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ABSTRACT
This paper seeks to examine the topic of Islamophobia and anti-Muslim racism that is currently present in reports of mainstream media and the implications it has on the lives of people in the Muslim community in Canada. The Western media has played a major role in both reviving historical Orientalist depictions of the ‘other’ and shaping the views of many ordinary Canadians about Muslims and people from the Middle East. Negative portrayals of Islam, and more specifically Muslims, have often been defended in the West under the principle of freedom of speech and the press, and this type of racism has been allowed to continue to exist in society under the contentious pretext of security. This paper draws on examples from two mainstream Canadian media outlets: The Toronto Star and Maclean’s Magazine. The analysis of the Toronto Star is limited to articles that were published between June 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2006 and July 29\textsuperscript{th}, 2008 about the Toronto 18 case. The Maclean’s magazine analysis focuses on articles that were written between January 2005 and July 2006, many of which have also been at the center of a complaint before the Canadian Human Rights Commission.
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For no other ethnic or religious group is it true that virtually anything can be written or said about it, without challenge or demurral.

Edward Said
INTRODUCTION:

I have chosen to broadly examine the implications of the media’s coverage of the Toronto 18\(^1\) in the *Toronto Star* and the anti-Muslim articles in *Maclean's* magazine within the framework of a new Orientalism that targets and demonizes Muslims and Islam. I am also concerned with the media coverage of different events and issues, such as the publication of the Danish Cartoons in Denmark, the debate over Shariah law in Ontario, and the reasonable accommodation debate in Quebec, as examples of negative portrayals of Muslims and Islam which show that the implication of such depictions are hardly considered by the media outlets or even the Canadian state. To add insult to injury, Islamophobia and anti-Muslim racism in the mainstream media has often been defended under the principles of freedom of speech and the press. Although these negative depictions are definitely not new to the West, there has been through the media a new revival of historical Oriental depictions of the ‘other’ and in this case of Islam and Muslims in order to re-create the binary between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Also, the social and political environment post-September 11, 2001 has allowed for this type of racism and discrimination to continue to exist under a contentious pretext of security. The negative portrayal of Muslims in the media has in effect constructed this community as the new racialized ‘other’ in Canada and even worse, the ‘enemy from within’.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the topic of Islamophobia and anti-Muslim racism in the media and the implications it has on the lives of people in the Muslim community in Canada. Despite the fact that anti-Muslim sentiment can be found in almost any mainstream media outlet post-September 11, for the purpose of this paper I have chosen to draw examples

---

\(^1\) Toronto 18 is the name that has been given by the media to the 18 local Torontonians who were arrested and accused of terrorism related charges on June 2\(^{nd}\), 2006. For more information visit the following website: <http://toronto18.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=71&Itemid=1>.
from the Toronto Star and Maclean’s Magazine. My analysis of the Toronto Star will be limited to articles that were published between the period of June 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2006 and July 29\textsuperscript{th}, 2008 about the Toronto 18 case. In Maclean’s magazine, I will examine articles that were published between January 2005 and July 2007 about Islam and Muslims. Many of the articles published by Maclean’s Magazine have also been at the center of a human rights complaint that has been filed by the Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC). Throughout my analysis of these articles, I will briefly discuss the complaint of CIC that has recently been filed before the Canadian Human Rights Commission. I have chosen to draw examples from these two particular media outlets in order to demonstrate that despite the differences in political and theoretical perspectives of various newspapers, when it comes to media reports, Muslims and Islam have been targeted in Western mainstream media.

In my analysis of both these newspapers I intend to demonstrate the harm done by such negative portrayal and treatment of Muslims and Arabs. The former President of the Canadian Arab Federation has been insightful in discussing the impact of the current political climate in Canada post-September 11: “our country has effectively engaged in an exercise of self-mutilation: stripping away civil liberties it holds dear, trampling on citizens’ rights it had foresworn to protect, and tearing away at its multicultural fabric with recklessness” (Arat-Koc 2006, 222). It is imperative that Canadians recognize that our liberal democracy that prides itself on being a multicultural society is in serious danger if this type of discrimination and racism continues to exist without public outrage. Although the threat of terrorism is something that should definitely be taken seriously by Western governments, the solution to this growing problem cannot be found in marginalizing a specific group in society; such a move, if anything, will only make the problem worse. It is only when one challenges this type of unfair treatment of
religious and ethnic minorities that we can effectively open the doors to dialogue. This paper is a contribution in that direction.

In addition, through my own analysis of both the Toronto Star and Maclean’s magazine, I seek to demonstrate that despite the fact that freedom of speech is a principle that all Canadians should defend and want to preserve, such freedoms cannot be a licence to harm and hurt other fellow citizens. More specifically, freedom of speech is deemed to be limited if it incites hate or discrimination against any ethnic or religious community in society. However, as I will show in my paper, these limits to freedom of speech are often only applied in practice to specific ethnic groups and not to all communities in Canada. The exclusion of certain communities such as Muslims, Arabs, South Asians, Blacks, and Aboriginal peoples is related to the fact that these communities are not yet completely accepted in the West and are therefore seen by the dominant community in society as being outside the White-European ‘nation’. Due to this unofficial status as outsiders in the Western nation, the protections under Western law, although on paper are supposed to be also applicable to these groups, in practice their applications are not always consistent. Media coverage like that of the Toronto Star and Maclean’s magazine further perpetuate this biased depiction of Muslims as the new ‘other’ or ‘enemy from within’ who are not deserving of the same legal and human rights as the dominant communities in Canada. In other words, unfair treatment of Muslims, Arabs, and others is not seen as a violation of their rights or against the law as they are not seen as equal citizens in the first place. The exclusion of certain ethnic and religious communities in the Canadian nation is definitely not a new phenomenon in the West and is a topic that is tackled throughout this paper.

Section One will be a review of the literature I have consulted for this paper. This section will also trace the history of anti-Muslim sentiments in the West in order to demonstrate that this
problem is not a new phenomenon in the West post-September 11, but rather one that is borne out of a deep Christian crusader and colonial legacy in the Muslim world. Historically, much of the ideas the Western European world had about Muslims and Islam was derived from the stories of travellers and crusaders in the Muslim and Arab world. The work of Edward Said, and more specifically his study of Orientalism, will be examined in greater detail in order to better understand how the historical relationship between the “Orient” and “Occident” continues to inform the Western world’s understanding of Islam and Muslims. This comprehensive evaluation of existing literature in the field seeks to draw the reader’s attention to common mistakes made by the Western media in their coverage of Muslims and Islam.

Section Two will provide a brief overview of Canada’s treatment of ethnic and religious minorities through a critical historical analysis. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate how various ethnic minorities have often been targeted based on race, ethnicity, and religion. In addition, arguments for and against multiculturalism will be examined in order to provide recommendations on what needs to be done in order to reclaim a true tolerant and multicultural society in Canada.

Section Three will outline and examine the changes to immigration, refugee, and security related policy post-September 11. Under intense pressure from the United States following the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Canadian government introduced several new security-related laws in order to combat the threat of terrorism. More specifically, Canada’s response to terrorism has come in the form of four pieces of legislation: Bill C-36 (the Anti-Terrorism Act), Bill C-35 (An Act to Amend the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act), Bill C-55 (Public Safety Act), and Bill C-11 (the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act). These new changes in
policy will be examined in order to demonstrate how they have had profound effects on the lives of Arabs and Muslims in Canada.

Section Four will examine the Toronto Star’s coverage of the Toronto 18 case. More specifically, the Toronto Star case study will include articles that were published between the period of June 2nd, 2006 and July 29th, 2008.

Section Five will examine Maclean’s magazine’s coverage of Muslims and Islam. The Maclean’s Magazine case study will be limited to articles that were published between January 2005 and July 2007, and specifically those written by Mark Steyn and Barbara Amiel. These articles are relevant because they have also been at the center of a human rights complaint filed by the Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC), the details of the case before the Human Rights Commission will also be discussed briefly throughout.

Section Six will seek to put both the coverage in the Toronto Star and Maclean’s magazine in context with other global issues pertaining to Muslims and Islam around the world. This section will also examine how anti-Muslim racism and Islamophobia in the media have often been defended on the basis of freedom of speech and the press.
Methodology:

The following paper follows a critical approach to social and political issues that seeks to go “beyond surface illusions to uncover the real structures in the material world in order to help people change conditions and build a better world for themselves” (Neuman 2006, 95). The critical approach is the best fit for this type of research as the ultimate goal in this paper is not just to point out anti-Muslim sentiments in the Western media, but also a critical appraisal of the harm in order to help address this problem. In other words, research conducted from a critical approach aims to not only critique and transform society, but to also empower people, especially the less powerful (Neuman 2006, 95). By educating people about the mistreatment of Arabs and Muslims in the media, this paper hopes to encourage the necessary change needed in order to overcome this growing problem in our society.

While there have been many cases of anti-Muslim racism in the media, this paper will broadly examine two mainstream examples in Canada. The case studies that will be examined in the paper will include examples from the Toronto Star and Maclean’s Magazine. As previously stated, my analysis of the Toronto Star will be limited to articles that were published between the period of June 2nd, 2006 and July 29th, 2008 about the Toronto 18 case. In Maclean’s, I will examine articles that were published between January 2005 and July 2007 about Islam and Muslims. Many of the articles published by Maclean’s magazine about Muslims have also recently been at the center of a human rights complaint that has been filed by the Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC). While analyzing the Maclean’s articles, I will also briefly discuss the details of the complaint that has been filed before the Canadian Human Rights Commission. I have chosen to focus on these two particular newspapers in order to demonstrate that despite the
differences in theoretical perspectives among various newspapers in Canada, Muslims and Islam have become unfairly targeted in the Western media.

Although the methodology of this paper relies heavily on a critical content analysis, it is not limited to merely analyzing the content of the Toronto Star and Maclean’s Magazine; rather, the effort is to encompass the analysis within anti-racist and anti-orientalist perspectives. These perspectives will be especially utilized in order to look at the history of different targeted communities in Canada. Although Muslims are currently the group who have been targeted as a result of their religious and racial identities, they are definitely not the first group to have experienced this type of racism. It is important to draw similarities between all targeted communities in order to unite people against this type of discrimination. Moreover, the content of these newspapers will also be examined in light of recent changes in immigration and anti-terrorism policies.

