
COURSE:	LAWS 4309A – (CRN 13596) State Security and Dissent
TERM:	Winter 2021
PREREQUISITES:	Fourth-year Honours standing and 0.5 credits from one of LAWS 3305, LAWS 3503, or LAWS 3509 or HIST 3305.
CLASS:	Day & Time: Please check Carleton Central for current Class Schedule. Wednesdays 6 to 9 pm Room: All Courses in the Winter 2021 term are offered online. This course will be delivered in a hybrid model with <u>mandatory</u> weekly synchronous/live seminars each Wednesday through Big Blue Button along with asynchronous learning links and podcasts accessible through CuLearn.
INSTRUCTOR: (CONTRACT)	Yavar Hameed
CONTACT:	Office Hrs: By appointment only. Available through Zoom or by telephone. Telephone: (613) 627-2974 Email: yhameed@hameedlaw.ca

CALENDAR COURSE DESCRIPTION

Historical and contemporary analysis of legal responses of Canadian governments to dissent, political opposition, insurrection, etc. Includes trial of political offences (treason, sedition, riot), national security measures (War Measures/Emergencies Act, Official Secrets Act), and other special powers (police, labour, immigration, parliamentary privilege, etc.).

COURSE DESCRIPTION

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.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

This course is not designed to develop a subject matter expertise in security related matters and/or constitutional or equality rights. The case studies and debates in the course allow the student to research, develop and demonstrate evidence-based reasoning and legal analysis on public policy concerns grounded in a diverse range of contemporary and historical political events. The major project component of the course is derived from the Freirian concept of liberation pedagogy achieved by identifying personal oppression, naming it with reference to studied conceptual tools from the course and developing a counter-hegemonic experience-based form of resistance to it. In this way, theory is grounded in relevant life-experience which has the potential of resonating with the learner because of its intrinsic significance.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Gary Kinsman et al, ed., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000). (Electronic Resource available through Carleton MacOrdrum Library)

All other weekly assigned and background readings will be hyperlinked or posted on cuLearn

EVALUATION

Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Department and of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by the instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Department and the Dean.

The first three classes will take the form of a lecture followed by open discussion within the class. The remaining classes will consist of debates followed by general class discussion and/or a guest speaker.

I. Brief of Argument for Debate (30 % of Total Mark)

The last nine weeks will be structured around debate resolutions. The resolution for each debate is provided in the syllabus, but may be modified by the instructor in consultation with the class 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.

Submission of Brief or Factum:

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 cuLearn.

The brief will be approximately 10 to 15 pages in length (NB: length will vary as well according to whether there are 1 or 2 students writing the same factum, i.e. 2 students are expected to produce a more in depth and lengthier factum). 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 cuLearn 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 and the instructor prior to the debate.

II. Major Project (MP) (50% of Total Mark)

A. MP Proposal (due (WEEK 5) on Wednesday February 10, 2021 (Value 10%))

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 short documentary film, creating a blog or website, 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 format approved by the instructor in consultation with the student.

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

B. MP Assignment and “Write Up” (Value 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 instructor or in the case of an extension, the **MP and write up are due on the last day of seminar, April 7, 2021.**

III. Participation in the Course (20% of total mark)

A. Instructor Evaluation of Participation (Value: 10%)

The instructor, based on their discretion and observations, will use the following criteria in evaluating student participation in the seminar for a mark out of 10:

- Attendance at each seminar;
- Timely submission of factum and proposal and final project;
- Level of preparedness based on comprehension and familiarity with readings;
- Level of preparedness and review of legal briefs in advance of seminar;
- Quality of interventions during seminar;
- Leadership in assuming role of judge;
- Constructive engagement in seminar based on role as jury member;
- Level of participation in judges’ panel and/or jury;
- Level of engagement with discussion based on questions posed during seminar;
- Ability to incorporate assigned readings during seminar interventions;
- Ability to incorporate other readings into seminar interventions.

B. Self-Assessed Participation in Debates and Class Discussion (Value: 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.

LATE PENALTIES AND REQUESTS FOR EXTENSIONS

A late penalty of 5% per day will be applied to all assignments submitted after the due date.

