

**“Look at me! Am I a security threat?!”: Border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens
post 9/11**

by

Pooneh Torabian

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Recreation and Leisure Studies

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2019

© Pooneh Torabian 2019

Examining Committee Membership

The following served on the Examining Committee for this thesis. The decision of the Examining Committee is by majority vote.

External Examiner

Donna Chambers, PhD
Professor
University of Sunderland

Supervisor

Heather Mair, PhD
Professor
University of Waterloo

Internal Members

Susan M. Arai, PhD
Adjunct Professor
University of Waterloo

Bryan Grimwood, PhD
Associate Professor
University of Waterloo

Internal-External Member

Suzan Ilcan, PhD
Professor
University of Waterloo

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

We live in an era in which security politics are generated and sustained by the ‘war on terror’ (Anderson, 2010; Bhandar, 2008; Mueller, 2006). This war often targets mobile people. As a result, security and tourism have become more intertwined with geopolitics and discrimination is a widely-debated feature of the politics of control (Bianchi, 2006).

Although it might seem that dual citizenship would lead to the ease of access when it comes to international travel, it is a form of hierarchical citizenship through which only some can benefit (Stasiulis & Ross, 2006). September 11 attacks have highly affected the international travel and tourism practices worldwide. Travelling across or even within borders has become an unpleasant experience for members of minority groups as they may be constantly at risk of facing with different discriminatory actions in the form of xenophobia, racism, and more recently islamophobia (Stephenson, 2006; Stephenson & Ali, 2010).

Guided by critical mobilities and intersectionality frameworks, the purpose of this thesis was to explore the border crossing experiences of Canadians dual citizens who have travelled internationally in the post 9/11 era. Critical mobilities accentuates mobilities as a right while highlighting the interplay of (im)mobilities and inequalities. Frameworks highlighting intersectionality consider being raced, gendered, and classed intertwined to illustrate the complexity of the individual’s experiences. This study challenges the idea of freedom of movement as a human right and illustrates the inequalities in terms of accessing international mobilities. The focus of this qualitative research was on the ontological experiences of international travel. I sought to understand what dominant discourses materialize at border

crossings, how these discourses become embodied in travellers' experiences, and how individuals navigate such discourses.

Employing narrative inquiry for the purpose of this research, I used a Foucauldian lens to examine the relationship between the body and the state or politics. Stories of participants revealed that bordering is "selective and targeted" (Rumsford, 2006, p. 164). In line with Muller (2010), I argue that border crossing is "less and less about the line in the sand and more and more about the bodies that cross it – each and every body" (p. 61). Borders are not fixed entities (Donnan & Wilson, 1999; Pickering & Weber, 2006) but are spaces "created and recreated by states and other actors in a way that is fundamentally gendered, raced, and classed" (Pickering & Weber, 2006, p. 12). Mobilities are shaped by one's gender, race, and class and made manifest through power hierarchies and structures, and reinforced or resisted through agency.

This research has developed an argument on how borders are written on human bodies and that bodies carry borders. Through use of critical mobilities and intersectionality as its broader frameworks, this research accentuates mobility as a right while highlighting the interplay of (im)mobilities and inequalities. This study has set the stage for the future tourism and mobilities research by providing discussions on the notions of dual citizenship and freedom of movement and their implications for crossing international borders.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, to Heather, I cannot say thank you enough for believing in this work and my ability to take it on. You have been such a remarkable, supportive, understanding, patient, and thoughtful supervisor and mentor. You helped me build the confidence and strength to carry on. I would have not been standing here if it was not because of YOU. Thank you, thank you, thank you!

To Bryan, thanks so much for being part of this journey. Your insights helped me a lot with framing this work.

To Sue, I appreciate your expertise and guidance in this work. The conversations we had over the years shaped my vision to move forward with this research.

To my supportive friends and colleagues, Maggie Miller, Kimberly Lopez, Meghan Muldoon, thanks for being on this journey with me. This would have been a very lonely process without you!

To my participants, Lutfiyah, Sophia, Sam, Rosa, Damian, Jehan, Naomi, Nina, John, Anne, and Maya. Thanks for sharing your unique stories with me and let me share it with the wider audience.

To my wonderful friends who helped me throughout this journey, Neda Ensafi and Dan Henhawk, thanks so much!

To my parents, Fereshteh and Hamid, thanks for your unconditional love and always supporting my choices.

To my adorable Mehrab, thanks for being such an awesome baby throughout this process. Words cannot express how much mommy loves you!

And last but not least, to my husband and best friend, Ali, finishing my PhD would have not been possible without your love, care, and support. I love you to the moon and back!

Dedication

To Ali, with love

Table of Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	xii
Vignette 1 – Just an ordinary passport!	1
1.0 Introduction	3
1.2 Research Purpose and Questions.....	6
Vignette 2 – Border Crossing	8
2.0 Literature Review and Theoretical Frameworks	12
2.1 Literature Review.....	13
2.1.1 Tourism: A Right for Everyone?.....	13
2.1.2 Tourism and Mobilities.....	15
2.1.3 Citizenship.....	17
2.1.3.1 Travelling with Dual Citizenship.....	20
2.1.4 Securitized Travel post 9/11.....	22
2.1.5 Fluid Identities.....	24
2.1.6 Borders as Contested Spaces.....	27
2.1.6.1 Risk Profiling at the Borders.....	31
2.1.6.2 Passports.....	33
2.1.6.3 Biopolitics: Bodies and Borders.....	36
2.2 Theoretical Frameworks.....	40
2.2.1 Race.....	40
2.2.1.1 Critical Race Theory (CRT).....	42
2.2.2 Gender.....	43
2.2.3 Class.....	44
2.2.4 Intersectionality.....	44
2.2.5 Critical Mobilities.....	47
2.3 Summary.....	50
Vignette 3 – Confused Citizen.....	52
3.0 Epistemology, Methodology, and Method	54
3.1 Epistemological Orientation.....	54

3.1.1 Critical Constructionism.....	54
3.2 Research Purpose and Research Questions.....	55
3.3 Methodology.....	56
3.3.1 Narrative Inquiry.....	56
3.4 The Recruitment Process.....	59
3.4.1 Participants.....	60
3.5 Method and Data Collection.....	62
3.6 Data Analysis.....	63
3.7 Ethical Considerations.....	66
3.8 Researcher’s Reflections.....	67
3.9 Summary.....	71
Vignette 4 – My Office on Campus.....	72
4.0 Findings.....	74
4.1 Lutfiya.....	74
4.1.1 The “special room”.....	74
4.1.2 Insurgent citizen and dynamics of authority.....	79
4.2 Sophia.....	86
4.2.1 Embodying fear.....	86
4.2.2 Like cows in a slaughter house.....	89
4.3 Anne.....	94
4.3.1 Russian face.....	94
4.3.2 We’re just nobodies.....	96
4.3.3 Canadian passport as a white flag.....	97
4.3.4 I am not a threat!.....	98
4.4 Damian.....	100
4.4.1 My voice is not Canadian.....	101
4.4.2 Gate keepers.....	102
4.4.3 They’re just doing their job.....	104
4.5 Jehan.....	105

4.5.1 The bottle of wine.....	105
4.5.2 Stressful leave.....	106
4.6 John.....	107
4.6.1 A very Arab name.....	107
4.6.2 Swiss Army knife.....	108
4.6.3 Chalk marks.....	109
4.6.4 At the Colombo airport.....	111
4.7 Maya.....	111
4.7.1 Countries with the question mark.....	111
4.7.2 I am who I am!.....	113
4.7.3 Just be professional!.....	115
4.8 Naomi.....	117
4.8.1 Freedom.....	117
4.9 Nina.....	119
4.9.1 They're better than us!.....	119
4.9.2 Modern heroes.....	121
4.10 Rosa.....	122
4.10.1 (Un)welcoming neighbour.....	122
4.10.2 Canadians! Real Canadians!.....	125
4.11 Sam.....	128
4.11.1 the colour of your passport and the colour of your hair.....	128
4.12 Summary.....	130
Vignette 5 – A café somewhere in Canada.....	131
5.0 Discussion.....	133
5.1 Surveillance, Dataveillance, and the Discourse of Security.....	134
5.1.1 Embodying the panopticon.....	137
5.2 Hierarchies.....	140
5.2.1 Hierarchical citizenship.....	141
5.2.2 Hierarchical mobilities.....	144

5.3 Bodies and Borders.....	147
5.3.1 Risky bodies and nobodies.....	147
5.3.2 Embodying fears at borders.....	152
5.4 Summary.....	154
Vignette 6 – Frankfurt Airport.....	156
6.0 Conclusion and Areas for Future Research.....	158
6.1 Conclusion.....	158
6.2 Future Research.....	162
7.0 References.....	165

List of Tables

Table 1 – Participants.....	61
Table 2 – Themes, sub-themes, and narratives.....	133

Vignette 1 – Just an ordinary passport!

5 March 2010 – 4:45 pm

I still recall the curious look on her face: “Aren’t you a permanent resident already!? It’s just a passport! Why do you want to have that? I have another friend who says she desperately wants it, too! But I never get it!” I was surprised by her question! Not that I did not know the answer, I just did not know where to start. I smiled: “Well, you know...” I paused for a moment. I could not find suitable words to respond to her. She continued: “What’s so special about this Canadian passport? Don’t you just use it to travel?” Travel?! I suddenly felt that I have a lot to respond to Tina, my Canadian friend whose mom was originally Scottish and her dad a native Canadian. I confidently started: “Yes, you’re right but....” I stopped myself again. I couldn’t make myself vulnerable like that. That was humiliating! What would have she thought about me?!

I was born in Tehran in 1984, 5 years after the revolution that changed the relationship dynamics between Iran and the West. As one of the consequences, international travel became overwhelmingly difficult for Iranian citizens. I got to know what Gozarnameh (the Farsi word for passport) meant and what value it could have even before I went to elementary school. Two of my aunts were studying in England in the 1980s and my uncle was also studying in Canada at the time. Not surprisingly, my grandmother wanted to visit them from time to time. She had to go through a frustrating process including: visiting the passport office; booking an interview appointment with the British or Canadian Embassy; waiting in the long line-up outside the Embassy, despite the fact that she had an interview scheduled; being interviewed; waiting to hear from the Embassy regarding the decision on her visa application; and finally collecting her

visa. Only then could she start thinking about PLANNING her trip and then, as soon as she was back, she had to begin planning ahead for her next trip. There was always someone among our family or friends who wanted to go on a business trip or visit someone abroad and I clearly remember their stories. So many have emigrated elsewhere, got dual or multiple citizenship, and likely only take their Iranian passport out of the drawer when they want to pay a visit to their home country.

Tina sipped on her coffee: “Hey! Are you with me?! I don’t see anything unique about this. It’s just an ordinary passport!”

1.0 Introduction

International travel has grown dramatically, and tourism is now being viewed as a crucial social need and even a human right (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2014; McCabe, Minnaert, & Diekmann, 2011). Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations (1948) states that: (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. As Edgell (1990) argued, The Manila Declaration on World Tourism (1980) emphasized access and freedom to travel and tourism as a societal and human right. Linked to this, a generally accepted definition of an international tourist, as set forth by the World Tourism Organization in 1991, is someone who crosses a country's border and enters another state's territory. Therefore, each nation state needs to ensure that its citizens are provided with "effective and non-discriminatory access to this type of activity" (Edgell, 1990, p.164). Bianchi and Stephenson (2013) argued human rights can only be meaningful if exerted by states. They also noted that if tourism is known to be a social need and a globalized right, then the idea that people should travel and be tourists must be at the core of what it means to be a citizen in today's world.

However, tourism must also be seen as a privileged form of mobility (Burns & Novelli, 2008). As Shamir (2005) argued, "differential ability to move in space - and even more so to have access to opportunities for movement – has become a major stratifying force in the global social hierarchy" (p. 200). In line with Shamir (2005), as Mau, Brabandt, Laube, and Roos (2012) discussed, the promise of increased mobility in today's globalized world only holds for members

of certain affluent and privileged countries. Mau *et al.* (2012) noted that mobility rights, in most cases, are a birthright privilege that depends on the person's nationality. However, as Bianchi and Stephenson (2014) discussed, individuals can have different experiences in terms of freedom of movement and the right to travel based on their class, gender, nationality, sexuality, race, ethnicity, and religion.

In 2018, and 70 years after the publication of the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, an average of two thirds of the people around the world had to obtain a visa prior to departure (World Tourism Organization, 2013). As Salter (2004) noted, visas enable a sovereign power to control who enters a country even before the entrant arrives at the border. He further added that visas are often issued on the entrant's passport to show they have visited or applied to a consulate or embassy and are admissible to the country. Although issuing visas by the receiving country is subject to a thorough check, entry into a country is ultimately decided at the border and is not necessarily guaranteed.

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and more recent terrorist attacks worldwide, have changed the discourse of immigration and international tourism within Europe and North America. Since September 11, international travel has become more regulated in the name of safety and security, and international movement for ethnic minority citizens, specifically Arab and Muslim travellers, has been hindered (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2013). Lyon (2003) also contended that after September 11, 2001, changes have been made both across borders and internationally to intensify surveillance and gather data for policing and intelligence.

Bianchi (2006) contended that neoliberal¹ expansion of markets as well as the issue of security has significantly formed the setting in which tourism takes place. Limitations of movement do not only affect the opportunities to move but also sustain inequalities across countries. Tourism researchers have addressed the issue of access in terms of disposable income, gender, and disability (e.g. Hall & Brown, 2010; Shaw & Williams, 2002; Small & Darcy, 2011; Stephenson, 2006). However, not many scholars consider the politics of international travel and access in tourism, with some notable exceptions (cf. Bianchi & Stephenson, 2014; Hall, 2010), nor do they make an adequate effort to connect to issues of human rights. Part of this might be due to how tourism discourse and scholarship is seen; indeed, a number of scholars argued that tourism is still dominantly viewed as an industry rather than a social force subject to relations of power (Blanchard & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2013; Cole & Eriksson, 2011; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Nash, 1989; Urry, 1990).

As an individual's freedom of movement is overshadowed and/or shaped by their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, nationality, gender, and class, it is crucial to explore the politics of international movement and to understand how these fragments of identity shape the border crossing experience. Bhandar (2008) argued that border crossing is a racial

¹ In this study, I challenge the neoliberal approach to freedom of movement and the right to travel, therefore it is helpful to briefly explain what this notion means:

neoliberalism – with small n – is reconfiguring relationships between governing and the governed, power and knowledge, and sovereignty and territoriality. Neoliberalism is often discussed as an economic doctrine with a negative relation to state power, a market ideology that seeks to limit the scope and activity of governing. But neoliberalism can also be conceptualized as a new relationship between government and knowledge through which governing activities are recast as non-political and non-ideological problems that need technical solutions. Indeed, neoliberalism considered as a technology of government is a profoundly active way of rationalizing governing and self-governing in order to optimize. (Ong, 2006, p. 3)

ontological experience. She noted how bio-technologies, used at and for border security, have tremendous impact on the experience of members of communities within a nation state. She further discussed the emergence of what she calls “risky [travel] subjects” post 9/11². Bianchi (2006) noted that tourism and mobilities have become increasingly intertwined with global geopolitics. Therefore, investigations into the forces shaping tourism and mobilities are warranted. Further, my own positionality as an Iranian-Canadian woman allows me to approach this issue of border crossing with a unique lens.

1.2 Research Purpose and Questions

The question at the heart of my inquiry is: What are the experiences of Canadians with dual or multiple citizenship when they cross international borders? My research sought to explore the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens post 9/11. It is framed by the intersection of theoretically-informed notions of race, gender, class, citizenship, and the freedom of movement. Questions guiding this research are:

1. What dominant discourses materialize at border crossings?
2. How do these discourses become embodied in individual experiences at the border?
3. How do individuals resist and/or transform the discourses?
4. What are the implications for citizenship and identity in tourism?

² Throughout this dissertation, I use the term ‘post 9/11’ to refer to the era after September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States. This is a widely accepted event that has changed the international travel, particularly but not exclusively, in North America.

This research is guided by intersectionality and critical mobilities frameworks, which were used to critically investigate how the intersection of race, gender, and class shape the freedom of movement and border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens post 9/11. Employing the method of unstructured interview and a methodological approach based in narrative inquiry methodology, I conducted 11 interviews with both men and women.

Part of my aim with this research is to push the boundaries of the existing tourism literature by exploring international border crossing experiences, and how they are shaped by the intersection of race, gender, class, citizenship, and freedom of movement. This study contributes to our understanding of tourism and citizenship by enhancing our understanding of border crossing experiences, particularly for Canadians who hold dual citizenship. The insights contribute to the existing literature of tourism politics, border studies, citizenship studies, as well as the discourse(s) of racialized identities in travel and tourism.

This dissertation has six chapters. What follows is a review of the relevant literature, introduction to the theoretical frameworks that guided this research, as well as a discussion of the methodological approach and methods employed to collect and analyse the data. Then, I provide a discussion of the data analysis process, a thorough presentation of the findings, and a consideration of those findings in light of extant literature. Lastly, the implications of this research, as well as methodological and theoretical contributions, and areas for future research are discussed. Each chapter starts with a vignette to better situate my own positionality as the researcher in this study.

Vignette 2 - Border Crossing

20 April 2015 – 5:50 pm

I have nothing to hide but I'm so nervous. I quickly pass my passport and permanent resident card to Ali and he passes our documents to the officer. My whole body is shaking. The smile on the officer's face soothes me a bit. I cannot see her eyes, though, as she has sunglasses on.

"What's your county of citizenship?" She asks while checking our documents.

Ali replies before I can: "Iran!" My heart beats faster.

"Do you have any guns, alcohol, or drugs?" She asks us.

"No!" we both reply.

"Where are you travelling to?" She asks.

He replies for us again: "Chicago and then Atlanta".

"You need to go through a secondary inspection and fill out a form since you are travelling with Iranian passports. It will be 12 dollars for the both of you altogether". She says this while writing something on a piece of orange paper.

"Drive towards the officer out there. He will let you know what to do" she says and immediately puts the orange paper under the wipers of our car and walks away.

What now!? What is awaiting us!? We drive slowly towards the officer. He asks us to stop the car.

“Roll all the windows down, open the hood and the trunk. Leave all your stuff including your keys, any electronic devices and cellphones in the car and walk to that building with your passports”. He says, pointing to a white building.

We get out of the car.

“Sir, do you have a knife?” He asks my husband, who doesn’t hear him because he’s trying to open the car hood.

“SIR, DO YOU HAVE A KNIFE?!” The officer almost shouts at him this time.

“No! No, I don’t!” Ali replies immediately.

We walk to the building and enter a room in which five immigration officers are sitting at an L-shaped counter with a few chairs in the middle. We are confused; not knowing whether we should sit down to be called out or to approach the officers. One of the officers finally beckons to us and asks for our passports. I am really intimidated by the look on his face.

“Sit there”. He says without looking at us.

I’m looking at my amber sandals and listening to the conversation between another traveller and one of the officers.

“Well, one day after work, I walked out the office and my licence plate was gone. Someone must have taken it or it might have been loose. You know it was not one of those metal plates” he says while standing at the counter.

“Hahaha! His licence plate was made of sugar! The rain washed it away!” One of the officers says aloud.

All the officers in the room laugh. I don’t know how to react. I look at my amber sandals again. The officer gives his document back and says “Sir! You know it’s a federal law to have licence plates when driving. Make sure you have them next time you want to cross the border! Have a good day.”

I can see the man walking towards his car through the window on my right. He drives away with no licence plate. The walls are covered with the large photos of the Detroit border, cars that are waiting in lines, and the officers with the stop signs in their hands. There are also two posters about human trafficking. I turn my head and see the officer who dealt with us first. She moves her hand and invites me to go by the counter.

“Where are you going again?” she asks curiously as I approach her.

“Chicago” I say. She stops typing and looks at me in the eyes for a few seconds.

“Ok, you may sit down now”. I sit down.

The phone rings “Yes!... UhumYes, I don’t know..... Uhum....It all depends...I have no clue” She holds her breath while rolling her eyes around.

All of a sudden, she hangs up the phone without saying a word and turns to the officer next to her “Stupid questions these people ask!” She calls me again, and this time gets my fingerprints, and also takes my picture.

"You may sit down now!" She calls me again after a few seconds.

As I get closer to the counter this time, she puts on a straight face "Ma'am, you need to stand behind the orange line!"

I move behind the orange line.

"Where are you going again?" She asks for the third time.

"Chicago and then Atlanta." I reply.

"Where will you be staying in Atlanta?" She asks.

"At my aunt's" I search my pockets to get her address. As I want to read the address to her, she asks me to give her the piece of paper. I cautiously take one step forward and cross the orange line.

"Ok, sit down please" she whispers.

My husband goes through the same process before we pay 6 dollars each and walk out. I get in the car. The hood, the trunk, and the doors are open.

I text my friend: "They held us for 45 minutes. On our way now."