I have chosen to do my research on this topic because the evidence shows that the Western media has, and continues, to play a major role in moulding the views of the average Canadian or American citizen about Muslims and people from the Middle East. The Western media’s negative depiction of Muslims has in essence allowed the governments of many Western countries to trample on civil liberties and freedoms in the name of national security. Furthermore, in light of this heightened sense of security post-September 11, the majority of Canadians and Americans have found themselves more willing to accept their respective state’s attempt to legally differentiate between those who are seen as the ‘other’ and those who are not in order to further combat terrorism. It is only when one makes a direct link between the media and its negative effect on public opinion, policy and law that one can combat the roots of racism and discrimination in our society.
SECTION 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Although anti-Muslim sentiments have become much more rampant in the Western media following the September 11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, these biased and often discriminatory views of Muslims and Islam have a much longer history in Western discourse. Most scholars of Middle Eastern and Islamic studies are very familiar with the study of Orientalism as extensively discussed and examined by Edward W. Said in his book entitled, *Orientalism* (1994). According to Said, Orientalism is a Western style of dominating, restructuring, and having authority or power over the Orient or ‘Other’ (Said 1994, 3). As a result of this unfair power imbalance the Orient is not a free subject of thought or action (Said 1994, 3). In effect, the unequal relationship between the Occident (the West) and the Orient (the ‘Other’), causes European culture to gain in strength and identity by setting itself up against the Orient culture (Said 1994, 3). The Oriental is seen as being irrational, depraved, childlike, and ‘different’, whereas the European is seen as rational, virtuous, mature, and ‘normal’ (Said 1994, 40).

Moreover, the Orient was also seen as a region that represented a grave threat to the West, and Europe in general and therefore needed to be confined or contained. Furthermore, it was up to Europe and the West to successfully maintain itself as a distinctly different culture and society than that of the Orient. Although Europe at the time was supposedly engaged in what they saw as being the “White man’s burden” of civilizing the Oriental world, what actually took place was very much the opposite of the liberal norms/principles that Europe cared so much to defend. Said points out that despite Europe’s

. . . purportedly liberal culture, one full of concern for its vaunted norms of catholicity, plurality, and open-mindedness . . . what took place was the very opposite of liberal: the
hardening of doctrine and meaning, imparted by ‘science,’ into ‘truth.’ For if such truth reserved for itself the right to judge the Orient as immutably Oriental in the ways I have indicated, then liberality was no more than a form of oppression and mentalistic prejudice (Said 1994, 254).

This idea of the Orient or more specifically Islam and Muslims representing a threat to Western civilization has been further perpetuated by Orientalist writings, such as in Samuel P. Huntington’s article “A Clash of Civilizations?” (1993) which was later embellished as a book. According to Huntington, in the post-Cold War era the primary source of conflict will be between groups or nations of different civilizations based on the cultural fault lines that separate each civilization from one another (Huntington 1993, 25). Huntington goes on to divide the world into different civilizations based on cultural and religious differences between different ethnic groups. The Islamic civilizations as well as the Chinese are depicted as being the most dangerous and threatening to the Western world. Huntington concludes that on both sides (Islam and the West) there appears to be a ‘clash of civilizations’ and goes on to quote a South Asian-Muslim author, M.J. Akbar as stating that “It is in the sweep of the Islamic nations from the Maghreb to Pakistan that the struggle for a new world order will begin” (Huntington 1993, 32).

It is important to note that when Samuel Huntington first published his article “A Clash of Civilizations?” in 1993, his work was highly criticized and shunned by various members of the academic community for its inaccuracy. However, post-September 11, Samuel Huntington’s book with the same title, minus the question mark at the end, became an instant bestseller (Abrahamian 2003, 529). This drastic change in public opinion is mainly a result of the Western media’s continuous attempt to frame the events of September 11 as somehow confirming Samuel Huntington’s previous assertion of a ‘clash of civilizations’ along the lines of ethnic and religious differences. Huntington’s thesis and other similar types of literature that have
proliferated post-September 11 have essentially re-divided and drawn borders around the Occidental and Oriental world.

Samuel Huntington’s thesis on the ‘clash of civilizations’ is also problematic due to the fact that the various civilizations that he outlines in his article are not exactly unified or homogeneous bodies. This is especially true about the Muslim world, or what Huntington calls the Islamic civilization in his article. There are obvious social and political reasons behind the Western media’s constant depiction of Muslims as belonging to one monolithic and inherently distinct body, despite vast differences in language, culture, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. More specifically, the construction of the supposed ‘other’ is essential in the creation of the ideal ‘Canadian’ or ‘Western’ identity. These inaccurate conflations have also been used to depict the supposed ‘war on terror’ as being a battle between ‘good’ and ‘evil’ and therefore fulfilling Samuel Huntington’s ‘clash of civilizations’.

Karim H. Karim’s book, *Islamic Peril: Media and Global Violence* (2000), explores the Western media’s lack of historical and cultural understanding in its coverage of conflicts involving Muslims in the Middle East, the Caucasus, the Balkans, and the West. Moreover, Karim examines how centuries of biased Orientalist depictions of Muslims and Islam have coloured the way such events are reported and presented to the world in the Western media. Karim critiques the Western media’s often simplistic and biased interpretation of various different complex issues associated with Islam such as jihad, terrorism, and the social construction of Islam as the new, post-Soviet global threat. For example,

Lack of security is often pinpointed as a key reason for the occurrence of terrorist incidents and the solutions are seen in technological and legislative improvements by the state to better detect, prevent, and punish terrorism. Persons who are not agents of the state and who use violence for political reasons are portrayed as criminals (Karim 2000, 22).
By focusing the public’s attention on the violence perpetrated by Muslims without informing the viewer about the politics behind such violent acts, the media in effect has distorted the true nature of the conflict. Moreover, this type of inaccurate reporting on behalf of the Western media also promotes Islamophobia in that it omits the causes and factors that lead some Muslims to commit violent acts, thus making it appear to the viewer that Muslims engage in violence because their religion is inherently violent.

There have been many other studies conducted by researchers uncovering the different ways the Western media has perpetuated stereotypes of Muslims and Arabs. Brigitte Nacos and Oscar Torres-Reyna’s (2002) study, *Muslim Americans in the News before and after 9-11*, is just one of the many work done in this area. The authors point out that according to some critics, the news in the United States, has long displayed an anti-Muslim and anti-Arab bias. Brigitte Nacos and Oscar Torres-Reyna analyzed and examined how the U.S. news media covered Muslim Americans over an 18-month period (12 months preceding the events of 9-11 and 6 months after 9-11) and whether these reports reflected negative biases and stereotypes of Arabs and Muslims, especially after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. For their newspaper analysis they selected the three largest daily newspapers that are published in New York City, the *New York Times, New York Post, and Daily News*. Nacos and Torres-Reyna’s findings revealed that the events of September 11 affected the news about American Muslims in terms of volume, themes, stereotypical references, frames, and viewpoints in several positive ways. More specifically, in their research they found that there was a shift from a fairly limited and stereotypical coverage in the pre-9-11 period to a more comprehensive and inclusive news presentation. They also found that after 9-11, the newspapers carried more appeals for a better understanding between Muslims and non-Muslims in the United States, more assurances that most Muslims have nothing to do
with terrorism and that Islam does not preach violence. Another positive change was the increase in thematic and the decrease of episodic news frames in the months following September 11. Moreover, when stories provide readers with more than facts and explain news events in a larger context, news consumers get more comprehensive information and are able to make well-informed judgments on important issues in the world.

Nacos and Torres-Reyna’s research fails to point out that post-September 11 many liberal newspapers ran new columns on Islam and Muslims with the purpose of explaining the events of September 11. For example, after the September 11 terrorist attacks, the New York Times newspaper introduced a new section entitled ‘A Nation Challenged’ where the editors attempted to search for causes and consequences of September 11. Although the newspaper denied the fact that it focused solely on the Islamic faith as being the number one cause for the September 11 attacks, the columns headlines painted quite the opposite picture. For several months following the attacks of September 11, the newspaper printed articles with headlines such as ‘Yes, this is about Islam’, ‘This is a religious war’, ‘Jihad 101’, ‘The one true faith’, ‘Dictates of faith’, ‘Defusing the holybomb’, ‘Barbarians at the gates’, ‘The force of Islam’, ‘Divine inspiration’, ‘The core of Muslim rage’, ‘Dreams of holy war’, ‘Mosque and state’, ‘Word for word: Islam’s argument’, ‘The deep intellectual roots of Islamic rage’, ‘The age of Muslim wars’, ‘A head-on collision of alien cultures’, ‘Feverish protests against the West’, ‘How Islam and politics mixed’, ‘Survey of the Islamic World’, and ‘Faith and the secular state’ (Abrahamian 2003, 531). These types of articles played a major role in reinforcing the idea that the Islamic faith and Muslims were to blame for the attacks of September 11. Therefore, one could say that although the editors claimed to not be pointing the finger at Muslims, the headings of various articles published reveal an obvious contradiction to these assertions. The New York Times, along with
various other liberal newspapers, is read by millions of people worldwide and it is safe to say that these negative depictions of Islam and Muslims would have a lasting impression on many of its readers. Nacos and Torres-Reyna’s research does not consider that despite the different advances in reporting that they found, the proliferation of such biased columns in many popular mainstream magazines would also have major effects on public opinion in the West.

