

**CONSTRUCTING CITIZENSHIP THROUGH NATIONAL SECURITY: AN ANALYSIS
OF BILL C-24 – *STRENGTHENING CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT* AND BILL C-51 –
*ANTI-TERRORISM ACT***

BRIANNA GARNEAU

Thesis submitted to the University of Ottawa
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters of Arts.

Department of Criminology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

© Brianna Garneau, Ottawa, Canada, 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give a special thank you to my supervisor Professor Baljit Nagra, whose encouragement, guidance and support assisted me in the makings and completion of this goal. I would also like to thank my examiners Professor Maritza Felices- Luna and Professor David Moffette for their invaluable feedback. Thank you all for supporting me, having faith in my abilities, and pushing me to reach my full potential throughout this entire process.

An infinite love-filled thank you to my mother, Lyne. This thesis would not have been completed without you. Thank you for being my biggest cheerleader in my moments of doubt and for being alongside me every step of the way in every way you could. Thank you to my step-father, Tommy, my brother Dante, and my sisters Chloe and Charlee-Rose for always carrying light into my gloomy days. Thank you to my dearest friends Subhah and Tara for being my partners-in-crime throughout this Master's program – it would have been a lonely experience without you and I am forever grateful to have had you experience this roller coaster with me. I love you all, thank you from the bottom of my heart.

This acknowledgement would be incomplete without thanking the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Ontario Graduate Scholarship program for their generous contributions which supported my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
Introduction of Thesis	1
Chapter I: Literature Review	4
Introduction	4
I- Canadian Citizenship and Nation Formation	5
Forming the Nation: The Process of Inclusion of the ‘National-Self’ and Exclusion of the ‘Foreign Other’	5
The Historical Construction of the ‘Good Immigrant/Citizen’	13
II- Race, Citizenship, and the War on Terror: Racializing the Enemy and the ‘Foreign Other’	16
III- National Security Context: Citizenship in the War on Terror	20
Conclusion	30
Chapter II: Theoretical Framework	33
Race: Orientalism, Internal Orientalism, and Cultural Racism	34
Securitization	43
Chapter III: Methodological Approach	46
The Research Design: A Mixed Methods Approach to Content and Critical Discourse Analysis	47
Data Sampling and Collection	49
Data Analysis	52
Limitations	56
Chapter IV - Establishing Canada and Canadian Citizenship: Exalting the Canadian White National	58
4.1 Producing the Narrative of the Canadian Nation: The Superior and Multicultural Nation	60
4.2 Exclusions of the White Nation: The Guise of Inclusivity and the Limits of Multiculturalism	66
4.3 Constructing the Ideal Citizen: The Racialization of Canadian Citizenship and Values	72
Chapter V: The Construction of the Threat	86
5.1 Cultural Racism in Constructing the Enemy	88
5.2 Demonizing the Terrorist: Securitization in Constructing the Threat and Danger	101
5.3 Second Class Citizenry: Discourses of Loyalty, Allegiance and Belongingness in Constructing the threat of the Dual National	113
Conclusion of Thesis	122
References	127
Annexe A: Data Sources	135

ABSTRACT

The colonial formation and imagination of the Canadian nation and its citizenry has historically been rooted in processes of racial inclusion and exclusion. This thesis considers the ways in which the historical exclusionary process of citizenship manifests within today's "War on Terror" through the language of national security. The analysis focuses on the discourses of two former Conservative bills: Bill C-24 – *Strengthening the Canadian Citizenship Act* and Bill C-51 – *Anti-terrorism Act*. Mobilized through a critical race perspective, my thesis documents first, the narratives that are told, and second, the discursive strategies that are used, to construct those deserving and undeserving of inclusion. My findings demonstrate that the ideal nation and its ideal citizens, who are deserving of inclusion within the nation, are fundamentally constructed in Whiteness. Meanwhile, the threatening 'Other', who is to be excluded and expelled from the nation, is imagined as a racialized Muslim, Arab and brown terrorist in the "War on Terror". By examining their respective parliamentary debates, my research reveals how the political discourses utilized in both bills uphold the racial exclusionary mechanisms of citizenship. As such, my research speaks to the evolving relationship between citizenship, national security, surveillance, and securitization by demonstrating how citizenship is used as a tool within the broader security regime of the state to fight the "War on Terror".

Introduction of Thesis

Inherent in the notion of Canadian citizenship have been processes of inclusion and exclusion. Exclusionary processes of citizenship have historically been shaped by political ideologies regarding who is deserving/undeserving of Canadian national identity; ideologies that are traced back to the racial underpinnings of colonialism as well as Orientalist tropes of Islam (Said, 1979; Thobani, 2007). In the national security context of the ‘War on Terror’ Canadian identity continues to undergo a “re-whitening” process, which consequently marginalizes non-white minorities (Arat- Koc, 2005). Muslim and Arab citizens who do not embody tropes of Whiteness are cast as threats to the well-being of Canada in need of exclusion from its borders. I attempt to demonstrate how these communities are relegated to a second-class citizenry in which their rights are jeopardized and their claims of belonging to the nation are undermined. To this end, this thesis seeks to shed light on the interwoven nature of citizenship and anti-terrorism discourses in the ‘War on Terror’ context by analysing contemporary citizenship and anti-terrorism legislation: Conservative Bills C-24 – *Strengthening the Canadian Citizenship Act*, and Bill C-51 – *Anti-Terrorism Act*. The following research question is used to guide my thesis: “How do the racial discourses surrounding Bill C-24 – *Strengthening the Canadian Citizenship Act*, and Bill C-51 – *Anti-Terrorism Act*, conceal and reinforce citizen inclusion and exclusion through the language of national security?”

Chapter one of my thesis presents a review of the existing research on the historical constructions of the Canadian citizen, Canadian nation-formation, and the constitution of its threats. This chapter contextualizes my research and demonstrates the gap in the literature it intends to fill. Chapter two outlines the theoretical framework that informs my analysis. Here, I

acknowledge my theoretical grounding in Critical Race Theory and present a list of concepts and theoretical contributions that are mobilized within my thesis. Chapter three details the methodological approach that I adopted to complete my thesis. I begin this chapter with an overview of my research design, followed by the approach I took to collect and analyse my data. I end this chapter with a discussion on the limitations of my research. Finally, in chapters four and five I present my analysis of the empirical material. My main findings are discussed using the theoretical framework outlined in chapter two in order to make sense of the discourses.

In chapter four, I discuss the discursive establishment of the Canadian nation and Canadian citizenship through the debates surrounding Bill C-24 and Bill C-51. This chapter unpacks the discourse and examines the ways in which current narratives of the nation are reinforced – these narratives being the construction of Canada as an exalted and multicultural Western nation. Additionally, I also examine the discursive strategies used to maintain these narratives as well as the colonial interests of the ideal white nation and ideal citizen. Theoretical contributions from various critical race scholars (Agnew, 2007; Hage, 2000; Mackey, 2002; Li, 2007; Thobani, 2007; Razack, 2008) are utilized to make sense of the discourse of these bills. Specifically, I demonstrate how the existing narratives and (White) interests of the Canadian nation-state are maintained through doctrines of cultural racism. In sum, this chapter reveals how the inclusionary, and by extension exclusionary, measures of the bills are inherently drawn along racial lines in order for the nation to preserve its Whiteness. I conclude chapter four with an analysis of the various markers of deservingness (and undeservingness) to construct both the ideal citizen and its ‘Other’ counterpart. The ‘Other’ is cast as someone who is to be excluded from the nation by way of their threatening nature and disloyalty to the interests of the nation.

This leads me to chapter five, where I examine the discursive techniques that produced and reinforced the construction of the threat in today's 'War on Terror'. Turning our attention primarily to the discourse of Bill C-51, the enemy terrorist was inherently constructed along racial lines, once again perpetuating the cultural racism found within the creation of the Canadian national identity and its threats. Regarded as being culturally incompatible with the White Western nation of Canada, I demonstrate how the construction of the 'terrorist' reinforced the subordination of the Islamic 'Other', which by extension reinforces the ongoing suspicion and demonization of innocent Muslim communities. Through processes of Othering and tolerance, the discourse reinforced distinctions between 'good' and 'bad' Muslims, using 'moderate' religious expression as a means of policing Muslim communities. Chapter five also outlines an essential process of securitization that comprises both bills. I outline two main techniques of securitization: first the dehumanization and demonization of the terrorist threat, and second the framing of the threat as an all-new, never-before-seen super threat. I call these techniques of securitization due to the fact that these discourses are necessary to legitimize, support, and facilitate the ever-growing and expansive national security regime, as well as its inherent mechanisms of exclusion. In a similar vein, discourses concerning the citizenship revocation provision of Bill C-24 allow us to observe how imaginings of the 'true', culturally incompatible, racialized terrorist threat re-emerge from discourses of national security, thereby demonstrating the ways in which citizenship has become a prominent tool for which the 'War on Terrorism' is fought.

In the conclusion of my thesis, I discuss my main findings in light of answering my main research question. By analysing both discourses surrounding Bill C-24 and Bill C-51, I argue that we can observe both the national project at work, as well as the broader security regime of the

state. One cannot exist without the other. To think of these discourses as two separate entities would be to fall into the decontextualization and depoliticization strategies of the global ‘War on Terror’; thereby contributing to its expansive powers. I argue that it is not only the imagination or fantasy work of the nation that is engendered within the discourses, but rather that the legislative provisions pushed forth are active steps taken in order to make the fanaticised White nation a reality. In essence, my thesis outlines the parallels between discourses of citizenship and national security – a parallel which reveals how the state’s security regime has become an essential tool to achieve the nationalist project.

Chapter I: Literature Review

Introduction

In this literature review, my intellectual interest is in exploring the historical exclusionary process of citizenship. The exclusionary process of citizenship is explicitly evident within Bill C-24- *Strengthening the Canadian Citizenship Act*, and implicitly in Bill C- 51- *Anti Terrorism Act*, which were passed by the former Conservative government of Canada in 2014 and 2015 respectively. Framing my research through race and securitization frames, I aim to demonstrate how Canadian citizenship has been reconfigured post-September 11 (9/11) by highlighting the racial underpinnings of citizenship and national security threats that are embedded in the ideologies of the ‘War on Terror’. In the ‘War on Terror’ context, Canadian identity continues to undergo a “re-whitening” process, which consequently marginalizes non-white minorities, particularly Muslim and Arab communities; rendering them different and inferior to their white counterparts (Arat-Koc, 2005; Naber, 2006). Furthermore, discourses emerging out of the ‘War on Terror’ have created a hyper racialized equation of the Muslim and Arab terrorist, allowing for the adoption of stronger ‘Canadian values’ as specific counterterrorism measures (Thobani,

2007). My research sheds light on the ways in which conceptualizations of citizenship and national security threats are shaped by political ideologies of who is deserving/undeserving of Canadian rights and freedoms, which subsequently creates classes of citizenships (re first and second class). My research also reveals the discourses used to justify discriminatory and unequal processes of citizenship, mechanisms of security, and anti-terrorism strategies.

Part I of my literature review presents knowledge on the historical construction of Canadian citizenship and nation, the process of inclusion and exclusion in creating the national-self and the foreign ‘Other’, and how these have been formulated along racial lines overtime. Part II demonstrates how these racialized, historical crystallizations of citizenship have been sustained over time and reinvigorated within the “War on Terror” sociopolitical context. Part III presents national security literature to contextualize the climate of the security state in which citizens are subjected to in the ‘War on Terror’. It is here that I end my literature review by presenting the current literature on Bill C-24 and Bill C-51. Overall, the literature and my research unveil how the seemingly separate spheres of citizenship and national security are intersecting points within the ‘War on Terror’.

I- Canadian Citizenship and Nation Formation

Forming the Nation: The Process of Inclusion of the ‘National-Self’ and Exclusion of the ‘Foreign Other’

Within academic literature, several scholars have highlighted the role of the ongoing colonial project within formations of the nation-state (Dua, Razack & Warner, 2005; Howell, 2005; Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007). Dating back to the time of colonialism, the benefits of citizenship were accorded to the European population and restricted from the Indigenous community, as well as racialized minorities (Thobani, 2007). As such, many have argued that the

production of citizenship is in fact a race problem, which actively excludes racialized non-European bodies from its benefits (Thobani, 2007; Razack, 2005).

Despite repetitive accounts of pride and collective national identity for a humanitarian and compassionate Canadian citizenship, immigration, and refugee policies, Canadian citizenship emerged out of a violent colonial project (Abu-Laban, 1998). More specifically, “citizenship emerged as integral to the very processes that transformed insiders (Aboriginal peoples) into aliens in their own territories, while simultaneously transforming outsiders (colonizers, settlers, migrants) into exalted insiders (Canadian nationals)” (Thobani, 2007: 74).

The process of exaltation rests on the classification of the Western self within binary opposition to its excluded ‘Other’ (Thobani, 2007). While the West is imagined to be founded on democracy and values of integrity, the ‘Other’ is not. While Canadian nationhood is understood to be comprised of honesty and compassion, and its people are regarded as law-abiding, orderly and modest, the ‘Other’ is susceptible to lawlessness, deceit, and intolerance (Thobani, 2007; Razack, 2005). In this way, Canadian national subjects are able to exalt themselves in relation to inferior cultural ‘Others’; a technique of power that not only fuels the project of nation building but also elevates the humanity of the national subject over and above the Aboriginal and “non-preferred racialized” immigrants (Thobani, 2007). While White identity is established as preferred “races”, racialized Others are deemed as “non-preferred races”, thereby reflecting how racialization has been mobilized to form the nation (Thobani, 2007; Winnant, 1994).

Through the exaltation of the West and the White Canadian identity, racial preferences populate the formation of the nation through the exclusion and restrictions of “non-preferred races” that come to be defined in direct relation to the national subject (re ‘us’) (Thobani, 2007).

The colonial project effectively crystalized a hierarchical triangular formation of citizenship, which prescribes different degrees of worthiness and humanity to the exalted national settler, the Aboriginal, and the immigrant (Thobani, 2007).

In their transformation into the exalted national subject, European settlers constituted the ‘Indians’ as possessing “backwards, barbaric, and uncivilized” customs, practices and rituals (Thobani, 2007: 46). The Aboriginal body was identified as “an ignoble savage”, and “marked for physical and cultural extinction, deserving of citizenship only upon the abdication of indigeneity” through assimilation to the modern customs of the national (Thobani, 2007: 75). The ‘Indians’ were regarded as being distinctly different on the basis that they did not share the element of humanity nor capacity to reason with the newly exalted nationals, thereby constructing them as ‘Other’ (Razack, 2004). By constituting Aboriginals as ‘Other’, the nation-self marked itself as a lawful subject and therefore an exalted member of the nation whose customs, practices, and laws were the natural order of things; a constitution that strengthened the ‘necessity’ for Western intervention and the colonial rule (Kamp, 2010; Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007).

As reflected in Canada’s history of Immigration and Citizenship Acts, immigrants’ ‘undesirable’ backgrounds have also been placed within this hierarchy of citizenship dependant on their ‘racial categorization’ (Kruger et al., 2004). The enactment of the Head Tax under the 1885 Chinese Immigration Act, and the Continuous Journey provision under the 1908 Immigration Act (designed to restrict South Asian immigration by requiring immigrants to have a continuous journey from their country of origin) provide two salient illustrations, among many examples, of the nation’s effort to exclude “non-preferred races” from its land (Abu- Laban, 1998; Hameed & Vukov, 2007; Li, 2003; Suyama, 1995). Additionally, the 1947 Immigration

policy asserted “the restriction of immigration from ‘the Orient’ in the name of preserving ‘the character of the population’” (Abu- Laban, 1998: 72).

Immigration and Citizenship acts underwent a process of liberalization in the 1960s, “marking a significant shift [away] from the ‘White Canada’ policy in which immigration selection was explicitly predicated on ‘race’, ethnicity, and nationality [...]” (Aiken, 2007: 65). Although present Canadian Immigration policy has seen a shift away from *overt* forms of racial exclusion (Li, 2007; Thobani, 2007), the intricate examination of policies reveals the ways in which racism remains embedded within its discourse (Agnew, 2007). By contrast, covert and embedded racism emerges through encoded concepts that conceal racial signifiers (Agnew, 2007). Li (2007) asserts that seemingly neutral terms such as ‘non-traditional’, ‘diversity’, ‘Canadian national identity’ that are saturated within political and public immigration discourse, are frequently used to refer to ‘racial’ problems of immigration identified by the exalted subject. This demarcates the long-standing racialized cultural framework inscribed within Canadian immigration and citizenship legislative discourse as well as within the fabric of the law. The preferred-race future national is “exalted as worthy of citizenship *and* membership in the nation”, while the “non-preferred” racialized immigrant is “marked as stranger and sojourner, an unwelcome intruder whose lack of Christian faith, inherent deviant tendencies, and unchecked fecundity” threaten the nation’s survival (Thobani, 2007: 75; Kruger et al., 2004).

Despite the shift towards their inclusion in the nation, citizenship rights of non-preferred races have commonly been suspended. The historical manifestations of the ways in which the state suspends citizenship rights of non-preferred racialized groups have been well established within the literature (Ali, 2016; Amin-Khan, 2012; Dhamoon & Abu- Laban, 2009; Harder, 2010; Li, 2003; Thobani, 2007; Winter, 2014). Offering the experience of Japanese- Canadians

and internment camps as an example, citizenship rights of racialized naturalized citizens are often suspended as “their racial identity [is] deemed more significant than their citizen status [...]” (Thobani, 2007: 94). Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009) also contend that in the aftermath of World War II the dangerous foreign ‘Other’ was classified as the Japanese male ‘enemy alien’. However, this initial focus on outsiders quickly became a way to target all Japanese persons, irrespective of their citizenship status. The period of the Japanese internment, framed as a necessity for the defense and security of Canada, in fact “had more to do with a re-nationalization project”, to free the nation of the “yellow peril” that had been constructed as a threat to the development of a preferred race nation and white privilege (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009: 165). The Japanese internment is a crucial example as it substantiates Canada’s history of marking racialized Canadian enemies and engendering racialized ‘Others’ as threats to ‘our nation’ and ‘our laws’ (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009).

Although the acquisition of citizenship is supposed to signify inclusion into the nation, several scholars have revealed processes of exclusion that occur amongst citizens (Anderson, 2008; Arat-Koc, 2005; Hage, 2000). The work of Hage (2000) makes important distinctions between the acquisition of formal citizenship and the lived experiences of national belonging. Hage (2000) asserts that while formal citizenship is granted by institutional state levels, the acceptance (or non-acceptance) into the nation is premised on the levels of national belonging one can acquire within the dominant community. Put simply, formal citizenship is not equivalent to the lived sense of belonging; rather, individuals are required to accumulate national capital deemed valuable by Canadian subjects that can be readily converted into claims to the nation.¹ However, Hage (2000) points to a prominent distinction between born

¹ I offer a more in-depth discussion of Ghassan Hage’s (2000) work *White Nation* in my theoretical framework chapter.

nationalism and acquired nationalism, whereby “no matter how much national capital an [immigrant] accumulates, the fact that he or she has acquired it, rather than being born with it, devalues what he or she possesses [...]” (pg. 62).

Anderson (2008) traces the historical differentiation between Canadian-born and naturalized/foreign-born citizens in his review of citizenship revocation processes across Canadian Citizenship and Immigration Acts dating back from Confederation to 2006. In his analysis of the various versions of revocation policies for naturalized citizens who obtained their citizenship under false representation or fraud, he demonstrates that “although Canadians are said to be equal as citizens, citizenship revocation distinguishes the Canadian-born, who possess their citizenship as a right, from the foreign-born, for whom it is a privilege that can be taken away” (Anderson, 2008: 80). As such, categories of citizens are captured within revocation policies, wherein Canadian-born citizens are recognized as first-class citizens, who hold more secure rights within the nation. Naturalized or foreign-born Canadians on the other hand, are deemed as second-class citizens, who have historically and consistently been subjected to the threat of having their citizenship revoked under citizenship and immigration policies. This segmentation of Canadian citizenship marks newcomers and immigrants as potential threats, therefore requiring measures to be in place that will allow the state to remove them from the nation at all times (Anderson, 2008). Whether it be to remove citizenship from those who obtained it fraudulently, or more recently within post 9/11 to revoke citizenship during the fight against terrorism, immigrants and naturalized Canadian citizens are subjected to a right-based differentiation as they are regarded as second-class citizens within the nation (Anderson, 2008). However, while membership in the category of a ‘born citizen’ equates to first class citizenry in principle, in practice, ‘born citizens’ who are also part of minority groups are not accorded the

same privileges. Put starkly, “being a citizen is no guarantee of equality, [as] real equality is hampered by inequities resulting from membership in stigmatized and minorities groups” (Abu-Laban, 1998: 70). It is the “ordinary Canadians”, or “Canadian-Canadians”, who are considered *real* Canadians by virtue of their ‘natural’ relationship to citizenship, and therefore granted citizenship as a right rather than a privilege (Anderson, 2008; Arat-Koc, 2005; Razack, 2004); a distinction that is also inherently constructed along racial lines.

Although Canadian tolerance seemingly denotes positive assumptions, several academics such as Hage (2002), Mackey (2002), Arat-Koc (2005) and Wilton (2010) argue that the term “tolerance”, often found in discourses of multiculturalism policies, implies that one group – those belonging to “Whiteness” – hold the power to tolerate (or not) the differences of others who are marginalized. Mackey (2002) argues that stories of a tolerant and multicultural Canada have become central to the formation of the Canadian national identity. However, these mythologies exist in contradiction to the brutal policies of extermination and cultural genocide that comprise the history of the Canadian nation. Multiculturalism as it stands “implicitly constructs the idea of a core English-Canadian culture, and that other cultures become ‘multicultural’ in relation to [it]” (p. 2). Moreover, the notion of tolerance designates the power to define the boundaries of the nation and those who are to be included in it (Arat-Koc, 2005). The national-self as ‘*real* Canadians’ are those who hold power and final authority to determine who is, and who is not, allowed into the nation (Abu-Laban, 1998; Arat-Koc, 2005). Mackey (2002) contends that individuals who conceive themselves as ‘*Ordinary Canadians*’, ‘*Canadian-Canadians*’ and by extension authentic Canadians, are often white, and claim the final authority to define inclusions and exclusions in the nation. In a similar vein, Howell (2005) asserts that

“tolerance is implicitly positioned as something that white Anglo Canadians must try to extend to racialized [minorities]” (p. 53).

These inclusions and exclusions rest on the limits of multiculturalism, whereby cultural diversity is tolerated and accepted only on the premise that it does not threaten the Western project of nation-building and national unity in Canada. Therefore, the state’s regulation of immigration (Abu – Laban, 1998), foreign policy (Howell, 2005), citizenship (Thobani, 2007), and the acceptance accorded by the dominant community (Hage, 2002) institutionalizes the inscription of Whiteness as an embodiment of legitimate and responsible subjects. The embodiment of Whiteness alludes to a subject that does not “threaten to erode white supremacy” (Thobani, 2007: 72). It is through the embodiment of Whiteness that persons are deemed worthy of the full benefits of citizenship and nationhood belonging (Hage, 2002; Thobani, 2007).

Whiteness as a marker of inclusion can also be observed within dual citizen discourses. The dual citizen is cast as a dangerous internal foreigner, who is regarded as “both an insider who *legally* belongs to the state, and simultaneously deemed as an outsider/Other who does not *substantively belong* within the nation” (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009: 169). However, the threat of dual citizens is inherently racialized (Harder, 2010; Winter, 2014). Through her analysis of the discourses pertaining to Lost Canadians², and the ‘Lebanon evacuation crisis’³, Winter (2014) established that although rhetoric regarding dual citizenship emerged in both cases, the notions of kinship and Whiteness were conflated in the construction of possible and impossible citizens. Specifically, while the possession of dual citizenship was not a concern for Lost

² “Lost Canadians are individuals who were born in Canada, or have a Canadian parent, but who lack or have lost Canadian citizenship due to the provisions of the 1947 Citizenship Act [...]” (Winter, 2014: 51).

³ The Lebanon evacuation crisis began in 2006 following the Israel-Lebanon war, where the military made escaping the conflict zone virtually impossible. Canada responded by initiating an evacuation plan in attempts to protect and rescue stranded Canadian citizens from the war (Winter, 2014).

Canadians, of which the majority were also American (Harder, 2010), Canadians of Lebanese descent were framed as ‘citizens of convenience’, “who solely obtain and maintain their Canadian citizenship for instrumental reasons in order to ensure access to social benefits, economic opportunities, and a safe place in times of war or economic recession” (Winter, 2014: 56). This reveals how the threat of dual nationals is engendered along racialized lines. On the one hand, white American Lost Canadians were deemed as possible, authentic, and loyal dual citizens by way of their ancestry and White European heritage (Harder, 2010). In contrast, non-White and non-Christian dual citizens emerged as impossible citizens who abused the benefits of the nation and eroded the value of citizenship (Winter, 2014). This demonstrates the ways in which racialized minority immigrants are constantly negotiating and defending their ‘Canadian-ness’, thereby enforcing the “implication that white ethnic communities have a longer lineage that somehow makes them ‘more Canadian’ than other [dual nationals]” (Creese, 2007: 356)

Despite the exaltation of the national-self through the inherent exclusion of foreign ‘Others’ and non-preferred race immigrants, the narrative of a virtuous, liberal Canada composed of peace, tolerance, orderliness, and welcoming of immigrants is upheld (Howell, 2005). The maintenance of this image is facilitated through the mechanisms of nation-formation and citizenry.

The Historical Construction of the ‘Good Immigrant/Citizen’

In addition to the embodiment of Whiteness, the Canadian ‘good immigrant’, and subsequently the ‘good citizen’ is constructed as being aware of their responsibilities to the nation-state, being active participants in the nation, and expressing loyalty to the country. These are most readily achieved by becoming economically self-sufficient, demonstrating language proficiency in English, and through the expression of political citizenship to demonstrate active

participation within the nation-state and prove their loyalty to Canada (Kennelley & Dillabough, 2008; Fleming, 2010; Sobel, 2015; Wilton, 2010). Presented within Canadian citizenship guides and discourses surrounding Canadian values, it is through these actions that immigrants can be included and acquire citizenship, and subsequently can come to understand, govern, and conduct themselves within the nation (Howell, 2005; Sobel, 2015).

A key component to successful integration is acting upon the responsibility of being economically self-sufficient (Kennelley & Dillabough, 2008). By becoming economically self-sufficient, immigrants demonstrate that they are non-reliant on the state, and therefore, are upholding their rights and responsibilities as future citizens in a neoliberal world (Kennelley & Dillabough, 2008). The act of upholding responsibilities demonstrates state-desired efficiency in self-regulation and self-surveillance (Howell, 2005). Furthermore, in the eyes of the state, immigrants are typically regarded as valuable and desired sources for economic contributions and prosperity (Thobani, 2007). However, this value is limited; the state conveys the need to control and regulate immigration flows through Immigration acts, as “the welfare state capitalize[s] on economic contributions of these immigrants, but constitute[s] [their] families as burden[s] to the nation-state” (Thobani, 2007: 25).

A second responsibility that is emphasized in Canadian citizenship discourses is the ability to demonstrate a language proficiency in English (Kennelley & Dillabough, 2008). Fleming (2010), Wilton (2010), Sobel (2015), and Creese and Kambere (2003) found the emergence of English dominance in the production of ‘good immigrant- citizens’, in which the English speakers dominate over the subordinate non-English speakers (or those who are perceived as non-English speakers by way of their accent). As observed by Creese and Kambere (2003), this power relation is revealed in the social construction of language fluency and its

intersection between accents and processes of racialization. Foreign accents emblematic of Whiteness, such as British and Australian accents are privileged as compared to racialized African accents, which are commonly perceived to be indicative of limited English skills, and by extension, a lesser degree of integration and belonging into the nation. In a similar vein, Fleming (2010) also argues that this hierarchy of Canadian citizenship is racialized, as individuals can only achieve full citizenship by conforming to a certain white, patriarchal Englishness. Thus, in order to convert from a stranger to a good citizen, aspiring citizens must demonstrate adequate language proficiency in English (Sobel, 2012; Wilton, 2010).

Being a ‘good immigrant- citizen’ also involves expressing loyalty to Canada (Kennelley & Dillabough, 2008; Wilton, 2010; Sobel 2015). Citizenship is granted only to those who demonstrate that they will actively stay in Canada, which in turn expresses their loyalty to the country (Sobel, 2015). Loyalty to Canada is also expressed as obeying the law and not committing crimes, and conforming to Canadian values, customs and rites (Howell, 2005; Kennelley & Dillabough, 2008; Sobel, 2015). Engaging in rite and rituals, such as reciting the national anthem and public pledges and oaths of allegiance have been identified as being symbolic to national identity (Thobani, 2007). Furthermore, in recent years, ‘good citizens’ are increasingly encouraged to join the military or police force to protect the nation from the ‘Others’ and “aggressive invaders” who may threaten it (Jafri, 2012; Thobani, 2007)⁴. To this end, the national-self is built by placing newcomers as potential contaminants of Canadian peace, tolerance and civility (Jafri, 2012). This fear of contamination is highlighted in the *Discover Canada* guidebook through the use of explicit terms such as “barbaric culture” and “violent,

⁴ *Discover Canada* citizenship guidebook, published in 2009, is the first guidebook to explicitly encourage individuals to join the military or police force (Jafri, 2012).

extreme or hateful prejudices”, emphasizing the need to leave these ‘cultural practices’ out of Canada (Jafri, 2012).

