

***Dangerousness and Difference:  
The Representation of Muslims within Canada's Security Discourses***

by Deborah Slonowsky

Thesis submitted to the  
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the MA degree in Globalization and International Development  
School of International Development and Global Studies  
Faculty of Social Sciences  
University of Ottawa

5 November, 2012

© Deborah Slonowsky, Ottawa, Canada, 2012

# Table of Contents

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>II. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>8</b>
1) CANADA'S MUSLIMS AND 9/11.....	8
- Post-9/11 Representations.....	8
- The Problem of Profiling.....	13
2) MULTICULTURAL MYTHS.....	15
- Glossing over the Continuation of Cultural Dominance.....	15
- Measurable Effects of Ideas of Difference.....	20
3) THE STATE AND THE PROVISION OF SECURITY.....	22
- Security as a Discourse.....	22
- Canada's Response to 9/11.....	25
4) SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW.....	29
<b>III. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>30</b>
1) CONCEPTS.....	30
- The Social Imaginary.....	30
- Defining Discourse.....	32
- The Power of State-Produced Discourses.....	33
2) DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	36
- What is Discourse Analysis?.....	36
- What is Critical Discourse Analysis?.....	39
3) TEXT SOURCES.....	42
<b>IV. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>46</b>
1) THE FOUNDATIONAL NARRATIVE: EXAMINING SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE.....	46
- Evoking Fear.....	46
- Problematizing the Country's Openness to Immigration.....	50
- Reimagining Terrorism and the Terrorist.....	54
- Removing Context from Terrorism.....	59
- Summary: Contributions to the Critical Analysis of Security Texts.....	61
2) PRODUCING THE IMAGE: ESSENTIALIZING PORTRAITS OF THE DANGEROUS MUSLIM.....	62
- Positive Representation?.....	63
- Associating Islam with Terrorist Violence.....	66
- Presenting Terrorism as a Clash of Cultures.....	73
- Reinforcing Alienness and Creating Precarious Membership in the National Community.....	79
3) CONDONING THE BEHAVIOUR: PROFILING AND RAISING PUBLIC SUSPICION.....	98
- Profiling Despite Denial?.....	99
- Encouraging Suspicion of the Ordinary.....	103
<b>V. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>108</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: TEXTS INCLUDED IN THE ANALYSIS</b> .....	<b>114</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>117</b>

## *Abstract*

This paper presents the results of a critical discourse analysis of a selection of Canada's security texts and argues that the country's security discourses construct Muslims as dangerous and different from the normative Canadian. The research relies on a social constructionist understanding of discourse and the recognition that our state's representatives and agents, operating from positions of discursive power, wield disproportionate influence in directing the national conversation and managing the signals that shape our social attitudes and imaginaries. By persistently qualifying terrorism with Islam, portraying the terrorist figure as a religiously and ideologically-motivated actor opposed to 'Western values' and by casting suspicion on the ordinary behaviour of Muslims, Canada's security discourses produce a mental model in which Islam and its followers are associated with a propensity for terrorist violence. The discourses also naturalize the idea that Muslims are in need of surveillance, not only by the state's agents, but by the public itself. When examined alongside a body of research illustrating Canada's 'visible minority' population continues to be negatively affected by dominant group discrimination, the results of the study raise questions about the culpability of state representatives in the reproduction of ideas of difference which continue to inform the country's social imaginary and hinder the equality and inclusivity of minority groups within the national collective.

*“I must say a word about fear. It is life's only true opponent. Only fear can defeat life. It is a clever, treacherous adversary, how well I know. It has no decency, respects no law or convention, shows no mercy. It goes for your weakest spot, which it finds with unnerving ease.*

Yann Martel, *Life of Pi*

## ***I. INTRODUCTION***

In early September 2011, a few days prior to the tenth anniversary of 9/11, Prime Minister Harper remarked in a CBC interview that although Canada was now safer than it was ten years ago, “the major threat is still Islamicism.”<sup>1</sup> His statement sparked a flurry of commentary. The Conservative camp quickly explained that the Prime Minister was referring to *Islamic* terrorism when he made mention of *Islamicism* (a term which, problematically, refers both to the study of Islam and the radicalization of Islam.) Tarek Fatah, of the Canadian Muslim Congress, supported the Prime Minister’s statement, arguing that “*Islamism* is a political doctrine and fascist ideology that encourages violence,” while Shahina Siddique, executive director of Islamic Social Service of Canada, expressed her great disappointment with the Prime Minister’s comments, explaining that “to brush the faith with the same stroke...is not something I expect from a prime minister [emphasis added.]”<sup>2</sup> Islamicism, Islamism, Islamic... although the matter is certainly undeserving of levity, it somewhat parallels the Gershwin lyrics “you like tomato, I like tomahto” for, no matter what the correct definition of these derivatives of the word ‘Islam’ may be, it is unreasonable to expect the Canadian public, under a steady barrage of often shrill voices warning of the Islamic terrorist, Islamist extremism, Islamicism and Islamism, to easily draw distinctions between the nuances of these terms and maintain a mental separation

---

<sup>1</sup> Meagan Fitzpatrick, “‘Draconian’ Anti-Terrorism Laws Not Needed, Opposition Says,” CBC News, 7 September, 2011, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/story/2011/09/07/pol-harper-islamicism-reaction.html>.

<sup>2</sup> Fitzpatrick.

between religion and extremist group. Public confusion, and there is plenty, and the negative emotions and images these terms summon within the public imaginary are hardly surprising. The end result of qualifying a crime with a religion or ideology, whatever the crime and whatever the religion or ideology, is the creation of a cognitive link between a belief system and a criminal act. When such discourses are repeated by individuals in positions of power and circulated through mass media, they give rise to mental templates which direct the way we perceive other cultures and religions, our compatriots and our neighbours and, ultimately, ourselves.

While 2011 marked ten years since the terrorist attacks of September 2001, it also marked the fortieth anniversary of multiculturalism in Canada, an occasion that passed in relative silence and without the week-long media spotlight afforded to remembering 9/11. The lack of acknowledgement is at odds with the fact that Canada is one of the few remaining Western countries in which multiculturalism enjoys state support. At events showcasing the Canadian identity, political figures and state representatives regularly boast of the country's multicultural history and policy. Likewise, state officials routinely credit the country's cultural and ethnic diversity for contributing to the nation's strength and wellbeing. However, these public tributes aside, there remains widespread misunderstanding amongst the Canadian public as to what multiculturalism actually means, especially the extent to which it allows immigrants to live their lives outside the nation's laws and institutions. Moreover, there is ample evidence suggesting that image belies practice and, beneath the country's celebrated narratives of cultural equality and ethnic harmony, multiculturalism has not neutralized historical power relations between minority groups and the white population of European-origin.

In a nation of increasing ethnic and religious diversity, these findings are especially troubling. When ideas of difference affect the way we think about one another, they influence our decision-making and our behaviours, leading to social and economic inequality, exclusion and societal tensions. While this thesis focuses on one specific topic, Canada's security discourses and their role in shaping public perception of Muslims, the study ultimately contributes to understanding a much larger issue: the construction of otherness and the production and reproduction of ideas of difference within diverse societies.

Canada may now be one of the most ethnically diverse countries in the world but, up until the 1960s, the country's immigration strategy was explicitly racist with policies crafted to preserve the white European character of the nation. Only when racial preferences were eliminated from immigration policies in 1962 did significant change in the ethnic and cultural makeup of the national collective occur. While individuals of European descent comprised as much as 87 percent of Canada's immigrants in 1966, four years later that number had dropped to 50 percent and, by 2008, migrants hailing from the U.S. and Europe accounted for less than 15 percent of Canada's new permanent residents.<sup>3</sup> As a result of consistently high immigration numbers and higher birth rates among non-European immigrants, Statistics Canada's forecasts 'visible minorities' will represent approximately one-fifth of the Canadian population by 2017 and one-third of the population by 2031.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Valerie Knowles, *Strangers at our Gates, Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-2006*, (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2007), p. 211 and "Facts and Figures 2008 – Immigration Overview: Permanent and Temporary Residents, Permanent Residents by Source Country," Citizen and Immigration Canada, August 2009, <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2008/permanent/10.asp>.

<sup>4</sup> Krishna Pendakur, "Visible Minorities in Canada's Workplaces, a Perspective on the 2017 Projection," [www.sfu.ca/~pendakur/pendakur\\_2017.doc](http://www.sfu.ca/~pendakur/pendakur_2017.doc), p. 2 and "Projections of the Diversity of the Canadian Population, 2006 to 2031," Statistics Canada, March 2010, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-551-x/91-551-x2010001-eng.pdf>, p. 23.

Canada's Muslim population represents one of the country's fastest-growing minority groups. Although significant Muslim immigration to Canada began only in the 1990s, in the ten years between 1991 and 2001, numbers increased by a noteworthy 128.9 percent.<sup>5</sup> Statistics Canada collects data on religion with every second Census survey. At the time of writing this thesis, 2010 data was not yet publically available. However, by using information collected during the 2001 Census and population projection models, Statistics Canada estimated the Muslim population numbered 884,000 in 2006, a figure representing 2.7 percent of that year's total population. Statistics Canada further projects that by 2031, the number of Muslims living in Canada will grow to approximately 2,870,000 and account for 6.8 percent of the country's total population and one-half of the non-Christian population.<sup>6</sup> As these projections illustrate, Muslims will represent an increasingly significant component of the national fabric in the years to come.

Although the category 'Muslim Canadians' is suggestive of a group whose members share strong religious or cultural connections, quite to the contrary, Canada's Muslims are of diverse national origins, sects, political and religious orientations. Muslim Canadians hail from all parts of the globe with significant numbers originating in South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Bosnia. While the majority of Muslims in Canada are Sunni, there are also large numbers of Shia, Ismaili and Ahmadi.<sup>7</sup> When this thesis refers to Muslims, or 'Muslims and Arabs' as a collective, it does not imply commonality where there is none but instead refers to a diverse ethno-religious population that has been socially

---

<sup>5</sup> Haideh Moghissi, et al, *Diaspora by Design, Muslim Immigrants in Canada and Beyond*, (University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2009).

<sup>6</sup> "Study: Projections of the Diversity of the Canadian Population," Statistics Canada, March 2010, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/100309/dq100309a-eng.htm>, pp.1 & 25.

<sup>7</sup> Kent Roach, "Canadian National Security Policy and Canadian Muslims," in *Muslims in Western Politics* ed. Abdulkader H. Sinno (Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 2009), pp. 220-221.

categorized as a homogenous group because of Western misrepresentation. Nonetheless, despite the population's diversity, both in Canada and globally, Western-produced representations of Muslims, and Arabs for that matter, have historically been of a monolithic entity and are often associated with negative imagery.

The history of negative Western representation of Eastern cultures can be traced back as long as Western civilizations have had contact with Islamic civilizations. As Edward Said argues in *Orientalism*, the seminal work on the subject, these historical ideas of difference and incompatibility continue to direct contemporary Western perceptions of Islamic populations.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, long held essentializing views which position Islamic cultures as 'backwards' and dangerous are now giving rise to domestic tensions as migration from Eastern nations to the West increases. As will be discussed throughout this thesis, Muslims, and individuals perceived to be Muslim, who reside in Western nations are frequently equated as one and the same as the Islamic fundamentalists who are the subjects of so many security texts and media reports. The result of such persistent misrepresentation is the creation of group of people who are socially positioned as the outsiders within.

Despite Canada's multicultural identity and its celebrations of cultural and ethnic diversity, negative portrayals of Muslims are commonplace. Studies reveal significant numbers of the Canadian public, while supportive of diversity and the country's multicultural policy, simultaneously agree that placing Muslims and Arabs under extra scrutiny is acceptable in order to preserve national security.<sup>9</sup> This contradiction might not be surprising because, as the thesis will argue, national security discourses regularly utilize

---

<sup>8</sup> Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

<sup>9</sup> One recent example is "A Decade After September 11th 2001," Leger Marketing, Association for Canadian Studies, 12 September, 2011, <http://www.acs-aec.ca/en/social-research/racism-discrimination-human-rights/>.

racialized assessments of dangerous which associate Muslims with a propensity for terrorist violence. As well, surveys of the Muslim population reveal many respondents believe non-Muslim Canadians do not like Muslims or that they believe Muslims are violent.<sup>10</sup> These findings raise serious questions about the societal obstacles barring Muslims from enjoying a sense of national belonging and social wellbeing. Canada's religious and ethnic diversity increases every year and these types of studies should serve as warnings about the potential for increased social exclusion and social tensions if the sources of negative perceptions are not addressed.

While there is an ample body of scholarship dedicated to the media's role in the reproduction of negative post-9/11 portrayals of Muslims and Arabs – Wendy Naava Smolash's work, referenced throughout this thesis, is but one example – it is important to recognize the media's reliance on statements from government and policing bodies to lend veracity to its reports. Likewise, as George Melnyk explains, when the media picks up on a political discourse, it often “repeats it endlessly” thereby creating a validity and legitimacy which becomes a sense of “public morality defined in terms of ‘good’ and ‘bad.’”<sup>11</sup> To be sure, the impact of state-produced discourses upon the social imaginary is significant. Because state actors operate from positions of social and material advantage, they possess great power in defining our national norms and shaping our social realities.<sup>12</sup> While there are always competing voices within any system of representation, the power balance between those voices is rarely equal. In his case, the state's assessments of danger, its

---

<sup>10</sup> Raja G. Khouri, *Arabs in Canada Post 9/11*, (Montreal and Toronto: G-7 Books, 2003), pp. 23-24.

<sup>11</sup> George Melnyk, “The Word ‘Terrorism’ and its Impact on Public Consciousness,” in *Understanding Terror, Perspectives for Canadians*, ed. Karim-Aly S. Kassam (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2010), p. 103.

<sup>12</sup> Teun A. van Dijk, “Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments,” in *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*, ed. by Stephen Harold Riggins (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), pp. 31-64.

definitions of terrorism and the terrorist and the priorities to which it chooses to direct public attention all operate as signals which can mark individuals and communities as part of the nation's 'in-group' or as a threat to its safety.

Although Canada's security policies are now framed and directed by the country's values and identity as a multicultural nation and although they no longer overtly identify the threatening Other in our midst based upon ethnic or cultural qualities, many critics argue that the state's propensity to portray minority groups as enemy aliens continues, only in a subtler manner than what was practiced in the past. Peter Li explains that the reproduction of "race" and racial differences do not necessitate the abandonment of democratic principles but, on the contrary, can be articulated through "a discourse that makes use of codified concepts and syntax to sanctify 'racial' messages and make them appear not in contradiction to the principles of equality and non discrimination."<sup>13</sup> Because racialized representations are often embedded in seemingly neutral discourses, the thesis utilizes the methodology of critical discourse analysis.

Critical discourse analysis examines the ways that discursive activity creates and sustains unequal power relations. The methodology is premised on the understanding that our social realities are produced and made real through discourses. As Nelson Phillips and Cynthia Hardy explain, "[w]ithout discourse, there is no social reality, and without understanding discourse, we cannot understand our reality, our experiences or ourselves."<sup>14</sup> Therefore, the research in this thesis asks how, in a country that celebrates a multicultural identity and promotes itself as a defender of ethnic and religious equality, are security

---

<sup>13</sup> Peter Li, "Social Inclusion of Visible Minorities and Newcomers: The Articulation of 'Race' and 'Racial' Difference in Canadian Society," Paper prepared for Conference on Social Inclusion, Ottawa, 27-28 March, 2003, [http://www.ccsd.ca/events/inclusion/papers/peter\\_li.pdf](http://www.ccsd.ca/events/inclusion/papers/peter_li.pdf), pp. 4 & 6.

<sup>14</sup> Nelson Phillips and Cynthia Hardy, *Discourse Analysis, Investigating Processes of Social Construction*, (Thousand Oaks California: Sage Publications, 2002), p. 2.

discourses informing the nation's social imaginary about the place of Muslims within the national collective? Do Canada's security discourses cast a shadow of suspicion upon Muslims? Do they suggest Muslims have a propensity for terrorist violence? These questions are at the heart of the research in this project.

## ***II. LITERATURE REVIEW***

### ***i) Canada's Muslims and 9/11***

#### *- Post-9/11 Representations*

Since the September 2001 terrorist attacks, unfavourable perceptions of Muslims have increased in Canada. In her study of post-9/11 discrimination, Denise Helly discovered that significant numbers of Canadians agreed they had grown *more* mistrustful of Muslims overall and especially of those with Middle-Eastern origins.<sup>15</sup> Helly also noted that perceptions of conflict and incompatibility between Muslims and non-Muslims had affected Canadian attitudes towards immigration. A 2002 survey by the Association for Canadian Studies found 43 percent of respondents believed Canada was accepting too many immigrants from Arab countries while 40 percent of respondents believed Canada was accepting too many immigrants from Asian countries, source regions for a significant portion of Canada's Muslim population.<sup>16</sup> In comparison, the disapproval rate for individuals emigrating from Africa and Latin America was much lower at 24 percent while the disapproval rate for migrants hailing from Europe was 16 percent.<sup>17</sup> More recently, in the months leading up to the tenth anniversary of 9-11, a Leger Marketing survey of over 1,500

---

<sup>15</sup> Denise Helly, "Are Muslims Discriminated Against in Canada Since September 2001?" in *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 36, No. 1 (2004), p. 35.

<sup>16</sup> Helly, p. 35.

<sup>17</sup> Helly, p. 35.

Canadians discovered that 56 percent of respondents agreed there is an irreconcilable conflict between Western societies and Muslim societies.<sup>18</sup> These results indicate a large portion of the non-Muslim population continues to harbour suspicion towards Muslims, even ten years after 9-11.

Post-9/11 mistrust of Muslims and Arabs is not a Canada-specific issue and evidence suggests the problem is even more pervasive in other Western nations. According to Ariane Chebel D'Appollonia and Simon Reich, there is ample evidence, both in the United States and in Europe, that the war on terror increased public perception that Muslims present a threat to national security. By reviewing U.S. public opinion surveys, these researchers found a significant portion of survey respondents believed "the U.S. government should curtail civil liberties for Muslim Americans who were perceived as 'potential threats' because of their religion or Middle Eastern heritage."<sup>19</sup> Along a similar line, the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia found the general public within many European nations envisioned Islam as "a monolithic block, engaged in a clash of civilizations, aggressive, and supportive of terrorism."<sup>20</sup>

When compared to non-Muslims in other countries, non-Muslim Canadians appear to harbour less aggressive attitudes towards Islam and its followers. This difference is reflected in a 2007 Environics survey which found while 17 percent of Canadian Muslims believed most or many Canadians were hostile towards followers of Islam, similar studies in other Western Countries resulted in much higher numbers: 51 percent of Muslims in

---

<sup>18</sup> "A Decade After September 11th 2001," Leger Marketing, Association for Canadian Studies, 12 September, 2011, <http://www.acs-aec.ca/en/social-research/racism-discrimination-human-rights/>.

<sup>19</sup> Ariane Chebel D'Appollonia and Simon Reich, "Quandaries of Integration in America and Europe," in *Managing Ethnic Diversity After 9/11, Integration, Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective* ed. by Ariane Chebel D'Appollonia and Simon Reich, (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010), p. 5.

<sup>20</sup> Chebel D'Appollonia and Reich, p. 5.

Germany, 42 percent of Muslims in Great Britain, 39 percent of Muslims in France and 31 percent of Muslims in Spain believed most or many of their non-Muslim compatriots were hostile towards Muslims.<sup>21</sup> However, regardless of whether 17 percent or 51 percent of a country's Muslim population perceives aggression by its non-Muslim compatriots, *any* amount of perceived hostility towards a group of people exacts a toll on society. As the Canadian Arab Federation explains, “[i]t cannot be healthy for a community to believe that the society it is part of associates its ethnicity and predominant religion with violence and negative images.”<sup>22</sup>

Not surprisingly, researchers have found that the more personal association non-Muslim Canadians have with Muslims, the more positive their opinions of the group. A 2004 Focus Canada survey discovered that non-Muslims who had personal contact with Muslims reported a 70 percent positive impression of Islam while only 36 percent of individuals who never or rarely had contact with Muslims reported positive impressions.<sup>23</sup> In a country as large as Canada in which the Muslim minority is heavily urbanized, these differences in attitude prompt an examination of the sources through which Canadians learn about their compatriots of different ethnicities and cultures. One Canadian Arab Federation study discovered an overwhelming 92.10 percent of surveyed Muslims believed what non-Muslim Canadians know about Arab culture stems from negative stereotypes and myths.<sup>24</sup> Such findings direct attention to the state's responsibility to engage *all* its members in cross-cultural understanding. As D. Crocker et al argue, the government must place greater

---

<sup>21</sup> Michael Adams, “Muslims in Canada: Findings from the 2007 Environics Survey,” Government of Canada, Policy Research Initiative, Date Modified 30 March, 2009. [http://www.horizons.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=2009-0008\\_06](http://www.horizons.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=2009-0008_06).

<sup>22</sup> “Arabs in Canada, Proudly Canadian and Marginalized,” *Canadian Arab Federation*, April 2002, <http://www.caf.ca/Admin.aspx?AppModule=TxAppFramework.Web.Admin&Command=EMBEDDEDFILE&DataObjectID=701&ColumnID=3581&FieldName=CONTENT&Lang=EN&RecordID=407>, p. 17.

<sup>23</sup> Adams.

<sup>24</sup> Arabs in Canada, p. 17.

priority on state-supported public education to “dispel prejudices and discriminatory practices against Muslims, immigrants and ethnic community members from the Middle East.”<sup>25</sup>

Some scholars attribute the rise in misperceptions and negative stereotypes to the civilizational framework that has shaped many of our post-9/11 security discourses. According to Sedef Arat-Koc, because the 9/11 terrorists were Muslims, the “entire discursive framing of the attacks of 11 September 2001 was directed by the notion of a ‘clash of civilizations,’” a paradigm drawing from the thesis of Samuel Huntington’s *Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*.<sup>26</sup> As Karim-Aly Kassam explains, the so-called clash of civilizations perspective “establishes a taxonomy of civilizations with the ‘democratic’ Euro-America West on the top and the ... ‘bloody’ Islamic near the bottom.”<sup>27</sup> This figuration has reinvigorated historical ideas of a global struggle between a monolithic ‘West’ vs. a monolithic ‘Islamic world,’ prompting commentators, such as Haideh Moghissi et al, to argue that in our present social context, framed by the war on terror, dangerous essentialization is now “demonizing Muslim believers... regardless of the extent of their religious adherence and the nature of their beliefs...and the variety of cultures from which they originate.”<sup>28</sup> According to Moghissi et al, “Muslims in the West

---

<sup>25</sup> D. Crocker, A. Dobrowolsky, E. Keeble, C.C. Moncayo and E. Tastsoglou, “Security and Immigration, Changes and Challenges: Immigrant and Ethnic Communities in Atlantic Canada, Presumed Guilty?” January 2007, <http://atlantic.metropolis.net/security/includes/Finalreport-English.pdf>, p. x.

<sup>26</sup> Sedef Arat-Koc, “Whose Transnationalism? Canada, ‘Clash of Civilizations’ Discourse, and Arab and Muslim Canadians,” in *Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006,) pp. 227-228.

<sup>27</sup> Karim-Aly Kassam, “Conclusion: ‘The Global War on Terror’ Overdetermined as a Clash of Civilizations,” in *Understanding Terror, Perspectives for Canadian*, ed. Karim-Aly S. Kassam, (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2010), p. 242.

<sup>28</sup> Moghissi et al, p. 12.

today, like Africans historically, have become another prime example of a population against whom ‘ethnic absolutism’ is applied, and with destructive effects”<sup>29</sup>

While this thesis is framed to examine the impact of security discourses on public perceptions of Muslims, it actually addresses public perceptions of Muslims and individuals *perceived* to be Muslim. As Wendy Naava Smolash points out, “signs of race that position subjects as ‘Muslim,’ ‘Arab,’ or ‘South Asian,’ (three entirely distinct, heterogeneous, though overlapping categories) act as Foucauldian markers of guilt and suspiciousness when they circulate in the public sphere,” thereby producing “an ‘enemy’ for public consumption.”<sup>30</sup> In a similar line, Reem Bahdi discusses the now ubiquitous conflation of identities she refers to as “the ‘Arabification’ of Muslims and the ‘Muslimification’ of Arabs,” a phenomenon through which two diverse categories of people are merged together within the public imaginary to represent a homogenous collective.<sup>31</sup> However, while acknowledging the inaccuracy and racist connotations of the inclusive category ‘Muslims and Arabs,’ Sedef Arat-Koc argues there is also some truth to the category as it has “become ‘real’ in the subjection of a group of people to specific forms of racialization and political designation in North America.”<sup>32</sup> Therefore, Arat-Koc explains that when he uses the term within his writing, he is referring to a specific type of racialization rather than a group of people with common ethnic or cultural ties. For the reasons mentioned above, when the category ‘Muslims and Arabs’ is used within this paper, it does not refer to an actual ethnic or cultural group but to a socially-constructed category of people.

---

<sup>29</sup> Moghissi et al, p. 12.

<sup>30</sup> Wendy Naava Smolash, “Mark of Cain(ada): Racialized Security Discourse in Canada’s National Newspapers,” in *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 78 No. 2 (Spring 2009), p. 747.