The granting of extensions is determined by the instructor who will confirm whether an extension is granted and the length of the extension. For requests for extensions lasting less than 7 days, please complete the form at the following link and submit it to the instructor prior to the assignment due date: <https://carleton.ca/registrar/wp-content/uploads/self-declaration.pdf>.

Extensions for longer than 7 days will normally not be granted. In those extraordinary cases where extensions lasting longer than 7 days are granted, the student will be required to provide additional information to justify the longer extension (up to a maximum of 14 days).

SCHEDULE

Please note the following dates:

January 11, 2021	Classes Begin
February 15 – 19, 2021	Winter Break, No Classes
April 14, 2021	Winter Term Ends
April 16 – 27 2021	Formally Scheduled Final Exams

Week 1 (Wednesday January 13, 2021): 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. –/ cuLearn or see: 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.

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

Week 2 (January 20, 2021): 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 Laws 4309 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. **cuLearn**

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. **cuLearn**

Week 3 (January 27, 2021): 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. CSIS has been criticized for improper surveillance of racialized communities (including but not limited to Muslims and Arabs in Canada) and individuals as well as civil society organizations, protestors and environmental groups opposing government policies. These complaints bring into relief the potential for abuse in terms of the use of Canadian intelligence as a tool of control 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 Reading:

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

Week 4 (February 3, 2021): Oppression of Indigenous Rights

The First Nation community of Neskantaga, which lies 450 km North of Thunderbay, is tragically the site of one of the oldest remaining boiled water advisories in Canada dating back some 25 years. The community was displaced about 20 years ago in 1999 from its earlier location at Lansdowne House later becoming the subject of federal infrastructural projects and plans, including a Reverse Osmosis Plant, which repeatedly failed to meet their targets and were ultimately abandoned in about 2006. Within the last 5 years, however, the federal government has renewed its funding efforts towards the creation of a clean drinking water plant. Although the plant has not been finished on target, it is moving towards a solution to the Neskantaga public health problem. Indigenous Services Canada has expressed willingness to work with Chief Moonias although serious tensions have been expressed in respect of the Ontario Regional Director's "paternalistic" attitude towards the community. Concerns also remain that the push towards mining extraction and the building of a road by the Noront mining company through the "Ring of Fire" rich mineral resource area is being given priority by Ontario over the health and human rights of the community.

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the crisis in Neskantaga represents modern day colonialism in Canada.

Assigned Readings: To be posted on cuLearn

Background Sources:

<https://www.mccarthy.ca/en/class-action-litigation-drinking-water-advisories-first-nations-0>

<https://theconversation.com/mining-push-continues-despite-water-crisis-in-neskantaga-first-nation-and-ontarios-ring-of-fire-150522>

<https://www.northernontariobusiness.com/regional-news/far-north-ring-of-fire/ontario-first-nations-agree-on-missing-link-road-to-the-ring-of-fire-2132065>

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/neskantaga-demands-ontario-top-bureaucrat-resignation-1.5812399>

<https://stockhouse.com/companies/bullboard/v.not/noront-resources-ltd?postid=32043935>

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/thunder-bay/noront-neskantaga-ring-of-fire-1.3723560>

<https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/10/02/canada-blind-eye-first-nation-water-crisis>

Week 5 (February 10, 2021): Racial Profiling in Policing (MAJOR PROJECT PROPOSAL DUE)

On October 20, 2020, Constable Daniel Montsion was acquitted of manslaughter, aggravated assault and assault with a weapon in connection with the death of Abdirahman Abdi outside of

his home in Ottawa. This verdict was met with both grief and sadness by Abdi's family and the coalition of his supporters known as Justice for Abdi. In March 2017, more than three years previous to Montsion's acquittal, his colleagues organized a campaign in his favour distributing wristbands with the words "United We Stand" on the outside and "Divided We Fall" on the inside of the wristband along with Montsion's badge number. At the time, the Ottawa Police Association vehemently defended the campaign stating that it "...has nothing to do with race... it's a member-driven initiative for expressing support for a fellow colleague." Montsion, at the relevant time of the wrist band campaign, was protected by a constitutional presumption of innocence and ultimately was not found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the "Divided We Fall" wristbands in support of Officer Montsion, charged with the killing of Abdirahman Abdi are an example of systemic racism within the Ottawa Police Service.