She texts me back: "You are lucky. They held me for almost three hours the first time I crossed the US border and I was travelling with my Canadian passport! All good, see you soon"

2.0 Literature Review and Theoretical Frameworks

This study explores the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens post 9/11. The literature examined in this chapter ranges from citizenship to mobilities and biopolitics. Only a handful of tourism scholars have considered these concepts in order to further elaborate, critically engage, or to trouble the politics of tourism. Nonetheless, there are some notable exceptions in tourism literature (see for example, Bianchi, 2006; Bianchi & Stephenson, 2013, 2014; Stephenson & Ali, 2010) that have played a crucial role in shaping my thinking in this research. To build the foundation for this study, in addition to tourism literature, I also borrowed from sociology, border studies, political science, and political geography.

This chapter begins with a discussion of notions of tourism and freedom of movement as well as considerations of the right to travel. This is followed by a review of the connection between tourism and mobilities and how the two notions intersect as these two concepts are key to the questions I pose in this study. Following this section, the concept of citizenship is unpacked to illustrate how it effects and is affected by notions of mobility and accessibility in international travel. I also discuss whether dual citizenship necessarily leads to more freedom in terms of international travel. I then argue that travel in the post 9/11 era has become securitized, and discuss the implications of securitization for tourism. This is followed by a discussion of the notion of identity, which is considered through a post-structural approach in order to investigate how individuals negotiate their identities when they cross international borders and further explore the fluid process of identity negotiation and transformation. This is followed by an in-depth exploration of the concept of borders, particularly how they can be, and have increasingly become, controversial and contested in tourism. I then move on to the

notion of risk profiling at the borders followed by a consideration of passports and biometric borders. This chapter concludes with a discussion of biopolitics, which is shaped by a Foucauldian lens as I discuss how biopolitics informs the experiences of different bodies at borders. Following this, I introduce intersectionality and critical mobilities as two theoretical frameworks that have informed my research and explain why and how they were employed.

2.1 Literature Review

2.1.1 Tourism: A Right for Everyone?

International travel is increasingly becoming “one among many benchmarks of a ‘civilized life’” (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2014, p.11) and is seen as a marker of privilege and power (Castells, 1996), as well as citizenship (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2014; Coles, 2008; Urry, 1995, 2000). Adler (1985) as well as Bianchi and Stephenson (2013) noted that freedom of movement and the right to travel are still far from being globally recognized; they argued freedom to international travel is seen as a symbol of privileged status and citizenship rights. However, as Rojek (1998) contended, more people travel freely in the modern era compared to the past. However, as he further argued, tourism is not viewed as a citizenship right until our freedom to travel is jeopardized.

Despite the ongoing struggles of the members of marginalized communities throughout the world, social justice in the context of international travel still remains unattainable for some diverse groups and populations and access to tourism is not universally seen as a right. Higgins-Desbiolles (2007) contended that the right to travel is “an ideological act which is predicated on a system of inequity” (p. 324). Growing inequalities between citizens are inevitably manifested

in international travel and particularly in the growth of the hyper-luxury market (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2013).

Scholars are coming to argue that limiting international movement leads to sustaining inequalities across the globe. Hall (2010) indicated how the size and structure of tourism and leisure activities can act as a highly political indicator of social justice and that tourism is an “idealized commodity” that only some can access (p. 34). He suggested if social justice is to be seen as a serious concept in tourism studies, it should not only be considered in terms of expanding the market but also how tourism opportunities, as life chances, are formed and reproduced. Tourism policy, as well as tourism studies, has been influenced by the neoliberal thinking about the role of individuals, the market, and the nation state (Hall, 2010).

If international travel is a right that all the people should have access to, it first needs to be separated from the neoliberal notion of freedom and unequal flows of mobility (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2013). Higgins-Desbiolles (2006) also added that “the discourse of tourism as an ‘industry’ has overshadowed other conceptualisations of the tourism phenomenon” (p. 1192), and this must include debates about who can travel. Therefore, the issue of access in tourism is frequently perceived as a market issue rather than being understood in a socio-political context. The freedom of movement is the outcome of fighting for political rights such as crossing international borders, whereas the right to travel, and more specifically tourism, entails the right to consume and the right to profit (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2013). In the following section, I discuss how tourism and mobilities intersect.

2.1.2 Tourism and Mobilities

Mobility is “at the heart of our understanding of tourism” (Hall, 2005, p. 134). The movement or temporary mobility of transnational actors can be a means by which tourism can be studied (Hall & Tucker, 2004). Globalization³ and advances in technologies have enabled the movement of capital, labour, and resources transnationally (Meethan, 2001). Thus, the landscape of tourism has changed significantly. Despite the importance of the issue of international mobilities in tourism, with some notable exceptions (See for example Stasiulis & Ross, 2006; Stephenson, 2006; Stephenson & Ali, 2010), the politics of international movement and citizenship are understudied in the field of tourism. Tourism scholarship benefits from what has been described as the ‘mobilities turn’ or paradigm as it provides an opportunity to challenge the predominant ways of knowing and thinking about tourism (Coles & Timothy, 2004; Creswell, 2006; Hall & Tucker, 2004; Sheller & Urry, 2004). As Hannam (2009) suggested, tourism needs to be understood as a process within the wider ontological context of mobilities. The mobilities paradigm does not differentiate between places and people; instead, it recognizes the materialities of mobilities and re-centres human body through which we make sense of places and movements (Bondi, Smith, & Davidson, 2005; Hannam, 2009). One of the influential scholars to investigate the connection between mobilities and tourism was Urry

³ Globalization promises a borderless world. However, as I discuss in this study, the concept of borderless world only enables the freedom of movement for some. It is helpful to consider what globalization entails:

It is widely asserted that we live in an era in which the greater part of social life is determined by global processes, in which national cultures, national economies, national borders and national territories are dissolving. Central to this perception is the notion of rapid and recent process of economic globalization. A truly global economy is claimed to have emerged or to be in the process of emerging, in which distinct national economic and, therefore, domestic strategies of national economic management are increasingly irrelevant (Du Gay, 1999, p.1).

(1990). He discussed the intersection of mobility and tourism with class, leisure, and consumption. Urry's approach to studying mobilities conformed a critical orientation to study mobilities and tourism. Aligned with the mobilities paradigm, in this research, I considered corporeality and embodiment in border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens. I further discuss this in the discussion chapter.

Benhabib (2004) noted that cross-border movements of people such as refugees, asylum seekers, and labour migrants are dependent on an international human rights regime. However, what did not receive Benhabib's attention was tourism. What differentiates tourism from other forms of mobilities such as resettlement, migration, refugees and asylum seekers is the temporary mobility in space and time (Bell & Ward, 2000; Hall, 2005; Larsen, 2001).

When it comes to tourism mobilities, nation states have undeniable impacts on who, when, and for what reason individuals are able to cross international borders freely. Nation states regulate their cross-border flows through controlling tourism mobilities and today borders are boundaries of inclusion as much as they can be boundaries of exclusion (Sofield, 2006). In line with Sofield, Coles (2008) argued that "tourism is used as a metaphor for conveying aspects of citizenship to public audiences and, in turn, has become a mechanism by which to regulate further short-term movements" (p. 69).

Creswell (2006) argued that dominant representations of mobility portray it as liberty or progress. However, a global mobility regime is emerging which is "[...] oriented to closure and to the blocking of access" (Shamir, 2005, p. 199). On the same note, Adey (2017) and Creswell (2013) asserted that mobilities are formed and constructed in relation to immobilities. I further

discuss this idea in the next chapter where I introduce the critical mobilities paradigm as one of the theoretical frameworks that guides this research. As I make clear in the discussion chapter, wanted and unwanted mobilities are constituted based on a system of inequality that encourages the freedom of movement for some. In the next section, the concept of citizenship from a Western perspective is explored followed by the implications of dual citizenship for international travel.

2.1.3 Citizenship

Citizenship lacks a clear, universal definition and is a contested concept (Coles, 2008). Turner (1993) defined citizenship as: “[...] that set of practices (juridical, political, economic, and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups” (p. 2). In line with Coles (2008), Turner (1993) noted that citizenship is not a universal term and originates in cultural and structural conditions that might be specific to the West. As Rose (1999) argued, the active citizenship in the neoliberal era is not only limited to voting but also includes a range of activities that all require the verification of legitimate identity such as employment, consumption, and other practices including financing. Arguably, freedom of movement and international travel can also be seen as one of the markers of citizenship as they entail rights and responsibilities for individuals.

Modern ideas of citizenship are usually associated with Marshall (1964, 1992). In 1950, Marshall argued that citizenship in the West is based on the three pillars: social, political, and

civil rights. For Marshall (1964), social rights are access to social welfare and security as well as living a civilized life based on prevalent standards of a society. Political rights include the right to vote and access to public offices. Civic rights are concerned with individual freedom of speech, thought, religion, and property rights as well as the right to justice. Rojek (1998) critiqued Marshall's classification, saying his argument is not comprehensive enough. For Rojek, Marshall does not take the interdependence of nation states into account and has wrongly assumed that the notion of citizenship is only of concern within nation states. He further argued that Marshall's model of citizenship needs to be reconstructed and risk should be added to his model of citizenship rights. Bianchi and Stephenson (2014) also contended that Marshall's model consists of three interrelated aspects: political participation, rights and responsibilities, and membership in a political community. They noted that Marshall's classification fails to take into account the economic forces that affect social, political, and civil rights; noting also how ethnicity, race, cultural differences, and sexuality impact the universal right to citizenship.

Delanty (2000) argued that from the Enlightenment era, Western societies have evolved in light of two separate yet overlapping traditions of citizenship: "(1) Classical liberalism, in which citizenship is defined in relation to market society and the institution of private property; and (2) Modern democracy and republicanism, in which civic and political rights are the foundations of citizenship" (p. 23). As Bianchi and Stephenson (2014) suggested, Delanty's categorization is critical to studying citizenship in the context of tourism, and recognizing the two forms of citizenship known as civic and libertarian is pivotal for understanding the contradictory interpretations of the rights and freedoms implicit and depicted through tourism.

The notion of citizenship contains considerations of management and the negotiation of mobilities (Hindess, 2002; Walters, 2006a, 2006b). Several scholars (see for example Agamben, 2005; Bauman, 1998; Salter, 2004, 2006; Sparke, 2006; Walters, 2006b) have discussed how differences are highlighted at border crossings and how citizenship rights might be accepted, declined, or even scrutinized. Bianchi and Stephenson (2013) noted that globalization has given new meaning to citizenship and extended its meaning beyond the nation state. Turner (1993) also called for a redefinition of citizenship in response to globalization and what he viewed as the decline of nation states. An example of this can be the European Union, through which the meaning of citizenship is not confined to the borders of a certain state. Therefore, border crossing experiences of the EU citizens have a different meaning in terms of the ease of access. Citizenship is both a process and a status, which is constantly redefined and debated over time in the context of ever changing political, historical, and social situations and it is not solely a sociological concept nor a legal concept but is defined by the relationship between these two (Isin & Woods, 1999).

Shaped by a sociological approach, critical citizenship scholarship emphasizes the role of individuals as "politically engaged" and/or the way(s) they are "practicing citizenship" (Isin, 2000, p. 5). Therefore, critical citizenship scholarship extends beyond the modern definition of citizenship that entails rights and obligations and shifts the focus to the practices and experiences of citizenship (Isin, 2000; Isin & Woods, 1999; Walters 2002). As Rygiel (2010) noted, citizenship is becoming a globalizing regime that regulates bodies and their mobilities. Foucault (1979) invited us to consider disciplinary power and contemplate how citizenship is dependant on different forms of power at microlevel such as at the level of the body. He called

for asking how these forms of power affect macrolevel forms of power. Following Foucault (1979, 1988), I approach citizenship as a concept that is associated with practices, technologies, policies, discourses, forms of power utilized to govern the mobilities of individuals and groups of people. Rygiel (2010) further argued that rather than viewing citizens and non-citizens based on their legal status and having established identities, citizenship should be viewed as performative. Therefore, although the more conventional view of citizenship associates it with rights and responsibilities, this perspective implies that the power of citizenship lies within individual's agency and the "potential to move individuals to act and to disrupt the order of things" (p. 41).

As Rygiel (2010) contended, from the standpoint of citizenship politics, changes to border control practices after 9/11, which I discuss further in depth in the next section, governing bodies use policies, technologies, practices, and discourse of citizenship for governing global mobilities more efficiently. She further noted that it is through the citizenship that rights are being restructured. In the following section, I further discuss the implications of dual citizenship and how it shapes the border crossing experiences of individuals holding this status.

2.1.3.1 Travelling with Dual Citizenship

When new Homeland Security measures were adopted and when Iran's newly acquired status as part of the "axis of evil" coalesced, I found myself among the ranks of individuals of Middle Eastern ancestry who were routinely stopped and interrogated on the border between Canada and United States. As I discovered on many occasions, my

having been born in Iran trumped my Canadian citizenship. These experiences eradicated the possibility of occupying a position of indeterminacy and contingency. As the border became a site of my own attitude toward my erstwhile hyphenated existence. To quote Ali Behdad, I realized that the border “is not a metaphor of subversive transgression and radical hybridity...but rather a site of policing and discipline, control and violence.” (Rahimieh, 2007, p. 229)

As more people have become mobile and live in more than one country, dual citizenship seems to be a way to manage the multiple identities (Castles & Davidson, 2000). However, as Rahimieh’s quotation illustrates, her Middle Eastern background occasionally overshadows her Canadian and American citizenships. Therefore, dual citizenship does not necessarily benefit the individual who holds the status. Many countries recognize some form of dual or multiple citizenships and as Faist (2001) contended, if nation states are not willing to welcome dual citizenship with open arms, they at least tolerate it. Stasiulis and Ross (2006) argued that, dual citizenship is perceived as a means of “enhancing personal and familial advantage, expanding the geopolitical spaces within which to accumulate and convert various forms of capital, including state entitlements to public goods” (p. 333). Although it might seem that having multiple citizenships would lead to the enhancement of rights, Stasiulis and Ross (2006) also challenged the liberal view of dual citizenship as always expanding rights and suggested dual citizenship is a form of hierarchical citizenship in which some can benefit from it whereas others cannot. They further argued recent human rights violations of dual citizens are situated in the current geopolitical realities such as the actions governments take in terms of security after 9/11. Arguably increasing intimidation and fear of Muslim and Arab dual citizens post 9/11

led to self-regulation, through avoiding international travel specially to the United States. I further elaborate on these ideas using the hierarchical citizenship in the discussion chapter.

2.1.4 Securitized Travel Post-9/11

The security approach to mobilities has emphasized more control and exclusionary practices (Lahav, 2013):

[O]n the one hand, the realist pursuit of state sovereignty to protect national territory has envisioned more protectionist approaches to international mobility. On the other hand, global economic imperatives of open markets, trade and tourism coupled with societal interest of civil liberties, social cohesion, democratic values, and constitutional guarantees have promoted liberal norms and practices. (Lahav, 2013, pp. 127-128)

Bianchi and Stephenson (2014) contended that neoliberalism and globalization have turned airports into entry points for cross-border movements of people and assessed how airport surveillance affects the notion of borderless world. Today the issues of safety and security that have been raised since the 9/11 attacks resulted in increased surveillance at border checkpoints all over the world. This issue has created a tension between states and tourism that led to what Heywood (1999) called extraterritoriality, which means the nation states accept some responsibility for what happened outside their borders. Extraterritoriality calls for extra caution and vigilance at the checkpoints of a country's border (Heywood, 1999).

One of the identification systems used in North America post 9/11 is the NEXUS frequent traveller or trusted traveller card programme. NEXUS is a joint program between the Canadian Border Services Agency, Canada Customs, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and US Customs and Border Protection (Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, 2004). The NEXUS program was designed to help with reducing delays for the frequent travellers who have been pre-cleared across the United States-Canadian border. Sparke (2006) noted that NEXUS and other Smart Border programs illustrate how a “business class citizenship has been extended across transnational space at the very same time as economic liberalization and national securitization have curtailed citizenship for others” (p. 151). He further argued the NEXUS programme can be viewed as an example of neoliberalism. Using programmes such as NEXUS have changed the meaning of citizenship in today’s context of North America (Sparke, 2006). Moreover, using contemporary trends at the airport surveillance, these fast-tracked systems sort individuals into slow-moving and fast-moving flows (Adey, 2006; Lyon, 2006). Wilson and Weber (2008) contended that one of the benefits of such programs is that it enables the border officers to focus on ‘high-risk’ travellers. Therefore, borders become points of inclusion as well as exclusion. Sparke (2006) noted that the US-Canada border and the NEXUS program illustrates how borders divide the border crossers to primary and secondary crossers. I further elaborate on how borders are bifurcated in a binary logic of wanted and unwanted in the discussion chapter. In the following section, the notion of identity from a post-structural approach is examined followed by a discussion of exclusion.

2.1.5 Fluid Identities

The structuralist approach to identity denotes that the nation states have power to define individual's identities as well as group identities, whereas the post-structuralist approach views identity as something that is fluid and can be negotiated despite the power relations that exist between the nation states and individuals. The nationalization of identities by states is what makes some members of the society "national subjects" whereas some are seen as "foreign objects" within the same territory (Sharma, 2006, p. 141). However, and as I discuss later in this chapter, possessing an identity 'given' by a nation state does not necessarily mean one is free to enjoy all the privileges it might bring about.

Both Bhabha (1990, 1994) and Said (1978) elaborated on the concept of identity and challenged the idea of sovereign independence of nation states. Bhabha (1994) argued that each individual plays an active role in the creation of their identity:

Each time the encounter with identity occurs at the point at which something exceeds the frame of the image, it eludes the eye, evacuates the self as site of identity and autonomy and – most important – leaves a resistant trace, a stain of the subject, a sign of resistance. We are no longer confronted with an ontological problem of being but with the discursive strategy of the moment of interrogation, a moment in which the demand for identification becomes, primarily, a response to other questions of signification and desire, culture, and politics. (Bhabha, 1994, p.71)

In this way of thinking, identity formation is a fluid process. Elaborating Bhabha's concept of transformative identities, Huddart (2006) noted:

Choices made by other people construct our identities, and our own choices in turn construct and transform our identities: Our day-to-day activities continue this process of construction. If we think about this construction in terms of politics, we can say that we are simultaneously actors, making political choices, and objects, the results of those choices: as objects we both create and are created. (p. 21)

Bhabha (1994) referred to the hybrid nature of cultures. As Kalscheuer (2009) argued, “[H]ybridity to him [Bhabha] is the result of an identification process by others; it is understood as a recombination of elements that are rooted in different traditions and that are creatively combined in the interstitial space between cultures” (p. 38). Bhabha (1994) argued the hybrid subject includes differences within its own self. Thus, it is not simply both self and other, but a third thing. As he further discussed, cultural hybridity brings about something new, different, and uncategorizable that enables negotiation of meaning. Building on Bhabha’s discussion, Stoddard and Cornwall (1999) noted that the hybrid subject is not simply a “[...] synthesis or fusion, since the elements do not match neatly; they are jagged, unequal, resistant to integration” (p. 333). Hybridity creates points of resistance in which members of marginalized communities and minorities can negotiate and transform their identities.

In line with Bhabha (1994) and Huddart (2006), Van Zoonen (2013) also argued that the ontological approach to understanding identity frames it as something that we do rather than something that we are. Therefore, as individuals we constantly negotiate and transform our identities. The post-structural conceptualisations of identity denote it as an ongoing, fluid process, which is fragmented, and these fragments are comprised of ethnicity, race, gender,

nationality, class, religion, sexuality, and age (Annus, 2011). There is no singular identity but multiple identifications that momentarily position us (Hall, 1990; Butler, 1990).

As Annus (2011) argued, based on ethnicity and other categories, modern nation states institute the notions of inclusion and exclusion, which provide a basis for legalized forms of othering. For Annus, othering leads to establishing group boundaries, which force the formation of a strong group identity among the members of a community that were included while excluding others. However, as Mau *et al.* (2012) noted, since economic and socio-cultural boundaries can be blurred, it is difficult to draw a fine line between 'us' and 'them', therefore it is more of a negotiation of where and when to make this separation and what it means to belong to a group.

Identity is established through the "synthesis of internal self-definition and external definitions of oneself offered by others" (Jenkins, 1996, p. 20). Moreover, boundaries make it possible to decide which group(s) one identifies with and draws a line between us and them (Jenkins, 1996). Lamont and Molnar (2002) emphasized the symbolic and social dimensions of boundaries and argued that symbolic dimensions are conceptual differences that are made by individuals or social institutions, which divide people into groups and create feelings of belonging. On the other hand, social boundaries are "objectified forms of social differences manifested in unequal access to an unequal distribution of resources" (p. 168). The construction of difference is occurring simultaneously along with the construction of sameness and these two processes cannot be separated (Annus, 2011).

The concept of identity in this research is approached through a post-structural lens as I examine how individuals negotiate their identities when they cross international borders and explore the ongoing and fluid process of identity negotiation and transformation. Identity negotiation cannot be understood without considering the national and global discourses that shape individual and collective understandings of various categorizations of identity and the relationships between them (Sabra, 2011). Therefore, in my research, I consider power relations when studying the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens and explore dynamics of power and identity negotiation in terms of the role of the state in defining national identity versus the role of individuals in accepting, negotiating, or resisting that identity.