<sup>31</sup> Reem Bahdi, “No Exit: Racial Profiling and Canada’s War Against Terrorism,” in *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*. 41 Nos. 2 and 3 (2003), p. 296 and footnote 11.

<sup>32</sup> Arat-Koc, p. 218.

- *The Problem of Profiling*

Although the Canadian government denies its security agents rely on profiling to carry out their duties, accusations that profiling exists are numerous. As Bahdi explains, the task of addressing profiling is extremely complex because of the inherent difficulty in measuring the extent to which it is practiced in Canada. Within Canada, racial profiling is the product of discretionary decision-making, not the product of policy. Therefore, when it occurs, profiling is most often undocumented, creating the public perception that targeting individuals for special scrutiny because of racialized signs of difference is not a significant problem within the country.<sup>33</sup> However, Bahdi points out that the continued reluctance of the Canadian government to take a legislative and policy stand *against* profiling together with the large number of publically prominent cases in which individuals claim they have been targeted because of their ethnicity or religious beliefs should serve as indicators that racial profiling is taking place.<sup>34</sup>

Critics argue that because the institutions charged with preserving national security routinely grant discretionary-decision making powers to their agents, they indirectly enable profiling. For example, Bahdi refers to Transport Canada which, although not officially condoning profiling, allows its security personnel the discretion to determine if an individual should be subject to greater scrutiny.<sup>35</sup> According to Bahdi, discretionary decision-making based on personal intuition is behind the reports that Arabs and Muslims, and individuals who look Arab or Muslim, are subjected to more rigorous security screening at Canadian Airports. Similarly, Helly points to security procedures at border crossings and the efforts of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service and the RCMP to “collect

---

<sup>33</sup> Bahdi, p. 297.

<sup>34</sup> Bahdi, p. 297.

<sup>35</sup> Bahdi, p. 298.

intelligence from persons active within the Muslim community,” a practice that is “justified by the need for intelligence on the possible existence of Islamist networks in Canada.”<sup>36</sup>

Helly argues that these procedures are extremely detrimental to the Muslim community, not only because they infringe on the fundamental rights of Canada’s Muslims, but because they further instill suspicion in the minds of non-Muslim Canadians.<sup>37</sup>

The issue of racial profiling reveals a significant tension within the nation’s celebrated image as a country of cultural and ethnic equality. In her discussion of the “myth of multiculturalism in the post-9/11 world,” Samantha Arnold points out that while significant number of Canadians agree they have a responsibility to cultivate racial and cultural tolerance, significant numbers simultaneously agree that racial profiling of Muslims and Arabs is acceptable.<sup>38</sup> Unfortunately, the results of the recent Leger Marketing survey indicate that such contradictory attitudes persist even ten years after September 11. The survey discovered that a significant 40 percent of respondents agreed with the statement that airport personnel should be allowed to perform extra checks on passengers who appear to be Muslim.<sup>39</sup> Once again, it appears that Canada’s image of cultural equality is in contradiction with societal practices and opinions.

According to Sherene Razack, the inconsistency between multicultural image and racially-directed security practices “turn[s] on a logic that normative citizens must be protected from those who threaten the social order, a category to which race gives

---

<sup>36</sup> Helly, p. 31

<sup>37</sup> Helly, pp. 31 & 32.

<sup>38</sup> Samantha Arnold, “Securing Canada: Muslims and the Myth of Multiculturalism in the post-9/11 World,” *Abstract of paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Honolulu, Hawaii*, March 5, 2005. (unpublished) [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p69267\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p69267_index.html).

<sup>39</sup> “A Decade After,” p. 10.

content.”<sup>40</sup> Individuals who “consider themselves ‘unmarked’ or original, easily find these [potentially discriminatory policies] defensible.”<sup>41</sup> As media, politicians and journalists continue to warn of a “deadly clash of civilizations between a medievalist Islam and a modern, enlightened West” the perceived need for the West and its authentic members to defend itself against an Islamic threat becomes all the more urgent and gives rise to an social environment in which discriminatory legislation and racist practices are accepted as reasonable measures to protect the non-Muslim population against the threatening Muslim Other.<sup>42</sup> As Sunera Thobani argues, although the country’s cultural and ethnic diversity is increasing, Canada’s anti-terrorism measures are “profoundly reshaping the meaning of Canadian nationality and citizenship” by recasting the nation as Western in nature and effectively excluding ‘non-Western’ individuals living within.<sup>43</sup> Within this framework, some individuals are perceived as in need of state protection while others are in need of surveillance.

## ***ii) Multicultural Myths***

### *- Glossing over the Continuation of Cultural Dominance*

While the literature reviewed in the previous section clearly indicates that racialized ideas of dangerousness are adversely affecting Muslim and Arab Canadians, the dominant perception within our multicultural society is that racism and discrimination are no longer relevant issues. The material presented in this next section addresses this contradiction and

---

<sup>40</sup> Sherene Razack, *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), p. 13.

<sup>41</sup> Razack, p. 13.

<sup>42</sup> Razack, p. 5.

<sup>43</sup> Sunera Thobani, *Exalted Subjects. Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), p. 221.

explores how negative perceptions of minority groups are produced and reproduced within a nation directed by multicultural values. As the reviewed scholarship indicates, multiculturalism has provided a national myth of cultural equality which has enabled a glossing over of the continuation of cultural and ethnic dominance.

Although Canada's multicultural *image* is celebrated, there is pervasive public misunderstanding about the policy itself. According to popular misconceptions, multiculturalism allows minority groups to carry on their lives in isolation from the established laws and institutions of Canada.<sup>44</sup> Kent Roach explains that multiculturalism critics and naysayers believe the policy "encourages immigrants to remain rooted in the culture, language, and politics of their homeland."<sup>45</sup> Unfortunately, there are no government-led initiatives to educate the public about the realities of multiculturalism, namely, that it does not operate in opposition to the country's institutions but within them.

In 1971, Canada became the first nation to officially adopt multiculturalism and, by enshrining the policy within the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Canada became, and remains, one of the few countries to have incorporated multiculturalism directly into the state administrative apparatus. At the policy level, multiculturalism is aimed at protecting minority rights within the common institutions and principles of the state. Will Kymlicka, one of the country's foremost multiculturalism advocates, describes the policy as reaching "beyond the protection of the basic civil and political rights guaranteed to all individuals in a liberal-democratic state to also extend some level of public recognition and support for ethnocultural minorities to express their distinct identities and practices."<sup>46</sup> Kymlicka

---

<sup>44</sup> Roach, "Canadian National Security," p. 240.

<sup>45</sup> Roach, "Canadian National Security," p. 240.

<sup>46</sup> Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Odysseys, Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 16.

points to increased naturalization rates, greater political participation of ethnic groups and higher numbers of mixed' marriages, amongst other indicators, to support his argument that multiculturalism has allowed minority populations to achieve greater integration success.<sup>47</sup>

Kymlicka's arguments aside, many scholars argue that policy alone cannot redirect long-held ideas of cultural dominance. In other words, while behaviour may be modified somewhat to align with policy, this should not be interpreted as a shift in ideology. Sunera Thobani addresses this issue by drawing attention to the sudden transformation in national image produced by the country's adoption of multiculturalism. As Thobani explains, with the passing of multicultural policy, the nation's identity was instantly recast from "a white settler colony to a multiracial, multi-ethnic, liberal-democratic society."<sup>48</sup> "Respect for diversity and cultural pluralism became emblematic of the Canadian national character" and the country was re-imagined, both at home and abroad, "as particularly amenable to resolving ethnic and cultural divisions" and welcoming of 'diverse' immigrants and their cultures.<sup>49</sup> However, transformation of national image does not necessarily equate to transformation of national ideology.<sup>50</sup> Archana Sharma rightfully recognizes that racialization in nation-making should not be dismissed as "an historical anomaly that has radically shifted with the advent of more liberal policies, including that of multiculturalism" and she reminds her audience that it was not so long ago that Canada openly supported racist immigration policies.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, one would be naïve to believe that, almost as if

---

<sup>47</sup> Will Kymlicka, "The Merits of Multiculturalism," in *Reading in Canadian History*, ed. Douglas R. Francis, (Toronto: Nelson Thompson, 2002) pp. 482 & 484.

<sup>48</sup> Thobani, p. 144.

<sup>49</sup> Thobani, pp. 143 & 144.

<sup>50</sup> Thobani, p. 144.

<sup>51</sup> Archana Sharma, "Productions and Patterns of the Migrant Body," in *Calculated Kindness: Global Restructuring, Immigration and Settlement in Canada*, ed. Rose Baaba Folsom, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2004), p. 40.

with the wave of a magic wand, policy alone could easily redirect modes of thinking that had long-dominated Canada's nation-building efforts.

Similarly, while it would be difficult to argue that multiculturalism has not advanced an anti-racist message in the country, Ben Pitcher points out that "signaling the unacceptability of racism in the public sphere" is not the equivalent of ridding society of the ideas that perpetuate racism and cultural dominance.<sup>52</sup> In fact, Pitcher argues that the very language of anti-racism is often used to discredit accusations of racism.<sup>53</sup> Along this line of argumentation, Thobani explains that Canada's multicultural discourse and its associated images of cultural and ethnic equality have become so embedded as truths within the national imaginary that "[t]he old nationalist minority, cast now as incorrigibly and shamelessly racist, [can] be made responsible for the racist sins of the past" while ongoing discrimination and racist behaviour can be explained away as unfortunate incidents caused by a few racist individuals, if not disavowed altogether.<sup>54</sup>

Such claims of cultural neutrality have led Himani Bannerji to argue that multiculturalism has become "the governing concept of a complex discourse of social power" within Canada.<sup>55</sup> In other words, if the national imaginary is so strongly influenced by the belief that discrimination and racism are no longer relevant problems, the reproduction of inequality can continue without recognition or challenge. To this end, Pitcher offers an insightful reminder when he argues that it is "often at the point where

---

<sup>52</sup> Ben Pitcher, "The Global Politics of Multiculturalism," *Development*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (December 2009), p. 456.

<sup>53</sup> Pitcher, p. 456.

<sup>54</sup> Thobani, p. 154.

<sup>55</sup> Himani Bannerji, *Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*, (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2000), p. 36.

racism is most forcefully rejected and said to have been overcome that it persists and endures, unrecognized and unnamed.”<sup>56</sup>

Critics also argue that in addition to concealing ongoing inequality, narratives of diversity and multiculturalism contain cognitive signals that *contribute* to the reproduction of inequality. For example, Bannerji points out that multiculturalism caused the entire population of non-white, non-European Canadians to be grouped together and categorized as ‘visible minorities’ and ‘minority cultures,’ effectively relegating anyone of non-European ancestry to his or her respective place within the country’s cultural hierarchy. As Bannerji argues, these categories are more than words, they are powerful concepts operating on an ideological level; they “express our socio-political understandings” and act as “codes for political subjectivities and agencies.”<sup>57</sup> Similarly, Thobani maintains that the state preserved its white national character when it officially designated non-white groups as ‘visible minorities’ because the category reinforces skin-based racial differences, thereby “opening the door to the fusing of this visible form of difference with culturally based differences.”<sup>58</sup>

Within a project that concerns itself with the impact of dominant discourses, it would be remiss to ignore these arguments. Not insignificantly, in 2007, Canada received international criticism for its use of the term ‘visible minorities’ when the UN’s Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination voiced concern that the practice of relegating people of colour to the category of ‘visible minorities’ implied that ‘whiteness’ was the

---

<sup>56</sup> Pitcher, p. 457.

<sup>57</sup> Bannerji, p. 41.

<sup>58</sup> Thobani, p. 158.

national standard.<sup>59</sup> Therefore, while this thesis does make references to the category in order to align with existing studies and literature, whenever the term ‘visible minorities’ is used, it is presented in single quotation marks to indicate it is contested terminology.

- *Measurable Effects of Ideas of Difference*

Ideas of cultural and ethnic dominance within Canada have measurable results. In the area of economic inequality, research reveals a persistent earning disparity between white Canadians and ‘visible minority’ Canadians. For example, the 2009 study of Jeffrey Reitz et al discovered that ‘visible minority’ households have significantly lower relative incomes and higher poverty rates than white Canadians.<sup>60</sup> What is most revealing here is that the researchers only examined incomes for *Canadian-born* individuals, thereby eliminating any settling-in factors that might be expected with recent immigration. Reitz et al’s findings are corroborated by the research of Krishna and Ravi Pendakur which found the earnings for Canadian-born ‘visible minority’ men were around 13 percent lower than the earnings for Canadian-born white men of similar age and education.<sup>61</sup>

Insight into the factors driving this earning disparity is provided by Philip Oreopoulos’s resume study which makes a connection between hiring practices and the job-seeker’s ethnicity. In this project, researchers altered features of otherwise identical resumes to vary the degree of an applicant’s ‘foreignness’ before submitting the resumes to prospective employers. The outcome was interview requests at a rate 40 percent higher for

---

<sup>59</sup> “UN Calls Canada Racist for ‘Visible Minorities Tag,’ *Canada.com*, 8 March, 2007, <http://www.canada.com/topics/news/national/story.html?id=f469b36e-c587-40e7-98e5-3aa50a371318&k=23802>.

<sup>60</sup> Jeffrey G Reitz, Raymond Breton and Karen K. Dion, *Multiculturalism and Social Cohesion: Potentials and Challenges of Diversity*, (Springer: Netherlands: 2009), p. 152.

<sup>61</sup> Pendakur, p. 3.

resumes containing an English-sounding name than for identical resumes with applicants with ethnic-sounding names.<sup>62</sup> These results led the researchers to conclude that racialized ideas of competence are negatively impacting the hiring process for minority group individuals and, by extension, are negatively affecting the economic outcomes for ‘visible minority’ Canadians.

Findings are equally troubling within the social arena. A 2002 Statistic Canada survey of 42,000 Canadians of various ethnic and cultural backgrounds revealed that ‘visible minority’ individuals frequently experience discomfort in social situations because of racialized or religious identities.<sup>63</sup> Even more worrisome is the discovery that the children of ‘visible minority’ immigrants reported an even more profound sense of exclusion than did their parents. It seems that perceptions of discrimination are not fading with future generations of ‘visible minorities,’ precisely the opposite pattern reported by white respondents who rarely experienced feelings of vulnerability and who described declining feelings of exclusion the longer they lived in the country. Altogether, the study strongly suggests that one’s visibility within the dominant white population plays a significant role in determining an individual’s perception of social belonging.

Perception should not be dismissed as insignificant. In a nation as diverse as Canada, perception is a crucial factor in either maintaining or undermining social cohesion. It is especially concerning then when Reitz argues the mainstream view within the country is that racism and discrimination of ethnic and religious minorities is not a problem.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Philip Oreopoulos, *Why Do Skilled Immigrants Struggle in the Labor Market? A Field Experiment with Six Thousand Résumés*, University of British Columbia, May 2009, [http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~oreo/research/compositions/why\\_do\\_skilled\\_immigrats\\_struggle\\_in\\_the\\_labour\\_market.pdf](http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~oreo/research/compositions/why_do_skilled_immigrats_struggle_in_the_labour_market.pdf).

<sup>63</sup> “Ethnic Diversity Survey: Portrait of a Multicultural Society,” Statistics Canada, 2003, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-593-x/89593-x2003001-eng.pdf>, pp. 16-17.

<sup>64</sup> Reitz et al, p. 152.

According to Rietz, this denial “undoubtedly contributes to the prevailing belief that existing government policies on the subject are adequate,” thus precluding any focused effort to correct the practices and systems that reproduce inequity.<sup>65</sup> The overall point to be taken from the discussions in this section is that despite the nation’s image as a bastion of cultural and ethnic equality, Canada’s multicultural narrative has not neutralized power relations between minority groups and the dominant population of European-origin; racialized ideas of belonging and exclusion are still active within the country. The question is: what systems of reproduction are keeping these ideas of cultural dominance alive?

### ***iii) The State and the Provision of Security***

#### *- Security as a Discourse*

The provision of security, long the utmost responsibility of the modern state to its subjects, is also a key mechanism through which national identities are defined and preserved. As Janine Brodie explains, the “the consolidation of national communities [is] often located within a particular security discourse.”<sup>66</sup> National security policies shape national identities “by identifying and acting upon the ‘radical threatening other, those who are not us and would harm us and our defining ideals.’”<sup>67</sup> Because state representatives possess the power to define national security threats, by extension, they also possess the power to define who is in need of the state’s protection and who or what that privileged group needs protection from. Therefore, Brodie argues that security discourses “categorize and organize humanity inside the territorial boundaries of national states, naturalizing the

---

<sup>65</sup> Reitz et al, p. 152.

<sup>66</sup> Brodie, p. 688.

<sup>67</sup> Janine Brodie, “From Social Security to Public Safety Security Discourses and Canadian Citizenship,” in *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 78, No. 2 (Spring 2009), p. 691.

imagined distinction between nationals (who have the birthright to national space) and foreigners (who exist outside this space or live precariously inside it.)”<sup>68</sup> Likewise, Nandita Rani Sharma argues that state elites often utilize discourses of undesirability within national security texts and speeches. Such discourses “motivate *action* towards the neutralization of whomever is presented as threatening the security of the homeland,” action that “comes to be seen as a national *obligation*.”<sup>69</sup> Because security discourses present the nation as a “community of similarity,” Sharma argues that, ultimately, those individuals identified as posing a threat “always come to be defined as foreign, regardless of the actual location of the people so identified.”<sup>70</sup>

The process by which a person or object comes to constitute a security threat is of central importance to this study. Although traditional security studies analyze threats from material perspectives, the growing field of securitization studies, while not disputing material dangers exist and have dire consequences, examines the processes by which certain issues (or people) become *socially constructed* as matters or objects of security. As Thierry Balzacq explains, “[s]ecuritization theory elaborates the insight that no issue is essentially a menace;” rather, “[s]omething becomes a security problem through discursive politics.”<sup>71</sup> According to Barry Buzan et al, “[t]he distinguishing feature of securitization is a specific rhetorical structure.”<sup>72</sup> An agent must convince an audience that an issue or thing or person demands a security response. But not every agent can successfully securitize an issue.

---

<sup>68</sup> Brodie, p. 691.

<sup>69</sup> Nandita Rani Sharma, “Nationalism and the Making of ‘Migrant Workers’ in Canada,” (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), p. 14.

<sup>70</sup> Sharma, Nandita Rani, p. 14.

<sup>71</sup> Thierry Balzacq, “A Theory of Securitization: Origins, Core Assumptions and Variants,” in *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. ed. Thierry Balzacq, (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2011), p. 1.

<sup>72</sup> Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, (Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers, 1998), p. 26.

Buzan et al point out that “the possibility for successful securitization will vary dramatically with the position held by the actor.”<sup>73</sup> “[S]ome actors are placed in positions of power by virtue of being generally accepted voices of security, by having the power to define security.”<sup>74</sup> Of course, our state representatives wield ample social power to be accepted as securitizing actors.

Along a similar line, David Campbell draws attention to the way certain issues are discursively presented as threatening or *more* threatening than others. Campbell argues that danger “is not a thing that exists independently of those to whom it may become a threat.”<sup>75</sup> Discourses labeling persons and things as dangerous do not depend on objective factors for veracity but, instead, are reliant upon their discursive effectiveness.<sup>76</sup> By way of example, Campbell refers to the process through which terrorism has become identified as the major threat to U.S. national security even though, when compared to other threats, “its occurrence within the United States is minimal...and its contribution to international carnage minor.”<sup>77</sup> While acknowledging the lives lost in the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City bombings, Campbell draws attention to the millions of other individuals who have died in the U.S. and elsewhere from civil war, preventable diseases and starvation and argues that “the concern surrounding ‘terrorism’ does not correspond with its occurrence.”<sup>78</sup> Societies and individuals face innumerable risks each day but Campbell reminds his audience that

---

<sup>73</sup> Buzan, p. 31

<sup>74</sup> Buzan, p. 31.

<sup>75</sup> David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, Revised Edition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), p. 1.

<sup>76</sup> Campbell, p. 2.

<sup>77</sup> Campbell, p. 2.

<sup>78</sup> Campbell, p. 2, see footnote 5.

“not all risks are equal, and not all risks are interpreted as dangers” regardless of their actual potential to inflict harm.<sup>79</sup>

Because state representatives operate from positions of discursive power, they are most often the determiners of national risk and dangerousness, not to mention the orchestrators of the laws and policies which determine how those risks and dangers are managed. Referring to Canada’s anti-terrorism measures, George Melnyk points out that although the threat of terrorism is real, one must keep in mind that the state controls security terminology and its usage; it “defines who is and who is not a practitioner of terrorism, never accusing itself of such acts” regardless of the violence it inflicts upon others.<sup>80</sup> Within this discursive framework, state-perpetrated violence is described as legitimate and justified while a long list of similar acts perpetrated by non-state actors is identified as terrorist activity. Once again, this discussion highlights the importance of discursive power in constructing and defining national security issues.

*- Canada’s Response to 9/11*

Canada’s response to the 2001 terror attacks was swift. The government immediately joined the U.S.-led ‘war against terrorism’ by instituting a series of wide-ranging legislative and policy developments which included amendments to criminal law, tax law, financial institution legislation, employment policies and intelligence gathering and airport security practices.<sup>81</sup> Bill-C36, passed into law on December 18, 2001 as the *Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA)*, introduced crimes into the Criminal Code which had never before been defined, including the financing of terrorist acts and the preparation to commit

---

<sup>79</sup> Campbell, p. 2.

<sup>80</sup> Melnyk, p. 102.

<sup>81</sup> Bahdi, p. 296.

terrorism.<sup>82</sup> Among other things, *ATA* legislation allows for increased powers of preventative arrests, the creation of lists identifying terrorist groups and terrorist suspects, increased provisions for maintaining government confidentiality in matters of national security and a new procedure to deregister charities suspected of having involvement with terrorist organizations either in Canada or abroad.<sup>83</sup>

Canada's counter-terrorism efforts also focus attention on the security risks posed by immigration and the immigrant. The *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA,) although introduced prior to September 11, passed into law on November 1, 2001, a few months after the terrorist attacks. The Act allows for increased power of detention over individuals deemed national security risks while simultaneously reducing an accused's access to an independent review of government security decisions.<sup>84</sup> One highly contentious feature of the IRPA is the reconfirmation of security certificates, instruments designed to remove foreign nationals accused as posing serious security risks and which preempt other immigration procedures and suspend the suspect's rights to access the evidence being used against him.

Inclusion of anti-terrorism measures within the IRPA, together with intensified pre-entry assessments for immigrants and increased surveillance of foreign nationals already in the country, have raised concerns that immigrants have become the targets of unjustified post-9/11 national scrutiny.<sup>85</sup> Erin Kruger et al argue that "[u]nder new national security objectives, the foreign national . . . becomes an object of security to be tracked, assesses and

---

<sup>82</sup> Roach, "Canadian National Security," p. 221.

<sup>83</sup> Roach, "Canadian National Security," p. 221.

<sup>84</sup> Audrey Macklin, "Borderline Security," in *The Security of Freedom, Essays on Canada's Anti-Terrorism Bill*, eds. Ronald J. Daniels, Patrick Macklem and Kent Roach, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001,) p. 384.

<sup>85</sup> Roach, "Canadian National Security," p. 231.

monitored.”<sup>86</sup> Likewise, Crocker et al argue that the inclusion of counter-terrorism efforts within immigration legislation has caused the immigrant and the terrorist to “become conflated within the public consciousness, within politics and within policy,” a fusing of identities which the authors believe has a serious consequence on citizenship.<sup>87</sup>

More particularly, many critics argue that the inclusion of religious and political motives within the *ATA*'s definition of terrorism has caused extra scrutiny to be directed towards Muslims and Arabs and those individuals perceived to be Muslim or Arab. According to these commentators, inclusion of religious, political and ideological motives within the *Anti-terrorism Act* sets the stage for profiling because it allows, and even requires, policing agents to collect evidence about a suspect's religious and political beliefs.<sup>88</sup> The Canadian Council on American-Islamic Relations' (CAIR-CAN) 2005 submission to the Senate Committee on the Anti-terrorism Act outlined the organization's concern that “introducing ‘ideology and religion’ into discussions of terrorism legitimizes intrusive and witch-hunt type questions,” a practice well-documented within several CAIR-CAN surveys.<sup>89</sup> Addressing this issue, Roach argues that while in some respects Canada's reputation for civil liberties and respect for diversity is well-deserved, the country “can, and should, do more to ensure greater respect for equality, multiculturalism and international law in its anti-terrorist activities.”<sup>90</sup> Roach expresses his disappointment that despite Canada's multicultural identity and the importance the country places on pluralism, even the

---

<sup>86</sup> Erin Kruger, Marlene Mulder and Bojan Korenic, “Canada after 11 September: Security Measures and ‘Preferred’ Immigrants,” in *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 15 (No. 4 2004), p. 80.

<sup>87</sup> Crocker, et al, p. 9.

<sup>88</sup> Roach, “Canadian National Security,” p. 224.

<sup>89</sup> “Brief on the Review of the Anti-Terrorism Act,” CAIR-CAN, June 2005, <http://www.caircan.ca/downloads/SS-ATA-06132005.pdf>, p. 7.

<sup>90</sup> Roach, “Canadian National Security,” p. 220.

