The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research

Volume 3, Fall 2012

Undergraduate Student Paper[1]
Security for the Many at the Expense of the New:
The Securitization of Refugees in Canada

Josh Walker, BA Honours, Criminal Justice,
The University of Winnipeg

Introduction

The criminal justice system is traditionally thought of as being made up of the police, courts and corrections; this has also been the traditional realm of criminological and criminal justice scholarship. However, this is quickly becoming an unrealistic limitation on the boundaries of our discipline. Increasingly, the language and logic of traditional criminal justice concerns are spreading into other facets of western society. One place where this is especially evident is the area of immigration, particularity in regard to refugees. In this article I demonstrate how refugees have come to be constructed as illegal, criminal and a threat to national security. This construction allows for discussions of deterrence and public protection to dominate refugee policymaking; this is confusing the issue as to where refugees should be located in discourse between immigration and criminal justice. Border Services are not generally thought of as a component of the criminal justice apparatus; however the police-like powers of investigation, arrest and detention are certainly examples of the state's most invasive powers, typically reserved for those

---

1   Editor's note: Each year, Honour's students in the Criminal Justice program at The University of Winnipeg write a major research paper on a topic of their choice as part of the degree requirements. This year, Josh Walker not only wrote his paper on a topic that directly linked up with the conference theme, but he presented his work on a panel at Securing Justice. We are pleased to be able to include Josh's paper in this volume of the *Annual Review*.

involved in the criminal justice system. The reaction of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration towards refugees is increasingly one that favours preventative detention as a first step, particularly when dealing with refugees from politically disfavoured nations. I will explore this by examining the case of the Tamil migrant ships that arrived on Canada's west coast in 2010 and the reaction to those events. The refugee, I argue, has become securitized in political and public discourse, allowing for the exercise of these expanded powers of control. The expansion of policing and detention practices into the area of immigration and refugee acceptance is an example of the neo-liberal "risk society" described by Garland (2002) and Ericson & Haggerty (1997). However this is a complex issue which cannot be understood solely with reference to risk. I would argue the securitization of the refugee is the result of being constructed as a risk subject and subsequently as a national security threat; a construction informed by pre-existent culturally rooted ideology and prejudice.

In order to analyze the securitization of refugees, I examine the most recent piece of immigration legislation, which at the time of writing was being debated in the House of Commons, Bill C-4 (an Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, the Balanced Refugee Reform Act and the Marine Transportation Security Act). The bill creates a new definition for the Department of Citizenship and Immigration (CIC) to utilize, the "designated foreign national". This definition is activated at the discretion of the Minister of Public Safety. The Act requires that an individual determined to be a "designated foreign national" be detained until such a time as their refugee application is approved or a decision is made by CIC or the Minister. No appeal of this detention may be made before a period of 12 months has elapsed, and should that appeal fail, the next appeal must wait another 6 months to be heard. This measure is being implemented in order to "provide more time to identify those who had arrived in our country and whether they posed a threat to our national security (Toews, 2011)". Ministerial discretion is a

legal instrument firmly rooted in the realm of dichotomous logic – i.e. risks vs. rights, liberty vs. security, etc. The goal of this is ostensibly to find an appropriate balance. Originally, discretion was a tool introduced to allow for the consideration of individual circumstances when making legal determination regarding deportation or acceptance of a refugee's claim. However, the movement to the neo-liberal society has reconstituted discretion as a technology for the minister to make subjective assessments regarding the risks of certain groups and individuals (Pratt, 2005). If a negative view is taken, this could also be argued to be a vehicle for state sanctioned racism exercised through exclusionary policy. A Federal Court decision in 1997 (*R v. Williams*) upheld the legality of deportation on the grounds of a minister's opinion that the subject was a danger. Later cases imposed the necessity of written reasons for forming an opinion of dangerousness (Pratt, 2005). The important thing about the case however, was that they legitimized and legally sanctioned the state's use of exclusionary practices for purposes of risk management.

