteness - rather than their racism - makes them unable to understand what those experiences might be" (p. 148).

(Shick, 2002, p. 101). Shick (2002) further explains that white identification establishes some as “rightful occupants” of the university space (p. 101).

“Systemic discrimination” or “chilly climates” are ways of explaining racialized group’s experiences in the university space (Paul and Herringer 1996; Prentice 1996). Ethnic and racial minorities are said to lack access, participation, and representation with consequent marginalization in educational institutions. For example, Whitworth (1991) proves that the average Canadian university professor is a white man. This representation is manifested in:

The teaching of a basically Eurocentric curriculum; the paucity of research and courses on racism; the absence of an anti-racist pedagogy; incidents of racial harassment and overt racism; the lack of resources allotted to implement equity and antiracism policies effectively; the power relations between white majority and minority faculty and staff; the polarization between white students and students of colour, and resistance to social change processes designated to eliminate racism (as quoted in Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 75).

The apprehension that the university reproduces the discriminatory attitudes, beliefs and values found in the larger society has only been exposed more recently. Henry and Tator (1994) make clear that the university space has been able to “maintain its sacrosanct values and traditions for generations because it formerly served a more homogeneous population, few of whose members challenged the values on which it was based or the regulations governing it” (p. 74). Also, because whiteness signals innocence, it has become inconceivable that this could be from someone who “belongs” here. Further, the evidence of discrimination and prejudice existing on campus is often argued as a problem of irrationality and an individual’s bad character (Shick, 2002, p. 116).

In actuality, several Canadian universities, including York, Queen’s, Western and Windsor, have carried out studies on campus racism, to which the opinions of students were focused largely around issues of curriculum and hiring. First and foremost, some have argued

that in order to transform the academe, there is a need to reduce the Eurocentric bias in the formal make-up of the university (Henry *et al.*, 2000). This includes the persistence of racism in minority representation in the education system and, the inadequate dialogue on race relations in education in general (Ibrahim, 1996). Cummins (1996) argues that the only way educational empowerment in a diverse society can be achieved is if the universities recognize that the interaction between educators and minority students is representative and actively work to challenge and change the institutional policies of disempowerment. Further D'Oyley and James (1998) go on to critique:

Curriculum must take into consideration that the changing characteristics of the student population, as well as recognize the need to have diverse teaching staff. Inclusive curriculum is one that reflects the total knowledge system of the school population, not simply those of the dominant group. (p. 72).

Additionally, Dei *et al.* (1997) make clear that effective change will arrive when a knowledge and understanding of the impacts biased education delivery has on racialized students:

Schools can be seen then as a microcosm of society and the primary site of social reproduction. Schools can create the conditions necessary to replicate extant social class and power relations, who maintain social order. However, for minority students, this entails replicating a position of marginality in which issues of equal access to opportunities and success is constrained by the same social and ideological factors, which operate in the broader social context and serve to legitimate their subordinate status. (p. 20).

These shortcomings reveal that the search for social justice in Canadian universities is tempered by the realization that the principle of equal opportunity in an unequally structured society can remain an illusion without a fundamental restructuring of society and its institutions (Henry and Tator, 1994). In a sense, Lee *et al.* (1998) explain the:

School is one site in which the hierarchical arrangement of skin power is confirmed daily. It is also the site where it can be undone. We can contribute to the building of communities and societies in which all the ways of being human are valued. (p. 27).

## B. Anti-racism and Education

To disrupt these realities, Stasiulis (1991) and others have discussed how anti-racist education intervenes in these discourses. These advocates call for non-exclusionary learning perspectives to inform a pluralistic society. Anti-racist education begins with a premise that racism exists and includes a focus on systemic racism. Dei and Calliste (2000) argue that it involves a shift from “tolerance of diversity to the pointed notion of difference and power” (p. 21). As such, Ng *et al.* (1995) present a new critical educational approach, which purports going beyond multiculturalism’s superficial celebration of difference. They argue that the effectiveness of anti-racist education is in both theory and practice which:

...requires that teaching be conceived as a political and moral activity before it is regarded as a technical or vocational one. As such, a task of anti-racist education thus becomes the analysis of the political, historical and social processes of society that have institutionalized and worked to sustain unequal power and the ways in which schools and the people who work in them are implicated in, and may contest, those power relationships (p. 61).

Walcott (1990) claims that anti-racist education recognizes intersecting forms of inequality, assumes the role of power in the perpetuation of racism, criticizes racial inequalities and addresses white supremacy. Further, Walcott (1990) states anti-racism is about “rupturing the dominant power structures that continually exclude and marginalize people of colour” (p. 110).

In Canada, anti-racist education has been compared to multicultural education. Multicultural education tends to foster a celebration of difference, tolerance and understanding, an acceptance of diversity and empathy for minorities (Dei and Calliste, 2000). Yet multiculturalism has in turn been criticized for perpetuating a white center, created a relationship of “us versus them” and homogenizing cultures in the process. Multicultural education does this by threatening Canadian stories of immigration in which Europeans produce a national narrative that establishes them as the original inhabitants (Schick, 2002, p. 105). Schick (2002) explains

that ideas of entitlement become embedded in a narrative that legitimizes the heroic nature of European colonization, which shape Canada as a white space (p. 106). In turn, studies of marginalized students in Canadian schools have found that the school system has failed to respond to their needs and aspirations, with feelings of alienation from the education system and in some cases eventual drop-out (James, 2007). As Thus, Schick (2002) concludes the ‘ivory tower’ is kept as a place where the rational subject does not speak of racism, and is thus kept as a place where bodies of colour do not belong (Razack, 2002, p. 18).

In an increasingly pluralistic society, educational institutions can no longer maintain or keep out the occupation of the ‘Other’. Though diversity may motivate the role multicultural education, other bodies of knowledge on university campuses continue to threaten the knowledge and space of the elite (Shick, 2002, p. 106). Sibley (1995) suggests that alternative knowledge threatens the established hierarchies and power structures in academia:

There are certain parallels between the exclusion of minorities, the ‘imperfect people’ who disturb the homogenized and purified topographies of mainstream social space, and the exclusion of ideas which are seen to constitute a challenge to established hierarchies of knowledge and, thus, to power structures in academia (p. 116).

Therefore, a major debate can be directed to the idea that Canadian educational institutions are premised on the discourse of state multiculturalism which claims that all Canadians are able to fully and successfully in the society, irrespective of their perceived difference (James, 2000). Scholars are now speaking out on the fact that multicultural education is defined by a legacy of monoculturalism in terms of vision, content and style, meaning that the inclusive premise continues to elude minority students, because they are not tolerated or accepted in Canadian society.

### **C. Race and Space**

There is a wide variety of scholarship that examines the relationship between space and race (Berry and Henderson, 2002; Goldberg, 1993; Soja, 1996; Teelucksingh, 2006). Most Canadian work has centered on the dynamics affecting an isolated part of the city, a particular racial group (Ruddick, 1996; Kobayashi and Peake, 2000) or a particular state apparatus. Significantly, to theorize race and space is to reveal the hegemonic social relations between racialized groups, dominant groups and institutions. For the purpose of this project, I will connect how racialization has informed the onset of hate incidents on university campus space.

The campus space is experiencing a racialization process that is directly experienced as spatial. Razack (2002) explains that in the process racial difference is about spatial difference. Making the same point Goldberg (1993) writes “racisms become institutionally normalized in and through spatial configurations, just as social space is made to seem natural, a given, by being conceived and denied in racial terms” (p. 185). Moreover, Feagin *et al.* (1996) explain that the “campus is a racialized space in which activities become localized white dominated rituals in which to display college symbols, promote school solidarity and spur student, alumni and public celebration of a college’s geographic and educational identities” (p. 54).

Schick's (2002) analysis of the operation of whiteness in the University of Saskatchewan is another reflection of the ways race works as a spatial signifier and enabler in different university settings. Schick (2002) observes that white students tend to guard the gates of academia seeing a black professor as “out of place”, further maintaining a psychological segregation of space. Schick (2002) indicates that racial identification processes work to establish some as “rightful occupants” of the university space, a place characterized by abstraction, objectivity, and rationality; quite unlike where ‘Others’ belong” (p. 101). In other words, as a production of difference, the description of space constructs and contains identities

that are said to belong in a particular site, casting out places of privilege and elite formation against the ‘Other’.

Razack (2002) explores how social spaces are organized to sustain unequal social relations by looking closely at the spatial and legal practices required in the making and maintaining of Canada’s white settler society (p. 1). Razack (2002) puts forward critical questions to “un-map” this relationship between identity and space. These questions include: *“what is being imagined or projected on to specific spaces and bodies, and what is being enacted there? Who do white citizens know themselves to be and how much does an identity of dominance rely upon keeping racial ‘Others’ firmly in place? How are people kept in their place? And, finally how does place become race?”* (p. 5). In the end, Razack (2002) argues that spaces are created by the law to expose hierarchies emerging from and producing, oppressive spatial categories. Thus, race continues to be “mapped,” both materially and symbolically, into Canadian society as an important organizing principle of desirability and undesirability (Sundstrom, 2003; Razack, 2002; Teelucksingh, 2006). Teelucksingh (2006) suggests the need to explore how these spatial conditions are simultaneously part of and influenced by racial domination and racial resistance (Anderson, 2002). Teelucksingh (2002) argues:

Claims to space, or to new spaces, are concurrently a process whereby various racialized people attempt to create new identities and alternative representations, as well as their resistance to the limits of the ideology of Canadian multiculturalism and the ongoing power relations associated with Canadian racialization (p. 3).

The notion of racialized spaces draws together the dynamic interaction of processes of racialization and space. Racialized spaces are fundamental to how individuals, the state, and institutional practices make sense of and “manage” race relations (Goldberg, 1993). Racialized space thus, does not have causal power, but instead groups relate to one another with social

relations of dominance and 'Otherness' is projected onto space (Soja, 1996, p. 46; Delaney, 2002). Accordingly, my analysis will center on the university as a racialized space.

As Henry and Tator (1994) claim the university is considered part of, yet "detached" from society. The concept the "ivory tower" has carried the meaning that the university space is removed from the influences operating outside the campus context, thus proving that the space is not a "hermetically sealed world." Britzman *et al.* (1993) note that racialized groups bring their own experience to the university, which is shaped by differing cultural, racial and social norms that function outside the boundaries of academia (as quoted in Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 74). In consequence minority students confront the problem that the university campus is a site of struggle. Racially motivated incidents have become likely and involve harassment in residences, cafeterias and other public spaces on campus and in retaliation react by "forming racially and ethnically based student associations, claiming particular space in public places and generally socializing mainly with each other" (Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 81). Consequently the racialization of the campus space leads to exclusionary practices for some groups of students.

#### **D. Hate on Campus**

For the purpose of this paper I will use Henry and Tator's (1994) definition of the university, which defines itself as:

An institution of higher learning devoted to the pursuit and communication of knowledge. The foundation of academic quest for truth and learning rests on those values associated with honest intellectual endeavor, stimulated by adherence to the most valid methods of inquiry; complete dependence on the principle of merit by those who engage in the primary activity of research and teaching; the creation and maintenance of standards of excellence in all of its activities, and a strict adherence to freedom of thought and expression (Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 74).

A significant body of research however, demonstrates that universities have preserved and perpetuated a system of structural inequality based on race (Henry *et al.*, 2000). This section focuses on the ways in which racially motivated hate incidents on campus continue to effect racist ideology and differential treatment of racialized students in Canada.

Canada's education system has been criticized for being committed to exclusionary practices based on structural forms of racism. From teachers to curriculum, mainstream aspects of schooling act to strengthen conformity and have been criticized as sites of racism and discrimination. Not surprisingly, Fleras and Elliot (2002) contend that the university has become a site for reinforcing social inequality and cultural uniformity, rendering certain groups marginalized in the process. As a result, university campuses have been transformed into contested spaces of identity struggle, where 'Otherness' is constructed, and hate is produced.

Hate motivated activity on campus is an example of how educational institutions stimulate divisive notions of difference, ultimately producing power over certain groups. Some surveys have provided insight into campus racism, generally reporting between 20-120 race-related incidents per year at Canadian universities (Fleras & Elliott, 2002, p. 194). Incidents range from washroom graffiti, physical violence between different ethnic groups and professors who make discriminating comments. For example, Holocaust deniers have deepened their efforts by making use of computer bulletin boards facilitating student recruitment to their goals (Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 81). Among other examples is the case of Robert O'Driscoll, a professor at the University of Toronto who has written on the conspiracy of Jewish financiers, Communists, Masons, and Mormons to enslave the world (Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 81). Professor Phillippe Rushton, another professor at the University of Western Ontario, has published work on hierarchical racial classifications, including the inherited racial differences between "Orientals"

and blacks (Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 81). These are all recent examples wherein students and a number of community groups have argued that the appearance of hate mongers in a classroom lends credibility and motivates hate motivated activity on campus.

According to Nakhaie (2004), power, intimidation, ethnocentrism, and the intent to cause harm are common elements in hate-motivated activity on campus. Additionally, Hurtado (1992) notes that hate incidents should be perceived as a sign of unresolved racial conflicts in university environments and not merely as isolated or abnormal activity. For instance, sometimes the competitive nature of ‘who is the enemy’ between student groups have led to more aggressive tactics, as perpetrators perceive an environment accepting of bigotry. This makes it impossible to measure the distinction between the end of reasoned discourse and the beginning of harassment, making the issue of hate activity on campus convoluted. Moreover, the ability to enact hate codes on campus have not been taken seriously, as the characteristics of hate crimes necessitate that institutional agents take the matter elsewhere, and do not play a role (Nakhaie, 2004). In turn, the university has denied the problem and resisted change in the name of academic freedom and the preservation of meritocracy (Henry and Tator, 1994). As Ramcharan (1991) contends the values of liberalism and tolerance are arguably the theoretical hallmarks of our educational institutions and yet the experiences of many students do not reflect these values (p. 22).