American *Patriot Act* “expressed a greater concern about the dangers of profiling than the Canadian *Anti-terrorism Act*.”<sup>91</sup>

Commentators have drawn parallels between past blemishes on the country’s security history when minority groups were labeled and persecuted as enemy aliens based upon their ethnicity and the ongoing detrimental effects of Canada’s *Anti-terrorism Act* upon the country’s Muslim and Arab population. As Macklin warns, given the history of the country, Canadians have “ample reason to worry about the extent to which an abstract, collective security will be purchased through the infliction of a tangible insecurity on particular individuals and communities.”<sup>92</sup> While we commonly look to the criminal law to protect us from the alien within, Macklin urges us to also “attend to the law’s role in *producing* the alien within [emphasis added.]”<sup>93</sup> Similarly, Bahdi points to “significant parallels between Arab and Muslim experiences in the modern War against Terror and the experiences of Japanese Canadians during World War II” and maintains that, in both situations, “decision makers have found themselves unable to screen loyal citizens individually from perilous enemies because the one category became psychologically, socially, and legally mingled with the other.”<sup>94</sup> As already mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, although the outright labeling of minority groups as enemies of the state is a practice of the past, subtle discursive signals couched within seemingly neutral security policies and legislation are no less capable of producing racialized images of the threatening Other.

---

<sup>91</sup> Roach, Kent, *September 11, Consequences for Canada*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2003), p. 72

<sup>92</sup> Macklin, pp. 398 & 399.

<sup>93</sup> Macklin, p. 398.

<sup>94</sup> Bahdi, p. 308.

#### *iv) Summary of Literature Review*

The literature reviewed for this thesis indicates mistrust of Muslims, and individuals perceived to be Muslim, increased in Canada after 9/11. Even ten years after the September 11 attacks, suspicion continues to influence the nation's social imaginary. As recent surveys reveal, significant numbers of Canada's non-Muslim population, while agreeing that the country's cultural and ethnic equality should be protected, simultaneously agree that extra scrutiny of Muslims and Arabs is acceptable in order to preserve national security. Just as concerning are surveys indicating a large portion of Canada's Muslims believe what non-Muslim Canadians know of them stems mainly from negative stereotypes and misrepresentations.

In a country that embraces its multicultural image, it seems unlikely that public support for security assessments based on ethnicity or religious beliefs would exist. However, notwithstanding the mainstream view that racism and ethnic inequality are no longer relevant problems within Canada, research illustrates that power relations between the white population of European-ancestry and the country's minority groups have not neutralized because of multiculturalism. As many commentators argue, and as numerous empirical studies reveal, multiculturalism has not been a panacea for racism and discrimination. Scholars of this line of thought argue that although multiculturalism has successfully produced an anti-racist discourse, it has simultaneously enabled the continuation of cultural and ethnic domination by producing a national myth of cultural equality. Moreover, some scholars argue that the very labels and categories utilized within Canada's discourses of diversity contain signals of representation which reproduce the relationships of inequality multiculturalism aims to diffuse.

Within multicultural nations, security discourses typically do not point to specific ethnic or cultural groups as the threatening Other; however, all security discourses contain discursive cues that direct an audience's imagination according to the ideology of the producer. The reviewed literature has shown that assessments of dangerousness are often socially-constructed. When the state defines who poses a threat to its members, it simultaneously identifies who rightfully belongs within the state and who belongs outside, whether that 'outside' is determined by geographic location or social inclusion. In post-9/11 Canada, ample concern exists that the country's security strategies unfairly target Muslims and that they are creating cleavages in the nation's cultural and ethnic landscape. Therefore, the research in this paper turns to a critical discourse analysis to attempt to uncover something of the ideology underlying the production of our nation's security texts and to examine if or how the country's security discourses contribute to the reproduction of the image of the dangerous Muslim Other.

### ***III. METHODOLOGY***

#### ***i) Concepts***

##### *- The Social Imaginary*

The term "social imaginary" is used throughout this thesis to describe the way individuals imagine their place and the place of others within the collective, including who belongs and does not belong. As Charles Taylor defines it, the social imaginary is "the way ordinary people 'imagine' their social surroundings," how they "fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met,

and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations.”<sup>95</sup> The social imaginary is a set of ideas shared by a large group of people, if not the whole of society, which gives rise to a common understanding that enables a common set of practices “and a widely shared sense of legitimacy.”<sup>96</sup> It is an ever-shifting terrain of representations influenced by many factors including, to a large extent, the discourses to which society is exposed.

The concept of the social imaginary also borrows from the work of Benedict Anderson and his idea of the ‘imagined community,’ the notion that members of a nation state “will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”<sup>97</sup> Although Anderson is speaking specifically about national communities, his ideas can be applied to transnational communities or hemispherical communities, collectives in which members are encouraged, through various means, to perceive a communal bond although not having first-hand knowledge of one another. Of particular interest to this thesis is the communal bond felt by members of that nebulous community, ‘the West,’ a collective which has figured prominently in post-9/11 years and, although its boundaries and membership are impossible to define, to which this thesis makes frequent reference. Canada’s identity as a ‘Western nation’ was reinforced in the years following September 11, in no small part through the clash of civilizations discourses commonly employed to explain the 9/11 attacks and justify the national alliances forged in the aftermath. Arat-Koc notes that Canada’s belonging in the West presents challenges to our collective national social imaginary because inclusion

---

<sup>95</sup> Charles Taylor, *Modern Social Imaginaries*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004), p. 23.

<sup>96</sup> Taylor, p. 23 & 24

<sup>97</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities, Revised Edition*, (London and New York: Verso, 2006), p. 9.

within the Western community implies the exclusion or denial of, “not only other civilizations, but the histories and cultures of ‘non-Western’ diasporas living in ‘the West’”<sup>98</sup> As Arat-Koc argues, this denial encourages a “rewhitening of Canadian identity after decades of multiculturalism.”<sup>99</sup>

- *Defining Discourse*

Generally speaking, discourse refers to all written texts and spoken productions delivered in a social context. However, individual texts and speeches do not produce social realities. Alone, texts are not meaningful; they only acquire meaning through their interconnection with other texts and through the histories and contexts in which they occur. Therefore, this project adopts Phillips and Hardy’s more specific definition of discourse as “an interrelated set of texts, and the practices of their production, dissemination and reproduction that brings an object into being.”<sup>100</sup> According to this definition, discourses “are shared and social;” they emerge out of interactions between social groups and the social structures in which the discourse is embedded.”<sup>101</sup> Moreover, while a text represents a single discursive unit, a discourse is the larger process of meaning-making of which a text is but one part.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Arat-Koc, p. 229.

<sup>99</sup> Arat-Koc, p. 229.

<sup>100</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 3.

<sup>101</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 4.

<sup>102</sup> Norman Fairclough, *Language and Power* 2nd Edition, (Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2001), p. 20.

- *The Power of State-Produced Discourses*

Within democratic societies, our state representatives and their agents are the individuals with the social power to make decisions affecting the state. Most-often, it is these individuals to whom the public turns when seeking an official definition or explanation of a situation. In Western societies, the vast majority of state representatives belong to the dominant cultural group, namely, they are white and of European origin, a situation van Dijk refers to as a “complex system of double dominance of class and position.”<sup>103</sup> As a group, state representatives naturally seek to “sustain and legitimate the dominance of the white group with which they identify,” a feat made possible because “their extraordinary legislative powers allow them to play a primary role in the reproduction of this system of dominance.”<sup>104</sup>

Representation is never a one-sided or uncontested process: meanings and identities are not simply imposed upon passive subjects but are instead negotiated, resisted and often even perpetuated by the subjects they affect. However, power imbalances between the parties in all systems of representation grant certain individuals great advantage in imposing their meanings and representations on others, namely, those individuals in possession of greater material and social resources have the advantage in shaping our social realities.<sup>105</sup> Political figures and state agents e the role of discourse in the reproduction and challenge of dominance enjoy “preferential access to material social resources and control over various forms of public discourse” thus giving them significant power in controlling public

---

<sup>103</sup> van Dijk, “Political Discourse,” p. 33.

<sup>104</sup> van Dijk, “Political Discourse,” p. 35.

<sup>105</sup> Teun A. van Dijk, “Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis,” in *Discourse & Society*, 4, no. 2, p.250.

discourse, shaping public opinion and building public consensus.<sup>106</sup> The ability to control public discourse creates the prime conditions in which control over the minds of people, as well as the management of social representations, can be gained.<sup>107</sup>

Kay J. Anderson's study tracing the country's evolving perception of Vancouver's Chinatown provides insight into the way state-produced discourse can perpetuate cultural dominance. Anderson argues that the Canadian state is "centrally implicated in the making of the Canadian social order" and is "a most effective 'private apparatus' of European hegemony."<sup>108</sup> Drawing from the work of Antonio Gramsci and his concept of cultural hegemony, Anderson illustrates how state discourses have been instrumental in determining and reproducing the official characteristics of Chinese Canadians.<sup>109</sup> An important aspect of Anderson's work is the attention she pays to discourse that does not directly denigrate minority groups but, nonetheless, effectively produces and reproduces negative imagery and ideas of difference. Anderson argues that this "benign face to racial ideology" has allowed cultural domination and the construction of otherness to avoid major resistance.<sup>110</sup> While overtly discriminatory discourse would not attract majority public support, subtle forms of negative representation can thrive within a multicultural society.

Similarly, van Dijk draws attention to the power of subtle forms of negative representation and argues that negative perceptions and the reproduction of ethnic and cultural inequalities in liberal democracies most often emerges through subtle and symbolic means, not through blatantly discriminatory or racist political discourse or action.

---

<sup>106</sup> van Dijk, "Political Discourse," p. 33.

<sup>107</sup> van Dijk, "Principles of CDA," p. 257.

<sup>108</sup> Kay J. Anderson, *Vancouver's Chinatown, Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875-1980*, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), p. 26.

<sup>109</sup> Anderson, p. 25.

<sup>110</sup> Anderson, p. 27.

Therefore, in order to understand the impact of state discourses upon the social imaginary, a researcher must delve deeper than a surface reading of state-produced texts to uncover and recognize the discursive structures and signals embedded within all text and talk. This is not to say that our state representatives and their agents consciously employ discursive strategies to convince the public of their world view. Rather, we are all influenced by the cultural systems of which we are part. Processes of representation and cultural reproduction, for the most part, are carried out unselfconsciously.

van Dijk identifies numerous discursive strategies regularly found in the discourses of government figures through which cultural and ethnic dominance is gained and maintained. One of these strategies is the pairing of positive self-representation with negative ‘Other’ representation. In this discursive structure, the text producer speaks of the nation’s long history of hospitality, equity and tolerance while simultaneously portraying immigrants or minority groups as threatening the social norms or resources and taking advantage of the tolerant and benevolent nature of the country.<sup>111</sup> Another strategy involves using the argument of fairness to avoid public resistance when the government enacts potentially, or openly, discriminatory laws or policies. In these instances, the text producer justifies his or her ‘difficult’ decision by arguing it is being made for the good of the nation; although the decision is difficult, it is fair and premised on principles of humanism and equality. Along a similar line, van Dijk observes that political figures and state representatives regularly rely on ‘the force of facts’ to lend credibility to arguments when public consensus is being sought on controversial initiatives. The ‘force of facts’ strategy provides the text producer with justification for contentious decisions by referring the public either to the international situation, previous agreements, financial difficulties or any other

---

<sup>111</sup> van Dijk, “Political Discourse,” pp. 36-37.

source of information, notwithstanding that the so-called ‘facts’ are often unclear or unsupportable.<sup>112</sup> Ultimately, because the discursive power balance is tipped in favour of our state representatives and their agents, what is said by these individuals, as well as what is not said, has a significant impact in shaping the nation’s social imaginary and informing us of our place within the social landscape.

## ***ii) Discourse Analysis***

- *What is Discourse Analysis?*

Discourse analysis is a qualitative methodology that concerns itself with the constructive effects of language. The bulk of our knowledge of our social and political ‘realities’ is formed on the basis of the discourses to which we are exposed, not on the basis of our first-hand experience. Therefore, discourse analysis embraces a social constructivist stance and endeavours to uncover the discursive processes through which our social world is developed, redeveloped and organized.<sup>113</sup> Although it is similar to other qualitative approaches that attempt to understand the meaningfulness of social life, discourse analysis stands apart from other research methods in that it strives to reveal the precarious status of meaning and the way meaning has been produced rather than attempting to understand our social world as it exists.<sup>114</sup>

Two salient features of discourse analysis are the importance the analyst pays to the interconnection between texts and the importance paid to the historical and social context within which a discourse is produced. Firstly, a discourse can never be revealed in its

---

<sup>112</sup> van Dijk, “Political Discourse,” p. 38.

<sup>113</sup> Christopher Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*, (Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave, 2010), p. 16.

<sup>114</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 6.

entirety through the examination of one document; the analyst must instead examine *bodies* of related texts to uncover clues as to the discourses from which they emerge. Texts do not produce meaning on their own; they produce meaning only when connected to other texts.<sup>115</sup> Secondly, a discourse cannot be understood without taking into consideration the context surrounding its production. Ultimately, in order to explain how social meaning is constructed, the analyst connects a text to the discourse from which it emerges while simultaneously locating the discourse within its historical and social context. For example, the research in this thesis looks at a body of related government texts and connects them to the discourses of security that have emerged in the aftermath of 9/11. Simultaneously, these discourses are studied by placing them within their social context, namely, heightened global concerns over so-called Islamic extremism and terrorism and Canada's participation in this global conversation as well as the local context of a multicultural country with a growing Muslim population. In addition, the discourses are analyzed with historical perspective. In this case, long held misrepresentation of Muslims and Arabs are taken into consideration as is Canada's security and social history.

There are numerous approaches to studying discourse for its socially constitutive qualities. Without getting into the details of various methods, differences in approach can be organizing along two theoretical dimensions, the first being the relative importance the researcher places upon individual texts versus the broader social context and the second being the importance the researcher places on power dynamics versus processes of social construction.<sup>116</sup> To be sure, all discourse analyses contain elements of each theoretical

---

<sup>115</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 4.

<sup>116</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 19.

dimension, but there is great diversity in the emphasis a researcher places on each element resulting in different styles of research.

With respect to the ‘text-context’ continuum, Phillips and Hardy explain that while context is a crucial element of any discourse analysis, projects can differ in the amount of emphasis a researcher places on distal or proximate context.<sup>117</sup> Distal context refers to broader features of social context such as ethnic composition, the institutions from where the discourse emerges, regional settings and so forth. Proximate context, as the word suggests, is concerned with more proximate contextual elements such as the interaction of individual participants in a discursive engagement or the specific occasions giving rise to a particular discourse. Critical discourse analysis, the method used within this project, places more emphasis on distal context.

With respect to the ‘power-social construction’ continuum, differences in approach occur based on the emphasis a researcher places either on the power dynamics and ideology giving rise to a certain discourse or the way social reality is constructed by a particular discourse.<sup>118</sup> While a constructivist study focuses more on the processes through which a discourse creates a certain social reality, critical studies focus more on the relations of power, knowledge and ideology surrounding a discursive process.<sup>119</sup> Once again, differences in theoretical approaches can be organized along continua, not dichotomies. Therefore, all discourse analyses contain elements of each theoretical element. Although the critical discourse analysis utilized in this thesis is more concerned with the connection between language and power than with processes of social construction, ultimately, the

---

<sup>117</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 19.

<sup>118</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 20.

<sup>119</sup> Phillips and Hardy, p. 20.

research presupposes an understanding of the ways discourse influences our social imaginaries and constructs our social realities.

- *What is Critical Discourse Analysis?*

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was chosen for this project because it attempts to understand the reproduction of social relations of power and dominance through discourse. An underlying tenet of CDA is that discourse has the power to “interpret conditions, issues, and events in favour of the elite.”<sup>120</sup> As Terry Locke outlines, the critical research orientation assumes, amongst other things, that “all thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are socially and historically situated” and that facts “can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription.”<sup>121</sup> Therefore, the objective of the CDA analyst is to “uncover the ideological assumptions that are hidden in the words of our written text or oral speech” in order to raise a critical awareness to resist and overcome relations of social power and dominance.<sup>122</sup> For these reasons, CDA is grounded in the sociocultural nature of discourse rather than the linguistic characteristics of text and talk.<sup>123</sup>

Although CDA research does not follow a formal blueprint, Norman Fairclough, who is credited for developing the CDA approach, has identified three stages of analysis to direct a researcher in a CDA project, namely: *description* of the text, *interpretation* of the relationship between the text and social interaction and *explanation* of the relationship

---

<sup>120</sup> Sue L.T. McGregor, “Critical Discourse Analysis – A Primer,” *Kappa Omnicron Nu Forum*, 15, No. 1, (Spring 2003), on-line, <http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html>.

<sup>121</sup> Locke, Terry, *Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Method*, (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2004), p. 25.

<sup>122</sup> McGregor.

<sup>123</sup> Frances Henry and Carol Tator, *Discourses of Domination, Racial Bias in the Canadian English-Language Press*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), p. 72.

between social interaction and social context.<sup>124</sup> The three stages do not operate as separate processes but blend into one another, especially as the description of the text somewhat presupposes the interpretation to come. When critically analyzing a text, the researcher's focus is "constantly alternating between what is 'there' in the text, and the discourse type(s) which the text is drawing upon."<sup>125</sup> In this way, the research is able to move beyond a surface reading of a text and identify the more nuanced discursive features that are responsible for the reproduction of power.

With respect to the descriptive process of analysis, Fairclough urges CDA researchers to examine a text's vocabulary, grammar and textual structures in order to locate cues revealing the text producer's experiential values, relational values and expressive values. *Experiential values* offer insight into text producer's experience of the social world, thus reflecting the knowledge and beliefs being represented within the text.<sup>126</sup> Often, experiential values are coded into the text through vocabulary, perhaps through the use of words that are ideologically contested or through the use of metaphors which have ideological attachments. *Relational values* are cues of the social relations represented and reinforced through the text. When looking for relational values, the analyst focuses on how a text's words, grammatical structures and textural structures depend on existing relationships and create social relationships between participants.<sup>127</sup> For example, the pronouns 'we' and 'you' are often used to represent relations of power and solidarity as when statements utilize an 'inclusive we,' thus implying the text producer has the authority

---

<sup>124</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 91.

<sup>125</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 92.

<sup>126</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 94.

<sup>127</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 97.

to speak for others and pass his or her opinions as the opinions of all others.<sup>128</sup> Finally, *expressive values* are cues into the text producer's evaluation of the reality surrounding the text.<sup>129</sup> Expressive values are ideologically significant as they reveal a text-producer's positive or negative feelings about a situation or subject. Often, they are central feature of persuasive language in which a text-producer's goal is to persuade the audience of the correctness of their opinion or value of an issue.

The interpretation process of CDA is conducted through the information a researcher finds within the text *and* through the information the researcher herself brings to the analysis.<sup>130</sup> Analysts are constantly drawing upon their own understandings of the social world and their own values when they interpret how discourses are operating. According to Fairclough, during the interpretation stage in the CDA process, the only feature distinguishing a researcher from the text-producer she is analyzing is the researcher's self-consciousness.<sup>131</sup> In the explanation stage of CDA, the researcher's objective is to explain how a discourse is part of a social process determined by social structures, namely relations of power, as well as the impact the discourse has upon those social structures.<sup>132</sup> Explanation involves the researcher making assessments on how power relations helped shape the discourse, what ideologies were drawn upon to create the discourse and how the discourse contributes to either sustaining or changing existing power relations.

Ultimately, the goal of the CDA researcher is to encourage social change through awareness and critical understanding. By that very objective, CDA research is normative

---

<sup>128</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 106.

<sup>129</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, pp. 93 & 94.

<sup>130</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 118.

<sup>131</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 139.

<sup>132</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power* p. 135.

and political and the analyst inevitably assumes a specific sociopolitical stance.<sup>133</sup> While a common critique of CDA studies is that they lack objectivity, Fairclough points out that all discourse researchers have “particular motivations for asking certain questions about texts and not others.”<sup>134</sup> Moreover, as Fairclough argues, there can never be an objective analysis of discourse in which the analyst simply describes what is ‘there’ in the text without being biased by his own subjectivity.<sup>135</sup> Ultimately, every researcher is motivated by his or her subjectivity and ideology and all social research questions inevitably emerge from the researcher’s particular motives that “go beyond what is ‘there’ ” in the data.<sup>136</sup>

### *iii) Text Sources*

The texts analyzed for this study were drawn from three sites of production and are predominantly post-September 2001 works. However, to provide a somewhat richer contextual analysis several pre-9/11 documents were included. Firstly, a collection of speeches from the throne, produced between September 23, 1997 to June 3, 2011, was examined to provide something of a contextual framing for the analysis of security texts. Delivered at the opening of each new session of parliament, the speech from the throne represents the core document of the central government and provides a foundational narrative from which the state’s legislative and policy developments emerge. Although the speeches are crafted less to address the specifics of national issues and more to provide a broad overview of the current government’s vision for the country, they offer insight into the government’s ideological leanings which, doubtlessly, affect the discourse of the state’s security agents as they are ultimately responsible for carrying out the mandate of these

---

<sup>133</sup> van Dijk, “Principles of CDA,” p. 252.

<sup>134</sup> Norman Fairclough, *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2003, p. 14.

<sup>135</sup> Fairclough, *Analyzing Discourse*, pp. 14-15.

<sup>136</sup> Fairclough, *Analyzing Discourse*, p. 15.

central government figures. As George Melnyk argues, governments “are ideologically motivated entities with economic and social interests and political goals.”<sup>137</sup> The discursive signals found within the speeches from the throne can help reveal these interests and goals and aid in constructing an intertextual framework for the analysis of security documents.

Secondly, the bulk of security texts examined for this project was drawn from documents produced by the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), a choice that needs little explanation as it is almost a matter of course that discussions of national security in Canada include references to the work or opinions of CSIS. As the state’s intelligence-gathering agency, CSIS is tasked with collecting information on national security threats and providing security advice to the state’s policing agents and legislative decision-makers. All of the CSIS data examined for this study was drawn from the agency’s website and is readily available to the public. The only exception is the 1999-2006 Annual Reports which, although now archived by the department, are available to the public upon request. According to CSIS’s 2009/2010 Annual Report, the agency’s website received more than six million visitors for the reporting year, three million of which were unrelated to recruitment or job postings. As CSIS claims, its website is a popular source of public information about the agency’s work and the nation’s current security environment.

To include a slightly wider perspective on the country’s security discourses, the third source of documents is the National Security Criminal Investigations Program of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (the RCMP.) As the state’s policing agency, the RCMP is entrusted with the responsibility of “preventing, detecting and investigating terrorism-

---

<sup>137</sup> Melnyk, p. 103.

related criminal activities in Canada.”<sup>138</sup> As is the case with CSIS documents, all of the RCMP texts analyzed for the study were drawn from the department’s website and are easily accessible by the public. Although the number of relevant online documents is limited, this body of texts complements the CSIS-produced texts as both the RCMP and CSIS are integral agents in the provision of national security, as well as authoritative sources of public knowledge on the national security environment.

Although examined together for the purposes of this study, speeches from the throne and security texts are guided by different processes of production and consumption. Fairclough refers to these practices as *genre*, a term he defines as the “relatively stable set of conventions that is associated with and partly enacts a socially ratified type of [discursive] activity” such as an informal chat, an interview, a newspaper article or a policy document.<sup>139</sup> According to Fairclough, “[a] genre implies not only a particular text-type, but also particular processes of producing, distributing and consuming texts.”<sup>140</sup> For example, speeches from the throne are produced following a historically established convention. These documents are crafted by elected officials at the beginning of each new session of parliament and utilize a somewhat standardized format to set out the priorities and national vision of a government whose legitimacy has been secured by electoral process. On the other hand, the production of security texts does not follow such a prescribed norm. Instead, production occurs largely in reaction to security issues as they arise. Therefore, our security agents must continually seek to legitimize their actions and

---

<sup>138</sup> “National Security Community Outreach,” Royal Canadian Mounted Police, <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/nsci-ecsn/pdf/nscs-ecsn-eng.pdf>.

<sup>139</sup> Norman Fairclough, “Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis,” in *Linguistics and Education*, 4, (1992), p. 284.

<sup>140</sup> Fairclough, “Intertextuality,” pp. 284-5.

garner public support through their texts, an objective which affects the tone, language and style of the productions.

However, while speeches and security texts must be recognized for their discursive dissimilarities so as not to make unsupportable presumptions about the way they reinforce one another, so to must they be recognized as separate communicative events within a *genre chain*. According to Mohammad Nodoushan, a genre chain “refers to how spoken and written texts cluster together in a given social/communicative context.”<sup>141</sup> All discursive fields are made up of separate communicative events, each of which is guided by its own genre and each of which functions as a ring in a genre chain.<sup>142</sup> Furthermore, genre chains “involve systematic transformations from genre to genre.”<sup>143</sup>

Turning to the texts analyzed in this study, speeches from the throne are but one communicative event in the discursive field of national security. Among other things, elected representatives use the speeches to outline the central government’s security priorities and to define the issues that threaten the nation’s security. Security texts represent another communicative event in the genre chain. However, while security texts are guided by a separate set of conventions, they are simultaneously reflective of the central government’s priorities and definitions as often contained within the speeches. Likewise, security texts influence the production of speeches from the throne in that security agents’ assessments of the threat environment shape central government priorities. Of course, there are numerous other communicative events in the genre chain, such as media reports which ensure security discourses receive wide dissemination, but what this discussion means to

---

<sup>141</sup> Mohammad Ali Salmani Nodoushan, “The Place of Genre Analysis in International Communication,” In *International Journal of Language Studies*. 5(1) 2011, p. 69.

