

## Course Outline

<b>COURSE:</b>	<b>LAWS 4309B – State Security and Dissent</b>
<b>TERM:</b>	<b>Winter 2014</b>
<b>PREREQUISITES:</b>	<b>Fourth-year Honours standing and one of LAWS 3305, LAWS 3503, or LAWS 3509 or HIST 3305</b>
<b>CLASS:</b>	<b>Day &amp; Time: Mondays 2:35 – 5:25pm</b> <b>Room: SA 403 (Please check with Carleton Central for current room location)</b>
<b>INSTRUCTOR: (CONTRACT)</b>	<b>Yavar Hameed</b>
<b>CONTACT:</b>	<b>Office: Loeb C442</b> <b>Office Hrs: By appointment only</b> <b>Telephone: (613) 232-2688 ext.228</b> <b>Email: yhameed@hf-law.ca</b>

---

You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term. For an accommodation request the processes are as follows:

**Pregnancy obligation:** write to me with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details visit the Equity Services website: <http://www2.carleton.ca/equity/>

**Religious obligation:** write to me with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details visit the Equity Services website: <http://www2.carleton.ca/equity/>

**Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:** The **Paul Menton Centre** for Students with Disabilities (PMC) provides services to students with Learning Disabilities (LD), psychiatric/mental health disabilities, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), chronic medical conditions, and impairments in mobility, hearing, and vision. If you have a disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact PMC at 613-520-6608 or [pmc@carleton.ca](mailto:pmc@carleton.ca) for a formal evaluation. If you are already registered with the PMC, contact your PMC coordinator to send me your **Letter of Accommodation** at the beginning of the term, and no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (*if applicable*). After requesting accommodation from PMC, meet with me to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Please consult the PMC website for the deadline to request accommodations for the formally-scheduled exam (*if applicable*) at <http://www2.carleton.ca/pmc/new-and-current-students/dates-and-deadlines/>

You can visit the Equity Services website to view the policies and to obtain more detailed information on academic accommodation at <http://www2.carleton.ca/equity/>

---

## Course Synopsis

Methods of state control vary through times of war and peace, constantly shifting in an attempt to reconcile the apparent tension between protecting civil liberties and ensuring security. This shifting tide is impacted by individual acts and broader social movements, which challenge the parameters of state control. This course explores counter-hegemonic resistance to state institutions that ideologically define security and in tandem exercise repressive control over Canadian society. Particular emphasis is given to laws in Canada that curtail basic civil liberties and legal challenges that test the limits of security for the state and “state apparatus”. The impact, successes and relevance of individual and collective struggles for equality and human rights are considered both historically and in a contemporary context in an effort to investigate the role of dissent within Canada. To this end, dissent is presented as both a practical and theoretical lens through which we may interrogate the construction of security and hegemonic control exercised by ideological and repressive state institutions.

### Evaluation Scheme:

(All components must be completed in order to get a passing grade)

The first three classes will take the form of a lecture followed by open discussion within the class. Students will be expected to hand in five questions pertaining to the readings that should be discussed during each seminar. These questions should be handed in every week at the end of class beginning in Week 2 until Week 12.

The remaining classes will consist of debates followed by general class discussion and/or a guest speaker.

### Debate (50 % of Total Mark)

The remaining eight weeks will be structured around debate resolutions. The resolution for each debate is provided in the syllabus, but may be modified by the instructor to provide greater clarity.

Either individually or in pairs students will take a position for or against the resolution for a selected week. One week prior to the selected week, students will be required to submit a factum (written and sourced argument) and will be responsible during the week in question to present an oral argument for or against the resolution.

The debates themselves will be judged by a panel of students, the instructor and/or the guest lecturer. The remainder of the class will act as a jury and, after the close of the debate, the jury will deliberate in private and come up with an independent conclusion. The jury and judges will then explain their conclusion to the class. The outcome of the debate (i.e. who wins and who loses, nb: a tie or hung jury is also possible) will not be determinative of the mark assigned, but the level of preparation, contribution and interventions of the student debaters will form part of their participation mark.

