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Abstract

This research will analyze the impact of bipartisan politics and the media's conflicting role in influencing public perceptions regarding national security issues. The central focus is on popular media narratives, critically examined as an impediment to fostering unified public solidarity or opposition regarding the enactment of controversial legislation. In light of the increase in geopolitical conflict and the pervasive nature of terrorism, this study attempts to analyze the media's public role versus the privacy of clandestine agencies whose policies, albeit controversial, address critical national security concerns. As a result, the conflict inherent between institutional and public spheres provides the groundwork for discursive and objective analysis.

Empirical data collection and critical analysis of relevant materials; academic journals, online archives and published works by individuals active in media and national security, provide the primary source of qualitative data. Research was primarily inductive. Analysis effectively combined data from various qualitative sources in an effort to justify the central hypothesis. Contemporary tragic events also provided a supplemental source of relevant content. It is important to note, such events resonate with the rationalization arrived at in the conclusion.

The principle aim of this research was to address the question: Does the media's promotion of the bipartisan political agenda impede or enhance national security policies? In addition, is the role of the media reflective of state subservience or does the media actively challenge national security initiatives, e.g. curtailing of civil liberties, human rights violations and loss of
constitutional freedoms? The analysis further subjected by cross-disciplinary inquiry and academic theories pertinent to achieving the principle aims of this research.

The theoretical framework and methodology utilized was consistent with political discourse analysis (PDA), specifically textual, as all discursive elements were present within the collected source materials. Additional analysis utilizing mediatization and audience theories provides the proper contextualization within communicative and media studies. Contemporary events surrounding geopolitical conflict, race relations and terrorism in relation to the institutional and international response, provides further demonstrable results, which is commensurate with the overall conclusions of this study.

The outcome and results of this research indicate that mainstream media provides both a support role, emphasizing status quo narratives concerning national and international political perspectives and policy, and also a contradictory role impeding domestic solidarity by exacerbating political division along the usual bipartisan lines. The specific focus on legislation that results in expanding judicial powers surrounding national security concerns. Such policies often interpreted as contrary to the preservation of domestic freedoms. These findings correlate with Couldry and Hepp's notions of institutionalist mediatization theory regarding the media as innately powerful agents of change, imparting influence on audiences and non-media actors.
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"To put it in a terminology that harkens back to the more brutal age of ancient empires, the three grand imperatives of imperial geostrategy are to prevent collusion and maintain security dependence among the vassals, to keep tributaries pliant and protected, and to keep the barbarians from coming together." (The Grand Chessboard p.40)

Zbigniew Brzezinski Ph.D. Harvard

National Security Advisor to President Jimmy Carter

Council on Foreign Relations
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1. Introduction

In the December 2015 report on *Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy*, the Secretary General of the United Nations identified an increase in international violent extremism, with explicit links to Islamist terrorism. In resolution 2178, the UN Security Council called for member states to enhance efforts to counter the threat of collective radicalization while recognizing international cooperation and observing compliance with the Charter of the United Nations, specifically in relations to international human rights law. The Secretary General's report stressed a need for a comprehensive approach that encompassed security based counter-terrorism measures in conjunction with systematic *preventive* methods, with equal emphasis on national and regional aspects of securitization.

The evidence to support the UN report findings is readily available considering contemporary tragic events such as the *Charlie Hebdo* shooting, *November 2015 Paris* coordinated suicide attack, the *Brussels* bombing, *Orlando Florida* mass murder, *Nice* cargo truck massacre and the recent *July 2016 Munich* shopping mall shooting. All of these tragic events illustrate that no country or region is immune from the ramifications of this ubiquitous menace. These incidents regardless if perpetrated by a lone wolf or agents of a collective such as *ISIL, al-Qaeda, Boko Haram* or *Hezbollah* all contribute to the growing threat and explicit need for effective, coordinated and proactive national and regional security countermeasures.

However, according to the UN report, over the last decade the balance between universal respect for human rights and the rule of law in relation to combative and preventive measures has been
negligible. As such, the Secretary General of the UN's recommendations outlined in the recent 2015 Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy report stressed comprehensive cooperation in concurrence with justifiable action in all conflict zones. The report underscored the need for member states and organizations to remain vigilant of the rule of law. "Certain rights are non-derogable even in time of public emergency, which threatens the life of the nation" (The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, 2015 p.6). In addition, the report further emphasized the need for compliance among all member states regarding reciprocal actions in relation to international law. "Any measures taken by Member States to prevent and combat terrorism must comply fully with the Charter of the United Nations" (ibid, p.2).

It would appear a paradox exists between the emphases on a unified global national security response, one capable of engaging in an ongoing open war against a mobile, pervasive enemy while observing concern for universal human rights, as defined by the UN Charter. Yet, the bipartisan, left vs. right dialectic fueled by corporate media intensifies the political divide, furthering indecision and increasing the reluctance to engage openly in an unbiased transparent fashion within public spheres of discourse.

As a result, the rhetoric surrounding the enactment of appropriate countermeasures to an open-ended war on terrorism have raised intensive debate from political, academic and media observers and participants. Consider that such debates, especially during wartime create systemic division between the government's authoritative stance and public's apprehension regarding overreach and encroachment. Conservative pundits often interpret the latter as dissent
and subversion. This was precisely the outcome when Attorney General John Ashcroft, in the 2001 US Senate hearings in December exclaimed, "To those who scare peace-loving people with phantoms of lost liberty, my message is this: Your tactics only aid terrorists—for they erode our national unity and diminish our resolve . . .” (Testimony to the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee 6 December 2001).

Herein lies the crucial elements of discourse surrounding the focus of this research. Maintaining respect for the rule of law, constitutional freedom and civic responsibility versus the adoption of reciprocal counter measures in national and regional security in order to preserve geopolitical stability and domestic order. Unfortunately, participants overwhelmed by media rhetoric and misinformation, are unable to determine agreeable solutions. As a result, decisions reflect contradictory and inconsistent bias, which impedes progress, and exacerbates tensions amidst growing security threats. This subjective dialogue, reflected by mass media, equally represents both ends of the political spectrum. Unfortunately, this confusion compounds issues in relation to safeguarding domestic liberties while attempting to assuage national security matters.

Baker (2003) states, "Limits on civil liberties are not simply byproducts of security measures, as they often have been in previous national crises. Instead, limits on liberties are the point of many of the security measures" (p. 563). Complicating matters further, Baker also believes that many aggressive antiterrorism policies may actually undermine the government's ability to address future threats (ibid). Preemptive strategies replacing long-term investigations are a primary example. Thus the principle factors are outlined which impact the decision process; bipartisan
politics, corporate biased media reporting, authoritative preventive legislation in conjunction with adherence to universal human rights while respecting national civil liberties.

This thesis will examine via political discourse analysis two key legislative polices enacted as countermeasures to the growing threat of global terrorism and its impact on regional affairs. 

*Patriot Act 2.0* also known as the *Domestic Security Enhancement Act* in the US, which would provide expansive powers in surveillance, wiretapping, detention and prosecution. In addition, *Bill C-51*, Canada's anti-terror legislation, which specifically enhanced the spy agency *CSIS* disruptive powers beyond intelligence collection and observation. Both legislative policies garnered much public scrutiny and media attention. The media's role, critically examined in relation to objectivity surrounding legislative enactment, as well as the public's perception surrounding the controversy will also be a factor in the ensuing analysis.

The aim of this research necessitates examination of the media's role in relation to shaping the public discourse around national security policies. I will be specifically searching for instances of bias, irrespective of the political ideology. The extent of bias will substantiate the results and much of the literature review will support the theoretical framework, which will focus on theories of *mediatization* and *audiences*. The methodology section will examine and analyze the relevant empirical data collected, which will include cross-disciplinary research as well as media centric studies. In addition, the overall data between both case studies is compared in an effort to determine the impact of media bias. The outcome focuses on addressing the central research questions, followed by the conclusion and a discussion on potential future research.
2. Context

The Global Terrorism Index, produced by the Institute for Economics and Peace, provides a key summary of global trends and patterns in terrorism. The information spans 15 years with data collected from the Global Terrorism Database. The GTD is the most comprehensive database of global terrorist activity. This exhaustive report examines 162 countries and "investigates the changing patterns of terrorism by geographic activity, methods of attack, organizations involved and the national economic and political context" (The Global Terrorism Index, 2015 p.4).

According to the report, deaths from terrorism increased by 80 percent compared to the previous year, which marks the highest increase in over 15 years. These events, concentrated within five key areas: Iraq, Nigeria, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Syria account for 78 percent of terrorist related deaths. However, terrorism is spreading to more countries, especially in the west were the report indicates lone wolf attacks account for 70 percent. "The West is designated as the countries where ISIL has advocated for attacks. They include the United States, Canada, Australia, and European countries" (ibid). In addition, Boko Haram and ISIL account for half of all terrorist related deaths.

In summation, the report identifies various controversial trends. These trends often contradict the rhetoric supported by major media outlets, especially those subservient to militarization and status quo narratives. The report identifies several inconvenient truths. As stated previously, terrorist activity is highly concentrated geographically. Almost 60 percent of the countries covered by the GTI report experienced no terrorist deaths in 2014. This means 95 of the 162
countries experienced no terrorist related deaths, while only 67 countries experienced one or more deaths. Unfortunately, trends also indicate a rise in incidents globally as the number of countries experiencing terrorist related deaths has overall increased. In fact, countries suffering from more than 500 deaths increased by 120 per cent. As recent incidents have proven, private citizens are increasingly the targets of terrorist attacks. Finally, the report identifies some dubious trends regarding terrorism in the west. Specifically, *the majority of deaths from terrorism do not occur in the West*. Of these incidents, the perpetrators are lone wolf attackers or small groups motivated by political extremism as opposed to Islamic fundamentalism.

The report also identified unusual economic trends, which again raise some controversial aspects related to an open-ended war with no discernable exit strategy, location or limitation on time and cost. The correlation between increasing global terrorism was equivalent to the rising cost of containment. There was a 61 percent increase from the previous year at a net cost US $52.9 billion. In fact, *the costs of containing terrorism are significant and greater than the direct costs of terrorism (ibid)*. Global national security expenditures estimated to be approximately US $117 billion.

Incidental to the cost of combating terrorism is the global arms trade which according to *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute*, has increased globally. "*Total global military expenditure has risen from US $1.14 trillion in 2001 to $US 1.711 trillion in 2014, a rise of 50%*" (Amnesty International: *Killer Facts: The Scale of the Global Arms Trade*, 2015). The *SIPRI* report identifies the five biggest exporters in 2010–14 were the United States, Russia,
China, Germany and France, and the five biggest importers were India, Saudi Arabia, China, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Pakistan. In addition, Amnesty International using SIPRI data determined that "military expenditure in the Middle East has grown from $US 99 to $US 173 billion during the same period, a rise of 75%" (ibid).

Ironically, corporate sponsored media or bipartisan politicians never address the correlation between this inconvenient relationship and the economic incentives inherent in fighting an open-ended war. Regardless, these disturbing figures reflect an alarming trend. As threats to national security increase, so does profits from the reciprocal sale of arms to geopolitically unstable conflict zones. In fact, many of the key importers are also areas with the highest terrorist related deaths as per the GTI 2015 report. In fact, as the utilization of proxy wars replacing conventional warfare grows so will the importation of arms, intelligence and training. This will exacerbate further conflict, terrorist related deaths and foment blowback repercussions towards western nations. This will manifest as increasing domestic terrorist inspired incidents.