<sup>142</sup> Nodoushan, p. 69.

<sup>143</sup> Nodoushan, p. 69.

illustrate is that the speeches and security texts *both* contribute to national security discourses and to the securitization of certain issues in separate *and* mutually transformative ways.

#### ***IV. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS***

##### ***i) The Foundational Narrative: Examining Speeches from the Throne***

Twelve speeches from the throne, covering the time period between September 1997 and June 2011 and representing the 36th Parliament up until the first session of the 41st Parliament, were examined for the thesis.<sup>144</sup> These twelve texts were analyzed for their contextual contribution to the critical reading of security texts and for the clues they contain pointing to government ideology and the continuities or shifts in the way matters of national security have been discussed by our government in the years leading up to and immediately preceding September 2001. During the timeframe examined, both the Liberal Party of Canada (the Liberals) and the Conservative Party of Canada (the Conservatives) formed governments. However, because the purpose of this study is to provide an overall picture of the influence of state-produced security discourses and not to compare and contrast partisan discourse, other than instances where differences between political party texts are relevant to the argument advanced in this thesis, they have not been commented upon. Instead, the speeches, have been studied as an aggregate body of documents.

##### ***- Evoking Fear***

Language summoning an emotional response from an audience represents an expressive value of a text producer. The expressive value of language reflects a text

---

<sup>144</sup> Speeches from the Throne. Parliament of Canada. <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/compilations/parliament/ThroneSpeech.aspx?Language=E>.

producer's positive or negative evaluation of a situation and can be key elements of persuasive language and a mechanism through which a text producer convinces his audience of the accuracy of his evaluation. In the matter of government-produced texts, the state's evocation of fear is a powerful discursive strategy in public consensus-building, especially in situations where legislation or policies may be controversial.<sup>145</sup> Similarly, the evocation of fear is a highly effective feature in shaping the social imaginary about the identity of a threatening Other, a theme further developed in the critical analysis of security texts that follows.

Over the course of the twelve analyzed speeches, a growing tone of negativity develops when the government discusses issues of public and national safety. While earlier speeches tend to adopt an optimistic tone, more recent speeches evoke a sense of fear through the inclusion of statements referring to declining safety, escalating security threats and increasing national and global instability. Declining optimism and waning confidence are hardly surprising when placed in context of the security and economic issues emerging in the aftermath of 9/11. However, the speeches reveal that the shift in tone is more closely correlated to political party than to context. A noticeable line of demarcation exists between the speeches crafted by Liberal governments, which tend to deliver optimistic messages, and the speeches delivered by the Conservative government, which frequently feature statements evoking fear and uncertainty.

The reason for pointing out the differences between political parties is to highlight the arbitrary nature of assessments of danger. Certainly, it seems more plausible that emotive statements of danger on the rise and global and national stability on the decline would be present within the first few speeches from the throne following 9/11 rather than

---

<sup>145</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 99.

emerging in speeches produced almost five years later. However, because the state and its representatives operate from positions of discursive power, they are the ultimate determiners of the risks and the dangers facing society. Referring back to Campbell's arguments, these dangers do not necessarily rely on objective factors for their veracity but are constituted through *effective* discourses.<sup>146</sup> Similarly, Corey Robin explains that politicians and government agents have much freedom in identifying the threats that face society and, "[i]n choosing, interpreting and responding to these objects of fear, leaders are influenced by their ideological assumptions and strategic goals."<sup>147</sup>

Speeches produced up until April 2006 do not contain statements that evoke fear in the audience. Rather, the expressive value of the language most often reflects the government's positive evaluation of the national situation. For example, in the September 1997 speech, the audience is told that "Canadians feel better about their own future and the country's future" and that the country's values "equip us exceptionally well for the challenges of the new age." A similar tone of optimism is utilized in the October 1999 speech in which the public learns that "Canadians are justifiably proud of having built communities where citizens feel safe" and "Canada has the momentum to lead the way toward a safer and more secure world." Interestingly, even one year after 9/11, in the September 2002 speech, statements evoking fear are not present. To the contrary, the government states that "Canadians today are confident about their personal prospects and Canada's future." While the government acknowledges that the events of 9/11 demonstrate "[w]e live in uncertain times" and "our progress at home can be affected in a moment by world events," these statements remain informative rather than emotive.

---

<sup>146</sup> Campbell, p. 2.

<sup>147</sup> Corey Robin, *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.16.

However, a noticeable change in tone occurs within the April 2006 address, the first speech from the throne produced by the Conservatives. Now, statements referring to public and national security contain discursive signals that warn of increasing dangers and decreasing safety. For example, in the April 2006 speech, the government states that, “[u]nfortunately, our safe streets and healthy communities are increasingly under the threat of gun, gang and drug violence” and, in the October 2007 address, the audience learns that “Canadians feel less safe today and *rightly* worry about the security of their neighbourhoods and the country [emphasis added.]” Inclusive statements, such as the one immediately preceding, present the text-producer’s evaluation of reality and imply that individuals who disagree with such evaluations are ‘wrong.’ Of course, the same is just as true when the text producer presents a positive evaluation of a situation and then suggests that all Canadians feel this way. However, what is at issue in this discussion is the power a text producer gains through the evocation of fear.

Political fears are not the same as individual fears. As Corey Robin explains, private fears are manifestations of our own personal experiences and psychologies and have little impact beyond ourselves. Political fear, on the other hand, refers to people’s “apprehension of some harm to their collective well-being.”<sup>148</sup> Political fear arises from “conflicts within and between societies” and has widespread societal impacts such as influencing the development of public policy and bringing certain groups into power while ensuring others stay out.<sup>149</sup> Because of the power that can be wielded through political fear, Robin argues

---

<sup>148</sup> Robin, p. 2.

<sup>149</sup> Robin, p. 2.

that it be considered a political tool, “an instrument of elite rule or insurgent advance, created by political leaders or activists who stand to gain something from it.”<sup>150</sup>

Parties in positions of discursive power can easily evoke fear amongst the public by projecting the idea that the public is in danger while withholding the details of what exactly the danger constitutes. Smolash points out that vague or incomplete references to danger imply an audience should know why it should be fearful. For example, when the government states that Canadians are justified in being afraid, such as in the October 2007 speech, the statement acts as information that constitutes the knowable, thereby sending the message that “a generalized national community feels fear and, [therefore,]... normative members of this community should be afraid.”<sup>151</sup> When these ideas are linked to coexisting discourses that inform the public of the identity of a threatening Other, the stage is set for the public acceptance of discretionary profiling of those individuals whose ‘authenticity’ within the collective has been placed in question. Razack and Thobani both address this issue in their arguments that suspension of the rule of law, erosion of civil liberties and increased policing powers, all in the name of national security, enjoy popular support in Canada because of the widespread belief that the ‘in-group’ must be protected from some threatening outsider living within.<sup>152</sup>

- *Problematizing the Country’s Openness to Immigration*

Another discursive shift found within the speeches is the manner in which Canada’s ‘openness to immigration’ is presented. Although extolled as a national strength in speeches delivered prior to 9/11, post-9/11 addresses begin to link immigration to increased

---

<sup>150</sup> Robin, p. 16.

<sup>151</sup> Smolash, p. 753.

<sup>152</sup> Razack, p. 13 and Thobani, pp. 220-222.

security risks. This shift reflects the government's ideology or belief system about the social world. In September 1997, Canadians are informed that "[o]ur values of openness, tolerance and sharing... equip us exceptionally well for the challenges of the new age." Likewise, one year after 9/11, in the September 2002 speech, the audience is told that "[o]ne of Canada's greatest assets – and a unique advantage in a globalized world – is our openness to immigrants from every corner of the globe." Through these statements, immigration is presented as a national strength and is associated with Canada's success.

However, in the October 2004 address, a change occurs and the text makes a subtle connection between Canada's open society and issues of national security. In the October 2004 speech, the public learns that the "new security threats that face Canada demand new approaches" and those approaches will be directed by national security policy to "ensure a more focused and integrated approach to securing our open society." Any uncertainty about what is implied by the phrase "securing our open society" is cleared away in the October 2007 speech which presents the country's openness to immigration as a national security challenge. In this speech, the government informs its audience that it "will address Canadians directly on *the challenge* of protecting our free and open society with a statement on national security [emphasis added]" and that it will introduce legislation to ensure it "has the tools it needs to stop those who would threaten our cities, communities and families, including measures to strengthen the *Anti-Terrorism Act* and to respond to the Supreme Court decision on security certificates," the Supreme Court decision in question being the February 2007 ruling that security certificates were unconstitutional.

While the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) deals exclusively with acts of terrorism, security certificates are administered under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and

are designed to remove foreign nationals deemed to be threats to national security. Therefore, in addition to creating the image of the risk-prone immigration society, the passage also produces a connection, even a conflation, between the terrorist figure and the immigrant, strongly suggesting that terrorism is imported by people from other countries. This mental abstraction is further supported through the relational value represented in the government's choice of the pronouns 'those' and 'our' in its statement referring to "*those* who would threaten *our* cities, communities and families [emphasis added.]" The pronoun 'those' does not have clear antecedent, thus leaving it to the reader's or listener's imagination to infer who these dangerous individuals may be. Moreover, the inclusive "our" implies that "those" who pose a threat do not belong to "our" cities, "our" communities or "our" families. These individuals are outsiders.

Although post-9/11 speeches begin to draw a connection between Canada's openness to immigration and heightened security risks, the government continues to portray Canada's diversity as a national strength. For example, the October 1999 address includes a statement that Canada is a country of "men and women of many different cultures, races and religions" and that the nation's "diversity is a source of strength and creativity." Six years later, in April 2006, Canadians are told that their country "is uniquely blessed in the strength and diversity of its people and regions" and, in March 2010, the government states that "[t]o be Canadian is to show the world that people drawn from every nation can live in harmony."

Concurrent representations of the troublesome open society and the strong diverse society may appear to be somewhat contradictory: how can a nation that extols diversity as a national strength be challenged by its openness to immigration? The answer is located in

the understanding that there are strong societal norms in Canada against discriminatory or racist narratives. Referring back to van Dijk's arguments, the formation of negative social perceptions and the reproduction of ethnic and cultural inequality in Western democratic nations most often occur through subtle and symbolic discourses.<sup>153</sup> To this end, one of the discursive strategies van Dijk recognized in his research of political discourses is the strategy of pairing positive self-representation, in which political figures extol the nation's long history of hospitality, equity or tolerance, etc., with negative 'other' representation, in which immigrants or minority groups are portrayed as taking advantage of the tolerant and benevolent nation and threatening the social norms or resources of the country.<sup>154</sup>

Therefore, by simultaneously circulating discourses that, at one end, celebrate diversity and extol it as a national strength and, at the other end, portray openness to immigration as a challenge to national security, the speeches from the throne produce the image of a country that, although accepting of and open to immigrants from all over the world, is forced to adopt national security strategies and policies to keep dangerous outsiders at bay. Claims that Canada's policies are discriminatory or unduly harsh to immigrants, foreign nationals or minority groups are defused by the positive self portrayals of a nation which embraces diversity. In this construction, diversity is not the problem nor are Canada's policies and practices: dangerous outsiders are the problem.

While the speeches reveal the emergence of a discourse portraying the immigrant as a security threat, not all immigrants are equally affected by post-911 immigration policies and not all immigrants are imagined as posing a risk to national security. The finer discursive cues located in the critical analysis of security texts that follows suggests that it is

---

<sup>153</sup> van Dijk, "Political Discourse," p. 36.

<sup>154</sup> van Dijk, "Political Discourse," pp. 36-37.

*certain* immigrants who present challenges to the nation's security. Kruger et al address this matter when they argue that, "[i]n the post-11 September political climate, governmental discourses increasingly relate foreign nationals to terrorists and/or threats to national security," *especially* those foreign nationals from regions deemed to be terrorist locations.<sup>155</sup> These discourses give rise to a racialized image of the dangerous foreign national eager to enter Canada for terrorist purposes and casts suspicion on individuals of similar national, cultural and ethnic backgrounds who are already living inside the country.<sup>156</sup>

*- Reimagining Terrorism and the Terrorist*

Without delving into the history of terrorism in the modern world, suffice to say our awareness of and vulnerability to terrorism long pre-dates the September 2001 attacks. Moreover, Canada itself has firsthand experience with terrorist acts, the Air India bombing and the attacks and murders carried out by the Front de libération du Québec immediately come to mind. Yet, speeches from the throne crafted after 9/11 present terrorism as a 'new' threat to national security. For example, in the February 2004 speech, Canadians are told that: "Given the responsibility to address *new* threats, such as non-state terrorism...the Government will develop...Canada's first national security policy" and, in the October 2004 speech, Canadians learn that: "The *new* security threats that face Canada demand new approaches immediately [emphasis added.]" Certainly, 'non-state terrorism' did not first reveal itself via the September 11 attacks but has posed a threat to societies as long there have been nation states and non-state actors intent on using violence to achieve their agendas.

---

<sup>155</sup> Kruger et al, pp. 78 & 80.

<sup>156</sup> Kruger et al., p. 79.

The discursive decision to suggest Canada is facing a previously unknown danger is ideologically significant as it reveals the government's interpretation of our social reality, namely: post-9/11 terrorism is something different from the terrorism of the past. Statements describing terrorism as a 'new' threat have the effect of erasing all knowledge of terrorism that has come before and creating a blank mental slate upon which the image of the terrorist figure can be redrawn according to the dominant discourses currently in circulation. In his discussion of dominant post-9/11 images of terrorists, Reza Aslan argues that societal perceptions of terrorism have narrowed after September 2001. To explain his point, Aslan argues that the 'War on Terror' is actually

a war against a particular brand of terrorism: that employed exclusively by Islamic entities, which is why the enemy in this ideological conflict was gradually and systematically expanded to include not just the persons who attacked America on September 11, 2001, and the organizations who supported them, but also an ever widening conspiracy of disparate groups... that declared [themselves] Muslim and employed terrorism as a tactic.<sup>157</sup>

Therefore, according to Aslan, the current War on Terror, in which Canada participates, can hardly be said to be a strategy against *terrorism*. If it were, it would include a wide range of terrorist activities and organizations not just Islamic entities.

In addition to fostering a reimagining of the terrorist figure, discourses that present terrorism as a 'new' problem without precedent before 9/11 raises the question of whether or not established policies and legislation can adequately deal with the issue. In the November 2008 speech, Canadians learn that

National security is the most fundamental duty of any national government to its citizens. Our Government will table a national security statement to explain how we intend to *balance* the *new* threats and challenges to national security that we face with the need for oversight, accountability and the protection of civil liberties [emphasis added.]

---

<sup>157</sup> Reza Aslan, *How to Win a Cosmic War: God, Globalization, and the End of the War on Terror*, (New York: Random House, 2009), p. xiv.

The government's choice to use the verb 'balance' creates a problematic mental abstraction in which public safety and national security are balanced against oversight, accountability and human rights. The text suggests that safeguarding national security in the face of these "new" threats is a zero-sum game. In other words, something of oversight, accountability and human rights has to be given up in order to ensure citizens' safety. As Mariana Valverde points out, people often falsely believe that if more security is needed, they will have to give up some of their democratic rights and, conversely, "if we decided to hold onto these rights and to our democratic traditions more generally, then our collective security may suffer."<sup>158</sup>

Another interesting grammatical feature of the above passage is that it does not tell us *who* is at risk of losing the benefit of oversight, accountability and protection of civil liberties. Furthermore, although the audience is told that the government owes a fundamental duty to provide security to its citizens, the text producer does not mention if these duties are also owed to non-citizens. Moreover, the second 'we' in the passage is ambiguous. Who is the 'we' being challenged by these new threats? Is it the government alone? Is it the government and its citizens? Or, do these challenges affect a larger group of people? All of the aforementioned grammatical features represent relational values of the text and offer cues into the social relations being represented and created in the discourse.<sup>159</sup> Once again, this passage produces a blank mental canvas upon which the text consumer is left to form images of the missing subjects according to the dominant representations and discourses.

---

<sup>158</sup> Mariana Valverde, "Governing Security, Governing Through Security," in *The Security of Freedom, Essays on Canada's Anti-Terrorism Bill*. eds. Ronald J. Daniels, Patrick Macklem and Kent Roach, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), p. 83.

<sup>159</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 93.

Analysis of post-9/11 speeches reveals a discursive separation between terrorist and criminal, this although the *ATA* is administered within the country's *Criminal Code*. Within earlier speeches, when terrorism is discussed, it is presented as one item in a list of other criminal activities. For example, the government tells its audience in the October 1999 address that it “will work to combat criminal activity that is becoming increasingly global in scope, *including* money laundering, terrorism, and the smuggling of people, drugs and guns [emphasis added.]” Similarly, in January 2001, the government explains it will “focus on safeguarding Canadians from new and emerging forms of crime” and then goes on to list several issues including “threats to security, such as cybercrime and terrorism.”

However, after 9/11, the speeches begin to speak of terrorism as an act separate from criminal activity. In the March 2010 address, the audience learns that “[j]ust as criminals threaten Canadians' personal safety, terrorists threaten our country's security.” In this statement, criminals and terrorist are now portrayed as two separate figures with a line of demarcation drawn between threats to personal safety and threats to the country's security. Similarly, in the most recent speech examined, delivered in June 2011, the audience learns that “[o]ur Government will move quickly to reintroduce comprehensive law-and-order legislation to combat crime *and* terrorism;” these measures “will give law enforcement officials, courts and victims the legal tools they need to fight criminals *and* terrorists [emphasis added.]” The grammatical choice to use the conjunction ‘and’ in place of the preposition ‘including’ in the preceding statements effectively creates a mental separation between crime and terrorism and criminals and terrorists. This grammatical construction reflects the text producers’ evaluation of the reality surrounding the text, namely, that post-

9/11 terrorism represents a new societal danger which falls outside the parameters of criminal activity.

Presenting a previously-known crime as ‘new’ and disassociating it from criminality has several effects upon the social imaginary, not the least of which has already been discussed regarding the creation of a blank mental space in which the text consumer is required to reimagine the issue in question as well as its perpetrator. In addition, by separating terrorism from the category of criminality, questions develop in the public mind as to whether current laws and policies are effective to deal with the danger. If terrorism is defined as a new threat falling outside of the realm of criminality, it is likely that new procedures and legislation are required for its control.

The matter of Canada’s post-9/11 legal developments is well beyond the scope of the study, however, it is nonetheless interesting to note the arguments of Kent Roach who has written extensively on Canada’s post 9-11 legal environment. Roach argues that “[h]ad the September 11 terrorists planned their crimes in Canada and had law enforcement officials been aware of their activities, the existing law would have allowed them to be charged and convicted of serious crimes before they boarded the aircraft.”<sup>160</sup> According to Roach, although the terrorism legislation developed after the 2001 terror attacks “has symbolic and political value as a response to September 11, ...old criminal and immigration laws still provided important legal powers to respond to terrorist threats.”<sup>161</sup> If the state’s ideological separation of pre and post-911 terrorism has led to the creation of redundant legislation, what signals are couched within the country’s security texts to inform the public of the identity of the ‘new’ terrorist figure for which such legislation is required?

---

<sup>160</sup> Roach, *September 11*, p. 23.

<sup>161</sup> Roach, *September 11*, p. 21.

- *Removing Context from Terrorism*

Finally, the analysis of the speeches from the throne reveals a change in the way the central government explains the causes of terrorism. While several earlier speeches include reflection on the social and historical context behind terrorist violence, post-9/11 speeches tend to either exclude such discussions or adopt civilizational discourses which frame terrorism as an issue of opposing values, pitting ‘us’ against ‘them’ and ‘our values’ against ‘their values.’ This observation aligns with the arguments of Steven Henington, who explains that

[t]he prevailing ideological keyword of our present is ‘terrorism,’ a word that slices acts out of the historical contexts that gave them birth, reframing them as spectacles that can be understood only as outbursts of fanatical irrationality.<sup>162</sup>

In several of the earlier speeches, when the topic of terrorism is broached, themes of development, poverty and corrupt governments, as well as references to the link between national security and human security, are included. For example, in the January 2001 text, the government states that the “well-being of Canada and Canadians depends on global human security, prosperity and development.” Likewise, in September 2002, although the text producer does make mention of Canadian values, the text does not utilize a binary framework to explain terrorism. Instead, the audience is told that “[w]e see unrest in many parts of the world. We still see far too much poverty,” and “[w]e will continue to speak out in every forum for the values of pluralism, freedom and democracy, and contribute to reducing the growing global divide between rich and poor.” In these instances, the text producer provides terrorism with context and the audience has information with which to make a critical analysis.

---

<sup>162</sup> Stephen Henighan, *A Report on the Afterlife of Culture*, (Emeryville, Ont.: Biblioasis, 2008), p.46.

In later speeches, however, contextual discussions are omitted from passages dealing with terrorism and, in the October 2007 speech, a civilizational discourse is used, portraying the terrorist as intent on attacking ‘our’ society:

The concern of Canadians in protecting our communities extends naturally to protecting our country against threats to our national security: *those* who would attack the peaceful pluralism of our society through acts of terrorism [emphasis added].

In this textual construction, our country’s national security is imperiled for unknown reasons by an unknown subject referred to only by the demonstrative determiner “those.” Curiously, the statement informs the audience that, through their acts of terrorism, “those” unknown individuals also desire to attack “the peaceful pluralism of our society.” This statement produces a confusing yet distinct link between terrorism and the nation’s pluralism and diversity and, once again, the text consumer is left to supply information on the subject’s identity by utilizing preexisting knowledge. Because discourses are intricately connected to and borrow from one another, a text consumer can easily make assumptions as to the identity of this terrorist figure who opposes Canadian values and peace.

The omission of context and the inclusion of statements supporting a ‘clash of civilizations’ paradigm reflect both experiential values and relational values of the text. Firstly, the textual structures provide insight into the government’s ideological leanings and experience of the post-9/11 social world, namely, that terrorism is without context and is committed by irrational actors. Secondly, these textual structures provide clues as to the social relations being represented in the text. Drawing insight from Kassam’s arguments: The objective of the clash of civilizations argument is to provide institutional structures with

the ideological basis from which to control, marginalize and disempower the Muslim ‘Other.’ The ‘Other’ is imagined to be what the ‘Self’ is not.<sup>163</sup>

- *Summary: Contributions to the Critical Analysis of Security Texts*

Canada’s state-produced discourses are guided by the speeches from the throne. Therefore, the discoveries made through the critical analysis of these texts provide a foundational framework for the analysis of security texts which follows. The twelve speeches examined for this project reveal numerous cues pointing to post-9/11 shifts in the government’s ideological leanings.

Firstly, a notable change in tone, from confidence and optimism to fear and uncertainty, takes place in the years following 9/11. Fear is a powerful discursive motivator in consensus- building and is a mechanism regularly utilized by the political elite to persuade the public of the correctness of political opinions and evaluations.<sup>164</sup>

Secondly, textual structures within several post-9/11 speeches make a link between Canada’s openness to immigration and heightened security threats. Interestingly, while the theme of ‘immigrant as threat’ emerges within the speeches, the notion of ‘diversity as strength’ does not waiver. The resulting image is of a nation accepting of diversity but forced to adopt strict policies because of threats by the dangerous foreigner.

Thirdly, post-9/11 speeches contain textual structures portraying terrorism as a new threat to the nation. Since terrorism has existed prior to the September 11 attacks, these representatives reveal the Canadian government is speaking of a specific type of terrorism within its post-9/11 texts. Moreover, by framing post-9/11 terrorism as ‘new’ and by positioning it as an issue separate from criminality, all that has come before in terms of

---

<sup>163</sup> Kassam, “Conclusion,” p. 242.

<sup>164</sup> Robin, p. 16.

definitions and legislation to deal with terrorism is erased. The public is left to reimagine the terrorist figure according to the dominant discourses in circulation and to question the policies and legislation needed to deal with this ‘new’ threat.

Finally, later speeches avoid discussions of the root causes of terrorism and the context surrounding terrorist acts. Instead, a civilization theme begins to emerge, hinting at the government’s shifting ideological stance on the issue of terrorism, namely, that post-9/11 terrorism is an act committed by irrational actors bent on opposing ‘Western’ values.

## ***ii) Producing the Image: Essentializing Portraits of the Dangerous Muslim***

The next two chapters present the results of the critical discourse analysis of security text and talk. While the bulk of the discussion takes place in this chapter and illustrates how Canada’s state-produced security discourses construct essentializing portraits of Muslims, the following chapter dedicates itself to illustrating the manner in which security texts condone and seek public consensus for the racial profiling of Muslims. By separating the findings into two sections, it is easier to recognize the process whereby dominant discourses shape the social imaginary *and* spur discriminatory behaviours.

