

epithet “Russian Mohawks,” thus mobilizing the Enlightenment’s full arsenal of vituperative metaphors of race, geography, and incivility in one simple construction.

A curious and possibly important undercurrent in British popular imagery, both positive and negative, was the ongoing interest in Peter’s troubled relationship with his son Alexis, a relationship that ultimately led to Alexis’ execution for treason. Somehow this sad episode held special meaning for British publicists, as if it encapsulated some essential truth about Peter and Russia. But what? What does this ongoing fascination with the execution of the regent tell us about British political sensibilities or their assumptions about civilized kingship? Here, as elsewhere, the reader must draw his/her own inferences.

Cross eschews simple political conclusions from his material. Neither does he impose any specific interpretive model on it. He describes the book tellingly as “a wide-ranging survey that embraces all forms of written evidence as well as visual images.” Here, as in much of his previous scholarship on Russia and Britain, he delights in offering rich descriptions of little-known material, and then allow the readers to make of it what they will. This approach to narration is both pleasing and slightly frustrating. Pleasing because it places the primary material at center stage and it avoids forcing cultural ambiguities and cross currents into a single rigid model. Frustrating because it deprives the reader of the author’s own readings of his materials, his sense of their significance in grasping the geo-politics of culture. Living as we do in a time when the cultural symbols and material interests of states and peoples are intertwined with powerful and often violent consequences, it would be instructive to apply these heightened sensibilities to past time, especially if it were done by someone with the expertise and erudition of Anthony Cross. From that single perspective this book, otherwise so engaging and consistently attentive to detail, is something of a missed opportunity.

Gary Marker
State University of New York at Stony Brook

Gary Kinsman, Dieter K. Buse and Mercedes Steedman, eds., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between The Lines, 2000).

This collection originated in a 1996 conference at Laurentian University which brought together critical researchers and Left activists concerned with understanding and critiquing dominant notions of Canada’s “national security.”

Including the editors' introduction, there are 23 chapters in the book, 15 of which are revised versions of papers presented at the conference. The editors have done a nice job of thematically introducing and organizing the papers, and securing additional contributions to round out the collection. Nevertheless, with its short, highly empirical or anecdotal papers, *Whose National Security?* reads very much like a conference proceedings.

The editors argue that "national security" is an ideological concept which represents the partial interests of privileged groups as the general interest of the "nation" (280). Furthermore, the concept is both elastic, thus offering powerful groups the ability to readily change the focus of national-security campaigns (280); and hegemonic, in the Gramscian sense of being uncritically taken-for-granted by most citizens (283).

The concept of national security is used to undermine the democratic rights of those groups who dissent from the patriarchal, capitalist, heteronormative, and racist relations of ruling in Canadian society (281). The editors call for critical investigations of national security "from the standpoints of those defined as being on the margins, of those defined as being subversive" (279). They also argue that critical scholarship on national security can play an important role in social-justice politics: "defending the democratic rights of the marginalized and excluded requires that we challenge and deconstruct the rhetoric and practices of 'national security'" (284).

The analytical framework of *Whose National Security?* has three other noteworthy features. Firstly, national security is presented as "a broader form of social and moral regulation" that "attempts to define 'proper Canadian' subjects" (3). Secondly, the scope of concern of national security is defined much more widely than in traditional studies, and includes gender, sexuality, ethnicity and immigrant status. Thirdly, non-state agencies like Churches are seen as having important roles in national-security campaigns.

The strongest papers in the collection are those that exemplify aspects of the editors' theoretical perspective. In "Constructing Gay Men and Lesbians as National Security Risks, 1950-70," Gary Kinsman studies the social organization of the national-security campaigns against gay men and lesbians from the standpoints of the targets of the campaigns. The paper critically juxtaposes empirical materials from three sources: interviews with twenty gay men and four lesbians who were personally targeted by this security campaign; interviews with state security operatives; and textual analysis of official security documents. Kinsman's paper highlights how resistance by gay men and lesbians forced the security police to change its practices.

Paula Maurutto's "Private Policing and Surveillance of Catholics: Anti-Communism in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto, 1920-60" is a shortened version of a paper first published in *Labour/Le Travail*. She analyzes

the Catholic Church's anti-communist practices in Toronto as being primarily concerned with moral regulation. Indeed, the Church's role is crucial to Maurutto's understanding of the Cold War which "operated as a mixed social economy in which government interests merged with the goals of private voluntary institutions" (46).

