Understanding the Impact of Surveillance and Security Measures on Muslim Men in Canada

Understanding the Impact of Surveillance and Security Measures on Muslim Men in Canada

Tabasum Akseer

Abstract

This study explores the effects of national security measures, in particular security certificates, on the Canadian Muslim male population. While the constitutionality and use of certificates have been widely debated, few studies have explored the impact of security certificates and other national security measures on the Muslim/Arab population in particular. This Martello Paper explores the perceptions of surveillance experienced by this group and notes significant quantitative and qualitative differences on Muslim men compared to non-Muslim men. Survey data (50n) illustrate a "chilling effect" among Muslim men in the study, who are significantly less likely to exercise their civil liberties. Through open-ended interviews, Muslim male respondents (20n) describe the consequences of the "chill" in their daily lives, on their religious identity, practices, and perceptions of belonging. These consequences, according to participants, lead to feelings of insecurity, vulnerability, and disenchantment and possibly even to radical views. This research offers suggestions for understanding Muslim subjectivity and the role of dialogue in contributing meaningfully to the state's efforts towards understanding and countering terror. Findings and implications from this research offer practical and timely insight into an issue confronting Canada and other Western liberal democracies.

About the Author

Tabasum Akseer is Director of Policy and Research in The Asia Foundation's Afghanistan office. She oversees a portfolio of multiple projects including the Foundation's annual Survey of the Afghan People. Tabasum leads the design, planning, and implementation of other smaller project-related surveys, as well as a data analysis training program to build Afghan capacity. She is responsible for building the Department's national staff and contributing to the Department's growth through proposal writing, donor relations, and skill-based development opportunities for national staff.

Prior to her work at The Asia Foundation, Tabasum consulted on projects intersecting gender, peace, security, and human rights. Most recently, she was a post-doctoral research fellow and consultant at the Center for International and Defence Policy, at Queen's University in Canada. At Queen's, Tabasum was a teaching fellow and assistant in the School of Religion, Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, and the Gender Studies department.

Her work has been presented at various national and international conferences and published in journals including, *Forced Migration Review, the Canadian Journal of School Psychology, the Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, and the *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*.

Tabasum earned a doctoral degree in Cultural Studies from Queen's University, in addition to a master's degree in Education, and bachelor's degree (Honours) in Political Science from Brock University.

Contents

1. Introduction to the Study

Background

In a post-9/11 context, the "war on terror" climate has contributed to the introduction and implementation of a variety of laws, policies, and approaches that are aimed at securing the nation. This monograph will disseminate the results of a study which explored the "chilling effect" of national security measures, in particular security certificates, on the Canadian Muslim male population. While the constitutionality and use of certificates have been widely debated, few studies have explored the impact of security certificates and other national security measures on the Muslim/Arab population specifically.

Current security strategies often "cast the net as widely as possible, identify suitable enemies, [and do] not worry about false positive identifications" (Ericson 2007, 48 as cited in Muller 2010). Simultaneously, there is an increase in the routine surveillance of citizens (Ball and Webster 2003; Lyon 2003), particularly travellers, on the one hand, and non-citizens (asylum seekers, refugees, and migrant workers) on the other (Lyon 2007). The use of techniques including surveillance as "social sorting" act "to plan, predict, and prevent by classifying and assessing … profiles and risks" (Lyon 2003). Social sorting is based on categories of risk to help identify those who belong or do not belong. The process involves "the sorting of people into categories on the basis of surveillance data and using these categories in social, political and economic decision-making … involved complex discriminatory technology" (Barnard-Wills 2012, 29). In particular, it is individuals from *suspect* ethnic groups who can anticipate differential treatment (Valverde and Mopas 2004). This differential treatment enables securitization of the politics of borders and bodies and has been facilitated by the vast expansion of technologies of control and strategies of exclusion (Nyers 2003, 169).

Detention procedures, for example, function as technologies of control, while deportation is a strategy of exclusion. Both are key components of security certificates, an immigration procedure that allows for the indefinite detention and deportation of non-citizens deemed threats to Canadian national security.

While studies focusing on the intensified securitization of borders are relatively well documented (see for example Andreas and Biersteker 2003; Drache 2004; Konrad and Nicol 2008; Salter 2004; Tirman 2004), fewer studies have addressed the specific impact this has had on contemporary citizenship practices (see for example Jacobsen 2010; Muller 2004; Nyers 2009). Shifting away from the empirical, I draw attention to ethical concerns raised by David Lyon, who has argued that, in a post-9/11 world, "an appropriate ethic begins by hearing the voice of the Other" (Lyon 2003) and also draws our attention to the consequences of immigration policies and anti-terrorism on human rights and civil liberties with the question, "What are the effects on civil liberties of techniques that rely on discriminatory categories?" (Lyon 2007, 163–6). Thus, the following research addresses two facets that are raised here: one is the impact of discriminatory categories within surveillance and immigration policies on the civil liberties of the Other; the second is an exploration of the subjective experiences of the Other, in their voice and speech, to document the impact of surveillance and security measures on their everyday life.

Purpose of this Study

The increased attention to border security in countries around the world has led to more-intrusive anti-terrorism measures and to changes in immigration policies. These measures, often aimed at Muslims, have created increased demands for new surveillance technologies (Macklin 2001; Helly 2004; Lyon 2007). Muslim / Arab refugees and naturalized citizens being targets of increased surveillance and security scrutiny by immigration officials has been well documented (CCR 2004; Bahdi 2003; ICLMG 2003; Fekete 2004; Naber 2006). In the Canadian context this is demonstrated by the increased use of security certificates: from 1991 to 2015, security certificates have been issued twenty-eight times, with twenty certificates upheld by the courts. The evidence, which shows an overwhelming proportion of the recipients have been non-citizen Muslim / Arab men, is a key concern for this study. While the constitutionality and use of certificates have been widely debated (see for ex-

ample Bell 2006, 2006a, 2011; Diab 2008; Larsen and Piché 2009; Larsen 2006; Larsen 2008; Larsen, Harkat, and Harka 2008; Pratt 2005; Razack 2008; Tator and Henry 2006), few studies have explored the impact of security certificates on the Muslim/Arab population in particular. Furthermore, because certificates reflect a larger pattern of surveillance and security measures aimed primarily, if indirectly, at Muslim/Arab men, there is a great need for research on the subjective experiences of this population and the impact of the measures on their everyday lives. One of the primary purposes of this study, then, is to provide insights into the long-term "unintended consequences" of securitization and increased surveillance of Muslim communities in Canada.

The primary research question guiding this study, and intended to address these gaps, is: "What impact have surveillance technologies and national security certificates had on Muslim/Arab males and their everyday lives, their sense of identity and belonging?" The core objectives, therefore, are to contextualize and document the experience of individuals, primarily Muslim men, with law enforcement, security measures, and surveillance practices, and, second, to determine whether and how the introduction of laws and other security measures have impacted the individual's knowledge/awareness of surveillance practices, perception of citizenship and belonging, and fear—the hypothesized "chilling effect."

Overview of Concepts and Theoretical Considerations

To understand the meaning of these responses and put them in theoretical context, this study employed claims from critical race theory (CRT), surveillance, critical security studies, and (in)securitization theories. Each of these offered specific insights and guiding key terms.

CRT framed my understanding of the connections between national security, surveillance, and race. CRT is particularly useful in showing how the regulation of populations through surveillance technologies is accomplished, particularly as it is focused on the experiences and knowledge of "ethnicized" and racialized minorities with respect to race and race relations (Delgado and Stefancic 2001). This research utilizes CRT by applying it to our understanding of surveillance and security.

Because this research seeks to document the perspectives of racialized minorities experiencing various surveillance techniques, the field of surveillance studies provides an important theoretical lens. Surveil-

lance is understood as one of the major mechanisms through which states and organizations keep track of and construct citizens. Through surveillance techniques, states codify the characteristics of the "imagined community" in efforts to develop "the capacities necessary to monopolize the authority to regulate movement" (Torpey 2000, 7). Surveillance monitors potential immigrant groups and assesses them as subjects for inclusion into the body politic. Modern surveillance avoids physical coercion and has the potential to wield considerable influence over behaviours (Lyon 2015). The term "social sorting" explains the processing of personal data by agencies to influence, direct, and manipulate behaviour in daily life—the unequal deployment and effects of surveillance systems where there is a tendency to operate as mechanisms for societal differentiation (Lyon 2003; 2007). In other words, surveillance systems assist with discerning or actively constructing differences among populations and then regulating those populations according to their assigned status (Gandy 2006; Haggerty and Ericson 2006), often invisibly, leading to a normalization of differential access, mobility, and treatment (Monahan 2008). It has the potential for marginalizing certain populations (Marx 2002).

The sorting of populations creates unintended consequences which can lead to "chilling effects," another key term for the purposes of this monograph. "Chilling effect" describes a context where "individuals seeking to engage in lawful activity are deterred from doing so by a governmental regulation not specifically directed at that activity" (Horn 2005). For example, a Muslim/Arab may avoid expressing his thoughts on jihad or terrorism online if he feels it will lead to unnecessary suspicion and doubt. However, there is a gap in our understanding of exactly how national security measures impact the daily lives of the affected populations, and this is precisely the gap the current study seeks to explore.

Because social sorting often happens along lines of race and ethnicity, and because the focus of this study is Muslim/Arabs, the terms "Islamophobia" or "anti-Muslim sentiment" are critical. Both terms incorporate common stereotypes and assumptions, where Islam is viewed as monolithic; separate and other; inferior to the West, barbaric, irrational, primitive, sexist; and violent, aggressive, threatening, supportive of terrorism, and engaged in a "clash of civilizations." Such language can produce an environment where hostility towards the religion is used to justify discriminatory practices towards Muslims and the exclusion of Muslims from mainstream society (Runnymede 1997, 5).

Another key component to understanding the impact of surveillance and security measures on racialized groups is critical security studies (CSS). CSS helps us to conceptualize the ways in which the national security agenda is constructed in efforts to securitize citizens from the threat of the foreign Other. Following the decline of the Cold War, conventional theories of security were challenged and viewed as inadequate in explaining the new landscape of security issues and actors (Burgess 2010). When discussing CSS, the focus is on ideas and concepts borrowed from International Political Sociology (IPS), a security approach that subsumes elements from all three of these critical schools. Within IPS, security is about sacrifice; the security of x means the insecurity of y. The practice of securing the general population entails insecurity for Muslim/Arabs; yet what are the consequences of this? This research intends to fill this gap by using CSS to explore the consequences of securitization.

While we use CSS to explore the consequences of securitization, another important theoretical contribution is provided by (in)securitization theory. According to Wæver, securitization is a "speech act" theory of security that focuses on how security issues are constructed through language and how shifts occur in the order of politics from ordinary to exceptional (Wæver 1998). In addition to security working as a "slogan" in which a dominant group justifies and imposes a political program by assessing who needs to be protected and who can be designated an object of fear, control, coercion (Balzacq et al. 2010). (In)securitization is demonstrated through surveillance technologies including routine bureaucratic decisions, actual technologies (or measures), with the quest for economic gains, working together as a part of its apparatus (Lyon and Murakami-Wood 2012, 320). Further, the term (in)securitization helps us to understand the consequences and implications of securitization, including the insecurity produced for both state and citizen. Little research is available on the subjective experiences of individuals, particularly those against whom measures are used; thus, this research will fill this gap by providing a qualitative understanding of the consequences of securitization.

Research Design

The aforementioned terms and key concepts were used to build on previous work exploring Canadian approaches to immigration, security, and citizenship, particularly specific anti-terrorism policies that (in)di-

rectly have an impact on Muslim / Arab communities. An explanatory mixed-methods research design that entails the collection, analysis, and integration of both qualitative and quantitative data was employed. The first phase used a survey design to collect quantitative data on the impact of national security measures on the general Canadian male population. In the second phase, Muslim / Arab men's experiences with security measures were qualitatively explored using open-ended interviews. Where the first phase offered a descriptive, quantitative look at how diverse Canadians respond to security measures, the second phase provided a more detailed understanding of the effects of those measures. Because this study is based on an empirically small sample size (n = 50 survey, and n = 20 open-ended interviews) and did not use random sampling, it does not make any claims to represent all Muslim / Arab men in Canada or to be generalizable to the wider Canadian population.

Outline

While the theoretical and methodological frameworks offered above are brief, they are explored in further detail in the subsequent chapters. In the following chapter, Chapter 2, I offer a review of the literature relevant to this study, namely Canadian immigration law and policy, inadmissibility, and security certificates, along with an understanding of anti-terrorism laws and literature on its impact. Chapter 3 describes and justifies the methodologies employed, with emphasis on the importance of mixed methods research. The present study uses explanatory mixed methods, relying on the sequential collection of information to collect and analyze quantitative data first, followed by qualitative data. Chapter 4 highlights key findings, including the impact of security and surveillance measures on Muslim Canadian men versus non-Muslim men in this study. In Chapter 5, the meaning and implications of these findings are discussed.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Considerations

The History of Immigration Law and Policy in Canada

The objectives of immigration law and policy have been shaped by a variety of economic, social, political, demographic, ideological, security, and public safety concerns (Elliot and Fleras 1996; Jakubowski 1999; Aiken 2007). As Whitaker notes, all Canadians, excluding indigenous peoples, are either immigrants themselves or descendants of immigrants (1991). Because the country has been shaped and reshaped by successive waves of immigrants, Canada has long been classified as a "classical immigration country" (Triadafilopoulos 2012, 2). Therefore, questions of immigration policy have been central to Canada's survival as an independent and prosperous state (Whitaker 1991, 2). A history of immigration law and policy will be briefly explored across three phases: first, from Confederation until 1900, when immigration was loose and aimed at settling Canada; second, from 1900 to 1967, which saw the gradual tightening of immigration based on racial and ethnic restrictions; and finally, 1960 onwards, which reverted to looser immigration policies. The section will end with the contemporary period, which has seen a return to restrictive immigration law and policies, including security certificates and the post-9/11 national security measures.

Phase 1: Confederation to 1900

Canada's first Immigration Act was passed in 1869, two years after Confederation, and immigration remained open and largely unrestrictive. The Act granted the federal government the "authority to deny entry to paupers and the mentally ill or physically disabled." It focused primarily on ensuring the safety of immigrants during their journey

to Canada and protecting them from exploitation once in the country. Although Prime Minster John A. Macdonald had anticipated an open immigration policy to help settle the west, population growth was slowed by the high rate of emigration to the United States throughout the late nineteenth century. Thus, the formation of an open, unrestricted policy was deemed essential to the growth and prosperity of the Canadian state. This policy had a notable exception: the introduction of a head tax on would-be Chinese immigrants in 1885. Chinese labourers had been brought to Canada to work on the western section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and there was public fear in British Columbia that the Chinese were immoral and diseased and would be unable to assimilate "properly." Thus, the Chinese Immigration Act of 1885 was the first legislation to officially exclude immigrants based on ethnic origin. It imposed a head tax of $50 (increasing to $500 in 1903) on every male Chinese immigrant seeking entry into the country. From 1886 to 1923, over $22 million was collected in head tax payments on Chinese immigrants. At the same time, immigration from northern European countries was encouraged for economic and agricultural reasons, with applicants from France and Britain given preference.

Phase 2: 1900 to 1967

Although early immigration policy following Confederation was open and unrestricted, a shift occurred in the early 1900s in which the developing Canadian state was tasked with attracting and retaining the "right" type of immigrants to populate the land. The laws established during this period distinguished between the *right* and *wrong* kinds of immigrants—those deemed desirable or undesirable based on strict racial or ethno-national characteristics. An array of policies and administrative practices that prevented the entry of non-White migrants, upholding a vision of the Canadian landscape as a "White man's country," were developed. In 1903, the national sentiment surrounding immigration was expressed by Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier's immigration minister, Frank Oliver. Reflecting a growing sentiment against "foreign" or "alien" immigrants. Oliver stated,

> It is not merely a question of filling the country with people … . It is a question of the ultimate results of the efforts put forward for the building up of a Canadian nationality … . This can never be accomplished if the preponderance of the population should be of such a class and character as will deteriorate rather than elevate

the condition of our people and our country at large. (Oliver 1903 as cited in Whitaker 1991, 8)

In this speech Oliver reminds Canadians that immigration was not for economic advantage alone, since immigrants were destined for Canadian citizenship. Oliver's caution was reinforced by popular beliefs that "racial (and class) origins were the determining factor in the capacity of 'foreigners' to assimilate into the Canadian community" (Whitaker 1991, 10). Enmity was reinforced by the perception among trade unionists that immigrant workers were strike-breakers and among the business class that they were dangerous foreign radicals. This fear became more pronounced after World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 (Whitaker 1991, 10).

The Immigration Act of 1906 reflected these fears by setting out new grounds for exclusion and strengthening control features (Whitaker 1991). The Act expanded the categories of prohibited immigrants, formalized deportation processes, and gave the government powers to make arbitrary judgments on which immigrants should be admitted. Prohibited classes of immigrants included the "feeble minded," those "afflicted with loathsome disease," "professional beggars," prostitutes and those living off their avails, persons convicted of crimes of "moral turpitude," and anyone "likely to become a public charge" or "dangerous to the public health" (Whitaker 1991, 11). Although specific restrictions by race, ethnicity, or nationality were not indicated, the government could, whenever expedient, make a proclamation to "prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants" (Revised Statutes of Canada 1906: Ch.93 s.26–30 as cited in Whitaker 1991).

Examples of further initiatives targeting specific groups, such as Japanese, East Indians, and Chinese, became evident with the gradual tightening of racial and ethnic restrictions to immigration until 1967. Following an influx of Japanese labourers into British Columbia in the early 1900s, anti-Asian sentiment flourished throughout the country. As a result, Canada moved towards restricting Japanese immigration into Canada through the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1908, where the Japanese government voluntarily agreed to limit the number of Japanese emigrants to Canada to only 400 annually. Japan agreed to the terms with the provision that Canada would not impose discriminatory laws on Japanese already in Canada (Sampat-Mehta 1984). Because both countries shared trade ties, and because Japan and Britain were allies, Canada did not want to jeopardize this alliance. This agreement

ensured that only a few Japanese trickled into Canada until well into the 1960s.

The immigration of East Indians into Canada proved more challenging, due to India's status as a British Commonwealth nation. Canada invoked the Continuous Journey Regulation, 1908, in which Canada stipulated that prospective immigrants must travel to Canada via a continuous journey from their country of origin on a non-stop thoroughfare purchased in their home country. Due to the absence of steamship service between India and Canada, the regulation successfully halted Indian immigration as thoroughfare tickets to Canada were not issued in India (Cohen 1987). This regulation was intended to favour European immigrants, although not specifying Indians directly. Further, the government had required that Indian immigrants possess at least $200 on arrival, compared to $25 for European immigrants.[1,2]

Further amendments in 1919 created grounds for denying entry and deportation, such as constitutional psychopathic inferiority and alcoholism. "Draconian measures" were enacted and "any non-citizen, or anyone whose citizenship had been acquired through naturalization, advocating the overthrow of constituted authority or associating with any group advocating the overthrow of government, could be deported" (Whitaker 1991, 11). Immigrants from countries identified as enemy alien nations were denied entrance, and the categories of political dissidents were expanded. The cabinet could now restrict immigrants by reason of "economic, industrial, or other condition[s] temporarily existing in Canada" (high unemployment at the time), due to their unsuitability, or their "peculiar habits, modes of life and methods of holding property." Further, individuals who had been deported by allied counties as radicals could be restricted from entry to Canada. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, created in 1920, initiated surveillance of ethnic organizations. Certain immigrants (particularly Ukrainians, Russians, Finns, and Jewish individuals), and those belonging to certain political ideologies (e.g., communist) were denoted as enemies of

---

1. Between 1914 and 1920, only one Indian immigrant was admitted into Canada.
2. The *Continuous Journey Rule* of 1908 was invoked to turn away 376 refugees from India coming to Canada via boat. Carrying 376 Indian Sikhs, the *Komagatu Maru* in 1914 sailed from China and was refused admission to Canada. The ship and its passengers were detained on the British Columbian harbour for over two months under poor conditions, including a lack of proper nutrition and sanitation. Following an unsuccessful appeal to the BC Supreme Court, the boat sailed back to India, where, upon its arrival, the passengers were met with suspicion by Indian authorities: following a raid, twenty passengers were killed.

the Canadian state (Whitaker 1991, 11). These particular groups were stigmatized as "dangerous foreigners" as some were socialist or community sympathizers (Avery 1979).

In 1923, all Chinese immigration was restricted to a specific class of Chinese immigrants: government representatives, diplomats, investors, Canadian-born children who had left for educational or other purposes, and students.[3] Immigration of "any Asiatic race" was restricted except for agriculturalists, farm labourers, female domestic servants, and the spouse and children of Canadian citizens. All Chinese and Japanese immigrants were required to renounce their former citizenship in order to be naturalized.

Unemployment, economic decline, and World War II resulted in further restrictions to immigration policy. To combat the rise in unemployment and prevent further economic decline, the government advanced a restrictive immigration admissions policy in 1931, limiting access to all except American and British subjects and agriculturalists (and their spouses and children) with significant economic capital.

Unemployed immigrants were deported, as they were considered a strain on public welfare or politically troubling (Whitaker 1991, 13; Simmons 2010). From 1930 to 1935, 28,097 unemployed immigrants were deported.[4,5] World War II introduced more restrictive and discriminatory immigration policies. With anti-Semitic sentiment spreading in Canada, in 1939 the admission of Jewish refugees was cautioned against by the Canadian government. Through the *War Measures Act*, the government was also empowered with special powers to "to act against the suspected spies with little or no regard for civil liberties, and outside the normal processes of the legal system" (Whitaker 2003, 243). In consulta-

---

3.   Despite protest from the Chinese community, official opposition was silent. From 1923 to 1946, it is estimated that only 15 Chinese immigrants gained entry into Canada. In 1947, the *Chinese Immigration Act* was repealed following pressure from church and labour groups. Chinese immigration was then regulated by 1930 rules for "Asiatics," allowing only sponsorship of spouse and children by Canadian citizens (Whitaker 1991).

4.   Only after public criticism did the government provide leniency and suspend deportation orders against those who were able to find work while awaiting deportation.

5.   Immigrants who had organized or participated in strikes or organized labour activities were also deported (Simmons, 2010). Under the *Criminal Code*, the Communist Party was made illegal. Any member, including naturalized immigrants, could have their citizenship revoked and be deported. Political deportation was now a federal policy. Exact figures on the number of individuals deported under specific grounds are unavailable, as some may have technically been deported under different grounds (i.e., criminal conviction, vagrancy, or being on the public charge).

tion with allies, the government "studie[d] the evidence, watche[d] the suspects, and waited for the right moment to strike in light of the international scene" (Whitaker 2003, 243). Thus, following the attacks on Pearl Harbor, the Act allowed for the internment of over 22,000 (including 10,000 Canadian-born) Japanese Canadians, who were deprived of their civil liberties and relocated to detention camps due to fears that they were loyal to the Japanese state and not to Canada (Weinfeld and Wilkinson 1999).[6] Public fear and hysteria led to 17,000 Italian Canadians also being interned, a policy promoted by political leaders by the end of World War II (Simmons, 2010).[7]

In 1947, Prime Minister Mackenzie King outlined a cautious approach to postwar immigration policy:

> regulation and vigorous administration, to ensure the careful selection and permanent settlement of such numbers of immigrants as can advantageously be absorbed in our national economy …
> . Canada is perfectly within her rights in selecting the persons whom we regard as desirable citizens. It is not a 'fundamental human right' of any alien to enter Canada. It is a privilege. It is a matter of domestic policy … . Because the people of Canada do not wish, as a result of mass immigration, to make a fundamental alteration in the character of our population … large-scale immigration from the Orient [would not be permitted] to change the fundamental composition of the Canadian population. (Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1 May 1947, 2644–6)

The Citizenship Act of 1947 created the category of Canadian citizenship, officially allowing residents to obtain citizenship regardless of their country of origin; it also articulated the conditions under which it could be revoked or lost.[8]

---

6. Although Canada was at war with Germany, Italy, and Japan, only Japanese and Italians were detained. The former would not receive a formal apology until 1988, with just over half receiving compensation.
7. As Simmons (2010, 58) writes, "the exclusions, deportations and internments … reflected the anti-immigrant and ethnic prejudice of the times interacting with the real economic and political threats arising from the Depression and the war. If so, what happened is old history and not relevant to today, except as a reference to what we want to avoid. However, if some of the same or related prejudices are still present, although more hidden, then the way the world is unfolding provides no lack of stresses that could trigger their reappearance. The problems that Muslims in Canada faced in the post-9/11 era comes to mind as an indication that ethnic prejudice and stressful events still mobilize hostilities toward minorities."
8. Prior to this, Canadian-born residents and naturalized immigrants were classified as British subjects. Canada was the first Commonwealth nation to enact its own citizen-

The Gouzenko Affair of 1945 entrenched security screenings of immigrant/refugee and citizenship applications. When the RCMP exposed an elaborate spy ring, led by Soviet defector Igor Gouzenko, it was seen as a "wake-up call" to bolster Canadian domestic security and borders. Selecting the targets and setting the parameters of surveillance was left to the discretion of the RCMP, whose officers accessed homes and apartments without warrants, detained people, and seized documents and papers (Aiken 2000, 61). Detainees were not arrested under criminal charges (thus lacking the rights granted them under the Criminal Code) and were unrepresented by counsel during weeks of interrogation (Whitaker 2010, 39).[9] Because the Cabinet viewed security as a key priority, high levels of secrecy were instituted. In fact, "not only was the actual process secret but the fact that such a process was in place was a closely guarded secret" (Canada v. Dueck [T.D.] T 938–95 1998 as cited in Aiken 2000, 62). In an era where "extraordinary state action against dissidents" (detention without trial, search and seizure, censorship) was not only tolerated but also sanctioned by the highest courts, transparency was to be avoided at all costs (Whitaker 2010). The affair set the precedent for the low priority accorded civil liberties by the RCMP during peacetime and generated a widespread preoccupation within the government about security (Aiken 2000). The impacts seeped into more extensive security screenings of immigrant/refugee and citizenship applications, demonstrating a persistent application of double standards with regard to new Canadians (Whitaker 2010, 43).

Amendments from 1900 to 1967 reaffirmed the federal government's power to exclude or limit groups based on social or economic priorities, thus creating "preferred classes" of immigrants who were further described as British, French, American, and Asians who have relatives in Canada.

---

ship classification.

9.   "Closely guarded secrets," or secret intelligence, were used in collaboration with other tools such as global political policing, repression of dissent and dissenters, the control of turbulent or "dangerous" classes, political conformity, and the invasive surveillance/regulation of daily activities (Whitaker 2000, 19). Though justified the protection of national security, its use, Whitaker argues, creates national *in*security, "an anxiety that afflicts states across the ideological spectrum." In fact, a form of surveillance technology, secret intelligence, has been used by various governments who have relied on secret or political politicking against the potential or perceived threats of subversion, if not revolution (Whitaker, 2000).

Phase 3: 1960 and Onwards

The 1960s saw remarkable changes in the exclusionary practices of im-
migration law (Taylor 1991). Discrimination in immigration policy was
banned in the Immigration Act of 1962, which eliminated the "White
only" policy from Canadian immigration. The new regulations required
independent immigrants from all parts of the world to be treated equal-
ly (in 1967 this would be formalized into the "points system"). Em-
ployment and/or sufficient financial capital to support them until they
could find suitable employment were the main requirements.[10] How-
ever, some distinction in sponsorship privileges remained, because the
categories eligible for sponsorship were wider for European-Canadians
than non-Europeans (Taylor 1991).[11]

The stage was set for additional changes by the 1966 White Paper
on Immigration. It recommended that Canada create an "expansionist,
non-discriminatory immigration policy, one that reconciled the need to
maintain family ties with the economic interests of Canada." Canada, it
said, should recruit qualified immigrants and restrict sponsored immi-
gration so as to avoid an influx of unskilled labour. In 1967, new regu-
lations set up a points system based on the applicant's education, work
skills, employment prospects, age, official language skills, and adapt-
ability. An applicant required 50 out of 100 points to gain entry into the
country, regardless of race, ethnicity, or national origin. That same year,
the Immigration Appeal Board Act was passed; allowing anyone who
received a deportation order to appeal to the Board, on legal or compas-
sionate grounds. The 1967 universal admissions policy and its entrench-
ment into the Immigration Act of 1976 dismantled the "White Canada"
immigration landscape and created the preconditions for Canada's de-
velopment into one of the most culturally diverse countries globally.

The next major change came in the Immigration Act of 1978. Its official
purposes were to enhance Canadian demographic goals as established
by the government; enrich the cultural and social fabric of Canada,
taking into account its federal and bilingual character; facilitate family
reunification; foster intergovernmental co-operation to assist the adap-
tation of immigrants to their new home; facilitate visits to Canada by

---

10. Furthermore, potential immigrants could not be criminals or terrorists or have dis-
    eases that may endanger public health.
11. This was adjusted in 1967 where sponsorship provisions were made equal for all
    groups, regardless of race and ethnicity. To date, immigration law contains no word-
    ing that permits discrimination on racist grounds (Taylor 1991).

foreigners; ensure non-discrimination among immigrants on grounds of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, and sex; fulfill Canada's international obligations with regard to refugees and "uphold its humanitarian tradition with respect to the displaced and persecuted"; foster a viable economy and regional prosperity; maintain the health, safety, and good order of Canadian society; and promote international order and justice "by denying the use of Canadian territory to persons who are likely to engage in criminal activity" (Whitaker 1991, 20). The Act created four basic categories for landed immigrants: family, humanitarian (including refugees and persecuted or displaced persons), independents, and assisted relatives. Removed from the prohibited category were "imbeciles," homosexuals, individuals with tuberculosis, and individuals guilty of crimes of moral turpitude (Whitaker 1991, 20). It was the first time that federal government clearly outlined the objectives of immigration policy, defined refugees as a distinct group, and required the federal government to consult provincial governments on matters of immigration planning and management. The reforms in 1978 revised the points system, which would henceforth apply only to the independent class of immigrants. And although provisions remained strict for exclusion and deportation, these were strongly weighed in favour of the state. The security and criminal charges were more precisely defined and included more remedies and procedures for the individual in question. The revised act "offer[ed] an express commitment to values of universalism and equality … informed by principles of fairness and respect for the equality rights of the immigrants and refugees to whom the reach of the law and its administration extended" (Aiken 2007, 66).

The entrenchment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 provided further protection for non-citizens. Previously the state argued that immigration was a privilege and not a right. But the landmark Supreme Court ruling in Singh vs the Minister of Employment and Immigration ruled that all individuals, including non-citizens, subject to Canadian law could seek protection under the Charter. According to Whitaker, "the import of this decision can hardly be overestimated. Governments now find [found] themselves much more constrained than in the past in setting policy" (Whitaker 1991, 23).[12]

With the new Charter, diversity and cultural protection became of-

---

12. In 1984, the responsibility of security aspects of immigration was transferred from the RCMP to the newly created CSIS, through the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act.

ficial government policy. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 provided the first national multiculturalism law in the world. Its official purposes were to better reflect Canada's increasingly diverse racial and ethnic composition, reduce discrimination, encourage implementation of multicultural programs, and protect the cultural heritage of all Canadians. However, in 1994, following a robbery and murder by Jamaican immigrants, the Government passed Bill C-44. It allowed the government to deport or indefinitely hold any landed immigrant found guilty of a felony under the Criminal Code. The Bill gave the individual "a scant" fifteen days to appeal the order to the minister of immigration (Aiken 2007, 89). Between the years 1995 and 2000, an estimated 2,000 non-citizens were issued danger certificates, clearly "a number that did not conform with an expressed intention of limiting the use of the process to exceptional cases where appeals would be manifestly without merit" (Aiken 2007, 89). For the first two years of its implementation, 40 percent of deportees were Black men from Jamaica.

In 1999, the Canadian government introduced security certificates, a document authorizing the indefinite imprisonment, without charge or trial, of all non-Canadian citizens deemed "threats to national security."[13] These provisions were tightened after 11 September 2001, when the United States, under President George Bush, declared a "global war on terror." Under American and global pressure, the Canadian Parliament rushed the omnibus Anti-terrorism Act (ATA), creating new terrorist offences. The ATA criminalized support for listed terrorist groups and provided the government with enhanced powers to fight terrorism. Among the most controversial were the legalizing of preventive arrest and the provision of investigative hearing powers that limited traditional individual rights. A sunset clause, however, forced Parliament to review the provisions every five years and decide anew whether to renew the powers or let them lapse.