Jack Shaheen’s book, *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People* (2001), critically examines the portrayal of Arabs and Muslims in Hollywood cinema and the effects of such depictions. Shaheen’s study of nearly one thousand Hollywood films reveals that Arabs and Muslims are often, if not always, depicted in cinema as being the dangerous, violent, backwards, uncivilized “Others”. This bias and negative depiction of Arabs and Muslims has gone unchallenged for centuries in Hollywood and has, in effect, served to naturalize stereotypical and prejudicial views of Arabs. The persistence of Arab and Muslim defamation in Hollywood and the media has a tremendous affect on not only public attitudes, but also public policy. For example, as a result of the dehumanization of Arabs and Muslims, the public no longer feels that they are entitled to the same rights as ordinary citizens. The proliferation of such sentiments post-September 11 can also be used to explain the public’s willingness to allow the government to restrict Arab and Muslim individual rights under anti-terrorism legislation such as the U.S. Patriots Act and the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) in the name of national security.

Edward Said’s book, *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world* (1997), analyzes the Western media’s coverage of the Iranian revolution, the hostage crisis in Iran, and various other events in the Middle East in order to demonstrate what he calls the American press’ invention of a fiction called ‘Islam’. This
fictitious representation of Islam and Muslims in the American media is very much similar to the
depiction of Communism in the 1950s. Said states that

malicious generalizations about Islam have become the last acceptable form of
denigration of foreign culture in the West; what is said about the Muslim mind, or
character, or religion, or culture as a whole cannot now be said in mainstream discussion
about Africans, Jews, other Orientals, or Asians (Said 1997, xii).

According to Said, these inaccurate assertions about Islam and Arabs are also meant to obscure
the role the United States and Israel play in the region. Said raises an interesting point in that
there is definitely a double-standard at play in the coverage of issues pertaining to Islam and
Muslims. Moreover, “covering Islam is a one-sided activity that obscures what ‘we’ do, and
highlights instead what Muslims and Arabs by their very flawed nature are” (Said 1997, xxii).

The violence committed by Islamic states is extensively scrutinized in the media and blamed on
the Islamic faith as a whole, whereas, violence committed by other Western countries is
portrayed as just a random act of violence and therefore not attributed to any religion or culture.

Edward Said raises another interesting point in that coverage of the Middle Eastern world
and more specifically Muslims or Arabs is very much informed and related to American
economic and political interests in that region. Said states,

Independence of the press is an admirable thing, whether in practice or in theory; but
nearly every American journalist reports the world with a subliminal consciousness that
his or her corporation is a participator in American power which, when it is threatened by
foreign countries, makes press independence subordinate to what are often only implicit
expressions of loyalty and patriotism, of simple national identification (Said 1997, 51).

In other words, the media has become intertwined with American foreign policy in the Muslim
and Arab world and therefore its coverage of Muslims is very much bias and inaccurate in many
cases.
SECTION 2: HISTORY OF TARGETED MINORITIES IN CANADA

It is important to take note of the fact that throughout history in Canada and around much of the Western world, minorities have often been targeted based on race, ethnicity, and religion. Canada’s own history of targeting ethnic communities can be traced as far back as to when early settlers first came into contact with the Aboriginal population, and how the community continues to be decimated by Canada’s racist treatment. Many government programs perpetuate the cycle of self-rejection and further social disruption in the Aboriginal community by instilling feelings of disempowerment, dependency, inferiority, and powerlessness (Barsh 1993, 35). Throughout Canadian history, other groups have also been targeted, such as Francophones, Italians, Ukrainians, Irish, Jews, Africans, Japanese, Chinese, South Asians, and most recently people from the Middle East and Muslims. The 20th century has witnessed a resurgence of nationalism and nationalist sentiment combined by official and unofficial projects to clearly identify and express a ‘national character’ in the West. The very presence of large numbers of immigrants in the West has made the social and political arguments for and against the Western nation as a clearly defined entity even more urgent.

One of the groups that have suffered the most as a result of intense discrimination and marginalization in Canada has been the Aboriginal people of this country. The arrival of Europeans in North America caused mass depopulation among Aboriginal communities as a result of the introduction of new diseases (White and Cronon 2002, 11). Moreover, many have also argued that the Canadian government took part in genocidal policies that essentially destroyed Aboriginal families and cultures. The Aboriginal family structure and culture was seen as an obstacle to the European colonial mission and the development of capitalism. As a result, European colonizers “embarked on a campaign to penetrate, exploit, and distort Native
families, and finally to destroy them altogether” (Gupta 2000, 217). Although Prime Minister Harper has very recently issued an official apology to Aboriginals who were abused in residential schools, many in the community still feel that this alone is not enough to undo all the damage that has been done to this community (Gray 2008).

The Aboriginal peoples are not the only community to have experienced systematic racism in Canada, but are rather part of a growing list of groups that have been targeted on the basis of racial and religious identities. During Sir Clifford Sifton’s term as Minister of the Interior (1896-1905) Canada began to admit thousands of Eastern and Central Europeans per year. This large flow of people into the country was met by fierce resistance from Canadians who felt that these immigrants were not only inferior, but unable to assimilate in Canada (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 130-131). Sifton’s attempts to secure more British, American, and Scandinavian immigrants did not attract the same type of criticism. Moreover,

As one Conservative MP explained, Canadians welcome British, American, French, and German immigrants because ‘they belong to the races to which we belong, they are men who tend to the elevation our population, and to the progress of our country. They are accustomed to our institutions, they are suitable to our climate, and we desire to get them (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 131).

During the 1880s approximately 15,000 Chinese labourers were admitted into Canada to help work on the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 94). Chinese immigrants endured intense racism and discrimination upon arrival in Canada. As a result of the growing opposition to Chinese immigration, the Canadian government set up a royal commission to examine this issue in depth (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 95). The commissioners concluded that “while Chinese workers tended to be an asset to the economy, their inability to assimilate into the larger white community, and the prevalence of white antagonism towards their continued presence, made some restrictions advisable” (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 97). As the CPR
neared completion and the demand for Chinese labour dwindled, the Canadian government passed the Chinese Immigration Act of 1885. This Act imposed a $50 dollar head tax on all Chinese immigrants with the exception of diplomats, students, tourists, and merchants (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 97). In addition to this Act, the federal government also passed the Electoral Franchise Act in 1885 that essentially sought to make sure that Chinese immigrants already in Canada would not have the right to vote (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 97). All these discriminatory laws aimed to exclude Chinese immigrants from full participation in the Canadian nation due to the fact that they were seen as posing a threat to the preservation of a White European society.

In the province of British Columbia, the harsh restrictions that were placed on Chinese immigrants were not seen as being enough. The province responded to these inadequacies by passing their own laws to further restrict Chinese immigrants from entering, living and working within British Columbia (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 97). The economic recession of 1907 and the high unemployment rates were especially felt in Vancouver as a result of continued population increase and severe housing shortage (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 145). Anti-Asian sentiments in the province reached new levels after it was reported that Grand Trunk Pacific Railway entered into a tentative agreement with the Canadian Nippon Supply Company to import Japanese labourers (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 145). The media further embellished these growing anti-Asian sentiments by issuing reports that warned of an impending ‘invasion’ of ‘50,000 Japanese’ (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 145). Growing fears of a supposed Asian invasion of the West coast eventually led to a mass rally in the summer of 1907 in which Asian property was destroyed and looted (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 145). Although economic and labour disputes played a role in the events that took place in Vancouver, one cannot deny the fact
that race also contributed majorly to the situation. In other words, this was not the first time that foreign labour was “imported” from outside, but because labour was now coming from overseas from supposedly ‘inferior’ races it became an issue.

Another immigrant group that faced similar discrimination and exclusion in Canada was the Jewish community. Opinion polls conducted throughout the war years revealed that many Canadians felt that Jewish immigrants would not adapt well to Canada and therefore would not be welcomed by the Canadian public (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 258). Jews that made it to Canada faced numerous restrictions that sought to limit the places they could work, live, and spend recreational time. More specifically,

There were restrictions on entry into certain teaching and nursing professions; bars to their advancement existed in many business enterprises, most notably in real estate, brokerage houses, banks, and loan companies; and there were few Jews in management positions of major industrial enterprises (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 258).

In addition, Jews were also barred from purchasing certain lands and houses; and they were denied membership to recreational centers and private clubs (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 258). In order to explain why thousands of Jewish refugees who qualified for admissions under Canada’s narrow immigration requirements were denied entrance, one need only to look at the statements that were publicly made by the Director of Canada’s Immigration Branch at the time, Fredrick Blair. According to Blair, Jews were considered to be of the ‘unpreferred’ class of immigrants and more specifically “they had a tendency to lie, and force themselves upon others, and therefore the Canadian government had to be particularly vigilant in resisting their attempts to enter Canada” (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 259).

Similarly, many Black immigrants were also rejected admission into Canada on the basis of race and skin colour. During the 1900s, African-Americans who approached immigration
officials with the desire to immigrate to Canada were either immediately rejected or their requests were put ‘on file’ indefinitely (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 154). Many African-American requests for migration were rejected on the basis that “it had been observed that after some years of experience in Canada [Negroes] do not readily take to our climate on account of the rather severe winter” (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 154). This claim was obviously false seeing as in thousands of African-Americans had successfully endured Canada’s harsh winters for over 150 years (Kelley and Trebilcock 2000, 154). Canada’s physical landscape and climate was historically used to construct racist and exclusive narratives of the ‘Canadian’ nation. “Canada was the ‘Britain of the North’, ‘this northern kingdom’, the ‘True North’ . . . her people, ‘[the] hardy northern race’; her location, those ‘Stern latitudes’” (Berger 1997, 4-5). The ‘northern’ race was associated with noble traits such as strength, hardihood, vigour, and purity (Berger 1997, 10). These images were used to construct a national ‘Canadian’ identity which was dominant to all other southern races. ‘Southern’ people’s inability to adapt to the Canadian landscape was used as justification to deny Black’s entry into the country and furthermore to exclude them from the narrative of the ‘Canadian’ nation.

The notion of race and religion continue to play a major role in denying certain immigrants access into the ‘Canadian’ nation regardless of their level of citizenship; however, the language and boundaries of such discrimination have taken on new forms. Many critics have argued that the discourse of diversity and multiculturalism as appropriated by supporters of Canada’s multiculturalism has in effect introduced a new kind of domination over non-white people. Following Canada’s open door immigration policies in the 1960s and 1970s, many non-white immigrants or ‘people of colour’ entered the nation, as a result, the Canadian government
introduced new vocabulary to deal with these changing circumstances. As discussed by Himani Bannerji,

the Canadian state was careful not to directly use the notion of color in the way it designated the newcomers. But color was translated into the language of visibility. The new Canadian social and political subject was appalled ‘visible minority,’ stressing both the features of being non-white and therefore visible in a way whites are not, and of being politically minor players (Bannerji 2000, 545).