Bill C-4 is a direct response to the events around the Tamil refugee ships MV Ocean Lady and MV Sun Sea that occurred in August of 2010. These two ships, carrying around 600 potential refugee claimants between the two vessels (fleeing the recently ended Sri Lankan civil war), created a public outcry around illegal immigration and border security. It was argued that these refugees were "jumping the queue" and abusing the Canadian immigration system. In addition, the association of the Tamil people with the Liberation Tigers of the Tamil Eelam (LTTE) terrorist group gave rise to questions about the security risk that these migrants might pose. When these ships arrived in Canadian waters they were intercepted by Canadian warships and Border Services officials placed them in immigration detention centers to await the processing of their refugee claims. Over one hundred claimants from the vessels were in detention for over a year while a determination was made regarding their eligibility for entry to Canada. Only five people from those ships were being accused of direct or even indirect links to the LTTE (Naumetz,

2011). Currently, even those who have been released from detention are still at risk of having their claims refused and being deported back to Sri Lanka; only three claims have been accepted at this time (Bell, 2012).

According to statements made in the House of Commons, Bill C-4 is intended to deter the type of human smuggling operations these refugees made use of, to prevent criminals from entering Canada, and prevent abuses of the immigration system by "jumping the queue". The ideals that the government is invoking are fairness for refugees and protection of public safety; however, the Bill will act to give qualified, desirable immigrants priority access to the resources of CIC officials by making sure only refugees who can afford to go through the established bureaucracy are deemed legitimate. This extension of provisions was enacted in the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) of 2001, which created limits on access to Canada's refugee determination process (Kruger et al, 2004), namely the ability to deny or revoke refugee status to those deemed dangerous. This is a subjective label that can be used even on someone charged with trafficking in small amounts of narcotics (Pratt, 2005). The act does not seek to punish human traffickers or deter people from using them; instead it seeks to deter them from coming to Canada specifically. Obviously then, this policy is more tailored to the protection of Canadian interests than consideration of the plight of the refugees that Canada has historically pledged to assist.

In this case, security logic is being used to justify actions that are primarily cultural and rooted in negative stereotypes regarding immigrants. The perception of security as an especially legitimate explanation for the enactment of restrictive and exclusionary policies significantly increases the risk of it being used to enact policy based in popular opinion and/or anxiety. The fact that legislation is being enacted with the Tamil case specified as its cause seems to indicate this is much more a response to public pressure on the government than proactive measures to increase the safety of Canadian

citizens. Unfortunately, by invoking a national security justi-fication, there is little recourse for interest groups or academ-ics to challenge the passage of the legislation.

The Problem of Security

We have reached a point in western society where actions taken with the goal of increasing our security cannot be questioned. The assumption that increased security is bene-ficial has become an intrinsic characteristic of security in the popular consciousness. This creates what Neocleous and Rigakos (2011) describe as an intellectual blockage- on politics, intellectual pursuits, and in the mindset of the populous. To question the need for security is unthinkable; for it is seen as an absolute necessity of modern life. In short, security has become a hegemonic idea. People generally want to feel safe, this is understandable and forgivable. However, the notion that increased security *ad infinitum* is desirable creates a dangerous socio-cultural environment that allows for the proliferation of oppression and discrimination. It also contributes to our increasingly risk-adverse society, which slows social progress (as well as progress in other realms). By demanding more security we render ourselves less safe as we open our society to accept the oppression of powerful groups. Also, we limit the power of other groups, which historically has only resulted in violence and revolution.

In light of this realization, it would seem that the only reason-able position to adopt is counter-hegemony, what Neocleous and Rigakos (2011) have termed *anti-security*. This is not an easy position to defend, largely due to the aforementioned intellectual blockage in place in regard to security. This block-age stems in part from the events of September 11th, 2001 which shook the world, and is now just over ten years behind us. However these authors argue that the security hegemony was already in place pre-9/11—the importance of that event was to make security all but unassailable as a justification. The tragic events of 9/11 took abstract fears and risks and crystalized them into an imaginable event, an actualized threat to security.