Campus racism also consists of invisible forms of hate, or systemic forms of racism that are built into the system. For example, universities privilege some members of the community by a way of tacit assumptions, mission statements, holidays, cultural values, power relations, and organizational structures (Henry and Tator, 1994). Moreover, the university has been criticized for excluding minority stakeholders from full and equal participation, failing to provide an educational experience that reflects the realities and needs of minority students (Ng, 1994). Thus,

Canadian education though widely celebrated as a site of opportunity, and assumed to be the main instrument for acquiring the skills necessary for full participation and integration in Canadian society is being contradicted by both visible and non-visible forms of racism in universities can materialize as a means of constructing difference. By extension, hate activity on campus has a direct impact the social processes of exclusion for racialized students.

Therefore, the campus space has become a contentious site of exclusion with allegations of hate incidents being leveled by students, faculty members and minority communities (Nakhaie, 2004; Henry and Tator, 1994; Ng, 1994; Ramcharan, 1987). The onset of hate motivated activity on campus has deteriorated the ideal of a university campus as a safe place for learning, and progressive thinking has been ruptured in its process (Downey and Stage, 1999; Nakhaie, 2004). Moreover, Henry and Tator (1994) explain that the university is not only an “important institution because it’s a center for higher learning but it is also occupied by young people who are easily influenced to take part in bigotry” (p. 76). Though a wide variety of research has been done around racism in Canadian universities (Henry and Tator, 1994; Ng, 1994; McCarthy and Crichlow, 1993), specific analysis of on-campus hate incidents should be further studied.

## **Problematizing Multiculturalism in Canada**

### **A. A critique of multiculturalism**

In Canada the notion of citizenship is today understood within the context of multiculturalism. While Canada’s Multicultural Act has created a legal framework, which allows and insists upon equal opportunity and participation in all levels of society by all members it has

not been done in a meaningful way, as demonstrated by the onset of hate motivated activity in society, particularly in the university. This section will examine official multicultural in Canada to bring to light the ‘fallacy’ of its functioning.

The history of the Canadian state is based on the idea of two founding nations: French and British, with obvious emphasis on the British Anglo-superiority. Abu-Laban and Gabriel (2002) construct the history of multicultural policy and date it back to the post World War Two period as a nation-building project to unify citizens. Emerging in the 1970’s as a new approach to nation building was the idea of a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework. This shift redefined Canadian identity through the inclusivity of minorities based on ethno-cultural and racial status. The historical underpinnings of multiculturalism continue to be manifestations of ‘difference’ and cultural ‘management’ techniques in Canada.

The Canadian multicultural policy was adopted in 1971 and made legal in 1988, through the Canadian Multicultural Act. The introduction to the Act drew from Canada’s responsibilities outlined in the Official Languages Act, the Citizenship Act, the Canadian Human Rights Act, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Canada a.). That is to say, the rights of individuals as defined in the above acts and conventions to which Canada is signatory, are a necessary prerequisite or are assumed in the Multicultural Act.

Within the Multicultural Act itself there are several aspects of the policy that are outlined. The official policy under the Multiculturalism Act of Canada states; “(a) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage; (b) recognize and promote the understanding that

multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada's future” (Canada a.). From this, what is most conjured in the minds of the Canadian public is the idea of diverse origins, historical contributions to Canadian society, celebrations of difference and the preservation of diverse cultures and languages. It is within this realm that multiculturalism is neutral and uncontested.

Additionally in the Act, there are other focuses that require greater inquiry in order to judge whether multicultural policy has been ideally practiced in Canadian society. The first is the promise that the Act will “encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada’s multicultural character” (Canada a.). Many have critiqued the outcomes multiculturalism as a superficial symbol of Canada rather than a material redistribution of wealth and resources. For example, beginning in the 1980s minorities continued to experience systemic discrimination and in turn, were criticizing multiculturalism. This resistance grew overwhelmingly when the Mulroney government passed the Act, giving more of legislative basis to multiculturalism (Abu-Laban & Gabriel 2002, p. 110). Throughout the 1990s, an increasing proportion of the discussion was based on the business and marketing value of multiculturalism as a tool for enhancing Canada’s global competitiveness (Abu-Laban & Gabriel 2002, p. 111). It is within this framework that current policies relating to multicultural diversity operate.

Today, official multiculturalism is known as a bold if imperfect experiment in forging unity from diversity (Feras and Elliot, 2002) and contradictory when applied to the lives of racialized groups who are confined to less protection than ‘legitimate citizens’. In order to expose the ‘fallacy of multiculturalism’ it is necessary to explore the idea of Canadian identity through material and ideological constructions. These ideological constructions are used to serve

as a 'legitimate' nation-building project through processes of racialization. Moreover, it is vital to deconstruct whether the mainstream acceptance and perception of multiculturalism exists through a 'politics of not-knowing' or a more subversive banality and xenophobic-type solidarity.

If one stands on the dark side of the nation in Canada everything looks different. The transcendent, universal and unifying claim of its multicultural legitimated ideological state apparatus becomes susceptible to questions. The particularized and partisan nature of this nation-state becomes visible through the same ideological and working apparatus that simultaneously produces its national 'Canadian' essence and the 'Other' – its non-white population (minus the First Nations) as *visible minorities* (Bannerji 1996, p. 6).

The major questions posed by Bannerji and other Canadian scholars, are based on the ways in which the current imagined national identity of Canada is premised and rooted in colonial relationships of power between whiteness and 'Otherness'. Some contend that Canada is constructed as a white colonial settler state, and explore ongoing projects of conquest against First Nations and minority populations. As a result official multiculturalism cannot be understood as a neutral entity. Many scholars continue to point out the flaws of official multicultural policy with vehement critiques of both inequality amongst Canadians and the fragmentation of a national identity as the failures of multiculturalism. It is important to note, however, that criticism of multiculturalism in Canada is placed within the context of dialogue about multiculturalism and its continued evolution.

Indeed, criticism of multiculturalism tends to begin at a point that both recognizes how much Canada has achieved and what the country has ignored. For instance, racialization is hidden in the uncritical acceptance of multiculturalism (Abu-Laban and Gabriel, 2002). Multiculturalism is both in the mainstream and the official governmental approach to acculturation espoused in Canada (Teelucksingh, 2006). The majority of Canadians see multiculturalism as a model that they share (Li, 1999), and the opposite of assimilation.

Teelucksingh (2006) argues that it enables “minority groups, to maintain aspects of their own culture while also interacting with the dominant group’s culture” (p. 6). This in turn, relies on a symbolic image of Canada as being a “cultural mosaic” composed of a wide variety of people from different parts of the world. However, the presumption that racial harmony is part and parcel of multiculturalism makes it easy for Canadians to contend that discrimination and racism does not exist in society. This uncritical recognition ignores the way in which multiculturalism operates. In practice, Teelucksingh (2006) argues that multiculturalism in social and political forms is a model that “at its best, is a substitute for anti-racism, and at worst, reinforced the economic, political, and cultural interests of dominant groups with power in Canadian society” (p. 6).

Another important point of entrance in discussing multiculturalism is the question of equality and the role of the state. Proponents and opponents of multiculturalism differently claim the idea that cultural minority groups successfully pursuing claims in liberal democracies. Taylor (1992) notes that a debate has emerged about whether equality is best guaranteed by principles of universalism and ‘difference blindness’ or whether true equality requires special recognition and valuing ‘difference’ (pg. 37-44). ‘Difference blindness’ holds that the state should treat everyone equally no matter what differences may exist between groups, which claim to emphasize individual rights (as quoted in Abu-Laban, 2002, p. 462). The alternative viewpoint holds that a more substantive equality cannot be achieved without also valuing difference alongside individual rights. From this standpoint the pursuit of equality can involve according differential rights on the basis of group membership to reduce potential vulnerability and disadvantage from majorities (Abu-Laban, 2002, p. 463).

Kymlicka (2007) presents an important distinction in the discussion on multiculturalism: the difference between policy and ethos. Ethos, for Kymlicka (2007), can be used to refer to what takes place in private institutions and civil society organizations because they have no legal duty to incorporate multicultural policies (p. 139). So while Kymlicka (2007) can be positive (indeed he cites this as a vital area in which to analyze the successes of multiculturalism) it is precisely the realm in which critics of multiculturalism claim that the idealism of the policy is lost. For example, Bissoondath (2002) argues that multicultural policy has led to an overly fragmented Canadian identity and society and criticizes the act for not addressing how far Canada ought to go in encouraging and promoting cultural difference (p. 40).

As such, many critics of multiculturalism have highlighted the ways in which the discourses on diversity have worked to sustain the differences between ‘Others’ and Canadians, and see these policies as adding to the idea of ‘tolerance’ versus acceptance. Mackey (1999) explains that intolerance manifests itself through the mythologized official policies rooted in the principle of multiculturalism. Similarly, Bannerji (1996) proves that the discourse of multiculturalism (its administrative, practical and form of ruling) serves as a culmination for the ideological construction of “Canada”. James (2003, 2005) explores how culture is a social construction that frames the life experiences of individuals to social factors that are informed by the ideology of multiculturalism, which promotes a culture that reflects social, ethnic and racial stratification. Jansen (2005) takes a similar stance and explains that multicultural legislation fails to provide support for minorities to integrate into society by showing its inability of ensuring full participation rights, freedoms, and privileges in Canadian society. Fleras and Elliott (2002) explain that multiculturalism should be approached as a means of criticizing the government’s policy toward minorities or managing and controlling diversity (Gunew, 1999), which is an

actual form of disguised monoculturalism. These contributors have demonstrated that official multiculturalism sustains a discourse of diversity in which racialized groups are merely patronized and tolerated, but not accepted.

Overall it is clear that official multicultural policy has been criticized as a site where structural racism occurs and is legitimized. Further, the purpose of its ideological framework is to stifle dissent by coding out minorities, or depoliticizing diversity (Fleras and Elliott, 2002, p. 59). In practice, official multiculturalism has a controlling effect, in that its outcomes reflect national or vested interests rather than minority concerns. Securing social control by endorsing diversity may sound like a paradox, however institutionalizing cultural differences involves a process by which the government neutralizes and controls diversity. In doing this the government has empowered itself through policy to regulate minorities by taking away their power.

At the center of racist discourse, one discovers the contested presumption of who is defined as 'Canadian'. For the dominant group this involves whiteness, while racial stereotypes distinguish the 'Other' as identifying features with associations suggesting inferiority. Consequently, the motive and rationale for hate on minority groups allows the dominant groups to re-create whiteness as superiority, while castigating the 'Other' for their presumed being. Thus, though hate motivated activity contradicts the goals of multiculturalism in Canada, it is also the context in which the primacy of whiteness can be recreated and the 'Canadian' be achieved.

## **B. Social Exclusion Theory**

As noted above, while multiculturalism as a policy, wherein it states the importance of all members of Canadian society having access to its institutions, provides guidelines and a mandate within public institutions in relation to integrating individuals of all races and ethnicities, it cannot necessarily ensure that it happens. For public institutions such as the university there continue to be acts of covert and overt forms of discrimination that contradict multiculturalism's very goals. The purpose in applying a social exclusion theory to hate on campus is to deconstruct larger social processes of marginalization affecting racialized groups in Canada.

Galabuzi (2006) describes social exclusion as both process and outcome. Today, it is manifested in a form of uncontrolled growth whose "processes commodify social relations, validate and intensify inequality along racial and gender lines" (Galabuzi, 2006; Byrne, 1999; Madanipour *et al.*, 1998). Some have used the framework because it looks at the root causes of structural disadvantage experienced by racialized groups in society, while addressing exclusion on the society at large. As Galabuzi (2006) argues, social exclusion allows for the:

...exploration of the other dimensions of exclusion relating to multiple forms of oppression. In a very vivid way, racism, sexism, and poverty intersect to creating specific forms of exclusion in Canada today (p. 174).

Accordingly, this framework criticizes the neo-liberal explanations<sup>18</sup> of modern social relations, and advocates possibilities for change. Purposely, social exclusion emphasizes the processes of group or individual isolation with and from key Canadian societal institutions (Galabuzi, 2006).

According to White (1998) there are a few principles of the social exclusion framework including the exclusion from civil society through legal sanction or other institutional mechanisms; the failure to provide the needs of certain populations; a denial of participation in society's social and cultural activities; and unequal access to normal forms of livelihood and

---

<sup>18</sup> Neo-liberal supporters argue for a free market society, wherein the impetus of the state intervention is reduced.

economy (As quoted in Galabuzi, 2006, p. 176). It also highlights the natural forms of belonging to society on the basis of agreed upon notions of citizenship. As Jensen (2002) argues citizenship has three major signifiers that define integration, including rights and responsibilities, equal access and a sense of belonging. These combined or not, if not obtained define the nature of social exclusion (Bryne, 1999). It is therefore critical to understand the role of the state in producing exclusion (Jenson and Papillon, 2001).

Saloojee (2005) points out that multicultural discourse was framed around issues of national unity and whether it could be forged through promoting differences, not framed around the challenges of social exclusion (p.191). Saloojee (2005) promotes Held's vision of "cosmopolitan democracy", which recognizes difference, and argues for substantive equality not just formal equality (p. 192-193). In reality the discourse establishes that the political response to racial exclusion, pro-active and about anti-discrimination rather than the passive protection of rights (Saloojee, 2005, p. 197-198). Further, Omidvar and Richmond (2003) argue that this can be achieved by fostering a notion of shared citizenship that recognizes unity and diversity as not mutually exclusive ideals (p. 169). So the contradiction lies in the rhetoric for multiculturalism; the goal of national unity has not been achieved via promoting differences because it is precisely those differences; that account for the social exclusion faced by so many communities and individuals. This is not to say that people experience discrimination because of "negative" differences, but rather that if multiculturalism is truly celebrated by Canadian institutions and society, why do the same individuals and communities experience racism-induced exclusion?

As Kallen (2003) argues, techniques of domination and social control have existed since the origin of the idea of Canada (As quoted in Galabuzi, 2006, p. 61). This is described through the problem of institutionalized racism wherein racial hierarchies have defined Canadian society

since colonization. For example, a history of Canada shows that racialized immigrant populations have never been part of white Canadian society. Racialized groups then and today are often perceived as ‘backward’ people and therefore ‘Othered’ and alienated from integrating in society (Elabor-Idemudia, 2005). Today, the social exclusion framework highlights the marginalization on certain groups from full and equal participation in Canadian society. Galabuzi (2006) describes social exclusion as an “uneven access to the processes of production, wealth creation, and power” (p. 173). Social exclusion is thus a contemporary form of ‘casting out’ certain groups from ‘Canadian life’, which operate and oppress groups due to their presumed ‘difference’.