Taking this into account, white immigrants such as the Irish, Italians, and Jews who historically were discriminated against in Canada have to a large extent been accepted into the ‘Canadian’ mainstream, whereas non-whites have not on the basis of skin colour.

Although the vocabulary of exclusion and discrimination has changed in the Canadian context, the root of the problem remains the same and therefore continues to affect the daily lives of immigrant communities in Canada. Moreover, the terms of multiculturalism and diversity are exclusively agreed upon by the dominant power and therefore set up an unequal power imbalance. Bannerji states:

From the days of colonial capitalism to the present-day global imperialism, there has emerged an ideologically homogeneous identity dubbed Canadian, whose nation and state Canada is supposed to be. The core community is synthesized into a national ‘we’, and it decides on the terms of multiculturalism and the degree to which multicultural others should be tolerated or accommodated. This ‘we’ is an essentialized version of a colonial European turned into Canadian and the subject or the agent of Canadian nationalism . . . So the identity of the Canadian ‘we’ does not reside in language, religion or other aspects of culture, but rather in the European/North American physical origin – in the body and the color of skin. Color of skin is elevated here beyond its contingent status and becomes an essential quality called whiteness, and this becomes the ideological signifier of a unified non-diversity. The others outside of this moral and cultural whiteness are targets of either assimilation or tolerance” (Bannerji 2000, 550-551).

Based on Bannerji’s previous statement, one could argue that Canada’s reputation of a perfect multicultural society is nothing more than an illusion of political and social acceptance and not in fact a reality on the ground. Moreover, in this illusion of acceptance and tolerance of ethnic minorities, the cultures of white immigrants from the ‘preferable’ class of migrants, are much
more celebrated than that of non-white immigrants. As argued by Bannerji and others like her, the discourse of multiculturalism has resulted in definitional power over non-white immigrants in Canada with regard to their ideological and socio-political location in society. Their allocation as “visible” minorities in Canadian society formally reduces them to a status that is deemed less powerful and therefore inferior to the dominant White class.

Although Himani Bannerji and others like her make a very convincing argument about the failures of multiculturalism in Canada, it is important to also take note of the fact that without the limited protections of multiculturalism, the lives of minorities in Canada would be in a far worse state. Canada’s multicultural system has come under intense attack by not only academics, but also right-wing political parties, ethnic minorities, and racists (Abu-Laban and Stasiulis 1992, 365). It is true that official multiculturalism in Canada has in practice been flawed and mediated by race; however, this does not mean that Canadian citizens cannot reclaim multiculturalism for what it truly should be. It is important to recognize the fact that the current experiences of Muslims and people from the Middle East post-September 11 are just part of an underlying problem that needs to be addressed in Canada. The problem of racism and discrimination towards certain ethnic communities in Canada has definitely not been unique to one group alone as demonstrated and discussed above. The solution to the problem of systemic racism and discrimination is not to eliminate multiculturalism altogether, but to focus attention on problematic elements and to critically look at the social, economic, and political issues affecting immigrant life in Canada. By looking at the media’s own bias towards a specific ethnic or religious minority group in Canada, this will reveal firsthand the failures of multiculturalism in Canada and what steps need to be taken in order to undo this problem.
SECTION 3: RECENT CHANGES TO POLICY POST SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon have ushered in a new era in Canadian immigration and refugee policy. Immediately following the events of September 11, 2001, American media outlets were quick to report that at least five of the September 11 terrorists had entered the United States through Canada. These outrageous accusations were later found to be completely false, however, the negative impression that Canada was somehow to blame as a result of its liberal immigration and refugee policies continued to linger on in the minds of many (Roach 2003, 5). Although the September 11 terrorists entered the United States legally on student visas and not as immigrants or refugee claimants, according to a nation-wide poll conducted in the United States, two-thirds of those polled (68 percent) strongly agreed that enforcement of immigration laws and the border had been far too lax and that not enough was being done to control the border and inspect prospective immigrants (Adelman 2002, 1). As a result of this lack of enforcement on behalf of the government, potential terrorists were easily able to enter the country posing as legitimate immigrants or refugees. Furthermore, a poll conducted for the Council for Canadian Unity revealed that support to reduce immigration increased significantly post-September 11 from 29 percent to 45 percent. In addition, 80 percent of those polled went on to demand that the Canadian government implement stricter immigration policies in order to combat terrorism (Adelman 2002, 1). Surveys such as these reveal that the September 11 terrorist attacks had an enormous impact on how North Americans viewed immigration policy in Canada and more specifically how immigrants and refugees were viewed in society.
The Canadian government’s response to terrorism has essentially come in the form of four pieces of complex legislation which all seek to increase security. These pieces of legislation include: Bill C-36 (the Anti-Terrorism Act), Bill C-35 (An Act to Amend the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act), Bill C-55 (Public Safety Act), and Bill C-11 (the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act) (Beare 2003, 2). The implementation of all these Acts has had massive repercussions on the lives of Muslim and Middle Eastern communities in Canada. The Act that has received the greatest amount of media coverage post-September 11 has been the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) which was ratified on December 18th, 2001. This Act set out to amend the Criminal Code, the Official Secrets Act, the Canada Evidence Act, the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) Act and other Acts, and to enact measures respecting the registration of charities, in order to combat terrorism (Bill C-36 2001). Furthermore, the ATA set forth a clear definition of what terrorism entailed in the Canadian context. According to the ATA, terrorism is “any act or omission committed inside or outside of Canada, either partially or wholly, for political, religious or ideological purposes, causes or objectives” (Wispinski 2001, 2). While this may appear to be an incomplete definition, the ATA focuses its attention on six key areas that include: new crimes and penalties, new investigative tools and procedures, electronic surveillance and communications interception, information gathering (secrecy and sharing), the listing of terrorist entities and the suppression of terrorist financing (Wispinski 2001, 1).

The broad definition of terrorism, investigative hearings and preventative arrests, the listing of terrorist entities, and de-registration of registered charities have all led to the racial profiling and demonization of Muslims and people from the Middle East. The provisions of the ATA have essentially created a culture of fear where Arab and Muslim Canadians are seen as threats to Canadian society simply based on their faith. The 'othering' of Arab and Muslim
Canadians has further endorsed the idea that these ethnic communities are not deserving of the same legal and human rights as any other Canadian citizen. The Council on American-Islamic Relations Canada, the Canadian Arab Foundation, and the Canadian Muslim Lawyer’s Association have all argued that the “soft use” of national security through informal interviews and investigations reveal that profiling is occurring by specifically targeting Arabs and Muslims. Furthermore, “soft use” is beginning to be replaced with “soft abuse”, where intimidation and threats of new terrorism laws are used to entice information from individuals without their legal advice (Council on American-Islamic Relations Canada, Canadian Arab Foundation & Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association, 2005). On the other hand, supporters of the Anti-Terrorism Act have argued that this is a necessary piece of legislation, which has tried to balance Canadian security and individual rights and freedoms as much as possible. Advocates of the ATA have also often used the excuse that “security comes at a price” and that there is an urgent need to “trade human rights and dignity for security” (Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association, 2005). This trade off of human rights for security has come at a high cost for Muslim and Middle Eastern communities in Canada.

Post-September 11, immigrants and refugees have also been central targets in the fight on terrorism. As stated by the Government Counter-terrorism backgrounder: “Most terrorist activities in Canada are in support of actions elsewhere linked to homeland conflicts. These activities include providing a convenient base for terrorist supporters and may involve using the refugee stream to enter Canada, or immigrant smuggling. In recent years, terrorists from different international terrorist organizations have come to Canada posing as refugees” (Beare 2003, 27). In order to deal with this alleged problem, the Canadian government introduced the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) in 2002 which replaced the Immigration Act of 1978. This
new Act has taken a much more security oriented approach in the implementation of immigration and refugee policy. The IRPA has effectively introduced three major changes to the ways in which immigrants and refugees are dealt with in the Canadian context. These changes include: the fast removal/deportation of those deemed to be a security threat, imposing harsher penalties for people using or selling forged documents, and denying those deemed a security threat access to the Canadian refugee determination process (Beare 2003, 27).

The most problematic feature of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) has been the introduction of security certificates. The issuing of security certificates allows for immigration officials to detain and deport non-citizens (both permanent residents and foreign nationals) who are deemed to be a threat to Canada’s national security (Zaidi 2007, 2). In light of new security concerns, the provisions of the IRPA provide safeguards against those individuals who are subject to normal immigration procedures, but also have links to terrorism or violent crimes (Zaidi 2007, 4). The new provisions of the IRPA, allow for the detention of non-citizens as a preventative security measure under three conditions: 1) when the person is a danger to the public; 2) when the person’s identity has not been established; and 3) when the person is unlikely to appear at proceedings (Zaidi 2007, 5-6). The shared exchange of intelligence data between the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (CIC), and the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (PSEP) serve as the basis for issuing security certificates against non-citizens (Zaidi 2007, 6).

Under section 77 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, immigration officials can issue a security certificate against non-citizens on the grounds of: 1) a person or group being a threat to national security, 2) violating human rights or international rights, 3) espionage, and 4) serious or organized criminality (Zaidi 2007, 8). Security certificates have been issued against
permanent residents of Canada, foreign nationals, and refugees. Although security certificates have been present in the Canadian immigration Act since 1978, the utilization of this power has been much more common post-September 11. There have been only 27 security certificates issued by the Canadian government, all which have been issued between the years of 1991-2003 (Zaidi 2007, 8). This sudden boost in the use of security certificates has had a lot to do with the changing political environment post-September 11. As a result of heightened security concerns, government officials have become more willing to issue security certificates against those deemed to be a threat to national security. Security certificates have mainly targeted specific ethnic and religious groups in Canada such as Islamic fundamentalists, Hindu and Sikh extremists, and Russian nationals engaging in espionage (Zaidi 2007, 8-9). However, currently of the five people on security certificates, all are male Muslims from the Middle East.