After exploring fluid identities, it is important to consider how dual citizenship comes into play in the border crossing of individual bodies. Therefore, in the next part, I discuss borders and how they have come to be contested spaces.

2.1.6 Borders as Contested Spaces

Sofield elaborated on what the term border encompasses: “The term ‘border’ includes both the legal demarcation between states and a signifier of differentiation or frontier where cultures and politics meet, often in contestation, in a dynamic relationship” (2006, pp. 102-103). As Hageman, Berger, Gamie, and Williams (2004) discussed, geopolitical borders are not static. Spatial borders have delineated nations, governments, ethnicities, cultures as well as defining centres and peripheries based on power and authority, by having “the governing elites in the nucleus and marginalized communities at the edge” (Sofield, 2006, p. 102). Sofield also

noted that although mental and material boundaries are usually viewed as being distinct, they are actually integrated. For Sofield, material border defines the legal jurisdiction of a government within its territorial borders, which enables the state to control movement within its borders, define citizenship and nationality while it is building up the image of the country and the members of the nation within that material border. Therefore, borders are combinations of both mental and material boundaries.

In the first decade of the twenty first century, scholars drew attention to the changing power and politics of borders such as growing security measures at borders and airports (see for example Salter, 2008; Sparke, 2006), sovereignty issues faced by individuals with multiple citizenship when they crossed borders (Stasiulis & Ross, 2006), and the increasing use of biometric passports (Amoore, 2006). Border studies research illuminates the point that the border crossing experiences of individuals with dual citizenship are undoubtedly shaped by the politics of borders and international travel.

Instead of looking at borders as an open-closed dichotomy (see for example Ribas-Mateos, 2005), it is more helpful to conceive of them using a multifaceted approach to understand their complexities. Employing a multifaceted approach to border studies, as Ribas-Mateos (2015) suggested, has four features. The first characteristic is multiplicity. This feature refers to what Mezzadra & Nelson (2013) called 'proliferation of borders' and denotes the boundaries between inclusion and exclusion at borders are blurred. On the same note, Anderson & O'Dowd (1999) identified the paradoxical functions of borders and illustrated that borders are simultaneously "gateways and barriers to the outside world" (p. 595). The second

feature is filtering. This component implies that a process of classifying people and commodities takes place at borders. Therefore, mobilities and immobilities exist simultaneously (Cunningham & Heyman, 2004). The third characteristic is ambiguity. Grimson (2012) argued that borders are not fixed entities but are always “unfinished and unstable” (p. 194). In further elaborating what this feature implies, Ribas-Mateos (2015) noted:

This is especially true since 9/11, which has influenced port regulation by governments and international bodies, resulting in the construction of ports as security bubbles where law is marginalized by the exercise of raw sovereign power and where port authorities are compelled to improve and manage security. (p. 7)

The last characteristic is related to facilitating empirical research. Ribas-Mateos (2015) suggested that examining different cases helps to delineate some of the methodological, conceptual, and empirical issues in the bordering processes.

Borders are not only spaces or zones, but they also entail numerous practices, processes, and forms of power and border reformations require attention to how national spaces or societies are formed and structured (Adkins & Lury, 2012; Latham, 2010). As Torpey (1998) argued, the act of detainment at the borders speaks to the power of the state to take one’s freedom of movement away.

Bhandar (2008) contended that border crossing is an ontological experience and the mode of securitization and the technologies used at the borders affect the border crossing experience of members of migrant communities. The US terrorist attacks in 2001 and subsequent terrorist attacks in Europe played a crucial role in justifying the implementation of a

range of border controls and detention practices, which have led to targeting certain individuals and/or groups of people. The securitization after September 11, 2001 has been discriminatory towards certain groups of people with Muslim, Arab, and/or Middle Eastern backgrounds (Rygiel, 2010). The individualization of security necessitates that individuals become defensive of their identity in a social context where securitization of identity seems crucial (Gates, 2008). As Bhandar (2008) argued, if borders are seen as a tool through which states control sovereign space and time, the connection between the ones who are able to cross the border and the ones who pass with hardship becomes more important. For her, the wait time and quality of border crossing speaks to the control of the state over everyday practices. She challenged the notion of freedom in this sense as the nature of time and its importance in neoliberal societies is subordinated and challenged by the practices at the borders.

State borders are forms of social boundaries (Mau *et al.*, 2012). Borders are more about problematizing presence before, during, and after entering a border rather than physical entrance to or exit from a national boundary (Balibar, 2004). In line with Balibar (2004), Bhandar (2008) also argued that identity construction should not be seen as something that only happens at the time of border crossing. Therefore, identities are not only shaped at the borders but are redefined and reconstructed beyond and within borders. Since I am looking at the border crossing experiences of Canadians with dual or multiple citizenship, I acknowledge that identities of individuals are constantly reconstructed, and the identity redefinition is not only limited to the points of the borders. These ideas and insights about borders encouraged me to be aware that individuals are renegotiating and reconstructing their identities before, during, and after border crossing. In the following section, I discuss the risk profiling and

securitization post 9/11 as well as the identification systems that are used to regulate and control international travel and argue that they can act as both barriers and facilitators to international travel.

2.1.6.1 Risk Profiling at the Borders

Bhandar (2008) argued that in North America and other securitized regions, “the racial ontological formations of border crossing” are due to the use of profiling as well as the politics of nationalizing identity as a response to the “War on Terror” (p. 404). She wrote:

Securitization is also dependent on a circulation of fear that externally manifests itself as new border regulations and forms of detainment and control. Fear of this kind is “ontologized” in the forms of border guards and border detainees. But this border and detention are forms of ontology that have also been exported to the internal limits of citizenship and the immigrants, police, and newcomers who practice that limit on a day-to-day basis. This is the onto-connection to the “war on terror”. (p. 406)

For Bhandar, the ontological status of the person is what is being problematized and results in control, and categorization, often through the use of bio-technologies at the borders. Racial profiling at the borders leads to stereotyping of members of certain groups. As Huddart (2006) argued, the problem with stereotyping is that it fixes the groups and individuals, denies their own identity, and approaches them based on prior knowledge that might be defective. We give inferior and superior values to stereotypes, which speak to the control and unequal power relations between different groups (Spracklen, 2013). Members of minority groups internalise

the stereotypes that are constructed and imposed on them in a society (Ladson-Billings, 1998). In a similar context of suspicion about members of non-white communities, hooks (1992) commented on her experience at an airport in France and drew attention to the difficulties racial minorities might face in airports or at the borders even before 9/11, in the 1990s. As she described, French officials used to stop black people to make sure they are not illegal immigrants and/or terrorists: “I think that one fantasy of whiteness is that the threatening Other is always a terrorist. This projection enables many white people to imagine there is no representation of whiteness as terror, as terrorizing” (p. 174).

Airports as well as other points of entry are sites of surveillance that enable eligible travellers to cross the border while filtering the dangerous or undesirable ones (Lyon, 2003). As Butler (2004) discussed, racial profiling and naming members of certain communities as dangerous or risky subjects and judging them in the name of national security is problematic since it leads to the dehumanization of certain populations.

Bhandar (2008) argued that “[t]he creation and manifestation of otherness inscribed in the border cultures explore the production of racial difference that easily collapses national identity with the racialized body” (p. 414). She used the case of Canadians moving across the border to the United States and argued that the assumption that had initially shaped this –to some extent– unprotected border is that the Canadian citizen/national who crosses the border is a “white national subject” (p. 415). However, and as I make clear later in the discussion chapter, due to the securitization post 9/11 as well as racial hierarchies, some Canadian citizens

who cross the border to the US or elsewhere are viewed as problem/unwanted/risky/dangerous bodies.

2.1.6.2 Passports

As Salter (2003) argued, the increase in international travel over the last century and the change in who can travel and where increased the importance of attempts to standardise, regulate and control tourists' identities and documents. Bianchi and Stephenson (2014) noted that passports, visas, and other travel documents are the means through which governments can impose their authority and regulate international travel through and across their borders. Gates (2008) also contended that identification systems do not only act as the means to exclude "problem identities from rights and responsibilities of citizenship, but to facilitate the active involvement of 'legitimate' subjects in their own self-government" (p. 225). She further argued that having a verifiable identification document that is also machine readable is becoming "a condition for the exercise of freedom" (p. 225).

A passport is a tool through which individuals can be mobile internationally and by which they can be "identified, tracked, and regulated" (Salter, 2004, p. 72). Passport is not a legal document only but a symbolic one and the relationship between the passport holder and nation state comes down essentially to an oath of loyalty on the part of the holder and the promise of protection on the part of the state (O'Byrne, 2001). O'Byrne raised the question of whether the passport becomes invalid if the state no longer keeps its promises, arguing the

passport is one of the means through which insiders and outsiders, citizens and non-citizens, tourists and non-tourists are regulated.

Bach (2003) argued that when governments encounter a crisis such as terrorist attacks, the first thing they do is to control the borders by limiting the movement in order to gain more security (Bach, 2003). This issue speaks to the restrictions of travel that are imposed by governments in extreme situations, an example of this can be the creation of the Department of Homeland Security by the United States after September 11, 2001 attacks, which led to increasing border security and the development of measures to identify high risk travellers (Salter, 2004).

Visas enable nation states to decide in advance who is allowed to enter their territory (Guiraudon, 2002), what Zolberg (2006) called “remote control” (p. 443). Aside from being essential means to enter a nation state, visas and passports help the security officials at the borders make a spontaneous decision to classify and codify different individuals based on their nationalities as well as predetermined classifications as to whether they pose a threat to the nation state (Bianchi & Stephenson, 2014).

Sorting individuals into high-risk/low-risk, desirable/undesirable, wanted/unwanted is amplified through biometrication of passports. Elaborating on the complexity of passports, Fekete (2004) noted that holding a passport from a Western country does not necessarily mean the passport holder can easily cross the border if his or her ethnicity is in question. Borders are constituted depending on the gendered, classed, and racialized bodies that cross them and

passports, as one of the means of control used at the border, are the result of the “ideological formation of national identity” (Bhandar, 2008, p. 415). Furthermore, Salter (2006) argued that:

[...] there is an internationalization of the body: through biometric capture, the assignation of risk profiles according to race, gender, ethnic, national and religious scripts, and the visa system within the institutions of customs and immigration controls. The visa system, as an essential component in the attempt of the state to claim a monopoly over legitimate movement, classifies mobile bodies as legitimate through the schema of production and subjection. (p. 179)

He illuminated that by assigning risk profiles according to different aspects of identity, bodies are first made known and are then categorized based on the level of risk. While globalization promises a borderless world, the use of security systems to control and regulate travel clearly speaks to the growing importance of borders.

Although holding a passport from a nation state like Canada implies that the passport holder has certain rights and responsibilities, the border crossing of individuals is not a linear process and is impacted by their religion, race, ethnicity, class, and gender. In the next section of this chapter, I discuss biopolitics from a Foucauldian perspective as well as biometric borders to illuminate how Foucault’s ideas can be used towards studying borders and more specifically border crossing post 9/11.

2.1.6.3 Biopolitics: Bodies and Borders

Khosravi (2007) portrayed the image of the border and how it divides individual bodies based on the system of inclusion as well as exclusion:

The paradigmatic scene of the world today is undoubtedly a picture of bodies, squeezed between pallets inside a truck. The picture is taken by an X-ray camera on the border between nation states. It exposes those invisibles, the people without papers on the wrong side of the border. The X-ray image shows the naked white bodies on a black background – a silhouette of human beings. Metaphorically, human bodies are displayed also naked of their political rights. (Khosravi, 2007, p. 321)

As Rygiel (2010) contended, Foucauldian analyses of power consider it as both a tangible source and a discursive effect. Therefore, the policies, discourses, legal rules, and structures become a productive expression of power. Foucault did not consider power to be static or entirely possessed by any institution or community. Instead, he conceived of power as being fluid, never exclusive to only one body or actor (Foucault, 1978). In Foucauldian understandings, power is not necessarily a negative force that is used to oppress and subjugate the ones who hold less power. Instead, power can be productive, constructive and used as resistance. In his perspective, power is not merely constraining but is constructive of reactions, responses, and subjectivities (1994).

In terms of the state borders, as Walters (2011) contended, although Foucault was interested in a range of practices related to borders such as security, surveillance, governmentality and biopolitics, he did not contribute much in terms of the forms of bordering

associated with nation states. “Foucault dealt at length with what we might call the microphysics of bordering, but much less with the place of borders considered at the level of tactics and strategies of governmentality” (p. 158). As Walters (2011) argued, border security may not have been a political issue during the 1970s the way that it is today in many nation states in terms of issues such as terror, globalization, immigration, loss of sovereignty, and human trafficking (Walters, 2011).

Foucault (1998) defined biopolitics as “the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life” (p. 140). This concept can be used as an analytical tool for understanding the complexities of contemporary borders. As Topak (2014) made clear, for Foucault “biopolitics is the product of the historical transition from a sovereign mode of power that exerts control over territory and uses practices of death, towards a modern biopolitical one which manages population” (Topak, 2014, p. 830). Furthermore, the border is the point at which individuals are subjected to power through their bodies and are being limited to an object of knowledge.

This highly technical form of knowledge-as-measurement is central to biometric systems as it is the key for imposing control. As Epstein (2007) noted, bodies are controlled by being known. The process of gathering information and knowledge through databases presumes power relations as it necessitates an institutional setting where individuals let their bodies be measured/known to power (Foucault 1975, 1980). As Hollinshead (1999a, 1999b) argued, the Foucauldian concept of power-knowledge not only makes room for understanding what kinds

of power and authority may flow within or across a 'host' or 'other' population, but what the dynamics of those 'powers' may actually be.

Surveillance studies place an emphasis on the normalizing technologies of power and how power is used to control, monitor, and regulate behaviours and mobilities of certain bodies (Saltes, 2013) such as racialized bodies (Browne 2012; Glover 2008, 2009; Poudrier 2003), gendered bodies (Koskela 2012; Monahan 2009), and classed bodies (Gilliom 2001; Maki 2011). Mobilities are no longer "a means of evading surveillance but has become the subject of surveillance" (Bennett & Regan, 2004, p. 453). As Germann Molz (2006, p. 380) argued, along with new technological forms of monitoring controlling mobilities, "new surveillance also refers to the shift in the surveillance paradigm from a state-controlled, hierarchical, centralised regime of surveillance to more polycentric, networked, and ubiquitous forms of everyday surveillance." Hierarchical forms of surveillance controlled by the nation states function based on the panopticon model discussed by Foucault (1979).

As is made clear in the discussions section, in examining the relationship between the body and the state or politics, I have taken a Foucauldian lens to the notion of biopolitics. Foucault viewed biopolitics as a means of regulating populations and "defending society from the abnormal" (Stone, 2004, p.77). He viewed biopower and biopolitics as "technologies of body" (2003, p. 249). However, Foucault distinguished between these two concepts and argued that biopower is a punitive system of power that is exerted through power and knowledge established within institutional regulations through surveillance and control. Biopower is concerned with the individualized body, whereas biopolitics is a governing system of power

aimed at the population as a political and biological problem and is exercised through administrative establishments of the state using statistical information, measures, and estimates (Foucault, 2003). Moreover, Mader (2007) echoed Foucault's definition of biopolitics and argued that body can be disciplined and controlled only if it is contained with measurable features. In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault argued that "The discipline of the body and the regulation of the population constituted the two poles around which the organization of power over life was deployed" (1990, p. 139).

Another deployment of biopolitics, as Muller (2010) noted, is the modern shift of border security to border management, which has resulted in a more extensive governance of bodies that cross borders. He further argued that the governing strategies of "the liberal state articulate the population as a collection of productive bodies, consumptive bodies, risky bodies, and so on" (p. 10). As Walters (2006) argued, borders have come to have a "sorting function" (p. 197) that identifies and filters risky and desirable bodies from the undesirable ones. Epstein (2007) further contended that body at the border:

It is also "just" a body; it is no longer so clearly a holder of rights: the figure of the body as the subject of rights has faded out of sight. In fact, only once (and if) the body has been deemed "productive" at the borders does it become once again a subject of rights. (pp. 156-157)

The concept of freedom of movement presumes that a normal, abled body has the means and access to the resources to be freely mobile (Creswell, 2013). Borders are not fixed entities (Donnan & Wilson, 1999; Pickering & Weber, 2006) but are spaces "created and recreated by

states and other actors in a way that is fundamentally gendered, raced, and classed” (Pickering & Weber, p. 12).

As noted earlier, labeling bodies is what the whole system of security and border management is based on (Epstein, 2007). Therefore, the way this system functions is to single out the risky/destructive bodies and let the productive/normal bodies through.

Chattapodhyay (2018) noted that “bodies carry borders but also make borders” (p. 3). Amoore (2006) views this as “an extension of biopower such that the body, in effect, becomes the carrier of the border as it is inscribed with multiple encoded boundaries of access” (pp. 347-348). Biopolitics is critical to the part that citizenship plays in terms of managing population mobilities at the borders (Rygiel, 2010). Citizenship as biopolitics involves managing populations through the construction of desirable and undesirable citizens, non-citizens and abject populations (Rygiel, 2010, p. 13).

2.2 Theoretical Frameworks

Before introducing intersectionality and critical mobilities as the theoretical frameworks I have utilised in this research, it is helpful to briefly define what race, gender, and class are and how they were approached in this study.

2.2.1 Race

Scholars began to theorise about race and racism in the United States in the first half of the twentieth century. The argument about race at the time implied that the inequalities

members of black communities were facing were due to their race and their inability to free themselves from poverty and become *normal* citizens (Spracklen, 2013). However, this racist ideology was challenged by scholars such as Omi and Winant (1986) who argued members of black communities and other minority groups have been systematically oppressed and marginalized. Daynes and Lee (2008) contended that racial hierarchies are forced upon the members of marginalized communities, which identify them as outsiders and problem citizens. Racial discrimination is damaging to both groups whether they are included or excluded as they both tend to develop stereotypes about the other as well as constructing unrealistic ideas about themselves (Brown, 2004).

Whiteness as a set of characteristics and experiences that are attributed to the white race, “is an identity that is “conflicted, confused, and complicated” (Mowatt, 2009, p. 514). McIntosh (1988) claimed white people do not necessarily see themselves as having race as well as the privilege that their skin colour might bring them: “Whites are taught to think of their lives as morally neutral, normative, and average, and also ideal, so that when we work to benefit others, this is seen as work which will allow “them” to become more like “us” (p. 178). She also contended that members of white communities might not be aware of the privileges that their skin colour allows them to have. They might not realize the difficulties such as the discrimination that minorities often encounter. Thus, they might think of racial discrimination as something that no longer exists (Bonilla-Silva, 2001; McIntosh, 1988; Tatum, 1997). I will further discuss this in the analysis chapter. Mowatt (2009) also noted that whiteness does not let the white identity be marked. If we see whiteness as a performative social interrelation, we realize that it is a fluid set of knowledge and practices (McDonald, 2005). However, as Gabriel

(1998) contended, instead of discussing what whiteness is, it is more beneficial to argue what it can do.

2.2.1.1 Critical Race Theory (CRT)

Critical Race theory (CRT) is a relatively new theoretical framework that developed out of Critical Legal Studies in the early 1970s (Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995). Critical legal studies scholars and practitioners viewed the law as a political process that reproduced socio-economic privilege (Price, 2010). By the mid-1990s, as Delgado and Stefancic (2001) discussed, silences and gaps that existed within Critical Race Theory itself inspired the emphasis on other races such as Native Americans, Latinos, and Asian-Americans. Moreover, queerness and critical race feminism started to receive attention by CRT researchers by the mid-1990s.

CRT seeks to challenge and problematize the “vexed bond between law and racial power” (Crenshaw et al., 1995, p. xiii). McDonald (2009) noted critical race theory researchers believe that analyses of whiteness emphasizes “the institutional discourses and exclusionary practices” (p. 9). However, as Hylton (2005) argued, considering power, whiteness, racism, and equality make it difficult to study race. Advocating what hooks (1992) called *racial realism*, early CRT researchers focused on the experiences of members of African American communities in a racialized society. Crenshaw (1992) argued “[...] black racialism yields a flat, fixed image of racial identity, experience and interest, which fails to capture the complex, constantly changing realities of racial domination in the contemporary US” (p. xxxi). Therefore, the experience and racial identity of one segment of Black Male America would be taken into account, whereas

Black women and members of non-black communities might not see their experiences being reflected through CRT (Crenshaw *et al.* 1995). On the same note, Price (2010) argued the white/black binary could not comprise the experiences of non-black minorities since issues such as immigration, language, national origin, and assimilation were simply not discussed by those working within mainstream Critical Race Theory, and they could not be addressed by CRT's insistence on the black/white binary as the primary conceptual tool, either.

Given the racialized experiences of travel post 9/11, which I discussed in the previous chapter and will further expand on in the analysis chapter, I approach race as a social construct in this research and discuss issues of race and racism considering institutional inequalities and power relations.

