REED W. TURCOTTE'S TRILOGY

(part 3)

Dominion *of* FEAR

Mired in lawlessness, this country's cultural gate keepers & media willingly empower the normalization of crime and disorder. Little is done to curtail the chaos and even less to dismantle its great divide & perpetual guilt.

A Message From This Author

In this book Dominion of Fear, as a veteran publisher, journalist and author, I have tried to deliver a powerful examination of a nation gripped by anxiety — from corruption and political decay to rising costs, media bias, and the growing influence of America. I also have turned this fear, observation, and insight into a coherent narrative that both informs and resonates.

To Canada's forgotten middle - this book is for you. The time for silence is over. The time for polite endurance has passed. If Canada is to remain a nation worth defending — a place where safety, decency, and duty still matter — then its people must rise. Not in violence, not in vengeance, but in voice, in unity, and in unrelenting insistence that enough is enough. Because when the law and liberty is lost and immoral media, politicians, activists and advocates rule, everything else that is evil follows.

If this country continues to slide into lawlessness and carry's on with its never-ending struggles, the red-and-white flag will still wave — but it will no longer stand for peace, justice, or freedom. It will mark the grave of a great nation that surrendered itself, one quiet compromise at a time.

Reed W. Turcotte

Previous Books By This Author

- *Gold - Indians & War - (Rock Creek, Fort Colville & area 1859 – 1899)*
- *Reed All About It - (Memoirs of a Controversial Publisher*
- *Greenwood - (The Early Years of Canada's Smallest City)*
- *When Newspaper Publishers Were King – (Rise of Canada's 4th Estate)*
- *Three Down Football - (History of Football in Canada)*
- *Canada's Beautiful Game - (History of Soccer in Canada)*
- *Retire – Reset & Reload - (Boomers are not Ready to give up Control)*
- *A Touch of Fake News - (+ Confessions of a Provocative Publisher)*
- *Legends From The West - (Spotlighting 100 legendary Western Canadians)*
- *Fragmentation of Canada - (Grim Outlook for the True North Strong & Free)*
- *Enemy Below - (Divorce Between The Three Amigos)*

DOMINION OF FEAR

By Reed Turcotte

Newspaper & Magazine Publisher, Historian,
Author & Emphatic Storyteller

E-Edition

Boundary Creek Printing & Publishing Co. Ltd. **(est.1896)**

Website: www.dominionoffear.ca

"The words that affect us most are the ones that inspire mankind to think for themselves." … Reed Turcotte (1991)

Contents

Acknowledgements

A salute to this great country called Canada even through a much-needed metamorphosis is overdue. For the twelve (and most likely - the last) time, an acknowledgement here would not be complete without a special ‘thank-you’ to my wife Lorraine, children, grandchildren and the million plus of you, who have read my diatribe over these many, many decades. All of you are hardy souls that are much appreciated by this scribe.

Introduction

A strong majority of Canadians feel they have the right to defend their home against intruders — and more than half say they don't always feel safe in their neighbourhoods and that the justice system is working against their interests. Canada once stood as a model of civility, order, and quiet strength. Today, that confidence is eroding. With unflinching clarity, this book reveals how fear has reshaped the Canadian spirit and asks whether we still have the courage to reclaim what was lost. Bold, reflective, and deeply Canadian, Dominion of Fear is a call to conscience — and a reminder of the values that once defined the Dominion.

So, why did this author write this book — the final part of a trilogy that began with *Fragmentation of Canada* and *Enemy Below*, and now concludes with *Dominion of Fear* — especially at seventy-five years of age? Perhaps the answer is rage: anger at watching a beloved country decay from its very center.

With a journalist's precision and a patriot's heart, I try to reveal how fear — of government, of one another, and of the world beyond our borders — has reshaped the Dominion into something unrecognizable. Each chapter reads like a collection of editorials, exploring the many paths that lead toward disorder, dishonesty, and decay. It examines how our so-called gatekeepers have allowed criminals, addicts, and repeat offenders to roam free — and how Canadians have been paralyzed by ideology and fear of backlash. This book should leave readers unsettled, but thinking.

One needs to look no further than Saskatchewan for proof of this national rot. In Regina, a career criminal and gang member was finally declared a dangerous offender and sentenced to indefinite imprisonment. For decades, he terrorized prisons and streets alike — inciting riots, attacking guards and inmates, and repeatedly escaping or attempting to escape custody. Correctional officers described him as a "placement

nightmare," responsible for dozens of violent incidents and continuous gang recruitment behind bars.

Even while under escort for medical care, he assaulted officers, stole a vehicle, and led police on a high-speed chase through Regina before being recaptured. His history reads like a chronicle of failure — not only personal, but institutional. Despite countless warnings, his pattern of violence was allowed to fester for years.

A Gladue Report cited a traumatic upbringing and substance abuse starting at age five. Diagnosed with FASD, ADHD, and PTSD, he spent most of his life in custody. Yet, despite every program and intervention, nothing changed. Justice T. finally ruled that only an indeterminate sentence could protect the public, acknowledge his background but conclude that his actions "overshadow any suggestion that his moral culpability should be significantly reduced."

This is not an isolated case, but a reflection of today's Canada — a system paralyzed by leniency, ideology, and endless excuses.

So, what is *Dominion of Fear* about? The answer lies just ahead — in the Preface.

(Source: S. Parks, Lodestar Media)

Preface

Nation Adrift - Fear and Lawlessness Have Drowned Canada

Canada, a nation once celebrated for its civility, modesty, and sense of order, now finds itself teetering on the edge of something far darker. The maple leaf, once a symbol of peace and stability, is today a fig leaf barely concealing a naked truth: corruption has seeped deep into the soil of the Dominion. Fear stalks its streets, lawlessness lingers in its institutions, and those entrusted with the preservation of decency seem complicit in the decay. Canada has not fallen suddenly—it has rotted slowly. And like all great declines, this one began not with the roar of cannons but the whisper of complacency.

This book seeks to tell that story, not as an academic abstraction but as a living narrative of how a nation famed for politeness became a cautionary tale of cowardice, connivance, and collapse. To understand why Canada is drowning in corruption, one must look beyond the surface of tidy suburbs and smiling politicians. Behind the maple veneer lies a reality where fear governs citizens, where crime is normalized, and where the public trust has been pawned for political expediency.

'Dominion of Fear' as far it relates to this book, means that in many cases, evil is brought to the surface by outside sources and their ideologies (liberals, influencers, activists, media and the cancel culture to name just four – more will be forth-coming in the pages of this novel). This often makes an individual (or a country) exhibit, through talk and eventually action, a superiority complex – they believe that they and their ideas to be loftier than all other points of view. This causes these types of personalities and or nations, to demonstrate a hatred, ignorance and fear towards outsiders (anyone else who does not share in their ideologies and philosophies).

To much of the world, Canada presents a serene Island - a vast northern land of clean cities, abundant resources, and a polite, law-abiding citizenry. The red-and-white flag flutters gently above Parliament Hill (as seen on the cover of this book), projecting peace, stability, and fairness. International rankings routinely place Canada among the safest and most livable countries on earth. Tourists marvel at the country's multiculturalism, friendly service, and picturesque landscapes. Yet beneath this image of civility lies a much darker truth — a truth that is increasingly impossible to ignore.

The truth is that Canada is now not only a Dominion of fear but also a 'Dominion **in** Fear'. The Dominion of Canada is mired in lawlessness. The word "lawlessness" may seem misplaced when describing a nation that prides itself on human rights, equality before the law, and a long tradition of democratic governance. But lawlessness is not always chaos in the streets or full-blown anarchy. It often begins quietly — through erosion. The slow decay of accountability.

Every nation has criminals. But what happens when crime ceases to be an aberration and becomes an accepted feature of life? That is the question modern Canada must confront. For decades, Canadians believed they were immune to the kind of systemic lawlessness that plagued other nations. It was a comforting myth—until the cracks began to show.

Consider Vancouver, a city that once boasted of its livability. Today, certain districts resemble failed states. In neighborhoods where opioids flow like tap water, the sound of sirens is a daily lullaby. Gang shootings occur in broad daylight, not in the shadows. Property crime has become so normalized that police forces no longer respond to vehicle break-ins. Insurance companies advise clients to "leave the doors unlocked" so thieves won't smash the windows. This is not urban legend; it is lived reality.

One anecdote drives the point home. A small business owner in Surrey, British Columbia—let's call her Maria—had her store broken into three times in six months. On

the fourth occasion, she didn't even bother calling the police. Why? Because the last time she did, the officer shrugged and told her, "Ma'am, we don't have the resources. You're better off installing cameras." Cameras, as if the criminals would care. Maria now operates behind steel bars, not because she wants to, but because the system that once protected her has abdicated its duty.

This normalization of crime has a corrosive effect: it breeds fear. And fear, once entrenched, becomes the perfect incubator for corruption. When people fear criminals more than they trust institutions, they begin to seek shortcuts—cash payments to inspectors, favors from officials, silent deals to "get things done." A society that fears its own streets soon begins to sell its own soul.

Fear in Canada is not confined to the alleys of Vancouver or the subway platforms of Toronto. It has metastasized into the political bloodstream. Governments, sensing the utility of fear, have weaponized it—not through jackboots and secret police, but through a softer, subtler tyranny.

Consider the pandemic years. Whatever one's view on public health policy, the methods employed revealed a chilling truth: fear works. Ottawa and provincial capitals alike discovered that a frightened populace is pliable. Lockdowns were sold as necessities; dissenters painted as dangers to public health. Citizens turned on each other, not because of ideology but because of fear. "Stay home, save lives" morphed into "Stay silent, obey orders."

When fear becomes governance, corruption soon follows. Emergency powers, meant to be temporary, become tools for opportunism. Procurement scandals during COVID-19—where contracts worth hundreds of millions were handed to firms with political ties—expose the rot. Fear allowed it. Fear made Canadians compliant. And compliance, as history teaches, is the currency of corruption.

Corruption rarely begins in the gutter; it starts in the marble halls of power. In Canada, those halls have become echo chambers of entitlement. The political class,

once expected to serve, now acts as a ruling caste, insulated from the consequences of their own mismanagement.

When revelations surfaced that a major Quebec-based engineering firm had been lobbying for leniency in a bribery case, the Prime Minister's Office allegedly pressured the Attorney General to intervene. The scandal should have ended careers. Instead, it became a masterclass in how Canadian politics operates: with plausible deniability, half-hearted apologies, and a public too weary—or too timid—to demand accountability.

Another case study: the WE Charity debacle. Millions in federal funds flowed to an organization with close ties to the Prime Minister's (Trudeau's) family. The excuse? "We were just trying to help students." The truth? A pattern of governance where friends of the powerful feast while ordinary taxpayers' foot the bill. This is not mere incompetence; it is corruption in its most Canadian form—polite, bureaucratic, and hidden behind press conferences filled with empty empathy.

Canada's corruption crisis is not without precedent. History is littered with warnings that went unheeded. The Pacific Scandal of 1873, where railway contracts were effectively bought with political donations, should have inoculated Canada against such schemes. It did not. Instead, the lesson learned was not "never again," but "be more discreet next time."

Another example lies in the sponsorship scandal of the early 2000s. Funds meant to promote national unity were siphoned into Liberal-friendly advertising firms. The outrage was real, but fleeting. Canadians moved on, comforted by the illusion that "it's better here than elsewhere." That illusion has been Canada's undoing.

In 2018, a mid-level bureaucrat—let's call him Daniel—attempted to expose irregularities in a provincial infrastructure contract. The numbers didn't add up; millions were unaccounted for. Daniel filed reports, wrote memos, even escalated the matter to his deputy minister. Weeks later, Daniel found himself reassigned to a windowless office

with no portfolio. His emails went unanswered. Eventually, he resigned. The contract in question? It was awarded, completed, and audited without a hitch—at least on paper. Daniel's story never made headlines. It didn't need to. In Canada, silencing a whistleblower requires no violence, just bureaucracy.

In 2022, a small-town police chief in Ontario hosted a lavish retirement party at a private estate. The guest list included local politicians, developers, and senior officers. The champagne flowed, the contracts did too. Within months, the developer who sponsored the event secured exclusive rights to a municipal housing project. When a local journalist sniffed around, the town council voted to "pause" any further inquiries, citing the need for "community harmony." Corruption here did not wear a ski mask; it wore a tuxedo and smiled for photographs.

So, with all this in mind, it is time to turn to chapter one, and read this authors CCCF process (clean, crisp, concise and factual) editorials aka stories.

Chapter One

Fear As a Tool of Governance

The quiet rewriting of legal norms to serve political ends. The soft-on-crime policies passed in the name of compassion, which embolden perpetrators while leaving victims in the shadows. The courtroom decisions that defy common sense, the police officers who are told to "stand down," and the prosecutors who no longer prosecute.

This isn't merely a tale of rising crime rates or a failing court system in Canada. It's the story of a national culture that has begun to tolerate — even enable — deviance, disorder, and dishonesty at the highest levels. It's the story of how institutions once tasked with protecting public safety have instead become paralyzed by ideology, bureaucracy, and fear of backlash. It's the story of neighborhoods surrendered to drug addiction and violence, of shopkeepers forced to watch helplessly as their businesses are looted, and of citizens who no longer believe that calling 911 will make a difference.

At the root of this descent is not just negligence but intent — a political and cultural class that long ago abandoned the principle of equal justice under law. It is the result of years of progressive social engineering that has prized tolerance over truth, rehabilitation over responsibility, and ideology over order. The consequences are visible in the swelling tent cities outside urban cores, in the ever-expanding list of unsolved violent crimes, and in the growing number of ordinary people who have lost faith in the system entirely.

This book does not seek to sensationalize, rather it seeks to reveal. It will trace the institutional failures, cultural shifts, and political calculations that have allowed lawlessness to take root and flourish in the heart of a nation once proud of its civility. Through the lens of justice, politics, public safety, and community life, we will expose the real cost of abandoning the rule of law — and ask the question few dare raise:

Can Canada be saved from the quicksand it finds itself in?

Canada's legal system, once regarded as a model of impartiality and fairness, is now a hollow shell of what it once promised to be. In courtrooms across the nation, justice is no longer blind — it squints through ideological filters, guided not by evidence or the public good but by political correctness, social activism, and bureaucracy. Judges hesitate, prosecutors withdraw, and law enforcement is paralyzed by shifting policies that seem to favor perpetrators over the public they're sworn to protect. The result is a slow-motion collapse of public confidence in the very institutions meant to preserve order.

At the heart of this breakdown is a chronic and deliberate leniency. A growing pattern of repeat offenders — some with dozens of prior convictions — being released back onto the streets with little more than a warning, has become disturbingly common. Violent criminals, who would have once faced serious time, now walk free within days. Bail hearings are a revolving door. Crown attorneys, overburdened and under pressure to reduce incarceration, negotiate plea deals that turn felonies into footnotes. The so-called "Catch and Release" justice system is not an exaggeration — it is now an operational standard in much of the country.

Consider the infamous case of a man in Vancouver arrested over forty times in a single year. His charges ranged from theft to assault to public mischief. Each time, he was processed and let go. Local police, frustrated and demoralized, stopped even bothering to make arrests in certain cases. "What's the point?" they asked, as judges imposed conditional releases or minimal sentencing in the name of rehabilitation. Meanwhile, the victims — often elderly, vulnerable, or small business owners — were left to pick up the pieces, with no apology and no restitution. Behind these lenient outcomes is a growing class of activist judges and policymakers who believe incarceration is itself an evil. They cite systemic bias, the overrepresentation of minorities in prisons, and the need for compassion. These concerns, while valid in

certain contexts, have morphed into an absolutist ideology that views nearly all punishment as unjust. The result is a justice system that prioritizes the well-being of the criminal over that of the victim. Empathy has become one-sided.

Worse still, this cultural shift in the judiciary has been reinforced by increasingly vague legislation passed by Parliament. Bills like C-75 — touted as “modernizing” the criminal code — have effectively weakened the hands of prosecutors and made it harder to detain repeat offenders. These laws are sold to the public as reforms aimed at efficiency or equality, but in practice, they tie the hands of law enforcement while emboldening criminal behavior. Then there’s the politicization of justice — a silent cancer spreading through every level of the system. Prosecutors are often told which cases to prioritize based on optics, not severity. Hate crimes or speech-related offenses receive disproportionate attention, while violent robberies, assaults, or vandalism are quietly dropped due to “resource constraints.” Police departments are increasingly hesitant to investigate certain crimes for fear of media backlash, lawsuits, or accusations of bias. Officers on the ground describe walking on eggshells, afraid that a single misstep will cost them their career, their pension, or worse.

Take, for example, the case of law enforcement officers in Toronto who hesitated to intervene in an armed standoff for nearly six hours — not because of danger, but because of political sensitivity. After years of public demonization, officers are trained to second-guess themselves, to delay, to consult, to appease. Split-second decisions, once made on instinct and duty, now require layers of oversight. This paralysis puts lives at risk, and criminals know it. Meanwhile, legal aid systems are stretched to the breaking point. Courts are backlogged. Trials are delayed for years. Witnesses lose interest or forget details. Evidence expires. Justice, as the old adage goes, delayed is justice denied — and in Canada, that delay is now standard operating procedure.

In smaller towns and rural communities, the situation is even more bleak. Police detachments are understaffed, sometimes forced to cover hundreds of kilometers with

just a handful of officers. When crimes occur, response times are hours — not minutes. Investigations, if they happen at all, are perfunctory. The message to criminals is clear: you can get away with almost anything, as long as you're careful. The law, once feared, is now a laughingstock. Some would argue this is not collapse but transformation — that a softer, more compassionate approach to justice is part of a progressive evolution. But in practice, this evolution has bred chaos. It has created a vacuum where rules are vague, consequences are rare, and criminality is often met with sympathy rather than sanction. In such a vacuum, the rule of law cannot survive.

The Canadian justice system is no longer a shield protecting society from its worst elements. It has become a maze of ideology, red tape, and selective enforcement. For law-abiding citizens, it feels more and more like an elaborate trap: obey the law, pay your taxes, trust the system — and watch the system betray you when you need it most.

Lawlessness does not arise in a vacuum. It is cultivated. It is rationalized. It is often disguised as compassion, progress, or reform. In Canada, the erosion of law and order has been driven not only by legal dysfunction, but by a larger political shift — a radical ideological re-orientation in how the state sees its role in society. Over the past two decades, successive governments, particularly at the federal level, have embraced a set of progressive values that elevate ideals like tolerance, inclusion, and equity above traditional responsibilities like safety, justice, and accountability.

The cost has been staggering. Nowhere is this more evident than in the proliferation of soft-on-crime legislation. Bills like C-5, which removed mandatory minimum sentences for crimes involving drugs, weapons, and repeat violent offenses, are touted by Liberal lawmakers as "modernizing" justice and "addressing systemic inequality." In reality, such policies have opened the floodgates to criminals who once would have been incarcerated. While pitched as a way to reduce prison overrepresentation among minority groups, they also conveniently reduce the burden

on the state to prosecute, house, and rehabilitate criminals — effectively outsourcing crime control to the public itself.

Under the guise of equity, punishment has become taboo. “Restorative justice” is now the mantra in many Canadian cities — a model in which criminals are encouraged to reflect on their misdeeds, perhaps apologize to the victim, and return to society with a clean slate. While this may have merit in minor, non-violent cases, it has now been applied to everything from assault to sexual misconduct to drug trafficking. Victims are often pressured into “restorative meetings” with their assailants — all in the name of healing and progress. But healing for whom?

These policies are not simply misguided; they are dangerous. They are the result of a governing class more concerned with how things appear than how they work. A generation of politicians and bureaucrats have become obsessed with optics — using hashtags, press releases, and social media campaigns to signal virtue rather than protect the vulnerable. In this environment, the concept of “criminal accountability” is framed as outdated, even oppressive. Perpetrators become “products of trauma,” while victims are told to be understanding, patient, or quiet.

The trend extends beyond the legal realm and into nearly every sector of public life. In schools, violent or disruptive students are no longer suspended — they’re “supported,” even when that means endangering other children. In city governance, councils pass bylaws that forbid police from removing illegal encampments, even when they sprawl across public parks and sidewalks. In corporate media, coverage of criminal acts is increasingly sanitized — race, gender, or immigration status of perpetrators is often omitted, even when directly relevant. Reality is filtered to fit a narrative.

Behind all of this is a deep-rooted fear of being labeled — racist, classist, xenophobic, transphobic. These labels have become weapons used to silence debate and paralyze policy. As a result, politicians no longer govern with courage; they govern with caution. Public safety is balanced against political fallout. Common sense is

subordinated to the court of Twitter (X). One of the most damaging examples of this ideological drift is the decriminalization — or effective tolerance — of hard drugs in major Canadian cities. Nowhere is this clearer than in British Columbia, where the provincial government, supported by federal ideology, has championed so-called “harm reduction” policies. These include safe injection sites, free drug supplies, needle distribution, and even mobile “safe use” vans. While intended to reduce overdoses, these policies have turned parts of Vancouver, Victoria, and Kelowna into dystopian drug zones.

Street corners in once-thriving neighborhoods now feature open drug use, discarded syringes, violent outbursts, and the steady decay of business and tourism. Rather than treating addiction as a crisis requiring real intervention, the government treats it as a lifestyle to be accommodated. Worse, criticism of these policies is often dismissed as cruel or uneducated. The net result: addicts are left to slowly die in public, and anyone who objects is labeled heartless. The root of the problem is a governing ideology that values “lived experience” over law, feelings over facts, and inclusion over order. This ideology has captured institutions far beyond Parliament Hill — it dominates education, health care, media, and even law enforcement agencies themselves. Police chiefs now give press conferences denouncing systemic racism, while ignoring the spike in gang shootings. Teacher’s unions focus more on social justice curriculum than on discipline or safety. Prosecutors are trained to examine their own “privilege” before pursuing charges.

All of this trickles down into the public’s daily life. The average Canadian sees more police standing down than stepping in. More politician’s virtue-signaling than problem-solving. More criminals walking free than facing justice. In this environment, citizens begin to disengage — not just from the law, but from the state itself. Law-abiding people grow cynical, bitter, and resentful. Some even begin to fantasize about extrajudicial solutions. That is how civil order collapses. To be clear, Canada has long

had a generous spirit. The country has historically welcomed immigrants, supported refugees, and worked to correct past injustices. But generosity without limits becomes negligence. Compassion without accountability becomes chaos. And progress without truth becomes propaganda.

The price of progressive politics is no longer theoretical. It is visible on the streets. It is felt in the homes of victims. It is written in the growing crime statistics that governments try to bury. Canada is not failing because of poverty, or immigration, or bad luck. It is failing because the people in charge have chosen ideology over integrity — and millions of citizens are now paying the price.

Canada's major cities once stood as symbols of order, prosperity, and multicultural harmony — urban centers where the quality of life was envied around the world. But in recent years, that image has deteriorated. Now, words like "unsafe," "unlivable," and "lawless" are frequently used by residents and visitors alike. What was once the pride of Canada — its peaceful and orderly urban life — has descended into visible, unchecked disorder. Vancouver, long seen as the jewel of the West Coast, offers a startling example. Only blocks away from high-end shops and luxury condos lies East Hastings Street, a stretch so overwhelmed by addiction, homelessness, mental illness, and crime that it resembles a failed third world state. Makeshift encampments line sidewalks. People inject hard drugs in broad daylight. Fires, overdoses, and assaults are daily occurrences. Businesses nearby have shuttered or been forced to invest in private security just to survive. Ambulances and police respond constantly — only to find themselves back again hours later. It's a closed loop of misery.

This is not an anomaly — it's the new norm. The same scenes are playing out in Toronto, Calgary, Edmonton, Ottawa, Montreal and much smaller towns. Tent cities spring up near parks, playgrounds, schools, and transit stations. The once-rare sight of public defecation, sexual activity, and open-air drug use has become tragically common. Residents are warned not to approach certain streets at night. Even daytime foot traffic

in these areas has declined. The warning is unspoken but understood – you are on your own. The causes are layered but interconnected — and most trace back to a refusal by government to enforce basic laws. Cities have adopted a policy of appeasement. In the name of harm reduction, “housing first,” or reconciliation, urban leaders have instructed police to avoid confrontation with offenders. Encampments are allowed to remain. Vandalism is overlooked. Drug trafficking is often ignored. And when local businesses complain, they are told to have “empathy” for those living in hardship — as though empathy should replace security. The result is not compassion — it’s surrender.

Shopkeepers in downtown Toronto describe theft as routine. Some estimate losing tens of thousands annually to organized shoplifting, often committed by the same small group of individuals who rotate in and out of jail with little consequence. In some cities, police no longer even respond to thefts under a certain dollar amount. The message to thieves is clear: steal under that threshold, and you’re safe. Even when suspects are caught, the courts release them before the ink on the paperwork is dry.

In some cities, this decay is being driven by ideologically rigid city councils who treat criminals as victims and victims as collateral damage. In Victoria, city councillor’s have blocked efforts to evict encampments from public parks, despite rising violence, arson, and drug trafficking. In Montreal, bylaw officers are told not to ticket squatters or illegal street sellers, even as law-abiding vendors suffer. In Ottawa, officials are more focused on regulating political speech than maintaining public safety. The rise of urban crime is not limited to property damage or petty theft. Violent crimes — including random stabbings, sexual assaults, and unprovoked attacks — have surged in recent years. Police data shows increasing incidents of attacks on public transit, in shopping centers, and even outside schools. Worse, many of these attacks are committed by individuals previously flagged for violent behavior but allowed to remain at large due to systemic leniency.

The average urban Canadian is now hyper-aware of their surroundings. Parents hesitate to take their children downtown. Women carry pepper spray — technically illegal in many places — because they no longer trust the state to protect them. And it's not just perception. Crime statistics, despite efforts to minimize or obfuscate them, show clear year-over-year increases in major metropolitan areas. But instead of addressing these realities head-on, political leaders engage in rhetorical games. Officials blame poverty, climate change, systemic racism — anything but the policy failures staring them in the face. Mayors form "task forces" and announce pilot projects, while real problems fester. Meanwhile, media outlets often downplay the scope of the decay, reporting crime as isolated incidents rather than as part of a wider pattern. When pressed, they refer to the danger of "stigmatizing vulnerable communities," as though public safety should be sacrificed on the altar of narrative control.

But the people living in these cities see the truth. They step over used needles on their way to work. They watch teenagers being robbed at transit stops. They hear the police sirens wail every night and wonder if their street is next. Urban life in Canada — once a promise of comfort and culture — is becoming an exercise in endurance. What's most dangerous is not the decay itself, but the normalization of it. When public disorder becomes routine, expectations shift. People stop reporting crimes because they know nothing will be done. They alter their behavior to avoid confrontation. They retreat from public life. And with each act of withdrawal, civil society shrinks.

This is how cities die — not all at once, but piece by piece. When safety is compromised, commerce falters. When law is optional, families leave. When leadership deflects blame, cynicism takes root. And when no one feels accountable, nothing gets fixed. Canada's cities are not lost — yet. But they are under siege. And until the government decides to prioritize the rule of law over ideological fantasies, they will continue to rot from within. The frontline of Canadian lawlessness is no longer hidden. It

is mapped on the streets of its most iconic cities, visible to anyone with the courage to look.

Beyond the towering skyline of lawless cities and the echo chambers of political elites, lies a quieter, more enduring tragedy: the disappearance of middle Canada — not just a geographic space, but a social class, a culture, a conscience. These are the citizens who once formed the backbone of the country — tradespeople, farmers, small business owners, nurses, police officers, truckers, and teachers. They built Canada with their hands, raised families on modest incomes, respected the law, and upheld the quiet virtues of duty, fairness, and community. But today, they are being pushed to the margins, both economically and politically, and increasingly find themselves alienated in a country they no longer recognize.

While the media fixates on urban crises and ideological battles, the plight of middle Canada is rarely mentioned. Yet, this group — spanning small towns, suburban neighborhoods, and rural regions — has borne the brunt of the consequences from Canada's descent into lawlessness. Their communities are less protected. Their voices are less heard. Their values are dismissed as outdated, even dangerous. In public discourse, they are painted as privileged, complacent, or worse — bigoted. The economic erosion of middle Canada has accelerated this decline. The rising cost of living, taxes, energy prices, housing, and inflation has strangled working-class families who once enjoyed a modest, stable life. In provinces like Saskatchewan, Alberta, and parts of Manitoba, entire towns are hollowing out. Younger generations are leaving for cities that no longer promise safety or opportunity. Meanwhile, family farms close. Local businesses fold. Services dwindle. And still, Ottawa's policies cater overwhelmingly to urban activists, environmental lobbyists, and bureaucrats — not to the people actually producing the food, building the homes, and driving the trucks.

And then came the insult to injury – they were silenced. For daring to speak out — whether about rising crime, out-of-control immigration, the state of their schools, or

the decline of national values — middle Canadians are often shamed, censored, or ignored. Their concerns are labeled “populist,” “anti-science,” or “extremist.” They are caricatured as angry white men in ballcaps, even when they are mothers, minorities, or recent immigrants who simply want safe streets and functioning institutions.

The most striking example of this occurred during the Freedom Convoy protests — a moment in 2022 when thousands of truckers and ordinary Canadians from across the country rallied against COVID mandates and government overreach. While the media portrayed them as radicals, the truth was more complicated – this was middle Canada, rising up in peaceful protest, waving flags, singing O Canada, and asking to be heard. Instead, they were met with scorn, slander, and state repression. Bank accounts were frozen. Police were sent in. And federal officials smeared them as “racists,” “misogynists,” and “threats to democracy.” It was a clear message: dissent — especially from the working class — would not be tolerated.

This divide between ruling elites and ordinary citizens has grown into a cultural chasm. Middle Canada still believes in responsibility, work ethic, and personal accountability. It still values family, faith, fairness, and national pride. But those values are now derided by a political class obsessed with identity politics, historical grievance, and post-national globalism. The result is a growing undercurrent of disillusionment, resentment, and quiet fury. Many no longer trust the media. They do not believe the crime statistics or government press releases. They hear about “record investments in public safety,” but see fewer officers, slower response times, and higher risk. They are told their communities are safe — but their daughters carry weapons on the way to school. They are told the justice system is working — while the man who broke into their neighbor’s house last week is already back on the street.

And they are not wrong. The numbers confirm their fears. Crime in rural Canada is spiking. Property theft, break-ins, and violent assaults are on the rise. Gangs and traffickers increasingly exploit under-policed highways and small towns. Farmers report

stolen equipment, vandalized crops, and police that arrive hours — sometimes days — after a report. Emergency services are stretched thin, especially in First Nations communities, where residents often face the worst of both worlds: urban-level crime, and third-world response capacity.

But middle Canada is not just a victim — it is a warning. A country that loses its middle class does not simply suffer a wealth gap. It loses its balance. Its civility. Its voice of reason. When the center collapses, extremes take over. And increasingly, the ignored are organizing. You can see it in the rise of alternative media. In grassroots protests. In the growing skepticism toward institutions. In the boiling anger that simmers below the surface. This is not the anger of anarchists or criminals. It is the anger of the taxed, the tired, and the betrayed. It is not the rage of privilege — it is the cry of a people who played by the rules and now find that the rules no longer apply. Middle Canada doesn't want revolution. It wants restoration. It wants a return to common sense, to law and order, to responsible government. But it is rapidly running out of patience — and out of time. A nation cannot survive without its middle. And Canada, if it continues on this path, will soon discover just how fragile the center really is.

Canada now stands at a precipice. What was once a country of peace, order, and good governance is now veering toward something unrecognizable: a nation where laws are enforced selectively, where victims are forgotten, and where the very institutions tasked with protecting the public have been hollowed out by politics, ideology, and neglect. The slow and quiet lawlessness infecting every level of Canadian life — from courtrooms to classrooms, from city streets to country roads — is not merely a crisis. It is a reckoning. The signs are unmistakable: A justice system more concerned with appeasing ideology than upholding accountability. Cities decaying into dangerous zones of chaos and disorder. An increasingly powerless middle class – dismissed and marginalized. A political class disconnected from reality, uninterested in course correction.

And beneath all of this: a population slowly losing faith — in their leaders, in their laws, in the promise of Canada itself. The tragedy of lawlessness is that it rarely announces itself with fanfare. It arrives quietly. A shopkeeper robbed but too afraid to report it. A judge handing down a sentence that mocks the seriousness of the crime. A parent telling their child not to call police because “they won’t come.” A teacher warned not to discipline a student for fear of retaliation. An honest citizen watching a repeat offender walk free — again. These are not isolated incidents. They are the new reality.

But lawlessness, while corrosive, is not inevitable. Canada still has the infrastructure — the people, the laws, the institutions — to pull itself back from the brink. But doing so will require something no government program or virtue-signaling politician can supply- courage. Courage to speak uncomfortable truths. The courage to restore order without apology. The courage to reassert the principles that once made Canada great: fairness, justice, personal responsibility, and above all, the rule of law. This is a call not just to politicians, but to citizens. To parents, business owners, teachers, workers, and veterans. To the forgotten middle. The time for silence is over. The time for polite endurance has passed. If Canada is to remain a nation worth defending — a place where safety, decency, and duty still matter — then its people must rise. Not in violence, not in vengeance, but in voice, in unity, and in unrelenting insistence that enough is enough.

Because when the law is lost, everything else follows. And if this country continues to slide into lawlessness, the red-and-white flag will still wave — but it will no longer stand for peace, justice, or freedom. It will mark the grave of a great nation that surrendered itself, one quiet compromise at a time.

In a country once defined by its peace, security, and quiet sense of decency, fear has now become an unspoken national condition. Not the fear of war, famine, or natural disaster — but something more insidious: the fear of a society slowly slipping into disorder. The fear that the institutions meant to protect you no longer will. The fear

that speaking up will make you a target. The fear that doing the right thing will cost you everything. And perhaps most damaging of all — the fear that no one in power even cares. This is the new reality for millions of Canadians.

The most immediate and visceral fear gripping Canadians comes from the streets — not from propaganda or paranoia, but from direct experience. People walking alone in once-safe neighborhoods now glance over their shoulders. Mothers hesitate before sending their children to walk to school. Transit users sit with keys between their fingers, ready to defend themselves. In cities like Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal and even Kelowna, there is no longer such a thing as “safe downtown.”

The randomness of violence is what terrifies people most. It’s not just gangs or targeted crime anymore — it’s the unprovoked stabbing on a subway, the stranger who punches a woman in the face while she waits for a bus, the man wielding a machete in a Tim Hortons, the fentanyl addict passed out beside a playground. People fear chaos, not just crime. They fear being in the wrong place at the wrong time, because “wrong” places now include malls, hospitals, city parks, and street corners. For every incident reported, dozens more go unreported. Ordinary Canadians talk about it behind closed doors: “Don’t go to that part of town.” “Keep your head down on the train.” “Call me the moment you get home.” This whispered fear travels faster than policy ever will. It breeds not outrage, but retreat.

One of the most damaging consequences of lawlessness in Canada is the rising fear of speaking the truth. Victims of crime are often afraid to go public with their experiences. Why? Because they might be accused of being intolerant, exaggerating, or even racist. A woman who’s harassed by a mentally ill man on a city bus is told by police there’s “nothing they can do.” If she complains online, she risks backlash for “lacking compassion.” A store owner who catches a repeat offender shoplifting is warned not to detain him — lest they be charged. This has created a culture of fear-driven silence.

Teachers are afraid to discipline unruly students — not because they don't want to, but because they've seen what happens to others who do. Police officers are afraid to use force even when justified, knowing their split-second decision might become a viral headline. Judges feel pressure to issue lenient rulings, lest they be accused of bias. And politicians? They fear social media mobs more than failing policies.

In workplaces, people whisper their concerns in private but remain outwardly compliant. In families, parents teach their children to keep quiet rather than draw attention. In communities, residents avoid political discussion entirely. The result is not peace — it is self-censorship born of fear. Canadians today are not just afraid of criminals — they're afraid of being branded for daring to object to lawlessness.

Fear has entered the home in a way that feels foreign and deeply unsettling. The idea of "home" — the one place you should be safe — is now uncertain. Break-ins are on the rise in both urban and rural areas. In rural Ontario and Alberta, organized crime groups target farms and estates for tools, fuel, and firearms. In suburban neighborhoods, homes are burglarized by addicts or repeat offenders, often in broad daylight. Many homeowners report police telling them to simply file an insurance claim, with no hope of an arrest.

Even more disturbing are the invasions that happen while people are home — families sleeping as masked men move through their houses. Seniors assaulted for their wallets. Parents tied up while their children watch in terror. These are no longer shocking headlines — they are familiar stories to too many. Some Canadians now sleep with weapons near their beds. Others have installed security systems, motion sensors, and floodlights. Private security firms are seeing record demand. People are no longer "paranoid." They are prepared. This is not how citizens of a free, peaceful country are supposed to live.

Fear has also infected the ranks of those who once upheld the system. Police officers now operate under a cloud of scrutiny that makes effective policing almost

impossible. They are trained to de-escalate, negotiate, and retreat — but rarely to act decisively. Many feel unsupported by their superiors, hamstrung by courts, and vilified by politicians. The fear isn't just physical danger — it's reputational and legal. One misjudged moment can end a career, spark a lawsuit, or lead to criminal charges.

Paramedics and hospital workers fear confrontation with violent or unstable individuals — a growing problem in cities where mental illness, addiction, and aggression are increasingly normalized. Social workers refuse to enter some neighborhoods without escorts. Transit operators have been assaulted so frequently that many demand hazard pay. Even judges and prosecutors privately admit that public expectations and media pressure have warped their sense of duty. The fear is no longer just among the powerless — it has penetrated those who were once in charge.

Perhaps the deepest fear among Canadians today is the fear that no one is coming to help. That if they're attacked on the street, police will arrive too late — if at all. That if their business is looted, insurance will cover less than half and the suspect will walk free. That if their children are threatened at school, administrators will offer counseling instead of consequences. That the justice system will see them not as victims, but as problems. This fear breeds hopelessness.

Many Canadians now feel abandoned by their government, by law enforcement, by the courts, and by the media. They've been told to be "tolerant," even when tolerance means stepping over addicts to get to work. They've been told to be "compassionate," even when compassion means accepting violence as part of everyday life. They've been told to "trust the system," even as the system crumbles around them. This abandonment is not just logistical — it's emotional. People no longer feel that their government represents them. They no longer believe that their suffering matters. The fabric of trust — between citizen and state — is tearing.

Fear changes people. It changes how they live, how they think, and how they interact with others. It leads to withdrawal. Isolation. Mistrust. Over time, it breeds

resentment and bitterness. And when fear becomes permanent, it morphs into anger. This is what we're seeing in Canada now. Not just fear — but rage. A quiet, simmering fury among people who have played by the rules their whole lives and now feel betrayed. These are not extremists. They are parents, workers, taxpayers. And they are tired of being afraid.

Fear also erodes civic duty. People stop reporting crimes because they believe nothing will change. They stop voting because they feel no candidate represents their interests. They stop standing up for others because they don't want to become targets themselves. This retreat from public life is a silent surrender — and it is exactly what allows lawlessness to thrive. In time, fear kills nations. The good news is that fear, while powerful, can be overcome.

History shows that people will endure a great deal — but when fear turns to defiance, they rise. Canada is not yet lost. The spirit of the country remains, bruised but not broken. The question is whether citizens will continue to retreat — or whether they will choose to confront the lawlessness that now threatens to define their future. The first step is truth. Fear thrives in silence. Canadians must begin to speak honestly — in their communities, workplaces, and institutions — about what they are seeing and experiencing. They must reject the culture of shame and censorship that has paralyzed discourse.

The second step is demand. Politicians must be made to feel the pressure of a public that will no longer tolerate leniency, cowardice, or ideology over order. Police and prosecutors must be empowered — and expected — to act. The justice system must be rebuilt around the principles of deterrence, consequence, and protection of the innocent. Finally, there must be unity. Fear divides, but courage unites. Canadians from all walks of life — right, left, urban, rural, new arrivals and old stock — must come together around a shared demand: the restoration of law, order, and common sense. Canada was never meant to be a country ruled by fear. Its people are not cowards. But

years of betrayal, neglect, and ideological madness have led even the bravest among them to doubt the future. The fear is real — but it does not have to be final. The same spirit that built this country — the pioneering will, the moral clarity, the quiet strength of ordinary citizens — can still rescue it. But only if Canadians refuse to remain silent. Only if they refuse to allow fear to govern their lives. Only if they remember that freedom, once surrendered to fear, is never easily regained. Canada is not yet beyond saving, but fear cannot be its national anthem.

Chapter Two
Corruption – The Silent Epidemic

Moral corruption refers to the decay or erosion of ethical principles and values, leading to a departure from what is considered right and just. It can manifest as a decline in integrity, honesty, and fairness, affecting individuals, institutions, and even entire societies. In essence, moral corruption is a serious issue that can have far-reaching consequences for individuals and societies. Addressing it requires a multi-faceted approach that includes promoting ethical values, strengthening institutions, and holding individuals accountable for their actions.

Corruption now runs rampant throughout all of North America but for the past one hundred plus years, Canadians felt superior to Americans (and Mexicans) because their country was safer and more caring compared to the United States. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case now, both countries are awash in homelessness, drugs, crime and evil. This 'Dominion that is in Fear' can be found everywhere – from politics to influencers to business, even in and around the native community of Canada.

In 2023, Canada saw a two percent increase in the Crime Severity Index (CSI), marking the third consecutive year of increases. While violent crime rates remained relatively stable, non-violent crime contributed significantly to the overall increase. Police-reported crime rates in rural areas were higher than in urban areas, particularly for violent crime. Much study has been done of the comparative experience and policies of Canada with its southern neighbour the United States, and this is a topic of intense discussion within Canada.

Both Canada and the United States administer national Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) programs to analyze the national crime rates. To match the American category of

aggravated assault to the Canadian crime categories of attempted murder, assault level three aggravated assault, and assault level two weapons or bodily harmed should be combined. Sexual assaults in Canada and rape in the United States are not comparable due to significant definitional differences.

Historically, the violent crime rate in Canada was far lower than that of the U.S. For example, in the year 2000 the United States' rate for robberies was sixty-five percent higher, its rate for aggravated assault was more than double, and its murder rate was triple that of Canada. However, the rate of reported property crimes was similar in both nations between the 1980s-2000s. In 2006, the rates of vehicle theft were twenty-two percent higher in Canada than in the U.S.

A comparable violent crime rate between Canada and the United States would include homicide, aggravated assault, robbery. In 2022, homicide rate in Canada was 2.27 per 100,000, the aggravated assault rate (attempted murder, assault level 3, assault level 2) was 211.3 per 100,000 and the robbery rate was 56.5 per 100,000. In 2014 the homicide rate was 1.47 per 100,000 in 2014, the aggravated assault rate was 138.28 per 100,000 and the robbery rate was 59.07 per 100,000. The combined rate of the three offenses was in Canada was 270 per 100,000 in 2022 and 198 per 100,000 in 2014..In the US in 2022 the homicide rate was 6.3 per 100,000, the aggravated assaults rate was 273 per 100,000 and the robbery rate was 67.1 per 100,000. In the US between 2014 and 2022 the aggravated assault rate increased eighteen percent while the robbery rate declined by thirty-four percent. In the United States the combined rate of the three offenses was 346.6 per 100,000 in 2022 and 337.4 per 100,000 in 2014.