Each debate will be preceded by a short introduction by the instructor. Thereafter, the student debates will continue from 1 to 1.5 hours (with intervening questions from the judges and the class) depending upon the flow of discussion. A good debate will not necessarily be cut off at a precise time, but will be moderated by the panel of judges.

### **Brief of Argument and External Readings 30%**

At least one week prior to the scheduled debate, the moving party (**for the Resolution**) is to identify a series of issues that are to be dealt with in the debate. The issues are necessary questions that must be answered in order to decide the ultimate resolution. Generally speaking, there should be approximately three issues to be addressed. One week before the debate, the

students are to email the instructor with their factum (**brief of argument**). A precedent of the brief and detailed explanation on how to prepare the brief will be provided on CU Learn.

The brief will be approximately 10 to 15 pages in length. The brief should consist of a recitation and interpretation of the resolution question, an outline of the argument and a more detailed breakdown of the points to be argued, with appropriate footnotes and citations. The parties to the debate are required to exchange their main resources to be used in the argument at least one week before the debate. The parties are also responsible at that time to post their facta and list of resources to CU Learn for review by the class.

The brief should attempt to persuade the judges by drawing upon assigned and external readings. Where external readings are relied upon by either party, they are to be exchanged with the party opposite prior to the debate. On the day of the debate, each group should have on hand an additional copy of its factum to submit to the instructor.

### **Discussion Questions 10%**

At the end of each class you will be required to hand in five questions relating to the debate resolution assigned for that week and/or the seminar topic. Students are also encouraged to engage in CU Learn discussion board exchanges on the topic of each week. These questions and discussions will form a gauge of your review of the readings, critical thinking and participation in the seminar and will be taken into consideration in this aspect of the evaluation out of a total of ten marks.

### **Self-Assessed Participation in Debates and Class Discussion 10%**

In addition to participation in discussion as debaters, students will also be expected to contribute to class discussion as jury members, judges and in the plenary discussion/ seminar wherein active student participation is expected. The overall participation mark will be **self-assessed** by the students (i.e. you will determine your own participation mark out of 10) in consultation with the instructor at the end of the semester.

### **Major Project (MP) (50% of Total Mark)**

#### **MP Proposal 10% (due (WEEK 5) on Thursday February 3, 2014)**

You are to propose a major project for the course to respond to one of a series of topics that the instructor will distribute at the start of the term. The project must engage directly with the questions provided, but can take any one of various forms including: organizing a public discussion or seminar, creating a documentary film, creating a blog or website, conducting investigative journalism, doing policy analysis with a view to providing the analysis to an NGO, government or private actor, proposing and developing the framework for a conference or dialogue, or other suitable format.

The specifics of how to design the proposal will be discussed in class and a precedent proposal will be posted on Web CT.

#### **MP Assignment and "Write Up" 40%**

The major project or "MP" will be assessed on the basis of content, creativity, original thinking, ability to assimilate course themes and readings, external research, relevance to the audience that is chosen for dissemination, structure and feasibility. An accompanying document or "write up" (approximately 10 pages) must be provided to explain the relationship of the project to the

course themes or relevant social problem discussed in seminar. Each final write-up should also include: a self-assessment component, which explains any difficulties or limitations in the project that would assist the instructor in the evaluation process as well as a section that explains the project within the broader literature and/or suggests further methods of developing or using the project. Unless otherwise stated by the instruction or in the case of an extension, the **MP and write up is due on the last day of seminar, March 29, 2014.**

**Readings: ASSIGNED TEXT AVAILABLE AS CARLETON LIBRARY ELECTRONIC RESOURCE : Canadian Electronic Library. Books Collection. AND AT OCTOPUS BOOKS – 116 THIRD AVENUE**

Gary Kinsman et al, ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000).

**Recommended Texts: (these are not mandatory for the course, but you will find them very useful for your project and your own personal study)**

David Barsamian. *Terrorism: Theirs & Ours* (An Interview with Eqbal Ahmed) (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2001).

Ward Churchill, *Acts of Rebellion*, (New York: Routledge, 2003).