Security as it affects refugee claimants is built upon a structure intended to maintain the security of society in all its aspects, political, ideological, and economic. Neocleous (2007) uses the image of a garden to illustrate the operation of security; a garden must be ordered within and protected from external harms. To carry the metaphor further, we can imagine political and ideological threats from within as weeds, which need to be managed and kept from reaching a level where they will impact the wellbeing of the crop. This might happen through the depletion of finite resources (jobs, health care) or spreading illness (in the national sense imagine illness as an ideological disruption). External harms might take the form of parasites, leeching resources and weakening roots. Another external harm might be predators, which destroy crops and leave the garden damaged; this is of course in reality the terrorist threat or actual warfare. Important to this imagery is the notion of the nation as a contained system that needs to be ordered both internally and protected externally. The refugees' place in this image is unclear, they cannot be categorized as an external threat if they act in a way that benefits society (population stability, labour pool). However, refugees may be seen as a source of internal strife for many cultural reasons, explored below. This means refugee claimants can become constituted as an external threat, often analogized with a more culturally vivid threat such as terrorism. In short, they become made up as a security problem, a kink in the armour that threatens the maintenance of internal order. However, since they come from somewhere outside "the garden" this becomes an issue of national security. This process is described by Neocleous (2007) as political reordering in society, where security is a key technology for political administration and liberal order maintenance.

Construction of the Illegal Immigrant

The strife caused by refugees among the populous has its roots in some of the most basic human instincts. Chacon

(2007: 1835) observed that "the notion of the outsider as a threat is as old as human history and it transcends national boundaries." The decision to *accept* refugees is determined based on compassion, national self-interest and protection. Despite an innate human tendency to favour the group one identifies with, nations routinely welcome outside trade and immigrants as a way to improve some aspect of the society, most often an economic need. Refugees are often accepted as part of a wider recognition of the value of human life free from suffering regardless of the possible benefit they might provide. That is not to say however that refugees and immigrants always find a welcome, safe harbor. Historically, migrants have been treated as a disruptive force, even in Canada where we have in recent years adopted a national identity of "multiculturalism." However the events of the Ocean Lady and Sun Sea reveal distrust and even hostility toward refugees that persist to this day. Many points have been raised to argue against accepting migrants, the most common being that "they steal jobs." Other arguments include: "they import crime", "they abuse the welfare system", "they don't respect/accept Canadian values", and the list goes on. I argue that this is part of a process of social construction that creates taken for granted assumptions and beliefs about refugees in contemporary culture.

An important point of focus for this discussion is the formation of the label "illegal immigrant" or "illegal alien". This is a term that did not exist before the 1930s in North America, instead the terms "irregular" or "illegitimate" were used. In 1929 legislation enacted by the United States Congress criminalized the act of illegal entry for the first time, and created the "illegal" immigrant (Chacon, 2007). This effectively took the minority subclass, low skilled laborers and the illiterate who did not or could not qualify for normal immigration, and placed them into an illegal and deviant role. The creation of the "illegal immigrant" category had a profound effect on the popular consciousness. In the words of Mehan (1997: 250), "Language has power, the language we use in public political discourse and the way we talk about events

and people in everyday life makes a difference in the way we think and in the way we act about them." The meaning we derive from labels goes deeper than the simple definition of the term in statute. The act of passing legislation that created the category simultaneously created the impression in the public mind that the "illegal" immigrant was a thing that existed and posed enough of a problem to require greater intervention than had been needed previously. Frequent use in media made the term a widely used one and this created a culture where the term "illegal immigrant" is not only used to signify irregular migrants, but also used to describe those simply suspected of, or perceived to be, irregular migrants, regardless of actual immigration status. These perceptions of undocumented status are heavily influenced by racial stereotypes. The linkage between being perceived as in the country without authorization and being "an illegal" is thus cemented in the public mind.

The linking of immigrants and being illegal in the collective consciousness has a rather predictable consequence: the assumption that immigrants and refugees are more prone to law breaking behavior than naturally born citizens. While studies indicate that this is not at all the case (see for example Tonry, 1997), the assumption persists. Chacon (1997: 1841) cites a US policymaker that demonstrates this associational connection: "The first law they break is to be here illegally. The attitude from then on is, I don't have to obey your laws." This process of linkage is an example of how migrants are constituted as a source of risk and insecurity. What is important to keep in mind, I argue, is that this constructed identity of migrants as "illegal" emerged in response to attitudes of distrust and anxiety that already existed.