The homicide rate in Canada peaked in 1975 at 3.03 per 100,000 and has dropped since then; it reached lower peaks in 1985 (2.72) and 1991 (2.69). It reached a post-1970 low of 1.73 in 2003. The average murder rate between 1970 and 1976 was 2.52, between 1977 and 1983 it was 2.67, between 1984 and 1990 it was 2.41, between 1991 and 1997 it was 2.23 and between 1998 and 2004 it was 1.82. The attempted

homicide rate has fallen at a faster rate than the homicide rate. By comparison, the homicide rate in the U.S. reached 10.1 per 100,000 in 1974, peaked in 1980 at 10.7 and reached a lower peak in 1991 (10.5). The average murder rate between 1970 and 1976 was 9.4, between 1977 and 1983 it was 9.6, between 1984 and 1990 it was 9, between 1991 and 1997 it was 9.2 and between 1998 and 2004 it was 6.3. In 2004, the murder rate in the U.S. dipped below six per 100,000, for the first time since 1966, and as of 2010 stood at 4.8 per 100,000.

Canada once prided itself on being among the world's cleanest democracies — a place where government was transparent, the press free, and institutions governed by integrity. For decades, that image largely held. But today, the façade is cracking. Beneath the surface of politeness and bureaucracy, corruption in Canada is not only present — it is thriving. And not just in the shadows, but in plain sight. Unlike the blatant corruption found in authoritarian regimes or narco-states, Canada's corruption is more insidious. It is systemic, bureaucratic, and protected by the very institutions that are supposed to expose and correct it. It takes the form of unchecked government spending, opaque decision-making, lobbying influence, sweetheart contracts, compromised oversight bodies, and a media too often in bed with power. What makes Canadian corruption dangerous is not only its depth — but its normalization.

Scandals come and go — SNC-Lavalin, WE Charity, Arrive CAN, McKinsey contracts, Chinese electoral interference — and yet nobody is held accountable. Ethics commissioners slap wrists. Parliamentary inquiries drag on with no teeth. The RCMP, once a national symbol of discipline, now appears hesitant — even unwilling — to investigate those at the top. Public trust quietly dies with every unanswered question. Citizens watch as billions of dollars are handed to favored corporations without transparency. As friends and donors are appointed to key government positions. As taxpayer money is used to buy influence and silence dissent. And they are told it's all

“within the rules.” But what happens when the rules are designed to protect the corrupt, not expose them?

At the federal level, corruption has taken root in the very mechanisms of governance. Under the guise of progressive ideals, the federal government has built a vast ecosystem of funding, contracting, and grant-giving that is immune to public scrutiny. The billions spent annually through non-competitive contracts and opaque procurement schemes are not just inefficient — they are political weapons. Take the WE Charity scandal, where hundreds of millions in public money were handed to a politically connected charity to administer a student grant program. The charity had direct ties to (then) Prime Minister Trudeau’s family. When the scandal broke, it led to multiple investigations and public outcry — yet no criminal charges. The program was canceled, the charity shuttered its Canadian operations, and the government moved on.

Or the Arrive CAN app, a simple border-screening tool that ballooned into a fifty-four-million-dollar boondoggle — with contracts handed to consultants who subcontracted them again, many with little actual work to show. A federal investigation found the government failed at “even the most basic” procurement safeguards. Still, no one was fired. Meanwhile, SNC-Lavalin, a company convicted of corruption and bribery, lobbied for — and received — a deferred prosecution agreement, despite laws meant to prohibit exactly that. The Attorney General who resisted political interference was pushed out. The company? Still doing business with the government.

In each of these cases, the pattern is the same: corruption exposed, outrage stoked, committee summoned, and… nothing. No prosecutions. No consequences. Just the erosion of trust. Corruption is not limited to political offices — it seeps into the judicial system as well. While Canada claims to operate under the rule of law, many now question whether that law is equally applied. Prosecutorial discretion is increasingly politicized. High-profile cases involving government allies are often delayed, downgraded, or quietly dropped. Meanwhile, average citizens — particularly those who

challenge government narratives — face aggressive and often disproportionate legal responses.

Freedom Convoy organizers faced arrest, surveillance, asset freezes, and prolonged detention for peaceful protest — while violent repeat offenders walk free thanks to catch-and-release bail policies. Which is the greater threat to democracy?

Court rulings now frequently align with ideological lines rather than legal principle. Judges appointed by political friends. Legal arguments distorted to fit activist agendas. Federal prosecutors pursuing political goals rather than public interest. The public sees this — and loses faith in a system that once prided itself on neutrality.

Behind every major government decision in Canada, there is often a powerful lobbying force pulling the strings. Whether it's the banking sector, Big Tech, energy conglomerates, or pharmaceutical giants. These corporate actors wield immense influence over national policy — often through backchannels and advisory roles never disclosed to the public. During the pandemic, for instance, major contracts went to multinational consulting firms like McKinsey, with longstanding ties to senior government officials. Despite widespread criticism of their role in everything from public health planning to immigration strategy, the firm has continued to receive lucrative contracts — without competitive bids, oversight, or results.

Meanwhile, Canadian pension funds invest heavily in Chinese state-linked enterprises, oil ventures with poor human rights records, and corrupt infrastructure projects abroad — all while preaching "ethical investment" at home. Why? Because it pays. And because no one is watching. Canada's corruption is rarely about envelopes of cash under the table. It is about access, influence, and unearned privilege. It is systemic and self-reinforcing.

Perhaps most dangerous of all is the erosion of a free and critical press. In a healthy democracy, the media exists to challenge power, expose wrongdoing, and speak for the voiceless. In Canada today, much of the media has become part of the machine.

The federal government now funds most major news outlets — through programs like the six-hundred-million-dollar bailout for “trusted” media and payroll subsidies tied to government criteria. This isn’t support. It’s quiet control.

The result? Investigative journalism is disappearing. Government scandals are downplayed or ignored. Dissenting voices are demonized or deplatformed. Citizens no longer trust what they hear — because they sense, rightly, that the press is no longer speaking truth to power, but protecting it. Independent journalists are hounded, sued, or denied press credentials. Alternative platforms — whether Rebel News, True North, or independent Substack writers — are mocked and delegitimized. And Canadians are told there is only one “official” narrative. This is not transparency. It is media capture. And it feeds the broader ecosystem of corruption by silencing those who dare to expose it.

While political and corporate corruption grab headlines, the public sector itself has become a breeding ground for entrenched favoritism, waste, and quiet corruption — much of it shielded by bloated bureaucracy and the protection of powerful unions. Government departments and Crown corporations operate with layers of bureaucracy designed not to promote efficiency or serve the public — but to obscure accountability. Multi-million-dollar programs are rubber-stamped with little scrutiny. Internal whistleblowers are ignored, punished, or shuffled aside. Procurement contracts are awarded to friends, former colleagues, or companies that fail to deliver — often with no consequences. Performance is irrelevant; loyalty is rewarded. Federal and provincial public sector unions now function less like defenders of workers and more like political actors. Their leaders have deep ties to government power, often endorsing the very political parties responsible for bloated budgets, endless wage increases, and zero transparency.

The result? Billions in taxpayer dollars funneled into dysfunctional programs and inflated salaries while frontline services suffer. Corruption becomes bureaucratic —

invisible but widespread. The average Canadian sees deteriorating services, skyrocketing taxes, and collapsing infrastructure, yet no one ever seems to get fired or held accountable. How does a failing system become so well-protected? The answer lies in the alliance between public sector unions and political power — a cartel of self-interest that now runs many corners of Canadian governance.

Canada's cultural institutions, including its political and academic elite, have increasingly relied on identity politics as a shield — using race, gender, and ideology to deflect criticism and justify corruption. Question a flawed hiring process? You're "anti-diversity." Demand financial transparency. You're "attacking marginalized communities." Challenge the efficacy of government programs? You're "spreading disinformation" or labeled "far-right." In today's political Canada, dissent is no longer debated — it is demonized. Government-funded programs — often under the banners of "equity," "inclusion," or "anti-racism" — are now awarded based on ideological alignment rather than need or merit. Grants and contracts go to activist organizations with close ties to politicians. Accountability disappears under a smokescreen of virtue.

This ideological corruption not only enables financial waste — it suppresses criticism and creates a chilling effect. People are afraid to speak out, afraid to question, afraid to lose their jobs, reputations, or businesses. In such an environment, real corruption flourishes — because it wears the mask of social justice. Ironically, this has hurt the very communities these programs claim to help. Resources are diverted to bureaucracies, consultants, and insiders. Meanwhile, crime, poverty, and disillusionment grow in the margins.

Perhaps the most alarming facet of Canada's corruption crisis is the growing body of evidence suggesting foreign states — particularly China — have infiltrated Canadian institutions, elections, and public policy. Intelligence leaks and national security reports in recent years have revealed disturbing patterns: Chinese agents allegedly funded political campaigns, funneled money to candidates, and interfered in nomination races.

Chinese consulates in Canada have pressured Canadian citizens, intimidated diaspora communities, and used proxies to shape media and education. The Trudeau government ignored CSIS warnings about this interference for years — and in some cases, allegedly silenced those who raised alarms. Instead of launching a full criminal investigation, the government resisted calls for a public inquiry. Only under extreme pressure did it reluctantly appoint a figure to conduct a limited review — one widely criticized as lacking independence or seriousness. The message? Electoral integrity can be compromised, and Ottawa will look the other way. This is corruption on a national scale — a betrayal of sovereignty for political convenience. And the consequences are dire: if elections can be influenced from abroad, democracy becomes a façade.

In theory, Canada has many oversight bodies — ethics commissioners, ombudsmen, parliamentary committees, the RCMP, internal audit departments, and even the Auditor General. But increasingly, these institutions are paralyzed by politics, underfunded, or simply ignored. When the Ethics Commissioner finds a violation, there are no consequences — only carefully worded reports. When the Auditor General uncovers billions in unexplained spending, the government responds with talking points, not prosecutions. When parliamentary committees demand documents or testimony, ministers dodge, redact, and delay.

Even the RCMP, once revered, has become deeply politicized — slow to investigate government corruption and often complicit in looking the other way. The Mounties have refused or failed to prosecute multiple federal scandals, including SNC-Lavalin, the WE Charity affair, and Arrive CAN, citing “lack of evidence” or “ongoing reviews.” Oversight has become a charade — a performance for the cameras that leads nowhere. Real accountability has vanished. Canadians see this and quietly conclude that the system is rigged — because it is.

One of the strangest features of Canada’s descent into corruption is the cultural attitude of its people. Canadians, long conditioned to trust authority, are now some of

the least likely citizens in the developed world to confront corruption or demand accountability.

Why? Partly, it's the legacy of politeness — the belief that "things aren't that bad" or that "it's worse elsewhere." But increasingly, it's also fear – fear of being shamed, sued, cancelled, or arrested for speaking out. Dissent is punished socially and economically. Whistleblowers are labeled extremists. And political critics are targeted by the same institutions they criticize. In such an environment, corruption wins. It wins because good people stay silent. Because institutions protect themselves. Because too few are willing to sacrifice comfort for truth.

Canadians today are afraid — and that fear has allowed corruption to metastasize like a cancer through every organ of national life. The rise of corruption in Canada is not just a failure of ethics — it is a systemic collapse of democratic integrity. Institutions meant to serve the public now serve themselves. Watchdogs are muzzled. The media is bought. The courts are politicized. Elections are suspect. And the public is pacified. This is not an aberration. It is the new normal — and it is dangerous.

The cost is more than financial. It is spiritual. it is cultural. It is the erosion of trust, the rise of fear, and the acceptance of injustice as unchangeable. But corruption cannot thrive forever in a healthy society. If Canadians choose to confront it — to pull back the curtain and demand accountability — it can be beaten. But that requires courage. It requires truth. And it requires ordinary citizens refusing to be silent. Corruption thrives in darkness. Only light can kill it.

Chapter Three
Media keeps The Phoney Narrative Running

During a press conference in West Kelowna in August 2025, a reporter told the prime minister that the recent Peachland wildfire reminded local outlets how important it is to be able to share information "quickly and effectively". "Bill C-18 stands in our way to get back onto Facebook and Instagram," he lamented. When asked further whether the Liberals were looking to rescind the Bill or an alternative to get news back on those important platforms, Carney replied that, "one of the roles of CBC/Radio-Canada *is to provide unbiased, immediate local information," particularly when it comes to situations such as that which residents of Peachland found themselves in.*

There is no institution that shapes public opinion more overwhelmingly than the media. In Canada, the mainstream press has long been viewed as a pillar of democratic society — a neutral unbiased force tasked with informing the public, challenging the powerful, and holding institutions to account. But this view is no longer credible especially when it comes to the CBC – despite Prime Minister Carney's rhetoric in West Kelowna in the summer of 2025.

Canada's media landscape has undergone a radical transformation in recent years. What once claimed to be independent journalism has now evolved — or devolved — into a culture of conformity, protectionism, and ideological narrative control. Instead of holding the powerful to account, major outlets now protect those in power, often through omission, distortion, or strategic silence. The result is a Canadian media ecosystem that manufactures fear, amplifies lawlessness by denying it, and consistently promotes a worldview steeped in left-of-center ideology. It no longer informs — it

conditions. It no longer investigates — it campaigns. And in doing so, it has become a central contributor to Canada's ongoing national decline.

For decades, Canada's media operated with a healthy degree of skepticism toward government. Newspapers like the Globe and Mail, the National Post, and Maclean's magazine once published hard-hitting investigations, thoughtful dissent, and cultural critiques that ranged across the political spectrum. CBC was trusted by many, despite its public funding, because it carried a reputation for balance — or at least a diversity of voices. But something changed. Around the turn of the millennium — and accelerating rapidly after 2015 — Canadian journalism (including television and radio news) shifted away from independence and toward alignment with government priorities, especially those of the Liberal Party. This was not merely a change in tone. It was structural.

Today, many of the country's largest outlets are functionally subsidized by the federal government, directly or indirectly and small newspapers (many who have given up and folded) no longer cover local councils or produce editorials that keep elected official's feet to the fire, so to speak. With hundreds of millions in taxpayer bailouts, grants, and payroll subsidies now propping up newsrooms, the line between journalism and state messaging has blurred beyond recognition. This shift has destroyed the adversarial relationship necessary for a functioning democracy. When journalists are paid by the state, can they truly investigate it? When opinion editors are ideologically aligned with those in power, can they challenge abuses of that power? The answer is increasingly clear — and it is "no".

In 2019, the Trudeau government announced a controversial six-hundred-million-dollar media bailout package. Marketed as a lifeline for "trusted journalism", it was framed as a noble defense against the disruptive power of social media and the collapse of print revenue. But in practice, it was a form of media capture. The program allowed the government to designate which newsrooms were "qualified" for subsidies — based

on opaque criteria. This created a chilling incentive: toe the line or lose funding. Soon after, payroll rebates were introduced for newsrooms that met the government's definition of "independent journalism." This further entrenched dependence on Ottawa for survival. The result is that hundreds of newsrooms across the country now owe their very existence to the same political party they are tasked with covering. They do not bite the hand that feeds them. Instead, they shape narratives that favor their benefactors.

It is no coincidence that media (especially the so-called media pundits) coverage of Liberal scandals — from SNC-Lavalin to WE Charity, from the Arrive CAN debacle to Chinese election interference — has been watered down, delayed, or framed in ways that minimize government culpability. Likewise**,** issues that contradict the dominant progressive worldview — rising crime, judicial failure, immigration overload, and public disorder — are often ignored or minimized, lest they contradict the government's messaging. This is not journalism – this is public relations — paid for with public money.

The decline of journalistic independence is not only about money — it's also about ideology. Today's Canadian media landscape is overwhelmingly staffed by individuals who share a broadly progressive worldview. Surveys of journalists consistently show strong support for left-of-center policies: pro-government spending, pro-globalism, anti-policing, pro-censorship in the name of "safety," and unwavering support for social justice movements. These views are not inherently illegitimate — in a healthy media ecosystem, diversity of thought is essential. But what's troubling is the uniformity of thought that now dominates most Canadian newsrooms.

Alternative viewpoints are often excluded not through debate, but through omission. Voices that challenge the progressive consensus — whether on gender ideology, immigration policy, crime statistics, or government overreach — are simply not given a platform. They are labeled "fringe," "far-right," "disinformation," or "unsafe." This ideological conformity creates an echo chamber in which journalists do

not question whether certain policies are working — they assume they are and dismiss any critics as morally suspect. For example: When violent crime spikes, the media blames “inequality” or “mental health” but avoids discussing lenient sentencing, open borders, or police defunding. When citizens protest government mandates or express economic despair, they are portrayed as “dangerous extremists,” rather than desperate Canadians with legitimate grievances. When immigration or housing policy fails, reporters highlight anecdotes of immigrant struggle rather than systemic mismanagement or demographic strain.

This bias is not always overt. Often, it is subtle — a matter of what stories get covered, what gets ignored, and how issues are framed. And over time, it shapes the national consciousness. Canadians come to accept dysfunction as normal. They believe they are isolated in their concerns. And they become more passive — more afraid.

In a healthy society, journalism is supposed to calm public panic by presenting facts, offering context, and separating real threats from imagined ones. In Canada, the reverse has become true: fear is stoked, amplified, and used as a weapon — often by the very media outlets tasked with protecting truth. Whether it’s pandemics, protests, climate anxiety, or political opposition, the media increasingly engages in sensationalism aimed not at informing Canadians, but at alarming them. This isn’t accidental. Fear drives clicks and boosts ratings. And most importantly, fear consolidates power — by justifying state intervention, emergency powers, and sweeping legislation that would never pass under calmer conditions.

A few recent examples illustrate this trend: During the COVID-19 pandemic, Canadian media largely functioned as an arm of the public health bureaucracy. Rather than investigating the science, questioning lockdown policy, or platforming dissenting experts, major outlets adopted a stance of rigid compliance. Fear-mongering became routine: Death tolls were prominently displayed, while survival rates were buried. Critics of mandates, vaccine passports, or school closures were demonized as “anti-science” or

“conspiratorial.” Protests like the Freedom Convoy were portrayed not as working-class grievances, but as existential threats to democracy.

The goal wasn’t nuance. It was moral panic — and it worked. Canadians were convinced to accept some of the most draconian policies in the Western world — all under the illusion of consensus manufactured by a media apparatus that refused to question the government’s evolving narrative.

Canada’s mainstream media has also played a leading role in spreading climate panic, often at the expense of balanced reporting. While climate change is a serious issue, the media has leaned heavily into apocalyptic language, framing Canada as on the brink of destruction unless radical carbon policies are adopted — despite Canada’s minuscule share of global emissions and vast natural resources. Energy development, especially oil and gas, is almost universally framed as “dirty,” “dangerous,” and “colonial,” with little attention paid to its economic necessity or geopolitical value. This has contributed to policies that undermine Alberta’s prosperity, drive up national inflation, and increase dependence on foreign oil. Again, fear is the lever — and ideology replaces inquiry.

As stated in a previous chapter, cities like Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal, and Winnipeg, crime and disorder have surged in recent years: stabbings on transit, random assaults, violent carjackings, open-air drug use, and gang activity are now the norm. Yet for a long time, the media refused to connect these outcomes to actual causes: weak bail policies, underfunded police, liberal prosecutors, and federal justice reform. Instead, coverage focused on abstract root causes: poverty, trauma, or systemic racism. This removed individual responsibility and downplayed public risk. Victims were mentioned only in passing. Criminals were humanized or anonymized.

Only once the evidence became overwhelming — and public outrage impossible to ignore — did media begin reporting on the wave of lawlessness. Even then, the framing often blunted the truth: “Experts say fear is rising, even though crime stats

remain stable." "Community advocates warn that increased policing could worsen the problem." This approach both denies reality and patronizes readers. It tells Canadians not to trust their own eyes — and certainly not their fears. In doing so, the media gaslights the population, encouraging passivity and eroding trust.

As the media helps manufacture fear and uphold ideological orthodoxy, the federal government has taken steps to cement that control through digital regulation. In recent years, Ottawa has introduced multiple laws that directly impact free expression in Canada — all with the enthusiastic support of major media organizations. This law gives the CRTC power to regulate online streaming content — including user-generated material on platforms like YouTube, Spotify, and Netflix — under the pretext of promoting "Canadian content." In practice, it allows government-appointed bureaucrats to manipulate digital algorithms, suppressing content that doesn't align with official narratives. Independent creators and dissenting voices — many of whom gained followings during the pandemic or by critiquing government policy — risk being de-ranked, shadow banned or denied visibility entirely.

This law forces tech platforms like Google and Meta to pay Canadian media outlets for linking to their news content. While framed as support for journalism, the real effect is to artificially prop up legacy outlets while punishing platforms that give space to independent reporting. When Meta responded by banning Canadian news links entirely, media and government cried foul — revealing the law's true purpose: not to protect journalism, but to control it. By reducing Canadians' access to news outside the mainstream, the law strengthens the narrative monopoly of establishment media.

The Canadian government was also preparing legislation to regulate "online harms," which will likely include mechanisms to target "hate speech," "disinformation," and undefined "harmful content." Critics — including civil liberties groups — warn this will create a quasi-censorship regime, allowing government agencies to police speech, shut down dissenting accounts, and criminalize unpopular views. Canadian media has

offered little to no resistance to these developments. In many cases, they actively cheerlead them — positioning themselves as the gatekeepers of “truth” and “safety.”

The result of all this — the bias, fearmongering, censorship, and ideological enforcement — is a country where many citizens no longer trust what they read, see, or hear. Public trust in Canadian media is plummeting. A 2023 Reuters Institute report found that only thirty-seven per cent of Canadians said they trust the news — a dramatic fall from just a decade earlier. Among younger audiences, the numbers are even lower. This erosion of trust fuels alienation and social fragmentation: Citizens become afraid to speak honestly, fearing reputational damage or cancellation. Skeptics of government policy retreat into self-censorship or online anonymity. Populist movements grow, not because they are inherently radical, but because mainstream outlets refuse to represent legitimate concerns.

In effect, the media — once a unifying force — has become a divisive and destabilizing one. At its best, media can help build a sense of shared nationhood — offering Canadians from all backgrounds a coherent vision of what the country stands for. But over the last two decades, much of Canadian media has played a very different role: not building Canada up but breaking it down. The notion of a shared identity rooted in Western values — individual freedom, rule of law, meritocracy, civic order — is increasingly treated with skepticism or outright disdain in major media outlets. In its place, we are offered a patchwork of grievances, victimhood, and perpetual guilt. This is clearest in how legacy media reports on Canadian history:

- The nation’s founding principles are framed as colonial and oppressive
- Historical figures are judged exclusively by modern progressive standards
- National holidays are reinterpreted through the lens of shame

Canada Day itself has, in recent years, been openly questioned by prominent media voices, who view celebration of the country as a form of moral insensitivity. A media ecosystem that relentlessly promotes guilt and division can only deepen the

cultural disorientation many Canadians now feel. This self-destruction has a purpose: to delegitimize traditional Canadian values, and replace them with a globalized, progressive ideology that sees patriotism, border control, and national identity as outdated or even dangerous.

Perhaps the most dangerous role Canadian media plays today is its commitment to delegitimizing dissent. In a healthy democracy, media should facilitate debate, tolerate heterodox views, and hold the ruling class accountable. In today's Canada, however, media increasingly acts as an enforcer of ideological purity. Those who challenge dominant narratives on race, gender, climate, immigration, COVID, or Indigenous affairs are routinely: Labeled as "far-right," "anti-science," "racist," "transphobic," or "climate deniers." They are denied media appearances or publication opportunities and are subject to public shaming, doxxing, and cancellation

This isn't just cultural — it's systemic. Journalists who ask the wrong questions are fired. Independent outlets face algorithmic suppression. University professors and columnists are hounded out of their professions for uttering opinions that were mainstream just ten years ago.

The result is a national conversation dominated not by reasoned disagreement, but by fear of reprisal. In this environment, most citizens learn to self-censor — especially those outside of elite urban bubbles. They may grumble privately, or vote against progressive candidates, but they know that public opposition comes at a steep price. The chilling effect is real. And it's dangerous. Because when people can no longer speak freely, they don't become more tolerant — they become more alienated, more resentful, and more willing to disengage from civic life altogether.

Amid this decay, however, a counter trend is emerging: the rise of independent Canadian media. Disillusioned with the ideological lockstep of legacy outlets, many journalists, thinkers, and citizens have turned to alternative platforms: Substack newsletters, YouTube channels, podcasts, and crowdfunded websites. These outlets

often lack the resources or institutional clout of the CBC or CTV — but they offer something far more valuable: truth-telling. Names like Rupa Subramanya, Rex Murphy (sadly, no longer with us), Jordan Peterson, Andrew Lawton, Diane Francis and Tara Henley became voices of opposition. So too have organizations like True North, The Hub, Western Standard, The Post Millennial, and Rebel News (despite its polarizing style). Though often attacked as "fringe," these platforms provide space for stories the mainstream media refuses to touch:

- The failures of multiculturalism and unchecked immigration
- The cost of climate policy on rural and working-class Canadians
- Rising urban crime and the consequences of weak bail systems
- Cancel culture and the erosion of academic freedom

Crucially, independent outlets survive not on government handouts, but on reader support. This makes them more accountable to their audiences — and more willing to challenge sacred cows. In a media landscape tilted hard to the left, this counterbalance is essential. And it's growing. Reclaiming a healthy, honest Canadian media will not be easy. The institutional rot is very deep. The incentives for fear, conformity, and ideological capture are powerful. But the alternative — continued decline into mistrust, division, and chaos — is worse.

A few key reforms are needed - a free press cannot be truly free if it's funded by the same politicians it's meant to scrutinize. The federal government should terminate all media subsidies, including bailouts, tax credits, and the $1.4 billion a year CBC budget. Let the market decide what journalism deserves to survive. Let Canadians vote with their wallets, not through forced redistribution. Laws like Bill C-11 and Bill C-18 must be repealed or radically revised. Canadians should have the right to access news freely, and creators should not be subject to state-approved algorithms or bureaucratic control.

Any future law regulating online speech must be tightly limited and overseen by independent courts — not partisan ministries. Instead of enforcing conformity, the media should embrace true diversity — not just of race or gender, but of thought, ideology, and perspective. This means hiring conservative voices, publishing counter arguments, and resisting the urge to blacklist opinions simply because they are unpopular with elite urban audiences. Canadians should be taught how to analyze bias, spot manipulation, and seek out multiple sources. This isn't about conspiracy thinking — it's about building an informed citizenry capable of thinking critically in the face of agenda-driven journalism.

The Canadian media once played a proud role in shaping a free and open society. Today, it risks becoming the tool of the very forces undermining that freedom. By promoting fear, sanitizing lawlessness, and silencing dissent, it is helping steer the nation into cultural disarray and democratic decline. Canadians are not well-informed — they are well-managed. And yet, all is not lost. The hunger for truth remains. The rise of independent voices proves that ordinary Canadians are still willing to fight for clarity, sanity, and justice.

But time is short. And the stakes are high. For Canada to regain its footing, its media must be reclaimed — not by bureaucrats, not by billionaires, and not by ideologues, but by the people themselves. Only then can the silence be broken. Only then can the fear be lifted. Only then can the truth be once again heard.

A minor source for this chapter was courtesy of Western Standards, J. Jager.

Chapter Four

Indigenous - Government Relations Are Shaping Fear

Okanagan Falls will be the first community in British Columbia to incorporate since the province adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) in 2019. This means this process will take place within a transformed political landscape. The legislation specifically states that Indigenous people have the right to "designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons." Chief Clarence Louie of the Osoyoos Indian Band according to a CBC article, said name changes are an important step and are long overdue.

"Okanagan Falls is an important site for our people, we had a reserve there, no one can deny that, and name changes are happening in this country," he said. The chief also disagreed that renaming Okanagan Falls should be a decision for the new mayor and council. "When it comes to reconciliation and land claims and Indigenous people having rights, those aren't up for a vote," he said.

As incredible as the above statement seems, it gets even wilder over in Ontario with the Mohawk Council of Kahnawake in August 2025 saying it might put tolls on roads that run through their reservation. The Mohawk Council of Kahnawake said that it is looking at imposing tolls on the roads crossing its territory in response to looming federal budget cuts. Grand Chief Cody Diabo told reporters the tolls could help offset the impact of cuts to federal departments, including Indigenous Services Canada.

Finance Minister François-Philippe Champagne sent letters earlier that summer to multiple ministers asking them to cut program spending at their departments by 7.5 per cent next spring (2026), ten per cent the year after and fifteen per cent in 2028-29.

Diabo said cutting the services provided to Indigenous people through Indigenous Services Canada, while transfer payments to the province are left untouched, amounts to “racialized austerity.” “Canada cannot claim a commitment to reconciliation while cutting the very services that support our communities,” he told reporters in the Mohawk community south of Montreal. “These cuts will deepen inequities in housing, health care, education, public safety, and more, while also undermining Canada's legal obligation under Section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.”

Section 15 promises every individual's right to equal protection under the law without discrimination. Diabo said his council is looking at implementing tolls on major highways where he says approximately 120,000 vehicles pass through daily.

He said details of the plan would be announced at a later date, but that the roads being considered include Routes 138 and 132 – both major highways used by people who commute to and from Montreal and its South Shore. He said tolls could be close to five dollars, which is the rate charged by nearby Auto-route 30. He said Kahnawake also includes a seaway and rail line and did not rule out eventually imposing more tolls.

And to add woe to injury, if the decision of a landmark Aboriginal title claim (August 2025) by the Cowichan Nation stands, according to B.C. Attorney General Niki Sharma, the case could have "significant unintended consequences" for private property rights in the province, and the government would appeal the ruling.

That's no surprise to Robin Junger, a lawyer with McMillan LLP focused on an Indigenous and environmental law. He said if the decision stands it will have “massive implications” and “could undermine the whole system of land ownership in British Columbia.” “Although the court was only asked to give a ‘declaration’ in relation to lands held by the City of Richmond and the Government of Canada, the reasoning of the court isn't limited to those lands,” he said. Junger said he believes the decision would likely be overturned on appeal and go all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada.

He said if he were a property owner he would not panic. Junger said a judge only goes by what parties argue in a case, adding he believes there are “reasonable grounds to pursue” an appeal on the key question of whether B.C. extinguished Aboriginal title when it issued private fee simple land titles, and whether it had the authority to do so. “If you look very closely at the decision, you'll see that the B.C. government, and in fact the Government of Canada, did not argue that these rights were extinguished. They declined to make that argument. Only the City of Richmond made that argument,” he said. “So, I think there's a lot of fertile ground to follow on an appeal, and we'll see where it lands.”

To understand why Indigenous-government relations contribute to fear and confusion today, one must confront both the historical grievances that continue to drive activism and the structural legal framework that allows for frequent and high-profile clashes. These grievances have evolved Canada into three very distinct societies, Quebec, English Canada and now Native Canada. All three sides have become vey fearful of each other. Equally important is the role of modern political strategy, in which Indigenous issues become tools for ideological positioning, and the influence of media narratives that often magnify the most disruptive or confrontational moments. In combination, these elements create a situation where fear — of unrest, of economic disruption, of social fragmentation — becomes part of the Canadian political climate.

It is impossible to examine the present without acknowledging the weight of the past. Canada’s relationship with its Indigenous peoples is rooted in centuries of contested territory, shifting alliances, and uneven treaties. From the earliest days of European settlement, Indigenous nations were regarded as distinct political entities, capable of negotiating agreements and, in some cases, waging war. This recognition formed the basis of treaties — solemn agreements that were meant to guarantee certain rights in perpetuity, such as land use, hunting, and fishing rights, in exchange for peace or the cession of certain territories.

However, the promises embedded in many of these treaties were broken, altered, or reinterpreted by successive governments. Lands were expropriated without consent, resources were exploited without fair compensation, and the Indian Act (first passed in 1876) imposed a rigid, paternalistic framework that sought to assimilate rather than empower. Residential schools — a system designed to eradicate Indigenous cultures and languages — left deep scars that persist through generations. These injustices are not ancient history; many affected individuals are alive today, and the intergenerational trauma continues to shape community dynamics.

In this historical context, distrust of federal and provincial authorities is not merely ideological — it is grounded in lived experience and collective memory. This deep-seated mistrust has fueled activism that is often uncompromising, and in some cases deliberately confrontational. While the Canadian public may see a railway blockade or a halted pipeline as a sudden act of defiance, for many Indigenous activists, these actions are the latest chapter in a centuries-long struggle for survival and sovereignty.

Yet this history also creates a powerful moral shield for certain modern actions, making them politically and legally more difficult to challenge. Governments, aware of their own historical culpability, often tread carefully — sometimes to the point of inaction — when Indigenous protests occur. Court orders to dismantle blockades may be issued, but law enforcement agencies are often reluctant to act, citing the need to avoid escalation or potential violence. This restraint, while perhaps justified in certain contexts, also reinforces a perception among the general public that some groups can defy Canadian law with impunity.

The resulting dynamic is a combustible one: Indigenous communities feel justified in using direct action to assert rights they believe have been ignored for generations, while many non-Indigenous Canadians perceive these actions as a threat to public order and economic stability. This mutual suspicion becomes fertile ground for

fear — not just fear of physical confrontation, but fear of a nation unable to reconcile its own governance with its foundational promises.

Canada is, in theory, a single sovereign (Dominion) nation governed by one Constitution and bound by one overarching legal system. In practice, however, there exists a parallel legal and political reality: Indigenous nations asserting sovereignty within their territories, often supported by constitutional recognition and affirmed in Supreme Court rulings. This duality — Canada's jurisdiction versus Indigenous self-government — creates fertile ground for confusion, inconsistent enforcement, and public mistrust.

The 1982 Constitution Act formally recognized and affirmed "existing Aboriginal and treaty rights," but it did not clearly define the boundaries or practical application of those rights. Subsequent court cases, such as Delgamuukw v. British Columbia (1997) and Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia (2014), have reinforced the principle that Indigenous title to land can exist even without formal treaties, granting significant leverage in disputes over development and land use. While these rulings were intended to clarify matters, they often left substantial legal grey areas — particularly regarding the extent of federal and provincial authority on unceded lands.

In many situations, Canadian courts issue injunctions to end protests or blockades, yet police (as previously mentioned) hesitate to enforce them when Indigenous sovereignty is invoked. This is not simply a matter of officers ignoring their duties; it reflects a real legal uncertainty over jurisdiction. If an action takes place on land claimed by an Indigenous nation, and that nation's leaders assert self-governing authority, enforcement becomes a political act as much as a legal one. Officers know that a misstep could trigger accusations of violating treaty rights or even spark a national crisis.

The result is a selective and inconsistent application of law. Ordinary Canadians see rail lines blocked for weeks, highways closed, or work camps evacuated — with little

visible intervention from authorities. In a society that values predictability in governance, such selective enforcement erodes public trust. The perception emerges that Canada has, in effect, multiple overlapping sovereignties (dominions) operating in competition, each with its own interpretation of rights and responsibilities.

This legal duality also has a chilling effect on investment and infrastructure planning. Companies seeking to build pipelines, mines, or hydroelectric projects face not only the formal regulatory process but also the unpredictable variable of Indigenous consent — consent which may not be unified even within a single community. A project might receive approval from an elected band council, only to be blocked by hereditary chiefs claiming legitimate governance under traditional law. Canadian courts may rule on the matter, but enforcement remains uncertain, as the moral and political weight of Indigenous sovereignty can override practical governance in the public eye.

For the average Canadian, this complexity is rarely explained in detail. Instead, they see what appears to be paralysis: governments unwilling to act decisively, police reluctant to enforce court orders, and disputes dragging on for months or years. This uncertainty fuels both fear and cynicism. Fear, because it suggests the rule of law is negotiable depending on who is involved; cynicism, because it creates the impression that Canada's leaders are more concerned with optics than with equal application of justice.

In short, the co-existence of Canadian sovereignty and Indigenous sovereignty — while legally acknowledged — is operationally unresolved. Without clear, mutually accepted boundaries, this dual system will continue to produce flashpoints where enforcement stalls, tempers flare, and the public's confidence in national stability erodes further.

If historical grievances and competing sovereignties form the backdrop, then resource disputes are the stage where these tensions explode into national crises. Canada's economy is heavily dependent on natural resources — oil, gas, minerals,

timber, and fisheries. Much of this activity takes place on or near lands claimed by Indigenous nations, including territories never ceded by treaty. The collision between economic imperatives and Indigenous land rights has produced some of the most disruptive and visible confrontations in recent Canadian history.

One of the most emblematic examples is the conflict surrounding pipeline projects, particularly the Coastal GasLink pipeline in British Columbia. While the project had agreements with twenty elected First Nations band councils along the route, it faced fierce opposition from Wet'suwet'en hereditary chiefs, who argued that they held ultimate authority over traditional lands. This internal divide within the community — elected versus hereditary leadership — gave rise to prolonged blockades of rail lines, highways, and construction access roads in early 2020. These blockades halted freight and passenger rail service across large portions of the country, costing millions of dollars daily and disrupting supply chains from agriculture to manufacturing.

The public reaction was sharply divided. Supporters of the protests framed them as legitimate acts of resistance against environmental harm and colonial imposition. Opponents saw them as acts of economic sabotage, holding the entire country hostage over a local dispute. The government's response — extended negotiations, hesitant law enforcement, and eventual partial clearance — did little to reassure either side. To many observers, it appeared that Canada was incapable of protecting its own economic arteries when challenged by determined protest action.

The fisheries disputes in Atlantic Canada present a similar pattern. In 2020, tensions flared when Mi'kmaq fishers began operating a "moderate livelihood" lobster fishery outside the federally regulated season, citing treaty rights affirmed by the Supreme Court's Marshall decision (1999). Non-Indigenous fishers, arguing the move threatened lobster stocks and violated conservation rules, responded with protests and, in some cases, acts of intimidation and violence. The federal government's reluctance to enforce regulations against either side — for fear of escalating into wider conflict — left

the situation festering. The episode reinforced the perception that when Indigenous rights collide with federal law, the result is often regulatory paralysis.

Mining and forestry disputes follow a similar pattern. Projects like the Ring of Fire mineral development in northern Ontario or logging in Clayoquot Sound have become symbols of competing visions for Canada's future: one driven by resource extraction and economic growth, the other rooted in environmental stewardship and Indigenous sovereignty. These conflicts are often further complicated by overlapping claims among Indigenous communities themselves, as well as by non-Indigenous environmental groups aligning with certain factions.

The stakes in these disputes are not abstract. Delays or cancellations of major projects translate into lost jobs, reduced tax revenues, and diminished investor confidence. Even when projects proceed, the uncertainty created by potential protests, legal challenges, or blockades increases costs and risk premiums. For a resource-dependent country like Canada, such instability in the economic sector can ripple outward, affecting everything from commodity prices to national GDP.

What is perhaps most damaging is the pattern: each major resource dispute tends to follow the same script — legal ambiguity, divided leadership, symbolic blockades, hesitant enforcement, prolonged negotiations, and partial or temporary resolutions. The repetition of this cycle has conditioned both Indigenous activists and government officials to expect stalemate as the default outcome. For the broader public, the cumulative effect is one of weariness and declining confidence in Canada's ability to make and enforce decisions that balance rights, environmental concerns, and economic needs.

In this way, economic flashpoints do more than stall projects; they become demonstrations of the fragility of national unity. When essential infrastructure can be halted for weeks or months with minimal intervention, it sends a message — both

domestically and internationally — that Canada's economic stability is vulnerable to political and legal deadlock.

In any democratic society, the media acts as both mirror and magnifier — reflecting events back to the public while also shaping how those events are understood. In the case of Indigenous-government conflicts in Canada, this dual role has often amplified public fear and confusion. The reality of these disputes is complex, but complexity does not always translate well into headlines or ninety second news clips. The result is a pattern in which dramatic moments — burning barricades, police standoffs, politicians under fire — dominate the public imagination, while the slower, more nuanced legal and political processes fade into obscurity.

Canadian media coverage of Indigenous issues tends to swing between two poles: sympathetic focus on historical injustice or sensationalized depictions of confrontation. Both can distort public perception when presented without sufficient context. On one hand, human-interest stories about community struggles, residential school survivors, or environmental defenders can foster understanding but may gloss over internal divisions or legal ambiguities. On the other, coverage of blockades, clashes with police, or economic disruption can make these events seem like sudden eruptions of lawlessness rather than the culmination of long-standing disputes.

This imbalance is exacerbated by the modern media ecosystem. Social media platforms reward emotionally charged content — images of RCMP officers in tactical gear or activists chaining themselves to equipment spread rapidly, often stripped of the background details necessary for informed judgment. The speed of online discourse pressures traditional news outlets to report events in real time, which can lead to incomplete or even inaccurate narratives taking hold before all facts are known.

The framing of these stories also reflects broader ideological divides in the media landscape. Left-leaning outlets often emphasize the moral legitimacy of Indigenous resistance and downplay its economic costs, while right-leaning commentators highlight

the economic damage and question the government's willingness to enforce the law. This polarization means that Canadians consuming different media sources can emerge with entirely different understandings of the same event — one seeing it as a fight for justice, the other as a collapse of order.

For the average Canadian, the lack of consistent, fact-driven reporting creates a persistent sense of uncertainty. They may not know whether a blockade is lawful under treaty rights, whether a court injunction has been issued, or whether the government is negotiating in good faith. This uncertainty feeds the broader climate of confusion: if the media cannot provide a clear and agreed-upon account of events, how can the public have confidence in the institutions managing them?

Moreover, the repetition of certain visual tropes — barricades across highways, masked protesters facing off against police, ministers holding urgent press conferences — conditions the public to associate Indigenous activism with confrontation. Even when protests are peaceful or solutions are reached, these images linger longer in public memory than the quieter moments of dialogue and compromise. This persistent visual shorthand fuels fear: fear of disruption, fear of escalating tensions, fear that Canada's supposedly stable governance can be brought to a standstill by groups operating outside the conventional political system.

The media, intentionally or not, thus plays a significant role in magnifying the perception that Canada is teetering between competing sovereignties, each ready to paralyze the other. And in politics, perception can be as destabilizing as reality. While much public discourse frames Indigenous communities as unified entities speaking with one voice, the reality is far more complicated. Like any political body, Indigenous nations contain diverse perspectives, competing priorities, and disputes over leadership and governance. These internal divisions — often invisible to the broader public until they erupt into open conflict — can intensify national disputes and contribute to the climate of fear and confusion in Canada.

One of the central challenges is the co-existence of two governance systems: the elected band councils established under the federal Indian Act and traditional hereditary leadership structures. Band councils, typically elected every two years, control the administration of federally funded programs and services on reserves. Hereditary chiefs, in contrast, derive their authority from pre-colonial governance systems and often hold sway over traditional territories beyond the boundaries of the reserves themselves.