In February of 2007 the Supreme Court of Canada struck down the security certificate system that was being used to detain five Muslim men on security-related offenses. Although the court did not rule against the use of security certificates, the court said that the manner in which security certificates and secret trials were conducted was a violation of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms on the grounds that it did not allow suspects or their lawyers to become aware of the charges or the reasons for their detention. However, the court delayed its judgement from taking effect legally in order to give Parliament enough time to modify the law. On October 22, 2007, the Conservative government introduced to the House of Commons, Bill C-3 to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act in order to allow for the appointment of a special advocate to represent the interests of a person named in a security certificate (Bill C-3 2007). According to Bill C-3, the Minister of Justice is required to establish a public list of people who may act as special advocates. During a security certificate proceeding, the presiding
judge must appoint a person from the list provided by the Minister of Justice to act as a special advocate. The role of the special advocate is to protect the interests of the person named in the security certificate when information or evidence is not disclosed to him or her. In doing so the special advocate is able to cross-examine witnesses during the proceedings that are held in absence of the public and detainee (Bill C-3 2007). Only time will tell if the use of special advocates in security certificate proceedings will make a difference in allowing non-citizens the right to a fair trial in Canada. However, some critics have already voiced their concerns that the use of special advocates will essentially make no difference in the long run due to the fact that judges have the power to terminate the appointment of advocates anytime during the proceedings (Bill C-3 2007). The government’s refusal to eliminate the use of security certificates has raised concerns over whether or not immigrants and refugees are being detained for years without criminal charges being laid against them and without being informed the basis of why they have been detained.
SECTION 4: CASE STUDY OF THE TORONTO STAR

One of the most highly publicized cases in Ontario, following the introduction of Canada’s new security provisions post-September 11, has been the case of the Toronto 18. On June 2nd 2006, the RCMP conducted a massive operation in the city of Toronto which included the arrests of 14 adults and 4 youth from the largely South Asian Muslim community. According to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), these 18 people had bought and acquired 3 tonnes of ammonium nitrate which was intended to be used to create explosive devices. More specifically, it was alleged that these men had planned attacks on various prominent Canadians including Prime Minister Stephen Harper, Parliament, the Toronto Stock Exchange, and the CBC. Even before the evidence against these men was heard in court, the RCMP, CSIS, and the media had already branded them “home grown” terrorists. Moreover, as a result of the sensationalized media coverage in this case the public quickly forgot that these men were supposed to be innocent until proven guilty.

As previously stated, the section of the paper focusing on the Toronto Star will be limited to the Star’s coverage of the Toronto 18 case between the period of June 2nd, 2006 and July 29th, 2008. Immediately following the arrests of these 18 men in Toronto, the media, including the Toronto Star, began running stories on the radicalization of Muslim youth in Canada. According to media reports, it was suggested that there was a growing epidemic of extremism and radicalization among the Muslim community in Canada and these recent arrests were only testament to that. Moreover, radical imams or leaders in the Muslim community were to blame for the spread of anti-Western sentiments and extremism. The adult men arrested in this specific case were portrayed as ‘radical jihadists’ who had contaminated the minds of these Muslim youth with hate. According to one of the moles hired by CSIS to infiltrate the group, Mubin
Shaikh, the alleged ringleader of Toronto’s home grown terror plot lived in a ‘jihadi fantasy’ but was also “delusional, nuts and a world-class exaggerator” (Teotonio, June 18, 2008). According to the testimony of Shaikh, the ringleader had asked him to keep the youth involved “in the dark about the camp’s real purpose” (Walkom, June 19, 2008). Without even hearing the evidence against this supposed ‘jihadi’ ringleader, one would assume just by the portrayal of him in the media that he is a dangerous man that must really be guilty of something evil.

This case in many ways had confirmed the fears of many Canadians that ‘Islamist radicals’ “were motivating impressionable Muslim youths” and government officials had to act quickly before the problem got worse (Walkom, April 16, 2008). According to a report in the Toronto Star, government officials believe that the arrests of this so called ‘home-grown terrorism cell’ is part of a growing phenomenon in the Muslim community. Moreover, the occurrence of such an event is not surprising to say the least; it involves a growing number of Western youths who have never set foot in Afghanistan but allegedly were radicalized here, and who are thought to be potentially as dangerous as the cells that once took orders from Osama bin Laden. Western governments, including Canada's, have repeatedly warned of this phenomenon and blamed recent attacks, such as last July’s bombings in London, as the work of such groups (Shephard, June 3 ‘2006).

An example of how these types of assertions about Muslim youth permeate even the highest level of Canadian institutions can be seen from the statements of the CSIS Deputy Director. During a Senate committee review of Canada’s anti-terrorism legislation, former CSIS Deputy Director Dale Neufeld, further elaborated on the topic of ‘Canadian-born radicalized youths’; he said:

It's the second generation, the children of Muslims who are born in this country. They have a very normal upbringing, according to our analysis, but at some point in their teenage years or young 20s, they decide that radical Islam is the path they want to take (Shephard, June 3, 2006).

Neufeld also went on to recognize that this group is definitely not alone,
The other (concern) is young Canadians who are generally quite disillusioned, which is again very disturbing because it's hard to detect and hard to investigate. They're the kids who don't do well in high school, but could do anything. They could become petty criminals. They could get involved in the drug culture. They might join a motorcycle gang. We're now seeing a number of examples where they decide to take up Islam in the radical form” (Shephard, June 3, 2006).

Reports and statements like those given by Neufeld perpetuated the false assumption that all Muslims whether born here or not are potential threats to the national security of the country and, therefore, steps had to be taken to properly deal with them.

The Toronto Star published an entire article about combating the problem of extremism found within the Muslim community. According to the author, Raheel Raza, despite the concerns of Muslim Canadians about how the media is covering this specific case, she insisted that they are just doing their job. Reza who claims herself to be a “moderate” Muslim states, “If some of the coverage is over the top that's the nature of the beast. The sooner we learn to deal with it, the better it will be for us. To consider ourselves victims of a media conspiracy is skirting the real issue” (Raza, June 13, 2006). Reza goes on to make the assertion that many Muslims are in denial about the problems in the Muslim community which makes it even harder to combat terror. Reza is confident that the Canadian legal system will eventually decide whether these men are guilty or innocent but the real issue that should be of concern to Muslims is dealing with the radicalization of our youth. Reza states, “We have to face the fact that there is a problem facing Muslim Canadian youth. A radical ideology is being used to poison their minds and hearts. We need to know where it's coming from and stop it” (Raza, June 13, 2006).

Raza goes on to outline a list of solutions to deal with the problem of radicalization in the Muslim community. These solutions include: 1) total transparency in mosques and equal participation of women, 2) better monitoring of foreign fundraisers by Revenue Canada, 3) Parents, teachers and preachers need to be more vigilant about the religious education being
given to youths, 4) to combat "home-grown terrorists" we need to find home-grown preachers as they have started doing in England and France, and 5) the waiting period for getting Canadian citizenship should be increased to at least five years so that thorough background checks can be made on applicants (Raza, June 13, 2006). Raza also goes on to criticize the living and economic conditions of many Muslim families by stating “some immigrants dump their families here while the men leave to work abroad. They come back only when it suits their needs. How will they cultivate loyalty toward Canada when they have a foot in two contrasting worlds?” (Raza, June 13, 2006). First and foremost, these proposed solutions to radicalization of Muslim youths as outlined by Raza, miss a very important point and that is the social and economic conditions that lead many of these youth to take such extreme measures. Also, racism and marginalization in Canadian society play a major role in this process of radicalization. Muslim youth who feel isolated from mainstream society may resort to forming their own religious circles where they feel more support and acceptance. Home-grown Muslim imams are not the only source of the problem, but part of wider societal problem. The solutions Raza outlines seek to place blame on the Muslim community alone and not recognize the failures of the Canadian government to help successfully integrate immigrants in Canada. She also does not seem to recognize the racism in the Canadian criminal justice system, a fact that was officially recognized by the Rae government in Ontario more than a decade back.²

Given that Reza seems to have internalized racism and the dominant discourse on Muslims, her faith in the Canadian justice system remains firm and unbroken. According to Reza, Canadians should be confident that the Canadian legal system will eventually come to the

right decision on the fate of these 18 men, but the real question is will it already be too late to undo all the harm that has been done. These men have been in prison for nearly two years now and many have claimed that they have been severely mistreated while in detention. According to the Star, one of the men arrested, Qayyum Abdul Jamal, who spent 17 months in jail, 13 of them in solitary confinement, if it had not been for his faith he would have been suicidal (Teotonio, April 16, 2008). Jamal states that while in jail he was “beaten, pushed and kicked by jail guards” (Teotonio, April 16, 2008). Another one of the adult men arrested, Shareef Abdelhaleem, described this ordeal as something that will profoundly affect his life and the other co-accused in the Toronto 18 case. In a series of telephone interviews Abdelhaleem told reporters how he felt robbed of precious time in his life, “these are the years when you grow a pot-belly, get married and have kids” (Teotonio, December 26, 2007). The preliminary hearing for all the adult men charged in the case was abruptly halted in September of 2007 by the Crown who filed for a direct indictment which essentially means the case will go directly to trial. The Crown’s decision to skip the preliminary proceedings is particularly surprising seeing as in both sides had come to a mutual agreement in which the defence had made various concessions in return for the chance to question key witnesses, some of whom never actually took the stand (Teotonio, December 26, 2007). Abdelhaleem seemed very distraught by the Crown’s actions when he spoke to reporters via telephone, “‘We have faith in the justice system that they will bring back the preliminary because it's what's right,’ he said. Otherwise it'll likely be years before the case makes it to trial. ‘This is an abuse of process . . . Why are we fighting to get back something we had a contract on?’” (Teotonio, December 26, 2007).