It can be argued that examples of social exclusion are tied to the fear of the ‘Other’ absorbing the material basis of Canadian identity through participating in Canada’s education system. Canadian universities have been criticized for producing and reproducing “racist ideology, attitudes, and structures of inequality” (Galabuzi, 2006, p. 191). In most cases, the visible and non-visible forms of exclusion are identified as alienation to racialized groups. Studies show exclusion is enabled by “course misrepresentation, absence of anti-racist curricula, low representations of racialized group members, and a general response of denial when issues of race and ethnicity are raised” (Galabuzi, 2006, p. 192). Another form of exclusion is how racism has become so integrated into the customs and experiences of everyday life on campus, to which exclusionary practices are normal and acceptable. It is within the social realm that justifications for hate activity are produced on campus. Further explanation of social exclusion highlights its characterization of spatial isolation and segregation, however this is beyond the scope of my analysis.

### **Conclusion of Literature Review**

I have outlined several themes around hate-motivated activity that reveal a definite gap within the literature. Some of this background includes a further clarification of theoretical approaches and the highlighted topics that show the pervasiveness of racism as it moves from explicit and aggressive to the subtle and implicit. The emerging consensus in the literature is that little is known about the effects of hate beyond the impact on the initial victim, despite the fact that even sometimes this is misunderstood or underestimated. The questions for the rest of this project are, what are the explanations and impacts of hate activity on Toronto university campuses, and society at large; and do these acts contradict or reaffirm Canada's image as 'multicultural'? This is both an empirical and theoretical question that has not adequately been answered beyond assertions. The omission is significant because the greater harm inflicted on campus by hate provides a key contradiction for multiculturalism's goals. Notwithstanding, it is necessary to gather empirical data in Toronto universities to provide context and narrative to the experience of hate on campus.

## **The Study: Methodology**

This study was conducted on Ryerson University and York University's recent experiences of hate activity on campus. In order to take on this issue, I employ a content analysis approach of two student newspapers. Content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts to the contexts of their use (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). While, content analysis is not the only research method that takes meanings seriously, it is both powerful and unassuming. Krippendorff (2004) describes content analysis as "a empirical grounded method, exploratory in process, and predictive or inferential in intent", which tries to "makes sense of what is mediated between people, textual matter, symbols, messages, information, mass-media content, and technology supported social interactions – without affecting those who handle that textual matter" (p. xiii).

### **Data Collection and Analysis:**

The data I examine in the present study emerge from Ryerson and York University's two student newspapers. These universities were selected as research sites for the present investigation because of the exigency regarding hate activity, and the hostile campus climate, which have emerged. Both universities are situated in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), though Ryerson is more centrally located in the downtown. The size of student enrolment however differs tremendously with Ryerson accommodating 24, 000 full time students, and York having 50,000 students. Student newspapers included are: the Excalibur, and the Eyeopener. These newspapers were chosen because they include student editorials and function independently from administration. The time-line considered is a 4-year period (the life-span of an undergraduate degree), looking at hate incidents on campus from January 2004 to August 2008. The criteria used to judge whether stories are applied to my research include whether the topic deals with

hate, racial bias, racism, prejudice, discrimination, and/or other processes of exclusion on campus.

Using the student newspaper is just one way to evaluate hate activity on campus. So far, much of the writing has occurred immediately after a hate incident and only for a brief period. Clearly, it is essential that research is consistent and thought out, rather than rash and reactive. In addition, reported incidents are hardly ever linked to larger analytical and theoretical explanations. It is also necessary to understand the underlying causes and context in which it occurred. Thus, my research strategy is more inclusive because I propose to (1) gather information on hate on campus reported by students themselves (2) evaluate and put incidents of hate on campus into context (3) and link the topic to larger theoretical interpretations to deal with hate on campus.

The technique of this research design allows for the categorization of articles by theme to draw on relevant trends of hate activity that exist on-campus. Krippendorff (1980) argues that thematic units relate to how concepts of interest in the content are useful in developing narratives, explanation or interpretations. Although there are many possible discourse categories for dissecting texts (Van Dijk, 1998), I chose six central matters including the type of incident, victim group, perpetrator, institutional response, context, and media's representation of the hate incident effectively. These categorizations are scrutinized through structured observation and latent coding.<sup>19</sup> The main purpose is to examine whether the articles created a discourse of difference about racial minorities (Wodak, 1996), exposed strategies of group definition ('us' and 'them') and uncover whether racial inequality was rationalized in a pragmatic way. Further, theoretical connections will be considered in the discussion section.

---

<sup>19</sup> *Structured Observation* is rules that explain how to categorize and observe observations with the content through coding four characteristics: frequency, direction, intensity and space. *Latent Coding* looks for underlying, implicit meaning in the content of the text (Neuman, 2006).

## **The Study: Findings**

Before analyzing the data, it is necessary to note that the existing empirical data is tenuous at best. Some of the limitations include some overlap in news stories evidenced through articles collected, the understanding of the underestimation of hate on campus, as some student groups experience with hate may go unnoticed in the student newspaper, and last, some conclusions can be argued to be subjective. However, my analysis rests on an overall theoretical understanding of social institutions as mediating structural relations of exclusion on campus. The data will serve the function of measuring hate activity on campus, which suggests a contradiction between the political discourses of multiculturalism.

### **A. Type of Incident**

In order to understand the magnitude of hate on campus, it is vital to understand what types of incidents occur, as well as the motivating factor to which it is played out. The thirty three news stories analyzed at Ryerson and York university all account for incidents of hate including hate speech, the promotion and spread of hate material, hate violence or physical assault, vandalism, the organization of hate groups and the onset of hate threats directed at specific groups on campus. These acts of violence do not only show the scope of the problem of hate, but they also determine the motivating factor on which hate is performed. Student newspaper coverage determines that the motivating factor most often-instigating hate activity on campus is largely Islamophobic (13 stories reported)<sup>20</sup>, followed by anti-Semitic (11 stories reported), and last anti-black (6 stories reported). Other motivating factors include white

---

<sup>20</sup> Islamophobia is a neologism that describes a prejudice or discrimination against Muslims. The term itself has been used since the 1980s, but became universally used after the September 11, 2001 attacks.

supremacy (2 stories reported), anti-Italian (1 case reported) and anti-aboriginal (1 case reported).

Interestingly, acts motivated by Islamophobic or anti-Semitic sentiments were characterized largely by the spread and promotion of hate material and hate speech, with a small proportion of physical assault or vandalism referenced in the student newspaper. Conversely, hate motivated by anti-black prejudice is typified by vandalism and hate threats. Last, white supremacist hate is depicted by the organization of hate groups on campus.

Islamophobia	13
Anti-Semitism	11
White Supremacist	2
Anti-black	6
Other	2

### **B. Victim Group**

All hate incidents have a direct impact on the overall campus environment and wider community. Specific victims of hate, either individually targeted or group directed on campus overwhelmingly included Muslim, Jewish and black students.<sup>21</sup>

Muslim Students	13
Jewish Students	10
Black Students	9
Other	4
N/A	2

### **C. Perpetrator**

Another important category related to hate on campus is the perpetrator. Most on-campus hate activity is reported as “anonymous”, wherein acts of vandalism and the spread of hate material sometimes can point to no perpetrator. Not surprisingly, a description of the perpetrator at Ryerson and York universities is often not available (N/A), accounting for approximately half of

---

<sup>21</sup> Hate motivated acts on Muslims and Jewish students account both racialized and religiously biased.

hate news stories on campus. Alarminglly however a majority of hate on campus is committed by an identifiable individual perpetrator (13 stories reported); instigated by conflicting student associations (6 stories reported); or an organized hate group (4 stories reported). To clarify, the indicator of ‘student associations’ does not suggest a purposeful perpetrating hate act like the other indicators. Student associations do however play an important role in fuelling hate activity by crossing the line of a political standpoint/perspective on campus wherein other groups of students are harmed.

The articles that do identify the perpetrator of hate on campus, makes clear that the majority of individual perpetrated acts of hate are targeted against Muslims with a few cases of hate against Jewish and black students.

Individual	13
Hate Groups	4
Student Associations	6
N/A	14

#### **D. Response**

The persistence of hate activity on campus makes it essential to judge the level of commitment, responsibility, and concern of the university. In turn, I have calculated how many articles have showcased any public statements made by the institution, faculty or external media. Frighteningly, most news articles did not account any public or official statements made by the university regarding the incident. Particularly, student newspapers show that the majority of the hate acts to which the university fails to respond are largely based on Islamophobia, accounting for approximately 10 articles without any reference to the university at large. Next, approximately 5 articles on anti-Semitic acts have no reference to university responses. In spite of the fact that the university may have actually issued a public statement regarding some of these incidents, it is still important to see that they were not pronounced in student newspapers,

further relaying the message that the university response is nil. This can dramatically impact future victims from not reporting hate acts on campus, while motivating future perpetrators to perform hate under the impression there are no consequences.

A few news stories did publicize statements by the university, which are defined by any response by either the president or high administration. Also, other articles have discussed the public comments made by faculty regarding the recent hate events. Mainly, faculty has spoken out on Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and anti-black violence. Last, some hate activity received external media attention. This describes any media outside the realm of the university, including local or national news. Examples include the Globe and Mail, the Toronto Star and the CBC.

*\* Please note that this data may suggest the failure of the student newspaper to appropriately document an institutional response, and may not reflect the reality of the problem.*

No Response	19
University Statements	7
Faculty Comments	5
Media Attention	3

### **E. Broader Context**

The ability to contextualize hate on campus is necessary to understand the nature, causes, or triggers. It is clear that hate motivated violence can be connected to global or local contexts, historical or current circumstance. Most stories of hate-motivated violence on campus are related to student perspectives in the Israeli and Palestinian conflict. Next, topics like black racism, hate against aboriginal and some anti-Semitic hate reflect a historical context. The category ‘post-911’ is characterized by increasing crimes against Muslims since September 11, 2001.<sup>22</sup> The debate around freedom of speech reflects a large number of hate incidents on campus, centered

---

<sup>22</sup> This claim is supported by the Toronto Police Services 2001 report on hate crime, which states that the “66 per cent increase in reported hate crimes was largely a result of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States.” The report refers to 121 incidents that were related to the terrorist attacks, accounting for 90 percent of all hate crimes. Muslims, Arabs, Pakistanis and Sikhs represent the largest targeted group (Toronto Police, 2002).

public debates and events’ dealing with contentious issues (i.e. Israeli Apartheid Week). Last, a few news articles did not expose any (N/A) context to hate activity on campus.

Israel/Palestine	10
Historical	2
Post 911	5
Freedom of Speech	6
N/A	2

#### **F. Media’s representation**

One of the dilemmas with the student newspaper is the feeling that some student groups get more coverage, sympathy and messaging in their experience to hate activity. Accordingly, the imbalance of coverage can actually lead to future hate aggression on campus. Thus, a critical indicator for judging campus hate is how it is represented to the campus community. To be able to judge the campus newspaper’s role in adequately representing hate issues is to measure the quality of coverage. Several indicators were taken into account including, the accuracy of the story, whether a story was detail oriented, whether both sides of the conflict were presented, whether there was a higher concentration of the perpetrator over the victim or campus community, how frequently the story was reported or the extensiveness of the coverage, and whether there were interviews by faculty or other students who spoke out against the violence. Accordingly, student newspapers showed as frequent a tendency to be biased (10 stories reported) in their reporting as neutral (12 stories reported).

Neutral	12
Fair	11
Biased	10

## Discussion

Overall, student newspapers at York and Ryerson universities reveal a significant relationship between race (and difference) and hate activity in all instances, confirming the findings in previous studies that universities are not immune to racism, though the reported perception of racial bias on campus is generally low. Moreover, articles on hate activity create the impression that hate is very much reactive but relatively rare amongst university students. Unfortunately this may underestimate the seriousness of the problem, and ignore the possibility of deeper inquiry. The topic of hate-motivated activity on campus demands a closer investigation of both its function and impact. In an effort to explore the confluence between hate, racialization, social exclusion and multiculturalism, this section will answer some of the pertinent questions at hand.

Although both Ryerson and York University declare themselves<sup>23</sup> through notions of excellence, diversity, social justice and tolerance, the campus climate of both have been breeding ground to persistent hate activity, largely committed against racialized student populations. Examining hate in the context of Toronto, the center of Canadian diversity, offers a unique

---

<sup>23</sup> Both universities have strong mission statements:

*“The special mission of Ryerson University is the advancement of applied knowledge and research to address societal need, and the provision of programs of study that provide a balance between theory and application and that prepare students for careers in professional and quasi-professional fields. As a leading centre for applied education, Ryerson is recognized for the excellence of its teaching, the relevance of its curriculum, the success of its students in achieving their academic and career objectives, the quality of its scholarship, research, and creative activity and its commitment to accessibility, lifelong learning, and involvement in the broader community” (Ryerson University, 2008, Mission Statement)*

*“The mission of York University is the pursuit, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge. We promise excellence in research and teaching in pure, applied and professional fields. We test the boundaries and structures of knowledge. We cultivate the critical intellect. York University is part of Toronto: we are dynamic, metropolitan and multi-cultural. York University is part of Canada: we encourage bilingual study, we value tolerance and diversity. York University is open to the world: we explore global concerns. A community of faculty, students and staff committed to academic freedom, social justice, accessible education, and collegial self-governance, York University makes innovation its tradition” (York University, 2008, Mission Statement)*

perspective of social exclusion and the meaning of Canadian multiculturalism. Thus, a broader aim will be to decode the manifestation of hate activity on campus as a way of exposing the ‘fallacy of multiculturalism’. To accomplish this, I will first offer some explanations as to why students partake in hate activity on-campus. Secondly, I will discuss the implications of hate activity in the university. Last, I consider hate activity as evidence of the ‘fallacy of multiculturalism’.