The ATA has been sharply criticized by scholars and activists. As Kent Roach pointed out, a critical aspect was missing in the Act; a non-discrimination clause which would act as a "symbolic statement of opposition to discriminatory forms of enforcement of the many new powers provided in the legislation" with the potential to "counter some post-September 11 public support for racial and religious profiling"

---

13. The arrival of a boat of 123 Chinese immigrants to the West Coast was met with hostility from the public, and the passengers were kept in long-term detention, with some prevented from making refugee claims.

(Roach 2007). In fact, none of the national security measures in the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) "explicitly condone nor prohibit" profiling (Aiken 2007, 91). As another legal scholar writes, it is challenging to assess the extent to which racial profiling is practised in Canada's anti-terrorism efforts (Davies 2006). However, ample evidence exists suggesting that racialized groups in Canada are subject to profiling (Bahdi 2003; Davies 2006).

Another missing aspect is a clear definition of two key terms, "terrorism" and "membership" (Davies 2006, 256). Discretion over these definitions and, ultimately, over what constitutes "terrorist activity" and "terrorists" makes racial and religious profiling by law enforcement authorities possible if not probable. Any targeting of Muslims will exacerbate feelings of fear and insecurity in a population that is already highly vulnerable (Bhabha 2003, 120). Indeed, in the context of the war on terror, racial profiling translates to using race as a proxy for risk assessments of individuals (Bahdi 2003, 295; Choudhry 2001, 372 as cited in Aiken 2007).

According to Dobrowolsky (2007), the ATA increased risks of discrimination for Muslims along lines of race, religion, colour, and national origin. And, as Bhabha predicted, the ATA

> will target Muslims, a community which suffers from historical disadvantage and ongoing stereotyping. The definition of 'terrorist activity' and the designation of 'terrorist groups' as outlined in the Act, will adversely impact on Muslims by subjecting them to differential treatment in the enforcement of criminal law provisions and administrative processes. An additional feature to consider will be the fact of intersecting inequalities, particularly those of a systemic nature, such as the case of non-citizen Muslims, who will be at an even greater risk of discrimination and for whom the adverse effects will be exceptionally grave. (2003)

Despite efforts to avoid undermining section 15(1) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which prohibit discrimination, scholars argue that for certain communities the basic status of rights and liberties in the Charter "are jeopardized" (Dubrowolsky 2007). Rights infringement can occur in many ways, for both citizens and non-citizens. For example, Canadian citizens detained outside of Canada have experienced "extreme deprivation" of rights and liberties, as witnessed in the case of Canadians Maher Arar and Omar Khadr. Arar is a dual citizen of Canada and Syria who, on the basis of faulty intelligence shared by

the Canadian RCMP, was deported by the United States to Syria, where he was tortured for over a year; Khadr was a Canadian-born teenager detained in the United States "indefinitely without charges, trial or Geneva-Convention protections in a military prison at Guantanamo, Cuba" (Abu Laban 2006). Both Arar and Khadr's experiences demonstrate the limitations of citizenship under the auspices of the ATA.

Inadmissibility and Security Certificates

After the ATA was introduced, Bill C-11, the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, replaced the Immigration Act of 1976.[14] New amendments included the broadening of government powers to arrest, detain, and deport immigrants. National security exclusions state that refugees and immigrants are "inadmissible" where "reasonable grounds" suggest they will "engage in terrorism" or "are members of an organization that there are reasonable grounds to believe will … engage in terrorism." Again, "terrorism" and "membership" are not defined in the Act; thus, the concepts remain indeterminate, providing judges and ministers with significant discretionary powers (Aiken 2007, 92). The use of security certificates, an anti-terror measure found in section 34 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2002), articulates inadmissibility of non-citizens as the following:

> (1) A permanent resident or a foreign national is inadmissible on security grounds for:
>> (a) engaging in an act of espionage or an act of subversion against a democratic government, institution or process as they are understood in Canada;
>> (b) engaging in or instigating the subversion by force of any government;
>> (c) engaging in terrorism;
>> (d) being a danger to the security of Canada; or
>> (e) engaging in acts of violence that would or might endanger the lives or safety of persons in Canada; or
>> (f) being a member of an organization that there are reasonable grounds to believe engages, has engaged or will engage in acts

---

14. This research identifies security certificates as a surveillance technology because they are based partly on evidence from data gathered through surveillance of telecommunications (cell phone records, emails, etc.) and travel. Further, once a certificate is applied, recipients are monitored in detention and post-detention through even more surveillance methods and technologies (e.g., GPS tracking devices).

referred to in paragraph (a), (b) or (c).

As Waldman notes, these grounds provide ample room for broad and unrestrictive interpretations (2004, 7.251). For example, the degree to which one poses a threat, or the distinction between membership in terrorist groups versus groups that have historically served cultural or economic purposes (e.g., the Tamil Tigers, Hezbollah, Hamas), is not clearly articulated (Bell 2011). Waldman notes that the term "subversion" is elusive and that the definition of "membership" in an organization could be broadly interpreted to include a range of definitions such as "associates of associates, sympathizers, supporters and fellow travelers" (2004, 7.255–60). Bell argues that the broad interpretations signal the way in which the use of the IRPA as an anti-terrorism tool is "akin to launching a war on an abstract noun" (2011, 61). Thus, the onus is on security professionals to identity terrorists and inadmissible individuals. The lack of specific criteria means that "it will be for the agents of law-enforcement and security to tell us who the terrorist is, when they have him in their grasp" (Dyzenhaus 2001, 28).[15]

Since 1991, twenty-eight security certificates have been issued (of which twenty were upheld by the courts), with membership in a terrorist organization the most common reason cited. Security certificates are employed when information surfaces regarding a person's "inadmissibility" under security grounds. Due to an increased revenue allo-

---

15. Project Thread, a joint investigation by the RCMP and Citizenship and Immigration Canada, was one such instance where accusations of racial profiling in detention and deportation cases caused scrutiny. In 2003, a group of twenty-three young South Asian/Muslim men were arrested and detained on security grounds and initially accused of being an al Qaeda sleeper cell. RCMP and CIC officials were unable to substantiate incriminating allegations, including a plot to destroy the CN Tower. As students, several young men lived together in a minimally furnished apartment: one was a student pilot; two men had pictures of airplanes in their room; another man's father was a pilot; and one man knew someone with an al Qaeda connection. Furthermore, a smoke alarm that had been set off in the kitchen was considered evidence that would suggest a sign of testing explosives (Jimenez, Freese and Burnett 2003; Khan 2004). The men were all co-coerced into waiving their right to a Pre-Removal Risk Assessment and denied access lawyers, thus expediting their deportation from Canada (Verma 2004; CBC 2003). The lack of sufficient evidence to detain the men devolved Project Thread into a mere immigration fraud charge as the RCMP and CIC distanced themselves from the original claim that the young men posed a threat to national security. On grounds of having expired visas, ten men were deported to Pakistan. All of the young men suffered extensive personal damage: one man's marriage was annulled; others were tortured and detained for lengthy periods in Pakistan; and others were harassed and face unemployment in Pakistan (Shepherd and Verma 2003; Verma 2003).

cated for immigration enforcement and anti-terrorism measures (such as security guidelines under the IRPA), the overall number of refugees and non-citizens subject to preventative immigration detention has increased (CBSA 2004; Dench 2004 as cited in Aiken 2007, 92). Aiken questions whether an increase in the detention of non-citizens is due to more dangerous individuals crossing the border or if it is a tangible result of moral panic about security post-9/11 (Aiken 2007).

Certificates are issued by the minister of citizenship and immigration and the minister of public safety, based on the advice of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS). Once signed by the ministers, the "reasonableness" of the certificate is assessed by a Federal Court judge. The judge must decide whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the evidence presented by the government establishes inadmissibility on security grounds. The judge's decision is based on "a bonafide belief in a serious possibility based on credible evidence … more than a flimsy suspicion, but less than the civil test of balance of probabilities" (Chiau vs Canada 1998 as cited in Willis and Wilke 2008). The threshold is much lower than the standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt mandated by Canadian criminal law (Willis and Wilke 2008, 29). Therefore, the certificate can be predicated on future conduct and on assessments of dispositions that have not surfaced in tangible actions. The suspects are judged according to what they are alleged to be (dangerous or not) rather than what they have done (Willis and Wilke 2008, 50).

Ericson argues that security certificates are a preventative approach, characterized by precautionary logic (2007). Legal standards are then reconciled and adjusted according to these parameters. Larsen points out that while the aim of such law is to manage uncertainty, uncertainty is future-oriented. The risks of moving towards a pre-crime society start to emerge, because a crime does not have to be committed for a security certificate to be issued (2008).[16] As an immigration procedure, certificates apply exclusively to non-citizens, including refugees, permanent residents, and foreign nationals (Bell 2006; 2006a). Detainees are not entitled to see all the evidence against them and are exempt from legal provisions designed to prevent deportations to countries

---

16. "Pre-crime" is defined as crime which is anticipated before it actually occurs; a pre-crime society is "characterized by calculation, risk and uncertainty, surveillance, precaution, prudentialism, moral hazard, prevention and which has the overarching goal of the pursuit of security" (Zedner 2007, 262).

where they may risk torture, human rights abuse, or death.[17] Although security certificates were intended to speed up the deportation procedures on non-citizens inadmissible on security grounds, the post-9/11 practice has been indefinite detention rather than speedy removal (Whitaker 2012).

Given these issues, many commentators see security certificates as problematic. They legitimate the suspension of basic human rights in defence of an overall promise of national security; in effect, they "suspend the rule of law" by "denying basic legal protection and judicial impartiality to non-citizen detainees" (Razack 2008; Bell 2006, 65). Bell suggests that security certificates "function as a moment of legal exception for the assertion of sovereign power and legitimation" (Bell 2006). Security certificates are unique in their orientation towards, and construction of, the non-citizen subject. Indeed, any use of immigration law as anti-terrorism law is problematic: it is dramatically over-inclusive in targeting innocent non-citizens, while under-inclusive in responding appropriately to terrorist threats from citizens. As Roach argues, using immigration law this way shows "a lack of confidence in the criminal law" (2011). Further, he argues that, for most of the years 2000 and 2001, security certificate recipients could not even be charged under the ATA's offences as the ATA could not be applied retroactively (Roach 2011, 406). As a result of these and other legal and constitutional criticisms, the Supreme Court of Canada, in 2007, declared significant parts of the security certificate process unconstitutional. The court gave the government a set time period during which the government must address the problems according to guidelines set down by the court. Revisions and further judicial intervention led to the release of certain certificate recipients, albeit under onerous conditions (Whitaker 2012). And although the Supreme Court addressed some concerns of the constitutional and human rights of the recipients, its decision upheld a fundamental distinction between citizens and non-citizens as it relates to anti-terrorism policies (Wilke and Willis 2008). The distinction is an important one, and as such the following section will briefly explore the importance of citizenship and nationalism for the purposes of this study.

---

17. However, due to pressure from human rights advocates and the international community, detainees who cannot be deported due to threats of torture or death face indefinite detention without charge, as they are considered threats to security if left at large (Whitaker, 2012).

Theoretical Framework

Conceptualizing Citizenship

As security certificates are an immigration procedure and can only be applied to non-citizens, it is important to understand how citizenship is constructed. The following section will briefly explore notions of citizenship and nationality as they relate to this research. This is significant because it helps us to understand how the state determines who belongs as a citizen and who does not. In T. H. Marshall's essay on citizenship and social class, the meaning of social membership includes three dimensions of citizenship: civil, political, and social rights (1950). Civil rights, for example, include equality before the law; political rights encompass the right to vote and to organize political parties; social rights refer to rights to welfare and to similar social services. Further, the "inequality of the social class system may be acceptable provided the equality of citizenship is recognized" (Marshall 1950, 8).

Citizenship and the nation-state fulfill the two important tasks: determining membership criteria; and specifying the nature and extent of the rights, obligations, and relationship between the individual and the state (Jacobson 1996, 7). It is interesting to note, then, that human rights are tied to effective citizenship (Arendt 1951). The most fundamental right, "the right to have rights," is to belong to a political community that is "willing and able to guarantee any rights whatsoever" (Arendt 1951). In turn, a political community realizes this and provides protection of its members' rights. Thus when citizens are deprived of the "right to have rights," their rightlessness highlights the dangers of not belonging and being "cast out of legality altogether" (Arendt 1951). This exclusion can be justified on the grounds that those applying to be citizens are considered unequal and pose a threat to the nation (Balibar 1991, 36). The existence of discriminatory practices is legitimated by international law (Stasiulis and Bakan 2005). National discourses of self-determination validate restrictions on immigrants through the doctrine of national, territorially based sovereignty (Stasiulis and Bakan 2005, 11). States that cannot protect their borders risk jeopardizing their sovereignty (Weber 1992). In the Canadian context, the perceived need to define, maintain, and control national and social boundaries is seen in migration and immigration policies (Jacobson 1996).

Surveillance of its population is an important component of how states decide who qualifies for citizenship; it is an entitlement "not extended to all" (Walby and Hier 2009, 126). Citizenship today has be-

come more complicated than Marshall suggested, due, among other things, to the "globalizing of risks" such as terrorism (1950). Denial of citizen rights, in effect, prevents access to civil and political rights. The alleged risks of particular racial and ethnic groups legitimize intensive state surveillance, allowing personal data to be shared between and among national and international agencies through the merging of databases.[18] The relationship between citizenship rights and membership in certain racial and ethnic groups is best understood through the lens of critical race theory. How and why the Muslim male is constructed as "dangerous" by the Canadian state and how surveillance works to identify, socially sort, and monitor bodies perceived as a threat is discussed in the next section.

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) provides an important framework for understanding the connections between national security, surveillance, and race. It is particularly useful in showing how the regulation of populations through surveillance technologies is accomplished. CRT focuses on the experiences and knowledge of "ethnicized" and racialized minorities with respect to race and race relations (Delgado and Stefancic 2001). Seeing racism as ingrained in the social fabric of the West, CRT maintains that individual racism and institutional racism are mutually exclusive, and both pervade dominant culture. The theory challenges liberal assertions that law is neutral (or colour-blind) by showing how its proclaimed ideals and practices of liberalism and meritocracy serve as vehicles to promote the self-interest, power, and privilege of dominant (White) elites, those with the most wealth, power, and privilege. Dismantling the invisible privileges of White people, CRT theorists argue, is a critical component of social change (see Lopez 1996; Delgado 1994; Ford 1994; Harris 1993; Bell 1987).

This invisible privilege gives "Whiteness" a rarely acknowledged position of dominance and power. According to Giroux, "whiteness, domination, and invisibility are intimately related … where 'whiteness' functions as a historical and social construction" (1992, 15). The dominant culture's blindness towards Whiteness becomes the source of its hidden authority because its status is strengthened by the fact that this is an unrecognized, unacknowledged racial category that secures

---

18. The risks of sharing databases can be seen in the Arar case and also the no-fly list.

its power through its refusal of self-identification (Giroux 1992, 15). In fact, the failure to recognize or acknowledge matters of race in Western discourses has fostered a habit of ignoring race or racism. To notice racism would mean to recognize an already discredited difference. And, to validate its invisibility through silence would further allow the racialized body to maintain a "shadowless participation" as a minority Other (Giroux 1992, 10–15). Further, the dominant American or Canadian subject is White; thus, anyone falling outside of that racial identification must add "hyphen after hypen after hyphen" for permission to apply that title of national belonging (Giroux 1992, 47).

This research purposefully employs the term Muslim/Arab rather than other identifiers such as South Asian, Middle Eastern, Central Asian, or West Asian. The term Arab is preferred to other racial labels such as Brown, as the latter is geographically limited to people from South Asian countries (Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, etc.). As the majority of security certificate recipients are from Arab Muslim countries (Algeria, Syria, Morocco, and Egypt), they identify as Middle Eastern and/or Arab, rather than Brown. While it should be noted that not all Muslims are Arabs, and not all Arabs are Muslim, for the purpose of this proposal the term Muslim/Arab will be used. This is consistent with Naber's category of "Arab-Middle Eastern-Muslim" Other, as it highlights multiple characteristics while merging them into a singular Muslim Other (2006, 235). An abbreviated version of Naber's term, Muslim/Arab will be employed theoretically and methodologically.

Race thinking is an idea that refers to the categorization in dominant discourses of the world in binary terms, the deserving and the undeserving (Razack 2008). Race thinking can be transformational for both dominant and non-dominant groups, when it unites with bureaucratic principles or when it is systemized or attached to a project of capitalism, at which point race thinking ceases to be a prejudice but becomes an organizing principle (Razack 2008). Individuals falling outside of the boundaries of the nation-state may be despised, reviled, and subjected to exclusionary practices of political and judicial procedures. Such procedures are likely to be particularly oppressive if the individuals or groups are seen as providing no benefit or advantage to the dominant (White) community (Gilroy 2000, 84). Through race thinking, extrajudicial laws and policies are justified—an important claim in this context because surveillance technologies of national security thrive in the bodies of the non-White citizen, the racialized non-citizen subject.

Racialized in Whiteness, citizenship was inherently linked to the dispossession and colonization of Indigenous peoples; yet it is celebrated as a crucial component of Canadian national identity. This celebration obscures the fact that these entitlements were taken by force during colonization and maintained through racial domination. It complements the disciplinary power of the state by "seduc[ing] subjects into reproducing their nationality" (Thobani 2007, 8).

For Thobani, to combat the threat of the Other the state needs to identify and isolate the enemy within, thereby preventing the enemy from influencing others (2007). Ideally, the state seeks to ensure this by extirpating the enemy or employing salient surveillance techniques. The development and maintenance of extensive surveillance techniques over suspicious individuals/groups is deemed necessary to create "extensive dossiers" on questionable political activity. While such dossiers must by law be "cumulative and permit cross-checking or matching with other data bases on citizens and groups," realistically the security system works extra-legally and is seldom subject to judicial review (2007, 22).

Thobani traces how the discourses of citizenship, nationality, and security are used to identify, define, and classify individuals and differentiate between those who do or do not deserve rights and entitlements, who must be governed differently. The administrative and bureaucratic regulation of citizenship permeates Canadian social life through the construction of uncontested citizens versus citizens who are always regulated, and under suspicion or surveillance. The latter must be controlled through national security measures, particularly through technologies aimed at protecting the population from perceived or real threats. Measures such as security certificates are justified within state-of-exception—a term that refers to the supposedly temporary suspension of laws due to a state of emergency or crisis (Agamben 2005).

Within the liberal multicultural state, racialized individuals are cast as outsiders of both legal and national boundaries. They demonstrate personal characteristics that are antithetical to the Canadian myth. A result is the exaltation of the national image and reconfiguration of the discriminatory practices as lawful and necessary for "self"-preservation. This creates an (inaccurate) image of Canada as a caring, tolerant, peace-loving, and law-abiding country (Thobani 2007).

Regimes assess the "dangerous" Other by their asserted dangerousness—one that is first constructed and then "balanced by 'their' rights against 'our' security from the threat they are seen to pose" (Wilke and

Willis 2008, 51). And, as the post-9/11 era demonstrates, "anxious publics are willing to put up with many more intrusions, interceptions, delays and questions than was the case before September 11" (Lyon 2002, 311). This same discourse has employed a historic imagining of the Other to construct threats (to national security) along culturally and religiously essentialized lines (Abu Laban 2002; Naghibi 2007 as cited in Byrne 2010). These representations reflect the broader global ideological context where a "clash of civilizations" discourse serves to legitimize "discriminating" policies that target Muslim communities (Abu Laban 2002, 459). The 1997 British Runnymede Trust report "Islamophobia: a Challenge for Us All" recognized the nature of anti-Muslim sentiment and identified eight constitutive components based on "closed" views of Islam that define Islamophobia. These components are:

1. Islam seen as a monolithic bloc, static and unresponsive to new realities.
2. Islam seen as separate and other (a) not having any aims or values in common with other cultures (b) not affected by them (c) not influencing them.
3. Islam seen as inferior to the West, barbaric, irrational, primitive, sexist.
4. Islam seen as violent, aggressive, threatening, supportive of terrorism, engaged in a 'clash of civilisations'.
5. Islam seen as a political ideology, used for political or military advantage.
6. Criticisms made by Islam of 'the West' rejected out of hand.
7. Hostility towards Islam used to justify discriminatory practices towards Muslims and exclusion of Muslims from mainstream society.
8. Anti-Muslim hostility accepted as natural and 'normal.' (1997, 5)

As the report's definition indicates, the discourse surrounding Islamophobia is that of Islam as monolithic and threatening, building on a history of Orientalist representations of Muslims as deficient or deviant versions of a modern, rational Europe (Said 1978). Orientalist depictions construct Muslim women as oppressed, exotic, victimized, and in need of saving, while Muslim men are depicted as uncivilized and barbaric (Said 1978).

Orientalist thinking legitimizes aggressive surveillance technologies targeting Muslims and those from the Middle East (Jiwani 2011; Magnet 2011; Razack 2008). Edward Said notes "the dogma … that the

Orient is at bottom something either to be feared (the Yellow Peril, the Mongol hordes, the brown dominions) or to be controlled (by pacification, research and development, outright occupation whenever possible)" (1978, 300–1). The prism of fear and suspicion renders Muslims as a monolithic group, intrinsically connected with the threat of terrorism (Naber 2006).

The ideal citizen is one without any group-based identifiers, while a non-citizen is someone who remains entangled in group-based identities (Razack 2007, 166). According to Razack, Muslims are shaped within this framework as undeserving of full citizenship status, including the right to practise their faith without fears of being labelled as anything other than "Moderate" or a "good Muslim" (2007). This binary has deep roots. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Orientalist scholars found evidence of the "good" and "bad" Muslim. The distinction at that time was between those who collaborated with the colonial enterprise and accepted the dominant powers' values and customs versus those who resisted the colonists' religious, cultural, or political power (Ramadan 2010, 22). This strengthens the contention that citizens who are considered unequal (culturally) can be summarily excluded from citizenship on the grounds that they pose a threat to the nation (Balibar 1991).

Western media plays a significant role in promoting and disseminating this discourse through their routine coverage of factional violence between the various Islamic groups in Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Syria, Egypt, and Pakistan. A "good Muslim" is the "moderate Muslim" who rose to the occasion following 9/11 and provided answers while condemning and distancing themselves from the violent "Muslim extremists," "Islamic fundamentalists," and "Islamists" (Mamdani 2002; 2004). They are "moderates," "liberals," and "secularists who do not adopt distinctive styles of dress, consume alcohol and practice their religion privately"; the "bad Muslims" are the "fundamentalists," the "extremists," and the "Islamists" (Ramadan 2010).

As discussed in previous sections, despite Canadian rhetoric that supports immigration for its economic, demographic, and humanitarian benefits, many of the immigration and refugee policies currently in place are restrictive, focusing less on family unification and overseas sponsoring of low-income family members and more on the issuing of temporary visas (Stasilius and Bakan 2005). Discourses of national security, welfare fraud, and the potential for refugees' criminal activity often accompany or call for shifts in policy (Stasilius and Bakan 2005).

Further, as the experiences of Maher Arar and Omar Khadr reveal, citizenship provides little guarantee for full and effective enjoyment of citizenship rights (Stasilius and Bakan 2005). Race maintains its place as an unspoken signifier that can be more important than legal citizenship. As non-citizens are more easily seen as carriers of "risk" and violence, according to Wilke and Willis, they experience harsher and more restrictive immigration law (2008). Their inability to participate in elections renders them unable to challenge their treatment. According to Bell, "foreignness" serves as an opportunity for disciplinary intervention and regulation (2008). The categorical suspicion of Muslim/Arabs has taken the form of an "objectless panic" serving as a "virtual mandate to heighten racialized ways of looking and judging in the name of national security" (Butler 2004, 88). Bell writes:

> Criminal acts designated as terrorist acts are thus suspiciously occasioned by the fact that all the current security certificate detainees are Muslim, Arab or South Asian, signaling how particular markers of foreignness are inscribed into the method by which officials identify enemies and threats to Canada. (2008)

Thus, combined with CRT, the theoretical contributions of surveillance studies and critical security studies (CSS) prove useful in helping conceptualize the ways in which the national security agenda is constructed in efforts to securitize citizens from the threat of the foreign Other.

Surveillance

The concept of power is important to this research. It is seen "not [as] a thing possessed by an individual or group, but a strategy, the effects of which are realized through a network of relations and tactics" (Foucault 1979, 27). "Tactics" are applied by the state over the population to ensure internal security (Foucault 1990). For Foucault, tactics can be understood as a variety of surveillance devices and systems deployed by the state. Rather than focusing on the exact tactics and systems used by state security specialists in issuing security certificates (since few specifics are available), this paper examines the security certificate itself, the result of the various surveillance devices and systems that went into its production. Thus, one can argue that the certificate is, in a Foucauldian sense, a biopolitical "tactic" and therefore embodies what surveillance is (see Bell 2008).

Of course, the discussions of power also require attention to the concept of knowledge. For Foucault, in fact, the two are inseparable (1979). It is the forms of knowledge that give rise to technologies of power such as the security certificate (Dandeker 1990). The certificate is developed by accumulating knowledge about individual behaviour with the objective to control behaviour through observation of activities ensuring social control (Bell 2008). The regularization of individuals' activities can be understood through the concept of disciplinary power which is central to this process (Foucault 1977; 1997; 1991; 2009).

Surveillance is an ordinary everyday experience based on practices such as "collection and processing of personal data … for purposes of influencing or managing those whose data have been garnered" (Lyon 1994; 2002). Modern-day surveillance sorts people into categories according to the risk they are seen as presenting to the state, and these assigned categories have real effects on individual life chances (Lyon 2003). In social sorting, personal data is processed by agencies to influence, direct, and manipulate behaviour in daily life. The social sorting process fosters the development of a classificatory system that results in relative (dis)advantage between persons of different categorical classifications (Lyon 2004). Numerous dangers are inherent in such surveillance systems, as their coding mechanisms often derive from categories based on stereotypical or prejudicial sources. For example, as Lyon writes, policing systems are symptomatic of broader trends in surveillance (2003). Here, there is a trend towards predicting and pre-empting behaviours, in a shift towards "actuarial justice" where the communication of knowledge about probabilities plays a prominent role in risk assessment (Ericson and Haggerty 1997). Risk assessment categories are produced by risk institutions that put differing values on distinct demographics (i.e., young vs old, poor vs rich, Black vs White, men vs women; Ericson and Haggerty 1997, 256 as cited in Lyon 2003). Thus, because social sorting systematically discriminates against certain individuals and negatively affects their life chances and choices in ways that become patterned, those thus selected become "cumulatively disadvantaged" (Gandy 2010).

The risks of such surveillance practices go beyond personal privacy to issues of social justice (Lyon 2003). Surveillance is also understood as one of the major mechanisms through which states and organizations keep track of and construct citizens and consumers. Surveillance monitors potential immigrant groups and assesses them as subjects for inclusion into the body politic. Modern surveillance therefore has the

potential to wield considerable influence over behaviours (Lyon 2015).

Simone Browne's concept of "racializing surveillance" is of particular importance here, clearly linking surveillance with race. Browne defines "racializing surveillance" as the "techniques of social control where surveillance practices, policies and performances concern the production of norms pertaining to race and exercises of power to define what is in or out of place," arguing that there are moments where the enactment of surveillance reaffirms the boundaries, borders, and bodies along lines of race (2015, 15). The outcomes of racialized surveillance include the discriminatory treatment of those who are "negatively racialized" by such surveillance practices (Browne 2015, 15).

According to scholars, post-9/11 anti-terrorism measures are often aimed at Muslims, and public fears have created a constant demand for new surveillance technologies (Macklin 2001; Helly 2004; Lyon 2007). Some devices and systems can be found in public transit systems, borders, and airports. These devices have increased the visibility of individuals for certain Muslim/Arabs. In turn, their visibility increases public perceptions of safety, as they are subtly identified as persons intending to conduct violence or harm. On the latter point, according to Lyon, the use of data-mining and surveillance techniques is intended to help identify and locate potential "terrorist cells."[19]

In fact, the positioning of the Muslim male identity is crucial to the justification of the increased security measures aimed at circumventing and controlling their bodies. Judith Butler's work also identifies the Muslim/Arab body as one of the precarious bodies: bodies who do not count and whose absence from political considerations is unnoticed (2004, 2010). Thus, surveillance becomes a technology through which bodies are made visible and whereby monitoring groups assess them as subjects for inclusion into the body politic.

Impacts of anti-terrorism policies

Some research has been done on the effects of post-9/11 anti-terrorism and immigration policies and Canadian security measures on populations considered a "threat." According to Cheran, institutions and systems, such as the legal system, shape marginalized groups' participation in society (2001). Immigration control mechanisms are used to

---

19. Recall, for example, Project Thread, which erroneously identified twenty-three South Asian men as al Qaeda sleeper cell agents, based on profiling techniques (i.e., an interest in flying airplanes). For more information, see note 19.

regulate and manipulate the movement of immigrants, to select only the highly skilled and wealthy migrants while restricting the unskilled and poor. Shifts in political contexts can radically alter who and what gets labeled as terrorist, and states may (and do) use illiberal measures to combat terror threats (Chomsky 2000). According to Wilke and Willis, anti-terrorism policies in Canada (along with British and American policies) do not have a consistent impact on all individuals (2008). In fact, non-citizens (including refugees and landed residents), individuals with dual citizenship in certain countries, and Muslims and ethnic minorities are most affected by "increased surveillance, preventive detention, extraordinary rendition, and similar policies" (Wilke and Willis 2008, 33). Further, in analyzing security certificate discourse, court decisions rely on terrorist "profiles" based on travel patterns and ideology. When an individual is matched with a certain "profile", he or she (usually he) has little opportunity to dispute their profile as dangerous to Canadian security (Razack 2007).

Speech acts and rhetoric fuel the discourse of fear and suspicion towards Muslims when rhetoric continuously reminds Canadians of the "enemy." For example, according to then-Prime Minister Stephen Harper, "if we're talking about terrorism … the major threat is still Islamicism" (CBC 2011), which is similar to MP Jason Kenney's statement: "The enemy is radical, extreme Islamism … but a radical political movement among a small minority of Muslims in some parts of the world. Let us call it by its name. We know what it is. Let us not be coy about it" (Canada 2004, 137.79: 5,177). Kenney later referred to "a radical Islamism which is predicated on anti-Semitism and a hatred for liberal democracy" (Canada 2004, 137.79: 5,197) and stated that "it is freedom and democracy that they fear and seek to destroy" (Canada 2004, 137. 80: 5,236). Keith Martin, also a Member of Parliament, told Canadians, "They hate us and the west for what the west portrays … fundamental Islam is anathema to our western culture and vice versa" (Canada 2004, 137. 90: 5,857). Undoubtedly, with political fearmongering in the background, some activists argue that security certificates are a politically motivated endeavour, while others have argued they damage Canada's political climate (Bell 2006).

As Jiwani writes, the post-9/11 context has signified the Muslim body as the bearer of risk (2011). The threat of destruction lingers on the Muslim body in a variety of ways: the use of stealth weapons technologies; the infiltration of sharia law in the West; or through the wombs of Muslim women whose offspring threaten to invade the Western na-

tion-state (Grewal 2003; Werbner 2007 as cited in Jiwani 2015). The systematic targeting of persons of Middle Eastern descent constitutes an example of racial profiling, a measure receiving some popular support in a context where the population is prepared to exchange certain rights and freedoms—or those of Others—for the sake of security (Bahdi 2003; Barak-Erez 2008; Gross and Livingston 2003; Viscusi and Zeckhauser 2003).