As such, a practical definition of the ‘good immigrant- citizen’ entails upholding responsibilities to the nation, active participation, and expressing loyalty to the state. Citizenship then is something that is always dictated by the state and is conditioned on the premise that immigrants adopt these behaviours and activities in order to be included within the nation. However, while constructions of the ‘good citizen-immigrant’ discursively produces the civilized European/ White national, they simultaneously by default also construct their enemy counterpart; the barbaric foreign ‘Other’ (Razack, 2004).

II- Race, Citizenship, and the War on Terror: Racializing the Enemy and the ‘Foreign Other’

Although the processes of exclusion of the foreign ‘Other’ have deep roots within Canadian history, these processes have been reconfigured and intensified during the ‘War on Terror’. While the liberalization of citizenship in the 1960s resulted in the eradication of overt forms of racial exclusion from the nation and rendered them intolerable, the events of 9/11 have resurrected these overt forms of reference (Kruger et al., 2004; Thobani, 2007). More specifically, the racialized ‘Other’ as the terrorist who presents an imminent threat to the state has been reconceptualised to include Muslims, Arabs, and brown bodies more broadly (Arat-Koc, 2005; Jiwani, 2005; Naber, 2006; Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007). The contemporary construction of Muslims as racialized citizen- suspects merely falls in line with the long history of Canada’s inscription of racialized Canadian enemies (Ali, 2016; Amin- Khan, 2012; Dhamoon & Abu- Laban, 2009; Li, 2003; Thobani, 2007).

Following the aftermath of the 9/11, state politicians mobilized the terrorist threat to declare a state of emergency not only confronting the United States, but also all civilized nations;

invoking political rhetoric of unity amongst Western nations (Thobani, 2007: 25; Arat-Koc, 2005). Consequently, the boundaries insulating Canadian national identity and belonging were reconfigured in order to unquestionably and unambiguously crystalize and intensify its 'White' configurations alongside its Western allies (Arat-Koc, 2005). Thobani (2007) asserts that the rhetoric that emerged reflected old colonial discourses, which resurrects the figure of the 'crazed savage'. However, instead of just being inscribed on Aboriginal bodies, the figure of the 'crazed savage' has been increasingly transmitted onto the category Muslim, which "has been constituted in this war as not only religious and political but also a racialized category", extending out onto Arab and brown bodies as well (Thobani, 2007: 235).

Given this, discursive distinctions between the national-self and foreign 'Other' mobilize the rhetoric of a clash of civilizations (Arat-Koc, 2005; Razack, 2004). The clash of civilizations rhetoric points to the imagined fatal incompatibility that the Orient has with modernity on the basis of their so-called adherence to culture, thereby "enabling [all Western nations] to imagine that they share something in common that marks them as superior" (Razack, 2004: 149; Razack, 2005: 14; Arat-Koc, 2005). The national-self is marked as being free, rational and reasonable, while the foreign 'Other' is constructed as inherently different by virtue of their pre-modern behaviour and shackles to tradition (Razack, 2004). As such, due to their racialized religious identity, "Muslims are considered to be dangerous 'Others' who are not only culturally inferior but also a threat to Western civilizations" (Nagra, 2017: 21).

The racialization of Islam has deep historical roots. Edward Said's (1979) work on *Orientalism* traces the historical configurations of labelling Western superiority and Eastern/Oriental inferiority through the demonization of Islam. Said (1979) argues that Islam has historically been perceived through an Orientalist lens, which frames the 'Orient' as politically,

socially, ideologically, and culturally incommensurable with the West and Western civilization. Dating back to the commencement of colonialism, the subordination of the ‘Orient’ was used to define the West in its opposition in order to support the exclusionary processes of European identity (Said, 1979). Within Orientalist tropes, Islam has been represented within this Orientalist binary; essentialized into an inhuman, irrational and uncivil entity (Said, 1981).

Representations of the ‘Orient’, and specifically the perception of Islam as traditional, backwards and irrational, have intensified post 9/11 (Arak-Koc, 2005; Nagra, 2017), conveying the continuance of the construction of the national-self using exclusionary terms to differentiate from the foreign ‘Other’ well beyond the years of colonization (Arat-Koc, 2005; Jackson, 2005; Jafri, 2012; Kamp, 2010; Kruger et al., 2004). Through the analysis of President Bush’s rhetoric on the events of 9/11, Jackson (2005) found that the construction of the national-self is bounded on identifying an enemy. The foreign ‘Other’ continues to be regarded as an inherent threat to the safety of Western nations: the subordinate ‘Other’ is constructed as uncivilized and as a body that “may threaten, degrade, pollute or contaminate” the national-self (Kamp, 2010: 413).

The racialized Muslim terrorist has been regarded as an “omnipresent enemy”, depicted as “monstrous” and “animal-like” “evil doers, hiding in the shadows with no regard for human life” (Thobani, 2007: 235; Razack, 2004). Moreover, Thobani (2007) argues that overt racialized discourses that were once eradicated and not tolerated following the liberalization of the 1960s can now be freely expressed and articulated when directed at Muslims and Islam. The reconfiguration of Canada as a white nation consequently abandons Arabs and Muslim individuals from their place in Western civilization and marks them as a threat to the nation (Arat- Koc, 2005; Razack, 2008).

This points to the re-emergence of overt forms of the figure of unassimilable bodies, specifically targeting the newly reconfigured racialized enemy/terrorist (Razack, 2004). Once again, the West has construed itself as the superior nation that is responsible for correcting “culturally inferior persons” (Razack, 2004: 132). Discipline and control of unassimilable bodies involve stringent immigration, citizenship, and border control policies in order to “keep out terrorists and rapacious immigrants and refugees who only want to grab the riches of the West and to plot its destruction” (Razack, 2004: 130; Kruger et al., 2004). In addition to their construction as unassimilable and premodern, Muslims communities are viewed as being “prepared to sell their daughters into marriage and a life of continual rape [...]” (Razack, 2004: 138).

The enemy is also racialized is through the use of gender to operationalize foreignness. Gendered racialization works to frame Muslim women as passive victims needing to be saved from violence and misogyny by the hands of fanatic, hyper-masculine terrorist Muslim men (Jiwani, 2005; Naber, 2006; Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007). The immediate need to save Muslim women and girls has become the dominant justification and rationale used by western nations to participate in the ‘War on Terror’ (Jiwani, 2005; Razack, 2004; 2005). Actions taking place in the “War on Terror” are conveyed as fights of freedom for women trapped by ‘them’: those who were filled with hatred, envy, and uncivility as a direct product of their backward culture (Razack, 2004; 2005; Thobani, 2007).

Although the imperilled Muslim woman provides a rationale for engaging in the “War on Terror”, Muslim women are not fully exonerated from suspicion (Jiwani, 2005; Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007). The division of the bodies of Muslim women falls along degrees of assimilability, which distinguish ‘good’ from ‘bad’ Muslims. ‘Good’ Muslims are those who

successfully assimilate; they are naturally anti-hijabs, express their gratitude toward the Western world for their mission to rescue, save, and liberate “their oppressed sisters” (Jiwani, 2005; Razack, 2004). On the other hand, the ‘bad’ Muslim woman is the one refuses to embrace Western gender norms and condemn her religion. Her refusal to unveil herself and to embrace Western forms of womanhood conveys her loyalty to Islam, therefore marking her as a threatening and fanatical mother of future terrorists (Jiwani, 2005; Thobani, 2007). Despite these distinctions, Muslim women and men alike, whether ‘good’ or ‘bad’, are always regarded as citizen-suspects (Thobani, 2007); a condition of being a racialized citizen in the age of terror (Bhadi, 2003; Fiala, 2013).

III- National Security Context: Citizenship in the War on Terror

The events of 9/11 have been used to accelerate and expand the already steady progress and development of a growing surveillance society and safety state (Wood, Konvitz & Ball, 2003; Lyon, 2006). The high-profile incident of 9/11 provided the state with the necessary justifications to ‘fast-track’ the implementation of various technologies and development of national security measures that had already been in contention long before the destruction of the Twin Towers (Wood et al., 2003). The ‘War on Terror’ has provided justifications for increased surveillance measures at borders, airports, as well as amongst citizens individually. Through the mobilization of politics of fear, the state has prioritized the need for collective responsabilization for the protection and security of the nation from enemies, who need to be excluded (Finn, 2011; Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007).

While the nation’s territorial borders were identified as being the initial threat, the threat shifted towards that of the enemy within the nation’s body, infiltrating the safety and security of the state (Fiala, 2003; Thobani, 2004; 2007). Consequently, the distinctions between the

national-self and foreign ‘Other’, ‘us’ versus ‘them’, became blurred as a result of the discourses surrounding the threat of “home-grown terrorism”, “enemy within”, or “the terrorist who permeates national borders and national citizenship” (Dhamoon & Abu- Laben, 2009: 180; Fiala, 2003; Thobani, 2007). Embedded within legislation, policing, and counterterrorism measures, racialized citizens, and particularly Muslims citizens, quickly became suspects within their own countries, irrespective of the fact that they may have lived in Canada their entire lives. (Fekete, 2004; Thobani, 2007). Inevitably linked to the enemy outside the nation (Fekete, 2004; Thobani, 2007), “the terrorist enemy has become the dangerous foreigner in our midst, [requiring] the policing task [...] to identify, remove, and incapacitate these persons” (Smith, 2007: 244; 245).

The literature points to three main security strategies adopted by Canada to mitigate risks and increase the integrity of national security: the securitization of borders, the encouragement of citizen-on-citizen surveillance, and the implementation of anti-terrorism legislation (Bahdi, 2003; Bhandar, 2008). Embedded within these national security strategies is an inherent process of racial profiling that casts Muslim communities under increased suspicion, surveillance and discipline (Fiala, 2003; Thobani, 2007). Consequently, rather than generate safety and security of the nation, these measures undermine national security and work to exclude both non-citizens and citizens alike; a consequence that has disproportionately impacted the Muslim community (Ali, 2006; Bahdi, 2003; Ball & Frank, 2003; Jamil & Rousseau, 2012; Nagra, 2017).

Vast concern and attention were paid to the nation’s borders following the events of 9/11. Borders became framed as points of entry for undesirable non-white bodies (Bhandar, 2008) and were identified as being the spaces where “[...] the dangers posed by the ‘terrorist threat’ were said to be most immediate [...]” (Thobani, 2007: 240). Consequently, the border crosser became a heightened target of surveillance (Bhandar, 2008). Furthermore, Canadian citizenship does not

protect or override the markers of the foreign ‘Other’ at points of entry (Jamil & Rousseau, 2012; Naber, 2006; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). Specifically, ‘Arab-Middle Eastern Muslim Others’ routinely feel targeted, questioned, detained, and subject to secondary screening on the basis of their names, country of origin/ethnicity, and their religion (Jamil & Rousseau, 2012). Nagra and Maurutto (2016) argue that the border becomes a site where citizenship is contested. Perceived as ‘accidental’ and not ‘real Canadians’, the border becomes a site where Muslims experience differential treatment and rights, and heightened surveillance, as compared to “white” Canadians.

The second strategy adopted in the national security context is that of citizen-on-citizen surveillance (Finn, 2011; Jamil & Rousseau, 2012; Thobani, 2007). The notion of citizenship transformed to include the burden of remaining hyper-vigilant for the uncivilized ‘terrorist within’, who may be deceptively passing as a citizen (Thobani, 2007). In her analysis of citizen-on-citizen surveillance as manifested in Neighbourhood Watch Programs, Ahmed (2000) demonstrates the reconfiguration of the ‘good citizen’ through a surveillance lens:

“the ‘good citizen’ is the one who watches (out for) suspicious persons and strangers, and who in that very act, becomes aligned, not only with the police (and hence the Law) but with the imagined community itself whose boundaries are protected *in the very labour of his look*.” (p. 30).

Citizens are increasingly advised to remain informed by reading the newspaper and watching the news, and identify and report unsafe or suspicious behaviour to authorities; all to support the police and the state in their efforts to combat terrorism (Thobani, 2007). Inherent in the enforcement and justifications for the civic need to be vigilant against those who “look” suspicious is the suggestion that there are visible markers of identity (re Muslim identity) that signify the rejection of Western values (Ahmed, 2000; Finn, 2011; Thobani, 2004).

Embedded in all counter-terrorism practices is the racial profiling of Muslims, Arabs and brown bodies. The phenomenon of “Flying While Arab” rests on the profiling of the would-be-

terrorist that is based on physical characteristics of Arab-ness or Muslim-ness (Fiala, 2003). The decontextualized and depoliticized figure of the global menace and terrorist as an Arab-Middle Eastern Muslim expands out to all border crossers - migrants, non-white immigrants, and racialized citizens alike - which reflect “the creation and manifestation of Otherness inscribed [within the nation’s borders]” (Bhandar, 2008: 414; Thobani, 2007). As a result of its over-inclusiveness (Bahdi, 2003), and focus on physical characteristics of Muslim-ness and Arab-ness rather than on a set of behaviours indicative of an attack (Fiala, 2003), racial profiling as a mechanism of state surveillance and security actively undermines, rather than strengthens, national security efforts (Bahdi, 2003; Fekete, 2004; Fiala 2003; Thobani, 2004). As stated by Thobani (2004),

“[t]o make racial profiling an acceptable political technique of governance is to inscribe suspicion and illegality onto the bodies of people of color, making it possible, in this case, to round them up on the basis of nothing more substantial than their "looking" like Muslims.” (p. 598).

While Thobani (2007) and Fiala (2003) demonstrate that these discourses blur the distinction between the national-self and foreign ‘Other’ given that enemies can be found lurking within the nation’s very borders, Finn (2011) and Ahmed (2000) demonstrate the ways in which these mechanisms of surveillance simultaneously work to reinscribe the boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘Others’. In addition to race, the figure of the Muslim terrorist is constructed and surveyed through various bodily cultural practices associated with Muslim identity: facial hair and certain articles of clothing become markers of suspicion, thereby intensifying the surveillance that brown bodies encounter (Finn, 2011). For example, veiled women are increasingly visible due to the “*hijab* as a signifier of Muslim identity”; rendering them vulnerable to surveillance as well as targets of backlash (Naber, 2006: 251). As such, national security measures work to uphold the

production of race, nationality, and religion as a quintessential form, as markers of suspicion, and a racialized foreign threat (Thobani, 2007).

Viewing Islam, holistically as a threat unjustly ignores the diversity of the Islamic movement, as these techniques and intelligence services denounce and stigmatize Muslim communities as terrorists (Fekete, 2004). Muslims are constructed as “foreign elements [and] aliens [...] with no tenure to citizenship, [whom] are here as sleeper terrorists” (Bahdi, 2003: 317). Constructing Muslim citizens as the ‘enemy within’ results in the categorization of “all Middle Easterners, citizens or not, as potential terrorists [...] (Fiala, 2003: 57). As such, Muslim, Arab, and brown bodies are fused into a singular ‘Other’, and are continuously marked as bodies that must be disciplined and surveyed through anti-terrorism legislation, providing justifications for these practices in the name of national security (Bahdi, 2003; Bhandar, 2008; Jamil & Rousseau, 2012; Thobani, 2007).

The third strategy implemented in Canada’s national security context has been the emergence of anti-terrorism legislation, for which the above practices once deemed outside the judicial order can now readily be enforced (Thobani, 2007; Bhandar, 2008). In the pre-9/11 period, the national security context was primarily concerned with organized crime and fighting the “War on Drugs”. With no clear anti-terrorism legislation, Canada traditionally relied on the criminal code for the prosecution of crimes (Wark, 2016). The events of 9/11 marked a change in the national security context, shifting its focus on the potential threat of terrorists, specifically those terrorists on the ‘outside’. This led to the emergence of various anti-terrorism measures, intelligence, and legislations (Wark, 2016). To date, Canada has introduced two major Anti-terrorism legislations: Bill C-36 Anti-Terrorism Act and most recently Bill C-51 Anti-Terrorism Act. Additionally, various acts have been amended under the broader Anti-Terrorism Plan, of

which citizenship and immigration legislation has increasingly become a prominent tool to fight the ‘War on Terrorism’ (Aiken, 2007; Roach, 2002; Rygiel, 2006; Shaffer, 2001).

As the main legislative response to 9/11, Bill C-36 established “for the first time in Canadian law a detailed definition of terrorist activities” (Roach, 2002: 122; Shaffer, 2001; Wark, 2016). Bill C-36 introduced three significant changes to criminal law by creating new terrorism offenses, giving the state new investigative detaining powers for people suspected of being involved in terrorist activities, and finally increased sanctions and penalties for behaviours categorized under these new offenses (Shaffer, 2001). Criticized for undermining Canadian citizens’ liberties and freedoms (Adelman, 2002; Roach, 2002), Shaffer (2001) emphasizes the political nature of the bill, which “attempt[ed] to show Canadians – and the international community – that the government [was] taking a strong stance against terrorism and [would] not allow terrorists to operate within its borders” (p. 196). Although Bill C-36 threatened to erode the freedoms of all Canadians, it particularly targeted people of Muslim heritage (Helly, 2004)

Shortly following the implementation of Bill C-36, the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) was introduced in June 2002. Contrary to its name, the IRPA contributed to the array of anti-terrorism measures and allocated greater revenue for immigration enforcement (Aiken, 2007). IRPA permits the restriction of non-citizens from entering Canada on the basis of security inadmissibility. For example, one of the national security exclusions in the IRPA grant the power to find “refugees and prospective immigrants inadmissible where there are reasonable grounds to believe they will ‘engage in terrorism’ or are ‘members of an organization [in which] there are reasonable grounds to believe will [...] engage in terrorism’” (Aiken, 2007: 92). IRPA also legislates the removal of individuals from the country “at the conclusion of an immigration inquiry or [under] a ‘security certificate’ procedure” (Aiken, 2007:

92). Following the implementation of this act, there was an increase in the number of non-citizens and refugee claimants who were subject to preventative immigration detention. Moreover, under security certificates, non-citizens can be arrested, detained and deported from decisions rendered at secret hearings in which the person and their legal counsel are restricted from attending; a process which has greatly been criticized for its unconstitutionality (Aiken, 2007). The IRPA provisions provide clear indications that Muslim non-citizens “with some unseemly associations may be all that is necessary to justify the invocation of secret hearings and mandatory, indefinite detention in unacceptable conditions” (Aiken, 2007: 95).

While Bill C-36 and the IRPA emerged as legislative tools to address the ‘outsider’ terrorist (Adelman, 2002), the political context of Bill C-24- *Strengthening Canadian Citizenship Act* and Bill C-51- *Anti-Terrorism Act* increasingly became concerned with the threat of homegrown terrorism. Passed in June 2014, citizenship Bill C-24, as implied in its name, advocated to strengthen a perceived fragile Canadian citizenship by increasing the requirements to obtain citizenship. Amendments included the increase of residency, language and physical presence requirements for permanent residents seeking citizenship status. Moreover, Bill C-24 introduced an anti-terrorism legislative provision that granted the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration the power to revoke citizenship from dual nationals convicted of terrorism-related offences. Pillai and Williams (2017) and Jayaraman (2017) have contextualized the revocation provision within the foreign fighter phenomenon, which is centered on the concern of the abilities of the foreign fighter (or terrorist traveler) to easily travel by way of their privileged European, American, or Canadian nationalities. With the looming thoughts of Al Qaeda as ideological resonance and inspiration, and the vivid reminders of Canadian home-grown extremists with the example of the “Toronto 18” case, the Harper government honed in on the

fear and threat of Canadians traveling abroad to train or fight with Islamist terrorist organizations (Wark, 2016). Consequently, citizenship revocation and denationalization were introduced as a response to the perceived radicalization within the nation (Pillai & Williams, 2017).

Furthermore, passed in June 2015, Bill C-51 introduced an array of national security measures. Of the most significant were the amendments made to the Information Sharing Act, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) Act, and the Criminal Code. These amendments have consequently resulted in the introduction of new kinetic powers of CSIS⁵ for the first time in Canadian history, the facilitation of information sharing amongst Government of Canada agencies in attempts to protect Canada from activities that undermine its security, and the new offence of “advocating or promoting terrorism in general” under section 83.221 of the Criminal Code. The October 2014 events of the Ottawa shooting of Cpl. Nathan Cirillo and St-Jean-sur-Richelieu ramming attack of Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent were quickly mobilized as reminders of the necessity of anti-terrorism measures within political discourses. Conservative Prime Minister Steven Harper “placed the attacks squarely within the broader context of the global war on terror almost immediately”, setting into motion several political moves as a result, such as public outcries of the “Canadian reality” of homegrown terrorism (as stated by minister of defense Jason Kenney), the joining of U.S-led airstrikes on ISIS in Syria, and finally, the passing of Bill C-51 (Stastna, CBC News Politics, 2015).

At the time this literature review was conducted, the literature published on Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 were predominately legal analyses (Forcese, 2014; Macklin, 2014; Roach & Forcese,

⁵ While in the past, CSIS was restricted to “soft powers” of simply collecting intelligence, Bill C-51 shifted their powers to “kinetics/ physical” powers by granting the agency new abilities of disruption. The physical interventions that CSIS could act on included “preventing individuals from travelling abroad, interfering with money transfers and financing, disrupting websites, [and] manipulating and removing content on computers” to name a few (Deibert, 2014: 198).

2015). Forcese (2014) and Macklin (2014) examined the implications of Bill C-24 and argued that this legislation violates the Canadian constitution and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Focusing on the provision that grants the Minister power to revoke citizenship from dual nationals convicted of terrorism-related offenses, Bill C-24 can be challenged under the Charter on the basis that it violates section 6 mobility rights; section 7, which is the equal right to life, liberty and security; section 11, which is the rights to due process; and section 15, which is the right that every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability (Forcese, 2014; Macklin, 2014). Moreover, this provision produced two-tiers of citizenship, whereby naturalized Canadians and dual citizens, whether born in Canada or abroad, are discriminated against as they are singled out for the “the peril of citizenship revocation” in the name of national security; consequently, rendering citizenship status as conditional (Forcese, 2014: 581; Macklin, 2014; Pillai & Williams, 2017). Macklin (2014) argues that the emergence of the figure of the “homegrown” terrorist triggered the Conservative push for Bill C-24 due to the fact that this threat could not be dealt with under immigration laws, as the “homegrown terrorist” cannot be considered as a foreigner or alien under the law. As such, the threat needed to be alienated by law by invoking national security discourses.

Winter and Previsic (2017) examined the public discourse surrounding Bill C-24 within mainstream media, and found that although the media maintained a critical and unsupportive position on the Conservative bill, public discourse reinforced and reproduced the “marking of Canadian Muslims – as a group – as being closer associated with terrorism [...]”. More specifically, “white, non-Muslim men (and women), were erased from the equation” of

Canadians who could be effected by citizenship revocation, thereby reinforcing the images of racialized dual citizens and the Muslim-terrorist nexus (Winter & Previsic, 2017: 76).

Roach and Forcese (2015) analysed the implications of Bill C-51 through a surveillance frame. They argue that the amendments made under Bill C-51 allow the state to magnify the breakdown of silos between public and private sectors, allowing for more fluid exchange and collection of data on citizens in order to pre-emptively identify potential terrorist activity. Moreover, Bill C-51 introduces a broad concept of security that is not necessarily exclusive to ‘terrorism’, thereby leading to the potential net-widening of the number of Canadians under state surveillance since institutions can share information about an “overarching and potentially endless range of ‘security concerns’”, outside those of terrorism (Roach & Forcese, 2015: 332). Specifically, the new offence of “advocating or promoting terrorism offences in general” added under the Criminal Code is arguably focused on criminalizing “radical” Muslim speech, which “will chill the expressive and associational activities of those who do not correspond to social expectations of “moderate Muslims””, regardless of whether or not they would ever actually resort to violence (Roach & Forcese, 2015: 341). The broad, ambiguous and unclear scope of “terrorism offences in general” raises concerns of net-widening targets by potentially including nationalist, sovereigntists, and Aboriginal and environmental activists under these provisions simply due to the fact that they have ideologies that are not consistent to those laid out by the state (Roach & Forcese, 2015). As such, Roach and Forcese (2015) call into question the respect of civil liberties under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Roach and Forcese, 2015).

In addition to the concerns for violations of Charter Rights and Freedoms, the legal analyses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 point to the ambiguity of the purposes of the bills, given that they “[do] nothing at the front end to prevent people from becoming radicalized, and [...]”

nothing at the back end to facilitate terrorism prosecutions” (Roach & Forcese, 2015: 156).

Forcese (2014) contends that only targeting naturalized and dual citizens for citizenship revocation in the name of national security “risks fuelling the perception that they are inherently more prone to such behaviour than are other citizens” (p. 581). As such, these legal analyses highlight the way in which the tropes of first and second-class citizens are reinforced (Anderson, 2008; Forcese, 2014; Macklin, 2014). While the literature has examined the legal and social consequences of these bills separately, this thesis seeks to move beyond a legal framework towards an examination of the discursive implications of the political discourses surrounding citizenship and anti-terrorism legislation. The simultaneous analysis of both bills permits us to observe the interwoven and codependent relationship between citizenship and anti-terrorism discourses in the ‘War on Terror’. Since the 2015 federal election of the Liberal Government, Bill C-24 has been replaced by Bill C-6 – *an Act to amend the Citizenship Act*. Bill C-6 has repealed many of the controversial provisions that were introduced in Bill C-24; most importantly, it has repealed the citizenship revocation provision for dual citizens convicted of terrorism- related offences ⁶. Meanwhile, Bill C-51 is set to be replaced by Bill C-59 – *an Act Respecting Security Matters*, which is currently at its second table reading in the Senate.

Conclusion

The colonial formation of the Canadian nation has historically been rooted in processes of inclusion and exclusion in the creation and imagination of the national-self and foreign ‘Other’. These mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion have also historically fallen along racial lines, as preferred white nationals are exalted and rendered worthy of full citizenship rights and

⁶ While Bill C-6 has repealed citizenship revocation provisions under these circumstances, the Liberal government has revoked citizenship under other clauses (i.e.: fraud) at higher rates than the Conservative government. See CBC’s article [Trudeau Government revoking citizenship at much higher rate than Conservatives](#).

benefits, while non-preferred racialized immigrants are cast as threats to the nation by virtue of the pre-modern backwardness and attachment to religion and culture (Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007). Although the liberalization of citizenship eradicated *overt* forms of racial exclusion, racism has merely become embedded through encoded concepts (Agnew, 2007). Discourses of multiculturalism and ‘tolerance of diversity’ have transformed seemingly positive liberal notions into covert signifiers of racial difference (Mackey, 2002; Li, 2007) and alludes to the power dynamics between exalted Canadian subjects and their subordinate racialized counter-parts (Hage, 2000; Howell, 2005; Thobani, 2007). This reveals the ways in which these discourses institutionalize the inscription of Whiteness as a condition for inclusion (Arat-Koc, 2005), whereby ‘good citizen-immigrants’ ascribe to elements of Whiteness (Hage, 2000) such as language proficiency in English and expressing loyalty to the state (Creese & Kambere, 2003; Jackson, 2005; Jafri, 2012; Sobel, 2015).

While the subordination and suspension of rights of racialized immigrants is not new to the history of the Canadian nation (Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007), its contemporary configuration has been inscribed onto racialized Muslim, Arab and Brown bodies (Bahdi, 2003; Bhandar, 2008; Jamil & Rousseau, 2012; Thobani, 2007). The reinsertion of the figure of the racialized foreign ‘Other’ into political discourses demonstrates how racialized, historical crystallizations of citizenship have been sustained over time and reinvigorated within the ‘War on Terror’ sociopolitical context (Arat-Koc, 2005; Kruger et al., 2004; Thobani, 2007). Through the amplified institutionalization of the racialized ‘enemy within’ within the national security context, Muslim, Arab, and brown bodies alike have been conflated into a homogenous citizen-suspect (Fekete, 2004; Fiala, 2003). The threat has been configured both as a hyper-masculine fanatic male terrorist and a Muslim woman who refuses to assimilate to Western gender norms

and unveil herself (Razack, 2004; 2005; Thobani, 2007). As such, suspect-citizens are subjected to mechanisms of exclusion thereby asserting their lack of worthiness for full citizenship rights and belonging (Arat- Koc, 2005; Bhabha, 2003; Finn, 2011 Jamil & Rousseau, 2012; Naber, 2006). Cast as suspect-citizens, they are typified as needing to be increasingly surveilled, both from the state and its citizens (Finn, 2011).

The events of 9/11 propelled three main national security strategies that were adopted by Canada, which included the securitization of borders, the encouragement of citizen-on-citizen surveillance, and most importantly the implementation of various anti-terrorism legislation (Bahdi, 2003; Bhandar, 2008; Thobani, 2007; Aiken, 2007; Roach, 2002). Embedded within all national security strategies is an inherent process of racial profiling which casts Muslim communities, or those who ‘look’ Muslim, under increased suspicion (Finn, 2001; Fiala, 2003). These strategies of national security fuse Muslim, Arabs and brown bodies into a singular ‘Other’ that must be constantly surveyed and disciplined through anti-terrorism legislation (Jamil & Rousseau, 2012), such as Bill C-36, IRPA, Bill C-51, and Bill C-24. However, rather than increase the security of the nation, these legislations have been critiqued on the basis that they actually work to suppress the rights of racialized minorities, particularly Muslims, and reinforce their exclusion from the nation (Aiken, 2007; Macklin, 2014; Roach, 2002; Roach & Forcese, 2015).