The Role of Risk

Despite the linkage of immigrants and illegality, the Canadian government continues to accept large numbers of regular immigrants every year. The issue being considered here is of course how *refugees* specifically are affected by this

social construction. In Canada, refugees have often been accused of being a drain on the welfare and social support systems and importing crime into the country (Pratt, 2005). These assumptions about refugees have become common-sense knowledge; these I argue are hegemonic ideologies in the Gramscian sense, much like how the need for security is an unassailable "fact", so too are these notions about refugees. But how does ideology reach such a privileged status? The Gramscian perspective asserts that a culturally diverse society can be dominated by one social class. This is achieved by manipulating cultural beliefs, perceptions and values so that the worldview of the most powerful group is imposed as the norm for that society. This is characterized as cultural leadership exercised via legislative and executive powers, as opposed to the overtly violent coercive relationship described by classical Marxism. The socially constructed ideas about refugees appear to be rooted in a liberal individual responsibility/meritocracy framework and have become embedded in the popular culture. These constructed cultural beliefs establish the refugee as a source of risk, and in the late modern, neo-liberal society, risk is something that needs to be managed and controlled.

Ericson and Haggerty (1997) provide an analysis of risk society in their *Policing the Risk Society.* They argue that governance in the risk society is directed towards providing security by contracting and minimizing sources of risk. Sources of risk are generally subjective and subject to political-cultural revision to reflect the trends and anxieties of the time. Strategies of risk management offer us no more than a reduced probability of danger because some level of risk will always exist. This means that security is more of a "yearning" than a material reality. The logic of risk management demands better knowledge with which to make assessments of risk, creating a continuous cycle of risk discovery and increased efforts to manage risk.

The acceptance of refugees is risky business from the perspective of policymakers and increasingly in the perspective

of the public. There is a reduction of some risks that is provided by refugee migrants, namely the maintenance of a low skill labour pool and a source of population stability. However refugees are more than simply "risky", particularly in the post-9/11 context. Haggerty (2003) argues the logic driving crime prevention practices is synonymous with risk logic as a calculative balancing of harm and benefit rooted in actuarial insurance practices. Rather, he suggests that the "precautionary principal" may better describe the rationale underpinning contemporary efforts at crime prevention. This logic is non-calculative and generally subjective in its assessment of risk sources. The determination of what is risky is "influenced by 'common sense' and long standing practice, as individuals draw on pre-existing emotional, ideological and cultural discriminations to guide their behavior" (Haggerty, 2003: 201). Precautionary logic invites anticipation of the worst imaginable scenario, regardless of its actual likelihood. In the case of the refugee, the foreigner about whom little is known, this worst case scenario imaginable invariably turns to the risk of terrorism. The focus of Bill C-4 reveals this anxiety clearly, as it aims to build in a buffer period where "designated" refugees can be evaluated while detained – their ability to cause harm limited. Garland (2003) notes that where precautionary logic is used, there is no level of acceptable risk; this is troubling because "in an important sense, [taking] risk is the important accompaniment of freedom and choice" (Garland, 2003: 68).

I have demonstrated how the refugee came to be constructed as illegal, however the factors that caused this construction to take place are important. The construction of a risky subject is informed not simply by an economic calculus of benefit and harm but also by existing cultural anxieties. This concept can be explained through a discussion of societal security which argues that the organizing force of a society is identity (Weaver et al, 1993). It is important to separate "society" from "nation" when discussing this concept as a nation may be composed of a multitude of large self-sustaining identity groups which this framework defines as a society. This idea

becomes relevant when we consider that a refugee group is a foreign "society" with a different social identity. King (2004) argues that refugees are viewed as a source of societal insecurity if they are defined as a potential threat to the survival of the social community's common identity. The fact that migrants have become constituted as an especially risky group since the events of 9/11 ensures that they are deemed a threat. When a group finds their culture under a perceived threat, the solution is to either strengthen their culture, and/or address the source of the threat. If we extend this logic, when the identity of the group (made up of the cultural beliefs, ideologies and history of the group) that is in political power is threatened, that culture and the threat become the subject of national security policy. This is especially true if certain perceived risks which are culturally hegemonic are the ones in play, as they are nearly impossible to critique or debate effectively. Hegemonic ideas about what is dangerous, the hegemony of the value of security, and the precautionary principle work together in this situation to create a state/public response to the refugee claimant.