This cycle continues to fuel geopolitical conflict as the economic incentives increase exponentially for various member states. As a result, preventive national security measures become more viable and justified as domestic concerns become more evident. Hence, in the US Patriot Act 2.0 and Bill C-51 in Canada were controversial legislative measures addressing imminent threats to national interests. The media's role is one of paramount importance, and one I believe shaped the public discourse around a predefined bipartisan agenda, which compounded national solidarity, elevated fear and intensified citizen divide.
3. Literature Review

The textual methodology provided by Political Discourse Analysis is the foundation, which establishes the critical framework for the examination of all empirical data. All source materials pertaining to dialogue, language, syntax and context analyzed in relation to what van Dijk (1997) describes as "the reproduction of political power, power abuse or domination through political discourse" (p.11). The enactment and drafting of legislation from judicial sources is a form of reproductive political power since new laws surrounding national security enable both an expansion in disruptive powers (Bill-C51) or an elimination of checks and balances (US Patriot Act 2), undermining the role of the courts, the press and Congress in curtailing Executive level decisions.

PDA is also an effective method of analysis utilized in this research since the central participants encompass the traditional role, as actors and authors of political and social change. However, as van Dijk (1997) also states, in equal consideration are "the various recipients in political communicative events, such as the public, the people, citizens, the 'masses', and other groups or categories" (p. 13). The relationship of the audience as recipients to the principle actors is indicative of class structures and attributed to hegemonic social formations. This is especially prevalent in political spheres where the people, citizens and the masses are generally passive recipients or as Block (2013) in her research in mediatized politics, exist within a cyclical process of conflict and consent between various individuals and groups struggling for ideological and political power (p. 261). This coincides with van Dijk (1997) observation concerning the public functioning "merely as recipients in one-way modes of communication" (p. 13) as opposed to being actively involved in political discourse (ibid).
In addition, the unique theoretical focus of PDA as a discursive framework of analysis is to acknowledge that it shares critical elements, such as concepts of social change and cultural inequality with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This is especially relevant in regards to interdisciplinary studies, as Fairclough, Graham, Lemke & Wodak (2004) identify that "scholars from a considerable range of disciplines in the social sciences and the humanities are beginning to develop new synthesizes between discourse analysis and a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives" (p. 3). In addition, "people organize and act through particular discourses" (ibid). Politics and the process of governance is a highly organized social hierarchy composed of various participants interacting at complex levels of engagement. It is precisely this discursive aspect and the collective element, which enables PDA as the appropriate method of analysis concerning the empirical data collected in this study.

It is important to note that PDA involves not only analysis of the structural elements of language but also the context. This entails not just the central participants, actions and resulting discourses, but also abstract elements such as political processes, systems, institutions, ideologies and events (van Dijk, 1997 p. 15). These abstract elements according to van Dijk also include political values, such as justice, freedom, equality and independence. Such values often attributed to individuals but also within a collective, as people organize within political and social spheres to maximize influence. This unified collective of participatory citizen's manifests as established political groups. "Collections of political actors may form more or less formal, cohesive or permanent groups, such as opponents, dissidents, demonstrators, diques, coalitions, crowds, and in general socio-political movements" (ibid).
One of the primary reasons for the formation of political groups is collective action. This is often a reactive civic response to the political process. As defined by van Dijk (1997), "the political process is the overall term that categorizes complex, long-term, sequences of political actions. In effect, such actions manifest as organized public dissent, protest and civil disobedience in relation to controversial and oppressive political decisions. In addition, the media has the ability to shape and control the public's perception by defining the content through editorial bias, disinformation campaigns and misrepresentation. The media in this sense becomes part of the overall discursive process as an element of political cognition. Defined by van Dijk (1997) as the "most pervasive common-sense notion" and understood within media circles as "public opinion" (p. 18).

Finally, PDA in relation to the political process is reflective of the interaction between the various elements described: politics and actors, media and public opinion. This cyclical process exists because participants continue to interact with political institutions to exact societal change. In this respect, there is a clear interactive role between political language and the context of the discourse. This is particularly relevant to this research since the impact of specific legislation is in itself a unique political process, in which an interplay of political values, ideologies, cognition and participants determine the extent of social change. As van Dijk (1997) states:

"Social policies are not merely abstract properties of political action or cognition, but largely expressed in text and talk, and politically acted upon as such, for instance in the formulation of bills, laws or regulations, which again are all political and legal genres of discourse" (p. 44).
The analytical research conducted by van Dijk concerning political discourse identified active participants, as an important factor within the political process. This coincides with media theories concerning audience research. As Livingstone (2013) states, "audiences are no longer sequestered in the disconnected domain of private domesticity and leisure" (p. 24). Engagement in the political process requires direct active participation. In characterizing the domain of political discourse, van Dijk identifies several key properties, interacting within this political process. One relevant property, which corresponds with Livingstone's notion of active audiences, is political actors. As van Dijk (1997) notes, the class of political actors is commonsensically defined by all those who are 'engaged in politics', by accomplishing political action, including demonstrators, lobbyists and strikers" (p. 17).

Livingstone further acknowledges that participatory audiences interact in a consistently mediated state. "Participation is now mediated. The subjects of everyday media (i.e., audiences) are also participants in whatever is, now, mediated: society, democracy, culture" (Livingstone, 2013 p. 27). Technological advances have intensified this mediated environment by increasing access to information and expanding on resources to cultivate interaction between individuals that comprise political actors and political groups. This environment as Livingstone has identified has become an important element in the discursive framework of audience participation. "The media environment becomes the infrastructure for all spheres of social life, to participate in society people must engage with the media" (ibid, p.26). Additionally, van Dijk (1997) associates political actions as participation involving "meetings of political institutions, organizations and groups, passing laws, voting, demonstrations, campaigning, and revolutions" (p. 18).
It is important to note that, van Dijk makes no distinction between sessions of parliament and meetings between groups of dissidents as part of an organized opposition and resistance. Both are participatory roles and considered equal as political actions within the larger framework of discourse (ibid). In this sense, for the political process to unfold, interaction must include what Livingstone identifies as participants and not just audiences. The distinction is the result of a "repositioning in society," and is primarily the result of a new paradigm shift (Livingstone, 2013 p.24).

Hence, the domain of politics is a unique process involving reciprocal actions between various actors, institutions and active participants, in order to achieve specific ends. Livingstone concurs further stating, "Participation is never a wholly individual act, and it always advances certain interests" (ibid). In addition, the impact of technology and digital media have greatly attributed to this paradigm shift. "A crucial change (albeit evolutionary more than revolutionary) is under way: the processes of participation (and, more widely, of democracy) are increasingly shaped by modern digital networked media" (ibid p. 25). As a result, the impact of media on the political process, which includes all properties active within the political domain as identified by van Dijk, cannot be understated.

Contemporary media has occupied a central role in creating and controlling the discourse within the public sphere. In this sense, the industry has increasingly institutionalized by forging corporate bonds through sponsorship, ownership and network affiliation. As Block (2013) argues in consideration of a culturalist approach in relation to power relationships and politics,
"the media are hegemonic in contemporary times" (p. 260). It is the hegemonic structure, which will manifest a consistent struggle for political and social relevance. As Couldry (2010) noted concerning the endless conflict of individuals functioning within neoliberal markets, they are civically empowered in an attempt to find a space for their collective voice, in turn mobilizing within unique spaces of power. "Voice is socially grounded and is not the practice of individuals in isolation" (p. 16).

This is especially relevant in relation to the dichotomy established by corporate media hegemony. As Block (2013) notes, "The media, via images, symbols, popular-culture narratives, have impregnated the political realm" (p. 266). Expanding this concept, Block (2013) further ads, "various media have become the omnipresent, naturalized stage on which humans construct, frame, and perform their polity, in a process that empowers some groups and disempowers others" (p. 274). Bipartisan politics as presented by the media enables this divide, shifting Couldry's notion of voices and spaces of power within van Dijk's political domain, influencing abstract elements such as political values and subsequently political action. The result, what Block (2013) refers to as a fourth age consisting of the mediatization of politics, an age of media hegemony (ibid, p.262).

In summation, the theoretical concepts concerning mediatized politics in an age of media dominance and hegemony will undoubtedly influence audiences in their participatory role. The framework and presentation of specific newsworthy events are consistently the subject of interpretative bias. Considering the expansion of previous media paradigms to reflect emerging
technologies, specific narratives impart influence over a wider audience with a more self-reinforcing effect. In addition, the consequences of media saturation further augments the outcome. One final component to consider is the quantity of active participants as opposed to passive audiences. Unfortunately, the latter often reflects a larger share of the overall level of participation. However, active mediatized participants, who critically engage within the political process, can effect societal change.

Considering the topic of this research, examination of a relevant and prevailing theory from political science and international relations was prudent in regards to context. The predominant theory of political realism provides much of the justification behind the incentives of the central actors, namely institutions, nation-states and on a micro level, political actors. Key aspects of political realism concern the maintenance and application of power. It is concerned with pragmatic policies as opposed to utopian concepts and idealistic concerns. Nation states are key players as opposed to international institutions or organizations and postulates a worldview dominated by self-interest, self-reliance and anarchistic perceptions. As Jones & Smith (2015) note, "The right of the state, moreover, may be expressed in terms of both its right to survive and its right to sustain the political order or constitution" (p. 943).

The legitimacy of state power, and the enactment of controversial legislation based on political realism provides the necessary analytical elements for PDA. Bipartisan politics reflected in a consistently mediatized environment, influence perception and the ensuing public debate. As a result, participatory interactions are complex, with shifting power relations and discourses.
**Existing Research**

This section will examine previous research, which correlates with the central focus of this study, namely, national security issues and how the media influences public discourse. The difficulty was in determining if the research was applicable to both political and media studies, as interdisciplinary theories is common in mediatised politics, but limited within specialized niches of political science and international relations. This could be the result of what Buckingham (2013) referred to as the "question of impact" in regards to academic research having tangible results and "impact narratives" in influencing policy and practice beyond the academy" (p. 52).

The idea that discipline specific research theories are not widely adopted was also noted by van Dijk (1997), who acknowledged that "the argument that the discursive elements; talk and text in political science are obvious to a discourse analyst but not a political scientist" (p. 12). As a result, political scientists would unlikely change their methodological approach. However, Block (2013) in her research concerning a culturalist approach to the mediatization of politics, that "emphasis on the symbolic and hegemonic qualities of the issue, requires an interdisciplinary or "multidimensionality" approach (p. 260).

Irrespective of the academic debate, I discovered several articles of relevance, which involved a cross-disciplinary approach concerning political and media studies. In addition, national security issues was also a focal point in relation to the media's impact in presenting complex issues and shaping overall public discourse. The existing research provided the basic premise to help substantiate my own findings concerning the media's role in framing controversial policies.
4.1 Media Framing: National Cultural Repertoires

The research by Nikole Hotchkiss utilized *media framing of national security* within a specific historical and crucial timeframe: 1984 and 2004. This period encompassed the end of the cold war, marked by the fall of communism and the rise of Islamic extremist-led terrorism. The study involved two key case studies: France and the United States. The relevance of this study is the identification of a *national culture* in relation to national security. As Hotchkiss (2010) notes concerning this connection, "understanding these processes is to observe the meanings and ideas that are disseminated into the public discourse, primarily through the media" (p. 367). This effectively identifies the role of media in relation to reinforcing the established historical national culture.