This dual system can produce situations in which two legitimate authorities within the same nation take opposing positions on major issues. The Wet'suwet'en pipeline dispute is the most widely known recent example: while the elected councils signed agreements with the pipeline company, several hereditary chiefs opposed the project, claiming jurisdiction over unceded lands. Both sides claimed to represent the legitimate will of the people, and the Canadian government found itself unable — or unwilling — to declare one authority as decisive.

Leadership disputes are not confined to hereditary-versus-elected tensions. In some communities, allegations of corruption, nepotism, and financial mismanagement have undermined trust in local governance. Federal audits and investigative journalism have, over the years, revealed cases where band funds — often derived from lucrative resource agreements — were misused or distributed in ways that benefited leadership circles disproportionately. While such problems exist in all forms of government, the small size and close-knit nature of many communities can make these disputes particularly bitter and highly personal.

These internal governance issues become national problems when they intersect with resource development or land rights disputes. For companies and governments seeking to negotiate agreements, the question of "who speaks for the community" can become a legal and logistical nightmare. Agreements made with one faction may be rejected by another, leading to blockades, protests, or litigation. Even when a project

appears to have broad support, a determined minority faction can derail it by appealing to treaty rights or traditional governance authority.

To outside observers, this often looks like inconsistency or bad faith. Canadians see agreements signed and then seemingly undone, court rulings made and then ignored, commitments given and then withdrawn. This unpredictability feeds the perception that Indigenous leadership operates by its own rules, unbound by the kind of finality expected in Western legal systems.

At the same time, criticism of Indigenous governance is politically fraught. Governments and media outlets tread carefully to avoid being accused of undermining Indigenous self-determination or perpetuating colonial attitudes. While such caution is understandable given Canada's historical record, it can also mean that legitimate concerns about governance and accountability go unaddressed. For many Canadians, the result is a sense that there is one standard of transparency and responsibility for their own elected officials, and a different, less clear standard for Indigenous governments.

In combination with historical grievances, jurisdictional disputes, and resource conflicts, these internal governance challenges create a layered and often intractable problem. They also ensure that the fear and confusion surrounding Indigenous-government relations are not solely the product of external forces — they can be generated from within.

In Canada's political arena, Indigenous issues are not just matters of justice, law, or historical obligation — they are potent tools for shaping public opinion, rallying voter bases, and undermining opponents. The complexity and moral weight of Indigenous-government relations make them particularly vulnerable to political exploitation. Politicians at both the federal and provincial levels know that these disputes evoke strong emotional responses, and they often tailor their positions not for resolution, but for political advantage.

At the federal level, governments of different stripes have alternated between public declarations of reconciliation and the quiet perpetuation of policies that maintain the status quo. Campaign promises to “renew nation-to-nation relationships” or “implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” are easy to make but far harder to deliver, especially when they clash with resource development priorities. This gap between rhetoric and action becomes fertile ground for opposition parties to accuse the government of hypocrisy — while simultaneously avoiding the politically costly work of offering their own concrete solutions.

Provincial politics add another layer. Resource-rich provinces like Alberta, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia often frame disputes with Indigenous communities through an economic lens, emphasizing job creation, tax revenue, and energy security. Provincial leaders may paint Indigenous opposition to certain projects as obstructionist or as being manipulated by environmental activists. In contrast, politicians in other provinces — or federal leaders courting urban voters — may emphasize environmental protection and Indigenous sovereignty, knowing these positions play well with progressive constituencies.

This strategic positioning is rarely about the careful balancing of rights and responsibilities; it is about optics. A politician photographed standing with Indigenous leaders in traditional regalia can project an image of cultural respect and reconciliation, even if their policy record tells a different story. Likewise, a hardline stance against a blockade can be framed as defending the “rule of law,” appealing to voters frustrated by perceived governmental weakness, even if that stance escalates tensions rather than resolves them.

The result is a feedback loop: politicians amplify selective aspects of a dispute to score political points, which in turn shapes media coverage and public opinion, which then pressures governments to act in ways that serve short-term political interests rather than long-term stability. This cycle perpetuates confusion because it is rarely

clear to the public whether a government's position is rooted in principle, pragmatism, or political expediency.

Worse still, political exploitation can deepen mistrust within Indigenous communities themselves. When leaders see their causes being used as political props — celebrated in campaign speeches but ignored once the election is over — cynicism grows. This fuels a willingness to bypass governmental processes altogether in favor of direct action, which further destabilizes the national picture.

In the end, the politicization of Indigenous issues ensures that they remain unresolved. Resolution requires difficult compromises, consistent policy, and the courage to confront unpopular truths. But in the Canadian political climate, these qualities often take a back seat to photo opportunities, partisan soundbites, and electoral math. The country is left with a volatile mix: high moral stakes, entrenched legal ambiguities, economic vulnerabilities, and a political class more interested in winning the news cycle than in achieving lasting solutions.

The tensions between Indigenous communities and the Canadian state are not new, nor are they simple disputes that can be smoothed over with symbolic gestures or temporary compromises. They are the product of centuries of broken promises, overlapping sovereignties, and legal ambiguities, compounded by high-stakes resource battles, media distortion, internal governance challenges, and political opportunism. Each element on its own might be manageable; together, they form a web of instability that undermines public trust in Canada's ability to govern itself consistently and fairly.

Fear arises because the rule of law — the bedrock of any stable society — appears negotiable. Confusion persists because the lines of authority are blurred, the historical record is contested, and the narratives offered to the public are often incomplete or ideologically driven. These conditions create a Canada where national unity feels fragile, where economic security can be disrupted with relative ease, and where political leadership is too often reactive rather than resolute. For example, data

from the non-profit Angus Reid Institute found in the summer of 2025 many Canadians were in favour of meaningful consultation and accommodation of First Nations for projects deemed in the national interest. Two-in-five believed that this is needed, but that the government and companies building the projects should retain final say (forty percent). One-quarter say First Nations should have a veto if projects infringe on their traditional territory, and the same number say infrastructure in the national interest should proceed regardless of objections. Also, in a separate report the AR Institute continued, “in the wake of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report in 2015, many Canadians have been grappling with the nation’s treatment of Indigenous Peoples. One of the key conversations has centred around Indian Residential schools (IRS), and the discovery of soil “anomalies” through ground-penetrating radar, initially referred to as the graves of children at what was once the largest residential school in the nation in Kamloops.

New data from the Institute finds Canadians sympathetic to the harmful legacy of these schools. Indeed, two-thirds (sixty-eight percent) say that IRS were a form of cultural genocide. Half (fifty-four percent) also say that Canada needs to continue to address the legacy left by these schools on Indigenous people. More than 150,000 children attended these schools, representing approximately one-third of Indigenous children.

As the four-year anniversary of the discovery passed in May, there is, however, widespread hesitancy to accept claims made by the Tk’emlúps te Secwépemc First Nation without additional evidence. To date, no human remains have been confirmed or exhumed and suspected anomalies remain unverified. The federal government has provided more than twelve million dollars to assist in the investigation, but disturbance of the sites has not been agreed upon. A majority of Canadians (sixty-three percent) and Indigenous people (fifty-six percent) hold the view that further evidence through exhumation is necessary to accept that the remains of children are buried at the site.”

Without a deliberate, transparent effort to clarify legal jurisdiction, address governance accountability, and reconcile the competing visions of sovereignty, these disputes will continue to flare into national crises. In such an environment, fear and confusion are not merely byproducts — they are predictable outcomes. And unless the country confronts the root causes rather than the symptoms, Canada will remain vulnerable to the same cycle of confrontation, paralysis, and mistrust that has defined so much of its recent history.

To sum up this chapter, things do not seem a lot different with the Indigenous community in Canada and Vladimir Putin's Russia. Both want to take back territorial ground lost. With natives, this can go back as far as the early eighteen hundreds - with Putin, it is to bring back the glory days of the USSR in the 1960s. In other words, things do not look very hopeful - the fear level between the two groups of Canadians will most likely rise (just like has happened between Russia and Ukraine), perhaps eventually evolving into something similar, but in this case more like a small-scale economic civil war.

Sources for this chapter include, M. Lowrie & Canadian Press, Angus Reid Institute

Chapter Five

Limitless Liberty Makes Order Optional.

According to the CCLA website, it is a human rights organization committed to defending the rights, dignity, safety, and freedoms of all people in Canada. "As was established in the organisation's founding principles, CCLA is the pre-eminent voice advocating for the rights and freedoms of all Canadians and all persons living in Canada. We are a leader in protecting rights and have earned widespread respect for our principled stand on such issues as national security, censorship, capital punishment, and police and state accountability —with a fearless voice on civil liberties, human rights and democratic freedoms. CCLA believes that every person in Canada should be entitled to basic rights, freedoms, dignity and respect."

On the surface the above manifesto sounds fair and reasonable – but is it? Canada has long prided itself on being a nation of tolerance, fairness, and liberty. From coast to coast, the country's identity is rooted in the belief that individual rights and freedoms are sacrosanct. This ethos is so embedded in the national psyche that to question it is considered almost heretical. After all, isn't Canada celebrated as one of the "freest" nations on Earth, a beacon for human rights and civil liberties?

But herein lies a paradox few dare to confront: Can a society have too much freedom? Can the pursuit of absolute liberty lead to chaos rather than order? The uncomfortable answer is yes—and Canada is living proof. In its unrelenting quest to enshrine every imaginable "right," the nation has drifted into dangerous waters where liberty no longer serves the common good but corrodes it. Today, Canada is not defined

by “peace, order, and good government” as its founders intended, but by escalating lawlessness, moral relativism, and social fragmentation—all in the name of freedom.

Modern Canada is a society that has elevated individual entitlements above collective responsibility, where every grievance becomes a constitutional battle and every limit on personal conduct is branded as oppression. The result? A fearful, fractured country that mistakes permissiveness for progress and human rights absolutism for justice. In this chapter, we examine how Canada’s over-indulgence in civil liberties, human rights, and freedoms has fueled a culture of lawlessness, eroded authority, and left the nation drowning in the very ideals it once celebrated.

Canada is a country that wears its freedoms like a badge of moral superiority. For decades, it has been celebrated as one of the world’s most tolerant societies, a country where human rights are not just protected but exalted. To question this sacred doctrine is to risk being branded as reactionary or authoritarian. But let us confront the question one more time: Can a society overdose on liberty? Can the pursuit of absolute freedom become its undoing?

Again, the unsettling truth is that it can—and Canada is living proof. In its unrelenting quest to safeguard every imaginable individual right, Canada has built a culture of entitlement without obligation, liberty without responsibility, and rights without restraint. The outcome? A fearful, fragmented nation drowning in lawlessness and social decay. Freedom, unmoored from duty, does not lead to paradise; it leads to chaos.

The thesis of this chapter is as stark as it is necessary: Canada’s rights obsession—rooted in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, amplified by activist courts, and fetishized by a grievance-driven culture—has unleashed forces that undermine the very foundations of peace and order. This is the paradox of excess freedom, and it is tearing the Dominion apart.

The architects of Confederation were pragmatic men. They understood the fragility of human societies and the need for a balance between freedom and order. That is why Canada's foundational principle was not "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as in the United States, but "peace, order, and good government." The emphasis on order was deliberate: liberty without structure breeds anarchy.

For much of the 19th and early 20th centuries, Canada upheld this balance. Freedom existed, but within a framework of accountability and common sense. The criminal law was firm, social norms were stable, and while imperfections abounded, society largely understood that rights came with responsibilities.

That balance began to tilt in the post-war era, especially after the cultural upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s. A rights revolution swept the Western world, and Canada embraced it with fervor. The state shifted from protecting fundamental freedoms to manufacturing new ones. Civil liberties ceased to be guardrails against tyranny and became tools for dismantling traditional authority. This trajectory reached its zenith in 1982 with the adoption of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, a document hailed as Canada's moral compass but which, in practice, has often served as a wrecking ball against order.

Canada's founding principle was not radical liberty but measured governance. The British North America Act of 1867 enshrined "peace, order, and good government" (POGG) as the guiding ideal of the federation. Unlike the American obsession with "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," Canada understood that liberty must coexist with stability. Freedom was never absolute; it was always conditional on the common good.

For a century, this balance held. The state exercised authority to maintain social harmony, and individual rights were respected but not idolized. Criminal law was robust, immigration controlled, and social norms relatively coherent. There were flaws, yes—but there was order.

That equilibrium shattered in the late 20th century. Influenced by post-war liberalism, civil rights movements, and judicial trends in the U.S., Canada plunged headlong into a rights revolution. The tipping point came in 1982 with Pierre Trudeau's Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms—a constitutional milestone hailed as Canada's "Magna Carta." In reality, it planted the seeds of imbalance that would bloom into today's disorder.

The Charter was not inherently flawed; indeed, its intent was noble. It sought to safeguard Canadians against state overreach and guarantee basic liberties such as freedom of expression, religion, and mobility. Yet, like all instruments of law, its interpretation has been everything. The Supreme Court of Canada, emboldened by judicial review, began expanding rights beyond their original scope. What was once a shield against oppression became a sword wielded to cut through virtually any legislative or societal limit.

Consider the doctrine of judicial activism that flourished after 1982. Courts began striking down laws in the name of rights, even when those laws were democratically enacted to maintain public order. Bail reform cases, criminal sentencing challenges, and policies on public morality were all subject to rights-based litigation. The result? Lawmakers grew timid, fearing that any attempt to legislate responsibility would be nullified by constitutional challenges.

In this climate, rights inflation took hold. Every inconvenience became an infringement, every lifestyle choice, a constitutional guarantee. Rather than ask, What is necessary for a functioning society? Canada asked, How can we ensure nobody ever feels restricted? The answer produced a culture where liberty is limitless, but security is scarce. The Charter was designed to shield citizens from state overreach, but in practice, it expanded judicial power at the expense of democratic governance. Prior to 1982, parliament and legislatures were supreme; afterward, the courts became Canada's

moral arbiters. Judicial activism flourished as judges interpreted rights broadly, often striking down laws enacted by elected representatives.

Consider R. v. Oakes (1986), the seminal case that created the Oakes Test for justifying Charter limitations. While the test aimed to balance rights and societal interests, its application entrenched a culture where rights challenges became the default response to any perceived restriction. From prostitution laws (Canada v. Bedford, 2013) to assisted dying (Carter v. Canada, 2015), courts consistently pushed the boundaries of "liberty" and "security of the person."

The unintended consequence? Every regulation, every policy, became vulnerable to litigation. Legislators grew timid, fearing that any measure to preserve order—mandatory minimum sentences, anti-protest injunctions, drug enforcement—would be overturned as unconstitutional.

The modern Canadian rights landscape is a minefield of entitlement. Courts and commissions have turned grievances into gold, elevating personal desires into enforceable claims. We have human rights codes that now govern pronouns, cultural representation, and ideological conformity. What began as a shield against discrimination has metastasized into a bureaucratic empire policing thought and speech.

This rights inflation is not benign; it is corrosive. When everything is a right, nothing is a duty. The expectation that individuals temper their freedoms for the sake of communal harmony has evaporated. Instead, we witness the rise of weaponized victimhood, where special interest groups use rights discourse to demand privileges that undermine social cohesion. And when the state acquiesces, it sends a dangerous message: rules are negotiable, laws are elastic, and authority is optional.

Post-Charter Canada saw the proliferation of "rights inflation." What began as guarantees of fundamental freedoms morphed into an endless expansion of entitlements. Human rights commissions—once tools against genuine discrimination—evolved into bureaucratic inquisitions policing pronouns, bathroom policies, and

ideological conformity. Example: Pronoun Mandates Bill C-16, passed in 2017, amended the Canadian Human Rights Act to include “gender identity and gender expression.” Critics, including law professor Jordan Peterson, warned this would compel speech under penalty of law. The government insisted it merely protected trans individuals from discrimination. Yet, the legislation symbolized a cultural shift: from protecting citizens from harm to enforcing ideological orthodoxy.

When everything is framed as a right, nothing remains negotiable. Dialogue is replaced by litigation, and compromise becomes heresy. Law enforcement in Canada today is paralyzed, not by lack of resources but by lack of legitimacy. Every police action risks being framed as a rights violation. Officers hesitate to enforce laws in volatile situations lest they spark a media storm or a Charter challenge. Judges, steeped in rights absolutism, grant bail to violent offenders in the name of “presumption of innocence,” even as communities reel from gun violence and repeat crimes.

This erosion of authority extends to governance. Legislators now govern with an eye toward litigation, crafting timid policies that prioritize avoiding lawsuits over ensuring public safety. Entire criminal justice reforms—such as reduced sentencing guidelines and relaxed bail conditions—are justified as advancing human rights, even as they unleash a wave of recidivism that devastates neighborhoods.

When rights become a trump card against responsibility, law loses its teeth and crime fills the void. Law enforcement in Canada today operates in a climate of paralysis. Every intervention risk being branded a civil liberties violation. Officers hesitate in confrontations, fearing disciplinary boards, lawsuits, or viral videos. The result? A policing crisis that emboldens criminals and endangers the public.

Bill C-75 (2019) prioritized bail accessibility, citing Charter principles of “reasonable bail” and “presumption of innocence.” Predictably, violent offenders exploited the system. In Ontario, a 2022 report revealed over forty percent of gun-

related homicides were committed by individuals on bail. Public outrage mounted, yet federal responses remained tepid—because tightening bail is seen as a rights rollback.

Governance fares no better. Politicians now legislate with an eye on constitutional challenges, crafting timid policies that prioritize Charter compliance over public safety. Laws designed to curb drug trafficking, regulate protests, or maintain public decency are diluted—or abandoned—under the threat of litigation.

Beyond the courts and legislatures lies an even more insidious problem: a cultural shift that prizes victimhood over virtue. Canadians are now conditioned to view themselves as oppressed whenever life imposes boundaries. Social movements, amplified by media and academia, celebrate grievance as a moral currency. This climate feeds an endless appetite for new rights, each more granular and self-serving than the last.

The result is societal infantilization. Citizens no longer see themselves as agents of responsibility but as consumers of entitlements. Personal failure? Blame systemic oppression. Criminal behavior? Blame poverty and demand decriminalization. The individual is absolved, and the state is cast as both villain and nanny. This is not liberty; it is decadence masquerading as justice. Few episodes illustrate Canada's impotence in the face of rights absolutism better than the Wet'suwet'en rail blockades of 2020 and the Freedom Convoy occupation of Ottawa in 2022. In both cases, small groups paralyzed critical infrastructure for weeks, citing constitutional rights to protest.

Governments dithered, police stood down, and the economy bled billions. Why? Because enforcing the law risked accusations of violating Indigenous sovereignty or Charter freedoms. The rule of law became optional, conditional on political optics.

This selective enforcement corrodes public trust. Canadians watch anarchic spectacles unfold in their capital and ask: If the law doesn't apply to everyone, does it apply at all? Few episodes illustrate Canada's impotence in the face of rights absolutism better than the Wet'suwet'en rail blockades of 2020 and the Freedom Convoy

occupation of Ottawa in 2022. In both cases, small groups paralyzed critical infrastructure for weeks, citing constitutional rights to protest.

Governments dithered, police stood down, and the economy bled billions. Why? Because enforcing the law risked accusations of violating Indigenous sovereignty or Charter freedoms. The rule of law became optional, conditional on political optics. This selective enforcement corrodes public trust. Canadians watch anarchic spectacles unfold in their capital and ask: If the law doesn't apply to everyone, does it apply at all?

Free expression, once a noble ideal, has become a double-edged sword in Canada. On one hand, hate speech laws and human rights tribunals attempt to micromanage discourse; on the other, social media platforms have turned the public square into a battleground of extremism. In this chaotic environment, free speech is both overprotected and overregulated—a paradox that fuels fear and division.

When citizens weaponize freedom of expression to propagate violence, misinformation, and hatred without consequence, the social fabric frays. When institutions respond by overcorrecting, censoring legitimate debate under the guise of "protection," trust in democratic norms collapses. Canada now occupies the worst of both worlds: a nation terrified to speak truth yet drowning in toxic speech.

British Columbia's decriminalization of hard drugs in 2023 was sold as a progressive triumph—a humane approach to addiction. Users could now carry small amounts of heroin, fentanyl, or meth without fear of arrest. The result? Overdose deaths surged, public spaces became open-air drug markets, and crime rates soared in Vancouver and beyond. The policy prioritized individual autonomy over communal safety, framing enforcement as oppression. Critics warned it would normalize drug abuse; they were dismissed as reactionaries. Today, B.C. is living the nightmare: "safe supply" policies that fuel black markets, playgrounds littered with needles, and businesses fleeing downtown cores. This is rights absolutism in its purest form: the belief that liberty means license, even when it kills.

The cumulative effect of rights overreach is visible on every Canadian street corner. Urban centers plagued by random violence. Communities hollowed out by drug epidemics fueled by “safe supply” policies that prioritize user autonomy over public order. Protests and blockades that paralyze infrastructure in the name of Indigenous sovereignty or climate activism, with governments too cowed by rights discourse to enforce the rule of law.

Ordinary Canadians live in quiet fear—not of the state, but of each other. They fear speaking candidly lest they trigger a human rights complaint. They fear walking at night in cities where crime rates soar, but policing is restrained by bureaucratic oversight. They fear that the nation once lauded for civility is descending into chaos—all because freedom has become untethered from duty.

The Charter enshrines freedom of expression, yet Canada has oscillated between overregulation and abdication. On one hand, hate speech provisions in the Criminal Code and human rights statutes have been used to sanction speech deemed offensive—Saskatchewan (Human Rights Commission) v. Whatcott (2013) being a key case. On the other, social media has unleashed torrents of extremism, harassment, and misinformation, often without accountability.

The paradox? Citizen’s fear speaking common sense lest they face a tribunal, yet mobs freely weaponize “expression” to spread hatred. The state tries to police thought while ignoring conduct. The outcome is neither liberty nor order but a climate of fear and cynicism.

Contrast Canada with nations that maintain equilibrium between liberty and order. Countries like Singapore or even France impose limits on protest, speech, and criminal behavior not out of authoritarian impulse but to preserve social harmony. Their streets are safer, their institutions respected, and their citizens less consumed by grievance. These societies understand a truth Canada has forgotten - freedom is not an end in itself but a means to a flourishing common life. Ordinary Canadians feel

unprotected by law yet overregulated in life. They whisper their dissent, clutch their belongings, and wonder when the nation of civility became a land of disorder.

Philosophers from Aristotle to Burke warned that liberty without virtue leads to tyranny—first of chaos, then of despotism. Canada stands at this precipice. In exalting rights above all else, the nation has eroded the moral ballast that keeps liberty afloat. Responsibility is the price of freedom, yet Canada offers freedom on credit, with no expectation of repayment. The debt is coming due, and it will be paid in social disorder.

Contrast Canada with nations like Singapore, which enforces strict drug laws, curtails disruptive protests, and maintains some of the world's lowest crime rates—all while delivering prosperity and stability. Even France, despite its libertarian self-image, imposes robust public-order measures to contain unrest. These societies grasp what Canada has forgotten: freedom without discipline is not freedom at all—it is anarchy's prelude.

Then what is the answer? The Dominion of Canada need not abandon its commitment to human rights, but it must rediscover the wisdom of its founding principle: peace, order, and good government. Rights must be recalibrated, not as absolute claims but as negotiated goods balanced against the common good. Lawmakers must reclaim the courage to legislate boundaries, and citizens must relearn the forgotten virtues of self-restraint and civic duty. Freedom is a precious gift, but when worshipped as an idol, it becomes a curse. Canada's experiment in limitless liberty has produced not utopia but an anxious, lawless society teetering on the edge of dysfunction.

The path forward is clear: rights anchored in responsibility, freedom tempered by order, and a nation restored to sanity before it drowns in the very sea it once sailed with pride. From Aristotle to Edmund Burke, thinkers warned that liberty unrestrained by virtue devolves into tyranny—first of chaos, then of authoritarianism. Canada stands on that brink. Its worship of rights has eroded the moral ballast that keeps liberty afloat.

Responsibility—the invisible currency of freedom—has vanished from public life. In its place: grievance, entitlement, and fear.

Chapter Six

Malaise Rampant in Politicians and Judges

Decisions are happening thanks to Section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which enshrines the right to "life, liberty and security of the person." But in just the last few years, judges across Canada have looked at the phrase "security of the person" and determined that it also confers a right for everything from bike lanes to tent encampments to doing drugs in playgrounds. (Tristin Hopper)

Canada today finds itself wobbling on the edge of a precipice, and what makes the drop all the more terrifying is that the very institutions tasked with protecting the public and preserving order have become complicit in the unraveling. Once upon a time, the Dominion (Canada) stood for something: restraint, integrity, the steady hand of law and governance. But now, those hands are trembling—or worse, they are soiled with the stains of corruption and indifference. Judges, politicians, mandarins of the state—they were meant to serve as guardians of the public trust, the stewards of the common good. Instead, they have become the architects of cynicism and fear, the enablers of lawlessness cloaked in the garb of respectability.

The thesis here is simple and brutal: Canada's judiciary and political class, through a lethal combination of malaise, ideological capture, and outright venality, are actively eroding the foundations of order and accountability. This is not some abstract decline visible only to academics or journalists; it is a lived reality for ordinary Canadians. From the revolving doors of the courts to the backroom deals of Parliament Hill, the signals are unmistakable. The message is clear: the law is negotiable, politics is for sale, and justice is just another commodity to be rationed for those who can afford it. It is in this moral vacuum that fear takes root, metastasizing into something larger

than any single scandal, any individual miscarriage of justice. It becomes cultural—an atmosphere of dread, a sense that the system is rigged and that the pillars of the Dominion are hollowed out from within.

Start with the courts, those marble fortresses that were once synonymous with impartiality and principle. Their role was never to please the mob, nor to act as legislative bodies by stealth. They were to apply the law without fear or favor, anchored in precedent and reason. Yet in recent decades, that mandate has been twisted into something unrecognizable. Judicial activism—once a pejorative whispered in legal circles—now struts openly across the bench, reshaping social policy and criminal law under the guise of "progress." The Charter of Rights and Freedoms, designed as a shield, has too often been weaponized into a sword, not for the innocent but for the cunning. Criminal defense lawyers long ago learned that a clever Charter argument can pry open the door to leniency even for the most hardened offenders. And so, murderers, rapists, and repeat violent criminals stroll out of courtrooms on technicalities, their convictions quashed because a deadline was missed, or a warrant form lacked the proper signature. Is this justice, or is it legalistic sophistry masquerading as fairness?

Consider the Supreme Court's decision in R. v. Brown (2022), where the justices struck down a prohibition on the "extreme intoxication" defense. Overnight, Canada became a jurisdiction where a man could commit a violent assault while blackout drunk and argue he was not criminally responsible because he lacked the requisite intent. Imagine being a victim—bloodied and broken—only to watch the perpetrator walk free because intoxication severed his moral tether. This ruling was celebrated in some legal circles as a triumph of constitutional principle. For the public, it was something else entirely: a chilling message that accountability is optional, that self-induced oblivion can cleanse even the darkest deeds.

Then there are the Gladue principles, introduced to address the disproportionate incarceration of Indigenous offenders. In theory, a noble corrective; in practice, a

doctrine that has metastasized into systemic leniency. Judges invoke Gladue reports to slash sentences for violent crimes, even sexual assaults, under the banner of “cultural context.” The result? Victims—often Indigenous women—are retraumatized by a system that privileges the biography of the offender over the blood of the victim. When justice becomes a sociology experiment, lawlessness is not an accident; it is a design flaw.

Leniency has become the new orthodoxy, celebrated by an elite chorus that views punishment as barbaric and deterrence as a myth. Conditional sentences and “restorative justice” programs—buzzwords that delight the progressive academy—translate, on the ground, into a revolving-door reality. The same predators’ cycle in and out of the system, their contempt for the law deepened by each slap on the wrist. Ask any frontline police officer who has hauled in the same offender half a dozen times in a single year. Ask the victims who see their attackers back on the streets before the psychological scars have begun to heal. What do these victims feel? Fear. Not abstract fear, but the visceral, bone-deep terror that the state has abandoned them.

It would be bad enough if this were merely the result of misguided ideology, but there are darker shadows lurking behind the bench. Appointments to Canada’s judiciary are draped in the rhetoric of meritocracy, but anyone who has studied the machinery knows better. The process is opaque, lubricated by political patronage and ideological vetting. Want to wear the robes? Best have the right friends in the right caucus, and for heaven’s sake, never utter a word that challenges the reigning orthodoxy on crime or social policy. The bench, like the bureaucracy, has become a gated community for the ideologically aligned. And once ensconced in their lifetime appointments, these judges operate in a realm of near-total unaccountability. A judge can gut a mandatory sentence, grant bail to a ticking time bomb, and when the inevitable tragedy follows, who pays the price? Certainly not the judge.

But the courts, for all their arrogance, do not operate in a vacuum. They are in symbiosis with a political class that has abandoned its role as custodian of the public interest. If the judiciary tilts left under the banner of “progress,” Parliament and the provincial legislatures have been only too happy to provide cover—or to indulge in their own forms of decay. Once, politics in Canada carried at least the pretense of principle. Today, it is nakedly transactional, a theatre of careerism where ethics are an afterthought and corruption are normalized through euphemism. Scandals come and go like passing weather systems: the SNC-Lavalin affair, the WE Charity debacle, the Arrive CAN fiasco were problems that were mentioned in previous chapters but resonate here also. Each one punctures the myth of Canadian exceptionalism a little deeper. Each one confirms what many already suspect: that in the Dominion, rules are for the ruled, not the rulers.

Let’s have a more in depth look at SNC-Lavalin, they remain the textbook case: a multinational engineering behemoth accused of bribery on an industrial scale, greasing palms in Libya while Canadian officials looked the other way. When the machinery of justice finally rumbled into motion, what did the political elite do? They tried to jam a wrench into the gears. The Prime Minister’s Office leaned on the Attorney General, not in the name of law but in the name of “jobs” and “economic stability.” Translation: too big to fail, too connected to punish. And so, the doctrine of equality before the law was quietly euthanized, its death disguised as pragmatism.

Then came the WE Charity scandal, a grotesque spectacle of self-dealing under the sugar-coated guise of youth empowerment. Tens of millions in public funds were funneled into an organization with cozy ties to the Prime Minister’s family. Parliamentary hearings devolved into farce, stonewalled by evasions and redactions. Accountability? A few ministerial resignations and some performative contrition, but the core rot remained untouched.

And let's bring back the forementioned Arrive CAN farce—a fifty-four-million-dollar digital boondoggle that could have been built for a fraction of the price by competent developers in weeks, not years. The audit revealed a trail of inflated contracts, phantom subcontractors, and bureaucratic ineptitude bordering on parody. Yet, predictably, no heads rolled. The taxpayers were fleeced, the insiders feasted, and the public moved on, numbed by the sheer volume of graft.

The Vice-Admiral Mark Norman affair added another layer of cynicism to the pile. Here was a decorated naval officer charged with breach of trust in what increasingly appeared to be a politically motivated prosecution. When the case collapsed, the government quietly cut a settlement check and slithered back into the shadows. No apology. No reckoning, just another day in a Dominion where the powerful play by their own rules.

And let us not kid ourselves into thinking this is a modern disease. Corruption has been baked into the DNA of Canadian politics from the beginning. The Pacific Scandal of the 1870s, in which Sir John A. Macdonald's government was caught accepting bribes from railway financiers in exchange for lucrative contracts, nearly toppled a young Confederation. The ink on the Constitution was barely dry when greed began gnawing at its edges. Fast forward a century and a quarter, and we arrive at the Sponsorship Scandal—an odious scheme in which public funds were siphoned through advertising firms to enrich Liberal Party operatives under the pretense of national unity. The Gomery Commission peeled back the curtain on a culture of entitlement so brazen it shocked even a politically jaded public. And yet, what changed? A few resignations, a few wrist slaps, and then business as usual resumed. Always business as usual.

When these two forces—the politicized judiciary and the debased political class—intersect, the result is a perfect storm. Consider the judicial appointments process again: who controls it? Politicians. Who benefits from a judiciary inclined to view corruption as a "complex policy issue" rather than a crime? Politicians. Who suffers

when the courts and legislatures conspire, by design or by neglect, to hollow out the rule of law? The ordinary citizen—the one who cannot hire a Bay Street firm to litigate a Charter motion, who cannot bankroll a lobbying campaign, who cannot speed-dial a Cabinet minister. For that citizen, the law becomes something alien, something distant, something feared rather than revered. And in that alienation lies danger, for once faith in the system collapses, the social contract frays, and what rushes in to fill the void is not order but chaos.

The psychological impact of this decay cannot be overstated. Canadians are not, by temperament, a revolutionary people. They do not storm barricades or topple statues. Their default mode is trust—trust in institutions, in process, in the dull but dependable machinery of governance. That trust is now evaporating, and in its place grows a bitter cocktail of fear and resignation. Fear that crime will go unpunished, that corruption will go unchecked. Resignation that nothing can be done, that the game is rigged, that the Dominion's vaunted stability was always a mirage. This is how nations die—not with a bang but with a shrug, as the public withdraws into private despair while the elites feast on the spoils.

History offers its warnings, and Canada would do well to heed them. The Weimar Republic did not collapse because of jackboots alone; it collapsed because the guardians of law and politics became impotent or complicit, leaving a vacuum for extremism to exploit. No one suggests Canada is on the brink of fascism, but the mechanisms of decline are eerily familiar: a judiciary detached from common sense, a political class insulated from consequence, a citizenry marinating in cynicism. These are not isolated cracks; they are fault lines, and they are widening.

Can this trajectory be reversed? In theory, yes. In practice, it would require a moral revolution among the very elites who have least incentive to change. Judicial appointments must be wrenched out of the shadows and subjected to genuine scrutiny. Politicians who violate the public trust must face more than the theater of "ethics

investigations" that conclude in wrist slaps. Mandatory sentencing guidelines, so blithely gutted in the name of "flexibility," must be restored to inject some semblance of consistency into criminal justice. Above all, a cultural shift is needed—a rediscovery of the unfashionable virtues of duty, restraint, and accountability. But culture does not change by fiat, and time is not on our side.

In the meantime, the Dominion drifts, its institutions corroding behind facades of respectability. The courts speak the language of rights while eroding the reality of security. The politicians mouth the platitudes of transparency while gorging at the trough of patronage. And the people—bewildered, anxious, disillusioned—cling to the hope that someone, somewhere, still believes in the old ideals. It is a fragile hope, and fragility has a way of breaking. If that break comes, it will not announce itself with fanfare. It will arrive quietly, like rot in the beams, until one day the house collapses and we wonder, too late, how it all began. But we know how it began. It began when those entrusted to guard the law and govern the land chose instead to serve themselves, leaving a nation to tremble in the gathering dark.

From Coast to Coast, tent cities rise where trust in institutions collapses. This is the unintended architecture of decades of political malaise and judicial leniency. (pic courtesy of Global News)

A makeshift camp hidden in the brush near Vernon. Officials call conditions “deplorable,” yet this scene repeats across the Dominion—a portrait of neglect dressed as compassion, while law and governance retreat into paralysis.

Chapter Seven
Dance Together or Collapse

Canada today finds itself in a peculiar state of division, as if two forces that once shared the same soil and the same founding myths have been pulled so far apart that they no longer recognize themselves in one another. On the one hand, the left in Canada has become rooted in a progressive vision of social justice, multiculturalism, and environmental urgency. On the other, the right still clings to the notions of tradition, economic prudence, and national sovereignty. To call them rivals would be far too polite; they are antagonists, locked in a struggle that has taken on a bitterness unusual for a country that prided itself, for much of its history, on moderation and compromise.

Canada is no longer a nation at ease with itself. For decades it sold the world an image of moderation, politeness, and a political culture that avoided the shouting matches of other democracies. That veneer has cracked. The Dominion is now a country divided into two bitter camps—the left and the right—each convinced the other poses an existential threat. What used to be healthy rivalry has curdled into antagonism. Instead of competing visions of policy, the two sides now hurl accusations of betrayal, corruption, and treason. The question before us is no longer how they differ, but whether they can ever co-exist in the same federation, or whether Canada is heading toward a slow, grinding civil rupture. Yet within that question lies the possibility of something greater: a chance to rediscover the meaning of unity, and to shape a fearless Dominion from the wreckage of distrust.

The antagonism has deep roots, though its intensity is recent. Confederation itself was born out of compromise between English and French, Catholic and Protestant, East and West. For a century, Canadian politics functioned like a pendulum, swinging

between Liberal and Conservative governments, each moderating the other, neither holding unchecked power for long. That balance depended on pragmatism—on a recognition that no side could govern without giving ground. The late twentieth century disrupted that equilibrium. Globalization, mass immigration, the rise of multiculturalism, environmental urgency, and identity politics altered the very terrain. The left embraced rapid change, framing it as progress and justice. The right, feeling cornered, clung harder to resource industries, tradition, and national sovereignty. The pendulum stopped swinging and instead stretched taut, pulled by forces moving farther apart with every passing year.

Scandals hardened the mistrust. The sponsorship scandal of the early 2000s revealed Liberal corruption at a scale that infuriated the West and deepened cynicism nationwide. The SNC-Lavalin affair (as mentioned in the previous chapter) decades later cast Justin Trudeau's government in the same light, suggesting a governing elite that bent the law when convenient. To conservatives, these episodes confirmed their suspicion that progressives were corrupt, entitled, and unfit to lead. Yet the left had its own grievances. Conservatives seemed married to oil and gas interests, dismissive of climate realities, and tolerant of social conservatives who resisted equality on matters of gender and identity. For progressives, this proved that the right was retrograde, dangerous, and hostile to modern Canada. Both sides concluded not simply that the other was wrong, but that the other was illegitimate. Once legitimacy is denied, cooperation collapses.

This division is not just ideological but geographic and cultural. Canada's left thrives in cities—Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver—where universities, media, and immigration shape a cosmopolitan outlook. The right finds its strength in rural and resource-driven regions—Alberta, Saskatchewan, swaths of rural Ontario and Atlantic Canada—where identity is tied to farming, energy, and stability. For one side, the other's worldview feels alien, even threatening. To a farmer in Alberta, progressive

policies are not enlightened but hostile to the very industries that sustain his family. To a student in downtown Toronto, conservative rhetoric is not protective but a rejection of her diverse and dynamic reality. Politics here is no longer about compromise on tax rates or regulation; it is about identity. When identity is at stake, there is no middle ground. What's left is enmity.

The media has not healed this wound, if anything, it has ripped it wider. Once aspiring to neutrality, Canadian outlets now trade in polarization. The CBC is cast by conservatives as a progressive fortress, while right-leaning outlets like Rebel News or Sun Media are painted by progressives as nests of reactionary outrage. Instead of common facts, Canadians now consume separate realities. The media rewards outrage, framing every debate as a struggle between saints and villains. Trust in institutions collapses under the weight of spin. Even when leaders act responsibly, half the country assumes dishonesty. Scandals land like bombs because the ground is already saturated with suspicion. It is a vicious cycle: distrust fuels division, division fuels distrust.

History shows Canada has managed unity under strain before. During the Second World War, Liberals and Conservatives joined in a war cabinet, suppressing partisanship for survival. In the 1960s, prairie social democrats worked with federal Liberals to build public healthcare, forging a consensus across ideological lines. Yet history also reveals how fragile unity is. The failure of the Meech Lake Accord in 1990 and the razor-thin 1995 Quebec referendum nearly tore the country apart. Unity is possible but never guaranteed. The Dominion has walked the edge of fracture before, and it is walking it again.

Today's antagonism carries a dangerous possibility: not open civil war in the American sense, but a cold war of politics and culture that paralyzes the nation. Already, Alberta flirts with separatism, exasperated by carbon taxes and a sense that Ottawa governs only for Quebec and Ontario. Saskatchewan echoes this resentment. Quebec, though quieter, still keeps its separatist sword sheathed but close. If mistrust hardens,

Canada could slide toward a slow-motion unraveling: federal authority weakened, provinces asserting autonomy, the national identity dissolving into competing enclaves. A federation of parts still technically united but hollowed of meaning. Once pride in being Canadian was common; now pride is fractured, regional, conditional.

And yet there remains a path toward fearlessness. For Canada to overcome, both left and right must recover a lost concept: the shared fate. Fearlessness is not born of uniformity; it arises when differences are carried forward with courage and mutual recognition. The left must confront its habit of writing off rural and resource Canadians as obstacles to progress. Without oil, gas, agriculture, and mining, the social programs and green projects they cherish cannot be funded. The right must accept that denying climate change, or sneering at pluralism, is a dead end that alienates the very generations who will inherit this nation. Both must acknowledge corruption as poison. Patronage and backroom deals, whether Liberal or Conservative, erode trust, and trust is the foundation of democracy itself. Honesty and humility are not luxuries now—they are survival necessities.

So, what would unity look like in practice? Electoral reform, to prevent first-past-the-post from locking Canada into perpetual regional grievance. A renewed federal compact that affirms both provincial autonomy and shared national responsibilities. Joint commissions tackling the crises that cut across ideology—housing, opioids, Indigenous reconciliation—forcing cooperation on problems too urgent for stalemate. A civic education revival that teaches young Canadians not only diversity and rights but the hard history of compromise that built Confederation. Unity would not erase differences; it would teach Canadians to carry them without collapsing under their weight. The fearless Dominion is not the absence of conflict but the refusal to let conflict consume the whole.

The alternative is grim. Declining voter turnout signals disengagement. Poisoned discourse reduces politics to smear and insult. Premiers in Alberta and Quebec test

federal boundaries, daring Ottawa to respond. These are early tremors of fracture. Continue down this path, and Canada risks becoming a federation in name only, held together by habit rather than conviction. Fear will govern, fear of each other, fear of the future, fear of collapse. It is not an inevitability, but it is a trajectory already visible.

The left and right are enemies because each believes the other threatens Canada's survival. To the left, the right is a danger to the planet, to justice, to dignity itself. To the right, the left is a threat to tradition, to industry, to the cohesion of identity. Both are convinced they are saving the country. Both may destroy it if they do not learn to see their opponent as a partner in a shared struggle. Nations that wallow in endless antagonism erode until they are unrecognizable. The choice before Canada is stark. Rediscover compromise or embrace collapse. Build a fearless Dominion or preside over a fearful ruin. Canada has faced this test before and survived. Whether it has the courage to survive it again will determine whether this fragile Confederation remains a nation or fades into the cautionary tales of history.

Chapter Eight
Elites and the Fear of Ordinary Canadians

Elitism is not a foreign concept imported from the aristocracies of Europe or the boardrooms of Wall Street. It is alive and thriving in Canada, wrapped in maple leaf rhetoric and smug appeals to fairness, equity, and justice. The problem is that while Canadian elites congratulate themselves for their wisdom, compassion, and supposed moral authority, the lived reality for millions of working people, students, and retirees is something altogether different. Their reality is one of unease, fear, and frustration at a system that increasingly seems rigged against them—a Dominion where those in lofty positions dictate, while those at the ground level suffer the consequences.

This chapter explores the many forms of Canadian elitism—whether found in university lecture halls, advocacy groups that coddle criminals, sporting arenas where millionaire athletes' posture as heroes, or bureaucratic offices where executives earn salaries most families cannot imagine. Together, these forces create a society in which the "average Canadian" feels not only ignored, but mocked, dismissed, and often betrayed. Worse still, these elites appear blind to the impact their arrogance has on the ordinary citizen, and the result is growing fear, resentment, and alienation across the Dominion.