2.2.2 Gender

Gender is a system of beliefs and practices that produce or sustain a sense of difference between women and men (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Gender roles ascribed by people and systems differ significantly across societies, cultures, and religions (Carles & Jubany-Baucells, 2010) and is created, maintained, and renewed through a complex arrangement of practices and shared understandings within a given society (Thompson & Armato, 2012).

Gender is embedded in various dimensions of society, such as the individual, interactional, and institutional (Risman, 2004, 2009). In this research, I approached gender as a social construct that is interwoven and inseparable from race and class.

2.2.3 Class

Constructions of class differentiate between groups and individuals in societies, designating power, status, rights, privileges, and freedoms based on wealth, mobility, and access to resources (Lopez, 2018). Like race and gender, class is often subject to how an individual is positioned in reference to others. Power relations within institutions shape the context through which individuals experience class. In this research, I approach class as a collective of “macro-level socio-economic Stratifications” (Lopez, 2018). To this end, I refer to class as the sum of socio-economic circumstances and resources that an individual has or can access to navigate social worlds.

2.2.4 Intersectionality

Intersectionality theory originated with feminist scholarship. Crenshaw (1989) first introduced the term intersectionality to enunciate the multilayered experience of being racialized, gendered, and classed and to challenge the boundaries between these concepts by looking at them as inseparable and as a political process (Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Kendall, 1995). Crenshaw’s aim was to specify that black women experience structural oppression as a result of racism and patriarchy (Brown, 2012). Intersectionality theory “seeks to understand experiences of the ‘Other’ or marginalized people and groups, within institutions that maintain discriminatory practices and social inequities” (McDowell & Carter-Francique, 2017, p. 395). Therefore, it is a beneficial tool for studying inequality and oppression (Anthias, 2013; Degnen & Tyler, 2017).

There are three interdependent strands of intersectionality as a broad-based knowledge project (Collins, 2015):

(a) intersectionality as a field of study, e.g., its history, themes, boundaries, debates, and direction; (b) intersectionality as an analytical strategy, e.g., how intersectional frameworks provide new angles of vision on social institutions, practices, social problems, and other social phenomena associated with social inequality; and (c) intersectionality as critical praxis, e.g., how social actors use intersectionality for social justice projects. (p. 3)

In this research, I have approached intersectionality as an analytical strategy. I rely upon an intersectional theoretical framework to produce new knowledge about the role gender, class, and race play at border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens.

Black feminism in the United States played a crucial role in incorporating race, gender, and class into the academy. In 1960s and 1970s, US Black feminism established “one site of a much broader array of cross-cultural, cross-national, and historically specific social justice projects that aimed to dismantle multiple social inequalities” (Collins, 2015, p. 7). The prompt concern of Black feminism was to empower African-American women through critical analyses of how constructing systems of race, gender, class, and sexuality together oppressed women and framed the social issues and inequalities that Black women encountered with. (Collins, 2015)

Over the past few decades, intersectionality has developed “into a critical analytical paradigm to explore the multifaceted relationships between social groups and structures,

beyond the limits of women of colour” (Mooney, 2018, p. 175, see also Dhamoon, 2011; Hancock, 2007). Intersectional scholarship has illustrated that “power is not only a function of class but also of gender and race” (Zollmann et al, 2018, p. 216). As Belkhir and Barnett (2001, p. 157) argued:

Race, gender and class represent the three most powerful organizing principles in the development of cultural ideology worldwide. Even though each culture constructs views of race, gender and class differently, there is always some social construction around these three particular differences/similarities, and thus far, that construction has almost always resulted in structured inequality.

As Davis (2008) noted, intersectionality “encourages complexity, stimulates creativity, and avoids premature closure” (p. 79), and “came together with poststructuralist research agendas to break up fixed and essentialist notions of identity” (p. 71). Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall (2013) noted that “what makes an analysis intersectional [...] is its adoption of an intersectional way of thinking about the problem of sameness and difference and its relation to power” (p. 795).

The use of intersectionality theory is relatively limited in tourism scholarship (Mooney, 2018; Pritchard, 2018) with the exception of a few studies (see for example Cole, 2017; Khoo-Latimore & Mura, 2016). As Watson and Scraton (2013) recommended, employing intersectionality theory contributes to tourism research by providing valuable insights into inequalities and multilayered identities and theorises individuals’ experiences as gendered, raced and classed, as well as considering other aspects of identity such as age, sexual

orientation, and being abled/disabled (Watson & Scraton, 2013). Employing intersectionality as a theoretical framework in this research enabled me to examine inequalities at the intersections of race, gender, and class.

Intersectionality is one of the theoretical frameworks that informed this research as I sought to understand how gender, race, and class shape the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens post 9/11. Adopting intersectionality enabled me to explore differences of more than one category (i.e. race, gender, and class) between different groups where privileged individuals were not positioned at the centre of this research (Mooney, 2016). In this study, participants included Canadian dual citizens, both men and women, from different ethnic backgrounds and revealed the diversity of experiences. In addition, including participants “with power” in this study helped me to elucidate “systems of domination” (McBride, Hebson, & Holgate, 2015, p. 338). In line with McCall (2005) and Shields (2008), I employed intersectionality in my analysis to consider how constructed identities of being raced, gendered, and classed intertwined. This framework has been very helpful in shaping my discussion and illustrates the complexity of the individual’s experiences to better explain the differences and manifestations of power and elaborate on them.

2.2.5 Critical Mobilities

As is briefly noted above, mobilities have long been under-theorised within social sciences and that was the point of departure for the critical mobilities paradigm (Sheller & Urry, 2006; Söderström, Randeria, Ruedin, D’Amato, & Panese, 2013; Urry, 2007). Of special concern

to critical mobilities research is how mobilities are made possible and how they produce inequalities. Moreover, this framework pays attention to the institutional and material infrastructure of mobilities as well as the economic and political conditions that promote or prohibit them. Mobilities is as much about movement as it is about the infrastructure that directs these movements. Critical mobilities develops a foundation for social theory that puts mobilities, immobilities, and their power relations at its center; it offers “a research agenda around the study of various complex systems, assemblages, regimes and practices of (im)mobilities; and at times involves a normative emphasis of addressing the future of mobility in relation to ecological sustainability and mobility justice.” (Sheller, 2013, p. 2)

This theoretical framework seeks to find answers to the following questions: How are (im)mobilities produced and reproduced? How are they performed and maintained? How are they resisted? (Sheller, 2014). A critical mobilities framework encourages scholars to question how (im)mobilities are co-produced, practiced, and represented in relation to the gendered, raced, classed mobilities and forms of dwelling and ‘grounding’ of particular others (Ahmed, Castaneda, Fortier, & Sheller, 2003) and adopts the kind of analysis in which “mobility and control over mobility both reflect and reinforce power” (Sheller, 2014, p. 795). Indeed, mobility rights, ethics, and justice have become central to critical mobilities research (Creswell, 2006; Bergmann & Sager, 2008; Uteng & Creswell 2008).

In further elaborating on how mobilities should be studied today, a number of scholars (see for example, Creswell & Merriman, 2008; Sheller & Urry, 2006; Urry, 2007; Watts & Urry, 2008) have contended that the notion of mobility and its implications should be examined on their own. Söderström et al. (2013) suggested that when utilizing the critical mobilities

framework, one should explicitly address the relationship between power and mobilities and do so “with reference to questions of inequality, domination, and constraint” (p. x). They further noted that while mobility has become predominant, critical mobilities accentuates mobility as a right while highlights the interplay of (im)mobilities and inequalities.

It should be noted that, in a previous study on North American border policy (Torabian & Mair, 2017), we employed a critical mobilities lens to investigate (im)mobilities in North America. This study helped me think about the role this framework could play in my own PhD work. Indeed, I found it helpful as I worked to illustrate the inequalities in terms of unequal access to freedom of movement and the means of travel such as a passport and visa.

Domination, as Creswell (2001) discussed, refers to how mobilities are shaped by domination and immobilites of other individuals. In order to analyse mobilities, it is crucial to consider immobilities and the inequalities that exist in terms of access to the freedom of movement. Constraints signifies the “contemporary patterns of asymmetrical power and privilege” in today’s world (Söderström et al., 2013, p. xi). Salter (2006) argued that it is crucial to employ:

[...] an analysis of the ways in which bodies are constructed not only in relationship to a single sovereign, but also as bodies that negotiate mobile subjectivities with respect to more than one sovereign, a process that conditions the ways in which we understand ourselves as international bodies. (p. 178)

Moreover, it is important to take into account Sheller’s (2011) argument about critical mobilities where she questions whether everyone has the right and access to be mobile in today’s world. In a research on anti-mobilities and tourism in Canada, we utilized critical

mobilities framework to analyze the Canadian travel policies and practices (Torabian & Mair, 2017) and suggested critical mobilities can be a useful framework for analyzing inclusion and exclusion practices as well as examining race and White privilege. Moreover, we made a call to tourism scholars to employ a critical mobilities framework to continue to challenge the normalization of travel policies and practices. Hannam, Sheller, and Urry (2006) argued that the relationship between “migration, return migration, tourism, transnationalism and diaspora” is central to mobilities research” (p. 10). In addition, Sheller contended that a critical mobilities framework challenges the idea of freedom of movement and questions who is “[...] demobilized and remobilized across many different scales, and in what situations mobility or immobility might be desired options, coerced, or paradoxically interconnected” (2011, p. 2).

As it is shown in the discussion chapter, critical mobilities and intersectionality have been beneficial theoretical frameworks for understanding the inequalities and power relations at the intersection of race, gender, and class as I challenged the idea of freedom of movement and access to international travel and sought to understand how mobilities of dual citizens are made possible and/or resisted.

2.3 Summary

This chapter opened with a discussion of the freedom of movement and the right to travel in the neoliberal era. This was followed by a discussion about the relationship between mobilities and tourism and how tourism scholars have approached the concept of mobilities in their work. I, then, explained different perspectives of citizenship and discussed the notions of

globalization and critical citizenship. Following this, I discussed the issues related to border crossing such as securitized travel post 9/11 and risk profiling. This was followed by a discussion of the implications of being a dual citizen and how it shapes border crossing experiences of individuals. I, then discussed how biometrics are used at the borders to make individuals known, and presented a Foucauldian approach to biopolitics and discussed how bodies come into play at border crossings. The chapter ended by a discussion on intersectionality and critical mobilities as two theoretical frameworks that have shaped my study. These frameworks helped me integrate race, gender, and class in my work as well as to attempt to centralize marginalized voices.

In the next chapter, I will introduce the epistemological foundation that has informed this research. This is followed by a discussion of the methodological approach and the methods I used in this research as well as the processes of data collection, analysis, ethical considerations, and my reflections on the project.

Vignette 3 - Confused Citizen

7 May 2015 – 3:30 pm

Another layer was officially added to my identity. As of today, I'm officially a dual citizen, an Iranian-Canadian woman! There are two differences between a Canadian permanent resident and a Canadian citizen: The right to vote and the right to get the Canadian passport. The first one suggests I can play a more active role in the community I live in, and what the second one means to me is the ease of access to international travel and freedom of movement! However, I do have mixed feelings about being a Canadian citizen. I have been a Canadian permanent resident for the past six years and it is interesting how from time to time people implied that I am an international student or assumed that I will go "back home" once I'm done with school in Canada. That is probably due to the fact that I am not Caucasian, I do have black hair, I do not wish to dye blonde or lighten, I speak English with an accent, and my first and last name are both non-Western. Do these make me "an immigrant" that cannot be viewed as "a Canadian citizen"? Do these make me less of a Canadian?

I am excited to be able to travel more freely from now on but I am still grappling with what it means for me to hold a Canadian passport when crossing the border. Who am I when I cross the border with my passport?! Am I an Iranian immigrant claiming a Caucasian identity using her Canadian passport? Or am I a Canadian citizen feeling comfortable to claim my Middle Eastern identity at the border who just uses her Canadian passport to cross the border easier? Or maybe I am both at the same time or neither...!

Who is a Canadian? Is there such a thing as “pure Canadian” out there? What is a Canadian identity and what’s the implication of it? I take a deep breath, close my eyes and try to picture a Canadian...

3.0 Epistemology, Methodology, and Method

This chapter starts with a discussion of the epistemological standpoint shaping this work. Following this, I restate the purpose of the research and research questions and thoroughly explain the methodological approach that was used to address the research questions. Following this will be a discussion about the methods I used to understand the border crossing experiences of my participants. In addition, the processes of data collection and analysis will be explained. The chapter ends with a discussion of the relevant ethical considerations and my reflections on the research process as well as the challenges faced with throughout the project.

3.1 Epistemological Orientation

3.1.1 Critical Constructionism

This research is positioned within the critical constructionism paradigm. The focus of critical orientations is on power and inequalities. Critiques of power and/or discourse(s) are at the heart of critical constructionism (Griffin, 2018). Critical constructionists believe that multiple realities exist which are dependent on the individual (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Critical constructionism views power as an ongoing, relational construction and does not assume that power is “one way and uncontested” (Hosking, 2008, p. 670). Critical constructionism invites reflexive recognition of its own constructive potential and participation in power relations (Foucault, 1977). According to Hosking (2008), there are three main tenets to critical

constructionism: “(1) [it] cannot rest on any claim to know how things *really* are, (2) [it] is not defined in terms of an interest in challenging closure or dominance relations, and (3) [it] does not limit itself to talk of knowledge independently of power relations” (p. 672). Critical constructionism breaks the process - product binary and views process as the product (Brown & Hosking, 1986). Critical constructionists acknowledge that social structures can shape opportunities and these structures are reproduced or resisted in situations (Pennell & Maher, 2015).

I found critical constructionism to be a suitable paradigm to conduct research with marginalized populations and to help me to centre their voices (Heiner, 2002). Researcher’s personal reflections throughout the research process are integral part of critical constructionism (Hosking & McNamee, 2007). Using this paradigm, I have been a participant along with those who chose to take part in this research project (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). My interest in studying the inequalities of access to international travel shaped my choice of study topic and I considered power as a relational process. I strived to centre the voices of participants along with my own voice. In addition, I adopted a post-structural lens to approach notions of identity and power in this research. Therefore, I considered identity as fluid and something that can be negotiated. In line with Hollinshead (1999a,1999b, 2007), I examined power as discursive and considered the dynamics of power that existed among individuals and structures.

3.2 Research Purpose and Research Questions

As stated in the introduction, the purpose of this research is to explore the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens who have travelled internationally post 9/11. This study is framed by the intersection of theoretically-informed notions of race, gender, class, citizenship, and freedom of movement. Questions guiding this research are:

1. What dominant discourses materialize at border crossings?
2. How do these discourses become embodied in individual experiences at the border?
3. How do individuals resist and/or transform the discourse?
4. What are the implications for citizenship and identity in tourism?

3.3 Methodology

3.3.1 Narrative Inquiry

The methodological approach underpinning this research is narrative inquiry, which adopts narrative as both the methodology and the phenomena of the study (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007), and focuses on the uniqueness of each individual as well as finding commonality between them (Polkinghorne, 1995). There are multiple definitions of the term narrative in qualitative research. For instance, Polkinghorne (1995) defined narrative as “the type of discourse composition that draws together different events, happenings, and actions of human lives into thematically unified goal-directed processes” (p. 5). Therefore, narratives can be defined as texts thematically organized in terms of temporal units and plots.

As Bruner (1985) and Polkinghorne (1995) suggested, there are two types of narrative analysis: narrative analysis and the analysis of narrative. Through narrative analysis, narratives

are situated within the context of a story-line and description of particular occurrences. In analysis of narratives, narratives are analysed for common elements and concepts. In this study, I employed narrative analysis followed by the analysis of narratives framework, progressing from stories to common elements. I further expand on these frameworks and how I employed them in the analysis section of this chapter.

The purpose of narrative inquiry is not only to explore the experience of individuals but also to search for the familiar, linguistic, social, cultural, and institutional narratives through which the individual experiences were shaped, articulated, and depicted (Clandinin, 2013). Narrative inquiry is not about reconstructing the Truth about the reality of the experiences of the participants; rather it is about understanding how individuals talk about their experiences and conceptualize them (Josselson, 2001). Therefore, the stories my participants shared reflect their own reality and even when those narratives are co-created, they are partial. Narrative shifts the emphasis of research away from the validity of the stories that are told and focuses on how the stories impact the narrator, society, and audience (Daly, 2007). As Clandinin and Connelly (2000) noted, the researcher should build trust in the relationship with their participants and try to comprehend the shared values and meanings that created their stories. In elaborating on what texts narrative inquiry produces, Elis and Bochner (2003) discussed narrative this way:

[...] create the effect of reality, showing characters embedded in the lived moments of struggle, resisting the intrusions of chaos, disconnection, fragmentation, marginalization, and incoherence, trying to preserve or restore the continuity and

coherence of life's unity in the face of the unexpected blows of fate that call one's meanings and values into question. (p. 217)

Three dimensions are found within narratives, "personal and social (interaction); past, present, and future (continuity); combined with the notion of place (situation)" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 50). Therefore, the role of the researcher is to represent the narratives considering context and implications such as societal pressures, cultural norms, and values. As McAdams (2012) noted, the researcher should engage with the narratives with an open mind.

People's stories can be constructed and interpreted in many ways to make sense of their reality (Daly, 2007). Narrative researchers "highlight the versions of self, reality, and experience that the storyteller produces through telling" (Chase, 2005, p. 657).

Stories can be told in a variety of ways. Ochs and Capps (2001) noted that narratives are co-constructed in conversations. To further elaborate on the importance of the other in storytelling, Henson noted "[t]he contextualizing of any given story within any given conversation illustrates the significance of the other in coauthoring our self-narrative, but also perhaps the inevitable incoherence of such storytelling" (2013, p. 520). Conversational storytelling is a form of narrative reproduction and the (re)storying of some aspects of personal experience (Henson, 2013).

Tourism scholars have used narrative inquiry approaches to reveal how identities are formed and how information is socially constructed about destinations and culture (see for example, Bosangit, McCabe & Hibbert, 2009; Chow-White, 2006; Griffin, 2013, 2015; Noy, 2004; Noy & Cohen, 2012; Pera, 2017; Santos, Belhassen, & Caton, 2008). As Adey (2017) claimed, "Narratives are essential to methods for mobilities" (p. 280). I employed narrative in this study

to illustrate the complexity of the border crossing experiences of my participants. In doing so, intersectionality and critical mobilities frameworks enabled me to critically examine how narratives of mobilities are produced, performed, resisted or transformed in relation to the multilayered identities of participants.

Narrative has enabled my participants to tell their own stories and be at the centre of this work. It has been crucial to make sure I do not speak for my participants. Therefore, as a researcher I strived to ensure that my research objectives and epistemological stance do not silence my participants (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). In doing so, I engaged with conversational narrative to centre the voices of my participants. Narratives were co-constructed between myself and participants in conversations that were audio recorded.

3.4 The Recruitment Process

Recruitment began in February of 2016. I recruited participants using purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002) as I wanted to recruit participants who met certain criteria. First, they needed to be Canadian dual citizens and second, they had to have travelled internationally in the last 15 years (i.e. in the post-9/11 travel era). In order to find and recruit participants, I shared the call for participation for my study on my Facebook page as a public post and asked my Facebook friends to share my Facebook post on their Facebook timelines or mention anyone they thought would fit the criteria under my post. Within the next 24 hours after sharing the call for participation on Facebook, my post was shared 25 times and I received 18 emails and/or private Facebook messages from people who were interested in participating in the study. Seven of the people who showed interest did not match my criteria as they were

either Canadian Permanent Residents or were not Canadian dual citizens at the time of their travel.

In total, 11 participants participated in this research. Of this number, ten participants were recruited through Facebook. The 11th participant was recruited after the public screening of her documentary in December 2016. After watching her documentary on occupied territories in Palestine, I realized the director of the documentary matches the criteria of my research and the study would benefit from hearing about her experiences. Therefore, I approached her after the session, told her about my research and asked whether she was interested in participating. She shared her contact information with me and once I sent her the information letter via email, she agreed to participate in my study.

3.4.1 Participants

Four of the 11 participants were men and seven were women. They were all Canadian dual citizens at the time of interview and had travelled internationally as a dual citizen post 9/11. Participants were citizens of the following countries: United States, Trinidad, the Philippines, Iran, the United Kingdom, Egypt, Netherlands, and Israel. It is important to note that I had one participant from each of the countries except for Iran. I recruited four participants from Iran because most of the people in my network are Iranian. For confidentiality, pseudonyms have been used. A short introduction to each participant is offered in the next chapter followed by their narratives. Table 1 provides further information about each participant.