Assigned Readings: To be posted on cuLearn

Background Sources:

R. v. Montsion, 2020 ONCJ 464 (CanLII), <<http://canlii.ca/t/jb4ms>>

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/daniel-montsion-abdirahman-abdi-judgment-1.5765173>

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/ottawa-police-daniel-montsion-wristband-abdi-1.4044425>

PART II: STATE SECURITY AND DISSENT DURING TIMES OF WAR

Week 6 (February 24, 2021): Removal of Citizenship in Times of War

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 the protection of national security may justify the deportation of naturalized Canadian citizens to their country of origin during times of war, apprehended insurrection or terrorist threat.

Assigned Reading:

A Macklin, "Citizenship Revocation, the Privilege to Have Rights and the Production of the Alien" (2014) 40:1 *Queens Law Journal*. **cuLearn**

Background Sources:

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**Week 7 (March 3, 2021): Sexual Orientation and Ideological Security**

The gay purge represents an active campaign prevalent within the Cold War designed to target, marginalize and alienate suspected gender deviants within the Canadian government. Replete with symbolic weaponry such as the “Fruit Machine”, the gay purge viewed gender deviance as an ideological threat. From the decriminalization of homosexuality in 1969 a series of social, legal and political events led to the Trudeau apology for the gay purge in 2017. Within this series of events, the legal case of Michelle Douglas is identified as a beacon of transformative change. Did the Douglas case end the gay purge? Was the case a catalyst for change or was it the product of decades of social mobilization that had effectively neutralized the gay purge?

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the 1992 Federal Court settlement in the Michelle Douglas case against the Canadian Forces represented the end of the “gay purge”.

Assigned Readings:

Douglas v. Canada, 1992 CanLII 2419 (FC), [1993] 1 FC 264, <<http://canlii.ca/t/4gsj>>

Queering '69: The Recriminalization of Homosexuality in Canada, 100 *The Canadian Historical Review*, 258, (U of T Press: June 1989).

“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.

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

Week 8 (March 10, 2021): The Propaganda of War

On September 19, 2020 a letter was written by the Wildlife Division of Nova Scotia’s Department of Lands and Forestry warning of a dangerous pack of wolves on the loose. In early October, however, it was revealed that this letter was a forgery. In fact, the letter was written by the Canadian Military, but was apparently not supposed to be released to the public according to a military spokesperson. It appears that the letter was part of a Canadian military program designed to influence targeted populations. The question remains as to the relevance and necessity of Canada’s military in engaging in strangely covert operations that relate to admitted attempts to manipulate the Canadian public. Was this propaganda project an exception or is it the rule?

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Canadian Armed Forces is built on propaganda.

Assigned Readings: To be posted on cuLearn

Background Source:

<https://www.thechronicleherald.ca/news/provincial/forged-letter-warning-about-wolves-on-the-loose-part-of-canadian-forces-propaganda-campaign-that-went-awry-509157/>

Part III: DISSENT AND DISTURBING OF THE PEACE

Week 9 (March 17, 2021): Justice vs. the Law

The law and justice are not the same thing. You sometimes have unjust laws and sometimes laws bring people to justice. A judge is a Justice but a judge's judgment is not always just. And then there is social justice – an often used amorphous term that means a lot of things to a lot of people, but what does it mean in practice. What does it mean to access justice? How does one seek justice for communities and is it possible to use the law to do good for communities? Is the practice of law meant to address structural change or is it a system of rules designed to maintain the *status quo*.

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT the law and justice are at odds and that it is morally justifiable to take the side of justice against the side of the law.

Assigned Reading: To be posted on cuLearn

Week 10 (March 24, 2021): Curtailment of Public Expression

On March 16, 2020, Ontario declared a lockdown along with jurisdictions throughout Canada and the world in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Gathering sizes were limited, provinces in some cases closed their borders, public services were limited to virtual access and businesses closed or were temporarily shuttered. Amidst the imposition of public health directives, there were inconsistencies in some cases interjurisdictionally between places like Ottawa and Hull and businesses themselves were divergent in their responses. For the public at large, many people were initially confused. Reports emerged of racial profiling on the part of bylaw officers along with the arbitrary imposition of massive fines. Several months later, however, despite strong compliance measures being ordered, COVID-19 infections skyrocketed in the fall of 2020. In response to this problem, municipalities have ordered the imposition of hefty fines resulting in public backlash as in the case of Adamson Barbecue in Etobicoke. What are the appropriate limits to state intervention in a period of public health controls? Should the public be subjected to repressive state control?