In the Canadian context, in 2003 the Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC) noted that hate crimes against Muslims had seen a 1,600 percent increase since 11 September 2001. The group reported that despite the significant increase, law enforcement does not maintain sufficient proper data on the religion of hate crime victims, making it challenging to link such crimes with Islamophobia. A report by the Toronto Police Services (2001) indicated a 66 percent increase in reports of hate crimes in 2001, with the largest increase against Muslims. Of the 121 hate crimes linked to 9/11, forty-five incidents were perpetrated against Muslims, with twenty and thirty-eight incidents against Jews and other groups respectively (Toronto Police Services, 2001). Further, Muslim/Arab community leaders have reported numerous instances of Muslim/Arabs being approached by security and law enforcement without warrants, sometimes even being taken away for interrogation. CIC suggests that such events are related to the new ATA as it has been used as a threat to "encourage" voluntary interviews through citing the risk of preventative detention as allowed in the ATA. CIC claims that, feeling at risk of further retaliation, victims of law enforcement fear stepping forward. Community leaders have also attested that hundreds of such interviews have taken place, as of 2003 (International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group 2003). In her study on surveillance as experienced by South Asian women, Finn emphasizes the reality of being subjected to surveillance by fellow citizens that has resulted from the heightened insecurity surrounding Muslim/Arabs (2011).

The aforementioned discussion on citizenship, critical race theory, and surveillance sets the stage for a deeper understanding of the voices and experiences of those affected by surveillance, particularly Muslim/Arab men who have been socially sorted and categorically identified as suspicious (Marx 1995; Lyon 2002).

Situating this Study

It is important to briefly highlight some of the research on the impact

of post-9/11 anti-terrorism and national security measures on Muslim/ Arabs and to identify some of the gaps in the literature. In addition to the research highlighted above, on the impacts of surveillance and profiling on the Muslim/Arab population, there is ample research surrounding national security measures (security certificates) and the legal parameters within which these certificates operate (see Bauman 2004; Bigo 2002; Burke 2007; Campos 2007; Davies 2006; Cole and Dempsey 2006; Erikson 2007), as well as research specifically on Canadian security discourses (e.g. Bell 2006, 2006a, 2011; Borovoy 2006; Diab 2008; Duffy and Provost 2009; Freilich, Opesso, and Newman 2006; Harris 2008; Larsen and Piché 2009; Larsen 2006, 2008; Larsen, Harkat, and Harkat 2008; Pratt 2005; Razack 2008; Tator and Henry 2006). However, there are few studies that explore the experiences of Muslim/Arab men with Canadian national security measures and the surveillance that accompanies and informs it.[20] It is well known that since 9/11, Muslim/Arab refugees and naturalized citizens have been the targets of increased surveillance and security scrutiny by immigration officials (CCR 2004; Bahdi 2003; ICLMG 2003; Fekete 2004; Naber 2006). Bahdi (2003), Fekete (2004), and Naber (2006) documented increased levels of surveillance of Muslim/Arabs as part of anti-terrorism policies in Europe, the United States, and Canada. In the North American context, on the social implant of security-surveillance on Muslim communities, Jamil and Rousseau have found that that Muslim/Arabs are the objects of increased suspicion, bias, and negative stereotyping, from both the state and its residents (2012). An American study found evidence that American Muslims' experiences with government surveillance correlate with increased anxiety over future surveillance (O'Conner and Jahan 2014). Individuals also avoid participating in discussions that may increase the possibility of surveillance and environments where their presence may be reported to intelligence agencies (O'Conner and Jahan 2014). Canada's practice of ethnic profiling in its anti-terrorism security measures is, typically, more guarded and less public than that of the US (Whitaker 2010, 60).

In the Canadian context, according to Spalek and Lambert, anti-terrorism policies and increased police activity have alienated Muslims and failed to improve national security (2007). The Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association states that anti-terrorism efforts, security certificates, and the ATA produce a self-perpetuating culture of fear based on

---

20. With the exception of contributions such as Razack's (2007; 2008) work.

secrecy and allegations that exacerbate profiling and discrimination of Muslims and/or Arabs (CMLA 2005). The Canadian Council on American–Islamic Relations and the Canadian Arab Federation argue that the label of Muslims and/or Arabs as "fifth columnists" and "threats to national security" and the use of "increased scrutiny by security agencies and police, racial and religious profiling, and discrimination in daily life" has created a "palpable chill" in individuals' attendance and participation in community events and activities. Fears they may "unwittingly attract the scrutiny of state agents, or worse still, be criminally charged for terrorism offences" are rampant (2005). Such sentiments were prominent following the Toronto 18 case, where Smith found that Muslim/Arabs were wary of speaking openly, not only because they fear government surveillance from outside of the community but also over fear of being labelled as "the enemy within" (2012, 32). Bell explains that human rights and social justice advocates have noticed an erosion of human rights through the use of security certificates, the ATA, and the culture of suspicion evoked therein, not only for Muslims and/or Arabs directly entangled in national security measures but also for the general Muslim/Arab Canadian population (2006).

There is heightened concern that the climate of fear and anxiety produced by the war on terror is threatening Muslim/Arabs' sense of belonging and citizenship (Cainkar 2009) and creating fear and suspicion within Muslim communities. This is experienced externally yet internalized by Muslim/Arab communities, further altering their relationship with Canada. The result is both a protective increase in cohesion and an internalization of distrust (Jamil and Rousseau 2012). In fact, in their work with American Muslim communities, researchers have noted that Muslim/Arab precariousness is attributed to the fear and suspicion surrounding their bodies in the war on terror (Ewing 2008; Maira 2009).

Arat-Koc also argues that government "security" measures not only justify but fuel racialization and suspicion of most Muslim/Arab Canadians. Once deemed an illegitimate and racist practice (Arat-Koc 2006), profiling is no longer a de facto policy but rather has now gained popular legitimacy (220). The "culture of fear" that is created by anti-Muslim/Arab policies and everyday acts of violence results in an "internment of the psyche" within the minority communities (Naber 2006, 240). This suggests "an internalized sense that one is being watched and could at any time be attacked, deported, or disappeared" (Naber 2006, 255). Jamil and Rousseau suggest that the internalization of fear

within minority communities requires further exploration; they argue that "this circulation of fear dynamic is an important element of the surveillance context, linking together the state, majority, and minority groups in nuanced ways and multiple ways" (2012).

This paper builds on these studies, looking specifically at the "culture of fear" and "internment of the psyche" (Naber 2006) that is caused by specific national security measures, security certificates, as experienced by Canadian Muslim/Arabs. This is the gap my research aims to fill. The primary research question which led to this research was, "What impact have surveillance technologies and national security certificates had on Muslim/Arab males and their everyday lives, their sense of identity and belonging?" Specific objectives are: first, to contextualize and document the experience of individuals (Muslim men) with law enforcement, security measures, and surveillance practices; second, to determine if the introduction of laws and other security measures have impacted the individual's knowledge/awareness of surveillance practices, perception of citizenship and belonging, and fear ("chilling effect"), and, if so, to find out what (if any) behavioural changes these individuals have made.

Conclusion

This chapter has given a historical account of Canadian immigration policy, from Confederation to the war on terror and the Anti-terrorism Act of 2002. Theories on citizenship, critical race, and surveillance were outlined to conceptualize and theorize these changes. The next chapter will explore the methodological tools this study used to explore the impact of these policy shifts on the Canadian Muslim/Arab male.

3. *Methodological Considerations*

Introduction

The following chapter will provide an outline of the methodological considerations and tools employed in my research. Because this research seeks to explore the impact of surveillance and security policies on the Muslim/Arab population, a useful approach to understanding the impact is a mixed methodology using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. This is followed by an explanation of sequential explanatory design, the data collection process, participant selection, ethics, researcher reflexivity, positionality, data analysis, and limitations of the study.

Mixed methods

Mixed methods research involves collecting, analyzing, and integrating both qualitative and quantitative data. This approach employs distinct research designs that may involve a variety of philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks (Creswell 2014, 4). Thus, this study will use a mixed methods approach to help understand the impacts of certain national security measures on the Muslim/Arab male population. The use of both broad methodologies and data (empirical and text) are useful in addressing a research problem. Some methods of data collection include interviewing, surveying, and observations, while methods of data analysis can entail the use of statistics (quantitative) and thematic analysis (qualitative) (O'Leary 2010, 89). Researchers use tools such as questionnaires, observation checklists, and interview schedules in the collection of research data (O'Leary 2010, 89). As a researcher with previous experience in both qualitative and quantitative research, I relied on my knowledge of software such as NVivo to help analyze data. I ensured that both forms of data (qualitative and quan-

titative) received appropriate attention treatment at all times of the research process during the collection, analysis, and write-up.

Phase 1: Survey

The first phase of this study focused on quantitative data gathered through a self-developed cross-sectional survey design. The purpose of using a survey design was to determine: if the introduction of laws and other security measures have had an impact on an individual's knowledge/awareness of surveillance and security measures; what is the individual's perception of surveillance and security measures; if there has been a "chilling effect" of surveillance and security measures; and if they have resulted in any behavioural changes.[1] A total of nineteen survey questions covered topics ranging from personal and family experiences with law enforcement and surveillance to knowledge of security certificates, awareness of surveillance measures, rights to privacy, civil liberties, and behaviour shifts as a result of (perceived) surveillance. These factors were identified through an analysis of other studies on the chilling effect of security measures (see for example the chilling effects of post-9/11 measures on writers, PEN America 2013; journalists, ACLU 2014; librarians and lawyers, Blanc 2010; academics, Atran and Axelrod 2010 and Warwick 2006; voting behaviour, La Raja 2011; charitable donations, ACLU 2009; perception of anti-terrorism measures, PEW 2013). This was achieved through questions such as "Have you ever been stopped or questioned by government and/or law enforcement officials?" or "Do you feel you receive equal treatment during experiences involving government and/or law enforcement agencies?" Responses were measured by a Likert scale[2] ranging from "All the time" to "Never." On other questions, respondents were asked to respond "true" or "false" to statements such as "The government and/or law enforcement monitors the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me" and "The government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs with the public." Questions such as "To what extent are you aware of government and/or law enforcement surveillance including monitoring of telephone,

---

1.   For the complete survey, see Appendix 1.
2.   Developed by Rensis Likert (1932), a Likert scale relies on fixed-choice responses formats to measure attitudes or opinions (Bowling 1997; Burns and Grove 1997). Likert scales measure levels of agreement or disagreement with a provided statement. This ordinal scale assumes the strength/intensity of experience is linear, on a continuum, and makes the assumption that attitudes can be measured.

Internet, email, and travel activity for anti-terrorism purposes?" were useful in measuring participants' perception and knowledge of surveillance practices.

The survey made use of scales to measure the items on the instrument; for example, continuous scales (i.e., very worried to unsure; very aware to unsure) and categorical scales (i.e., yes/somewhat/no and true/false) (Creswell 2014). To measure temporality and how/if respondents' experience has shifted over the years, some survey questions were repetitive, asking respondents to base responses on experiences seven years ago and at present. For example, participants were asked to respond "true" or "false" to statements such as "The government and/or law enforcement monitors the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me," "The government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes," and "Surveillance is necessary for Canadian national security and the war on terror."

Data from fifty participants was collected by administering the surveys in person to individuals who were recruited through multistage or clustering procedures. In these recruitment methods I first identified groups or organizations and then obtained access to individuals within those clusters (Babbie 2007). Participants included twenty-five self identified Muslim/Arab men and an equal amount of non-Muslim men (n=25) for comparative purposes. All participants were recruited through snowballing techniques in the Niagara Region, the Greater Toronto Area, and Kingston, Muslim/Arab participants being found randomly through campus Muslim Student Associations, masjids, public spaces including coffee shops, community organizations, and generally by word of mouth. To minimize bias, Muslim/Arab participants were sought in both "neutral" public locations such as coffee shops, community organizations, and food courts as well as in masjids and Muslim Student Associations. Non-Muslim/Arab participants were recruited in a similar process, in public areas such as coffee shops, food courts, and on-campus events.

Efforts were made to ensure that students and young adults were not over-represented in each sample size. A detailed breakdown of the participants by demographic factors[3] is provided in Chapter 4. Stratification of the population occurs where the characteristics of the popula-

---

3. It should be noted that, due to confidentiality and the small population of Muslim men in smaller cities (i.e., Kingston), the exact site for each participant is not disclosed.

tion are identified and stratified first before selecting the sample (Fowler 2009). Stratification of the participants ensured that an equal amount of Muslim/Arab and non-Muslim/Arab males are represented in the sample.

Participant selection criteria included: 1) being at least twenty-five years of age and able to recall experiences seven years ago[4]; 2) identifying as either a Muslim/Arab male or a non-Muslim/Arab male. Univariate statistics were tabulated for each variable using proc univariate/means and proc frequency commands.[5] Depending on variable scale, bivariate associations were assessed using participant's t-tests (proc test) and chi-square tests or fishers' exact. Ordinary least squares linear and logistic regression multivariable models were considered where sample size permitted. Type 1 error rate was held at 0.05 for all analyses. This process will be explored in more detail in Chapter 4.

All participants were Southern or Eastern Ontario residents and range in age from twenty-five to fifty-six, having spent anywhere from one year to their entire lives in Canada. Of the twenty-five Muslim/Arab men, eight were non-citizens while the rest were either permanent residents or had Canadian citizenship status. Ethnic identities included Southeast Asian, Pakistani, Afghan, Malaysian, African-Canadian, and European-Canadian converts to Islam. All men identified as Muslim; however, the degree to which they were practicing or not practicing was not recorded. All twenty-five non-Muslim/Arab men reported having Canadian citizenship and identified as European-Canadian; their religious identities varied, either atheist, no-religion, or Christian.

Phase 2: Open-Ended Interviews

The purpose of open-ended interviews was to further explore and document the experiences of twenty Muslim/Arab men (including ten who had participated in the survey) with law-enforcement officials and surveillance practices, as well as their thoughts on national security measures and terrorism. While this study does not claim to be an ethnographic study, it borrows techniques from ethnography to understand and explore ways of life from the perspective of participants (Atkinson et al. 2007). Ethnographic in-depth interviews are useful when

---

4.   A seven-year temporal frame was used, as 2008 signified the intensity of national security measures and anti-terrorism strategies that were indirectly aimed at Muslim/Arabs.
5.   Data analysis followed using SAS 9.4 statistical software.

studying the experiences, perspectives, and opinions of marginalized groups, as they allow for the dissemination of their voices and experiences (Esterberg 2002). They provide a "thick description" of a personal encounter between the researcher and another culture (Geertz 1973, 5). Ethnographic methods have commonly been used in the practice of international relations (IR) and politics.

A total of twenty open-ended interviews with Muslim/Arab men were conducted in two stages in 2015 and 2016. From the first stage, ten out of the twenty-five participants who participated in the survey were recruited from the first (survey) phase of the study. As mentioned, all participants were offered the opportunity to be interviewed. The low response rate could be attributed to a variety of factors, including time, availability, the length of the original survey (six pages), discomfort with speaking with a female, fear, or lack of trust or suspicion towards the researcher. The latter three factors can be attributed to some pre-existing conditions within the Muslim/Arab community. Other scholars have alluded to the paranoia and lack of trust within the Muslim community (Ewing 2008; Jamil and Rousseau 2012; Maira 2009; O'Conner and Jahan 2014). It is also possible that those ten participants' responses could be slanted due to their exposure to the survey questions. In particular, the questions relating to national security and surveillance practices may have conditioned participants to respond in a certain way or assume that I as the researcher was looking for a certain answer.

Following the first phase of interviews, ten more participants were recruited though snowballing procedures within social networks and community organizations, with a particular focus on individuals who had direct knowledge of security measures. Questions covered in both stages of the open-ended interview process included participants' perceptions of the threats to Canadian security, the roots of terrorism, the role of national security measures, the role of their ethnic/religious communities in the war on terror, and the impact of national security measures on their sense of identity and belonging in Canada. Some of the open-ended interview questions are:[6]

- What do you think are the current threats to Canadian national security?
- What is your understanding of terrorism (domestic and international); why do you think it occurs?

---

6. For a complete list of interview questions, see Appendix 3.

- Do you personally feel pressured to act in a certain way or adopt certain behaviours? If so, where does this pressure come from? And, what are some of the behaviours that you adopt?
- What role do you think you and/or your community can play in helping the government reduce terrorist threats?
- Does knowing about security certificates (or other security measures) impact your understanding of citizenship and Canadian identity?

To increase the richness and depth of the data, multiple data collection sources were used, including in-depth open-ended interviews, the researcher's field notes, a follow-up with participants, and, where possible, participants' (n=10) responses to the survey (Denzin and Lincoln 2005).

In addition to the interviews, I documented my observations using thick descriptions, which are a significant component of ethnography intended to richly describe the observations of the researcher (Goldbart and Hustler 2005). After participants filled out the survey and completed the interview questions, I made notes on the participant's body language, eye signals, voice tone, and other non-communicative gestures. I also recorded my personal thoughts and transformations. Reflexivity is a recent shift in ethnographic research and points to the use of self-reflexive field practices and writing techniques (Foley 2002). Because ethnography is a personal encounter between the researcher and another culture, it is a writing style that specifically puts the researcher in the text. According to Salter, this process is fundamentally self-reflexive (2004). Reflexivity is the need to be "critically conscious of what one is doing as one does it" (Crapanzano 2010, 56). Through reflection and articulation of thoughts, feelings, emotions, and reactions throughout the research process, the researcher becomes a source of data that can contribute to the "thick description" that is being developed (Wilkinson 2013). The process is more than self-reflection; rather it is a method of exposing and questioning one's assumptions about how things work, so that those assumptions can be checked and our interpretations can be refined on the basis of lived experience—both others' and our own.

The role of positionality is an integral critical perspective designed to situate the researcher in relation to their research and the field through a reflection of personal norms, values, self-perception, identities, prior knowledge and experiences, and its influence on the research process and interpretations (Wilkinson 2014). As a researcher and a Muslim, I hold several positions when conducting this study, as an outsider and

insider (Naples 2003). As a female, I am an outsider as I cannot claim to fully understand the experiences of male respondents, particularly in their experiences of profiling and surveillance. However, as a Muslim, I assumed a role of an insider as I could understand that profiling and monitoring of our community is a lived experience in the Muslim community. As a Muslim, the assumption I carried was that it was easy to gain the trust of participants who were otherwise wary and suspicious of outside strangers. As a non-threatening female, I naively assumed this trust was easier to obtain. In the greater context of heightened suspicion and lack of trust within Muslim communities (Ewing 2008; Jamil and Rousseau 2012; Maira 2009; O'Conner and Jahan 2014), these were factors that came across my mind when Muslim/Arab individuals returned blank surveys back to me or politely declined my request for an interview once I shared details of my research with them. Indeed I sensed the hesitation and fear among some Muslim/Arabs that they may "unwittingly attract the scrutiny of state agents, or worse still, be criminally charged for terrorism offences" (CMLA 2005, 3-4) should they participate in my study.

Essentially, although my status as a Muslim provided access to a group that is difficult to gain entry to as a non-Muslim researcher, a combination of fear, suspicion, and lack of trust certainly made the recruitment process challenging. My gender also proved challenging, particularly when interviewing participants who were recruited from the MSAs and masjids. What I noticed during the first two interviews was that participant responses were brief, lacked detail, and at times were vague. The interview was cordial, to the point, but slightly uncomfortable for both participant and researcher. I felt discomfort at the fact that I was not wearing a hijab, the traditional head covering worn by some Muslim women. Furthermore, and perhaps more uncomfortable for myself, was that as a woman I should not have been alone with a random male, particularly one that I approached leaving a masjid. While I felt completely safe in their presence, it was simply awkward for the first two interviews. My identity as an educated, Westernized, "liberated" female did not provide me with the same comfort and confidence that wearing a hijab would provide. For subsequent interviews, I opted to wear a hijab and asked a colleague to accompany me in the data collection process. He sat nearby but not within hearing distance of our interview. His mere presence produced significant changes in the quality of responses for all subsequent interviews. Participants were more forthcoming, detailed, and honest about their experiences. This

could have been attributed to the presence of my hijab, my colleague, or my own confidence.

At all times, participants were made to feel comfortable discussing issues of profiling, stereotypes, religion, and culture. Our common identity as Muslims allowed for common reference points, creating a rapport and enabling participants to share personal experiences with me.

Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim (Creswell, 2005). A thematic analysis of the data was used using NVivo, which allowed the interviews to be linked together. Verification procedures included triangulation of different data sources, member checking, rich and thick descriptions of the cases, and reviewing and resolving disconfirming evidence (Lincoln and Guba 1985; Miles and Huberman 1994; Stake 1995; Creswell 1998; Creswell and Miller 2002).

Conclusion

As mentioned, an explanatory mixed methods design entails the sequential collection of information. In the first phase, using a survey design, this research collected quantitative data on the impact of national security measures on the general Canadian male population (n = 50). Comparatively, Muslim/Arab men (n = 25) reported a stronger reaction to national security measures than their non-Muslim/Arab counterparts. The former group's experiences with security measures were qualitatively explored in Phase 2, using open-ended interviews (n = 20). In two stages, Muslim/Arab men provided a rich and thick description of the effects of national security measures, such as security certificates. Where the first phase offered a descriptive quantitative look at how diverse Canadians respond to security measures, the second phase provided a more detailed understanding of the effects of those measures. Thus, the explanatory method is appropriate for the purposes of this study as the data collected from the quantitative approach directly informed the qualitative interviews, creating more depth of meaning and knowledge (Bryman 2006; Ivankova, Creswell, and Stick 2006).

4. Results and Data Analysis

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the significant themes that emerge from two phases of the data collection process: a survey and open-ended interviews. In the first section, I first provide an overview of the survey respondents (twenty-five Muslim men [MM], twenty-five non-Muslim men [NMM]) showing participants' opinions on the general impacts of national security measures and distinctions across religious background and temporal shifts since 2008. An overview of the open-ended interviews will qualitatively explore participants' increasing feelings of helplessness, disenchantment with the Canadian government policies, and alienation experienced by Muslim men.

The survey results found statistically significant differences between Muslim and non-Muslim men's perceptions of government data collection and surveillance practices. Results traced Muslim men's experiences of a "chilling effect" on civil liberties including speech online and in person, their internet usage and practices (including researching and speaking about controversial topics, sharing personal information, pictures or videos, disguising internet activity, and avoiding group discussions that may be perceived as controversial). They were also statistically more likely than non-Muslim men to avoid individuals or groups of people perceived as suspicious, as well as avoiding dressing in a manner that reveals religious orientation. Non-Muslim men's use of passwords on their personal electronic devices is found to be a significant difference from Muslim men, who are less concerned with their electronic privacy. Since the former Conservative government came to power in 2006, temporal shifts since 2008 found Muslim and non-Muslim men's perception of government data collection, surveillance practices, and notions of civil liberties have shifted significantly.

For example, Muslim men increasingly believe that Canada has transformed into a police state and are more worried about their rights to personal privacy.

Following the survey results, this chapter will provide a qualitative synthesis of the results from twenty open-ended interviews with Muslim men where participants discussed the links between anti-terror measures and youth radicalization, a lack of trust in government, a sense of injustice, the importance of cross-cultural discussions, and community involvement in anti-terror efforts. Overall, this chapter reveals key differences in how Muslim and non-Muslim men experience national security measures and the increasing feelings of helplessness, disenchantment with the Canadian state, and alienation experienced by Muslims in Canada.

Phase 1: Survey

In Phase 1, the findings from fifty surveys conducted with twenty-five Muslim and twenty-five non-Muslim participants are presented. Muslim participants were selected based on their identification as Muslim and ranged in age from twenty-five to fifty-six. Participants' length of time in Canada ranged from their entire lives to, in the case of recent immigrants, just over a year in Canada. Seventeen participants were Canadian citizens; others were permanent residents or on student or work permits. Nine participants were married, sixteen were not. Participants self-identified as Afghan (nine), Pakistani (four), South Asian (three), Jordanian (one), Algerian (one), Malaysian (one), African (one), Bengali (one), Brown (one), Asian (one), and undisclosed (two). Fifteen participants disclosed their occupations, including postal employee, chef, IT services worker, sales worker, engineer, researcher, academic, professional, and graduate student.

Non-Muslim participants were selected randomly based on their religious identification as non-Muslim. All identified their ethnicity as "White" or European-Canadian and ranged from twenty-five to forty-one years of age, with most having lived in Canada their entire lives. All except one participant was a Canadian citizen; eight were married, while seventeen were not. All participants identified their occupation; some examples include engineer, personal support worker, construction worker, salesperson, professional, and graduate student.[1]

---

1.   For a full demographic breakdown of participants, see Appendix 4.

Survey Results: General Thoughts on Surveillance and Security Measures

In general, 68 percent of Muslim men (MM) agreed that most Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices, as opposed to 44 percent of non-Muslim men (NMM).[2] Fifty-six percent of MM felt that the government and/or law enforcement is more interested in collecting and monitoring the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, rather than of everyone, compared to 32 percent of NMM. Twenty-four percent of MM believed that "the government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes," as opposed to 4 percent of NMM. In fact, while 29 percent of MM were content with the government and/or law enforcement collecting their own personal phone, internet, and travel activity for anti-terrorism, a scant 4 percent of NMM were okay with the practice. Surprisingly, 100 percent of NMM agreed Canadians are uninformed of the collection of citizens' private data, compared with 76 percent of MM. And, while 56 percent of NMM felt the government is transparent in explaining details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs to the public, an overwhelming 88 percent of MM disagreed.

Civil liberties. Mobility and association. To begin, 60 percent of MM agreed government and/or law enforcement surveillance measures have an impact on their freedom of mobility, compared with 33 percent of NMM. In fact, 56 percent of MM agreed or somewhat agreed that they avoid engaging in community activities or events that may be perceived as controversial, compared with 20 percent of NMM. Similarly, another 54 percent of MM avoid engaging with individuals or groups that may be considered suspicious by law enforcement or government, compared with 24 percent of NMM. In terms of physical appearance, 56 percent of MM avoid dressing in a manner that reveals their religious identity (i.e., clothing, symbols, facial hair), compared with a surprising 84 percent of NMM who do not worry about displaying their religiosity.

Speech. In general, 72 percent of MM were reluctant to comment on particular topics deemed controversial in person, over the telephone, or online (email, forums, etc.), compared with only 28 percent of NMM. Specifically, over half of MM participants (60 percent) were worried about their ability to speak freely in person, compared with only 28 percent of NMM. And, more surprisingly, 92 percent of MM were worried about their freedom to speak openly online, compared with only

---

2. For more data on the Comparison of Results and P Value for 2015/2016 MM and NMM, see Appendix 5.

52 percent of NMM.

Internet and social media usage. When using social media, 52 percent of MM intentionally avoided activities or discussions that may be perceived as controversial, compared with only 16 percent of NMM. In fact, 60 percent of MM were averse to sharing personal photos or videos online, compared with 28 percent of NMM. When it comes to researching topics or watching videos online, 80 percent of MM took measures to avoid topics that may be controversial or suspicious, compared to 60 percent of NMM. And, almost twice as many MM (44 percent) took precautions to cover or disguise their internet activity (delete history, cookies, etc.), compared to NMM (20 percent). Similarly, almost twice as many MM (63 percent) restricted the types of apps they use or websites they visit, compared to NMM (38 percent). On the other hand, it is NMM who were 96 percent more likely to use a passcode or password on their electronic devices, compared to 76 percent of MM.

Temporal shifts from 2008 to present. General thoughts on surveillance and security measures.[3] Since 2008, MM felt more strongly that Canada has transformed into a police state (2008 to present, 16 percent to 84 percent) and that Canadians need to openly discuss governments' collection and monitoring of data (64 percent to 88 percent).[4] MM have become increasingly worried about the government and/or law enforcements' vast collection of data (20 percent to 60 percent), the surveillance practices employed (28 percent to 64 percent), and its impact on individuals' civil liberties (speech) (48 percent to 88 percent). NMM decreasingly believe that the government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes (44 percent to 4 percent) and increasingly believe that Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices (24 percent to 48 percent). Like MM, NMM increasingly believe that Canada has transformed into a police state (16 percent to 60 percent). Fewer NMM support government policies and initiatives geared towards public safety (68 percent to 24 percent).

Civil liberties. With a strong statistical significance, over the past seven years MM were increasingly worried about their rights to personal privacy (16 percent to 84 percent), their freedom of speech online (16 percent to 88 percent), and their freedom of speech in person (12

---

3. See Appendix 8, Comparison of P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim and Non-Muslim Men.
4. For more data see Appendix 7, Results Table and P Value in Non-Muslim Men.

percent to 56 percent). They were also more averse to commenting on particular topics than NMM in person, over the telephone or online (32 percent to 76 percent). MM were more averse to expressing opinions on people, politics, government, law, or other controversial issues (36 percent to 68 percent). MM were also more worried about whom they meet and associate with, online and in person (5 percent to 48 percent). In fact, they take extra precautions to avoid individuals or groups of people who may be considered as (potentially) suspicious or as threats (36 percent to 68 percent). NMM also demonstrate increasing concerns regarding their civil liberties from 2008 to present but to a lesser extent. In 2008, only 24 percent of NMM were worried about their rights to privacy; now, this figure is 76 percent. Worries about privacy and freedom of speech have also increased among NMM, both in person and online. Additionally, 52 percent avoid expressing opinions on controversial topics, up from 28 percent in 2008.

Smart phone, internet, and social media usage. When using a smart phone or hand-held device, unlike seven years ago, MM were now more likely to use a password (36 percent to 72 percent), disable location tracking (GPS) devices (12 percent to 48 percent), and restrict the types of apps or websites they use (16 percent to 56 percent). MM more frequently adjust settings on devices to limit personal information shared with others (24 percent to 60 percent) and avoid sharing personal contact information (32 percent to 72 percent), photos, or videos online (36 percent to 72 percent). MM avoid researching topics or watching videos that may be considered controversial or suspicious (40 percent to 76 percent) and take extra precautions to cover or disguise internet activity (28 percent to 52 percent). NMM were also more likely to protect their personal electronic devices with a password or passcode (76 percent to 100 percent), avoid sharing photos or videos (32 percent to 68 percent), and adjust settings to limit personal information shared with others (64 percent to 76 percent). No other significant shifts were detected among NMM from 2008 to 2015–16.

Borderline statistical shifts were found in MM's increasing sense that they need to be better informed of personal rights and liberties (72 percent to 88 percent). MM were also more averse to sharing information on social activities or events they were attending (32 percent to 60 percent) and to dressing in a manner that reveals their religious affiliation (24 percent to 52 percent). Like NMM, MM were also less likely to believe that the government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes

(40 percent to 24 percent) and that the government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs (24 percent to 12 percent).

Limitations

Given the small sample size of the survey (twenty-five Muslim, twenty-five non-Muslim participants), these findings are not representative of the MM or NMM population and should not be construed as such. Rather, the findings are demonstrative of key concerns and differences across two distinct population samples. Overall, the survey revealed that indeed there are key differences in perceptions of surveillance and security measures, its impact on civil liberties, and practical implications (for example, online activity and internet usage) for Muslim and non-Muslim men. The next section will offer a qualitative understanding of these differences in perception and experience among the Muslim male population.

Phase 2: Open-Ended Interviews

Phase 2 of this study interviewed twenty participants, with participant recruitment based on their identification as Muslim. Their length of time in Canada varies from being born in Canada to having lived there at least four years. Almost all participants (seventeen) identified as being Canadian citizens, with two on a student visa and one a permanent resident. Marital information is available only for some participants. All participants identified as having diverse ethnic origins, including Pakistan (five), Afghanistan (four), Jordan (two), India (two), Bangladesh (one), Algeria (one), Libyan-White mixed (one), Lebanese (one), and two identified more generally as Arab. Participant occupations ranged from postal employee, sales, information technology, healthcare worker, engineer, lawyer, and professional or graduate students. Ten participants self-identified as being active in their ethnic or religious communities.[5]

Thematic Results

Theme 1: Knowledge of laws, security measures, and surveillance practices. Throughout participant interviews, participants shared distinct opinions on their knowledge of laws, security measures, and

---

5. For an overview of participants in this section, see Appendix 9, Demographic Information for Phase 2, Open-ended Participants.

surveillance practices. This section will discuss participants' general understandings of terrorism as a social phenomenon, where a recurring theme was the important role of media and political speech in establishing a particular discourse which, according to the participants, often ties terrorism with Islam, not only through speech acts but also through images in the media. Although participants hint at their personal experiences here, their subjective experiences are not discussed until the next section. A consensus among most participants is that Canadian responses to terrorism are a result of foreign pressure from the international community, namely the United States and Britain, rather than a response to a specific domestic threat as Canada. According to one respondent, this obliges Canada to show a "tough stance on terrorism" (Participant 044). Participant 025 suggested that "Canadian security is concerned about international security because [the] many wars that our government is involved [in] sometimes don't concern Canadians directly."