The current literature positions me to examine the ways in which the historical exclusionary process of citizenship manifests itself within Bill C-24 and Bill C-51. Given that research has been done on the two bills separately (Forcese, 2014; Jayaraman, 2017; Macklin, 2014; Pillai & Williams, 2017; Roach & Forcese, 2015; Winter & Previsic, 2017), my research project aims to examine the ways in which the discourses surrounding both bills work together to

create the racialized second-class citizen-suspect. Furthermore, while legal analyses provide significant contributions to illustrate the legal and social consequences of legislation, it is important to examine the narratives emerging out of public political discourses. As such, my research seeks to contribute to the literary gap by examining the political discourses of both bills simultaneously, in order to reveal the relationship between national security and securitization as a means to uphold the racial and colonial exclusionary mechanisms of citizenship (Moffette & Vadasaria, 2016). Therefore, my thesis answers the following research question: “How do racial discourses surrounding Bill C24- *Strengthening the Canadian Citizenship Act* and Bill C51- *Anti Terrorism Act* conceal and reinforce citizen inclusion and exclusion through the language of national security?”.

Chapter II: Theoretical Framework

The theoretical approach that I adopted for my research is rooted in Critical Race Theory. Critical Race Theory reveals how racial discourses are embedded in our social institutions and work to “keep minorities in subordinate positions” (Delgado, Stefancic & Liendo 2012: 22). Of the most influential institutions is that of law, as it works to create the very differences it seeks to manage, thereby “translat[ing] ideas about race into the material societal conditions that confirm and entrench those ideas” (Haney López, 2000: 10). As such, the law “is both a product and promoter of racism” (Aiken, 2007: 62). Critical Race Theory endorses that race is comprised of complex social meanings that are politically configured and reconfigured. Moreover, this theoretical framework posits that “racism is a means by which society allocates privilege and status” (Delgado et al., 2012: 21).

Given that Critical Race Theory is a political movement in search of a theory (Delgado et al., 2012), drawing from different concepts that hold similar underlying epistemological

assumptions allowed me to theorize the ways in which the bills mobilize the same techniques to create a racialized second-class citizen in the “War on Terror”. Specifically, I mobilize the concepts of *Orientalism*, *Internal Orientalism*, *Cultural Racism*, and *Securitization*, in order to contribute to gaps in the literature outlined by Moffette and Vadasaria (2016). More specifically, this conceptual framework helped me “develop an understanding of instances of securitization and violence as part of liberalism's racial story, a story underwritten by colonial modernity”, as securitization studies have largely explored “the ways that migrants and those deemed a 'threat' are policed, criminalized, and subjected to violence, [however] scholarly contributions to these studies have seldom engaged with its relationship to race and colonialism” (Moffette & Vadasaria, 2016: 1; 2).

Race: Orientalism, Internal Orientalism, and Cultural Racism

Orientalism and Internal Orientalism

To understand the discursive and imaginative techniques that are mobilized within the debates of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51, and the ways in which these assert Western superiority, I will use Edward Said's *Orientalism*. Orientalism describes the discursive tropes that underline the West's perception of the ‘Other’ and posits the “ineradicable distinction between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority” (Said, 1981: 42). Crafted as a European invention that divided the world into Orient and Occident/West, Said (1979) contends that Orientalism is a “Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (p.3). This polarized division of the world classified “anything Eastern (oriental) [as] inferior, traditional and backward” (Nagra, 2017: 18). Moreover, Orientalism as a discourse was produced and fundamentally exists in an uneven distribution of power, including political power (colonialism and imperialism), intellectual power (linguistic power), cultural power (texts and values), and

moral power (as with ideas about what ‘we’ do and what ‘they cannot do or understand) (Said, 1979: 12; Nagra 2017). As such, Orientalism, became “an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness” (Said, 1979: 6), whereby the discursive constructions of the Orient serve to support the exclusionary processes of European identity. Such an identity is predicated on the “idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison to all non-European peoples and cultures” (Said, 1979: 7;1995).

Given that the Orient is filtered through a Western gaze and perspective, the Orient is subsequently cast in its opposition. With the aid of the polarizing functions of language (Jackson, 2005), the West defines itself by defining the Orient. For example, by imposing the characteristics of lazy, irrational, uncivilized and crude onto the Orient, Europeans by default were contrastingly and homogenously categorized as active, rational, civilized, and modern (Said, 1979). By defining themselves in relation to “Oriental people”, the Europeans were subsequently able to exalt themselves in comparison to their ‘Other’ counterparts (Thobani, 2007). The work of Sunera Thobani (2007) finds utility here, as Orientalism also establishes discursive parameters of difference which frame the Orient as politically, sociologically, and ideologically incommensurable to the West. Similarly, Thobani (2007) defines the process of exaltation as essential to the “constitution of the national subject as a particular kind of human being, a member of a particular kind of community, and hence, ontologically and existentially distinct from the strangers to its community” (p. 5). These parameters of difference reflect the relationship of power and domination between the Occident/West and the Orient (Said, 1979; Thobani, 2007). Moreover, Said (1981) argues that representations of the Orient, particularly the contemporary Islamic Orient, inherently exalts the West and its interests, and reduces the Islamic Orient into a malevolent and backward essence. Such a relegation harmfully ignores the diversity

and humanity of Muslim and Arabs (Said, 1979; 1981; Thobani, 2007). Consequently, the contemporary Islamic peril is regarded as a “problem to be solved or confined or [...] taken over”; a problem that permeates both external and internal borders (Said, 1979: 332; Hage, 2000).

Using the theoretical foundations of Said’s *Orientalism*, Ghassan Hage (2000) mobilizes the concept of *Internal Orientalism*. Hage’s *Internal Orientalism* helps us see how the Orient is positioned as passive objects to be governed within the borders of the nation, and “governed by those who have given themselves the national governmental right to ‘worry’ about the nation” (p. 17). Those who formulate the discursive parameters of difference between the West and its ‘Orient within’ assume the conviction that they are masters of the national space, who decide who is included, and who should remain excluded, from that space.

Masters of national space naturally assume this mastery, or managerial position, by way of their “privileged position vis-à-vis the nation” as a result of their superior social and cultural capital (Hage, 2000: 42). Their capital is rendered superior because they are born nationals, thereby having acquired their capital through inheritance or innate possession, as opposed to acquired nationals who must accumulate it. This also distinguishes national belonging from formal citizenship, whereby the acquisition of formal citizenship is not indicative of the experiences or abilities of individuals to claim national belonging to the particular state in question. Put differently, the state’s formal, institutional-political acceptance of new citizens is fundamentally distinguished from the dominant community’s practical-cultural acceptance of such people at the everyday level (Hage, 2000).

Migrants can accumulate practical nationality and national belonging by assimilating to specific cultural practices. Hage (2000) conceptualizes the accumulation of national belonging as

‘the game’, whereby the accumulation of national capital within the social field can be converted and used to make claims of being more or less of a national than others. In a cumulative manner, the sum of valued social and physical cultural styles, dispositions, and characteristics, such as “looks, accent, demeanour, taste, nationally valued social and cultural preferences and behaviour, etc.” can be converted into symbolic and national capital to achieve practical nationality (Hage, 2000: 53). However, “the extent to which they can actually accumulate national capital is linked to the cultural possessions and dispositions [new citizens] bring with them” and their similarity, or differences, to elements of the dominant national capital (Hage, 2000: 54). These elements coincide with categorizations of the superior Western subject; national capitals such as “being male, European, of British descent, of Irish descent, Protestant, Catholic, rich in economic capital, [...], or having a white skin [...].” operate to grant claims of dominant national belonging. Hage (2000) constitutes these elements as elements of Whiteness, “and it is only by naturalising its hold on this Whiteness that a group can achieve aristocratic status” (p. 65). Whiteness then is positioned as a condition of acceptance, and subsequently is an aspiration that one accumulates various capitals to try to be. Hage (2000) outlines that the accumulation of national capital reaches its pinnacle “when it comes face to face with those whose richness in national capital does not come from a struggle to accumulate it and ‘be like’ [Whiteness], but who appear ‘naturally’ [White]” (p. 61). It is here that Hage’s work establishes that how one accumulates national capital in the national space will determine its abilities and capacity to be legitimately converted into national belonging. This logic, in which Hage terms as the aristocratic logic, rests on the principle that no matter how much national capital a ‘Third-world looking immigrant accumulates, the very fact that it was accumulated does not grant the same

level of belongingness that is held by the national aristocracy (re White nationals) who are said to inherently possess the ‘essence’ by virtue of having being born with it.

While the belief of national capital as something that can be readily accumulated and translated into national belonging for “whomever can grab it” operates like a democratic incentive for aspiring nationals to ‘play the game’, the aristocratic logic ensures the entrenched static order, in which Whiteness can maintain its dominant position within the field (Hage, 2000). Whiteness, in other words, permits the power to position ‘Others’ as included or excluded from the nation, and to impose specific national values, national identity, and national order, which constitute the conception of the ideal nation.

According to Hage (2000), masters of national space include both forms of White racism as well as White multiculturalism, who despite being divided on their support for or opposition to multiculturalism, share the conviction that they are, in one way or another, masters of national space. He argues that,

“[B]oth White racists and White multiculturalists share in a conception of themselves as nationalists and of the nation as a space structured around a White culture, where Aboriginal people and non-White ‘ethnics’ are merely national objects to be moved or removed according to a White national will. This White belief in one’s mastery over the nation, whether in the form of a White multiculturalism or in the form of White racism, is [conceptualized as] the ‘White national fantasy’. It is a fantasy of a nation governed by White people, a fantasy of White Supremacy” (p. 18).

The ideal nation is said to be formed under the ‘White Nation fantasy’, which is theorized as “a fantasy of White supremacy”. The ideal (or desired) nation is predicated on discursive notions of returning to a nation/home that has been lost and in need of being recovered; achievable through the removal or exclusion of undesired objects who have invaded national spaces. Hage (2000) contends that the classification of an object as undesirable and its regard as having invaded the national space occurs when nationalists deem their presence as harmful - that is, harmful to the

White nation. Undesirable objects are ‘harmful’ to the nation in that they threaten it with their Orient, Iraqi, or Muslim will- “a will which [has been] imagined to be unwilling to submit to the national will represented by the enacted nationalist” (p. 70). Under the White Nation fantasy, the nationalist seeks to produce and achieve a distinct image of the racialized nation, thereby interpellating the Orient as a passive object to be dominated, restructured, governed, and to have authority over by those who have the power to manage and produce the nation.

Hage’s (2000) theorizing of internal orientalism, a White nation fantasy, and the ideal nation will allow me to examine how the House of Commons debates discursively produce images of the ideal nation, constituted with ideal citizens and ideal immigrants that are to be granted inclusion and belonging in the nation. This theory also positions me to understand and determine who is excluded from the ideal nation; namely, which racialized minority groups, cultures, and ‘Orientals’ are regarded as threats to the nation and its will. Moreover, this theoretical positioning will allow me to unveil discourses that produce the second-class citizen and the ways in which their formal citizenship and national belonging are distinguished from ‘first-class’ citizens. In all, these concepts allow me to observe how Whiteness functions as a structure of organizing and governing the nation.

The distinctions between the ideal citizen and its threatening ‘Other’ are determined, set and influenced by an inherent process of racialization and a play of power. Ideologically, the racial discourse of Orientalism runs through the collective belief system of the nation and has been woven into its laws, languages, rules and norms; it has become both a theory and practice for the West (Agnew, 2007; Nagra, 2017; Said, 1979). However, these discourses are encoded and remain hidden in “euphemisms, metaphors, and omissions that support given ideologies and policies” (Henry & Tatro, 2002: 11 as cited in Agnew 2007). Nevertheless, discourses that are

encoded are also readably able to be decoded given the right tools to observe and deconstruct normative structures and linguistic cues that have come to represent race and racial differences (Li, 2007). To accomplish this, I turn to the theoretical concept of cultural racism.

Cultural Racism

Closely related to Said's and Hage's work on the (Internal) 'Orient', the concept of cultural racism, defined as the "inability or unwillingness to tolerate cultural difference", is an important theoretical concept to mobilize for my research (Agnew, 2007: 13). As notions of biological race inferiority have been dispelled, cultural racism has reclaimed the reigns as a subsequent way to enforce processes of racialization in order to maintain and exclude racial inferior positions. Cultural racism works to demarcate racialized, non-white groups as being 'culturally incompatible' and 'too different to comply or integrate', thereby marking the need to expel them from the nation. As a replacement for biological notions of racism, culture is conceived as a fixed property of social groups rather than fluid, changing, and dynamic (Gilroy, 1990). However, although cultural racism does not explicitly rest on biological distinctions, an element of biology is indisputably present as cultures that are deemed inferior are often not white (Agnew, 2007).

While racist discourses of the past have been more overt in nature, cultural racism scholars have highlighted the ways in which racist discourse has become more chameleonic in nature (Goldberg, 1990). Specifically, cultural racism uses coded language that links "social cohesions with national identity and preferred culture" (Agnew, 2007: 13). The racial discourse that is paramount to cultural racism then, is predicated on the use of "encoded concepts, hidden subtexts, and a coherent syntax that, taken together, provide a logical apparatus for individuals to signify 'race' and 'racial' differences [...]" (Li, 2007: 42). As such, racial discourses are able to

be expressed without any overt reference to race itself (Gilroy, 1990). For example, terms such as ‘diversity’ and ‘(non)traditional’ have, over time, become racially charged; they have come to signify non-white immigrants and the problems they continue to bring to Canada (Li, 2007). However, “the objectionable nature of their usage is camouflaged because the original terms are innocent or noble when first created” (Li, 2007: 46). As such, the encoded racial discourse of cultural racism provides the means through which exclusion along racial lines can be achieved without jeopardizing the democratic principles and image of a tolerant and open Canada (Li, 2007; Mackey, 2002).

Cultural racism also retains its chameleonic nature by fusing race with the nationhood and patriotism (Gilroy, 1990). According to Gilroy (1990), the abilities of a cultural group to abide by Western laws - which have been presented as the summit of civilization - has been used determinant of their ‘cultural compatibility’. Specific forms of lawbreaking become defined as a cultural attribute of a whole racialized group, thereby supplying the final evidence to confirm their alien status in relation to the nation, substantiating their incompatibility to the nation, and marking their threat to the nation’s survival (Gilroy, 1990). As racialized cultures become constructed as incompatible and mutually exclusive with Western identity, “to speak of the nation is to speak automatically in racially exclusive terms” (Gilroy, 1990: 268). In this sense, cultural racism pits the nation and the citizen in binary opposition to the alien, foreigner, and immigrant through a process of Othering, thereby marking them “as a threat to the nation [who] must be relegated to the margins of society, often blamed for all the social and economic ills that befall the nation” (Agnew, 2007: 14). This theoretical concept facilitated my understandings of the ways in which racism is expressed in covert ways and provides useful tools for me to decode the language and rhetoric mobilized within the debates. Understanding the ways in which culture

has come to signify race and racial differences positioned me to observe the delegation of the foreign ‘Other’ to inferior position both outside and within the nation. By defining White Western cultures as universal, normal and “culturally appropriate”, racialized non-white cultures are thereby ‘Othered’, and calls for their expulsion are normalized on the basis of their cultural inferiority.

In this sense, the labelling of certain cultures as being inferior allows for the clash of civilizations framework to emerge. Razack (2005) argues that the clash of civilizations framework rests on the distinctions between the West and ‘the rest’ (i.e.: the East/ the Orient as would be described by Said). Inherent to the clash of civilizations framework is a spatializing of morality that classifies the modern Western self in binary opposition to the premodern ‘Other’ (Razack, 2008; Thobani, 2007). While ‘we’ (the West) have reason, ‘they’ do not. While ‘we’ are positioned in modernity, ‘they’ are not (Razack, 2008). The clash of civilizations is a heightened form of cultural racism, wherein the two cultures established by cultural racism (re the West and the inferior ‘Others’) are not only considered inherently different from one another, but are now at war with one another by way of these differences. As Razack (2008) contends, the clash of civilizations between premodern Islam and the exalted modern West rests on the idea of the need for the West to defend itself, through war, from the Islamic threat.

Following this logic, under the clash of civilizations racialized ‘uncivilized them’ inherently pose a threat to the Canadian nation, the principles of democracy, and to civilization itself (Razack, 2005). Such constructions subsequently justify the extreme measures and the suspension of rights that are enforced to protect the nation from non-preferred races (Razack, 2008; Thobani, 2007). According to Li (2007), these justifications are premised on the “undesirability of vulgarized cultural practices or extenuating circumstances when the public

good is being threatened” (p. 43). Grounding justifications within this framework allow for the explicit and direct expression of cultural racism and its racial discourses. Put simply, the explicit expression of racial discourses can exist provided they are discursively paired with a convincing and properly furnished rational and justification. It is on this point that I turn to the concept of securitization.

Securitization

Jackson (2013) establishes the concept of securitization within official discourses of national security that are used to justify and legitimate the security regime. In the liberal state’s attempt to maintain an idealized image of security in a post 9/11 context, the process of securitization is also a process of depoliticisation, whereby security threats, and security more broadly, are stripped of “any political dynamic in the[ir] official presentation[s]” (Jackson, 2013: 147). The liberal state engages in the process of framing security and its necessity as if we are in the “face of unfamiliar and unprecedented terrorist threats” (p. 149). Securitization narratives work to assert the contrast between ‘old’ and ‘new’ terrorist threats, whereby pre-9/11 terrorists were characterized as being motivated along political, ‘legitimate’ avenues, therefore rendering them as “manageable through conventional methods” (Jackson, 2013: 151). Meanwhile, the ‘new’ post 9/11 terrorist is characterized as a ‘never-before-seen’ threat, motivated by extremist ideology and religious fundamentalism. Securitization as a process of depoliticisation is realized through the culturalisation of the contemporary security threat where the modern terrorist is an intolerant and irrational fanatic “driven by culture and religion”, thereby marking them as different from ‘us’ (Jackson, 2013: 152). It is on this point that we can observe the racial discourses of cultural racism at play with practices of securitization. As such, projects of national

security are also projects of civilization that work to construct the ideal citizen-subject and suppress resistance to the new social order (Jackson, 2013).

By erasing the political context, the culturalisation of the terrorist threat constructs the security problem as being between the civilized and the uncivilized/barbaric, requiring the security regime to enter “uncharted territories” that “necessitate[e] new measures previously uncalled for” (Jackson, 2013: 158). Put differently, “removing any formal consideration of a political response to terrorism from the security agenda [...] justifies the use of the most extreme violence to oppose a threat that is both incapable of being tolerated and unable to be confronted politically” (Jackson, 2013: 153). Neocleous (2009) reveals the ways in which the logics of exclusion are embedded within securitization narratives; constructing the terrorist as a threat to “our way of life”, “our values”, and “our culture” more broadly, justifies a war with the excluded enemy abroad, as well as within. In this sense, declaring something as a security threat is to also declare it as a threat to the social fabric and purity of Western civilization. Similarly, Razack (2008) contends that race thinking - the “denial of a common bond of humanity between people of European descent and those who are not” - becomes embedded into processes of securitization, thereby rendering these processes as racial projects wherein a particular kind of (White) nation-state and national subject comes to being. Annexed into processes of securitization, race thinking permits for the suspension of rights to appear as law itself rather than violence. Put differently, “violence against racialized ‘Others’ comes to be understood as necessary in order for civilization to flourish [and for] the state to preserve itself” (Razack, 2008). Therefore, in the presence of ‘insecure territories’, violent practices of “extensive penal control” and active exclusion of people from the land are justified (Neocleous, 2011: 202).

The concept of securitization primarily allowed me to understand how the discourse of Bill C-24 and C-51 framed both external and internal security threats (re terrorists in the ‘War on Terror’) through the inherent use of race thinking (Razack, 2008). This understanding allowed me to mobilize the concept of securitization not only in its traditional sense as a discursive process of framing security threats, but also by acknowledging its epistemological roots in the racial projects and colonial modernity that are central to nation building (Moffette & Vadasaria, 2016). Furthermore, this concept was also useful in order to theorize the rhetoric used to justify the increased security regime of the state. It allowed me to examine the mobilization of national security discourse in framing which citizens need to be surveilled, controlled, managed, and ultimately excluded from the nation and from the rule of law; a “targeting [that is] heavily mediated by sets of assumptions about race and class (Neocleous & Rigokas 2011: 45; 46).

Conclusion

To conclude, mobilizing these concepts together allows me to engage with securitization literature in conjunction with concepts epistemologically rooted in critical race theory. I therefore am able to explore the close relationship between race, colonialism, and securitization within formations of citizen inclusion and exclusion (Moffette and Vadasaria, 2016). My theoretical framework positions me to understand and observe both historical and contemporary distinctions between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority; a relegation which facilitates the exaltation of the Canadian nation and its Western subjects from foreign ‘Others’ (Said, 1979, Thobani, 2007). These distinctions are not only found between the nation and its outsiders, but also in relation to the ‘Others within’. Drawing on Hage’s (2000) concept of *Internal Orientalism* allows me to understand the construction of idealized citizens and immigrants as

those who accumulate elements of ‘Whiteness’ within ‘the game’ so as not to threaten the interests of the White National Fantasy.

Given that racism is no longer acceptable in its biological forms (Agnew, 2007; Goldberg, 1990), the literature on cultural racism is necessary in order to observe the encoded concepts that uphold these constructions (Li, 2007). The classification of non-white, racialized cultures as culturally incompatible and too different to integrate into Western civilization (Agnew, 2007) mirror the Orientalist tropes which comprise the clash of civilizations (Razack, 2005; Thobani, 2007). The logic of the clash of civilizations cast the racialized uncivilized ‘them’ as an inherent threat to the Canadian nation that can only be dealt with through the force of war. This heightened form of cultural racism provides the necessary justifications for the expansive securitization of the state and for the measures put in place to exclude ‘them’ from the nation (Jackson, 2013; Razack, 2005; 2008). Together, these concepts allow me to examine the mobilization of national security discourse in framing which racialized second-class citizens need to be surveilled, controlled, managed, and ultimately excluded from the nation (Neocleous & Rigokas 2011).

Chapter III: Methodological Approach

The following chapter outlines the methodological approach adopted to collect and analyse my data. The main research goal of my thesis is to examine how racial discourses surrounding Bill C-24- *Strengthening the Canadian Citizenship Act* and Bill C-51 – *The Anti-Terrorism Act* conceal and reinforce citizen inclusion and exclusion through the language of national security. Using a mixed methods approach of qualitative content analysis and critical discourse analysis, I analysed the House of Commons debates of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 in order to explore the following specific research goals: (1) the production of citizenship, the national-

self and the foreign Other/Orient; (2) the process of inclusion and exclusion to create the second-class citizen; (3) racial discourses that emerge in the bills that relate to the “War on Terror”; and finally, (4) the relationship between citizenship and national security threats.

The Research Design: A Mixed Methods Approach to Content and Critical Discourse Analysis

I began my research with the intention of conducting a critical discourse analysis of my materials. Critical discourse analysis is a methodological approach that is extensively used to study legislative bills and their surrounding discourses (Kamp, 2010; Jackson, 2005; 2007; Ozguc, 2011; Wilton, 2010). Martinez (2007) describes critical discourse analysis as a tool to examine the production of social reality, power relations, and ideological controls that manifest within language (p. 125). Moreover, a main objective of critical discourse analysis is to investigate the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions (Wodak, 2001; Martinez, 2007: 127). In this sense, ideology is both a device that establishes and maintains unequal power relations (Wodak, 2001) and is a tool used to challenge notions of hierarchal social structures (Martinez, 2007). Through critical discourse analysis, researchers are able to determine how language produces meaning; a tool that was particularly relevant for me to determine how language is used to produce certain conceptions of citizenship, second-class citizens and national security threats, which contributes to the production, reproduction and transformation of social relations present in society (Van den Hoonaard, 2012). Jackson (2005) stipulates that language moulds how we see the world; it determines our perceptions and provides us access to a concrete reality. The reality-making effect of language affects political actions. Therefore, the discourses circulated regarding citizenship and national security threats are not without consequence to social processes and structures. For example, the strategically planned and deliberate speeches of politicians attempt to “shape public perception of the world

and the types of people in it” (Jackson, 2005: 21). Another objective of critical discourse analysis is to demystify discourses by deciphering ideologies. Through mobilizing critical discourse analysis and its critical lens, I was able to determine, reveal, contest, and challenge the notions of Canadian citizenship and national security, and reveal the ways in which these productions are “contingent, relational, and political constructions that are (re)produced by dominant discourses” (Ozguc, 2011: 39).

While critical discourse analysis was a fitting approach for my research project, upon collecting my data I discovered that it was unfeasible for me to conduct such an analysis in its entirety, given the breadth of data and in consideration of time restraints. To complete all the elements necessary for a genuine critical discourse analysis was simply beyond the scope of a Master’s thesis. Furthermore, one of the main challenges of conducting critical discourse analysis is the lack of a core method for employing it (Van Dijk, 2015; Wilton, 2010). Resultingly, proponents of critical discourse analysis stipulate that the “procedures of critical discourse analysis may be seen as a multi-staged content analysis” in that the techniques of content analysis are commonly used within the framework of this approach (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak & Vetter, 2000: 66). However, as a researcher, it was still important for me to carry out the objectives of critical discourse analysis. For these reasons, I developed a mixed methods approach where I also relied on qualitative content analysis - in addition to techniques of critical discourse analysis – in order to address time constraints and to organize and manage my data so that I could adequately answer my research question⁷.

Qualitative content analysis a method of “categorizing qualitative textual data into clusters of similar entities, or conceptual categories, to identify consistent patterns and

⁷ I discuss my step-by-step method approach in my *Data Analysis* section below.

relationships [across overarching] [...] themes” (Given, 2008: 120). An advantage to this approach is that it allows researchers to condense large volumes of data, make sense of them, and ultimately derive meaning from artifacts of social communication (Berg, 2004; Elo & Kyngas 2008; Given, 2008). Moreover, qualitative content analysis is useful to identify not only manifest content, - that is the explicit or surface meaning of texts- but also latent content, which examines the underlying ideas, assumptions, and ideologies that shape and inform manifest content (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Consequently, this method was particularly useful for me to address my research goals: the production of citizenship, the national-self, the foreign Other/Orient, and second-class citizenry that emerged within political discourses.

Data Sampling and Collection

Political discourses can be primarily found in parliamentary debates. Proposed laws in the form of bills are tabled at the House of Commons or the Senate, and are debated in 3 stages at each respective chamber before receiving royal assent and becoming law. During the parliamentary debates, the members of parliament and the members of the Senate will study bills through committee meetings, where witnesses can be invited to provide expert testimony pertaining to the bill at hand. While political discourses surrounding Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 can be found at all these levels of parliament, my analysis focuses solely on one form of political performance; that is, the debates that took place in the House of Commons. Through purposive sampling, which selects information-rich cases for in-depth analysis wherein “the phenomena of interest in the research are likely to appear” (Curtis, Gesler, Smith, & Washburn, 2000: 1003), I deemed that the selection of these debates was appropriate given that both Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 originated from the House of Commons. Qualitative researchers commonly rely on analytical saturation to determine whether they have collected enough data (Wood & Kroger, 2000).

Analytical saturation within content analysis occurs when the researcher obtains no new categories, properties, or relationships among them. Furthermore, Wood and Kroger (2000) state that the notion of saturation in discourse analysis does not necessarily mean “that one stops finding anything new with further cases, but that the analysis of the cases considered to date has been thorough” (p. 81). As such, utilizing both notions of saturation, I judged that there was sufficient data to make interesting, well-supported and well-grounded arguments as the patterns of the discourse quickly emerged during my preliminary readings of the data (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Similarly, it was important for me not to be overly ambitious; faced with too much data, I ran the risk of failing to do a close and careful analysis (Wood & Kroger, 2000). For this reason, I decided to exclude the committee meetings and the Senate debates from my sample⁸.

Nonetheless, the House of Commons debates remain a representative sample to capture the political discourses of these bills as its proceedings were heavily reported in the media and were also filmed for the public to watch and follow. Given (2008) states that CDA “concerns itself with the role of cognition in maintaining oppressive social practices and reproducing ideologies” (p. 146). As such, the discourses within these debates and the beliefs and norms it produced were largely disseminated within public discourses, thereby demonstrating the power of the elites - and its implications in - shaping public opinion and producing and maintaining discriminatory ideologies (Given, 2008). I analysed the 372-page document and the 509-page document of the Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 House of Commons debates respectively. The texts of the debates were retrieved from the Parliament of Canada website, and copies were stored

⁸ The conclusions, recommendations, and official positions of political parties that derive from committee meetings are reported back to the House of Commons. Therefore, even though the committee meetings were excluded from my sample, the discourses of these meetings were, to an extent, captured within the House of Commons debates. Moreover, although analytical saturation was reached within my sample, the discourse of the Senate debates could be an objective of a future research project.

electronically and printed for coding. The debates of Bill C-24 took place from of May 2014 to June 2014 and received royal assent on the 19th of June 2014. The debates of Bill C-51 took place from February 2015 to May 2015 and received royal assent on the 18th of June 2015.

The discourses of the bills I examined were limited to texts, as I analysed the transcripts of the debates⁹. The body of texts I analysed consist of interwoven layers of language (Jackson, 2005)¹⁰. The first layer of language refers to the official speeches given at the debates, which served to inform policies and legislative action (Jackson, 2005). Meanwhile, the second layer of language involves legislative bills. This layer flows directly from the first, whereby the “articulation of broad policy goals and intentions result in the passing of new laws, policy documents, and national strategy statements” (Jackson, 2005: 17). Given this, I was able to analyse the core principles, assumptions and knowledge that were used to inform and solidify the passing of the citizenship and anti-terrorism laws; an avenue through which I could observe the reality-making effect of language (Jackson, 2005). By studying the House of Commons debates, I was able to analyse the language of “those in power, who are responsible for the existence of inequalities and who also have the means and opportunity to improve conditions” (Wodak, 2001: 10). The discourses of the debates provide an avenue to observe the political discursive constructions of inequalities, and the justifications provided for the unequal distinctions between the national-self and the foreign, threatening ‘Other’.