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED THAT punishing non-compliance with public health measures in the pandemic is a mistake.

Assigned Reading: To be posted on cuLearn

Week 11 (March 31, 2021): Housing as a Human Right

Landlords own properties, which they rent to tenants for a rate that is determined by the market under terms that are governed by the *Residential Tenancies Act* in Ontario. If the tenant cannot make their monthly rental payment, they risk eviction. However, should this be the case in the context of a global pandemic that has dramatically altered the landscape of available employment, social services and public housing? While the government of Ontario temporarily granted a moratorium on evictions between March and July 31, 2020, evictions have been continuing since August 2020. What should the legal and moral limits be on displacing tenants from their home when they have nowhere else to go? Should landlords have to bear the responsibility for the burden for the inequities of the system? Can the provincial or federal governments, already overrun with unprecedented debt bail out those affected?

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED that no one should be evicted during a pandemic.

Assigned Readings: To be posted on cuLearn.

Week 12 (April 7, 2021): Freedom and Abolition

Prisons in Canada are inhospitable places where prisoners face unhealthy conditions, traumatic situations, physical danger, disease and torture. The normalization of prisons and prison conditions is both a social and political compromise that often serves as a solution for housing persons with complex and severe mental health challenges. However, in the spring of 2020, Canadian policy makers, bureaucrats, prosecutors and courts were pushed to consider radical options to respond to the looming problem of housing prisoners in large carceral facilities in the face of a growing health and resource crisis caused by a global pandemic. For the first time, the policy of *decarceration* in Canada became a guiding consideration that would animate bail reviews, immigration detentions, alternative plans to detention and sentencing. If decarceration could emerge as a reasonable policy option urged by the crisis of a pandemic, would the notion of abolishing prisons still make sense outside of a global health crisis?

BE IT RESOLVED THAT prisons in Canada should be abolished.

Assigned Readings: To be posted on cuLearn.

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATIONS

You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term. For an accommodation request the processes are as follows: <https://carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf>

Pregnancy obligation

Please contact 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 Department of Equity and Inclusive Communities (EIC): <https://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 Department of Equity and Inclusive Communities (EIC): <https://carleton.ca/equity/>

Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

If you have a documented disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact The Paul Menton Centre (PMC) at 613-520-6608 or 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 as soon as possible to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Please consult the PMC Website for their deadline to request accommodations for the formally-scheduled exam (if applicable) <https://carleton.ca/pmc>

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one's own. Plagiarism includes reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source. Examples of sources from which the ideas, expressions of ideas or works of others may be drawn from include but are not limited to: books, articles, papers, literary compositions and phrases, performance compositions, chemical compounds, art works, laboratory reports, research results, calculations and the results of calculations, diagrams, constructions, computer reports, computer code/software, and material on the Internet. Plagiarism is a serious offence. More information on the University's Academic Integrity Policy can be found at: <https://carleton.ca/registrar/academic-integrity/>

Survivors of Sexual Violence

As a community, Carleton University is committed to maintaining a positive learning, working and living environment where sexual violence will not be tolerated, and survivors are supported through academic accommodations as per Carleton's Sexual Violence Policy. For more information about the services available at the university and to obtain information about sexual violence and/or support, visit: <https://carleton.ca/studentssupport/svpolicy/>

Accommodation for Student Activities

Carleton University recognizes the substantial benefits, both to the individual student and for the university, that result from a student participating in activities beyond the classroom experience. Reasonable accommodation must be provided to students who compete or perform at the national or international level. Please contact your instructor 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. <https://carleton.ca/senate/wp-content/uploads/Accommodation-for-Student-Activities-1.pdf>

For more information on academic accommodation, please contact the departmental administrator or visit: <https://students.carleton.ca/services/accommodation/>

Department Policy

The Department of Law and Legal Studies operates in association with certain policies and procedures. Please review these documents to ensure that your practices meet our Department's expectations: <https://carleton.ca/law/current-students/>