The material in this chapter is organized around three discursive themes: 1) associating Islam with terrorist violence; 2) presenting terrorism as a clash of cultures; and 3) reinforcing foreignness and creating precarious membership in the national community. These discourses of dangerousness and difference borrow from and feed into one another, ultimately producing the mental portrait of the Muslim as the alien within, the dangerous Other who is prone to committing terrorist violence and whose cultural values stand in stark contrast with those embraced by normative Canadian society. Through the pervasive

qualifying of terrorism with religion, the contemporary image of the terrorist within Western nations has become synonymous with the ‘Muslim terrorist.’ This image alone is hugely problematic and, when it is interwoven with discourses that speak of terrorism as a crime committed by individuals whose allegiance to and integration in Canada is suspect, it further widens the mental separation between followers of Islam and the perceived ‘us’ of Canadian society.

*- Positive Representation?*

The arguments presented in this thesis do not suggest our state representatives and agents operate within a secret agenda to persuade the Canadian public of the otherness of Muslims. On the contrary, the research explores the ideologies embedded within the Canadian psyche which operate primarily at an unselfconscious level. These ideologies influence our discourses and inform us of our place and the place of others within our national community. It bears repeating that our state security agents do occasionally address the issue of Muslim misrepresentation. However, the thesis concerns itself with dominant discourses, discourses which sustain a certain hegemonic representation of Canada and its members. Positive representations of Islam and its followers are rarely performed naturally. Most often, discussions take place in controversial contexts dealing with religious accommodation, women’s rights, radicalization or threats to national security. Moreover, when positive representation does occur, it is often done consciously to negate negative representations. In this way, while the public is told that certain pervasive images and perceptions are incorrect, they are simultaneously reminded of them.

One example of a text that might, on cursory examination, appear to constitute positive representation of Muslims is an online document produced by the RCMP's National Crime's Investigation Program. The text directly addresses the influence of security language upon our social realities. Although the discussion is crucial to dismantling pervasive post-9/11 misrepresentations, critical analysis of the document reveals it reproduces the very ideas one would hope it would combat. For example, the introduction to the document reads as follows:

*Words Make Worlds* addresses the problem of language — specifically, the language that we use to define and describe certain types of terrorist activity — and how incorrect use of such language can compound the problem. It also uses language — specifically interpretations of the concept of jihad — as a backdrop to a discussion of radicalization, its linkages to extremist action, and possible mitigating strategies.

This special report is designed primarily to stimulate discussion among RCMP members and with their counterparts in other agencies, particularly with regard to the need for a common language to describe terrorism adequately. Just as critical is the need for a comprehensive understanding of the process of radicalization and the manner in which we may intervene.

*Text 1, Source: RCMP, National Security Crime's Investigation, "Words make Worlds: Terrorism and Language," (n.d.), p. 2.*

In the opening sentence of this piece of text, the text producer states that there is a “problem of language.” From the information provided in the text, a text consumer can only be led to believe that the problem in question is terrorist activity. Likewise, from the second sentence, we learn that language, “specifically interpretations of the concept of jihad” has “linkages to extremist action” as well as “possible mitigating strategies.” Therefore, we have an action: interpretations of the concept of jihad, and a reaction: extremist action and possible mitigating strategies. Nowhere is it mentioned that the problem of language is the reproduction of negative stereotypes within the ‘non-Muslim social imaginary.’ Instead, the text suggests that language is creating misrepresentations within the ‘Muslim social imaginary’ which, in turn, are fueling extremist activity. The

second paragraph tells us that report is directed primarily at RCMP members and their counterparts in other agencies. Therefore, this document offers us a glimpse into the ideology directing the provision of security within our country.

Immediately following the introduction, under a heading entitled “Key Issues and Observations” a reader finds these initial two points:

> Terms like ‘Islamic terrorism,’ ‘Islamist terrorism,’ “*Jihadism*” and “Islamofacism” succeed only in conflating terrorism with mainstream Islam, thereby casting all Muslims as terrorists and potential terrorists.

> Distorted and inflammatory linkages between Islam and terrorism can serve to convince Muslims – both in the West and in the larger Islamic world – that the West is, in fact, their enemy.

*Text 2, Source: RCMP, National Security Crime’s Investigation, “Words make Worlds: Terrorism and Language,” (n.d.), p. 2.*

In this piece of text, the text producer first acknowledges that language has the power to misrepresent groups of people and then, in the second point, deflects focus from non-Muslim perceptions onto Muslim perceptions of “the West.” The text consumer is told that inflammatory linkages “can convince Muslims” that the West is their enemy. The word ‘enemy’ is anything but neutral and evokes images of conflict and battle. Thus, in both the introduction in Text 1 and the two points above, the individuals at risk of making misinterpretations are Muslims and the individuals at risk of suffering because of these misrepresentations are non-Muslims. The text-producer’s motive might be interpreted as an attempt to mitigate the risk of provoking Muslims who are, once again, represented as a homogenous collective in binary opposition to “the West.” Likewise, the term “Islamic world” creates a vast mental expanse between individuals imagined as belonging to that ‘world’ and those who do not. To be sure, there are also good examples of the state representative’s attempts to right the issue of negative stereotypes; however, these instances

do not constitute dominant discourses which are the focus of this project and the topic of the discussions that follow.

- *Associating Islam with Terrorist Violence*

As the critical reading of Canada's speeches from the throne suggests, in the years following 9/11, the Canadian government began utilizing a discourse referring to terrorism as a 'new' threat to the country's security. Terrorism is not a novel danger. The discursive choice to position it as such indicates the state is referring to a specific *type* of terrorism within its post-9/11 security texts. As this section will illustrate, although speeches from the throne do not identify the source of this new threat, these details are hardly necessary as the text consumer can easily infer the missing information through cues available in concurrent discourses. This process is understood through the concept of intertextuality, the manner in which a text producer makes assumptions about what an audience already knows and a text consumer utilizes preexisting knowledge when interpreting a text. An understanding of intertextuality is crucial to the arguments made in this thesis because the construction of the "alien" within our multicultural society is not accomplished through one discourse alone but through a series of interrelated discourses that rely heavily on a text consumer's preexisting knowledge.

Every discourse contains traces of other discourses and these traces are what help constitute meaning. As Fairclough explains "[d]iscourses and the texts which occur within them have histories[;] they belong to a historical series."<sup>165</sup> The interpretation of intertextual context "is a matter of deciding which series a text belongs to and, therefore,

---

<sup>165</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 127.

what can be taken as common ground for participants, or *presupposed*.”<sup>166</sup> Therefore, when our central government speaks of ‘new’ security threats within its post-9/11 speeches from the throne, what is presupposed is the commonality between the individuals responsible for these ‘new’ threats and the individuals responsible for the September 11 attacks, that commonality being an individual’s “Muslimness.” As Thobani argues, post-9/11 rhetoric “draws an equation between the actual perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks [and] all other Muslim strangers as their racial and civilizational cohorts.”<sup>167</sup> This equation has resulted in the conflation of Muslim and terrorist figure within the social imaginary.

Canada’s security texts are rife with references such as Islamic terrorism, Muslim terrorists and the now in vogue terminology, Islamist extremism, all of which create a mental link between Islam and terrorist activity. For example, the 2009/10 CSIS Public Report, the most recent report posted to the CSIS website, contains no less than sixteen references to Islam or some derivative of Islam within the first four pages of a section entitled “The Threat Environment,” most of which references evoke images of violence.

- Islamist extremist violence
- Islamist extremist-inspired violence
- violent Islamist extremists
- Islamist extremist threat
- Islamist extremist ideologue
- Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb
- Islamist extremist groups
- Somali Islamist extremist groups
- jihadists
- violent ‘jihad’ against the West
- Islamic world
- Islamist extremists are as likely to target other Muslims
- distorted interpretation of Islam
- Islamist terrorists

---

<sup>166</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 127.

<sup>167</sup> Thobani, p. 236.

- Islamist ideology
- Islamist rhetoric

*Text 3, Source: CSIS 2009/10 Public Report, The Threat Environment, Terrorism, pp 8-12.*

In the years following 9/11, the perception that terrorism is an Islamic problem has developed into an almost common sense understanding within the social imaginary, giving rise to the situation where the words ‘Islam’ and ‘Muslim’ have the potential to evoke a reflexive negative cognitive response within non-Muslim audiences. Beneath the widespread acceptance of associating terror with Islam are cultural and ethnic power relations and the hegemonic view of Canadian society. Although Canada’s Muslim population is expanding rapidly, Muslims represent a minority group with limited power of representation. As Fairclough explains, there is power *in* discourse, which enables more powerful participants to “[control] and [constrain] the contributions of non-powerful participants,” and there is power *behind* discourse, which determines who has entitlement to access certain discourses as well as impose and enforce constraints on that access.<sup>168</sup>

Without disputing that the threat of terrorist violence is real and has real consequences, we might ask ourselves: if the Muslim voice held representative power, would the country’s security discourses continue to speak of ‘Islamic terror’ and the ‘Muslim terrorist’? Helly reminds us that, while we regularly read and hear about ‘Muslim extremists’ or ‘Islamic militants,’ such descriptions are generally omitted from discussions when similar actions are undertaken by people of other faiths.<sup>169</sup>

Analysis of security texts reveals that discourses positioning Muslims as terrorist threats did not emerge after September 2001 but that they have antecedents prior to 9/11. As illustrated in Texts 4 and 5, extracted from the two pre-9/11 CSIS Public Reports

---

<sup>168</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, pp. 38 & 52

<sup>169</sup> Helly, p. 36.

included in the study, earlier security texts also contained statements describing “Islamic religious extremism” as one of the “prime motivators” of contemporary terrorism and “Sunni Islamic extremism” as “the preeminent international terrorist threat.”

While state-sponsored terrorism continues to pose a significant threat, one of the prime motivators of terrorism today is Islamic religious extremism. In the past few years, Sunni Islamic extremism, exemplified by terrorist financier Osama bin Laden, has emerged as the preeminent international terrorist threat.

*Text 4, Source: CSIS 1999 Public Report, Terrorism Today, p. 6.*

One of the prime motivators of contemporary terrorism is Islamic religious extremism, at the forefront of which are Sunni extremists.

*Text 5, Source: 2000 CSIS Public Report, The Global Security Environment, p. .1*

Another good example is found in a 1999 CSIS research paper on the topic of “Trends in Terrorism.” In this excerpt, included as Text 6, the vocabulary provides cues as to the text producer’s interpretation of the social world. Firstly, the choice to insert the word “literally” in the first sentence intensifies the statement and informs the audience that what is being said is without exaggeration or inaccuracy. Immediately following, the text producer provides the reasons for Islamic extremists posing the largest danger: In part, the danger is due to the “magnitude of numbers and Islam’s global reach” thereby implying a direct correlation between terrorist threat and the spread of Islam. A text consumer might easily conclude that if the number of Muslims and the global reach of Islam were smaller, so too would the threat of religious terrorism. Furthermore, the text-producer explains the danger is due to the “many militant Islamists who do not owe allegiance to any particular organization” unlike “the cohesive groupings *of the past* [emphasis added.]” This statement establishes the continuity of the threat of Islamic-instigated violence as well points to the increasing difficulty in countering this problem: numbers are growing, cohesive groupings are breaking down and, therefore, “identification and trace checks” are becoming difficult.

Islamic extremists literally pose the largest danger in terms of religious terrorism. In part an outcome of magnitude of numbers and Islam's global reach, it is also because, unlike the cohesive grouping of the past, many militant Islamists are individuals who do not owe allegiance to any particular organization, making identification and trace checks very difficult.

*Text 6, Source: Perspectives, Report No. 2000/01, Trends in Terrorism, 18 December, 1999.*

Statements qualifying terrorist violence with Islam continue throughout post-9/11 texts and are often accompanied by phrases warning the text consumer of the increasing global scope of the threat. For example, Texts 7 and 8, found in the 2001 CSIS Public Report, the first report published after 9/11, and in the 2003 CSIS Public Report, warn their audiences, respectively, that the danger of Islamic extremist activity “has expanded to become truly global in scope” and that “few areas in the world are immune,” the latter phrase likening the “threat of Sunni Islamic extremism” to a sickness of society for which there is no immunity. Such discursive constructions add greatly to an atmosphere of paranoia and fear as they facilitate the sense of escalating danger for which there is no solution nor safe haven. Furthermore, the cause of this escalating danger is directly connected to a specific group of individuals.

Over the past decade, Sunni Islamic extremism has become one of the primary motivators of contemporary terrorism and this phenomenon has expanded to become truly global in scope. Advocates and supporters of an extreme form of Islam are now active in a number of regions including North America, Europe, the Middle East, North Africa, Central Asia and, to a lesser extent, Latin America.

*Text 7, Source: 2001 CSIS Public Report, Global Security Environment, pp. 1-2.*

Current signs point to increased terrorist threats, particularly from Sunni Islamic extremists either directly aligned with or supporting of the ideology espoused by Al Qaeda. Osama Bin Laden has vowed to use Al Qaeda to strike the United States and its allies, including Canada. Recent history has shown that few areas of the world are immune from the threat of Sunni Islamic extremism.

*Text 8, Source: 2003 CSIS Public Report, Threats to Canadian Interest, pp. 1-2*

Without questioning the state’s assessment of the scope of the terrorist threat, the point to be highlighted from the discussion so far is that our state’s security agents utilize a

discourse of dangerousness which associates religion with terrorist violence. These discourses mark the followers of the religion with the label of suspect terrorist. When religion is used to describe a crime, it plants seeds of uncertainty in the public mind and suggests that the religion is somehow responsible, thus forestalling critical analysis of the socio political reasons for the violence. Likewise, as Kassam argues, critical capacity is similarly suspended when an individual or group is assigned the label of terrorist within the public domain. “Immediately, the individual or group is considered part of a category of the ‘other,’ undertaking an irrational act, and is inherently ‘evil.’”<sup>170</sup> Instead of questioning why certain *individuals* have chosen to commit terrorist violence, the discussion flows around a *group’s* perceived shortcomings.

Furthermore, in a country like Canada, where the Muslim population is still fairly small and the non-Muslim population still fairly unfamiliar with Islam, other than what is represented of Islam through the media, of course, one must question the capacity of non-Muslims to draw distinctions between the “extreme forms” of Islam to which our state’s agents make frequent reference and the “non-extreme” Islam practiced by their neighbours. To use the word “extreme” to describe a religion is, in and of itself, problematic. For any practice to have the capacity to become ‘extreme’ it must, at its core, contain some ‘less extreme’ form of the same controversial activity or belief. As was touched upon earlier, numerous studies illustrate that significant numbers of Canadian Muslims and Arabs believe non-Muslim Canadians perceive them in a negative light. The Canadian Arab Federation’s 2001/02 study found 41.3% of those polled believe that Canadians “don’t like Muslims”

---

<sup>170</sup> Karim-Aly Kassam, “The Terrorist ‘Other’: The Fundamentalist and the Islamist,” in *Understanding Terror, Perspectives for Canadians*, ed. Karim-Aly S. Kassam, (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2010), p. 153.

while an unsettling 84.6% believe Canadians think Muslims are violent.<sup>171</sup> While it is not possible to measure the extent to which state-produced discourses of dangerousness are driving these perceptions, one thing is certain: these discourses do nothing to counter the perceptions and misrepresentations at the heart of the issue.

The discursive linking of Islam and terrorism is found throughout the body of analyzed security documents. However, in more recent texts, there is a change in terminology through which state agents draw the connection between Islam and terrorist danger. While earlier texts make direct references to Islamic and even Sunni and Shi'a terrorism, the terminology of choice within later texts becomes 'Islamism' and 'Islamist' in reference to Islamic fundamentalist groups and their followers. For example, there are no references to Islamic extremism throughout the 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10 CSIS Public Reports. However, there are numerous references to "Islamist extremism," as illustrated in the Texts 10 and 11 below and Text 3 at the beginning of this chapter.

In the foreseeable future, the primary threat to Canada and its interests will be that associated with Islamist extremism, or what has been referred to as the "Al Qaeda phenomenon".

*Text 9, Source: 2007/08 CSIS Public Report, The Threat Environment, p.11.*

The threat from Islamist extremism continued to be the priority concern of most of the international community, including Canada.

*Text 10, Source: 2008/09 CSIS Public Report, The Threat Environment p. 9.*

While the change in terminology might suggest the state's security agents recognize the error in making associations between a religion and terrorist violence, given the history of the state's discourses of dangerousness, it is questionable whether such a slight shift in terminology is sufficient to cause the public to make a sudden cognitive leap from associating Islam with terror to associating fundamentalist groups with terror. Moreover, as

---

<sup>171</sup> Khouri, pp. 23-24

Said argues, “[t]he deliberately created associations between Islam and fundamentalism ensure that the average reader comes to see Islam and fundamentalism as essentially the same thing.”<sup>172</sup> Although one might argue that the semantic differences between the adjectives ‘Islamic’ and ‘Islamist’ constitute a clear division between religion and fundamentalist group, any nuances in meaning between two such similar terms are confusing at best and damaging at worst, especially when employed in a context so heavily influenced by racialized visions of the terrorist figure.

*- Presenting Terrorism as a Clash of Cultures*

The analysis of security texts reveals a civilizational discourse influences the country’s security discourses. Adopting a civilizational paradigm precludes significant examination of the social, political or economic issues fueling terrorist violence and instead represents terrorism as an act committed by irrational individuals opposed to Western culture and values, a theme hinted at in several post-9/11 throne speeches. Such a superficial explanation speaks of terrorism as an act fueled by conflict between two opposing civilizations, or cultures, thereby pitting an embattled ‘us’ against an irrational terrorist ‘them.’ As Kassam writes, the clash of civilizations thesis engages in a myopia where “terror is seen on religious grounds rather than within the context of human rights poverty reduction, economic development, ecological crisis, and access to resources.”<sup>173</sup> When viewed through this framework, terrorism simply becomes a problem of irrationality or cultural deficiency. Any deeper analysis into the root causes of the problem is suspended, as is any self-awareness of culpability. Ultimately, the cultural clash paradigm

---

<sup>172</sup> Said, Edward W, *Covering Islam, How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981) p. xii.

<sup>173</sup> Kassam, “Conclusion,” pp. 245-246.

facilitates a polarization, what Kassam argues is “a problem of group think, where the terrorist ‘Other’ is separate from the superior ‘Self.’”<sup>174</sup>

For example, Texts 11 and 12 describe the violent Other driven by nothing else but a perceived conflict between the West and Islam. In Text 11, the author effectively forestalls any critical discussion of terrorist violence by stating that “all” of these extremist groups “interpret world affairs through the prism of a perceived conflict between the West and Islam.” Likewise, in Text 12, the text producer draws the conclusion that “citizens and symbols of the Western world become legitimate targets” of some extremist groups “as a result of” an “extreme interpretation of Islamic law.” When terrorism is viewed through this culture clash perspective, it “generates paranoia and hostility: paranoia, because it arouses fear and suspicion through the ‘us against them’ mentality; and hostility, because these feelings of insecurity manifest themselves in expressions of anger.”<sup>175</sup> The paranoia and hostility is then directed towards the individuals who are marked by their religion or ethnicity as the threatening Other.

The threat from Islamist extremism primarily originates from several groups that can be characterized as the Al Qaeda ‘core’, its affiliated groups, and those individuals inspired by Al Qaeda’s ideology; all interpret world affairs through the prism of a perceived conflict between the West and Islam.

*Text 11, Source: 2007/08 CSIS Public Report, The Threat Environment, Terrorism, p. 10-11.*

Sunni Islamic extremist groups generally aim to establish Islamic states which follow their extreme interpretation of Islamic law. Consequently, it is also the stated goal of many of these organizations to eliminate Western and secular influences in their countries. As a result, citizens and symbols of the Western world become legitimate targets in the minds of some of these groups.

*Text 12, Source: 2002 CSIS Public Report, Counter Terrorism, Terrorism Threat, p. 6.*

Not insignificantly, our state’s security discourses portray the violent Other as the misled party under the influence of a false sense of conflict while the ‘we’ of the discursive

---

<sup>174</sup> Kassam, “Conclusion,” p. 245.

<sup>175</sup> Kassam, “Conclusion,” p. 246

equation are positioned as the enlightened party who know better and are under attack for nothing else but a belief in humanistic values. In this way, our state agents exercise their social power and place all onus of misperception on the Other. However, by the very act of stopping short at such a surface explanation and avoiding an examination of the root causes of extremist activity, the state itself is subscribing to the culture clash thesis. Canada's security discourses produce a mental abstraction of an unwinnable situation, a perpetual conflict between 'good' and 'evil.' There are no grievances to address in this conflict and no foreseeable solutions, only an ongoing battle between the misinformed violent Other and the civilized 'us' forced to put up a defence against these irrational actors.

In Text 13 we can see how the text producer exercises and maintains power by attributing the clash of cultures worldview to the Other who is represented as the party possessed of a "misguided belief that the Islamic world is under attack by the West, and thus needs to be defended with violence." Firstly, although the act of misrepresentation is cast on the Other, the statement itself reinforces the notion of two binary domains by pitting the "Islamic *world*" against "the West." Secondly, power is wielded through the discursive construction as it ultimately provides the state with justification for any violence it inflicts. As well, previous to this statement, consumers are told that radicalized individuals frequently have "significant grievances against Western Governments." However, details of these grievances are omitted and the idea is positioned immediately before a statement beginning with the transitional word, 'additionally,' thus leading an audience to connect the idea of "grievances against Western governments" with a "misguided belief that the Islamic world is under attack by the West," thereby inferring that these grievances, too, are fictitious. By attributing the clash of cultures fallacy to the Other, all of this party's claims

can be dismissed as irrational while the need for the West to examine its contributions to the conflict can be avoided.

Radicalization remains a very individual process, impossible to profile with any degree of accuracy. However, several drivers do appear with some frequency, including significant grievances against Western governments, their societies or way of life. Additionally, these individuals hold a misguided belief that the Islamic world is under attack by the West, and thus needs to be defended with violence.

*Text 13, Source: 2009/10 CSIS Public Report, The Threat Environment, Terrorism, p. 10.*

Similarly, in Text 14, the audience is told that the notion that “the world is fundamentally ‘at war’ with Islam” is the “one size fits all explanation” that drives terrorism. Here, once again, the party held liable for maintaining the clash of cultures paradigm is the Other. The text also contains experiential values that offer cues into the reality being represented by the producer. The text speaks of the “perceived” suffering of the global community of Muslims at the hands of the West thereby constructing the claims as imaginary and robbing them of legitimacy while erasing any Western culpability. Similarly, the text producer links the superficial clash of civilizations discourse with grievances based on current global conflicts, such as those in Palestine and Afghanistan, and presents such claims as a “romance” of unequal struggle that “may be especially appealing to young Muslims.” In this way, the text sets the stage to discredit any claims made on behalf of the ‘Muslim community’ against Western powers as based on the fallacy of a clash of civilizations. As Razack argues, because of the pervasiveness of these types of discourses,

[f]ew Westerners think we are implicated in the violence of our world. Instead, we are now much more likely to believe in... a contemporary form of race thinking, namely, the story that *we* are under siege by Muslims and that our governments must save us from this threat [emphasis added.] We agree for the most part that stern measures must be taken against ‘those who do not share our values.’<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> Razack, pp. 174-5.

Geopolitical factors — particularly the perceived suffering of the Ummah (global community of Muslims) at the hands of the West — are also critical drivers pushing individuals into extremist thought, if not action. The message that the world is fundamentally “at war” with Islam is key to the Islamist “single narrative” — or “one size fits all explanation” — that drives terrorism the world over. This narrative is reinforced by current events — such as the Israel / Palestine issue and the conflict in Afghanistan — which characterize the embattled Muslim communities as small but stalwart Davids beset by a lumbering and brutal Goliath. The romance of this unequal struggle may be especially appealing to young Muslims, who feel both justified and compelled to come to the aid of their brothers and sisters against the powerful forces arrayed against them.

*Text 14, Source: Radicalization: A Guide for the Perplexed, June 2009, RCMP, National Security Criminal Investigation Unit.*

In the next excerpt in Text 15, taken from a text produced by the RCMP’s National Security Criminal Investigation Program, we can see how experiential values, lending insight into the text producer’s ideology, relational values, lending insight into the relationships being presented in the text, and expressive values, lending insight into the text-producer’s evaluation of a situation, work together to position religious extremism as a problem of a clash of cultures while casting a shadow of deficiency on the Islamic diaspora. The excerpt represents one point from a list of “Key Issues and Observations” on the issue of radicalization.

At risk individuals may be characterized by a strong sense of specific or generalized grievance, with strong leanings towards a shared Islamic identity and a spirit of specifically Islamic activism and mobilization that is often in conflict with Western social and political norms. They reject Western culture and are drawn to historical and ideological discourses that “prove” the greatness of the Islamic civilization. The combination of perceived oppression and the search for a dignified alternative, easily translates into openness to physical, or practiced, *jihad*.

*Text 15, Source: RCMP, National Security Criminal Investigation Program, “Words make Worlds: Terrorism and Language,” (n.d.), p. 2.*

Firstly, the text producer is discussing features which characterize an individual’s *risk* of extremism. Therefore, the characteristics can be interpreted as contributing factors to extremist activity. The listed features include a strong sense of grievance along with “strong leanings towards a shared Islamic identity” as well as “a spirit of specifically

Islamic activism and mobilization that is often in conflict with Western social and political norms,” whatever those nebulous ‘norms’ might be. Certainly, strong leanings towards one’s religious community and a spirit of religious activism and mobilization are characteristic of members of other faiths but they are not routinely held up as contributing factors to extremist activity nor described as in conflict with Western norms. The point here is that the document is crafted from the non-Muslim subject position and the “at risk individuals” in question are members of the Islamic diaspora living in the West. Thus, the text producer exercises power over the Islamic diaspora by acting as the expert in assessing risk and representing Islam as a contributing factor to extremist activity. Presented this way, a reader might easily surmise that Islam is driving extremism.