⁹ Hodgson (2000) draws our attention to the various arrays of material that contribute to discourses that are much broader than just language. Discursive practices also contribute to the discourses, which include the symbols politicians appropriate, such as flags, colours, and dress codes. Discourses are “an amalgam of material practices and forms of language and knowledge where each reinforces the other in a continuous cycle” (Jackson, 2005: 19).

¹⁰ Jackson (2005) stipulates that discourses consist of an entire language that contains various components and layers to construct institutional practices and their accompanying assumptions, beliefs, and political and cultural narratives.

Data Analysis

I began my data analysis with a deductive approach to qualitative content analysis. A deductive approach to content analysis entails the operationalized creation of categories that are determined by the research question and the specific goals. The categories and the codes within them were created based on the knowledge I gathered from my literature review and theoretical framework in order to observe how racial discourses emerged across the data (Berg, 2004; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Elo & Kyngas, 2008). My codes were based on the latent content of the member of parliaments' speeches in order to capture the underlying meanings of the text. For example, the code "establishing Canada" was created and noted in the margins of my text when coming across statements such as:

We are blessed to live in a great country. In fact, it is the greatest country in the world. Canada is free, prosperous, open and tolerant. Canadians can succeed or fail based on their own merit, believe what they wish, travel as they wish and worship as they wish. However, some wish to take all that away from us (Bill C-51 - Kellie Leitch, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 212-3).

Furthermore, the code "(dis)loyalty" was created and noted for statements such as:

"People are citizens if they do not commit these crimes; if they commit the crimes, they are no longer citizens. That is the difference. There are not two classes of citizenship. We would not have citizens who have other nationalities in circumstances where these very grave acts of disloyalty to Canada are committed (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 257),

and so forth. Following the coding of my data, I re-organized my categories into two overall themes that were present across the discourses of the bills: the construction of the Canadian nation (re national self) and citizenship (re ideal citizen), and the construction of the threat (re terrorist 'Other'). While qualitative content analysis gives researchers rigorous tools to sort, categorize and code data in a systematic way, the method fails to provide a means through which researchers can articulate and analyse the themes found in the data. To address these

shortcomings, I borrowed tools from critical discourse analysis to make sense of and derive arguments from the themes that emerged in my research.

The methodological approach to critical discourse analysis permits the translation of theoretical claims into instruments and methods of analysis (Wodak, 2001). The analysis of my data is deeply rooted in the theoretical claims of the concept of cultural racism¹¹. It was particularly important for me to analyse the ways in which racism is now covertly expressed within encoded concepts, hidden subtexts and coherent syntax (Li, 2007). As Li (2007) stipulates, discourses that are encoded are also readably able to be decoded given the right tools to observe and deconstruct normative structures and linguistic cues that have come to represent race and racial differences. As such, borrowing from Jackson (2005: 25), the following questions were used to guide me through my analysis (for which I tailored to my own unique research question):

1. What assumptions, beliefs and values underline the language in the text, and how stable or internally consistent are the constructions and messages across political parties?
2. What patterns can be observed in the language? For instance, I considered the histories and embedded meanings of the words used in the text, and how various linguistic cues, syntax, and sentence construction reinforced the meanings and effects of the constructions.
3. How does language create, reinforce or challenge power relations in society? For example, I considered the knowledge and practices that were normalised by the text, as well as the political power functions of the discursive constructions.

These guiding questions allowed me to uncover the meanings, histories, myths, and narratives used by the various political parties to construct the national-self, ideal citizen, and

¹¹ As described in my theoretical context chapter, cultural racism refers to processes of racialization that demarcate racialized, non-white groups as being 'culturally incompatible' with the West. The covert articulations of cultural racism are achieved through encoded, camouflaged concepts that have over time come to signify race and racial differences (Agnew, 2007; Li, 2007).

terrorist ‘Other’. Aligned with Said’s (1979) work on Orientalism, and Razack’s (2005) clash of civilizations framework, I also observed the underlying binary function of language which reveals how almost “every noun, adjective and verb has its direct opposite” (Jackson, 2005: 21). Examining the basic binary function of language invites us to consider how “language can never truly be a neutral act” (Jackson, 2005: 21), thereby offering us a window to decipher the Orientalist narratives embedded within the discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51. To do this, I also noted two linguistic concepts (Wodak, 2001) that are of particular importance to my research. This included the actors (i.e.: the political party articulating the text) as well as their argumentations (the kind, form, and argumentation strategies that were used to justify political inclusion or exclusion). This allowed me to uncover the common threads and points of contention both within and between political parties. Moreover, this also allowed me to analyse the linguistic means that were used to stabilize and intensify inequalities (Wodak, 2001); first between citizens and the threatening ‘Other’ outside the nation, followed by inequalities between first and second-class citizens within the nation.

Furthermore, research conducted through critical discourse analysis should pursue emancipatory objectives (Wodak, 2001) and offer alternative discourses to the ones it has demystified (Jackson, 2005). I had anticipated that my data would provide alternative discourses, particularly from the speeches of the opposing parties who were against the bills. However, the discourses that emerged within the debates were disproportionately entrenched in discourses of Whiteness and Othering. True or pure alternative discourses were unfortunately rare occurrences throughout the debates. As such, the alternative discourses that did emerge in the data were the exceptions, rather than well-established patterns across the data. However, this is not surprising. As Jackson (2005) states, “a hegemonic political discourse is one where the debate uses

language, terms, ideas and knowledge of the dominant discourse, and where alternative words or meanings are rarely found and dissenting voices are almost never heard” (p. 19). Despite the lack of alternative discourses presented in this thesis, my thesis inadvertently offers emancipatory effects through decoding and demystifying the narratives perpetuated within the discourse; it uncovers the mechanisms of racial and political power used to draw parameters of difference between deserving and undeserving subjects.

Finally, van Dijk (2001) argues that discourse is used as a means for speakers and writers to exercise power. According to him, this exercise of power can be analysed through a variety of linguistic markers, including but not limited to, word order, lexical style, disclaimers and syntactic structures. Throughout my analysis, I consider the implicit meanings hidden in insinuations, vagueness, omissions and polarizations (van Dijk, 2001), the order of arguments (i.e.: whether it was an opening or closing remark), and the number of times common phrases were used; all in attempts to conceive of the politics of power at play within the debates. Additionally, I consider both what is included in the speeches, as well as what was left unsaid – both important elements in understanding the specific discourses (Jackson, 2005). Therefore, I also pay attention to the silences of the texts (i.e.: what van Dijk conceptualizes as omissions), as they provide just as much information into discursive constructions as that which is derived from what is said (Rosenberg, 2003). Jackson (2005) argues that “in no way can we assume that the words of these ranking officials are unconscious, accidental or unplanned” (p. 27). To this end, the discourses that emerge in the House of Commons debates are not natural discourses, but rather orchestrated ones, whereby specific narratives that are intended to reach and convince public perception are created. As such, it is important to consider the preparation of arguments for the debates, the experts the members of parliament chose to use to support their arguments,

and the discursive repetitions that were mobilized throughout the debates, as these are all deliberate strategies to construct a specific narrative rooted in ideologies of exalted national subjects and foreign threatening ‘Others’. While the debates of Bill C-24 took place a year before the debates of Bill C-51, I argue that its discourses set the foundation and shaped the debates and the discourses of Bill C-51. As I will show in the following analysis chapters, the narratives and discourses in both bills rest on the same logic to fulfil the national project of Canada.

Limitations

Qualitative research, and critical discourse analysis in particular, receive many accusations of being biased towards the readings and interpretations of texts (Elo & Kyngas 2008; Van Dijk, 2015; Wodak, 2001). In this regard, my discovering of being considered a second-class citizen under Bill C-24 is what initially sparked my interest to conduct this research. As a daughter of a father born in St-Vincent and a potential dual citizenship holder, my citizenship was threatened, made conditional, and cast as a lesser value compared to first-class, single Canadian citizenship holders. My discovering of the revocation provisions under Bill C-24 lead me to internalize, for the first time, the extent to which racialized minorities are devalued. Despite having been born in Canada, and having lived here my entire life, these provisions communicated to me that I was somehow “less Canadian” and less deserving of secure citizenship; if I were to commit a terrorist offence, I would potentially face expulsion from the nation. However, my half-sister, whose father is also Canadian born, would not face the same punishment. Although to a lesser degree as compared to others, my Canadian identity and national belonging have been undermined within these political discourses. As such, to a certain extent, I have a personal attachment to my research. Despite this, my findings are deeply rooted and supported within an extensive array of literature and theoretical contributions that have

undertaken similar research objectives, thereby demonstrating the consistency across discourses and language of citizenship and national security.

A second important consideration for my research is to acknowledge that the House of Commons debates and legislative bills only provide a window into the discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51. My findings are restricted in the sense that they can only speak to a portion of the texts that make up the discourse surrounding these bills. An array of other texts, such as the media, newspaper articles, verbal speeches, etc. also contribute to the discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51. Moreover, given that I did not observe the debates in real-time in the House of Commons, several important discursive practices (Hodgson, 2000) such as non-verbal communications, spatial objects, and symbols that were present during the debates were lost in the transcription of the text. However, because the first and second layer of language establish the core assumptions and narratives that inform discursive practices (Jackson, 2005), the House of Commons debates and legal texts provide a valid means through which we can observe the foundations of the discourse.

Finally, while my original objective of conducting a complete critical discourse analysis of the texts was hindered due to time restrictions, the analytical insights I was able to gain from a partial critical discourse analysis are demonstrative of the efficiency of the method. The narratives and the discursive techniques used to produce them that were revealed in the data shed light into the ways discourse structures legitimize, (re)produce, and challenge power relations. As such, critical discourse analysis of parliamentary bills remains a viable and insightful approach to research for those with enough time. My findings are presented thematically; the divisions of chapters are based on the primary themes and narratives that I observed in the official texts.

Chapter IV - Establishing Canada and Canadian Citizenship: Exalting the Canadian White National

This chapter explores how the discourses found within the debates of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 produced and reinforced existing narratives of the Canadian nation; namely, the narratives of Canada as an exalted and multicultural Western nation, and the interests of the ideal white nation and ideal citizen. In section 1 of this chapter, I explore the construction of the ideal, fantasized nation that rests on the narratives of Canada as an exalted Western nation (Hage, 2000; Thobani, 2007). This narrative was maintained via three main discursive strategies: first through the essentialization of Canadian identity¹², second through the erasure of Canada's colonial history, and finally, through the creation of the national imaginary of Canada as being a historically "welcoming" nation. These discursive strategies were mobilized in order to position the nation as superior, while simultaneously preserving its Whiteness.

Section 2 of this chapter explores the contradictions within the constructions of the ideal, fantasized nation (Hage, 2000). My findings reveal that this construction of the ideal nation is established through a false guise of inclusivity. In reality, the presentation of Canada as a welcoming, inclusive and multicultural nation is merely superficial, and is ruptured by imaginations of the desired 'how-it-use-to-be' nation (as presented by the Liberal and New Democratic parties), and the security regime of the 'War on Terror' (as presented by the Conservative government). Utilizing Mackey's (2002) theoretical contributions about the limits

¹² Sociological essentialism refers to the belief that a group holds innate, universal and a set of fixed qualities that defines all its members (Agnew, 2007). Likewise, cultural essentialism refers to "discourses and practices which label and relate to particular groups of people in ways which suppress difference and homogenise and fix them [...]" (Sayer, 1997: 454). It is an outlook that "assumes that the experience of being a member of the group under discussion is a stable one, one with a clear meaning, a meaning constant through time, space, and different historical, social, political and personal contexts" (Grillo, 1995: 19). I use the term essentialism to describe the taken-for-granted Canadian identity that is described within the discourse as it is used as a strategic doctrine to justify the exalted position of the nation, and subsequently aids in the achievement of colonialist and imperialist projects.

of multiculturalism, I argue that the guise of inclusivity reveals how the “power to define, limit and tolerate differences still lies in the hands of the dominant group” (Mackey, 2002: 70). As such, this section attempts to demonstrate how narratives of inclusion into the nation are saturated with both implicit and explicit measures of exclusion; measures which are inherently constructed along racial lines to buttress the White national project.

This leads me to my final section, which explores the construction of the ideal citizen who is to be included and accepted in the nation. By default then, the ideal citizen is also constructed through the imagined ‘Other’, who is to be excluded from the nation. In order to construct the ideal citizen, and subsequently the excluded ‘Other’, the discourse utilized various markers of deservingness (and undeservingness) within implicit racial undertones that are unconcealed remnants of the nation’s colonial legacy. In particular, my findings reveal how the state’s vested interests in preserving the Whiteness of the nation are found within the mandated elements of Whiteness that new citizens are required to accumulate and assimilate to in order to be regarded as deserving of citizenship and acceptance into the nation.

The findings explored in section 3 of this chapter present an added layer of complexity to Hage’s theorization of the accumulation of national capital (re ‘the game’). Hage’s theory stipulates that in order to be included and accepted in the nation, one must participate in the game of acquiring national capital in the form of linguistic, physical and cultural dispositions. By playing the game, accumulated national capital can then be converted into claims to national belonging. While he theorized ‘the game’ via practical, day-to-day interactions, my analysis demonstrates how the state first creates the game through citizenship legislation, and subsequently requires newcomers to play ‘the game’ if they wish to acquire legal citizenship and true belonging to the nation. As such, the discourse of Bill C-24 provides a space to observe the

state's expectations of integration, such as attachment and knowledge about the history, geography and the two official languages of Canada, and expressions of loyalty that racialized immigrants/ aspiring citizens must accumulate in order to be accepted into the nation. These levels were not only measured by one's ability to assimilate to these elements of Whiteness (re the exalted 'Canadian way of life'), but also through the abandonment of the 'ways of the Orient', which are constructed as inherently lawless and therefore deemed as a threat needed to be excluded from the nation.

4.1 Producing the Narrative of the Canadian Nation: The Superior and Multicultural Nation

The discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 produced and reinforced existing narratives of the Canadian nation; namely, its position as a superior, exalted Western nation as well as its mythology of multiculturalism. In the following section, I outline how these narratives were maintained via three main discursive strategies: firstly, through the discussion of an essentialized Canadian identity, secondly, through the erasure of Canada's colonial history, and finally, through the creation of the national imaginary of Canada being a historically "welcoming" nation. Borrowing the theoretical insights of Thobani (2007), I consider these discursive strategies to be mechanisms of exaltation whereby Canada can position itself as a superior Western nation, while simultaneously preserving its Whiteness. The exaltation of the nation is needed to produce the ideal White national fantasy; a production that rests on the perpetuation of cultural racism for the nation to come to fruition. As I will demonstrate, through the use of encoded concepts that imply Whiteness throughout the debates, the narratives and mythology of the Canadian nation as a superior, welcoming multicultural nation are sustained.

The discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 crystalized an essentialized idea of what it means to be Canadian. Such taken-for-granted references to the Canadian identity is a discursive

technique used to maintain the White colonial project of Canada: it is by failing to explicitly define what it means to be “Canadian” that the Whiteness of Canada is implied. Cultural racism - a racism that has moved away from traditional concepts of biological difference towards an emphasis on racialized cultural differences as described earlier - saturates this discourse via the use of encoded concepts that are used to allude to the Whiteness of Canada (Agnew, 2007) and to link race with nationhood and nationalism (Gilroy, 1990; Nagra, 2017). For example, the essentialized Canadian identity is presented in the following statement from Conservative member Wai Young:

One important responsibility for anyone who wishes to acquire Canadian citizenship is to **understand who Canadians are as a people, where we come from, and what values define us.** To help ensure that **new citizens share a common understanding of Canada's history, traditions, and institutions,** the government introduced a new citizenship study guide in 2009 called, “Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship” (Bill C-24- Wai Young, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 279).

As exemplified by the use of the phrase “who Canadians are as people, where we come from, and what values define us”, embracing the history, traditions, and institutions of Canada are important steps for new citizens to come to be included in the nation. While references to Canadian values, history and tradition are commonly used throughout the debates, they are never explicitly defined or explained. Failing to explicitly define said concepts subsequently alludes to Canada’s white national identity and masks the racism that comprises the nation. For example, the encoded concept of “tradition” highlights the notion of Canada’s national identity as a “European tradition of white Canada, which is seen as being undermined by non-traditional immigrants” coming from non-European (re non-white) countries (Li, 2007: 44). As such, while race is not explicitly articulated, the term “tradition” reveals the racial implications of the discourse (Li, 2007); it outlines that newcomers are to learn the traditions of Canada in order to

preserve the White national identity. Implicit references such as this one permit the articulation of racial discourses to go unquestioned and camouflaged; the multicultural image of Canada is able to retain itself, while simultaneously placing White Canadian-ness at the top of the hierarchy of preferred races (Thobani, 2007; Mackey, 2002). As such, for immigrants to be accepted into the nation, they must adhere to values that are rooted in Canada's colonial legacy, so as to not erode Canada's traditional values as a settler colonial state.

Such an assertion was further reinforced within the discourse by outlining that potential new citizens are to study, learn, follow, and embody the teachings of the *Discover Canada* citizenship guidebook in order to personify the essence of the Canadian national identity. In other words, this guidebook serves as their key to the "knowledge of our country Canada" - a guidebook which is known for its maintenance of the colonial ideology (Jafri, 2012). In her arguments to support the increased knowledge test requirements in order to "meet the standards required for a modern, first-class country", Wai Young continues her speech by stating that

To pass the test, prospective citizens need to have **knowledge of our country**, which better prepares them to assume the **obligations and responsibilities of being Canadian** citizens and **to join Canadians in celebrating what it means to be Canadian**. Without this foundational knowledge, citizenship becomes meaningless [...] After all, it is this knowledge of who we are and the shared celebration of it that **make us the great nation that we are** (Bill C-24- Wai Young, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 280).

As such, the knowledge of 'our' history, traditions, and institutions that immigrants are to learn and understand are rooted in the ongoing White colonial project of Canada, in which the inclusion of immigrants into 'our great nation' is predicated on their abilities to assume and adhere to 'Canadian values' and the "obligations and responsibilities" that maintain the interests of the White settler-colonial state.

Not only does the guidebook – which serves as the key to the "knowledge of our country" that new citizens are to acquire – preserve the Whiteness of the ideal nation, but the discourse

also erased the colonial history of the nation. The erasure of colonial violence and racism is a necessary strategy for Canada to exalt its nationals and maintain the superiority of its citizenship and its ‘great nation’. This was achieved through exclamations of returning to a past welcoming Canada that were expressed in the counter-arguments of the opposing parties. In her opening remarks for her opposition to the bill where she recounts her experiences hosting events to welcome newcomers to Canada, Hélène LeBlanc of the New Democratic Party (NDP) stated:

I would like to thank them [new citizens at the citizenship ceremony] from the bottom of my heart for helping me to appreciate once again how fortunate and privileged we are to live in Canada, **a country that throughout its history has welcomed newcomers with open arms**. [...] Year after year, my riding welcomes newcomers and refugees who come to Canada because of its highly **democratic values and its tradition of welcoming people** from every country in the world. However, **the bill now before us would slam the door in their faces**. Since Conservatives came to power, it has become increasingly difficult for people to come to this country (Bill C-24- Hélène LeBlanc, New Democratic Party, June 6th 2014, p. 208-9).

Similarly, Robert Aubin of the New Democratic Party stated:

Canada is a land of immigrants. The **founding peoples built a welcoming country** where everyone **can feel free to settle and contribute to the nation's prosperity while living our shared values**. We are all, to varying degrees, immigrants [...] Canadian immigration laws are therefore **an important part of our identity and even of our uniqueness as a country** (Bill C-24- Robert Aubin, New Democratic Party, May 28th 2014, p. 304).

The narrative of a “welcoming Canada” which “throughout its history has welcomed newcomers with open arms” discursively reinforces the exalted Canadian nation. The historical violence and racial exclusionary mechanisms of the nation are erased in order to render the national space as superior (Thobani, 2007). These narratives of a “welcoming Canada” are necessary and needed to produce and maintain the narrative of “Canada the good” by way of “obscuring histories of violence” (Howell, 2005: 49). Specifically referencing here “the founding peoples [whom have] built a welcoming country” effectively erases how this “welcoming” country came to be built: through the genocide of Indigenous communities and oppression of racialized minority

communities such as Chinese Canadians. Moreover, while the narrative of the country's "tradition of welcoming people from every country in the world" works to erase the colonial violence that "marks the origin of the national subject [...]" (Thobani, 2007: 9), it simultaneously inserts the global narrative and self-presentation of Canada as a multicultural western nation.

The mythology of Canada as a multicultural nation simultaneously operated alongside discourses of tolerance. As demonstrated in the following examples, the national imagery of "Canada the good" was mobilized to exalt the nation and position the power of the dominant culture:

They must not forget that **Canada is a land of hope for the entire world** because our society is based on the **values of love, tolerance and openness**, which we cherish. [...] They must not forget that **voting for this bill means renouncing everything that makes us a people of love, tolerance and openness, everything that makes us Canadian** (Bill C-51; Sadia Groguhé, New Democratic Party, May 4th 2015, p. 206).

I would therefore put the question directly to the members to this place. Is there any reason, let alone a compelling one, to make it more difficult for law-abiding applicants to achieve citizenship? Is it the case that we have decided that **diversity no longer represents a societal virtue and Canadian value**? Is it the case that **multiculturalism** is no longer a constitutional norm? (Bill C-24; Irwin Cotler, Liberal Party, June 6th 2014, p. 206).

If we do not value and hold our citizenship dear to us, how then can we maintain our value to others around the world? After all, **Canada has always stood for freedom, equality, and respect for the rule of law** built around a **model of compassion, care, and the great strength of our diversity** (Bill C-24 - Wai Young, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 279).

Imagining Canada as a 'land of hope for the entire world' through imagery and rhetoric of love, tolerance, openness, freedom, equality, and diversity perpetuates the narrative of Canada's tolerance to create the national identity (Mackay, 2002). Interestingly, although in opposition to both bills, the NDP and Liberal Party's counter-arguments also engage in creating narratives of Canadian national identity, in which 'values' such as tolerance, diversity, and multiculturalism are underscored to comprise the nation.

Additionally, the discursive prosody¹³ of the use of the word “virtue” exalts Canada by asserting these values as being rooted in the intrinsic moral worthiness of Canadian nationals (Thobani, 2007). The connotation of such a term brings forth the notion of a moral compass; a “virtue” represents a quality considered morally good or desired by a person. Therefore, the Canadian nation is exalted to a position of moral betterment compared to its ‘Other’ counterpart. Mackay (2002) contends that “this story of Canada’s tolerant nationhood has often been framed in terms of its policy and mythology of ‘multiculturalism’, a policy defined in official government ideology as ‘fundamental characteristic of Canadian heritage and identity’” (p. 2). Given that the multicultural nation can claim to be tolerant of difference and diversity, this allows for the nation to erase its racist history as “it [can now] recast itself as uniquely committed to pluralism and exalt its basic goodness” (Thobani, 2007: 54).

For example, the use of the word ‘diversity’ has commonly been used to “refer [...] to non-white immigrants and to the substantial differences they are deemed to have brought to Canada” (Li, 2007: 44). In a similar vein, the term “openness” works to position the dominant culture as the masters of the national space. In other words, the power rests in their hands to determine the differences that are tolerable to the nation and the degree of diversity they are willing to be ‘open’ to (Hage, 2000). As such, these “seemingly neutral terms” that have been said to reflect and exist within positive liberal notions in fact contribute to Canada’s tolerance narrative; they connote that only those with an acceptable threshold of difference, of which the masters of national space can tolerate, are to be included in the nation’s fabric (Hage, 2000; Li, 2007; Mackay, 2002).

¹³ Baker and Ellece (2011) define a discursive prosody as the way in which neutral words (and texts) acquire positive or negative connotations from emotionally charged words that they are collocated with (as cited in Winter & Previsic, 2017).

To summarize this section, the discourse of bills reinforced the narratives of the superior Western nation of Canada and its mythology of being a multicultural nation. The political parties engaged with three main mechanisms of exaltation to sustain these narratives: first through the creation of a taken-for-granted Canadian identity, secondly through the erasure of colonialism, and finally through the myth of being a welcoming and tolerant nation. The exaltation of the nation was made possible through the use of encoded concepts throughout the debates, which perpetuated the cultural racism needed to maintain the ideal white national fantasy. As such, “cultural racism constructs and defends a national culture, homogenous in its Whiteness” that is constantly under threat from outsiders (Nagra, 2017: 17), thereby justifying political ideologies of those deserving of inclusion or exclusion from the nation’s fabric.

4.2 Exclusions of the White Nation: The Guise of Inclusivity and the Limits of Multiculturalism

Continuing with Hage’s theoretical insights on the fantasy of the ideal white nation, I observed that the discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 primarily constructed the ideal nation through what I call the guise of inclusivity. While, as discussed in section 1, multiculturalism is being used as a tool to exalt the nation and give power to its White nationals as masters of national space, I demonstrate in this section that the discourse contradicts the images of multiculturalism that the nation is putting forth. These contradictions exist under the guise of inclusivity, which refers to the ways in which discourses produce the image of the nation as being inclusive to migrants; however, these constructions are merely a myth, as inclusivity implicitly or explicitly relies on exclusionary measures. This was primarily observed within the debated positions regarding the desired ‘how-it-used-to-be’ nations. Specifically, the Liberal and New Democratic Party formulated the image of the desired nation as inherently multicultural, welcoming, and tolerant. While at first glance the rhetoric presented by the opposing parties

seems to be inclusive, upon further examination exclusionary measures are implicitly found, whereby the inclusion of migrants is inherently predicated on the level of ‘goodness’ one possesses. Meanwhile, the Conservative Party made exclamations of the importance of returning to a past nation with stronger security regimes, insinuating that Canada has, over the years, become ‘too welcoming’. As such, the guise of inclusivity is ruptured as securing the borders through the exclusion of migrants is reinforced in the discourse. However, despite this rupture, the Canadian nation as an exalted entity is preserved through the creation of an image of solidarity with the superior Western ‘superpower’, as well as through juxtaposing the fear of ‘too many’ to the threatening Orient, whose position is subordinate to that of the exalted national subject.

The desired ‘how-it-used-to-be’ nation (Hage, 2000) presented by the Liberal and New Democratic Party was constructed using the mythological narrative of a multicultural nation and tolerant national identity. In his criticism of the bill, Irwin Cotler of the Liberal Party stated:

“Indeed, approaching immigration and integration in such a derisive and discriminatory matter **is at odds with Canada's long history of being a welcoming and inclusive nation**” (Bill C-24- Irwin Cotler, Liberal Party, June 6th 2014, p. 204).

Positioning the new provisions under Bill C-24 as being at odds with Canada’s welcoming and inclusive nature crystalizes these characteristics into the mythology of Canadian identity (Thobani, 2007). However, in reality, the national home is formulated under the *guise* of an inclusive nation. As Mackey (2002) contends, both the discourse and the policy “defines and limits specific forms of support for multiculturalism [...]” (p. 65). Under this guise, the claimed nature of welcoming immigrants, newcomers, and new citizens into the nation has been “something lost [and] in need of being recovered” (Hage, 2000: 40):

It is my contention that Canadian governments, from John Diefenbaker to Paul Martin, have put the main focus on welcoming. The **primary task was to welcome people to Canada**, to welcome them to become landed immigrants and citizens and visitors. There

was some focus on the bad apples, but **the primary emphasis and priority was to welcome the large numbers of good people who wanted to come here.** All of that has changed under the current government. **There is very little welcome. It is almost all vigilance** (Bill C-24 - John McCallum, Liberal Party, February 27th 2014, p. 354-6).

The opposing parties constructed the Conservative party as being the “persons” responsible for this loss of the “Canadian welcoming nature”. The assertion of welcoming the “good people” engages in the linguistic boundary drawing of the nation, whereby the decision related to the degree of welcome-ness (re tolerance) extended to immigrants and newcomers, and by extension their deservingness of inclusion, is predicated on the degree of ‘goodness’ one possesses (Thobani, 2007; Razack, 2008). As such, cultural diversity and ‘multicultures’ are only tolerated and accepted on the condition that newcomers buttress Canada’s project of nation-building and contribute to sustaining the specific ‘way of life’ (re Whiteness) of the nation (Mackey, 2002).

The narrative of Canada in need of returning to its past state of security, both in terms of strengthening citizenship as well as its national security, also presented itself within the discourse, often in contrast to the multicultural “welcoming” narrative of the nation. While the Liberal and NDP parties cried out for a return to a mythological former state of welcoming-ness of immigrants, the Conservative Party expressed the desire to return to a “national space where there are not ‘too many’” (Hage, 2000: 39):

Under our current Citizenship Act, last amended under a Liberal government in a thorough-going way in 1977, **the door was open** to people who claimed residence in this country, **in relatively large numbers, but whose physical presence in the country** was never checked. That is **the kind of abuse Liberal governments left behind them**, decade after decade, and this government is moving to correct, because **Canadians attach importance to their citizenship.** They want **to see the rules followed [...]** (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 212).

The migrant is explicitly reinserted into the discourse as being responsible for the loss of virtues of the Canadian nation, as highlighted through the notion of “having our doors open” not only to good immigrants, but bad immigrants as well, due to lax citizenship and security regimes.

Additionally, the reference to the “relatively large numbers” of immigrants seeking to enter Canada emphasizes the image of threatening and undesirable bad immigrants permeating and flooding ‘our’ borders. Hage (2000) explains the category of ‘too many’ not only embodies forms of racist beliefs, but also primarily emphasizes the spatial management of the nation. The use of such a category reflects “the wish to preserve not only a ‘race’ [...] or a ‘culture’”, but also an imagined desired national space; most often “formulated as a wish to return to a former state of affairs, a return to what the nation ‘used to be’” (Hage, 2000: 39). By reinserting the migrant, as well as the security dangers of being a welcoming nation into the discourse, the performative role of inclusion is ruptured, thereby revealing the limits of multiculturalism (Mackey, 2002), in which the provisions under the bills (re nationalist practices) are oriented and shaped to both “construct and help make the imaginary [White] nation” (Hage, 2000: 42).