With a connection made between immigrants, illegality, and crime it is not much of an extension to label them a national security threat. The connections already established, carry the underlying message that immigrants represent a threat, a source of insecurity and risk. The fact that this source of insecurity comes from outside the boundaries of the nation or even outside the boundaries of the popular culture can produce an integrating effect for the population, commonly referred to as an "us vs. them" mentality. The fear of an outside threat, an enemy to rally against, reinforces exclusionary cultural values as the population attempts to protect itself. The creation of a perceived threat in the public mind makes it a security concern but it is the identity of the state that guides the construction of what is a threat. Of course, identifying the identity of a state is problematic. As noted above, nations are not homogenous structures, so how do we expand this understanding to explain the securitization of refugees?

Lohrmann (2000) argues that it is in fact "the political

exploitation of cultural differences that confers a security dimension to immigration (p. 8)". The political use of security is completely bound up in cultural differences, with the political acting out the desires and demands of the culturally and/or socially dominant group. Take Canada for example, national security laws are enforced almost exclusively on immigrants, refugees, and naturalized citizens. In fact most of the laws do not even apply to those born in Canada; security certificates are an example of this (Wilkinson, 2009). This reproduces cultural assumptions that immigrants are in some way different from natural born Canadians and fundamentally unequal in the eyes of the populous. Furthermore, security measures levied solely on non-citizens reproduces the risk identity of refugees. The risk that minority ethnic and political groups might pose has legitimized intensified state surveillance even before the events of 9/11 and since then there has been a marked increase (Walby & Heir, 2009). This is an example of the risk management logic that has become pervasive in our society. Rimke (2010) argues that "as prudential neo-liberal subjects we are incited to continuously scan and assess public and private spaces especially in terms of threats by certain dangerized Others" (p. 175). Dangerization is what Rimke (2010) describes as the "tendency to perceive and define the world and other according to socially scripted categories of menace and risk" (p. 175). This is not a new observation, but it is an important one, both Garland (1997) and Pollack (2010) make note of the fact that ideological assumptions form the basis of perceptions of risk. I argue that this is indicative of an internalization of culturally hegemonic ideology. It is the hand that writes the "social script of menace" that bears responsibility for the actions that result from ideology; using Gramsci, that responsibility falls on the dominant socio-political group. Essentially, we are expected to govern ourselves according to the cultural perceptions of risk and danger that different groups/individuals represent. We are governed by our insecurity. The precautionary logic of security insists that we accept the risk identity of dangerized individuals and groups, lest we fall

victim to them. In a neo-liberal society the responsibility to avoid victimization falls to the individual (Rose, 2000), the "prudential neo-liberal subject" must take the ideological constructions offered by the dominant group and use them to inform behavior and beliefs. This also means that individuals must accept the security measures imposed on them; to do otherwise would be allowing risk and inviting insecurity. In fact it has been seen that the internalization of security ideology brings with it demands for increased surveillance and regulation. Refugees, constructed as a threat to economic, cultural and physical security, place the onus on the State to react to that threat. The State is not simply empowered to act, it is required to act.

Security, Culture and Hegemony

The State, Gramsci suggested, maintains control not just through violence and economic coercion, but also ideologically; through the creation of a hegemonic culture in which the values of the bourgeoisie became the 'common sense' values of all. The formation of the modern state marks the beginning of a period when "the state needs the consensus of the citizen and must create that consensus for it to function. For Gramsci, coercion is not the essence of state power. Hegemony is power. It may be protected by coercion" (Davidson, 2005: 6). Thinking back to risk, Garland (2003) argues that the representation of risk is subject to political manipulation. What is "factual" cannot be discerned from politically loaded perceptions, especially when the issue is contentious one. In situations which enflame the public, statements of risk are inevitably informed by public anxiety. Garland (2003) observes that "democratic governments have learned that they must listen to public concerns of this kind, rather than brush them aside as "uniformed," "irrational," and "unscientific"" (p. 57). This reminds us of the limited importance of individual political actors; they are only actors carrying out the demands of the dominant socio-cultural group. Since anxiety is rooted in cultural ideologies, so also are the actions of the state.