Defining terrorism. In discussing their thoughts on terrorism as a social phenomenon, most participants stress that the act of terror cannot be reduced to race, colour, religion, or gender. Participants have broadly similar understandings and definitions of terrorism. For example, Participant 020 defined terrorism as "an act of violence perpetrated … for religious or political reasons." Others disagreed that religion is a motive in terrorism, claiming that religion condemns acts of violence. For Participant 042, the investigation of individual psychology is important in explaining the carrying out of such acts while doubting religion as a motive.[6] Alternatively, Participant 019 attributed terrorism to a "low level of education, understanding, and ignorance." The notion of power fuelling terrorism is introduced as the "need to suppress and / or dominate another person, country, or population" (Participant 013). The search for power and chaos was mentioned by Participant 048, who attributed terrorism to "people who believe in the power of chaos and murder to drive [their] point. They think violence is more effective

---

6. Indeed, participant responses on reasons behind terrorism varied and were as diverse as those in terrorism studies literature. Terrorism studies scholars, for example, blame various reasons, including social and economic deprivation, victimization, socialization, and "cultures of violence" which were mentioned and / or alluded to participants. Other reasons scholars argue include exposure to ideology, alienation, social networks, the internet, and trauma (Bjord and Horgan 2008; Dalgaard-Nielsen 2008; Juergensmeyer 2003; McCauley and Moskalenko 2008; Silber and Bhatt, 2008; Wiktorowiz 2005).

than dialogue. They don't believe in the power of words but the power of weapons and fear."

Though participants shared diverse opinions in explaining the reasons why individuals perform acts of violence, participants did suggest that terrorism was used to foment fear in the Canadian population. Participant 042 used the term "fear-mongering" to suggest that there is a constant reminder from the government and media sources that "we have to be scared and that the boogeyman can strike at any time if we're not prepared … ." This fear creates an environment where individuals were forced to "give up their rights" through measures because they were "scared into thinking that we need this greater security measure, [that] we have to give up our [privacy] so that we can feel safe."

Mentally unstable individuals versus terrorists. Extending their definitions of terrorism, participants felt that "double standards" were being applied in labelling terrorism internationally and domestically. Participants suggested acts of violence performed by non-Muslims were attributed to factors such as mental illness while those caused by Muslims were more likely to be referred to as terrorism. With reference to the Sandy Hook[7] shootings in the United States, Participant 002 said that if "a White person shoots 30 kids, that's [an act of] terrorism, yet it is labelled as a mental health issue where the person [is] psychologically unfit."[8] Other participants referred to the Norwegian massacre by Anders Breivik.[9] Participant 048 expressed frustration with the labelling process: "He is a White Christian, but does that mean all Christians are terrorists? No, it just means that *he's* a lunatic. Terrorists are lunatics; they don't represent their religion. Their religions are actually *against* terrorism." Domestically, over half of participants referred to the Parliament Hill[10] and Quebec[11] shootings and their association with terrorist organizations including ISIS and al Qaeda. Some, like Participant

7. For more information, see http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2012/12/us/sandy-hook-timeline/.
8. Of course distinguishing between terrorism and a criminal matter is important, as the former leads to distinct set of policy recommendations (policies which can impact individuals from a particular grouping, for example) and the latter leads to a standard criminal justice response (Bouchard and Thomas 2015).
9. For more information, see http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/jul/23/anders-behring-breivik-norway-attacks.
10. For more information, see http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/parliament-hill-shooting-police-reports-released-in-ottawa-1.3097571.
11. For more information, see http://news.nationalpost.com/news/canada/was-quebec-attack-on-soldiers-really-terrorism-or-just-the-violent-actions-of-a-disturbed-man.

033, suggested that these associations were weak efforts to "discredit Muslims." Another argued such attacks, rather than being carried out by agents of ISIS or al Qaeda, were "caused by deranged, mentally ill individuals. … A few people have really messed up ways of thinking. They are like copycats or just deranged people" (Participant 038).[12]

Role of media in constructing Islamophobia. Participants all shared the opinion that shaping the public perception of acts of violence and identifying perpetrators as either "mentally unstable" or "terrorists" is done through media. The media, according to participants, are quick to label any Muslim as a terrorist, even in incidences where the individual has a history of mental health illness. Participant 042 stated, "It doesn't help when the media is always reminding us, in the newspapers, that this terrorist or that one were Muslims." To resolve this, Participant 025 argued that "we need to identify what is exactly terrorist … not target a specific group of people and try to stigmatize those people." He refers to a shooting in an American church:[13] "[This] is one guy who killed many people in *church*.[14] … This is a type of terrorist … but the way the media treats the people [is] not the same if it were done by a Muslim." Several participants also lamented the use of token images in the media. Participant 033 said:

> If something happens [and] it is related to terrorism, they show
> people … praying in a mosque … [or] a woman in a *hijab* or man
> in [a] beard. … These are some signs that the media tries to show
> in the news. … For someone who has no knowledge on Islam,
> they will make that link between mosque and terrorism, Muslim
> and terrorism.

According to most participants, the prevalence of these images and negative associations with Islam has increased over the years because "when you have Islamophobia, a multi-million-dollar machine taken to airwaves to create lies through rhetoric -- via political candidates,

---

12. This is particularly interesting as terrorism studies scholars Bouchard and Thomas (2015) also discuss mental illness and "imitation" as a factor behind acts of violence, particularly among "lone wolf" terrorists.
13. For more information, see http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/picturegalleries/world-news/11682703/Charleston-church-shooting-Gunman-kills-nine-people-in-South-Carolina.html.
14. For more information, see http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/picturegalleries/world-news/11682703/Charleston-church-shooting-Gunman-kills-nine-people-in-South-Carolina.html.

elected officials, etc.—targeting younger people, more are pressured to show we are not as the images portrayed" (Participant 030).

Securitization of speech and impact of political rhetoric. Adding to what is arguably the racist messaging of the media in conflating Islam and terrorism is the use of political speeches and rhetoric by political leaders. In the Canadian context, participants highlight the problematic comments by leaders such as former Prime Minister Stephen Harper and former Minister of Immigration Jason Kenney, who used words such as "Islamist" and referenced mosques as "breeding grounds for terrorism" (Participant 033). Such comments fuel Islamophobia and divide Canadians while angering many Muslims. Like many participants, Participant 046 provided a deeper understanding of the impact that the role of media has in shaping our perceptions: "The language that our previous PM used … [such as] 'Islamicism or Islamists being the greatest threat to Canada,' 'jihadism,' … [is] very troublesome for many people." Some participants discussed the long-term effects of such language and Islamophobia on young people's behaviour and mental health:

> Within school systems, a young person who spent basically all of their formative years defending Islam and their faith, that means that they were in school, they were maybe eight or nine years old, just a few years after 9/11. And since then it's been "Islam, Islam, Islam is bad, Islam is this, Islam is that" and they've had to defend, defend, defend, as to what their faith stands for … . I think that's a factor towards this, this, uh, the type of behaviour that, you know, brings us down that path [towards radicalization].

Others suggest that racist rhetoric "demonizes the Muslim community." Participants explain that political stances of "defending Canadian values against barbarism" alienate Muslims. Further, such Islamophobic stances show up in policies unrelated to national security. Participant 044 said,

> That is why they are very slow to react with the refuges. That is why the Prime Minister's Office wants to look at each refugee application to ensure that Muslims are not coming in, and that preference [is] given to Christians.[15]

---

15. For more information, see http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/government-prioritized-some-refugees-because-they-are-being-targeted-by-isis-harper-says/article26746945/.

Thoughts on terrorism and national security. According to participants, the problem with Islamophobia, either perpetuated by the media or politicians, is its use to create fear and justify national security measures that are otherwise undemocratic and have a disproportionate impact on Whites and Muslims (and even within Muslim ethnic groups).

Fear for civil liberties. Most participants agreed that certain national security measures, including Bill C-51 and the now scrapped dual citizenship law proposals, are deeply undemocratic. Some participants noted the slow loss of liberties and its impact on their sense of security. Participant 013 asked, "How can we protect ourselves and be secure if we are losing our freedoms? Freedom of speech, freedom to associate with whomever you want to associate with without being labelled as a 'terrorist' or 'threat to national security?'" Many saw the measures as trying to induce fear among specific communities. For example, Participant 033 stated,

> The government is terrorizing us by creating these laws that are going to separate us, and they want to divide and conquer … . Terrorism requires an element of fear, so they want to put fear in people's hearts and heads and divide us, so they can better rule us.

Essentially participants agreed that the measures are "against democracy … [and a] threat to Canadian security" which may "cause a lot of problems in the future" (Participant 019).

Participants with little knowledge of national security measures offered experiences that demonstrated an infringement of their personal liberties. For example, Participant 023, of East Indian origin, stated that while he did not know about any national security measures specifically, he was aware of the "random security checks they do at the airport … . I don't think they are random, because I always get selected randomly … but it's possible that there's another terrorist that might have the same name as me."

Disproportionate impact among White and first-, second-, and third-generation Muslim participants. Subjective experiences of national security measures vary among Muslims, as participants raised the issue of a disproportionate impact of measures within the Muslim communities, including a disproportionate impact on first-, second-, or third-generation immigrants. One participant distinguishes between the different immigrant communities:

> There is *established* immigrants who perhaps came in the [19]60s
> to [19]80s, and then you have more *contemporary* immigrants. …
> They came recently. A lot of them will come from refugee pop-
> ulations . . Many of them, at least here in [city], are from Iraq,
> Afghanistan, and Somalia. And amongst those   communities …
> they are extremely excited, they are very happy to be in this coun-
> try, but at the same time they are also very concerned … especial-
> ly the newcomer population, where they are trying to establish
> themselves as being Canadians. (Participant 046)

As a result, newcomers are "very guarded and … careful about what
they do, what they say … to prove that they are not terrorists" (Partic-
ipant 046). Further to the point, Participant 033 declared that "national
security measures will impact new immigrants most because they are
under scrutiny; it won't impact second- and third-generation so much,
but they still need to get involved with something productive and pro-
active."

Passing as White. Across the generations of immigrants within the
Muslim community, several participants indicate that the impact can
be felt less on those Muslims with lighter skin; for example, those who
"pass off as White" versus Muslims with darker complexions. For ex-
ample, a Lebanese participant talked about his experiences "passing as
White":

> To be honest, I didn't have any problems growing up. … I grew
> up in a small community, I was the only kid with an immigrant
> background, but I was White so I, sort of, fit in more, I guess. … If
> I weren't White then I think it would be harder. (Participant 020)

A Libyan participant said that

> because I don't look like a stereotypical Muslim, I blend in a little
> more than some of the other Arabs, so I don't really experience
> the discrimination myself. [But] when people know my [Muslim]
> name … that changes the way they treat me … . I can hide by
> changing my name … but I don't want to. I am proud of who I am
> and I would never change it for some bigots. (Participant 033)

Subjectivity: security certificates in particular. Moving away from a gen-
eral discussion on national security measures, only half of participants
were aware of security certificates and their implications. Among those
who were, participants noted that certificates, as with security mea-

sures in general, are undemocratic, ineffective, infringe on civil liberties, have a distinct impact on newer versus older immigrants, and are an exaggerated response to terrorism.

Undemocratic. Participants saw security certificates as akin to illegal practices found in undemocratic countries. Several participants referred to security certificates as a "third-world practice." For example, Participant 019 exclaimed, "It's happening in other countries … [but] I can't understand why it's happening *here.* Canada is supposed to be a democratic country!" Participant 046 described certificates as "very much like what laws are accused of [being] in third-world countries … very harmful … against the fabric of democracy … against the morals and standards and values that are preached as being the values of Canada." Essentially, participants feel that the use of security certificates diminishes Canada's identity as a peaceful and democratic country. In fact, Participant 013 summed up his feelings about certificates and other measures in general, labelling them as divisive:

> They divide us by the class system, Bill C-51, the second-class citizen. … They say, 'We are all one,' but there's still going to be some pockets of people that will oppress you. But we are not all one. We are different.

Infringe civil liberties. In addition to the sentiments highlighted above, participants expressed worry that the divisive and discriminatory nature of security certificates and related measures limit constitutional freedoms and erode rights. For some participants, including Participant 033, the discriminatory aspect of security certificates was difficult to discuss. "Some things you can't discuss: it's hard to discuss race and racial relations; it's hard to discuss politics and what the role of the government actually is in the real world, which is really limited." Participant 030 states that, above all, security certificates should "not discriminate or be used as a racial profiling tool," nor set "double standards" or be used as a "political discriminatory tool." Rather, certificates "should only be used when all legal options are exhausted. … Dealing with the individual within the legal system is more effective and less draconian" (Participant 030).

Ineffective. Many participants also see security certificates as counter-productive and ineffective. Several participants refer to darker consequences of using certificates. Participant 019 said,

> Violence produces violence. … One day if I find myself in court or
> jail and I didn't know why, this for sure, I mean, will not result in
> a normal regular person for sure. Someone is facing a charge and
> he doesn't know why—I don't think this would at all be effective.
> This might cause more problems.

Participant 048 suggested, with a laugh, "Security certificates are just
the government's way of signalling [sic] out a certain group of individ-
uals, non-citizens, usually Muslims. … They only make people angrier.
… If you look at how much controversy they are causing, if you look at
how angry people become, they are counterproductive, not effective."
Participant 013 similarly correlated security certificates with a height-
ening of fear and tension, potentially leading to radicalization within
the Muslim community. Thus, he argued, certificates are ineffective and
counter-productive

> because the less the population is allowed to discuss certain topics
> and be informed, the more susceptible the population becomes to
> brainwashing or being influenced by certain groups that want to,
> you know, forward their own agenda on people and force what
> they want, such as ISIS … where they prey on the weak-minded
> and the ones who are weak already, because of what they are
> going through in their lives and their communities. And they
> want to make change, and they don't know how, and along comes
> a group that can brainwash them into thinking that what they
> are doing is right. So these measures are only going to make that
> brainwashing worse. … [If] you don't discuss something, when
> it does come out that person doesn't know how to deal with that
> topic or that subject, and they may go to an extreme, one direction
> or another.

Participant 042 expressed a similar claim of security certificates pro-
moting fear, stating that, by design, certificates are flawed because

> it's really racist. You can't say, 'Yeah we are just trying to keep
> Canada secure by using these measures' and then *only* charge
> Muslims—and even then, you can't even tell the Muslim what it
> is that [they] have done? What is that trying to say? It's just saying
> that, 'Yeah, if you are Muslim in this country, you're going to have
> a hard time.'

Emphasizing this point further, Participant 042 said,

government [is] telling Canadians that '… Yeah, Islam is a prob-
lem' … the kind of stuff that makes Muslims feel like, 'Hmm,
maybe our government is racist.' And then when we hear ISIS
and al Qaeda accusing the West of being hostile to Muslims … we
gotta agree with it because yeah, look at what's happening … .
Look at Bill C-51, that's going to make things worse now.

Participants said they saw certificates as counterproductive and a
fear tactic. Participant 034 suggested that certificates are "just a waste
of time" because "it can be two things: either the government is really
stupid, thinking these measures are going to help keep Canada secure,
or"—he continued, after a pause and reflection—

the government is just sending a message to tell Muslims to watch
out, be careful . … If I do something vaguely, remotely illegal, I
will be deported … . When I see shit like that happening … and
it's happening to actual people that I know, it's unfair, it's sad… .
And why? Because some idiots who happen to be Muslim are
making threats in *our* name, in the name of *our* religion. They
don't represent me. So why am I being punished just because he is
the same religion? This is injustice because we are innocent. These
measures, they just hurt the Muslim community and cause us
pain. They don't keep us safe.

On the other hand, multiple participants offered an alternative per-
spective, arguing for the effectiveness of certificates: "I think they are
effective, because there's a real, like—it's a fear behind them, right? You
don't know who is watching you" (Participant 020).

Distinct impact on new vs old immigrants. With national security mea-
sures in general, security certificates were seen as having a dispropor-
tionate impact on newer versus older immigrants. While participants
were aware that security certificates only apply to non-citizens, their
knowledge of the impact of certificates is understood as disproportion-
ate among various types of immigrants. Participant 046, a third-gener-
ation Muslim Canadian, said he does not personally feel threatened by
certificates, but he shared his concern "for the community around me
and for the people that I know, for the newcomers." Participant 002, a
permanent resident, worried that

putting out the security certificate targets me and my type of peo-
ple, but if you were to look at it from 'born here' or White people,
who have … longer generations of people who have been here …

security certificates for them are *protecting* them.

According to participants, the result of certificates will certainly cause newer generations of immigrations to "rethink Canadian loyalty" (Participant 030).

Excessive response to terrorism. Another theme emerged among participants regarding security certificates: that they are an overreaction to terrorism or an excessive response. As one participant put it, certificates are the government "going above and beyond" the call for national security. "To actually stop a person in the act of terrorism, that's a different question" and requires a different approach (Participant 020). He goes on to explain his thoughts on how Canada's response to the Parliament Hill shooting was excessive:

> It's sort of a hot topic, right? … It scares people, terrorists. Statistically you're more likely to die in a car crash or airplane crash than to be blown up … but [there is] more surveillance in people's minds, so they use this as a means to, sort of, push, to push certain political agendas, I guess. …
>
> There might not be statistical proof behind these threats, but it's made out as if it's going to be the end of the world.

Theme 2: Evidence of the "chilling effect" and (any) behavioural changes. Further to critiques of these measures, participants identify the impact that simply knowing about these measures has on them. What is noted here is the "chilling effect" of national security measures, particularly security certificates. This is documented in participants' knowledge and awareness of racism (the different treatment of White versus Muslim terrorists; and racism fuelled by media sources); fear, paranoia, and anxiety amongst Muslim/Arabs and the general Canadian society (suspicion within Canadian society; fear of outsiders; fear of difference; and fear within the mosques) and the pressure to monitor one's behaviour. As this section will demonstrate, the pressure to act in a certain manner has a direct impact on Muslim/Arab individuals' expression of identity across various contexts and the potential to lead to radicalization.

Knowledge and awareness of racism. In general, most participants reflect on a perceived double standard surrounding how White versus

Muslim/Arab terrorists are labelled. The previous section comment-
ed on participants' frustrations with labelling; in conversations and on
mass media, White individuals who commit terrorist acts are viewed
as mentally unstable while Muslims committing similar acts are seen
as motivated by their religion. Participants were quick to point out that
terrorists are not restricted to a certain race or religion. According to
participants, the "biased" and "unfair" media coverage of terrorism is
shaped by the same racist or anti-Muslim assumptions that contribute
to immigration and national security policy. Racist undertones are evi-
dent in sensationalized newspaper headlines that create tension within
communities. In the context of Islamophobia in the media and society,
Participant 044 said,

> It's a difficult place environment for Muslim youth right now.
> … They are always getting attacked, getting beat up on, not just
> physically but sometimes that too. You turn the news on, and it's
> … an issue. Every piece of legislation seems to be about Muslims
> in some way or another.

Participant 013 argued that there is little room to counter the racist
messaging caused by the media and society:

> If you're gonna be labelled, you're gonna be labelled. If you're
> a man of colour walking in a largely White community, you're
> gonna raise suspicion no matter what. For example the poor kid
> who's walking around in his own community with the Skittles,
> Trayvon Martin[16] … you don't have to do much to be labelled as
> someone who is suspicious. You could be walking through the
> airport, coming through security or at the border there, and you
> know they could pull you aside and label you as someone who is
> a trouble-maker and start searching you.

Nearly all participants contended that the criteria used to select indi-
viduals for national security surveillance are similar to the Islampho-
bic messaging from the media: "I do not know how the government
selects individuals to be monitored, but I can assume their selection
criterion is reflective of their viewpoints that are often expressed in the
media" (Participant 038).

Fear, pressure, paranoia, anxiety, and suspicion. The above section docu-

---

16. For more information, see http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/25/justice/florida-zimmer-
man-5-things/index.html?iid=article_sidebar.

ments the impact of sensationalized and anti-Muslim messaging on individuals. Participants also spoke of the fear, pressure, paranoia, anxiety, and suspicion resulting from Islamophobic sentiments encountered in their daily lives. Participants reported feeling fear and pressure towards individuals outside of their immediate circles. Some spoke about the effects of violence towards Muslims and mosques: "When I hear about mosques being vandalized or Muslims being attacked, then no, I don't feel welcome. I feel scared and fearful" (Participant 042). Several participants reiterated the

> pressure to be transparent … [to show] that I'm not like those guys on the news. When my friends and I go somewhere together, we can't make certain jokes or be really loud, [or else] we always get stares from people. It's different when we are in areas where there is more diversity, like Scarborough or Toronto. But when we are in a smaller city, we have to be careful not stand out too much or to act in a way that people can look at and say, 'Oh, look at those rowdy Arabs, typical,' you know? [Laughs.] It's like you have to try extra hard to be on your best behaviour. … I know a few Muslim guys that were verbally attacked two years ago. (Participant 048)

Based on his fifteen years of living in Canada, Participant 002 said,

> It's getting worse. … If people are scared that something will happen to them, then fear will only grow within that community. So if we get more bills like that [Bill C-51] that pass then we're just going to become more scared of what might happen.

Participants also spoke of the pressure for transparency "in order to avoid the suspicion of extremist beliefs and/or terrorist activity" and to "conform … to blend in." Another participant argued that Canada has transformed into a society "where being different can sometimes promote fear simply due to a lack of understanding, even when those differences are not harmful in any way" (Participant 038). The "chilling effect" on participants' freedom of thought and speech is dramatic. Several participants said they voiced their experiences of being silenced in public forums:

> There is pressure so you don't say something that might automatically flag you. Because we don't know what that means for the government. Whether they might just automatically [start] just looking at my family, or just me here by myself, and my group

of friends, right? 'Cause once they start looking at you, then they start digging. And once they start digging around … they can find whatever they are looking for. (Participant 002)

Participants talked about the pressure increasing, particularly after an act of terrorism occurs:

Whenever an act of terrorism occurs, whenever something happens … wherever around the world, there's sort of a push for people to speak out against it. Right? Like, we always hear, 'Where are the Muslims? Why don't they respond to this?' (Participant 020)

This pressure to speak up translates to being proactive within the community. Participant 027 reported sensing that "there is pressure … to be proactive and report any suspicious activity by youth or other people [in our community] to the law enforcement."

Monitoring online behaviour. As well as a pressure to speak up, participants shared other examples in which their behaviour is altered due to a perceived fear or, as Participant 034 mentioned earlier, to avoid "being flagged." Almost all participants indicated they were more vigilant with their online activity. Participant 009 said, "I have to watch out … . I don't know who's looking at it and how they are interpreting it." Participants said they recognized that monitoring and large-scale data collection for purposes of national security are "effective" simply because of the fear behind them:

You don't know who is watching you on … the internet now. They can be collecting data from—well, they are collecting data on Google and Facebook, on these things, on everybody. So the question now is how is that hampering with freedom of speech online, right? Now that you know that someone's listening to you, or someone's recording to you, how are you going to react? Now people have to think of what they post. They can't just be free … . I try not to be one of those people. … It's your right to say whatever you want or to do whatever you want. You shouldn't have an external force, like government, suppressing you. (Participant 017)

A similar suppression of thought is seen among other participants who speak of avoidance and silencing on political topics online. Participant 017 said, "I try my best to avoid having a political discussion," and Participant 034 "avoid[s] any political argument and pretty much

agree[s] with what the government tells [us] the truth is. … I try not to have an opinion [online]."

Insecurity. Knowledge of violence occurring towards Muslims creates fear and anxiety, along with feelings of insecurity within their own communities. Some participants refuse to go out at night, while others avoid areas that are not Muslim-dominated. Some note their anxiety when they hear of violence happening to Muslims in their communities or when they "get questioned by CSIS or someone tries to pull off their *hijab.* … Arbitrary acts of racism and discrimination do happen to Muslims frequently" (Participant 033). A Toronto suburb resident said he deters his friends from walking at night because

> you become more vulnerable. People hate you for no reason other than the fact that you belong to the same religion that some fanatic belongs to, [one who] is ordering people to do evil things in the name of your religion. … This is mob mentality.

Participants mentioned being treated as suspicious individuals in their own neighbourhoods. One participant said that Muslims are pressured to "[not] go outside at [night]time because you don't know what is going to happen. If you're going to the mosque, [and] it's across the street, go with other people but just don't go by yourself" (Participant 002).

Suppressing their identity. Because of the fear, pressure, paranoia, anxiety, and suspicion that participants (as individuals within their family and communities) experience, many described the strategies they employ to mitigate the negative effects of discrimination and profiling. Some said they suppress their Muslim/Arab identity, particularly in non-Muslim/Arab-dominated neighbourhoods such as Kingston, Ontario. This fear is attributed to a hate crime where several Queen's University students were attacked in downtown Kingston.[17] This incident shocked the Queen's Muslim Association to which the victims belonged and the Queen's University/Kingston community in general. The trauma lingered even three years following the attack. In fact, even though Participant 020 "passes as White," he said he still makes attempts to hide his Muslim identity "in certain circumstances, yeah … especially being in a small community … with mostly White peo-

---

17. For a recounting of several hate crimes targeting Muslims in the United States, see http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/06/22/the-story-of-a-hate-crime.

ple around." Even in more diverse Toronto, participants reported feeling uneasy about "looking Muslim." Participant 002 said he "couldn't walk around the street in a *thobe*[18] and not be automatically singled out. Just because there's a lot of people, like, a lot of multiculturalism, [that] doesn't mean I feel safe."

Monitoring outward appearance. To negotiate between the various contexts and perceptions of personal safety, participants reported monitoring their outward appearance—for example, being cautious about appearing in public wearing a *thobe*, *topee*[19], or beard—and avoiding hanging out in large groups, as safety precautions. An essential strategy was described by Participant 042:

> You have to blend in. Don't stand out. Don't walk around at nighttime in a *thobe* in a neighbourhood … . Don't do stuff that makes you be perceived as those fanatics on TV. But, don't act like you're trying too hard to hide something. You have to be true to yourself, but you also have to be smart about it. [We] would always go for burgers and *shisha* after work … . Some of my friends would wear a *thobe* … but I always tell them … 'Don't [wear] that. It is bad enough that we are four Muslim-looking guys, two with beards; you don't need to wear a thobe. Just wear jeans. Save the *thobe* for the mosque. *Astaghfiullah.*[20]'

Participants were indeed cautious with their outward image, due to "that factor of watching out" (Participant 009), because, as one explained, "You don't want them [non-Muslims] to be looking at you the same way they look at people on TV: the terrorist organizations, fundamentalists, extremists." A father of two teenage girls, Participant 001 noted the impact of this pressure on his family: "[When we are] wearing *hijab* ... our *topees*, clothes, and everything … [society is] looking at us in an evil way, like, 'Those [Muslims] are not good people, they are terrorists.'" Pointing to the *thobe* he was wearing, Participant 001 said,

> I know that this is a Muslim community around here, [so] I don't have—I shouldn't be afraid to go to some other area with these clothes. Even sometimes when I am wearing a *topee*, I don't go outside. I take the *topee* off [laughs] and go outside and come back, because [if] I don't, you never know.

---

18. An ankle-length garment with long sleeves, similar to a robe, worn by many Muslim/Arab men.
19. A small beanie worn by Muslim men on their head; a Sunnah; act of worship.
20. Arabic for an expression of disapproval.

Participants largely agreed that they choose not to wear *thobes* in areas where there is a lack of diversity. Participant 036 stated that "I would be worried about how I would be perceived by others. … They would probably stare and see me as a Muslim and not as a human being." Participant 042 said, "I don't know why I can't walk around in my *thobe* in the middle of the night without being afraid that someone will hurt me." Some participants expressed frustration regarding the perception of men wearing *thobes* being suspicious compared those in to Western clothing:

> If I just wear jeans and a shirt … then I just become another
> person around them … but if I'm wearing a *thobe* and I'm with a
> group of other people wearing a *thobe*, they can think, 'What is
> this Brown group of people going to do?' (Participant 002)

Several participants spoke about the pressure they feel to avoid growing beards. Participant 027, who was clean-shaven, said, "If I left a beard then people would act differently with me." Participant 020 explained he has to be attentive with

> making sure the beard is short, and you don't wanna go out with
> the *thobe* or *kurta*[21] in public. [Because] there's always that fear of
> backlash, that fear of being sort of negatively viewed or treated
> harshly. … [The fear is caused by] stereotypes in the community,
> in the neighbourhood, about Muslims. It's not about not being
> seen as a Muslim but [about] not pushing your Muslim identity,
> not living your Muslim identity to the fullest.

Participant 048 provided the following warning with a laugh:

> You know you just have to watch yourself. Don't be too loud,
> don't hang out with more than three–four Arabs [laughs again],
> and don't grow your beard too long! Those are typical things that
> scream, 'I'm a Muslim, look at me,' so watch out, and control the
> image that you give up.

Impact on freedom of association and mobility. In addition to not wearing a *thobe* or growing a beard, several other participants indicated feeling a chill on their freedom of association. Some, like Participant 048 quoted above, provided advice on how to avoid the "suspicious gaze" by avoiding "hang[ing] out with more than three–four Muslims." Partici-

---

21. A loose collarless tunic, worn by men in South Asia and the Middle East.

pant 002 also offered an idea of how the White gaze interprets groups of three or four Arab/Muslim men:

> Just the group mentality—so there are three or four of you, then the White person might assume that something is going on. Individually that one person can be just as bad as the group of four, or not bad at all, but just being in a bigger group automatically puts you in that frame. You can be targeted. It's just that simple.

Participants also reported that they avoid individuals who, or activities that may include individuals who, "may be involved in suspicious activity" (Participant 027). Participant 036 provided the following advice: "I would hang out with a group of three–four Muslim/Arabs only if they look assimilated. Even then it's in the back of my mind. I will still think about how others will perceive me." But he quickly added, "It also depends on which area I am in. If I'm in an area dominated by White people, I would be a little more self-conscious versus certain areas in Toronto where I feel more comfortable and blended."

In addition to feeling insecure as Muslim/Arab men, participants also spoke of the strategies used by their sisters or female relatives, for whom, as briefly explored above, the decision to wear a *hijab* is affected. Participant 002 spoke of the pressure for Muslim *hijabi* girls who "would be considered suspicious because they are wearing a hijab. … There's pressure … . 'If you're going to go outside at nighttime, go with someone. If you're a girl, just don't go out [alone at nighttime] at all." Speaking of the impacts of increased discrimination and evolving security measures on *hijabi* women, Participant 044 shared the following:

> [There] is a growing anti-Muslim sentiment, where Muslim women wearing *hijab* are getting attacked in the street, and … this is pretty shocking … . Lots of Muslim girls, for example, have taken off the *hijab* because it's just too much, too much negativity that they gotta deal with about it.

Similarly, Participant 034 said, "Maybe it is safer for the girl to not wear the hijab at all, if she is going to be alone or walking at nighttime." In sum, given incidents of racial profiling and discrimination, reported either by the media or informally within their communities, participants expressed a need to silence their Muslim/Arab identity. And, as the next section will explore, given their knowledge of post-9/11 national security measures, particularly those (in)directly aimed at Muslims, a surprising fourteen of the twenty participants articulated

connections between security certificates and youth radicalization.

Pathways toward youth radicalization. Participants indicated that the ubiquity of security measures and practices aimed at them, combined with feelings of helplessness, fear, and paranoia resulting from Islamophobia and racial profiling, can lead to youth radicalization. They felt that anti-Muslim policy and rhetoric that justify the use of security certificates also feed into messaging from ISIS and al Qaeda: that "your government does not want you; therefore, take up arms and revolt against them" (Participant 044). This leads to youth feeling disenfranchised, neglected, and angry towards their government. Some may then choose to take up arms and "fight the good fight" either back home or domestically (Participant 046). Further to this point, several participants articulated the connections between security certificates and youth radicalization. With reference to suspicion towards Muslims in general, participants warned that security measures (in)directly aimed at Muslims echo the messaging provided by extremist groups like ISIS or al Qaeda:

> It destroys a society when you become suspicious of particular individuals. Especially when person after person you start seeing looks a certain way, has a particular type of name, you know, you just, you are feeding into a particular stereotype … . It might even be a catalyst for individuals who want to go down this path of radicalization because this is the type of messaging [that] … ISIS and al Qaeda give: 'Your government is against you, they hate you, go attack them.' And so to somebody … something like security certificates comes up, or that somebody they know or heard of is detained because of security certificates, that might just be enough to push that individual over the edge. (Participant 046)

Participant 044 agreed the anti-Muslim measures resemble

> what groups like ISIS and al Qaeda have been trying to say for a long time, which is that, 'Don't you get it? The West is at war with you.' And that, 'They [the West] don't care about you,' and that, 'You don't belong with them.' You see that type of language, and then they just point to the type of legislation and say, 'Look, this is your own government passing legislation.' You know … it's a dangerous trend because, you know, people will just start to get angry at the West and feel that they are just—tuning out, and they belong somewhere else. And maybe some of them will leave, and maybe some will just fade out, and maybe they just won't leave

but just won't engage anymore.