Despite the rupture in the guise of inclusivity, the nation is able to preserve its exalted status through the creation of an image of solidarity with the superior Western ‘superpower’, as well as through juxtaposing the fear of ‘too many’ to the threatening subordinate Orient. Firstly, the discourse constructed the image of the Canadian nation in solidarity with the superior West “and other modern and civilized nation formations that are said to share similar qualities” (Thobani, 2007:10). Both Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 justified stronger citizenship and anti-terrorism provisions by drawing parallels between other Western nations and NATO allies:

“This [dual citizen revocation] measure would bring Canada **into line with virtually every other western democratic nation** that has similar revocation laws (Bill C-24- Devinder Shory, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 274).

It is reasonable, not just in our country but **in all free, democratic, self-respecting societies, those that have made the NATO alliance** the success it is, **to draw a limit** (Bill C-24 – Minister of CIC Chris Alexandre, Conservative Party, February 27th 2014, p. 342).

It is important to emphasize that the improvements we want to make to our terrorism prevention **tools are compatible with what like-minded countries have in place** [...] It

is important because it shows that **countries with strong democratic conditions, such as ours, and strong institutions which respect the rule of law, like ours**, have also recognized that they can take **measures that are firm in their response to terrorism** [...] (Bill C-51- Peter MacKay, Conservative Party, February 18th 2015; p. 10 - 11 document 2).

The emphasis on the importance of falling “into line with virtually every other western democratic nation” establishes the West as being the ultimate superpower; the nations for which Canada, and all other countries in the world, should follow suit. The West then is constructed as a global sovereignty by virtue of their superior order of humanity (Thobani, 2007). Being able to “draw a limit” and “take measures that are firm in their response to terrorism” is suggestive of the West’s noble quest and move towards freedom and progression. If countries with “strong democratic conditions” and “strong institutions which respect the rule of law” are adopting similar anti-terrorism measures, then by default, through the exaltation of the Western empire, these exclusionary measures to keep out racialized immigrants are legitimized and accepted (Thobani, 2007). In a similar vein, the clash of civilizations framework further reinforces the justifications of these measures. Specifically, the notions that “‘we’ know about democracy [...] ‘we’ have values of integrity, honesty, and compassion [...]; [and] ‘we’ are law-abiding, orderly, and modest people” (Razack, 2005: 14) act as narratives to support the ‘all-knowing’ Canada and to legitimize the ‘necessary’ measures needed to protect ‘us’ from the uncivilized ‘them’. The reluctance to do so would not only be suggestive of abandoning the West, but also by default would imply taking the side of the enemy (re terrorist)¹⁴.

Moreover, the nation is able to maintain its exalted status despite the rupture in the guise of inclusivity by attaching the fear of the ‘too many’, whom are entering our doors (or bombarding them with large numbers), to the Orient who threatens to abuse the nation. As Hage

¹⁴ I offer a more in-depth analysis of the “with us or against us” discourse in the following chapter V.

(2000) asserts, the flow of migrants can only be classified as undesirable and ‘too many’ when ‘they’ “are seen to have invaded spaces where the masters of national space [‘we’] find their presence harmful”; that is, harmful to the White nation (p. 37). The imagery of having “our doors open” is suggestive that Canada, at one time, was too multicultural, too welcoming, to the Oriental migrant who’s “physical presence” was never monitored, surveilled, and regulated within the borders of the nation. Framed as an abuse of both the rules and the institution of citizenship, the Conservative discourse reinforces the need to “shut the doors” on those who would weaken, threaten, and therefore harm, the “value of Canadian citizenship”.

Through fantasizing about the desired ‘used-to-be’ nation, the discourse of the House of Commons debates mobilized the guise of inclusivity in order to convey those who should be included and excluded from the nation. While the Liberal and New Democratic Party implicitly maintained the guise of inclusivity by formulating the image of the desired nation on the myth of Canada’s multicultural, welcoming, and tolerant nature, the Conservative party explicitly revealed the limits of multiculturalism through exclamations of returning to a past nation with stronger security regimes. The Conservative Party’s construction of the desired nation was based on securing the borders from the flow of migrants, who are regarded as responsible for the loss of virtues of the Canadian nation, thereby explicitly calling for their exclusion. Despite the rupture in the guise of inclusivity, the discourse preserved the exalted position of the Canadian nation through the narrative of joining other Western allies in solidarity in the ‘War on Terror’, as well as through the orientation of the fear of ‘too many’ within constructions of the subordinate Orient who threatens the nation. Framed as an abuse of the rules and the institution of citizenship, the Conservative discourse reinforces the exclusion of those who would weaken, threaten, and therefore harm, the “value of Canadian citizenship” – a discourse premised on

racialized idealizations of the Canadian citizen.

4.3 Constructing the Ideal Citizen: The Racialization of Canadian Citizenship and Values

In order to construct the ideal citizen, the discourse oriented the various markers of deservingness (of inclusion) within processes of racialization and Othering. Specifically, the discourse reinforced parameters of difference between the West and the Orient, whereby the Canadian national is exalted in relation to the subordinate racialized ‘Other’, who is defined as lawless and in opposition to ‘Canadian values’ and therefore deemed a threat to the Canadian nation. These narratives supported the exclusion of ‘lawless’ fraudulent citizens of convenience, who abuse the privileges of Canadian citizenship. Meanwhile, the discourse outlined that those who are deserving of inclusion into the nation are those who assimilate to elements of Whiteness; elements which are mandated by the state. Using Hage’s theoretical concept of ‘the game’, which involves the acquirement of elements of Whiteness that are converted and used in order to make claims of national belonging in the dominant community, my findings reveal an added layer of complexity. While Hage (2000) theorizes the game of the accumulation of national capital at practical, day-to-day levels, the discourse of the debates reveals the many ways the state requires aspiring new citizens to enter and play ‘the game’. It is precisely this that my analysis is centered on: the manner in which the state has attempted to legalize ‘the game’. By requiring individuals to participate in the acquisition of national capital, which ultimately translates to the requirement of embodying elements of Whiteness, the state has prescribed into law the rules of the game that must be followed, played, and achieved in order to be worthy of legal citizenship and inclusion in the nation; a prescription which reveals the means through which Whiteness is used as a governing structure.

Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 discursively outlined and produced the ideal Canadian citizen through discourses of (un)deservingness, specifically focusing on an individual's level of commitment to so-called 'Canadian values':

Citizenship defines who we are as Canadians, but it comes with certain responsibilities, like respect for the rule of law, contributing to the well-being of our communities, supporting ourselves and our families [financially], and protecting our country. Citizenship also means that we share a commitment to the values that are rooted in our history, values like peace, freedom, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law (Bill C-24 Rick Dykstra, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 236).

The concept of citizenship here demonstrates the underpinning of Canadian identity; citizenship is a core concept for which an individual's national identity is defined, and subsequently defines the acts that one is to follow to demonstrate their deservingness of it. The construction of Canadian citizenship and national identity under tropes of peace, freedom, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law effectively demarcate it from its racialized so-called 'Other' counterpart, by way of the natural functioning of the binary structure of language (Jackson, 2005). Jackson (2005) positions these encoded concepts as "the language of civilizations", in which these terms used to illustrate Canadian values, paired with the syntax of the sentence (Li, 2007), effectively "connotes that there are bad nations of people"; notably those whose culture is incompatible with freedom and human rights, and whose society is characterized by the undemocratic disrespect for the rule of law (p. 48). As such, those deserving of citizenship and inclusion into the nation are those who reject the characteristics of a 'bad nation' and embrace 'Canadian values' of peace, freedom, human rights, and the rule of law. The discourse works to enforce the discursive parameters of difference between the West and the Orient/ "bad nations", who are constructed as not being characterized of the very values that are used to exalt Canada (Thobani, 2007).

The discursive parameters of difference between the West and the Orient also simultaneously position the ‘Other’ as inferior in relation to the dominant culture:

Canadians are known around the world, and **in our self-image**, we quite rightfully like to think of ourselves as being a **people who believe in the fundamental concepts of fairness and due process**. It is something that **attracts people to this country**. When I think **of why people immigrate to Canada**, some of what they **are attracted to are the concepts of democracy, equality, and fairness** (Bill C-24- Don Davies, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 188).

Given that the ‘Other’ is constructed as going against these ‘fundamental concepts’, those who embody the imagined values of the White nation are subsequently those who are deemed worthy and deemed as the rightful individuals attracted to Canada. The explicit construction of the imagined nation’s self-image as embodying concepts of fairness, due process, democracy, and equality, discursively paired as being characteristics that attract and ultimately lead people to immigrate to Canada, lends to the implicit reference to racialized newcomers, coming to Canada from inferior, “bad” nations to experience these ‘Canadian values’. The presented reflection on reasons “why people immigrate to Canada” suggests that they are coming from nations that are not comprised of these “concepts of democracy, equality, and fairness”; all characteristics deemed to be incompatible with the Orient. Such a creation establishes a simultaneous process of exaltation and Othering, whereby the narrative of the Canadian nation as being comprised of law-abiding, responsible, compassionate, and caring citizens committed to the values of diversity and multiculturalism is dependent on the coexisting narrative of the ‘Other’ as its opposite (Thobani, 2007). For example, Wai Young of the Conservative Party stated that aspiring citizens should embody “[the] values of seizing opportunity, hard work, diligence, dignity, and respect are values that infuse Canada and embody the Canadian values that we all hold dear” (Bill C-24- Wai Young, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 278). The ‘Other’ is therefore defined by its opposite and is constructed as someone who takes advantage of opportunities, lacks dignity and

respect, and cheats their way into the nation. Put simply, within the discourse of Bill C-51 and particularly Bill C-24, the simultaneous process of exaltation and Othering defines the ‘Other’ as lawless (Thobani, 2007).

The relational definition of Canadian nationhood and its ‘Other’ (Thobani, 2007) is repeatedly underscored through Conservative justifications for Bill C-24, namely by emphasizing that “the strengthening Canadian citizenship act introduced by our [Conservative] government would ensure that we are not only protecting the value of Canadian citizenship from those who would cheapen it, but that we are also improving the citizenship system” (Costas Menegaki, Conservative Party, February 27th 2014, p. 365). An interesting project of Othering reveals itself here, in which the ‘Other’, whom does not adhere to Canadian values, both threatens and cheapens the value of citizenship. The words cheapen, lie, and cheat are often discursively linked to the concept of “citizens of convenience” and “citizens by fraud”; two categories of citizens who are to be excluded from the nation due to the threat they pose to the collective welfare and prosperity of the nation (Thobani, 2007):

However, Canadians **have little patience or tolerance for people who do not play by the rules**. We have all heard the stories about individuals **who lie or cheat to become citizens of this great country**. These people **concoct schemes** and pretend to be living in Canada but have no real intention of ever moving and planting roots here. Instead, they only **wish to abuse the privileges of our citizenship**, using their Canadian passports or citizenship whenever it is most convenient for them (Ted Falk, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 292-3).

While the national is defined as a law-abiding individual who ‘plays by the rules’, the outsider is defined as a lawless individual who is willing to lie, cheat, and carefully calculate and concoct schemes to gain and ‘abuse’ the privileges of Canadian citizenship. Additionally, the vision of the national space is realized by the exclusion of those who “abuse the privileges” of citizenship, as they have exceeded the threshold of Canadian tolerance, thereby legitimizing and justifying

the manager of the national space to defend the nation and put ‘them’ back where ‘they’ belong (Hage, 2000: 92):

As I have said, these changes would also help **deter citizenship of convenience**. Taken together, the amendments in Bill C-24 **would preserve and protect the value of Canadian citizenship** both today and in the future by ensuring Canadians **have a real, rather than a tenuous or non- existent, connection to Canada**. [...] [they] appreciate the steps taken by Bill C-24 to **promote strong ties to Canada and buy-in to core Canadian values** (Bill C-24- Chungsen Leung, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 234).

The emphasis on strengthening citizenship by ensuring a strong attachment and acceptance of/ buy-in to core Canadian values reinforces “the shared racial identity and global interests [of the West]”, namely by protecting and defending the *White* Western nation (Thobani, 2007: 203).

While citizens of convenience were constructed as being not truly connected to the country and therefore undeserving of citizenship, deserving citizens were exalted as those who have a strong connection, integration, and sense of belonging to the nation, and express loyalty to Canada. As demonstrated in the Conservative justifications for the increase in residency requirements under Bill C-24, citizenship is ‘reinforced and strengthened’ through a shared and collective sense of national belonging:

[...] we are also determined to **continue to reinforce the value of Canadian citizenship** to show that it is **not just by being interested in Canada, by being domiciled in Canada, or by having visited Canada that one becomes a Canadian citizen** (Bill C-24 Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 255).

It [increasing requirements] is actually something that Canadians want us to do to **ensure that the connection, the integration, and the sense of belonging are strong, the way they should be among citizens who share political institutions, who share the burden of participating in this democracy together** (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 256).

As such, deservingness then, is predicated on one’s ability to accumulate national capital, such as being a good sportsperson (Hage, 2000) who shares the burden of participating in [...] democracy’ with the rest of ‘Canadians’. Moreover, it is interesting to note that residency

requirements introduced in this bill required a physical presence of citizenship applicants for 4 out of 6 years, increased from the previous 3 out of 5 years. Despite the requirement of physical presence as a provision to grant citizenship, the exclusionary discourse remains attached to the notion of being within the nation's borders but not deserving of citizenship. This draws our attention to the notion of the 'outsider' or 'Other within', whereby the attachment or connection to physical space is discarded, and citizenship rather is predicated on the connection to, and integration of, specific 'Canadian values':

This is important, because **physical presence** in Canada helps newcomers **to integrate** and **establish a sense of belonging** and **attachment to Canada**. However, it is more than that. It is **also about the ability for those individuals to learn what it is to become a Canadian, to learn about our history, to learn about our geography [...]** and the fact that we have **two official languages**. It gives those individuals the **length and the breadth of understanding, and the ability to know that when they achieve Canadian citizenship, it is because they earned it and because they understand it** (Rick Dykstra, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 238).

The call for integration, attachment, and knowledge about the history, geography and the two official languages of Canada as key elements for success in the achievement of Canadian citizenship can be conceptualized as modalities of national belonging. Such modalities, or categories of national belonging, act in a cumulative manner, whereby the acquirement of these 'cultural achievements' are converted and used in order to make claims of being more or less of a national than, or at least as national as others (Hage, 2000). These acts - in which individuals accumulate national capital in order to make claims of belonging to the nation - are what Hage conceptualizes as 'the game'. As such, the discourse outlines the ways in which a new citizen can make nationality claims and participate in 'the game': by converting their length of stay through residency requirements, their "capacity to speak the national language" (Hage, 2000: 52) through learning the official languages, as well as various cultural possessions through the means

of integration, or rather, through their ability to adopt the ‘Canadian way of life’ by abandoning the ‘ways of the Orient’.

Hage (2000) conceptualizes this ‘game’ of accumulating national capital and converting it to acquire national belonging at practical, individual levels. Particularly, he distinguishes formal citizenship from national belonging, which are often incorrectly equated with one another. For Hage, while citizenship is the formal indicator of national belonging, he argues that there is an important incompatibility between “the states formal acceptance of new citizens and the dominant community’s everyday acceptance of such people” (Hage, 2000: 50). In other words, the acquisition of formal citizenship for a new citizen is not indicative of their practical acceptance and belonging within the nation.

While ‘the game’ is conceptualized by Hage at a practical and individual level, to be played only once citizenship is achieved, my research reveals that the state officially requires and mandates the accumulation of national capital, in order to earn acceptance into the nation, well before the acquisition of legal citizenship. In this sense, legal citizenship then is also made into a game. Elements such as integration, attachment, and knowledge of the history, geography and languages of Canada outlined in the discourse are the modalities of national capital that the state requires immigrants to accumulate before they are granted citizenship. These elements are “value characteristics within the national field” which equate to day-to-day practical national capital such as “looks, accents, demeanor [...] and nationally valued social and cultural preferences and behaviour [...]” deemed desirable within the nation (Hage, 2000: 53). Moreover, within the nation, it is national belonging that constitutes the ‘winning’ of ‘the game’; through the successful accumulation of elements of national capital, citizenship is something that can be achieved, but not before it is earned through the embodiment of Whiteness.

The call for integration blatantly echoes the racial undertones, discursive tropes, and the colonial violence of assimilation. The conceptualization of integration found within the discourse of the bills rests on the racial endeavour of the nation, whereby integration is measured based on one's ability to successfully acquire elements of national capital that coincide and operate with categories of Whiteness:

As Canada faces an aging population and we need more immigrants, we need to **ensure that we attract immigrants who can be successful as soon as possible**. The new **language proficiency** test at level 5 is very basic and would therefore ensure that our new citizens have **the most important tool that they will need to succeed in Canada**. That is the **ability to communicate in one of our two official languages**, enabling their **full participation and success in Canadian society [...] language capabilities are essential not only for economic success, but also for integration** (Wai Young, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 280).

Under this bill, language proficiency is constructed as a large marker of deservingness, particularly given that they increased the requirements. Success here is predicated on one's ability to integrate into the White imagined-nation through "one of [the] two official languages" of Canada" (re English first and French second). The discursive link between success, language, and "attracting immigrants who can be successful as soon as possible" underscores Canada's official languages as elements of Whiteness that are required to accumulate national capital (Hage, 2000). Moreover, the "extent to which [new citizens] can actually accumulate national capital is linked to the cultural possessions and dispositions they bring with them" (Hage, 2000: 54). The equation of success to language fluency in English or French, and the nation's desire to attract immigrants who can be successful as soon as possible, discursively "patrols the borders of the nation" whereby those who already hold this particular element of Whiteness are easily included within the nation, while racialized 'Others' are relegated to the outskirts and excluded (Creese & Ngene Kambere, 2003: 565). As such, the implicit racial undertone presented in this excerpt perpetuates the "social construction of language fluency and [its] intersection [...] [with]

the processes of racialization” (Creese & Ngene Kambere, 2003: 566). Elements of Whiteness, such as language fluency in one of the official languages (with the proper accent), “give the person either some already contextually validated national symbolic capital or the advantages of proximity with the dominant national culture which can quicken the process of cultivating and accumulating national capital” (Hage, 2000: 54). Outlining language as a necessity for integration reinvigorates the narratives of diversity, whereby racial - and by extension cultural - differences can be managed and tolerated if and only if elements of Whiteness are embodied in order to maintain and to mitigate the threat to the imagined nation: [...] “we value our diversity by using one of our unifying languages” (Bill C-24- Wai Young, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 281). Once again, this discursive contradiction brings to the forefront the cultural racism that seeps within the nation, and reveals the conditions of acceptance and tolerance from the dominant group: the acceptance and tolerance of diversity only through integration - or in other words, assimilation¹⁵.

It is interesting to note that discourses of Whiteness are also perpetuated by non-white, racialized minorities. For example, comments made by Conservative members Wai Young and Chungsen Leung, during the debate, who are both first-generation Chinese immigrants, contribute to the construction of the fantasized White nation and its ideal citizens. This occurrence of racialized minorities contributing to discourses of Whiteness shed light into the implicit, embedded and chameleonic nature of cultural racism and its hegemonic racial discourses. As Pyke (2010) suggests, racism can be indirectly internalized into worldviews “via cultural myths and ideologies that seemingly have nothing to do with race per se”; a process in

¹⁵ However, Hage (2000) explains that no matter how much national capital an immigrant acquires, it will never translate into full national belonging by virtue of the fact that it was acquired, rather than something an individual was born with. The findings outlined in chapter V demonstrate this at-play in the discourse.

which hooks (2003) refers to as indoctrination and mental colonization (p. 556). In a similar vein, Hage's theory also finds utility here, whereby the adoption of discourses of Whiteness is a means through which citizens can accumulate national belonging. While the members of parliament have evidently acquired formal citizenship, their discursive reinforcement of Whiteness can speak to 'playing the game' at the practical level. In this regard, the liberal myth "that the oppressed can escape their "Otherness" by shunning their difference lures them into supporting the very rules [and discourses] that define them into existence as the "Other"" (Pyke, 2010: 557). The alignment with discourses of Whiteness acts as a mean through which individuals can acquire national capital, and subsequently 'earn' national belonging, through the embodiment and assimilation to elements of Whiteness.

Another large marker of deservingness under this bill is the expression of loyalty to Canada, which manifests itself in the militarization of citizenship and conditionality of citizenship for dual nationals. Within the discourse, citizenship is first militarized through the designation of deservingness to those newcomers who choose to enrol in the Canadian armed forces. Despite the vast division between the Conservative government and the opposing parties in relation to the general support or refusal of the bill, the fast-track/ expedited citizenship provision, which shortened the residency requirements from the new 4 years to 3 years for permanent residents who joined the Canadian army, was unanimously supported by all political parties:

What else is good in the bill? **The fact that it will expedite citizenship for those who are landed or in the armed forces is a good thing.** If they are **willing to serve Canada, to go abroad, to put their lives in harm's way**, I think there should be **a reward for that**. Expedited citizenship would be fair (Bill C-24 - Malcolm Allen, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 154).

As members know, **service in the Canadian Armed Forces is unique**. We call on our soldiers to make the **ultimate sacrifice**, to **risk their lives in faraway places** away from

their families in **some of the worst conditions imaginable**, and they do it gladly. They are willing to **lay their lives down for their fellow Canadians**. That is what makes service in the Canadian Armed Forces unique and **deserving of the highest possible respect**. Bill C-24 seeks **not only to support these brave men and women but also to strengthen and defend the values they stand for and protect**. To do this, we must act to **address one of the biggest threats facing Canada today: terrorism** (Bill C-24 - Devinder Shory, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 273).

The newcomers who choose to enrol in the military are constructed as honorable individuals, willing to “put their lives in harm’s way”. Enrolling in the Canadian military is demonstrative of their affirmation and commitment to ‘Canadian values’ and the Canadian ‘way of life’. As such, this renders them as deserving of citizenship and acceptance into the nation. Military service then, comes to be “represented as a privileged form of civic behaviour [...]” (Gulliver, 2012: 18), in which their commitments to ‘defending our values’ and sacrifices made to protect the nation are reflective of the highest form of possible respect; that is, citizenship. In this case, joining the armed forces provides a means for newcomers to acquire national capital and demonstrate their belongingness to the nation by expressing their loyalty and choosing ‘our’ side of the ‘War on Terror’. Those who chose the ‘right’ ‘good’ ‘us’ side of the ‘War on Terror’ by enrolling in the Canadian armed forces and honouring and serving Canada, were to receive a fast-track to citizenship under this bill. In a similar vein, those who chose the ‘wrong’ ‘evil’ ‘them’ side of the ‘War on Terror’ were to be both symbolically and physically expelled from the nation by stripping them of their citizenship:

It [Bill C-24] would underline and deepen the value of Canadian citizenship, as never before. It would **reward those who serve Canada at home and abroad**, and it **would send the clear message that gross acts of disloyalty, when they are committed by dual nationals, would lead to revocation of citizenship** (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, June 9th 2014, p. 94).

When discussing the ways in which citizenship would be ‘strengthened’ by Bill C-24 (which in and of itself suggests that citizenship, as it currently stands, is weak), Conservative party members highlighted that the bill would “protect and promote Canada’s interests and

values by honouring those who serve Canada [by joining the Canadian armed forces], [and] by revoking citizenships of dual citizens who are members of armed forces or recognized armed groups engaged in conflict with Canada” (Bill C-24 - Joe Daniel, Conservative Party, June 6th 2014, p. 202). Those convicted of terrorism offences are deemed as fundamentally undeserving of citizenship as their acts are constructed as an expression of extreme disloyalty. Hidden under the guise of wanting to maintain Canada’s vow to not render persons stateless under their commitments to the UN Convention on Reducing Statelessness, this revocation provision uniquely applied to dual citizens. Consequently, the citizenship held by dual nationals is constructed on a contractual basis, as they are only fully accepted into the nation depending on where their loyalty and allegiance was situated:

They [the amendments proposed by the NDP and Liberals in committee] would have **watered down the penalties for disloyalty** that we are **absolutely adamant be in this bill**, because there **are limits to the forms of behaviour that are acceptable from Canadian citizens if they are going to retain citizenship when they are dual nationals** (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, June 9th 2014, p. 86).

As such, it is only dual nationals who are subjected to the “limits to the form of behaviour” that is deemed acceptable and compatible with Canadian citizenship. Terrorism committed by dual nationals specifically is deemed as intolerable by the masters of national space¹⁶. This reveals that within the ‘War on Terror’, dual citizenship “can no longer be tolerated for it suggests an equal allegiance elsewhere” (Fekete 2004: 23). By virtue of holding two citizenships, the state enforces the precarious nature of their citizenship by enforcing that dual nationals must give up their ties with their second citizenship in order to be alleviated from the threat of revocation and offered the same rights and protections as single citizenship holders:

¹⁶ The intolerance of terrorism committed by dual nationals specifically is also indicative of the constructions of the ‘true’ threat in the War on Terror. I explore this construction in depth in Chapter V.

It would apply to those who have only Canadian citizenship, and **anyone who wants it to not apply them can renounce their other citizenship** (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 258).

People do not have to have two citizenships. Whether they are naturalized or they are born here, they can have one. **They could choose Canadian only, and they would not have any problems** (Bill C-24 - Wladyslaw Lizon, Conservative Party, June 9th 2014, p. 103).

In order to achieve a more secure citizenship, or to accumulate a stronger legal citizenship, the Conservative party suggests a choice for them to renounce their citizenship to the other country that is not Canada. The renunciation of their other citizenship acts as a signifier of loyalty, and by extension a signifier of deservingness, as it conveys their commitment to Canadian citizenship through the abandonment of their loyalties and ties to the Orient. As such, Canadian citizens are regarded as more or less of a legal or ideal citizen, based on the number of citizenry ties they have. The ideal citizen then, is someone who expresses their loyalty exclusively to Canada by holding only Canadian citizenship. The restrictive choice of renouncing their other citizenship so as to avoid the “problems that come with it” is a dilemma that single citizenship holders never have to confront; an assertion that not only discursively suggests second-class citizenry, but also crystalizes it. By reasserting the distinction between honouring those who serve Canada, and expelling those who ‘go against’ the nation, citizenship as a tool is then transformed into “an instrument [used] to ensure the security of society against diffusely imagined enemies” (Enloe, 2000: 4). As such, this reveals how the “‘War on Terror’ is being fought largely through citizenship policies and practices” (Rygiel, 2006: 145).

The nation’s investment in preserving its Whiteness is observed within the discourse of the debates through the racialized construction of who is deserving of inclusion in the nation, and who is to be excluded from the nation. Specifically, the discourse points to the ways the state mandates new citizens to enter the ‘game’ or field of the White nation; an added complexity to

Hage's practical, day-to-day theorization of national belonging in the dominant community. My findings reveal that the state pushes and mandates new citizens to participate in 'the game' of accumulating elements of Whiteness well before formal citizenship is acquired. New aspiring citizens then, are only able to make nationality claims and are subsequently accepted into the nation once they have achieved satisfactory levels of integration, attachment, and knowledge about the history, geography and two official languages of Canada. Furthermore, full and stronger legal citizenship is offered to those who express their loyalty to Canada by choosing 'our' side of the "War on Terror" either through joining the Canadian armed forces or renouncing their dual citizenship. The successful acquisition of these elements is measured via their ability to adopt the 'Canadian way of life' through the abandonment of 'the ways of the Orient'. As such, the discourse reveals the implicit racial undertones found within constructions of the ideal citizen and Canadian values; racial undertones that are blatant remnants of the colonial legacy and violence of assimilation of the nation.

Conclusion

The discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 strategically constructed, reinforced, and maintained existing narratives of Canada as an exalted, multicultural Western nation. The reinforcement of these narratives also simultaneously constructed the imagined White national fantasy and the ideal citizen who is deserving of acceptance into the nation. In these constructions, the limits of multiculturalism within the nation were highlighted. More specifically, the discourse revealed that markers of inclusion and deservingness are saturated in processes of racialization and exclusion, which also uncovers how official state multiculturalism is a White settler management tool to govern diversity. Determinants of inclusion/exclusion and deserving/undeserving reveal the nation's intolerance to their strategically racially produced

‘Other’, thereby contradicting the mythological narrative of Canada being a multicultural and welcoming nation. Such contradictory narratives are able to exist and remain unquestioned due to the implicit remnants of colonial and imperial power; concealed through positive liberal notions used to exalt the nation (Li, 2007; Thobani, 2007). As such, through the construction of the Canadian national identity as exalted, superior and White, the discourse is able to simultaneously construct its threat as inferior, racialized beings while upholding state multiculturalism. As Thobani (2007) asserts, such parameters of difference drawn between the West and the Orient fundamentally rest on one ‘elemental truth’: the Other as an uncivilized, unevolved being who is destined to extinction, degradation and destruction by modernity in today’s ‘War on Terror’. The following chapter explores this.