J. Keri Cronin and Kristy Roberston, eds. *Imagining Resistance: Visual Culture and Activism in Canada*, (Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2011).

Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed (30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition)*, (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc., 2007).

Joel Harden, *Quiet No More: New Political Activism in Canada and Around the Globe* (Formac Lorimer, 2013).

David Theodore Goldberg, *The Racial State* (Wiley Blackwell, 2001).

Mike Larsen, Kevin Walby, eds. *Brokering Access: Power Politics and Freedom of Information Process in Canada* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012).

Martin Luther King Jr., *Why we Can't Wait* (New York: The New American Library Inc., 1964).

Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010).

Gary Kinsman. et al. eds., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000).

Kerry Pither, *Dark Days: The Story of Four Canadians Tortured in the Name of Fighting Terror* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008).

Sherene Razack ed. *Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002).

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

Kent Roach, *September 11: Consequences for Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003).

Jeff Schmidt. *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul Battering System that Shapes their Lives* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2000).

Maureen Webb, *Illusions of Security: Global Surveillance and Democracy in the Post-9/11 World* (San Francisco: City Lights, 2007).

Harsha Walia, *Undoing Border Imperialism* (AK Press, 2013).

Eyal Weizman, *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation* (London: Verso Books, 2007).

## **LIST OF SEMINARS**

### **Week 1 (Thursday January 6, 2014): Introduction and Background: Hegemony and Modes of State Control**

State security in liberal democracies is created and maintained by the use of violence and by the construction of institutions that ideologically promote conformity and adherence to the Rule of Law. While civil society is constrained by the overt and ideological modes of state control, movements of resistance develop within civil society at historical moments of political disequilibrium. Such movements challenge the priorities of the "Security State" and its modes of activity. This seminar introduces notions of power, hegemony and the relationship between hegemonic control of the security state and policy and legislative formation.

#### **Assigned Readings:**

Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Towards an Investigation" in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (London: New Left Books, 1971) 127. **–/CU LEARN or see:** [www.hu.mtu.edu/~rlstrick/rsvtxt/althuss1.pdf](http://www.hu.mtu.edu/~rlstrick/rsvtxt/althuss1.pdf)

Gary Kinsman et al., "How the Centre Holds- National Security as an Ideological Practice" in Gary Kinsman et al, ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000) 278- 85.

#### **Additional Suggested Reading:**

Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed (30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition)*, (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc., 2007), chapter 2 at pp. 72-86.

Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

## **PART I: Forming and Maintaining the Security of the Canadian State**

### **Week 2 (January 13, 2014): State Formation and the Negotiation of National Interests**

As a White "settler society", Canada was founded on principles, which privileged certain national and racial categories, while denying political and economic participation to other groups such as First Nations and immigrants from Asia and Africa. The formation of the Canadian State, therefore, reflects this hierarchy through an exclusionist immigration system and differential application of domestic laws based upon racial category.

**GUEST SPEAKERS: Former 4309 B Students Share their Past Projects and Experiences in the Course**

**Choose Debate Topics and Form Groups for Weeks 4 through 12**

**Assigned Readings:**

Sherene H. Razack, "Introduction: When Place Becomes Race" in Sherene H. Razack, ed., *Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002) 1. **CU LEARN**

Andrew Parnaby & Gregory S. Kealey, "The Origins of Political Policing in Canada: Class, Law, and the Burden of Empire" (2003) 41 *Osgoode Hall L.J.* 211. **CU LEARN**

Harsha Walia, *Undoing Border Imperialism* (AK Press, 2013).

**Week 3 (January 20, 2014): Surveillance and the Role of Security Intelligence**

Surveillance of Canadian society is an intrinsic part of state security and has played an important role in the evolution of the infrastructure of Canadian security intelligence. After the McDonald Commission in 1981, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) succeeded the RCMP as a civilian body mandated to investigate threats to Canadian national security. While ostensibly national security policing and intelligence functions were separated, the new entity failed to engender appropriate reliability or accountability to meet its invasive investigatorial powers. CSIS struggled to find its feet in the years immediately following the demise of the Cold War, but has gained renewed importance in the post 9/11 era. However, the role of Canadian security intelligence in cases like that of Maher Arar, Abdullah Almalki, Abusoufian Abdelrazik and others bring into relief the potential for abuse in terms of the use of Canadian intelligence as a tool of control and alienation of those who are considered as culturally or ideologically "deviant" within the normative framework of belonging defined by Canada's national security elite.