The audience is also told that these at risk individuals “reject Western culture” – once again leaving much to the imagination – and “are drawn to historical and ideological discourses that ‘prove’ the greatness of the Islamic civilization.” This statement reinforces the notion of incompatibility between ‘Western culture’ and ‘the Islamic civilization.’ As well, the choice to insert the word ‘prove’ in quotation marks represents an experiential value of the text. It implies the text producer considers the idea of ‘proving’ the greatness of Islamic civilization odd or incorrect and therefore establishes a discursive distance from the idea.

Finally, a text consumer learns that the combination of “perceived oppression and the search for a dignified alternative, *easily translates* into openness to physical, or practiced, *jihad* [emphasis added.]” The statement could have been crafted by substituting “easily translates,” an expressive modality implying a high degree of certainty, with “may translate,” thereby presenting a possibility. As Fairclough writes, cues into the ideology of

a text producer often lie in the “the authenticity claims, or claims to knowledge, which are evidenced by modality forms”<sup>177</sup> In this case, the expressive modality ‘translates’ indicates the text producer has assessed the situation and has concluded that the listed characteristics, taken together, “easily” translate into *jihad*. Ultimately, the text casts a cloud of suspicion over individuals with an Islamic identity while portraying the Islamic belief system at odds with Western norms and culture.

- *Reinforcing Alienness and Creating Precarious Membership in the National Community*

Canada’s history of labeling the immigrant as enemy suspect is long. As Li writes, “[m]uch of Canada’s immigration discourse has to do with keeping the wrong people out and safeguarding its territorial space from introducers who are often depicted with a racial overtone.”<sup>178</sup> While Li is referring to individuals seeking access to the country, the problem has a far wider reach, extending to individuals already living in the country. Thus far, the analysis has revealed that Canada’s security discourses are tightly bound up with the image of the Muslim terrorist driven to violence because of an extreme interpretation of Islam. This section continues from that point and illustrates how discourses of difference shape our security texts and create the idea of continuous outsiders *within* the national community.

Although the analysis of speeches of the throne hinted at a post-9/11 shift in the way the central government speaks of Canada’s open society – earlier speeches presented openness to immigration as a strength while later speeches associated it with increased security risk – security texts do not follow this pattern. The idea that openness to

---

<sup>177</sup> Fairclough, *Power and Knowledge*, p. 107.

<sup>178</sup> Peter Li, “The Place of Immigrants: The Politics of Difference in Territorial and Social Space,” in *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXXV No. 2, 2003, p. 1.

immigration equals an increased risk of terrorism is found throughout the entire body of security texts, both in pre- and post-9/11 documents, perhaps not a surprising discovery in light of ‘danger at the border’ being an underlying theme of most national security discourses. As Texts 16 to 18 illustrate, pre-9/11 security texts already drew a clear connection between openness to immigration and the threat of terrorist activity. Texts 16 and 17 include the same standard line, warning the audience that Canada’s open society, among other things, “make it attractive grounds for coordinating terrorist support activities.”

Closer to home, Canada’s open society, proximity to the US and prominence in many technological fields make it attractive grounds for coordinating terrorist support activities and acquiring proprietary information and technology.

*Text 16, Source: 1999 CSIS Public Report, Global Security Environment, p. 2.*

Canada’s open society and prominence in technological fields make attractive grounds for coordinating terrorist support activities and acquiring proprietary information and technology. Canada remains a world leader in accepting refugees and immigrants, and will continue to receive a steady flow of people from some regions torn by conflict.

*Text 17, Source: 2000 CSIS Public Report, Global Security Environment, p. 2.*

Text 18, an excerpt from the earliest of the examined documents, produced in June 1998, reveals how, three years before 9/11, immigration *and* the immigrant were identified as factors contributing to Canada’s risk of terrorism. The final sentence of the first paragraph in this excerpt, which lists reasons why Canada is ‘vulnerable’ to terrorism, presents an interesting image as it suggests “the ability of the state to suppress terrorism in a ruthless, repressive fashion” is limited by “our openness and respect for rights and freedoms.” The statement presents an odd image as it might be interpreted to suggest that the state is amenable to the idea of suppressing terrorism in a “ruthless and repressive fashion” were it not for the country’s openness and respect for rights and freedoms. In the second paragraph, we learn that “the nature of our society and the related policies concerning refugees and immigrants *make us particularly vulnerable* to terrorist influences

and activities” but, in the final paragraph, we are told that “*very few*” immigrants and refugees are “bent on using Canada as a safe haven from which to support terrorist activities [emphasis added.]” Although the text producer draws a connection between immigration and terrorism, at the very least, the rhetoric is tempered with perspective, a feature not frequently found in later security texts. Nonetheless, the expatriate community is implicated in terrorist activity and its loyalty is placed in question by suggesting the community is naïve and exploitable, a theme that is intensified in texts produced in later years.

Under heading: “The Terrorism Threat to Canada”

But on the other side of the ledger, there are a variety of factors which explain why Canada is, indeed, vulnerable. Our borders and our coastlines are long. Our society, like all developed countries, is comparatively wealthy—a source of technology, of equipment and funds. As with other democracies, our openness and respect for rights and freedoms limit the ability of the state to suppress terrorism in a ruthless, repressive fashion.

We, uniquely among developed countries, exist alongside the United States, one of the world's pre-eminent terrorist targets. While distance from conflict and moderation in our policies may make us less likely than others to be a target, we also, for the very same reasons, can be seen as a haven that might be safer than others. And, finally, the nature of our society and the related policies concerning refugees and immigrants make us particularly vulnerable to terrorist influence and activities.

There is probably no country in the world that reflects the population of the planet more fully than does Canada. Links of family, emotion, culture, religion and ideology exist between millions of Canadians and societies abroad. When conflict grips those countries, its echoes can be—and are—felt here. One million legal immigrants will enter Canada over the next five years.

We remain, proudly, a primary recipient of refugees. While the vast majority of those immigrants and refugees have no greater priority than to be productive participants in a peaceful and prosperous society, there are those very few who slip through, bent on using Canada as a safe haven from which to support terrorist activities. And there are others already here—some naive—who become the focus of exploitation in support of those activities.

*Text 18, Source: WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, Submission to Special Committee of the Senate on Security and Intelligence, 24 June, 1998.*

For example, Text 19, taken from CSIS speaking notes produced one year after 9/11, typifies post-9/11 discourses linking images of the religiously-motivated figure with images

of the dangerous immigrant and the risk-prone immigrant community. In the first section of the excerpt, the consumer is provided with information on the nature of the terrorist threat and, later, is told why Canadians are vulnerable to terrorism, ending with the statement: “It is, therefore, *our* responsibility to do everything *we* can do to prevent terrorists from finding a haven in Canada and, if by chance they do, to find them and deal appropriately with them [emphasis added.]” The pronouns ‘our’ and ‘we’ reflects the social relations represented in the text and are subject to slippery interpretation: They can easily be construed to as an inclusive relationship through which the text producer is making an implicit authority claim by speaking on behalf of the audience in outlining the shared responsibility the audience has to prevent terrorists from entering Canada, as well as to find them if they are already here. This interpretation is especially likely given that the first statement in this bulleted point does make use of an inclusive pronoun by describing “[o]ur proximity and close ties to the United states.” Formal features of a text are all a matter of choice. The statement could easily have been crafted to read: “It is, therefore, *CSIS’s* responsibility to do everything *it* can do to prevent terrorists from finding a haven in Canada,” thereby avoiding any ambiguity.

## The Nature of the Threat

- In the absence of a major attack, some had advanced the view that the lack of another major terrorist attack since last year indicated that the threat had diminished.
- The absence of another massive terrorist operation during the last year was, however, never a reliable indicator of a lack of focus or ability on the part of al-Qaeda or other Sunni Islamic terrorist organizations. Al-Qaeda and its associated organizations have long been distinguished by their careful planning and patience.

[Three points omitted.]

- The important point here is that while the war on terrorism has, in our view, disrupted al-Qaeda, it remains willing and able to strike. As George Tenet, the Director of the CIA, said recently in public testimony, there are indications that Sunni Islamic terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda plan to strike against American and allied targets. Many al-Qaeda leaders are still at large and are working to reconstitute the organization and resume its terrorist operations.
- Al-Qaeda remains a dangerous organization of international scope. Its amorphous structure, always one of its hallmarks, gives it a capacity to rely on local resources, thus making it difficult to locate and neutralize. As well, it continues to receive support from extremist Sunni terrorist groups or individuals around the world.
- With trained al-Qaeda activists now present in dozens of countries, their operations do not critically depend on the existence of a centralized command structure and they can operate independently of each other.
- Given the numbers of activists trained in Afghanistan throughout the 1990s, we have to assume that they will try to strike again, and we all have seen the consequences of their success.
- As to the nature of the threat to Canadians, while we do not have the exposure of our neighbours to the south, and like them, we are likely regarded as a hard target, Canadians have a number of things to fear from terrorism.
- Our proximity and close ties to the United States, the openness of our society for the movement of both people and money, and our multi-ethnic population make our country one in which terrorists may seek to find a haven. While our situation in that respect is the same as for every other major western democracy, these are elements we would prefer not to have in Canadian society. It is, therefore, our responsibility to do everything we can do to prevent terrorists from finding a haven in Canada and, if by chance they do, to find them and deal appropriately with them.

*Text 19, Source: WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, Speaking Notes for address to Vancouver Board of Trade, 7 November, 2002.*

A more significant excerpt has been included in Text 19 to illustrate the importance of large scale structures in meaning-making. The ordering of information in a text is key feature in determining a text's interpretation as text order sets up a text consumer's expectations and directs the assumptions a consumer is being asked to make.<sup>179</sup> In the example of Text 19, the author first warns the audience of the ongoing nature of the threat and provides cues as to the identity of the threatening parties. This is accomplished through numerous religious associations, such as the statement: "Sunni Islamic terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda plan to strike against American and allied targets" and even a reference to a specific country: "Given the numbers of activists trained in Afghanistan throughout the 1990s, we have to assume that they will try to strike again..." Therefore, the initial part of the text is speaking of a very particular type of terrorism with a very particular type of terrorist in mind.

Immediately following this information, the author explains why Canadians are vulnerable to such threats. In particular, "the openness of our society for the movement of both people and money" and "our multi-ethnic population make our country one in which terrorists may seek to find a haven." The reference to Canada's multi-ethnic population is quite telling as it has no relevance to the text other than to reinforce the image of the terrorist as 'ethnic' figure. More to the point of structural features, by first identifying the dangerous Other and following with a discussion of the factors that place Canadians at risk, the text leaves little room for questioning the identity of the individuals seeking to enter Canada for terrorist purposes, the so-called "elements *we* would prefer not to have in Canadian society [emphasis added.]" Once again, the choice of the inclusive 'we' implies a relationship of solidarity between the speaker and the audience.

---

<sup>179</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, pp. 114-5.

Of course, not all texts include statements that make direct associations between terrorist activity and religion or ethnicity but these associations are hardly necessary: a consumer can easily draw the same conclusions by utilizing preexisting knowledge. As mentioned in the opening section of this chapter, we constantly rely on preexisting knowledge when interpreting texts. Moreover, as Fairclough explains, “[h]ow people interpret the point of a text is of considerable significance in terms of the effect of a text, for it is *the point* that is generally retained in memory, recalled, and intertextually alluded to or reported other texts [emphasis added.]”<sup>180</sup> In the case of Text 19, it is a fair assumption that the audience will interpret ‘the point’ of the speech as a warning about the ongoing risks posed by certain dangerous Others who are either seeking access to the country or are already living here. This is the knowledge a consumer will carry forward when interpreting other texts.

Within security texts, an individual’s ties, however remote, to regions deemed terrorist locations are also damning. In these discursive constructions, the discourse implies that individual from so-called ‘terrorist regions’ seek to enter Canada to plot or carry out terrorist violence. The texts also position individuals already living in Canada who have ties to ‘terrorist countries’ as targets of suspicion, a topic which is explored in more detail in the chapter that follows.<sup>181</sup> Suffice to say, the suspicious Others become associated with the issues in their so-called homelands and their loyalty to Canada is continually placed in question, regardless of the length of time they have been in Canada or, even more perplexing, regardless of their birth in Canada. According to Arat-Koc, “[w]e are living at a time when the transnational ties of Arabs and Muslims – whether social, familial, financial,

---

<sup>180</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 133.

<sup>181</sup> Kruger et al, p. 79.

political or involved in shaping a general sense of identity – are perceived as suspect, of not directly criminalized.”<sup>182</sup>

For example, in text 20, the author employs the strategy of positive self-representation paired with negative Other presentation to present the idea that Canada, a generous country with a “proud history of openness to newcomers from around the world” is under pressure from dangerous Others who have “strong links to homelands that are in distress, are failed states, or that harbour terrorist groups.” As a result of these links with former homelands, text consumers are told that “Canada is increasingly implicated in a more complex, turbulent world.” This statement effectively wipes away any culpability of Canadian foreign policy for the country’s involvement in global complexities and, instead, the consumer’s is led to assume that these threatening Others with their ties to troubled homelands are the reason Canada is being drawn into contentious global issues. Certainly, it is not that difficult to understand how immigrants might maintain a ‘strong link’ with their country of origin, however ‘troubled’ that country may be, without being involved in terrorist activities. In fact, most individuals from countries in distress emigrate *precisely* to escape from turmoil. Kruger et al note, the problem in perception lies in the fact that “[g]overnment discourses do not specify at what point foreign nationals who are considered to be security threats are differentiated from those who are nonthreatening.”<sup>183</sup> When this distinction is lacking, the focus turns to the *potential* for threat “thus substantiating actions directed at identifying, assessing, and, in some cases, preventing entry to, or permanent residence in, Canada [emphasis added.]”<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> Arat-Koc, p. 217.

<sup>183</sup> Kruger et al, p. 86.

<sup>184</sup> Kruger et al, p. 86.

In a much more general sense, of course, the movement of people in and out of Canada is enormous. As the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism notes in his 2009 annual report, Canada has a proud history of openness to newcomers from around the world. Canada has the highest relative immigration rate of any major Western country. In 2010, we expect to welcome about 250,000 permanent residents. This connection to the world is a Canadian hallmark, a central facet of our identity.

Increasingly, however, Canadian citizens have strong links to homelands that are in distress, are failed states, or that harbour terrorist groups. Canada is therefore increasingly implicated in a more complex, turbulent world.

*Text 20, Source: Fadden, CSIS submission to House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU,) 11 May, 2010.*

Text 21 provides a good example of how discourses of difference draw imaginary boundaries around groups considered to be vulnerable to terrorist activity. In this excerpt from a community outreach pamphlet produced by the RCMP's National Security Criminal Investigations Program, the reader learns that the outreach initiative is an effort to engage "all of Canada's ethnic, cultural and religious communities in the protection of Canada's national security," the implication being that some of these "ethnic, cultural and religious" communities are now *not* engaged and, at a more basic level, that this is an ethnic, cultural or religious problem. The text goes on to speak of a partnership with "impacted communities" and collaboration with "affected communities" in order "to counter terrorist criminal activity and radicalization leading to violence." The labels "impacted" and "affected" are ideologically significant as they represent negative expressive values indicating the author's negative perception of these communities and the idea that they are more affected than others by terrorist activity and radicalization. Through these markers, an entire group of people becomes implicated in terrorist violence. It goes without saying at this point that, through the process of intertextuality, the identities of the impacted and affected "ethnic, cultural and religious" communities are not a mystery to most readers.

The RCMP National Security Community Outreach initiative is a comprehensive effort to engage all of Canada's ethnic, cultural and religious communities in the protection of Canada's national security. The effective protection of Canada's national security requires the awareness and active engagement of all citizens, as it is a shared responsibility. A strong and integrated law enforcement approach, in partnership with impacted communities, has been created to counter terrorist criminal activity and radicalization leading to violence. While there is a clear role for law enforcement in countering violent radicalization, it must be undertaken in full collaboration with both the affected communities and the relevant government agencies.

*Text 21, Source: RCMP, National Security Community Outreach pamphlet.*

Security discourses further isolate Muslims and individuals perceived to be Muslim by constructing the terror suspect as a continuous foreigner, regardless of whether the individual in question was born in Canada. As we have already seen, security discourses are tightly bound up with racialized visions of the dangerous Other. Therefore, individuals who are marked by their religion or ethnicity as posing a threat of terrorism are also cast as continuous strangers, individuals who belong outside the bounds of normative 'Canadianness' regardless of the length of time they have lived in the country. For example, in Text 22, the CSIS Director speaks of "second- or third-generation Canadians, who in some ways are relatively well integrated into Canada economically and socially [but,] for one reason or another develop connections with their former "homeland."

Included in this grouping are a number of people who are involved in espionage and a few who are involved in foreign interference, but I guess the group I'd like to talk about a little bit are those who have been radicalized domestically. It's a characteristic that we're finding in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. Usually, second- or third-generation Canadians, who in some ways are relatively well integrated into Canada economically and socially, for one reason or another develop connections with their former homeland. They become very disenchanted and are led to contemplate doing violence either in Canada against Canadians or against someone else overseas.

The public example of this is the Toronto 18, most of whom have either pleaded guilty or are on the road, I hope, to conviction. These are people who have become appallingly disenchanted with the way we want to structure our society. They reject the rule of law, they want to impose Shariah law—they want to do a whole variety of things.

There are a number of such groups in Canada that we're investigating, as there are in the

United States and the United Kingdom. That's the most worrisome part, I think, of our work today. It's the people who have been in this country for quite a while who are rejecting the very essence of what we are in Canada.

*Text 22, Source: Fadden, CSIS submission to House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU,) 11 May, 2010.*

The idea that someone who has been born in this country can have his or her “integration” into Canadian society held up for examination, let alone be portrayed as having a former “homeland,” is not only illogical but is revealing of the world view of our state’s security agents. It is difficult to imagine that the same narrative could be employed successfully if the suspect were a second- or third- generation individual of European descent. The immigrant attachment to Canadian values and the Canadian way of life has long been deemed suspect but, as Thobani points out, this “alleged lack of attachment” is now equated with a “radical potential for terrorism among new immigrants, and *also* among the Muslim community [emphasis added.]”<sup>185</sup> There is no doubt that the subjects of Text 22 are Muslim as the author warns, in the second paragraph, that these individuals “have become appallingly disenchanted with the way we want to structure *our* society. They reject the rule of law, they want to impose Sharia law – they want to do a whole variety of things [emphasis added.]” The reference to Sharia law identifies these threatening Others by religion and the inclusive ‘our’ in the statement reinforces the divide between the normative “us” and the deviant “them.” The statement also evokes fear over the unnamed “whole variety of things” these Others want to do.

The final sentence of the passage further reinforces the alienness of the text’s subjects. Here, the author explains the problem is “the people who have been in this country for quite a while who are rejecting the very essence of what *we* are in Canada [emphasis added.]” Once again, the inclusive “we” supports a discursive hegemony

---

<sup>185</sup> Thobani, p. 236.

through which the author speaks for a normative audience when describing these deviant Others. Moreover, the author's choice to use the phrase "who have been in the country for quite a while" assigns newness or temporary status to the subjects. These people do not belong here, they are not even from here, they have only "been here for quite a while," thereby implying they were firstly somewhere else despite their birth in the country. Ultimately, these representations freeze Muslims into a permanent alien status and assign them a precarious membership in the national community. The discourses of alienness create social divisions between the Muslim and non-Muslim population and, even more worrying, they work to win public consensus for the expulsion of the threatening Other from the country.

While security texts regularly speak of keeping the threatening Other out, they also speak of having the threatening Other removed. Geo-political borders, as Macklin explains, "serve many functions in public consciousness, both literally and symbolic."<sup>186</sup> Not only do they "demarcate the nation-state's essential territoriality" and "assert and exert sovereignty," but "their selective permeability operates as a measure of the nation-state's security against external threat, whether characterized in physical, ideological or ethnocultural terms."<sup>187</sup> When a person or group becomes labeled as threatening by the nation state, the state has the power to remove the threatening party thereby reinforcing normative ideas of who belongs and who does not.

Text 23 is an example of a pre-9/11 document that utilizes the removal discourse. In this text, the author chooses to refer to 'terrorists' and not 'suspected terrorists,' or some similarly less conclusive terminology, when he speaks of denying admission to and

---

<sup>186</sup> Macklin, p. 383.

<sup>187</sup> Macklin, p. 383.

removing the threatening Other. The discursive choice represents an expressive value of the author because the label of ‘terrorist’ forecloses any public questioning or debate about the guilt of the individuals who will be removed. As Melnyk notes, once someone is identified as a ‘terrorist’ by the government, media or law, whether or not proof of guilt is available, “anyone challenging the usage or application becomes smeared with the label.”<sup>188</sup> The term, ‘terrorist,’ “has been accepted as the descriptor of a heinous moral persona” and it is meant to preclude debate.<sup>189</sup> However, examining the issue from a critical angle, if an individual *is* guilty of terrorist activity, as the label of terrorist implies, is national security best preserved by expelling the guilty party from the country and, as is often the case, relocating him or her to a country deemed a location of terrorist activity? Viewed from this perspective, the practice of expelling ‘terrorists’ strongly suggests our state agents apply the label based not on proof of guilt, but on the state’s judgment for the *potential* of guilt.

Over the past several years, in carrying out its responsibilities under the CSIS Act, the Service has targeted key individuals within terrorist organizations in order to impair their ability to operate here. The Service continues to work in partnership with Citizenship and Immigration Canada, the Department of Justice, the RCMP and the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to help prevent terrorists from entering Canada and remove those residing here.

*Text 23, Source: 1999 CSIS Public Report, Counter-Terrorism, Terrorism Today p. 6.*

Removal discourses imply that national security will be safeguarded by relocating the threatening Other beyond the border of the nation state, an idea that flies in the face of logic which would conclude that an individual proven to be involved in terrorist activity is best dealt with through proper legal channels, not by expulsion from the country so he or she can continue to pose a danger from afar. Instead of fostering a sense of security, the deportation of terrorists should result in public panic: the threatening party has been allowed

---

<sup>188</sup> Melnyk, p. 104.

<sup>189</sup> Melnyk, p. 104.

to ‘get away,’ so to speak. The disconnect between public acceptance for the expulsion of terrorists and the reality of terrorist violence being perpetuated from afar implies that public approval for deportation is based less on the belief that actual terrorists are being expelled and more on the belief that certain undesirable individuals are being removed. In this case, proof of terrorist involvement is unnecessary; what matters is evidence of one’s *risk* to commit terrorist violence in the future. Razack explains that this type of reasoning is based on a logic that “the nation is a kin group that must be fortified against outsiders whose disloyalty we will *recognize*, a disloyalty that is visible not in what people do but in who they are.”<sup>190</sup> The research findings discussed in this chapter touch directly on this issue, namely, that current security discourses reinforce the notion that one’s risk of committing terrorist violence can be assessed through one’s ethnicity, religion or transnational connections.

The expulsion of non-citizens for suspicion of terrorism is directly tied to the contentious issue of security certificates. Although the legal mechanics and constitutional validity of this instrument stretch well beyond the scope of this paper, of importance to the arguments advanced here is recognition that the removal process relies heavily upon public consensus, consensus which can be gained and maintained through discursive strategies. Text 24 reveals our state agents are well aware of the importance of not isolating the public through their actions. Within a discussion of the available methods to deal with the dangerous Other, the author states that “[t]he first step is to keep people of concern out of Canada, something that happens on a regular basis without impinging on the public conscious.” From the state’s point of view, denial of admission to the country is preferable to expulsion because the former is easier to achieve without attracting public scrutiny.

---

<sup>190</sup> Razack, p. 28.

Under heading: Nature of the Response

- To canvass some of the ways in which people of concern will be dealt with when they are identified, some will be dealt with under Immigration legislation. The first step is to keep people of concern out of Canada, something that happens on a regular basis without impinging on the public conscious. To do that, we rely on our intelligence, whether derived in Canada or from operations abroad, and information shared by intelligence services around the world with whom we have relationships. In addition, the Service is now screening all refugee claimants as they arrive in Canada. As well, the new Immigration and Refugee Protection Act sets out a process that makes possible the use of classified information in dealing with inadmissible refugee claimants who may come in the future, and some of those who are already here. The deportation provisions of that Act - held over from the old Immigration Act - will also continue to allow the government to expel those who do not have Canadian citizenship.
- We have succeeded in expelling some 14 major terrorist targets under section 40.1 of the Immigration Act, now section 77 of the new Act. Each of these cases was carefully selected because the individual was regarded as a threat. Those cases have drawn repeated legal challenges, but more resources and a very solid body of successful jurisprudence should allow this option to be used more frequently.