Chapter V: The Construction of the Threat

The following chapter explores the manner in which the discourse of the House of Commons debates produced and reinforced constructions of the threat through various discursive techniques. These narratives were primarily constructed within Bill C-51 debates, however, the debates of Bill C-24 also lend itself to implicit references to the threat, especially when observing the discourses of the citizenship revocation provision. The terrorist enemy was first constructed along racial lines through the use of cultural racism, which in turn helped to substantiate Canadian national identity. Specifically, the discourse of the debates facilitated the necessary distinctions between preferred culture and ‘those that threaten’. These distinctions both established and helped sustain the differences between the national self and the ‘Other’. Through the mobilization of the language of the clash of civilizations (Jackson, 2005), which includes “Us” versus “Them” dichotomies, the terrorist is regarded as culturally incompatible in comparison to the exalted White Canadian national. Moreover, as demonstrated through the

discursive strategy of repetition, the terrorist is constructed solely as a masculine, racialized jihadist terrorist. Such constructions consequently reinforce the subordination of the Islamic ‘Other’ and perpetuate the ongoing suspicion and demonization of Muslim communities and Islam. In a similar vein, the discourses framed the threat of radicalism found within the nation as a potential source of homegrown terrorism. Through processes of Othering and tolerance, the discourse reinforced distinctions between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Muslims, using ‘moderate’ religious expression as a way to police Muslim communities and conflate terrorism with Islam.

In tandem to articulations of cultural racism, the discourses also engaged with processes of securitization through the construction of the threat. Two techniques of securitization emerged within the discourses. First, the terrorist threat was constructed as an omnipresent, monstrous and disease-ridden being; a specific securitization strategy used to demonize and dehumanize the threat. Second, the terrorist threat was constructed as a new, unprecedented and ‘never-before-seen or experienced’ super threat; a second technique of securitization in which the danger attached to the threat is conflated. The simultaneous mobilization of these two techniques acted as discursive vehicles to justify and legitimize the various processes of securitization that were presented within the bills – mainly, to rationalize the extreme undermining of both constitutional rights and human rights more broadly in the name of national security.

Finally, Bill C-24’s discourses surrounding the citizenship revocation provision, which revoked the citizenship of dual nationals convicted of terrorism or related offences, worked to construct and reinforce historical narratives of the ‘true’ threat to the nation. Through discourses of loyalty and allegiance mobilized by the Conservative party, as well as discourses of belongingness utilized by the opposing party, the ‘true’ threat to the nation was imagined as the naturalized dual citizen; an imagination which consequently erased the born dual national from

constructions of the ‘true’ terrorist threat. As such, although these bills were presented as being concerned with homegrown terrorism, the erasure of the born dual national from the threat subsequently reinforces the narrative of the naturalized citizen as a dangerous, ‘unfaithful and untruthful’ outsider/Other, who has permeated ‘our’ borders and threatens ‘our sacred’ nation from within.

5.1 Cultural Racism in Constructing the Enemy

The discourses surrounding both Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 relied on cultural racism to produce certain constructions of Canadian national identity and the enemy that it faced: the terrorist in the post-911 ‘War on Terror’. Particularly, the discursive technique of constantly repeating ‘Us versus Them’ rhetoric was used to engrain the distinctions between the Orient and the West and to assert the narratives of the clash of civilizations. The linguistic boundary drawing between the Orient and the West was created and reinforced through the construction of the terrorist threat as a barbaric, premodern and racialized entity, committed to destroying and degrading Canada by virtue of their innate opposition to civilization and inherent difference to the exalted Canadian national identity. Moreover, the discourse of the debates further racialized the terrorist enemy by holding the Muslim community responsible for the ‘flourishment’ of homegrown terrorism. Radicalism and extremism were constructed as “warning signs” for potential terrorists, thereby discursively producing distinctions between ‘good’ Muslims and ‘bad’ Muslims for which the nation can tolerate (or not). Finally, the threat of terrorism was presented as an act of war; a strategy mobilized in order to justify the measures presented within the bill and to silence criticisms by reminding those opposed to the legislation who the true enemy to the nation is.

To begin, the anti-terrorism discourse found within Bill C-51 actively engages in the act of identity work by inserting the ‘civilized us’ and the ‘barbaric them’ into the discourse surrounding the bill, through the use of repetition as a discursive technique. The following passage was consistently repeated 33 times by the Conservative members; every time almost word for word, with only a few slight variations throughout the debates:

It is clear that the **international jihadist movement has declared war on Canada**. Canadians are being targeted by jihadi terrorists simply because these terrorists **hate our society and the values it represents**. That is why our government has put forth these measures that protect Canadians against jihadi terrorists who **seek to destroy the very principles that make Canada the best country in the world in which to live** (Bill C-51- Costas Menegakis, Conservative, February 19th 2015).

This preamble to the Conservative members’ speeches insert, produce, and enforce the language of civilizations by positioning the racialized ‘jihadist’ terrorist as people whom ‘hate our society and the values it represents’. This narrative is embedded in the foundational myths of the Canadian nation, in which the civilized Western nation is confronted by a “savage” racial “international jihadist terrorist” enemy that is inherently opposed to the values and principles of civilization by virtue of their cultural incompatibility and loyalties to premodern barbarianism (Razack, 2008). This narrative is maintained and reinforced in the following variations of the opening speeches of various Conservative members:

It is clear that jihadi terrorists have declared war on Canada and her allies. **This war is not only against our physical existence and our people, but also our values**. These terrorists hate us for the very reason that **Canada is the greatest country in which to live, work, and raise a family. They dislike our equality; they dislike our modernity; and they dislike our prosperity** (Bill C-51- Chungsen Leung, Conservative, February 23rd 2015, p. 352).

The international jihadist movement has declared war on countries like Canada and our allies, **countries that believe in freedom, democracy, openness, and tolerance** (Bill C-51- Roxanne James, Conservative, February 19th 2015).

Employing the concepts of “equality”, “modernity”, and “prosperity” instinctively brings to the forefront its oppositions - “inequality” (re the violation of women rights), “pre-modernity”, and “failure” respectively, thus emphasizing the premodern, unequal, and unsuccessful nature of the ‘international jihadist movement’ (Jackson, 2005). As such, the ‘Other’, once again, is explained by what it is not. Juxtaposing the ‘international jihadist movement’ from the Canadian nation produces the narrative of Canada as an exalted civilized nation through the emphasis of various ‘values of civilization’. While Canada embraces the ‘civil values’ of family, freedom, democracy, openness and tolerance (which make it ‘the greatest country in which to live’), the processes of Othering delegate the Islamic Orient to a position of inferiority by referring to their ‘their’ hate of ‘our’ values and principles (Said, 1979; Thobani, 2007).

This narrative continues to be reiterated in the Conservative opening speech when Stella Ambler states:

Let me be clear. The international jihadist movement has declared war on **Canada and her allies**. This is because **they despise modern society. They would take away rights for women. They would go back to barbaric, theocratic laws** (Bill C-51- Stella Ambler, Conservative Party, February 23rd 2015, p. 326).

The clash of civilizations discourse emerges with statements such as “they despise modern society” and “they would go back to barbaric theocratic laws”. The terrorist enemy is inherently racialized given the sole emphasis on jihadist terrorism specifically as opposed to referring to other acts of terrorism. Moreover, this preamble provides us with a clear opportunity to observe cultural racism in the works – the racialization of the terrorist threat occurs by differentiating ‘them’ through “religious and cultural difference [rather] than by race in the [traditional] genetic sense” (Fredrickson, 2002: 145). Terms such as jihadist terrorism “clearly racialize the criminal behaviour” and subsequently the crime of terrorism becomes associated with the collective features of the racialized community (Li, 2007: 48). However, this process of racialization and

articulation of race remains accepted in this context given the syntax of the discourse. As Li (2007) argues, the syntax of racial discourse relies on extenuating circumstances, such as the threats to national security and the public under siege of terrorism, in order for references to race to become acceptable. Cultural racism then, is reinforced through the repetition of the narrative of the pre-modern, pre-historic and culturally inferior jihadist terrorist, who is prepared and eager to “take away the rights of women”.

An interesting note to make is the gender-element that presents itself within the discourse. This is shown when Stella Amber states “The international jihadist movement has declared war on Canada and *her* allies [...]” and shortly afterwards “[...] they would take away the *rights for women*”. The discourse here brings to the forefront a gendered victim; referencing Canada using the pronoun “her” and referring to women’s rights works to frame women, and particularly Muslim women in the wake of 9/11, to the status of victimhood. The victimhood of Muslim women is revealed when Blake Richards of the Conservative party stated that “they [the jihadist terrorists] have no qualms about trading girls like livestock to serve as concubines and rewards for jihadist fighters” (Bill C-51 – Blake Richards, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 198). The terrorist ‘Other’ then, and specifically the Islamic ‘Other’, is constructed as a sexist being, whose culture and practices are an innate danger to, and contribute to the oppression of, women and girls. The discourse works to construct both Muslim women, as well as Canada itself, as a gendered passive victim needing to be saved from the misogynistic violence of the fanatic, hyper-masculine barbaric jihadi terrorist man. As such, gender is also mobilized within the discourse as a tool to racialize and label Muslim communities as inferior (Jiwani, 2005; Naber, 2006; Razack, 2004; Thobani, 2007).

The selective focus on jihadist terrorism reinforces the intrinsic foundations of cultural racism and representations of the Orient found within the national narrative, whereby the Islamic ‘Other’ in particular is reduced to a barbaric and theocratic entity. Similarly, Bernard Trottier of the Conservative Party stated that:

“[...] We have also **declared war on the barbaric caliphate**, or the so-called Islamic state of Iraq, and the Levant, or ISIL (Bill C-51- Bernard Trottier, Conservative, February 19th 2015; pg. 463).

The discursive pairing of the term “caliphate”, which is defined as “the rule or reign of a chief Muslim ruler” and “barbaric” discursively inserts barbarianism into the narrative of Islam and the Muslim community as a whole. As such, the Islamic ‘Other’ is reduced to a backward, premodern terrorist (Said, 1979). Additionally, the emphasis on returning to theocratic laws, paired with the focus on the jihadi terrorist threat, conflates Islam with terrorism. On this account, Islam, as a religion, is regarded as a threat to the nation (Said, 1979).

The ‘threat of Islam’ is further reinforced through the emphasis on the threat of homegrown terrorism, particularly in the discussions regarding radicalism and extremism, and the distinctions between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Muslims. Jackson (2007) posits the ways in which the ‘War on Terror’ produces “labels and terms [that] are organized into a series of oppositions”; namely, the West versus the Islamic world, and the extremists or radicalists versus moderates (p. 401). These discursive oppositional binaries emerged within the discourse, for example, when Justin Trudeau of the Liberal Party stated:

Further, I want to affirm once again to our **friends and fellow citizens in the Muslim community** that Canadians everywhere know that **recent acts of terror committed in the name of Islam are an aberration of their faith**. We believe that continued mutual cooperation and respect are critical. The government should develop and fund a structured community process that brings people together and helps prevent the **influence of distorted ideological propaganda posing as religion** (Bill C-51 - Justin Trudeau, Liberal, February 18th 2015; p. 496).

The discourse here unambiguously identifies the threat coming from ‘Islamists’, thereby making the explicit link between religion and terrorism in which “an unconscious and seamless association between the two is formed” (Jackson, 2007: 405). Meanwhile, the qualifications of “recent acts of terror in the name of Islam are an aberration of their faith” and “the influence of distorted ideological propaganda posing as religion” attempt to mitigate labels, narratives and assumptions that perpetuate cultural racism. However, while “these kinds of statements are ubiquitous, [they] notably fail to avoid subsequent expressions of prejudicial material (Jackson, 2007: 402) and are often met with more extreme expressions of racial narratives of the terrorists:

I also want to say that I appreciated the comments, certainly from this side of the House, that we believe as well that the terrorist actions we have seen are an **aberration of the Muslim faith**. There are **so many moderate Muslims** in Canada **who are contributing greatly to our society** (Bill C-51 - Joan Crockatt, Conservative, February 18th 2015, p. 496).

Here, the reference to “moderate Muslims” in contrast to those terrorists who represent “an aberration of the Muslim faith” naturally establishes a distinction between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Muslims, whereby only the moderate Muslims whom have successfully accustomed to Canadians values can “contribut[e] greatly to our society”, and therefore, are accepted and tolerated within the nation. The terms “moderate Muslim” act as coded words to enforce this distinction between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Muslims – notably, Muslim religion and faith must be expressed a certain way (i.e.: via Canadian values) and is only tolerated in such a way that reflects the Westernized colonialist logic; a threshold that is measured based on their degree of assimilability, hidden behind integration rhetoric.

As such, the threat of homegrown terrorism is framed as a failure of integration (Heath-Kelly, 2012) into the nation’s White national fantasy, as “terrorism, radicalism and extremism have become entangled with notions of [...] integration” (Lynch, 2013: 245):

We have heard a lot about it in the context of **preventing radicalization**, the spiral of

violence that the world seems to be caught up in these days. We have not **talked very much about integration**. The government is not trying to understand how it is that new converts are quickly picking up and leaving, for example. This bill does not address those problems (Bill C-51- Denis Blanchette, New Democratic Party, April 24th 2015, p. 259).

The reference to integration presented by the New Democratic Party demonstrates the “securitized notions of integration and assimilation” whereby Muslims “who do not assimilate” or do not fall under tropes of moderate Muslims are suspected of being radicals and by extension, vulnerable to commit terrorist acts (Lynch, 2013: 245). Furthermore, the distinctions between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Muslims through securitized notions of integration subsequently implies that there are clear markers of faith and religion expression that “separates moderate Islam [...] (re moderate ‘good’ Muslims) from extremist political Islam (re ‘bad Muslims)” (Mamdani, 2002: 767) who are responsible for the threat of terrorism. Such discourse consequently alludes to a suspect community, in which all Muslims, unless proved to be “good”, are presumed “bad”. This presumption consequently places all Muslims “under obligation to prove their credentials by joining in a war against “bad” Muslims” (Mamdani, 2005: 15). For example, Bernard Trottier of the Conservative Party stated:

However, I think the important thing to remember is that **this initiative of deradicalization is not really the entire responsibility of our police forces. It really has to be the community and society as a whole**. There needs to be a **complete societal effort** for de-radicalization. There are **imams** I have met with in Toronto who have talked about their need to get involved in this initiative. They know they need to **root out extremist elements within some of their congregations**, and there could be other organizations that get involved in terrorist activities (Bill C51 - Bernard Trottier, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 191).

Similarly, Sadia Groguhé of the New Democratic Party stated:

Canada **must adopt a strategy to counter radicalization**. We are asking for a plan to support Canadian communities that are combatting radicalization on the ground. That approach works. It has been adopted by most of our allies. The United States has taken a proactive approach to combatting radicalization. It **supports communities and faith leaders by connecting them with counter-radicalization experts**. It strives to provide communities with information on how to recognize **the warning signs of radicalization** and the means to prevent it. Canada has no such approach. The Conservatives reject that,

and that is absurd (Bill C-51 - Sadia Groguhé, New Democratic Party, May 4th 2015, p. 206).

While the main prevention strategy presented by the opposing parties was the prevention of radicalization, there is a prevalent silence in the discourse regarding what exactly it means to be ‘radicalized’. Regardless of this, the discourse surrounding radicalization actively responsabilizes the Muslim community to join the “social effort” to prevent the growth of homegrown terrorism. Again, the specific reference to imams, congregations and faith leaders (re Islamic faith leaders) discursively associates the “problem of radicalism”, the “root [of] extremist elements”, and the “warning signs of radicalization” as being sourced and found within the Muslim community and Islam - demonstrating once again the inherent racialization of the terrorist threat. It is by failing to define ‘radicalization’ and its ‘warning signs’ that the discriminatory constructions of the terrorist threat prevail and thrive – those constructions being associated with certain ‘types’ of Muslims who do not fit the image of ‘moderate Muslim’ for which the nation can tolerate. Categorized as ‘bad’ Muslims whom are culturally prone to terrorism within the national imaginary (Thobani, 2007), the ‘warning signs of radicalism’ is then something that can be observed, monitored and therefore surveilled. As such, the discourse implicitly encourages the surveillance of and within Muslim communities, wherein all ‘bad’ ‘un-moderate’ Muslims are cast as terrorist suspects. The responsabilization of Muslim communities for radicalism prevention communicates that “there is a fault line running through Islam”, and subsequently outlines actions for which “good Muslims” should follow to express their loyalty and support “us” in a war against “them”, the radical Islamists (Mamdani, 2005; 2002: 767).

The main consequence of the language of civilizations is to create a narrative that the barbaric eastern enemy is not merely only opposed to the values and freedoms of the Canadian nation, but also to civilization itself. The discourse also framed matters of national security as

issues of war in order to both justify the provisions presented in the bills, as well as exalt the Canadian nation. Firstly, framing matters of national security as issues of war allows for a wider freedom of action. For example, Roxanne James highlights:

It is abundantly clear that the international jihadist movement has declared war on Canada. Canadians are being targeted by jihadi terrorists simply because these terrorists hate our society and the values it represents. **Terrorism is not a human right. It is not a personal freedom. It is an act of war.** This is why our Conservative government put forward the legislation we are speaking to today. It would protect Canadians against jihadist terrorists who seek to destroy the very principles that **make Canada the best country in the world in which to live** (Bill C-51- Roxanne James, Conservative, February 19th 2015).

The construction of terrorism as an act of war allows for actions which would otherwise be difficult and probably unacceptable in a time of peace to be justified and accepted given the necessity and exceptionality of the state of national security (Jackson, 2005). The repetition of the Conservative preamble was always situated at the beginning of every opening speech for each member, right before they provided rationales for the ‘necessity’ and ‘need’ of the provisions under this bill. Moreover, framing terrorism through war discourses also reinforced the self-exalting national imagery of Canada, whereby “assuming a more militaristic presence in [their response to terrorism] is deemed as a reflection of the nation’s innate masculine nobility [and] its virile ‘goodness’” (Thobani, 2007: 219). By inflating and drawing our attention to the threat posed by terrorists, the Conservatives aimed to justify their security measures by discursively eluding to a fragile, gendered and innocent Canada under threat of war. The image of a fragile Canada is rooted in the historical imaginations of the nation as vulnerable to threatening outsiders; a strategy that is used to shore up nationalism and support for the ‘War on Terror’ (Thobani, 2007). In other words, positioning the nation under tropes of fragility and vulnerability simultaneously maintains Canada’s exalted position ‘as the best country in the world in which to live’, as it “allows for Canadian nationality to be imagined as a more robust,

potent, and masculinized force” whose hand is forced to fight the noble ‘War on Terror’ (Thobani, 2007: 233).

Likewise, the consistent repetition of this preamble “lends to a great deal of coherence to the overall narrative [presented], which in turn reinforces its believability and influence amongst its listeners” (Jackson, 2005: 154). Similar to an unconscious process of brainwashing via the discursive strategy of repetition, the discourse continually maintained and reproduced the distinctions between the Orient and the West. Such distinctions work to engrain the clash of civilizations and justify the banishment of the barbaric jihadi terrorist, where the so-called sacred rights and liberties of the Canadian nation are suitably suspended (Razack, 2008).

The discursive parameters of difference between the civilized ‘us’ and the barbaric ‘them’ were also drawn and established when speaking of the ‘true enemy to the nation’. In response to the concerns of the growing and overarching powers of CSIS, police, and national security agencies, the following assertions were repeated 11 times by various political parties¹⁷ throughout Bill C-51’s debates, in order to construct the ‘true’ enemy and threat to the nation:

The fundamental fact is that **our police and national security agencies are working to protect our rights and freedoms. They are not working against us; they are working against the terrorists.** We have to remember that **these are jihadi terrorists** who endanger our security and take away our freedoms in a very **fundamental and barbaric** way (Bill C-51- Ed Komarnicki, Conservative, April 24th 2015, p. 242).

I would also remind members opposite that **CSIS is not the enemy. ISIS is the enemy.** It is important that we focus on who **the real enemies** are in these **threats to our country** (Bill C-51- Robert Sopuck, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 148).

The rhetoric of ‘Us versus Them’ was mobilized in order to justify the legislative provisions that threatened the civil liberties of Canadians. Rather than fear the new powers granted to ‘noble,

¹⁷ The Conservative party mobilized these discourses the majority of the time. However, these discourses also presented themselves within debate arguments made by the Liberal Party as well, thereby demonstrating that regardless of the political position on the bills, all political parties discursively construct the same narratives of the Canadian nation and its subsequent enemy.

honourable, and brave' Canadians within CSIS, police, and national security agencies (re Us), the discourse worked to assert that the true enemy and threat to our country were terrorists who continually "assault the security of democracy, like Canada, and on our individual and collective rights to life, liberty, and security of the person" (Bill C-51- Irwin Cotler, Liberal Party, May 4th 2015, p. 181). Constructing the 'true' threat as terrorists who endanger the well-being of Canadians in a "fundamental and barbaric way" preserves the exalted 'good' status of the Canadian national identity, as well as justifies the repressive and draconian laws that were put forth under Bill C-51.

As Razack (2008) contends, "it is the idea that only an unfettered state power can properly confront the threat to the nation" (p. 28). Through the logic of masculinist protection, whereby state powers in the name of security are to remain unquestioned, unchallenged and obeyed (Young 2003), the West has no other choice but to adopt extraordinary powers characterized by brute force to confront the threat (Razack, 2008). As such, the questioning and concern of the growing powers of the state, police and Canadian army are conceived of as mundane and almost ridiculous, given the nature of the threat that the nation is facing. Citizens are reminded that their masculinist protectors "who are on the front lines every day **do what is necessary** to keep those who seek to profit from harming Canadians at bay (Bill C-51- Blake Richards, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 199-200), even if it means threatening civil liberties and net-widening the surveillance of all Canadians (and not just 'terrorists'). In response to these concerns, the Conservative party stated:

Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for his example. I hesitate to use this word, but it sounds somewhat bizarre to me, because **Canadians** would not be targeted under this act (Bill C-51- Ted Opatz, Conservative, February 19th 2015, p. 452).

We will never apologize for taking jihadi propaganda out of circulation. In fact, if companies that provide website content hosting services or other businesses are profiting

from this type of horrific material, they should seriously reconsider their business models and **lack of commitment to the values we cherish here in Canada** (Bill C-51 - Roxanne James, Conservative Party, May 5th 2015, p. 57).

Here, ‘true’ Canadians, who are “committed to the values we cherish here in Canada” are erased and excluded from the national imagination of the threat. The race thinking that underpins processes of securitization can be observed here, particularly through the ‘reassurance’ that “Canadians would not be targeted under this act”. The assumption that the suspension of civil rights, “will not affect those of us who are deemed to be within the political community” runs through the discourse (Razack, 2008: 28)¹⁸. However, as raised by several experts and activists¹⁹ as well as the media²⁰, the provisions of Bill C-51 threatened to increase the racial profiling of Muslim Canadians, as well as disproportionately threaten their civil rights and liberties. Despite the widespread precautions noted by public discourses, and even a select few members of the opposing party in-house²¹ (although rare), statements such as this one help illustrate that Muslims are not seen as being ‘real’ Canadians (Thobani, 2007). In the national imagining, any ‘real Canadian’, who is “committed to the values of Canada” (re who has integrated and assimilated to Whiteness and the Western identity) would not be caught under this bill and

¹⁸ While Razack (2008) applies this assumption to the state, or culture, of exception, I extend this assumption to processes of securitization more broadly given the inherent ties that these processes have to race thinking and nation-building (as discussed in my theoretical framework).

¹⁹ The International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group (CSILC), whose mandate is to defend the civil liberties and human rights set out in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, federal and provincial laws, and international human rights instruments, highlighted many problematic and dangerous elements of Bill C-51 – concerns that were also shared with Amnesty International Canada, the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association, la Ligue des droits et libertés, and the National Council of Canadian Muslims: <http://iclmg.ca/issues/bill-c-51-the-anti-terrorism-act-2015/>

²⁰ Several articles were published during Bill C-51’s House of Common readings outlining the dangers this bill posed to Muslim Canadians. See CBC’s article [C-51 anti-terror law causes some Muslims to reconsider vote](#), iPolitics’ article [Who has the most to fear from C-51? Canadian Muslims.](#), and Canada’s National Observer’s article [Muslims response to Bill C-51 muted by fear?](#), to name a few.

²¹ Randall Garrison of the New Democratic Party stated on February 19th 2015 that “it [Bill C-51] will clearly have impacts on Muslim Canadians in particular because of the unfortunate tendency of the government to stray into Islamophobic rhetoric and bizarre claims by the Minister of Justice that terrorism is somehow culturally based” (p. 388).

subjected to the suspension of rights. However, the extent of integration and assimilation can only go so far, as racialized minorities are not afforded the same level of ‘Canadian-ness’ as white nationals within the national aristocracy (Hage, 2000). Erasing ‘Canadians’ from the imagined threat therefore asserts the cultural incompatibility of the racialized terrorist suspect.

This assertion facilitates excluding the ‘Other’ from the nation by virtue of what their beliefs and life practices are imagined to be – a strategy used to design the clash of civilizations (Razack, 2008). For example, Ted Opitz and Blake Richards of the Conservative party stated:

They [terrorists] have done this [declared war on Canada] for no other reason than that we support freedom, we support democracy, we support the rule of law. **These are the concepts that they simply despise, these barbaric terrorists who make up the so-called Islamic State, or Daesh. There is no rhyme or reason to it. There is no logic to it. They just do not like our way of life and they do not like our values.** It is too bad, because we are going to **combat them at every turn. We are going to defend Canadian values and Canadian democracy at every turn** (Bill C-51 - Ted Opitz, Conservative, February 19th 2015; p. 449).

We speak of **the so-called Islamic State**, Boko Haram, and al Qaeda, all groups that have in **common a thirst for violence** and the **perversion of their religion that serves as the basis of their ideology.** [...] They **lurk on social media**, propping up support and radicalizing our youth by relaying propaganda, **luring them away** to be conscripted to serve as foot soldiers in the international jihadists' crusade **against western democracies.** (Bill C-51- Blake Richards, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 198).

Again, the powerful act of identity work is engaged, whereby the terrorist is inherently incompatible with the ‘way of life and values of Canadians’. This process of identity creation (Jackson, 2005) functions to maintain and make deeper the boundaries of difference between ‘us’ and ‘them’ that found the clash of civilizations. The ‘premodern’, ‘barbaric’ terrorist is stripped of all political motivations and conceived of as being driven by their culture and religion (Razack, 2008). As such, the jihadist terrorist is faced with a fate of being designated as an illogical, irrational, unreasonable being, with an animal-like ‘thirst for violence’ to wage war on Canadian values, the Canadian way of life, western democracies, and civilization itself; a

demonized threat which necessitates the defence of the nation through war-like anti-terrorism measures.

To summarize this section, through constructing the terrorist as a barbaric, premodern, and a racialized religious entity, the discourse presented continually maintained and reproduced the distinctions between the Orient and the West. These distinctions were mobilized to perpetuate cultural racism, engrain the clash of civilizations, exalt the Canadian national identity and the West, and justify the violations of rights. While the Conservative Party mobilized the discursive strategy of repetition in order to engrain “us” versus “them” narratives, the Liberal and New Democratic Party also circulated discourses to reinforce these narratives. Specifically, the opposing parties unanimous concern for homegrown terrorism (and radicalism as its source) contributed to culturally racist discourses which maintain the threat of Islam. Moreover, the Conservatives justified their security measures by discursively alluding to a fragile, gendered Canada under threat of war from masculine, racialized jihadist terrorists. These justifications also required an “essential dehumanization and demonization process of the terrorists” in which vivid descriptions of an omnipresent monstrous, animal-like and sub-human terrorists lurking both outside and inside the nation’s borders are produced (Jackson, 2005: 49).

5.2 Demonizing the Terrorist: Securitization in Constructing the Threat and Danger

The discourses of Bill C-51 and Bill C-24 utilized two essential processes of securitization within the construction of the terrorist threat. Firstly, the securitization technique of dehumanization and demonization of the terrorist enemy were mobilized, whereby the terrorist was constructed as a premodern monstrous entity (Thobani, 2007) as well as an infectious disease to the nation (Jackson, 2005). Secondly, the discourse produced the terrorist threat as a new, unprecedented threat by way of their embrace of modern technologies to

permeate the nation's borders. I conceptualize these as securitization techniques as these narratives effectively decontextualize and dehumanize the actions and behaviours of 'terrorists'; a strategy that is necessary to justify and legitimate the broadened security regime and the new anti-terrorism measures proposed in these bills. Moreover, these securitization techniques also facilitated the Conservative's attempts to silence and discredit the critiques raised by the opposing parties. Specifically, the techniques of securitization silenced and discredited criticisms via with us or against us rhetoric, whereby any opposition was cast as 'siding with the enemy' and choosing the wrong side of the 'War on Terrorism'.

The first way in which the terrorist was dehumanized and demonized was through their construction as an omnipresent monstrous enemy. The image of a monster circulating both inside and outside of the nation, everywhere and anywhere was crafted throughout the debates. For example, members of the Conservative Party stated:

The **radical jihadists** declared war on this country, Canada. If there is one thing we can count on terrorists to do, that is to keep their word. They said they are **coming to the west to drink our blood** [...] (Bill C-51- Mark Adler, Conservative Party, May 5th 2015, p. 121).

The powerful imagery of the 'radical jihadist' traveling overseas to the 'west to drink our blood' disseminates the necessary demonization and dehumanization techniques of securitization; invoking the image of drinking blood effectually strips all traces of humanity from the jihadi terrorist and serves to reinforce feelings of fear and danger that threaten the nation (Razack, 2008). Moreover, not only did the discourse produce an omnipresent, animalistic terrorist enemy on the outside of the nation, but it also reinforced the threats of the 'enemy within':

These jihadi terrorists **recognize no border**, and **if frustrated in their attempts to travel overseas to join the caliphate**, they will **seek to commit acts of terrorism right here in Canada**. We do not believe in exporting terrorism, and that is why we need Bill C-51 (Bill C-51- Ted Falk, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 218).

The construction of the jihadi terrorist that recognizes no borders serves to instill the image of a terrorist threat that is no longer merely confined to enemies outside the borders of the nation.