Back to Reza’s argument of having faith in Canada’s judicial system to do the right thing, thus far this has not actually taken place yet. Many of the men accused, those of which have not
been granted bail or released, have lost precious time with their friends and families. Moreover, their lives have forever been tarnished by these accusations and as a result even if the courts do find them innocent down the road it will still be very difficult for them to rebuild their lives after this ordeal. As extensively discussed by Reza in her article, extremism is definitely a very important issue that should be dealt with, but making sure our judicial system continues to function properly in order to ensure that people receive fair trials is just as equally important.

Two years after the arrests of the Toronto 18, the media has slowly started to take notice of the fact that there is very little merit to the evidence presented against these men. In the early reports made by the media very little attention was paid to the fact that many of the images shown to the public were set up by the RCMP and CSIS. The 3 tonnes of ammonium nitrate that was supposedly seized by the RCMP in the summer of 2006 was not in fact confiscated at the time of the raid, but was only presented to the media for display purposes. Following the 2006 arrests, the Toronto Star ran an entire article on ammonium nitrate and the difficulty in purchasing this substance in Canada if you were not a commercial farmer. The report also warned Canadian suppliers of the substance to be on guard and not to sell it to suspicious customers. More specifically suppliers should “Be wary of customers who insist on paying cash, won't show identification or ask to take the product with them instead of having it delivered, the guide says. And be suspicious about any customer who seems to know little about acreage, crops or soil composition” (Goddard, June 7, 2006). Ken MacQuarrie, president of the Canadian Association of Agri-Retailers, goes on to say that "If (the customer) is not a farmer in your local area," MacQuarrie said, "don't sell to him. It's that simple" (Goddard, June 7, 2006). Little attention is paid to the fact that the ammonium nitrate was not bought by terrorists, but by the RCMP. As reported by the Toronto Star, the delivery of three tonnes of ammonium nitrate to
this supposed terrorist cell in Southern Ontario was all part of a undercover police sting operation. “Sources say investigators who had learned of the group's alleged plan to build a bomb were controlling the sale and transport of the massive amount of fertilizer, a key component in creating explosives” (Shephard and Teotonio, June 4, 2006). The fact of the matter is that these men even if they wanted to purchase ammonium nitrate would have probably never been able to do so without the help and direction of the CSIS informants.
SECTION 5: CASE STUDY OF MACLEAN’S MAGAZINE

More recently, Maclean’s Magazine has been at the center of a human rights complaint filed by the Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC). According to CIC, Maclean’s magazine has published several highly Islamophobic articles between the period of January 2005 and July 2007 which are a series of some nineteen articles. Moreover, many of the articles published by Maclean’s specifically target the Muslim community by promoting false stereotypes and distorting facts to present a bias image of Muslims as a whole. The CIC complaint to the Canadian Human Rights Commission was filed and submitted initially by five Osgoode law students who at the time tried to settle the dispute with Maclean’s directly. These law students had first approached Maclean’s editors with a request to allow for a response to these biased and Islamophobic articles. Their request for an apology and written response was immediately turned down by Maclean’s magazine editors who claimed they “would rather go bankrupt than allow [them] to publish a response to the flagrantly anti-Muslim article ‘The Future Belongs to Islam’” (Awan et al. 15). The purpose of this section is not to discuss the details of the Osgoode student’s request and proposal to Maclean’s, but rather to examine the content of these articles and come to a fair conclusion as to whether or not the articles in question are anti-Muslim in nature and moreover if they promote hate and intolerance.

The report that was prepared by the five Osgoode law students entitled, “Maclean’s Magazine: A Case Study of Media-Propagated Islamophobia”, makes the claim that many of Maclean’s Magazines articles that have been published about Islam and Muslims are: (1) promoting Islamophobia and fear of Muslims; (2) representing Muslims as violent people who are prone to engage in violence and are incapable of living peacefully in their host societies; (3)
casting suspicion on Muslims at large as potential terrorists, extremists, and radicals; (4) representing the presence and growth of Muslims in Western societies as a threat to the Western values of democracy, freedom, and human rights; (5) attempting to import a racist narrative and language into mainstream Canadian society; (6) attacking multiculturalism and religious freedoms; (7) attacking laws that provide protection to identifiable communities from the type of discriminatory journalism that Macleans is engaging in; (8) condemning any and all efforts by politicians, law enforcement, media and other institutions to reach out to Muslim communities and to exercise sensitivity (Awan et al. 2007, 4).

The articles mentioned in this report include: “The future belongs to Islam”; “Wake up, ostriches: Islam's in an expansionary phase. In case you hadn't noticed”; “Wake up, Europe. It may already be too late --- Why the fall and spring riot seasons in France are signs of the coming apocalypse”; “What should I do, Imam? Novelist Robert Ferrigno imagines the Islamic Republic of America in the year 2040”; “Celebrate tolerance, or you're dead - Oriana Fallaci appeals to Europe to save itself. Good luck”; “The press darling who became 'the Jew’”; “Why are teachers trashing Western values?”; “Feeding the hand that bites them”; “The little mosque that couldn't - We're so boundlessly tolerant we tolerate endless dreary shows about how intolerant we are”; “The war on terror is the real women's issue - Feminists whine about life in the West but they won't fight the bigger battle”; “The church dance that snowballed - A masterful new work on al-Qaeda and 9/11 explains how a loser cult has metastasized”; “Q&A with terrorism expert David Harris - On how Canada is handling the issue of Islamic extremism”; “A Twilight zone of insanity - Cartoons in a Danish newspaper depicting the prophet Muhammed have set off a clash of civilizations. Problem is, all blonds look alike in a jihad”; “Finally, someone who cares about Christians - Christendom might finally have a saviour in the Pope”; “Far better to be at the zoo
than this circus”; “Racism is the core force behind the carnage in Darfur”; “The Making of a Canadian Terrorist - From small-town boy to al-Qaeda assassin”; “A 'Canadian spy' - Afghan authorities claim a Calgary man in a Kabul jail is part of a larger network backing the insurgency”; “I begged to confess' - William Sampson makes stunning revelations about his rape and torture by the Saudis”. By just reading the titles of some of the articles published by Maclean’s magazine it is not farfetched to assume that these types of headings can in fact promote and perpetuate Islamophobia and fear of Muslims.

One of the central themes in many of these articles is the assertion that Muslims, including the Muslim community in Canada, is part of a global Islamic conspiracy to take over the Western world and impose oppressive Islamic laws. Furthermore, these articles make the claim that there is a religious and ideological war underway between Muslims and non-Muslims and therefore Muslims need to be viewed as potential enemies (Awan et al. 4). The fear of Muslims and this ‘supposed’ Islamic takeover of the Western world are further perpetuated with false assertions on what will take place after Islamic rule is established in the West. According to the authors of some of these articles published by Maclean’s magazine, Muslims will not only burn books and libraries (Amiel, Feb. 19, 2007), but all women will be forced to wear the Muslim veil (Amiel, Feb 16, 2006), honour killings will become a common practice, and women will no longer be able to vote (Steyn, Jan 9, 2006). In addition, Christians will be expelled from their countries and Jews will be massacred (Steyn, Feb 23, 2006).

Another central theme that is present in several of the articles published in Maclean’s is the assertion that Muslims are inherently violent people and therefore cannot live peacefully in their Western host countries. For example, one of the articles published entitled, “A Twilight
“Zone of Insanity”, discusses the Danish cartoons controversy in Denmark in such a way as to suggest that all Muslims whether radical or moderate have violent tendencies. The author goes on to suggest that

Most of the time they [Muslims] work quietly at their jobs, running their shops or doing whatever it is they do. Then, one day, like the Indian bull elephant in George Orwell's essay, they go berserk. Perhaps the madness was jump-started by the urging of the Saudi imams, but suddenly much of the Muslim world spun out of control (Amiel, Feb 7 ‘2006).

As a result of such depictions, the reader is left with the assumption that all Muslims are essentially like ticking time bombs and can be triggered at anytime, moreover, once they feel offended they react in very violent ways. Another article praises Pope Benedict XVI for finally standing up against ‘medieval’ Islam and not being intimidated by the threats of angry Muslims.

Finally there appears to be someone in Christendom who isn't resigned to Christians being harassed, imprisoned, tortured and even executed in Islamic countries simply for their beliefs. This Pope has his eye on the beleaguered flock living under Islamofascism. No one else appears to care a whit about them (Amiel, Oct 2 ‘2006).

The ways in which the author describes certain incidences of Christian persecution in Islamic countries unfairly portrays all Muslims as somehow condoning the persecution of religious minorities. The author completely forgets the fact that thousands of Muslims are tortured and persecuted in their own countries as well. The problem in many of these predominately Muslim countries is not Islam itself, but rather the political tyranny exercised by governments that are supported by Western states in most cases.

Many of the articles published also cast suspicion on all Muslims as potentially being or sympathizing with terrorists, radicals, and extremists. Mark Steyn’s article, “The Future Belongs to Islam”, makes no distinction between moderate and extremist Muslims and basically portrays them all as potential threats to the stability of Western democracy and liberal values. Steyn states, “Of course, not all Muslims support terrorists -- though enough of them share their basic
objectives (the wish to live under Islamic law in Europe and North America) to function wittingly or otherwise as the ‘good cop’ end of an Islamic good cop/bad cop routine” (Steyn, Oct 20, 2006). Another article published in Maclean’s makes the assertion that 80% of Canadian Muslim imams are alleged ‘radicals’ based on the assessment of the Italian Imam Palazzi who visits Canada “every now and then” (Frum, June 13, 2006). Barbara Amiel’s article, “Wake up, ostriches: Islam's in an expansionary phase. In case you hadn't noticed” also makes the assertion that extremism is on the rise in the Muslim community in Canada. Moreover, Amiel argues that although the majority of Muslims are moderate, it is the minority extremist faction of Islam that will shape society. Amiel states,

Canada has a relatively small Muslim population. Moderate Muslims are probably the majority, but in a time of expansionism, the fringe determines the course. Young Muslim Internet sites in Canada extol the merits of fundamentalism, cite extremist clerics as role models. Chat rooms discuss the virtues of the Islamic state (Amiel, Feb 16, 2006).