Hotchkiss identifies the impact of *national cultural repertoires* in relation to the discourse on *national security*. Various academic theories according to Hotchkiss (2010) will shape the predominant discourse, affecting *change with the national cultural repertoire* (p. 367). For instance, political scientists emphasize the role of *international non-governmental organizations* in propagating ideas across national boundaries. This contrasts with media scholars who give credence to the *consolidation of markets and the impact of globalization* (ibid). Regardless, national cultural repertoires are historical in nature, attributing to the representative values and traditional character of a nation state. As such, they are open to influence from various political actors and institutions, especially as Hotchkiss noted, during a *national crisis*. It is important to note, that in an increasingly mediatized environment, the media *effect* is also intensified.
Two cases studies: France and the United States, historically contrasted during specific periods in an effort to identify the prevailing public discourse. In France, civic solidarity with emphasis on basic economic and social rights and the centrality of the French culture. This contrasts with the US, which functions by the logic of individualism and the market (ibid, p. 370). This was an important element in identifying those specific cultural factors, which affect the public's perception concerning national security concerns. As Hotchkiss (2010) notes, "Specifically, French framing can be expected to focus on civic solidarity arguments while US media should rely on high levels of the use of individualism frames" (ibid). Hence, the media and journalists have a persistent cultural base in which to frame the ensuing narrative.

The relevance of this study, aside from the similarity in thematic elements, rests with acknowledging the significance of the media, as an institution in shaping political discourse. In this case, national security was the focus and the media through an understanding of the distinct national culture repertoires was able to frame and shaped both the overall narrative and discourse. This idea also correlates with Potter's (2011) research on the conceptualization of mass media effect. Especially in regards to patterns of influence and gradual long-term change or reinforcement principle (p. 901). The results would coincide with Hotchkiss (2010) research concerning national cultural repertoires, which change, either in convergent or divergent directions, due in part to the impact of media framing (p. 371).

The relevance of this study in relation to my research is due primarily to the topic of investigation: national security, as well as how one specific element shapes the discourse.
4.2 Mass Communication and National Security

This second article was relevant to my study as it revealed the historical correlation between mass media and national security in relation to contemporary globalized conflict. This study revealed an important distinction between past trends in national security and the emerging domestic threats in a post-Cold War period. "Now the concept of national security is no longer seen exclusively in terms of containing the enemy" (Al-Rfouh 2005 p. 53). Post-Cold War threats have gravitated from traditional militarized security solutions to one that transcends predefined geographic territory. "Emphasis has now shifted towards an understanding that there are common fears and issues that cannot be resolved through military means alone" (ibid).

In addition, parallel developments in both media and communication and national security in relation to technological developments has drastically altered not only theoretical concepts applicable in academic spheres but also practical applications. "Recent years have witnessed the emergence of mass media as the chief source of the public’s perception of national security in almost every country" (ibid p.54). However, Al-Rfouh equally acknowledges that the media is not a credible or reliable source of newsworthy events. He attributes this to the continued corporatization and globalizing effects. "Since corporations mostly own the media outlets, they are prone to adhere to their own respective corporate missions and operational budget" (ibid p.55). Hence, media narratives will be narrowly defined and political issues rigidly framed.

The relevance of parallel developments and its impact on media framing is what Adorno & Horkheimer (2013) identified as a "culture industry engulfed by an insatiable uniformity" (p .15).
This is reiterated in contemporary times concerning mass media and its commodifying effect. "FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein claimed, “As big media companies get bigger, they are likely to broadcast even more homogenized programming that increasingly appeals to the lowest common denominator” (Al-Rfouh 2005 p. 55). In this respect, the media does not serve the interest of the public in presenting unbiased and objective coverage of pertinent events. Corporate influence will unlikely determine the general perception, shaping the ensuing discourse and altering the national culture repertoire. As a result, proactive legislation and policies enacted by government in response to a national security threats, consistently framed according to media specific narratives.

It is interesting to note that Al-Rfouh (2015) identifies that the majority of past research in media and national security is associated historically with the Cold War (ibid, p. 42). In this respect, I agree with his assessment as much of the geopolitical landscape has changed. In addition, due to technological advances, especially digital age communication developments and the internet, access to information and socio-political interaction has increased. Al-Rfouh (2015) notes:

"The advent of dynamic, digital, and instantaneous technology such as the Internet, communications satellites, broadband, cable, and fiber optics, has impacted not only the communications processes on global governance but has triggered a rethinking of the global agenda for governance in the post-Cold War era (ibid, p.44)

This studies relevance in terms of cross-disciplinary application and analysis of historical parallel developments in media's and national security, rationalize the need for further research.
4.3 Mass Media and Terrorism

The research by Altheide concerning the historical role of US media in relation to war and terrorism narratives, and the subsequent framing for public consumption was consistent with the arguments constructed in my research. The predominant media discourse focused on perpetuating fear as a motivating incentive to garner public support, and reinforce a political agenda based on a specific ideological doctrine. "Analysis of news reports and advertisements suggest that popular culture and mass media depictions of fear, patriotism, consumption, and victimization contributed to the emergence of a ‘national identity’ and collective action that was fostered by elite decision-makers’ propaganda" (Altheide 2007, p. 299).

Altheide used the Gulf War as a specific case study, and focused on media reports and the lack of discourse or opposition due primarily to limited, controlled sources and effective propaganda. The study utilized quantitative analysis of the major news coverage and examined the linguistic elements of how the media framed events, in order to reinforce status quo narratives. Creative use of language, syntax as well as physical access to coverage events and reliable sources enabled the establishment media to present a very limited perception of the truth. "The selection of news sources is of paramount importance, particularly when those sources are able to set the discourse, to provide the vocabulary and meanings of activities, and to set the parameters for discussion" (ibid p.296).

The relevance of this study in relation to my research was to draw historical inferences of media collusion and deception in relation to political conflict, discourse and language applications.
4.4 Political Realism: Western Foreign Policy

The final research article I examined was a study by Jones and Smith, concerning political realism and its historical relevance in the past, by providing philosophical insights for policy makers who must content with contemporary challenges and threats to national security. The relevance to my study was more esoteric than theoretical or methodological. The paper focused on presenting some of the key philosophical arguments among several centuries of elite European theorists who have influenced contemporary academics such as political scientist and economist Francis Fukuyama, John Mearsheimer and syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer. They essentially advocate a unipolar neoconservative approach to governance in world affairs in which the hegemony of the US was of primary importance.

The central importance of this study was that it identified contemporary neorealism with centuries past political philosophies and provided empirical historical evidence for both utilization and justification. Diplomats and statesmen such as Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Jean Bodin and Justus Lipsius, "defined what came to be known as raison d’état or ‘reason of state’ offered a distinctly realist political vision" (Jones & Smith 2015, p. 939). This defined the state as the principle collective, which enables governance through pragmatic means. In summation:

Its proponents offered instead advice founded on reason rather than rationalism, and on practical experience (phronesis or prudentia) when faced with ambivalent moral and political cases" (ibid).

As a result, political actors enable political realism, an ideology by maintaining state centricity through the enactment of judicious policies in response to contemporary emerging threats.
The aforementioned research all contribute specific elements of applicable value to my own study. *Political realism* provides the ideological justification for many of the central arguments, which answer questions on why state actors function according to a value system contrary to what the public perceives as good governance, especially among western democracies. On the surface, this would contradict van Dijk's (1997) notion of shared cultural *political values*. In this respect, political values seem to differ between *those* who govern and *the* governed. Jones & Smith (2015) contend further, "*The right of the state, moreover, may be expressed in terms of both its right to survive and its right to sustain the political order or constitution*" (p. 943).

The historical research by Hotchkiss, Altheide and Al-Rfouh concerning the duplicitous role of mass media, indicate the level of influence of both corporate ownership and the military industrial complex. In addition, Al-Rfouh's research analyzes the impact of digital media in compounding the globalizing effects of western style news, which attributes to commercialism, profit as opposed to critically engaging issues, cultivating discourse, or engage in public spheres of debate. Much of these studies reiterated my own research and results, especially concerning media coverage regarding the enactment of two controversial pieces of legislation regarding national security.

Finally, I have elected to use a similar approach, using discursive analysis to arrive at a conclusions reached by the preceding existing research. My focus on the legislative enactment of controversial policies in the US and Canada, and the subsequent role of the media, validates and confirms the hypothesis proposed by the previous cross-disciplinary research.
5. Data and Methodology

This research is an empirical study, which utilizes an inductive approach to analyzing the data collected and formulating the premise. The predominant method of data collection was qualitative, resulting from information gained on government websites and archives. In particular concerning the topic of examination, national security legislation from two unique sources: US and Canada. In relation to data assembled for analysis of the US Patriot 2.0 act I, examined government sources directly, especially the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) online archive, which features internal scholarly articles and primary historical sources, declassified under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) was of particular importance as agency watchdog for the preservation of civil liberties and constitutional rights. Articles on the ACLU website provided oppositional viewpoints.

In regards to Bill C-51, I searched for references in relation to internal memos, articles, interviews and statements from the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS). In addition, I did general searches under the University of Ottawa with the main keyword: Bill C-51, in order to account for relevant articles representing academic and legal opposition to the enactment. As much of the initial legislative discourse commenced by the efforts of Craig Forcese, a law professor at the University of Ottawa and Kent Roach, a professor at the University of Toronto.

I also utilized additional elements to support my hypothesis and attempted several semi-structured email interviews within the allotted time before the submission deadline. I originally attempted soliciting the agencies in question directly by contacting through general public
channels: website contact forms, general inquires and public relations or human resource liaison. Unfortunately, this proved futile due to time constraints and the nature of the organizations in question resulting in the inability of direct contact due to security concerns and matters of confidentiality. As a result, I decided to extend my inquiry to individuals who are retired from service, yet maintain an active visible presence in the industry via blogs, live interviews, debates and protests. Regrettably, this also proved unproductive due to time and scheduling conflicts. One individual, Ray McGovern, a veteran of the CIA, with a career that spanned 27 years in the agency, now a political activist and essential founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS) was of primary interest to my study. His critical insights would have provided a unique perspective, adding realism to my empirical data.

Finally, I examined several mass media related websites for appropriate content in relation to media framing and the subsequent public discourse surrounding subjective and bias coverage. The qualitative data collected focused on media presentation and reflected audience perception of these legislative events. This was a critical step in my research as the data collected was a cross examination of media in two countries: US and Canada, using only mainstream corporate owned news agencies, as opposed to alternative grassroots or non-profit organizations. In Canada, I researched the key terms surrounding the legislation for relevant articles from three principle media sources: The Toronto Star, CBC News and The Ottawa Citizen. In the US, I concentrated on the two bipartisan corporate owned media networks, Fox News that represents a republican, conservative viewpoint and in contrast, CNN, a liberal democrat biased network. Since my premise correlates to bipartisan politics, the media in relation to framing is also suspect.
5.1 Data Collection

In this section, I divided my collection efforts into two main sections for the ensuing analysis. One section focused on the legislation in question: *Patriot Act 2.0* and *Bill C-51*, respectively, US and Canada using the same methodology for analysis and collection. I was specifically looking for any relevant data connecting national security agencies: CIA and CSIS in relation to each countries respective legislation. The significance of this data in relation to my study and the premise was to identify the impact this legislation would have on the agency in question. In one example, this was not as transparent while the other was directly applicable. This presented an interesting contrast in which the results were of significant concern for the preceding section, which consisted of empirical data obtained from select media sources. This section focused on the ensuing media narratives and narrow discourse, divided along bipartisan lines.