*Text 24, Source: Speaking Notes for WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, to the Vancouver Board of Trade, 7 November, 2002.*

Unlike Text 23, Text 24 does not make references to terrorists. Instead, this passage contains clear cues indicating the state is expelling individuals based on assessments of dangerousness. In the first paragraph, the author refers to the removal of “people of concern,” suggesting the state’s ‘concern’ about an individual’s guilt is sufficient grounds for denial of admission or deportation. In the second bulleted point, we learn that CSIS has “expelled some 14 major terrorist *targets* [emphasis added]” because, in each of these cases, “the individual was regarded as a threat.” The statement implies the individuals in question became “targets” of CSIS’s investigations and, ultimately, the subjects of expulsion, not because of evidence of guilt, but because state agents “regarded” the individuals security threats. The text strongly suggests state security agents are the rightful arbiters of guilt in matters of national security. In fact, we are told that the cases “have drawn repeated legal

challenges” indicating the situation may not be as clear-cut as portrayed. The ideas produced in Text 24 tie directly to Razack’s argument that the suspension of fundamental rights and the rule of law in the post-9/11 environment often go unchallenged because of the pervasive belief that those who threaten “us” are not like “us.” They “can only be stopped by brute force.”<sup>191</sup> Operating within this ideological framework, “only an unfettered state power can properly confront threats to the nation.”<sup>192</sup>

A larger excerpt has been included in Text 25, the final excerpt of this chapter, to illustrate how state agents utilize their position of discursive power to reinforce the dominance of their representations and points of view. This feat is accomplished by discrediting critical questioning and opposing discourses while simultaneously reinforcing the irrationality, and even the ‘inhumanness,’ of the threatening Other. Fairclough reminds us that power in discourse “is not a permanent and undisputed attribute of any one person or social grouping.”<sup>193</sup> Instead, “those who hold power at a particular moment have to constantly reassert their power, and those who do not hold power are always liable to make a bid for power.”<sup>194</sup> Therefore, discourse should always be viewed as a site of reproduction and contestation.

In Text 25, the current director of CSIS challenges a wide range of opposing discourses. He criticizes ‘our elites’ in paragraph 2 and, somewhat surprisingly, the media for downplaying the terrorist threat. In paragraph 4, “opinion leaders” are criticized. According to the text producer, “[a]lmost any attempt to fight terrorism by the government is portrayed as an overreaction or an assault on liberty.” Likewise, in paragraph six, certain

---

<sup>191</sup> Razack, p. 28.

<sup>192</sup> Razack, p. 28.

<sup>193</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 57.

<sup>194</sup> Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 57.

NGOs, advocacy journalists and lawyers are condemned for romanticizing terrorism and “forging a positive public image for anyone accused of terrorist links or charges.” On the whole, the text portrays state security agents as having to struggle against a divergent body of opponents whose inaccurate assessments and persistent downgrading of the terrorist threat seriously impede the state’s efforts to preserve national security.

1. So Canada, I think it is crystal clear, is not immune from terrorism nor untouched by its effects.
2. You would not know this to be true, however, when you look at how Canadians discuss matters of national security. Our elites tend to avert their eyes, and media tend to give what little coverage they grant on this subject to groups that seem to feel that our charm and the Maple Leaf on our backpacks are all that we need to protect us.
3. It’s a curious stance, given that Canadians accept almost all other trappings of the global system. We are a trading nation, selling, buying and investing in every corner of the world. We believe in diplomacy and international development, and devote considerable energy to making the international system strong and functional through its multi-lateral institutions. We are peace-keepers, peace-makers and combatants along with our allies when the international order is threatened. Some of these activities are fully accepted by Canadians, while others are controversial, but they are at least debated with some reason. We believe in democracy and human rights, and we believe in protecting those values with all the tools at our disposal. In that sense, we endeavour to live up to our national self-image as citizens of the world who are connected to its realities, good and bad.
4. And yet, I suggest we have a serious blind spot as a country. Many of our opinion leaders have come to see the fight against terrorism not as defending democracy and our values, but as attacking them. Almost any attempt to fight terrorism by the government is portrayed as an overreaction or an assault on liberty. It is a particular position, given that terrorism is the ultimate attack on liberties. If terrorists believe in anything, it is nihilism and death, and they are truly equal opportunity oppressors.
5. They operate across cultures and feed on hate and doubt. They are loyal to no one, embrace no national community, and play by none of the carefully nurtured rules or social conventions that nation states respect. Terrorists are therefore the ultimate enemies of a liberal democratic order and the human rights that give that order its beating heart.
6. So why then, I ask, are those accused of terrorist offences often portrayed in media as quasi-folk heroes, despite the harsh statements of numerous judges? Why are they always photographed with their children, given tender-hearted profiles, and more or less taken at their word when they accuse CSIS or other government agencies of abusing them? It sometimes seems that to be accused of having terrorist connections in Canada has become a

status symbol, a badge of courage in the struggle against the real enemy, which would appear to be, at least sometimes, the government. To some members of civil society, there is a certain romance to this. This loose partnership of single-issue NGOs, advocacy journalists and lawyers has succeeded, to a certain extent, in forging a positive public image for anyone accused of terrorist links or charges.

7. I should stress that I do understand the ‘presumption of innocence’ principle and am not arguing that those accused of offences should be portrayed as guilty. In fact, a more balanced presentation is what I am hoping for.

*Text 25, Source: Remarks by Richard B. Fadden, Director CSIS, to the Canadian Association for Security Intelligence Studies (CASIS) Annual International Conference, 29 October, 2009.*

The text also reproduces the normative “us” v. the implicit “them” binary and presents the terrorist figure as a monstrous, irrational being opposed to Canadian values. According to this construction, Canada is enlightened and just: its members are “peace-keepers” and “peace-makers” and the country’s role in violence against other nations is explained away as combat engagements “with our allies when the international order is threatened.” While “[w]e believe in democracy and human rights, and we believe in protecting those values with all the tools at *our* disposal,” terrorists are “the ultimate enemies of a liberal democratic order and the human rights that give that order its beating heart.” “*They* are loyal to no one, embrace no national community, and play by none of the carefully nurtured rules or social conventions that nation states respect.” “If terrorists believe in anything, it is nihilism and death, and *they* are truly equal opportunity oppressors.” The inclusive use of ‘we’ and ‘they’ in this text, as illustrated in the selected statements above, is relationally significant; it builds a relationship of solidarity between the text producer and the audience while reinforcing the vast incompatibility and savage aggression of a monolithic Other.

Lastly, and perhaps most revealing of the ideological stance of the text producer, after informing the audience of the heinousness of the terrorist figure and negating the validity of oppositional texts, the author suggests that the “accused” terrorist figure be

denied basic human qualities, such as familial contacts and the compassion of others. Why, the text producer asks, “are those *accused* of terrorist offences *always* photographed with their children, given tender-hearted profiles, and more or less taken at their word when they accuse CSIS or other government agencies of abusing them [emphasis added]?” The audience is encouraged to assume guilt without debate and to deny the accused his humanity. Why else would it be incorrect for one to believe that these individuals might be deserving of “tender-hearted profiles” and might, in fact, be the subjects of abuse? While the text suggests the audience should dismiss the subject’s allegations of abuse and wrongful accusal as publicity maneuvers, it simultaneously suggests the state’s assessments of danger and threat are to be construed as akin to guilt. Through these statements, the accused terrorist, along with all individuals who have become socially-constructed as having a propensity for terrorism, are pushed even further beyond the bounds of national belonging and, ultimately, expelled from full humanity. As explained by Nick Haslam, “[w]hen people are divested of their agentic and communal aspects of humanness they are deindividuated, lose the capacity to evoke compassion and moral emotions, and may be treated as means towards vicious ends.”<sup>195</sup> Public support for the suspension of rights, denial of admission to the country and expulsion beyond its borders is easily won and maintained when the subject of the action is dispossessed of human qualities.

In paragraph seven, the author adds, almost as an afterthought, that the “presumption of innocence principle” stands and the author is “not arguing that those accused of offences should be portrayed as guilty” but, rather, is looking for a “more balanced presentation.” Certainly, it would not be difficult to agree that a more “balanced presentation” is exactly

---

<sup>195</sup> Nick Haslam, “Dehumanization: An Integrative Review,” in *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 10, No. 3 (2006), p. 254.

what is needed in this excerpt as to suggest that accused individuals who claim abuse at the hands of the government are “always” photographed with their children and “more or less taken at their word” is not only absurd but flies in the face of the plethora of post-9/11 cases in which individuals have been wrongfully accused of terrorist involvement and detained. Taken all together, Text 25 provides a good example of discourse as a site of social struggle for the construction of meaning and also illustrates how our state representatives utilize their power to project their visions of truth onto the public

Ultimately, the discourses of dangerousness and differences which shape the country’s security texts construct essentializing portraits of Muslims as the dangerous, irrational Others whose religion and ethnicity signal the potential for terrorist violence. The discourses give rise to an ‘us’ v. ‘them’ framework which naturalizes the idea that Canada is under pressure from Muslims who are portrayed as permanent aliens within the national collective, regardless of their birth in the country and regardless of the country’s multicultural identity. As Smolash argues, when a religion is juxtaposed with terrorism and violence, its followers are “always at risk of being pushed to edge of belonging in moments of tension.”<sup>196</sup> The evidence found within the body of examined security texts indicates our state intelligence and policing agents play a significant role in pushing Muslims to the edge of belonging within our national collective.

### ***iii) Condoning the Behaviour: Profiling and Raising Public Suspicion***

Building on the arguments already developed, this chapter illustrates how security discourses justify the need for racial profiling and raise public suspicion about the ‘ordinariness’ of the racialized terrorist suspect. By destabilizing normalness, these

---

<sup>196</sup> Smolash, p. 759.

discourses encourage the public to engage in surveillance of the Muslim population by suggesting racialized signs of dangerousness should trump appearances of “ordinariness.” Profiling, according to Bahdi’s definition, “involves separating a subsection of the population from the larger whole on the basis of specific criteria that purportedly correlates to risk.”<sup>197</sup> The subgroup is then subjected to “special scrutiny for the purposes of preventing violence, crime, or some other undesirable activity.”<sup>198</sup> In this moment of time, the specific criteria that correlate to risk include “place of birth, religious practice, name, and physical appearance, signs that have nothing to do with any biological notion of ‘race’ but are nonetheless racialized in public discourse” in order to argue that an individual is guilty of terrorism.”<sup>199</sup> Sujit Choudhry believes the reason for the rise of profiling is clear: “[T]he hijackers identified by American law enforcement officials all appear to be to have been Arab, and the arguments made by proponents of ethnic and racial profiling is that had airport officials engaged in profiling, the terrorist acts of September 11 could have been prevented.”<sup>200</sup> Therefore, the individuals who argue in favour of racial profiling argue that the gains outweigh the losses, those losses being “the humiliation and stigmatization of Arab and Muslim communities.”<sup>201</sup>

#### *- Profiling Despite Denial?*

The Canadian government does not officially endorse profiling and, in fact, vehemently denies it relies on the procedure within its security investigations. Nonetheless, numerous commentators, including Muslim and Arab organizations, argue that racial

---

<sup>197</sup> Bahdi, p. 295.

<sup>198</sup> Bahdi, p. 295.

<sup>199</sup> Smolash, p. 757.

<sup>200</sup> Sujit Choudhry, “Protecting Equality in the Face of Terror: Ethnic and Racial Profiling and s.15 of the Charter,” in *The Security of Freedom, Essays on Canada’s Anti-Terrorism Bill*, eds. Ronald J. Daniels, Patrick Macklem and Kent Roach, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001) p. 367.

<sup>201</sup> Razack, p. 32.

profiling is a problem and that it isolates Muslims and Arabs from the general population.

In a 2005 brief reviewing the country's *Anti-Terrorism Act*, the Canadian Arab Federation (CAF) and CAIR-CAN voiced their concern that, since September 2001,

Arabs and Muslims in Canada have been increasingly stereotyped as 'fifth columnists' and threats to national security. Quite simply, our communities have been blanketed by a culture of fear and suspicion that has manifested itself in increased security agencies and police, racial and religious profiling, and discrimination in daily life.<sup>202</sup>

At the heart of debate is the ATA's definition of terrorism which states terrorism is an act committed "in whole or in part for a political, religious or ideological purpose, objective and cause."<sup>203</sup> Roach points out the problem with the definition is that it "demands proof of motive as an essential element of a crime, something that is generally not necessary in criminal law."<sup>204</sup> Likewise, Muslim and civil liberty groups argue that the Act instructs state security agents to examine the religion, ideology and political participation of suspected terrorists and grants discretionary power to agents "to collect evidence about a terrorist suspect's religion and politics," a practice that could easily encourage "guilt by association based on religion and politics."<sup>205</sup> Although one might argue that the ATA does not specifically identify any one religion or ideology, Arat-Koc reminds us that we are living in "a period of intensified racialization and demonization of Arab, Muslim, and South Asian Canadians."<sup>206</sup> It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the individuals racialized by security discourses are the individuals "being targeted for 'random checks' or treated as suspect by law enforcement and intelligence agencies."<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup> "Brief on the Review of the Anti-Terrorism Act," CAIR-CAN, June 2005, <http://www.caircan.ca/downloads/SS-ATA-06132005.pdf>, pp. 3-4.

<sup>203</sup> *Criminal Code*, s. 231(6.1)

<sup>204</sup> Roach, "*September 11*," pp. 25-26.

<sup>205</sup> Roach, "Canadian National Security," p. 224.

<sup>206</sup> Arat-Koc, p. 233.

<sup>207</sup> Arat-Koc, p. 233.

Despite the government's denial and legislation's silence on racial profiling, neither condoning nor prohibiting the practice, discursive cues within security texts suggest security agents routinely profile based on racialized features such as ethnic and religious identity. For example, in Text 26, the author explains that the difficulty of detecting and tracking extremists is due to the "varied ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds" of the individuals involved. The clear implication of this statement being: if the individuals in question were of a determined ethnic or socio-economic background, they would be easy to detect, by no other means, of course, than profiling. In this way, profiling is normalized within the text as a strategy by which security agents can more efficiently direct their efforts.

The Canadian experience has shown individuals involved in extremism to be of varied ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds. This makes their detection challenging and tracking their activities difficult to achieve. It is assessed that homegrown cells will continue to develop and that attacks using a variety of tools, from firearms to explosives, will be planned in the hopes of executing such attacks within Canada.

*Text 26, Source: 2007/08 CSIS Public Report, The Threat Environment, Terrorism p.13.*

Similarly, in Text 27, the text producer discusses individuals who are of interest to CSIS and draws an association between "the hardcore terrorist" and less committed individuals "who may be connected *only* by shared faith, ethnic origin, ideology or whatever other thread of association they have in common [emphasis added.] The strong suggestion here is that a portion of these individuals of interest have come into CSIS's sights only because of certain features, including their faith, ethnic origin and ideology, which they share with members of terrorist groups whom they associate with. It is hard to understand how this selection process does not constitute profiling. Both Text 26 and 27 illustrate the ease with which state agents both identify and brand terror suspects by racialized features. As Razack points out, when profiling "becomes so thoroughly recast as

bureaucracy, it becomes easy to miss the inclining rather than declining significance of ‘race.’”<sup>208</sup>

Thirdly, one needs to keep in mind that the level of commitment and capacity of the individuals of interest to us can vary widely. The goals of the hardcore terrorist will be very different from those on the fringes of the same group who may be connected only by shared faith, ethnic origin, ideology or whatever other thread of association they have in common

*Text 27, Source: Speaking Notes for WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, to the Vancouver Board of Trade, 7 November 7, 2002.*

Harvard Law School professor, Randall Kennedy, points out that “[a] disturbing feature of the debate over racial profiling is that many people, including judges, are suggesting that decisions distinguishing between persons on a racial basis do not constitute unlawful racial discrimination when [‘]race[’] is not the sole consideration prompting disparate treatment.”<sup>209</sup> Kennedy disagrees with this argument and explains that if even *one* racialized feature is allowed to be a factor of risk, that factor might result in the decision to investigate an individual. In other words, any use of a racialized feature “may serve to distinguish two individuals who otherwise manifest identical suspect behaviour, subjecting one to heightened scrutiny while letting the other walk free.”<sup>210</sup>

While the producer of Text 26 denies CSIS uses racial profiling in its investigations, the denial is based wholly on the text producer’s definition of profiling. In this case, the text contains cues signaling that religion *is* a factor in triggering a security investigation if it is tied to another factor, such as travel to a suspect country or links to suspicious persons. The author’s claim of non-profiling, therefore, is based on the argument that being Muslim is not *the sole* consideration in prompting an investigation. Kennedy argues that politicians

---

<sup>208</sup> Razack, p. 33.

<sup>209</sup> Randal Kennedy, “Suspect Policy: Racial Profiling Usually Isn’t Racist. It can Help Stop Crime. And it Should be Abolished,” in *The New Republic*, 13 September, 1999, <http://www.tnr.com/article/suspect-policy>.

<sup>210</sup> Choudry, p. 369.

and security and policing agents must be held to define precisely what they mean when they refer to racial profiling. In particular, we must ask “whether they merely reject [profiling] based *solely* on race or whether they also condemn [profiling] that is *at all* triggered by a racial factor [emphasis added.]”<sup>211</sup> The dilution of meaning, as hinted at here in Text 26, permits racial profiling to continue without scrutiny. Moreover, although the author claims neutrality by explaining that the same investigative process is applied to other groups, this in no way proves profiling is not taking place but, on the contrary, suggests profiling is used on an even wider scale.

I also want to address the misperception that the Service uses racial profiling in its investigations. I can categorically say that this is not the case. The Service investigates the activities of persons or groups to the extent that they are suspected of posing a threat to our national security. For example, we have no interest in a Muslim person just because he or she is a Muslim. If a person, however, has a pattern of travel to places like Afghanistan and Pakistan, associates with individuals known to the Service for their threat-related activities, then yes that person's activities may warrant investigation, if there are reasonable grounds to suspect that those activities may present a threat. The same could be said for Irish Canadians with links to the IRA, Indo-Canadians to the Babbar Khalsa, Arab Canadians to Hamas and Anglo-Saxons with links to the white supremacist movement. The Service investigates on the basis of activities, and not ethnic or religious background.

*Text 26, Source: Speaking Points for Jim Judd, Director CSIS, Inaugural Meeting of the Cross-cultural Roundtable on Security, 8 March, 2005.*

#### *- Encouraging Suspicion of the Ordinary*

A recurring theme within the analyzed texts is the claim that security agents are challenged in their efforts because the “ordinariness” of terrorists and radicalized individuals makes them difficult to detect. These statements present the ‘unremarkable’ and the ‘ordinary’ as suspicious, thereby creating an image in complete contradiction to the “continuous foreigner” and “monstrous Other” portrait discussed in the previous chapter. These competing narratives produce a “damned if you do, damned if you don’t” situation in

---

<sup>211</sup> Kennedy.

which Muslims are marginalized for being different and placed under suspicion for being ordinary. Ultimately, the discursive feature labels every Muslim as a potential terrorist and encourages the public to mistrust an entire category of people and place them under surveillance. The representation also encourages public acceptance for racial profiling by suggesting terrorists ‘posing’ as ordinary individuals impede the efforts of security agents. Therefore, even the ordinary requires investigation. As Thobani explains, “[m]aking racial profiling a politically acceptable technique of governance is to inscribe suspicion and illegality onto the bodies of those who ‘look’ like Muslims.”<sup>212</sup>

Text 28 pairs the image of the unremarkable terrorist figure with the idea that this ‘guise of normalcy’ presents a great challenge to security agents. Firstly, the producer makes direct associations between Islam and the terrorist figure; therefore, the subject of this text is implied to the audience. Secondly, the producer issues multiple statements to emphasize the difficulty of providing security: Sunni Islamic terrorism is . . . not an easy target to investigate; the links between individuals or the groupings are . . . hard to find; the men recently arrested near Buffalo provide an example of the difficulty; and all of their skills pose a real challenge for CSIS. Therefore, the audience is provided with numerous signals – “not easy,” “hard to find,” “difficulty” and “real challenge” – that locating and investigating the terrorist subject is wrought with difficulty.

Thirdly, the producer problematizes the ordinariness of the terrorist figure by linking it to the difficulty of providing security. The men arrested near Buffalo led “underwhelming lives,” to most observers “there was nothing of which to be suspicious” and one was described in a newspaper article as “a pillar of the neighbourhood.” Moreover, many of “Canada-based Sunni extremists are “well educated and highly computer literate.”

---

<sup>212</sup> Thobani, p. 240

All of these things are cited as creating difficulty for the agent when identifying the security target. However, critical examination of the text begs the question: Of what relevance is this information? Are not many, if not most, criminals difficult to detect within the general public? And what is so remarkable about being well educated and highly computer literate? The statements imply that this 'normalcy' defies expectations and they reinforce the notion that these people are not 'us.' Their ordinariness cannot be trusted; therefore, all must be placed under surveillance.

- Sunni Islamic terrorism is, however, not an easy target to investigate.
- Most of CSIS's more committed Sunni targets are products of the jihad. They have fought in the Holy War with the Arab Mujahedin in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Chechnya, and have participated in Osama bin Laden's terrorist training camps. Many of the people trained in those camps have since dispersed widely into the international arena to an estimated 60 countries, including Canada. These facts can, indeed, be clues to start an investigation.
- In al-Qaeda, however, the hierarchical organized structure that makes the investigation of many other terrorist organizations somewhat easier does not exist. The informal network, highly decentralized and distributed, that characterizes al-Qaeda is fundamentally different from that of other terrorist groups like the Tamil Tigers or, indeed, even a criminal organization like a Mafia family.
- The links between individuals or the groupings are therefore hard to find.
- The men recently arrested near Buffalo provide an example of the difficulty in identifying these targets. A recent New York Times article described theirs as "underwhelming lives." To most around them, there was nothing of which to be suspicious. One was even described in the article as "a pillar of the neighbourhood, someone who constantly talks up the golden opportunities of American life." The article notes that most of them had no criminal records and those who did were for very minor crimes.

[two bulleted points omitted]

- Getting back to our situation, many of the Canada-based Sunni extremists are also well educated and highly computer literate. They take advantage of encrypted e-mails, cell phones and satellite communications. All of their skills pose a real challenge for CSIS and, indeed, other intelligence services around the world, as well

as presaging the threat from those who will seek to use those skills as more than operational tools.

*Text 29, Source: Speaking Notes for WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, to the Vancouver Board of Trade, 7 November, 2002.*

In Texts 30 and 31, the audience learns, once again, that the ordinariness of the terror suspect presents a challenge to security investigations. In Text 30, the author states that ordinariness “is what permits *apparently integrated, apparently nondescript* individuals to become radicalized to the point that they cross the terrorist line... unnoticed until it is too late.” The choice to include the qualifier ‘apparently’ reveals the text producer’s belief that these individuals are not integrated or nondescript, they only appear to be. This “duality” poses “a serious challenge for law enforcement and security agencies.” The subject of Text 30 is similarly denied full integration into society. In this case, integration is only an appearance which “[makes] detection and intervention more difficult” for the state’s security agents. In both cases, the outsider status of the terrorist subject is unspoken but is clearly alluded to within the texts. These subjects do not naturally belong in the national community in the first place for, if they did, they would not have to ‘integrate.’ Furthermore, even if they do integrate, the texts inform the audience that the behaviour and outward appearance of these individuals is not to be trusted. Thereby, suspicion is cast upon the entire group.

“Ordinariness” is a key factor in the domestic radicalization phenomenon. It is what permits apparently integrated, apparently nondescript individuals to become radicalized to the point that they cross the terrorist line, and then to plan and carry out terrorist acts, unnoticed until it is too late. .... This duality represents a serious challenge for law enforcement and security agencies that must address and — particularly — anticipate the problem of radicalization.

*Text 30, Source: Radicalization: A Guide for the Perplexed, June 2009, RCMP, National Security Criminal Investigations, p. 6.*

In fact, violent radicals come from all social and age levels are spread widely across the educational spectrum and can appear fully integrated into society, making detection and intervention more difficult.

*Text 31, Source: 2009/10 CSIS Public Report, The Threat Environment, p.11.*

In Text 32, the text producer's motives are much clearer as he outlines the problem of the public's perception of 'ordinariness.' In this excerpt, the subjects are labeled "Canadian-born," a practice that Razack argues is meant to draw a distinction between those who are merely born here and "those who are truly Canadian by virtue of possessing Canadian values, if not Canadian skin."<sup>213</sup> The author's problem is that the ordinariness of these 'Canadian-born' terror suspects "works against law enforcement and the security community" during their public education efforts for it "seems to imply that [these individuals] could not possibly be either aspiring or active terrorists." This is a curious idea because the unfortunate truth is that 'ordinary' individuals of every ethnic and cultural group plot and commit heinous crimes every day. Yet, policing agents rarely lament that public education efforts are hampered because the public feels these suspects are too ordinary to have committed the crimes. The point missing here is that individuals are not successfully criminally prosecuted on the basis of their 'un-ordinariness' but on the basis of criminally relevant evidence. The text suggests that the producer's discomfort with the suspects' ordinariness is due to the fact that normalcy defies stereotypical representations of the dangerous terrorist Other which work so well in securing the public's consensus for racial profiling *and* operating outside the rule of law.