While the two aforementioned papers are the strongest in the collection, many of the other papers will be of interest to readers with particular interests. For instance, I first flipped to those papers that discuss researchers' experiences with trying to gain access to state surveillance records. The book includes three papers in the section "Finding Security in the Archives." In addition, in the section "Old Methods and Recent Trends" there is a paper by Evert Hoogers which describes the attempts by the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) to gain access to documents created on CUPW by the RCMP Security Service between 1965 to 1984. This is fascinating, practical information for anyone who has been frustrated by the limited information that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) is willing to release about past surveillance activities.

The acts of mass destruction and murder that occurred on 11 September, 2001 have pushed issues of "national security" to the front of the political agenda. Canada joined George W. Bush's "war on terrorism" by sending combat troops to Afghanistan. This has increased the possibility that Canadian territory will be targeted in any future al-Qaeda attacks. The government also enacted an anti-terrorism law, Bill C-36, that creates new police powers and limits civil and political rights. Furthermore, CSIS has been promised a 30% increase in its budget over the next five years so that it can hire 280 new intelligence officers and expand overseas covert-spy operations (*Globe and Mail*, 13 June 2002: A1). Security concerns are also paramount in the Canadian state's response to the movement against corporate globalization, as witnessed by the policing of the 2001 Summit of the Americas in Quebec City and the 2002 G-8 Meeting in Alberta. Is *Whose National Security?* relevant in this new political moment, or is the book passé?

Most of the papers in *Whose National Security?* deal with Cold War themes, surveillance and social control. For the period between 1945 and the 1970s, we learn important details of the monitoring and targeting of gays and lesbians, of groups regarded as "fronts" for the Communist Party, of new left and aboriginal groups, and of immigrants and Catholics. This was a period when political and cultural dissenters were defined as enemies and subject to intense surveillance. Does the contemporary secret police establishment conflate criminality and dissent in the same way? In his chapter on police spying at the University of Saskatchewan, 1920-71, Steve Hewitt, guardedly comments that police spying at the university "supposedly ended with the death of

the RCMP Security Service in the 1980s" (100). He is guarded because it is impossible to know for sure. On the same theme Larry Hannant comments, "[w]e know so little about the contemporary Canadian security intelligence system that we cannot possibly offer any informed view on whether or not it merits the slightest iota of support from citizens" (220). In this vacuum of hard information it seems reasonable to assume that political dissenters are still being labelled as "enemies" by CSIS, especially when that dissent is highly critical of U.S. foreign policy and the corporate capitalist system. Indeed, combine such political dissent with Islamic faith and brown skin, and one can almost be guaranteed to draw special attention from CSIS in the wake of 11 September 2001. The Cold War may be over, but dissenting groups are still being identified as threats to the nation, so the contributions to *Whose National Security?* provide an historical window on this new conjuncture in national-security politics.

That said, *Whose National Security?* does not discuss how the McDonald and Keable Royal Commissions changed the terrain of national-security work in Canada, and how CSIS has been doing things differently from or similar to the old RCMP Security Service. The book does include two papers with a focus on recent events: an excerpt from Zuhair Kashmeri's book on CSIS's harassment of Canadian Arabs during the 1991 Gulf War; and Karen Pearlston's account of the suppression of protesters at the 1997 APEC meeting in Vancouver. What the book lacks is an analytical treatment of changes in the surveillance state over time, particularly as old "enemies" faded in importance in the 1980s and new "enemies" were created. For instance, research on the bombing of Air-India flight 182 on 23 June 1985 suggests that CSIS had already reoriented its security priorities prior to the bombing.¹

We are living at a time when the attacks of 11 September 2001 have infused the concept of national security with overriding concerns for the safety of North American civilians. The theoretical framework posited in *Whose National Security?* will need to be expanded to handle this new reality since state surveillance can no longer be presented as a straightforward instrument of the interests of Canadian elites. At the same time, threats to democratic rights are grave, and critical scholarship on issues of national security is needed as never before.

Tom Langford
University of Calgary

¹ Zuhair Kashmeri and Brian McAndrew, *Soft Target: How the Indian Intelligence Service Penetrated Canada* (Toronto 1989), v.