When probed further about the grievances shared by young Muslims, Participant 044 said, "When [radicalized youth] list their grievances, [they list] definitely certificates … Bill C-51 and C-24 ... the zero tolerance for culturally barbaric behaviour."[22] One graduate student of Middle Eastern origin said he had been visited by CSIS several times over the past years and was well aware of the effects of racism and Islamophobia on Muslim youth. Some of the factors that may contribute to radicalization of visible minorities include those "who experience social exclusion and poor sense of social belonging due to the Canadian government's discriminatory [policies] against them" (Participant 017).

Participant 036 offered an alternative connection between national security measures and radicalization:

> [As to] whether I think these measures directly radicalize people, I don't know. Maybe it's making those people fearful, but I also think that they—I know that a lot of the people who were arrested were young, impressionable, and have a history of drug abuse … [but] those who go extremist routes are venting frustrations. It is difficult to point out individual cases where religion is used as promoting radicalization, so religion is not much to fall back on, especially since it's easy to use scriptures taken out of context.

Another participant said that religion has little to do with radicalization:

> These grievances rarely have to do with religion. The grievances had to do with, perhaps, immigration policies. Why were their parents' credentials not recognized in this country? … Because that grievance doesn't get addressed at a younger age, that festers and grows and eventually manifests itself in very hardline religious understandings of the world that are almost motivated by that youthful aggression almost, like this, this, identity search from a young age. It's real frustration. … Because those issues don't get addressed, the grievances continue to compile, and that's where they head towards this path of radicalization.[23] (Participant 046)

---

22. For more information, see https://openparliament.ca/bills/41-2/S-7/.
23. He continues to say: "So what they say is that there's a … [pause] there is … an obsession with foreign conflict, for instance. There is an obsession with the day of judgment, an obsession with the end of times. They become … [pause] they have sort of a … not a … I'd like to call it a hero complex, so the idea is that the West has committed tremendous—these grave acts against the Muslim world, and these individuals are

Ironically, Participant 002 demonstrated precisely the type of frustration Participant 046 highlighted above:

> So if someone says, 'Okay, I believe in what ISIS is saying. This is how I should live my Muslim life. Screw Canada, screw the States, I'm going with you guys,' it could go that way, and then they become active [radicalized]. When you're influenced [by security measures], whether [or not] you've been confronted by them in the past … [you may think] 'Hey, I agree with these guys.' It can go that way—I can become an ISIS fundamentalist—but it's not. I'm not going to do it.

Contextualizing this further, Participant 044 described the mindset of a youth who has grievances with the government:

> If you feel like 'Those guys [Canadians] aren't my crew, they aren't my friends, they don't care for me, then, you know, the logical extension of that is 'I gotta find my crew … my family … where I belong' and that kind of recruitment strategy of these groups like ISIS and others, where they are saying, 'Come join us; you belong with us.'

Participants reported that feelings of helplessness and disenchantment with the state increase with the presence of "nosy intelligence officers" and "informants" (Participant 017) within mosques and community organizations. "Being interrogated by random government agents for barely being related to specific religious groups … or for example, in my case, simply being a Muslim" (Participant 017) exacerbates negative feelings towards the government. Other participants describe unexpected RCMP and CSIS visits to mosques as offensive and intrusive. Participant 042 said,

> When they [RCMP or CSIS] show up … they are not looking for help: they are looking for information, so that they can point fingers and create tension. … It is scary. I cannot think what new immigrants who are not used to police presence must feel when

---

responsible for righting those wrongs. They will be openly against democracy, they will be openly against the institutions, the Western institutions, they—another one is, they will have a sudden, almost a social trauma; in other words, their entire friend circle, their entire circle will completely shift, and it will shift to an extreme level. So they will stop talking to their friends, and they will get a brand new set of friends. They will drop out of school. They might quit their job. And a lot of this will happen rapidly. … These are some of the behavioural indicators that a young person on that path to radicalization."

they see RCMP and CSIS snooping around and asking people questions at the mosque. It's not effective at all. If you want information, ask respectfully.

Participant 017 explained his frustration with CSIS:

They [CSIS] come into the mosque where I pray and ask the Brothers what they know of me. They contact my co-workers to ask about me. They call me at work. They insist that I call them and report anything suspicious … . And they talk to my wife if I am not home. This is disrespectful. … They basically asked me to co-operate, but why should I? So they can harass other innocent Muslims too?

Participant 027, who is also frequented by CSIS, said,

CSIS contacted a co-worker's ex-husband to ask if he knew anything unusual about me [laughs]. I've only ever spoke to my co-worker at work, and yet they think her ex-husband would know something about me? I have nothing to hide. The only reason they harass me is because I am a Muslim male.

The notion of hiding something was brought up by Participant 048, who contended that security measures lead to resentment within the Muslim communities:

We purposely try really hard not to be perceived as if we are hiding something. There is more pressure to be open and transparent, especially with law enforcement. If RCMP asked a Muslim guy, 'Hi, can we talk to you?' he is going to say, 'Yes, of course. I have nothing to hide. Let's talk.' But with a non-Muslim, they … would be more guarded and protect themselves from unwanted questioning.

To add on to the fear and suspicion, Participant 048 said that

with the new laws that we are going to pass, a Muslim or Arab does not want to be charged with something crazy like 'refusing to cooperate in an investigation' [laughs]. [Muslims] try harder to show that they can be trusted, they have nothing to hide, they haven't done anything.

The 'chilling effect' of national security measures, particularly security certificates, is well documented in participants' knowledge and

awareness of racism; fear, paranoia and anxiety; the pressure to moni-tor one's behaviour; the expression of identity across various contexts; and, finally, the potential for national security measures to lead to rad-icalization of Muslim youth. The following section will explore the im-pact of the "chilling effect" on perceptions of citizenship and belonging.

Theme 3: Perception of citizenship and belonging. Despite this chilling effect within the Muslim/Arab communities, knowledge and awareness of security measures and their link to radicalization does not seem to compromise individuals' sense of belonging and their Canadi-an identity. In fact, nearly all participants unequivocally express their contentment in being in Canada versus being "back home" (Participant 013). And despite their profound experiences of profiling and stigmati-zation, many participants reasoned that Canada is "better than where we came from" (Participant 034). In fact, some even express their ap-preciation for their Canadian identity, feeling welcome as immigrants and recommending Canada as an ideal place for immigration. Partici-pants who felt hesitant about recommending Canada as an ideal place attributed this hesitancy to factors such as

> being treated as an external due to my skin colour. … Things have changed [for the worse] in the past five years, and I do feel doubt-ful about moving to Canada … . I am not so positive about giving a lot of positive feedback … telling my friends to move to Canada. (Participant 017)

Another participant stated that he has seen Canada become more hostile to Muslim/Arabs:

> In two years [I have seen it getting worse] … . This is [also] the opinion of others I know, and they have been here for over twenty years, who say, 'We think in the future it [Canada] won't be good for their children,' especially when it comes to … practising their religion. (Participant 019)

Participant 030 warned other immigrants about the unwelcoming shift in Canada's treatment of immigrants: "the country is becoming unwelcoming … because of such measures, given the anti-immigrant rhetoric and Islamophobia. I am not saying, 'Don't come to Canada,' but I am saying, 'Just be aware.'"

Despite feeling welcome in Canada, some participants suggest the hostile climate towards Muslims "will likely get worse before it gets

better. Maybe in a few more years of Liberal rule we will start to reverse the racism that the Conservatives have enshrined in our society" (Participant 034). Again, despite the skepticism noted here, most participants agreed that Canada is a good place to resettle: "Canada is still my home, and no matter how racist things get I will never desert my home, my family, and friends" (Participant 013).

Multiculturalism. Several participants praised Canada's approach towards multiculturalism and argued that, despite its shortcomings, Canada is still welcoming. Participant 036 said,

> Despite all these measures, the people are still friendly and nice once you get to know one another. People are very tolerant. I think we also have a pretty good social welfare system … . This country is my home, and I just want my home to better understand the issues that some of its residents are experiencing.

Similarly, participants shared their appreciation for the civil liberties Canada has provided. Participant 001 said, "The way we [are] performing our religious activity in this country … it is very difficult in our own country [of origin]." Many participants also praised Canada's approach towards tolerance and diversity:

> Tightening this and making more restrictions on people's actions, this would cause a problem. So plurality and democracy, this is the most important thing… . [The] thing that makes Canada special is opening to other cultures and religions. (Participant 019)

Despite critiques of national security measures, some participants expressed appreciation for their hybrid identity: "I'm Canadian first and Afghan second … . I don't know what [it] means to be an immigrant" (Participant 013). Several others argued that, despite the challenges here, Canada is still a far better option than other countries such as the United States and European nations. Participant 001 asked, "Where can people [immigrants] go? Only Europe and [laughs] America. If you compare different countries, Canada is much better 'til now." Participant 009 reported seeing Canada as a superior alternative to elsewhere: "We are right next to America, and, from what I've heard, America could be a little bad in terms of the living as a Muslim." Other participants agreed:

> Comparatively, [Canada is] probably one of the best places for immigrants to settle. I think some of the policies that people are

introducing are leading us down the wrong path, but I still think
we are better than a lot of other countries. (Participant 020)

Participants also reported that the lack of real terrorism in Canada
makes it a peaceful place to live. "We are lucky that, thank God, we
have not seen the atrocities that the States and Europe have seen" (Par-
ticipant 033). Participant 038 said,

Hatred exists everywhere, and, although our media still promotes
it, we are fortunate to have a generally high level of education in
Canada so the amount of hate simply caused by a lack of knowl-
edge is not as significant in comparison to countries such as the
United States.

Participant 048, who is of Bengali origin, agreed: "Canada … gives
so much promise to immigrants … beautiful country … people … . I
don't let the few bad apples ruin it for the country." Several participants
praised the relative safety and promise of the "better life" and "better
educational opportunities for kids" (Participant 020) available in Cana-
da. Others described Canada as "a place where you can raise your chil-
dren without worrying about their life" (Participant 027). The ability to
raise one's family without fear was highlighted by participants. "You
don't have to worry about men coming to your door and kidnapping
your father or pillaging your neighbourhood" (Participant 034).

The increased number of Muslim candidates running in the 2015 elec-
tion was, to participants, another sign of tolerance and hope. Indeed,
"these are all positive signs that, yes, we have a government that's us-
ing this as [a] political tool to win votes. But hopefully other leaders
are using their own common sense and behaving democratically and
respectfully" (Participant 030).

Finally, participants' praise included a reflection on the role of the
judiciary as fair and impartial. Despite discrimination and xenophobic
policies, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

still protects people's rights and [ensures the] existence of a strong
set of values, universal values that Muslims share as well. And
there are success stories: for example, the Supreme Court *niqab*[24]
ruling[25] which proves that if you follow right due process and

---

24. An article of clothing covering the face, worn by a small minority of Muslim women.
25. A ruling following the case of Zunera Ishaq who challenged the Conservative gov-
    ernment's ban on wearing the niqab while taking an oath during her citizenship cer-

legal system, you do have ways of obtaining justice. (Participant 030)

Thus, despite the "distrust for the Harper government … there is also a deep trust and appreciation for the judiciary and the rule of law" (Participant 044).

However, praise for Canada stopped when participants reflected on surveillance and national security measures and the controversial laws and policies surrounding them:

> [Laws] change our perspective of what Canada is really about. I know … Canada is peaceful and tolerant … but [these laws] and some of the hate towards Muslims makes you question, really, your place here in Canada. You come here to escape from tyranny and injustice, but, look [laughs], there is some tyranny here too. (Participant 042)

Further, participants generally agreed that democracy does not mean accepting oppression: "[It] doesn't mean that we shouldn't be vocal against laws and procedures that violate our rights. … It doesn't mean we should accept racist laws like C-51" (Participant 34).

Theme 4: Reclaiming agency and moving forward. Participants were concerned about national security measures, security certificates, and their impact on racial profiling, Islamophobia, and radicalization. These same participants were also positive about moving forward and reclaiming their notion of identity and agency. Themes they suggested included alternative strategies for the government (work with communities; avoid racist rhetoric; reinforce multiculturalism) and strategies for communities (encourage openness and transparency; counter terrorist claims/ideologies; promote civic engagement; identify youth at risk). Participants reinforced sentiments of Canadian pride and nationalism but stressed the importance of religious tolerance and understanding.

Role of government. Participants suggested alternative ways that governments can work with communities to counter violent extremism and discourage homegrown radicalization. A good place to start

---

emony. The Conservative government formally withdrew a controversial challenge involving the niqab. See http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/niqab-appeal-appeal-citizenship-ceremonies-canada-jody-wilson-raybould-1.3321264

is by avoiding "criminaliz[ing] individuals because of immigration is-
sues" (Participant 030). In fact, according to some participants, softer
approaches are available to the government "[in] understanding the
Muslim community … [particularly] the new immigrants" (Participant
033). Overall, participants advocate more respect and tolerance from
law enforcement, and a halt to the biased practice of "picking favour-
ites among the Muslim communities … [such as the] Ahmadiyya and
Ismaili communities … simply because [they are] better established …
have more money, a louder voice" (Participant 034). Overall, partici-
pants agree that the best approach is for the government to "empower
leaders, religious leader[s], ethnic leaders within a community to let
them take charge. And then to treat them with dignity and respect [so]
that they can call Canada home" (Participant 027).

The theme of working with communities[26] in constructive collabo-
ration is prevalent across most of the interviews. Participant 046 calls
for more transparency and communication with Muslim communities,
more effort in "building a pathway with the communities … through
intermediaries between law enforcement and … 'trusted individuals
[within the Muslim communities].'" Participant 030, who is involved
in conversations between Public Safety Canada and Muslim commu-
nities, said, "A better tool to fight Islamophobia is to promote positive
interaction. More openness and transparency towards faith and culture
is the way to go." The result can be fruitful for both sides, according
to participants, including Participant 034: "If they [government] just
ask nicely, for whatever information they need, whatever support they
need, whatever they want—just ask nicely and respectfully. You will
get more help."

Participant 036 said,

> Muslims feel misunderstood by the government … [and] want
> to understand this problem of terrorism and radicalization … .
> Muslims are suffering [globally due to acts] by terrorist organi-
> zations like ISIS and the Taliban … . And domestically, Muslims
> are suffering because of the negative stereotyping and the bias, so
> [they] have a lot to lose.

Almost all participants highlighted the importance of increased com-
munication. Participant 009 said, "Obviously it's not something that
happens overnight but over the long run, with the coming generations,

---

26. In countering violent extremism (CVE).

[with] the kids growing up." Participant 033 said,

> If you are worried about some kids being radicalized, well then
> instead of blaming the Muslim community, why don't you
> say, 'Hey, let's talk about what is going on. Let's work together
> because this is a problem that affects your community and the
> country.'

The benefit of "making inroads with the Muslim community … [and] showing respect for all our beliefs, and our practices" (Participant 013) will certainly go a long way, according to several participants.

Participants overwhelmingly believed an awareness of the impact caused by negative and stereotypical rhetoric is important. Participant 030 said words like "Islamicism" and "mosques being breeding grounds" will result in a "push-back." Therefore, he said, the solution is to

> stop singling out the Muslim community … if the government is
> serious about rooting out terrorism with genuine leaders in the
> community, and not 'self-proclaimed' leaders who fuel Islam-
> ophobic claims, which will lead to more division and polarization.
> We need to organize all the communities together.

The benefits of treating Muslims with respect and understanding were made clear in a statement by Participant 017, who declared: "Once I feel like I am being [as] fairly treated by the government as the rest of its citizens, I will do anything in my power to cooperate with the government agencies in fighting against terrorism." And while slightly outside of the scope of the government's powers, Participant 038 suggested that the government can reduce terrorism through use of the media, simply by "not giving these international terrorist networks the media coverage and attention they seek." Despite his earlier optimism, Participant 013 said,

> There is nothing you can do that the government will listen,
> because they have their own agenda. They don't care. All they
> wanna do is get re-elected. [They] can make promises, but they
> never really follow through with the promises.

Role of mosques/community. While participants offered insightful suggestions on how the Canadian government can work more effectively with Muslim/Arab communities, they also offered suggestions for

ways in which the Muslim/Arab communities and masjids can work with the government. Participant 030 suggested that making positive changes "starts with thinking and one's mentality to begin with. Especially our immigrant background … we need to start taking care of our surroundings and see it as home, rather than a pit stop." Participant 009 suggests Muslims be more "inviting towards non-Muslims" and that Canadians need to "co-exist." Some participants highlighted the importance of openness in Muslim communities in thwarting suspicion and advised that communities avoid forming "closed groups … something [that] might cause … suspicion" (Participant 019). On the topic of openness and transparency within the Muslim community, Participant 013 said it exists and that more emphasis should be placed on religious leaders to "denounce activities that lead to terrorism." Several participants offered examples of the impact of religious leaders. For example, several participants referred to a prominent Toronto Imam, Yusuf Badat, who is very active and vocal within the Muslim mosques. Participant 001 said,

> Brother Badat[27] always mentions in his *khutba*[28], we have to be part of this broader community, with this local politics, national politics, international politics, as a Muslim community. Then we can raise our voice … to be effective.

Participant 036 discussed the importance of community engagement as promoted by Imam Badat:

> [He] is always talking about how as a community we need to voice our concerns with our local MPs, [how] we need to be more involved in the discussion and overall narrative. [He] is a great leader who … promotes dialogue and understanding among Muslims and non-Muslims.

According to participants, religious leaders can promote the importance of a united community. Having a stronger voice can only happen if Muslims are united. Participant 048 said Muslims "are unrepresented in politics, but we can fix that by being a stronger, more united group." Others stressed the importance of unity and strengthening the Muslim voice at the provincial and federal levels. Participant 042 urged "better

---

27. For a profile of Badat, see http://www.islamicfoundation.ca/ift/directory.aspx/full_time_school/yusuf_badat.
28. Religious sermon delivered during weekly Friday afternoon prayers.

representatives" of Islam who can use their platform to confidently say, "'No, that does not represent us; *here* is what our religion is all about.'" Participants stressed the importance of an alternative narrative, a united voice so that

> if any of these terrorist threats do rise up, the community is going to protect itself together. … The government won't need to get involved at all, and the stronger the bond the community grows, the lesser the impact the terrorists will have in terrorizing the community. (Participant 023)

In addition to the various ways in which Muslim / Arab communities can work with the government and increase openness, transparency, and engagement, participants also recommended increasing awareness and promoting knowledge-sharing within their communities. For example, one of the problems Participant 001 highlighted is that "basically we [Muslim community] are not aware of these laws and orders, whatever is going through Ottawa. … Our understanding [is] whatever we get through this local media … and this could be one way or another [be true or false]." The lack of awareness and knowledge of the measures is seen as a limitation by Participant 002, who said,

> If I know that hanging out with a group of guys late at night, and there's four of us with beards, and that's bad from the government side, then we shouldn't be doing it. Even though we're not doing anything bad. I don't know how the government looks at stuff, but whether it's, like, phone calls or your airplane itinerary, your conversations online, we don't know what kind of stuff gets tagged. But we should know that.

Participant 013 said, "All that has to happen is a little bit of education."

Role of (online) media. In previous sections, participants expressed criticism of television and print media for promoting Islamophobia; however, *social* media and the internet were identified as possible avenues where Muslims can and do offer an alternative perspective. The internet is a venue where "people are more aware of what's going on than they used to be. … It gives us a chance to portray ourselves." Participants used the internet "to facilitate a more positive understanding of Muslims" (Participant 034). Participants said they believe that, since they have little control over television and print media, the internet is

a better alternative:

> It's [a] free … and effective way to present what our religion
> and culture is all about. We can start by making sure we create a
> positive image on our Facebook, Twitter, and other social media
> accounts. By acting like good role models, good citizens, people
> will know what our religion is all about. (Participant 034)

Essentially, participants said, the internet should be used with an
overall goal of countering terrorist claims and ideologies within trou-
bled communities. The importance of the "online world" plays a sig-
nificant role in providing counter-messages to youth in the real world.
Participant 025 uses the internet to suppress the voices of

> some among Muslims—as I say, there are some among other
> groups or other communities who have some ideas which can be
> related to terrorism … and [we] need to recognize that among us
> there are some people who have crazy ideas. … We need to take
> responsibility as Muslims … to teach our true religion via forums,
> blogs, posts, etc.

Some participants suggest using the same tactics used by terrorist
groups online to create counter-narratives and encourage youth to re-
ject extremist messaging. Participant 036 said,

> The internet should be used to create an alternative narrative so
> that youth who find certain terrorist ideology appealing can re-
> think it by accessing more accurate information. There should be
> a discourse online that there isn't a war against Muslims or Islam
> because that is what ISIS is telling our youth to think, and unfor-
> tunately some youth do buy into it. So instead of being silenced
> online and letting the voices of ISIS or whatever terrorist group
> thrive, we need to be just as rigorous in creating those count-
> er-narratives and delivering them through Facebook or Twitter,
> whatever mechanisms ISIS uses.

One participant suggested the importance of promoting a stronger
Canadian identity as an effective counter-messaging tool for radical-
ized youth:

> Instead of going down this path to radicalization, if there is
> counter -messaging, they, you know, they can say to themselves,
> 'Hey listen, no, it's not what you think it is. Canadians don't hate
> us. Canada isn't out to get Muslims … and so we reject that type

of messaging that you are trying to bring towards us,' ... the mes-
saging from ISIS, or al Qaeda, or any other extremist organization.
... A tool to reject extremism is having that sense of [Canadian]
identity. (Participant 046)

Fostering civic engagement. Alternatively, some participants suggested
engaging troubled youth in positive ways of thinking about the social
problems experienced by Muslims. For example, when a youth tells
Participant 044 about their 'grievances' with the Canadian state, he

> agree[s] with them ... and [says to them], 'The grievance that you
> listed are grievance that I share. They are the same ones. I feel the
> same way. The difference is that ... what I plan on doing about it
> is, I believe, consistent with Islam. What you talk about doing is
> inconsistent with Islam.' So after number one, I affirm their griev-
> ances. Number two, we have a theological discussion. 'So what
> does Islam stand for?' And we have a theological discussion, and
> if you get them on that one, then I say, 'Back to these grievanc-
> es—what can we do about it?' Different people require different
> solutions." (Participant 044)

Here the importance of promoting civic engagement (particularly
with youth and those at risk) is highlighted by several participants who
place responsibility within Muslim communities in general. Participant
030 said he organizes frequent community-building initiatives with
Muslim and non-Muslim youth:

> Civic engagement is not just about talking about being good Mus-
> lims. If we are unable to have an impact at the political level and
> contribute as active citizens, then we don't have a strong claim
> to being more respected. It starts not just at politics but in civic
> leadership too. We need strong public relations in [the] commu-
> nity, a well-coordinated public relations with genuine municipal
> relationships.

Beyond stressing the importance of civic engagement and being a
part of the political process, participants encouraged Muslims to vote,
volunteer, and engage in charity: "Feeding the poor, caring for neigh-
bours, that leads to better communities, and it's mandated in the Qu-
ran. ... Youth engagement are practical approaches to these issues"
(Participant 030). Participants noted Muslims have become more polit-

ically aware "in recent years… . In this particular campaign[29] there are a lot of Muslims who are running for Parliament (Participant 030)." At the same time, there is an increase in "grassroots Muslim organizations that are encouraging Muslims to go out and vote" (Participant 044). Such changes are tremendous, the same participant said, as while there may not be "100 percent voter turnout in the Muslim community … it will be much higher than in previous years" (Participant 044).

Contradictions between terrorism and Islam. A*s* some of the above discussion shows, that participants found it important to point out the distinction between extremist ideology and religion is significant. Also significant is the emphasis participants placed on countering extremism with the importance of religion. As mentioned in earlier sections, distancing Islam from terrorism is a common theme, particularly as participants emphasized the importance of peace, tolerance, and respect within Islam and the contradictions between Islam and terrorism. Participant 033 said,

> Muslim fundamentalism? [Laughs.] Nothing like it has existed in Muslim nations. Peace, tolerance, and respect … . This is our basic belief. Nothing in between … . If we create some other belief outside of that, then we are not true Muslim.

Participants overwhelmingly criticized "radical extremists" who "associate themselves with Islam" (Participant 027). Others similarly said that "no God-fearing Muslim would strap on a suicide vest and yell out, '*Allahu Akbar*'"[30] (Participant 034). In fact, almost all participants explain the contradiction between suicide bombers and Islam:

> Every pious Muslim knows at least these two things: one, if you kill one person, it is as if you have killed all of humanity; and two, suicide is *haram*[31] … condemned. … But why does society give them the honour of calling them Muslim [when] … they are the enemies of Islam? (Participant 034)

One participant brought up the notion of state-sponsored terrorism and said there are "wealthy Muslims [in Saudi Arabia] who influence and finance the people [terrorists], those who don't know the religion" (Participant 001).

---

29. 2015 Canadian federal election.
30. Arabic for "God is great."
31. That which is forbidden in Islam.

Some participants noted Islam's promotion of peace and encouraged others to gain more knowledge of Islam. Participant 036 said this is "the only way to successfully and truthfully counter the Islamophobic discourse." Participant 020 also raised the importance of teaching Muslims about Islam: "If people did more of what real Muslims did, they would … help, sort of, change people." Almost all participants noted the importance of being a good human and neighbour in Islam:

> Islam is a good religion which promotes best of human beings, so if you try to be a good Muslim … be proud to be a good Muslim … like a good neighbour. So just be yourself. (Participant 025)

However, some participants noted internal tensions brought on by trying to be a positive role model and controlling one's emotions:

> Because of the common misconception that Islam is a radical and violent faith, I feel additional pressure on top of my moral obligations to control my emotional reactions even when they are justified, in order to avoid giving anyone the opportunity to attribute my natural human instincts to beliefs instilled by my faith. … Because of the stigma associated with the Islamic religion, I have a responsibility to represent what Islam truly stands for, by embracing peaceful and thoughtful behaviours in an attempt to open the eyes of Canadians whose understanding of the faith is very narrow and polluted by our media outlets. (Participant 038)

Almost all participants stressed the fact that, as Muslims, they have "nothing to hide" (Participant 034). They likewise emphasized their desire, in participating in the research study, to be transparent about their feelings and intentions. Participant 001 said,

> True Muslims don't have to worry about anything. … If my email or phone [is] being recorded, I don't mind. [Laughs.] They can do it. But if they use it in [a] proper way, I don't mind. I'm not a threat to anybody. I don't want anybody being a threat to me.

Another participant said, "If you're honestly not doing anything wrong then I don't have to change anyone's perspectives. … I shouldn't have to change anything" (Participant 002). Indeed most participants were willing and frank in sharing their perspectives on critical issues relating to their everyday lives, saying they see it as obligatory:

> I share my feelings and thoughts with everybody who asks. I

don't openly share it, but if you ask I will. I don't feel any pres-
sure not to speak. But I do feel a sense of responsibility from my
faith. … Not in the form of fighting, but in the form of defending
[against] any injustice or anything that is not right that I see.
(Participant 013)

Maintaining Hope. Finally, given the extent of Islamophobia in the
current political climate, a common theme among participants was
hope for the future. Almost all interviews ended on a positive note,
with participants reflecting on their concerns but also their hopes for
the future. One participant said,

> I am a hopeful … positive man. I don't think things are that bad
> … not yet. We will see what will happen with C-51 and how far
> the government decides to take it … . We will get through this as a
> community and as a nation. (Participant 042)

Others said that "these things that Harper is doing and saying, that's
not going to change how fortunate and blessed we are to live in a safe
and peaceful society" (Participant 048). Finally, Participant 044 said,

> At the end of the day, our belief system is that there is a God.
> That there is a day of judgment … and that every single soul will
> have to stand before Allah on that day and be taken to account for
> everything that they did and didn't do. And our role really is just
> to have a good, strong relationship with Allah. That's it, and that's
> what matters. Just be a good human. And try to connect with your
> Creator, try to read more Quran, try to do the good, [have] more
> remembrance. Try to do that stuff. Because those people that are
> suffering around the world under tribulation, under dictators, if
> they are patient and they persevere, they may be rewarded on the
> day of judgment for their patience and perseverance. So we wish
> that [had] not happened to them, but it may help them in the end
> in that they get rewarded. So don't think that you have to be the
> one that has to fight the good fight. Let Allah be that judge. You
> just worry about yourself becoming a good person.

The role of positive messaging was important to participants, given
the impact of national security measures and heightening pressures on
the Canadian Muslim community.

Conclusion

In sum, this chapter began with a general understanding of how national security measures are perceived by Muslim and non-Muslim men in this study. Findings from survey data in Phase 1 show statistically significant differences between Muslim (25n) and non-Muslim (25n) men's perception of government data collection and surveillance practices. Results indicate statistically significant effects on Muslim men, who experience a "chilling effect" on civil liberties and freedoms, including freedom of speech, thought, mobility, and association. Since 2008, negative consequences have increased more for Muslim men than for non-Muslim men. I explored these quantitative differences in depth in Phase 2, through open-ended interviews with Muslim men (20n). Here Muslim men discussed perceptions and experiences relating to national security measures and its impact on their subjective experiences, their sense of belonging and identity. Participants described security and surveillance measures as being ineffective and disenfranchising while, again, disproportionately affecting Muslims. The "chilling effect" constituting fear, paranoia, anxiety, pressure to self-monitor, and pressure to alter one's behaviour and identity, including physical appearance, to avoid unnecessary suspicion was explored in depth. Important here are participant discussions of measures leading to radicalization and countering violent extremism in Muslim communities. The implications and significance of these themes will be explored in more detail in the following chapter.

5. *Implications and Conclusion*

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to determine what impact surveillance technology and national security measures (such as security certificates) have on the Muslim male population, their everyday lives, and their sense of identity and belonging. Specifically, the objectives of this study are to determine if the introduction of laws and other security measures have had an impact on the individual's knowledge and awareness of surveillance practices, perception of citizenship and belonging, and fear ("chilling effect"). If so, what (if any) behavioural changes have these individuals made? To accomplish this goal, this research used a two-part explanatory mixed methods approach: Part I employed quantitative techniques (survey, n=50) to assess distinctions between Muslim (n=25) and non-Muslim (n=25) perceptions of surveillance and security measures, and any temporal shifts. The purpose of using a survey design was to determine if the introduction of laws and other security measures have impacted Muslim and non-Muslim men differently. These findings were explored through qualitative methods in Phase 2, which consisted of open-ended interviews (n=20) that explored Muslim men's perceptions of surveillance and security and its impact on their daily lives and their sense of identity and belonging. Findings and implications from this research are essential in our understanding of how national security measures shape and impact marginalized populations. As Lyon (2003) argues, there is little empirical research on the "unintended consequences" of security measures, particularly on the ways surveillance methods and technologies reinforce social division and feelings of exclusion in Muslim and/or Arab communities. Similarly, Razack (2008) argues that it is unknown to what degree these measures mark "insiders" from "outsiders". Thus, this re-

search addresses this gap by offering empirical evidence of how Muslim men are marked as 'outsiders' and the accompanying "unintended consequences."

Summary of Findings

To begin, it is important to note data was collected during the term of former Prime Minister Stephen Harper's Conservative government, in 2015, until December 2016, a few months after Justin Trudeau's Liberals assumed office. Within this time, controversial laws including Bill C-51[1], Bill C-24[2], and Bill S-7[3] were proposed and debated, although minimally. It was only after data collection was complete (December 2016) that the Liberal government announced these laws will be repealed, revised, or dismissed.[4] Thus the research findings are reflective of participant fears and concerns at a moment where the threat of these laws was plausible and realistic.