_Collection Summary: Table 1_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation - Section I</th>
<th>Legislation - Section I</th>
<th>Media - Section II</th>
<th>Media - Section II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Patriot Act 2.0</em> (Indirect)</td>
<td><em>Bill C-51</em> (Direct)</td>
<td><em>Patriot Act 2.0</em> (Bipartisan)</td>
<td><em>Bill C-51</em> (Non-Partisan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency</td>
<td>Canadian Security Intelligence Service</td>
<td>Fox News (Republican/Conservative) CNN (Democrat/Liberal)</td>
<td>The Toronto Star CBC News The Ottawa Citizen Ottawa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Justice</td>
<td>Government of Canada</td>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table represent an outline of the two principle sections of analysis, separated by location, legislation, corresponding agencies and the major media institutions and their respective websites of inquiry. The primary keyword was the legislation bill in question.
The following is a summation of my efforts, regarding the collection of qualitative data based on the elements in Table 1. The initial legislative searches involved both CIA and CSIS websites as a primary source. I searched for relevant keywords associated with the anti-terrorist legislation. At first using only the descriptive policy names as defined in Table 1. If no relevant source material emerged, I expanded my initial keywords using broader terms associated with the content of each specific legislation. In other words, I searched for key provisions contained within the act itself. This strategy proved to be effective.

CIA Library & Archive: https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/search/

Result: No results for principle keywords, "Patriot Act 2" or "The Domestic Security Enhancement Act" (These terms are synonymous and refer to the same policy)

A central provision of the Patriot Act 2 consisted of expanding anti-terrorism enforcement powers. This entailed surveillance, secret arrests, racial profiling, civil asset forfeiture and
wiretapping among others. I used the broad term "anti-terrorism policies" to yield considerable results. The most recent, chronologically, in 2012 resulted in 6648 articles, memos and journals.

Results: Table 2 – Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)

Using the information supplied, I was able to access specific declassified articles, journals and internal memos between various executive level government departments. I based my choice on the relevance of certain titles, and after cursory review, narrowed the choice of sources. The title choice based on key terms and provisions relating to the enactment of Patriot Act 2.0.

The CSIS website did not have an internal database but only an archive, which provided relevant publications regarding threat assessments, national security mandates and intelligence issues. The report, 2018 Security Outlook - Potential Risks and Threats was of particular value since it is a cross-disciplinary academic study on future threats within a specific timeframe.


Result: No results for principle keywords, "Bill C-51"
In addition, CSIS releases an annual report for parliament and public consumption. Its purpose is to detail Canada’s security environment and the organization role in terms of maintaining national security. The section on individual rights and freedoms was relevant to my analysis. The 2013-2014 Public Report was the most recent and included in my empirical data.
The search for empirical source materials relevant to national security and *Bill C-51* led me to the central website for the Government of Canada. I was able to achieve extremely valuable results using the primary keyword.

*Results: Table 3 – Government of Canada*

---

**Government of Canada**: [https://recherche-search.gc.ca](https://recherche-search.gc.ca)

**Result**: About 4,860 keyword applicable articles: "Bill C-51"

Due to volume of results, I scanned the various titles and Meta descriptions for overall relevance. Eventually, I narrowed down my selection criteria based on the textual content. I decided to utilize various sources from the results. After determining the applicability, I included these sources in my empirical data collection. Along with the previous search for sources in relation to Patriot Act 2, I now had sufficient content for the legislative portion of my analysis.
In the following section, I focused my search on *media sources* utilizing the same keywords as the previous section, which concentrated on national security agencies. I divided the media sources by the predominant political ideologies that represent the bipartisan, left vs. right dialectic. This was an important factor, as I wanted to have source material that represents both ends of political spectrum in an effort to substantiate my premise regarding media bias. I encountered no difficulties in obtaining suitable matches for my keyword search terms.

*Results: Table 4 – Fox News*

*Fox News: [http://www.foxnews.com/politics.html](http://www.foxnews.com/politics.html)*

*Results: 2,140 keyword applicable articles: "Patriot Act"*

Fox News network is a major US conservative and republican media conglomerate. Frequently accused of bias, while framing issues to reflect free market economics and martial values.
Results: Table 5 – CNN News

CNN News: http://www.cnn.com/politics

Results: 1,805 keyword applicable articles: "Patriot Act"

CNN is one of the world's largest news organizations with many global affiliates and satellites. The world headquarters based in the Atlanta is one of the central bureaus. CNN represents contrary political views compared to Fox News and as a result, frames issues within liberal and democrat bias. The dichotomy that exists between both media networks is well established and accepted by the public. As a result, the social divide only intensifies along political lines.

Finally, I also included an additional search using the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) source. However, I balanced the amount of relevant articles utilized in my research to reflect both political perspectives. This was necessary in order to support a principle element of my hypothesis, which concerned universal media bias and transparency in the public sphere.
Results: Table 6 – American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)

ACLU: https://www.aclu.org/search/

Results: 2,452 keyword applicable articles: "Patriot Act"

I decided to utilize the ACLU as a source of additional empirical data because of its unique position within the legal and political sphere. Founded in 1920, the organization is responsible for working with individuals and communities within the legal system by operating in courts to preserve rights and liberties guaranteed by the US Constitution. This source was critical in providing much of the resulting discourse surrounding the enactment of national security related policies. Similar to my previous search attempts using media networks, the results provided an enormous amount of data. As a result, I narrowed my choice of data based on the title and content of the articles, scanning for specific items related to the key provisions and interpreted as potential violations of the Constitution.
This final section focused on data surrounding Bill-C51 and the Canadian media network coverage. I utilized the same methodology as in the previous section. Articles chosen based on title and meta-descriptions. I eventually narrowed this further based on focal points and key provisions, which related to the controversial elements in the policy.

Results: Table 7 – The Toronto Star

Toronto Star: https://www.thestar.com/search.html

Results: 305 keyword applicable articles: "Bill C-51"

In contrast to the US media related empirical data collection, the search for relevant articles in Canadian news networks is irrespective of partisan politics. In other words, political ideology and the influence on editorial policies was not a direct factor in the choice of networks, since Canada has a smaller overall market share, population, international reach and a fundamentally different national cultural repertoire, shaped by unique social, historical and political factors.
Results: Table 8 – CBC News

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill C-51</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results 1 - 10 of about 1130 for Bill C-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CBC News: http://www.cbc.ca/gsa/ Results: 1,130 keyword applicable articles: "Bill C-51"

Results: Table 9 – The Ottawa Citizen

CBC News: http://ottawacitizen.com Results: 227 keyword applicable articles: "Bill C-51"
It is important to note some distinctions between the US and Canada in terms of media and the persuasive influence of politics on editorial policy. The US, as a unipolar hegemon has a more predefined media environment, with clear divisions along partisan politics. Fox News for the right and CNN/MSNBC for the left. In addition, media framing of key issues for the US is fundamentally different then for Canada considering the geopolitical significance and influence of the US in the global matters. Corporate elements are an additional factor, which can also hinder or impede journalistic policies, especially in relation to bias and misrepresentation.

Results: Table 10 – The University of Ottawa

The University of Ottawa: http://www.uottawa.ca/gcse/

Results: 498 keyword applicable articles: "Bill C-51"
These final inquiries provided an academic perspective on the discourse. This was included as part of the overall methodology of gathering empirical data. I selected the ACLU in similar fashion as a non-media entity, adding relevance to the debate in the section on US policy. In all instances, I used the same selection process to ascertain which articles are applicable in my research premise. Textual analysis using PDA was the primary methodology incorporated as all data collected was textual in nature. This was relevant as the collected data satisfied the theoretical framework in which not just the language but the structural elements which would include the audience reception and comprehension as per van Dijk's political cognition.

These structural factors provide the diversity of elements enabling the arrival of a more consistent premise or conclusion. As van Dijk (1998) notes, "Discourse is not simply an isolated textual or dialogic structure" (p. 2). The complexity is the result of the interrelations between the various participants, the social context, production factors and eventual reception. There are numerous factors, which contribute to the communications process, as van Dijk was aware of the role of media in the production process, which involved framing and subsequent audience reception (ibid). This was a critical aspect in the selection process as particular articles in my search results originated from pre-established politically bias media sources.

As such, my selection criteria of data and the ensuing analysis was central to what van Dijk defined in relation to news framing, especially in regards to headlines and themes. Headlines, according to van Dijk (1988), "define the overall coherence or semantic unity of discourse, and also what information readers memorize best from a news report" (p. 248).
5.2 Research Limitations

Considering the controversial nature of the subject matter, any limitations encountered were primarily due to lack of direct access to relevant information from key sources. I was keenly aware of this fact as lack of public transparency regarding the internal workings of clandestine agencies is essentially off limits. As a result, I could not expand on the qualitative aspects of my research, especially in relations to conducting interviews with key personnel who are active within the field. I had attempted on numerous occasions to solicit confidential interviews, stating the intended purpose as a graduate thesis project but received no response, or general HR type denials, which are customary and expected. This resulted in a lack of primary source data of a qualitative nature. Hence, my conclusions are primarily deduced from public sources.

The media itself presented another level of limitation as the subjective editorial bias tainted the presentation of facts and the ensuing discourse. In the US, this transparency is evident in the public sphere, as the primary media networks divide coverage along a dialectic political ideology. The result is issues and events framed within a certain perspective. This applies to both the left/liberal and right/conservative. Canadian media appeared to resonate with the current administration, which represents a departure from the conservative.

Finally, the inability to obtain data by semi-structured interviews from additional sources such as retired or inactive personnel was in itself a limitation. My subject of which I was acquainted was a former CIA operative and case officer with numerous years of professional service, now retired and a political activist and dissident. His outspoken criticism, which I acknowledged due
to his direct experience, would also influence the conclusions of my research. Time permitting with access to more sources; I would balance his unique experience with additional interviews that espouse contrary views. George Tenet or David Petraeus, both former directors of the CIA and academics affiliated with Georgetown University would have been suitable choices.

In addition, the numerous retired security professionals who comprise the organization Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, VIPs would have also provided unique and diversified insight. As of 2015, the group is comprised of 28 retired analysts from various US Intelligence agencies, namely the CIA, FBI, NSA, State Department and Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA). It is important to note that this organization was formed to protest the use of faulty intelligence, especially concerning issues related to war, terrorism and national security policies. I believe their individual or collective experience would have substantially contributed to my qualitative data and subsequently the results of my research.

5.3 Ethical Considerations

The subject matter of my thesis and my approach did not entail crossing any ethical boundaries related to violating personal confidentiality concerns or creating inconsistencies to arrive at inconclusive results. Since my study was predominantly qualitative in nature using sources easily accessible through public and academic channels, duplication of the conclusion is a simple process. In addition, as stated in the research limitations, the lack of access to live subjects to supply additional data negated any ethical or confidentiality concerns. As a result, there was no misrepresentation or conflict of interest from a researcher's perspective concerning data.
However, in the process of assembling my data, I applied for a position as an Intelligence Officer, IO with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, CSIS. On July 8, 2016, while in New York, CSIS human resources in Ottawa conducted a live one-hour confidential phone interview. Shortly after, I was invited to complete and extensive application, which included background checks and top-secret security clearance. On August 8, 2016, at the central headquarters in Ottawa, Canada I completed a live comprehensive written analytical exam.