These types of exaggerations of the facts only increase fear and animosity towards Muslims and therefore are highly problematic.

Many of the articles published in Maclean’s magazine also depict Islam and Muslims as anathema to Western culture and the Western values of democracy, freedom, and human rights. Mark Steyn’s article, “The Church Dance that Snowballed” examines the life of a prominent figure in the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, Sayyid Qutb, in order to demonstrate that all moderate Muslims by and large share an inherent hatred towards the West and Western culture. Steyn completely leaves out the fact that many historical figures such as Leo Strauss, who is largely seen as the “father” of neo-conservatism, were also very critical of Western liberalism. The 2004 BBC documentary, Power of Nightmares: the Rise of the Politics of Fear, examined how both Qutb and Strauss saw American liberalism as aimlessly hedonistic and permissive and
thus needed to be stopped. 3 However, Steyn chooses to focus on only Qutb’s rejection of American liberalism in his article and moreover blames his Islamic faith for the adoption of such a radical ideology.

According to Steyn, as a result of this inherent characteristic that all Westernized and moderate Muslims possess, they have the potential to join terrorist organizations aimed at destroying the West all together. Steyn goes on to state, “In the jihad, somebody always shows up, somebody middle-class and prosperous and educated and perfectly assimilated except for an urge to self-detonate on the London Underground” (Steyn, Sep 21, 2006). Another article written by Mark Steyn goes on to warn the Western world of ‘medieval’ Islam and the challenges it poses to the preservation of Western culture. Some of the allegations made about Muslims in this article include the following: they are ‘sheep-haggers”, they engage in sex with minors and animals, and they support the sodomizing and beheading of non-Muslims (Steyn, Apr 28, 2006).

Steyn also goes on to criticize Canada’s multiculturalism by sarcastically stating,

Our tolerant multicultural society is so tolerant and multicultural we'll tolerate your intolerant uniculturalism. Your antipathy to diversity is just another form of diversity for us to celebrate (Steyn, Apr 28, 2006).

Both of Steyn’s articles attempt to depict the world in a gloomy ‘clash of civilization’ type scenario and as a result Muslims are seen as being outside ‘Western’ society and culture. Moreover, in order for the preservation of Western culture and society, it is imperative that the West no longer tolerate ‘backwards’ Muslim culture and values.

---

SECTION 6: PUTTING ISLAMOPHOBIA IN CONTEXT

First and foremost, it should be noted that the Toronto Star’s coverage of the Toronto 18 case when compared to Maclean’s magazine’s coverage of Muslims is definitely less biased in nature. However, many of the articles in the Toronto Star did turn a blind eye to some of the facts and at times also exaggerated the evidence presented. For example, virtually no initial articles reported on the fact that the ammonium nitrate presented to the media at the RCMP press conference following the arrests of these 18 men was not in fact seized during the raids, but only there for display purposes.\(^4\) Instead of questioning why the RCMP would buy ammonium nitrate for “display purposes” many in the media decided to continue to play on the emotions of their readers. For example, several days after the arrests, the Toronto Star ran an entire article warning suppliers of ammonium nitrate in the country to be especially wary of “suspicious” customers (Goddard, June 7, 2006). It has only been more recently that the Toronto Star has begun running stories that reveal how weak the Crown’s case and evidence is against these men. During early proceedings very little was written in the Toronto Star questioning the credibility of CSIS’s key informants in the case, one of which (Mubin Shaikh) has been recently charged with assaulting two 12-year-old girls and has also admitted to spending a significant amount of his CSIS-paid money on cocaine.\(^5\)

Nonetheless, despite variations in the degree of Islamophobia and anti-Muslim racism, both the Toronto Star and Maclean’s magazine case studies reveal the extent to which Muslims and Islam have been unfairly targeted in the Western media. This extensive campaign of Islam

\(^4\) To view the documents that prove that 3 tonnes of ammonium nitrate was not in fact seized during the time of the raids watch the following independent documentary: Weingarten, David (2008). Unfair Dealing. Video Retrieved July 29, 2008, from Toronto 18 Website: <http://toronto18.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=71&Itemid=1>.

\(^5\) Ibid.
and Muslim bashing in the media has at times been defended under the principle of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. For example, when the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* decided to publish twelve provocative cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad, the media immediately attempted to portray the issue as a worldwide battle to defend a central tenet of Western democracy, freedom of speech. Muslims were portrayed as being violent and primitive people who were out to destroy Western liberal democracy and replace it with oppressive Shariah law. The reaction to these cartoons in much of the Muslim world was one of complete outrage and dissatisfaction. Many felt that it was a personal attack on the Islamic faith that sought only to worsen the relationship between the West and the Islamic world post-September 11. Numerous Muslims demanded a public apology whereas others took part in violent protests, flag-burnings, attacks on embassies, and uttered death threats. The violent reactions to these cartoons were definitely uncalled for and did nothing but further exacerbate the situation, but nonetheless the reaction of the media was also just as irresponsible. As conditions continued to worsen between Denmark and the Islamic world, with some Muslim countries even going so far as to call for a Muslim boycott on Danish goods, the media did very little to help improve the relationship between the parties involved. Instead of trying to promote mutual understanding and tolerance, many in the media decided to re-ignite tensions by republishing the cartoons in various other newspapers as a sign of solidarity with Denmark and the supposed fight for freedom of speech. In addition, critics also argued that if other prophets such as Jesus Christ could be depicted in satirical cartoons why give Muslims special status to get offended at such portrayals of Prophet Muhammad.

It is important to point out that there are always limits to free speech and expression in the media, especially when it promotes hate about a specific religious or ethnic community in
society. This leaves us with the question of why is it that these limits are not being applied to the Muslim community? The answer to this question can be found in the Orientalist perspective outlined earlier that views Islam and Muslims as not an integral part of Western civilization. Furthermore, Muslims living in the West are seen as foreigners or outsiders of the Western state regardless of how long they have lived as legal residents. Consequently, the media too has often tried to downplay many ethnic and linguistic differences by depicting the entire Muslim community as one homogenous entity. There are obvious political motives behind the creation of the category ‘Arab’ and ‘Muslim’ when referring to a community that makes up over one billion people worldwide:

The category ‘Arab and Muslim’ is problematic because it often does not recognize the complexity and the heterogeneity of the categories ‘Arab’ and ‘Muslim’ but conflates the two . . . Arabs are not just Muslims, but also Christians and Jews. In popular representations in Western countries, ‘Arab’ may be used to include other ethnic groups, such as Turks, Armenians, Persians, or Roma – groups with different languages and ethnic or national backgrounds who do not identify as Arab. Conflations overlook that the category ‘Muslim’ encompasses many ethno-cultural and linguistic groups, the majority of whom are neither Arab nor Middle Eastern but Indonesian, Malaysian, Filipino, Sudanese, Indian, or Chinese . . . the inaccurate conflations erase difference in order to ‘serve the creation of another difference: the difference between the free, white, male American citizen and this constructed Arab’ (Arat-Koc 2006, 218).

Moreover, the construction of the supposed ‘other’ in society is essential in the creation of the ideal ‘Canadian’ or ‘Western’ identity. By recognizing the fact that the Muslim community is very much a heterogeneous body, one undermines the creation of binaries such as ‘us’ and ‘them’, “East" and "West,” Muslim and non-Muslims because it reveals the fluidity of such categories.

Many of the articles published in Maclean’s magazine have attempted to affirm Samuel Huntington’s past assertions of a ‘clash of civilizations’ between the West and Islam. The events
of September 11 have been portrayed in the media as confirming Huntington’s prophecy of future conflicts in the 20th century. Many have forgotten the fact that when Huntington first published his article it was highly shunned and criticized by various members of the academic community:

Political scientists pointed out that international politics, even in the post-cold war world, are still made by governments, and governments pursue state and national interests—not cultural ones . . . Other historians pointed out that Huntington’s underlying premises were reminiscent of 19th-century social Darwinism—especially the fear of The Other, of Barbarians at the Gate, and of non-European hordes threatening the West. In his depiction of the USA as a vulnerable ‘cleft country’, Huntington inadvertently categorised Americans of African and Spanish origins as outside Western civilisation—even though they may have lived in the West for over 300 years. Huntington seems to have re-bottled 19th-century fears—the Brown, Yellow and Black Perils—into the Islamic, Sinic, Hindu and African ‘civilisations’ (Abrahamian 2003, 530).

Negative depictions of Arabs and Muslims such as those in many of the Maclean’s magazine articles have had profound effects on public attitudes and policy towards these ethnic communities in many Western countries.

As pointed out by Karim H. Karim, there is substantial evidence to prove that negative and biased depictions of Arabs and Muslims in the media are having a major impact on North American attitudes towards these ethnic communities. For example,

One poll of American perceptions about Arabs elicited the responses, ‘anti-American’, ‘anti-Christian’, ‘cunning’, ‘unfriendly’, and ‘warlike’, and another received around 40% agreement on the statement: ‘Muslims belong to a religion that condones or supports terrorism’. Two surveys that inquired about Canadian’s comfort levels in their relations with various groups in the country, place Muslims near the bottom of the lists. A study measuring the social distance of Australians to various groups placed Muslims the furthest (Karim 2000, 66).

These types of assumptions have had very negative effects on the integration and settlement of Arabs and Muslims around much of the Western world. In essence this depiction of a ‘clash of civilizations’ has in effect successfully constructed Arabs and Muslims in the West as the new
racialized ‘Other’ or ‘enemy from within’. In light of these events, Western governments have begun to introduce discriminatory and racist policies in attempts of limiting and controlling Muslim populations.