In Phase 1, the survey phase, findings suggest a clear distinction between the impact of surveillance and security measures on Muslim men (MM) and non-Muslim men (NMM) respondents, including subsequent behavioural changes. These findings are consistent with other research that indicates Canadian, British, and American anti-terrorism policies have uneven effects, with Muslim/Arabs experiencing negative consequences not felt by non-Muslim/Arabs (Wilke and Willis 2008). The present study offers a unique contribution as it focuses solely on the Canadian context.

Findings provide empirical evidence of heightened fear, suspicion, and anxiety felt disproportionately by Canadian Muslim men. This "chilling effect" of surveillance and security measures is statistically stronger among MM versus NMM respondents. MM are more vigilant about their mobility, association with others, participation in community events, and physical appearance. In the digital world, MM are also more reluctant to comment on particular topics in person or over the

---

1. For more information, see http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/trudeau-tracker-anti-terrorism-bill-1.3586337.
2. For more information, see http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/liberals-to-repeal-citizenship-law-bill-c-24-immigration-minister/article28861630/.
3. For more information, see http://news.nationalpost.com/news/canada/canadian-politics/barbaric-cultural-practices-bill-to-criminalize-forced-marriage-tackle-honour-killings-set-for-final-vote.
4. However, at the time of writing (February 2018), significant changes to these measures have yet to be made.

phone. And they are far more worried about their speech and research online. MM take more precautions to cover their online activity but are surprisingly less likely than NMM to use passwords on their electronic devices. Findings from this may imply that Muslim men are simply showing that "they have nothing to hide" by not using a passcode.

The responses also show that, over the past seven years, this "chilling effect" has intensified, as MM respondents have become increasingly worried about their rights to privacy and to freedom of speech, thought, and association. While it is true that respondents were being asked to recall how they felt seven years ago (and that memories may be faulty), MMs did report becoming more privacy-conscious with their electronic devices now than in the past. While they still avoided using passcodes, MM said they disabled GPS, disguised internet activity, avoided sharing personal photos and information, and restricted the types of apps and websites used. These findings are not surprising given the increasing intensity of surveillance techniques aimed at Muslims over the past decade and the introduction of controversial laws and bills, the sharia debates from 2003 to 2008, the *hijab* and religious accommodations in Quebec in 2013, the Zero Tolerance for Barbaric Practices (Bill S-7), the dual citizenship bill (Bill C-24), and the anti-terrorism bill (Bill C-51) in 2015. While some of these measures have since been abandoned, they subjected Muslims in Canada to increased attention and scrutiny. These measures will be discussed in more detail below, along with a summary of the findings from Phase 2, the open-ended interviews with Muslim men.

Security certificates. The original goal of this study was to determine the specific impact of security certificates. However, as only half of the participants were familiar with the procedure, security certificates remain relatively unknown among Muslim/Arab communities. The participants who were aware of them, however, were very knowledgeable about the specifics of the certificates and very critical of them. Their arguments mirrored those of many activists, academics, and legal experts in saying that certificates were undemocratic, ineffective, excessive, and infringed on civil liberties.

Other measures. Unlike certificates, all participants reported being aware of other measures aimed at the Muslim/Arab population: Bill C-51, Bill C-24, and Bill S-7. These measures have sparked widespread debate and considerable controversy, and, as noted above, no amendments or repeals were passed during the time period of my study (Hall

2016). Participants contextualized these measures as a pre-emptive response to terrorism, either domestic or abroad. They argued that there is much contention surrounding the definition of exactly what terrorism entails. Most participants felt the term's meaning could vary depending on race, gender, and religion. For example, participants claimed the label "terrorist" was only applied to individuals who are religiously motivated and are of Muslim/Arab background. At the same time, similar crimes committed by non-Muslim/Arabs are defined differently, with labels such as "mentally unstable," as in the case of Anders Breivik or Adam Lanza. If "a White person shoots thirty kids, that's [an act of] terrorism, yet it is labelled as a mental health issue where the person [is] psychologically unfit" (Participant 002).

Media. Security certificates and other policies including Bill C-51 are not stand-alone entities. Rather, participants argued, they work alongside sensationalized media and political rhetoric to promote Islamophobia and fear of the Other. To my surprise, many respondents commented on the role of the media in participants' lives. Almost all criticized the media as promoting a negative, stereotypical view of Muslims and Arabs as terrorists:

> If something happens [and] it is related to terrorism, they [the media] show people … praying in a mosque … [or] a woman in a *hijab* or man in a beard. … For someone who has no knowledge on Islam, they will make that link between mosque and terrorism, Muslim and terrorism. (Participant 033)

Political rhetoric/speech. In addition to the media, the impact of political rhetoric and speeches emerged as a significant theme in responses, with participants feeling it contributed to, if not encouraged, Islamophobia. Participants cited commonly known incidences where politicians used the politics of fear to support political initiatives. The use of words and phrases such as "the major threat is still Islamicism" (CBC 2011), "[the *hijab*] ... is rooted in a culture that is anti-women … that is unacceptable to Canadians, unacceptable to Canadian women" (Chase 2015), and references to mosques as breeding grounds for terrorism (Payton 2015). Such language is "very troublesome for many people" (Participant 046).

Race and citizenship. Findings illustrate that security measures have a disproportionate impact on Muslims versus non-Muslims in this study, but a significant contribution to the literature here is that sur-

veillance and security measures have a disproportionate impact even within Muslim/Arab groups. In fact, Muslims in the study who have citizenship or are second-, third-, or older-generation Canadians do not experience the same discrimination as newcomers or non-citizens. They have grown more assimilated or have become economically, socially, or spatially removed from newcomer experiences, and thus they may not experience measures in the same way. They may also know how to navigate different contexts involving racism or discrimination better. Furthermore, light-skinned Muslims/Arabs often "pass as White" to escape (feared) discrimination. For example, a light-skinned participant stated, "If I weren't White, then I think it would be harder." Ironically, participants shared their concern over being relegated to second-class citizenry, not just because of Bill C-24, which would allow the government to revoke Canadian citizenship from dual citizens convicted of terrorism, but also because of the discrimination experienced in their everyday lives: the institutionalized racism prevalent in media, politics, and society. Thus, although the subjective experiences of Muslim/Arabs varies across race, gender, citizenship, and class, there are still significant barriers experienced as a group.

Behavioural changes. Despite these differences, all Muslim participants reported that they had changed their behaviour, limited their mobility, and presented themselves in ways that enabled them to "blend in" and avoid standing out, online and off-line. In the real world, it is more difficult to cover one's identity, thus the "chill" is more significant and carries broader implications. In fact, to tone down their Muslim/Arab identity, participants choose not to grow their beards too long or wear a *thobe* in public. They also reported urging caution or feeling fearful for female relatives who wear a *hijab*.[5] Participants also reported that they avoid travelling alone at nighttime or hanging out with groups of three or four other Muslim men, as these are, according to proponents of Bill C-51, indicators of behaviours that are deemed suspicious (CCLA 2015). This is particularly true of Muslims who are more "at risk" (i.e., those who do not have full citizenship and/or have darker, stereotypically Muslim/Arab features). Participant 020 advised "making sure the

---

5.   This fear and concern over their female relatives is interesting as it fits in nicely with discourse on Muslim women's bodies. However, this should not be seen as an act of paternalism; rather, given the highly publicized incidents where Muslim women have been attacked and/or have had their hijabs pulled off, the threats against the female Muslim body are very real.

beard is short, and you don't wanna go out with the *thobe* or *kurta* in public." Such changes are necessary, according to participants, because

> there's always that fear of backlash, that fear of being sort of neg-
> atively viewed or treated harshly … . It's not about not being seen
> as a Muslim but [about] not pushing your Muslim identity, not
> living your Muslim identity to the fullest. (Participant 020)

Essentially, participants said, "You have to blend in. Don't stand out" (Participant 042).

Radicalization. Among Muslim participants a growing resentment was reported towards the government for racist and discriminatory messaging. In addition to the fear and paranoia, a poignant "chilling effect" of surveillance and security practices is that, according to the participants, it leads to a sense of helplessness among young Muslims. Although a highly controversial perspective, participants in this study overwhelmingly argued that this helplessness can contribute to radi-calization of young people. This radicalization occurs for a variety of reasons, according to participants. For example, Canadian-born Mus-lim youth have spent a significant part of their lives, since 9/11, facing stereotyping in the media and society. Even newcomers are aware of the Islamophobia, either because of a hate crime in their community or because they have learned of policies such as security certificates, Bill C-51, Bill C-24, or Bill S-7. The presence of intelligence officers (CSIS or RCMP) and informants within mosques have also caused considerable damage to the Muslim communities and their relationships with law enforcement and government.

> [CSIS] come into the mosque where I pray and ask the Brothers
> what they know of me. They contact my co-workers to ask about
> me. They call me at work. They insist that I call them and report
> anything suspicious … . And they talk to my wife if I am not
> home. This is disrespectful. … They basically asked me to co-oper-
> ate, but why should I? So they can harass other innocent Muslims
> too? (Participant 017)

According to participants, such activities lead to young people devel-oping disenchantment with the state, feeling Canada is "against them" or that Canadians are anti-Muslim. These measures resemble "what groups like ISIS and al Qaeda have been trying to say for a long time, which is that, 'Don't you get it? The West is at war with you'" (Partici-

pant 044). Participant 002 said,

> It could go that way, and then they become active [radicalized]. When you're influenced [by security measures], whether you've been confronted by them in the past … [you think,] 'Hey I agree with these guys.' It can go that way—I can become an ISIS fundamentalist—but it's not, I'm not going to do it.

Patriotism. Despite the negative implications of surveillance and security measures on Muslim men's subjective experiences as described above, this research found that Muslim participants are wholeheartedly patriotic—they praised Canadian multiculturalism and conveyed a strong sense of Canadian identity. While some participants said their sense of belonging in Canada is adversely affected by xenophobic practices, a majority of participants said they retain their Canadian identity by using hyphenated identities; for example, "I'm Canadian first and Afghan second" (Participant 013).

Terrorism vs Islam. Notably, near the completion of the interview, almost all participants commented on the contradiction between terrorism and Islam, suggesting frustration with common stereotypes and a desire to "clear" Islam of wrongdoing. Promotion of Islam as a peaceful and tolerant religion led most participants to express hope for the future.

Interpretation of Findings

Survey results indicating an uneven impact of surveillance and security measures on Muslim compared with non-Muslim men in this study is consistent with concerns from groups and scholars who worry that Muslims experience unique consequences as a result of surveillance and security measures. Consequences include suspicion, discrimination, hostility, and attacks. As surveys and related literature indicate, this leads Muslim/Arabs to become more anxious, fearful, insecure, and worried about their personal safety (Abu-Ras and Abu-Bader 2008, 2009; Abu-Ras and Suárez 2009; Alvi 2003; Akram 2002; Brown, Abernethy, Gorsuch, and Dueck 2010; Cainkar 2004, 2010; Council on American-Islamic Relations [CAIR] 2005; MSRG Special Report 2004; Singh 2002). Browne's concept of "racializing surveillance" is also evident as the enactment of surveillance reaffirms the boundaries, borders, and bodies along lines of race (2015, 15). More specific to the Canadian context, findings echo Wilke and Willis' (2008) point that anti-terror-

ism policies in Canada (along with British and American policies) do not have a consistent impact on all individuals. Non-citizens, including Muslims and ethnic minorities, are most affected by "increased surveillance, preventive detention, extraordinary rendition, and similar policies" (Wilke and Willis 2008, 33). The present study is the only known study that compares the experiences of Muslim men to non-Muslim men in the Canadian context. More work on the subjective experiences of each respective group is necessary.

The following interpretation is based on data from the qualitative interviews, as they provide a rich understanding of the impact of security and surveillance measures on Muslim men.

Insecurity of the state. As mentioned in previous chapters, in the field of International Political Sociology, security is about sacrifice: the security of one group means the insecurity of another. In the context of the current study, one can argue that the security of the Canadian state is dependent on the insecurity of Muslim men. One participant said, "Putting out the security certificate targets me and my type of people … [yet] certificates protect them [White people]" (Participant 002). According to participants in this study, the security of non-Muslims promotes the insecurity of Muslims. As previously mentioned, the concept of (in)securitization illustrates the consequences and implications of securitization, including the insecurity produced for both state and citizen (Balzacq et al. 2010). According to participants, this insecurity is promoted through harmful effects of the media and political rhetoric. Participants said that the media and politicians need to "stop singling out the Muslim community … if the government is serious about rooting out terrorism with genuine leaders in the community, and not 'self-proclaimed' leaders who fuel Islamophobic claims, which will lead to more division and polarization" (Participant 030). Essentially the media and politicians are sending a message for Muslims to

> 'Watch out, be careful.' … If I do something vaguely, remotely illegal, I will be deported … .When I see shit like that happening … to actual people that I know, it's unfair, it's sad … . This is injustice because we are innocent. These measures, they just hurt the Muslim community and cause us pain. They don't keep us safe. (Participant 034)

Role of media. The participants claim of media promoting racist stereotypes of Arab/Muslims should not be surprising considering racist

imaginings of the Other are a longstanding element in Western mass media. Muslims are treated as a homogeneous mass that is violent, uncivilized, and inherently opposed to Western ideals.[6] Such depictions are found in news reports (see Dixon and Williams 2015; Nacos and Torres-Reyna 2007; Powell 2011), movies and television (see Alsultany 2012; Shaheen 2009), and even video games (see Dill, Gentile, Richter, and Dill 2005; Šisler 2008).

The result of negative stereotypes, according to participants and researchers, is indeed the cultivation of negative attitudes towards Muslims (e.g. Das, Bushman, Bezemer, Kerkhof, and Vermeulen 2009; Kalkan, Layman, and Uslaner 2009; Nisbet et al. 2009; Saleem and Anderson 2013). Further, according to a recent study, it is the negative attitudes to the Muslim as terrorist that fuel public support for political and military action in Muslim countries (Saleem, Prot, Anderson, and Lemieux 2015). Here we can recall the tropes of "saving Muslim women" from the "dangerous Muslim male" (Abu Lughod 2002). Saleem, Prot, Anderson, and Lemieux (2015) even found a positive association between public exposure to media portrayals of Muslims as terrorists and support for public policies that harm Muslims domestically and internationally.

Further, the exposure of individuals to anti-Muslim media footage has increased perceptions of Muslims as aggressive and increased support for harsh civil restrictions of Muslim Americans (Saleem, Prot, Anderson, and Lemieux 2015). Research studies indicate the association between Muslim/Arabs and terrorism in the media is strong enough that even subtle terrorism cues implicitly activate anti-Muslim/Arab sentiments (see Park, Felix, and Lee 2007; Saleem and Anderson 2013). In fact, even terrorism cues lacking a direct reference to Muslim/Arabs increase implicit bias toward Muslim/Arabs (Saleem and Anderson 2013).

Role of political rhetoric. In addition to the racism presented in the media, participants claim that the use of racist and discriminatory language by politicians is damaging. This is echoed by other scholars. In fact, the National Council of Canadian Muslims (NCCM) and the Canadian Muslim Lawyers' Association (CMLA) were "deeply troubled" by former Prime Minister Stephen Harper's insinuation that mosques are venues where terrorism is advocated or promoted.

---

6.   See *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People* (Media Educ. Found. 2001).

In the United States, anti-Muslim fear politics are more direct. During the 2015–16 American presidential primaries, GOP frontrunners stoked fears of the Muslim with comments such as "I would not advocate that we put a Muslim in charge of this nation" (Pengelly 2015) and that Muslims should be "temporarily" banned from entering the country (Trump 2015). Such language is undoubtedly divisive and has serious ramifications for all Muslims (and those perceived to be Muslim; e.g., Sikhs). For example, a study released by the Bridge Initiative at Georgetown University correlated anti-Muslim attacks on individuals and institutions with anti-Muslim rhetoric in the 2016 presidential campaigns. Their findings indicate that violence directed at Muslims increased after such rhetoric. Specifically, in the nine months prior to the election season there were just two anti-Muslim attacks; this increased to fifty-three such attacks in December 2015 alone, after Republican presidential candidate (and current president) Donald Trump called for a "Muslim ban" following the San Bernadino attacks (Bridge Initiative Team 2016).

Participants claim both the media and political rhetoric are damaging to the everyday experiences of Muslim/Arabs. In addition to media tropes and racist speeches, government initiatives such as security certificates and bills (C-51, C-24, and S-7) (in)directly regulate pre-emptive behaviour, something that all participants were aware of. In fact, discussions with participants give rise to two significant implications of the aforementioned anti-Muslim policies and sentiments: their effect on the subjective experiences of individuals; and their impact on the security of the state (discussed in subsequent sections).

Regulating behaviour through law and policy. That participants are aware of these (proposed) measures and associate them with supporting the same Islamophobic agenda that security certificates present is an interesting finding. The use of vague language by politicians and security practitioners (including law enforcement; e.g., RCMP) in supporting these measures is an essential element in how measures are enforced and perceived. For example, in 2015 the Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA) argued that a lack of consensus on the term "terrorism" and a vague definition offered in the new anti-terrorism act (Bill C-51) will complicate things further. The CCLA argued that one person's peaceful protest in a democratic society may be considered a "terrorism offence in general" by another. The resulting "chilling effects" have been predicted by scholars such as Roach (2011) and

civil liberties groups. The impact of these initiatives is likely to increase fear, anxiety, and insecurity among Muslims (Abu-Ras and Abu-Bader 2008, 2009; Abu-Ras and Suárez 2009; Alvi 2003; Akram 2002; Brown, Abernethy, Gorsuch, and Dueck 2010; Cainkar 2004, 2010; Council on American-Islamic Relations [CAIR] 2005; MSRG Special Report 2004; Singh 2002).

Participants who were aware of security certificates argued (as have activists, academics, and legal experts) that certificates are undemocratic infringements on their civil liberties, as well as being both ineffective and excessive. They saw certificates as politically motivated and based on fearmongering (Aiken 2007; Roach 2011), similar to Bell's (2006) critique that said the same (Aiken 2007; Roach 2011). A distinct contribution from this research is that the critiques are from individuals personally threatened by the procedure: Muslim men who are "at risk." One participant, a permanent resident, said he was worried that "putting out the security certificate targets me and my type of people … [yet] certificates protect them [White people]" (Participant 002). Such a comment speaks to a subtlety of security certificates: their purpose is to illicit fear and compliance; in other words, to govern and make docile the Muslim male population. As argued in earlier chapters, security certificates are a form of biopolitical control.

Internment of psyche. Evidence of these measures as a biopolitical tool is witnessed by participant testimony that Muslim/Arab men avoid travelling alone at night or hanging out in groups of three or four as these are, according to proponents of Bill C-51, indicators of behaviours deemed suspicious (CCLA 2015). This is particularly true of Muslims who are more "at risk" (i.e., those who do not have full citizenship and have darker, stereotypically Muslim/Arab features).

This avoidance of typical, everyday behaviour being translated as "risky" by participants is reminiscent of Naber's term "internment of the psyche" (2006, 240). The term refers to the "culture of fear" that is created by anti-Muslim/Arab policies and sentiments resulting in an "internment of the psyche" within the communities (Naber 2006, 240). As Jamil and Rousseau (2012) suggest, the internalization of fear within minority communities requires further exploration. By providing an ethnographic understanding of how Muslim/Arab men respond to this in the Canadian context, my study details participants' fear of trivial physical characteristics, such as the length of their beards, being racialized and stigmatized. These findings demonstrate precisely how

fear and suspicion of the Other "sticks" to their bodies, rendering them objects of fear, interchangeable with other bodies (Ahmed 2004, 127–8). These findings also demonstrate how the Muslim male desires to be seen as a "good Muslim", avoiding distinctive styles of dress in public. Unlike Ramadan's (2012) "good Muslim" trope, participants here openly practise their religion and are devout in their faith. The difference here, it seems, is that participants need to monitor their outward appearance for reasons of personal safety (e.g., they do not want to be attacked while wearing a *thobe*, as other Muslims have) rather than for reasons of social acceptance and assimilation.

Race and citizenship. The results showing that Muslim male participants view these measures as creating second-class citizenship for some have likewise been documented in scholarly work on Islamophobia and politics. As Butler argues, discourses of Islamophobia and fear work to consolidate a sense of *us* versus *them*, and this mobilizes and consolidates different publics and strategic alliances (2010). According to Grandin (2009), during the neo-liberal era the "security state" manufactures Islamophobia in part to consolidate itself, to weave out and evict the "bad Muslims" from public space (Razack 2008). The result is the creation of a distinct second-class citizenry, a group barred from obtaining the privileges associated with, and considered necessary conditions for, citizenship. Similarly, Volpp argues that since the 9/11 attacks, the exclusion of Muslim Americans from appearing as ordinary Americans has "haunt[ed] their ability to enjoy citizenship as a matter of rights" (2002). Ali's work also describes how Islamophobia is reifying the second-class citizenship status for American Muslims (2012).

Radicalization. As a result of the aforementioned policies and overall experiences of discrimination, many participants predicted that young people will become disenchanted, feeling that Canada is "against them" or that Canadians are anti-Muslim. This is precisely the type of recruitment messaging terrorist groups such as ISIS or al Qaeda use to promote radicalization. The hypothesized connection between intensified surveillance and security practices on youth radicalization within the Canadian Muslim community is an issue urgently requiring further study.

Canadian identity and belonging. The impact of national security measures, including security certificates, Bill C-24, and Bill C-51, on participants' identity and sense of belonging was also identified in oth-

er research. For example, participants' use of hyphenated identities, as in as Participant 013's statement that "I'm Canadian first and Afghan second," is reminiscent of Morrison's argument that the dominant American or Canadian subject is White and that anyone falling outside of that racial identification must add "hyphen after hyphen after hyphen" for permission to apply that title of national belonging (1992, 47). In this study, almost all participants identified not as Canadian but with hyphenated identities. The use of hyphenated identities can be seen through the perspective of work by Cainkar, who suggests that the post-9/11 climate of fear and anxiety threatens Muslim/Arabs' sense of belonging and citizenship (2009). Therefore, Muslims take up a hybrid or hyphenated identity for purposes of social acceptance or to minimize the risks of being identified strictly as an Other. This is plausible, given that Jamil and Rousseau claim that fear and suspicion over their Muslim identities results in an internalization of distrust; having a Muslim-Canadian identity (rather than a strictly Afghan or Muslim identity) provides not only national belonging but also a sense of security, as it diminishes the threat of being an Other (2012).

Similar to present findings, a Fall 2015 Environics Institute survey found that a majority of Muslims reported that they were proud to be Canadian (83 percent), that the treatment of Muslims in Canada is better than in other Western countries (84 percent), and that they are optimistic the new (Liberal) government would lead to improved relations between Muslims and non-Muslims (90 percent) (Environics Institute 2015). However, the survey also reported that the next generation of Muslims will face more discrimination and stereotyping than Muslims do today, noting that one in three Muslims have experienced discrimination (Environics Institute 2015). As both the interviews and Environics survey data demonstrate, the experiences of Muslim Canadians are mixed and cannot be homogenized as entirely positive or negative.

The interviews conducted for this study demonstrate a determination among many Canadian Muslims to embrace positivity and reject xenophobia. But it reminds us that xenophobia is a part of the Canadian fabric, a tribulation that past immigrant groups have experienced and—at least to some extent—overcome (for example, the Chinese, Japanese, Italians, etc.). The fact that participants are aware of their role in society as "political scapegoats" makes this determination even more surprising. Furthermore, their desire for more government engagement and closer dialogue with Muslim communities to address radicalization and violence shows most participants retain some faith in the *bona*

fides of the Canadian state. Participants' calls for greater transparency and accountability, not just for the government towards Muslim groups but also within Muslim communities, and their suggestions that the internet be used to promote a counter-narrative to Islamophobia are further evidence of their engagement (and their recognition of the potential influence the digital world wields).

Despite suggestions in the broader Environics survey that the next generation of Muslims will experience stronger discrimination (2015), the participants in my study were, over all, optimistic. They felt that the shift toward a more liberal government and the increase of Muslim civic engagement would produce fairer and more inclusive representation and, subsequently, more enlightened policies.

Recommendations

The recommendations below are focused on federal policy-making levels because security and surveillance measures (certificates and bills) are produced at the federal level. Some grassroots efforts that could be undertaken by local communities are also suggested. Federal policy changes that take into account the civil liberties and dignity of individuals, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or citizenship, should be considered, and policies that (in)directly target specific groups should undergo reformation.

An important component of such change is the examination of the role of political rhetoric in promoting anti-Muslim sentiment. According to scholars, speech acts are intrinsically linked to security (Balzaq et al. 2010). When political leaders use words like "Islamicism" or make statements that describe places of worship as "breeding grounds for terrorism," the ramifications can lead to further insecurity within both Muslim communities and society in general. Political leaders (and their speechwriters) should be aware of the dangers—for themselves and for the Canadian population at large, whether Muslim or non-Muslim—of such inappropriate labels.

The role of the media in promoting Islamophobia also needs consideration. Findings elsewhere suggest that, rather than the provocative role many outlets (and social media) now play, media could work to counter anti-Muslim attitudes. A more balanced view of Muslims could reduce the perception that Muslims are violent (Bacha 2011). Saleem, Prot, Anderson, and Lemieux suggest even a brief news clips, cartoons, commercials, or films which counter stereotypes can have an impact on

stereotypical assumptions about Muslims and reduce support for anti-Muslim public policies, at least temporarily (2015). Brief counter-stereotypic media messages might be usefully employed in the Canadian context (Bodenhausen et al. 1995; Mastro and Tukachinsky 2012; Power et al. 1996; Ramasubramanian 2007, 2011, 2015 as cited in Saleem et al. 2015).

Finally, the promotion of civic engagement among Muslim communities is essential. A recent Huffington Post article linked the prevalence of the anti-Muslim sentiment to "years of political apathy" among the Muslim community: where voter turnout is below the national average, the author claimed, politicians in a "disengaged electorate" can (and have) used Muslims "as fear bait for a political party to mobilize its base and consolidate power" (Qureshi 2015, online). We do not know if the Muslim population in Canada is similarly disengaged, and the recent 2015 elections did witness a surge in Muslim voter turnout (Nasser 2015). However, the momentum must be actively promoted within and beyond Muslim communities so that the next federal election sees stronger Muslim representation (Qureshi 2015).

Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated the uneven impacts of surveillance and security measures on the Canadian male population in the present study. In particular, this research illustrates the insecurity caused by these measures on the subjective experiences of Muslim men participants. More broadly, this research demonstrates that the insecurity of Muslim men may have consequences for the security of the state.

At a theoretical level, it has been demonstrated that the "chilling effect" caused by anti-terror security measures has contributed to a specific "culture of fear" (Naber 2006) among Muslims respondents. As shown throughout this paper, immigration and anti-terror measures, including security certificates and Bill C-51, Bill C-24, and Bill S-7, have a disproportionate impact on Canadians, with Muslim men experiencing a "chilling effect" on their civil liberties and their sense of identity and belonging. This "chilling effect" may lead to further insecurity for the state, potentially including the radicalization of disengaged youth.

Bibliography

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen. "Liberalism, Multiculturalism and the Problem of Essentialism." *Citizenship Studies* 6, no. 4 (2002): 459–82.

Abu-Ras, Wahiba, and Soleman H. Abu-Bader. "The Impact of the September 11, 2001 Attacks on the Well-being of Arab Americans in New York City." *Journal of Muslim Mental Health* 3 (2008): 217–39.

———. "Risk Factors for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD): The Case of Arab and Muslim-Americans, Post-9/11." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 7 (2009): 393–418.

Abu-Ras, Wahiba, and Zulema E. Suárez. "Muslim Men and Women's Perception of Discrimination, Hate Crimes, and PTSD Symptoms Post 9/11." *Traumatology* 15 no. 3 (2009): 48–63.

Agamben, Giorgio. *State-of-Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Ahmed, Sara. "Affective Economies." *Social Text 79* 22, no. 2 (2004): 117–39.

Ahmed, Sara, Maryam Kia-Keating, and Katherine Tsai. "A Structural Model of Racial Discrimination, Acculturative Stress, and Cultural Resources Among Arab American Adolescents." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 48 (2011): 181–92.

Aiken, Sharryn. "From Slavery to Expulsion: Racism, Canadian Immigration Law and the Unfulfilled Promise of Modern Constitutionalism." In *Interrogating Race and Racism,* edited by Vijay Agnew. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

———. "Of Gods and Monsters: National Security and Canadian Refugee Policy." *Revue québécoise de droit international* 14, no. 1 (2000): 7–36.

Akram, Susan. "The Aftermath of 9/11, 2001: The Targeting of Arabs and Muslims in America." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 24, no. 2/3 (2002): 61–118.

Ali, Yaser. "Shariah and Citizenship: How Islamophobia Is Creating a Second-Class Citizenry in America." *California Law Review*, no.

1027 (2012). http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.
cgi?article=4176&context=californialawreview

Alsultany, Evelyn. *Arabs and Muslims in the Media: Race and Representa-
tion After 9/11*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.

Alvi, Hayat. "The Implications of the September 11th Attacks for the
Muslims in the U.S." *2003*. www.aucegypt.edu/academic/pols/
maye/implications_of_the_September_11.htm.

Amer, Mona, and Joseph Hovey. "Anxiety and Depression in a Post-Sep-
tember 11 Sample of Arabs in the USA." *Social Psychiatry and Psy-
chiatric Epidemiology* 47 (2012): 409–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/
s00127-011-0341-4.

American Civil Liberties Union. "Blocking Faith, Freezing Charity:
Chilling Muslim Charitable Giving in the 'War on Terrorism Financ-
ing.'" New York: ACLU Press, 2009.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and
Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. London: Verso, 1991.

Andreas, Peter, and Thomas Biersteker. *The Re-Bordering of North Amer-
ica*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Arat-Koc, Sedef. "Whose Transnationalism? Canada, 'Clash of Civiliza-
tions' Discourse, and Arab and Muslim Canadians." In *Transnational
Identities and Practices in Canada,* edited by Vic Satzewich and Lloyd
Wong, 216–40. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006.

Attorney Team for Victims of Illegal Investigation Against Muslims. Ex-
tensive and Systematic Surveillance and Profiling of Muslims: Japan's
Violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
2013. http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CCPR/Shared%20Docu-
ments/JPN/INT_CCPR_CSS_JPN_17427_E.pdf.

Avery, Donald. *Dangerous Foreigners: European Immigrant Workers and
Labour Radicalism in Canada, 1896–1932*. Toronto: McClelland and
Stewart, 1979.

Babbie, Earl. *The Practice of Social Research,* 11th ed. Belmont, CA: Wad-
sworth/ Thomson, 2007.

Bacha, Julia. Pay Attention to Nonviolence [video file]. 2011.

https://www.ted.com/talks/julia_bacha?language=en.

Bahdi, Reem. "No Exit: Racial Profiling and Canada's War against Ter-
rorism." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 41, no. 2, 3 (2003): 293–317.

Balibar, Ettienne. "Is There a 'Neo-Racism'?" In *Race, Nation, Class: Am-
biguous Identities,* edited by Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Waller-
stein, 17–28. New York: Verso, 1991.

Ball, Kirstie, and Frank Webster. "The Intensification of Surveillance."

In *The Intensification of Surveillance: Crime, Terrorism and Warfare in the Information Age*, edited by Kirstie Ball and Frank Webster. London: Pluto Press, 2003.

Balzacq, Thierry, Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmenuel-Pierre Guitter, and Christian Olsson. "Security Practices." *International Studies Encyclopaedia* 1–30. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.

Barak-Erez, Daphne. "Terrorism and Profiling: Shifting the Focus from Criteria to Effects." *Tel Aviv University Law Faculty Papers* 91 (2008): 1–9. http://www.tau.ac.il/law/barakerez/articals/cardozo.pdf.

Barnard-Wills, David. *Surveillance and Identity: Discourse, Subjectivity and the State*. Routledge, 2012.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004.

Blanc, F. "*Dissent after September 11: Mobilization of Librarians, ACLU, Cities and Lawyers*." PhD Diss., Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, 2010.

Bell, Colleen. *The Freedom of Security: Governing Canada in the Age of Counter-Terrorism.* Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.

———. "Subject to Exception: Security Certificates, National Security and Canada's Role in the "War on Terror"." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 21, no. 1 (2006): 63–83.

Bell, Derrick. *And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.

Bhabha, Faisal. "Tracking 'Terrorists' or Solidifying Stereotypes? Canada's Anti-Terrorism Act in Light of the Charter's Equality Guarantee." *Windsor Review of Legal and Social Issues* 16 (2003): 95–136.