The exam was confidential involving casework reminiscent of counter-intelligence using a fictitious espionage scenario against a hostile foreign target. All candidates present had to sign confidentiality statements concerning the details of the exam and selection process to follow. As a result, my candidacy and interest in potentially working as an IO for one of my research subjects, presents a unique opportunity, which must balance confidentiality with criticism in regards to the acquisition of controversial powers via Bill C-51, a primary subject of study.

5.4 Validity of Research

The criteria for validity in research is dependent on numerous factors especially in relation to the process or methodology as well as the overall product, which includes the conclusions of the study. As Whittemore, Chase & Mandle (2001) note, "Attention to both process and product, art and science, contribute to validity and subsequently quality in qualitative research" (p. 534). In order to adhere to criteria regarding the overall process, I have utilized a diverse set of sources for my empirical data. I maintained consistency regarding the selection procedure in order to produce a rational outcome. As a result, the conclusions and results confirm what was
discovered during the analysis. Established by not only the volume but also the unique characteristics of each empirical search source. In addition, I specifically used sources of relevance to my research questions. The resulting search inquiries provided data and information, which enabled me to formulate my premise and to use the same data to substantiate the conclusions. PDA, as a discursive methodology of analysis was also justified in this research concerning the specific nature of the topic. This contributed to concerns regarding validity in terms of the process (methodology) selected as well as the overall product (framework).

In regards to the actual data, I believe the diversity of sources as well as the bipartisan selection factors also contributed to legitimacy of this study. The quantity was divided to provide a more reliable analysis, devoid of subjective bias or misrepresentation due to one-sided data sources, which favor a single political perception. Further division between using media-centric and government sources also helped contribute to the balanced perspective.

6. Research Results and Analysis

Considering the volume of data, I decided it was prudent to divide my analysis into two distinct areas of focus. One on the national security agency and legislative policy in question and another on media, encompassing both political spectrums. The analytical framework is also divided between my two case studies: US and Canada. This added clarity and organized the ensuing results making it easier to correlate this information with my central research questions.
6.1 US: Patriot Act 2.0 and National Security

One of the key provisions of the *Patriot Act*, following the tragic events on September 11, 2001, allowed for the indefinite detention of immigrants entering the US, identified as potential terrorists. Justification was based on an imminent need for stricter measures, which proactively address future threats. In two years, the Domestic Security Enhancement Act, dubbed, *Patriot Act 2* was drafted, which grants additional sweeping powers to the government, eliminating or weakening remaining limits on government surveillance, wiretapping, detention and prosecution (ACLU Fact Sheet on PATRIOT Act II, 2016). As a result, extensive media coverage and academic debate ensued following both the enactment and subsequent provision extensions. This analysis will focus on the government rhetoric surrounding this controversial provision.

Under the draft, citizens or groups, irrespective of political persuasion who engage in civic protest or dissent who break the law with the intent of influencing the government can be labeled a terrorist if their activities are dangerous to human life (ibid). The consequence of such a label would incur strict penalties including civil asset forfeiture, revoked citizenship even for natural born individuals, deportation, death penalty or indefinite detention. According to the *ACLU*, the act essentially undermines the inherent checks and balances built into the system, undermining courts, Congress and the press (ibid). Essentially, an executive level overreach.

In this section, the rhetoric surrounding this legislation was analyzed, focusing on provisional justification through declassified documents. I then contrasted the results against the discourse in the proceeding section on media coverage, reaction, public perception and opposition.
My analysis revealed that the prevailing rhetoric from the perspective of the State concerning national security was to promote stability and security within the public sphere. In the US, the key provision relating to the indefinite detention (sec. 501) of suspected terrorists was of particular concern, since according to Patriot Act 2; this could now include US citizens as opposed to only foreign nationals or immigrants. As a result, I focused on one particular aspect, which was indefinite detention and the justification for the use of *enhanced interrogation techniques* or EIT's. *Why?* The significance of the media as well as the controversy surrounding international condemnation over violations of human rights, rule of law and dignified treatment of the accused. This provision was essential in determining one important element of discourse.

I believe examination of *this type* of discourse provides insight into extreme power relationships, as enactment of controversial security measures could only manifest under such political duress. As such, an open-ended war on terrorism with an omnipresent enemy is essentially a struggle between civil liberties and securitization policies. As Baker (2003) notes, "Liberties are gaping holes in the security fabric; they must be sealed off permanently if the nation is to be safe" (p. 548). In addition, "terrorism must be stopped in advance as well as prosecuted, and this compelling proactive mission necessitates different procedures" (ibid p.555).

However, indefinite detention does not always necessitate that interrogation will follow. In matters of domestic detention, it can actually lead to deportation, or in more severe cases, if the person in question is declared as an *enemy combatant*, severe repercussions will likely follow. Consider the case of *Yaser Esam Hamdi* and *Jose Padilla*, both declared enemy combatants and
held in indefinite military detention without charge and without counsel. "The Hamdi and Padilla cases illustrate how the securitized environment as framed by the administration is fundamentally altering the relationship between the citizen and the state" (Barker 2003, p. 558).

In this sense, national security policies enacted in response to emerging or perceived threats, "define how the State relates to its citizens" (van Dijk 1997, p. 17).

Compounding matters further is the controversy over the use of enhanced interrogation techniques, EIT's. This would obviously be one of the consequences of indefinite detention as an enemy combatant. As such, the key provision in question merits additional analysis concerning the central discourse. In this example, I utilized the CIA archive of declassified documents, open to the public and made available by the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA. In this sense, such documents and the content clarify and reinforce the existing power relationships and overall framework of discourse between political actors: citizens and the State.

CIA Document Number (FOIA) /ESDN (CREST): 6542324 Case Number: F-2015-02400
These official documents, produced for specific reasons would be applicable in future studies as *intertextual content*. Fairclough (1992), identified *manifest intertextuality, as a kind of consolidation of text in which the content is drawn from several sources, marked by excessive quotations* (p. 85). In this case, the above referenced CIA internal document would provide the justification for both secondary government studies, political speeches vindicating EIT’s and media sources referencing official documents as evidence, utilized for mass persuasion.

It is important to note that intelligence activities, both domestic and foreign, which involve national security concerns, transpire in secrecy and are not transparent in the public sphere. This is a necessary element in preventing sensitive and highly classified government information from acquisition by hostile foreign entities. However, lack of transparency can also create a sense of distrust and apprehension among citizens or the accused. From the perspective of the CIA, the rhetoric is warranted and an essential part of the trade. "*The basic conundrum for intelligence agencies is that it requires secrecy to be effective, but government secrecy in a western Liberal democracy is generally undesirable*" (Manget 2014, p. 30). Consequently, "*The United States is at war. The enemy can immediately exploit information gained through espionage to launch attacks*" (Sulick 2014, p. 25). Such statements from two former Directors of Intelligence, DCI's illustrate the discursive framework from the perception of the State in matters of national security. Opposition must rationally contend with this powerful contextual framework.

The correlation between secrecy, indefinite detention and the potential for the accused to undergo EIT methods is dependent on case specifics. Regardless, the discursive framework is
establish as the narrative surrounding national security, based on language and context as well as the pragmatic approach by officials formulates a powerful and influential position. As van Dijk (1997) notes, "Who controls public discourse, at least partly controls the public mind, so that discourse analysis of such control is at the same time inherently a form of political analysis" (p. 44). This pragmatic approach is also indicative of political realism, as national security concerns are contemporary in nature and require proactive responses.

6.2 US: Patriot Act 2.0 & Bipartisan Media

The discourse surrounding audience perceptions on national security and subsequent enactment of proactive legislation is a direct influence of media production. As Deacon and Stanyer (2014), note "mass media or ICTs have the power to bring about change on their own, in other words, they always exert a powerful net effect on communicative practice" (p. 1035). This correlates with Livingstone (2009) original notion concerning the historical processes of disempowerment, whereas in our contemporary mediatized environment results from, "the accrual of power created by the increased pervasiveness and autonomy of media institutions, values and technologies" (ibid). In this respect, the media is at the forefront of the not only the public acquisition of events and information but also responsible for shaping popular opinion and discourse.

In the ensuing section, I examined the dominant bipartisan media networks, which provide news coverage for most Americans. On the right, Fox News wholly owned and controlled by 21st Century Fox Corporation and chaired by billionaire Rupert Murdoch. This network publishes
articles and news with an editorial bias that represents conservative and the right leaning political perspective. As stated previously under the methodology, I searched for the main legislative keyword, which correlates with the topic of study and selected several articles of reference using the title and meta-descriptions as selection criteria.

In one article, titled, Gonzales: No. 1 Priority is Fighting Terror is a reference to the appointment of the new Attorney General, Alberto Gonzales quote regarding support for strict antiterrorism measures. The article highlights bipartisan conflict, especially in regards to the left (democrats) using accusative language and links to the Iraq war. The right (republicans) are generally supportive of war and the preeminence of the military. "Gonzales was opposed by many Democrats because of his work on administration polices they faulted in the abuse of prisoners in Iraq." Concerning his election to the position, "he was confirmed on a 60-36 vote with all of the "no" votes coming from Democrats and Democratic-leaning independent Jim Jeffords of Vermont."

In addition, the article quotes a democrat senator who further expands on the partisan divide by admitting uncertainty. "Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., said, "I like and respect Judge Gonzales as a person and as an inspiration," but "I am unsure Judge Gonzales is the right man for this crucial job." In contrast, the article highlights adverse sentiments and support from the right, "Republicans say Gonzales will do an excellent job as attorney general, praising him for how he worked his way up to being Bush's top lawyer in the White House." The predominant use of language and the apparent focus on the bipartisan divide reinforces the stereotype of bias.
In the article, *Debate Rages over Legality of NSA Wiretap Program* the central focus is on another controversial provision, namely eavesdropping on international calls, which originate and end within the US. The article presents some compelling testimony from academics representing both sides of the debate. "There isn't any question in my mind that this operation violated federal law," exclaimed George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley. Contrasting this perspective with, "I think there's a very powerful case that the president has independent authority to order surveillance without a warrant," said Robert Turner, a University of Virginia professor who specializes in national security law.

The predominant rhetoric as in the previous article is to perpetuate the left versus right dialectic. Reinforcement by quotes from principle actors and politicos focus on establishing narratives based on oppositional points rather than assurances of solidarity, which would reassure the public and foster trust in the establishment. Consider the following quote from the article by Republican (right) Senator Lindsey Graham, "There's going to be a building outrage in more of the liberal media than anywhere else about this, and there are going to be Democratic members of Congress who are going to deny any involvement here". In this one instance, reference to the oppositional political party is direct, distracting focus from the essential point of contention, namely the legality of the wiretap program.

Considering the inherent power relationships that exist between elected representatives and the public, the resulting discourse is one shaped by subservience to authority. *However, what about the truth?* Fairclough (2014) stated, "Dialectic proceeds from discourse to, or towards, truth, in
a practical sense (p. 5). The media based on the aforementioned articles do not reflect an editorial policy based on objective journalism, as the political establishment is only interested in presenting pre-established narratives, which reinforce division, as opposed to an informed debate, which facilitates open dialogue and cooperation. The language is direct and deterministic with little room for public opinion or input. This dialogue is indicative of top down hierarchal organizations, structurally regimented with predefined power relations between actors.

I will now focus on the liberal media in the US, which promotes a progressive ideology. The presentation of events uses similar methods in order to foster audience support and influence. Article titles and meta-data descriptions were the underlying criteria of selection, followed by cursory reading of the content, scanning for relevant keywords and terms. The predominant discourse I searched related to textual content symptomatic of perpetuating the left vs right dialectic. This would provide critical data in relation to my research question concerning media subservience to political stereotypes and status quo narratives maintained by the system.