The first concern that emanates from this study stems from the inadequate naming of hate on campus. In effect, I re-conceptualize hate activity on campus, through the student newspaper; by using the consequences of the victim as a criterion to analyze hate (Blee, 2005). Using consequences to victims as the measure broadens the notion of hate beyond individual, targeted inflictions of harm and also includes its communicative, interpretive and contextual aspects.<sup>24</sup> By doing this, an inclusive description the victim(s) experience, including institutional and collective harm against subordinate racial groups is probed.<sup>25</sup> It may be objected that using this criterion creates a category of hate that is too broad because it blurs into discrimination, harassment and prejudice.<sup>26</sup> Yet, such vague edges importantly draw attention to that what constitutes hate activity on campus, and social exclusion in Canada.

### **Explaining the prevalence of hate on campuses**

---

<sup>24</sup> Blee (2005) explores how interpretation can be made more robust by a focus on victims and audiences as well as the perpetrators in these specific areas. She uses her work on modern white supremacist skinhead violence, Ku Klux Klan cross burnings in the 1920s, and contemporary hate crimes to illustrate the analytic possibilities of this re-conceptualization (p. 607).

<sup>25</sup> This approach was further rationalized because the issue of hate on campus has largely been wrongfully interpreted. For instance, one news article explains that Ryerson’s Safety and Security Manager Lawrence Robinson said identifying an incident, as a hate crime is often a ‘judgment call’. He notes, “It is tricky sometimes to draw the line between discriminatory and hate-motivated stuff”. “To the extent you have to interpret the intent of the person who drew the graffiti. It also depends on the amount of damage done” (Puzic, August 14 2006). My interpretation then doesn’t need to differentiate discrimination from hate activity, as it is more inclusive.

<sup>26</sup> For instance, the Excalibur writes that there have been significant incidents that have occurred appearing to be motivated by hate. However, the university’s provost and the Toronto Police do not acknowledge them as ‘hate’ but as a result of ignorance that will not be tolerated at the university (Chung, March 29 2006)

There are a multiple of explanations on the onset of hate-motivated activity in Toronto universities. The primary characteristic of hate on-campus is the inherent conflict between Canadian egalitarian values of justice and fairness and the racist ideologies reflected in the collective belief system as well and in the racist attitudes of individuals (Henry and Tator, 1994, p. 4). However, this conflict is multi-faceted and demands closer study when analyzing the relationship between the university and hate motivated activity.

For one, the criterion of *racially* motivated hate activity – refers to violence in which the victim is representative of a presumed racial classification in a racial group. As Perry (2002) explains, hate motivated activity can be seen as a “coherent racial project” (Omi and Winant, 1993) in that it connects the structural meanings and organization of race with the cultural construction of racialized identity - the ‘Other’ (p. 72). In other words, the pattern of hate activity on campus is “predicted on legitimating ideologies and images that mark the ‘Other’, and the boundaries between *self* and *other*, in such a way that normalizes the inequality” (Perry, 2002, p. 78). Stereotypes imbedded in these meanings inform hate motivated practices and serve to erase and mark the victim as inferior. Blee (2005) uses the example of a white student who commits a hate-motivated offence against a Muslim student, to which the victim is “fungible<sup>27</sup>” (p. 607). In a sense, the perpetrator’s immediate motive stems from their relationship with ‘Others’ in a white surrounding, as much as from hostility toward Muslims in general. Additionally, today’s social understanding of Islam is often associated with 9/11 or terrorism - a racist representation which then allows a system of hate to penalize these groups on campus.

---

<sup>27</sup> Blee (2005) explains that the *fungibility of the victim* – the criterion for the *racial* aspect of racial violence – refers to violence in which the victim is representative of a presumed racial classification, a point nice developed by scholar Lu-in Wang (2001) (p. 607).

Several examples in the student newspaper expose the idea that hate activity is a reiteration of violence against the ‘Other’ on campus. Using one case at York University displays this:

One streak of “hate” events was a series of shocking pamphlets distributed in Vari Hall by members of the Campus Coalition of Zionists during an event they called “*Table Against Terror*”. The material included a cartoon depicting caricatures of Muslim people standing next to a sign that featured a sword piercing the globe, with a caption “*Global Jihad: Killing Infidels Worldwide for Allah (All Sects Welcome)*”. The display also included a large banner stating, “*Table Against Terror: We’ve JiHAD Enough.*” Two other cartoons provided racist justifications for the killing of Palestinian and Lebanese children. One of these featured a caricature of a Palestinian child drawn to look stupid and cross-eyed and wearing a shirt with the words “*I love Martyrdom.*” A Palestinian toddler in the same cartoon was shown in a diaper with a pacifier in his/her mouth holding a large gun against his/her chest.” (Alvi, November 1 2006)

Perpetrators involved in this display of hate explained that “*(the material) was more than an accurate display of the problem of terror being faced today by Israel and all Western civilization*” (Alvi, November 1 2006). This reveals a knowledge base that is highly stereotypical and based on racist assumptions about Muslims, further rationalized by the construction of the ‘Other’. Similar incidents have occurred in more violent contexts, for example at the University of Toronto:

*A Muslim student was followed in the female washroom and was assaulted by having a pamphlet shoved down her chest which supported the Danish cartoons, relating to freedom of speech*”. Further, the news article explains that when the student tried to discard the pamphlet, the assailant began to yell anti-Islamic epithets at the student and her friend (Chung, March 29 2006).

Another example of a active hate construction of the ‘Other’ at York University was displayed when Hillel (Jewish Student Association) brought in a speaker, Nonie Darwish who claimed that, “*Most Muslims are terrorists,*” and making other comments regarding Islam during a speech on campus:

Darwish, an active spokesperson for Hillel, generalized Muslims into hateful stereotypes claiming that Islamic customs “*treat its women like a herd of sheep who should neither be seen nor heard.*” She also generalized all Arab nations by saying that, “*Money comes easily through selling oil, thus their energy and money is mobilized to hate, war and Jihad and that every aspect of the Muslim culture is geared toward hatred and the elimination of Israel*” (Yutangco, April 5 2006).

Thus, the embedded stereotypes that construct the ‘Other’ provide both motive and rationale for hate activity to occur against racialized groups on campus. Stereotyping is so prevalent that it oftentimes becomes nearly automatic or mechanized. Acting on the interpretations of the ‘Other’ allows dominant groups to re-create superiority among some groups, while castigating the ‘Other’ for their presumed traits (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000). A series of cases at Ryerson University are evidence in depicting ‘Others’ as non-deserving of respect and therefore subject to violence:

In one case, the Star of David and the words “*Die Muslim Die*” were found spray-painted on the walls of Ryerson’s Multi -Faith Center. Muslims use this room as a prayer space on campus (Gerson, August 14 2006).

Additionally, the perpetrating group, identified as “FBC Ridaz” took liability for the graffiti in one of the threatening flyers posted on campus. The flyers read: “*While this may be considered a hate crime or a despicable act, it is not. We are just getting back at the Muslim faggots that vandalized Jewish property and wrote anti-Semitic graffiti. We assure that Muslim students at Ryerson University that we will continue to send messages and that this incident is only the first of many.... No Muslim student will be safe and that security isn’t going to stop us*” (Gerson, August 14 2006).

At the same time, another group, self-titled the “*Full blooded Israelis Bridgade*” posted flyers exclaiming: “*The Islamic infidels have no belonging in Toronto and in the world at all. Islam is a disease that has made its way into the world and it must be eradicated...we ask that wherever you spot a Muslim... that you beat them and cause harm to them. Kill these Islamic Infidels.*” The note signed off “*God is great*” (Gerson, August 14 2006).

These examples illustrate a narrative of exclusion on-campus, in relation to racialized groups, in particular to Muslims. These incidents also directly contradict mainstream images of the campus climate, safe campus space, academic integrity or race-relations between students. The harm is in

fact that students, who participate in hate activity, influence others on campus to join by spreading hate messaging. Moreover, the systemic validation of ‘Othering’ in these circumstances is a display and assertion of power over certain groups. These incidents are likely to grow, as reactionary responses from victim groups are highly likely on-campus.

It is important to interpret hate on campus within the narrative of white hegemony. Ultimately, hegemonic constructions of race identity infuse the experiences and interactions of subordinate groups (Perry, 2002) in a white dominated society. In racially hierarchical societies like Canada, ‘Othering’ mean differing relations of and access to power, which in the end influence the structure and dynamics of race, ethnic, class and gender relations. As Mukurjee (1988) and Lee (1985) note an ideology based on the efficacy of material interests and benefits, provides a basis for understanding, how race is structured by the economy and the state (as quoted in Dei, 1993, p. 39). Thus, racialized groups have far less access than Anglo-Canadians to high status, prestige, and economic and political power.

The impact of power differentials manifests itself in all spheres of social life including the university, where racialized student groups are marginalized and segregating from access to power on campus. Consequently, hate activity on campus is directly implicated in efforts to maintain these unequal power relations. The power wielded is exercised in such a ways as to “develop, evolve, nurture, spread, impose, and enforce the very myths that underlie racism” (Ferdandez, 1996, p. 160). Target groups become the scapegoat and demonizing group gives the dominant group a sense of power. As Blee (2005) argues “hate or feelings of animus are not only necessary motives for whites in a racial society to view (and use) racial minority group as propos in a ritualized enactment of white solidarity and identity building” (p. 607). Thus the very

persistence of hate activity shows that it is itself a mechanism of social power by which white hegemony is expressed. For example, at Ryerson University:

A display of White power was evidenced in a controversial Facebook group entitled "*I'm a White Minority Group @ Ryerson.*" Before the group was shutdown, its membership totaled 137 affiliates. Former Ryerson Student union (RSU) president, Muhammad Ali Jabbar argued that, "*We cannot have anyone who has view that are borderline racist*". Chris Fortin (the perpetrator, and third year biology student at Ryerson), denies that the '*White Minority Group*' was racist, claiming that its condemnation was because it did not fit in with what he calls the "*RSU's narrow view of political correctness.*" He goes onto argue that, "*Ryerson needs less a focus on what people can and can't say and more a free marketplace of ideas.*" Interestingly, members of the group maintain that it was meant to be a joke (Wintersgill, January 29 2008).

This story shows the prevalence of white privilege today and its reiterations on campus. In some cases, the active construction of whiteness, exploits stereotypes to legitimate violence on campus. Moreover, at the center of this discourse one discovers the 'Canadian' – a presumption that suggests whiteness (Razack, 1998). Hence, hate activity against racialized students on campus becomes understandable as an arena in which the primacy of whiteness can be created and in which the limits of what is 'Canadian' can be affirmed (Perry, 2002).

Further from the explanations already suggested, it is still unclear the other broad contexts to which students become mobilized to partake in racist acts. As in other harmful acts, the issue of hate is subject to interpretation by many persons and communities who are involved or affected (Jenness and Grattet, 2001; Jackman, 2002). In discussing the causes for which students perform hate motivated incidents, the issues of academic freedom, free speech and fundamental rights of individuals are extremely important. Some incidents on campus connect to and are defended by the debate of freedom of speech in relation to hate activity on campus. For example:

On campus at York, hate posters containing the controversial Danish cartoons depicting the prophet Muhammad scattered along the halls of York University

written by the Undercurrent titled, “*The twilight of freedom of speech*”. The posters went on about questionable statements against Islam (Siad, March 8 2006).

Freedom of speech and academic freedom<sup>28</sup> are in other ways blatantly used to justify hate on campus. At Ryerson University, several high-profile cases of students were charged with hate crime were defended by perpetrators as notions of freedom of speech.<sup>29</sup> Another incident at York University tries to rationalize hate speech with this perspective:

*We don't feel that it is necessary to apologize to the student body. A lot of different speakers are brought onto campus and not everyone is going to hear what they want to say,”* says Hillel president Adam Hummel. *“Her views, although they have offended some people, are views which she expressed and we support her right to freedom of speech* (Yutangoo, April 5 2006).

However, there is a major difference between freedom of speech and hate speech on campus. The use of freedom of speech as explanatory suggests a strategic analytic advantage of further questioning the interpretive nature of hate on campus. Some incidents reveal that hate speech is legitimized as ‘academic freedom’ or treated as ‘freedom of speech’ by eradicating enemies, explicit racial strategy and/or a way to advance white dominance.

---

<sup>28</sup> “The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) defines academic freedom as “(the professor’s) freedom to express freely their opinion about the institution, its administration and freedom from institutional censorship” (Sharaf, January 12 2004).

<sup>29</sup> A former Ryerson student, Alexan Kulbashian, 25, was charged with promoting hate through a website he hosted. He was also charged in 2002 for assault. Both charges have been dropped. In March 2006, the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) fined him \$1,000 for hosting hate sites littered with racist jokes and propaganda. His company AffordableSpace.com was fined \$3,000 in the same decision. The Canadian Ethnic Cleansing Team, which Kulbashian lead in 2001, was fined the same amount. Kulbashian refers to himself as a “free-speech activist” to which he says he fights his battles on the political and legal fronts. Kulbashian was also the president of the Armenian student’s society at Ryerson for several months (Press, September 26 2004). The second case of Kevin Haas, 21, was charged with two counts of threatening death, and seven counts of mischief under \$5,000. The Crown is seeking the attorney general’s approval to also charge Haas with hate crimes. (Sharaf, August 14 2006; Doolittle, September 19, 2004)

The idea of ‘reasonable racism’<sup>30</sup> is also a trigger and justifications of hate activity on campus (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000), with some student newspapers referring to hate activity as a “misunderstanding” on campus. For example, one incident at Ryerson depicted this:

*A racist email addressed to the RSU with the subject header “KKK – White Power” was sent to get noticed. The perpetrator of this act commented about the incident saying, “I probably wasn’t thinking at the time, but what I wrote was not hate speech.” This shows that the real charge in performing this type of hate is overlooked and is interpreted as a reaction or mistake. What makes this dangerous is captured by one student’s response, “every marginalized group on campus is being targeted by this student, and he’s doing it in a proud way, which is the most disturbing part” (McLean, March 11 2008).*

It is vital to acknowledge that these dilemmas on campus can become mute as whites find justifications to exhibit prejudicial attitudes or support positions that maintain white privilege. Whites then talk as ‘reasonable racists’ and argue using elements of liberal free market ideologies that little can be done to change the racial status quo (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000, p.73). Thus, even though hate speech moves away from physical violence, it still however has an interpretive nature in defining what the group ‘is’ (‘Other’) and what it wants to accomplish (social exclusion).