Post-September 11, there has also been a massive increase in support for anti-immigration and Islamophobic parties in the West, and more specifically in Europe. Although these extreme right-wing parties have in many ways always existed in the Western political spectrum, they have more recently become part of mainstream European politics as a result of the ‘war on terror’. More recently, Western feminist and gay activists have increasingly been recruited to support anti-immigration policies, especially targeting immigrants from the Muslim world who are seen “...as holding on to an alien culture that, in its opposition to homosexuality and gender equality, threatens core European values” (Fekete 2006, 2). As a result, European countries have introduced citizenship reforms, revised integration policies, and limited the rights of existing citizens and long-term residents to family reunification or temporary worker categories, all in hopes of limiting and controlling Muslim populations. These discriminatory policies are part of a wider discourse on European national identity and are meant establish parameters around notions of belonging and citizenship. Moreover, they essentially set out the guidelines that dictate inclusion and exclusion from the Western nation. Moreover, “[Muslims] do not merely threaten Europe as the ‘enemy within’ in the war on terror, their adherence to Islamic norms and values threatens the notion of Europeanness itself” (Fekete 2004, 4). What is particularly alarming about this fact is that the notion of ‘Europeanness’ is constructed in a way as to make sure that Muslims will always be the ‘outsiders’, no matter how long they have been in Europe. This disturbing reality is further compounded in that if the category ‘enemy within’
did not exist beforehand, it eventually will come into existence as a result of the constant ‘othering’ of a specific community within society.

Despite the fact that many Muslim European residents are citizens in their countries and in many cases European born, they continue to be viewed as ‘outsiders’ and foreign to European society. For example, although France’s 1998 Soccer World Cup Championship team was hailed as being a national victory against the cultural prejudice and racism of Jean Marie Le Pen’s Front National party, it did not change the public’s conception of French Muslims:

In the minds of many French, for every ‘integrated’ Zinedine Zidane, the team’s captain and Marseille-born son of Algerian Kabyle immigrants, there exists a Khaled Kelkal, another son of Algerian immigrants, linked to the Algerian Armed Islamic Group (GIA) and held responsible for a failed terrorist attack on a high-speed train line in France (Fernando 2004, 836).

This political and social environment of paranoia and the constant suspicion of the ‘other’ in society have essentially led to intense policing and surveillance of Muslim communities in France and across much of the Western world. Muslims are suspect not because of any actions they may have committed but because of their connection to Islam and more specifically the Muslim world. What is particularly alarming about this fact is that rather than targeting specific individuals who may have a direct connection to terrorist related activities, many European countries have resorted to systematically compiling widespread intelligence about groups or communities that are deemed to be potential security risks (Fekete 2004, 8). In other words, European governments have shifted towards a policy of guilt by association, in which you are automatically suspect if you are thought to have connections to a community that is deemed to be a security threat.

This concept of guilt by association is definitely not a foreign concept to Canada; rather one could also argue that the same shift has occurred in Canada post-September 11. Sherene H.
Razack’s book, *Casting Out: Race and the Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics* (2007), examines how the events of September 11 and the supposed ‘war on terror’ have essentially given way to human rights violations all in the name of security. More specifically, Razack states,

> In this climate, where the suspension of rights is legally authorized as necessary in what is called the ‘war on terror,’ there are also calls to end multiculturalism, to increase the surveillance of immigrants and refugees, and to further limit their fundamental rights. Confronted with the possibility of an imminent terror threat, few protest such erosions of citizenship (Razack 2007, 4).

This ideology of potential extremist ‘sleeper cells’ was, in fact, also used to justify the interment of the Japanese during WWII. Just like Islamic extremists, the Japanese were viewed as potential threats to the security of the nation. Furthermore, they were viewed as the ‘enemy within’ the nation that was secretly waiting to attack during vulnerable times (Razack 2007, 37).

Many of the articles published in the Toronto Star following the arrests of the Toronto 18 immediately assumed that these men were guilty and part of the growing number of extremist Muslims in Canada. The Toronto 18 men were portrayed as extremists and radicals who had rejected Western society and culture all together and sought to destroy it by blowing up buildings and killing ordinary Canadian citizens (Shephard, June 3, 2006). As Dr. Marty McKay, a clinical psychologist in Toronto, explained in one of the articles, these radical youth are “immersed in an ideology they see as right, holy and good and anything not part of that is a threat” (Teotonio and Leeder, June 10, 2006). However, McKay seems to also succumb to the mainstream perspective about Muslims as he goes on to say that this type of rhetoric can eventually lead to “they’re trying to destroy us, so we're going to destroy them” ways of thinking and seeing the world (Teotonio and Leeder, June 10, 2006). Security expert, John Thompson, goes on to explain how this ‘jihadist generation’ has further strengthened itself in Canada,
The heart of the whole jihad conflict is that the Islamic identity is having an extremely hard time adapting to the modern world . . . A lot of people who identify themselves as Muslims find it extremely hard to be a Muslim in the modern age (Teotonio and Leeder, June 10, 2006).

These types of depictions are problematic because they cast suspicion on the entire Muslim community and therefore encourage increased police surveillance of one specific ethnic and religious community in society. Moreover, these types of explanations also avoid looking at the social and economic conditions that may lead some of these youth to such extremes.

Very little was published in the Toronto Star that these arrests came at a critical time when the federal government was not only looking to increase funding for CSIS and the RCMP, but was also set to review Canada’s security bill. The Conservative government at the time was under intense pressure from critics for its security legislation. Canada’s Anti-Terrorism Act, Bill C-36, was seen by many as overstepping its boundaries and in violation of basic human rights. The arrests of the Toronto 18 and the supposed uncovering of a terrorist sleeper cell in Canada came right before Parliament was set to review the government’s 2002 anti-terror laws. As a result the arrests of these 18 men or supposed ‘terrorists’ “bolstered the arguments of those who wanted the more draconian aspects of that legislation kept in place” (Walkom, April 16, 2008). These arrests were not only crucial to the preservation of the Conservative government’s security laws, but also to the RCMP and CSIS. Without an imminent threat of terrorism in Canada, the budgets of both the RCMP and CSIS would most likely have been cut enormously upon Parliaments review of Bill C-36. Both the RCMP and CSIS needed to prove to Canadians that a terrorist act could also happen in Canada and therefore it was up to them to protect the country from this looming threat. This would also probably explain why CSIS would agree to pay $4,300,000 worth of taxpaying dollars to two of its key informants in the case. The first CSIS
mole whose name cannot be published was paid $4 million dollars, and the second, Mubin Shaikh was paid $300,000 dollars (Walkom, September 25, 2007). It is safe to say that the Toronto 18 arrests have definitely achieved their purpose of instilling fear in the hearts of many Canadian citizens and as a result many people have found themselves more willing to allow for concessions in the basic human rights of those deemed to be a ‘threat’ to society.

The introduction of Bill C-36 and the fairly recent changes to Canadian immigration and refugee policy are all part of the global phenomenon of securitization post-September 11. As extensively discussed in Maggie Ibrahim’s article, “The Securitization of Migration: A Racial Discourse” (2005) the securitization of migration and new discourses of security have essentially given way to new forms of racism. Ibrahim states,

An investigation of racism will reveal how the securitization of migration discourse is built upon the concept that cultural difference leads to social breakdown. By examining a shift in racism, from notions of biological superiority, to exclusion based on cultural difference . . . it is possible to understand that this new migrant-as-a-threat narrative reactualizes a racist discourse” (Ibrahim 2005, 164).

The racist and discriminatory actions of many Western government is very much a by-product of the securitization of migration discourse in that Muslims are seen as a threat to national security and therefore must be assimilated or denied access into the Western nation as a whole. What these governments have failed to understand is that their racist policies of assimilation have essentially created a supposed ‘security threat’ that may have not existed beforehand. Moreover, they have marginalized and isolated one of largest ethnic and religious minorities in the West and as a result have created a community or group of people that are united in their disillusionment of Western policies.
CONCLUSION:

All in all, both the Toronto Star and the Maclean’s case studies demonstrate firsthand the level of Islamophobia and anti-Muslim racism currently present in mainstream Western media. Although many of the articles published in the Toronto Star about the Toronto 18 case were less biased in content when compared to the Maclean’s magazine articles this does not negate the fact that it too also ran misleading articles about these arrests being part of what they called the growing “jihadi generation” in Canada. Many of the articles published in Maclean’s magazine about Islam revived historical Orientalist depictions of Muslims as violent and barbaric people who sought to destroy Western society all together. More specifically, articles such as Mark Steyn’s “The Future Belongs to Islam” sought to warn people of a Muslim “takeover” as a result of the mass influx of immigrants from the Muslim world. Furthermore, Steyn’s article and many other articles that have been published in Maclean’s, depict Muslims as being a threat to the preservation of Western society, democracy and human rights.

The media’s negative portrayal of Muslims has played a major role in the revival of xenophobia and the fear of a supposed ‘enemy from within’ in not only Canada, but many other Western countries. Muslims have often been depicted as one homogenous community in order to create and cement new binaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’ and therefore construct divisions between the ‘civilized’ and ‘uncivilized’. These types of categories seek to only further embellish claims of a “clash of civilizations” between the West and Islam. The creation of an ‘enemy from within’ or the foreign ‘other’ is a tactic that has often readily been used by many Western nations to unite a country at times of distress or war. Increased negative depictions of Muslims in the media post-September 11 has essentially constructed this community as the new racialized ‘other’ in Canada and much of the Western world.
The targeting of Muslims in the West and more specifically Canada is problematic not only because it undermines our commitment to multiculturalism and basic human rights, but also because it risks creating a supposed threat that might have not existed beforehand. In other words, if the category of ‘enemy from within’ did not exist beforehand, it eventually might come into existence as a result of the continued ‘othering’ of a specific community in society. Islamophobia and anti-Muslim racism in the mainstream media has often been defended under the principle of freedom of speech and the press, however, it should also be remembered that there are limits to the rights of any citizen, including the right to free speech and expression in the media, especially when it promotes hate about a specific religious or ethnic community in society. Examples such as the Western media’s sensitivity towards issues surrounding the Jewish community and more specifically the Holocaust demonstrate that these limits do exist; however, they have often only been applied to specific ethnic and religious communities. The Muslim community’s status as “outsiders” in the Western nation is largely to blame for the Western media’s refusal to extend such limitations to include Islam and Muslims. I hope that this paper has revealed the harm done by such negative portrayals of Muslims and opens the doors to addressing this important issue in Canadian society.
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