Table 1. *Participants*

Participant's Pseudonym	Dual Citizenship	Age	Gender
Lutfiyah	American – Canadian	Early 20s	Female
Sophia	Israeli – Canadian	Mid 30s	Female
Anne	Canadian – Dutch	Mid 20s	Female
Damian	Trinidadian – Canadian	Late 30s	Male
Jehan	Iranian – Canadian	Mid 60s	Male
John	Canadian – British	Mid 30s	Male
Maya	Egyptian – Canadian	Late 40s	Female
Naomi	Iranian – Canadian	Mid 30s	Female
Nina	Filipino – Canadian	Late 40s	Female
Rose	Iranian – Canadian	Early 50s	Female
Sam	Iranian – Canadian	Mid 30s	Male

Reflecting back on the use of participants' quotations in the discussion chapter, I realized that I tend to rely more on two of my participants: Lutfiya and Sophia. Indeed, all the border crossing experiences shared with me were compelling. However, this might be due to the fact that I find the juxtaposition of Lutfiya's and Sophia's experiences fascinating as they were both talking about the same border and that they were coming from totally different positions when it comes to hierarchies of access.

Now that I have briefly explained who the participants of this study are, in the following section, I illustrate the interview and data collection processes of this research.

3.5 Method and Data Collection

After receiving the ethics clearance from the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo, I started data collection. The data collection took place from February 2016 to January 2017. I interviewed participants at a mutually agreed upon location and all the interviews were audio-recorded with the consent of participants. Each participant was interviewed one time. Only one participant asked whether we could meet again to continue the conversation. Therefore, I met with her twice. The interviews were between one hour and twenty minutes to three hours long with an average length of one hour and forty-five minutes. I met with Jehan, Maya, and Naomi in their homes and interviewed Damian, Lutfiya, Nina, and Rosa at the cafés where they suggested they feel comfortable to be interviewed. Only Sophia asked me to suggest a café to meet at since she did not have a specific preference as long as the café was in downtown Toronto. Anne asked to be interviewed at a public library. I interviewed Sam over phone as he lived in the US at the time of the interview. In addition, I interviewed John over Skype since he lives in the UK. It is important to note that I conducted two of my interviews in Farsi as my participants suggested they were feeling more comfortable being interviewed in that language. I translated the interviews to English once they were transcribed.

In order to explore the border crossing experience of Canadians dual citizens, I conducted in-depth, unstructured interviews with participants. To start, I asked participants an open-ended question such as “Can you tell me about one of your border crossing experiences?”

Questions such as the one I mentioned do not set any kinds of limit or specifications on the type of narrative that is expected by the researcher (De Fina, 2009). Following the response of participants to my first open ended question, I started asking them questions based on what they had shared with me.

Regardless of the method used, researchers bring their interpretation and preconceptions to the phenomenon they study (Patton, 2002). Since beginning to think about my research, I have engaged in reflexive journaling to reflect on my own experiences as well as what it means for me to embark on this project. Keeping a reflexive journal has helped me with finding my voice and positionality in the research. I kept a journal throughout the project and wrote about my own assumptions, ideas, and feelings before and after the interviews with participants. I took these ideas into account when I was analyzing the data and writing the discussion chapter and I further describe this below. Furthermore, keeping a reflexive journal helped me with re-storying narratives as I had taken notes of the details that were not necessarily present in the audio-recorded files of the interviews. As an example, I have provided some excerpts from my journal in the form of vignettes at the beginning of each chapter. These vignettes helped me with setting the stage and further elaborating on my own standpoint as an Iranian-Canadian woman.

3.6 Data Analysis

The interviews were analysed using critical mobilities and intersectionality as theoretical frameworks. Intersectionality enabled me to reconstruct each narrative in relation to race, gender, and race to reveal the differences in experiences of dual citizens. In line with McCall

(2005) and Shields (2008), I employed intersectionality to further illustrate the complexity of the individual's experiences. I utilised this framework to illuminate the constructed identities of being raced, gendered, and classed intertwined to better explain and elaborate on the differences and manifestations of power. Critical mobilities helped me with identifying the inequalities and power relations based on race, gender, and class and to better elaborate on how mobilities were stopped, made possible, and/or resisted.

As De Fina (2009) suggested, it is crucial to take the interview context into account when analysing the narratives and discuss how it shapes and is shaped by the narrative. Moreover, as she contended, we should note what kinds of questions prompted the narratives and how these narratives developed. In addition, we should ask ourselves about the power relations between the interviewer and the interviewee.

Following Polkinghorne's (1995) processes of narrative analysis and analysis of narratives, I engaged in the re-storying process described by Clandinin and Connelly (2000) as a collaborative process of renegotiating or retelling the story between the researcher and the participants of the study. McCormack (2004) argued that re-storying narratives is a methodology that employs narrative analysis as well as analysis of narratives. He further noted that narrative analysis refers to the process of bringing together participants' stories into a reconstructed narrative and analysis of narrative encompasses delving deeper in the narratives told by the participants to gain more insights and pull out themes that are related to their experiences (McCormack, 2004; Polkinghorne, 1995). Re-storying narratives helped me better understand the similarities and the differences of my participants' experiences. Moreover, this

collaborative process made it possible for me to appreciate my participants' stories even more by making their voices and experiences central to this research.

To start the data analysis, I engaged with the interview of each participant. I decided to focus on one participant at a time and listened to each interview numerous times. In addition, I took notes each time I was listening to the interviews which helped me with writing the discussion section later. After each interview was transcribed, I read each narrative several times and took notes on the margins of the transcripts to learn what the dominant concepts my participants talked about in their interview, and what is at the core of each story (Mishler, 1986).

Following this step, I decided to break down each narrative into shorter pieces as each interview consisted of numerous topics that each deserved attention. At this stage, I included some excerpts from my reflexive journal as well. After breaking down each interview, I developed two to six, shorter narratives for each participant depending on the length and concepts they mentioned in our interview. At this stage, I created sub-titles for each narrative based on the concepts participants had shared. In re-storying the narratives, I included my own voice in each story and re-constructed each narrative in the form of a conversation. During the previous stage, I realized that the language and word choices of my participants were key in this research and explanation of their border crossing experiences. Therefore, I decided to employ a conversational format in the writing.

In the next stage of analysis, I decided not to include some of the shorter narratives as I found them to be distracting since they were irrelevant to the purpose of this research. For instance, one participant shared the story of her migration to Canada, but I decided not to

include this story since it did not immediately serve the purpose of this study. By the end of this phase, I had omitted six short narratives.

Following this, I then started to read the narratives again and that was when some themes started to emerge. As I engaged more with the narratives again and read each of them numerous times, I delved deeper into what participants had shared with me to gain more insights into their experiences. Based on the narrative analysis and analysis of narratives, five themes emerged. At this stage, I renamed some of the sub-titles of narratives to better reflect the themes. I will further explain each of these themes in the discussion chapter.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Since the topic of my study was a sensitive or emotional one for some of my participants, creating a safe environment for them was crucial. To do this, I made sure my participants were interviewed in a space where they felt comfortable. In addition, I shared my own border crossing experiences, when appropriate, during our conversation. For instance, at the beginning of one of the interviews, the participant shared that she was curious to know why I have chosen this topic for my doctoral dissertation. As I was explaining the reasoning behind my decision, I shared my border crossing experience in Germany where the border officer told me he was looking for drugs in my purse. Following this, the participant shared a similar experience she had at the US border and that started our conversation.

One participant with whom I met twice, brought to my attention how the interview process has been difficult for her in terms of the emotions she had experienced after each interview. She shared this with me after the second interview. However, she mentioned that

the process was therapeutic for her and she felt good about sharing her experiences with me. In fact, she viewed storytelling as a way of resistance. However, this made me think whether I should have followed up with each participant after each interview to make sure they had enough emotional support.

One other issue I faced occurred during my very first interview. Two of my participants were living at the same residence as they were father and daughter. Once I arrived at their house and was getting prepared to start the interviews, I realized they are both going to be present when each of them is being interviewed. Therefore, I asked whether we can have the interview in another room and they both mentioned they feel comfortable to be interviewed in front of each other. I first interviewed the daughter and then the father. However, at times throughout the interview with the father, I felt that what he shared with me was overshadowed by his daughter's experiences and how she framed her answers. For instance, each time he described a racist incident that others or himself experienced at airports, he tried to convince me that what had happened was not racist which was similar to how her daughter explained such incidents. This put me in an awkward position and I felt uncomfortable the whole time. Both of these interviews were among the shortest interviews I conducted for this study.

3.8 Researcher's Reflections

My interest in this topic is rooted in my own positionality as a dual citizen and I had been reflecting on the research topic even before embarking on this study. Throughout the research process, I have been reflecting on my own positionality as a dual citizen and how it might come into play during my data collection and analysis. By way of addressing this, as noted

earlier, I deliberately start each chapter of this dissertation with a vignette to include my own voice as a dual citizen and share my own racialized, gendered, and classed experience.

Using narrative inquiry helped me better understand the complexities that exist in the border crossing experience of Canadian dual citizens. My own status as a non-white female researcher who holds dual citizenship helps me with understanding racialized, gendered, and classed experiences of my participants at international borders.

One of the issues that is well worth reflecting on is the current political climate. I defended my proposal in early October of 2015, one month before the Paris attacks. On November 13, 2015 several terrorist attacks took place in Paris, France and the city's northern suburb, Saint-Denis. Over 100 people were killed and more than 300 got injured. At the time, I was still in the process of getting ethics clearance from the Office of Research Ethics at the university. By the time I had my defence, terrorism had already been a widely debated issue due to the threat of ISIS and other terrorist groups worldwide. Thus, I was very well aware that it would definitely have implications for my research and data collection. However, I started thinking about how these series of attacks would change the discourse of immigration and international travel not only in Europe but worldwide. Soon after, series of terrorist attacks happened in Belgium, France, Syria, Iraq, Turkey, and the US. I delivered a guest lecture about border crossing in an undergraduate class the day before the Paris attacks. Some of the students became defensive and mentioned that I am trying to compromise safety and that securitization was absolutely necessary to protect the nation states from the potential threats. This made me feel that I should shift the focus of my research and concentrate on something less political.

However, I decided to proceed with my research and started data collection in February of 2016 when the terrorist attacks had become more intense and the border crossing had become more difficult even compared to a few months earlier (*The New York Times*, 2016). I was unsure whether this was the right time to start my interviews and started to doubt my research and implications of it. I had many conversations with friends or acquaintances about securitization and border crossing. Through those conversations, day after day, I realized the difficulties of bringing the untold stories to the spotlight. There were so many instances that made me question my decision to speak up and tell these stories – the untold stories of the ones who did not have the privilege of a “Canadian” citizen despite the fact that they were travelling with one of the most powerful means of travel in the world, a Canadian passport! People were intimidated as the politics of fear was shaping the discourse of immigration and international travel worldwide. I started to fear that people might not get the point of why I am doing this research. Time and time again I was told, at conferences or during casual conversations, that terrorism is real and the border securitization is necessary since every nation state needs to protect its people and territory. For a while, whenever I met one of my best friends, she tried to convince me that what is happening at the borders every day is “normal since the world is a dangerous place because of terrorism”. After my presentation at one of the conferences, in which I shared the preliminary findings of my research, someone approached me and suggested that the narratives I shared were “too political to be told” and that I need to “understand the political climate and think twice about the consequences of my research in the future”. In short, I was invited to be silent because basically it was not the right time to speak up. Despite the racial profiling and discrimination, they experienced at the

border, some of my participants told me they “do not blame the border officers because they were doing their job and they did not really mean to irritate them”. What did all this mean for my research? Was I on the right track?

The US election was a hot topic as Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton were chosen to be presidential candidates from the Republican and Democratic parties. Trump was talking about extreme vetting and that Islam hates the US and is at war with them. He was talking about temporarily banning Muslims from entering the US until they can find a solution to the problem – the problem he constantly referred to as ‘radical Islamic terrorism’. In November 2016, Trump was elected as the US president. I had already conducted all my interviews except for one. In that climate, I felt that the narratives of my participants needed to be told and I intended to help them with sharing their stories. I kept a journal throughout my research. Here is an example of what I reflected on in my journal:

One day, as I was venting about Trump’s travel ban to a friend, she suggested that I should give myself some distance as “This too shall pass!” But how could I do that? I was feeling that my research is at my face all the time. Travel ban was all over the news and even daily small talks I had with other people. I just looked at her. She went on and on trying to convince me that I am overthinking the travel ban and making a big deal out of it, that I was not living in Iran anymore and I am not moving to or living in the States either, that there was nothing I could do about it. Therefore, I should not feel targeted or humiliated. I did not continue the conversation and became silent but then continued to have this conversation with myself in my head and sometimes in writing in my small light green notebook.

Although the realities of the world we live in make me discouraged and helpless from time to time and it makes me doubt my research path, at the same time, I feel more determined to continue doing what I do. I firmly believe that narratives of marginalized and racialized individuals need to be told and it is my responsibility to shed light on these stories and to use my privilege to bring these narratives to the spotlight.

3.9 Summary

This chapter began with a brief explanation of my epistemological orientation. This is followed by research purpose and questions. The methodology I used in this study was narrative inquiry and I conducted in-depth unstructured interviews with my participants to learn about their border crossing experiences post 9/11. Following this, the recruitment process was described followed by a short introduction to each of the participants to demonstrate how each of them fit within my research. In addition, I explained the interview process and data collection and illustrated how I analysed my data and what ethical considerations I had to take into account. The chapter ended with a discussion of the challenges I faced throughout the research process and a reflection on the context of my research and how it formed my study.

Vignette 4 - My office on campus

6 March 2017 – 11:07 AM

I realized I have been staring at the monitor of my laptop for a while – don't know for how long but long enough for my tea to get cold. The news article up on my screen is about a Canadian born woman who was turned away at the Canada-US border yesterday⁴. "Damn it," I quietly mumble. I scroll down to read the rest of her story on the CBC website. She was denied entry with her Canadian passport! A Canadian born citizen with no criminal record was turned away?! She was born to Indian parents, but she is a Canadian citizen. Once again, I think to myself, who is a Canadian?! I have been grappling with this question for the past few years. Apparently taking the citizenship oath and getting your Canadian passport is not good enough! So, what should one do to be considered as Canadian and have the rights of a Canadian citizen? That woman was turned away after being held for six hours! Why? She was asked to apply for a visa through the US embassy in Ottawa before travelling to America. I remember that my mom is planning to visit her sisters in the States. Although I know how much she misses them, I should talk her out of it! I don't want her to be feel humiliated or be targeted! I feel the anxiety all over my body. Maybe.....I....hmmm, I don't.... The conversation I have with myself in my head is driving me insane! "LET GO OF IT!" I say loudly to myself.....I take a deep breath and look back at my screen. I have a new email from a friend. She has sent me a link. I click on it. "Crossing the

⁴ <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/canadian-denied-entry-us-immigrant-visa-1.4011202>

U.S. border this March? Read these tips first”⁵. I skim through the text. What strikes me is the last two paragraphs. The second last one starts with this sentence: “Expect more scrutiny if a visible minority” and the last one says: “Your laptop and phone can be searched”. I close my laptop and reach out for my cup. The tea is cold, too cold, and bitter.

⁵ <http://www.cbc.ca/beta/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/us-border-crossing-eddie-kadri-1.4008558>

4.0 Findings

This chapter presents the results of the narrative analysis and the analysis of narratives that were utilized to analyse what each participant shared. What follows are the narratives of participants after a brief introduction is provided for each.

4.1 Lutfiya

Lutfiya is an American-Canadian woman. She has lived in Canada for the past 11 years. She was born in Illinois and has lived in Illinois and Massachusetts before moving to Canada with her family after September 11, 2001. She has a Palestinian-Kashmiri heritage and is in her early twenties. We met at a café in uptown Waterloo.

4.1.1 The “special room”

Lutfiya and I meet at a quiet café in Waterloo. She starts the conversation by explaining why her family decided to move from the United States to Canada:

In a post-9/11 environment where you're always on red alert, or orange alert, or yellow alert, depending on the likelihood of a terrorist attack that day, [...] you cannot exist in a social environment where everybody is afraid of each other all the time, and there's just fear all the time! And they manipulate people using fear. They keep it going in the media, and they cultivate this thing where you're totally under control because you're afraid. And it's not a healthy atmosphere to be in.

When I ask Lutfiya how she views herself when it comes to her citizenship, she says “[If someone asks me where I am from], I will tell them that I am Palestinian, I’m Kashmiri, I was born in the United States, and I’m living in Canada, so you can pick from that what you will!” She laughs and continues, “I know the way I am read at the border is not American or Canadian. I’m not delusional in that sense!” Lutfiya explains how she responded to somebody who asked where she is from at a conference:

I said, “I’m Palestinian and I’m Kashmiri.” so she said, “Oh, I’m a pure blood!” In the sense that my blood then, by counterdefinition, was impure because the Palestinianness of it was diluted. It was just very racist and disgusting and whatever. But I’ve always

been really adamant that I'm not half of anything, I'm not a halfy! I'm not half Palestinian, not half Kashmiri. I'm fully Palestinian and fully Kashmiri.

When her father was in middle school, Lutfiya's grandparents moved from Palestine to Jordan and then to the United States as refugees and gained American citizenship later. However, her grandmother moves back to Palestine after 25 years. It is very important for Lutfiya to visit her grandmother as she feels a strong connection to her and her Palestinian heritage:

[I]t's very important for me to go there, it's been the most growth I have experienced in my life...has been in those very intense summer months in Palestine. It's a very emotional experience for me. Last time I left in 2014, I cried uncontrollably at the airport and in the airplane and it's very-- I don't really do public displays of emotion at all but it's like I'm so afraid that this is something that I will not be able to come back to and my worst nightmare was realized this past summer.

She pauses and looks away. Lutfiya tells me she has travelled to Palestine every summer since 2010 but in 2015 she was detained and deported which has been a horrendous experience for her:

I was just sad. I wasn't even angry. I know that I was depressed for the majority of last year and I have never been like that before. I was really depressed. I was having nightmares, I was unable to socialize, I was extremely withdrawn. I couldn't focus on things. I had a previous experience with post-traumatic stress disorder from a very different context. And a lot of those symptoms came back. Hyperactivity and that kind of thing.

"Did you have both passports on you every time you go?" I ask.

"Not at the same time. But alternate years, I think I tried one, one year and one, another year. The last time I had my American." She replies and nods quickly:

American, yeah. Yes, my American. And that was a very conscious decision last year. This past summer, [...] my dad suggested I use the American passport because Americans do a better job of taking care of their citizens overseas but every time I would kind of go up and present that, and the person wouldn't even look at my passport. He or she would just look at my face and send me to the special room. I would be like, "But just...American! I'm an American!" But it doesn't matter, right? In their racialized ethnic whatever logic stratification...

"So, you think the US is doing a better job protecting their citizens compared to Canada?" I wonder.

"Yeah. [I]n Canada.... If something happens to you, hopefully you're white because otherwise, they don't care!" She laughs and adds, "So, that was really the only reason, not that I thought that I'd have an easier time or anything. And didn't end up being useful at all!"

“I see! So, what was your experience?” I ask.

“I decided to travel [to Palestine] through Jordan in 2015. So, the first time I went by myself, I was 17, and I went through Tel Aviv, I flew directly from Toronto to Tel Aviv and it was...” She exhales deeply and continues:

[I]t’s just a really awful experience the whole time because you’re traveling with Israelis, and they all think that you’re about to, first of all, blow up their plane. They are vile to you! They are so rude, so mean, so mean to me. And then you’re traveling there, and you’re in this environment where you feel like you are under threat all of the time. Yeah. So, I mean, you walk on the plane and people are just—there’s also some of that group mentality, herd mentality, they’re all together. I feel like if something were to happen, I would be fully alone, nobody would help me. And again, you want to talk about the dynamics of gender. I mean, being a woman traveling alone is not easy.

Lutfiya believes flying to Israel is very different from other places she has travelled to. She tells me about her observations and how she feels while she is on the plane, *“I’ve flown a lot in my life and I have never seen a crowd that has that kind of ethos ever. It’s rambunctious, it’s aggressive, and it makes me feel very unsafe.”* She adds:

when you fly to Israel, once you enter Israeli air space you can’t get up! You’re not allowed to stand up on the plane! Sometimes they don’t let you open or close [the shades of] your windows. Really strange rules over Israeli air space that I’ve never experienced in another flight. Really bizarre. Meal, everything stops then. It’s really over the top and I don’t know how that would help.

Lutfiya lowers her eyebrows and says:

At the Tel Aviv airport, there’s nobody else. It’s you and maybe one other Palestinian family in that interrogation cell, kind of the waiting area for hours and hours. It’s just a very clinical, cold, very scary experience. And so, I did that the one year.

“What does the Tel Aviv airport look like?” I lean forward and question.

Lutfiya replies:

So, the airport there in Tel Aviv, it’s very beautiful. It’s fairly new. And you walk through this kind of glamorous concourse and you see, similar to in Canada, you know how you have the multiple languages welcoming you in, that kind of thing. But then when you walk up to passport immigration control or whatever it is, it’s basically a series of kiosks that people are funneled into, and the person immediately points to a room in the corner that she knows I’m familiar with because every time I’ve come through there, that’s what I’ve had to go through! [...] she didn’t look at my name, she didn’t look at my passport. She looked at me. I would’ve had better luck if I was wearing my scarf like this but that time I wasn’t, it was more traditional. More easily identifiable Muslim, and I’m obviously not Israeli so she sent me immediately. I remember putting my passport a little bit in her face and she looked at it and she’s like, “I told you!”