Another instance of the debate between hate speech and freedom of speech was illustrated at Ryerson:

*An event entitled “What is a Terrorist” invited Mohammed Elmasry, a professor at Waterloo. Elmasry who answered “yes” to the question “so anyone and everyone from Israel, irrespective of gender, over the age of 18 is a valid target?” This incident of supposed free speech, according to Elmasry, garnered a lot of attention about academic freedom, expression of opinion and the role of the professor (Sharaf, January 12, 2004).*

Thus what is clear from these few examples is that the notion of ‘freedom of speech’ is not unlimited. In fact, there are crucial limitations, though sometimes ambiguous, that need to be

---

<sup>30</sup> Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000) use the idea of ‘reasonable racism’ to explain how Whites talk and argue using elements of liberal humanism combined with the pragmatism of free-market ideologies, that little can be done to change the status quo (p. 73).

drawn on-campus to protect minority groups (Kallen, 1991; Kallen and Lam, 1993; Li, 1995; McKay-Panos, 2004). Political Science professor at York University David Dewitt said problems arise “when faculty inadvertently gives the impression that they are speaking on something in which they have an authority and that expertise carries weight” (Sharaf, January 12, 2004). This answer should be understood among students as well.

Another factor to which students partake in hate activity is associated to the poorly developed linkages between violent incidents and the social context in which these incidents occur. Viewing hate activity in isolation from the broad context can misrepresent the victim’s actual experience and minimize the seriousness at risk (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000; Blee, 2005). On campus, broader contextual factors are either highly pronounced or ignored. This sense of unfolding context is helpful in understanding hate on campus, where hate can be rationalized for empowerment among student associations or a reactionary tool to global issues.

For instance, a large amount of hate activity on campus is referenced to the global Israeli – Palestinian conflict. A rash of anti-Semitic hate incidents, for one, has hit Ryerson in recent years that associate with this issue. In particular one news story examines a physical assault on a Jewish student that involved spitting, harassment and derogatory comments such as “Palestine forever, forever and ever... Fuck you, you fucking Jew” (Press, March 23 2006). Another article from York University explains:

*On a campus where the Israel-Palestine conflict is played out in Vari Hall, many students, both Muslim and Jewish, see York as an oppressive place. For instance, Muslim students are banding together next Monday to combat racism through an event entitled “From Ground-Zero to Islamophobia: Who are the Victims?” Unfortunately, the event has already garnered negative attention after it was discovered that a vandal had scrawled “Terrorism Lives at York” on some of the posters promoting it (Szekely and Oliveira, March 24 2004).*

Next, one student depicts the context to which these hate incidents are growing:

*Unfortunately, the intensifying anti-Arab racism in Israel (as documented by numerous polls and studies) is strongly reflected in the sectors of York's Israel-oriented Jewish community.... And so long as the York community as a whole fails to address the pervasive on-campus association with the Israeli state (and its armed forces), the anti-Arab racism and intolerance of dissent so pervasive in Israel can be expected to echo locally (Freeman-Maloy, April 2 2008).*

Additionally, several anti-Semitic acts occurred in the context of Holocaust and Genocide

Awareness Week at York:

First off, eight-two stickers reading, "*Boycott Israeli Apartheid*" had been displayed in the Student Center at York University, and created by the Coalition Against Israeli Apartheid (CAIA) on campus. One commenter goes on to explain, "*Incidents and events happening globally impact York. There's a lot of challenges in the Middle East these days*" (Thompson, November 8 2006).

Secondly, Hillel brought a speaker named Steven Katz to speak about certain issues pertaining to genocide, which were later denounced as hate speech: In his long and untactful speech, he made some outrageous comments when he claimed that the situation of the Indigenous population were not considered an act of genocide under his definition....In addition to constant denial of cases generally considered as genocide, Katz also kept using the work '*Muslim fighter*' '*Muslim resistance*' and '*Muslim terrorists*' and when a representative from the York Federation of Students took the initiative to ask him not to emphasize the word '*Muslim*,' Katz claimed that "*if you don't know anyway to reference them, you can call them what you like, it won't change a thing.*" In this case, Hillel had a responsibility to make it clear to their speakers that this in fact is a 'multicultural' society where you have to respect minority rights and values. The article ends with this statement: "so, if Hillel fears anti-Semitism on campus, in return it should not spread racism, Islamophobia or hatred towards Arabs" (Hussain, November 22 2006).

These news stories expose that hate aggression on campus is largely the outcome of a specific context; whether global (Israeli vs. Palestine) or local (a specific knowledge forum) we see a growing number of hate incidents. So, as Blee (2005) explains, "rather than viewing hate as an incident, or series of incidents, motivated by racial animus, it is more productive to consider how hate motivated incidents serves as an accomplishment (albeit, a negative one) of social actions, how it is the culmination of factors rooted in the past situations at the same time as it is an impetus for future acts" (p. 613). Hate activity on-campus can also be lure to form 'voice' that

brings together disparate collections of young people whose political and ideological agenda are sometimes uninformed, ambiguous and opposed to each other in relation to global issues.

For instance, one political charged flyer advertised at Ryerson's Student Campus Center promoted a movie "*Zionism: White Supremacy, Imperialism or Both?*" which forced some students to respond (Morrow, March 13 2007). Aviv Polyakov, a student at Ryerson spoke out against some disturbing images:

*In one poster, it appeared that a picture of a soldier was photoshopped next to an Arab woman begging for her life", she said. She also adds, "For me, it's less about religion. I just think its racism – if it was an Asian or a Black person (on the posters) it would not be tolerated."* The article goes on to say that Polyakov still feels isolated on campus and bothered by the posters, to which she believes is a misrepresentation of Israel. She ends, "*We wanted to serve our country, it was something I was proud of, now its something I have to be afraid of because I'm a minority in this school*" (Morrow, March 13 2007).

One faculty from the University of Toronto, Michael Marrus, a history professor who specializes in the Holocaust and anti-Semitism, spoke out about this violence to which he believes is a test for any group whether they are trying to solve the problem or if they are stirring the pot of hatred. He goes on to say in the news article, "I think it is the job universities to contribute a higher level of analysis and discourse than you would find in the community... you don't need a university to be a amplifier for sloganeering" (Morrow, March 13 2007).

Some argue that the Canadian education system, mainly curriculum and the lack of minority faculty representation can also attribute to hate activity on campus (James, 2003; James and Wood, 2005; Dei, 1994; Henry and Tator, 1994; 2005). Dei contends (1994) that "universities have recently admitting that textbooks used and courses taught by mostly white instructors in the past, espoused rigid orthodoxies that are racist, while learning about 'Other' populations in Canada is usually distorted and can also reinforce prejudiced ideas" (p. 39). For

instance, the Queen's University report on race relations (1991)<sup>31</sup> identified a number of concerns in their curriculum (as quoted in Dei, 1994). Additionally, the university continues to face a problem of minority representation among faculty at the academic levels. At York University few faculty members (6.4 percent) were from racial minority groups (Henry and Tator, 1994). In reaction to this, some students have become critical of this reality:

One article reveals questions posed by a student at York University who reacts to anti-Black hate on campus: "*We want administration to know we are serious. Where are your Black teachers? Where is the Black faculty members in science? Why are no more Black students being taken in as graduate students? Where are the Black TA's?*" (Valz, January 30 2008)

Notably when analyzing the construction of 'difference' and the manifestation of hate on campus, one cannot deny the Eurocentric nature of much of the current university's offerings. Some point out that discriminatory and ethnocentric education within the school system, marginalize some groups, and influence perpetrators to perform hate on-campus. Thus, to combat racism in the education system of the university there is a need to "open up spaces for previously silenced or marginalized voices to be heard. We need to create spaces for students to interrogate existing paradigms and explore alternate ones..." (Ng, 1994, p. 44).

Last, inadequate penalty and the reluctance of the university to respond to hate on campus are other motivations in which students partake in hate activity on campus. At the level of policy, many universities have developed statements or general policies, which note that harassment and discrimination will not be tolerated on campus (Henry and Tator, 1994). Largely, most often the university uses the Student Code of Conduct to deal with issues regarding hate

---

<sup>31</sup> As noted in the Queen's report, related to Eurocentrism are the significant gaps in the curriculum: the existence of course titles that do not reflect their content e.g., "The history of political thought" which should be renamed "the history of western political thought"; the prevalence of core courses in departments that only include Eurocentric issues; the lack of anti-racist courses; the need to hire faculty minority; the need to introduce more interdisciplinary studies, and the need to develop bridging programs for minority students to help meet academic standards. (as quoted in Dei, 1994)

activity. However, sometimes the failure to acknowledge complaints regarding hate incident poses larger and more serious issues:

*It is disappointing and disheartening that York University administrators have not taken a proactive role to stop the spread of racist imagery and negative stereotypes that only serve to fuel hatred on our campus. (Alvi, November 1, 2006)*

Another case at York regarding anti-black hate activity forced one student to speak out regarding their dissent in the university's lack of response:

*I am angry that the York administration did not take this seriously and took over 24 hours to respond after numerous phone-calls, emails, and student outcry. Even the police showed up the day of the incident to create a formal report, question students and detail the scene. York administration chose to speak with news cameras before speaking to the students whose dollars line their pockets and whose safety is their responsibility...I am disappointed at the students and faculty who chose to turn another cheek to the matter or don't want to involve themselves because they believe Black issues only affect Black people; are we Black first or people first? Don't we all deserve a learning environment where there can be dialogue, a free and informed exchange of ideas? As non-Whites, we are already participating quite well in the Eurocentric take on the universe (Plato, Aristotle, Tolstoy, Marx, Engels...must I go on?) we are taught each day (McGeachie, January 29 2008).*

Thus, it is vital that the university play a role in responding effectively to hate activity on-campus. Individual, group and victim communities are progressively becoming mobilized to challenge the lack of authority in many hate-motivated situations. Students also reinterpret that if the response of the university is nil, it will leave room for more bigotry on campus to occur. Furthermore, the idea that penalties are not enforced further motivates hate perpetrators to continue their adherence to racial violence, as there is no consequence. Though some articles reveal an institutional response<sup>32</sup>, whether it is by the university President, administration or faculty, there is more to be done in terms of denouncing hate activity on campus.

---

<sup>32</sup> For instance, one article explains that "after six months of mounting racial tension on campus, President Sheldon Levy (Ryerson President) said he was going to personally look into Kulbashian... In general, Levy has found the

Taken together, these results provide the reader with additional answers and more questions. The data and theoretical arguments emphasize the social milieu that allows hate activity on campus to occur. Moreover, it is vital to extend this research of hate on campus to the larger implications for the individual victim, victim group and society at large. This broadening will allow a closer examination of social exclusion and the controversy surrounding official policies, such as multiculturalism, that stand to protect minority groups.

### **The implications of hate activity on campus**

The understanding of the broad contexts in which students become mobilized to partake in hate motivated activity brings attention to the ways in which larger social relations of subordination and dominance are implicated in both the acts and institutional policies. What are the implications of hate in the university, and Canadian society? An understanding of communicative and interpretive effects of hate activity shows that incidents do not merely damage the immediate victim, but can convey long-enduring messages of vulnerability and empowerment quite far removed from the act (Blee, 2005). In other words, they can seal borders of racial identity – and can entrench institutional forms of racism (Perry, 2002; Blee, 2005). By this, I mean that two ways of analyzing the implications of hate on campus is the claim of how they conceal superiority and power amongst mainstream Canadians versus inferiority and exclusion amongst the racialized populations. Though it may be worthwhile for further research to address other direct consequences, such a psychological harm to victim groups, these implications, may be more politically effective examples to judge multiculturalism.

First off, rethinking the implications of hate on-campus helps clarify that racial violence is directly related to hierarchies of power and privilege. Thus, rather than focusing on the motive

---

amount of publicity given to race issues on campus this year disheartening, saying it takes away from the tolerant groups who work together” (Press, September 26 2004).

or intent of perpetrators, it is vital to highlight the communicative nature of hate on campus. As Blee (2005) explains, a number of scholars have written on the ways in which such violence sends a message to ‘Others’ (individuals or larger audiences), as inferior and thus do not belong (Pinderhughes, 1993; Soule and Van Dyke, 1999; Crenshaw, 2002). Reiterations of the impact of this message of exclusion amongst students on campus are largely found in the student newspaper. For example, from a selected number of articles on a range of different hate incidents, some students respond with feelings of exclusion in the following ways:

*Within the last two months there has been an increased amount of hate towards Muslim people on campus and it has become a hostile atmosphere,”* Abidi said. *“A lot of Muslim people don’t feel safe here, when they’re walking alone, going to the washroom alone. Women are taking off the hijab because they are scared... I don’t feel safe* (Penney, March 21 2006).

*I was really shocked,”* said the victim (of a anti-Semitic incident at Ryerson), who was wearing a yarmulke at the time. *“I just kept thinking, wow I can’t believe that just happened.”* The victim and his friend went and sat down in the hall outside the Hub cafeteria. The three individuals (perpetrators) stared down the victim, and talked amongst themselves inside the Hub. He didn’t want to leave the area and let the three feel like they had intimidated him... Still, the victim said, he’s not comfortable walking around campus, constantly fearing he’ll see the three assailants (Press, August 14 2006).

Hate incidents, such as these, often create messages of fear or isolation in the victims(s) racial community, even those socially or geographically distant from the immediate victim (Blee 2005, p. 608). In response to hate graffiti at Ryerson, a Toronto Police Hate Crime Unit detective reports on one incident, *“The language in the flyers is very overt, very calculated to cause distress... (They’re) aiming for causing alarm and outrage”* (Gerson, August 25 2004). Such communication may be an accidental byproduct of violence, as in some kinds of institutionalized harm. However, in reference to on-campus hate activity, the communication of exclusion is often intentional.