Ordinary working Canadians—the backbone of this Dominion—carry the weight of the economy on their shoulders. They rise early, commute long distances, and often work jobs that require more sweat than prestige. Yet in modern Canada, they are increasingly treated as expendable.

Factory closures and outsourcing have eroded stable employment, while inflation eats away at already thin paycheques. Families must juggle housing costs, food prices,

and taxes that seem to grow year by year. In cities like Toronto, Vancouver, Calgary and even Kelowna, the cost of living has become so crushing that even middle-income earners feel themselves slipping downward.

What deepens their sense of fear is the growing awareness that the elites—politicians, professors, activists, athletes, bureaucrats—do not share these struggles. When an MP from Ottawa lectures about climate responsibility while expensing a luxury flight, or when a non-profit director earns $400,000 annually while advocating for "affordable housing," the working-class Canadian shakes his head and wonders if anyone in power actually understands his life.

This disconnect feeds into fear, because working people know that when crime rises, when neighborhoods deteriorate, or when drug use becomes rampant, it is their communities—not the insulated enclaves of the elites—that suffer first. They walk home from bus stops at night. They ride transit filled with addicts and violent offenders. They feel the insecurity that statistics only vaguely capture.

The Canadian working class is not naive. They recognize that elites will always exist in some form, but they expect leadership, humility, and solidarity from those who claim to guide the nation. Instead, they feel patronized and lectured by people who would never survive a week on their wages or in their neighborhoods. That imbalance between experience and power creates a deep reservoir of mistrust.

Canada's retirees once believed they had earned the right to security. They paid their taxes, contributed to pensions, and built the foundations of the modern Dominion. Yet for many, their golden years are now tarnished by fear—fear of crime, fear of financial shortfalls, fear of being forgotten.

The elites tell retirees they should be grateful: after all, Canada is "one of the best places in the world to live." But a retiree on a fixed income who watches grocery bills climb by twenty percent in a year does not feel blessed. Nor does the pensioner who waits six months for medical care, only to be treated by a system that seems more

concerned with bureaucratic paperwork than patient dignity. What makes matters worse is the dismissive tone with which elites approach the concerns of the elderly. When retirees speak about feeling unsafe walking downtown, they are told they are "fear mongering." When they object to decriminalization policies that flood their neighborhoods with addicts, they are labeled intolerant or reactionary. In short, they are made to feel irrelevant, as though the Dominion no longer has room for their voices.

This fuels not only resentment, but also a deeper kind of existential fear—the sense that the country they built has been handed over to a new class of self-righteous rulers who neither value their sacrifices nor intend to protect their dignity.

At the other end of the generational spectrum lie Canada's students. Once told that education was the ticket to opportunity, they now graduate with crushing debt and dim job prospects. Tuition costs continue to climb, even as universities expand their administrative overhead and funnel money into programs that often do little to prepare young people for the realities of work.

Worse still, students are taught within academic systems that are often dominated by professors who live in intellectual isolation. These academics, cloistered in their ivory towers, lecture about social justice, criminology, or political theory, but rarely set foot in the neighborhoods where crime takes place, or in the shelters where addicts struggle, or in the factories where workers grind out a living.

For these professors, crime is a theoretical construct, reducible to systemic oppression and social inequities. Rarely do they acknowledge the lived terror of a single mother facing a home invasion, or the trauma of a bus driver assaulted by a repeat offender. Their students absorb this detached worldview, one that often excuses the perpetrators while sidelining the victims.

By the time these students graduate, they not only face financial insecurity, but also ideological confusion. They have been trained to see criminals as victims and the law-abiding as oppressors. They carry debt, anger, and cynicism into a world that offers

them few solid opportunities. And in their hearts, many recognize the deep gulf between the utopian visions they were taught and the harsher realities they encounter.

The Canadian university professor has become a symbol of elitist detachment. With tenure protecting their positions and lecture halls providing captive audiences, many professors imagine themselves as intellectual vanguards, guiding society toward enlightenment. In reality, they often embody a dangerous arrogance: the belief that because they have studied crime or social inequality, they understand it better than those who live it.

Consider the criminology professor who delivers a lecture on “restorative justice,” arguing that prison is cruel and counterproductive. For him, crime is a dataset, a set of theories. He does not walk the streets at night. He does not face the addicts on transit or the gangs in certain neighborhoods. He studies papers, not people. Yet his ideas shape policy, and his students carry these doctrines into careers in law, politics, and advocacy.

This academic detachment has a corrosive effect on public trust. Ordinary Canadians know that crime is not an abstraction. They see needles in playgrounds. They hear about carjackings on the news. They feel unsafe in areas that once were safe. And when they hear professors dismiss these concerns as “exaggerations,” they conclude—rightly—that the elites are insulated from the very fears they dismiss.

Canada is home to countless societies, advocacy groups, and charitable organizations that claim to champion justice and equality. Many do good work. But many others have become disconnected from the very people they are supposed to serve.

Too often, these groups side reflexively with criminals, addicts, or offenders—seeing them exclusively as victims of circumstance rather than agents of choice. Victims of crime are rarely their focus. Instead, these organizations campaign for lighter sentences, expanded rights for offenders, and increased public funding for “harm

reduction," while communities are left to deal with the fallout of emboldened lawlessness.

The leaders of these groups frequently earn salaries that rival or surpass those of elected officials. Their offices are located in urban centers, far from the communities most affected by crime and social disorder. And when they speak, they do so with the confidence of those who believe their ideology is unassailable, dismissing the lived fears of ordinary citizens as ignorance or prejudice.

In this way, advocacy groups become part of the elitist machinery that fuels fear. They do not listen; they dictate. They do not experience; they theorize. And they rarely acknowledge the harm their policies inflict on neighborhoods struggling with insecurity. If elitism has a symbol that resonates most strongly with ordinary Canadians, it is the vast gulf in salaries between the elites and everyone else.

Professional athletes in Canada earn tens of millions annually, playing games while preaching about social justice. University administrators and non-profit directors earn six-figure salaries while telling working Canadians to "do more with less." Bureaucrats at crown corporations or federal agencies collect compensation packages that dwarf what most families will see in a decade. For the average Canadian—working two jobs, saving little, and worried about bills—these salaries are not only incomprehensible but also insulting. They reflect a society where value is measured not by contribution, but by position and prestige.

This salary divide contributes directly to fear. It reminds the average citizen that he or she is invisible in the eyes of elites. It shows retirees that their decades of labor mean little compared to the branding power of a hockey star or the moral preening of a non-profit executive. And it tells students that even if they work tirelessly, the upper echelons of society remain inaccessible.

Taken together, these forms of elitism—academic detachment, advocacy arrogance, inflated salaries, and political condescension—create an atmosphere in

which ordinary Canadians feel increasingly alienated from their own country. Fear thrives in this environment.

- The worker fears that no one speaks for him.
- The retiree fears she has been forgotten.
- The student fears that education is a scam, a costly initiation into debt and a disappointment.
- Communities fear that crime will worsen while elites continue to excuse it.

What ties these fears together is not only the presence of crime, poverty, or insecurity, but also the absence of empathy from those who claim to lead. Elites do not feel the same dangers, and so they dismiss them. They do not suffer the same hardships, and so they minimize them. And in doing so, they deepen the fear that Canada is becoming a Dominion divided into two nations—one lived on the ground, the other theorized in the tower. The Professor says: Crime is caused by inequality; offenders are victims too. The Transit Worker says: I was assaulted twice in one year by repeat offenders who were released the same day. The Non-Profit Executive says: Safe injection sites reduce harm. The Parent says: My child picked up a used needle in the park. The Athlete says: We must speak about justice while cashing endorsement deals. The Retiree says: My pension barely covers groceries, and you tell me to be grateful.

These contrasts highlight the great divide. The elites live in a narrative; the people live in reality. The former feels righteous; the latter feel afraid. Canada's elites like to see themselves as guardians of progress and morality. But their arrogance, detachment, and self-interest have created a Dominion where ordinary citizens feel not only ignored but endangered. The working man, the student, the retiree—they live in a Canada defined by rising costs, crime, and uncertainty. Meanwhile, professors, executives, athletes, and activists live in insulated bubbles, shielded from consequence and blind to reality.

This imbalance fosters fear, resentment, and division. It convinces ordinary Canadians that the system no longer works for them, and that those in charge neither understand nor care about their struggles. Elitism, therefore, is not merely a cultural annoyance. It is a destabilizing force, contributing directly to the fear and insecurity that now define life in the Dominion. If Canada continues down this path—where elites dictate from on high while ordinary citizens suffer below—the gulf between classes will widen, trust will erode, and fear will become the nation's permanent condition.

In the end, the problem is not only that Canada's elites are out of touch. The deeper problem is that they no longer feel any need to reconnect. They believe their way is the right way, that their worldview is the only worldview. And in that smug certainty lies the root of a Dominion unraveling.

Chapter Nine

Stoking Fear in Canada Today-Who & Why

Fear has become the ambient air of Canadian life. It is not simply an individual sentiment; it is a manufactured product, engineered, circulated, and maintained by groups, organizations, influencers, activists, and cultural gatekeepers who have discovered that fear is a remarkably potent currency. Fear governs, fear silences, fear shapes policy, fear redefines morality, and fear keeps ordinary people perpetually looking over their shoulders. To understand the rise of fear in Canada today, one must examine who is stoking it, what mechanisms they employ, and why they are motivated to do so. This chapter explores these actors, from activist collectives and campus ideologues to cultural influencers and cancel-culture mobs and dissects the motivations behind their campaigns of intimidation.

Canada, long imagined as a calm, tolerant Dominion, has become a society where fear operates as a daily regulator of behavior. It is no longer fear of foreign enemies or natural disaster; it is fear of one's own neighbours, colleagues, and social media followers. Fear of being "called out," fear of being ostracized, fear of being accused of insensitivity, fear of reputational ruin.

One need only look at recent Canadian headlines to see this. The firing of veteran CBC broadcaster in 2021, over a word repeated in a newsroom training context, became a cautionary tale across the industry. This journalist's career ended not over malice but over the climate of fear where intent no longer mattered. If it could happen to a well-known veteran, it could happen to anyone.

What was once considered healthy democratic debate has now become dangerous territory. One poorly phrased comment, one dissenting opinion, one ill-timed joke can trigger a cascade of outrage, cancellation, and personal destruction.

No institution in Canada has done more to cultivate fear than the universities. Campuses, once bastions of inquiry, have transformed into ideological silos where fear enforces conformity. Professors who challenge dominant narratives risk professional exile; students who voice dissenting opinions risk social annihilation.

The University of Ottawa has become a symbol of this culture. In 2020, a professor was suspended for quoting, in a classroom discussion, a term central to a debate on racism and language. The case drew national attention and sparked resignations from other faculty, but the damage was done: a chilling message spread across Canadian campuses. Words themselves had become dangerous, and professors could lose careers simply for examining them.

At Wilfrid Laurier University in 2017, graduate teaching assistant was hauled before a disciplinary panel for showing her class a video debate featuring Jordan Peterson. She was accused of creating a “toxic climate” simply by exposing students to an academic controversy. Shepherd recorded the interrogation, and the story exploded nationally, illustrating how universities had embraced fear as enforcement.

The machinery of fear begins with language. Universities have institutionalized ever-expanding codes of acceptable speech. Professors tip-toe through lectures, worried that a single word could trigger a formal complaint. Students monitor one another, not in pursuit of learning, but in search of potential infractions.

The unspoken lesson is clear: fear keeps you safe, fear keeps you employable, fear keeps you inside the approved moral boundaries. Universities cultivate fear, but media amplifies it. Canadian media outlets, increasingly indistinguishable in their ideological leanings, feed the public a steady diet of crisis, outrage, and moral panic. Stories are framed to emphasize division, to highlight victimhood, and to portray Canada

as perpetually teetering on the edge of some catastrophe—whether climate apocalypse, systemic collapse, or cultural oppression.

Consider the frenzy in 2021 surrounding the discovery of possible unmarked graves at former residential school sites. Without waiting for forensic confirmation, national outlets declared the findings as mass graves, setting off a wave of fear, anger, and despair across the country. Churches were burned, statues toppled, and reconciliation efforts strained. Months later, when archaeologists clarified that soil anomalies were not yet confirmed as human remains, the correction barely registered. The fear had already served its purpose.

The fear economy is profitable. Outrage brings clicks, clicks bring revenue, and fear ensures constant audience engagement. A single Toronto Star opinion headline during COVID "unvaccinated should be barred from grocery stores"—illustrated how far mainstream outlets would go to inflame panic, demonize neighbours, and keep fear alive. In this way, Canadian media functions less as a neutral observer and more as an active participant in the fear-industrial complex.

Cancel culture is the most visible expression of fear in Canadian society. It is not merely a trend but an institutionalized practice, a form of social control whereby mobs—digital and physical—police speech, art, and behavior. In 2020, author Joseph Boyden, once celebrated as a leading Indigenous voice in literature, saw his career collapse after activists questioned his ancestry. Festivals withdrew invitations, publishers distanced themselves, and his books disappeared from classrooms. Whether or not the criticisms were fair, the mob had spoken, and he was canceled, and few dared to defend him.

Comedians have also faced the wrath of Canadian cancel culture. A Quebec comic, endured years of legal battles after a joke about a disabled child was deemed discriminatory. His case went all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada, which narrowly ruled in his favour in 2021. By then, however, the chilling message had been

delivered to every comic in the country: tread carefully, or risk ruin. The logic of cancel culture is absolute: no nuance, no forgiveness, no proportionality. Past mistakes are weaponized, private messages become public indictments, and the only acceptable response is complete submission or permanent exile.

What is striking in Canada is how eagerly institutions comply with the mob. Universities, corporations, and governments routinely capitulate to outrage, reinforcing the power of cancel culture and teaching Canadians that silence is safer than dissent.

While mobs operate spontaneously, activist organizations refine fear into strategy. From climate coalitions to identity-based advocacy groups, many Canadian NGOs wield fear as their most effective political tool. Extinction Rebellion's Canadian branches have staged disruptive protests—blocking bridges in Vancouver and gluing themselves to streets in Toronto—while warning of imminent planetary collapse. Their rhetoric is intentionally catastrophic: children are told they may not live to middle age unless society dismantles modern industry. The goal is not balance, but panic.

Identity-based activists likewise employ fear. In 2022, school boards across Ontario and British Columbia removed books and renamed schools at the urging of activist groups warning of "unsafe environments." Often, fear of backlash—not evidence of harm—drove the decisions. Librarians and teachers admitted privately that they disagreed but complied, fearing for their jobs. By portraying the public as perpetually endangered, activists create urgency, delegitimize criticism, and extract concessions from governments and corporations.

In the age of social media, influencers have become new gatekeepers of cultural fear. They thrive on creating moral panics, mobilizing followers into outrage, and framing themselves as defenders of virtue against endless enemies—politicians, corporations, or ordinary citizens with the wrong opinions.

During the 2022 Freedom Convoy protests in Ottawa, Canadian influencers on both sides flooded platforms with fear-laden narratives. Pro-convoy voices warned of

looming tyranny and government crackdowns. Anti-convoy voices depicted the protestors as violent extremists threatening national security. Each side weaponized fear, and the resulting hysteria made compromise impossible.

Unlike traditional journalists, influencers face no editorial oversight, no fact-checking, and no accountability. Their narratives, however exaggerated, often dictate the tone of national conversations. And because many Canadian influencers occupy echo chambers aligned with activist causes, their fear mongering always pushes in one ideological direction—further left further radical, further intolerant.

Corporations, far from resisting, have learned to weaponize fear for their own purposes. Fear of reputational damage has made them hyper-sensitive to activist demands. In 2020, when a major grocery organization faced criticism over employee pay during the pandemic, the company rapidly pivoted to virtue-signaling campaigns about climate and diversity, hoping to deflect outrage. Similarly, a Canadian airline, faced with accusations of language discrimination, scrambled to announce policy changes and public apologies, regardless of their actual operational feasibility.

But corporations also use fear directly against consumers. Marketing campaigns increasingly rely on guilt and anxiety: buy this product or you are complicit in climate collapse, wear this symbol or you are siding with oppression, consume this brand or you risk being left behind. Fear has replaced aspiration as the driving force of consumer culture in Canada.

Why do these groups and organizations invest so heavily in fear? The answer is straightforward: fear works. Fear short-circuits rational debate, suppresses dissent, and makes people easier to control. Fear also unites otherwise fragmented movements. Activists with differing agendas—climate, gender, race, economics—find common ground in fear. By presenting every issue as an existential threat, they transform ordinary disagreements into moral battles where compromise is impossible. Fear creates urgency, urgency creates mobilization, and mobilization creates power.

The consequences of this fear-driven environment are profound. Public debate has withered, as Canadians increasingly self-censor. Creativity suffers, as artists and writers avoid risky subjects. Academia stagnates, as research is constrained by ideological taboos. Journalism declines, as stories are framed to fit pre-approved narratives.

At the personal level, Canadians live with constant anxiety. Worker's fear losing their jobs over minor missteps. Students fear social exclusion for speaking honestly. Citizen's fear voicing political opinions at odds with the dominant narrative. The cumulative effect is a society where fear, not freedom, sets the boundaries of life.

Yet fear cannot remain dominant forever. History shows that societies built on fear eventually collapse under their own contradictions. Canadians are beginning to tire of the relentless moral panics, the endless demands for conformity, and the suffocating atmosphere of intimidation. Some journalists are breaking ranks, some professors are speaking out, and some citizens are refusing to be cowed into silence.

When Jordan Peterson, once a relatively obscure psychology professor at the University of Toronto, refused to comply with compelled-speech legislation, he sparked both outrage and a mass following. Whatever one thinks of his ideas, his defiance revealed that fear loses power the moment individuals resist.

The path forward requires courage. Canadians must relearn how to disagree without fear, how to tolerate unpopular opinions, and how to resist the manipulations of activists and influencers. It requires institutions with the backbone to resist mob pressure, media willing to report rather than inflame, and leaders prepared to defend freedom over popularity.

Fear will always exist, but it need not govern. A free society demands citizens who refuse to be ruled by intimidation. Canada's future depends on whether its people can break the spell of fear and reclaim the confidence to speak, to think, and to live without apology.

Who, what, and why is stoking fear in Canada today? It is the universities that teach conformity, the media that amplify panic, the mobs that enforce cancel culture, the activists who leverage dread, the influencers who sell outrage, and the corporations that commodify anxiety. They do so because fear is effective—profitable, powerful, and politically useful.

But a nation that lives in fear cannot thrive. Canada, once known for civility and resilience, now risks becoming a Dominion of silence and submission. Breaking free requires confronting the fear merchants directly, exposing their tactics, and refusing to be governed by the false choice between conformity and destruction. Only then can Canadians hope to restore a society rooted not in intimidation, but in freedom.

Chapter Ten
Liberalism Is Obsessed With Image Over Substance

Canada has always been a fragile nation, bound together more by compromise than by shared identity. Its geography is vast, its regions distinct, and its populations diverse in language, culture, and history. What once held the Dominion together was not ideology but pragmatism—a recognition that for such a country to survive, governance required balance, humility, and respect for difference.

In recent decades, balance has been abandoned, and humility replaced with arrogance. Today, Canada's governing ethos has been captured by one brand above all: liberalism. Not liberalism in its classical sense of individual freedom and limited government, but the modern, partisan Liberal brand—centralized, progressive in name but elitist in practice, obsessed with image over substance, and willing to sacrifice national unity for political survival.

This chapter explores how the Liberal brand has come to dominate Canadian politics and culture, why it is tearing the Dominion apart, and what consequences flow from this dominance. Through history, case studies, and present realities, we see how a political identity once associated with moderation has transformed into a corrosive force, leaving a fractured society in its wake.

The Liberal Party of Canada has been called the "natural governing party," dominating Canadian politics for much of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. To many outsiders, this seems impressive: how could one party remain so resilient for so long? The answer lies not in genuine popularity, but in branding.

The Liberal brand is less about ideas and more about projection. It presents itself as the champion of progress, tolerance, and Canadian identity. It claims to embody the

“middle ground” even when pushing policies far to the left of mainstream sentiment. It survives by telling Canadians that to oppose Liberalism is to oppose Canada itself. Flags, multicultural symbolism, and constant appeals to “Canadian values” are all wrapped into its marketing.

But beneath this polished veneer lies a cynical political machine. The Liberal brand thrives on division. It wins elections by pitting regions against each other, by exploiting fears of extremism, and by presenting itself as the only defense against chaos. It claims to be inclusive while demonizing opponents, pragmatic while enforcing rigid ideology, unifying while presiding over the most divided Canada in living memory.

The Liberal brand did not emerge overnight. Its roots go back to the early 20th century, when the party positioned itself as the voice of national compromise. Under leaders like William Lyon Mackenzie King, the Liberals cultivated a reputation as steady managers who could hold together a fractured country. Yet even then, their strength lay less in principle than in opportunism. King himself once said he would never let “principle stand in the way of practical politics.” That mindset has defined the party ever since.

In the postwar years, Pierre Elliott Trudeau elevated the Liberal brand to near-mythic status. His “Just Society” rhetoric, his cosmopolitan image, and his bold moves—like official bilingualism and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms—reshaped Canadian identity around Liberal priorities. But Trudeau’s legacy was double-edged. While celebrated in some quarters, his policies alienated the West, inflamed Quebec nationalism, and planted seeds of regional resentment that still fester today.

The modern iteration of the Liberal brand under Justin Trudeau pushed these tendencies to new extremes. Where his father spoke of national unity, Justin governs through calculated polarization. Where his father at least balanced intellectual depth with political theater, Justin reduces governance to performance art. The result is a

shallow but highly effective brand machine, endlessly repeated through media, academia, and bureaucracy, suffocating alternative visions of Canada.

The Liberal brand survives not through competence but through image-making. It cloaks itself in progressive language, but its actions often betray a hunger for power at all costs. Consider climate policy. The Liberal government under Justin Trudeau (when he was prime minister) has declared climate change the existential issue of our time, introducing carbon taxes and promising green transitions. Yet pipelines have been purchased, emissions targets missed, and oil revenues quietly banked. The substance does not matter; what matters is the brand—Trudeau photographed at international summits, lecturing the world on Canada's moral superiority, while back home little changed.

Or take Indigenous reconciliation. Few prime ministers have spoken more about reconciliation than Justin Trudeau did. He wept publicly at memorials, lowered flags for months, and wrapped himself in Indigenous symbols. Yet boil water advisories persist, child welfare gaps remain, and real reform is endlessly delayed. Once again, the Liberal brand triumphed over meaningful change.

This dissonance between words and deeds has become a defining trait. Liberalism in Canada today is not about solving problems but about appearing to care. Its true genius lies in managing optics, not outcomes. One reason the Liberal brand endures, is its grip on media and cultural institutions. Canada's major newspapers, publicly funded broadcasters, and arts councils often reflect and reinforce Liberal narratives. The six hundred-million-dollar media bailout in 2018 deepened suspicions that the press had become financially tethered to the government, blurring lines between journalism and propaganda.

When controversies strike, media framing often shields Liberals while magnifying Conservative missteps. Scandals like blackface photos would have destroyed politicians of other stripes. Yet the Liberal brand survives, aided by sympathetic coverage and

narratives emphasizing apology, growth, and forgiveness. Meanwhile, Conservative leaders face caricature as dangerous reactionaries even for modest proposals.

The cultural sector, too, is saturated with Liberal branding. From CBC dramas to Canada Council grants, the official story of Canada is told in Liberal tones: progressive, multicultural, vaguely anti-American, and suspicious of tradition. To dissent from this narrative is to risk being cast as un-Canadian.

If the Liberal brand claims to unify, in practice it divides. Its political strategy depends on winning urban centres—Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver—while disregarding vast swathes of rural Canada, particularly the West. This urban-rural divide has hardened into a near-permanent fracture. Western alienation has become a defining feature of Canadian politics. Under the Liberals, Alberta and Saskatchewan have watched as their energy industries are vilified, their economic contributions dismissed, and their voices ignored in national debates. The 2019 federal election produced a "blue wall" across the Prairies, where Liberals failed to win a single seat. Rather than heal this divide, the Liberal brand exploits it, portraying Western dissent as extremism while doubling down on urban progressive support.

Quebec, too, remains estranged. While the Liberals rely on Quebec seats, they tread carefully around provincial nationalism, often accommodating demands that would never be granted elsewhere. This fuels resentment in English Canada, which sees a double standard in Ottawa's treatment of Quebec compared to Alberta or Ontario. The net effect is a Canada more fractured than ever. A government branding itself as the symbol of unity presides over disunity at historic levels.

To understand how the Liberal brand operates, one must examine concrete examples. SNC-Lavalin (2019): The Trudeau government pressured then–Attorney General Jody Wilson-Raybould to intervene in a criminal case against a Quebec engineering giant. When she resisted, she was demoted and eventually expelled from caucus. The message was clear: the Liberal brand protects its allies, even at the cost of

justice. WE Charity Scandal (2020): The government awarded a massive contract to administer a student program to WE Charity, an organization with close ties to the Trudeau family. Revelations of speaking fees and financial entanglements followed. What should have been a career-ending scandal became another episode in the long story of Liberal survival, aided by friendly media coverage. Blackface Photos (2019): Multiple images emerged of the Prime Minister in black-face and brown-face costumes. In almost any other country, this would have ended a leader's career. In Canada, the Liberal brand rebranded it as a moment of youthful indiscretion, defusing outrage and reframing Trudeau as a flawed but repentant figure. These cases reveal how the Liberal brand manipulates narratives to maintain power, always prioritizing survival over integrity.

Another weapon of the Liberal brand is its monopoly on morality. Liberals frame themselves not merely as political actors, but as guardians of virtue. To vote Liberal is to be enlightened, compassionate, and modern. To oppose Liberalism is to risk being labeled regressive, intolerant, or even hateful. This moral branding is reinforced through legislation. Bills on speech regulation, online harms, and anti-hate measures are presented not as contested policies, but as moral imperatives. Critics are dismissed as bigots or extremists. Debate is foreclosed not by reason, but by moral intimidation.

The most striking example is Bill C-11, the so-called Online Streaming Act. Marketed as a way to "support Canadian content," it in fact hands sweeping regulatory powers to the CRTC, giving government-appointed bureaucrats influence over what Canadians see and hear online. Platforms are pressured to amplify approved voices while sidelining dissenting or independent creators. Critics—ranging from YouTubers to academics—warned that the bill threatens free expression and chills creativity. Yet the Liberal brand sold it as a patriotic duty, insisting that anyone who opposed it was against "Canadian culture." Once again, morality was weaponized to silence debate.

The result is a shrinking space for genuine pluralism. Canadians increasingly self-censor, not wishing to be tarred with moral condemnation. The Liberal brand has thus fused politics with virtue, transforming elections into referenda on morality itself. The Liberal brand might be survivable if it merely involved hypocrisy or arrogance. But its deeper danger lies in its corrosive effects on Canadian unity and democracy. First, it destroys trust. When citizens see a government more concerned with optics than results, more loyal to allies than to principles, trust in institutions erodes.

Second, it entrenches division. By appealing to narrow coalitions—urban, progressive, bureaucratic—the Liberals alienate vast sections of the population, creating resentment and regional hostility. Third, it suffocates debate. By monopolizing morality, the Liberal brand discourages disagreement and fosters a culture of fear. Citizens no longer argue about policy; they avoid speaking at all. Finally, it undermines national identity. Canada is reduced to a set of branded gestures—flags, apologies, slogans—while the substance of shared purpose disintegrates. The Dominion becomes not a real community but a marketing campaign, hollow and fragile.

If the Liberal brand continues its dominance, Canada faces a perilous future. Western separatism, once fringe, now garners serious discussion. Quebec nationalism remains alive, if subdued. Indigenous disillusionment grows as symbolic gestures replace real progress. Urban-rural hostility hardens, leaving fewer spaces for compromise.

Economically, the obsession with branding over substance leaves Canada falling behind. Productivity stagnates, investment flees, and young Canadians face diminished prospects. Socially, fear and division spread, as citizens retreat into echo chambers rather than risk open exchange. Politically, democracy withers, as elections become battles of branding rather than contests of vision. The Dominion cannot survive indefinitely under such strain. A country held together by fear, division, and marketing slogans is a country heading toward disintegration.

Breaking the stranglehold of the Liberal brand requires courage—not only from political opponents but from citizens themselves. Canadians must reject the false equation of Liberalism with Canadian identity. They must rediscover that patriotism does not belong to one party, that unity cannot be manufactured through slogans, and that democracy requires debate, not conformity. Alternative visions of Canada exist. Conservatives, New Democrats, Greens, independents, and emerging movements all offer different paths. None are perfect, but all represent opportunities to break free from the suffocating monopoly of Liberal branding. To reclaim Canada, citizens must demand substance over image, accountability over excuses, and unity rooted in respect rather than manipulation.

The Liberal brand, once a symbol of pragmatism and moderation, has become a corrosive force tearing the Dominion of Canada apart. It thrives on division, survives on branding, and governs through fear. Its legacy is one of distrust, alienation, and disunity. Canada deserves better. A nation as vast and diverse as this one cannot be held together by marketing campaigns and moral intimidation. It requires honesty, courage, and real vision. The choice before Canadians is stark: continue down the path of branded disintegration, or rediscover the principles of unity, freedom, and substance that once allowed this fragile Dominion to endure. Only by breaking free of the Liberal brand can Canada hope to survive.

Chapter Eleven
Social Media – The New Dominion of Fear

Social media, once hailed as a tool of connection, has become one of the greatest sources of fear, hatred, and division in Canada. What began as a digital novelty has evolved into a force that shapes how Canadians think, act, and view one another. Its platforms—Facebook, Twitter (now X), Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, and others—were built not to connect but to capture attention. And attention, as the algorithms quickly learned, is best captured through outrage and fear. If left unchecked, social media will continue to erode trust, deepen divisions, and reshape Canada into a Dominion of perpetual fear. Lawlessness will feel omnipresent, even when not supported by reality. The sense of national unity that once held the Dominion together will fragment.

The last two decades have seen the rise of a phenomenon unlike any other in the history of human communication. In Canada, as elsewhere, social media began innocently enough. At first, it was celebrated as a tool of connection, a way for far-flung families to stay in touch, for students to share their ideas, for workers to keep up with colleagues. It was marketed as a great democratizer of speech, a platform for the voiceless, a stage for creativity, and a bridge across borders. Yet what was supposed to liberate the human spirit has instead been weaponized against it. Social media has become the incubator of fear, hatred, tribalism, and deep division. And for Canada, a country already grappling with anxieties about identity, lawlessness, and cultural fragility, the effect has been corrosive beyond measure.

The subject of social media is vast, but this chapter will attempt to focus it tightly on the Canadian experience. How did social media, once seen as a harmless distraction or a modern convenience, become a dark engine of polarization in the Dominion? Why

do Canadians, who once prided themselves on moderation and civility, now seem so quick to turn on each other with vitriol and cruelty, often through the glowing screens in their pockets? And what, if anything, can be done to arrest this descent into digital chaos?

To answer these questions, we must retrace the path by which Canadians came to embrace social media so fully, understand the mechanisms by which it fosters division, and evaluate the steps—if any—that governments, communities, and individuals can take to blunt its corrosive effects.

Social media, in its earliest Canadian incarnation, arrived with excitement. When Facebook first opened its doors to universities, Canadian students were among the earliest adopters. By the late 2000s, platforms like Twitter, YouTube, and later Instagram spread across the Dominion with astonishing speed. What began as a novelty—friends posting vacation photos or sharing funny videos—quickly turned into a dominant form of communication.

The promise was connection: immigrants could speak with relatives overseas at the tap of a button; Indigenous youth in remote reserves could access conversations happening in St. Johns or Calgary; politicians could speak directly to citizens without the mediation of journalists. Canada, a vast nation defined by geography, seemed particularly suited to this new form of communication.

But embedded in that promise was a flaw. Social media was never truly about connection. It was about attention. And attention, as the platforms quickly discovered, is most effectively captured by triggering emotion. The mild, the polite, and the moderate do not generate “engagement.” Outrage, fear, anger, and tribalism do. Canadians who logged on to see their nephew’s hockey pictures soon found themselves pulled into shouting matches with strangers about pipelines, immigration, or gun rights. Algorithms, designed in Silicon Valley but applied globally, learned that users stayed

online longer when they were upset. And so, Canadians—like citizens everywhere—were fed a steady diet of content designed to make them fearful, enraged, or both.

Canadians have always lived with a quiet undercurrent of fear. The fear of being overshadowed by America. The fear of losing national identity in the face of global culture. The fear of economic decline, of regional alienation, of political corruption. Social media took those latent anxieties and magnified them.

Fear travels quickly online. A single story of a violent crime in Toronto can be shared thousands of times within hours, reaching audiences in Halifax or Saskatoon, many of whom may not realize the event is isolated and not representative of a broader trend. A rumor about government corruption, even if unfounded, can gain traction before fact-checkers can intervene. A single video of police misconduct—or of an alleged hate crime—circulates endlessly, shaping perceptions of an entire country.

Canadians scrolling through their feeds are bombarded daily with images and headlines that reinforce a sense that society is collapsing, that their communities are unsafe, that their values are under attack. Even if statistics show declining crime in some areas, social media ensures that every stabbing, shooting, or robbery feels immediate and personal. Fear, amplified in the digital age, creates the impression of lawlessness.

And once fear sets in, it breeds anger. Social media's architecture thrives on this cycle: fear creates anger, anger drives engagement, and engagement enriches the platforms. It is no wonder, then, that so much of Canada's national discourse now feels like a never-ending argument, a war of words where compromise is impossible and civility is lost

The darker side of social media is hatred. It is hatred of immigrants, hatred of the wealthy, hatred of the poor, hatred of the unvaccinated, hatred of the government, hatred of those who criticize the government. Every ideological trench in Canadian society has been deepened by social media.

Consider how political partisanship has been inflamed. During election cycles, platforms like Facebook and Twitter are flooded with memes, videos, and articles—many of them misleading or outright false—attacking whichever party is in power. Algorithms reward the most incendiary content, so users are more likely to see posts suggesting that Carney is a tyrant or that Pierre Poilievre is a fascist than they are to see reasoned debate about fiscal policy.

The same pattern plays out in cultural issues. Debates about gender identity, Indigenous reconciliation, environmental policy, or free speech quickly devolve into screaming matches. Each side believes the other is not just wrong, but evil. The anonymity of the internet emboldens users to spew insults they would never dare to utter in person. And the result is a Canada that feels increasingly divided, not by geography or class as in previous eras, but by digital ideology.

Hatred online is not without real-world consequences. Social media has been linked to radicalization, both on the far right and the far left. Fringe groups, once relegated to basements and backrooms, now organize openly on encrypted apps and private Facebook groups. Conspiracy theories about global cabals, government mind-control, or foreign interference spread unchecked. And each new wave of hatred leaves Canadians more distrustful of each other, more alienated, and more fearful.

One of the most destructive features of social media is the echo chamber. Canadians online rarely encounter opposing viewpoints in good faith. Instead, algorithms feed users more of what they already believe. A conservative user who clicks on one video criticizing immigration will soon be shown dozens of similar clips. A progressive user who shares a post about climate change will be served an endless stream of alarmist headlines.

The effect is that Canadians are no longer having national conversations. They are living in parallel digital realities. Each camp sees the other as brainwashed, irrational, or malicious. The old ideal of Canada as a country of compromise, negotiation, and

moderation is breaking down. In the past, Canadians may have disagreed over issues, but they were forced to encounter opposing perspectives in newspapers, on television, or in Parliament. Social media has allowed everyone to retreat into ideological cocoons. And in those cocoons, fear and hatred multiply unchecked.

Another critical factor is anonymity. Canadians, known traditionally for politeness, become monsters behind a screen name. Shielded by distance and faceless avatars, users feel free to unleash torrents of abuse. Teachers, journalists, nurses, and even ordinary citizens have been harassed and threatened online. The chilling effect is real: people become afraid to voice opinions, not because the government silences them, but because fellow citizens will attack them mercilessly.

This digital mob mentality has undermined the fabric of Canadian society. Once, disagreement could be civil; now it is often dangerous. Social media has allowed cowards to weaponize words, and the damage is felt not only in mental health crises but in the erosion of trust across the Dominion.

Traditional Canadian media has not resisted this trend. In fact, it has embraced it. Newspapers, struggling to survive, chase clicks by amplifying outrage. Headlines are written for maximum shareability, not accuracy. Television networks mine Twitter for stories, mistaking viral posts for genuine public sentiment.

This has created a feedback loop. Social media amplifies fear and hatred, the media reports on what social media is saying, and then those stories feed back into social media. Canadians are caught in a hall of mirrors, unsure where reality ends and where digital fabrication begins.

The result is distrust. Distrust of politicians, of journalists, of neighbors, of institutions. Canadians no longer know whom to believe. And in that distrust, fear thrives. The Canadian government has not ignored the problem. In recent years, Ottawa has floated various proposals to regulate online harms, disinformation, and hateful content. Bill C-11, framed as legislation to modernize broadcasting and ensure Canadian

content is promoted online, sparked controversy. Critics saw it as a veiled attempt to control speech, to allow bureaucrats to decide what Canadians can or cannot see. Supporters argued it was a necessary step to protect Canadian culture from being drowned out by American or foreign media giants. The debate over Bill C-11 revealed the difficulty of addressing social media's harms. Any effort to regulate is perceived by one side as authoritarian overreach and by the other as insufficiently strict. Meanwhile, the platforms themselves remain largely unaccountable, their opaque algorithms shaping Canadian discourse in ways even legislators cannot fully grasp.

Other proposals, such as the "online harms bill" tabled in draft form, attempted to crack down on hate speech and harmful content. But defining harm in a multicultural, politically polarized country proved nearly impossible. What one group sees as hate, another sees as truth. What one group calls misinformation, another calls dissent. And so, regulation becomes a battlefield in itself, further deepening divisions. Several moments in recent Canadian history highlight the destructive power of social media:

The Freedom Convoy (2022): What began as a protest against vaccine mandates quickly grew into a national crisis, fueled in large part by social media. Facebook groups, Twitter hashtags, and TikTok videos allowed organizers to coordinate and amplify their message far beyond Ottawa. The convoy was both a product of genuine grievances and of online misinformation, with many Canadians convinced of conspiracies that mainstream media ignored. Social media didn't just report on the convoy—it created it.

Indigenous Protests and Blockades: Movements supporting Indigenous sovereignty have used social media to mobilize sympathy and solidarity, sometimes effectively shutting down rail lines and ports. While some Canadians see this as justice, others see it as lawlessness. Social media inflamed tensions by portraying every event through a lens of moral absolutism—heroes on one side, villains on the other.

Immigration and Refugee Debates: Viral videos of border crossings or sensationalized reports of refugee arrivals have sparked heated arguments. Social media

allows fearmongers to portray immigration as an “invasion,” while activists counter with emotional appeals. The nuance of policy is lost, replaced by memes and slogans.

Each of these cases illustrates how social media doesn’t just reflect Canadian fears—it multiplies them. Beyond politics, the psychological toll is immense. Canadians, particularly youth, are experiencing record levels of anxiety, depression, and loneliness. Social media, though marketed as connection, leaves many feeling isolated and inadequate. Images of perfect lives, curated feeds, and constant comparison breed insecurity. When fear and hatred are added to the mix, the effect is toxic.

The rise of cyberbullying, online harassment, and cancel culture has left scars on an entire generation. Many Canadians now fear not only crime on the streets but humiliation online. Reputation destruction, once the domain of tabloids, is now a click away for anyone with a grudge and an internet connection. The central question remains: what can be done? Can Canada rein in social media’s destructive tendencies without sacrificing freedom of expression?

Several avenues exist: Stronger Regulation: Governments could force platforms to be more transparent about their algorithms, remove harmful content more swiftly, and ensure Canadian law applies online. Yet such regulation risks being abused by those in power to silence dissent. Digital Literacy Education: Canadians must be taught, from childhood, how to navigate social media critically. Recognizing misinformation, resisting outrage bait, and understanding echo chambers are essential skills in the 21st century. Platform Accountability: Social media companies, many of them foreign, profit from Canadian users. They must be held responsible for the harms they cause. This could mean taxation, fines, or requirements to invest in Canadian cultural production and safety. Community Responsibility: Ultimately, no law can make people civil. Canadians themselves must resist the temptation to dehumanize each other online. This requires cultural renewal, a recommitment to decency and moderation. Technological Alternatives: Some argue for creating Canadian-owned platforms, designed with

different incentives—prioritizing genuine dialogue over outrage. Whether such alternatives could compete with global giants is uncertainty.

If current trends continue unchecked, the future looks grim. Social media will further erode trust, deepen divisions, and spread fear. Lawlessness, both perceived and real, will feel omnipresent. Canadians may retreat into smaller and smaller echo chambers, losing the sense of shared national identity that has long defined the Dominion. But there is also a possibility—faint but real—that awareness of the problem could lead to solutions. Canadians are not powerless. They can demand accountability, they can educate themselves and their children, and they can choose, as individuals, to use social media differently.

Yet the danger remains: technology moves faster than policy, faster than culture, faster than human adaptation. Unless decisive action is taken, social media will continue to shape Canada not as a nation of peace, order, and good government, but as a Dominion of Fear.

Social media was supposed to bring Canadians together. Instead, it has driven them apart. It has amplified their fears, multiplied their hatreds, and undermined their trust. It has given rise to movements that threaten the stability of the nation and has left individuals more anxious, more divided, and more hostile. The challenge is immense: to tame a beast designed to feed on outrage. Yet if Canada is to survive as a coherent society, it must find a way. For the Dominion cannot withstand a future in which its citizens are permanently at war with each other, stoked by algorithms that value profit over peace.

In the end, social media may prove to be the greatest test Canada has ever faced—not a foreign invasion, not an economic collapse, but the slow corrosion of its social fabric by forces invisible yet omnipresent, subtle yet overwhelming. Whether the Dominion can withstand this test remains an open question.

Chapter Twelve
Quebec's Shadow Over the Dominion

Quebec has always been the most complicated and contradictory province in Canada. It is a land of beauty, culture, and pride, yet also a source of constant tension. Quebec claims to be unique, a nation within a nation, and it has turned this sense of exceptionalism into political leverage. But with that leverage comes resentment, especially from Western provinces. The central paradox of Quebec is this: once the most conservative region in Canada, rooted in Catholic tradition and family values, it is now one of the least receptive to conservatism in its Anglo form. Instead, Quebec has embraced state-driven liberalism, statist nationalism, and progressive cultural values. This rejection of conservatism, combined with its insistence on special recognition and subsidies, fuels fear and division across the Dominion.

In the story of Canada, there is no province that both fascinates and frustrates the rest of the country more than Quebec. It is the land of two solitudes, a province that is at once a jewel of culture and a thorn in the side of Confederation. Quebec has long styled itself as unique, exceptional, and apart — not simply another Canadian province but a nation within a nation. And yet, this uniqueness has come at a cost. Quebec's refusal to embrace conservatism, its longstanding romance with liberalism and progressive policies, and its inability to bridge divides with Western Canada have all added to the climate of fear, suspicion, and fragmentation that defines modern Canada.