In the CNN article, Battle over the Patriot Act, the central focus is on the efforts of republican (right) senator Majority Leader Mitch McConnell attempts at reauthorizing key provisions of the Patriot Act, specifically section 215 regarding the National Security Agency, NSA bulk collection of Americans telephone records. "The Islamic State, McConnell warned, was at our doorstep. The country would be "in danger" if the Patriot Act authorities were to lapse for even one day." The article continues to focus on bipartisan political divide concerning attempts at reauthorization by including an additional republican (right) reference to another proponent of
the debate; "His ally in resisting surveillance reform, Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Richard Burr, R-North Carolina, introduced a bill inaptly described as a "compromise." The structural framing of the content promotes division along partisan politics and reinforces the divide between political classes. Elected representatives versus the malleable audience. The language utilized employs collective efforts at identifying Americas under one political ideological class, who espouse ideals in opposition to the right. The language utilizes an absolutist approach in which public perceptions are uniform and confirmed as opposed to varied and interpretive.

"Moreover, Americans no longer assume that executive branch officials can and should decide national security matters for us in secret." Further reiterated in the articles conclusion as the author makes the final decision for the collective concerning the topic in question. "It is time to stop treating freedom and bravery as luxuries we cannot afford, and to reclaim them as our nation's proud heritage. That begins with ending the bulk collection of Americans' phone records." In addition, "Lawmakers and the public alike have begun to realize that we have sacrificed too much liberty for marginal or nonexistent security gains."

The author uses an appeal to the masses based on the preservation of liberty using language, which frames the conclusions as logical. In addition, the use of self-inclusion negates representations of the audience as others, since the author includes herself among those impacted by the provision in question. This has a powerful effect, creating an image that only the left preserves civil liberties and protects privacy, while the right, inhibits any notion of freedom.
Continuing analysis of CNN coverage concerning this key provision extends to an additional report titled, "Senators alarmed over ISIS link, Patriot Act rollbacks in wake of Boston terror case." Once again, partisan divisional reporting methods, which highlight party difference, determines the language and context. This effectively polarizes the audience as efforts by the liberal media continue to adhere to pander to the left vs. right dichotomy. "I'm highly concerned about the security of this nation across the board," said Wisconsin Republican (right) Sen. Ron Johnson, following with, "These threats aren't diminishing. They're growing, and we need to recognize that reality. We can't put our heads in the sand."

The article continues to obfuscate legislative focus, instead perpetuates bipartisan division by illustrating comments by another republican (right). Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine politician, who argued, that reforms made to the Patriot Act's metadata collection program, known as Section 215, would make it harder to answer these questions, in relation to self-radicalized terrorist or those in direct contact with organizations such as ISIS. Hence, she continued, "That's absolutely the key question, and that's why it's so important that we have the authorities under section 215."

An elected official from the opposing political party (left) quickly contrasted this position. Oregon Democratic Sen. Ron Wyden, who also serves on the Senate Intelligence Committee and champion of reforming the surveillance programs, stood by the reforms to the NSA program. Justification based solely on values and concerns central to the progressive agenda and appeal to his constituents. "The real question, as we've seen again in this debate, is finding approaches
that make us safer and protect our liberty." As in the previous article, the editorial discourse focuses on presenting opposing political views in relation to the controversial provisions concerning national security legislation. In this sense, the liberal media is more concerned with maintaining the political divide, framing the opposition through selective commentary, which appears contrary to the nation's best interests. However, there is no viable solutions presented from the left in terms of increased security. Only vapid diatribe and blanket criticism based on emotional appeals to ethical considerations and traditional American talking points such as liberty. My analysis of the bipartisan US media, which encompasses both ends of political spectrum has revealed that media serves to divide, perpetuating diversion and focus from the central issue of investigation. The audience as the recipient, consistently manipulated by the language and context.

Newsworthy events are carefully framed to exploit emotionalism through the selection of quotes and comments from key individuals representing both political parties. The audience whose latent political bias becomes more receptive to the dialogue, which stresses and reinforces division by editorial organization, selection and even omission. As a result, the audience is sufficiently distracted and marginalized, which effectively removes any uniformed consensus, which transcends politics, religion or even cultural traits and preferences. It would seem that the following statement by Noam Chomsky (1998) concerning media manipulation is most relevant, “Citizens of the democratic societies should undertake a course of intellectual self-defense to protect themselves from manipulation and control, and to lay the basis for meaningful democracy (p. 3).” Unfortunately, under present US media editorial policies, the awareness of important events will present few solutions, as public discourse is both limited and restrained.
6.3 Canada: Bill C-51 & CSIS

The Canadian Security Intelligence Service, CSIS is a federal agency responsible for investigating activities, which constitute threats to the security of Canada. Key threats include terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, espionage, foreign interference and cyber-tampering affecting critical infrastructure. CSIS programs are proactive and pre-emptive ("Role of CSIS", 2015). Information is collected, analyzed and disseminated to government affiliates through intelligence reports. In an effort to counter the global threat of terrorism, CSIS also maintains close collaboration with traditional foreign allies and is a principle member of Five Eyes, FVEY, which is an intelligence alliance comprising Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States.

On October 2014 in Ottawa and Quebec, two separate incidents linked to terrorism resulted in the deaths of several Canadian service members. As a result, the conservative government argued for expanded legislative efforts in order to enable proactive and preventive policies. In 2015, Bill C-51, the Anti-terrorism Act introduced key provisions concerning matters of privacy and security. One controversial provision, focused on expanding the CSIS mandate by granting new preemptive powers. This entailed the ability to disrupt terror plots, enlist the RCMP (police) to limit the movements of a suspect, expand no-fly list powers, monitor terrorist propaganda, and remove barriers to sharing security-related information. As a result, the media embarked on an extensive campaign in an attempt to reveal the impact on Canadian society.
In terms of the *national cultural repertoires*, Canada historically is fundamentally a *liberal* society as per the adoption of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Therefore, the provisions enacted in Bill C-51 encountered severe criticism, especially from numerous legal academics and civil libertarians. In the following analysis, I will examine empirical data retrieved from two primary government sources: CSIS online archives, which contains internal publications available to the public and the *Government of Canada* website library. I will examine the language, context and predominant discourse in several official documents. I will then contrast this information with the proceeding section on media presentation. The results will be relevant to the central premise, addressing key aspects of my research questions.

In an effort to remain proactive, in 2008 CSIS established The Academic Outreach program, which represents a collaborative effort between internal experts and non-governmental academics. As a result, various seminars, conferences and workshops were organized in an effort to draft a specialized report. The incentive was to foster dialogue and a contextual understanding of evolving security issues. In 2015, the results of this collaborative effort to determine the security risks and potential threats to various global regions by 2018 was completed. The report is extensive, organized by geographic threat assessments, emerging cyber-security issues and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The importance of this extensive report in my research is twofold. It provides the academic justification for the existence of organizations such as CSIS, but also highlights the urgency of Bill C-51’s more aggressive provisions, in which the provisional expansion of the CSIS mandate
which enables preemptive and proactive measures to be utilized. Since the report, emphasized specific emerging threats in the near future, rationalization for the provisions, which expanded the CSIS mandate, was established. The report contains separate sections with analysis covering China, Russia and the Middle East. This report in summation states that over the next two years, there is a high potential for dangerous global instability. The section on the instability in the Middle East is of particular value in my analysis as it correlates directly with Bill C-51's implied application because domestic terrorism often equates to jihadist Islam in the West.

The section concerning the Middle East conflict attributes the continual influence of religion in secular society as a principle concern. "Instability in the Middle East has been driven by the unresolved question of the role of religion in public life." In addition, the authors identify the incompatible shift from democratic models of establishing a so-called caliphate to efforts initiated by extremist violence and force. "Demands of Islamist state-building and the requirements of democratic power-sharing cannot be reconciled." Egypt and the resulting coup, which removed the Muslim Brotherhood from power, provided the historical reference.

In regards to the connection of sequential time and events to discourse, van Dijk (1997) acknowledged that, "reference to the present tends to be negative and those to the future positive" (p. 27). This presupposes that change by political action always entails positive results. In this sense, Bill C-51, proposed after the tragic events in Oct 2014 was justified as a preemptive and proactive strategy in addressing future emerging threats to Canada's security. As such, the establishment discourse surrounding the enactment of the Bill C-51 supported the
controversial provisions. Justified because CSIS disruptive powers are preemptive, (future) proactively preventing terrorism (past/negative) in order to maintain stability and safety. "Indeed, their raison d'être is to design policies that make life better', or at least prevent (further) deterioration or catastrophe" (ibid). In essence, the Global Outreach Program and the subsequent 2018 Security Outlook report findings represent the raison d'être of organizations such as CSIS.

The Government of Canada website has revealed an extensive amount of data in relation to Bill C-51. In an effort to narrow the results, I scanned the titles and meta-descriptions for relevant information. One archived document, Harper Government welcomes the Royal Assent of the Anti-terrorism Act, 2015, provided some indispensable reference material related to my analysis of the discourse, originating from political actors and institutions. The document outlines the principle provisions that Bill C-51 will provide to law enforcement and intelligence services in combatting terrorism. "Canadians know that Canada is unfortunately not immune to the ever-evolving threat of terrorism." "Without security, there can be no liberty." The language is direct and all-inclusive, referring to a collective identity and unified action.

In addition, the use of short authoritative statements reinforce the government presumptions concerning liberty and security being mutually dependent. The logic, based on perpetuating fear is successful in efforts to garner support from the audience. The framing of events by political actors is an essential element of contextualization. As van Dijk (1997) states concerning particular discursive approaches, "Nationalist or populous appeals in political argumentation are
classical examples of persuading the opposition by making reference to the benefits for the nation or the People" (p. 30). The aim is to diminish the public's resolve in terms of resistance to controversial legislation. By reinforcing narratives that appeal to emotions, critical reasoning can be circumvented enabling public acquiescence to controversial legislation such as Bill C-51 or Patriot Act 2.

The documents concludes with an extensive listing of official quotes, from various political actors who support rapid enactment of the key provisions. The prevalent discourse established is that the government has an essential obligation to maintain security through preventive and proactive measures. Key provisions in Bill C-51 enable this function and public acceptance is critical to achieving these results. This coincides with van Dijk's (1997) "analysis of political talk and text, concerning semantic participants and reflexivity." This would entail "public issues that are the object of political attention, such as those of national and international policies, war and peace and national security" (ibid).

The following quote from the CSIS director, Michel Coulombe is indicative of van Dijk's persuasive political talk in relation to strategies of argumentation:

"The terrorist threat to Canada's national security interests has never been as direct or immediate. The scope of the threat, the speed of change, and the ease with which people engaged in threat related activity can connect means we no longer have the luxury of time to contemplate our response. The new measures are essential for this evolving threat environment" (Canada News Centre, 2015).
The language, content and syntax all reinforce an authoritative narrative, absolutist in terms of emphasizing a singular solution, revealed through application of the provisions in Bill C-51. This quote is also relevant considering the source, his role and the organization in question, which is one of the principle political institutions that benefits from C-51's enactment. In addition, the following excerpts from various quotes reflect the use of in and out-group structures of discourse. "To protect Canadian families and keep our communities safe." "To help ensure the safety of Canadians.” "To defend the democratic freedoms, equality, and justice that bind us as Canadians.” "The Jewish community is an at-risk community." As van Dijk (1997) notes, "Principles of exclusion and inclusion are at play here, and reflect the partisan strategies of power in the political process" (p. 34). Hence, bipartisan emphasis in the political domain.