The consensus culture is one where people in the working-class identify their own good with the good of the bourgeoisie and help to maintain the status quo rather than revolting. Once a group is in a position to exercise cultural leadership, Gramsci argues that they work so that their own values are perceived as a universally valid ideology and beneficial to all of society, whilst benefiting only or primarily the ruling class (Hunt, 1997). A society where this has been successful could be called a hegemonic society, completely regulated by constructed norms, and a supporting conception of national identity, which have become inseparably attached to the culture of that society. Through the cultivation of ideologies and the achievement of a cultural hegemony the state has the ability to regulate how the individual interacts with their world in a very personal way. By constructing refugees as a threat to security we impose a potent method of governance on that population, they must be regulated and controlled in order to alleviate the threat they supposedly pose. This is perfectly acceptable within security logic, even laudable and necessary.

This takes Marxism away from a purely materialistic epistemology and brings in a social constructionist idea. An important distinction that Gramsci makes is in regard to coercion; Marx argues that capitalism is inherently coercive and oppressive and that this will eventually lead to a revolution which changes the economic makeup of society. For Gramsci, hegemonic dominance ultimately relies on a "consented" coercion, where consent is derived from the cultural identification of common sense values which dictate behavior; when in fact the values dictating behavior are primarily or exclusively serving bourgeoisie interests and is coercive in that the values themselves are imposed. This means that coercive intervention has been consented to by citizens, and will not provoke the resistance that would have occurred had consent not been obtained. This throws a wrench into the Marxist dream of the revolution, as it basically discounts the historicism Marx argues. It requires a crisis of moral authority to remove the "masks of consent" and reveal the true coercive nature of the cultural hegemony (Hunt, 1997). It becomes ap-

parent through this discussion that individuals, by accepting hegemonic values, are contributing to their own oppression and the oppression of minority groups who violate constructed culturally hegemonic norms.

Quite often, obeying cultural norms quickly becomes constructed as a moral consideration for the populous. For example, some parts of the Canadian cultural identity include courtesy, tolerance and generosity. Individuals perceived to be in violation of these cultural norms actually receive a moralized stigma as a consequence of violating these values; they are rude, intolerant or greedy. The creation of a system of regulating moral guidelines is an important part of the creation of a cultural hegemony, these norms act to regulate and allow for the use of sanctions. Moral entrepreneurs play an important role in defining what values become integral parts of the cultural landscape of a society. Numerous moral guidelines are constructed to regulate many different aspects of the individual, acting essentially as a form of socialization to create the ideal citizen, "making up the person" as Hunt (1997) termed it. Through moral regulation the individual can be entirely reconstituted. Class, gender, sexual norms, race relations and individual identity all come to be defined as an ethical undertaking.

It is this moralization of interests which would seem to be the manner in which they are converted to ideology. Moral judgments are arguably among the hardest to refute or challenge because they truly embody the spirit of a hegemony or discourse. This makes them especially useful as a regulatory tool, due to the difficulty of changing or challenging them. Hunt (2009) suggests a basic form which we can use to unpack how values become cultural ideology. This involves the linking of a moralized subject with a moralized practice or object in a manner which suggests some wider socially harmful consequences will occur unless the behavior/object is properly regulated. For example with alcoholism, the moralized subject is the middle/lower class laborer and the potentially harmful consequence of his use of alcohol (the moral-

ized behavior) is the loss of employment, strain on family, and so on. However the extent to which a moral ideology is enforced depends largely on the cultural hegemony of the time. Changing hegemonies will displace or replace ideologies with ones more suited to the time period.

So what culturally hegemonic values are supported by moves towards immigration reform? To properly answer that we must first identify the type of reform being undertaken. Bill-C4 is designed to make it more difficult for immigrants to enter Canada under suspect refugee claims through the use of human traffickers and to weed out potential terrorists. Therefore we can see that the cultural hegemonic is the idea of increasing security as an intrinsic good. This raises the possible argument that the security hegemony described by Neocleous and Rikagos (2011) does not just support culturally hegemonic values but has actually become a part of the culture itself. The idea that security itself constitutes a moral responsibility represents a powerful tool for creating new regulations. This is perhaps the most evolved version of the consensus oppression thesis; oppression/coercion is not simply permitted to forward other cultural values, but instead becomes a value in and of itself. This moral/security linkage can be seen in the introductory speech for Bill C-4, when the Minister of Public Safety claims that "Bill C-4 would, first and foremost, crack down on those criminals who would abuse our generous immigration system and endanger the safety and security of our Canadian communities" (Vic Toews, Hansard, June, 21, 2011). This quote provides startling insight into the mechanics of the political process; notice the linkage between a moralized statement (taking advantage of our generosity) and the inclusion of security as an additional justification in the same breath, as if the two fit together perfectly. This demonstrates how the two hegemonies act to support each other. Security is used to further justify cultural protections but it is also a morally laudable goal unto itself. The fact is that attaching security to the argument acts like a trump card; it provides one aspect of justification that cannot be dismissed. During the rest of the speeches on C-4 in Han-