Rather, the ubiquitous terrorist has permeated the nation and is hiding, lurking, and threatening from within. For example, Ted Opitz of the Conservative Party stated:

If we had asked most Canadians a year ago or more whether they wanted more action to protect our national security, they would likely have said that the previous strong actions by our Conservative government would have been enough. **However, October 22 changed all of that.** We were attacked twice in three days by admitted jihadi terrorists, in their own words. Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent and Corporal Nathan Cirillo were **killed in cold blood by jihadi terrorists.** These attacks made it clear that our security legislation had to change and **evolve with the times.** Evidently, that is not clear to some (Bill C-51- Ted Opitz, Conservative Party, May 5th 2015, p. 80).

The October 2014 events of the Ottawa shooting of Cpl. Nathan Cirillo and St-Jean ramming attack of Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent were extensively mobilized as reminders of the necessity of anti-terrorism measures within political discourses. The phrase “killed in cold blood by jihadist terrorist” was used by Conservative party members 12 times throughout the debates, always in reference to the October 2014 attacks, thereby extending the threat of the ‘blood thirsty terrorist’ enemy into the confines of the nation. This common expression alludes to the notions of calculated and deliberate attacks that have surpassed the sophistication of previous anti-terrorism policies.

Although the dehumanization and demonization of the terrorist was most concretely expressed within the discourse of the Conservative Party, all political parties, regardless of their position on the bills, reinforced this imagery of the terrorist monster. Along similar lines, Elizabeth May of the Green Party stated:

In the context of Canada, that [reducing the threat of terrorism] means **reducing the threat of radicalizing Canadian citizens** and Canadian residents to take up – inspired through all sorts of **misguided, alienated, disenfranchised, and misinformed views** – the cause of ISIS or other extremist groups. We must avoid the radicalization of

Canadians by these **monstrous organizations** (Bill C-51- Elizabeth May, February 23rd 2015, p. 298).

As such, the premodern terrorist is able to sink its monstrous teeth into the values of the nation. Whether it be the ‘terrorist’ who travels to Canada with premodern barbaric ideologies, or the technological permeation of online propaganda that reach Canadians from within the nation, the production and reinforcement of the ‘demonized terrorist’ serves to instill a natural fear within the nation. By raising up fear and casting the terrorist under this imagery, the state is able to justify the degradation and destruction of the of the terrorist in the name of national security, Canadian values, and Western civilization itself (re feared and destroyed in the name of Whiteness)²²:

Be it the brutal and **merciless attacks on Canadian soil in October** or abroad in Sydney, Paris, and Copenhagen in recent weeks, **terrorism attacks core values and what we as Canadians hold dear: our freedoms and our democracy**. As the Prime Minister indicated following the violent attacks, “We will not be intimidated”. It is therefore essential that we provide those entrusted to investigate, analyze, and respond to terrorism with **all the necessary tools to degrade and destroy** threats to our national security **in whatever form they may take**. This is exactly what the anti- terrorism act, 2015 would do (Bill C-51- Mark Adler, Conservative, February 19th 2015; p. 427).

Furthermore, the discourses of disease also emerged within the rhetoric to dehumanize the threat as well as conflate the danger faced “right here on Canadian soil”. The October 2014 attacks were mobilized once more to “remind [Canadians] that the world is a dangerous place and that Canada **is not immune** from the threat of terrorism” (Bill C-51- Ted Falk, Conservative Party, February 23rd 2015, p. 342). For example, Jay Aspin of the Conservative party stated:

²² The Whiteness of Canadian values as discussed in chapter IV: the construction of Canadian citizenship and national identity under these tropes of peace, freedom, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law effectively demarcate it from its racialized so-called ‘Other’ counterpart, by way of the natural functioning of the binary structure of language (Jackson, 2005). Jackson (2005) positions these encoded concepts as “the language of civilization”, in which these terms used to illustrate Canadian values, paired with the syntax of the sentence (Li, 2007), effectively “connotes that there are bad nations of people”; notably those whose culture is incompatible with freedom and human rights, and whose society is characterized by the undemocratic disrespect for the rule of law (p. 48).

As we all know, the international jihadist movement has declared war on Canada and her allies. As we have seen in Copenhagen, Brussels, Sydney, Paris, and **even right here at home in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu and Ottawa**, jihadi terrorists are attempting to destroy the values that make Canada the best country in the world to live, work, and raise a family. **Clearly, Canada is not immune to homegrown terrorist threats.** Therefore, the legislation before us today also includes, in support of the terrorism prevention pillar, measures to address the radicalization of these homegrown threats (Jay Aspin, Conservative Party, February 23rd 2015, p. 295).

Jackson (2005) describes such constructions as reinforcing discourses of disease, whereby the threat of the “scourge of terrorism” “invokes notions of infection, dirt, squalor and sickness” (p. 73). By referencing that “Canada is not immune from the threat of terrorism” covertly produces the threat as a disease - at risk of spreading through the nation and infecting “our home”, “our way of life” and “western civilization” more broadly. Moreover, the imagery of the home being threatened and violated by the “scourge of terrorism” invokes emotive language to engender insecurities and amplify the perceptions of threat. Characterized as a disease similar to cancer or a plague which poisons communities “right here at home”, the disease discourse works to further demonize and dehumanize the terrorist (Jackson, 2005), as the Orient is reduced to a form of sickness which infects the minds and bodies of its hosts.

Secondly, the disease discourse was also often mobilized in order to describe the threat of radicalism as a source of home-grown terrorism, where the “minds of our youth” were vulnerable to being “poisoned” and “brainwashed” by radical, extremist ideologies within the borders of the nation. For example, when responding to the criticisms from opposing parties that the new “advocating terrorism” offence introduced under Bill C-51 may violate freedom of expression, Ted Opatz of the Conservative Party stated:

Advocating for jihadi terrorism where Canadians are killed en masse is not a human right; it is an act of war. Canada is not alone in dealing with **the scourge of terrorism promotion [...] Terrorist propaganda** is an important tool that **terrorists use to brainwash individuals into joining their barbaric cause. Those who advocate**

terrorism undermine our values and put all Canadians at risk, and this government will not stand for it (Bill C-51- Ted Opitz, Conservative, February 19th 2015, p. 451).

Here, the online terrorism propaganda circulating within the nation is capable of “infect[ing] and destroy[ing] us from within our own body politic” (Jackson, 2005: 73). By “brainwashing individuals to join their barbaric cause”, the premodern terrorist is constructed as being able to infiltrate, recruit and ‘radicalize vulnerable Canadians’ and lure them abroad via their modern technological tools:

When we talk about the international jihadist movement, **either the self- radicalized lone wolf from a Canadian suburb plotting ominous terrorist attacks on Canadian soil or the Islamic State fighter lured abroad in Syria**, these are **all jihadists ready to commit any and all atrocities**. They are **determined**, they are **resourceful**, and they are **driven by hatred** (Bill C-51- Blake Richards, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p. 200).

It is unfortunate and difficult to accept, but we see a **concerning number of Canadians travelling to other countries to join and fight alongside terrorists from Syria to Somalia**. Even more worrisome, we know that some of these **radicalized Canadians have returned to this country, burning with hatred**, and often with military training and combat experience (Bill C-51- Rick Dykstra, Conservative Party, April 24th 2015, p. 268).

Much like a sick body burning up from a fever, the returned terrorist is infected, poisoned and driven by a “burning hatred” for Canada and its values, and subsequently carries the ‘infection of radicalism and extremism’ into the borders of the nation.

Once relegated to the margins of, and subsequently excluded from humanity as a result of proliferating dehumanization and demonization techniques, the ‘War on Terrorism’ with both the enemy abroad and within, along with its new, extraordinary measures needed to ‘win’ the war, can be justified (Neocleous, 2009). Specifically, the ‘need’ for new security legislation that ‘evolves with the times’ is predicated on the narrative/ myth of the ‘evolving threat of terrorism’ (re home-grown terrorism); a threat in which Canada has ‘never faced before’. These rhetorical associations are deliberately and strategically mobilized to script a discourse of danger, whereby the ‘new age of terrorism’ requires ‘new’ ‘modernized’ laws in order for the nation to be any

match to the terrorist in the ‘War on Terror’.

The terrorist threat was also constructed as an unprecedented, ‘never before seen’ threat that ‘is more complex, more insidious and more dangerous than could have [ever] been anticipated’ by virtue of the terrorists’ abilities to adopt and use modern technologies:

Their values may seem medieval, and talk about an earlier time in history, but they show no reluctance to embrace technology to communicate, to terrorize, to recruit and raise funds. The threat is more complex, more insidious and more dangerous than could have been anticipated even a few years ago [...] (Bill C-51- Rick Dykstra, Conservative, April 24th 2015, p. 268).

As such, despite their premodern ideologies and monstrous, disease-like desires to attack the nation, the terrorist is cast as a sophisticated threat with modern technologies, capable of infiltrating the nation’s borders to devise attacks on Canadian soil. It is due to these very technologies that the terrorist is omnipresent and can carry out deadly acts ‘anywhere and at any time’, as their abilities to infiltrate the nation’s borders is both physical (through terrorist travel) and technological (through the use of online terrorist propaganda). While the attacks of the twin towers marked the start of the beginning of a new age of danger, the threat, in the context of Canada, was demarcated from the threats of the time of 9/11:

It used to be that a terrorist threat was more like the one that occurred on 9/11, with an organized attempt to create damage here in our country. That is still a threat that we need to guard against. **In addition, the use of social media** and the kinds of **campaigns to radicalize young people** that are being conducted by Daesh, or ISIS, are **new channels** for terrorist activities and threats. Therefore, **it is reasonable and appropriate, and I would say it is necessary**, for the government to respond and to reduce access to those channels. That is what Bill C-51 would do. That is why the Liberals are supporting this bill (Bill C-51- Joyce Murray, Liberal Party, May 5th 2015, p. 107).

When CSIS was created, **the threats we faced as a country and as a global community were markedly different from those we must combat today**, threats are **agile, diffuse and evolving rapidly**. The terrorists’ ability to use **modern social media** is becoming very well known, as we see on almost a daily basis around the world (Bill C-51 - Robert Sopuck, Conservative Party, May 4th 2015, p.148).

The ‘new threat’ was constructed around the circulation of online terrorist propaganda and its risk of “radicalizing Canadian youth”. The notion of a new and growing use of the internet and social media that fostered this unprecedented threat was used to justify the provisions presented in the bills, which were championed for their abilities to match the technological advancements of the enemy. Specifically, the ‘new terrorist threat’ is constructed as being “agile, diffuse, and evolving” and therefore “more complex, insidious, and dangerous”. Moreover, this threat is conceived of as “markedly different” from previous threats that the nation has faced due to their sophistication and willingness to embrace the *technological* aspects of modernity, rather than ideological. Positioning the terrorist as a “formidable and frightening foe [...] is an overt attempt to amplify the threat and exaggerate the dangerousness of the enemy, thus allowing authorities to claim even greater powers in pursuit of them” (Jackson, 2005: 108). As such, these constructions of the ‘new terrorist threat’ empowered members of parliament to legitimize their demands for the “reasonable and appropriate” tools to match the monstrous, albeit technologically modern, powers of the threat.

Furthermore, the ‘unprecedented dangers’ of the ‘blood thirsty terrorist’ enemy found within the nation was often highlighted through the discursive reference to radicalism and to the October 2014 attacks once again:

There is a **real** and **present** terrorist threat to Canada and her allies. We saw this on our **own soil in late October**, and we have seen it countless times around the globe in recent months. Copenhagen, Paris and Sydney **were all hit by radical jihadists who had declared war on western civilization**. Again and again, we see that individuals **radicalized to violence** can **carry out deadly acts anywhere and at any time, whether it be in the heart of our busy cities or on the streets of our small communities** (Bill C-51- Corneliu Chisu, Conservative, February 19th 2015, p. 443).

The mobilization of the October 2014 events here was a discursive securitization strategy used to produce the discourse of danger, in which the nation is classified as being in a state of a “super-supreme emergency”. In this state, the rapid evolution of the terrorist calls for new, extraordinary

powers to properly defeat it (Razack, 2008). The omnipresent nature of the threat is emulated once again - deadly acts of violence could happen anywhere and at any time within our communities, whether it be in “Canadian malls, malls where our children go, malls where grandmothers go” (Bill C-51- Cathy McLeod, Conservative Party, February 23rd 2015, p. 279) or “around their homes [...] [and] around the schools [...]” (Bill C-24 - Costas Menegaki, Conservative Party, June 12th 2014, p. 55). However, a temporal dimension of the threat is inserted into the discourse, whereby “terrorism [is not regarded] as a passing or ephemeral threat, but one that inhabits all of our time: present and future, the immediate and imminent” (Jackson, 2005: 100). The threat of terrorists is constructed as real, present, and threatening the nation now, in this very moment, thereby classifying the state of “super-supreme emergency” and subsequently reinforcing the discourse of danger.

As such, the scripted discourse of danger consequently produces a logical conclusion of the language which lends itself to the acceptance of provisions no longer constrained by bureaucratic checks and balances (Jackson, 2005). For example, as shown by Tim Uppal of the Conservative Party:

Now, we are advocating for the anti-terrorism act, legislation that would enable our national security agencies to **keep pace with the ever-evolving threats** to our national security. **Canada, like our allies, needs to modernize our laws to arm** our national security agencies in the fight against Jihadi terrorists who we know **have declared war on Canada**. The anti-terrorism act would protect Canadians by allowing the federal government to share information that the government already has across departments, within government, for national security purposes. **Today's threats evolve too quickly to risk vital information being trapped in bureaucracy**(Bill C-51- Tim Uppal, Conservative Party, May 5th 2015, p. 36).

In addition to stressing the rampant evolving nature of the threat, the need for anti-terrorism measures to loosen bureaucratic strings, which currently are in place in order to protect the right to privacy and protection from arbitrary information sharing, is also essentialized in the discourse. Most notably, the debates stressed the importance of allowing government of Canada

agencies such as Canadian Border Service Agency (CBSA), Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship of Canada (IRCC)²³, the Royal Canadian Mountain Police (RCMP), and Canadian Security Intelligence Services (CSIS) with increased and broader abilities to share information for national security purposes. This provision under Bill C-51 was essential in order to facilitate the revocation provision of Bill C-24²⁴. Furthermore, the demand to “modernize our laws”²⁵ to align “ourselves” (Canada) with “our allies” once again serves to reinforce the West as the ultimate superpower, whose actions and measures are legitimized by virtue of their positions within the exalted Western empire²⁶.

In attempts to create a counter-discourse to that of the Conservative Party, the opposing party associated this rhetoric with the political tool of fearmongering, thereby exposing the political power at play within the hegemonic discourse. For example, members of the New Democratic Party stated:

Fear usually elicits strong emotional reactions in people. Unfortunately, we are in a situation where the international context is full of horrors and atrocities that are raising fears among some Canadians. Right now, I feel as though the Conservatives are **using fear to try and score political points**, even though the election is six or seven months away, and I find that extremely unfortunate. **Can we have a rational debate on the real threat that exists?** Can we get some **rational, democratic responses to deal with the radicalization of our young people and answer our questions regarding public safety in order to keep all Canadians safe, without using fear as the main motivator?** (Bill C-51 - Alexandre Boulerice, New Democratic Party, February 19th 2015, p. 420).

By calling for ‘rational democratic responses’ to the threat, this rhetoric attempts to mitigate the threat amplification strategies that are mobilized within the discourses of danger. Similarly, Alex Atamanenko of the New Democratic Party stated:

²³ Previously referred to as Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) during the time of the debates.

²⁴ Stella Ambler, Conservative Party, February 23rd 2015, p. 328.

²⁵ It is interesting to note the use of the word “modernize” although the laws that were implemented under these bills were anything but modern, but rather arcane and draconian.

²⁶ As discussed in Chapter IV.

This bill is being rammed through without any kind of oversight. **It is being rammed through as a fear tactic.** It is meant to kind of **wield all this hype and fear of so-called jihadists and Muslims, all lumped into one, as a fear tactic**, and, I am afraid, as an [??] as an election platform for the next election (Bill C-51 – Alex Atamanenko, New Democratic Party, February 23rd 2015, p. 293).

However, the opposition's criticisms and alternative discourses were silenced through the rhetorical emphasis on the urgency of the presented provisions, conveying the message that not only do we need to pass these bills without the previous bureaucratic constraints, but the failure to do so immediately would leave Canada unsafe, unsecure, and vulnerable to terrorists:

Mr. Speaker, **we heard from credible witnesses** throughout the testimony, those with law enforcement and security intelligence experience and those who deal with terrorism. Every one of the individuals who went before the committee agreed that **the threat of terrorism is real**, it is **evolving**, and we need to deal with it on **an urgent basis** (Bill C-51 - Roxanne James, Conservative Party, May 5th 2015, p. 58).

[In response to Elizabeth May's (Green Party) refusal of the Bill]
I would ask two questions. First, I would ask if my friend has to be **confronted personally by a knife-wielding terrorist** for her to understand that the **threat is really out there** and that Canadians need to face it. [...] (Bill C-51- John Weston, Conservative, April 24th 2015, p. 239).

Underlining the ever-evolving terrorist threat and the urgency of such provisions worked to both conflate the terrorist threat that Canada faced, as well as strategically justify the expedited legislative process of the bills. Moreover, oppositions to the bills were also silenced by referring to the importance of establishing solidarity and unity with the Western empire²⁷. These justifications framed the provisions under the bills as the “common sense” response to the threat that was faced by the nation in the current ‘War on Terrorism’:

These are very **common-sense** changes that would **protect us from the real jihadi terrorism threat. On this side of the House**, we know that this threat is real. We have heard it in witness testimony. **It has evolved**, it is **growing**, and it **is real** (Bill C-51- Roxanne James, Conservative Party, May 5th 2015, p. 55).

²⁷ As discussed in chapter IV.

By solidifying unity with other Western allies and conflating the threat as an ever-evolving, growing and very much “real” threat, the provisions under the bills were presented as the natural, “common sense” response to the jihadist threat. As such, any opposition or points of concern raised by opposing parties were silenced and subsequently discredited; most often through with us or against us rhetoric. For example, Mark Adler of the Conservative Party stated:

The NDP should really learn to rise above its ideological blinders and do what is right for Canada. **It takes the side of being soft on terrorists** and terrorist organizations and is **on the side of those who would harm our Canadian Forces or those who would betray their own Canadian citizenship** by taking up arms to fight in foreign lands. **These are the kinds of people the NDP chooses to support, rather than those hard-working people who come from all over the world to our great country of Canada [...]** (Bill C-24 - Mark Adler, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 31).

[...] The opposition members have **the opportunity right now to correct their mistakes and support our government's proposals to protect Canadians from ruthless terrorists. If they do not support this bill, the New Democrats reaffirm that they are soft on terrorists and organizations like Hezbollah** (Bill C-24 - Mark Adler, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 312).

Through the use of with us or against us rhetoric, opposing parties were cast as “soft on terrorism, and therefore, by extension of their opposition they were by default ‘siding with the enemy’ and choosing the wrong side of the ‘War on Terrorism’”. The strategy of unity is enforced in attempts to draw clear unambiguous boundaries between ‘good’ ‘friendly’ ‘us’ and the ‘bad’ ‘enemy’ ‘them’ (Jackson, 2005). Referencing the opportunity for the opposing parties to “correct their mistakes and support [the] government’s proposal to protect Canadians from ruthless terrorists” implies that they are on the ‘wrong side’ of the ‘War on Terror’. Moreover, by being on the ‘wrong side’ of the ‘War on Terror’, they are inevitably supporting the “ruthless terrorists” – constructed as “those who would harm our Canadian forces or betray their own citizenship” by expressing disloyalty. As such, the enforcement of unity within the ‘War on Terrorism’ consequently results in condemnation of anyone who opposes the proposed legislation in the name of “protecting Canadians” and “enhancing national security”: if you are

not loyal and “if you do not choose [Canada] (for any reason at all), then you are with the terrorists” (Jackson, 2005: 86).

The demonization and dehumanization of the terrorist threat was an essential technique of securitization used to justify the erosion of constitutional rights in the name of national security, in which the terrorist threat was constructed as an omnipresent, monstrous, disease-ridden being. Moreover, the inflation of danger and the threat faced by the nation was a second securitization technique mobilized within the discourse of the debates, whereby the narrative/myth of an ‘evolving never-before-seen or experienced’ super threat was constructed. The marginalization and subsequent exclusion of the terrorist threat from humanity, paired with the conflation of danger acted as discursive vehicles to justify and legitimize the ‘new’ extraordinary measures presented by the bills. These techniques of securitization in turn undermined both constitutional rights as well as human rights more broadly. Regardless of the threat posed to constitutional rights, any opposition of the bills was criticized for siding with the terrorist enemy as it was used to shatter the illusion of a united Western alliance, wherein the failure to side with Canada, for any reason at all, is constructed as siding with the terrorists (Jackson, 2005). As such, this subsequently calls into question the loyalty of citizens to the cultural-national identity (Abbas, 2007). It is on this note that I turn to the next section.

5.3 Second Class Citizenry: Discourses of Loyalty, Allegiance and Belongingness in Constructing the threat of the Dual National

The final way in which the threat is imagined within the discourses surrounding the bills is through the naturalized dual citizen. Despite being a citizenship bill, the discourses of Bill C-24 shed light into the broader security regime of the state by reinforcing the narratives of the ‘true’ threat to the nation. Specifically, the construction of the ‘true’ threat is observed within the

discourses of the debates surrounding the citizenship revocation provision, which revoked the citizenship of dual nationals convicted of terrorism or related offences. On the one hand, in their justifications for the revocation provision, the Conservative government mobilized the rhetoric of loyalty and allegiance to construct the threat. Such discourses effectively conceptualized the terrorist threat as the naturalized dual citizen, and subsequently erased the born dual national from the imagined threat. This reveals that although concerns for homegrown terrorism were said to fuel these bills, the threat is still imagined to be coming from the racialized foreign ‘Other’ outside the nation. These narratives are also reinforced within the discourses of the opposing parties, despite their refusal of the provision. Through the mobilization of discourses of belongingness, the terrorist threat was imagined by the opposing parties via the conflation of naturalized citizens and dual nationalism once again. To this end, the counterarguments of the Liberal and NDP parties reinforced narratives of the ideal nation, in which racialized naturalized citizens do not truly belong within the nation.

The first way in which terrorist threat was constructed as the naturalized dual citizen was through the Conservative Party’s justifications for citizenship revocation. Utilizing loyalty and allegiance rhetoric, the Conservative discourse equated loyalty to the nation with the oath of allegiance. For example, Minister Chris Alexander stated:

Citizenship is a privilege that involves immeasurable benefits for Canadians, but it also brings with it responsibilities. That is why we are absolutely determined to address abuse and fraud. That is why **we do not think that terrorism, espionage, treason, and taking up arms against the Canadian Forces are compatible with Canadian citizenship**, and we will revoke it for those who have dual nationality. They will have, in effect, **withdrawn their allegiance to Canada by these very acts**. The principle of allegiance has been an elementary principle behind citizenship. Those who show these **gross forms of disloyalty have clearly forfeited their allegiance, and if they are dual nationals, they will forfeit their citizenship** as well (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, June 12th 2014, p. 10-11).

Citizenship in this country involves **an oath of allegiance** to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada. It involves **loyalty to our institutions, to our political system, and to all of the benefits that citizenship brings us.** [...] That is why we think that **dual nationals** who have committed acts of terrorism, espionage, or treason **should no longer enjoy citizenship.** They have **forfeited and violated their allegiance** to this country (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, May 28th 2014, p. 258).

The ability to ‘forfeit one’s allegiance’ and subsequently to ‘forfeit their citizenship’ is only applicable to dual nationals. The encoded concept of ‘allegiance’, which commonly refers to the Canadian oath of allegiance to the Queen (taken only by naturalized citizens at citizenship ceremonies), reveals how the born dual national, as opposed to the naturalized dual national, is erased from the imaginings of the terrorist threat. In his response to the New Democratic Party’s criticism regarding the retroactive nature of the citizenship revocation provision and their categorization of the provision as “fundamentally un-Canadian”, Costas Menegakis rebutted:

[...] Does the member not think that **if individuals perpetrate an act of terror or treason against Canadians and Canada that it is in direct violation of the oath that they took when they came to this country** and said, “I want to **choose Canada as my country**; I am making this oath but I am going to be **unfaithful and untruthful** because after I make this oath I am going to perpetrate treason and I am going to do terror against my country, Canada”, those people should lose their Canadian citizenship? (Bill C-24 - Costas Menegakis, Conservative Party, June 9th 2014, p. 173).

Here, the naturalized dual citizen is explicitly conflated with the terrorist threat. The references to the pledge of allegiance, and one’s choice to come to Canada and ‘take the oath [...] when they come here from another country’, allude to the suspicion of naturalized dual citizens, who are required to undergo immigration processes and citizenship ceremonies in order to acquire citizenship. Moreover, this forfeiture not only tied to the violation of the oath, but it is also conceived of as a *moral* forfeiture:

We on this side think that dual nationals who commit an act of treason or espionage or who are members of a terrorist group serving inside or outside our country have **morally forfeited the right to be Canadian citizens.** We think that **moral forfeiture** to the right to Canadian citizenship **should be reflected in legislation** [...] (Bill C-24 - Chris Alexander, Conservative Party, June 9th 2014, p. 95).

Categorizing and framing the forfeiture of citizenship under aspects of morality mirrors the discursive securitization techniques observed within Bill C-51's discourse, whereby the stripping of morality facilitates the harsh, punitive and draconian nature of citizenship revocation as a means to protect national security²⁸. This categorization works to exclude naturalized dual citizens from the moral community of the nation; a form of exclusion which subsequently justifies their relegation to the physical margins of the nation through revocation.

Consequently, the born dual national is erased from the imagining of the terrorist threat, as born citizens are not required to take this pledge at birth to affirm their right to citizenship. The prominent equitation of loyalty and upholding the pledge and oath of allegiance that is taken by naturalized citizens reinforces the narrative of dangerous, 'unfaithful and untruthful' 'Others', permeating 'our' borders and threatening 'our sacred' nation from within (re the narratives perpetuated within Bill C-51's discourse). As such, the naturalized dual citizen is discursively relegated to second-class citizenry, as they are faced with conditional citizenship based on their abilities to 'faithfully observe the laws'; a value which is perceived as being incompatible with the ways of the Orient (Thobani, 2007). As an alternative discourse, Pierre-Luc of the New Democratic Party attempted to dispel this narrative:

Going back now to the first issue that my colleague raised regarding the oath of citizenship, I would like to ask him a question. He mentioned that people who came to Canada take the oath of citizenship, **but someone who was born in Canada and got a French citizenship, for example, would have dual citizenship without having taken the Canadian oath, having been born here [...]** (Pierre-Luc Dusseault, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 182).

And later continues,

²⁸ The NDP member Alexandre Boulerice speaks to this draconian nature of Bill C-24: "We have good reason to be very worried about this government's apparent desire to resurrect a situation that, for all practical purposes, has not been seen since the Middle Ages: forcing one of its citizens into exile, kicking a citizen out of the country. If a person has another nationality – be it French, Algerian or Burmese – and if that is enough to strip him of Canadian citizenship, that is very serious because that means condemning him to exile and forcing him to leave the country, banishing him (Bill C-24, June 9th 2014, p. 144).

If I were a dual national that would not necessarily mean that I was, for example, a Moroccan citizen who came to Canada and got Canadian citizenship. **It could be the opposite. I could be a Canadian citizen who obtained citizenship elsewhere.** That would make me a dual national. **I would be subject to the rules for dual nationals even though, at birth, I was just a Canadian citizen** (Pierre-Luc Dusseault, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 183).

While this rebuttal attempts to dispel the conflation of the dual citizen with the naturalized citizen and therefore acts as an alternative discourse, the discursive distinction between the born and naturalized dual citizen was also produced by the opposing parties throughout the debates. Similar to the fact that attempts to mitigate negative labels accorded to Islam are met with more extreme expressions of racial narratives (Jackson, 2007)²⁹, I argue that this is emblematic of the ways in which alternative discourses are often met, discredited and silenced by hegemonic political discourses. The ‘true’ threat then, was imagined to be someone who was once an outsider ‘Other’, whom has found their way into the borders of the nation, though never truly belonging.

Despite their clear opposition to the citizenship revocation provision, the discourse maintained the erasure of the born dual citizen from the imaginations of the terrorist threat. However, in contrast to the discourses of loyalty, for which a few members confronted the Conservative party for³⁰, the second-class status of the naturalized dual national was reinforced via discourses of belonging. This was clearly illustrated in the opposing parties’ concerns that citizenship revocation would create a two-tiered citizenship, whereby dual citizens would be held

²⁹ As discussed in section 5.1

³⁰ As expressed by Irene Mathyssen of the New Democratic Party; “The new revocation procedures are apparently related to a citizen's loyalty to Canada. However, it is unclear why only dual citizens should be so targeted. Do the Conservatives think dual citizens are less loyal than other Canadians? We have to step back from this and make a very clear statement that all Canadians should be treated fairly and equally” (Bill C-24 – Irene Mathyssen, New Democratic Party, May 28th 2014, p. 241).

to a different standard than other ‘single’ Canadian citizens. For example, Pierre-Luc Dusseault from the New Democratic Party stated:

However, as a Canadian citizen holding only one citizenship, I will first face justice, and a judge or a jury will find me guilty or not guilty, based on the evidence adduced. I will then have to serve my sentence and I may end up spending the rest of my life in jail. **That is the likely scenario for a person born in Canada. A Canadian who obtained his citizenship later on in life and who holds dual citizenship** will go through the same process and may end up being convicted by a judge. **However, his sentence will be harsher than mine, because he may be stripped of his citizenship.** I cannot be stripped of mine because I only have one. Under international treaties, I cannot be made a stateless citizen (Bill C-24 - Pierre-Luc Dusseault, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 180).