Why does Quebec persistently reject conservatism while finding comfort in liberal and statist ideologies? Why do Quebec politicians, intellectuals, and media elites appear to disdain the traditions and values held by many Canadians outside their

borders? And why does Quebec — a province that demands special recognition, billions in equalization, and constant political concessions — remain estranged from Western Canada, where a very different set of values and struggles define daily life?

These questions are not simply matters of political science or cultural anthropology. They go to the heart of the Canadian identity crisis. Quebec's position within the Dominion has always been precarious, and its political choices ripple far beyond the St. Lawrence Valley. By clinging to left-of-center ideologies and spurning conservative traditions, Quebec has become a key contributor to the uncertainty, fear, and division gnawing at the country's foundations.

To understand Quebec's role in this climate of fear, one must journey through its history of Catholic conservatism, its rapid secular revolution, its embrace of state-driven liberalism, and its adversarial relationship with Western provinces. Quebec is more than a province — it is a mirror that reflects the fractures of the Canadian project.

Quebec's political leanings did not arise by accident. For centuries, the province has been shaped by deep historical forces: the survival of French culture in an English-dominated continent, the Catholic Church's dominance, the trauma of conquest, and the relentless struggle for recognition.

When Britain defeated France on the Plains of Abraham in 1759, Quebec entered a new era. French elites were displaced, yet the ordinary French-Canadian people, tied to their land, language, and religion, refused to vanish. The Catholic Church became their shield, the parish their anchor, and survival their guiding principle. This "survivance" mentality bred insularity. Quebec's people saw themselves as under siege, culturally fragile, and therefore suspicious of change. For generations, this survival instinct manifested in conservatism of a unique kind — not the economic or political conservatism of Britain or the Anglo colonies, but a cultural conservatism centered on the Church and tradition. Priests controlled education, health, and morality. Political

leaders worked hand-in-glove with bishops. The Quebecois of the 19th and early 20th centuries were pious, rural, and deferent.

By the 1960s, Quebec turned its back on this heritage almost overnight. The Quiet Revolution dismantled centuries of Catholic dominance and ushered in a new era of secularism, nationalism, and state intervention. Schools and hospitals passed into government hands. Liberal governments under Jean Lesage and his successors replaced the priest with the bureaucrat. Hydro-Québec was expanded as a symbol of nationalist pride.

In this sudden rejection of old Catholic conservatism, Quebec did not pivot toward Anglo-style conservatism. Instead, it embraced social democracy, big government, and progressive ideals. The Church's collapse left a vacuum, and into that vacuum rushed intellectuals, bureaucrats, and leftist movements.

Unlike Western Canada, where populist conservatism thrived, Quebec nationalism fused with liberal and leftist politics. To be a good nationalist meant supporting state intervention to protect the French language, culture, and identity. Economic liberalism and free market conservatism were viewed with suspicion because they were associated with Anglo elites and foreign capital. Thus, Quebec's modern identity was born - fiercely nationalist, deeply attached to state-driven liberalism, and hostile to Anglo-Canadian conservatism.

At the heart of the question lies a paradox. Quebec was once the most conservative part of Canada — devoutly Catholic, family-oriented, tradition-bound. Yet today, it is perhaps the least conservative, at least in the Anglo sense. Why? In Quebec's political lexicon, conservatism is often conflated with Anglophone power, British tradition, and Western oil interests. To embrace conservatism, in Quebec's imagination, is to betray its distinctiveness and surrender to Anglo norms. The conservative parties that have emerged in Quebec — from the old Union Nationale to the more recent ADQ

— have always struggled to balance nationalism with right-leaning economics. They rarely last.

The Quiet Revolution instilled a deep faith in the state as protector of Quebec identity. Where Western Canada sees Ottawa as a meddler, Quebec sees government as a guarantor of survival. Language laws, cultural subsidies, and equalization payments all reinforce this dependence. Conservatism, which preaches small government and individual responsibility, directly threatens this model.

With the Church gone, liberalism and secularism filled the spiritual void. The bureaucrat, the professor, and the activist became the new priestly class. Quebec's political elite now preaches progressivism, feminism, multicultural skepticism (with a focus on protecting francophone culture), and climate zealotry. The province has developed an almost moral disdain for conservatism, viewing it as backwards, foreign, and dangerous.

Quebec's political choices do not occur in isolation. They ripple across the Dominion, shaping the fears of Canadians from coast to coast. Every constitutional crisis in Canada since 1960 has revolved around Quebec: the FLQ crisis, the 1980 referendum, the 1995 referendum, the failed Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords. Canadians fear Quebec's perpetual demands for special recognition. For decades, politicians have tiptoed around Quebec, terrified of sparking separation.

This constant threat of fragmentation (as was written about, in this author first book of his trilogy, Fragmentation of Canada), creates a climate of anxiety. Western Canadians resent that Quebec can threaten national unity and receive concessions while their own grievances — alienation, lack of pipelines, equalization burdens — are ignored.

Quebec's voting habits tilt federal politics leftward. Without Quebec, the Liberal Party would never have dominated Ottawa for much of the 20th century. Conservatives often find themselves locked out of Quebec, forced to cobble together coalitions

elsewhere. Many Canadians fear that Quebec's electoral weight ensures Canada remains stuck in progressive governance, detached from the realities of resource economies and rural conservatism.

Equalization payments are another source of fear and resentment. Quebec consistently receives billions while Western provinces like Alberta pay in. For many Westerners, this looks like Quebec siphoning wealth while blocking pipelines, denouncing oil, and pushing climate policies that hurt the West. The perception is clear: Quebec takes while lecturing others, adding bitterness to an already divided nation.

Perhaps no divide in Canada is sharper than the one between Quebec and Western Canada. Quebec's survival is cultural — preserving language and identity in an English continent. Western Canada's survival is economic — building prosperity despite Ottawa's indifference and interference. These two survival stories clash. Quebec protects itself through government intervention, while the West seeks freedom from Ottawa's grip.

Nothing symbolizes this clash more than pipelines. Alberta and Saskatchewan demand energy corridors to sell their oil. Quebec, by contrast, blocks pipelines in the name of environment and nationalism while happily importing oil from abroad. This fuels Western anger. To the West, Quebec is hypocritical — living off equalization funded by oil wealth while sabotaging the very industry that sustains the country.

Western Canada leans Conservative: Quebec leans Liberal or Bloc. This creates a permanent tension. A party that wins the West often loses Quebec, and vice versa. National unity becomes impossible when two massive regions pull in opposite directions. Quebec adds to the fear that saturates Canadian life in several ways: Fear of endless concessions: Will Ottawa ever stop bending to Quebec? Fear of being ignored: Western grievances pale compared to Quebec's constant demands. Fear of instability: The threat of another referendum always looms. Fear of imbalance: Quebec's statist liberalism forces Canada leftward, alienating conservatives nationwide. Quebec is not

the sole cause of Canada's malaise, but it is a central player. Its rejection of conservatism and embrace of liberalism do not simply reflect a preference — they shape the entire national political culture. In doing so, Quebec has become both the darling and the burden of Confederation.

Quebec is a paradox. It claims to be a nation apart, yet it demands Canadian subsidies. It rejects conservatism, yet once embodied tradition more than any other province. It champions liberalism yet insists on strict language laws that limit freedom. It demands recognition but scorns the West's pleas for respect. This paradox fuels fear across Canada. Fear of fragmentation, fear of domination, fear of unfairness. Quebec is not simply another province; it is the epicenter of Canada's anxieties. Its disdain for conservatism, its romance with liberalism, and its tense relationship with the West ensure that the Dominion of Fear remains fractured and uncertain.

As long as Quebec remains wedded to its peculiar brand of statist liberalism, Canada will remain divided — a country forever negotiating with itself, never confident, never whole. Quebec's shadow stretches across the Dominion, and in that shadow, fear grows.

Chapter Thirteen
Immigration – The New Uncertainty

Immigration is central to Canada's self-image. Politicians call it the country's lifeblood, pointing to waves of newcomers who helped build railways, farms, and cities. Yet today, immigration is no longer viewed as simply a source of prosperity. It has become a lightning rod for anxiety — tied to crime, housing shortages, cost of living spikes, cultural fragmentation, and political manipulation. Ordinary Canadians increasingly feel that immigration is not managed for their benefit but for the interests of political elites and business. What was once a story of optimism has turned into one of fear.

Immigration has always been part of the Canadian story. From the early French settlers along the St. Lawrence to the waves of Irish, Scottish, Chinese, Ukrainian, and Italian arrivals who built the railroads, tilled the Prairies, and filled the factories, Canada is a nation shaped by newcomers. Politicians and academics love to call it a "mosaic" — a land enriched by diversity. But beneath that carefully polished slogan lies another reality: immigration, particularly in the modern era, is feeding Canada's fears.

The promise of immigration as a source of prosperity has collided with the anxieties of ordinary citizens. Housing shortages, rising costs of living, cultural fragmentation, and above all, concerns about crime are now bound up with the immigration question. Canadians are told to welcome more and more newcomers, but they are seldom asked whether the system works for them, their neighborhoods, and their families.

Today, immigration has become a lightning rod in Canada's Dominion of Fear. It is not only an economic issue; it is a moral, cultural, and security concern. And the story begins with crime — the primal fear that one's community is no longer safe. Canada

once prided itself on being one of the safest countries in the world. Cities were thought of as clean, orderly, and free of the violent crime that plagued American counterparts. For decades, immigration was woven into this image: the story of hardworking families arriving to build better lives, contributing to their communities, and embodying Canadian civility.

But that narrative has begun to fray. Increasingly, stories of violent crimes linked to immigrant gangs, organized crime networks, and refugee claimants dominate headlines. While elites insist that crime rates are “stable” or “not statistically significant,” ordinary Canadians see and feel something different in their neighborhoods. Toronto has become a focal point for this fear. Street gangs with roots in Caribbean, Somali, and South Asian communities dominate crime reporting. Gun violence in the GTA has surged, with police forces tracing much of it back to gang conflicts imported through immigration pipelines. Vancouver faces its own crisis: the drug trade and gang wars tied to Asian and South American cartels. Montreal, meanwhile, wrestles with organized crime layered on top of longstanding Mafia traditions.

These realities undermine the comforting narrative of immigration as a simple social good. Instead, crime creates an atmosphere of suspicion and fear — a sense that Canada is importing instability. Another source of unease is the flood of asylum seekers crossing irregular borders, particularly at Rox-ham Road in Quebec before its closure. Many arrive without proper screening. While the vast majority are peaceful, a small minority engage in crime or strain social services, creating flashpoints of tension. Canadians fear not knowing who is entering the country, and whether they bring risks with them. Government officials and academics often downplay the link between immigration and crime, citing aggregate statistics. But crime is not evenly distributed — its clusters in certain neighborhoods, overwhelmingly immigrant-heavy, where police

resources are stretched thin and residents live in daily fear. For those on the ground, elite reassurances mean little. Their lived reality is one of insecurity, not safety.

While crime is the sharpest edge of immigration fear, it is not the only one. Canada's housing crisis is now one of the worst in the developed world. Supply cannot keep up with demand, and immigration has become a central driver of population growth. For many Canadians — especially younger generations — the dream of home ownership is vanishing. Immigration is seen, fairly or unfairly, as accelerating the scarcity and pushing prices sky-high. Rapid population growth strains infrastructure - drives up rent, and increases demand for groceries, transportation, and energy. Canadians already facing inflation now see immigration as adding weight to an already unbearable burden. Hospitals, schools, and welfare programs are buckling under new pressures. Canadians wait longer for medical care, while newcomers often receive priority in settlement services. This creates resentment and a perception of unfairness. Fear grows from the sense that the country is overextended, its resources spread too thin.

Canada once spoke of integration; now it speaks of multiculturalism. The difference is not small. Integration promised unity; multiculturalism promises permanent difference. For many Canadians, this shift breeds unease. They fear that the shared values which once bound the country together are being diluted. In Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal, entire neighborhoods function as cultural enclaves. Signs are not in English or French; businesses cater only to one group; schools are divided along ethnic lines. Canadians fear the rise of "parallel societies" where loyalty to the larger Canadian project is weak. The very idea of a common Canadian identity feels under siege. As immigration accelerates, ordinary citizens fear becoming strangers in their own land. What was once a cultural mosaic now feels like cultural balkanization.

For Ottawa, immigration is not just policy — it is politics. Parties court immigrant-heavy ridings in Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal. Liberal governments in particular have treated high immigration levels as a way to secure permanent electoral advantage.

Conservatives, wary of backlash, tread carefully. Canadians sense that immigration is less about national interest than about political survival. Immigration is heavily policed in the public square. Critics are branded as xenophobic or racist. This stifling of debate creates another fear: the fear of speaking openly. Many Canadians feel their concerns are silenced by elites who equate legitimate anxieties with bigotry.

Immigration also sharpens regional divides. The West, already alienated by Ottawa's energy policies, now feels ignored on immigration. Alberta and Saskatchewan bear the costs of rapid inflows but lack the political clout of immigrant-heavy Ontario and Quebec. This deepens resentment and accelerates separatist talk. Once-stable neighborhoods have become sources of anxiety. Parents fear gang violence near schools. Seniors lock their doors at night. Small business owners face theft, extortion, or vandalism from gangs. Immigration is not the sole cause, but it is woven into the story.

Reports of random stabbings, assaults, and harassment on buses and subways — often committed by individuals with immigrant backgrounds or by recent arrivals without stable housing — reinforce the perception of rising lawlessness. Police forces are accused of systemic bias when they target immigrant gangs, creating a chilling effect. Officers pull back, neighborhoods feel abandoned, and crime festers. Fear fills the vacuum.

Immigration, once a source of pride, has become another driver of national fear. Fear of Crime: Canadians fear for their safety in cities reshaped by gang violence and organized crime. Fear of Scarcity: Housing, healthcare, and services feel increasingly out of reach. Fear of Cultural Loss: Identity seems fragile in a country that prizes multiculturalism over unity. Fear of Speaking Out: Canadians feel silenced in the debate, afraid to be labeled bigots. Fear of Division: Immigration deepens the East–West divide, feeding alienation. Together, these fears fuel suspicion, resentment, and instability — eroding the sense of security that once defined Canada.

Canada's immigration system is not simply about welcoming newcomers; it has become a crucible of national anxiety. Crime, housing, cost of living, cultural fragmentation, and political gamesmanship all converge to make immigration one of the most divisive issues in modern Canada. Ordinary citizens fear not just the stranger at the border but the transformation of their neighborhoods, their cities, their entire country. In crime statistics, in housing prices, in cultural disunity, they see evidence that the system no longer serves them.

Immigration may enrich elites and deliver votes, but for many Canadians, it adds to a Dominion already drowning in fear. Until Canada confronts these realities honestly - immigration will remain less a promise of hope than a source of division and dread.

Chapter Fourteen
A Nation Surrounded by Voices of Outrage

The power of activists (individuals and groups working on diverse causes) comes not only from their protests but from their capture of institutions. Universities now enforce activist orthodoxy in policies, punishing faculty and students who question the latest ideological trends. Corporations are coerced into issuing public pledges on climate, reconciliation, or gender, not out of conviction but survival. Government officials legislate under the constant threat of activist-led campaigns to destroy careers. In practice, advocacy groups function as unelected regulators, bypassing the will of the broader public. Activists claim to champion the voiceless, but this chapter will show how they have created a nation where fear silences the majority. Their strength lies not in truth or numbers but in intimidation and institutional capture. Unless Canadians resist this cycle of fear, the country will remain a Dominion not of pride but of perpetual dread.

Canada once enjoyed a global reputation for civility, compromise, and balance. To outsiders, it was the northern nation of peacekeepers, innovators, and polite pragmatists. Yet within its borders, a very different picture has emerged. Fear dominates the public square, and not merely because of crime, political division, or economic stagnation. A new source of dread comes from the loudest voices of all—the activists and advocacy groups who claim to speak on behalf of the public, but in practice dictate policy, distort debate, and silence dissent.

No nation, Canada included, is free from social movements. Advocacy, lobbying, and protest are part of democratic life. Yet what distinguishes today's activist culture from the past is its intensity, its absolutism, and its capture of institutions once designed to resist narrow ideological pressure. In this transformation, activists have not only

reshaped debates on climate, gender, race, policing, immigration, and indigenous reconciliation—they have also shifted the national psyche. Fear of being "called out," ostracized, or ruined now outweighs open conversation.

Activist groups in Canada have not always been destructive. In earlier decades, their energy often drove necessary reforms. Women's suffrage, workers' rights, and even environmental protections emerged from organized activism. Yet the distinction between constructive and destructive activism lies in scope and moderation. Where once groups sought tangible goals—votes for women, an eight-hour workday, pollution controls—modern advocacy rarely stops at practical gains. Instead, it seeks perpetual struggle, an endless battlefield of outrage where victory is never acknowledged because victory would mean dissolution. The shift began in the late twentieth century, when advocacy groups professionalized. Instead of small, volunteer-driven movements, they became bureaucratic machines with budgets, donors, and permanent staff. Organizations no longer disbanded when they achieved their goals; they simply found new battles. For a modern activist group, extinction is failure. Thus, success is always redefined, the bar forever raised, ensuring a cycle of conflict without resolution.

This perpetual mission feeds directly into Canada's climate of fear. Activists today do not just campaign against policies—they campaign against people. A Canadian citizen who voices disagreement, even politely, risks being painted as racist, sexist, colonialist, transphobic, or worse. Labels become weapons, and reputations fall within hours. The new activism thrives not by persuading but by intimidating, not by building consensus but by dividing society into the virtuous and the condemned.

The power of activists lies not merely in protests on the streets but in their infiltration of institutions. Universities, corporations, media outlets, and government agencies now host entire divisions dedicated to activist-approved causes. Diversity, equity, and inclusion offices, reconciliation committees, gender councils, and climate task forces ensure that activist language becomes institutional law. Consider Canada's

universities, once intended as forums for free inquiry. Student activist groups, often allied with faculty associations, have transformed campuses into ideological battlegrounds. Those who question orthodoxies on gender, climate, or race find themselves shouted down, disinvited, or formally investigated. The activist ethos has moved from the protest signs of 1968 to the administrative policies of 2025.

Corporations, too, have fallen under pressure. Advocacy groups deploy boycotts, social media campaigns, and shareholder intimidation to force companies into public declarations. A business that sells hamburgers must now apologize for climate impacts. A bank must proclaim commitments to indigenous reconciliation or LGBTQ+ rights. Refusal risks reputational death. These coerced gestures, however, often mean little in practice—serving not the public good but the activist need to demonstrate dominance. Government is no less vulnerable. Politicians increasingly legislate not on the basis of majority opinion or long-term strategy but under the threat of activist condemnation. A minister who fails to adopt the language of “systemic racism” or “climate emergency” can expect organized campaigns to destroy their career. Advocacy groups act as unelected regulators, dictating the terms of discourse while bypassing democratic debate.

The Canadian public has learned to fear activists not because they are armed with physical power but because they wield reputational and institutional power. Fear of unemployment, cancellation, or social exile drives ordinary citizens into silence. One does not have to agree with an activist to be destroyed; one merely has to hesitate before repeating their slogans. This fear is amplified by the speed of modern communication. Social media ensures that any misstep can be magnified instantly to a national audience. An offhand comment becomes a headline, a decades-old remark becomes a scandal, and an unpopular opinion becomes grounds for dismissal. Advocacy groups maintain vast networks of followers ready to pounce on targets, ensuring fear spreads faster than reason. The result is a Canada where self-censorship dominates.

Teachers avoid controversial topics, journalists follow activist-approved narratives, and neighbors no longer discuss politics openly. The activist victory is not measured in policies passed but in words never spoken.

What, then, do activists truly want? On the surface, their causes appear noble. Who would not want cleaner air, safer communities, or fairer treatment for minorities? Yet beneath the surface lies a more troubling reality: activists thrive on crisis. Without fear, they lose relevance; without division, they lose funding. Many organizations have grown into multimillion-dollar entities dependent on perpetual outrage to justify their existence. The ultimate goal is not resolution but dominance. Activists seek to remake Canadian identity according to their ideology. This means rewriting history to portray Canada primarily as a nation of crimes—colonialism, patriarchy, racism, exploitation. It means recasting citizens not as individuals with agency but as members of identity groups locked in permanent conflict. And it means enforcing conformity by punishing those who resist. In short, the activist end game is control: control of language, control of institutions, and control of collective memory.

The evidence is not theoretical. Canada has witnessed this transformation across multiple fronts. In environmental activism, calls for sustainability have mutated into absolutist demands for the end of entire industries. Oil and gas, forestry, and even agriculture are painted as moral evils. Protesters block pipelines, sabotage construction sites, and sue governments, insisting that compromise is betrayal. Thousands of Canadian workers live in fear that their livelihoods will vanish not through democratic debate but through activist veto.

Indigenous advocacy shows a similar pattern. Genuine grievances have been raised and acknowledged, yet many groups now demand not reconciliation but perpetual guilt. Land acknowledgments before meetings, renaming of cities, and billion-dollar transfers have not resolved tensions; they have deepened them. Activists thrive

on keeping wounds open, ensuring that healing never occurs. Ordinary Canadians fear speaking critically, lest they be branded colonial oppressors.

Gender and identity politics likewise illustrate the trend. LGBTQ+ and gender activism has secured many rights long overdue, but movements now push into extremes—demanding unquestioned acceptance of radical ideologies about gender identity in schools, workplaces, and laws. Parents who object are dismissed as bigots; teachers who hesitate risk dismissal. Fear, not dialogue, sustains the movement.

Even policing has not escaped the activist grip. Anti-police advocacy groups have successfully pushed for defunding initiatives, oversight boards stacked with critics, and a culture of suspicion toward law enforcement. The result is a fearful public, less protected than before. Communities see rising crime yet fear speaking against activist narratives that glorify offenders as victims of systemic oppression.

The dominance of activists is multiplied by their alliance with media. Canadian media outlets, increasingly dependent on advocacy-driven narratives, amplify activist talking points while dismissing dissent as dangerous. Activist press releases become headlines; activist spokespeople become “experts.” Fear is further amplified by media framing. A protest of fifty is described as a movement. A policy opposed by thousands is ignored if activists bless it. The public comes to believe that activist positions represent majority opinion, when in reality they may reflect only a small but loud minority.

The greatest tragedy of activist dominance is the silence of the majority. Most Canadians are moderate, pragmatic, and willing to compromise. They want fair solutions, not ideological warfare. Yet fear prevents them from speaking. The silenced majority watches as activists dictate school curricula, rewrite laws, and redefine morality, wondering when it became dangerous to voice common sense. This silence feeds the cycle. Activists mistake lack of resistance for consent. Governments interpret quiet streets as endorsement. And so, the activist agenda marches on, unchecked.

Internationally, Canada's activist culture has transformed its reputation. Once admired for balanced diplomacy, Canada now appears fractured and self-loathing. Endless apologies, symbolic gestures, and activist-inspired policies make the nation seem insecure rather than strong. Investors hesitate, allies grow skeptical, and ordinary Canadians feel ashamed of a country that once inspired pride.

If activists achieve their ultimate vision, Canada will no longer be a nation of shared identity but a patchwork of competing grievances. The economy will shrink under the weight of activist vetoes, the culture will fracture under the strain of identity politics, and freedom will shrink beneath the pressure of enforced orthodoxy. The ultimate goal is not merely reform but transformation: to dismantle the Canada that was and replace it with a Canada defined by perpetual guilt, endless struggle, and activist rule.

Activists and advocacy groups claim to champion the voiceless, yet they have created a nation where fear silences the majority. Their power lies not in numbers but in intimidation, not in truth but in control. Canada's future depends on whether ordinary citizens can overcome this fear, reclaim open dialogue, and reassert the principles of balance, pragmatism, and freedom that once defined the Dominion. For now, activists have turned Canada from a beacon of civility into a land of dread. Fear, once an aberration, is now a political weapon. And until the nation confronts the activist machine, Canada will remain trapped in its Dominion of Fear.

Chapter Fifteen
America is Both Canada's Shield & Shadow

America has always loomed over Canada, both as protector and as problem. Canadians have long measured themselves against their southern neighbor, yet today that comparison brings only unease. The United States, once a symbol of strength, now appears fractured and fearful, and Canadians, constantly exposed to American news and culture, cannot help but absorb that fear into their own lives. The two nations mirror one another's decline, both suffering from lawlessness, division, and a collapse of confidence in institutions.

America hangs over Canada in ways that are impossible to escape. It has always been that way, from the days when Canadians lived in fear of being swallowed by their larger, more aggressive neighbour, to today when American news, culture, politics, and violence spill across the border in an unstoppable flood. Canada may pride itself on being distinct, calmer, and more polite, but in reality it exists in a shadow. The shadow is America's, and it has grown darker, heavier, and more frightening in recent years. Canadians look south and see not just the chaos of another country's decline but a distorted reflection of their own. What Americans live through today, Canadians often find themselves rehearsing tomorrow. And what frightens Americans has a way of frightening Canadians even more, because it comes amplified, dramatized, and repeated endlessly through a cultural machine that does not stop.

The fear that Canada now swims in cannot be understood without America. For much of the 20th century, Americans were admired for their energy, their wealth, their sense of invention and freedom. But admiration has curdled into unease, and unease into something like dread. Canadians are now wary of America not only because it is

unstable, divided, and violent, but because that instability leaks across borders. Fear itself has become contagious, and in an age of instant information, nothing spreads faster. Canadians may talk about their own housing crises, their own crime waves, and their own political corruption, but the language, the metaphors, and even the anxieties are imported. When an American city collapses into rioting, Canadians see Toronto or Vancouver in that spectacle. When Americans talk openly of a coming civil war, Canadians wonder how far away their own rupture might be. The border is real, but fear has no customs station. It flows freely, and in doing so, it warps both nations at once.

The heart of the unease is America's apparent unraveling. Canadians have always assumed that America, for all its flaws, was the sturdy anchor of the continent — brash, loud, and flawed, yes, but also fundamentally stable. That assumption is gone. Today America looks less like an anchor than a ship breaking apart in a storm. The right and the left no longer merely disagree; they inhabit entirely different worlds; each convinced the other is bent on destruction. Political violence, once whispered as a nightmare, is now openly discussed. Commentators, scholars, and ordinary people speak without irony about the possibility of a second civil war. Armed groups drill in the woods. Politicians hint at secession. Media channels stoke division with relentless fury, monetizing rage while democracy itself is questioned. Canadians, who once leaned on the idea of America as a democratic constant, now see a neighbour losing faith in its own institutions, its own identity, even its own survival. Fear of collapse is not a paranoid fantasy anymore; it is a daily headline.

For Canadians, this is destabilizing in two ways. First, because the collapse of American order would drag Canada down with it — economically, culturally, even militarily. Second, because the same forces tearing America apart are alive inside Canada too, merely smaller, quieter, or a step behind. Canadians see that the divisions over race, ideology, guns, gender, immigration, and crime are not purely American questions. They are Canadian questions as well, and the more bitterly America fights,

the more Canadians find themselves rehearsing the same arguments. Every American cultural battle — from book bans to statues to social justice crusades — eventually finds its way north. And as it does, Canadians cannot help but feel their own sense of security slipping.

One of the deepest causes of fear is the normalization of crime. In the United States, the sheer scale of violence is staggering - mass shootings that have become routine, cities where gunfire is daily background noise, entire communities hollowed out by drugs, gangs, and neglect. Canadians watch this with horror, but also with a numb familiarity, because their own cities are not immune. American lawlessness becomes the lens through which Canadians interpret their own. When car jackings surge in Winnipeg or random stabbings erupt in Vancouver, the Canadian mind links it to the broader pattern seen in the United States. The message is clear: crime is no longer an anomaly; it is a new baseline. In both countries, ordinary people live with the sense that the state no longer protects them. The social contract, the guarantee of safety, has been broken. And once broken, it is nearly impossible to repair.

Take this story that was published by Fox News and was written by Sarah Rumpf-Whitten … Stephen Federico's daughter, Logan, twenty-two, was murdered in her sleep in May while staying overnight at a friend's house in Columbia, South Carolina. Police say the suspect, Alexander Devonte Dickey, thirty, broke into the home, shot Logan, and then went on a shopping spree with her stolen credit and debit cards. But what has shocked and outraged many is not only the brutality of the crime, but court documents revealing Dickey's thirty-nine arrests, and twenty-five felony charges before Logan's murder. Yet he had spent barely six hundred days in jail over the past decade.

"He should have been in jail for over one-hundred and forty years for all of the crimes he committed," Federico told Fox News Digital. "He was committing crimes since he was fifteen years old. But nobody could figure out that he couldn't be rehabilitated?

Well, you'd have to put him in prison to see if he could be rehabilitated. Isn't that the idea of prison?"

The reasons for this normalization in both the United States and Canada are complex but interconnected. In the United States, decades of inequality, disinvestment, and cultural fragmentation have created entire zones where law has no real presence. Policing is both overbearing and absent — aggressive in some contexts, nonexistent in others. Canadians see echoes of this in their own streets: police hesitant to act, prosecutors releasing offenders again and again, governments unwilling to confront the decay of public safety. America shows Canadians what happens when fear is left to fester: citizens arm themselves, communities divide, and mistrust corrodes everything. The Canadian fear is that the same script is being rehearsed north of the border, only with fewer weapons but the same erosion of trust.

The political divide in America is perhaps the most terrifying spectacle for Canadians. It is not simply left versus right; it is a chasm that no longer has a bridge. The right views the left as tyrannical, obsessed with control, determined to erase traditions. The left views the right as violent, bigoted, and anti-democratic. Each side believes the other is not merely wrong but dangerous, illegitimate, even evil. Canadians watch this descent into hostility and wonder how long their own society can avoid the same fate. Already Canada is polarized in ways it has never been before. Urban versus rural, progressive versus conservative, immigrant versus native-born, young versus old — the fractures deepen. American rage acts as both warning and blueprint. The fear is that if America does shatter, Canada will follow, not because it wants to but because the gravitational pull is too strong.

Economics adds another layer. Canada's economy is tied so tightly to America's that any tremor south of the border is felt instantly. When Americans panic about inflation, Canadians see their own grocery bills climb. When U.S. interest rates soar, Canadian mortgages tighten into unpayable knots. The American culture of fear is not

just political or social; it is economic, and it flows north as predictably as the weather. Canadians feel trapped in a relationship they cannot escape. America's decline does not stop at the border; it arrives in Canadian households every time a paycheck is stretched thin, or a retirement plan looks precarious. The fear is not abstract; it is the daily grind of financial insecurity.

Media magnifies all of this. Canadian news, once more focused on its own identity, now borrows endlessly from American headlines. Cable news channels beam U.S. debates into Canadian living rooms. Social media, dominated by American voices, drowns out Canadian nuance. Canadians consume American fear at industrial scale, and in doing so, they absorb it as their own. When Americans riot, Canadians feel the tremor. When American schools lock down, Canadian parents worry about their own children. When American politicians scream about betrayal, Canadians wonder how close their own politics are to the abyss. Media saturation ensures that Canada cannot look away, even if it wanted to. Fear is not only contagious; it is addictive, and the American media machine ensures there is always more to consume.

But perhaps the most unsettling realization for Canadians is that Americans themselves are afraid. The United States is not simply a source of chaos to be observed from afar; it is a nation terrified of itself. Surveys show trust in institutions collapsing, confidence in democracy fading, and belief in the future withering. Americans fear their government, their neighbours, even their own families. They live with the constant awareness that violence could erupt anywhere, at any time. This fear fuels more division, more suspicion, and more anger. Canadians, looking on, see not a powerful protector but a wounded giant lashing out in confusion. And in that image, Canadians see their own possible future: a society that has lost its cohesion, its sense of purpose, and its ability to trust.

The uneasy truth is that Canada and America are bound together in decline. Each reflects the other's failures; each amplifies the other's fears. The border is no protection

from cultural contagion. America's polarization breeds Canadian polarization. America's lawlessness breeds Canadian unease. America's fear becomes Canada's fear, and in the end, both nations find themselves locked in the same spiral. The Dominion of Fear is not purely Canadian; it is continental. And unless something breaks the cycle, both countries may find themselves in the same destination: societies where fear is the only constant, trust is the only casualty, and the future is nothing but uncertainty.

The most important thing to remember is that the contagion is neither purely cultural nor purely material — it is structural. The United States exports patterns of organization, crisis, and collapse the same way it exports movies and music. When factory towns are hollowed out and their social infrastructure collapses, an economic lesson travels across the border. When the social contract frays and people lose faith in institutions, that lesson likewise radiates outward. The transmission is not mechanical so much as mimetic: Canadians see what the United States tolerates and begin to imagine tolerating it themselves. In the language of fear, the United States becomes a preview, not necessarily of identical outcomes, but of plausible ones. The question for Canada is not whether the same precise disasters will occur; the question is whether Canada will adopt the same habits of fear and response that made those disasters possible.

Start with the political mechanics. Polarization in the United States has calcified into ideological tribes that hardly communicate. Voter coalitions have shifted, identities hardened, and political life has become a constant struggle for cultural dominance rather than governance. Surveys and long-form studies have documented this change: Americans increasingly say their political opponents do not merely disagree about policy but cannot even agree on basic facts — a condition that destroys the possibility of pragmatic compromise and institutional continuity. That kind of political environment makes the unthinkable thinkable. When tens of millions of citizens believe that the other side is existentially dangerous, the blunt instruments of state — courts,

legislatures, policing — begin to look like illegitimate tools. In such a climate, alternatives to ordinary democratic process begin to look attractive to the desperate or the fanatical. Those are not abstract observations; they are measurable trends in public opinion and party alignment that point to a political landscape where consensus has withered, and anger rules the day.

That erosion of consensus is mirrored by a more general decline in institutional trust. People in the United States increasingly report that they have little confidence in the institutions that once mediated social conflict: the media, the judiciary, even the electoral process. Trust is the lubricant of democracy; without it, the machinery seizes. When citizens believe the media lies, or the courts are politicized, every contested decision becomes a struggle for legitimacy instead of a settling of differences. That is a recipe for perpetual crisis. The decline in confidence is not uniform across every institution, but the net effect is unmistakable: citizens are less likely to accept routine losses, more likely to question outcomes, and more likely to invest in extra-legal remedies. That pattern of disillusionment breeds anger, and anger is contagious.

Violence — and the normalization of violent risk — is another driver of continental fear. The United States experiences levels of gun death and mass-shooting incidents that are far higher than other wealthy democracies; such events become repeated spectacles in the media and on social platforms. The scale of those tragedies — tens of thousands of gun deaths in a single recent year — recalibrates what societies consider exceptional and what they consider the new normal. For many Americans, the idea that a child could be shot at school is no longer an unthinkable horror but an occasional, almost predictable tragedy. That acceptance, even if it is only tacit, shifts the tenor of public life. Fear becomes an ambient condition: parents plan emergencies into school drop-offs, houses are built with fewer public-facing windows, and communities organize not around hope but around prevention and suspicion. Canadians feel the

reverberations of those choices; they watch and learn how societies adapt to living with persistent violence, and they begin to configure their own institutions in response.

Economic intimacy turns these cultural and political shocks into immediate material pain. Canada's economy is woven into America's in ways that make insulation impossible. Three-quarters of Canada's exports go to the United States; the flows of capital, goods, and labor mean that economic fluctuations south of the border are amplified at home. When the U.S. consumer stalls, Canadian exporters feel it. When American tariffs or trade pressures appear on the horizon, Canadian farmers, energy companies, and manufacturers confront sudden existential decisions. Economic shocks create insecurity, insecurity breeds fear. In short, the two economies function like one organism: if the United States coughs, Canada's chest tightens. That interdependence is not merely a backdrop — it is the conduit through which American panic arrives at Canadian kitchen tables.

There are also technological accelerants. Social media platforms, designed to maximize attention and engagement, favor content that triggers outrage, dread, and moral panic. Algorithms reward outrage because outrage keeps people clicking. This means a local event becomes global in minutes, and a rumor about a national crisis becomes a worldwide story in an hour. Canadian audiences, who often consume the same feeds as Americans, absorb the performance of panic and learn its forms. The rapid spread of partial information and the ease of manipulating narratives make fear more contagious and more durable. Narratives of decline are economically useful — clicks equal cash — and in a system that monetizes emotion, fear is both a product and a commodity.

But that description, while accurate, is still too abstract. To understand how the American pattern matters to Canada, we should trace a few specific vectors. First, the politics-to-policing vector. As the political center erodes in the United States, policing becomes politicized: local law enforcement agencies are alternately demonized and

deferential depending on partisan control and public mood. Reform movements, often legitimate in their aims, are sometimes met with political backlash that leaves policing policy in flux. The result is a patchwork of responses: in some jurisdictions you have aggressive reforms paired with under-resourced enforcement; in others, you have retrenchment and militarized police postures. Canadians watch both experiments with interest and alarm. They see what happens when policing is pulled in two directions — accountability on one hand and empowerment on the other — and they ask: what balance will protect public safety without enabling abuse? In Canada that question becomes urgent precisely because the answers being tried in the United States are so visibly failing in places, and so violently successful in others. The lesson Canadians may draw is cynical: stability requires strong enforcement; or conversely, reform that is not resourced is worse than none. Either lesson increases fear — of the state, of criminals, or of repressive responses.

Second, the culture-wars vector. From book bans to curriculum fights to controversies over public monuments, what begins as an ideological skirmish in the United States often migrates north. Canadian media picks up American phrases and frames them as Canadian problems, and politicians respond in kind. The style is as contagious as the substance: performative denunciations, viral outrage campaigns, and the demand that institutions purge dissenting views — these rhetorical instruments travel with remarkable speed. For many Canadians, the image of their own cultural institutions sandwiched between two warring camps — call-out culture on the one side, reactionary retrenchment on the other — is deeply unsettling. Fear grows because institutional spaces that once felt like neutral forums — universities, libraries, school boards — seem to be battlegrounds where personal reputations and livelihoods can be destroyed by viral accusation. The result is a chilling effect: debate narrows, self-censorship grows, and the public square becomes a perilous place.

Third, the information-trust vector. When Americans treat news outlets as enemies and when social networks become the primary channel of political engagement, truth-checking decays. We live in a world where two dissonant realities can be broadcast simultaneously, each convincing its audience that it possesses the one true narrative. For Canada, this means that foreign misinformation campaigns, domestic political operatives, and noise merchants can more readily find footholds. The practical effect is an eroding ability to make collective decisions. When people disagree not only about policy but about what the facts are, the very possibility of shared governance collapses into contestation. Institutions exist to manage disagreement; they cannot do their work when the parties do not trust the premise that facts are shared.

Fourth, the economic-fear vector. The American model of rising inequality and hollowed middle-class neighborhoods is instructive (and worrying) for Canada. Though Canada's social safety nets are broader and its inequality less extreme in many measures, the dynamics that produce precarious work, unaffordable housing, and generational insecurity are visible north of the border. Young Canadians who watch American narratives about creeping poverty and the collapse of the middle class see their possible futures reflected in those stories. That reflection hardens into political choices — support for import-substituting protectionism, suspicion of global capital, or an embrace of populist outsiders promising to "shake things up." Thus, America's economic anxieties become ingredients in Canadian politics, altering demands, coalitions, and the tenor of discourse.

All of these vectors converge in one key phenomenon: the legitimization of fear as a political tool. Fear is not merely a side effect of failure; it is increasingly a strategy. Political entrepreneurs on both sides of the border mobilize fear to energize their bases, to delegitimize opponents, and to justify extraordinary measures. If the public is already primed by repeated American invocations of existential threat — invasion, voter fraud, cultural annihilation — then similar claims in Canada find a more receptive audience.

The rhetorical infrastructure of survivalism is thus transnational: the vocabulary of cliff-edge politics translates easily, people understand the metaphors, and activists learn the playbook.

There are, of course, mitigating currents. Canada's institutions, though stressed, are not identical to their American cousins. The constitutional arrangements, electoral systems, and social policy legacies provide different guard rails. Canadians have a history of steady incremental reforms rather than cataclysmic ruptures, and there are strong civic traditions that can blunt the worst tendencies of imitation. But guard rails require trust to function; if that trust erodes then differences in structure become less protective. The key question for Canada is whether it will absorb the negative elements of the American example — the speed of social media panic, the politicization of institutions, the glamorization of violent response — while refusing to internalize the civic habits that allow recovery. Historically, Canada has borrowed policy and culture from the United States selectively; the danger now is that the selection process will invert, and Canadians will import the panic and export the caution.

What are the likely near-term consequences if the continental mood does not change? One plausible scenario is increased securitization. As fear rises, citizens demand safety, and politicians respond with measures that promise immediate protection: more resources for law enforcement, expanded surveillance, tighter control at borders. Those policies may reduce certain kinds of crime, but they also shift the balance between liberty and security in ways that can produce their own resentments and instabilities. Another scenario is cultural retrenchment: institutions that face relentless attack may close off, becoming corporate in their governance and inward in their sensibilities, thereby starving public discourse of open contestation and depriving society of spaces where differences can be worked through civilly. A third scenario is economic decoupling: if political and trade tensions between the two countries intensify, Canada

may accelerate diversification away from the U.S. market — a costly but logical response that would rework livelihoods across the country.

If Canada chooses the path of decoupling and retrenchment, the short-term effect may be a kind of protective nationalism that calms some immediate fears. But long-term, isolation breeds its own anxieties: fewer diversified trade partners, shrinking markets, and brittle domestic industries that are vulnerable to shocks. The alternative — deepening integration with the U.S. despite the political chaos — is also fraught. It binds Canada to a partner whose institutions are under stress, increasing the risk that American collapse would drag Canada into systemic failure. Neither choice is comfortable; neither promises a simple escape from fear.

So, what can be done? There are practical measures that can reduce the risk of contagion and long-term policy directions that can fortify civic resilience. Canada can—and should—invest in information infrastructure that fosters local journalism, fact-checking, and civic education; that strengthens the capacity of citizens to distinguish between manipulation and reality. It can deepen economic ties with diverse partners to reduce the material impact of American shocks while strengthening domestic social safety nets, so economic anxiety does not become a permanent political fuel. It can also invest in policing and justice reforms that balance accountability with capacity, avoiding the extremes of abandonment and repression. Most importantly, Canadians must rebuild the habit of shared reality: institutions that routinely demonstrate competence and fairness will gradually restore trust, and trust is the single most important antidote to panic.

The final, and most human, element of this crisis is psychological. Fear is addictive not because it is entertaining but because it is agency-amplifying: in panic, small decisions feel important, narratives of purpose grow larger, and belonging to a tribe gives a sense of control. The antidote to that rush is slow work: the boring daily labor of governing, of improving schools, roads, and hospitals; the careful building of

community life that is resilient but not paranoid. Those are not glamorous choices. They will not yield viral headlines or midnight cable clout. But they are the kind of incremental civic investments that break cycles of fear. If Canada can recommit to that slow work even as it watches the United States lurch and howl, it will preserve the possibility of a calmer future.