sard, many criticisms were raised but the need for increased security was never questioned.

In Hunt's language, the immigrant has become a moralized subject. I argue that there is also an additional immigrant category which exists in the mind of society, which is the *dangerous immigrant*. This is the group which security can be exercised over most easily. This includes the potential terrorist, the fraudulent refugee applicant, and the unknown individual (here, I am thinking of those who enter Canada through the use of human traffickers and other illegal means). All these individuals are placed in the same category, the security risk. I would suggest that this is a racialized image in the public mind as well, with certain groups perceived as more dangerous. Take the Tamils which prompted Bill C-4; these were refugees fleeing the end of a bloody civil war they had recently lost. However they were identified with the Tamil Liberation Tigers terrorist group, rightfully or not. Their ethnicity associated them to the dangerous cultural category of the terrorist, just as has occurred with Middle Eastern individuals since 9/11. This association justifies the use of increased security measures, serving to perpetuate stereotypes and promote a feeling of insecurity that allows for additional surveillance, arbitrary detention and generally unequal treatment. This is something to be concerned about. Security justifications for increased surveillance and restrictions on minority populations are actions taken in favour of one group over another. Security operates in order to protect the interests of one cultural group against the perceived threat of another. This is intrinsically an ethnocentric and discriminatory practice. To have such a concept engrained in our society represents a problem as it allows for unequal treatment of ethnic and cultural groups. This is a violation of the equality and tolerance Canadians claim to value. This is a violation of a human rights view of justice; all individuals have the right to equal treatment regardless of their racial background or country of origin. To argue otherwise is to perpetuate the same environment of global suspicion that has grown more severe for the last decade. The importance

of the historical context becomes evident here. While security existed as a frequently used justification prior to 9/11, it was that event that vaulted it into a common-sense, intrinsic value status.

Conclusion

Neocleous and Rikagos have observed that there is an analytical blockage where security is concerned, this blockage limits the way we think about certain groups and fixes their identity as dangerous. The hegemony of security will not allow erosion of these constructions as that would also bring security measures into question. These two authors implore the reader to think about the possibility of *anti*-security; how to question and act against the apparatuses of security. This paper has explored how security influences how we react to refugees and migrants. This is a crucial consideration of the security problem that considers the international nature of security. By analyzing security within the framework of Gramscian cultural hegemony I have demonstrated that the role of culture and ideology is central to this issue. Culture is a fundamental institution of society which acts to define boundaries, norms and values. It forms the heart of individual and group identities and also helps give meaning to the lives of billions. Problems arise when people take offense to the cultural values and norms of others or become convinced that their own culture is supreme and should be the culture everyone belongs to or worse, that it requires protection. In a globalized world, cultural purity is not a possibility, immigration has distributed cultures and interspersed its adherents amongst each other. It is perhaps inevitable that conflict arises from these cultural intersections.

It is when conflict creates a feeling of insecurity that it is nurtured and expanded to the point where security becomes a goal unto itself, that the problems of late modern times begin to emerge. Differential regulation and surveillance of minority groups only serves to reproduce ethnocentric ideologies and the impression that we are insecure. Through

the perpetual quest for security we are sacrificing many of the cultural trappings of the last century, the assumption of equality of human beings stands threatened, as do rights to privacy and freedom from unreasonable government intervention in our lives. The bill currently before Parliament is a manifestation of precautionary security logic rooted in deep seated ethnocentric beliefs. It is now up to us to consider how to resist such daunting obstacles, to find a way to engage with issues of security in a manner that can effect actual material change. This paper seeks to lay bare one aspect of the problem, so that it may be critically engaged with and solutions found. This is the beginning of anti-security, the first step. I call upon you, the reader to take the next one.