Bigo, Didier. "Globalized (In)security: The Field and the Ban-Opticon." In *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11,* edited by Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, 10–48. Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2008.

———. "Migration and Security." In *Controlling a New Migration World,* edited by Virginie Guiraudon and Christian Joppke. New York: Routledge, 2001.

———. "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease." *Alternatives* 27 (2002): 63–92.

———. "Security, Exception, Ban and Surveillance." In *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond,* edited by David Lyon Lyon, 46–68. Wilan, 2006.

———. "When Two Become One: Internal and External Securitizations in Europe." In *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European*

Integration: Power, Security and Community, edited by Morten Kelstrup and Michael Charles Williams. London: Routledge, 2000.

Bigo, Didier, and Anastassia Tsouskala. *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

Bodenhausen, Galen, Norbet Schwarz, Herbert Bless, and Michaela Waenke. "Effects of atypical exemplars on racial beliefs: Enlightened racism or generalized appraisals?" *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 31 (1995): 48–63.

Bornstein, Avram. "Antiterrorist Policing in New York City after 9/11: Comparing Perspectives on a Complex Process." *Human Organization* 64, no. 1 (2005), 52–61.

Borovoy, Alan. *Categorically Incorrect: Ethical Fallacies in Canada's War on Terror*. Toronto: The Dundurn Group, 2006.

Bowling, Ann. *Research Methods in Health*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997.

Bridge Initiative Team. *Violence & the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election.* 2016. Georgetown University. http://bridge.georgetown.edu/infographic/anti-muslim-violence-the-2016-u-s-presidential-election/.

Brown, Allen, Alexis Abernethy, Richard Gorsuch, and Alvin Dueck. "Sacred Violations, Perceptions of Injustice, and Anger in Muslims." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 40 (2010): 1003–27.

Browne, Simone. *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2015.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Basic Books, 1992.

Bryman, Alan. Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research* 6, no. 1 (2006): 97–113.

Burgess, J. Peter. *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Burke, Anthony. *Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence: War Against the Other*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Burns, Nancy, and Susan K. Grove. *The Practice of Nursing Research Conduct, Critique, & Utilization*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders and Co., 1997.

Butler, Judith. *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* London: Verso, 2010.
———. Precarious Life: Powers and Mourning and Violence. London: Verso, 2004.

Byrne, S. "Framing Post-9/11 Security: Tales of State Securitization and of the Experiences of Muslim Communities." In *Locating Global Or-*

der: American power and Canadian security after 9/11, edited by Bruno Charbonneau and Wayne Cox. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010.

Cainkar, Louis. *Homeland Insecurity: The Arab American and Muslim American Experience after 9/11.* New York, NY: Russell Sage, 2009.

Campos, Joseph. *The State and Terrorism: National Security and the Mobilization of Power*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Canada. *Proceedings of the First Session of the 37th Parliament of Canada*. 137.79–137.95. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publications, 2004.

Canadian Islamic Congress. *Anti-Islam in the Media 2003*. 2003.

CBC News. "Harper says 'Islamicism' biggest threat to Canada." 6 September 2011. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2011/09/06/harper-911-terrorism-islamic-interview.html.

CBSA. "Departmental Performance Report, 2003–2004." Ottawa: Canada Border Services Agency, 2004.

Chase, Steven. "Niqabs 'rooted in a culture that is anti-women,' Harper says." *Globe and Mail*, 10 March 2015, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/niqabs-rooted-in-a-culture-that-is-anti-women-harper-says/article23395242/.

Cheran, Rainford. "Xeno racism and international migration." *Refuge* 19, no. 6 (2001): 1–3.

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,* edited by Ronald Daniels, Patrick Macklem, and Kent Roach. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Cohen, Tannis. "*Race Relations and Law*." Toronto: Canadian Jewish Congress, 1987.

Cole, David, and James X. Dempsey. *Terrorism and the Constitution: Sacrificing Civil Liberties in the Name of National Security*. New York: The New Press, 2006.

Council on American–Islamic Relations. *The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States: Unequal Protection*. Washington, DC, 2005. http://www.cair.com/CivilRights/CivilRightsReports/2005Report.aspx.

Creswell, John. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Research,* 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Pearson Education, 2005.

———. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.

Creswell, John, and Dana Miller. 2002. "Determining validity in quali-

tative inquiry." *Theory into Practice* 39, no. 3 (2002): 124–30.

Creswell, John, Vicki L. Plano Clark, David Gutmann, and William Hanson. "Advanced Mixed Methods Research Designs." In *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research,* edited by Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie, 209–40. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003.

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*? Ottawa: Status of Women Canada, 2007.

Crotty, Michael. *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.

Dandeker, Christopher. *Surveillance, Power and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

Das, Enny, Brad J. Bushman, Marieke D. Bezemer, Peter Kerkhof, and Ivar E. Vermeulen. "How Terrorism News Reports Increase Prejudice Against Outgroups: A Terror Management Account." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 45 (2009): 453–9.

Davies, Alysia. "Invading the Mind: The Right to Privacy and the Definition of Terrorism in Canada." *University of Ottawa Law and Technology Journal* (2006): 249–52.

Davies, Marianne. "Unequal Protection Under the Law: Re Charkaoui and the Security Certificate Process under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act." *Saskatchewan Law Review*, 69, no. 2 (2006): 375.

Delgado, Richard. "Rodrigo's Eight Chronicle: Black Crime, White Fears: On the Social Construction of Threat." *Virginia Law Review* 80, no. 503 (1994).

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press, 2001.

Dench, Janet. "Detention Statistics." *Email to CCRList.* 23 March 2004.

Denzin, Norman, and Yvonna Lincoln. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2005.

Diab, Robert. *Guantanamo North: Terrorism and the Ddministration of Justice in Canada*. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2008.

Dill, Karen E., Douglas A. Gentile, William A. Richter, and Jody C. Dill. "Violence, Sex, Race, and Age in Popular Video Games: A Content Analysis." In *Featuring Females: Feminist Analyses of the Media*, edited by Ellen Cole and J. Henderson Daniel, 115–30. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2005.

Dixon, L. Travis, and Charlotte L. Williams. "The Changing Misrepre-

sentation of Race and Crime on Network and Cable News." *Journal of Communication* 65 (2015): 24–39.

Drache, Daniel. *Borders Matter: Homeland Security and the Search for North America*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2004.

Dobrowolsky, Alexandra. "(In)Security and Citizenship: Security, Im/migration and Shrinking Citizenship Regimes." *Theoretical Inquiries into Law* 8, no. 2 (2007): 628–62.

Duffy, Maureen T., and Rene Provost. "Constitutional Canaries and the Elusive Quest to Legitimize Security Detentions in Canada." *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 40, no. 3 (2009): 531.

Dyzenhaus, David. "The Permanence of the Temporary: Can Emergency Powers be Normalized?" In *The Security of Freedom: Essays on Canada's Anti-terrorism Bill*, edited by Ronald Daniels, Patrick Macklem, and Kent Roach, 21–38. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Elliott, J. L., and Augie Fleras. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race and Ethnic and Aboriginal Dynamics in Canada,* 2nd ed. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada, 1996.

Ely, M., et al. *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles within Circles*. London, RoutledgeFalmer, 1991.

Environics Institute. "Survey on Muslims in Canada." Toronto, 2015. http://environicsinstitute.org/404.htm?aspxerrorpath=/institute-projects/current-projects/survey-muslims-canada.

Ericson, Richard. *Crime in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity, 2007.

Ericson, Richard, and Kevin Haggerty. *Policing the Risk Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Esposito, John L., and Ibrahim Kalin. *Islamophobia: The Challenge of Pluralism in the 21st Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Ewing, Katherine P. *Being and Belonging: Muslims in the United States since 9/11*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 2008.

Fekete, Liz. "Anti-Muslim Racism and the European Security State." *Race & Class* 46, no. 1 (2004): 3–29.

Finn, Rachel L. "Surveillant Staring: Race and the Everyday Surveillance of South Asian Women after 9/11." *Surveillance and Society* 8, no. 4 (2011): 413–26.

Ford, Richard. "The Boundaries of Race: Political Geography in Legal Analysis." *Harvard Law Review* 107 (1994): 1841–1921.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979*, edited by Michael Sennelart, Francois Ewald, and Alessandro Fontana. Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008.

———. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane, 1977.

———. "Security, Territory, and Population." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth,* edited by Paul Rabinow et al., 67–71. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Freilich, Joshua D., Matthew Opesso, and Graeme Newman. "Immigration, Security and Civil Liberties Post 9/11: A Comparison of American, Australian and Canadian Legislative Changes." In *Migration, Culture Conflict and Terrorism,* edited by Joshua D. Freilich and Rob T. Guerette, 49–69. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Gandy, Oscar H. "Engaging Rational Discrimination: Exploring Reasons for Placing Regulatory Constraints on Decision Support Systems." *Ethics and Information Technology* 12, no. 1 (2010): 29–42.

———. *The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

———. "Quixotics Unite! Engaging the Pragmatists on Rational Discrimination." In *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond,* edited by David Lyon, 318–36. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing, 2006.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Gilroy, Paul. *Between Camps: Race, Identity and Nationalism.* London: Penguin, 2000.

Giroux, Henry A. "Post-colonial Ruptures and Democratic Possibilities: Multiculturalism as Anti-racist Pedagogy." *Cultural Critique* 21 (1992): 5–39.

Government of Canada. *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, S.C. 2001 c. 27.* 2001.

Graham, Stephen. "Spaces of Surveillant Simulation: New Technologies, Digital Representations, and Material Geographies." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 16 (1998): 483–504.

Grandin, Greg. *Empire's Workshop: Latin America, the United States and the Rise of New Imperialism.* New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, 2009.

Green, Jennifer C., and Valerie J. Caracelli. "Advances in Mixed-Method Evaluation: The Challenges and Benefits of Integrating Diverse Paradigms." In *New Directions for Evaluation*, edited by American Evaluation Association. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Green, Jennifer C., Valerie J. Caracelli, and Wendy F. Graham. "Toward a Conceptual Framework for Mixed-Method Evaluation Designs." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 11, no. 3 (1989): 255–74.

Grewal, Inderpal. "Transnational America: Race, Gender and Citizen-

ship after 9/11." *Social Identities*, 9, no. 4 (2003): 535–61.

Gross, Samuel R., and D. Livingston. "Racial Profiling under Attack." *Columbia Law Review* 102, no. 5 (2003), 101–26.

Guba, Egon G. "The Alternative Paradigm Dialog." In *The Paradigm Dialog*, edited by Egon G. Guba, 17–30. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990.

Hacking, Ian. *Representing and Intervening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Haggerty, Kevin D., and Richard V. Ericson. *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Hall, Chris. "Trudeau Tracker: Promised Changes to Anti-terrorism Law C-51 Still Months Away." CBC News, 17 May 2016. http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/trudeau-tracker-anti-terrorism-bill-1.3586337.

Harris, Cheryl I. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8 (1993): 1707–91. http://www.abheritage.ca/albertans/speeches/king_1.html.

Harris, David B. "Is Canada Losing the Battle Between Liberty and Security?" In *Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States*, edited by Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott, 29–159. Vancouver: Fraser Institute, 2008.

Heer, Jeet. "The Line Between Terrorism and Mental Illness." *The New Yorker*, 25 October 2014. http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/line-terrorism-mental-illness.

Helly, Denise. "Are Muslims Discriminated Against in Canada Since September 2001?" *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal* 36, no. 1 (2004): 24–48.

Hesse, Mary B. *Revolutions and Reconstructions in the Philosophy of Science*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980.

Horn, Gayle. "Online Searches and Offline Challenges: The Chilling Effect, Anonymity and the New FBI Guidelines." *New York University Annual Survey of American Law* 60 (2005): 735–78.

Huysmans, Jef. "Security! What do you mean?" *European Journal of International Relations* 4 (1998): 226–55.

International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group [ICLMG]. *In the Shadow of the Law*. 14 May 2003. http://www.law.hku.hk/ccpl/Docs/14062003b-iclmg.pdf.

Ivankova, Nataliya V., John W. Creswell, and Sheldon Stick. "Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice." *Field Methods* 18, no. 1 (2006): 3–20.

Jackson, Patrick T. *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations.* London: Routledge, 2010.

Jacobsen, Katja. "Making Design Safe for Citizens: A Hidden History of Humanitarian Experimentation." *Citizenship Studies* 14, no. 1 (2010): 89–103.

Jacobson, David. *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Jakubowski, Lisa. "Managing Canadian Immigration: Racism, Ethnic Selectivity, and the Law." In *Locating Law, Race/Class/Gender Connections,* edited by Elizabeth Comack et al. Halifax: Fernwood, 1999.

Jamil, Uzma, and Cécile Rousseau. "Subject Positioning, Fear, and Insecurity in South Asian Muslim Communities in the War on Terror Context." *Canadian Sociological Association* 49, no. 4 (2012): 370–88.

Janz, Nancy, Marc A. Zimmerman, Patricia A. Wren, Barbara A. Israel, Nicholas Freudenberg, and Rosalind J. Carter. "Evaluation of 37 AIDS Prevention Projects: Successful Approaches and Barriers to Program Effectiveness." *Health Education Quarterly 23*, no. 1 (1996): 80–97.

Jiwani, Yasmin. "Trapped in the Carceral Net: Race, Gender and the 'War on Terror.'" *Journal of Global Media Studies* 4, no. 2 (2011), 13–31.

———. "Violating In/Visibilities: Honor Killings and Interlocking Surveillances." In *Theorizing Feminist Surveillance Studies,* edited by Shoshana Amielle Magnet and Rachel Dubrofsky, 79–93. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2015.

Kalkan, Kerem O., Geoffrey C. Layman, and Eric M. Uslaner. "Bands of Others? Attitudes toward Muslims in Contemporary American Society." *Journal of Politics* 71 (2009): 847–62.

Kinnick, Mary, and Ken Kempner. "Beyond 'Front Door' Access: Attaining the Bachelor's Degree." *Research in Higher Education* 29, no. 4 (1988): 299–317.

Klassen, Cecil, and Barbara Burnaby. "'Those Who Know': Views on Literacy among Adult Immigrants in Canada." *TESOL Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (1993): 377–97.

Konrad, Victor, and Heather Nicol. *Beyond Walls: Re-inventing the Canada–United States Borderlands.* London: Ashgate, 2008.

La Raja, Raymond. "Does Transparency of Political Activity Have a Chilling Effect on Participation?" Paper presented at the Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, 31 March–3 April 2011.

Larsen, Mike. "Governing Non-citizens as Security Threats: Canada's Security Certificate Regimes." Unpublished CPSA-ACSP paper, 2008. http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2008/Larsen.pdf.

———. "Governing Non-Citizens as Security Threats: Canada's Security Certificate Regime." Presentation at the YCISS Violent Interventions Conference, Toronto, ON, 2008.

———. "Talking About Terrorism: An Analysis of Official Canadian Insecurity Narratives in the Post-September 11 Context." PhD diss., University of Ottawa, Ottawa, 2006.

Larsen, Mike, and Justin Piché. "Exceptional State, Pragmatic Bureaucracy, and Indefinite Detention: The Case of the Kingston Immigration Holding Centre." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 24, no. 2 (2009): 203–29.

Larsen, Mike, Sophie Harkat, and Mohamed Harkat. "Justice in Tiers: Security Certificate Detention in Canada." *Journal of Prisoners on Prison* 17, no. 2 (2008): 31–46.

Likert, Rensis. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes." *Archives of Psychology* 140 (1932): 1–55.

Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Egon Guba. "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences Revisited." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research,* edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 97–128. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2011.

López, Ian Haney. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York University Press: New York, 1996.

Lyon, David. "Airport Screening, Surveillance, and Social Sorting: Canadian Responses to 9/11 in Context." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48, no. 3 (2006): 397–411.

———. *The Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society.* London: Polity, 1994.

———. "An Electronic Panopticon? A Sociological Critique of Surveillance Theory." *Sociological Review* 41, no. 4 (1993): 653–78.

———. "Everyday Surveillance: Personal Data and Social Classifications." *Information, Communication, and Society* 5 (2002), 242–57.

———. "Filtering Flows, Friends, Enemies." In *Politics at the Airport,* edited by Mark B. Salter, 29–50. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

———. *Surveillance After September 11.* London: Polity, 2003.

———. "Surveillance, Security and Social Sorting: Emerging Research Priorities." *International Criminal Justice Review* 17, no. 3 (2007), 161–70.

———. *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press, 2001.

Lyon, David, and David Murakami Wood. "Security, Surveillance, and

Sociological Analysis." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 49, no. 4 (2012): 317–27.

Macklin, Audrey. "Borderline Security." In *The Security of Freedom: Essays on Canada's Anti-Terrorism Bill*, edited by R. J. Daniels, Patrick Macklem, and Kent Roach, 383–99. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Magnet, Shoshana A. *When Biometrics Fail: Culture, Technology, and the Business of Identity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.

Maira, Sunaina M. *Missing: Youth, Citizenship and Empire after 9/11*. Durham and London: Duke Press, 2009.

Mamdani, Mahmood. "Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: A Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 3 (2002): 766–75.

———. *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War and the Roots of Terror.* New York: Pantheon Books, 2004.

Marshall, Thomas. H. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1950.

Marx, Gary T. "What's New About the "New Surveillance"? Classifying for Change and Continuity." *Surveillance & Society* 1, no. 1 (2002): 9–29.

Mastro, Dana. E., and Riva Tukachinsky. "The influence of media exposure on the formation, activation, and application of racial/ethnic stereotypes." In *The International Encyclopedia of Media Studies, Media Effects/Media Psychology, vol. 5*, edited by Erica Scharrer, 295–315. Boston, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Mertens, Donna, M. *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods.* 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2010.

Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1994.

Moghaddam, Fathali, Benjamin R. Walker, and Rom Harre. "Cultural Distance, Levels of Abstraction, and the Advantages of Mixed Methods." In *Handbook on Mixed Methods in the Behavioral and Social Sciences,* edited by Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie, 51–89. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003.

Monahan, Torin. "Editorial: Surveillance and Inequality." *Surveillance & Society* 5, no. 3 (2008): 217–26.

Morrison, Toni. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination.* New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Morse, Janice M. "Approaches to Qualitative–Quantitative Method-

ological Triangulation." *Nursing Research* 40 (1991): 120–3.

MSRG Special Report. *Restrictions on Civil Liberties, Views of Islam, and Muslim Americans.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2004. http://www.comm.cornell.edu/msrg/report1a.pdf.

Muller, Benjamin. "(Dis)Qualified Bodies: Securitization, Citizenship and 'Identity Management'." *Citizenship Studies* 8, no. 3 (2004): 279–94.

———. "Unsafe at Any Speed? Borders, Mobility and 'Safe Citizenship'." *Citizenship Studies* 14, no. 1 (2010): 75–88.

Naber, Nadine. "The Rules of Forced Engagement: Race, Gender and the Culture of Fear Among Arab Immigrants in San Francisco Post 9/11." *Cultural Dynamics* 18, no. 3 (2006): 235–67.

Nacos, Brigitte, and Oscar Torres-Reyna. *Fueling Our Fears: Stereotyping, Media Coverage, and Public Opinion of Muslim Americans*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.

Naghibi, Nima. *Rethinking Global Sisterhood: Western Feminism and Iran.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

Nasser, Shanifa. "Muslim Canadian Federal Election Turnout Driven by Fact 'So Much Was at Stake." *CBC News*, 20 November 2015. http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/muslim-voter-turnout-canada-election-1.3327060.

Neuman, Lawrence. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* 7th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2009.

Nisbet, Erik, Ronald Ostman, and James Shanahan. "Public Opinion Toward Muslim Americans: Civil Liberties and the Role of Religiosity, Ideology, and Media Use." In *Muslims in Western Politics*, edited by Abdulkader H. Sinno, 161–99. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009.

Nyers, Peter. "Abject Cosmopolitanism: The Politics of Protection in the Anti-deportation Movement." *Third World Quarterly* 24 (2003): 1069–93.

———. *Securitizations of Citizenship*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

O'Connor, Alexander, and Farhana Jahan. "Under Surveillance and Overwrought: American Muslims' Emotional and Behavioral Responses to Government Surveillance." *Journal of Muslim Mental Health* 8, no. 1 (2014): 95–106.

Park, Jaihyun, Karla Felix, and Grace Lee. "Implicit Attitudes Toward Arab-Muslims and the Moderating Effects of Social Information." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29 (2007): 35–45.

Payton, Laura. "Muslim Groups 'Troubled' by Stephen Harper's

Mosque Remark." *CBC News*, 2 February 2015. http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/muslim-groups-troubled-by-stephen-harper-s-mosque-remark-1.2940488.

PEN America. *Chilling Effects: NSA Surveillance Drives US Writers to Self-Censor.* New York, NY: PEN American Center, 2013.

Pengelly, Martin. "Ben Carson Says No Muslim Should Ever Become US President." *The Guardian*, 20 September 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/sep/20/ben-carson-no-muslim-us-president-trump-obama.

Peoples, Columba, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Powell, Kimberly A. "Framing Islam: An Analysis of U.S. Media Coverage of Terrorism Since 9/11." *Communication Studies* 62 (2011): 90–112.

Power, J. Gerard, Sheila T. Murphy, and Gail Coover. "Priming Prejudice: How Stereotypes and Counter-Stereotypes Influence Attribution of Responsibility and Credibility Among Ingroups and Outgroups." *Human Communication Research* 23 (1996): 36–58.

Pratt, Anna. *Securing Borders: Detention and Deportation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.

Qureshi, Aurangzeb. "Stephen Harper's Islamophobia is a Product of Canadian Muslim Apathy." *Huffington Post*, 11 September 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/aurangzeb-qureshi/stephen-harper-islamophobia_b_8120374.html.

Rabinow, Paul, and Nikolas Rose. "Biopower Today." *Biosciences* 1 (2006): 195–217.

Ramadan, Tariq. "Good Muslim, Bad Muslim." *New Statesman*, 139 (2010): 22–5.

Ramasubramanian, Srividya. "The Impact of Stereotypical Versus Counterstereotypical Media Exemplars on Racial Attitudes, Causal Attributions, and Support for Affirmative Action." *Communication Research* 38 (2011): 497–516.

———. "Media-Based Strategies to Reduce Racial Stereotypes Activated by News Stories." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 84 (2007): 249–64.

———. "Using Celebrity News Stories to Effectively Reduce Racial/Ethnic Prejudice." *Journal of Social Issues* 71 (2015): 123–38.

Razack, Sherene. *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law & Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

———. "The 'Sharia Law Debate' in Ontario: The Modernity/Premodernity Distinction in Legal Efforts to Protect Women from Culture."

Feminist Legal Studies 15 (2007): 3–32.

Rippy, Alyssa, and Elana Newman. "Perceived Religious Discrimination and its Relationship to Anxiety and Paranoia among Muslim Americans." *Journal of Muslim Mental Health* 1 (2006): 5–20.

Roach, Kent. *The 9/11 Effect: Comparative Counter-Terrorism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Rossman, Gretchen B., and Bruce L. Wilson. "Numbers and Words: Combing Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in a Single Large-Scale Evaluation Study." *Evaluation Review* 9, no. 5 (1985): 627–43.

Rubenstein, William. "The Real Story of U.S. Hate Crimes Statistics: An Empirical Analysis." *Tulane Law Review* 78 (2004): 1213–46.

Ruby, Jay. 1980. "Exposing Yourself: Reflexivity, Anthropology, and Film." *Semiotica* 30, no. 1–2 (1980): 153–79.

Runnymede Trust, The. *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All*. London: Runnymede Trust, 1997.

Ryan, Anne. "Post-positivist Approaches to Research." In *Researching and Writing Your Thesis: A Guide for Postgraduate Students,* edited by M. Antonesa, H. Fallon, A. B. Ryan, A. Ryan, T. Walsh, and L. Borys, 12–26. Kildare, Ireland: MACE: Maynooth Adult and Community Education, 2006.

Said, Edward. *Covering Islam.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

———. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Saleem, Muniba, and Craig Anderson. "Arabs as Terrorists: Effects of Stereotypes Within Violent Contexts on Attitudes, Perceptions, and Affect." *Psychology of Violence* 3 (2013): 84–99.

Saleem, Muniba, Sarah Prot, Craig Anderson, and Anthony F. Lemieux. "Exposure to Muslims in Media and Support for Public Policies Harming Muslims." *Communication Research* 44, no. 6 (2015) 1–29.

Salter, Mark B. "Passports, Mobility, and Security: How Smart Can the Border Be?" *International Studies Perspectives* 5 (2004): 71–91.

Sampat-Mehta, Ramdeo. "First Fifty Years of South Asian Immigration: A Historical Perspective." In *South Asians in the Canadian Mosaic*, edited by Rabindra Kanungo. Montréal: Kala Bharati, 1984.

Schauer, Frederick. "Fear, Risk and the First Amendment: Unraveling the Chilling Effect." *Faculty Publications*, Paper 879, 1978. http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/facpubs/879.

Schratz, Michael, and Rob Walker. *Research as Social Change: New Possibilities for Qualitative Research.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Shacklock, Geoffrey, and John Smyth. *Being Reflexive in Critical Educational and Social Research*. London: Falmer Press, 1998.

Shaheen, Jack. *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2009.

Simmons, A. *Immigration and Canada: Global and Transnational Perspectives*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2010.

Simon, Alan B. "The Return of Panopticism: Supervision, Subjection and the New Surveillance." *Surveillance & Society* 3, no. 1 (2005): 1–20.

Singh, A. "We Are Not the Enemy: Hate Crimes Against Arabs, Muslims, and Those Perceived to Be Arab or Muslim after September 11." Human Rights Watch Report 14, no. 6. New York, NY: Human Rights Watch, 2002.

Šisler, Vit. "Digital Arabs: Representation in Video Games." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 11 (2008): 203–20.

Sjoberg, Laura, and Jeffrey Horowitz. "Quantitative Methods." In *Critical Approaches to Security: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*, edited by Laura Shepherd, 113–17. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.

Slife, Brent, and Richard N. Williams. *What's Behind the Research: Discovering Hidden Assumptions in the Behavioral Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.

Smith, Jane. "Islam in America," in *Muslims in the West after 9/11: Religion, Politics and Law*, edited by Jocelyne Cesari, 28–42. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Spalek, Basia, and Lambert, Bob. "Muslim Communities under Surveillance." *Criminal Justice Matters* 68, no. 1 (2007): 12–13.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 271–313. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.

———. "A Conversation with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: Politics and the Imagination." Interview by Jenny Sharpe. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28, no. 2 (2003): 609–24.

Stasiulis, Daiva, and Abigail Bakan. *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Tashakkori, Abbas, and Charles Teddlie. "Introduction to Mixed Method and Mixed Model Studies in the Social and Behavioral Science." In *The Mixed Methods Reader*, edited by John Creswell and Vicki L. Plano Clark, 7–26. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008.

———. "Major Issues and Controversies in the Use of Mixed Methods in the Social and Behavioural Sciences." In *Handbook on Mixed Methods in the Behavioual and Social Sciences*, edited by Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie, 3–50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003.

———. *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.

Tator, Carol, and Frances Henry. *Racial Profiling in Canada: Challenging the Myth of a Few Bad Apples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Taylor, K. W. "Racism in Canadian Immigration Policy." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 23, no. 1 (1991): 1–20.

Thobani, Sunera. *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2007.

Tirman, John. *The Maze of Fear: Security and Migration after 9/11*. New York: The New Press, 2004.

Toronto Police Services. *Annual Hate/Bias Crime Statistical Report.* Toronto Police: Toronto, 2015.

Torpey, John. *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos. *Becoming Multicultural: Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012.

Troyer, Loon. "Counterterrorism: Sovereignty, Law, Subjectivity." *Critical Asian Studies* 35 (2003): 259–76.

Trump, Donald. "Donald Trump Statement on Preventing Muslim Immigration." 2015. https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/donald-j.-trump-statement-on-preventing-muslim-immigration.

Valverde, Mariana, and Michael Mopas. "Insecurity and the Dream of Targeted Governance." In *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces,* edited by Wendy Larner and William Walters, 233–50. London: Routledge, 2004.

Viscusi, W. Kip, and Richard Zeckhauser. *Sacrificing Civil Liberties to Reduce Terrorism Risks: Discussion Paper No. 401*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Law School, 2003.

Volpp, Leti. "The Citizen and the Terrorist." *UCLA Law Review* 49 (2002): 1575–6.

Wæver, Ole. "Security, Insecurity and Asecurity in the West-European Non-War Community." In *Security Communities,* edited by Emmanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, 69–118. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Walby, Randy K., and Sean Hier. "Securing Citizenship: Identity Cards, Secure Passports, and Border Surveillance in Canada." In *Anti-Terrorism: Security and Insecurity after 9/11*, edited by Sandra Rollings-Maggnusson, 125–38. Halifax: Fernwood, 2009.

Waldman, Lorne. *Immigration Law and Practice.* Markham: LexisNexis Butterworths, 2004.

Walzer, Michael. *Spheres of Justice*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Warwick, Shelley. "Will the Academy Survive 9/11? Scholarship, Security, and United States Government Policy." *Government Information Quarterly* 22 (2005): 573–93.

Weber, Cynthia. "Reconsidering Statehood: Examining the Sovereignty/Intervention Boundary." *Review of International Studies* 18, no. 3 (1992): 199–216.

Weinfeld, Morton, and Lori A. Wilkinson. "Immigration, Diversity and Minority Communities." In *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, edited by Peter S. Li, 57–87. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Werbner, Pnina. "Veiled Interventions in Pure Space: Honour, Shame and Embodied Struggles among Muslims in Britain and France." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24, no. 2 (2007): 161–86.

Whitaker, Reg. *Canadian Immigration Policy Since Confederation*. Toronto: York University, 1991.

———. "Cold War Alchemy: How America, Britain and Canada Transformed Espionage into Subversion." *Intelligence and National Security* 15, no. 2 (2000): 177–210.

———. "How Canada Confronts Terrorism: Canadian Responses to 9/11 in Historical and Comparative Context." In *Understanding Terror: Perspectives for Canadians*, edited by Karim-Aly S. Kassam. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2010.

———. "Keeping Up with the Neighbours: Canadian Responses to 9/11 in Historical and Comparative Context." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 41, no. 2–3 (2003): 241–65.

Wilke, Christian, and Paula Willis. "The Exploitation of Vulnerability: Dimensions of Citizenship and Rightlessness in Canada's Security Certificate Legislation." *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice* 26 (2008).

Wolfers, Arnold. "National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol." *Political Science Quarterly* 67, no. 4 (1952): 481–502.

Appendix 1

Phase 1, Survey

Who am I? This research is being conducted by Tabasum Akseer (PhD Candidate, Cultural Studies Program, Queen's University) under the supervision of Sharry Aiken, Associate Professor in the Faculty of Law and Cultural Studies Program, and David Lyon, Professor in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Law and Cultural Studies Program, at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

What if I have concerns? Any questions about study participation may be directed to Tabasum Akseer (905-347-3553 or t.akseer@queensu.ca); project supervisors, Sharry Aiken (613-533-6000 ext. 78007 or aiken@queensu.ca) and/or David Lyon (613-533-6000 ext 74489 or lyond@queensu.ca). Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081. This research has received ethical clearance from Queen's GREB.