***Guest Speaker on History of CSIS and National Security in Canada***

**Assigned Readings:**

Introduction in Gary Kinsman et al, ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000) 1-8.

"Spymasters, Spies, and their Subjects: The RCMP and Canadian State Repression, 1914-39" in Gary Kinsman et al, ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000) 18- 33.

**Suggested Readings:**

Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).

Kerry Pither, *Dark Days: The Story of Four Canadians Tortured in the Name of Fighting Terror* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008).

### **Week 4 (January 27, 2014): Confronting Claims of First Nations Sovereignty**

The settler negotiation of First Nations treaty rights on behalf of the Crown created proprietary control over land, which previously was not subject to ownership (in its Western definition) by First Nations. However, the one-sided nature of these settler treaties continue to be contested until today. Frustrated with the poverty and marginalization of their people, certain First Nations developed resistance movements to assert a claim to their land by occupying Crown or corporate controlled land. Occupation of land by First Nations, however, have in some cases resulted in violent confrontation with the Canadian State. What justifies the use of force by the state against First Nations? Can violent confrontation shift the discourse of security and state sovereignty that constrains the rights of First Nations in Canada?

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT blockades of railway lines by First Nations protesters constitute a lawful form of expression in a free and democratic society.**

#### **Assigned Reading:**

Ward Churchill, "The New Face of Liberation: Indigenous Rebellion, State Repression, and the Reality of the Fourth World" in *Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2003) 13. **WEB CT**

*Canadian National Railway Company v. John Doe*, 2013 ONSC 115 (CanLII)

*R. v. Billy et al*, 2004 BCSC 1474 (CanLII)

### **Week 5 (February 3, 2014): Racial Profiling as a Tool of National Security (MAJOR PROJECT PROPOSAL DUE)**

For more than a decade five Muslim men have been battling an immigration removal process under the security certificate regime pursuant to the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*. After millions of dollars of public funds spent on security intelligence, creating a specialized holding facility and legal wrangling which has made its way to the Supreme Court on three occasions, the security certificate regime persists. The certificate against Mr. Almrei was quashed, the certificate against Mr. Charkaoui has been withdrawn, the case of Mr. Harkat has been appealed to the Supreme Court (again) and Mohamed Mahjoub has been found to be a danger to Canada under immigration law despite the fact there are no reasonable grounds to believe that he ever engaged in any act of terrorism and has never been investigated or charged under the Criminal Law. How can the state justify such extraordinary and expensive measures of detention? Is the approach based on a fair and sound approach to immigration regulation consistent with fundamental justice and equality under Canadian law?

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT Mohamed Zeki Mahjoub constitutes a danger to Canadian national security.**

**Guest speaker: TBA**

#### **Assigned Readings:**

*Re: Mahjoub* 2013 FC 1092

Reem Bahdi, "No Exit: Racial Profiling and Canada's War Against Terrorism" (2003) 41 Osgoode Hall L.J. 293. **CU LEARN**

Zuhair Kashmeri, "When CSIS Calls: Canadian Arabs, Racism, and the Gulf War" in Gary Kinsman et al., ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000) 256. **CU LEARN**

## **PART II: STATE SECURITY AND DISSENT DURING TIMES OF WAR**

### **Week 6 (February 10, 2014): Internment of Japanese-Canadians**

During periods of war, individual freedom is often subverted in the interest of building a common movement and collective "war effort". The promotion of nationalism provides moral justification for the promotion of State interests abroad, while it also serves to create and consolidate a generally compliant attitude within civil society susceptible to the suggestions of the dominant class. Within this paradigm, normally unimaginable programs such as the internment of Canadian citizens based on ethnicity, increased surveillance, racial profiling, arbitrary detention and torture can be advanced, with little or no opposition, in the name of national security.