The continent at present is at a kind of hinge point. The United States is testing the limits of democratic endurance and social cohesion. Canada sits in the same room, listening to the test with a mixture of dread and attention. The decisions made by citizens and leaders in the next decade will determine whether the Dominion of Fear subsides into cautious confidence or whether it hardens into an architecture of suspicion and permanent crisis. No single policy will fix the problem; no single event will decide it. It will be the accumulation of small choices — whether to fund public media, whether to shore up local economies, whether to choose rhetoric that tempers rather than inflames — that either widen the crack or heal it.

If there is a practical moral here, it is this: fear must be refused as a political currency. When politicians, media executives, or activists realize that panic sells, the incentives to provoke panic become irresistible. Changing the incentives is difficult but not impossible. Rewarding steady governance, investing in institutions that work, and refusing to celebrate performative outrage will not reverse the tide overnight. But they will begin to re-anchor public life in habits of trust. That is the only real antidote to the contagion the United States currently exports: not stronger borders nor tougher policing alone, but the slow reconstruction of civic faith.

The United States will continue to shape Canada’s emotional landscape because the two countries are intertwined economically, culturally, and geographically. But shapes are not destinies. Canada has choices and institutions with the capacity to resist the worst tendencies of its large neighbour. The work will be humble and prosaic: a better local newspaper, a more resilient manufacturing base, a health-care system that

does not crumble under stress, and courts that demonstrate impartiality. Those are the scaffolds of calm. Without them, fear will be the default setting for public life, and the Dominion of Fear will have extended its reach well beyond what was intended.

One of the most visible and frightening examples of America's unraveling, and how that unraveling echoes into Canada, came on January 6, 2021. The storming of the U.S. Capitol shocked the world, not because political violence in America was unthinkable, but because it had been building for years and yet was still allowed to explode in plain sight. Canadians watched as thousands of people, whipped into fury by conspiracy theories and political rhetoric, invaded the symbolic heart of American democracy. For many Canadians, it was a surreal moment: if America's democratic process could be physically assaulted by its own citizens, then the myth of American stability was over. The images of broken windows, police officers crushed in doorways, and lawmakers fleeing under escort replayed on Canadian screens for days. The attack was not simply an American scandal; it was a contagion of dread that seeped across the border. Canadians began asking whether their own Parliament could one day face such chaos. What would prevent a Canadian convoy protest, for example, from escalating into something worse?

The Capitol riot marked a new chapter in how Canadians perceived American politics. No longer was it possible to dismiss America's polarization as a family squabble that would work itself out. The fragility was undeniable. If Americans were willing to attack their own system, then what security could Canadians feel in theirs? And when, barely a year later, Canada itself saw the so-called "Freedom Convoy" paralyze Ottawa, the eerie reflection was undeniable. Trucks blocking the streets of the capital, ordinary citizens furious at government restrictions, rhetoric about tyranny and liberty — the Canadian protest was not identical to the Capitol riot, but it rhymed. The contagion had crossed the border. America's chaos was not contained; it had found a stage in Canada,

adapted to Canadian conditions, and proved that the virus of political anger respected no boundary.

The American cultural war over abortion provides another sharp example. When the U.S. Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade* in 2022, the seismic shockwaves were immediate. Canadians, even those who believed their country's abortion rights were more secure, felt unease. Demonstrations erupted in Canadian cities both in solidarity with and in opposition to the ruling. Politicians who had not intended to discuss abortion suddenly faced questions. Activists on both sides became more energized, borrowing slogans, imagery, and even funding from their American counterparts. Once again, Canadian politics was infected by an American decision. It was not that Canadians had suddenly lost rights; it was that fear had been reignited — fear that rights were fragile, that nothing was guaranteed, and that imported ideological battles could reshape Canadian society. America's collapse of consensus became Canada's nervous preoccupation.

Crime provides another transnational example. In cities like Chicago, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, violent crime has persisted at stubbornly high levels despite decades of policing reforms, community programs, and federal funding. Canadians watch documentaries, read news reports, and scroll through social media accounts chronicling these urban crises. The images of boarded-up homes, police tape fluttering in the wind, and neighborhoods living under the sound of constant gunfire create a narrative of urban collapse. Then Canadians look to their own cities — the random stabbings in Vancouver's transit system, the rise in carjackings in Toronto, the opioid-ravaged neighborhoods of Edmonton and Winnipeg — and the parallel feels frightening. America's crisis is bigger, louder, and more violent, but the Canadian version is unmistakably familiar. The lesson absorbed is not hope that Canada will avoid the worst, but fear that Canada is simply on a slower timetable to the same destination.

History makes this fear sharper, not softer. Canadians remember that America has been here before. The 1960s saw assassinations, riots, and deep divisions over race and war. The 1970s brought Watergate, oil shocks, and malaise. Yet in those eras, America always seemed to right itself, to reassert its stability. This time feels different. The institutions that once restored balance appear weaker, more distrusted, and less capable of consensus. In the 1960s, Americans trusted Walter Cronkite to deliver the news; in the 2020s, Americans accuse every media outlet of peddling lies. In the 1970s, Congress still had bipartisan coalitions; in the 2020s, legislative compromise is nearly impossible. Canadians sense that America's ability to rebound is diminished, and with it, their own sense of continental stability. The past offered reassurance; the present offers only doubt.

Economics, too, carries historical echoes. Canadians remember the 2008 financial crash, which began in the United States with reckless lending and financial engineering but quickly cascaded across the world. Canadian banks weathered the storm better than their American counterparts, but ordinary Canadians still suffered job losses, evaporating savings, and years of uncertainty. The memory of that crisis remains vivid, a reminder that Canada cannot escape American economic chaos. Today, as inflation, housing bubbles, and widening inequality dominate the headlines, Canadians worry that another American-driven crash could devastate them again. The fear is not irrational; it is historical memory, reinforced by dependency.

The role of media in amplifying these fears cannot be overstated. American networks like CNN, Fox News, and MSNBC dominate cable packages in Canada. Social media algorithms push American political fights into Canadian feeds at a rate far higher than Canadian content. Even Canadian journalists increasingly frame stories in American terms, because they know those narratives attract more attention. The result is that Canadians live inside an American psychological environment, even while physically in Canada. When Fox hosts rage about crime, Canadians absorb that fear. When MSNBC

pundits warn of authoritarianism, Canadians absorb that too. The saturation leaves little room for a purely Canadian conversation. The American fear machine is too loud, too relentless, and too profitable to ignore.

But America is not only frightening because it is a neighbor. It is frightening because it appears genuinely afraid of itself. Canadians perceive this fear in the defensive, almost desperate tone of American politics. Conservatives speak of "taking the country back," as though it has already been stolen. Liberals speak of "saving democracy," as though it is on its death bed. Each side conveys panic, not confidence. Canadians recognize this tone because they hear echoes of it in their own politics. Canadian parties now increasingly campaign not on what they will build, but on what they will prevent: the collapse of healthcare, the loss of freedoms, the invasion of crime, the betrayal of values. The American politics of existential panic is now the Canadian politics of constant alarm. Fear has become the common vocabulary.

Some Canadians once comforted themselves with the belief that their society was more cohesive, more civil, and more resilient. But recent events have eroded that comfort. The pandemic, for example, revealed fractures in Canadian society that mirrored America's: anti-vaccine protests, government mistrust, conspiracy theories, and online rage. Canadians may not have stormed Parliament with the same ferocity as Americans stormed the Capitol, but the sentiment was close enough to make the distinction feel unsteady. The American disease of distrust had spread, and Canada had no immunity.

What this all means is that Canada's Dominion of Fear is inseparable from America's. The two nations are not merely neighbors; they are mirrors. America's decline terrifies Canadians not just because it threatens to spill over, but because it reveals what Canada might become. The image is distorted but recognizable: polarized, crime-ridden, fearful, and fragile.

The tragedy is that both nations seem caught in feedback loops they cannot escape. America is locked in a cycle of division feeding fear, and fear feeding division. Canada is locked in the role of the anxious observer, importing the dread while experiencing its own version of decline. Neither has found the courage to break the cycle, to rebuild trust, or to silence the constant drumbeat of panic. Instead, both continue to live inside the Dominion of Fear, where America leads, and Canada follows, each too paralyzed to imagine a calmer way forward.

America has always been Canada's shadow and its shield, its closest partner and its most complicated problem. For generations, Canadians looked south with a mixture of admiration and caution, aware that whatever storm shook the United States would ripple across the border. Today, that storm feels permanent, not a passing squall but an age of fracture and unrest that Canadians cannot help but internalize. The fear, the lawlessness, and the sense of unraveling that dominate Canada are, in many ways, reflections of what has become normalized in America itself. Yet the relationship is not one-sided. Canadians fear America not only because it is unraveling but because its decline magnifies our own. A fearful nation cannot feel secure when its neighbor is spiraling, and the United States—once the confident anchor of democracy—now appears as fearful, divided, and unstable as Canada, if not more so.

The American influence has always saturated Canadian life, whether in commerce, media, or culture. Canadians consume American news at a greater rate than their own national stories. Our televisions beam nightly images of school shootings, mass protests, and partisan rage as if they were unfolding on Canadian soil. For many Canadians, the border is invisible in the realm of information, and thus American problems become Canadian fears. Every riot in Portland or Chicago echoes in Toronto. Every polarized election in Washington ignites debate in Ottawa. Canadians begin to speak of themselves not only in relation to their own politics but in the language of

American division. Fear becomes imported, internalized, and magnified, until Canadians no longer know where American collapse ends and Canadian anxiety begins.

It is not difficult to see why. America itself seems to be unraveling, a country tearing itself apart along partisan and cultural lines. The right and the left no longer debate policy; they debate reality itself. Trust in government, the media, and institutions has collapsed to levels unseen in modern history. A sense of existential struggle now defines every election, every Supreme Court ruling, every cultural controversy. For many, the United States appears to be lurching toward some kind of civil war, not necessarily in the traditional sense of armies clashing, but in a chronic, grinding conflict where violence, mistrust, and fragmentation become everyday features of life. Canadians watch this unfold with alarm, but also with a creeping sense of recognition, for the fractures of America resemble our own, only louder, sharper, and more violent.

Crime in America has become normalized to such a degree that Canadians, once sheltered from the extremes of urban violence, now wonder if they are simply watching their own future play out in advance. In American cities, shootings are so common that only the most spectacular reach the headlines. Mass shootings, school shootings, and workplace shootings occur so often that the word “epidemic” has lost its force. Carjackings, assaults, and thefts are not only tolerated but often dismissed as the inevitable cost of urban life. The justice system, overwhelmed and politicized, cycles offenders in and out of jail with little pretense of reform. What shocks Canadians is not simply the level of violence but the resignation that surrounds it, the acceptance that this is the new normal. And when Canadians turn on the news and see this acceptance, they cannot help but internalize the fear that lawlessness has already crossed their own streets.

Yet it is not only crime that has become normalized. It is the constant drumbeat of division, the sense that America itself is breaking apart. Right and left no longer

represent political perspectives but warring tribes. The right sees the left as authoritarian socialists dismantling the Constitution. The left sees the right as fascist reactionaries bent on eroding democracy. Both believe the other is willing to destroy the republic to secure power. In such a climate, compromise is dead, and every policy debate becomes a question of survival. For Canadians, the lesson is grim. If America, with its power, wealth, and institutions, can descend into tribalism, then Canada, smaller and more fragile, is hardly immune.

Part of what fuels Canadian fear is the sheer weight of American culture. Hollywood, Silicon Valley, and Washington define the tone of modern life. Canadian screens are filled with American arguments, Canadian conversations with American terminology. Words like “woke,” “cancel culture,” “MAGA,” or “deep state” are American exports that now define Canadian disputes. Canadians adopt American fears even before they fully understand them. A school board debate in Texas becomes a reference point in Toronto. A police shooting in Minneapolis sparks protests in Vancouver. Canadian politics is constantly refracted through the American lens, as if our own debates are insufficient without the American backdrop. The result is that Canadian fear is never purely Canadian; it is always infused with the anxieties of a country ten times our size and infinitely louder in its chaos.

Economics too ties our fates together. The Canadian economy lives and dies by American demand. When American inflation spikes, Canadian prices rise. When American industries falter, Canadian jobs vanish. A fragile Canadian household, already pressed by housing costs and taxes, cannot ignore the tremors of the American economy. And yet it is not only material dependence that breeds fear. It is the constant reminder that Canada lacks sovereignty in the deepest sense. We are tethered to a neighbor whose stability can no longer be assumed. Canadians fear not only American crime and division but American weakness itself. If America stumbles, Canada will be dragged down with it.

But Canadians also recognize that America itself is drowning in fear. The United States is no longer the confident republic that strode across the twentieth century. It is instead a nation consumed by doubt, unsure of its identity, its future, and even its values. Trust in institutions has collapsed. Churches, once central to community life, are hollowed. Universities are distrusted as ideological factories. Congress is viewed as corrupt and broken. The Supreme Court is seen not as a neutral arbiter but as a partisan weapon. In such a climate, fear becomes the default condition. Fear of crime, fear of government, fear of the other side, fear of collapse. Canadians look south and see not a superpower but a society trembling in its own skin.

Violence magnifies this fear. America's epidemic of mass shootings is unique in the developed world, yet within the United States, it has become so common that responses feel ritualized: outrage, mourning, political stalemate, resignation. Each new shooting adds to the background noise of American life. Canadians watch this cycle with horror, yet the normalization seeps northward. When Canadians hear of a rare school stabbing or shooting on their own soil, they immediately interpret it through the American lens, fearing the contagion has spread. America's acceptance of violence as normal creates the impression that Canada is only a few steps behind.

The cultural war further deepens Canadian unease. Americans now fight over history itself, tearing down statues, re-writing curricula, and demanding ideological purity in every corner of life. The debate over gender, race, and national identity has become all-consuming, dividing workplaces, families, and friendships. Canadians, exposed daily to these debates, find themselves pulled into arguments that are not entirely their own. Yet they cannot escape the intensity of American polarization, and so Canadian society begins to fracture along similar lines, echoing American battles while layering them over our own fragile unity. Fear grows because Canadians sense that if America cannot manage these disputes without chaos, neither can we.

Canadians also fear the militarization of American politics. Armed protests, militias, and talk of secession have become disturbingly common in American discourse. Once-fringe fantasies of civil war now appear in mainstream media. While a traditional civil war may not erupt, the chronic low-level violence of a divided society feels increasingly likely. Canadians, accustomed to thinking of America as the guarantor of continental stability, now wonder whether that guarantor is itself crumbling. The prospect of a fractured America is not only frightening but destabilizing, for Canada depends on American strength for its own security.

This is the paradox: Canadians fear America not simply because of what it might do, but because of what it is becoming. A fearful, divided, and lawless America reflects back into Canada, magnifying our own insecurities. As America loses confidence, so too does Canada, for we have long measured ourselves against our neighbor. In the end, the fear is not only about crime, division, or economics. It is about the realization that the anchor of North America is drifting, and with it, Canada is being pulled into uncharted waters.

And yet, within this fear lies a grim symmetry. Both nations are caught in cycles of lawlessness, mistrust, and division. Both are haunted by the normalization of crime and the collapse of faith in institutions. Both are polarized between visions of the future that seem irreconcilable. Canada's fear is not imported from America alone; it is shared, reflected, and amplified. America appears to be breaking apart, but so too does Canada, and in that mirror, both nations confront the same uncomfortable truth: fear has become the defining feature of life on this continent. What was once the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America now risks becoming the Dominion of Fear and the Disunited States, bound together not by confidence but by collapse.

The uneasy bond remains. Canadians will always look south, and Americans will always cast their shadow northward. The question is no longer whether American fear will infect Canada—it already has. The question is whether either nation can recover the

stability and confidence that once defined them, or whether the future will be one of perpetual fracture, where fear itself is the common language spoken on both sides of the longest border in the world.

Selected sources consulted for the claims above: Pew Research work on political polarization and partisan coalitions; Pew and Gun Violence Archive reporting on gun deaths and mass-shooting trends; Statistics Canada reporting on Canada's trade dependence on the United States; U.S. Trade Representative data on bilateral trade; Gallup reporting on confidence in institutions.

Chapter Sixteen
Perceived Fear - The Big, Bad Wolf

Canada's greatest unease does not come from within its borders but from the vast republic to the south. The United States — at once ally, trading partner, and cultural superpower — has become the central object of Canada's modern fear: feared for its influence, its volatility, and its reach. Canadians admire America's vitality yet recoil from its aggression; they depend on its markets but resent its dominance. It is a relationship defined by proximity and imbalance, affection and apprehension, intimacy and unease.

This fear manifests in many forms. Politically, Canadians worry about the rise of American-style populism — the alt-right rhetoric, the polarization, the moral certainty that leaves no room for compromise. The American contagion of outrage has infected Canada's discourse, especially online, where imported slogans and grievances drown out reasoned debate. The fear is not just of imitation but of transformation — that Canada's moderation will dissolve under the pressure of American extremes.

Yet this chapter insists that not all of these fears are justified. Some are magnified by habit — by an ingrained anti-Americanism that defines Canadian identity in opposition rather than affirmation. The United States, for all its flaws, remains a land of innovation and courage as much as chaos. To move beyond fear, Canada must rise, quietly, steadily, on its own terms — into the Dominion of Resolve.

Canada has always lived in the shadow of a colossus. It is a curious thing, to be a nation defined as much by proximity as by purpose. The map shows a vast, self-contained country stretching from ocean to ocean, yet that expanse carries an invisible gravity—the pull of a neighbour whose size, appetite, and noise eclipse all else. For as

long as Canada has existed, the United States has been the mirror that distorts as much as it reflects. The American experiment was born of rebellion and expansion, Canada's of restraint and order. Yet the two are joined by geography and history, by commerce and culture, and, most painfully, by fear.

The fear of America is not simple. It is not a hatred, nor even jealousy, but something closer to apprehension—a recognition that our peace, our civility, our self-image could be undone not by invasion, but by osmosis. For most Canadians, the United States is both a friend and a warning, an idea and an influence. We admire its energy, its wealth, its confidence. We fear its anger, its noise, its reach. It is the same paradox that haunted earlier generations: admiration curdled by anxiety. And as the years pass, that anxiety has deepened, finding new shapes in politics, culture, economics, and even sport.

In this authors earlier books, *Fragmentation of Canada* and *Enemy Below*, he touched briefly on this unease—how the pull of American power, like a magnetic field, could warp the moral compass of a quieter, more self-effacing nation. But in those works, the theme was a thread, not the fabric. Now it feels essential to confront it fully, because the shadow has lengthened. The United States is no longer simply our partner or our protector; it is our preoccupation, our mirror of fear.

For many Canadians today, the spectre of America has taken on a darker cast. They see a republic that once symbolized freedom now convulsed by rage and division, and they fear that this contagion is crossing the border. They watch as populism, born in American anger, finds footholds in Canadian soil. They listen to talk radio and social media echo chambers where grievance and suspicion drown out dialogue, and they wonder whether we are witnessing not the spread of ideas, but of infection. "Alt-right conservatism," they call it, a phrase spoken with the same unease as one might speak of a virus. The fear is that Canada's politeness, that old civic glue, will dissolve under imported American heat.

Yet the fear is not only political. It is psychological. The United States has become a kind of emotional weather system, its storms of rhetoric and ideology sweeping northward through screens and airwaves. Canadians find themselves buffeted by debates that are not their own, outraged by issues that do not originate here, drawn into tribal loyalties shaped in Washington, not Ottawa. The fear of American politics is really the fear of losing our own discourse—of being swallowed whole by the American conversation until nothing distinct remains.

Still, this fear coexists with dependence. Economically, culturally, even emotionally, Canada remains tied to the American heartbeat. Our exports flow south; our artists seek validation there; our news cycles orbit theirs. It is difficult to fear something upon which you rely. Yet that is precisely the Canadian predicament—reliance masked by resentment, admiration tinged with anxiety.

At a personal level, the fear surfaces most vividly at the border. Every Canadian knows that quiet tension when approaching the crossing: the line of cars, the mirrored sunglasses, the clipped questions. We tell ourselves it is routine, procedural, harmless. But beneath the surface lies something deeper—a sense of imbalance. The border is the one place where the polite Canadian self-image meets the American assertion of power face to face. The officer's tone, the suspicion, the command to pull over and "go inside"—all of it punctures the illusion of parity. You are reminded, in those moments, that the relationship is not equal, that access to the United States is a privilege, not a right. The very process of crossing becomes an enactment of fear—fear of misstep, fear of being misunderstood, fear of being detained.

This border anxiety is not new, but it has grown sharper in recent years. The post-9/11 security era turned every traveller into a potential threat. Canadians who once crossed freely for shopping, family visits, or sports tournaments now describe the ordeal as demeaning—a gauntlet of suspicion. It has become a metaphor for the broader relationship: Canada forever proving itself, forever explaining, forever being examined

by a neighbour whose trust is conditional. The “wringer,” as some call it, is no longer a place; it is a state of mind.

Economically, too, the imbalance feeds the fear. Canada’s prosperity has long been linked to access to American markets. When that access is threatened—by tariffs, trade wars, or presidential whims—the national anxiety spikes. Every time Washington hints at protectionism, Canadians feel the tremor. Jobs in manufacturing, forestry, agriculture, and energy hang on decisions made far beyond our control. The fear is not abstract—it’s personal, tied to mortgages, pensions, and the fragile notion of stability.

The renegotiation of NAFTA was a recent reminder of this vulnerability. For months, Canadians watched as the world’s most powerful nation threatened to dismantle a deal that had defined continental trade for decades. There were tense headlines, late-night meetings, and a pervasive feeling of helplessness. When the new agreement was finally reached, many in Canada felt less relief than resignation: we had kept the peace, but at what cost? This sense of dependency—of being perpetually at the mercy of American decisions—has become a chronic national ache.

And yet, paradoxically, Canadians still believe in the American dream, even as they fear it. The lure of opportunity, wealth, and recognition across the border remains powerful. Countless Canadian innovators, scientists, and artists have found their futures in American cities, drawn by funding, visibility, and ambition. The fear, then, is double-edged: we fear America’s dominance, and we fear being left behind without it. The devalued Canadian dollar, often hovering well below its southern counterpart, becomes a symbol of that inferiority—a daily reminder that our economy, our purchasing power, our very sense of worth is measured in comparison to theirs.

This sense of diminishment seeps into sport, culture, and everyday life. The dream of parity — in markets, in prestige, in recognition — is what drives so much Canadian ambition and anxiety. Nowhere is this more visible than in professional sports. The National Hockey League, once the pride of Canadian invention, now operates

primarily as an American business. Most of its franchises are U.S.-based, most of its revenue flows from U.S. television contracts, and most of its players, though Canadian by birth, earn their fortunes in American cities. Each contract negotiated in U.S. dollars feels like another quiet transfer of ownership — of our heritage, our mythology, our sense of mastery. For generations, hockey has been our national claim to excellence, our shared mythology. Yet each season more of our brightest players head south, chasing contracts that Canadian teams cannot match. The exchange rate tilts the scales; American franchises can pay more, promote more, and promise more. The fear that our national game might someday become an American commodity cuts deep, because it strikes at identity itself. If hockey belongs to Canada, what happens when its best belongs elsewhere?

The same pattern unfolds in football. The CFL, a uniquely Canadian institution that once defined autumn weekends, struggles to compete against the sheer spectacle of the NFL. Stadiums that once roared with local pride now half-fill with fans wearing Dallas Cowboys and Kansas City Chiefs jerseys. Even our sports bars have been colonized by American broadcasts, their rhythms and commercials drowning out our own commentary. The fear is not only of losing games, but of losing ourselves in the process — of surrendering even leisure to a foreign rhythm.

It extends even to the arena of sport, where cultural pride collides with economic reality. For generations, hockey has been our national claim to excellence, our shared mythology. Yet each season more of our brightest players head south, chasing contracts that Canadian teams cannot match. The exchange rate tilts the scales; American franchises can pay more, promote more, and promise more. The fear that our national game might someday become an American commodity cuts deep, because it strikes at identity itself. If hockey belongs to Canada, what happens when its best belongs elsewhere?

Even our heroes are measured in American terms. A Canadian actor becomes famous when they succeed in Hollywood, a Canadian singer when they top U.S. charts. The pipeline of talent runs one way. It is not just an economic migration but a symbolic one—a quiet exodus of validation. Each success story is tinged with irony: we celebrate our own only when America first does. The fear, unspoken but real, is that without American approval, Canada's cultural voice would fall silent.

This is where the unease edges toward something existential. America's influence is not merely external; it lives within us, shaping taste, opinion, even imagination. American movies tell our stories, American media frame our worldview, American companies shape how we work and connect. The modern Canadian mind is saturated with American content, leaving less and less room for our own reflection. In the age of streaming and algorithms, the distinction between cultural sharing and cultural absorption has nearly vanished. The result is a creeping homogenization—a Canada that looks and sounds less like itself.

And yet, this too breeds contradiction. We want access to the same culture we resent. We binge their shows, quote their comedians, debate their elections. Our fear of American cultural dominance is entangled with fascination, even affection. It is not so much that we wish to reject America, but that we wish to consume it safely—to enjoy its power without being consumed ourselves. That is the impossible balance Canada has always sought: engagement without erasure.

Underlying all of this is the question of sovereignty—of who ultimately controls Canada's future. When Canadians look south, many see not a neighbour but a potential claimant. The fear that America covets our natural resources—our water, oil, gas, minerals—has persisted for decades. It is rooted partly in geography and partly in history. As America's population grows and its resources strain, Canada's abundance gleams invitingly just beyond reach. Water, in particular, looms as the commodity of the future. Vast northern lakes and rivers hold what the American southwest increasingly

lacks. The notion that some future deal—or worse, some future crisis—might lead to Canadian water flowing south through pipelines or diversions is not far-fetched in the public imagination.

Oil and gas tell a similar story. While Canada officially controls its energy resources, the infrastructure of export and investment is deeply tied to American interests. When Washington shifts policy, the ripple hits Alberta and Saskatchewan before it touches Texas. Canadians sense this dependency intuitively, even if they cannot chart it on a graph. The fear is that one day, under the guise of "continental security" or "mutual development," our northern wealth might quietly change hands.

These anxieties have been part of Canada's subconscious for generations. In author Turcotte's last book, '*Enemy Below*', he explored how fear often arises not from the presence of an external enemy but from the suspicion that one lies beneath the surface—quiet, unseen, yet capable of eruption. The same principle applies here. America is not, in the literal sense, Canada's enemy. But it occupies that same psychic space: the looming presence below the waves, vast and unpredictable. We tell ourselves that friendship ensures safety, that alliances and treaties bind us together. But beneath that reassurance lies the gnawing question: what happens when American interest no longer aligns with ours?

That question has grown louder in recent years, amplified by the figure of the American president. Leadership in the United States is never a private matter for Americans alone. Each occupant of the Oval Office shapes Canadian moods, markets, and even moral climates. We live next door to the most powerful office in the world, and we feel its temperature daily. When that office is occupied by a steady, cooperative leader, Canada breathes easier. When it is held by one impulsive, divisive, or unpredictable, the nation tenses.

Today, many Canadians confess to fearing the U.S. president personally—not merely disagreeing with policy but dreading the man himself. They see in him a symbol

of chaos, ego, and volatility. His words move markets; his moods shift alliances. Canadians watch the daily tumult with a mixture of disbelief and apprehension, knowing that a single decision, tweet, or trade threat could shake their economy or security overnight. The fear is both rational and emotional. Rational, because Canada's fortunes are linked to American stability; emotional, because the presidency once represented something noble, and now feels like a roulette wheel.

The very idea that one man's temperament could unsettle a nation of thirty-eight million underscores how vulnerable Canada truly is. It is not just that America looms large—it is that we have allowed its moods to dictate our own. In that dependency lies the essence of fear. Fear of the U.S. presidency has become, in many ways, shorthand for the deeper dread Canadians feels about American unpredictability. For more than a century, Canada's fate has been tethered to the temperament of its southern neighbour's leader. We remember Kennedy for his eloquence, Reagan for his bluster, Clinton for his charm, Bush for his wars, Obama for his calm. Each left a distinct imprint upon Canada's psyche. But no presidency in recent memory has so thoroughly shaken Canadian confidence as the current one. It is not merely a question of politics, but of stability — of the unsettling realization that rationality and restraint can no longer be assumed from Washington.

The modern Canadian fear is therefore both personal and systemic. It is the fear of what happens when America stops playing by its own rules. The institutions we once trusted to contain excess — the courts, the media, Congress — now seem caught in the same vortex of chaos. Canadians who once looked south and saw a model of democracy now see a warning. The Republic that was supposed to inspire has become, instead, a study in fragility.

And yet, Canadians cannot simply turn away. Our media feeds are saturated with American content; our news cycles are driven by American events. The coverage of an American scandal often eclipses Canadian stories entirely. The constant exposure

breeds both fascination and fatigue — we are drawn to the drama even as it exhausts us. The fear becomes self-sustaining, reinforced by the very attention we give it. America dominates not only our markets and politics but our emotional landscape.

The reach of American media is total. When CNN coughs, Canadian broadcasters cough also. When Fox News stirs outrage, that outrage echoes north. Algorithms push the same stories, the same debates, the same polarizing narratives into Canadian homes. In this digital age, the border has dissolved in all but name. Canadians are now participants, not observers, in the American psychological experiment — and that realization unsettles many.

What makes this all the more ironic is that Canadians, by nature, are not extremists. Ours is a nation that values moderation, compromise, and civility. Yet the American style of discourse — confrontational, moralizing, emotional — is infecting our public square. We see it in Parliament, in our provincial politics, and most corrosively, in social media. Debates that once could be settled with quiet disagreement now erupt into ideological warfare. The fear is not that American politics will overtake Canada by force, but that Canadians will willingly import the worst of it — the division, the absolutism, the anger.

It is no coincidence that the term “culture war” now appears in Canadian headlines. Issues that have no direct bearing on our laws or culture — gun rights, abortion debates, the teaching of American history — are fought with the same ferocity here. It is as if we have begun to mistake imitation for identity. The fear of Americanization is not just the fear of domination, but of substitution — of replacing our own moral framework with theirs.

And yet, in moments of honesty, some Canadians admit to a strange envy. The United States, for all its flaws, possesses an energy that Canada lacks. Its people are loud because they believe they matter; its politics are chaotic because they are alive. There is a vitality, a daring, a rawness that Canadians often find both repellent and magnetic.

The quiet civility that defines our character can, at times, feel like inertia. And so, our fear of America is complicated by fascination — the same way a small town might fear the big city yet secretly long for its pulse.

This psychological tension runs deep into our national story. From Confederation onward, Canada defined itself in opposition to America's revolution. Where they broke free in violence, we evolved through negotiation. Where they celebrated the individual, we built institutions of collective security. The entire architecture of Canadian identity — from universal health care to peacekeeping diplomacy — is designed to distinguish us from the American model. Yet that distinction now feels harder to maintain, blurred by globalized media and interwoven economies. The fear that we may someday wake up and find the differences gone is no longer far-fetched; it is visible in our speech, our entertainment, our politics, and even our spending habits.

Economically, Canada's vulnerability is structural. Nearly three-quarters of our exports go to the United States. Our financial systems are integrated; our corporations are interdependent. A single tariff or trade dispute can ripple through our economy like an earthquake. The fear that American protectionism might return — that a single presidential order could throw thousands of Canadians out of work — is not paranoia but experience. We have lived through softwood lumber disputes, dairy wars, aluminum tariffs, and "Buy American" policies. Each time, Canada vows diversification; each time, the dependence deepens.

Even our dollar seems to bow to American moods. When Washington gets sick, the loonie (like almost all else) catches the flu. The devalued currency affects not only trade but psychology. Every Canadian traveller who crosses the border and calculates the exchange rate feels it — that subtle sting of inferiority. The American dollar, like the American voice, carries authority. The fear is not simply of losing money but of losing parity, of being reminded again and again that our economic fate is priced in another's coin.

Culture follows money, and money follows attention. When Canadians spend their evenings streaming American shows, buying American brands, and arguing over American elections, the ecosystem that sustains Canadian culture withers. It is not that Canadian creativity has vanished — far from it — but that its audience has been rerouted. Young Canadians can name American senators but not their own cabinet ministers, can quote U.S. comedians but not Canadian writers. This imbalance creates not merely cultural dependency but intellectual colonization.

And yet, to speak of this openly often provokes discomfort. Many Canadians, particularly younger ones, resist the idea that America's influence is dangerous. To them, the borderless world of culture and commerce feels natural, even liberating. The fear, they say, belongs to an older generation clinging to distinctions that no longer matter. Perhaps there is truth in that. But even as the world integrates, sovereignty still matters — not as nostalgia, but as necessity. When a nation ceases to define its own cultural language, it becomes an echo, not a voice.

This erosion of self-definition is where fear transforms into something more profound: shame. Canadians are proud of their moderation, yet quietly ashamed of their dependence. We are a wealthy, educated, resource-rich country, yet we cannot seem to escape America's orbit. Every attempt to assert independence — in foreign policy, in media, in defense — seems to circle back to the same gravitational pull. It is as if we are the moon to America's sun: visible only by reflected light.

That metaphor might sound poetic, but it carries real consequence. The Canadian imagination — the way we see ourselves — is perpetually refracted through America's lens. When Americans see us as harmless, we see ourselves as polite. When they see us as boring, we joke about it. When they ignore us, we console ourselves with superiority. Our very self-image has become reactive. Fear of America is not simply fear of domination; it is fear of erasure, of being forever the footnote to someone else's story.

And yet, beneath this anxiety lies a contradiction too seldom admitted: Canada has benefited enormously from America's existence. The U.S. market has sustained our industries; American defense spending has shielded our borders; American innovation has fueled our prosperity. The fear, then, is not only of American power, but of what happens if that power wanes. A weakened, fragmented, or isolationist America would leave Canada exposed to a harsher world — a world without the protective umbrella we so often criticize.

This paradox defines our national psychology: dependence on a protector we distrust, and fear of a collapse that would expose our fragility. The Canadian conversation about America is always two-sided — admiration intertwined with suspicion; gratitude mingled with resentment. We fear the U.S. president yet fear more what might come if his country turns inward. We fear American expansionism yet rely on American consumption. We fear their dominance yet fear irrelevance without them.

In *Fragmentation of Canada*, (this authors first book in this now completed trilogy) Turcotte explored how internal divisions — linguistic, regional, ideological — were tearing at the national fabric. What he sees now is that many of those divisions are amplified by the American echo. Western alienation resonates with American libertarianism. Quebec nationalism draws inspiration from other global separatist movements filtered through U.S. media. Urban progressivism and rural conservatism borrow their talking points from opposite wings of the American culture war. Even Canada's debates about freedom, race, and history are imported, translated from American originals. The fear that Canada is fragmenting is therefore inseparable from the fear that we are fragmenting along lines not our own.

It is worth asking, then: are these fears justified, or have they been magnified by our own insecurity? Some of it, unquestionably, is projection. Canadians have long defined themselves by what they are not. America's flaws make us feel virtuous; its excesses make our restraint look wise. Fear becomes a kind of moral posture — a way

to affirm our difference. But this moral comfort can also breed complacency. By constantly contrasting ourselves with the worst of America, we neglect our own decay. We congratulate ourselves for not being them while quietly becoming them.

Perhaps the real question is not whether America is changing Canada, but whether Canada ever truly resisted the change. Our institutions, our media, our economy — all were designed with American compatibility in mind. The trade corridors, the television networks, the universities, even our urban skylines reflect cross-border patterns. The integration is so deep that disentanglement may no longer be possible. To fear America, then, is to fear our own reflection — to realize that the two nations, however distinct in law, are now bound by a shared fate.

And so, we reach the heart of the Canadian dilemma: we are afraid of losing our sovereignty, but perhaps we already have, not through conquest but through comfort. The slow, invisible kind of surrender that comes from convenience — buying the cheaper product, watching the louder show, voting for the safer option. Every small accommodation accumulates until dependence feels natural. The American fear, in the end, may not be about them at all. It may be about us — about our unwillingness to stand alone, to bear the weight of our own destiny without leaning on the giant beside us.

Canada's dependence on the United States is not simply a matter of trade balances or treaties; it is emotional, almost existential. To live next to a superpower is to live beside a mirror that distorts as much as it reflects. We tell ourselves we are different — gentler, more civil, more just — but our daily lives are threaded through with American decisions, inventions, and appetites. When the U.S. sneezes, Canada catches a cold, as the old saying goes; yet it is more than economics. When America shouts, Canada listens. When America panics, Canada trembles. And when America divides, Canada feels the tremors of that fracture in our own national soul.

Nowhere is this influence more potent than in the sphere of culture — that invisible empire of images, voices, and ideals that has, over a century, woven itself into the fabric of Canadian life. American movies are our common mythology. American music fills our airwaves. American news dominates our feeds. Even our arguments are often borrowed — our rhetoric imported from a culture that loves combat more than compromise. The fear here is subtle but profound: that Canada, in consuming so much of America, may slowly become it.

We tell ourselves that the CBC or Canadian content rules will protect us, but the truth is that the flood is too great. Streaming platforms, social media algorithms, celebrity worship — these are not neutral forces. They carry American assumptions about fame, power, and freedom. The Canadian voice becomes a whisper beneath the roar of the Republic. When our children know the names of every American president but not a single Canadian poet, we have lost more than cultural ground; we have surrendered part of our identity. It is not an invasion of armies, but of attention. America's cultural dominance seeps into the subconscious. It teaches us what to desire and what to fear, often without our realizing it.

This fear of cultural erasure is not new. In his earlier work, *Fragmentation of Canada*, this author touched on how regionalism and identity fractures were accelerated by external influence — by the overwhelming presence of the United States in our daily consciousness. That same anxiety reappears here, magnified. The modern Canadian feels besieged not by tanks or tariffs, but by the endless stream of American content that defines the very idea of modernity. The heroes are American. The villains are American. The stories are American. And in this global marketplace of attention, Canada plays the supporting role — polite, peripheral, apologetic.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, even Canada's sports, once a bastion of national pride, now feel precarious. Hockey, the soul of Canadian competition, has become another export commodity. Young athletes dream not of playing for the

Montreal Canadiens or the Toronto Maple Leafs, but of signing lucrative contracts in Dallas, Los Angeles, or Las Vegas. The lure of the American dollar — and the despair of our weakened currency — has drained the north of much of its talent. Each player who crosses that border for a brighter spotlight or a fatter contract is, in a small but symbolic way, a defection of spirit. Canadians fear not just losing athletes but losing the very idea that we can sustain excellence at home.

The same is true of Canada's professional teams. The fear that the NFL, MLS, NBA, or MLB will one day swallow our franchises is not paranoia; it is the logical anxiety of a small market standing beside a behemoth. The Canadian dollar's chronic underperformance means our teams always fight uphill. Every economic downturn, every shift in broadcast rights, every move of an American owner reminds Canadians that even our games — our moments of joy and tribal belonging — are subject to the whims of the empire next door. It is a microcosm of a larger fear: that sovereignty itself is fragile in the shadow of American profit.

Beyond culture and sport lies the deeper anxiety of dependency — the recognition that America's prosperity underwrites much of our own. Our trade agreements, our energy exports, our technology sectors — all are tied to the American market. And yet this intimacy breeds unease. What happens when the U.S. turns inward, when its populists demand protectionism, when tariffs return as weapons in a new economic war? Canadians still remember the sting of the softwood lumber disputes, the threats to our auto industry, the chaos of NAFTA renegotiations. These are not abstract fears. They are lessons learned in humiliation.

During the Trump presidency, Canada discovered just how vulnerable it could be. Overnight, our most dependable ally became erratic. Tweets moved markets. Insults replaced diplomacy. Canadian industries were threatened with tariffs on a whim, and our leaders were treated like junior partners in a relationship we had long assumed was built on respect. For many Canadians, that moment was an awakening — a realization

that our dependence on the U.S. is not a partnership, but a power imbalance. And when the president of that nation is driven by volatility or vengeance, Canada becomes collateral damage.

This fear lingers even now, despite changes in administrations. It has entered the Canadian psyche as a kind of trauma. The fear is not only of a particular president, but of the system that can produce one — a political machinery so polarized and angry that it seems to manufacture chaos by design. Many Canadians watch the news from Washington with a sense of grim fascination: the endless congressional gridlock, the threats of violence, the cultish devotion to strongmen. The fear is not just that such politics will spill over, but that they already have — that Canada's civility is eroding under the influence of imported rage.

The rise of right-wing populism in Canada — small but loud — owes much to this contagion. The slogans, the social media style, the sense of grievance: all are borrowed from America's playbook. What Canadians fear most about the "alt-right" is not simply its ideology, but its energy — its ability to reshape discourse, to make anger seem authentic and cruelty patriotic. This is what they see across the border, and they fear it will take root here, fed by frustration, inflation, and alienation. In a nation that once prided itself on moderation, the American style of politics feels like an infection of the spirit.

And yet, the paradox is inescapable. For all our fears, Canada remains deeply bound to the United States — economically, culturally, militarily, emotionally. We vacation there, we shop there, we study there. Our greatest fear may not be of America itself, but of the part of ourselves that depends upon it. Canada defines itself in opposition to the United States, yet we measure our success by its standards. We fear becoming like them yet crave their approval. We resent their arrogance yet envy their ambition. This tension is at the heart of the Canadian condition — and the source of much of our national anxiety.

Water, oil, gas, minerals — these are the material frontiers where fear becomes tangible. Many Canadians believe, perhaps rightly, that America's appetite for resources will never be satisfied, and that our northern bounty is too tempting to ignore. They fear that one day, through trade agreements or corporate takeovers or outright coercion, the United States will claim what lies beneath our soil. The history of American expansion — its hunger for territory, its belief in manifest destiny — haunts Canadian imagination. The idea that Canada could be economically conquered without a single shot fired is no longer fiction; it is a plausible scenario in a world where capital moves faster than armies.

This fear is sharpened by the memory of past betrayals — the sense that Canada's resources have always been bartered away too cheaply. In the book, *Enemy Below*, this author explored how dependency and subservience, particularly in the realm of defense and energy, made Canada vulnerable to manipulation. That same dynamic persists today, though in more sophisticated forms. American corporations control much of our energy infrastructure, our digital networks, even our news platforms. The occupation is invisible, but it is real. And Canadians feel it — in the rising cost of living, in the vanishing of local industries, in the quiet despair of realizing that our sovereignty may already be compromised.

And so, the fear grows: that the U.S. does not need to invade, because it already occupies our screens, our markets, our minds. The border, in a psychological sense, is fading. The modern Canadian lives in a state of dual consciousness — geographically north, culturally south. We worry about what will happen if we lose our autonomy, but the more subtle truth is that we may already have surrendered it. Fear, in this context, becomes not merely an emotion but a diagnosis. It reveals the extent of our entanglement, our inability to stand alone.

Still, there is another dimension to this fear — one that must be acknowledged with honesty. Some of these anxieties are magnified by a long tradition of Canadian

anti-Americanism, an instinctive reflex that defines our identity through contrast. To be Canadian, in the popular imagination, is often to *not* be American. This opposition comforts us, gives shape to our national story. But it can also blind us. Not all-American influence is malignant, and not every Canadian fear is justified. Sometimes what we call fear is envy dressed in humility. We scorn the brashness of America while secretly admiring its vitality. We condemn its excesses while consuming its culture. Our relationship is not that of victim and oppressor, but of siblings — close, competitive, co-dependent, forever bound.