Demographic questions

Age: _____ Gender: _____
Marital status: _____ Citizenship status: _____

Length of time in Canada: ___(years) Religious orientation: (optional)
Ethnicity:_____ Occupation: (optional)_____

1. Have you ever been stopped or questioned by government and/or law enforcement officials?   Yes ☐   No ☐
    a. If yes, how comfortable were you with the experience? (select one)
       ☐ Very comfortable, it was routine,   ☐ somewhat comfortable though it was unexpected,   ☐ not comfortable at all,   ☐ confused, violated, or discriminated

   b. How satisfied were you with that experience?
       ☐ very satisfied,   ☐ satisfied'   ☐ somewhat satisfied
       ☐ not satisfied at all,   ☐ confused

2. Have any family, friends or community members been stopped
    or questioned by law enforcement officials?   Yes ☐   No ☐
    a. If yes, do you know if that experience was: (select one)
        ☐ Very comfortable, it was routine,   ☐ somewhat
        comfortable though it was an unexpected,   ☐ not
        comfortable at all ,   ☐ confusing, or otherwise prob-
        lematic
    b. How satisfied was he/she with that experience?
        ☐ very satisfied,   ☐ satisfied,   ☐ somewhat satisfied
        ☐ not satisfied at all,   ☐ confused

3. Do you feel you receive equal treatment during experiences
    involving government and/or law enforcement agencies (i.e.
    RCMP, CSIS, regional police)?
                ☐ all the time,   ☐ sometimes,   ☐ occasionally
                ☐ seldom,   ☐ never

4. Bill C-13 allows telecommunication companies to provide per-
    sonal information on Canadians to the government and/or law
    enforcement. Are you:
                ☐ very worried,   ☐ worried,   ☐ somewhat worried
                ☐ not too worried,   ☐ not worried at all,   ☐ unsure

5. Bill C-51 is a law designed to "encourage and facilitate infor-
    mation sharing between Government of Canada institutions in
    order to protect Canada against activities that undermine the
    security of Canada." Bill C-51 lowers the threshold for arrest,
    criminalizes the promotion of terrorism, allow CSIS to disrupt
    suspected terror activities, remove terrorist material from the
    Internet, allow for court proceedings to be sealed, and expand
    the no-fly list. Are you:
                ☐ very worried,   ☐ worried,   ☐ somewhat worried
                ☐ not too worried,   ☐ not worried at all,   ☐ unsure

6. How well do you think the Canadian government is doing in
    securing Canadians from the threat of terrorism?
                ☐ very well,   ☐ well,   ☐ somewhat well,   ☐ not too
                well,   ☐ not well at all,   ☐ unsure

7. Please answer true (T) or false (F) to the following questions:
    a. The government and/or law enforcement monitors the

activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me   ☐ T   ☐ F

b.   The government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes   ☐ T   ☐ F

c.   Most Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices   ☐ T   ☐ F

d.   Surveillance is necessary for Canadian national security and the war on terror   ☐ T   ☐ F

e.   Data monitoring and collection is necessary for national security and the war on terror   ☐ T   ☐ F

f.   Surveillance is something that all governments conduct on their citizens   ☐ T   ☐ F

g.   It is ok to restrict personal liberties for national security   ☐ T   ☐ F

h.   Canadians are uninformed of the government's collection of citizens' private data   ☐ T   ☐ F

i.   Canadians should openly discuss information on the government's collection and monitoring of data ☐ T   ☐ F

j.   The government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs with the public   ☐ T   ☐ F

k.   I am well informed of the government's national security initiatives and measures   ☐ T   ☐ F

8.   Seven years ago (pre-2008), how would you have responded to the same questions? (T) or (F)

a.   The government and/or law enforcement monitors the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me   ☐ T   ☐ F

b.   The government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes   ☐ T   ☐ F

c.   Most Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices   ☐ T   ☐ F

d.   Surveillance is necessary for Canadian national security and the war on terror   ☐ T   ☐ F

e.   Data monitoring and collection is necessary for national security and the war on terror   ☐ T   ☐ F

f.   Surveillance is something that all governments conduct on their citizens   ☐ T   ☐ F

g.   It is ok to restrict personal liberties for national security   ☐ T   ☐ F

h.   Canadians are uninformed of the government's collec-

        tion of citizens' private data   □ T   □ F
- i. Canadians should openly discuss information on the government's collection and monitoring of data □ T   □ F
- j. The government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs with the public   □ T   □ F
- k. I am well informed of the government's national security initiatives and measures   □ T   □ F

9. How aware are you of your rights to *privacy* under Canadian law?
□ very aware,   □ aware,   □ somewhat aware
□ not too aware,   □ not aware at all,   □ unsure

10. How aware are you of your rights to *free speech* under Canadian law?
□ very aware,   □ aware,   □ somewhat aware,   □ not too aware,   □ not aware at all,   □ unsure

11. How aware are you of your rights to *meet with whomever you want* under Canadian law?
□ very aware,   □ aware,   □ somewhat aware,   □ not too aware,   □ not aware at all,   □ unsure

12. How aware are you of your rights to *move around and travel freely* under Canadian law?
□ very aware,   □ aware,   □ somewhat aware,   □ not too aware,   □ not aware at all,   □ unsure

13. To what extent are you aware of government and/or law enforcement surveillance including monitoring of telephone, Internet, email, and travel activity for anti-terrorism purposes?
□ very aware,   □ aware,   □ somewhat aware,   □ not too aware,   □ not aware at all,   □ unsure

14. Please answer true (T) or false (F) to the following statements:
- a. I am worried about my rights to personal privacy □ T   □ F
- b. I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want online   □ T   □ F
- c. I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want in person   □ T   □ F

d. I am worried about my ability to meet and speak with whomever I want ☐ T ☐ F

e. I am worried about the vast amounts of data that government and/or law enforcement have collected ☐ T ☐ F

f. I am ok with the government collecting my personal phone, Internet, and travel activity for anti-terrorism ☐ T ☐ F

g. Canada has transformed into a police state ☐ T ☐ F

h. I support all the policies the government has erected for my safety, Canada must defend itself at all costs ☐ T ☐ F

i. Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my freedom of speech ☐ T ☐ F

j. Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my ability to go where I want ☐ T ☐ F

k. I need to be better informed of my personal rights and liberties ☐ T ☐ F

l. I need to be better informed of the various surveillance practices of the government and law enforcement ☐ T ☐ F

15. Seven years ago (pre-2008), how would you have responded to the same questions? (T) or (F)

a. I was worried about my rights to personal privacy ☐ T ☐ F

b. I was worried about my ability to say whatever I want online ☐ T ☐ F

c. I was worried about my ability to say whatever I want in person ☐ T ☐ F

d. I was worried about my ability to meet and speak with whomever I want ☐ T ☐ F

e. I was worried about the vast amounts of data that government and/or law enforcement have collected ☐ T ☐ F

f. I would have felt OK if the government collected my phone, Internet, and travel activity for anti-terrorism ☐ T ☐ F

g. Canada has transformed into a police state ☐ T ☐ F

h. I supported all the policies the government has erected for my safety, Canada must defend itself at all costs ☐ T ☐ F

    i. Government and/or law enforcement surveillance had no impact on my freedom of speech ☐ T ☐ F

    j. Government and/or law enforcement surveillance had no impact on my ability to go where I want
☐ T ☐ F

    k. I needed to be better informed of my personal rights and liberties ☐ T ☐ F

    l. I needed to be better informed of the various surveillance practices of the government and law enforcement
☐ T ☐ F

16. What are the chances that *your* activity in the following instances *may* be collected, monitored, and/or analyzed by the government and/or law enforcement agencies: (circle one response for each item)

    a. Internet searches and email data: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

    b. Actual content of phone calls, email, and travel information: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

    c. Social networking activity (ie. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube): is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

    d. Donations to organizations or charities: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

    e. Financial transactions and purchases: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

17. What are the chances that *a friend, family, or community member's* activity in the following realms *may* be monitored by the government and/or law enforcement agencies:

    a. Internet searches and email data: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

    b. Actual content of phone calls, email, and travel information: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

    c. Social networking activity (ie. Facebook, Twitter,

Instagram, YouTube): is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

d. Donations to organizations or charities: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

e. Financial transactions and purchases: is happening, has happened, may have happened, unlikely to have happened, unsure

18. Recently, have you done or considered doing any of the following because due to the possibility of your activity, including online and in-person communications, being monitored by government and/or law enforcement

    a. Avoid commenting on a particular topic in person, telephone, or online (email, forums, etc.)
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    b. Avoid writing (online or in print) on a particular topic
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    c. Avoid sharing personal contact information online (name, address, email, etc.)
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    d. Avoid sharing personal photos or videos online
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    e. Avoid sharing information on social activities or events you are/will be attending
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    f. Avoid expressing opinions on people, politics, government, law, or other controversial issues
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    g. Avoid researching topics or watching videos online that may be controversial or suspicious
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    h. Take extra precautions to cover or disguise Internet activity (delete history, cookies)
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    i. Avoid activities or discussions that may be perceived as controversial on social media
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    j. Avoid engaging in community events, activities, protests that may be perceived as controversial
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    k. Avoid individuals or groups of people that may be considered suspicious/threats
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    l. Avoid dressing in manner that reveals religious beliefs (ie. clothing, symbols, facial hair):
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    m. Restrict financial transactions (donations to religious groups or non-profits):
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    n. If using electronic devices (ie. smart phone, tablet, laptop, desktop, or regular cell phone), do you:

        i. …store personal information on it?
          ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

        ii. …use a passcode or password?
          ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

        iii. …adjust settings to limit personal info shared with others?
          ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

        iv. …restrict the type of apps that you use or websites you visit?
          ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

        v. …disable location tracking device (GPS)?
          ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

19. Seven years ago (pre-2008), before you were aware of government surveillance practices, did you do any of the following?

    a. Avoid commenting on a particular topic in person, telephone, or online (email, forums, etc.)
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    b. Avoid writing (online or in print) on a particular topic
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    c. Avoid sharing personal contact information online (name, address, email, etc.)
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    d. Avoid sharing personal photos or videos online
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    e. Avoid sharing information on social activities or events you are/will be attending
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

    f. Avoid expressing opinions on people, politics, government, law, or other controversial issues
       ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

g. Avoid researching topics or watching videos online that may be controversial or suspicious
    ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
h. Take extra precautions to cover or disguise Internet activity (delete history, cookies)
    ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
i. Avoid activities or discussions that may be perceived as controversial on social media
    ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
j. Avoid engaging in community events, activities, protests that may be perceived as controversial
    ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
k. Avoid individuals or groups of people that may be considered suspicious/threats
    ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
l. Avoid dressing in manner that reveals religious beliefs (ie. clothing, symbols, facial hair):
    ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
m. Restrict financial transactions (donations to religious groups or non-profits):
    ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
n. If using electronic devices (ie. smart phone, tablet, laptop, desktop, or regular cell phone), do you:
    vi.   …store personal information on it?
           ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
    vii.   …use a passcode or password?
           ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
    viii. …adjust settings to limit personal info shared with others?
           ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
    ix.   …restrict the type of apps that you use or websites you visit?
           ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no
    x.   …disable location tracking device (GPS)?
           ☐ Yes, ☐ somewhat, ☐ no

Appendix 2

General Research Ethics Board

May 26, 2014

Miss Tabasum Akseer
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Cultural Studies
Queen's University
Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6

GREB Ref #: GCUL-033-14; Romeo # 6012833
Title: "GCUL-033-14 Nation, nationalism, immigration and national security in the post 9/11 Canadian context: Towards a holistic understanding of national security measures"

Dear Miss Akseer:

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled **"GCUL-033-14 Nation, nationalism, immigration and national security in the post 9/11 Canadian context: Towards a holistic understanding of national security measures"** for ethical compliance with the Tri- Council Guidelines (TCPS) and Queen's ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article D.1.6) and Senate Terms of Reference (article G), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GREB

will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB, with a copy to your unit REB, of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Adverse Event Report). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services or irvingg@queensu.ca for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research. Yours sincerely,

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair, General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. David Lyon and Ms. Sharryn Aiken, Supervisors

Appendix 3

Phase 2, Open-Ended Interview Guide

Part 2: Open-Ended Interview for Interested Participants [provide info on security certificates to participant if necessary]

General thoughts on national security measures (i.e., security certificates) and terrorism

1. What do you think are the current threats to Canadian national security?
2. What is your understanding of terrorism (domestic and international); why do you think it occurs?
3. What is your understanding of the role of national security measures (such as security certificates) in the war on terrorism?
4. Do you think they are effective at thwarting domestic terrorism? International terrorism?
5. Do you think there is a religious fundamentalist and/or terrorist threat in Canada?
6. Do you think there are terrorist networks active in Canada (e.g., ISIS or al-Qaeda cells)? Have you noticed any changes in perceptions of Canadian security?
7. Do you think there is pressure over certain ethnic or religious communities to act a certain way and be more open and transparent? Assuming there is, is this pressure getting worse or better?
8. Do you personally feel pressured to act in a certain way or adopt certain behaviours? If so, where does this pressure come from? And, what are some of the behaviours that you adopt?

Moving forward

9. What do you think individuals can do to avoid being wrongly labelled as suspicious or being susceptible to surveillance practices?

10. What do you think the government can do to better reduce terrorist threats (while also respecting the rule of law and human rights)?
11. What role do you think you and/or your community can play in helping the government reduce terrorist threats?
12. Does knowing about security certificates (or other security measures) impact your understanding of citizenship and Canadian identity?
13. Do you feel welcome as an immigrant?
14. Taking into consideration what you know of security measures (ie. security certificates), and your personal experience, would you recommend Canada as a place for immigrants to settle?
15. Has your knowledge and experiences caused any doubt in *your decision* to settle in Canada?
16. Has knowledge and experiences caused any doubt in your *family's, friends' or community members' decision* to settle in Canada?
17. Thank you for your time. Do you have any questions or additional comments?

Appendix 4

Phase 1, Demographic Information for Survey Participants

Table 1

Demographic Information for Phase 1 survey participants

Age	Marital status (1 = married)	Citizen (1= citizen)	Length of time in Canada (years)	Religious Orientation (1= Muslim)	Ethnicity	Occupation (optional)
56	1	1	17	1	Bangladesh	Postal worker
26	0	1	15	1	Pakistani	Sales
27	1	1	27	1	Afghan	Grad student
35	0	1	30	1	Afghan	Restaurant
36	1	0	1	1	Undisclosed	Undisclosed
25	0	1	25	1	Brown	Undisclosed
27	0	1	25	1	Pakistani	Undisclosed
25	0	1	20	1	Pakistani	Engineer
25	0	0	4	1	Pakistani	Undergrad
26	1	1	13	1	Afghan	Undisclosed
28	0	1	14	1	Afghan	Undisclosed
25	1	1	14	1	Afghan	Undisclosed
29	0	1	28	1	Afghan	Information technology specialist

Table 1, continued

Demographic Information for Phase 1 survey participants

Age	Marital status (1 = married)	Citizen (1= citizen)	Length of time in Canada (years)	Religious Orientation (1= Muslim)	Ethnicity	Occupation (optional)
24	0	0	1	1	South Asian	Undisclosed
25	0	0	10	1	South Asian	Undisclosed
27	0	0	1	1	South Asian	Undisclosed
37	1	1	10	1	Afghan	Health Services
25	0	1	16	1	Asian	Research Assistant
38	0	0	15	1	Jordan	Engineer
27	1	1	10	1	Jordanian	Grad student
25	0	1	8	1	African	Grad student
25	0	0	5	1	Undisclosed	Undisclosed
34	1	1	10	1	Afghan	Chef
25	0	0	2	1	Malay	Grad student
34	1	1	34	1	Algerian	Post-doc
35	1	1	25	0	White	PSW
29	1	1	29	0	White	Construction
26	1	1	26	0	White	Grad student
28	1	1	28	0	White	Grad student
26	0	1	26	0	White	Unemployed

Table 1, continued

Demographic Information for Phase 1 survey participants

Age	Marital status (1 = married)	Citizen (1= citizen)	Length of time in Canada (years)	Religious Orientation (1= Muslim)	Ethnicity	Occupation (optional)
37	1	1	37	0	White	VP Exec
31	0	1	31	0	White	Sales
33	0	1	33	0	White	Sales
41	1	1	41	0	White	Sales
35	1	0	4	0	White	Grad student
25	0	1	24	0	White	Grad student
29	1	1	29	0	White	Grad student
25	0	1	25	0	White	Grad student
32	0	1	32	0	White	Grad student
25	0	1	25	0	White	Gas station
25	0	1	25	0	White	Grad student
25	0	1	25	0	White	Maintenance
29	0	1	29	0	White	Grad student
28	0	1	28	0	White	Chef
27	0	1	27	0	White	Unemployed
30	0	1	30	0	White	Grad student
34	0	1	34	0	White	Accountant

Table 1, continued

Demographic Information for Phase 1 survey participants

Age	Marital status (1 = married)	Citizen (1= citizen)	Length of time in Canada (years)	Religious Orientation (1= Muslim)	Ethnicity	Occupation (optional)
28	0	1	28	0	White	Grad student
32	0	1	32	0	White	Legal profession
27	0	1	27	0	White	IT computing

Appendix 5

Comparison of Results and P Value for 2015/2016 MM and NMM

Table 2

Comparison of Results and P Value for 2015/2016 MM and NMM

Question	2015/16 #agree MM	2015/16 #agree NMM	Statistical sig using Chi-Square
Q7a The government and/or law enforcement monitors the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me	13	9	0.00874**
Q7b The government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes	6	1	0.0416**
Q7c Most Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices	16	12	0.0874*
Q7d Surveillance is necessary for Canadian national security and the war on terror	16	19	0.7576
Q7e Data monitoring and collection is necessary for national security and the war on terror	12	17	0.152
Q7f Surveillance is something that all governments conduct on their citizens	9	14	0.3946
Q7g It is ok to restrict personal liberties for national security	5	5	0.9423
Q7h Canadians are uninformed of the government's collection of citizens' private data	18	26	0.009**
Q7i Canadians should openly discuss information on the government's collection and monitoring of data	22	26	0.1489

Table 2, continued

Comparison of Results and P Value for 2015/2016 MM and NMM

Question	2015/16 #agree MM	2015/16 #agree NMM	Statistical sig using Chi-Square
Q7j The government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs with the public	3	11	0.0147**
Q7k I am well informed of the government's national security initiatives and measures	6	5	0.3057
Q14a I am worried about my rights to personal privacy	21	19	0.2401
Q14b I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want online	22	14	0.0016**
Q14c I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want in person	14	8	0.0227**
Q14d I am worried about my ability to meet and speak with whomever I want	12	9	0.152
Q14e I am worried about the vast amounts of data that government and/or law enforcement have collected	15	15	0.4436
Q14f I am ok with the government collecting my personal phone, Internet, and travel activity for anti-terrorism	7	1	0.0172**
Q14g Canada has transformed into a police state	9	15	0.2575
Q14h I support all the policies the government has erected for my safety, Canada must defend itself at all costs	6	6	1
Q14i Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my freedom of speech	3	1	0.2971
Q14j Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my ability to go where I want	10	16	0.0615*
Q14k I need to be better informed of my personal rights and liberties	22	26	0.1489

Table 2, continued

Comparison of Results and P Value for 2015/2016 MM and NMM

Question	2015/16 #agree MM	2015/16 #agree NMM	Statistical sig using Chi-Square
Q14l I need to be better informed of the various surveillance practices of the government and law enforcement	23	24	0.5515
Q18a Avoid commenting on a particular topic in person, telephone, or online (email, forums, etc.)	19	17	0.0054**
Q18b Avoid writing (online or in print) on a particular topic	18	17	0.4459
Q18c Avoid sharing personal contact information online (name, address, email, etc.)	18	19	**
Q18d Avoid sharing personal photos or videos online	18	17	0.0661*
Q18e Avoid sharing information on social activities or events you are/will be attending	15	11	0.2803
Q18f Avoid expressing opinions on people, politics, government, law, or other controversial issues	17	13	0.107
Q18g Avoid researching topics or watching videos online that may be controversial or suspicious	19	11	0.0096**
Q18h Take extra precautions to cover or disguise Internet activity (delete history, cookies)	13	17	0.0299**
Q18i Avoid activities or discussions that may be perceived as controversial on social media	18	9	0.0054**
Q18j Avoid engaging in community events, activities, protests that may be perceived as controversial	13	7	0.09*
Q18k Avoid individuals or groups of people that may be considered suspicious/threats	17	13	0.0731*

Table 2, continued

Comparison of Results and P Value for 2015/2016 MM and NMM

Question	2015/16 #agree MM	2015/16 #agree NMM	Statistical sig using Chi-Square
Q18l Avoid dressing in manner that reveals religious beliefs (i.e. clothing, symbols, facial hair)	13	5	0.0084**
Q18m Restrict financial transactions (donations to religious groups or non-profits)	6	7	0.69
Q18ni …store personal information on it?	16	23	0.2116
Q18nii …use a passcode or password?	18	25	0.0416**
Q18niii …adjust settings to limit personal info shared with others?	15	19	0.3835
Q18niv …restrict the type of apps that you use or websites you visit?	14	10	0.0833*
Q18nv …disable location tracking device (GPS)?	12	12	0.666

Appendix 6

Results Table and P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim Men

Table 3

Results Table and P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNemars test
Q7a The government and/or law enforcement monitors the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me	13	13	1.000
Q7b The government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes	6	10	0.0578
Q7c Most Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices	16	7	0.0039
Q7d Surveillance is necessary for Canadian national security and the war on terror	16	12	-
Q7e Data monitoring and collection is necessary for national security and the war on terror	12	11	1.000
Q7f Surveillance is something that all governments conduct on their citizens	9	9	1.000
Q7g It is ok to restrict personal liberties for national security	5	5	0.6547
Q7h Canadians are uninformed of the government's collection of citizens' private data	18	15	0.5271
Q7i Canadians should openly discuss information on the government's collection and monitoring of data	22	16	0.0253

Table 3, continued

Results Table and P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNemars test
Q7j The government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs with the public	3	6	0.0956
Q7k I am well informed of the government's national security initiatives and measures	6	5	0.4795
Q14a I am worried about my rights to personal privacy	21	4	<.0001
Q14b I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want online	22	4	<.0001
Q14c I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want in person	14	3	0.0023
Q14d I am worried about my ability to meet and speak with whomever I want	12	2	0.0023
Q14e I am worried about the vast amounts of data that government and/or law enforcement have collected	15	5	0.0039
Q14f I am ok with the government collecting my personal phone, Internet, and travel activity for anti-terrorism	7	6	0.7389
Q14g Canada has transformed into a police state	9	3	0.0196
Q14h I support all the policies the government has erected for my safety, Canada must defend itself at all costs	6	10	0.1573
Q14i Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my freedom of speech	3	13	0.0039
Q14j Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my ability to go where I want	10	13	0.2482
Q14k I need to be better informed of my personal rights and liberties	22	18	0.0833

Table 3, continued

Results Table and P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNemars test
Q14l I need to be better informed of the various surveillance practices of the government and law enforcement	23	21	0.5637
Q18a Avoid commenting on a particular topic in person, telephone, or online (email, forums, etc.)	19	8	0.0021
Q18b Avoid writing (online or in print) on a particular topic	18	8	0.0051
Q18c Avoid sharing personal contact information online (name, address, email, etc.)	18	8	0.0252
Q18d Avoid sharing personal photos or videos online	18	9	0.0063
Q18e Avoid sharing information on social activities or events you are/will be attending	15	8	0.0833
Q18f Avoid expressing opinions on people, politics, government, law, or other controversial issues	17	9	0.0037
Q18g Avoid researching topics or watching videos online that may be controversial or suspicious	19	10	0.0046
Q18h Take extra precautions to cover or disguise Internet activity (delete history, cookies)	13	7	0.0186
Q18i Avoid activities or discussions that may be perceived as controversial on social media	18	11	0.1269
Q18j Avoid engaging in community events, activities, protests, that may be perceived as controversial	13	9	0.1718
Q18k Avoid individuals or groups of people that may be considered suspicious/threats	17	9	0.0321

Table 3, continued

Results Table and P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNemars test
Q18l Avoid dressing in manner that reveals religious beliefs (i.e. clothing, symbols, facial hair)	13	6	0.0833
Q18m Restrict financial transactions (donations to religious groups or non-profits)	6	3	0.1655
Q18ni …store personal information on it?	16	12	0.2036
Q18nii …use a passcode or password?	18	9	0.0016
Q18niii …adjust settings to limit personal info shared with others?	15	6	0.0039
Q18niv …restrict the type of apps that you use or websites you visit?	14	4	0.0023
Q18nv …disable location tracking device (GPS)?	12	3	0.0016

Appendix 7

Results Table and P Value in Non-Muslim Men

Table 4

Results Table and P Value in Non-Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNemars test
Q7a The government and/or law enforcement monitors the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me	9	10	0.3173
Q7b The government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes	1	11	0.0027
Q7c Most Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices	12	6	0.0455
Q7d Surveillance is necessary for Canadian national security and the war on terror	19	14	-
Q7e Data monitoring and collection is necessary for national security and the war on terror	17	14	0.1573
Q7f Surveillance is something that all governments conduct on their citizens	14	9	0.0455
Q7g It is ok to restrict personal liberties for national security	5	5	1
Q7h Canadians are uninformed of the governments collection of citizens private data	26	2	
Q7i Canadians should openly discuss information on the governments collection and monitoring of data	26	19	

Table 4, continued

Results Table and P Value in Non-Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNemars test
Q7j The government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs with the public	11	10	0.200
Q7k I am well informed of the government's national security initiatives and measures	5	1	0.0833
Q14a I am worried about my rights to personal privacy	19	6	0.0009
Q14b I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want online	14	4	0.0047
Q14c I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want in person	8	4	0.3173
Q14d I am worried about my ability to meet and speak with whomever I want	9	2	0.0253
Q14e I am worried about the vast amounts of data that government and/or law enforcement have collected	15	7	0.0143
Q14f I am ok with the government collecting my personal phone, Internet, and travel activity for anti-terrorism	1	4	0.0833
Q14g Canada has transformed into a police state	15	4	0.0027
Q14h I support all the policies the government has erected for my safety, Canada must defend itself at all costs	6	17	0.0005
Q14i Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my freedom of speech	1	16	0.0001
Q14j Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my ability to go where I want	16	16	0.7055
Q14k I need to be better informed of my personal rights and liberties	26	21	

Table 4, continued

Results Table and P Value in Non-Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNe-mars test
Q14l I need to be better informed of the various surveillance practices of the government and law enforcement	24	20	0.3173
Q18a Avoid commenting on a particular topic in person, telephone, or online (email, forums, etc.)	17	11	0.4235
Q18b Avoid writing (online or in print) on a particular topic	17	6	0.0074
Q18c Avoid sharing personal contact information online (name, address, email, etc.)	19	9	0.0293
Q18d Avoid sharing personal photos or videos online	17	8	0.0029
Q18e Avoid sharing information on social activities or events you are/will be attending	11	2	0.0293
Q18f Avoid expressing opinions on people, politics, government, law, or other controversial issues	13	7	0.0293
Q18g Avoid researching topics or watching videos online that may be controversial or suspicious	11	7	-
Q18h Take extra precautions to cover or disguise Internet activity (delete history, cookies)	17	12	0.1116
Q18i Avoid activities or discussions that may be perceived as controversial on social media	9	3	0.2615
Q18j Avoid engaging in community events, activities, protests, that may be perceived as controversial	7	7	0.0719
Q18k Avoid individuals or groups of people that may be considered suspicious/threats	13	10	0.7212

Table 4, continued

Results Table and P Value in Non-Muslim Men

Question	2015/16 (# agree)	7 yrs ago (# agree)	Statistical sig using McNemars test
Q18l Avoid dressing in manner that reveals religious beliefs (i.e. clothing, symbols, facial hair)	5	3	0.5724
Q18m Restrict financial transactions (donations to religious groups or non-profits)	7	2	-
Q18ni …store personal information on it?	23	22	1.000
Q18nii …use a passcode or password?	25	19	0.0455
Q18niii …adjust settings to limit personal info shared with others?	19	16	0.0455
Q18niv …restrict the type of apps that you use or websites you visit?	10	4	
Q18nv …disable location tracking device (GPS)?	12	7	0.1573

Appendix 8

Comparison of P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim and Non-Muslim Men

Table 5

Comparison of P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim and Non-Muslim Men

Question	P value MM	P value NMM
Q7a The government and/or law enforcement monitors the activity of suspicious individuals and/or terrorists, not me	1.000	0.3173
Q7b The government only collects data for anti-terrorism purposes	0.0578	0.0027
Q7c Most Canadians are concerned about government surveillance practices	0.0039	0.0455
Q7d Surveillance is necessary for Canadian national security and the war on terror	-	-
Q7e Data monitoring and collection is necessary for national security and the war on terror	1.000	0.1573
Q7f Surveillance is something that all governments conduct on their citizens	1.000	0.0455
Q7g It is ok to restrict personal liberties for national security	0.6547	1
Q7h Canadians are uninformed of the governments collection of citizens private data	0.5271	
Q7i Canadians should openly discuss information on the government's collection and monitoring of data	0.0253	
Q7j The government is transparent on details surrounding its anti-terrorism programs with the public	0.0956	0.200

Table 5, continued

Comparison of P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim and Non-Muslim Men

Question	P value MM	P value NMM
Q7k I am well informed of the government's national security initiatives and measures	0.4795	0.0833
Q14a I am worried about my rights to personal privacy	<.0001	0.0009
Q14b I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want online	<.0001	0.0047
Q14c I am worried about my ability to say whatever I want in person	0.0023	0.3173
Q14d I am worried about my ability to meet and speak with whomever I want	0.0023	0.0253
Q14e I am worried about the vast amounts of data that government and/or law enforcement have collected	0.0039	0.0143
Q14f I am ok with the government collecting my personal phone, Internet, and travel activity for anti-terrorism	0.7389	0.0833
Q14g Canada has transformed into a police state	0.0196	0.0027
Q14h I support all the policies the government has erected for my safety, Canada must defend itself at all costs	0.1573	0.0005
Q14i Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my freedom of speech	0.0039	0.0001
Q14j Government and/or law enforcement surveillance has no impact on my ability to go where I want	0.2482	0.7055
Q14k I need to be better informed of my personal rights and liberties	0.0833	
Q14l I need to be better informed of the various surveillance practices of the government and law enforcement	0.5637	0.3173
Q18a Avoid commenting on a particular topic in person, telephone, or online (email, forums, etc.)	0.0021	0.4235
Q18b Avoid writing (online or in print) on a particular topic	0.0051	0.0074
Q18c Avoid sharing personal contact information online (name, address, email, etc.)	0.0252	0.0293

Table 5, continued

Comparison of P Value for Temporal Shift in Muslim and Non-Muslim Men

Question	P value MM	P value NMM
Q18d Avoid sharing personal photos or videos online	0.0063	0.0029
Q18e Avoid sharing information on social activities or events you are/will be attending	0.0833	0.0293
Q18f Avoid expressing opinions on people, politics, government, law, or other controversial issues	0.0037	0.0293
Q18g Avoid researching topics or watching videos online that may be controversial or suspicious	0.0046	-
Q18h Take extra precautions to cover or disguise Internet activity (delete history, cookies)	0.0186	0.1116
Q18i Avoid activities or discussions that may be perceived as controversial on social media	0.1269	0.2615
Q18j Avoid engaging in community events, activities, protests, that may be perceived as controversial	0.1718	0.0719
Q18k Avoid individuals or groups of people that may be considered suspicious/threats	0.0321	0.7212
Q18l Avoid dressing in manner that reveals religious beliefs (i.e. clothing, symbols, facial hair)	0.0833	0.5724
Q18m Restrict financial transactions (donations to religious groups or non-profits)	0.1655	-
Q18ni …store personal information on it?	0.2036	1.000
Q18nii …use a passcode or password?	0.0016	0.0455
Q18niii …adjust settings to limit personal info shared with others?	0.0039	0.0455
Q18niv …restrict the type of apps that you use or websites you visit?	0.0023	
Q18nv …disable location tracking device (GPS)?	0.0016	0.1573

Appendix 9

Demographic Information for Phase 2, Open-ended Participants

Table 9

Demographic Information for Phase 2, Open-ended Participants

Partici- pant ID	Age	Ethnic origin	Length of time (yrs) in Canada	Occupation
001	56	Bangladesh	17	prefer not to disclose
002	26	Pakistan	15	Sales
009	25	Pakistan	4	Undergrad student
013	29	Afghan	28	Information technology specialist
017	37	Afghan	10	Health Services
019	38	Jordan	15	Engineer
020	27	Jordan	27	Grad student
023	32	Pakistan	6	Grad student
025	34	Algerian	34	prefer not to disclose
027	34	Afghan	10	Chef
030	32	Pakistan	32	Web designer/community leader
033	34	Arab	34	prefer not to disclose/community leader
034	32	Indian	22	IT/community leader
036	28	Afghan	28	prefer not to disclos-
038	25	Libyan-White mix	25	Student
040	38	Lebanese	28	Health care/community leader

Table 9, continued

Demographic Information for Phase 2, Open-ended Participants

Partici-pant ID	Age	Ethnic origin	Length of time (yrs) in Canada	Occupation
042	36	India	26	community leader
044	42	Arab	42	prefer not to disclose
046	34	Pakistan	34	prefer not to disclose
048	37	Bangladesh	37	community leader