I add, “And the room they are pointing to....”

Lutfiya interrupts me, *“The interrogation room? There’s nothing! There’s no food, no water! There’s chairs all around the edges, metal chairs...and washrooms inside I think”* She narrows her eyes and continues, *“There was a TV up in the corner because you’re in there for a whole day, but I’ve heard this was taken down. You don’t have any of your stuff but nothing besides that.”* I nod, and she adds:

And a camera watching you all the time, and you don’t have anything. By design, there are no outlets. You can’t charge your phone, there’s just nothing! [I]n this room, and it’s almost like an afterthought, doesn’t fit with the rest of the architecture in the area, and there are two offices where presumably immigration control people are. You don’t know who they are, they don’t identify themselves, they don’t wear badges, they are often in plain clothes. I don’t know who they are. I remember not being sure whether I had my laptop with me, but I didn’t want to pull it out and use it just in case they demanded to see my email or anything like that. And I remember they did ask me, “What is your email address?” And so, I wrote it down, whatever, and I wrote down the one that I don’t really use, and she said, “No, your other email address.” I was like, “This is creepy!”

“Wow! What kind of questions have they asked you?” I inquire.

Lutfiya tells me more about the nature of the questions she received:

They asked me really strange things! I mean they ask you everything from, “What are you doing? What are you studying?” Whatever, to [...] questions about my religiosity. So, trying to infer from whether or not I’m a religious person, what my attachment to Palestine or activism might be. They asked me, at one point, questions about my brother and his religiosity. He’s six years younger than me, so when I went the first time he was like 12 or 13 years old. He wasn’t with me or anything, and I became extremely defensive. I mean, you just crossed the line! You can’t talk about him that way!

“Do you remember what that experience was like for you?” I wonder. Lutfiya nods:

They were asking me about how religious my brother is and if he prays and I became immediately very reactionary and so I said something like, “I’m sorry. How religious are you?!” and then he was like, “Get out of my office.” I was like, “Okay.” At that point, I was just fed up kind of, but I wasn’t worried at all that they wouldn’t let me in. Ever. So, it doesn’t matter. If we have to play this game, and if we have to battle out the major political battle, me and you, then fine. I’m ready and willing to!

She pauses and purses her lips before she continues:

They’ll be like, “What’s your grandmother’s name?” Right! I’m going to stay with my grandmother, so I tell them, “This is her name or whatever, and this is her identity card number.” They will run her through the system, but then they will turn their computer around and show me profiles of people and everything is in Hebrew, and they’ll say, “Is

this your grandmother? Is this your grandmother?" and it's like, I mean, this is a very advanced security system. They know who is who! If I tell you this person's name, why are you showing me somebody with a different name?! [I]t's part of the intimidation! So, when they landed on the profile of my 70-something-year-old grandmother, that's pathetic!

Lutfiya tells me about the last time she was given permission to enter Palestine in 2014 and how going there through Jordan could be challenging for Palestinians even with dual citizenship:

[...] I had heard that Palestinians have an easier time going through Jordan. Palestinians, if they have Jordanian citizenship, need preapproval to enter Israel. So, if you're there, you're going. I mean they're not going to turn you away there because the approval has come from before. But it's not actually any easier for Palestinian Americans or Canadians! I went through Jordan, and it was super easy [that time] because they were occupied with another group that was of much more concern to them, and that's why I decided to go through Jordan again the next time in 2015.

She further describes the hardship she experienced going through Jordan:

The thing with Jordan is that you don't just fly in and then you go home. You fly into Amman, go through Amman's immigration, you take an hour taxi to the Allenby Bridge crossing [that connects Jordan to West Bank], you have to kind of exit Jordan, go through that process, take a bus over No-Man's Land, sit in the Israeli terminal, go through all of that kind of thing, take another bus to the Palestinian Authority side, which is a joke, they have flags duct taped to the wall. It's such a joke! And then from there, you take another bus to Jericho. And then from Jericho, you take another bus to wherever you want to go! It's just a traveling nightmare and I don't really speak Arabic and I was alone! There's no signs! There's no English!

She had used her Canadian passport to travel to Jordan and then Palestine in 2014 and it took her four hours before she granted a permission to enter Palestine whereas she saw other people going through faster:

Half an hour if you're German going through [as a] tourist and whatever! Yeah. Maybe half an hour. There is nothing [border officers] have to do! They make a decision, that's the only thing they have to do. Are we letting them in? Or are we not letting them in? So, all the extra stuff is just bullshit, really! They're just wearing you down or that kind of thing.

Lutfiya reveals how emotional it has been for her to leave Palestine for Canada the last time she travelled there:

[L]eaving in 2014 was so hard. I mean just that whole experience and it's very alienating. In Palestine, I feel so connected to human beings. They are so sincere, and I feel like I'm part of something and loved and part of a community and I'm recognized and accepted, I feel really accepted! So, all of a sudden, it's a very dramatic shift where you're in a place where you're worried, you feel vulnerable, you feel humiliated, you feel like nobody accords you respect, you feel very alone. I couldn't stop crying and I remember there was an Italian flight attendant, I was in such a mess that he came to me at one point and asked me, "Love, are you okay? Are you going to be okay?" I was like, "Yeah. I'm doing fine," but I was watching the coastline receded, you can see everything below you, the coastline is tiny. You see everything as the plane circles-- if this passenger plane is circling to get out, it doesn't immediately go west. It kind of circles and so almost you go over Jordan, even almost. That's how far east you go and then you circle because that's tiny. And then you circle away and I was just straining. I had a window seat on the left side, I'm straining to see as much as I can see for the last time and as it went and as it went away then I couldn't see it anymore. It was so hard for me because I had a feeling that maybe I won't see this again or maybe I won't be allowed to see it.

Lutfiya clears her throat and wipes up her tears, and says:

But it's really tough to also know that you're sitting next to somebody, um, in a plane full of people who can go any time with no problem. That American woman visiting her kids, good, she should be allowed to visit her kids. Fine. But that's the fact that she can do that, and she has no real connection to the place. Lucky her! Lucky all these people are! Lucky them. They get to do whatever they want. They get to come and go and they're so happy and free about it. It's like, I mean I went and I saw history and I connected with my family and whatever and develop these relationships and I don't get to come and go as easily as you and it's tough for me in those moments, really, really hard for me!

4.1.2 Insurgent citizen and dynamics of authority

Lutfiya sighs and starts telling me about her detention experience in 2015:

In 2015, I was naively expecting something similar to what happened previous times and it did not happen at all! I flew through Cairo and then landed in Amman. Because I am international, you go through a separate system than Palestinians from Jordan. So, you're put on the special bus, and your passports are collected together, and you don't see them until after you enter the Palestinian side. If you walked it'd take you 15 minutes to cross this no man's land but it's not allowed. You have to get on the bus! it's highly, highly securitized and has lots of formalities. So, we made it to the Israeli terminal area, the processing point at about 2:00 PM. I had met a girl who was

traveling from France along the way. And we kind of just were talking and we were the same age and sort of became friends. And then so we sat down in a holding area. You go through a number of processing stages as soon as you land at the Israeli terminal. Over and over and over again they process you and approve you to go just to the next room. And you don't really know what they're doing but they put all of these coloured stickers on your passport and it's just strange.

"I see. Who is in charge before you enter the Israeli side?" I wonder.

Lutfiya sips on her coffee and says:

Jordanian authorities up to a point, but they take all of their orders from the Israeli authorities and it's very clear to see that, as is illustrated even by my own experience later, that the Jordanian terminal couldn't close until they got word from the Israelis that they wouldn't be sending anybody back. So, the service workers in the middle points, so the bus drivers, the Jordanians who help you with your luggage. Those people, I find their position to be really interesting because they develop social relationships with the people with whom they work, but there's still this layer, this avid layer, of the dynamics of authority. And people know their place at the end of the day.

Lutfiya sits up and clears her throat:

Anyways! Back to where I was at! There's lots of security as if it was an airport although it's not an airport! And then immediately I was pulled over at the second security area which is kind of unusual. I hadn't experienced that before. And was told to just wait. I was questioned several times and their questions they kind of make you very nervous. Not because you have something to hide or whatever but because they're deeply personal questions, they're questions about your opinions and about your motivations and about your aspirations and that kind of stuff. The first round of questioning. They won't even start with introductions, they'll say, "So tell us what sort of activism you're involved in at school?" We know but tell us more about it. why do you do that? just details about exactly why you're doing what you're doing. They're very polite. It's interesting. They're extremely robotic, extremely robotic! So, when they ask me a question they won't look at me, but they're very much paying attention because then they'll rapid fire more questions as you're kind of stuttering out an answer. And they'll cut you off before you finish. They're not taking notes. They're not recording you. The point of the interrogation process is not to get any information because they have everything. You'll be still answering something and they'll move on to the next question. And here in Canada if they ask you a question, they're waiting to hear the answer, right? So. it's just a strange kind of thing to acclimatize to especially after traveling.

She moves in her chair and adds:

The sexual politics of the security area is fascinating to observe. Everybody working there is young, there's nobody over the age of 32. Nobody in that entire area maybe they're in the offices behind. I think the Israeli security and army uniform is very different from the rest of the worlds'. Very tight clothing. You know how usually women will have their hair pulled back or braided or something? It's long and flowing everywhere and in people's faces! I mean just in a professional setting, that's usually a requirement that you know you keep things under control, whatever. You know looking professional. Very, very tight, low-cut clothing, and all of this kind of stuff.

Lutfiya was planning to attend a conference in Palestine and the organizers decided not to publish the name of presenters until six months after the conference in case this might have been a problem for some attendees. At first, she was concerned about her attachment to the conference, *"I don't know if they knew about my participation in the conference, but I don't think it was relevant because they had made their decision as soon as I got there that they wouldn't be letting me in!"*

Lutfiya had met a French citizen around her age on her flight to Israel and became friends and talked about different things. She was visiting Israel as a tourist, and when Lutfiya was stopped she waited with her which soothed her:

Well, at that point it was evening, and at 11:00 PM. By the time it was like 8:30, she was like, "This is weird, and I'm not going to leave you until we all figured out what the hell was going on at this point. And so, she said, "This is really strange. I don't care. Don't worry. I'll get to Jerusalem. It doesn't matter, but I'm not going to go until they let you out because this is just ridiculous at this point!" and so, this is the first time she had been hearing about any of this. And so, for her to see my experience that was based solely on the fact of my ethnicity alone and my activism, then it really, I think, opened her eyes to some of the reality of being Palestinian in Israel.

Although Lutfiya had to wait for almost nine hours without any explanations, she was hopeful they will let her in:

I was so excited. I didn't think that anything could stand in the way. And I really was invested in the power of my passport! I'm very naïve! I really thought at the end of the day, I have an American passport, and Americans do not need a visa to enter Israel. You get it there. There's no reason that they can deny me entry! They cannot do it. It's just not possible. It's not in the realm of possibilities. I still have this naivety. I thought that my passport was the end of the story. I was very tired, hungry, thirsty, whatever, but the previous month had just been Ramadan and I was like, Good thing I had practiced fasting!

She laughs and looks away:

So, it's 11:00 PM! I waited from 2:00 PM to 11:00 PM at the terminal! But I arrived at 8:00 AM in the morning in Jordan after a night of no sleep. I was just waiting and waiting! They called my name a couple of times for just questioning and each time took no more than five minutes and it was so shocking to me. They didn't even get me into their offices. So, in this room, there's a table at bar level on the one end, and there's also this VIP room where if you pay \$100 you can be in an air-conditioned area and they give you water but still you're at their mercy. It's such a gimmick!

"Wow! \$100 just for the AC and water!?! That's it?!" I ask, shocked.

"Basically! Because there's nothing that they can do to expedite your travel, they do this for visiting dignitaries and UN people." She sighs and continues:

So, it's 11:00 and he calls my name, and I'm like, "Oh, my God. Finally. This is it!" Because I heard that they close at 10:00. That's what they tell you at the tourist websites, they close at 10:00 so make sure you go in advance, whatever. And so, I'm really excited! I hop up. I can remember I had so much energy, like, Finally! Right?! And he goes, "You've been denied entry. We're not letting you in. Thank you." And I'm like, "Sorry, what?" And he basically said, "We're sending you back." Or something like that. And this is in, again, standing up, not in an office or anything. And I totally lost it because I didn't come from Jordan. I came from Canada. So where do you want me to go now? He said, "You have to go back to Jordan." And I said, "I did not come from Jordan." But for them, I came directly from Jordan and that's where I need to go back to. I said, "Listen, what do you want me to do?" I was crying, whatever. He sends me back and still does not give me my passport.

Lutfiya looks down and starts playing with her fingers:

So, the girl, the French girl, sees me and she's like, "What happened?" Expecting that we're going now, and I said, "They're not letting me in. Let me just clarify some things and I'll be okay, whatever. "But I was really panicked because I didn't know what to do and I didn't have anybody, and it was night time. My grandmother and my aunt were waiting for me and had not heard from me. I was expecting to roll in at like 3:00 in the afternoon, have some kanafeh [a traditional Palestinian dessert] and go for a walk, whatever, right?"

Lutfiya asked for more clarification as to why she was denied entry and she did not receive a clear answer:

I did, and they gave me multiple different answers. So, one was that I was a security threat. Somebody brings me up again to sign some form that says I understand, and it said something about prevention of illegal immigration considerations. So, I assume that means overstaying or something, despite the fact that I live here in Canada, so why the

hell would I do that?! Everything is here. And then another person, and this is totally made up, he said that, "It's not our decision. We have to coordinate with three different administrative bodies in Israel and the military. They said no. They're the ones who said no." which means the military identified me as a security threat and then the other one was because I lied to them!

She moves her hands in the air and angrily says:

It's total bullshit! It's so ridiculous! They almost opened the opportunity for me to kind of resist and fight back a bit and kind of really plead with them like, "Where am I supposed to go? My grandmother is expecting me." Like, seriously, where am I supposed to go? So, I made it into somebody's office, one of the offices, and I said, "Can I at least use your phone?" What the hell, right? And so, I call my grandmother. She's shrieking, like, "Oh, my God. Where are you? We're so excited. What happened?" And I'm like, "Dede, listen. It's not happening." My uncle comes on the phone and I had to be very business-oriented because I didn't have a lot of time. So, I say I don't know what to do. This is the situation. He's like, "Did you tell them this? Did you tell them that?"

Lutfiya pauses when she finishes her sentence. I look down so my eyes do not meet hers, but I can hear the strong emotions in her shaky voice:

Then the officer whose phone I'm using in his office starts yelling at me to get off the phone and hurry up! So, I'm being yelled at on the phone and crying and just trying to figure out what the hell I'm supposed to do. I got the phone number of an uncle that I have in Amman. It's my father's uncle actually, and we've met only once. I go back, still don't have my passport or anything, I'm just dissolving in tears. And all the other, kind of, passengers who are around me have-- there's this idea of-- I wasn't embarrassed when normally I would have been because there's this kind of protectiveness about me. Some random woman brought me tissues, but at the same time, a deep sense of like, pathetic sense. It seems that everybody has sympathy, but nobody can do anything because we're all at the mercy of the same establishment, which is really a sickening feeling.

Her voice is clearly shaking. I look at her and see Lutfiya's eyes that are now in tears, "Because this is my home! This is my home! What do you mean I can't go there? Who are you to tell me that I cannot go there?"

I feel the urge to say something, I need to calm her down, but I cannot. Lutfiya clears her throat and moves in her chair. She lowers her voice and says she sat down for another hour without her passport although she was already told she cannot enter the country:

This is 12:00-ish, so after another hour just sitting there being told that I'm not getting in and then still not being allowed to go, which is effectively detention-- And so finally, the first officer who had interrogated me at 2:00 PM escorted me to go and pick up my

luggage from the other side and bring it back because my luggage had gone through. It was so hard because I walked through the exit to the other side. it was so hard. I could see the door. So, she brought me back, and the French girl approached us and says to the officer, "Are you taking her back now? What's going on?" And the officer kind of looks at her like, "Why does this white girl care? Why does she care about you?"

The officer took Lutfiya to a coach bus and gave her passport to the bus driver. Lutfiya explains to the bus driver that all she has is a phone number of an uncle who lives somewhere in Amman. *"And this conversation is all in Arabic and my Arabic is like shit! Then he reclines the passenger chair and goes to sleep until 2:00 in the morning and I'm like, "What the hell is happening right now?"* Lutfiya says and adds:

Meanwhile they were questioning one other Palestinian-American guy, and his family was allowed to go through. He's from Florida, and I saw him being repeatedly questioned, and he was held for as long as me. He came just after me but was held that whole time, but they obviously let him through. Finally, an officer from the Israeli terminal comes in and basically says, "We're not sending anybody else back. This is your only passenger. You can go now."

Lutfiya then explains that the bus driver asked one of his friends to drive her to Amman, *"This is so unsafe but what choice do I have? You want to walk to Amman or do you want to drive with this guy to Amman?"* Lutfiya says and tells me she was devastated:

I go to the other side, and there's 10 officers working there and I'm the only client if you will. And they're all like, "What happened? What happened? But what happened? This is crazy. What happened? How could they not--?" I was like. *"look at me! Am I a security threat, seriously?!"* I could not stop crying! So, halfway through, I stopped. I decided I should stop crying and humanize myself so that if he wants to kill me or rape me, it will be harder! Of course he didn't kill me or rape me and he dropped me off! But the position that I was put in was just really awful. Thank God nothing happened!

Lutfiya stayed with her dad's uncle in Amman for the next 11 days, *"[O]ver the course of which, my American citizenship and passport did not help me at all. I tried. I was like, "Okay. You know what? There's a delay in the plan. That's fine. My conference isn't for a week."*

She was still hopeful that she can find a way to resolve the situation, but soon realized there is no way:

The American embassy in Jerusalem told me that your attempts are useless. They said, "Listen, we're really sorry. Yes, you're right that you have the right to enter, but there's nothing that we can do for you. Nothing!" The Americans can do nothing to advocate on my behalf. *Why did I travel with your stupid passport?".* Their responses were so frustrating. It was basically like, *"Yeah. We're really sorry about that. Good luck! Keep us updated!"* Practically speaking, because the Americans didn't actually end up doing

anything, it wouldn't have been different if I had used my Canadian passport! I mean, Harper was still there, and he's not really that interested in doing anything to agitate Israel.

In addition, Lutfiya went to the Israeli consulate in Amman several times but her efforts were useless:

[It] was such a waste of time! You stand in line under the hot sun. You go through all this outside security and they didn't even let me into the building, and the guy said, "Listen, I have seven or eight people every day like you. There's nothing we can do. You have to coordinate with Cogat [Coordinator of Government Activities in the Territories]. It's the ministry that governs affairs of the territories in Israel.

Lutfiya is frustrated that she could not take privilege of her American passport:

I think it was systemic. I don't think it was personal, in a sense it was because of my ethnicity, but that's part of a more systemic problem. I may have a Canadian passport. It doesn't make you.....um, are you going to wear it in a display so that everybody knows that you're Canadian? It lets you travel, and you have incredible privileges having that passport to travel. I have both, imagine. I mean, wow! But I still couldn't go where I wanted to go. I'm not interested in going to all the other places. I mean I love traveling, but if I can't be allowed here, then I really don't care. I wish that they could strip me of my right to travel to every other country if only that would let me go to where I wanted to go.

She frowns and takes a deep breath and then tells me she takes her Canadian citizenship for granted because she sees herself as a misfit in Canada, *"I feel like it's within the realm of possibility in the American psyche for someone who looks like me and you to be an American. It's not ludicrous. In Canada, it is still!"*

"For someone who looks like me and you to be Canadian?" I question. She nods:

A Canadian, a real Canadian! I mean, anybody who wants to be a Canadian can be a Canadian, but I think there's still this conception of inclusion based on whiteness. That's a real problem in Canada. I'm not part of the lifestyle of Canada!

Lutfiya looks me in the eye and says, *"Do you know the most important reason I decided to talk to you about all this?"* I tilt my head to the right and, she adds:

If people can relate to me because they think that I am sort of Canadian, I want to tell them what the reality of living that experience is! So, this is an opportunity for me to be

able to share that and an opportunity for me to reflect on my assumptions about identity as well. You cannot pick and choose your identity to suit certain situations. If somebody tells me I'm an American I'll be like, "Absolutely not!" I'm not an American because I don't like what an American is associated with! I don't like that history! I don't like what it stands for. So, no! I'm not an American, despite being a product of American culture, I'm not American, I'm Palestinian, I'm Kashmiri! But if I want to travel to Palestine, I will say, "I'm an American. Believe me, I'm an American. I'm nothing but an American. Okay, I'm an American and a Canadian, you know?" But you don't get to do that. It's how I try to represent myself but it's not how I see myself. Even at a time of representing yourself with a Canadian or an American passport, they know that I'm lying. If this is a form of legitimacy, it will give me entry that I deserve, and that you deserve, and that anybody deserves, then I will use it.