This complexity makes the American fear uniquely Canadian. It is not hatred, but unease, not rejection, but reluctance. We live in the orbit of a nation whose gravitational pull we cannot escape. Every Canadian government, no matter how independent its rhetoric, must calibrate itself against the United States. Every national policy — from defense to immigration to environment — must consider the reaction in Washington. This dependence breeds both comfort and contempt. We benefit from their markets, their protection, their proximity — and yet we resent it. We fear that in gaining their favor, we lose our soul.

In this way, Canada's fear of America is also a fear of itself — of its own fragility, its own contradictions, its own unfinished identity. The American shadow looms not just across our border, but across our sense of who we are. It is a mirror in which we see both what we admire and what we dread becoming. There comes a point in every dependent relationship when the smaller partner begins to wonder whether its survival depends upon submission. Canada has long lived with that suspicion when it comes to the United States. We look south and see both promise and peril, a civilization that dazzles with power even as it threatens with chaos. The fear is not merely that America will harm us, but that it will define us — that the sheer weight of its presence will compress our individuality into imitation.

Our proximity to the most powerful country on earth has made us both privileged and precarious. We are shielded from many global storms because we live in America's lee, but that same shelter binds us to its fate. When America thrives, we prosper. When it falters, we tremble. We have made a national habit of believing that our stability is our own achievement, yet deep down, Canadians know that our economy, our culture, and even our defense is inseparable from the American system. This knowledge breeds quiet resentment — and fear that independence is an illusion we politely maintain to feel comfortable in our own skin.

The modern Canadian psyche is thus divided between gratitude and anxiety. We admire America's innovation, its dynamism, its confidence. But we fear its volatility, its violence, and its appetite. We rely on its markets yet dread its tariffs. We celebrate its democracy, yet recoil from its extremes. We emulate its technology and art yet fear the moral erosion that often follows. We tell ourselves that Canada is a gentler, fairer, more civilized cousin, but that very comparison betrays an insecurity — an unspoken acknowledgment that we define ourselves by contrast rather than by conviction.

Every generation of Canadians has wrestled with this duality. After Confederation, the founders feared annexation. During the twentieth century, we feared economic domination. Now, in the twenty-first, we fear absorption — not by conquest, but by contagion. The instruments of invasion have changed. The soldiers now are influencers, algorithms, corporate mergers, and ideology. America does not need to raise a flag over Ottawa to control Canada; it need only continue exporting its narratives, its values, its noise. The domination is ambient, almost invisible — but it shapes our lives just as powerfully as any historical empire once shaped its colonies.

Yet it must be said: fear alone cannot define a nation. To fear is to concede weakness; to live by fear is to let another's shadow dictate your light. Canada's great test in this century will not be to resist America, but to rediscover itself — to build a confidence strong enough to coexist with power without being consumed by it. We

cannot undo geography, nor should we want to. What we can undo is dependency of the spirit, the reflex that looks south for validation before daring to act.

That reflex, however, runs deep. We see it in our economy, which orbits around U.S. consumption. We see it in our media, which mirrors American talking points. We see it in our politics, where left and right both draw their language from U.S. culture wars that rarely fit our own reality. Even our protests now borrow slogans from across the border, as though imagination itself has been outsourced. And we see it in our self-image: Canadians often define themselves not by what they are, but by what they are not — not violent, not arrogant, not divided, not American. It is a passive identity, built on negation rather than affirmation.

The antidote to fear, then, is not hostility but purpose. Canada must know itself not as the polite appendage of an empire, but as a nation capable of moral leadership, creativity, and courage. It must rediscover pride not in contrast to America, but in contribution to the world. If we wish to be more than a northern echo, we must speak with our own voice — clear, confident, compassionate. The task is not to sever ties with the United States, but to stand beside it as an equal, defined by conviction rather than convenience.

Still, the anxiety lingers. Every new American election brings dread to Canadian households, as though our destiny were on their ballots. Every presidential tweet that shakes the markets ripples through our pensions and mortgages. Canadians have begun to view the U.S. not as a stable ally, but as an unpredictable force — capable of brilliance one moment and belligerence the next. The fear of the U.S. president, whoever occupies that office, is not personal but symbolic. It is the fear of unpredictability in a partner too powerful to ignore. It is the fear of being caught in the slipstream of history's most restless nation.

For many, the Trump years crystallized this dread. The casual insults toward allies, the transactional view of friendship, the indifference to multilateralism — all of it

forced Canadians to confront an uncomfortable truth: America's interests are not our own. We had long believed that decency and shared values guaranteed cooperation, but those illusions shattered. The mask fell away, and behind it we saw the naked face of national self-interest. That realization left a scar. Even if calmer leadership returned, the innocence did not. Canadians learned that America's benevolence is conditional, and that our sovereignty can never rely on sentiment.

And yet, if we look with steadier eyes, we must admit that not every fear is justified. Some are magnified by habit — the residue of anti-American reflexes that have lingered for generations. For every story of American excess, there is one of generosity. For every arrogant act, a courageous one. The United States remains a complex nation, capable of both brilliance and brutality, progress and regression. To fear it entirely is to ignore its better angels. But to trust it completely is to ignore our history. Maturity lies in balance — in recognizing both the danger and the necessity of our relationship.

There is an irony here that cannot be ignored: even as we fear America's influence, we depend upon it for protection. Our military rides beneath its umbrella. Our intelligence networks are entwined. Our trade corridors rely on its ports and its currency. The United States shields us from the world's harsher winds, yet that same shield casts a long shadow. We are safe, but small. Protected, but peripheral. The cost of that safety is the slow erosion of self-determination.

And so, we must ask: what kind of independence is left to a country that depends on another for its defense, its commerce, and its cultural oxygen? Is Canada still the master of its own destiny, or merely the caretaker of borrowed prosperity? These are the questions that haunt the modern Canadian — questions that inspire both gratitude and grief.

There is still time, however, to answer them with courage. Canada can, if it chooses, reassert the principles that once made it admired: decency, moderation, equality, and stewardship. It can be a counterweight to American extremism — not

through defiance, but through example. We cannot out-shout the United States, but we can outlast its moods. We can show that democracy need not be loud to be strong, that compassion is not weakness, that compromise is not surrender. In an age of anger, civility can be revolutionary. That, perhaps, is the true Canadian strength — one the world still needs.

To reclaim this strength, Canada must first confront its fear without denial. We must acknowledge that our identity crisis is not America's fault alone. We allowed dependence to become comfort, and comfort to become complacency. We allowed our creative industries to atrophy, our manufacturing to hollow, our sense of purpose to drift. America did not take these from us; we surrendered them willingly, lulled by convenience. The path forward is not to resent America, but to revive ourselves.

If we fail to do so, the risk is not invasion but irrelevance. A nation that measures itself only by its neighbour will one day vanish into that neighbour's reflection. We must guard against that fate, not with walls or slogans, but with willpower — the will to preserve what makes us unique. That uniqueness lies not in size or power, but in temperament: our capacity for empathy, for listening, for coexistence. Those virtues, though mocked by cynics, are the ones the world most desperately lacks.

The final fear — the deepest one — is not of America at all, but of our own fading confidence. Canada once had a quiet faith in its destiny, a belief that civility could be a strength and humility a virtue. We have lost some of that faith amid the noise of modernity. But history offers us a choice: to shrink into dependency or to rise into maturity. Fear can paralyze, or it can awaken. It can drive retreat, or it can demand renewal. The difference lies in courage.

So let us not fear the eagle's shadow but learn to fly in our own sky. Let us remember that our worth does not depend on comparison, that our sovereignty is not measured in military might but in moral clarity. America will continue to loom large, as it always has. It will seduce, inspire, and alarm us in equal measure. But the measure of

Canada — the true test of our dominion — will not be how we react to American power, but how we define ourselves beyond it.

In the end, the American Fear is a mirror of the Canadian soul. It reveals not only our anxieties, but our aspirations — the desire to matter, to endure, to remain distinct in a world of giants. The eagle will always fly above us, casting its shadow across our fields. But shadows do not erase what lies beneath them; they only remind us that the sun is still there, waiting for us to stand tall.

And so, the Dominion of Fear must become a Dominion of Resolve — a country that faces its fears without surrendering to them. Only then can we say, with confidence and without apology, that Canada is not an echo, not an appendage, not a reflection — but a voice, steady and sovereign, at last.

Chapter Seventeen

The Fiscal Abyss – Governments in Perpetual Deficit

Canada once took pride in its reputation for fiscal prudence. Balanced budgets were not just accounting achievements but symbols of a stable, dependable nation. Today, that legacy is in ruins. At every level—federal, provincial, and municipal—governments are drowning in red ink. Deficits have become the norm, debt has ballooned, and interest payments consume vast resources. For Canadians, these are not abstractions. They are daily reminders that their leaders cannot be trusted with the most basic duty of governance: living within their means. The federal government has set the tone by normalizing deficits. Despite possessing the widest tax base, Ottawa routinely spends far more than it collects. In recessions or crises, deficits soar; in good times, instead of repairing the damage, politicians expand programs further.

Canada's story has long been told as one of balance, prudence, and measured responsibility. For generations, the Dominion prided itself on being a nation that lived within its means, avoided the excesses of its southern neighbor, and embraced moderation in finance as in culture. There was once a sense of pride in Ottawa's ability to present a balanced budget, in provinces charting their accounts responsibly, and in cities that funded civic services through predictable, if sometimes burdensome, property taxation. To be Canadian meant to believe that the system, while not perfect, was stable, cautious, and dependable.

That image is shattered today. The federal government, the provinces, and the municipalities are all drowning in red ink. Balanced budgets are relics, not realities. Chronic deficits have become the norm, not the exception. Debt has metastasized at every level of governance, and interest payments are devouring public resources once

destined for services. The dream of fiscal stability has collapsed into the nightmare of perpetual shortfall. For ordinary Canadians and businesses alike, this is not an abstract concern—it is a looming shadow that feeds anxiety, fear, and distrust in a country once known for careful stewardship.

This chapter will explore Canada's desperate financial situation, from Parliament Hill to the smallest city hall, and explain how governments' unwillingness or inability to balance their books has become one of the central reasons citizens fear for their future.

At the heart of the fiscal crisis lies Ottawa. The federal government, despite commanding the broadest tax base and the greatest revenue-raising powers, has been running chronic deficits for decades. Canada's national debt now towers in the hundreds of billions, and yet budgets continue to be tabled with projected shortfalls, glossed over with slogans about "investments in the future" or "building an inclusive economy."

The truth is simpler: Ottawa is addicted to spending beyond its means. Politicians fear the electoral consequences of restraint, so they expand programs, promise benefits, and announce new initiatives year after year without regard to the bill. In times of crisis, such as recessions or pandemics, the deficits swell into gaping holes; in times of growth, rather than repairing the fiscal damage, Ottawa doubles down on spending to buy votes and cling to popularity.

This culture of permanent deficit has profound consequences. Servicing the federal debt now consumes tens of billions annually—money that could fund health care, infrastructure, or tax relief. Instead, it disappears into interest payments, a silent siphon draining the nation's vitality. Ordinary Canadians sense the danger, even if they do not parse the numbers. They know that when government debt rises, taxes will eventually follow. They know that money wasted on interest is money not spent on services. And they know, above all, that the leaders they elect are lying when they insist the books are "under control."

Ottawa's inability to balance its own accounts breeds fear. It signals that the national government itself cannot be trusted with stewardship. If the highest level of the Canadian state is content to live in perpetual deficit, what hope is there for responsibility elsewhere?

If Ottawa sets the tone, the provinces bear the brunt. Health care, education, and infrastructure—the three pillars of Canadian society—are provincial responsibilities. They are also the costliest. As the population ages, health-care costs balloon. As students demand better facilities, education budgets swell. As roads crumble and public transit collapses under pressure, infrastructure costs mount.

For provinces like Ontario and Quebec, deficits have become structural. Balanced budgets are occasional blips, achieved through accounting tricks, windfalls of federal transfers, or temporary surges of revenue. But over the long term, expenses grow faster than revenues, and the debt piles higher. Alberta, once a paragon of fiscal discipline and resource wealth, has also fallen into the pattern of overspending, justifying deficits as "temporary" even when oil prices recover. British Columbia, that was often praised for its economic management, faces pressure from housing costs and way too many and costly infrastructure needs that is sinking it deeper and deeper into the red.

Provinces pass this burden onto their citizens in both overt and hidden ways. Taxes rise, services decline, and fees creep upward. Universities hike tuition, hospitals close beds, and highways deteriorate. Families feel the pinch directly in their wallets and indirectly in the quality of public life. Businesses, too, absorb the cost through higher corporate taxes, more regulation, and the uncertainty of ever-changing fiscal policy.

The provinces, trapped between Ottawa's rhetoric and municipal desperation, often resemble drowning swimmers clinging to one another for survival. Their deficits feed the fear that the federation itself is unstable, that no level of government can truly manage the nation's needs.

If provinces are sinking, cities are gasping for air. Municipal governments in Canada lack the revenue tools available to senior levels of government. Their primary source of income is property tax, a blunt instrument that punishes homeowners while failing to keep up with modern costs. Grants from provinces are unpredictable, and federal funding often comes tied with strings.

Yet cities are expected to address homelessness, crime, transit, housing shortages, and the effects of immigration—all while maintaining parks, garbage collection, police services, and fire protection. The mismatch between resources and responsibilities is glaring. Municipal deficits, while sometimes less visible, translate quickly into real consequences: transit systems deteriorate, potholes multiply, libraries close, and social services vanish. Canadians experience municipal failure most directly in their daily lives. When garbage piles up, when buses fail to arrive, when encampments spread across downtown parks, citizens see with their own eyes what fiscal imbalance looks like. Fear grows not from abstract numbers in a budget document but from the lived reality of decline.

Cities across Canada are now openly warning that they face financial collapse unless new revenue sources are granted. Toronto, the country's largest metropolis, speaks of "structural deficits" that cannot be closed without help from Ottawa or Queen's Park. Smaller cities echo the same refrain. The despair is palpable, and it feeds the broader national fear: if even the local governments cannot keep the lights on, what kind of country is Canada becoming?

Why, Canadians ask, do their governments not simply balance the books? Why do deficits persist even in times of prosperity? The answers are many, but they all reveal a deeper sickness in the political system. First, politicians prioritize short-term popularity over long-term stability. Cutting spending angers voters; promising new programs wins applause. The electoral cycle rewards generosity and punishes austerity. The result is predictable: governments overspend, knowing the reckoning will fall on future leaders.

Second, ideology plays a role. Progressives insist that deficits are investments, that government borrowing stimulates growth and creates fairness. Conservatives talk of restraint but often fail to implement it when in power, fearing the backlash. The result is a bipartisan culture of deficit acceptance, where the debate is not about whether to run a deficit but how large it should be.

Third, corruption and inefficiency magnify the problem. Bloated bureaucracies, sweetheart contracts, and mismanaged projects waste billions. Citizens watch as governments pour money into vanity infrastructure, failed IT systems, or over-budget transit projects, then return to them demanding higher taxes. The anger turns into fear: if governments cannot even spend wisely, how will they ever spend less?

Finally, globalization and economic uncertainty offer convenient excuses. When recessions hit or markets shift, governments blame external forces for their deficits. Yet when prosperity returns, the deficits remain. Ordinary Canadians are no longer fooled. They see a pattern of excuses masking a deeper unwillingness to govern responsibly.

The consequences of endless deficits go beyond numbers. They corrode the trust between citizen and state. They fuel fear about the future. And they impose real economic costs. Debt servicing costs are perhaps the most obvious. As interest rates rise, governments pay more and more just to maintain their debt. This is money that could have built hospitals, hired teachers, or improved transit. Instead, it flows to bondholders and lenders, many of them foreign. Canadians rightly ask: why are we sending billions abroad in interest while our own hospitals beg for funding?

Deficits also crowd out private investment. Businesses hesitate to expand in a country where government borrowing soaks up available capital and threatens higher future taxes. Entrepreneurs fear that today's deficit will become tomorrow's tax burden. Confidence erodes, and with it, jobs and opportunities. Ordinary families face a psychological toll. They learn to fear government promises, knowing that new programs today mean higher taxes tomorrow. They lose faith in the future, doubting whether

pensions, health care, or social services will survive. Fear becomes a constant companion, shaping how Canadians live, work, and plan.

At root, Canada's fiscal crisis is not merely about deficits or debt. It is about the fear these deficits inspire. Canadians fear that their governments are not in control. They fear that politicians are mortgaging their children's future. They fear that the nation itself is living on borrowed time. Once, the Dominion offered its citizens a sense of calm stability. Balanced budgets were symbols of maturity and reliability. Today, deficits are symbols of chaos, irresponsibility, and decline. The fear is not only economic—it is existential. If governments cannot balance their books, how can they protect their borders, ensure safety, or uphold justice?

The story of Canada's deficits is thus the story of a country adrift. Federal, provincial, and municipal governments alike are failing in their most basic duty: to live within their means. Until they rediscover the discipline of balance, fear will remain the defining condition of Canadian life.

Chapter Eighteen
Deepening Crisis of Affordability

The single greatest source of fear among Canadians today is not crime, not politics, not even corruption—it is the relentless rise in the cost of living. From housing to food, energy to taxes, the financial ground beneath ordinary citizens is shifting so quickly that millions no longer feel secure in their own country. What was once a stable, middle-class nation has become a place where people work harder, spend more, and yet feel poorer than ever before. Canadians now speak the same language of worry. The cost of rent. The cost of a mortgage. The price of groceries. Heating bills. Insurance premiums. Taxes. Every conversation circles back to affordability. This is not simply economic strain; it is existential fear. Families are haunted by the possibility of losing their homes, seniors by the risk of outliving their savings, young people by the sense that they may never achieve the life their parents once considered ordinary.

The Canada of the past prided itself on moderation, balance, and a certain practical modesty in the way it lived. Housing was attainable. Food was affordable. Utilities and fuel, while always subject to fluctuations, were generally manageable. Families could plan, save, and grow. But in the Canada of today, nothing feels stable, nothing feels predictable, and for millions of citizens, nothing feels affordable. The rising costs of everything—from groceries to rent, from energy to insurance—has become the single most pressing fear in the lives of ordinary Canadians. It is no longer simply an inconvenience or an economic statistic; it has become an existential threat to the stability of households, the aspirations of the young, and the dignity of the retired.

This chapter explores the deepening crisis of affordability in Canada: why costs have escalated so dramatically, how those costs filter into fear, lawlessness, and political

disillusionment, and what—if anything—can be done to alleviate the fear before it hardens into despair.

The phrase “the rising costs of everything” may sound like hyperbole, but in Canada today, it is the lived reality. Renters in cities like Toronto and Vancouver face average monthly rents that would once have been unthinkable. Mortgage holders are staggering under the weight of variable interest rates that make homeownership feel like a punishment rather than an achievement. Food prices—once dismissed as seasonal fluctuations—have entered a state of permanent inflation, with staples like bread, eggs, and meat doubling in cost over just a few years. Energy bills are escalating, not only because of global price shocks, but because of domestic taxation regimes layered atop them. Insurance rates are climbing. Transit passes, school fees, mobile phone plans, car ownership, property taxes—all inching upward year by year, month by month.

The financial oxygen of the average Canadian household is being steadily consumed. Disposable income has disappeared; savings rates are collapsing; consumer debt is soaring. And at the root of it all lies fear: fear of losing one’s home, fear of failing to provide for one’s family, fear of sliding into poverty despite working full-time.

Canada’s affordability crisis begins with housing. The dream of owning a home has, in many regions, died outright. Prices exploded during the low-interest years, driven not only by domestic buyers but by waves of speculative investment, foreign money, and a failure of governments at every level to build enough supply. Now, with interest rates high, Canadians are trapped: unable to afford a new mortgage, unable to refinance, yet still expected to pay more each month. Renters, too, face despair as demand soars while supply remains strangled by red tape and zoning laws. Housing is not just another expense. It is the anchor of life. When that anchor breaks, fear overwhelms everything.

Canadian grocery prices have risen faster than wages, leaving families shocked each time they shop. Climate disruptions, supply chain failures, global unrest, and fuel

costs all play their part, but so does domestic inefficiency. Canadian farmers face enormous costs of compliance, carbon taxes, and distribution fees. The result is that a simple bag of groceries feels like a luxury purchase. For lower-income families, food insecurity is now a permanent condition.

In a northern country, energy is life. Yet Canadians pay some of the highest energy costs in the developed world, not only for gasoline but for heating, electricity, and natural gas. Carbon pricing, infrastructure bottlenecks, and policy inconsistency combine with global shocks to produce soaring bills. For many seniors and working families, the choice has become stark: heat or eat.

Every dollar borrowed is a dollar feared when interest rates rise. For decades, Canadians were encouraged to borrow—on mortgages, lines of credit, and credit cards—because money was cheap. Now, with rates elevated, the debt burden has become unbearable. What was once manageable has become crippling, and the more Canadians owe, the more they live in constant fear of financial collapse.

At every level, taxes are creeping higher—property taxes, income taxes, sales taxes, fees, levies, and surcharges. The paradox is bitter: Canadians are paying more to governments that themselves cannot balance budgets, and the services provided in exchange are deteriorating. People feel trapped between private inflation and public taxation, squeezed from both sides.

The rising costs of everything are not only an economic phenomenon; they are a psychological one. Fear has seeped into the daily lives of Canadians. The fear of eviction, foreclosure, bankruptcy. The fear of retirement without dignity. The fear of having to tell children “we can’t afford that.” These fears do not remain private—they spill into politics, into culture, into the very sense of national identity.

Canadians once believed their country was stable, fair, and moderately prosperous. Today, they fear it is unstable, unfair, and increasingly hostile to ordinary

aspiration. A family earning six figures in a major city can still feel poor, a new graduate can feel hopeless, and a retiree can feel abandoned.

When the middle-class fears poverty, the poor fear destitution, and the young fear they will never advance, the entire social fabric begins to tear. Rising costs have become a political battlefield. Governments, regardless of party, offer subsidies, rebates, and short-term gimmicks rather than long-term structural reforms. Politicians promise affordability while simultaneously driving policies—whether through taxation, restrictive zoning, or energy regulations—that worsen the crisis.

This breeds cynicism. Canadians fear not only the costs themselves but also the inability of their political class to address them honestly. When government becomes associated with incompetence and exploitation rather than relief and stability, fear becomes anger. And when anger is ignored, lawlessness often follows.

Fear, left unaddressed, will harden into despair. If Canada is to alleviate the fear of rising costs, it must move beyond rhetoric and enact meaningful change. What can be done? Housing Reform: Radical supply-side reforms are needed—cutting red tape, ending exclusionary zoning, streamlining approvals, and incentivizing mass building of rental and ownership properties alike. Canada has the land; what it lacks is the political will. Tax and Energy Relief: Rolling back certain taxes on essentials—like food, heating, and fuel—would provide immediate breathing room. Energy policy must be pragmatic rather than ideological, focused on affordability and reliability first. Debt Support and Financial Literacy: Expanding tools for debt restructuring, financial counseling, and limits on predatory lending could help families trapped by compounding interest.

Food Security Measures: Investment in domestic food production and distribution—reducing unnecessary middlemen, streamlining regulations, and bolstering local agriculture—could stabilize prices and reduce reliance on imports.

Government Accountability: Above all, Canadians need to see governments that balance budgets, control spending, and stop passing the costs of inefficiency onto

citizens. Without fiscal responsibility at the top, every attempt to relieve households will be temporary.

The rising costs of everything need not doom Canada forever. Other nations have faced inflationary spirals and affordability crises, and many have emerged from them. But relief requires honesty, leadership, and courage. Canadians cannot be expected to endure endless cost increases without breaking. A society cannot function when its people live in perpetual financial fear. The Canadian people are not asking for luxury. They are asking for stability—for the ability to house themselves, feed their families, heat their homes, and live without constant dread of financial collapse. If this cannot be delivered, then fear will define the Dominion more than any maple leaf ever could.

In this books story of Canada's decline into fear and lawlessness, the rising costs of everything stand as the most relentless engine. Crime, corruption, and politics may erode trust, but unaffordability erodes survival itself. To fear one's bills more than one's government, to fear one's grocery receipt more than one's neighbor, is to live in a society where economics has replaced community, and where despair shadows every paycheck.

Unless Canada finds the will to act—boldly, responsibly, and compassionately—the fear of rising costs will not only define the present but will consume the future.

Chapter Nineteen
A Waiting Room Nation

Canada once believed its greatest symbol was not the flag, nor the Mountie, nor the maple leaf, but the hospital card — that slim, unassuming piece of plastic that guaranteed every citizen, rich or poor, could walk through the doors of any hospital and receive care without cost. It was more than policy; it was moral identity, a covenant between the state and the citizen. Health care, we were told, made us better *than others — most especially, better than the Americans.*

For decades, that belief held firm. Canadians took quiet pride in knowing that if they broke a bone, fell ill, or faced cancer, they would be cared for. It was a reflection of who they were: compassionate, fair, civilized. The system, they believed, was proof that decency could be organized, bureaucratized, and delivered at scale. The Canadian dream was not of wealth or opportunity — it was of security, the assurance that one would never be abandoned in pain.

But the waiting rooms tell a different story now. They are crowded, fluorescent chambers of exhaustion and despair. The stretchers line the hallways; the air carries the scent of disinfectant and hopelessness. Nurses rush between curtained cubicles, doctors stare at screens, and somewhere behind the noise, an old man moans softly, waiting for someone to notice him. Days pass, then nights. The triage nurse has long stopped apologizing. Everyone is waiting — not just for care, but for a system that no longer works.

The truth is unavoidable: Canada's health care system, once the envy of the world, is collapsing under its own sanctimony. The nation that prided itself on compassion has built a structure that traps its sick in limbo. For the working Canadian —

the taxpayer, the contributor — the promise has become a cruel parody. While hospitals overflow with addiction cases, overdoses, and mental health crises, those who once trusted the system now wait endlessly for surgery, for diagnostic tests, for a bed that never opens. How did it come to this?

The origins lie in a dream — a noble one. In the aftermath of World War II, amid the ruins of Europe and the fear of another Great Depression, the world sought new social contracts. In Saskatchewan, Premier Tommy Douglas — the father of Canadian Medicare — introduced a publicly funded hospital insurance plan in 1947. It was radical, moral, and deeply humanistic. By the late 1960s, universal health coverage spread nationwide. It became the Canadian creed: that health care was not a privilege, but a right.

Yet in that triumph lay the seeds of future dysfunction. A system built on political virtue was never designed for long-term sustainability or efficiency. Politicians discovered that defending “free care” was easier than improving it. Every election became a competition in moral signaling: who loved the system more? The result was inevitable — bureaucracy metastasized, accountability vanished, and innovation was seen as heresy.

By the 1980s and 1990s, the cracks were showing. Hospitals merged or closed, funding was frozen or slashed, and provinces struggled to balance budgets while protecting the sacred cow of “universal access.” Ottawa and the provinces blamed each other; both claimed to defend the principle, while quietly eroding the practice. The Canada Health Act of 1984 enshrined five grand principles — public administration, comprehensiveness, universality, portability, and accessibility — but failed to define how these ideals would survive in an aging nation with rising costs and finite resources.

The result, four decades later, is a hybrid monster: a system that promises everything to everyone yet delivers little to anyone efficiently. Every year brings new reports, commissions, and task forces — all saying the same thing: the system is

unsustainable. And yet, reform never comes. Because to question it is to commit political suicide. To suggest private options, competition, or innovation is to invite accusations of cruelty, of “Americanization.” In this paralysis, the system has rotted from within.

Walk into any major Canadian hospital today and you will see the collision of compassion and collapse. Emergency rooms, designed for acute care, have become shelters of last resort — overcrowded with those who have nowhere else to go. The homeless, the addicted, the mentally ill — all flow into the ERs because the social safety nets around them have disintegrated. Police bring them in at night, paramedics drop them off, and exhausted nurses try to manage crises that are not medical but social.

Meanwhile, those who built the country — the taxpayers, the seniors who fought and worked — sit waiting for hip replacements, heart procedures, and cancer diagnostics. They watch as their pain is triaged below chaos. They are told to wait weeks, then months, then years. Some die before their appointments ever arrives. In many communities, the family doctor is a ghost — six million Canadians now lack one.

For the doctors and nurses, the despair is profound. They entered medicine to heal, not to ration. But every shift has become triage — moral and professional. They must choose who waits and who doesn’t, who gets the scarce bed and who endures another night on a stretcher. The burnout is catastrophic. Much leave for the United States or retire early. The Canadian Medical Association warns of mass attrition, yet government ministers continue to issue platitudes about “investing in people” while cutting or freezing resources.

At the heart of it all is a paradox: Canadians believe in a system that no longer believes in them. They cling to the moral identity of “free health care” as proof of collective goodness, even as the system itself has become cruel in practice. The national myth persists because it is comfortable — it hides the fear that Canada might have to become pragmatic.

To understand the depth of the failure, one must see the structure of incentives. In the Canadian model, the government is both payer and provider. There is no competition, no incentive for efficiency, no reward for excellence. Bureaucracy governs medicine. Hospitals are managed like departments of government, not dynamic institutions. Decision-making is slow, innovation is stifled, and the patient is a number in a queue.

Contrast this with the United States. South of the border, the system is messy, inequitable, and often cruelly expensive — but it moves. It innovates. It treats health care as an industry that rewards results. American hospitals compete for patients, invest in technology, and attract global talent. The wealthy get world-class care; the poor often struggle — yet the engines of progress run constantly. The system is unjust but alive. Canada's, by comparison, is fair but dead.

And yet, the irony is that both nations fear becoming each other. Americans fear the loss of choice and the bureaucracy of socialized care; Canadians fear the profit motive and the specter of medical bankruptcy. Both systems contain truth and hypocrisy. But somewhere between them lies a model that works — one that many European nations have already achieved.

In France, Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, a hybrid approach thrives. Universal coverage is guaranteed — every citizen is insured — yet private competition exists. Patients can choose doctors, hospitals compete on quality, and wait times are measured in days, not months. Governments regulate, but do not monopolize. Health care is treated as a shared responsibility, not a state religion.

Could Canada evolve toward such a model? Could it shed its ideological rigidity and embrace reform? To do so would require courage unprecedented in modern Canadian politics. It would mean admitting that the sacred system has failed. It would mean breaking the monopoly of provincial health bureaucracies, introducing private

options within a universal framework, and decentralizing control to local institutions. It would mean treating patients not as citizens to be managed, but as clients to be served.

But before any of that, it would mean facing the truth: Canada's health care system is not sick — it is dying. And with its decline, something larger is dying too — the belief that government can be both compassionate and competent.

The illusion of health care equality was always fragile, but for decades Canadians believed in it because it felt humane. It made them feel different from Americans — less selfish, more civilized. It became a moral shield, a collective boast whispered with polite superiority: At least we don't let people die because they're poor.

Yet that quiet pride has turned into quiet panic. Canadians now watch the nightly news and see their hospitals in crisis, ambulances lined outside emergency departments, surgeries cancelled, children flown to other provinces for care. They read about patients dying in waiting rooms or elderly people being "decanted" to nursing homes without family consent. Each story chips away at a myth that once defined the nation.

The truth is that Canada's health care system is not a symbol of compassion anymore — it is a reflection of decay. The moral order that built it has been replaced by managerial drift and ideological cowardice. The bureaucrats still issue cheerful press releases about "transformational change," but everyone knows the transformation is downward. Canada has become a waiting room nation — polite, patient, endlessly tolerant of dysfunction.

The cracks began to widen long before the pandemic, but COVID-19 tore away the last pretenses. Under the weight of fear and emergency powers, Canada's hospitals collapsed into chaos. Staff shortages turned into permanent vacancies, burnout became exodus, and "temporary" measures hardened into new norms of delay and rationing. The system never recovered. And yet, the political class spoke only in platitudes — praising "our heroes" while quietly allowing the infrastructure to crumble.

What was once the pride of the Dominion has become a national embarrassment. In global rankings of health system performance among advanced economies, Canada now routinely falls near the bottom. The Commonwealth Fund — once friendly to the Canadian model — ranks it last among 11 developed nations for wait times and access to care. Even the United States, long scorned by Canadians, scores higher in several categories.

But numbers alone don't capture the humiliation. The decline is spiritual as much as operational. The promise of Medicare was not just that care would be free, but that it would be timely, decent, and human. That covenant is broken. Consider the rural communities where hospitals close overnight because there is no doctor on call. Consider the urban emergency rooms where paramedics wait eight hours to offload a patient because there are no beds. Consider the cancer patient that was told that diagnostic imaging is "months behind schedule." These are not anomalies — they are the new normal.

And yet, Canadians endure. They apologize to nurses who ignore them, they thank administrators who fail them, they vote for governments that reassure them that "health care is safe in our hands." It is a national ritual of denial — the fear of confrontation dressed up as civility.

Meanwhile, beneath the fluorescent lights, another crisis festers: the silent war for resources between the medical system and the social one. Emergency departments have become the last refuge of every societal failure — the addicted, the homeless, the mentally ill, the lonely. Hospitals, meant to heal the body, now absorb the moral collapse of the streets. Doctors have become psychiatrists, social workers, and custodians. Each overdose, each psychotic episode, each police drop-off consumes time and space that once belonged to the injured, the sick, and the dying.

This collision between compassion and dysfunction defines the modern Canadian hospital. No one can be turned away, and so no one is truly served. Compassion, when

stripped of structure, becomes chaos. It is not the fault of the individual nurse or doctor — they are victims too, trapped in an impossible moral economy. The fault lies in the political cowardice that allows the system to become a substitute for every other failure of governance. Instead of solving homelessness, addiction, and mental illness, politicians funnel the human wreckage into the hospitals and call it compassion. It is not compassion - it is abdication.

In a perverse twist, those who pay for the system are now the ones denied by it. Middle-class Canadians, the backbone of the tax base, find themselves waiting months or years for surgeries that their American counterparts receive in weeks. They watch their loved ones suffer and die, not because of medical incompetence, but because the machine of administration moves too slowly to save them. Doctors whisper what politicians won't: the system kills by delay.

Those who can afford it quietly seek treatment abroad — in the U.S., Mexico, or Europe. It is an open secret that thousands of Canadians each year become "medical refugees," crossing the border for procedures they cannot wait for at home. Yet to say this aloud is to invite outrage, as though truth itself were a form of treason. In truth, there is nothing un-Canadian about wanting to live.

The great irony is that the moral foundation of Canada's health care — equality — has created a new inequality: between those with means to escape and those without. Universal care has become universal delay. South of the border, Americans live with a very different fear. There, the system is dynamic but merciless. Hospitals gleam, technologies advance, but the poor are often crushed by debt or denied care. The private market drives innovation — but at the price of humanity. The American dream of choice has become, for many, a nightmare of invoices.

And yet, even in its harshness, the U.S. system possesses what Canada's has lost: vitality. Hospitals compete to attract patients. Doctors can innovate without bureaucratic permission. Efficiency and customer service are rewarded. The system is

brutal, but it moves — it acts. Canada's, by contrast, waits. It studies, consults, pilots, evaluates — and waits some more. A patient in pain becomes a "case." A doctor's judgment becomes a "process." The suffering of the individual is absorbed into the ritual of systemic inertia.

The Canadian dream of health care equality has hardened into an ideology. To question it is heresy. Politicians, unions, and advocacy groups speak of "defending Medicare" as if it were a holy relic rather than a tool that must evolve. The phrase "two-tier system" is invoked like a curse. But the truth is that a two-tier system already exists — not by design, but by neglect. Those with money or connections skip the line privately or abroad, while everyone else is told to wait their turn in a system that no longer turns at all.

Fear sustains the illusion. Canadians are told that if they open the door even a crack to private competition, the entire system will collapse into American chaos. But the evidence from Europe tells a different story. France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland — all maintain universal access while allowing private participation. These systems are efficient, innovative, and humane. They are not Americanized; they are modernized. The difference is that they trust their citizens to make choices. Canada does not.

Instead, Canadians are infantilized by their governments — told that reform would betray their values, that efficiency is greed, that choice is inequity. And so, the waiting rooms grow longer, the hallways more crowded, and the myth more desperate.

The cost of this delusion is not measured only in wait times or dollars, but in morale. The health care crisis has become a crisis of faith. It is not merely the system that is failing, but the belief that Canada can manage anything well anymore. Each failure in health care reinforces the broader sense that the country itself is unraveling — that the state cannot build, maintain, or reform even the institutions it once excelled at.

The decline of health care is the decline of confidence. And as confidence dies, so does unity. The federation itself strains under the weight of provincial variation and federal neglect. Alberta talks of autonomy, Quebec asserts its difference, and the federal government hides behind platitudes about “partnership.” The reality is that the system is a patchwork of thirteen provincial fiefdoms, each run by bureaucracies more accountable to their unions than to their patients. There is no national vision, only overlapping jurisdictions and endless committees. The irony is that health care, which was supposed to bind Canada together, now exposes its fractures.

There is a moment, somewhere between exhaustion and acceptance, when a patient stops pressing the call button. In that silence lies the deepest indictment of Canada’s health-care collapse: people have stopped believing that help will come. They wait not in anger anymore, but in resignation. The same numb faith now marks the national psyche. Canada’s health-care crisis is no longer a technical failure; it is a cultural one. It reflects a country that has grown comfortable with decline, mistaking endurance for virtue.

But resignation is not destiny. The patient can still be saved — if the nation finally admits that the old medicine no longer works. Reform must begin with truth. The myth of moral superiority has to end. Universal access is not synonymous with single-payer monopoly. Compassion does not require inefficiency. Equality does not mean uniform mediocrity. The belief that public and private principles cannot coexist has become a superstition that kills.

Across the Atlantic, other democracies have shown that universality and competition can live side by side. France ensures care for all through mandatory insurance but allows citizens to choose among competing public and private plans. Germany blends solidarity with market discipline. The Netherlands runs a regulated private system in which insurers compete to provide the best service at the lowest cost,

under strict government oversight to guarantee equity. In each case, reform began when citizens confronted the same fear Canadians face today — the fear of change.

Canada's path to recovery must follow five broad steps. None are easy, but each is possible. First, guarantee a universal core. Every Canadian should retain the unconditional right to emergency and essential care — financed publicly, delivered wherever it can be done best. The moral foundation of Medicare must remain, but its walls must be opened to light and air.

Second, permit an optional private tier within the public framework. Let Canadians purchase supplementary insurance or pay directly for elective or expedited procedures, while maintaining equal access to basic care. Such competition would relieve pressure on public queues, attract investment, and keep medical talent at home. What is now whispered in political corners should become an honest national conversation.

Third, decentralize decision-making. Local hospitals, clinics, and physicians know their communities far better than distant bureaucracies do. Funding should follow patients, not administrative formulas. Give managers authority to innovate — and hold them accountable for outcomes, not paperwork.

Fourth, digitize and integrate. Canada's health records remain fragmented across provinces and systems, wasting billions and endangering patients. A modern, interoperable digital infrastructure — privacy-protected but nationally standardized — would save lives and money alike. Technology cannot cure moral decay, but it can cure inefficiency.

Fifth, separate medical care from social crisis. Addiction, homelessness, and severe mental illness require their own dedicated systems — community treatment centers, supportive housing, long-term psychiatric care — not endless cycling through emergency departments. Compassion must be organized, not improvised on the hospital floor.

Together these reforms would do more than unclog waiting rooms; they would restore a sense of moral reciprocity between citizen and state. Canadians would once again feel that the taxes they pay buy something tangible — dignity, not delay. Doctors and nurses would recover professional pride. Patients would recover faith.

But reform will not come from bureaucrats. It will come only when Canadians stop being afraid of the word change. Politicians will not move until the public gives them permission to be brave. The conversation must begin in households, boardrooms, clinics, and community halls — the places where the myth of "free care forever" has quietly broken down.

There will be fierce resistance. The unions that guard the status quo will cry "privatization." The political class will weaponize nostalgia. Yet beneath the noise lies a growing consensus that something fundamental must shift. Even within government reports, the language has changed from "sustainability" to "survival." The patient is crashing; heroic measures are no longer optional.

If Canada acts, it can still lead the world — not as a relic of moral virtue, but as a model of mature pragmatism. A reformed system could blend universal humanity with disciplined management, the compassion of the public with the agility of the private. It could once again make the nation proud not because it clings to an idea, but because it makes that idea work.

And beyond policy, there is something deeper at stake. The health-care crisis mirrors a spiritual one: the slow death of responsibility. For decades Canadians have been told that "the system" will take care of everything. That abdication — the transfer of duty from citizen to state — has left both weaker. A revitalized health system would remind the country that freedom and compassion require effort, not complacency.

Reform, if it ever comes, will feel like chaos at first. It will demand new laws, new funding models, and new courage. But chaos is preferable to decay. It is the turbulence of rebirth, not the stillness of decline. Imagine, then, a Canada fifteen years from now

that has faced this fear honestly. Hospitals hum with efficiency; patients book surgeries within weeks; doctors from abroad apply to work here because innovation is rewarded. The homeless and addicted receive targeted care in dedicated facilities rather than in emergency hallways. The ER nurse, no longer broken by impossible triage, can finally treat patients as people. The system breathes again.

Such a vision is not utopian. It already exists in parts of the world that once looked to Canada for inspiration. What they achieved, Canada can relearn. The alternative is darker. Without reform, the system will continue to implode — more staff will leave, more patients will die waiting, and public faith will erode until even the myth of universal care collapses. The nation that once defined itself by compassion will be remembered for its apathy.

In that sense, the health-care crisis is a national test. It asks whether Canada still possesses the courage to tell itself the truth. Fear built the paralysis; only honesty can cure it. At the end of every examination, a doctor must write a diagnosis and a plan. The diagnosis is clear: systemic failure caused by denial. The plan is equally clear: courage, competition, compassion. The prognosis depends entirely on the will of the patient — the nation itself. Canada can still heal. The tools exist, the examples abound, the people remain decent and capable. What is missing is the decision to stop waiting.

And so, this chapter closes as it began, in the waiting room — but the door ahead is open now. The nurse calls the next name. The nation must stand, walk forward, and begin its own treatment. The system is sick, yes — but the country does not have to die with it.

Chapter Twenty
A Nation Divided: The Age of Polarization

When partisan leaders act as if those in other parties are dangerous, morally bankrupt or just plain stupid, than these kind of politics eventually impact how Canadians see each other as human beings …Fair Vote 2023

Canada once prided itself on moderation. A land of compromise, civility, and common sense. For generations, that was the quiet boast of the Dominion — that while others succumbed to ideological storms, Canada remained steady, polite, and calm. Ours was a country built not on revolution, but on negotiation, not on slogans, but on solutions. Yet that centre has not held. The notion of a shared national temperament — a cool, rational middle ground — has begun to collapse beneath the weight of political rage and cultural suspicion. What once bound Canadians together, a sense of decency and collective restraint, is giving way to something raw, tribal, and bitter. A nation divided now stares back at itself in the mirror, unable to recognize the reflection.