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT Canada should be permitted to deport naturalized Canadian citizens to their country of origin during times of war in the interest of protecting national security.**

#### **Assigned Readings:**

*Reference re: Persons of Japanese Race* [1946] SCJ No. 7.

Ann Sunahara. *The War Measures Act: Can Its Use be Controlled?* (Unpublished paper)

## **CLASSES SUSPENDED FOR WINTER BREAK FEBRUARY 17-21, 2014**

### **Week 7 (February 24, 2014): Sexual Orientation and Ideological Security**

The Cold War provided an interesting metaphor capable of maintaining the nationalistic intensity of a war effort during a protracted and undefined period as against a generically defined global enemy whose scope of influence justified an expanded State role in the scrutiny and surveillance of the private lives and activities of people in Canada. A culture of suspicion, distrust and ideological profiling created fertile ground for enforcing a moral consensus capable of prioritizing national security and the necessity of quelling dissent.

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the RCMP investigation of gays and lesbians as national security risks between 1950 and 1970 was illegal according to the existing laws of Canada at the time.**

#### **Assigned Readings:**

"Constructing Gay Men and Lesbians as National Security Risks, 1950-70" in Gary Kinsman et al, ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000) 143-153.

Julie Guard, "Women Worth Watching: Radical Housewives in Cold War Canada" in Gary Kinsman et al., ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000) 73 - 88.

"Debilitating Divisions: The Civil Liberties Movement in Early Cold War Canada, 1946-48" in Gary Kinsman et al, ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000) 143-153.



### **Week 8 (March 1, 2014): The War in Afghanistan**

Canada has been involved in a war in Afghanistan for over a decade, which has no clear objective or simple anticipated conclusion. Strong domestic sentiment exists in Canada to support our troops, but few have spoken out against the legality of the War and the political question of phased withdrawal is ongoing and blurred. What accounts for the lack of self-reflexivity of Canadians in respect of the continued foreign military presence in Afghanistan? What responsibility does Canada have to the people of Afghanistan? What exactly has Canada achieved in Afghanistan?

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT Canada's intervention in Afghanistan has improved the rights of Afghan women.**

#### **Assigned Readings:**

Rana Kapur, "Un-Veiling Women's Rights in the "War on Terrorism"" (2002) 9 *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy* 211.

Deniz Kandiyoti, "The Politics of Gender and Reconstruction in Afghanistan" United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (Occasional Paper No. 4). (February 2005).

### **Part III: DISSENT AND DISTURBING OF THE PEACE**

#### **Week 9 (March 8, 2014): Disturbing Campus**

With the rise of tuition fees and the increased "professionalization" of post-secondary education, students are feeling increasingly pressured to finish their degree while focusing on the extrinsic value of education. The inclination to challenge the structure, functioning and disciplinary control exerted by the University over students is subordinated by an inclination to simply survive and succeed. Increasingly, moreover, the University itself is developing more formal codes of non-academic behaviour to control conduct that is considered to be contrary to the values of the University. What are the limits of free speech in an academic environment? Should the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* protect students from disciplinary measures of the University that serve to curtail criticism? What is the importance of publicly criticizing the University or its policies?

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT students should be permitted to use social networking tools to criticize their University.**

**GUEST SPEAKER: TBA**

#### **Suggested Reference:**

*Pridgen v. University of Calgary*, 2012 ABCA 139 (CanLII).

Jeff Schmidt. *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul Battering System that Shapes their Lives* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2000).

### **Week 10 (March 15, 2014): Measuring Perceived Insurrection**

The FLQ Crisis in October 1970 stands out as a pinnacle example of state response and state interest towards quelling dissent in the name of national security. Who defines the moment when an expression of dissent becomes a national crisis? At what stage does it become acceptable to limit fundamental freedoms in an effort to preserve the security of the *status quo*? What state responses emerge in the wake of a perceived breach of national security?