Although hate on campus sends a message of exclusion to racialized students, the meaning that is received is not permanent. In some contexts, victims and/or those in the victim's racial groups may receive a message that they are vulnerable to violence, while some live with psychological harms that deteriorate a sense of belonging to Canadian society (Blee 2005; Perry 2002). In one incident a Jewish student reports of her identity as, "*It was something I was proud of, now it's something I have to be afraid of because I'm a minority in this school*" (Morrow, March 13 2007). Thus, the case of hate activity on campus, one that is highly racialized, is illustrative of the "racial project" at work wherein minority groups both at the university and in society at large feel socially excluded.

In opposition, it is possible to examine the relationship between hate-motivated activity on campus and societal racism, wherein hate activity reinforces a narrow vision of the deserving and legitimate 'Canadian' – securing a position of superiority for non-racialized populations. For instance, for perpetrators, a sense of their *self*, their relations with peers, access to power – are often highly significant in actions that transfer and label hate motivated violence (Perry, 2002). These factors are often ignored; as they appear too commonplace to explain the motivation behind hate activity (Blee, 2005, p. 614). This normalized racism sheds light on how student groups react and relate to each other's differences on campus. Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000) explain through their study mapping white college student's racial ideology in the United States that students tend to document this discomfort when they find themselves sharing physical space with minority groups (p. 51). My research shows that whites are not the only ones who experience this. One student writes:

*It's not easy being a student these days... The 18-year old who walks out of a neighborhood where (he or she) was more or less sheltered and onto a university campus comes to a new kind of experience... For example, there are some Jewish students who have never been with Muslims. (They) come to York and then pick*

*up an (anti-Semitic) pamphlet. It's difficult to adjust (to that)* (Puzic, August 14 2006).

This discomfort with 'difference' is especially evident when white students are in situations where they are the minority, a setting that is relevant to Toronto campuses where diversity is growing. However, this is not meant to suggest that mainstream populations are more harmfully effected by hate on campus. Instead, this reveals an assumption that the attitudes, which create hate motivated acts in retaliation to the 'Other', actually solidify and validate power and privilege amongst non-racialized populations, an implication that can have over-reaching effects.

Therefore, it is vital to understand that the implications of hate are campus is twofold. For one, the communicative message of social exclusion is directed at racialized groups, while a dissimilar message of superiority is directed to the audience who see themselves as similar to the perpetrator (Blee, 2005). However, as with victims, the messages may be received differently. Blee (2005) notes that after a hate incident, some whites for example, may receive the message of their "potential empowerment vis-à-vis racial minorities" (p. 608). One of the major mechanisms at work in the university setting is the dominance that obscures both the prevalence of racism and the extent of white privilege (McIntosh, 2004). Thus, one aspect of the struggle in universities is to demystify this discourse, wherein all students can feel a sense of integration and empowerment to learn, in a safe campus environment. It is crucial to expose how this seemingly benign discourse around race and the institutions put their stamp on a perpetual racial project where whites benefit at the expense of the racialized 'Other' (Bonilla and Forman, 2000; Perry, 2002; Mason, 2005;).

A major impact to the communicative nature of hate on-campus is its reflection in the student media, a tool which many students use for information. Student newspapers reveal highly

contradictory and biased coverage in assessing hate activity on campus. For instance, one article begins with a discussion of hate-activity on-campus in the following way:

University officials and faculty are urging students and community members to take all forms of anti-Semitism and other forms of hate-motivated crimes very seriously and resist desensitization to offensive material and graffiti. *“I don’t think we should ever accept (anti-Semitism material) as the new normal,”* Ryerson President Sheldon Levy said, *“Regardless of whether it’s the first time or the 15<sup>th</sup> time that it’s happened, every time is a horrible time. Hate is hate.”* (Puzic, August 14 2006).

Though the concluding sentence makes obvious that *“hate is hate”*, the coverage of an article with a title encompassing discrimination as a topic, while announcing anti-Semitism as widespread over other hate activity is groundless. Further, this example shows that some hate activity is sensationalized, but other forms of racial violence are skewed or not pronounced in a fair way. Mainly, the implications of misrepresentation of hate incidents in the campus press has largely been focused on the consequences of violence rather than on the perpetrator’s motive which illuminates the often-neglected interpretive nature of hate on campus. Interpretative meanings can form knowledge around race relations on campus, racist institutional policies, contexts to which hate is exercised (i.e. global and local political debates) and other extreme forms of bigotry at the university. It is therefore a failure of the student newspaper and a major stress that hate activity should be understood and informed to students as interpretive – with meanings negotiated by and between various parties, including the university (Blee, 2005, p. 601; MacGinty, 2001; Jackman, 2002).

Lastly, it is vital to expect that hate activity, whether on campus or in the public domain, creates implications that are non-definitive and range depending on the act and the victim. Many scholars have taken it upon themselves to research the various impacts of hate activity,

specifically hate crime; however these practical explanations are non-conclusive to the nature of racialization and social exclusion in the university, and are beyond the scope of this analysis.

### **Defeating the purpose: multiculturalism and hate activity on campus**

Within Canadian multicultural discourse, there is a general acceptance that government is responsible to condemn racism and exclusionary practices affecting minority populations based on their racial, ethnic or religious status. Additionally, a multicultural society is based on the understanding that racism is wrong and socially unacceptable. The introduction of a national policy of multiculturalism in 1971 provided a new understanding of Canadian citizenship that some argue was more inclusive of ethnic and racial minorities. However, official multiculturalism has also become a hotly debated ideal among scholars concerned with addressing its potential and limits (Abu-Laban and Gabriel, 2002).

As noted above, while official multiculturalism as a policy states the importance of all members of Canadian society having access to institutions, protection, and respect for diversity, this ideal is not what it seems. This section will critically analyze the extent to which hate motivated activity is a factor in the persistent social exclusion of racialized populations and a direct contradiction of multiculturalism's goals. The 'fallacy' then, lies in the fact that while the rhetoric for multiculturalism persists, the goal of national unity, in particularly on campus, has not been achieved through the promotion of racial differences which account for the social exclusion by so many communities and individuals.

When blatant forms of hate motivated activity emerge, particularly in universities, multiculturalism relies on its ideological stance to minimize this reality as isolated. Also, as it pertains to the liberal era, multiculturalism, attempts to redefine, revise or recast racist actions in ways that suggest that they are not racist at all (Abu-Laban, 2002). Within this view there is no

relationship between structures and ideologies that created racism of the present. For instance, the discourse underlying Canadian society has shifted its rhetoric from blatant historical racism to the rhetoric of an inflated sense of belonging that continues to benefit from the “unjust enrichment” of whiteness (Henry and Tator, 1994) and the unjust treatment and exclusion of people of colour. This necessitates the development of a discourse that embraced liberal principles of equality while simultaneously facilitating the extraction of racial privileges (Henry and Tator, 1994; Abu-Laban and Gabriel, 2002).

What is striking about this is how widespread false assumptions of multiculturalism are. Aspects of hate on campus, for one, expose a tradition, which serves to perpetuate popular stereotypes of people of colour while at the same time creating white privilege through a multicultural framework. Zamudio and Rios (2006) argue that racial praxis in the university is part and parcel of ongoing racial project that serves to obscure the systemic discrimination of racial privileges to Whites (p. 484). As Lewis *et al.* (2000) argue, indeed it is vital to expose how institutions are nested within larger social contexts, such as multiculturalism, that advance this racial ideology (as quoted in Zamudio and Rios, 2006, p. 498).

The data presented in this paper demonstrate that racism, particularly as hate motivated incidents are not merely residual isolated incidences but persistent elements of Canadian society today (Zamudio and Rios, 2006, p. 500). In fact, the data suggests that the discourse of liberal multiculturalism provides a vehicle for the articulation of traditional racist acts, wherein the context to which students partake in racially charged hate on campus is directly linked to the construction of the ‘Other’, which serve to reproduce an image of non-belonging to Canada. The fact that these hate incidents takes place in the university, a liberal public institution, where the rhetoric of equality is foremost does problematize the implementation of multiculturalism. Thus,

it is worthy to consider the nature of issues of racism on campus as further evidence to the contradiction of multiculturalism.

It is under the guise of supporting liberal principles of equality (like multiculturalism), that the most reprehensible stereotypes and dehumanizing ideologies of people of colour are disseminated (Zamudio and Rios, 2006, p. 495). Further the myth of multiculturalism fuels a volatile environment on campus with the onset of material and symbolic hate motivated violence remaining a reality. The examples provided in this paper show a range of ways in which racism is played out, from the explicit to the implicit, from internal beliefs to external actions (Zamudio and Rios, 2006, p. 498). Unfortunately, what is dangerous is that this discourse is never exposed, thereby providing a security blanket in a society endemic for racial contradictions protected by multiculturalism. For instance, the popular responses to hate activity at Ryerson and York University are interesting in the discussion for underscoring the value of multiculturalism on campus. For example, at York officials were quick to denounce the perpetrators of a hate brochure on campus:

*“We want to send a clear message to the person or persons who have distributed this offensive material on our campus. They are not welcome here at York University,”* said Robert Tiffin, York’s vice-president students, in a statement. *“This type of harmful propaganda is contrary to fundamental Canadian values”* (Dale, November 9 2005).

Thus, the picture is not all negative considering the many statements given by the university and range of student groups that reflected a sense that hate on-campus is not acceptable, and a sense that in Canada citizenship and multiculturalism entails freedom from discrimination and respect for diversity. To the extent that this is present, however reaffirms the relevance of multiculturalism as a discourse about Canadian citizenship that provides support for the presence and concerns of racial minorities in Canadian universities. The data of hate activity on campus

instead illustrates the fault lines that have governed the practice of multiculturalism in Canada. For instance, one of the main findings of this study is that social forms of exclusion emerge amongst students who are targeted by hate incidents on-campus. One article revealing the aftermath of hate on campus cites a student saying, “*It must be important to all of us Canadians... Toronto has to reclaim its multicultural state*” (Szekely and Oliveira, March 24 2004).

The cultural and structural contexts that conditions hate activity on-campus are many and varied. Most often the nature of hate has served to maintain the stigmatized outsider identity as ‘Other’. As Perry (2002) argues, the same ‘Other’ have been defined stereotyped negatively in terms of their relationship to some dominant norm – that is black is defined inherently inferior to white, Jewish inferior to Christian etc (p. 89). Thus, racial bigotry on campus has been described as a primary channel for enacting these differences, as well as acting on them. Moreover, some argue that this serves to illustrate how the liberal Canadian state can act in a discriminatory fashion, how easily this can be supported within some circles of the mainstream public, and how discrimination and direct violence towards racialized populations on the basis of their presumed ‘Othered’ status” (Henry and Tator, 1994; Abu-Laban, 2002; Zamudio and Rios, 2006).

So is Canada racially tolerant? Data collected in this paper has indicated that significant portions of students in the university have blatant experiences with hate activity and racism. Henry and Tator (1994), for instance, argue that white Canadians tend to dismiss a large body of evidence documenting racial prejudice and differential treatment while “fundamental inequality exists and continues to affect the lives and life chances for people of colour” (pg. 2). Thus, the maintenance of multiculturalism can be described as ‘fallacy’, in which respect for diversity is not accomplished with the reality of hate motivated activity. Clearly the interest in upholding and

maintaining an ideal multiculturalism is a reflection of how populations in Canada are increasingly multi-ethnic, multi-racial and multi-religious (Perry, 2002; Blee, 2005). Given the centrality of the debate of multiculturalism for the future, it is worth critically (re) examining what supporters and critics of multiculturalism have said, and the relative stresses and silences in this ongoing debate, which expose the nature of its mystique. Abu-Laban (2002) argues that, “addressing the problems of multiculturalism in turn requires de-masking the myth of the neutral state, the myth of unblemished record of liberal thought and scholarship, and holding a non-racialized view of difference” (p. 460).

In conclusion, although in many ways the ideals of multiculturalism has been a central notion upon which Canada has built its identity, many of its promises and goals have not actually been achieved. Instead, its superficial and vague nature makes it easy for multiculturalism to be an ideal, as opposed to practiced policy. The discourse of hate on campus reveals that liberal, free-market and the pragmatic rhetoric of multiculturalism serves colour-blind racism, which allows whites to defend exclusion in an apparently non-racial manner through the framework of multiculturalism. There are many dissenting views of multiculturalism within Canada, who argue that its policies disguise the tangible inequalities and discriminations faced by racialized groups. This proves the point that multiculturalism is only a ‘fallacy’. It is unclear still whether we can continue to use multiculturalism as a viable policy for Canada’s future of minority integration. A policy of social inclusion with a revision of the multiculturalism act would be a good starting point for building a unified sense of the ‘Canadian’ that is inclusive to all.

## Conclusion

In this paper, I have drawn on current literature to re-conceptualize hate by definition and scope; contextualize hate on campus by bringing to light literature on racism, racialization and education, anti-racism, race and space, and specific hate incidents in the university; and last, problematize multiculturalism in Canada by presenting the critiques of official policy and discuss social exclusion theory. The research reveals considerable evidence that the onset of hate activity in Canadian society is often assumed to be rash or abnormal, as presumably Canadians value and accept difference in all forms. However, recently many scholars have exposed how hate activity is an aggressive and defensive reaction to a collective threat posed by the 'Other' which serve to solidify the boundaries that separate racialized populations and mainstream Canadians.

Moreover, this paper asked the following critical questions: *Why is hate motivated activity manifesting on-campus and in what contexts do students become mobilized to partake in racist acts? What are the implications of hate in the university, and Canadian society? And last, is hate motivated activity evidence of the 'fallacy' of multiculturalism?* Interestingly, the arguments made in this paper present a striking story of the recent manifestations of hate activity in Canadian society. Through a number of articles in the student newspaper, this study has proved that hate incidents are notorious on university campuses. The case of Toronto's Ryerson University and York University has presented a definite urgency in this research, with hate motivated activity remaining an ongoing issue. The examples shared capture the extent (both in the number and intensity) of the experiences of racialized students wherein the totality of racist events reflects the ways that racism is performed on campus. At the center of this reality is the role in which the university plays in mobilizing and rationalizing racist acts that work to marginalize students of colour. Thus, this paper has critically argued that educational institutions,

particularly the university, are sites of exclusion scripted by the onset of racially motivated hate incidents.