References

Bell, S. (2012, Febuary 6). *Few refugees recognized from Sun Sea, Ocean Lady.* Retrieved March 3, 2012, from National Post: http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/02/06/few-refugees-recognized-from-sun-sea-ocean-lady/

Canada. (2011). Preventing human smugglers from abusing canada's immigration system act. Ottawa: Conservative Party of Canada.

Chacon, J. (2007). Unsecured Borders: Immigration Restrictions, Crime Control and National Security. *Connecticut Law Review, 39*(5), 1827-1894.

Davidson, A. (2005). Gramsci, Hegemony and Globalisation. *Journal of Third World Studies, 20*(2), 4-36.

Ericson, R., & Haggerty, K. (1997). *Policing the Risk Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garland, D. (1997). "Governmentality" and the problem of crime: Foucault, criminology, sociology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 173–214.

Garland, D. (2002). *The Culture of Control, crime and social order in contemporary society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garland, D. (2003). The Rise of Risk. In R. Ericson, & A. Doyle, *Risk and Morality* (pp. 48-86). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Haggerty, K. (2003). From Risk to Precaution: The Rationalities of Personal Crime Prevention. In R. Ericson, & A. Doyle, *Risk and Morality* (pp. 191-214). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hunt, A. (1997). Moral regulation and making-up the new person: putting Gramsci to work. *Theoretical Criminology, 1*(3), 275-301.

Kruger, E., Mulder, M., & Korenic, B. (2004). Canada after 11 September: Security Measures and "Preferred" Immigrants. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 72-87.

Lohrmann, R. (2000). Migrants, refugees and insecurity: current threats to peace. *International Migration*, 3-22.

Mehan, H. (1997). The Discourse of the Illegal Immigration Debate: A Case Study in the Politics of Representation. *Discouse and Society, 8*(2), 249-270.

Naumetz, T. (2011, Febuary 14). *Mass detention of 300 Tamil migrants cost $18-million, says Canada Border Services Agency* . Retrieved March 3, 2012, from The Hill Times Online: http://www.hilltimes.com/news/2011/02/14/mass-detention-of-300-tamil-migrants-cost-%2418-million-says-canada-border-services-agency/25475

Neocleous, M. (2007). Security, Liberty and the Myth of Balance: Towards a Critique of Security Politics. *Contemporary Political Theory, 6*, 131-149.

Neocleous, M. (2008). *Critique of Security.* Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.

Neocleous, M., & Rigakos, G. (2011). *Anti-Security.* Ottawa: Red Quill Books Ltd.

Pollack, S. (2010). Labelling clients 'risky': social work and the neo-liberal welfare state. *British Journal of Social Work*, 1263–1278.

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

Rimke, H. (2010). Beheading Aboard a Greyhound Bus: Security

Politics, Bloodlust Justice and the Mas Consumption of Criminalized Cannibalism. *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*, 172-186.

Rose, N. (2000). Government and Control. *British Journal of Criminology*, 321-339.

Toews, V. (2011, June 21). *41st Parliment, 1st Session, Edited Hansard, Number 012*. Retrieved October 14, 2011, from Parliment of Canada: http://www.parl.gc.ca/ HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Pub=Hansard&Doc=1 2&Parl=41&Ses=1&Language=E&Mode=1#int-3919005

Tonry, M. (1997). Ethnicity , Crime , and Immigration. *Crime and Justice, 21*, 1-29.

Walby, K., & Hier, S. (2009). Securitizing Citizenship: Identity Cards, Secure Passports, and Border Surveillance in Canada. In S. Rolling-Magnusson, *Anti-Terrorism: Security and Insecurity after 9/11* (pp. 125-140). Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Weaver, O., Buzan, B., Kelstrup, M., & Lemaitre, P. (1993). *Identity migrationand the new security agenda in europe.* London: Pinter.

Wilkinson, L. (2009). Are Human Right Jeopardized in Twenty-First-Century Canada? An Examination of Immigration Policies Post-9/11. In S. Rollings-Magnusson, *Anti-Terrorism: Security and Insecurity after 9/11* (pp. 102-124). Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Zinn, J. (2004). Literature Review: Sociology and Risk. *SCARR Working Paper*