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the use of the *War Measures Act* is necessary for the protection of Canadian national security.**

**Assigned Reading:**

***War Measures Act***

**Suggested References:**

Pierre Elliott Trudeau, "War Measures Act Speech" (CBC Television news, October 16, 1970), online: CBC Archives <[http://archives.cbc.ca/IDCC-1-71-101-618/conflict\\_war/october\\_crisis/](http://archives.cbc.ca/IDCC-1-71-101-618/conflict_war/october_crisis/)>.

FLQ, Manifesto of October 1970, see:

<http://www.marxists.org/history/canada/quebec/flq/1970/manifesto.htm>

**Week 11 (March 22, 2014): Disturbing of the Peace**

The Canadian State is based on the constitutionally enshrined principles of "peace, order and good governance". These principles, however, legitimize the values of the State, maintaining the integrity of private property and the authority of corporations and their owners. The control of the dominant class is therefore ensured by the legal infrastructure of the State. Accordingly, to challenge the dominant class in the interests of the socially marginal or disenfranchised may involve direct action to redress social injustice. While symbolically and practically valuable, direct action, by disturbing of "the peace", may result in a contravention of the Law. Does disturbing the peace necessarily undermine the security of the State? Can challenging the basis of unjust laws result in greater economic and social security? How does the approach or strategy used change the answers to these questions?

**RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the G17 alleged "ringleaders" of the June 2010 G20 Toronto protests should not have been prosecuted.**

**GUEST SPEAKER: TBA**

**Assigned Readings:**

John Clarke, "Social Resistance and the Disturbing of the Peace" (2003) 41 *Osgoode Hall L.J.* 491. **CU LEARN**

Jackie Esmonde, *The Policing of Dissent: The Use of Breach of the Peace Arrests at Political Demonstrations* (2002), 1 *J.L. & Equality* 246. **CU LEARN**

*R. v. Sonne*, 2012 ONSC 2126 (CanLII)

G20 Justice Website: <http://www.g20justice.com/index.html>

Statement of Claim in Class Action Law Suit: *Good v. Toronto Police Services Board*

**Week 12 (March 29, 2014): New Faces of Dissent and Alternative Topics**  
(readings to be announced)

**A. Is the Future Unoccupied?**

As a reaction to the global financial crisis and the overwhelming control of local and global economies by the so called “one percent”, the “occupy” movement spread from Wall Street across North America including into many Canadian cities. The unilateral or direct claim to occupy public space that is at the heart of this movement was widely criticized in the media as being without focus or practical objective; however, it captured the imagination of a large segment of disenfranchised and disheartened people. This movement galvanized the political and social expression of diverse voices towards a new way of thinking and the development of alternative paradigms for social and community based responses to problems of economic disparity, political oppression and social disconnection. But where is it now?

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Occupy movement is irrelevant to social resistance struggles in Canada today.**

**B. ALTERNATIVE TOPIC: Whistling truth to Power**

As the security state expands its role in controlling and monitoring personal information and communications, the scope for abuse and the consequences for invading personal privacy are increasing. For those who sit complacently within the machine of state surveillance, there is a tacit understanding that “Big Brother” is watching us for the greater good. However, for those who critically reflect on the significance of the state’s unauthorized invasion into personal privacy an ethical quandary arises that challenges the otherwise unassailable dogma of national security. For those who choose to blow the whistle on perceived unlawful practices of the state by unauthorized disclosure of sensitive information, the consequences are profoundly significant for democracy, the Rule of Law and state control and come at great personal risk. Does Canada have a role to protect whistleblowers and should it extend such protection to whistleblowers who reveal Canada’s own state secrets?

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the revelations of NSA whistleblower Edward Snowden constitute a danger to Canadian national security.**

**C. ALTERNATIVE TOPIC: the Rise of “Clicktivism”**

*Avaaz*, the social media popular online community of global activists signing petitions to support social causes by a click of the mouse has been touted as a “game changing” phenomenon in global politics. Many, however, caution that the perspective of arm chair activists has no real appreciation for the nuances of the political situation on the other side of the world and that this form of cyber polling is either dangerous or of very limited utility. Is the face of global activism changing and how significant is the use of social media in affecting the behavior of persons, states and corporations around the world?

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT social media activism is an effective and democratic tool of creating meaningful social change in Canada.**