What has happened to us? The answer, as with most tragedies, did not appear overnight. The erosion of civility began quietly, like a hairline crack in glass — invisible until the entire pane suddenly shattered. The first signs were subtle: a harsher tone in Parliament, a nastier current in online debates, a creeping intolerance for disagreement. But slowly, steadily, that current became a flood. Today, one scarcely needs to mention politics at a dinner table without risking a quarrel. Neighbours glare across ideological fences; families split over matters of belief and belonging. Even the simplest civic conversation has become fraught, as if every opinion must signal loyalty to one tribe or another. Canada, once proud of its moderation, has succumbed to polarization.

The age of fear and anger has not spared the north. For decades, Canadians consoled themselves with the idea that polarization was an American affliction — a symptom of their rougher politics and louder media. We watched, with a mixture of superiority and concern, as Democrats and Republicans descended into hostility, as cable news became a theatre of rage. But the infection spread. Through television, social media, and cultural osmosis, Canada absorbed the habits of division. American anger became our soundtrack. We borrowed their vocabulary, their moral absolutism, their contempt for compromise. Slowly, we began to mirror their rage — until our own discourse grew just as poisonous, our own public square just as fractured.

Now the disease is homegrown. The lines between left and right have hardened into walls; every issue becomes a battlefield. The old Canadian reflex — to find common ground — has withered in the face of endless outrage. Political life is no longer a debate over policy, but a war of moral identities. You are not simply wrong; you are evil. You are not misinformed; you are a threat. In this new moral order, disagreement itself is dangerous — a form of betrayal. The social contract that once allowed Canadians to live and let live is breaking down.

The political class, sensing opportunity, has not sought to heal the wounds. It has learned to profit from them. In the modern political economy, division is currency. Outrage fuels fundraising; fear drives engagement. The system rewards those who inflame, not those who reconcile. Each party, each leader, has discovered that nothing rallies a base like the demonization of the other side. The result is a politics of permanent antagonism — a contest not to govern the country, but to destroy one's opponents. Compromise is weakness, moderation is treason, and victory means total humiliation of the other camp. This is not democracy; it is ideological war conducted through ballots instead of bullets.

The parallels with the United States are no longer superficial. Canada has absorbed the entire performance: the televised shouting matches, the social media

vendettas, the moral posturing, the tribal flags. The old Canadian habit of understatement — of assuming that politics should be boring, practical, and decent — has been replaced by a hunger for spectacle. Outrage has become entertainment. We consume anger the way others consume sports or celebrity gossip. We cheer for our side and jeer the enemy, mistaking fury for passion and moral certainty for truth. The cultural temperature has risen so high that even once-mundane issues — the carbon tax, immigration, gun ownership, vaccine mandates, Indigenous reconciliation — now function as loyalty tests in a national civil war of values.

How did a country built on compromise become addicted to conflict? The answer lies partly in technology, partly in ideology, and mostly in fear. The internet, once hailed as a tool of democracy, has become a machine of polarization. Algorithms built to maximize engagement learned long ago that outrage keeps users scrolling. Every click, every share, every heated argument online feeds the invisible system that monetizes division. Social media does not care who wins the debate; it only cares that the debate never ends. And so, the country fragments into echo chambers — self-contained worlds where one's views are always affirmed, one's enemies always ridiculed. Truth becomes optional, context irrelevant. The more polarized the content, the more viral it becomes. Rage is profitable; nuance is not.

Ideology, meanwhile, fills the vacuum left by the collapse of trust. Canadians once trusted institutions — Parliament, media, courts, even each other. But after years of scandal, censorship, and hypocrisy, that trust has eroded. Into that void rush the certainties of ideology. People crave meaning, and when civic faith dies, they find belonging in politics. But politics, stripped of humility, becomes religion — and religion, stripped of grace, becomes fanaticism. Thus, we arrive at the present: a secular theocracy of left and right, each convinced of its righteousness, each demanding conversion or exile. Politics no longer merely governs our lives; it defines them.

The left insists that its moral mission — social justice, environmental salvation, equity — justifies censorship and intolerance. The right, in turn, retreats into populist rage, conspiracy, and nostalgia for a purer past. Both believe they are saving Canada; both are in fact dismantling it. Between them lies a silent majority — ordinary Canadians who still long for civility, who do not recognize this ideological battlefield. Yet they have been driven underground, cowed by the fear of saying the wrong thing, of being branded by one tribe or the other. The middle ground is now a minefield. To speak with moderation is to risk isolation. The reward for decency is derision.

Polarization does not simply divide opinions; it rewires emotions. It turns fellow citizens into caricatures — villains to be mocked or feared. We stop listening. We stop imagining that others might have reasons for their beliefs. Instead, we reduce them to symbols of evil: the “woke liberal,” the “bigoted conservative,” the “climate denier,” the “Marxist activist.” These are not real people, but avatars of resentment. Once this dehumanization takes root, reconciliation becomes nearly impossible. A divided nation cannot reason with itself; it can only shout.

It is a tragic irony that a country founded on collective survival — on the need to work together against geography and climate — now seems unable to cooperate against its own demons. The pioneers who built this nation endured isolation, cold, and hardship, yet they relied on one another. Modern Canadians, surrounded by comfort and abundance, have turned isolation into ideology. The new wilderness is not physical but moral. We are lost in a landscape of hostility.

The political incentives ensure the wilderness will deepen. Polarization is not a glitch; it is the design. Parties now calibrate their messages not for unity but for maximum contrast. Every policy becomes a wedge, every speech, a provocation. Politicians speak less to the nation than to their algorithmic base. Their goal is not to persuade the undecided, but to energize the faithful. The more outrageous the rhetoric,

the more coverage they receive. Outrage travels faster than reason, and politics has become a contest of viral anger.

Media, too, thrives on this cycle. The business model of fear depends on perpetual conflict. News outlets that once prided themselves on balance have discovered that partisanship pays. A headline that stokes indignation will always outperform one that invites thought. Outrage is the only remaining common language. The public, addicted to anger, consumes news not to learn but to affirm. Each side demands its own version of reality, and media delivers it. The result is not merely bias but fragmentation: multiple parallel Canadas, each convinced the other is mad or malicious.

This fragmentation seeps into daily life. The workplace, the classroom, the family dinner table — all have become ideological arenas. The fear of saying the wrong thing silences conversation. One must speak the approved language or remain mute. Social etiquette has been replaced by political orthodoxy. Friendship, once based on affection, now depends on alignment. People unfriend, unfollow, and avoid those who think differently. The emotional cost of disagreement is too high. A quiet loneliness spreads — the loneliness of those who no longer dare to speak freely.

Yet beneath this hostility lies a deeper fear: the fear of meaninglessness. Polarization, for all its ugliness, gives people a sense of purpose. To belong to a tribe is to feel significant. It offers clarity in a world of uncertainty. Every crisis — climate, immigration, inequality, identity — becomes not a problem to solve but a battlefield to join. And so, citizens become soldiers in causes they barely understand. The war is endless because the reward is belonging. To hate together is to feel alive.

The tragedy is that none of this resolves the real problems facing Canada. The cost-of-living soars, health care falters, crime rises, infrastructure decays — yet the political class is too busy fighting cultural wars to address them. Every issue becomes a moral litmus test instead of a practical challenge. Energy policy, immigration reform,

housing affordability — all are subsumed into ideology. Debate becomes impossible because every disagreement is taken personally. The machinery of governance grinds to a halt while politicians perform outrage for their followers. Meanwhile, ordinary citizens pay the price of dysfunction.

This, then, is the deeper cost of polarization: it destroys competence. A government consumed by ideology cannot govern effectively. Bureaucracies lose focus; policy becomes theatre. Opposition parties, addicted to scandal, prefer obstruction to solutions. The entire system rewards noise over results. The nation drifts while its leader's bicker. Democracy itself begins to corrode, not from tyranny but from exhaustion. People lose faith not only in politicians, but in politics as such. Cynicism spreads like rust, eating away at the idea that change is possible.

Cynicism is the final stage of polarization. Once citizens believe that nothing can change, they stop caring who governs. Voter turnout declines, civic participation collapses, and democracy then become a hollow ritual. The machinery of elections continues to function, but the spirit that animates them fades. Canadians still cast ballots, but many do so with resignation, not hope. They no longer vote for something, only against something. It is a politics of negation, of lesser evils and defensive choices. The idea of collective progress — of building something together — has withered into suspicion that the system itself is rigged, corrupt, or pointless. This despair is fertile ground for demagogues who promise simplicity in a complex world.

In such an atmosphere, every leader becomes a caricature. The prime minister is either a saviour or a tyrant, the opposition leader, either a patriot or a villain. The nuance of governance — the necessary compromises, the half-measures, the gray areas — vanishes. Political identity becomes moral identity. Citizens choose sides as they would choose faiths, and to doubt one's own side is heresy. Social media amplifies this psychology. The daily outrage, the endless cycle of accusation and defense, leaves no space for reflection. In this theatre, politics is no longer about service but spectacle.

Leaders compete not for the public good, but for attention. And attention, like power, is addictive.

The most insidious effect of polarization is the corrosion of empathy. When citizens cease to imagine the humanity of their opponents, the social fabric unravels. This loss of empathy manifests everywhere: in the sneer of political pundits, in the cruelty of anonymous online mobs, in the refusal to believe that good intentions can exist on the other side. Empathy, once the hallmark of Canadian civility, has become a casualty of ideological war. We have traded compassion for certainty, humility for righteousness. Each side sees itself as the last defender of virtue — and in that conviction, becomes blind to its own excesses.

This blindness fuels extremism. When the centre collapses, the extremes rush in to claim legitimacy. On the left, moral zealotry disguises itself as progress. On the right, resentment masquerades as patriotism. Both sides claim to speak for "the real Canada," yet both distort it beyond recognition. The true Canada — complex, diverse, cautious, decent — disappears beneath the noise. The very qualities that once defined this nation's strength — patience, pragmatism, understatement — now seem quaint. In their place rises a culture of accusation and performance, where moral outrage substitutes for understanding and loyalty for logic.

The educational system, once a sanctuary of reason, has not escaped this contagion. Universities, once devoted to open inquiry, now often resemble ideological battlegrounds. Professors and students alike tread carefully, fearful of saying something that might be labeled offensive. The language of debate has been replaced by the language of denunciation. Words like "safe space" and "inclusive dialogue," once well-intentioned, have become tools of conformity. The right responds with derision, accusing academia of indoctrination, while the left defends its orthodoxy as moral necessity. The result is not enlightenment but estrangement — a generation more certain of its outrage than its knowledge.

Even culture itself bends under this weight. Art, literature, comedy, film — all have become political minefields. Every creative act risks misinterpretation; every joke risks cancellation. The artist must now choose between honesty and survival. Satire, once the sharpest weapon against hypocrisy, is now feared as cruelty. The public no longer laughs together but laughs apart — each side producing its own approved humor, its own cultural echo chamber. When laughter divides rather than unites, a society is in deep trouble.

What makes polarization so dangerous in Canada is that it strikes at the heart of our national myth — the belief that we are immune to extremes. For generations, Canadians defined themselves against the turmoil of others: not as brash as Americans, not as tribal as Europeans. We prided ourselves on moderation as if it were a national resource. Yet that very complacency blinded us. We assumed our civility was permanent, our tolerance unbreakable. We mistook habit for virtue. Now we see that civility is not a natural state but a fragile achievement — one that must be defended daily against the temptations of anger and self-righteousness. We forgot that moderation requires courage.

Our political system, built for consensus, strains under the pressure of division. The Westminster model presumes cooperation — government and opposition bound by a shared respect for institutions. But when that respect collapses, the model falters. Question Period becomes theatre, legislation becomes weaponized, and public servants are treated as enemies. The bureaucracy, once the neutral machinery of governance, now faces ideological purges and suspicion from all sides. The rule of law, too, is politicized: court rulings are praised or condemned not for their reasoning but for their political convenience. The idea that institutions stand above partisanship is fading fast.

Regional divides compound the problem. Western alienation, Quebec nationalism, and the urban–rural split have all intensified in this age of polarization. Each region views the others not as partners but as obstacles. The West resents federal

overreach; Quebec defends its distinctiveness; Atlantic Canada feels forgotten; Ontario and British Columbia pursue their own ideological experiments. Instead of one country with regional differences, Canada is becoming a collection of regions with occasional federal coordination. Confederation, once a pact of mutual respect, now feels like a reluctant marriage sustained by habit rather than affection. The old joke that Canada's national sport is "disagreement" no longer seems funny.

As regional resentment grows, so too does populism. Populism thrives where trust dies. It tells people that the elites have betrayed them, that institutions are corrupt, that only anger can restore justice. It simplifies complex realities into emotional narratives of betrayal and revenge. Populism on the right condemns globalism, multiculturalism, and bureaucracy, populism on the left attacks' capitalism, colonialism, and inequality. Each offers easy villains and impossible promises. In both forms, populism flatters grievance and punishes reflection. It turns politics into spectacle and leadership into performance. The populist leader does not solve problems; he dramatizes them.

The media amplifies all of this, often without intending to. In the frantic competition for attention, nuance is sacrificed. Headlines must provoke; commentary must outrage. Television panels resemble courtroom brawls, with "balance" achieved not through reason but through confrontation. Online journalism, dependent on clicks, rewards the loudest voices. The journalist becomes a personality; the story becomes a brand. Truth, stripped of complexity, becomes another partisan weapon. Once, Canadians could rely on their national media to calm rather than inflame. Now, too often, it mirrors the anger it reports. The distinction between news and opinion blurs until neither can be trusted.

Trust is the invisible thread that holds nations together, and it is fraying. Without trust, no democracy can function. We must believe, at some basic level, that our fellow citizens are acting in good faith. Yet in polarized Canada, that assumption is gone. Every

action is interpreted as manipulation, every motive as deceit. A government initiative cannot be merely flawed; it must be malicious. A protest cannot be sincere; it must be subversive. This paranoia corrodes everything it touches. Even moments of national unity — such as during crises or disasters — are short-lived, quickly poisoned by suspicion. We can no longer grieve or celebrate together without arguing about the politics of it.

The consequence is exhaustion. A nation cannot live indefinitely in a state of moral combat. The human spirit, bombarded daily by outrage and fear, grows weary. People withdraw from civic life not because they are indifferent, but because they are overwhelmed. They retreat into private concerns, tuning out politics entirely. This retreat, however, only deepens the crisis. As moderates fall silent, extremists dominate the conversation. The marketplace of ideas becomes a shouting match where only the loudest survive. Silence, once the refuge of civility, becomes complicity.

In this climate, the very language of citizenship changes. Words like “duty,” “service,” and “common good” sound old-fashioned. The new vocabulary is tribal: identity, authenticity, self-expression. Politics becomes a competition of grievances, a marketplace of victimhood. Every group claims oppression; every individual demands recognition. The collective narrative that once bound Canadians — the idea of shared destiny — fragments into a thousand personal stories, each demanding validation. The mosaic has shattered into shards. Diversity, once a source of pride, becomes a source of tension. Without a unifying vision, diversity descends into division.

And yet, somewhere beneath this noise, the old Canada still flickers — in small towns where neighbours still help one another, in volunteer fire departments, in the quiet generosity of strangers. The spirit of decency has not vanished; it has been driven underground. It survives in the spaces untouched by politics — in acts of kindness too humble to trend online. Perhaps that is Canada’s last hope: that the ordinary decency of

its people can outlast the madness of its elites. But hope alone is not enough. Decency must be defended, and right now it has few defenders.

The danger is that polarization becomes self-perpetuating. Each new outrage deepens the divide, which produces new outrages in response. It is a feedback loop of fury. Breaking it requires courage — the courage to listen, to doubt one's own tribe, to forgive. But such virtues are in short supply. Fear and outrage are easier; they are rewarded. Politicians gain followers, media gains clicks, activists and advocates gain attention. Reconciliation, by contrast, offers no spectacle. It is quiet work, and quiet work rarely makes headlines.

Even when attempts at dialogue arise, they are often performative. "National conversations" become exercises in confirmation bias. Panels are stacked, narratives predetermined, apologies scripted. Genuine engagement — the kind that risks discomfort — is avoided. We pretend to talk while entrenching our positions. The art of persuasion, once the essence of politics, has been replaced by the science of manipulation. The goal is not to convince, but to convert or destroy. Democracy becomes a numbers game rather than a moral one.

Democracy cannot survive long on cynicism and fatigue. It requires belief — the fragile faith that dialogue is still possible, that truth still matters, that compromise is not surrender. Without that faith, nations begin to rot from within. Canada stands at that precipice now. The divisions are not yet violent, but they are vicious. The hostility remains mostly verbal, but words shape worlds. The longer we indulge in contempt, the more likely it becomes that contempt will turn to something harder, something irreversible. History offers too many examples of nations that laughed at their divisions until those divisions consumed them.

What makes the Canadian crisis uniquely tragic is that it betrays our own mythology. We built an identity around moderation, around the notion that we were the sane cousins in a noisy family. We told ourselves that our restraint was permanent

— that we were immune to extremism because we preferred politeness. Yet politeness, when detached from conviction, curdles into cowardice. For years, Canadians avoided confrontation by refusing to name hard truths. We mistook silence for harmony. And in that silence, resentment festered. The country that prided itself on being nice became one in which niceness masked indifference — and eventually, indifference turned into anger.

That anger now defines our politics. Every election becomes a referendum on national identity. Are you the real Canadian, or are they? Politicians exploit this insecurity with surgical precision. They no longer appeal to unity, but to grievance — regional, cultural, or moral. Each speech, each campaign ad, each headline is designed to remind Canadians who to blame. It is easier to mobilize resentment than to inspire hope. And so, the political imagination of the country shrinks. Vision gives way to vengeance. Canada's once broad sense of possibility is replaced by the narrow calculus of partisan gain.

Polarization rewards those who fear the future and punish those who seek to build it. The reformer is drowned out by the agitator, the pragmatist by the zealot. The public square becomes a coliseum where reason is fed to the lions. The tragedy is that this climate drives away precisely the kind of people we most need — the honest, the moderate, the creative. Who would enter public service today, knowing that any misstep will be recorded, twisted, and weaponized? Who would risk a career in politics when sincerity is mocked, and integrity exploited? As good people withdraw, the field is left to opportunists who mistake volume for vision. Thus, the cycle sustains itself: division breeds cynicism, cynicism breeds disengagement, and disengagement leaves only the divisive in charge.

At times, it feels as if Canada has become a country of strangers — not by geography, but by spirit. We occupy the same land but live in separate realities. The algorithm curates our news; ideology curates our morality. Even our language diverges.

Words that once carried shared meaning — freedom, justice, equality, truth — are now contested territory. Each side claims them, redefines them, weaponizes them. The dictionary itself has become political. Without common words, we lose common ground.

The breakdown of shared reality has consequences far beyond politics. It erodes the very possibility of trust. How can one collaborate with those whose facts are different, whose truths are personal, whose history is rewritten with every debate? The centre cannot hold because it no longer has a shared vocabulary. Reason, which depends on agreement about what exists, collapses under the pressure of competing fantasies. And yet, the human need for belonging endures. Deprived of shared truth, people cling to shared myths. Polarization becomes not only a political structure but an emotional refuge.

In this state, even national symbols fracture. The flag, the anthem, the institutions of heritage — once unifying emblems — now provoke division. To some, they represent pride, to others, oppression. The very idea of Canada becomes a debate. Are we a failed colonial project or a fragile miracle of coexistence? Are we defined by our injustices or our ideals? The inability to answer such questions collectively weakens the nation's moral core. A country that no longer agrees on what it is cannot long remain what it was.

The consequences of such confusion are already visible. Foreign powers exploit our divisions through disinformation. Domestic extremists, sensing opportunity, recruit among the disillusioned. Institutions once respected are now vilified. The courts, the police, the press — each is accused of serving one ideology or another. The result is a nation that distrusts everything except its own anger. When faith in shared institutions collapses, the door opens to chaos. Fear becomes the common denominator of citizenship. And fear, once normalized, demands authority. The final stage of

polarization is not civil war, but submission — the weary acceptance of strongmen who promise to end the noise.

Canada has not reached that point, but the slope grows steeper each year. The warning signs are all present: contempt for compromise, glorification of grievance, disbelief in the possibility of neutrality. These are not the habits of a healthy democracy; they are the symptoms of decline. Yet most Canadians still believe themselves immune. They imagine that extremism always belongs elsewhere — in other countries, among other people. But history punishes complacency. Nations that assume their stability is permanent often lose it first.

If there is any hope of reversal, it lies not in politics but in culture. Politics follows emotion; emotion follows story. Canada must rediscover a shared story — not a myth of perfection, but a narrative of effort and endurance. The story that says: we are imperfect, but we try. We argue, but we compromise. We stumble, but we build. The country's survival has always depended on this quiet humility. Without it, the machinery of government may continue, but the spirit of the nation will not. We must remember that unity does not mean uniformity. It means choosing to remain at the same table, even when the conversation is hard.

This requires courage — a kind of moral bravery that has been missing from public life. It means speaking across divides without surrendering one's convictions. It means defending one's opponents when they are unfairly attacked. It means valuing truth over victory. These are small acts, invisible to history books, but essential to the survival of democracy. For polarization thrives on cowardice: the cowardice of silence, of complicity, of convenience. To resist it is to reclaim citizenship itself.

Perhaps this, in the end, is what this book *Dominion of Fear* has been about — not merely the corruption of institutions or the spread of fear, but the slow unravelling of courage. Fear is the natural state of division; courage is its antidote. And courage, unlike anger, requires empathy. To rebuild a nation so deeply fractured, Canadians must

learn again to imagine one another as human beings. That is not naïve optimism; it is moral realism. Every democracy that has survived its own polarization did so not through power but through mercy — the mercy of seeing in one's enemy the reflection of oneself.

The path forward will not be heroic. It will be humble: a return to the virtues that once defined Canada before ideology consumed it. Decency. Patience. Modesty. Listening more than speaking. Believing that good faith is possible even when agreement is not. Relearning the art of disagreement without hatred. Rebuilding trust, one conversation at a time. These are unfashionable virtues, but they are the only ones that can save a fractured democracy. The alternative is a slow descent into the very chaos we once believed could never happen here.

For now, the divisions remain. The culture of outrage will not vanish overnight. But history is never final; nations can rediscover themselves if they wish. Canada has faced darker moments and endured. It can do so again — if it remembers that the true strength of the Dominion was never its wealth or resources, but its restraint. The world once admired Canada because it refused to give in to its worst impulses. It believed in moderation when others believed in extremes. That faith must be rebuilt, even if only in fragments. Each act of fairness, each refusal to hate, is a small piece of that reconstruction.

If we fail, if the noise and bitterness consume what remains of our civility, then the Dominion of Fear will be complete. Not because we were conquered, but because we conquered ourselves — through apathy, arrogance, and anger. History will record that a peaceful people destroyed their own peace by forgetting how to speak to one another. But if we succeed, if we find the courage to turn away from outrage and toward empathy, then the fear will fade, and something like hope might return. Not the naïve hope of perfection, but the quiet confidence of a country that chooses decency over division.

In the end, nations are not defined by their governments but by their temperament — by the character of their people. Canada's story is not yet over. But its continuation depends on whether we can still see ourselves as one people, bound by a fragile but sacred promise: that we will not become enemies. That we will disagree without despising. That we will remember, even in anger, that our shared fate is more important than our separate certainties. If that promise breaks, everything else will follow. If it holds, perhaps — just perhaps — the Dominion of Fear will give way to something stronger: a Dominion of Courage.

The Last Word

What makes Canadian corruption uniquely insidious is not its scale but its subtlety. It does not manifest in briefcases stuffed with cash or bloody coups. It thrives in the language of excuses: “That’s just how things work,” “They’re all the same,” “At least it’s not as bad as the States.” These phrases, uttered daily in coffee shops and corporate boardrooms, are not harmless—they are the lullabies of decay.

When citizens excuse corruption, they empower it. When they tolerate small lies, they invite larger ones. And when they cloak cowardice as civility, they surrender the moral high ground without a fight.

Today, Canada stands at a crossroads. One path leads to reform, transparency, and a reclaiming of the values that once defined the nation. The other leads to something far bleaker—a country where fear is permanent, lawlessness normalized, and corruption institutionalized. The warning signs are everywhere: police forces demoralized and underfunded; courts clogged and ineffective; politicians unrepentant; media complicit; citizens numbed by apathy. These are not isolated issues—they are symptoms of a systemic sickness.

A nation does not drown in corruption overnight. It happens slowly, imperceptibly, like a rising tide. And by the time the water reaches the chin, it is too late to swim. Canada, polite to a fault, may whisper as it sinks, but make no mistake - the death splash will be heard around the world. Canada is no longer the calm, moderate country it once pretended to be. The Dominion is fractured, pulled apart by two bitter antagonists—the left and the right—who increasingly see each other not as rivals in a democracy but as existential threats. Where there was once compromise, there is now hostility. Where there was once a pendulum of power, there is now a gulf of mistrust. The pressing question is whether these two sides can learn to coexist and help shape a

fearless Dominion—or whether Canada is heading toward a slow collapse under the weight of its own divisions.

For much of its history, Canada survived by compromise. Confederation itself was built on bargaining between French and English, Catholic and Protestant, East and West. Liberals and Conservatives alternated in power, each moderating the other, neither able to dominate indefinitely. But the late twentieth century shattered that balance. Globalization, mass immigration, multiculturalism, environmental urgency, and the rise of identity politics reshaped the landscape. The left embraced rapid change: the right resisted it. The gap widened until what had once been healthy rivalry turned into enmity.

Using Quebec as an example, they chose the climate of fear road. Quebec's choices had ripple effects across the entire Dominion. Its politics and demands contribute directly to the sense of unease felt by Canadians in every region. Since the 1960s, every national crisis has revolved around Quebec: the FLQ terrorism, two separation referendums, the failure of Meech Lake and Charlottetown. The rest of Canada fears Quebec's constant flirtation with independence. Ottawa bends over backwards to accommodate Quebec, leaving others — especially the West — resentful.

The divide between Quebec and Western Canada may be the deepest fault line in the Dominion. In the eyes of many Westerners, Quebec is hypocritical: it demands endless support from Ottawa but refuses to share in the struggles of the resource economy. This clash fuels calls for Western independence, echoing Quebec's own separatist movements. In this sense, Quebec is not merely a bystander but a central actor in Canada's story of fragmentation and fear.

As stated in a previous chapter, Quebec is a province apart. It claims to be unique, and indeed it is — but this uniqueness comes at the cost of national cohesion. Its disdain for conservatism and its embrace of liberalism do not only define Quebec's

politics; they shape the entire country's trajectory. Its strained relationship with the West magnifies divisions.

The result is a Dominion living under Quebec's shadow: fearful of separation, resentful of concessions, and divided by irreconcilable visions of the nation. Quebec was once the bastion of conservatism through the Church, but now it is the citadel of progressivism, statist liberalism, and cultural exceptionalism. In both roles — past and present — it has kept Canada uneasy, uncertain, and fractured. As long as Quebec remains wedded to its peculiar political identity, Canada will remain a country negotiating with itself, never secure, never whole. Quebec's pride and Quebec's demands ensure that the Dominion of Fear endures.

Corruption scandals also deepened the bitterness between left and right. The sponsorship scandal exposed Liberal misuse of public funds and enraged the West. The SNC-Lavalin affair under Justin Trudeau reinforced the suspicion that progressive elites played by different rules. Conservatives, meanwhile, were painted as handmaidens to oil and gas, resistant to climate action, and too tolerant of social conservatism. Each side stopped seeing the other as legitimate. Once legitimacy is denied, cooperation collapses.

This division runs deeper than ideology. It is geographic and cultural. The left dominates cities—Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal—where immigration and cosmopolitanism shape outlooks. The right draws strength from rural and resource-driven regions—Alberta, Saskatchewan, rural Ontario—where identity is tied to farming, energy, and stability. To rural Canadians, progressive policies feel like attacks on their livelihoods. To urban progressives, conservative rhetoric feels like hostility toward diversity and progress. Politics is no longer about policy compromises but about identity itself. And when identity is on the line, middle ground disappears. Instead of shared facts, Canadians inhabit different realities. Scandals, even minor ones, explode in this

atmosphere because trust is already shattered. The media no longer calms the waters; it rewards outrage and deepens suspicion.

Canada has faced division before and survived. During the Second World War, Liberals and Conservatives governed together in a war cabinet. The birth of public healthcare required cooperation across ideological lines. Yet unity has also proven fragile. The failed Meech Lake Accord and the razor-thin Quebec referendum in 1995 nearly broke the country apart. Today, the danger is not open civil war but a cold, grinding conflict in politics and culture that paralyzes the nation. Already Alberta and Saskatchewan flirt with separatism. Quebec keeps its old separatist sword close at hand. If mistrust hardens further, Canada risks sliding toward a hollowed-out federation—technically united, spiritually fractured.

But collapse is not inevitable. There remains a path toward fearlessness, if both sides rediscover the idea of a shared fate. Fearlessness is not the absence of conflict but the courage to carry differences without letting them consume the whole. The left must learn that dismissing rural and resource Canadians as obstacles is not only unjust but suicidal; without energy and agriculture, the social programs and green projects they prize cannot be funded. The right must accept that sneering at pluralism and denying climate change alienates the generations who will inherit this country. Both sides must confront corruption, whether Liberal patronage or Conservative corporate influence, because nothing corrodes trust faster. Honesty and humility are not luxuries now; they are survival necessities.

What might unity look like? Electoral reform, so no region feels permanently excluded by first-past-the-post politics. A new federal compact that respects provincial autonomy while affirming shared national responsibilities. Joint commissions on issues too urgent for partisanship: housing, opioids, Indigenous reconciliation. A revival of civic education, teaching young Canadians that democracy is not war but negotiation, and

that compromise built this country. These are not utopian dreams—they are practical necessities if Canada is to remain whole.

The alternative is bleak. Voter turnout continues to fall. Discourse poisons itself with insults and smears. Regional leaders openly defy Ottawa. These are tremors of fracture. Follow that path, and Canada risks becoming a country in name only, a federation glued by habit but hollow at its core. Fear will dominate – fear of one another, fear of collapse, fear of a future we cannot shape together.

The left and right despise each other because both see the other as a mortal danger. To the left, the right threatens the planet, social justice, and dignity itself. To the right, the left threatens tradition, industry, and cohesion. Both think they are saving Canada. Both may destroy it if they cannot learn to coexist. The choice is stark: rediscover compromise or embrace collapse. Build a fearless Dominion or preside over a fearful ruin.

Canada has walked to the edge before and pulled back. It can do so again, but only if it remembers that the Dominion was built not on agreement, but on the courage to live with difference. Fearless nations are not those without conflict—they are those that refuse to be broken by it. The time has come for Canada to decide which it will be – will it be peace or will it be war.

Epilogue

Crime: The Sharp Edge of Fear

A nation is not destroyed in a single moment. It fades, quietly at first — in the shrug of indifference, the silence of those who know better, the slow surrender of civility. Canada's decline did not arrive with thunder or revolution, but with exhaustion. We grew tired of listening, tired of caring, tired of defending the fragile virtues that once defined us. Fear filled the vacuum where faith and decency once lived.

And yet, through all the noise and fracture, something remains. Beneath the anger and cynicism lies a faint but enduring heartbeat — the memory of what Canada was meant to be. A place where freedom did not mean selfishness, where equality did not require conformity, where compassion was not weakness but strength. The Dominion was never perfect, but it aspired to be kind. That aspiration itself was an act of courage.

If fear has been the great unravelling of this Dominion, then courage must be its repair. Not the loud courage of conquest, but the quiet courage of character — the daily decision to remain kind in an unkind world. Canada's survival has always depended less on greatness than on goodness. It can still depend on that.

For many Canadians, crime is the most visible and frightening aspect of fear in the nation. Toronto faces rising gang violence rooted in Caribbean, Somali, and South Asian communities. Vancouver struggles with Asian cartels and drug networks. Montreal battles layered crime groups — Mafia, biker gangs, and new immigrant-linked networks. Refugee Concerns: Asylum seekers entering irregularly, especially through Quebec's Rox-ham Road before its closure, raise fears of inadequate screening. While most are peaceful, even isolated crimes reinforce suspicion. Crime is not spread evenly but

concentrated in immigrant-heavy neighborhoods in larger cities and in the downtown core (Main street Canada is the general hang-out for the homeless)) in smaller communities. Police are stretched thin, residents feel unsafe, and fear becomes the daily reality. Gate keepers often dismiss these fears, pointing to aggregate statistics, but statistics mean little to citizens watching violence escalate outside their doors.

As mentioned in previous chapters, multiculturalism through immigration also fuels cultural unease. Once, newcomers were encouraged to blend into Canadian identity. Now multiculturalism promises permanent difference. Citizens fear the dilution of shared values. Parallel Societies: In major cities, whole neighborhoods operate in other languages, with businesses and schools serving only one community. Canadians worry about weakening social cohesion. Loss of Identity: With each wave, some Canadians feel like strangers in their own land — a shift from cultural mosaic to cultural balkanization.

This fear is less about hostility toward newcomers themselves and more about a creeping sense that Canada no longer has a common story. Immigration is also a political tool. Parties, particularly the Liberal one, rely on immigrant-heavy ridings in Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal to secure dominance. Immigration targets are set with politics in mind, not national interest. Silencing Debate: Citizens who question policy are branded xenophobic or racist. This creates a new fear — the fear of speaking openly about immigration at all. Western Alienation: The West, already angry over energy policies, sees immigration as another example of Ottawa ignoring its realities. Alberta and Saskatchewan carry costs without political weight.

Fear is no longer abstract; it is lived daily. Parents worry about gang recruitment near schools. Seniors lock their doors in neighborhoods once considered safe. Public transit becomes a site of random stabbings and assaults, often tied to unstable newcomers. Police, accused of systemic bias when confronting immigrant gangs, pull back. Communities feel abandoned. These everyday experiences deepen the perception

that Canada has become a lawless society. Left of center organizations, media, goody-two shoes and such, insist on celebrating diversity, but ordinary Canadians increasingly see danger, division, and scarcity. Until the country confronts these fears honestly, the dominion of Canada will remain not as previous, a land of milk and honey with a promise of renewal - but just another chapter in the *'Dominion of Fear'*.

Canada has long prided itself on tolerance and liberty but there is a point where freedom ceases to be a blessing and becomes a curse. When every restriction is seen as oppression and every desire framed as a right, the social fabric unravels. In its relentless pursuit of rights, Canada has elevated personal autonomy above communal responsibility. The result? Entitlement without accountability, liberty without limits, and governance without authority. Freedom unanchored from duty does not create harmony—it breeds chaos. Canada is a nation that wears its freedoms like a badge of moral superiority. For decades, it has been celebrated as one of the world's most tolerant societies, a country where human rights are not just protected but exalted. To question this sacred doctrine is to risk being branded as reactionary or authoritarian. But let us confront a question too few dare to ask: Can a society overdose on liberty? Can the pursuit of absolute freedom become its undoing?

The unsettling truth is that it can—and Canada is living proof. In its unrelenting quest to safeguard every imaginable individual right, Canada has built a culture of entitlement without obligation, liberty without responsibility, and rights without restraint. The outcome? A fearful, fragmented nation drowning in lawlessness and social decay. Freedom, unmoored from duty, does not lead to paradise; it leads to chaos.

The thesis of this book is as stark as it is necessary: Canada's rights obsession—rooted in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, amplified by activist courts, and fetishized by a grievance-driven culture—has unleashed forces that undermine the very foundations of peace and order. This is the paradox of excess freedom, and it is tearing the Dominion apart.

Canada need not abandon its Charter or betray its values. But it must rediscover the wisdom of POGG—peace, order, and good government. That means recalibrating rights, reclaiming authority, and reasserting the principle that freedom exists within limits, not beyond them. If Canada continues down its current path, its story will serve as a cautionary tale for the world: a society so obsessed with liberty that it liberated itself from law, order, and ultimately—from sanity itself. Philosophers warned centuries ago: liberty without virtue collapses into tyranny—first of chaos, then of control. Canada stands on that brink. It worships rights while discarding responsibility, and now it reaps the harvest of disorder. Canada must return to the wisdom of its founding: peace, order, and good government. That means laws with teeth, leaders with courage, and citizens with a sense of duty. Freedom is precious—but without limits, it devours itself.

If nothing changes, Canada will not be a beacon of liberty. It will be a warning to the world: a nation so obsessed with rights that it lost its grip on reality. Fear will permanently take over the Dominion and then Canada will cease to exist or at best become a third world country.

So, in review, Canada once defined itself by moderation — a land of quiet reason, tolerance, and decency. Its politics were mild, its temperament civil. But in recent years, a colder wind has blown across the Dominion. The country that once prided itself on balance now finds itself split along sharp ideological lines. The tone of debate has grown cruel, the spirit of cooperation replaced by contempt. Polarization — once thought a uniquely American disease — has taken root here, transforming the national mood into one of suspicion and fury.

The seeds of this division were sown slowly. For decades, Canadians avoided confrontation by burying their disagreements under a culture of politeness. The result was not harmony but silence — a silence in which resentment festered. When social media and partisan media arrived, that resentment found a megaphone. The algorithms rewarded anger, and politicians quickly learned to weaponize it. Today, every issue

becomes a battlefield. Every election, a moral crusade. Canadians no longer see rivals — only enemies. The political map has become a moral one, divided into the righteous and the damned.

Polarization has reshaped how politics functions. It rewards outrage, not ideas, attack, not empathy. Parties no longer seek to persuade but to inflame. They know division pays dividends — it energizes supporters, raises funds, and guarantees loyalty. The result is a democracy addicted to hostility. Every controversy becomes a proxy war in a never-ending culture conflict. The House of Commons, once a chamber of debate, now echoes with the language of accusation. Each side claims to be defending Canada itself, even as their tactics corrode it.

The public, exhausted by noise, turns cynical. Many Canadians have lost faith not only in parties but in the system itself. They see politicians as actors in a bad play — all shouting, no substance. This cynicism is dangerous. It drives disengagement, leaving the field open to extremists who thrive in the vacuum of moderate participation. When good people retreat, the loudest voices take control. In that void, democracy begins to hollow out from within.

The media, too, bears responsibility. In chasing clicks and outrage, many outlets have traded context for conflict. They no longer report events so much as dramatize them. Outrage sells; calm does not. The public sphere becomes a performance of anger, and journalism becomes another theatre of division. Canadians, starved of shared facts, retreat into partisan echo chambers — each side convinced the other is delusional. Even basic truths are no longer agreed upon. Words like “freedom,” “justice,” and “truth” are weaponized, stripped of their shared meaning. A country cannot long survive when its citizens no longer speak the same moral language.

This breakdown of shared reality corrodes every institution it touches. The courts, the police, and the press — once symbols of stability — are now viewed through partisan lenses. Every verdict or headline is interpreted as political. Trust collapses. And

without trust, democracy becomes impossible. The public begins to see conspiracies everywhere and integrity nowhere. Fear replaces confidence; suspicion replaces citizenship. The “Dominion of Fear” that once lurked in the background now defines the public mood.

The social cost is steep. Families divide over politics; friendships dissolve over opinions. Neighbours become strangers, not because of difference but because of contempt. The culture of outrage has made empathy a liability. Canadians, once known for humility, now measure morality by ideology. The goal of discourse is no longer to understand, but to defeat. This spiritual corrosion is far more dangerous than any single policy failure. It turns a society inward and bitter — a land of small wars and shrinking hearts.

Underlying it all is a profound insecurity. Canada’s identity has always been fragile — balanced between regions, languages, and histories. Polarization exploits those fractures. Western alienation, Quebec nationalism, Indigenous reconciliation, urban-rural divides — all become weapons in a larger struggle over belonging. Politicians use these wounds for advantage, deepening them for gain. The result is a Canada that feels increasingly unrecognizable to itself: a collection of grievances held together by geography rather than purpose.

Yet polarization did not create fear on its own; it fed upon it. Canadians are anxious about their economy, their culture, their future. The rising cost of living, the erosion of trust in institutions, and the feeling that the world is spinning faster than they can keep up — all have made the public more vulnerable to manipulation. Fear narrows empathy. When people feel threatened, they cling to tribes. Politicians know this instinct and exploit it ruthlessly. Every headline, every scandal, every moral panic becomes another opportunity to divide and rule.

Still, the story need not end in despair. If the disease is division, the cure is courage — the moral courage to see opponents as human beings, not as symbols of evil.

It requires rejecting the easy comfort of outrage and rediscovering the discipline of fairness. Unity does not demand uniformity. It demands the willingness to remain in conversation, even when it hurts. Democracy was never meant to be easy; it was meant to be continuous — an act of faith renewed daily through decency and restraint.

That renewal begins not in Parliament but in culture — in the stories Canadians tell about themselves. For generations, the national myth was one of modesty and compromise. It was not glamorous, but it worked. Canada endured because its people believed that civility was not weakness, that tolerance was strength. To rediscover that belief is to rediscover the country itself. Without it, politics will devour the culture; with it, culture can redeem politics.

The path forward will not be dramatic. It will be slow, built on small acts of decency: defending opponents when they are misrepresented, choosing fairness over fury, refusing to surrender conversation to extremists. These gestures will not make headlines, but they may rebuild the invisible fabric of trust upon which all nations depend. For the real crisis is not political but spiritual — a loss of empathy, a collapse of grace. No law or policy can restore those; only individuals can.

If Canadians fail to find that courage, the consequences will be grave. The "Dominion of Fear" will not be imposed from outside but chosen from within. A nation cannot be destroyed by enemies it refuses to become. But if hatred and suspicion prevail, history will record that a people once admired for their calm destroyed their own calm in a storm of anger. The great irony of polarization is that it convinces each side it is saving the country, when both are, in truth, dismantling it.

Yet there remains a final hope: that Canadians, when faced with the brink, will once again pull back. The country has survived division before — linguistic, regional, cultural — and found compromise. It can do so again if it remembers the moral foundation on which it was built and has restraint, fairness, and respect for difference. These are not old-fashioned virtues; they are the architecture of survival.

In the end, every democracy lives or dies not by its power but by its temperament — by how its citizens choose to treat one another when they disagree. Canada's fate will not be decided in Parliament or on social media, but in the hearts of ordinary people who choose whether to listen or to shout. The Dominion still has a choice: to remain a house divided, or to rediscover the quiet strength that once made it whole. If it chooses courage over fear, perhaps the story of division will yet become a story of renewal.

Afterword

This book began as a lament — a chronicle of fear spreading through a nation that once prided itself on calm. But as it grew, it became something more: a meditation on memory, courage, and the fragile promise of decency that still holds Canada together.

This author has watched a country he loves change — sometimes subtly, sometimes violently — into a place where division is easier than dialogue, and anger more fashionable than grace. Yet even in that darkness, I have seen flickers of light: the teacher who refuses to give up on civility, the neighbour who still lends a hand, the citizen who still believes that fairness matters.

These small acts are the antidote to fear. They are proof that Canada's story is not finished — only interrupted. The Dominion will endure if its people choose to remember that kindness is not weakness, that truth is not partisan, and that courage, however quiet, can still change the course of a nation. If fear has divided us, then courage — ordinary, human courage — may yet bring us home.

-30-