6.4 Canada: Bill C-51 & the Media

This final section of the analysis will focus on the reaction and presentation by the media of specific contemporary events concerning national security. The discourse will reflect upon the application of CSIS expanded powers in relation to my central research questions, concerning the role of Canadian media networks. I will adopt the same criteria used for determining which articles are relevant to my research based on title and meta-descriptions from the lead paragraph of each article in question. Why is this relevant to PDA? Because according to van Dijk (2008), analysis of structural elements includes both the micro (language and discourse) and macro (power, dominance, inequality) in order to determine the thematic composition. (p. 354) In addition, “Themes and topics are realized in the headlines and lead paragraphs” (Sheyholislami, 2016 p. 3).
I examined several major news media websites in Canada for any discourse surrounding this controversial legislative bill. The Toronto Star, featured an article titled, *Be Brave, Scrap Anti-Terror Law*. The foreboding caption was synonymous with the content, which espoused the author's vigorous attempts at denouncing this controversial legislation. "*There is no evidence that the legislation makes us any safer, and yet no doubt that it infringes on our civil rights.*" Followed by "*There’s nothing Canadians can say to justify Bill C-51’s violations of our civil rights.*" Finally, in light of recent tragic events, "*With terror in the news almost daily, the political temptation to leave these policies in place is undeniably great and will very likely remain so for years to come.*" It appears, the monopoly on fear is not limited to conservatives.

It is clear from such statements that the central discourse concerns privacy issues and distrust over any expansion of power by government-sanctioned entities. As van Dijk (2005) notes, "*power is seldom absolute*" (p. 355). "*The power of dominant groups may be integrated in laws, rules, norms, habits, and even a quite general consensus.*" (ibid). In this case, the dominant group has introduced controversial legislation, which can impede civic elements within the public sphere. As a result, active participants such as the media are "*engaged in politics, by accomplishing political action*" (van Dijk, 1997 p.17). Resistance based on editorial content, frames the discourse from the perspective of a liberal bias, which promotes civil liberties, transparency and retention of privacy rights above national security concerns. Unfortunately, the State attributes national security vis-à-vis secrecy as the preeminent concern. "*Some secrecy is essential to both national security and democracy, but excessive secrecy undermines democratic accountability and decision-making, and sometimes national security itself*" (Harvard Law Review, 2009 p. 2228). This contrast further compounds the prevailing paradigm.
The CBC News article, "Bill C-51 passes in House of Commons" is indicative of the bipartisan divide, which stresses division based on the popularity of two opposing political ideologies. This is representative of the dominant paradigm in US media editorials. As a result, national security issues are framed within bipartisan talking points culminating in predictable responses. "The Anti-Terrorism Act, also known as Bill C-51, easily passed third reading by a margin of 183 to 96, thanks to the Conservative government's majority and the promised support of the third-party Liberals." In addition, "Prior to the vote, the Opposition New Democrats voted noisily — and in vain — in favor of proposed amendments..." As previously stated, media emphasis on the perpetuation of contrasting political philosophies will yield collective emotional responses from the audiences. This will accentuate division and distract from comprehending realistic solutions, which transcend these emotionally driven reactions. This is relevant because recipients, as a collective tend to accept the opinions and statements through discourse from authoritative and credible sources such experts, academic scholars and the media. (van Dijk, 2005 p. 357).

The final article analyzed was from the Ottawa Citizen, and was again symptomatic of the bipartisan focus concerning Bill C-51. Evident from the bluntness of the title, which reflected ideological contrast and lack of support for the bills controversial provisions. "Liberals mull keeping some new powers for spy service." The article includes several references to liberal opposition to conservative (Tories) sponsored legislation and emphasizes issues that adversely affect Canadian's rights and freedoms. "The incoming Liberals have promised to amend C-51, dubbed the Anti-terrorism Act of 2015, to forbid disruption operations from breaching Canadians’ Charter rights and protections." In addition, focusing on reference to revisions aimed at addressing the controversial provisions, "The Liberals’ planned amendments to C-51
were prepared in Liberal Leader Justin Trudeau’s office following consultations with experts and some caucus members. The text and content emphasize contrast in action based on redundant references to political ideologies.

The overall rhetoric is stylistically direct, explicit and unequivocal. Key political actors and institutions, utilize this approach in regards to the implementation and application of C-51's provisions. The language and syntax replicate the authoritative position of the CSIS director comments, regarding the essential role these provisions provide in addressing emerging threats. "The Liberal campaign promise is that no protected rights and freedoms under Charter can be breached, period." The result is a polarizing effect between the recipients: citizen audiences with those in power - the authority, political actors and institutions and elected officials. This conflict reflects the central paradigm, providing data, which directly concerns my research questions. As van Dijk (2005) notes concerning this schism, "conflict is thus cognitively represented and enhanced by polarization, and discursively sustained and reproduced..." (p. 362).

In an effort to exhaust all public resources for relevant empirical data related to my research, I utilized the University of Ottawa archives for additional academic data. During the media frenzy over C-51 enactment, much of the ensuing academic oppositional discourse resulted from the faculty of law's vociferous attempts at engaging within the public sphere. Numerous open debates, conferences concerning specific ominous provisions and media outreach efforts attempted to foster a unified civic resistance. This coincides with van Dijk (2005) notion
concerning the discourse-power circle concerning dominant groups and institutions having proportional power of influence. "Those groups who control most influential discourse also have more chances to control the minds and actions of others" (p. 355). One method of cultivating resistance in the public domain is to focus on specific issues and concerns, which affect distinct cultural and social groups. This approach, commonly utilized in the polarization of various outgroups based on ethnic and religious affiliations. The latter represents the criteria I used for the selection of my final analysis of empirical data.

The University of Ottawa archive search yielded numerous results. However, the article titled, "Bill C-51 will worsen racial profiling of Muslim Canadians" was pertinent due to the inherent social conflict, which represents another level of contention based on a racial component. This aspect of social inequality is a central tenant of critical discourse studies. "Racism (including antisemitism, xenophobia, and related forms of resentment against racially or ethnically defined Others) is a complex system of social and political inequality that is also reproduced by discourse in general" (van Dijk, 2005 p. 362). The controversial provisions of C-51, especially in relation to the disruptive powers granted to CSIS was of primary concern since contemporary security threats often correlate with extremist ideology and radicalized Islam.

The authors clearly reiterate their fears concerning racially motivated surveillance and aggressive domestic counterterrorism tactics. The shadow of these looming security intelligence amendments forebode of a worsening of CSIS profiling activities against Muslim communities in Canada. In addition, concerning the recruitment of human sources, CSIS has on occasion forced
Muslim refugee claimants to spy within their communities in order to be granted the right to stay in Canada. Unfortunately, CSIS is a HUMINT (Human Intelligence) organization and must propagate human sources for critical intelligence data, which enables preemptive countermeasures to emerging threats. Developing human sources within specific culturally identifiable communities is standard tradecraft. Historically developed under conventional warfare with military application, it has now evolved into a domestic method for obtaining intelligence on emerging threats. Regardless, the authors are considerably vocal in their collective condemnation.

Fear and distrust is a central part of the discourse. Many young Muslims (teenagers and younger) know what CSIS is and fear it. There is a strong correlation between in and outgroup identification which has only served to perpetuate the conflict and division. Muslim community leaders also report that CSIS recruits Muslims to spy within the community, causing internal distrust and conflict. In addition, politicians advocating for Bill C-51 have mobilized Muslim culture and the proclivities of the thoughts and dress of Muslims in Canada. This is indicative of de-emphasis or defocusing using passive constructions to allude to extraneous and reactive considerations. (van Dijk 2005, p.359)

In this sense, interpretation and the subsequent context are highly suggestive of one's perspective based on political, social or cultural factors. As such, discursive reality becomes malleable.

"News not as a reflection of reality, but as a product shaped by political, economic, and cultural forces" (ibid). Media, as such becomes complicit in perpetuating injustice and social conflict.
7. Discussion

This section will be a summation of the results of my research. It is based on the various components which contributed to my empirical data, including the subsequent analysis which was based on a cross disciplinary theoretical framework. In addition, I will reference how the conclusions obtained factor in relation to my central research questions as well as having any conflicting information. The cross-disciplinary approach was important due to the main topic of investigation, which required theoretical input to justify the authoritarian nature of political institutions and actors. Albeit, media theories inundated with notions of hegemony, patriarchy and power relations are commonplace, very few studies critically reflect on political legislation as an expression of inequality or injustice. In addition, the relevance of media and the impact on national security narratives in respect to theories of audiences is limited in scope.

The empirical data collected from media sources in the US indicates that perpetuating bipartisan rhetoric is the dominant paradigm. Irrespective of political ideology, the reinforcement of the left vs. right dialectic is evident throughout the editorial content. This would be a reflection of neo-liberal restructuring, since editorial policies tend to comply with ownership and sponsorship bias. As Fairclough (2000) identified concerning language and its reflexive construction by social actors, creating a narrative of progress. (p. 148). As a result, much of the discourse focused on rhetorical factors, inhibiting civic solidarity and provoking emotional reactions, exacerbated by hyperbolic media framing. The dialectical composition of US media was less apparent in Canada, as the media I utilized for empirical data appears to have more uniformity in opposition to C-51's controversial provisions. Numerous search results using the online archives of The Toronto Star, CBC News and Ottawa Citizen, reveal both title and meta-descriptions
indicative of progressive liberal values and ideals. As a result, there was a more sustained and unified public reaction consistent with the *national culture repertoire* of Canada. This resistance, intensified by the media coverage was synonymous with efforts to rally the public in protest over the enactment. The University of Ottawa faculty of law, organized open debates and conferences as concerns over the balance between privacy and safety intensified. Eventually, culminating in a nationwide organized protest, appropriately named, "Day of Action" in March 2015.

In contrast, the subsequent passage and reauthorization of the Patriot Act was a seamless non-event for the US mainstream media with limited public engagement. Opposition stemmed predominantly from alternative media sources. However, as, McQuail (2013) notes concerning audience reception, "*commercial exploitation or political manipulation has not been ended by new thinking, multimediality and the coming of the Internet, although it has become much more complicated*" (p. 19). Considering the *national culture repertoire* in the US focuses on individualism and dominance of free market economics, this is not surprising. As Hotchkiss (2010) notes, "*discussions of national security in the US are expected to reference issues of cost, market logic and individual responsibility*" (p. 370). Hence, the solidarity inherent in contrasting national cultures, which are galvanized in a crisis, are confounded. Powerful and influential media networks who perpetuate bipartisan rhetoric and misinformation exacerbate the civic divide, making a unified and formidable response impossible. As such, Lopach & Luckowski (2006) identify media commentary occupying two positions, "*for presidential power and national security or for judicial intervention and civil liberty*" (p. 245). Thus, media framing of controversial legislative events along partisan narratives impedes national security initiatives.
The results obtained from both Canadian media and US sources indicate this political dichotomy represents a paradigm shift, regarding media production and audience perception. The language, syntax and context superseded by subservience to corporate policies, has effectively restricted public discourse and action. This has a negative effect on the entire democratic process. As Fernandes (1998) notes, "Dissent is the essence of a democratic polity. But when it comes to matters of national security, it is the unity of purpose and action of the entire people alone which will see us through" (p. 828). These results conclusively substantiate my premise regarding the role of corporate media in framing national security issues at both the micro and macro level of analysis. As van Dijk (2005) notes concerning critical discourse analysis, "In everyday interaction and experience the macro- and micro level form one unified whole. As a result, bipartisan media limitations functioning at the micro level of social interaction "may enact or be a constituent part of legislation at the macro level" (ibid).