4.2 Sophia

Sophia is an Israeli-Canadian woman. She was born in Israel and became a Canadian citizen in 2006. She has been living in Canada and Israel since she gained her dual citizenship. She is in her mid thirties. Sophia and I met in a café in downtown Toronto.

4.2.1 Embodying fear

Sophia clenches her hands and describes her experience at the Berlin airport:

So, I grew up on the stories of my great-grandparents, my grandparents, and my parents, and it's the same thing that happens in Israel with the Palestinians, which is, when you don't think about people, when you don't encounter them, when you don't live with them, the only thing you know about them is the little bits of stories that you get to have. So, for example, with Palestinians, I've been taught my whole life that Palestinians want to kill us. And by the time I actually met a Palestinian for the first time in my life, he was such a normal, nice human being that the clash between the propaganda I grew up with, and the reality that I was experiencing, was a very intense experience. And in Russia, in the Soviet Union or in Israel, we don't learn anything about Germany other than they were Nazis, and so when I arrived in Germany, even something so simple like an airport, it immediately triggered all of those emotions of being surrounded by Nazis.

Sophia's words make me more curious to know about that experience, the moment that Sophia realized she is scared. I lean forward and ask, "was that the first time you....?"

Sophia interrupts me, "Went to Germany? Yeah. Yeah, it was the first time I went to Germany." I nod and say, "and you used your Canadian passport, right?" Sophia nods. She then looks up at the ceiling that is painted in dark red and replies:

I was shocked that I had that experience because the German people today have nothing to do with Nazism, and there's a lot more dangerous places for Jews in the world than Germany, but it was in Germany that I had that experience.

“Was that just a moment or you experienced the feeling for a while?” I ask.

Sophia shakes her head and continues:

No, it went with me everywhere because [pause] Yeah, because what I figured is that [pause] so all my life I'd been learning about how the Germans did such a great job, knowing their history and reflecting on the crimes they committed, and that the German people are taught about the Holocaust so much. In fact, Germany's considered the gold standard in remembering perpetrator crimes. So even though I had this visceral, emotional, almost instinctual reaction, my mind was telling me....but you know the German people, they are not Nazis and blah, blah, blah. But the people that I met there, the interactions I had with the German people, it made it very clear to me that even the German people, who are the so-called standard in tackling denial and perpetrator history, are in total denial, and that in fact, they haven't really dealt with it the way that I....

She leaves her sentence unfinished which leads to an awkward silence.

I feel the urge to break the silence, “How so? Can you give me an example?”

She nods and says:

Yeah. So, for example, in Berlin, everywhere you go there's little stones in front of buildings and on the little stones, they're like bronze or they look like gold, but they're probably bronze, and in front of a lot of buildings. And it was a project of remembering, where in front of every apartment building, they would write on these little stones the name of Jewish families that disappeared, where they were murdered, how many family members, and what their profession was. Every building you go into, you can see amongst the cobblestones of the entrance, for example the Schwartz family, and the Golden family, four family members. He was a dentist. They disappeared. They were murdered in Auschwitz on this day. So that everywhere around the city, you get the sensation of just how many people, regular, living human beings were exterminated.

Sophia sips on her cider and then tells me that she did not know about the stones and that they were brought to her attention by the organizer of her tour:

I didn't know that, so the person who organized my tour in Germany for my film, she lives in a building in Berlin and I went to see her, and we're sitting in her kitchen and we're talking about, um, we were laughing about this experience I was telling her, in the airport, about how brainwashed I was about Germans, that I felt scared of being in the airport, even though the Holocaust was 70 years ago! And so, she says, “But did you see

the stones in front of my building?" And that's the thing, right? Is that you know something intellectually and then you know something emotionally, but bridging the two? It's horrifying.

She clears her throat and looks afar. Her voice is clearly shaking:

So, as we were sitting in her kitchen, she says, "Well did you see those stones?" And explained to me what they were. And suddenly it hit me that we could be sitting in the kitchen of a family that disappeared, that was murdered. And when it's that personal you suddenly get it. Sitting in her kitchen, I suddenly realized, this kitchen, this dining table, could have been the dining table of a family that was murdered just because they were Jews. Suddenly I realized, oh my God! The German people are not totally removed from the Nazis, they are the children, they're grandchildren of Nazis. They are parents. They are grandparents. And some of the people I was meeting personally were alive then and were part of a society that was collectively perpetrating this massive crime on humanity.

She pauses and shakes her head.

There is not so much space between tables in this café and as Sophia is talking, I realize the family at the table next to us have stopped talking and are looking at us. I can feel the warmth of their look on my face – Sophia has not realized this or maybe she is just ignoring them. My heart is beating fast. I move in my chair and see an older guy looking at us curiously. What if someone from the tables next to us ask something from Sophia or me? I think to myself.

Sophia takes a deep breath and continues:

And when I would go to convenience stores and I would see elderly people, all I could think about was, "Did you kill Jews? Did you keep quiet about people killing Jews? Were you married to somebody who was killing Jews?" Everybody's involved in the crime, right? Whether they want to or not. And so, when we were sitting in her kitchen, I asked her, "Well, you know what was your family doing during the Holocaust?" And I later realized, or I later learned, um, it's considered very rude to ask someone what their family was doing in the Holocaust because you might remind them with a question that, in fact, their family was doing something horrible in the Holocaust. And when I asked her, she said, "Oh, no, nobody in my family were Nazis." And I said, "Oh, okay, so what did they do during the war?" And she said, "Well, my uncle, he was a guard at Auschwitz.

She raises her voice, I can see the anger in her brown eyes:

So, I said, "Well, your uncle worked at Auschwitz, how is he not a Nazi?" Which is, again, a very, very rude thing to ask someone. And she said, "Well, you know he had to have a job, but he didn't – I don't think in his heart of hearts he supported Nazism." And that was the story I heard everywhere I went, and I went all over Germany, I went all over

Austria, and Switzerland, the German parts of Switzerland, everyone I met, nobody was a Nazi! I met the granddaughter of the head of the Luftwaffe, like the air force. And she told me that her grandfather wasn't a Nazi. people constantly self-narrate! Such as, Canadians like to believe that the [white Canadians] like to believe that they live in this multicultural country where everyone is equal but living in this country where everyone is equal as a person who's not white is very different. And until very recently, it was legislated, right? The discrimination against black people and Jews, and against the indigenous....

Most people at both tables next to us are looking at Sophia and I right now. I look down to avoid any eye contact with them, but I can still feel the warmth of their look on my face.

4.2.2 Like cows in a slaughterhouse

Sophia described how she felt the first time she crossed a checkpoint to the West Bank, “[...] *I've never in my life been so scared because I intellectually already understood the occupation, but it was the first time I [pauses] felt it.*”

“As an Israeli, are you allowed to travel to Palestine?” I ask curiously.

Sophia shakes her head, “*Not legally, no. Not legally, but if you know what you're doing, you can get in and out without being noticed.*”

I nod and say “So, you are able to cross the checkpoints then.”

She pauses for a moment and says:

I'm a journalist. Half the time I spend is in the West Bank. You are physically not allowed legally [to] be in the West Bank or in the Gaza Strip, which means that you're not present when the biggest of the war crimes happen. You are not there. You cannot hire Palestinians because that would be illegal. So, you don't have any source on the ground, your only source of news is the army's press releases. Every single piece of journalism that gets published has to go through the military censor before it gets published. But Israel is perceived by the world as a democracy. Israel is perceived by the West as a democracy in the Middle East!

“I see! So, was that your first time ever going through a checkpoint?” I ask.

Sophia explains to me that the very first checkpoint she went through, was like an airport, “*It's like you're driving your car, or you go on the bus, and then they come on the bus and they check you. Most of the checkpoints I go through, like Qalandia Checkpoint, it's a pedestrian checkpoint.*” She adds that she does not know how to drive and therefore takes the bus to the checkpoints:

I always take the bus and I'm always there with the regular Palestinians. And you stand in these enormous lines that take forever and ever. And then you go through these really tiny little turnstiles with all this barbed wire everywhere, and all these cages everywhere.

This is what I have seen in documentaries but now I am sitting in front of someone who has had the experience herself, I think to myself. I look at Sophia and demand an explanation, "Wow! So, everyone has to go through the same....?"

Sophia interrupts me right away:

One by one. Yeah. Like cows in a slaughterhouse. It's really terrifying. Architecturally, there's snipers everywhere. There's the military armored vehicles everywhere. You get out and you are completely exposed, and there's cameras everywhere. And you know that at any moment if something happens, you're dead, right? So, everyone is just slowly walking down this really small cage until you get to the front of a checkpoint. And then inside of this enormous structure, which is bulletproof and bombproof, and like it's got thick walls and thick windows that you could almost detonate a hydrogen bomb and nothing would happen to the people inside.

The restaurant is getting more crowded and almost all the tables are full now. Sophia's eyes are flashing, and her voice is rising higher and higher:

And there's so many cameras everywhere. And like this soldier yells at you through a megaphone, and you barely understand what she's saying. And she yells in Hebrew, right? So, if you're Palestinian, you don't speak Hebrew, it's your own fucking fault. They don't care. So, she yells at you in Hebrew, and you're like, "What?" And she yells, "Show me your visa!" So, you put your passport to the window. And then if she likes it or she doesn't like it, you either spend the rest of the day being interrogated, or you go to jail, or you go back home, and you have to turn around, or you get through. So, it's so nerve wracking. Even though I have the right passport. I have an Israeli passport. So, the worst thing that can happen to me is that I'll be interrogated and potentially like reprimanded. If they really want to make a showcase out of me, they would put me in jail, but chances are that won't happen. If I'm Palestinian, I could be dead as a result of this interaction.

Sophia compares the checkpoint to a fish bowl and portrays how she is feeling more and more nervous every step she is taking towards the fishbowl which reminds me of the panopticon:

[E]very time you're moving towards the fish bowl, it's like you can't breathe, right? So, you get there, and you are so nervous because you know there is always snipers and the guns. There's automatic machine guns. There's just a feeling of total powerlessness, and you're nervous, and she [the soldier] is yelling at you. So, hundreds of thousands of people have to go through this experience every single day.

I nod and say, "So, you're feeling nervous every single time you have to cross a checkpoint."

Sophia closes her eyes and takes a deep breath. She then adds:

I have it every time I go, every single time. So, she [the soldier] is yelling at you, so you show the passport. Maybe she asks you a question you didn't understand, so you say "What?" That irritates her. So, she's twice as angry, she's twice as likely to send you to interrogation. And at interrogation, you know you can end up being tortured in a secret jail, or you can end up having, like, five hours of your life wasted on some fucking asshole who just puts you in a room, or you can be interrogated, or you can be forced to talk about the lives of other people. As a journalist, my biggest worry is that they take away my footage, that they copy my footage, that they do something to my equipment, that they bug my phone or my laptop, that they force me to reveal sources, that they take my laptop, hack into it, and get my contacts. Those are things that I think about every time I go. So, I don't carry with me my contacts' names. I don't carry in my cellphone the numbers of contacts. I have to constantly memorize or use an encrypted cloud-based system in which I access the phone numbers on my contacts. Or I write them on a pieces of paper, and burn those. There's thousands of things!

"So stressful!" I exclaim.

"Constant stress! Of course! And I have an Israeli and a Canadian passport. I'm at the top of the totem pole of rocks." Sophia states.

"But you still feel powerless and fearful" I mumble.

"Completely powerless! And it's illegal. If they want to, if they want to punish you, they can put me in jail. They've done it before." Sophia says as she is playing with her fingers.

"You mean they have done it to you before?" I ask surprisingly.

She nods and discloses:

Oh, yeah! There's always that risk. I mean sometimes they just, um, for example, at Qalandia Checkpoint there is this space between where the Qalandia refugee camp ends and where the checkpoint starts. And to go from the refugee camp to the checkpoint you have to go through this landscape of essentially, um, apocalypse. It's like all these snipers, and there's a watch tower and this military wall, and there is another military watch...small military watch tower inside of a cage. And so, you have to walk through this area to get to the checkpoint, and sometimes snipers, they just shoot you as you're walking.

"Even before you get there!?" I ask.

"Yeah, before you get to the checkpoint!" Sophia sighs.

She tells me about a famous case few months back, where a brother and a sister were machine-gunned because she got a phone call as she was walking and reached into her pocket to get the

phone call, and the soldiers decided she could have been pulling out a gun. So, they shot them on the spot and killed them both. The girl was pregnant.

Sophia slams her eyes shut and continues:

[Y]ou are walking in the space that you know at any moment you could be killed and Palestinians do it every day, right? I do it maybe twice a week, sometimes three times a week, but I know I can always get out. They are living inside of that reality. So, on the one hand, you're dealing with the fact that you are at risk, but then you are privileged. You are privileged but you are also powerless. So, you're not allowed to your feelings. You're not allowed to your trauma because you're an Israeli. Your trauma is forbidden. You can't talk about your trauma. You can't talk about your fears because at the end of the day, you can get out. You're privileged! So, how dare you even complain! As a journalist, you're not supposed to talk about the trauma you inherit as a result of constantly witnessing, and hearing, and living these stories.

She rests her chin in her palm and pauses for a few seconds. Sophia implies how lucky she feels because she has a very good network of people that support her and understand why she does what she does, but she believes she should acknowledge the fact that she is working in a career that is requiring constant traumatization:

Because of course, when you go through a checkpoint, you are at the mercy of soldiers. Most of these soldiers are 18, 19 years old. If I'm traveling alone, which is almost all the time, they can rape me, they can sexually assault me, they can hit on me, they can touch me, they can do whatever they want to me and I can't do anything back. So, as a woman, you're going through twice the experience. And most of the women colleagues I know, they use that. They flirt with the soldier to get through because they know that if you just appease his ego, you'll be fine. But sometimes, if he finds you particularly attractive, he'll take you to an interrogation cell, and then who knows what will happen to you, right? And you can't talk about it! There's nobody to talk to about it. There's nowhere you can file a complaint. No soldier has ever been prosecuted for anything they did at a checkpoint!

I jump in, "Really, no soldiers? Not even one?!"

Sophia shakes her head and adds: "*[During] the entire war, on the Gaza Strip, when there were dozens of violations of international human rights and the rules of war, only one soldier was prosecuted for stealing the credit card of a Palestinian at a checkpoint!*"

There is a moment of silence between us before I ask, "So can you tell me a little bit about your experience being in the West Bank, or in the Palestinian territories?"

Sophia nods her head and asserts:

[T]he fact that I have two passports has a huge impact on my work. Essentially, if I didn't have a Canadian passport, I would not be able to do my job, because it's illegal for Israelis to be almost everywhere I am, especially in the places where there are the most acute violations of human rights. You can technically go there if.... you need to sign a piece of paper that says you relinquish the government from the responsibility of protecting you, but it's still illegal. And it says whenever you drive into the West Bank, it says on these huge banners, entrance to Israelis is forbidden.

“So, you're almost always using your Canadian passport to cross the checkpoints?” I ask.

Sophia nods and explains to me that when you cross the checkpoints to Palestinian West Bank, your passport won't be checked. In fact, when you cross the checkpoints back to Israel, the military soldiers check your passport, *“[W]hen you come out, it's a combination of things. If I see a particularly—like if I get the sense, um, because it's all based on the mood of a particular soldier”*. She decides which passport to show spontaneously:

If you interact with a particularly right-winged soldier, or a soldier who's particularly racist, it's better to use your Canadian passport because then they know they can't do anything to you because doing something to you means getting your embassy involved and the Israeli government, and like you would have to deal with all these officials. Um, but if I see that I'm with a soldier that kind of doesn't care, like he's just there because he has to, because it's a forced army for everyone, men and women. So, if I feel like I'm dealing with a soldier who's not going to care, I show my Israeli passport. So, if (s)he asks me, “Why are you there?” I can say, “Well, I made a mistake and I took the wrong turn.” Or “I just meet somebody at the checkpoint.”

Sophia takes a deep breath and looks down. She then looks at me with narrowed eyes:

It's a very subtle game. Foreigners need a visa to be in Israel. Israel is very restrictive about who's allowed in the country. If you've ever been critical of the state of Israel, there's a chance you're not going to go in. If you've ever published on social media something that demonstrates that you're critical of Israel, you're not going in. If you have an Arab name, there's a good chance you're not going in. If you've ever visited an Arab country, there's a good chance you're not going in. If you're an NGO worker, a human rights worker, there's a very good chance you're not getting in. If you did get in, you get a three-month visa. I don't have the visa because I get in on the Israeli passport. That's why when I go to a checkpoint, oftentimes I use my Israeli passport even at the risk of going to jail because I know that if it's a very strict soldier, then he's going to look at my Canadian passport and he's not going to see a visa, and he's going to send me to interrogation. But it usually involves like a long explanation about I'm a journalist and this is what I'm doing, and blah, blah, blah. If it's someone who's an idealist, like an ideologue, like he's there because he hates the Arabs, and he wants to kill the Arabs, and

so on, which is I would say, maybe a third of the soldiers, then I use my Canadian passport, because then he knows he can't do much to me.

I lean back and look at her. All I can think about right now is the hardship people have to go through for going from one side of a checkpoint to the other and how the Israelis and Palestinians experiences are tremendously different from each other. Sophia's words bring me back, *"There is no end to the human imagination and how to perpetrate torture on each other. That's why I work towards the dismantling of systems of domination, including Israel."*

4.3 Anne

Anne is a Canadian-Dutch woman. She was born in Canada and has lived in Canada her whole life. She has a naturalized passport for the Netherlands through her father. She is in her mid twenties and got her Netherlands passport when she was about 21 or 22. We met at the public library in Waterloo.

4.3.1 Russian Face

Anne travelled to Russia for six weeks in 2009 with a group from her church. Along with the group, she used her Canadian passport and it took them two months to get the visa from the Russian Embassy, *"It took us two months I think. And when we got to their airport, their customs was like crazy! They were so angry"* She laughs out loud and then continues:

I don't know. They're all like had the Russian face which is, um, very don't-look-nice-and-don't-be-nice! They were just speaking Russian. I think they knew English, but they were speaking in Russian to us. They knew we didn't know Russian!

I tilt my head to the right and question, "So, you think that was intentional?"

Anne replies with no hesitation, *"Yeah, cause we were speaking to them in English and they were responding in Russian!"* She slightly pushes her eyebrows together and adds, *"They gave us forms to fill out to come into the country. You need to do that and then we handed them back to them and we filled them wrong and they yelled at us to do it again!"*

"They yelled at you? In Russian or English?!" I ask.

Anne laughs and then says:

I don't remember but they were switching back and forth obviously cause they needed to tell us what to do, but they [the forms] were all in Russian, the whole form was in Russian! One of my friends knew Russian because he grew up there, he was telling some people how to fill it out and those people were telling other people how to do it. We

were like oh that means city! And that means the address! and we were getting the address we were supposed to stay at from our phones. We were trying to make all the forms look the same. It was interesting! I mean we all had visas in our passports, but they still wanted us to write stuff like where and how long we were gonna be there, when we were gonna leave and then once we've handed everything back to them fine at the customs, they were like ok, fine, go! We were like ok! I didn't feel welcomed.

Anne is looking away, but I can hear the frustration in her voice, "There was a lot of people walking past of us and they didn't have to fill anything out and they obviously said what they need to say and then they go but they're not..." She pauses for a few seconds and then says, "I thought they're going to love us, because we're Canadian! Who doesn't love Canadians?! We're not threatening at all! We were with a Christian organization and were going to be helping with the English classes at a university there."

I ask Anne about her experience flying out of Russia and she tells me the group had left for Canada earlier. Since she was going to Holland from Russia, Anne took a different flight. She says, "It was a small airport and it was just the plane personnel from the aircrafts and random people dropping people off. The airplane personnel do all the check-ins and they leave, so then it was just me there." Anne had stayed in the Moscow airport for six hours by herself before flying to Holland and she was scared waiting in the airport by herself:

There was no waiting area, there was just two benches. I had sat there on my luggage. There was one little bathroom to go to and I had all my stuff with me like really close because it was a small airport in Moscow and I could literally see the street from where I was, people could just come in off the street to get into the airport. It was such a small place, it wasn't like...So I was like [paused] just scared waiting in the airport by myself. That's the only time I haven't felt safe in an airport. I was praying the whole time. I'm like, "Lord, don't let people steal my stuff!" I felt like there was no one there to help me. If there was a problem, nobody was offering help.

On their way to Russia, however, Anne and her friends had a stopover in London. Anne wanted to leave the airport for a few hours, but her friends were scared that something might happen to them. However, she left the airport on her own:

I'm like, "Nothing's going to happen! It's the UK. It's better than the transit system and the people are more helpful than in Canada! I don't know why people are scared of leaving the airport in the UK! I'm like, nothing can happen to you here. Whereas Canadians had a perception that they had to all stay together and couldn't leave, they were scared, just because it was a different place, but I was like, I'm not going to be scared in any EU country.