The opposing parties constructed citizenship as something that should not come “with a string attached” waiting for it to be pulled back whenever behaviour is deemed intolerable by the masters of national space³¹. While such positions within the discourse were not surprising to find, upon further analysis I observed that there was also a tiered system within the category of dual national itself; much like the one asserted by the Conservative discourse. The opposing parties also reasserted the narrative of the imagined ‘true’ threat, whereby the born dual citizen is once again erased from the imaginings of the terrorist threat. For example, in the above excerpt, Pierre-Luc Dusseault references the distinction between the “likely scenario for a person born in Canada” in contrast to the scenario for “a Canadian who obtained his citizenship later on in life and who holds dual citizenship”. Such a distinction expunges the imaginings of a born dual citizen from the terrorist threat, thereby reinforcing the assumption that dual citizens who are likely to be affected by this bill are indisputably naturalized citizens. Moreover, the gendered constructions of the terrorist threat are also reinforced, as the pronoun “his” indicates the

³¹ As expressed by David Christopherson of the New Democratic Party: “This is so wrong, it is so un-Canadian. [...] I have to say this is wrong. In my opinion it is un-Canadian. That is not what it means to be a Canadian citizen with a string attached, where we can pull the string back whenever we want if we do not like an individual’s actions (Bill C-24 - David Christopherson, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 171).

inherent portrayal of the fanatic, hyper-masculine barbaric jihadi terrorist, as manifested in Bill C-51. Similarly, David Christopherson of the New Democratic Party asserts that “If they have done something absolutely horrible to humanity, we have laws to deal with that just the same as if it were one of us who were born here” (Bill C-24 June 9th 2014, p. 170). Here, we can observe the conflation between the naturalized citizen and the dual citizen; ‘they’ (re the naturalized dual citizen) are separated from those of ‘us’, ‘who were born here’.

As such, while the debates raised by the opposing party present the point of contention as being between single and dual citizens, the complexities of the discourse reveal that the tiered system is really centered, in a covert and convoluted way, on born versus naturalized citizenship. The conflation of dual citizens and naturalized citizens can also be observed when Anne-Marie Day of the New Democratic Party stated:

“[...] two types of Canadians were being created. There are **Canadians and immigrant Canadians**. [...] **if they are not-native born Canadians**, they will be deported and their citizenship will be revoked. That is wrong. You are either Canadian or you are not. We do not have two systems” (Bill C-24 - Anne-Marie Day, New Democratic Party, June 12th 2014, p. 18).

The conflation of the dual citizen and naturalized citizen suggests and reinforces the narrative that those born in Canada are not imagined to be dual citizenship holders. The specific reference to “immigrant Canadians” and “native born Canadians” draws our attention to these white national imaginations. It also demonstrates that naturalized dual citizens, or “immigrant Canadians”, are those assumed to be vulnerable to have their citizenship revoked, meaning that they are also those who would be convicted of terrorism-related offences.

The tiered system and conflation between born and naturalized dual nationals was also created via discourses of belongingness. Through a cultural racism lens, we can observe how notions of belongingness offered to born citizens differ compared to those offered naturalized

citizens. For example, the New Democratic Party stated:

This is a classic example of two-tiered citizenship. If a person with dual citizenship has their citizenship revoked, they are at risk of becoming stateless. In other words, **their country of origin** might not take them back and they will be in limbo (Bill C-24 - Sadia Groguhé, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 131).

On top of that, they **have to go back to a country they once fled**, usually for their own safety (Bill C-24 - Marc-André Morin, New Democratic Party, June 9th 2014, p. 184).

The references made to “their country of origin” and having to “go back to a country they once fled” implicitly suggests and reinforces the notion that the dual citizen under threat of losing their citizenship, does not, and never truly belonged within the nation. This in turn reinforces security narratives, as these references allude to the notion that they were once outsiders who crossed into the borders of our nation and threatened its Whiteness and existence.

The discourses surrounding the specific citizenship revocation provision of Bill C-24 reinforced historical imaginings of the ‘true’ threat to the nation. Through discourses of loyalty and allegiance mobilized by the Conservative Party, as well as discourses of belongingness used by the opposing parties, the born dual national was erased from the imaginings of the terrorist threat. Consequently, the discourses of the debates conceptualized the ‘true’ terrorist threat as the naturalized dual Canadian, as the dual citizen was consistently conflated with the naturalized citizen. As such, despite concerns for homegrown terrorism, the historical narrative of the threat as a dangerous, ‘unfaithful and untruthful’ ‘Other’, that has permeated ‘our’ borders and is now threatening ‘our sacred’ nation from within, is maintained.

Conclusion

The discourses of Bill C-51 primarily, and Bill C-24 reveal and reinforce existing constructions of the contemporary terrorist threat through the perpetuation of cultural racism, processes of securitization, and through imaginings of the dual national as the ‘true’ terrorist threat. The discursive technique of repetition and the language of civilizations were mobilized in

order to perpetuate cultural racism, which created the image of a racialized jihadist terrorist whose cultural incompatibility to Western civilization and values threatened the national security of the nation. Such depictions served not only to maintain the subordination of the Islamic ‘Other’, but also to exalt the White Canadian national, as the jihadi terrorist is constructed as a threat by virtue of their inherent cultural differences to ‘us’. These depictions allow us to observe the simultaneous workings of cultural racism and its heightened form: the clash of civilizations. Consequently, the discourse also served to cast suspicion and demonization of Muslim communities and Islam, whereby concerns over homegrown terrorism engaged with processes of Othering and tolerance. Notably, the threat of radicalism found within the nation reinforced distinctions between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Muslims. The ‘good’ ‘moderate’ Muslims who eagerly cooperated with police agencies in the fight against radicalism and thus, joined ‘us’ in the ‘War on Terror’ against ‘them, were constructed as great contributors to the Canadian nation, as compared to those radical extremists who are an aberration of the Islamic faith. Depictions of the moderate Muslim as important contributors to the Canadian nation were presented alongside constructions of the ‘true’ enemy: the ‘true’ threats were radical terrorists who endanger the well-being of Canadians in a “fundamental and barbaric way”, rather than police and security agencies despite their potential to erode charter rights. Discursively clarifying and demonizing who the true threat to the nation is served to preserve the exalted ‘good’ status of the Canadian national identity.

In addition to discourses of cultural racism used to draw the parameters of difference between the West from the threatening Orient, techniques of securitization were mobilized within the discourse. The first technique of securitization used was the demonization and dehumanization of the terrorist threat, wherein the terrorist threat was constructed as an

omnipresent, monstrous, disease-ridden being. The second technique of securitization utilized was the inflation of the danger and the threat faced by the nation, which was supported by the narrative/ myth of an ‘evolving never-before-seen or experienced’ super threat. These techniques functioned as discursive vehicles to justify and legitimize the ‘new’ extraordinary measures presented by the bills, which in turn undermined both constitutional rights, and human rights more broadly. However, regardless of the threat posed to constitutional rights, any opposition was constructed as breaking the solidarity of Western allies. The failure to side with Canada, for any reason at all, was constructed as siding with the terrorists (Jackson, 2005) and subsequently demonstrating a lesser loyalty to Canada (Abbas, 2007).

Finally, the discourses concerning the citizenship revocation provision allow us to observe the imaginings of the ‘true’, culturally incompatible, racialized terrorist threat. Specifically, the born dual national was erased from imaginings of the terrorist threat, thereby emphasizing the threat inherent to naturalized citizens. This erasure subsequently reinforces the narrative of dangerous, ‘unfaithful and untruthful’ ‘Others’, permeating ‘our’ borders and threatening ‘our sacred’ nation from within. While the Conservative Party accomplished this through the mobilization of discourses of loyalty and allegiance, the opposing parties utilized discourses of belongingness in order to conflate the dual national with the naturalized citizen. To this end, the discourses of the debates reinforced narratives the threat of racialized naturalized citizens who do not truly belong within the nation; discursively relegating them to second-class citizenry.

Conclusion of Thesis

In my examination of how racial discourses of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 reinforce citizen inclusion and exclusion through the language of national security, the House of Commons

debates shed light on the compounding and dialectic relationship between citizenship and anti-terrorism discourses within the 'War on Terror'. Set out with the objective of addressing the gap between race, colonialism and securitization studies (Moffette & Vadasaria, 2016), my thesis reveals how the exclusionary process of citizenship is reliant on and reinforced through the construction and exaltation of the Canadian nation and its national identity, the dehumanized construction of the terrorist threat, and the production of second-class citizenry.

My thesis demonstrates how the ideal, White fanaticised nation rests on the narratives of Canada as an exalted and multicultural Western nation. These existing narratives and (White) interests of the Canadian nation-state are maintained through doctrines of cultural racism. The encoded concepts that saturate national security and citizenship discourses inform ideologies of those deemed deserving and undeserving of inclusion into the nation. Through the essentialization of the Canadian identity, the erasure of Canada's colonial history, and the creation of the imaginary of Canada as a historically 'welcoming' nation - three discursive techniques that were mobilized in the discourse - the Canadian nation is able to position itself as superior, all while preserving its Whiteness. Along these lines, my findings reveal that calls for inclusion to achieve the ideal nation fundamentally rest on both implicit and explicit measures of exclusion that are racially charged. Crying out for the desired 'how-it-used-to-be' nation (Hage, 2000), before the times of national security threats, shows the true colours of the nation and uncovers the limits of multiculturalism as described by Mackey (2002), whereby the power to include or exclude, and tolerate differences rests in the hands of those who perceive themselves as masters of the national space – White nationals. Consequently, the ideal citizen, who is granted inclusion in the nation, is constructed alongside its racialized 'Other', who is to be excluded from the nation. Through various markers of deservingness (and undeservingness), the

discourse outlined the state's vested interests in preserving the Whiteness of the nation through mandated elements of Whiteness.

The main insight that materialized from my research was a theoretical contribution to the work of Ghassan Hage (2000). While his theory on 'the game' of accumulating national belonging was conceptualized at the practical, day-to-day interactions amongst racialized minorities and the dominant community, my study revealed how the state mandates 'the game' through citizenship legislation. Inscribed within law, the state pushes newcomers to 'play the game' long before formal citizenship is granted. As such, similar to the ways in which national belonging is accumulated, my thesis reveals how the acquisition of legal citizenship itself is also a 'game', in which citizenship can be accumulated through specific types of behaviour; namely, by staying loyal to Canada, preserving its Whiteness, and abandoning the 'ways of the Orient' through satisfactory levels of integration, attachment, knowledge, and language proficiency in English.

If ideal citizens deserving of inclusion into the nation are those who embody the mandated elements of Whiteness, then threats to the nation that are undeserving of citizenship are by default racialized 'Others'. The construction of the threat in today's 'War on Terror' emerged within the discourse as culturally incompatible beings, who have no place within the nation. The terrorist was uniquely constructed as a racialized, masculine jihadi terrorist; a construction which reinforced the subordination of the Islamic Other and the demonization of Muslim communities and Islam. By virtue of the never-before-seen nature of the threat, and their animal-like thirst for blood, the racialized terrorist was cast to the outside of humanity. My thesis argues that these two techniques of securitization were necessary to legitimize the draconian

laws presented under these bills, namely the revocation of citizenship for dual nationals convicted of terrorism-related offences.

It is here that the dialectical relationship between citizenship and anti-terrorism discourses truly reveals itself. Despite Bill C-24 being a citizenship bill, the provisions and political discourses surrounding it reveal how citizenship is being used as a tool to both buttress the White national project of Canada and to fight the “War on Terror”. The discourses of Bill C-24 shed light into the broader security regime of the state by reinforcing the narratives of the ‘true’ threat to the nation. The historical imaginations of the threat coming from the racialized outside foreign ‘Other’ were maintained through the conceptualization of the ‘true’ threat as being the naturalized dual citizen, which erased the born dual citizen from the imagined threat. By conflating the threat of the dual national with naturalized citizens, the fantasized ideal nation, in which racialized naturalized citizens do not truly belong within the nation and are merely threats to its Whiteness, continues to flourish. As such, the discourse quite literally paints racialized naturalized dual citizens into the corners of suspicion, as they are cast as being the terrorist threat in need of expulsion from the nation.

To this end, I argue that discourses have material consequences whereby the discursive production of categories of people create realities that are crystalized and sustained within legislation and ascribed into the law itself. When looking at legislation at face value, it is easy to assume its neutrality. However, critical analysis allows us to observe how laws are in fact not neutral, but rather, are racially charged projects that intend to continue the legacy of colonialism. As such, the analysis of the political discourse of the House of Commons debates, in consideration with the legislative provisions of their respective bills, provide us with a window to observe the political context surrounding these legislations and uncover the true intentions of

the nation. Citizenship inclusion and exclusion is found within the coded language of national security, wherein cultural racism and the production of the threatening Islamic ‘Other’ are circulated in abundance within the discourse. The compounding nature of Bill C-24 and Bill C-51 reveal it is not only the imagination or fantasy work of the nation that is engendered within the discourses, but rather that the legislative provisions pushed forth are active steps taken to make the fanaticised White nation a reality. To this end, the security regime has become a means through which the state achieves its nationalist project.

Future research on the discourse of citizenship and national security must continue and further develop the presentation of alternative discourses to substitute the harmful ones that are currently perpetuated within the ‘War on Terror’. It is in contextualizing the problem of terrorism within political circumstances, rather than the current cultural ones that have been engrained and institutionalized over the years, that substantive and effective solutions to political violence can be achieved (Jackson, 2005). Although such discourses were rare throughout the debates of these bills, I will conclude my thesis with the words of Alex Atamanenko from the New Democratic Party to demonstrate that the words we use have consequences and that the ideologies we perpetuate are not set in stone. Alternative understandings to citizenship and anti-terrorism that move away from its exclusionary foundations can exist within political discourses – it is only a matter of increasingly voicing them in order to dismantle and demystify the ideologies of our time.

It would also appear that the Conservative government is using terror to deflect us from real problems facing Canadians, such as the loss of jobs, the growing disparity between the rich and the poor, and climate change, to name a few. History is full of examples of irresponsible leaders rallying their citizens by exaggerating threats to their security. As Mr. Lavigne goes on to say: Some of these tactics are taken right out of the fascist playbook. Create an enemy that is hard to identify. Make it an enemy that is nebulous and seems to be able to do things that nobody else can. Don't define the enemy. Just identify. Generate fear around that enemy. Then send out the message that the only people who can deal with this enemy are us.

References

- Abbas, T. (2007). Minorities in Britain: Integration, multiculturalism and radicalism in the post 7/7 period. *Journal of International Studies*, 28(3), 287-300.
- Abowitz, K.K., & Harnish, J. (2006) Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76 (4), 653-690.
- Adamoski, R., Chunn, D., & Menzies, R. (eds.). (1999). Rethinking the citizen in Canadian social history. *Contesting Canadian citizenship: Historical readings* (pp. 11-42). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Adelman, H. (2002). Canadian borders and immigration post 9/11. *International Migration Review*, 36(1), 15-28.
- Agnew, V. (2007). *Interrogating race and racism*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2000) *Strange encounters: Embodied others in postcoloniality*. London: Routledge.
- Aiken, S.J. (2007). From slavery to expulsion: Racism, Canadian immigration law and the unfulfilled promise of modern constitutionalism. In V. Agnew's (ed) *Interrogating race and racism*, (p. 55- 111). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Alasuutari, P. 1995. Cultural Distinction. In *Researching culture: Qualitative method and cultural studies* (pp. 63-69). London: Sage Publications.
- Alcoff, L.M. 2009. The Problem of speaking for others. In A.Y. Jackson & L.A. Mazzei (eds.) *Voice in qualitative inquiry* (pp. 117-136). New York, NY: Routledge
- Al-Dabbagh, A. (2010). *Literary orientalism, postcolonialism, and universalism*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Ali, A.I. (2016). Citizens under suspicion: Responsive research with community under surveillance. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 47(1), 78-95.
- Amin- Khan (2012). New Orientalism, securitisation, and the western media's incendiary racism. *Third World Quarterly*, 33(9), 1595- 1610.
- Anderson, C.G. (2008). A long-standing Canadian tradition: Citizenship revocation and second-class citizenship under liberals, 1993- 2006. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 42(3), 80-105.
- Arat-Koc, S. (2005). The disciplinary boundaries of Canadian identity after September 11: Civilization, identity, multiculturalism, and the challenge of anti-imperialist feminism. *Social Justice*, 32(4), 32-49.

- Bahdi, R. (2003). No exit: Racial profiling and Canada's war against terrorism. *Osgood Hall Law Journal*, 41(2 & 3), 293-317.
- Baker, P. & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Ball, K., Haggerty, K.D., Lyon, D. (2012). Surveillance as sorting: Introduction. *Routledge handbook of surveillance studies*. (pp. 119-121). New York: Routledge
- Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Becker, H. 1967. Whose side are we on? *Social Problems* 14(3): 234-247.
- Benhabib, S. (2004). *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennet, C.J., Haggerty, K., Lyon, D., Steeves, V. (2014). *Transparent lives: Surveillance in Canada*. Edmonton: AU Press, Athabasca University.
- Berg, B.L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Bhandar, D. (2008). Resistance, detainment, asylum: The onto-political limits of border crossing in North America. In D. Cowen and E. Gilbert (eds) *War, citizenship, territory* (pp.281-302). New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, F.A. (2003). Tracking 'terrorists' or solidifying stereotypes? Canada's anti-terrorism act in light of charter's equality guarantee. *Windsor Review of Legal and Social Issues*, 16 (95), 95-136.
- Birkbeck, T. (2015). C-51 anti-terror law causes some Muslims to reconsider vote. CBC News. Retrieved from:
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/c-51-anti-terror-bill-canada-election-montreal-muslims-1.3246095>
- Bligh, M.C., Kohles, J.C., & Meindl, J.R. (2004). Charting the language of leadership: A methodological investigation of president Bush and the crisis of 9/11. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 562- 574. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.562
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Creese, G., & Ngene Kambere, E. (2003). What colour is your english?. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 40(5), 565-573.

- Curtis, S., Gesler, W., Smith, G., & Washburn, S. (2000). Approaches to sample and case selection in qualitative research: Examples in the geography of health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 50, 1001-1014.
- Deibert, R. (2013) Who knows what evils lurk in the shadows? In S.J. Toope and E. Iacobucci (eds) *After the Paris attacks: Responses in Canada, Europe and around the globe* (pp. 191- 202). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Delgado, R., Stefancic, J., & Liendo, E. (2012). *Critical race theory: an introduction* (2nd ed). New York: New York University Press.
- Dhamoon, R., & Abu- Laban, Y. (2009). Dangerous (internal) foreigners and nation-building: The case of Canada. *International Political Science Review*, 30(2), 163-183.
- Dinshaw, F. (2015). Muslim response to bill c-51 muted by fear? Canada's National Observer. Retrieved from:
<https://www.nationalobserver.com/2015/06/08/news/muslim-response-bill-c-51-muted-fear>
- Dua, E., Razack, N. and Warner, J. (2005). Race, racism and empire: Reflections on Canada. *Social Justice*, 32(4), 1-10.
- Elghawaby, A. (2015). Who has the most to fear from c-51? Canadian Muslims. iPolitics. Retrieved from:
<https://ipolitics.ca/2015/04/14/who-has-the-most-to-fear-from-c-51-canadian-muslims/>
- Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Fekete, L. (2004). Anti-Muslim racism and the European security state. *Race and Class*, 46 (1), 3-29.
- Fiala, I. (2003). Anything new? The racial profiling of terrorists. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 16(1), 53-58.
- Finn, R. (2011). Race and the everyday surveillance of South Asian women after 9/11. *Surveillance and Society*, 8(4), 413-426.
- Fleming, D. (2010). Becoming citizens: Racialized conceptions of esl learners and the Canadian language benchmarks. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(3), 588-616.
- Forcese, C. (2014). A Tale of two citizenships: Citizenship revocation for 'traitors and terrorists'. *Queen's Law Journal*, 39(2), 551-586.
- Fredrickson, G.M. (2002). *Racism: A short history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Gilliom, J., & Monahan, T. (2013). *Super vision: An introduction to the surveillant society*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gilroy, P. (1990). One nation under a groove: The cultural politics of “race” and racism in Britain. In D.T Goldberg’s (ed) *Anatomy of racism*, (p. 263- 282). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Given, L. M. (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vols. 1-0). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412963909
- Goldberg, D. (1990). *Anatomy of racism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Grillo, T. (1995). Anti-essentialism and intersectionality: Tools to dismantle the mater’s house. *Berkley Journal of Gender, Law, & Justice*, 10(1), 16-30.
- Hage, G. (2000). *White Nation: Fantasies of a white supremacy in a multicultural society*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Haney López, I.F. (2000). The social construction of race. In R. Delgado and J. Stefancic (eds) *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 163-175). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hodgson, D. (2000). *Discourse, discipline and the subject: A Foucauldian analysis of the UK financial services industry*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Howell, A. (2005). Peaceful, tolerant, and orderly? Feminist analysis of discourses of ‘Canadian values’ in Canadian foreign policy. *Canadian foreign policy*, 12(1), 49-69.
- Jackson, R. (2005). *Writing the war on terrorism: Language, politics and counter-terrorism*. Manchester University Press.
- Jackson, R. (2007). Constructing enemies: ‘islamic terrorism’ in political and academic discourse. *Government and Opposition*, 42(2), 394-426.
- Jackson, W., (2013). Securitisation as depoliticisation: Depoliticisation as pacification. *Socialist Studies*, 9(2). 146-166.
- Jafri, B. (2012). National identity, transnational whiteness and the Canadian citizenship guide. *Critical Race and Whiteness Studies*, 8, 1-15. Retrieved from: <http://www.acrawsa.org.au/ejournal/>
- Jamil, U., & Rousseau, C. (2012). Subject positioning, fear, and insecurity in South Asian Muslim communities in the war on terror context. *Canadian Sociological Association*, 49(4), 370- 388.

- Jayaraman, S. (2017). International terrorism and statelessness: Revoking citizenship of ISIL foreign fighters. *Chicago Journal of International Law*, 17(1), 178-216.
- Jiwani, Y. (2005). The great white northern encounters September 11: Race, gender and nation in Canada's national daily, the globe and mail. *Social Justice*, 31(4), 50-68.
- Kamp, A. (2010). Formative geographies of belonging in white Australia: Constructing the national self and other in parliamentary debate, 1901. *Geographical Research*, 48(4), 411-426. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-5871.2010.00647.x
- Kassam, S. (2015). 'Settling' the multicultural nation-state: Little mosque on the prairie and the figure of the 'moderate' Muslim. *Social Identities*, 21(2), 606-626.
- Kennelley, J., & Dillabough, J. (2008). Young people mobilizing the language of citizenship: Struggles for classification and new meaning in an uncertain world. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(5), 493-508. DOI: 10.1080/01425690802263643
- Larsen, M., Piché, J. (2009). Public vigilance campaigns and participatory surveillance after 11 September 2001. In S.P Hier and J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Surveillance: Power, problems, and politics* (pp. 187-202). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Li, P.S. (2003). The place of immigrants: The politics of difference in territorial and social space. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, (2), 1-14.
- Li, P.S. (2007). Contradictions of 'racial' discourse in V. Agnew's (ed) *Interrogating race and racism* (pp. 37-54). University of Toronto Press.
- Lopez, H. (2006). *White by law*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lyon, D. (2006). Why where you are matters: Mundane mobilities, transparent technologies, and digital discrimination. In T. Morrin (Ed.), *Surveillance and security: Technological politics and power in everyday life* (pp. 209-224). New York: Routledge.
- Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.
- Macklin, A. (2014). Citizenship revocation, the privilege to have rights and the production of the alien. *Queen's Law Journal*, 40(1), 1-54.
- Mamdani, M. (2002). *Good Muslim, bad Muslim: America, the Cold war, and the roots of terror*. New York: Three Leaves Press.
- Martinez, D.F. (2007). From theory to method: A methodological approach within critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 125-140.

- Moffette, D., & Vadasaria, S. (2016). Uninhibited violence: Race and the securitization of immigration. *Critical Studies on Security*, 1-15. DOI: 10.1080/21624887.2016.1256365
- Naber, N. (2006). The rules of forced engagement: Race, gender, and the culture of fear among Arab immigrants in San Francisco post 9/11. *Cultural Dynamics*, 18(3), 235- 267.
- Nagra, B & Maurutto, P. (2016). Crossing borders and managing racialized identities: Experiences of security and surveillance among young Canadian muslims. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 41(2), 165- 194).
- Nagra, B. (2017). *Securitized citizens: Canadian Muslims' experiences of race relations and identity formation post 9/11*. University of Toronto Press.
- Neocleous, M. (2009). The fascist moment: security, exclusion, extermination. *Studies in Social Justice*, 3(1), 23-37.
- Neocleous, M. (2011). 'A brighter and nicer life': Security as pacification. *Social & Legal Studies*, 20(2), 191-208.
- Neocleous, M., & Rigokas, G. (2011). *Anti-Security*. Ottawa. Red Quill Books.
- Ozguc, U. (2011). Remaking Canadian identity: A critical analysis of Canada's human security discourse. *Journal of Human Security*, 7(3), 37-59.
- Pillai, S. & Williams, G. (2017). Twenty-first century banishment: Citizenship stripping in common law nations. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 66, p.521-555.
- Pyke, K.D. (2010). What is internalized racial oppression and why don't we study it? Acknowledging hidden injuries. *Sociological Perspectives*, 53(4), 551-572.
- Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2006). Biopower today. *Biosocieties*, 1, 195-217.
- Razack, S. (2004). Imperilled Muslim women, dangerous Muslim men and civilized Europeans: legal and social responses to forced marriages. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 12: 129-174.
- Razack, S. (2005). Geopolitics, culture, clash, and gender after September 11'. *Social Justice* 32(4), 11-21.
- Razack, S. (2007). "Your client has a profile": Race and national security in Canada after 9/11. *Law, Politics, and Society*, 40, 3- 40.
- Razack, S. (2008). *Casting out: The eviction of Muslims from western law and politics*. University of Toronto Press.
- Roach, K., & Forcese, C. (2015). *False security: The radicalization of Canadian anti-terrorism*. Toronto, ON: Irwin Law Inc.

- Rosenberg, E. (2003). *A Date which will live: Pearl Harbour in American memory*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Said, E., (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E., (1981). *Covering Islam*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Said, E. (1995). *Orientalism: Western conceptions of the Orient*. 1978. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin.
- Sayer, A. (1997). Essentialism, social constructionism, and beyond. *Sociological Review*, 45(3), 453-487.
- Shaffer, M. (2001). Effectiveness of anti-terrorism legislation: Does bill c-36 give us what we need?. In R.J Daniels, K. Roach, and P. Macklem's (eds) *The security of freedom: Essays on Canada's anti-terrorism bill*, (p. 195- 214). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sobel, N. (2015). A typology of the changing narratives of Canadian citizens through time. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 47(1), 11-39.
- Stastna, K. (2015). Ottawa shooting inflated the rhetoric of 'homegrown terror'. CBC News Politics. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/ottawa-shooting-anniversary-muslims-1.3282199>
- Thobani, S. (2004). Exception and rule: Profile of exclusion. *Signs*, 29(2), 595-598.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis: in search of meaning*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Van Den Hoonaard, D.K. (2012). *Qualitative research in action: A Canadian primer*. Don Mills, ONT: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). In R. Wodak and M. Meyers (Eds.) *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H.E Hamilton, and D. Schiffrin (Eds.) *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed) (pp. 466- 485). John Wiley & Sons.
- Wark, W. (2016). Worth repeating over and over again: The Canadian search for a national security strategy (pp. 60- 84). In *Securitizing minority/Muslim Canadians: Evaluating the impact of counter-terrorism, national security, and immigration policies. A major report*. University of Ottawa.

- Wilton, S. (2010). State culture: The advancement of 'Canadian values' among immigrants. *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 42, 91-104.
- Winant, H. (1994). *Racial conditions: Politics, theory, and comparisons*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Winter, E. (2014). (Im)possible citizens: Canada's 'citizenship bonanza' and its boundaries. *Citizenship Studies*, 18(1), 45-62.
- Winter & Previsic (2017). Citizenship revocation in the mainstream press: A case of re ethnicization? *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 41(1), 55- 82.
- Wodak, R (2001). In R. Wodak and M. Meyers (eds) *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). Sage Publications.
- Wood, L. A. & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Young, I.M. (2003). The logic of masculinist protection: Reflections on the current security state. *Signs*, 29(1), 1-25.
- Zedner, L. (2010). Security, the state, and the citizen: The changing architecture of crime control. *New Criminal Law Review*, 13(2), 379-403.

Annexe A: Data Sources

Bill C-24: Strengthening the Canadian Citizenship Act. (2014). 40th Parliament, 2nd session, Retrieved from the Parliament of Canada website:
<http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=E&Mode=1&DocId=6684615>

Bill C-24: Strengthening the Citizenship Act. House of Commons Debates. Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. 41st Parliament, 2nd session. Retrieved from:
<https://openparliament.ca/bills/41-2/C-24/>

Bill C-51: Anti-Terrorism Act. (2014). 40th Parliament, 2nd session, Retrieved from the Parliament of Canada website: <http://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-2/bill/C-51/royal-assent>

Bill C-51: Anti-Terrorism Act. House of Commons Debates. Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. 41st Parliament, 2nd session. Retrieved from:
<https://openparliament.ca/bills/41-2/C-51/?singlepage=1&singlepage=1&page=1>