In turn, on the basis of the findings reviewed in this report, many recommendations can be made relating to government and educational institutions. Effective prevention to hate and bias activity is best undertaken pro-actively, rather than after events have taken place, and using multi-agency and community partnerships and strategies which are carefully planned on the basis of careful analysis of the problems existing or anticipated. All and all strategies should aim to change attitudes, broaden understanding, help those at risk, and support victims. Specific response to hate activity involves a number of important elements: closer attention to the issue of hate activity, public confidence in the justice system, and greater collection of statistics on the prevalence of hate in Canadian society. A hate prevention program in the university in particular will involve a school climate in which prejudice and hate-motivated behavior are not acceptable, but which also permits the expression of diverse viewpoints. Some universities have already made some progress with the implementation of support networks, conflict resolution, anti-racist education and media education.<sup>33</sup>

In conclusion, the link between hate motivated activity on campus and official multiculturalism is not outstanding. I have argued that social exclusion is a direct outcome of hate in the university, where racialized students come to adhere to messages of inferiority and feelings of non-belonging. The racist meanings innate in these messages materialize as a way of constructing identity and difference, to which hate motivated activity support patterns of

---

<sup>33</sup> In 2006, Queen's University issued a response to the report on "Understanding the Experiences of Visible Minority and Aboriginal Faculty Members at Queen's University" by Frances Henry with recommendations for change. Major themes emphasized were Leadership, Education, Recruitment/Hiring/Retention, Reward Systems and Strengthening Institutional Culture. Some specific initiatives include: the incorporation of equality and diversity values and objectives in internal and external decisions and actions, to redesign equity and diversity awareness and training, to engage in rigorous recruitment strategies in culturally diverse communities, to reward leaders/administrators who achieve equity and diversity goals, and to provide a vehicle to foster interactions and networking amongst racialized /Aboriginal groups across campus (Henry, 2006, p. 123).

domination and exclusion in Canadian society. In turn, official multiculturalism in Canada becomes a 'fallacy' wherein the onset of hate motivated activity on university campuses expose a true contradiction in its goals. To this extent that this issue remains invisible, supports the power and privilege awarded to perpetrators of hate acts in the university and Canadian society at large. Further research, thus is significantly required in order to outline the ongoing issue of hate activity on Canadian campuses and judge the official policies that unfortunately have functioned in a way that protect and secure these inequalities.

## List of News Stories

A total of 33 articles were used in this paper, with 14 different incidents reported in news stories of hate on campus. Specific breakdown of news articles:

	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Type of Incident</b>
1.1	Ryerson	<i>Hate Crime hits Campus</i>	Anti-Semitism
1.2	Ryerson	<i>Are we desensitized from discrimination?</i>	Anti-Semitism
2.1	Ryerson	<i>President-elect joins rally to condemn U of T "hate crimes"</i>	Islamophobia
3.1	Ryerson	<i>Ex-Student Leads Controversial Free Speech Fight; Called Racist</i>	Anti-Semitism
4.1	Ryerson	<i>Hate Lit resurfaces in campus library</i>	Anti-Semitism
5.1	Ryerson	<i>Death Threats Alarm Campus</i>	Islamophobia
5.2	Ryerson	<i>Hate Crimes Considered</i>	Islamophobia
5.3	Ryerson	<i>Arrested for threats</i>	Islamophobia
5.4	Ryerson	<i>Bailed out of jail</i>	Islamophobia
5.5	Ryerson	<i>A Portrait of the Accused</i>	Islamophobia
5.6	Ryerson	<i>Graffiti, threats hit Rye</i>	Islamophobia
6.1	Ryerson	<i>RSU VP e-mailed 'racist threat'</i>	Anti-Black
6.2	Ryerson	<i>E-mail scandal grabs Tory attention</i>	Anti-Black
7.1	Ryerson	<i>Hate E-mails Received by PSA</i>	Anti-Pakistani
8.1	Ryerson	<i>Freedom of Speech?</i>	Anti-Semitism
9.1	Ryerson	<i>Zionist sparks anti-Semitism fears and Palestinian debate</i>	Anti-Semitism
10.1	Ryerson	<i>White Minority Group Shutdown</i>	White Supremacist
10.2	Ryerson	<i>Candidates Past revives Racism Fears</i>	White Supremacist
1.1	York	<i>Zionists' Pamphlet Criticized</i>	Anti-Iran
2.1	York	<i>Jews, Italians, Blacks Targeted</i>	Anti-Semitism/Anti-Italian/Anti-Black
3.1	York	<i>Battle against Racism Continues</i>	Anti-Black
4.1	York	<i>Anti-Muslim Speech</i>	Islamophobia
5.1	York	<i>Rash of Hate Crimes in 2003-2004</i>	Anti-Semitism/Islamophobia
6.1	York	<i>Hate Continues</i>	Islamophobia
7.1	York	<i>Racist Leaflets Found</i>	Anti-Semitism
8.1	York	<i>Panelists Discuss Danish Cartoons</i>	Islamophobia
9.1	York	<i>Graffiti Sends Wrong Message</i>	Anti-Black
9.2	York	<i>Hate Speech Despicable Cowardly</i>	Anti-Black
10.1	York	<i>Radical Islam Criticized</i>	Anti-Semitism/Islamophobia
11.1	York	<i>Holocaust Weeks Sees Acts of Vandalism</i>	Anti-Semitism
12.1	York	<i>Denying the Aboriginal Genocide</i>	Anti-Aboriginal/Islamophobia
13.1	York	<i>Hate Crimes</i>	Islamophobia
14.1	York	<i>Nature of Israel Advocacy on Campus</i>	Islamophobia

## Works Cited

- Abu-Laban, Y. & Gabriel, C. (2002). *Selling diversity: Immigration, multiculturalism, employment equity, and globalization*. Broadview Press.
- Abus-Laban, Y. (2002). Liberalism, multiculturalism, and the problem of essentialism. *Citizenship Studies*, 6(4), 459-478.
- Alvi, Z. (2006, November 1). Hate continues. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Anderson, K. (2002). The racialization of difference: Enlarging the story field. *Professional Geographer*, 54 (1), 25-30.
- Bannerji, H. (1991). *Unsettling relations: The University as a site of feminist struggle*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- (1996). On the dark side of the nation: Politics of multiculturalism and the state of Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 31(3), 103-128.
- (2000). *On the dark side of the nation: Essays on multiculturalism, nationalism and gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Berk, R. (1994). Forward. In M. Hamm (Ed.), *Hate crime: International perspectives on causes and control*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Berry, K., & Henderson, M. (2002). *Geographical identities of ethnic America: Race, space and Place*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.
- Bissoondath, N. (2002). *Selling illusions: the cult of multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Bjorgo, T. (1994). Legal reactions to racism: Law and practice in Scandinavia. In M. Hamm (Ed.) *Hate Crime: International perspectives on causes and control*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Blee, K. (2005). Racial violence in the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28 (4), 599-619.
- Bobo, L. & Hutchings, V. (1996). Perceptions of racial competition in a multiracial setting, *American Sociological Review*, 61 (6), 951-72.
- Bobo, L. & Klegel, J. R. (1993). Opposition to race-targeting: Self interest, stratification ideology or racial attitudes? *American Sociological review*, 58, 443-464

- Boeckmann, R. & Turpin-Petrosino, C. (2002). Understanding the harm of hate crime. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (2), 207-225.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. & Forman, T. (2000). I am not a racist, But...: Mapping white college students' racial ideology in the U.S.A. *Discourse & Society*, 11, 50–85.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Britzman, D., Santiago-Valles, K., Jumenez-Munoz, G. & Lamash, L. (1993). Slips that show and tell: Fashioning multiculturalism as a problem of representation. In C. McCarthy and W. Crichlow. (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Bryne, D. (1999). *Social exclusion*. London: Open University Press.
- Burayidi, M. (1997). Multicultural nations in a multicultural world: An introduction. In M. Burayidi (Ed.) *Multiculturalism in a cross-national perspective*, (pp. 1-11). NY: University Press of America.
- Calliste, A. & Dei, G. S. (2000). *Anti-racist feminism*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Canada. (1985). Department of Canadian Heritage. Canadian Multicultural Act. R.S., c.24 (4<sup>th</sup> Supp.)
- Canada. Canadian Heritage. Canadian Multiculturalism Act. 01 July 1988. 10 Apr. 2008 ([http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/multi/policy/act\\_e.cfm](http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/multi/policy/act_e.cfm)).
- Chung, A. (2006, March 29). Hate crimes. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Cowan, G., Resendez, M. Marshall, E., & Quist, R. (2002). Hate speech and constitutional protection: priming values of equality and freedom. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (2), 247-264.
- Crenshaw, M (2002). The causes of terrorism. In C. Besteman (Ed.) *Violence: a reader*, (p. 99-117). New York: New York University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1996). Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse Society. Ontario, CA. California Association for Bilingual Education. Canadian Race Relations Foundation.
- D'Oyley, V. R. & James, C. (Eds.) (1998). *Re/Visioning: Canadian perspectives of the education of Africans in the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. North York: Captus Press Inc.
- Dale, D. (2005, November 9). Racist leaflets found. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.

- Dauvergne, M., Scrim, K., & Brennan, S. (2008). Hate crime in Canada. Canadian centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series, Ottawa. Ministry of Industry – 2006. Statistics Canada.
- Dei, G. (1993). The challenges of anti-racist education in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 25 (2), 36-51.
- Dei, G. (1996). Black/African Canadian students' perspectives on school racism. In M. Ibrahim (Ed.) *Racism in Canadian Schools* (pp. 42-61). Toronto: Harcourt-Brace.
- Dei, G.; Mazzuca, J.; McIsaac, E.; & Zine, J. (1997). *Restructuring 'drop out': A critical ethnography of the dynamics of Black students' disengagement from school*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Dei, G., Karumanchery, L., & Karumanchery- Luik, N. (2004). *Playing a race card: Exposing white power and privilege*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Delaney, D. (2002). The social that race makes. *Professional Geographer*, 54(1), 6-14.
- Doolittle, R. (19/10/04). Arrested for threats. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Doolittle, R. (08/14/06). Death threats alarm campus. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Downey, J.P., & Stage, F. K. (1999). Hate crimes and violence on college and university campuses. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40 (1), 3-10.
- Dua, E., & Lawrence, B. (2000). Challenging white hegemony in university classrooms: Whose Canada is it? *Atlantis*, 24, 105-122.
- Durrani, P. (11/28/06). Hate e-mails received by PSA. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.
- Ehrlich, H. J. (1992). Campus ethnviolence: A research review (Institute Report No. 5) Baltimore: National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence.
- Elabor-Idemudia, P. (2005). Immigrant integration in Canada: Policies, programs and challenges. In C. James (Eds.), *Possibilities and limitations: Multicultural policies and programs in Canada*, (pp. 58-75). Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Faulknew, E. (1997). Anti-Gay/Lesbian violence in Toronto: The impact on individuals and communities. Ottawa: Research and Statistics Branch, Department of Justice, Canada.

- Feagin, J. R. (1992). The continuing significance of racism: Discrimination against Black students in white colleges. *Journal of Black Studies*, 22, 546-578.
- Feagin, Joe R. Vera, Hernan & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at white colleges and universities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Fernandez, J. (1996). The impact of racism on Whites in corporate America. In B. Bowser and R. Hunt (Eds.), *Impacts of racism in White America*, Thousand Oaks CA: SAGE.
- Fleras, A., & Elliott, J. L. (2002). *Engaging diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Nelson Thompson Learning.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *The social construction of white women, whiteness race matters*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freeman-Maloy, D. (2008, April 2). Nature of Israel advocacy on campus. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Galabuzi, G.E. (2006). *Canada's economic apartheid*. Toronto: Canada's Scholars Press.
- Gannon, M. & Mihorean, K. (2005). Criminal victimization in Canada 2004. *Juristat: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*, 25 (7), 1-26.
- Gerson, J. (08/14/06). Graffiti, threats hit Ryerson. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Goldberg, D. T. (1993). *Racist Culture*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Green, D. P., Strolovitch, D. Z. and Wong, J. (1997). *Defended neighborhoods, integration, and hate crime*. Yale University: Institution for Social and Policy Studies.
- Gunew, S. (1999). Colonial haunting: The (post) colonialism of multiculturalism in Australia and Canada. *Australian-Canadian Studies*, 17(2), 11-31.
- Hamm, M. S. (1994). *Hate crime: International perspectives on causes and control*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Harpham, B. (2006, February 6). Radical Islam criticized. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Hartigan, J. (1997). Green ghettos and the white underclass. *Social Research*, 64(2).
- Henry, F. (2006). Response to the Report on "Understanding the Experience of Visible Minority and Aboriginal Faculty Members at Queen's University." Queen's University: Senate Educational Equity Committee.