In regards to the political actors, the institutions and organizations who are direct benefactors of national security legislation, the unilateral response favored enactment and reauthorization. This position coincides with support for strong proactive and preemptive measures in line with hegemonic structures of power and dominance. The difficulty arises when the balance between civil liberties and constitutional law, conflicts with aggressive legislation and provisions, which confront emerging national threats. In addition, Political realism provides institutional justification for aggressive and controversial provisions. Emphasis on the nation state, political autonomy and territorial integrity provided the theoretical basis. Considering this is the dominant theory influencing political relations, both domestic and foreign matters are framed accordingly. The theory posits the preeminence of the State, which acts in accordance the
national interest. Security matters related to intelligence activities are within the scope of preserving national interests. This correlates with neoliberal philosophies, which place significance on individualism, which in a collective sense, shaped by national culture repertoires; emphasize a strong military response since retention and expanding power is paramount to State survival.

My research into subversive provisions in regards to indefinite detention and use of EITs has revealed a strong aversion by the public, irrespective of risk to national interests. In the US, the CIA through various declassified documents, made available to the public via the FOIA has revealed historically favorable application of these erroneous methods. This is especially relevant since both the CIA and CSIS acquire data predominantly through HUMINT operations, in which human sources provide the Intel. *Open source material is often helpful, but it is usually out of date and sometimes full of errors. Consequently, our major source of data on terrorist groups is HUMINT.* (CIA Document 000620573) As a result, institutions tasked with preemptive measures in order to secure national security matters will utilize and support controversial policies in order to fulfill the objective. The critical data obtained from human sources who willingly comply via bribery, extortion, threats or those detained and interrogated will yield results. Irrespective of the content and reliability, the information extracted will serve as future incentives for the continued application and use of subversive methods. As Smaw (2011) identified concerning the correlation between political realism and the impact on national security concerns, *"Staunch pragmatists are willing to sacrifice all civil liberties and all democratic processes in the name of national security"* (p. 2). Hence, my empirical data revealed a national security paradigm in which the theoretical basis of political realism was
reflective of the dominant discourse with the media exacerbating matters through the bipartisan framing of events. As a result, the audience perception and reaction, further reinforced by a rigid editorial process which emphasized the left vs. right dialectic. Considering the centralization of power inherent in hegemonic political structures, media compliance effectively eliminates any unified opposition. As van Dijk (2005) notes concerning the impact of this information polarization, "institutions and their leaders, have more or less exclusive access to, and control over, one or more types of public discourse" (p. 356).

Additional research considerations could necessitate analysis of alternative media sources. The results examined using a similar methodology in which bipartisan rhetoric is a central paradigm. However, I believe such results would produce limited new data, regardless of the legislative provisions primarily due to limited popularity and audience reach. In addition, most politically active members of the public subscribe to status quo narratives, irrespective of political leanings. Unfortunately, this trend is reflective of collectivist popularity of political parties, which enjoy the most media exposure. In any case, future research can examine the impact of digital media sources as a viable alternative in relation to national security policies. The contrast in alternative open source information as opposed to corporate ownership of major networks would reveal a potentially new discourse, creating a paradigm shift from the usual partisan divide.

In regards to national security policies, major media networks historically offered limited deliberation outside existing narratives. A unified non-partisan mass rejection of biased editorial policies would be required to end the information monopolization of corporate owned media.
8. Conclusion

This relevance of this study concerns analysis of the discourse concerning national security legislation in respect to bipartisan media narratives. Political discourse analysis provided the methodological framework as textual content was the primary element of inquiry. In addition, cross-disciplinary concepts from International Relations attributed political realism, as the dominant theory for the rationalization of subversive provisions. The empirical data collected from mass media archives and government sources in both the US and Canada reflects a dominant discourse that perpetuates the war paradigm. Editorial coverage consistently reflects bipartisan bias, framing issues in relation to national security by appealing to a divided subscriber base.

The difficulty in approaching this research from a multidisciplinary perspective is due to the myriad of social science theories that formulate concepts on power based on hegemonic structures. This would apply to both private and public sector spheres as the dominance of corporate media coincides with top down government command structures. As indicated by the internal structure of national security agencies which mirror military ranks. My main concern was how this would inadvertently influence my findings considering both the corporate media and national security agencies operate under the same *national culture repertoires*, political pressures and economic models vis-à-vis neoliberal doctrines. The development of many social theories challenging hegemonic power structures resulted from Marxist doctrine in an effort to supplant the growth of capitalism. However, the political or public classes do not define national security as function of a profit driven system. As a result, issues concerning controversial legislation are *not* framed from this perspective. Considering my research has identified a
correlation between the cost of fighting an open-ended war on terrorism and the global arms trade, this aspect of analysis becomes very revealing of inconvenient truths concerning the war paradigm. This would present some potential future research incentives as social theories and critical discourse analysis cross-pollinates in the humanities, influencing interpretation and research results. The dominance of the theories and similarities in methods can hinder as well as enlighten results. Additional research into complex multidisciplinary topics will yield the more data before academic inquiry and debate intensifies.

In summation, media framing is bipartisan, reflecting corporate policies that adhere to promoting a left vs right dichotomy. National security, a function of the State, which defined through political realism, is representative of the most important actor. As a result, controversial legislation is enacted to deal with what the media and government promote as emerging domestic threats. Irrespective of contrary evidence, which indicates, collectivized terrorism (ISIS, al-Qaeda) is geographically isolated compared to lone wolf incidents, thus refuting political rhetoric and media sensationalism. As a result, an inconspicuous collusion between corporate media and the national security apparatus of provisions that curtail civil liberties and impact human rights develops. The audience, as passive and active participants, through reinforcement of media framing and political rhetoric are divided between ethical considerations and fear over emerging threats. Ironically, considering much of human history, war has been the norm and peace has been the exception. However, due to systematic editorial bias in media and government war rhetoric, that paradigm is inverted so public perception is skewed.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 - US: Fox News

"Mr. Gonzales was at the heart of the Bush administration's notorious decision to authorize our forces to commit flagrant acts of torture in the interrogation of detainees," said Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass.

The ACLU already is calling for Gonzales to remove himself from any torture investigations by the Justice Department, and Schumer has suggested he not participate in his department's investigation into who inside the administration leaked a CIA employee's name.

His friendship with Bush does cause some concern, critics said. "Gonzales pledged to be the attorney general of all Americans, and not be in the president's pocket," said ACLU lawyer Christopher Anders.

http://www.foxnews.com/story/2005/02/04/gonzales-no-1-priority-is-fighting-terror.html

That hasn't stopped members of Congress in both parties who want administration officials to come before them and testify about the program. Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., said he intends to hold hearings on whether the president violated federal law, and Sen. Barbara Boxer, D-Calif., said she's asking presidential scholars to see if Bush committed an impeachable offense.

"It is a ridiculous idea that this president would be impeached for executing his responsibility to protect America from terrorist attacks," said Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas.

Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a former Judge Advocate General attorney, said he thinks the president is doing his job by ordering wiretaps, but is concerned about presidential misuse of the law.

Lawmakers and the public alike have begun to realize that we have sacrificed too much liberty for marginal or nonexistent security gains. The bulk collection program is the poster child for this poor bargain. Collecting Americans' phone records en masse gives our government the ability to deduce the most personal details of our lives -- information that is none of the government's business, as well as being ripe for abuse. On the flip side, multiple independent reviews have concluded that the program adds little value to counterterrorism efforts.

Obama warns of grave consequences without NSA resolution

Moreover, Americans no longer assume that executive branch officials can and should decide national security matters for us in secret. The public debate prompted by Edward Snowden's disclosures has brought surveillance policy back within the sphere of the democratic process.

But Oregon Democratic Sen. Ron Wyden, who also serves on the Senate Intelligence Committee and was a champion of reforming the surveillance programs, stood by the reforms to the NSA program, which had large bipartisan support in both houses.

"Obviously, if you serve on the Intelligence Committee, you understand that this is a dangerous time," he said. "The real question, as we've seen again in this debate, is finding approaches that make us safer and protect our liberty. What the Senate realized this week, with respect to collecting all these phone records on law-abiding individuals, we were talking about an approach that did not make us safer and at the same time compromised our liberties."

Meanwhile, Rep. Bennie Thompson, D-Mississippi, the top Democrat on the House Homeland Security Committee, said he didn't receive any indication at a classified briefing on the plot that there were any security failures in tracking the suspects.

"As far I've been told and informed, the system worked," he said.
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As the Toronto Star has argued before, there is no evidence that the legislation makes us any safer, and yet no doubt that it infringes on our civil rights. In its overly vague wording, it is dangerously open to interpretation, a threat to freedom of speech, privacy and security of the person.

Take just a few of its most egregious aspects.

The legislation empowers the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) to “take measures” to disrupt activities it believes pose a security threat, without defining what those measures are or creating a public process to ensure the agency doesn’t trample Canadians’ rights along the way.

It casts a chill on free speech, outlawing the “promotion” of terrorism “in general” (whatever that means), even when there’s no intention of committing a violent act.

It vastly broadens the definition of an “activity that undermines the sovereignty, security or territorial integrity of Canada” to include any “interference with the capability of the government” in relation to issues such as diplomacy, critical infrastructure and economic stability. As experts have pointed out, this language allows the government of the day to take aim at critics of Ottawa’s foreign policy, First Nations, environmentalists or political adversaries, among other troubling targets.


Appendix 4 - Canada: CBC News

Appendix 5 - Canada: The Ottawa Citizen

Already, the incoming Liberals have promised to amend C-51, dubbed the Anti-terrorism Act of 2015, to forbid disruption operations from breaching Canadians’ Charter rights and protections. And CSIS will, as set out in the original bill, continue to require a warrant from a Federal Court judge if it needs to break any criminal or other laws during operations.

But a source knowledgeable about the Liberals’ thinking says senior officials are keeping “an open mind” on many aspects of C-51, especially the controversial new disruption powers.

The source cautioned “they have not come out either for or against such powers, though they are at least nervous about the idea of warrant approval for disruption.”

Disruptive powers can take many forms, from cancelling someone’s travel plans and interfering with financial transactions, to covertly sabotaging extremist websites, and doing intrusive surveillance in which people know they are being watched.

The Liberals’ planned amendments to C-51 were prepared in Liberal Leader Justin Trudeau’s office following consultations with experts and some caucus members. An original plan to unveil detailed amendments during the recent election campaign was shelved. Instead, the party briefly outlined seven changes to national security laws in its official election platform.
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A culture of fear

Such profiling is not new. Dr. Patti Tamara Lenard and Dr. Baljit Nagra (one of the authors of this piece) from the University of Ottawa are currently conducting a nationwide study on how counterterrorism policies affect the experience of Muslims in Canada. Their research has recorded troubling techniques used by CSIS in investigations of Muslim communities over the last decade.

Muslim community leaders are reporting that CSIS has on occasion forced Muslim refugee claimants to spy within their communities in order to be granted the right to stay in Canada. According to these community leaders, during investigations CSIS agents have been known to disrupt Muslim families by doing late-night home visits and by interrogating people in front of their young children. These techniques are reportedly used not only on those who are deemed security threats, but also on those Muslim Canadians who happen to be actively involved within their communities and considered by CSIS to be only indirectly “persons of interest.”