The other part of this problem is that the very ordinariness of Canadian-born terrorist suspects actually works against the law enforcement and security community when it sets out to educate the public about the problem of radicalization. The fact that young people like the "Toronto 18" defendants are so utterly rooted in Canadian youth culture and the minutiae of daily life in Canada seems to imply that they could not possibly be either aspiring or active terrorists. Taken to its logical extent, this perception can imply that the

<sup>213</sup> Razack, p.3.

case itself is not a viable criminal prosecution but rather the organized persecution of a group of hapless teenaged “wannabes.”

*Text 32, Source: Radicalization: A Guide for the Perplexed, June 2009, RCMP, National Security Criminal Investigations, p. 6.*

All of the texts examined in this section unseat Muslims’ belonging in the national community. They condone public suspicion and surveillance of Muslims and they build support for racial profiling. If the dangerous Other is masquerading amongst us as an ordinary citizen, detectable in no other way than through his racialized signs of dangerous, how else will we identify him than to scrutinize all individuals bearing similar signs of difference? As Bahdi explains, racial profiling does not expose potential terrorists nor does it increase national security.<sup>214</sup> To the contrary, profiling “undermines national security while harming Arabs, Muslims, and other racialized groups by heightening their vulnerability and reinforcing their exclusion from Canadian society.”<sup>215</sup> Highlighting the ordinariness of racialized terror suspects within national security texts effectively informs the public that even the so-called “good Muslims” are bad.

## V. CONCLUSION

Cognitive scientists, Richard Nisbett and Lee Ross, explain that we do not so much believe what we see but see what we believe. Because stereotypes are essential for our survival, “[t]o a very real extent, people have to judge every book by its cover.”<sup>216</sup> A problem arises, however, when we see what we *expect* to see and “reject any information that would challenge [this] already established point of view.”<sup>217</sup> After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, age-old stereotypes of Muslims as the archenemies of the West were once again

---

<sup>214</sup> Bahdi, p. 294.

<sup>215</sup> Bahdi, p. 294.

<sup>216</sup> Richard Nisbett, and Lee Ross, *Human Inference: Strategies and Shortcomings of Social Judgment* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980), p. 175.

<sup>217</sup> Nisbett & Ross, p. 176.

thrust into the spotlight and given new life. As an abundant body of research illustrates, these stereotypes have wreaked havoc on public perceptions of Muslims within dominant non-Muslim populations leading to economic inequality, social marginalization and, at the worst end, the suspension of rights and the rule of law.

The research within this thesis has shown that through the discourses of dangerousness and difference which shape our country's security texts, our state representatives and agents contribute to the reproduction of negative stereotypes of Muslims. These discourses naturalize the idea that Canada, a multicultural country with a long history of openness to immigration, is under pressure from the Muslim Other who seeks to take advantage of the country's humanitarian nature. As well, Muslims are constructed as the permanent aliens within, individuals whose non-Western values and predisposition for violence justify their exclusion from national belonging.

Of course, our country's current security discourses, directed by the nation's multicultural identity, rarely make direct references to minority groups as the threatening Others in our midst. However, negative social perceptions and the reproduction of ethnic inequality most often emerge through subtle and symbolic discursive means, not through blatantly discriminatory or racist discourse which is more likely to isolate an audience rather than earn its support. Because all texts contain clues reflecting the ideologies of their producers, identifying those clues has been the work of this thesis. As has been mentioned numerous times throughout the paper, the findings of this study are not meant to be interpreted as the strategic work of racist state representatives and agents. On the contrary, this project was motivated by a desire to examine the ideologies that inform our country's

security discourses and to evoke an awareness of how these discourses reproduce relationships of inequality in Canada.

At the heart of the research is the understanding that our social realities and our perceptions are rarely formed on the basis of objective observations but, instead, are socially constructed. Discourse plays a key role in this process, directing meaning-making and shaping our social attitudes. As explained by Victoria M. Esses et al, our social attitudes have concrete results: they influence the formulation and the implementation of public policy, they affect day-to-day behaviours, either promoting equity or discrimination, and they shape our collective vision of national identity by influencing how we perceive who is, and who is not, a member of the national in-group.<sup>218</sup> The concrete effects of ideas of difference in this country are reflected in numerous studies, some of which have been reviewed in this paper, which reveal the persistence of minority group discrimination. Because of the hold these ideas of national authenticity continue to have on the Canadian social imaginary, in times of tension, racially-directed policies and practices are still able to garner public support based on the rationale that the normative population needs to be protected from the racialized threatening Other.<sup>219</sup>

Claims of racism and discrimination may seem at odds with the country's multicultural policy and identity. Surely, as a collective we have long moved past such issues. Unfortunately, the converse is true. While multiculturalism has successfully advanced an anti-racist message, it has not successfully neutralized power relations between the dominant white population and non-white groups, nor has it dismantled historical

---

<sup>218</sup> Victoria M. Esses, John F. Dovidio and Gordon Hodson, "Public Attitudes Towards Immigration in the United States and Canada in Response to the September 11, 2001 'Attack on America,'" in *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2, No. 1, ( December 2002), p. 70.

<sup>219</sup> Razack, p. 13.

ideologies that inform us about who rightfully belongs in the country and who does not. As Henry and Tator explain, “[o]ne of the more significant barriers to dismantling racialized ideologies and discourse... is that dominant culture has often co-opted the discourses of liberalism, diversity, and equality while maintaining and preserving hegemonic practices.”<sup>220</sup> Critical discourse analysis allows us to move beyond a surface reading of a text and to recognize the nuanced features responsible for reproducing these relations of power.

Muslims, one of the country’s fastest growing minority groups, have long been the subjects of negative perceptions and suspicion, a practice that continues to today. Typically, when Muslims are referred to within media stories and government speeches and texts, they are positioned as the controversial figure in matters of security, gender rights, religious accommodation and the like. The institutionalized suspicion emerging after the September 2001 terrorist attacks further amplified misperceptions and further entrenched the image of the ‘dangerous Muslim’ within nation’s social imaginary. As Arat-Koc remarks, it is not “the experience of racism but its growing public legitimacy, spread, and [mainstreamed] in all major institutions, from the media to law and policy,” that is new for Arab and Muslim Canadians.<sup>221</sup>

Canada’s security texts are rife with statements drawing connections between Islam and terrorist violence. These discursive associations represent Muslims as possessing a propensity for terrorist activity and they suggest a religion is somehow responsible for terrorist violence. Kassam insightfully points out that “[t]o blame acts of terrorism on

---

<sup>220</sup> Henry and Tator, p. 236.

<sup>221</sup> Arat-Koc, p. 220.

religious texts of any faith, is both intellectually lazy and politically dishonest.”<sup>222</sup> Critical questioning is forestalled and, instead of asking why certain *individuals* have chosen to commit terrorist violence, the discussion revolves around a *group’s* perceived shortcomings.

Similarly, critical analysis is stymied when security texts rely on the superficial “clash of civilizations” paradigm when explaining the motives behind terrorist violence. The clash of civilizations thesis presents terrorism as an act without context, driven by conflict between two vague entities: the “Islamic world” and “the West.” Thereby, an embattled ‘us’ is pitted against an irrational terrorist ‘them.’ This binary framework aligns with what Razack refers to as ‘race thinking’, “the belief in the division of humanity into those prone to violence and those who are not according to descent.”<sup>223</sup> When viewed in this framework, terrorism becomes a problem of irrationality or cultural deficiency and, once again, analysis of the contextual roots of terrorist violence can be avoided together with any examination of Canada’s own culpability in global unrest.

Ultimately, security discourses construct followers of Islam as the enemy aliens within, continuous outsiders whose membership in the national community is precarious and whose propensity for violence requires close surveillance. Regardless of whether or not the subjects of security discussions have been born in Canada, security discourses persistently represent terror suspects as racialized figures and outsiders whose integration in and loyalty to the country are suspect. Thus, “they” are different from us and always will be. Moreover, by positioning the ‘unremarkable’ and the ‘ordinary’ as suspicious, the state encourages public surveillance of an entire group of people and encourages public acceptance for profiling based on nothing else but racialized assessments of dangerousness.

---

<sup>222</sup> Kassam, “The Terrorist Other,” p. 162.

<sup>223</sup> Razack , p. 28.

As Thobani warns, “[m]aking racial profiling a politically acceptable technique of governance is to inscribe suspicion and illegality onto the bodies of those who ‘look’ like Muslims.”<sup>224</sup>

Our state representatives and agents need to adopt a security discourse more sensitive to the diversity they profess to value. Currently, little effort is made by our government to counter pervasive negative imagery of Muslims and to ensure the public is made aware that terrorist violence is not the work of a monolithic group of irrational, religiously-motivated actors. Kent Roach rightfully reminds us that “[t]here is a need to ensure that no group in Canadian society becomes a permanent underclass that is presumptively suspected of a crime or of a particular crime such as terrorism.”<sup>225</sup> Our state representatives and agents have a responsibility to ensure they fairly represent and speak for *all* members of the state within security discourses and that they avoid contributing to the misrepresentation of any group of people. In light of Canada’s growing Muslim population and what appears to be increasing intolerance in many Western nations, what is wrong with holding ourselves to a higher standard that reflects the values our state officials so vehemently claim we possess?

---

<sup>224</sup> Thobani, p. 240

<sup>225</sup> Roach, *September 11*, p. 72.

## ***APPENDIX A: TEXTS INCLUDED IN THE ANALYSIS***

### **I) Speeches from the Throne**

Available online at:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/compilations/parliament/ThroneSpeech.aspx?Language=E>

#### **36th Parliament**

1st Session, Speech dated 23 September, 1997

2nd Session, Speech dated 12 October, 1999

#### **37th Parliament**

1st Session, Speech dated 30 January, 2001

2nd Session, Speech dated 30 September, 2002.

3rd Session, Speech dated 2 February, 2004.

#### **38th Parliament**

1st Session, Speech dated 5 October, 2004.

#### **39th Parliament**

1st Session, Speech dated 5 April, 2006

2nd Session, Speech dated 16 October, 2007

#### **40th Parliament**

1st Session, Speech dated 19 November, 2008

2nd Session, Speech dated 26 January, 2009

3rd Session, Speech dated 3 March, 2010

#### **41st Parliament**

1st Session, Speech dated 3 June, 2011

### **II) CSIS**

All of the CSIS documents are available online at: <https://www.csis.gc.ca/bts/index-eng.asp> with the exception of Public Reports pre-dating 2006-07. These earlier publications are available on request from CSIS.

#### **- Annual Reports**

1999 Public Report

2000 Public Report

2001 Public Report

2002 Public Report

2003 Public Report

2004-2005 Public Report

2005-2006 Public Report

2006-2007 Public Report

2007-2008 Public Report

2008-2009 Public Report

2009-2010 Public Report

- Speeches and Presentations

The following is a complete list of CSIS speeches and presentations posted online as of the date of this study. All documents were included in the study and reviewed but not all contain information relating to counter-terrorism.

June 24, 1998 – WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, Submission to Special Committee of the Senate on Security and Intelligence

April 29-30, 2002 – Address by WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, to Terrorism and Technology Conference

May 27, 2002 – Remarks by WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, to Commons Subcommittee on National Security

June 12, 2002 – Talking Points for WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, at the Canadian Centre for Intelligence Security Studies, Carleton University

November 7, 2002 – Speaking Notes for WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, to the Vancouver Board of Trade

December 3, 2002 – Director's Speaking Notes, Appearance before the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights

April 1, 2003 – WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, Appearance before the Parliamentary Subcommittee on National Security

October 16-18, 2003 – Appearance by WPD Elcock, Director of CSIS, at the Canadian Association for Security and Intelligence Conference

February 21, 2005 – Control, Accountability and Review: The CSIS Experience. A Submission to the O'Connor Commission of Inquiry.

February 22, 2005 – Presentation by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, to Subcommittee on Public Safety and National Security.

March 7, 2005 – Presentation by Jim Judd, Director Canadian Security Intelligence Service to the Senate Committee on the *Anti-Terrorism Act*.

March 8, 2005 – Speaking Points for Jim Judd, Director CSIS, Inaugural Meeting of the Cross-cultural Roundtable on Security

October 31, 2005 – Presentation by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, to the Senate Committee on the *Anti-Terrorism Act*.

February 17, 2006 – presentation by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, to the YMCA Friday Luncheon Discussion Club, Ottawa, Ontario

May 29, 2006 – Statement by Jack Hooper, Deputy Director Operations CSIS, to the Senate Committee on National Security and Defence (SCONSAD)

June 3, 2006 – Statement by Assistant Director, Operations at Press Conference

August 15, 2006 – Address to the Canadian Bar Association Panel on National Security and Human Rights by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS

September 28, 2006 – Transparency and Intelligence, Notes for Remarks at Royal Canadian Military Institute (RCMI) Toronto, Ontario by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS

October 27, 2006 – Remarks by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, to the Canadian Association for Security and Intelligence Studies (CASIS)

October 31, 2007 – Opening Statement by Mr. Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, to the Public Safety and National Security Committee

January 19, 2007 – Talking Points for 2007 Raoul Wallenberg International Human Rights Symposium

May 24, 2007 – Notes for Remarks to Carleton University Alumni Association, Rideau Club, Ottawa  
November 15, 2007 – Speech by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, to the Canadian-UK Colloquium: Security and Diversity  
April 15, 2008 – Remarks by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, at the Global Futures Forum Conference in Vancouver  
January 22, 2009 – Remarks by Jim Judd, Director of CSIS, at the University of Ottawa – CSIS and Canadian Universities  
October 29, 2009 – Remarks by Richard B. Fadden, Director CSIS, to the Canadian Association for Security Intelligence Studies (CASIS) Annual International Conference  
May 11, 2010 – Remarks by Director Richard B. Fadden to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security  
March 15, 2011 – CSIS Press Conference Statement  
November 10, 2011 – Speaking Notes, Assistant Director Policy and Strategic Partnerships, Andy Ellis – 2011 CASIS International Conference

### **III) RCMP, National Security Criminal Investigations Program**

Available online at <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/nsci-ecsn/index-eng.htm>

The following is a complete list of documents posted online by the National Criminal Investigations Program as of the date of this study.

Radicalization – A Guide for the Perplexed (June 2009)  
Words Make Worlds – Terrorism and Language (no date)  
National Security Awareness – Make it part of your plan  
National Security Criminal Investigations Program (Brochure)  
National Security Community Outreach (Brochure)  
Youth Online and at Risk: Radicalization Facilitated by the Internet

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- “A Decade After September 11th 2001.” Leger Marketing. Association for Canadian Studies. 12 September, 2011, <http://www.acs-aec.ca/en/social-research/racism-discrimination-human-rights/>.
- Adams, Michael. “Muslims in Canada: Findings from the 2007 Environics Survey.” Government of Canada, Policy Research Initiative. Date Modified 30 March, 2009, [http://www.horizons.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=2009-0008\\_06](http://www.horizons.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=2009-0008_06).
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities, Revised Edition*. London and New York: Verso. 2006.
- Anderson, Kay J. *Vancouver’s Chinatown, Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875-1980*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1991.
- “Arabs in Canada, Proudly Canadian and Marginalized.” *Canadian Arab Federation*. April 2002, <http://www.caf.ca/Admin.aspx?AppModule=TxAppFramework.Web.Admin&Command=EMBEDDEDFILE&DataObjectID=701&ColumnID=3581&FieldName=CONTENT&Lang=EN&RecordID=407>
- Arat-Koc, Sedef. “Whose Transnationalism? Canada, ‘Clash of Civilizations’ Discourse, and Arab and Muslim Canadians.” In *Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006, 216-240.
- Arnold, Samantha. “Securing Canada: Muslims and the Myth of Multiculturalism in the post-9/11 World.” *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, March 5, 2005*. (unpublished.) [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p69267\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p69267_index.html).
- Aslan, Reza. *How to Win a Cosmic War: God, Globalization, and the End of the War on Terror*. New York: Random House, 2009.
- Bahdi, Reem. “No Exit: Racial Profiling and Canada’s War Against Terrorism.” In *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*. 41, Nos. 2 and 3 (2003), 293-315.
- Balzacq, Thierry. “A Theory of Securitization: Origins, Core Assumptions and Variants.” In *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. Ed. Thierry Balzacq. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2011, 1-30.
- Bannerji, Himani. *Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar’s Press, 2000.
- “Brief on the Review of the Anti-Terrorism Act.” CAIR-CAN. June 2005. <http://www.caircan.ca/downloads/SS-ATA-06132005.pdf>.
- “Brief on the Review of the Anti-Terrorism Act.” Canadian Arab Federation (CAF) and Canadian Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR-CAN). September 2005. <http://www.caircan.ca/downloads/CCC-RAA.pdf>.
- Brodie, Janine. “From Social Security to Public Safety Security Discourses and Canadian Citizenship.” In *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 78, No. 2 (Spring 2009), 687-708.

- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers, 1998.
- Campbell, David. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, Revised Edition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Chebel D'Appollonia, Ariane and Simon Reich. "Quandaries of Integration in America and Europe." In *Managing Ethnic Diversity After 9/11, Integration, Security and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective* ed. by Chebel D'Appollonia, Ariane and Simon Reich. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010, 1-19.
- Choudhry, Sujit. "Protecting Equality in the Face of Terror: Ethnic and Racial Profiling and s.15 of the Charter." In *The Security of Freedom, Essays on Canada's Anti-Terrorism Bill*. Eds. Ronald J. Daniels, Patrick Macklem and Kent Roach. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001, 367-381.
- Crocker, D., A. Dobrowolsky, E. Keeble, C.C. Moncayo and E. Tastsoglou. "Security and Immigration, Changes and Challenges: Immigrant and Ethnic Communities in Atlantic Canada, Presumed Guilty?" January 2007, <http://atlantic.metropolis.net/security/includes/Finalreport-English.pdf>.
- Esses, Victoria M., John F. Dovidio and Gordon Hodson. "Public Attitudes Towards Immigration in the United States and Canada in Response to the September 11, 2001 'Attack on America.'" In *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2, No. 1, (December 2002), 69-85.
- "Ethnic Diversity Survey: Portrait of a Multicultural Society." Statistics Canada. 2003. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-593-x/89593-x2003001-eng.pdf>
- "Facts and Figures 2008 – Immigration Overview: Permanent and Temporary Residents, Permanent Residents by Source Country." Citizen and Immigration Canada. August 2009. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2008/permanent/10.asp>.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Fairclough, Norman. "Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Linguistics and Education*. 4, (1992), 269-293.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power* 2nd Edition. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2001.
- Fitzpatrick, Meagan. "'Draconian' Anti-Terrorism Laws Not Needed, Opposition Says." CBC News. 7 September, 2011, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/story/2011/09/07/pol-harper-islamicism-reaction.html>.
- Hart, Christopher. *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave, 2010.

- Haslam, Nick. "Dehumanization: An Integrative Review." In *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 10, No. 3 (2006), 252-264.
- Helly, Denise. "Are Muslims Discriminated Against in Canada Since September 2001?" In *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. 36, No. 1 (2004), 24-47.
- Henighan, Stephen. *A Report on the Afterlife of Culture*. Emeryville, Ont.: Biblioasis, 2008.
- Henry, Frances and Carol Tator. *Discourses of Domination, Racial Bias in the Canadian English-Language Press*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Kassam, Karim-Aly, "Conclusion: 'The Global War on Terror' Overdetermined as a Clash of Civilizations." In *Understanding Terror, Perspectives for Canadians*. Ed. Karim-Aly S. Kassam. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2010, 241-249.
- Kassam, Karim-Aly. "The Terrorist 'Other': The Fundamentalist and the Islamist." In *Understanding Terror, Perspectives for Canadians*. Ed. Karim-Aly S. Kassam. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2010, 153-163.
- Kennedy, Randall. "Suspect Policy: Racial Profiling Usually Isn't Racist. It can Help Stop Crime. And it Should be Abolished." In *The New Republic*. 13 September, 1999, <http://www.tnr.com/article/suspect-policy>.
- Khouri, Raja G. *Arabs in Canada Post 9/11*. Montreal and Toronto: G-7 Books, 2003.
- Knowles, Valerie. *Strangers at our Gates, Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-2006*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2007.
- Kruger, Erin, Marlene Mulder and Bojan Korenic. "Canada after 11 September: Security Measures and 'Preferred' Immigrants." In *Mediterranean Quarterly*. 15, No. 4 (2004), 72-87.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Odysseys, Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Kymlicka, Will. "The Merits of Multiculturalism." In *Reading in Canadian History*. Ed. Douglas R. Francis. Toronto: Nelson Thompson, 2002: 480-487.
- Li, Peter. "Social Inclusion of Visible Minorities and Newcomers: The Articulation of 'Race' and 'Racial' Difference in Canadian Society." Paper prepared for Conference on Social Inclusion, Ottawa. 27-28 March, 2003. [http://www.ccsd.ca/events/inclusion/papers/peter\\_li.pdf](http://www.ccsd.ca/events/inclusion/papers/peter_li.pdf).
- Li, Peter. "The Place of Immigrants: The Politics of Difference in Territorial and Social Space." In *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. XXXV No. 2, 2003, 1-13.
- Locke, Terry. *Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Method*. London: Continuum International Publishing, 2004.
- Macklin, Audrey. "Borderline Security." In *The Security of Freedom, Essays on Canada's Anti-Terrorism Bill*. Eds. Ronald J. Daniels, Patrick Macklem and Kent Roach. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001, 383-404.

- McGregor, Sue L. T. "Critical Discourse Analysis – A Primer." In *Kappa Omnicron Nu Forum*. 15, No. 1, (Spring 2003, <http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html>)
- Melnyk, George. "The Word 'Terrorism' and its Impact on Public Consciousness." In *Understanding Terror, Perspectives for Canadians*. Ed. Karim-Aly S. Kassam. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2010, 101-123.
- Moghissi, Haideh, et al. *Diaspora by Design; Muslim Immigrants in Canada and Beyond*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- "National Security Community Outreach." Royal Canadian Mounted Police. <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/nsci-ecsn/pdf/nscs-scsn-eng.pdf>.
- Nisbett, Richard and Lee Ross. *Human Inference: Strategies and Shortcomings of Social Judgment*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980.
- Nodoushan, Mohammad Ali Salmani. "The Place of Genre Analysis in International Communication." In *International Journal of Language Studies*. 5(1) 2011, 63-74.
- Oreopoulos, Philip. *Why Do Skilled Immigrants Struggle in the Labor Market? A Field Experiment with Six Thousand Resumes*. University of British Columbia. May 2009, [http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~oreo/research/compositions/why\\_do\\_skilled\\_immigrants\\_struggle\\_in\\_the\\_labour\\_market.pdf](http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~oreo/research/compositions/why_do_skilled_immigrants_struggle_in_the_labour_market.pdf).
- Pendakur, Krishna. "Visible Minorities in Canada's Workplaces, a Perspective on the 2017 Projection." [www.sfu.ca/~pendakur/pendakur\\_2017.doc](http://www.sfu.ca/~pendakur/pendakur_2017.doc).
- Phillips, Nelson and Cynthia Hardy. *Discourse Analysis, Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. Thousand Oaks California: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Pitcher, Ben. "The Global Politics of Multiculturalism." *Development*. 52, No. 4 (December 2009), 456-459.
- "Projections of the Diversity of the Canadian Population, 2006 to 2031." Statistics Canada. March 2010. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-551-x/91-551-x2010001-eng.pdf>.
- Razack, Sherene. *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Reitz, Jeffrey G., Raymond Breton, Karen K. Dion. *Multiculturalism and Social Cohesion: Potentials and Challenges of Diversity*. Dordrecht, NLD: Springer: 2009.
- Roach, Kent. "Canadian National Security Policy and Canadian Muslims." In *Muslims in Western Politics* ed. Abdulkader H. Sinno. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009, 219-244.
- Roach, Kent. *September 11, Consequences for Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003.
- Robin, Corey. *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

- Said, Edward W. *Covering Islam, How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Sharma, Archana. "Productions and Patterns of the Migrant Body." In *Calculated Kindness: Global Restructuring, Immigration and Settlement in Canada*. ed. Rose Baaba Folson. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2004, 33-42.
- Sharma, Nandita Rani. "Nationalism and the Making of 'Migrant Workers' in Canada." Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Smolash, Wendy Naava. "Mark of Cain(ada): Racialized Security Discourse in Canada's National Newspapers." In *University of Toronto Quarterly*. 78, No. 2 (Spring 2009), 745-763.
- Speeches from the Throne. Parliament of Canada. <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/compilations/parliament/ThroneSpeech.aspx?Language=E>.
- "Study: Projections of the Diversity of the Canadian Population." Statistics Canada. March 2010, <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/100309/dq100309a-eng.htm>.
- Taylor, Charles. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Thobani, Sunera. *Exalted Subjects. Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- "UN Calls Canada Racist for 'Visible Minorities Tag.' *Canada.com*. 8 March, 2007. <http://www.canada.com/topics/news/national/story.html?id=f469b36e-c587-40e7-98e5-3aa50a371318&k=23802>.
- Valverde, Mariana, "Governing Security, Governing Through Security." In *The Security of Freedom, Essays on Canada's Anti-Terrorism Bill*. Eds. Ronald J. Daniels, Patrick Macklem and Kent Roach. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001, 83-92.
- van Dijk, Teun A. "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments." In *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*. Ed. by Stephen Harold Riggins. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997, 31-64.
- van Dijk, Teun A. "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse & Society*, 4, No.2 (1993): 249-283.