- Henry, F. and C. Tator. (1994). The ideology of racism in Canadian society: Democratic Racism. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXVI (2).
- (1994). Racism in the university. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXVI (3).
- (2000). The theory and practice of racism in Canada. In M. Kalbach and W. Kalbach (Eds.) *Perspectives on ethnicity in Canada: A Reader* (pp. 285-302). Harcourt Brace.
- (2004) The victimization of racial minorities in Canada. In Robert Brym with W. Mattis and T. Rees (Eds.) *Society in question: Sociological readings of the 21st Century*. Toronto: Thomson Nelson.
- (2005). *The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society*, 3rd edition (Thomson Nelson).
- Henry, F., Tator, C., Mattis, Winston, & Rees, T. (2000). The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society (2nd ed.). Toronto: Harcourt Brace.
- Hier, S. (2000). "The contemporary structure of Canadian racial supremacism: Networks, strategies and new technologies." *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 25(4): 471-494.
- Hier, S. & Walby, K. (2006). "Competing analytical paradigms in the sociological study of racism in Canada." *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, Vol. 38(1): 83- 104.
- hooks, b. (1988). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking Black*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- (1990). *Yearning: race, gender, and cultural politics*. 1st ed. Toronto, Ont., Canada: Between-the-Lines.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63.
- Hussain, L. (2006, November 22). Denying the aboriginal genocide. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Ibrahim, A. (1996). *Racism in Canadian schools*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace and Company Canada.
- Iganski, P. (2001). Hate crimes hurt more. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45 (4), 626-638.
- Israel, M. (1999). Hate speech and the first amendment. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 15 (1), 97-110.
- Kallen, E. (1991). Never again: Target groups responses to the debate concerning anti-hate crime propaganda legislation. *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, 11: 46-73.
- Kallen, E. (2003). *Ethnicity and human rights in Canada: A human rights perspective on*

- ethnicity, racism and systemic inequality.* Oxford University Press.
- Kallen, E. and Lam, L. (1993). Target of hate: the impact of the Zundel and Keegstra trials on a Jewish-Canadian audience. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXX(1), 9-24.
- Kelly, R. J. & Maghan, J. (Eds.) (1998). *Hate crime: The global politics of polarization*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis; An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications.
- (2004). *Content Analysis; An introduction to its methodology 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kobayashi, A. & Peake, L. (2000). Racism out of place: Thoughts on whiteness and an anti-racist geography in the new millennium. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90 (2), 392-403.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). Disentangling the debate. In J. Stein *et al.* (Eds.) *Uneasy partners: multiculturalism and rights in Canada*, (p. 137-156). Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press
- Jacobs, J. (1993). Should hate be a crime? *The Public Interest*. Fall: 3-14.
- Jacobs, J. & Henry, J. (1996). The social construction of a hate crime epidemic. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 86 (2), 366-391.
- Jacobs, J. B. & Potter, K. (1998). *Hate crimes: Criminal law and identity politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *Velvet glove: paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Jackman, M. (2002). Violence in social life, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 387-415.
- Jackson, R. & Heckman, S. M. (2002). Perceptions of white identity and white liability: An analysis of white student responses to a college campus racial hate crime. *Journal of Communications*, 434-450
- Janhevich, D. (2001). Hate crime in Canada: An overview of issues and data sources. Integration and Analysis Program. *Canadian Center for Justice Statistics*, Catalogue 85-551-XIE.
- Janhevich, D. (2002). Integration and analysis program, Canadian Centre for JFustice Statistics Hate Crime Study: Summary Results of Consultation. *Statistics Canada*.
- Jansen, C. (2005). Canadian multiculturalism. In Carl E. James (Eds.), *Possibilities and*

- limitations: Multicultural policies and programs in Canada (pp. 21-33)*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- James, C. (1994). The paradox of power and privilege: race, gender and occupational position. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 14 (2), 47-51.
- James, C. (2003). *Seeing ourselves: Exploring race, ethnicity and culture*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing Inc.
- (2005). Perspectives on multiculturalism. In Carl E. James (Eds.), *Possibilities and limitations: Multicultural policies and programs in Canada (pp. 12-19)*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- James, C. & Wood, M. (2005). Multicultural education in Canada: Opportunities, limitations and contradictions. In Carl E. James (Eds.), *Possibilities and limitations: Multicultural policies and programs in Canada (pp. 93-107)*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Jeffrey, B. (1998). Standing up to hate: legal remedies available to victims of hate motivated activity. Ottawa: Citizens' Participation and Multiculturalism, Department of Canadian Heritage.
- Jeness, V. & Grattet, R. (2001). *Making a hate crime: From social movement to law enforcement*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Jensen, J. (2001). Citizenship: It's relationship to the Canadian diversity model. *Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN)*.
- Jensen, J. & Papillon, M. (2001). The changing boundaries of citizenship. A Review and a Research Agenda." Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN).
- Labine, J. (2007, November 28). Zionists' pamphlet criticized. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 7, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Landau, T. (2006). *Challenging notions: Critical victimology in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press Inc.
- Lawrence, C. R. III; Matsuda, M. J.; Delgado, R.; & Crenshaw, K. W. (Eds.) (1993). Introduction. In Lawrence C. R. III, Matsuda, M. J., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K. W (Eds.), *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech and the first amendment (pp. 1-15)*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Lawrence, F. (1999). *Punishing hate: Bias crimes under American law*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- League of Human Rights B'nai Brith Canada. (2002). Audit of anti- Semitic incidents, Received on August 14, 2008 from: <http://www.bnaibrith.ca/publications/audit2002/audit2002-06.html>

- League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada. (2005). *Audit of Antisemitic incidents: Patterns of Prejudice in Canada*. Toronto: League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith.
- Lee, E.; Menkart, D. & Okazawa-Rey, M. (Eds.) (1998). *Beyond heroes and holidays: A practical guide to K-12 anti-racist, multicultural education and staff development*. Washington, D. C. Network of Educators on the Americas. Canadian Race Relations Foundation.
- Leets, L. (2002). Experiencing hate speech: Perceptions and responses to anti-Semitism and anti-gay speech. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (2), 341-362.
- Levin, J. & J. McDevitt. (1993). *Hate crimes: The rising tide of bigotry and bloodshed*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Levin, B. (2002). From slavery to hate crime laws: The emergence of race and status-based protection in American criminal law. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (2), 227- 246.
- Levin, J., Rabrenovic, G., Ferraro, V., Doran, T., & Methe, D. (2007). When a crime committed by a teenager becomes a hate crime. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51 (2), 246-257.
- Li, P. (1995). Racial supremacism under social democracy. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 27 (1), 1-17.
- (1999). The multiculturalism debate. In P. Li (Ed.), *Race and ethnic relations in Canada (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 148-177)*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Mackey, E. (1999). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. New York: Routledge.
- MacGinty, R. (2001). Ethno-national conflict and hate crime. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(4), 639-653.
- Madanipour, A. (1998). Social exclusion and space. In A. Madanipour, G. Cars & Allen, J. (Eds.) *Social exclusion in European cities*. London.
- Mason, G. (2005). Hate crime and the image of the stranger. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 45 (6), 837-859.
- Mather, J. (2007, April 10). Ex-student leads controversial free speech fight; called racist. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- McCarthy, C. & Crichlow, W. (1993). *Race identity and representation in education*. London: Routledge.
- McClintock, M. & Le Gendre, P. (2007). Overview: Hate crime report card. *Human Rights First*.

New York.

- McDevitt, J., Levin, J., & Bennett, S. (2002). Hate crime offenders: An expanded typology. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (2), 303- 318
- McGeachie, E. (2008, January 29). Hate speech despicable, cowardly. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). Unpacking the invisible knapsack, *Peace and Freedom*, 10-12.
- (2004). "White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In M. Anderson and P. H. Collins, *Race, class and gender: An anthology*, (p. 103-108). Belmont: CA: Wadsworth.
- McKay-Panos, L. (2004). Hate crimes in Canada. *Law Now*, 28 (4).
- McLean, J. (03/18/08). Email scandal grabs Tory attention. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- McLean, J. (03/13/08). RSU VP e-mailed 'racist threat'. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Miles, R. (1989). *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Mock, K. (1993). Victim impact of racially motivated crime: Overview. League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada. <http://www.bnaibrith.ca/league/articles/km940100.html>
- Morrow, A. (03/13/07). Zionist film sparks anti-Semitism fears and Palestinian debate. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Nakhaie, M R. (2004). Who controls universities? Ethnoracial origins of Canadian university administrators and faculty's perception of mistreatment. *Calgary Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 36 (1), 92-110.
- Neilson, J. & Kiefl, G. (1995). *Survey of hate- motivated activity*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Toronto: Pearson/ Allyn and Bacon.
- Ng, R. (1994). Sexism and racism in the university: Analyzing a personal experience. *Canadian Women Studies*, 14 (2), 41-46.
- Ng, R.; Staton, P. & Scame, J. (Eds.) (1995). *Anti-Racism, Feminism and Critical Approaches to Education*. Toronto: OISE Press: The Ontario Institute of Studies in Education.
- Nielsen, L. B. (2002). Subtle, pervasive, harmful: Racist and sexist remarks in public as hate

- speech. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (2), 265- 281.
- Olzak, S., Shanahan, S. & McEneaney, E. H. (1996). Poverty, segregation and race riots: 1960 to 1993. *American Sociological Review*, 61 (4), 590-613.
- Omi, M., and H. Winant. (1993). The Los Angeles ‘race riots’ and contemporary U. S. politics. In R. Goodring-Williams (Ed.), *Reading Rodney King, reading urban uprisings* (pp. 97-114). New York: Routledge.
- (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Omnivar, Ratna and T. Richmond. (2003). Perspectives on social inclusion: Immigrant settlement and social inclusion in Canada, pp. 1-23.  
<http://www.laidlawfdn.org/files/children/richmond.pdf>
- Omidvar, R. and T. Richmond. (2005). Immigrant settlement and social inclusion in Canada. In T. Richmond & Saloojee (Eds.), *Social inclusion: Canadian perspectives*, (p. 155-179). A. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing
- Paul, L., & Herringer, B. (1996). Visions and viewpoints on systemic discrimination and chilly climate. *CAUT: Status of Women Supplement*, 43 (4), 1-2.
- Penney, O. (2006, March, 21). President-elect joins rally to condemn U of T “hate crimes” *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Petrosino, C. (1999). Connecting the past to the future: Hate crimes in America. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 15 (1), 22-47.
- Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crime*. New York and London: Routledge.
- (2002). Defending the color line. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46 (1), 72-92.
- Pinderhughes, H. (1993). The anatomy of racially motivated violence in New York city: a case study of youth in southern Brooklyn. *Social Problems*, 46 (1), 72-92.
- Pinkow, L. C, Ehrlich, H. J., & Purvis, R. D (1989). Group tensions on American college campuses. (Working paper no. 1) Baltimore: National Institute against Prejudice and Violence.
- Prentice, S. (1996). Addressing and redressing the chilly climate in higher education. CAUT: Status of Women Supplement 43, no. ¼
- Press, J. (2006, August 14). Hate crime hits campus. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.

- Press, J. (08/14/06). Bailed out of jail. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Puzic, S. (2006, August 14). Are we desensitized from discrimination? *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Puzic, S. (8/11/05). Hate resurfaces in campus library. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Rabrenovic, G. (2007). When hate comes to town: Community response to violence against immigrants. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(2), 349-360.
- Ramcharan, S., Chacko J. & Baker, R. (1991). An attitudinal study of visible minority students at the University of Windsor. University of Windsor.
- Razack, S. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye*. University of Toronto Press.
- Razack, S. (2002). (Ed.) *Race, space and the law: Unmapping a white settler society*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Roberts, J. (1995). Disproportionate harm: Hate crime in Canada. *Department of Justice Canada*, Working Paper.
- Ruddick, S. (1996). Constructing difference in public space: race, class and gender as interlocking systems. *Urban Geography*, 17 (2), 132-151.
- Ryerson University. Mission statement. Retrieved on August 14, 2008, from <http://www.ryerson.ca/about/>
- Saloojee, A. (2005). Social inclusion, anti racism and democratic racism. In T. Richmond & Saloojee, A. *Social Inclusion: Canadian Perspectives*, (p. 180-202). Ed. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Sharaf, A. (08/14/06). Freedom of speech? *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Sharaf, A. (08/14/06). Hate crimes considered. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Shick, C. (2002). Keeping the ivory tower white: Discourses of racial domination In S. Razack (Ed.) *Race, Space and the Law: unmapping a white settler society* (pp. 99-121) Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Shefa, S. (30/03/04). Groups aim to ease religious tension. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.

- Siad, S. (2006, March 8). Panelists discuss Danish cartoons. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Sibley, D. (1995). *Geographies of exclusion: Society and difference in the west*. London: Routledge.
- Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Soule, S. & Van Dyke, N. (1999). Black church arson in the united States, 1989-1996, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22 (4), 724-42.
- Stasiulis, D. (1991). Theorizing connections: Race, ethnicity, gender and class. In P. Li (Ed.) *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada (pp. 269-305)*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Statistics Canada (2001). *Census* (Ottawa Statistics Canada, 2001).
- Sundstrom, R. (2003). Race and place: Social space in the production of human kinds. *Philosophy and Geography*, 6(1), 83-95.
- Szekely, R. and A. Oliveira. (2004, March 24). Rash of hate crimes in 2003-2004. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup conflict, *Psychology of intergroup relations*.
- Taylor, C. (1992) The politics of recognition. In Amy Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition* (Princeton , Princeton University Press), pp. 25–73.
- Teelucksingh, C. (ed.). (2006). *Claiming space: Racialization in Canadian cities*. Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Thompson, V. (2006, November 8). Holocaust week sees acts of vandalism. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Thompson, V. (2008, February 6). Graffiti sends wrong message. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Toronto Police. (2005) Annual report: Hate motivated crimes. Toronto: Hate Crime Unit, Intelligence Services.
- Toronto Police. (2006). Annual report: Hate motivated crimes. Toronto: Hate Crime Unit, Intelligence Services.
- Torres, K. (2008). Culture shock: Black students account for their distinctiveness at an elite

- college. *Ethnic and Racial studies*, pp. 1-23
- Turpin-Petrosino, C. (2002). Hateful sirens. Who hears their song? An examination of student attitudes toward hate groups and affiliation potential. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (2), 281 – 302.
- Valz, R. (2008, March 5). Jews, Italians, Blacks targeted. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 7, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Valz, R. (2008, January 30). Battle against racism continues. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 7, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage Publications.
- Visser, J. (11/28/06). White minority group shut down. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Walcott, R. (1990). Theorizing anti-racist education. *Western Canadian Anthropologist*, 7(2), 109-120.
- Williams, P. (1991). Blockbusting the canon. Ms. September
- Winborne, W. & Cohen, R. (1999). Hating those different from ourselves: The origins of racial, ethnic, and religious hatred. In S. McElhaney and T. Gulotta (Eds.) *Violence in homes and communities: Prevention, intervention, and treatment (pp. 157-179)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Wintersgill, C. (01/29/08). Candidate's past revives racism fears. *Eyeopener* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 8, 2008 from Eyeopener Web edition.
- Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse: Real language series*. Longman: London.
- Yang, P. (2000). *Ethnic studies: Issues and approaches*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- York University. Mission Statement. Retrieved on August 14, 2008, from <http://www.yorku.ca/ycom/yms/>
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Yutangoo, P. (2006, April 5). Anti-Muslim speech. *Excalibur* (Toronto, ON). Retrieved July 7, 2008 from Excalibur Web edition.
- Zamudio, M. & Rios, F. (2006). From traditional to liberal racism: Living racism in the everyday. *Sociological Perspectives*, 49(4), 483-501.