4.3.2 We're just nobodies!

Anne shares her experience of crossing the border from Romania to Moldova, *"When I was in Romania, I went to Chisinau, the capital of Moldova with some Romanians and that was about a ten-hour drive. when we were getting to the border, the Romanians had a hard time, they were like..."* Anne pauses for a few seconds as if she is thinking about something. Then she continues, *"the border people didn't so much like it that the Romanians were coming in!"* Anne starts playing with her hair and adds, *"I don't know why, they [Romania and Moldova] like to be hard on each other sometimes, they just like to make a fuss, little bit like Latin people! They like to show their emotion and like to show things."*

I am confused and apparently Anne sees the question mark on my face, so she further explained what she meant:

They like to show their emotions so they're a little bit like, "What are you doing here? Why you want to come in?" But with my passport, I give them my Dutch passport and they're like, "Oh yeah, come on in." Like, "Come on in, no problem." And the Romanians are like, "How do they like you and they don't like us? They don't like us because we're regular people. They like you because you're a Western European." And I'm like, "Oh, I didn't know that. I didn't think that." And they're like, "Well, because you have some respect for being a Western European, whereas we're just nobodies. We're just Romanians. Like, whatever. Romanian." And I was like, "Oh, that's interesting!"

"So, you had never realized it before?" I question.

Anne shakes her head and replies, *"Well, I didn't feel that before. I thought they'd be like, "Why is this Western European traveling with you?" And at that point, when I'm in Romania, I call myself a Dutch citizen."* She looks at me and adds, *"I don't necessarily say I'm Canadian, because it gives me more of an association to say I'm European. Yeah, I don't know, I didn't think about that! But then, the Romanians, they said it to me."*

I think to myself, how privileged she is, and she had not even realized the privilege until after someone mentions it out to her. I then ask, "Do you have a similar experience in Western Europe?"

Anne moves her hands in the air and says:

In Eastern Europe they are more, I guess, a warm culture. So, in Western Europe, they are very much on...um, their view of a person is kind of tainted by what is your profession, what is your education, what connections do you have. You don't have to be nice! You just [should] be polite and tell them, "I'm an important person!" so we can get along. Whereas, in Eastern Europe, if you're alone, you kind of have to, um, as a woman, um, I can also play my white card a little bit, but not so much. I guess in Europe, because I am a European citizen, I'm allowed to be there!

Anne rests her arms on the table and continues:

[W]hen I'm looking at them [immigration officers] or how they're interacting with other people, I'm like, "Okay! Do they want me to feel submissive? Do they want me to look submissive? Or do they want me to look confident? And often in Western Europe, since I'm a Western European, I can speak with confidence to them and they respect me for that because they know that's what they're looking for, and they're like, "Oh, this girl was able to read us, and she was able to respond properly!" Whereas, maybe somebody from another culture is not feeling the same confidence to be able to read what that person wants and to respond properly. Or maybe they feel like, "If I were to respond with confidence to that person, they might be like, 'Who do you think you are? You look like an immigrant. We're not going to treat you like that!" So, you have to navigate should I play the innocent, I don't really know what I'm doing, I need your help, you're the officer, please help me kind of card? Or if you want to play the confidence card? It's just different depending on what the other person is looking for. But you really have to navigate it. Yeah. In the States, I do that! I'm just like, "You know what? I'm just Canadian, just trying to come through. Just let me through; I'm not doing anything wrong." But in Western Europe, I'm pretty confident.

4.3.3 Canadian passport as a white flag

Anne's perception of citizenship has apparently changed since she got her Dutch citizenship and became a dual citizen:

I always perceive myself as a Dutch Canadian - Canadian first with a Dutch heritage. But then as soon as I got my passport and I started traveling, then I noticed that I was starting to also become more familiar with the Dutch culture. A lot of my family, their only experience of the Dutch culture is 1950s Dutch culture, whereas Holland is very different than [what] it used to be in the 1950s. So, I would consider myself a modern Dutch person, which means that I am Dutch. I'm not a grandfather! I don't have the old Dutch. I'm new Dutch!

I ask what her citizenships mean to her and this is how she responds, *"If I'm traveling on a Canadian citizenship, I'm Canadian, I'm having Canadian passport, I feel like it's kind of a white flag, like, we're not doing anything wrong over here."* Anne sees her Canadian passport as a white flag, she has the same feeling toward her Dutch passport, *"[W]hen I'm in Holland or when I'm in Europe, I feel like my Dutch citizenship does the same. It's like a white flag. I'm like, "Look, a little Dutch country over here, we're not doing anything wrong."*

I laugh and say, "So you have two white flags on you wherever you go!"

She giggles and says, *"Yes! wherever I go! And that's probably why I don't like going to Asia, South America, or Africa, because I don't think that I have a white flag there."* She adds:

I like to show, when I'm in a culture, that I have some understanding about them not that I'm coming and I'm better than them. And I think that the Canadian passport and Dutch passport, in some ways, allow me to do that because in some countries my country is doing a little bit better than their country but there are still opportunities for me to have understanding about their situations.

Anne thinks there is more understanding between the host community and the tourist if one goes from one superpower to another:

[Y]ou're both on an even playing field power-wise and you're both competing for your credibility. I mean, Russia has always tried to be more self-sufficient. They were the ones who ruled other countries. They are a mother country in themselves."

She moves in her seat and continues:

Whereas there's other little countries that are kind of feeding off of the other countries, and they're like the helper countries. And I feel like Canada is a helper country to the UK and to the States. And Romania is a helper country to, maybe, Moldova and not so much Russia anymore. Netherlands has connections with the UK and Germany, Hungary, and Czech. They're all very much working together. I think it's just more that there's the big superpowers and they are the ones that are like, more understanding of each other."

4.3.4 I am not a threat!

"So, who are you when you're travelling?" I ask.

Anne immediately says, "I am not a threat!"

"You are not a threat?" I ask

She leans forward and says, "I don't know. This is what I am thinking."

We both stop talking and look at each other. Anne breaks the silence by telling me about her stopover in Frankfurt when she was travelling back to Canada from Romania in January:

They were checking passports and tickets just randomly at a checkpoint. It was just the Germans and German officials. There was a lineup to talk to the officials, so you could continue. Some people in front of me were other ethnic backgrounds and....

I interrupt her by asking what she means by the ethnic background and she replies:

I think she was, the lady directly in front of me had dark hair and she had darker skin. I think she might have been Indian, but I don't know. And her English wasn't so good. And he was asking her questions and stuff. And then he's like, "Okay, you can go." And then I

came and I have my passport. And I was like, "Do you need to see this?" And he's like, "No, I just need to look at your eyes. Thank you. Go." And then I was like, "Okay."

When I ask Anne whether she thinks the woman in front of her was a threat and she herself was not, she says:

It's the way that I look. Yeah! I know it's so interesting! He was just like, "I just need to look at your eyes." And he smiled and he just let me go through." I didn't have to show anything. It's so interesting. That's why I'm like, "See? I'm just not a threat!" And then seeing when I was leaving the Romanian airport, I just have to smile, and people can often just let me through. There are other occasions when they're not. But other times, they don't see me a young white woman as a threat. Yes. Whereas they're always checking other people.

"I see. So, who do you think is a threat at the borders?" I question.

"Anyone who is not coming or is not going from a Western country to a Western country. I mean, if their ethnic background is not from Western countries." She replies.

I ask whether she means if they are not white.

She answers, *"Yeah. It depends. If they have a good handle on English, then usually people are like, oh well, they've been living there a long time. English, German, or something. If they have a really good handle on the language."* Anne looks away. After a lengthy silence, she looks back at me and says:

I don't experience a lot of things that I see other people experience at the airports because...I don't know yet! I always see a lot of families traveling together, or some older people that are obviously coming from another country, maybe the Middle East, maybe Africa - not so much Africa - mainly India and Middle East, I'm seeing a lot. And some Asians but not as much, not where I've been, anyway. And they seem a little bit more, um, nervous about the whole process. For me, I just kind of walk around, walk through, and I'm like, "Oh, yeah. No problem!" Everyone thinks I'm fine and they just look at me and I just walk through. Because I have the European passport, they just think, "Oh, she's just a regular European person traveling around, doing her stuff, visiting people. She's got money. She's got connections. She's got all those things, so she's fine. I guess he was, um, from my perspective, he was implying that like my eyes looked truthful and that he understood me in some way.

Anne giggles and clears her throat. Then adds:

If it's a male officer, I just smile and say I'm a Dutch-Canadian and I'm traveling or I'm coming to visit my relatives or I'm going home, or I make a joke! If I say that I was volunteering at an orphanage in Romania, sometimes they're like, "Oh, that's so wonderful!" I'm talking to them on an even playing field. When I approach them, I first

caution and I'm like, "Do you need to look at my passport"? or "Do you need to look at my papers?" Or, "Here's what you need," and then I talk to them, like I guess, at eye-level. I'm talking like I have the same power as they do.

Anne says she knows the officers cannot stop her at the border or find anything "wrong" with her: "[They] have to do [their] job but [cannot] find anything wrong with me. [I]f [they] do, I can stand up for myself and say, 'No! Go check it out and I'll be fine! You can't do anything to me.'" since they know she is "a person who's educated, who's traveling, who has connections in Europe and they're just a person with a job just like [she is]." However, at the same time she admits she might have felt more nervous under other circumstances:

If I was trying to navigate my way through a country and didn't have any connections or support, and only had a certain amount of money, or that people were counting on me back in my country, then I would feel, probably, a lot more nervous about whether this person who looks different than me, who has more power lets me in or not. I think I would feel way different. But I feel like they can't do anything to me. They can stop me for like an hour and question me, but they're not going to find anything that would be reasonable enough to not let me through. But I noticed that also it's a measure of confidence. And it's possible for somebody to not feel confident if they are of a different background, especially if you're approaching a German. Like, I have German friends and even sometimes they scare me.

Anne believes being stopped at the border is also related to the traveller's level of confidence:

I've found that the Romanians, who are white, they can be very intimidated by Western Europeans. So even the Eastern Europeans can feel intimidated by Western Europeans. I think it has to do a lot with confidence in the person. I have some friends who are Romanian and are completely confident to go over to a Western country and be like, "No. I have a right to be here because I'm part of the EU, and I'm educated, and I know English, and so I have a right to be here!" and then they get respect. You often have to navigate whether the person who you're talking to wants you to feel equal or lower. I even have it with my own dad. I can't talk to him equally. I need to make sure that I show him a certain amount of respect and a little bit lower than him. Otherwise, he'll feel the resistance. And I see that with officers too. Do they want me to feel lower than them because I can do that? And then I'll make them feel good!

4.4 Damian

Damian is a Trinidadian-Canadian dual citizen. He was born in Canada, but his parents moved back to Trinidad when he was only three months old. He moved back to Canada at the age of 18 to go to university. He is in his mid thirties and has been living in Canada for the last ten years. We met in a café in uptown Waterloo.

4.4.1 My voice is not Canadian

When I ask Damian whether he views himself as a Canadian, he replies:

You got me at an interesting time. It's not a battle but depending on who it is, I'll say I am Trinidadian because to me that is where I was raised. But for certain instances, anytime I have to produce identification as a Canadian, I had it where it will be hard to believe it and people are like you're Canadian?! Really?! Like what do you mean I have my passport and birth certificate! [They're like] you didn't grow up in Canada cause you don't sound Canadian. You know? My voice is not Canadian.

"So, do you think it is just the voice or they have certain assumptions about a Canadian person?" I question.

"I think both. Because my last name is Scottish English something, so with that last name, how I look and how I sound confuses the hell out of people." Damian says and adds, "I read stuff and heard stuff about what your last name gets you and there is a lot of dynamics about it."

I lean forward and ask, "How does all this come into play when you travel internationally?"

Damian says: *"when I'm traveling in most cases I am a Canadian, because the passport gets me, plain and simple, the ability to freely move and you are viewed differently just being a Canadian."* He leans back and continues:

Ummm, you're from a place that's, you know, very, the society is very stable, a developed country, with not much security threats over here and for me I travel a lot between the States, the Caribbean, Canada. I haven't travelled to Europe or anything yet...

I nod and say, "I see. So, you think that when you're viewed as a Canadian, you are less of a threat to the..."

Damian finishes my sentence, *"Mainly to the United States. Because there are a lot of Trinidadians in the States. And a lot of Trinidadian doing good and bad and ugly in the States."*

Damian pauses for a second and adds:

Hmmmmmm....and it is true! And Trinidadians are different because they are everywhere and in every field. Whether they are first generation, second generation, sometimes even third but now recently there is a lot of travel between Trinidad and America, because Trinidad is based in the Caribbean, right by South America and it is the main transit point for everything drugs, human [trafficking], everything! It's getting ridiculous. So, now it is almost not as big as security threat internationally, but we're known! if you are Trinidadian and you go to America with a Trinidadian passport, you are known, for whatever reason. Like you may not be on the top of the list, but you are known. So, when I'm traveling, especially to the States, I am Canadian, because it is just easier, just makes my life easier. [W]ith the Canadian passport there is no question and you can go!

Damian looks me in the eye, narrows his eyes and adds:

There is another reason that I get it! People from the developing world will do whatever they want...and do all kinds of things to get to the developed world. So, this is just from my experience, you know whenever I am stopped [at the border], I'm worried because of my flight but not because of my security. But I could see the looks on some people's faces like they are like what's going to happen to them...and again I think it is a part of procedures and the protocols...like there were just chairs and no table or anything. But the border guys were all behind their desks and looking like happy and looking like there is not anything wrong. Try to do procedural things but they are also looking at us to see what expression they get from the people.

4.4.2 Gate Keepers

"I treat border security agents as gate keepers!" Damian takes a deep breath and continues:

Gate keepers most of the time need to hear certain things, if you get what I mean. So, I am not giving them things to allow them to..., um, so, when they ask [questions], I am just like that's where I live now, that's where my parents are, my dad works here, my dad has a job there and there will be like: okay! And I didn't seem to be lying and such and you can be on your way...but...so... but now as I've been here for 10 years and I've renewed my passport here. So, there is no question.

"You mean they don't ask you any of those questions anymore because you have renewed your passport here in Canada and not in St. Kitts?" I wonder.

Damian folds his arms and replies, "Getting to the whole dynamic of bordering patrol, the security agents, what they are, and what they are for, they are just doing their job, they are just doing their job." He puts more emphasis on the second sentence and continues:

It really is to figure out who you are within the 10 minutes period talk! And how you act and if you act in a certain way that shows the threat to them, to the security or to the country... that's how I see that. My parents always told me "don't mess with the people". So, they are doing their job. They need to hear certain things not that telling lies and whatever. This is what they want you to understand and this is what they want to know.

"So, you are cautious about the information you share with them." I say.

He nods and adds, "Yes...and that was mainly for U.S. borders. The Canadian border guys are not as bad as U.S. borders, Canadians are fine, but in the US you're really careful, especially since after 9/11, U.S. has become a little ridiculous." Damian continues:

So... I tell you about the one time I was flying... me being Canadian, coming back from U.S. I have friends and family and go down there two or three times a year, I was coming

back one time, I use my Canadian passport, and I am like I am coming from US, I went to New York and Miami to visit friends, I was visiting for this long.... She was listening to me and she is looking and she is like: "You are Canadian? Have you lived here your entire life?"... No she didn't say that. "Have you lived here your whole life?" I was like, eh ... this is new!

Damian giggles and continues:

She didn't seem too malicious and she was just like "you lived here all your life?" and I was like this is new because they don't usually do this. And I was like "well, No, I haven't lived here my entire life. I've only lived here like in the last decade cause I went to school and stuff". Then she got too much in the story and she was like yes because you don't sound like someone who lived here his entire life and I was like well, yeah!

I open my mouth but before I can say anything, he adds, "And this is back to my point of border security people doing their job. So, she was curious and not as ridiculous as the time when you enter the U.S. she was just kind of curious I would say." Damian believes he handled the situation very well:

So, if I started acting like "why you are asking me that etc.?"...Then she would be like "alright what are you hiding and stuff?"...but if I just be like "well, this is what happened" and give her the right story and then she judges my body language, it doesn't seem that he is lying to me, he is not being a threat, his credentials are fine and the story he has is a kind of story that is kinda in the system as well because I cross a lot so they could see but to me it was a little amusing because it had never happened before. Yeah, I was pleasantly surprised... cause I am not the kind of person who, um, I understand that they are doing their job.

"And you did not get offended by her comment?" I question.

Damian replies:

No, not really. Because as I said it could confuse some people. You know what I mean. So, when you first meet, and I have an accent like this that I don't really hear it.... [They're like] We're Canadian and you?! And now I have to explain.

"So, do you think like all Canadians have a certain accent?" I ask.

He thinks for a moment and says:

Hmm... typical... like someone who's lived here all their entire life... yes! Like who is born and raised here yes. But someone like me, an anomaly I guess, who has a dual living status, living half of my life somewhere else, especially in cases like crossing the border back into Canada, and again she didn't come across maliciously, she didn't seem to be...she was almost like "huh..."Whereas like, um, for me sometimes, as I grow older and understand it sometimes coming back, in most cases coming back in Canada, in the

border are like if you are Canadian they check your passport and you answer their questions and...and you are fine... she was one... and to me she was like... and I see it...I didn't take it personally, it's a power relationship.

4.4.3 They're just doing their job

In one of his trips to the United States, Damian bought a case of beer from duty free for his friend and declared it at the border on his way back to Canada:

So, while crossing, I was like I have a case of beer just to declare and I said it's for me, but I bought it for my friend. And [the border officer] was like very aggressive and she was like "you know that you cannot buy things to give it as gift!" so she was just like scolding me for saying that and I was like, "Oh okay! I am sorry, and it is my case of beer" and I didn't know how to respond to that. I don't know if she was having a bad day or she was just trying to do her job but today extreme...I didn't know what else to say and I am not in the mood to go through the process. But if you have to do your job, you have to do your job, it kinda just gets a little awkward! but she got angry and she kind of scolded me... and I was like okay! She treated me like if I was a kid and kind of just like you are not supposed to do this blah blah! I was like "alright, sorry! And what should I do now?" And that kind of look in my face she just looked at me and said "okay, have a good night! Go!" Like a hit or miss!

Damian rolls his eyes and says:

Well in the world today, post lovely 9/11, that everybody has suffered, security is first and they themselves are part of this ridiculous, a little bit ridiculous process in America! I look at [the border officials] like you know what...

He exhales deeply and continues, *"I don't have anything to hide! Maybe you choose to stop me, and it probably ends up being a waste of your time and that's the difference in me as well, I'm not someone to make a big fuss."* Damian points out that he is well travelled and has crossed the US-Canadian border from young age, so he knows *"they can dig and dig and dig, and there is nothing!"* He further adds, *"it's almost like if it happens to me, it happens! I can see how for others it might be a big deal but for me, it's not! I also know part of the ridiculousness that comes from post 9/11."*

I look him in the eye and ask, "But how does that make you feel each time they interrogate you at the border?"

Damian looks away and replies:

I've never thought of it. Because I know as an adult, um, I understand again the ridiculousness... and I also understand the plight of the people at the front line because I've worked in an industry, a front-line industry, at the end of the day they are doing

their job. Some might be worse than the others, you just hope that it doesn't happen to you, but they may also need to do it because they have hard data saying that okay... from certain countries...yes... it is sad because not everybody from certain countries are bad human beings, but It's a blanket for all! You know what I mean? If somebody is from a certain country, we have to do something, randomly checking or something. You know what I mean?

4.5 Jehan

Jehan is an Iranian-Canadian citizen who gained dual citizenship status in 2006. He is in his sixties and has been living in Canada for more than 20 years. We meet at his house in Waterloo for the interview.

4.5.1 The bottle of wine

Jehan was not used to travelling before getting his dual citizenship. However, he precisely remembers the first time he travelled abroad, *"My first trip outside of the country was to Syria in 1998 and I was very excited."* The next time he travels abroad was in 2001 when he travelled to Dubai with his family to have an interview at the Canadian embassy, *"Things happened on that trip that might sound funny! You know, because of certain restrictions after the revolution, when Iranians travel abroad, they buy alcohol or, women for instance, they remove their compulsory hijab right away."* He giggles and adds:

I, too, wanted to buy a bottle of wine and got a box of chocolate with that. I went to the cashier to pay. I called my wife's name and the cashier became hesitant and asked if we are Iranian and whether we are Muslim. I said yes and then he was like "we cannot sell wine to you then!" He took the bottle of wine back and I paid \$18 for the chocolate! I was like "No, I made a mistake, I'm Jewish! I'm not Muslim! I want my wine back!" but he would not listen.

Jehan laughs and says, *"but we never had any problems crossing the border. We travelled to Cuba as soon as we got our Canadian passports in 2005 and again no problem!"* Later that year, Jehan and his wife travelled to the United States to attend a conference on human rights:

Because of the theme of the conference, the officer went easy on us and I think because this has been reflected on our profiles, we were never questioned, stopped, or interviewed at the US border. Therefore, we have never been worried when crossing the US-Canada border.

4.5.2 Stressful leave

Jehan tells me what dual citizenship means to him:

As dual citizens, we become empty of ourselves. For example, we neither fully celebrate Christmas, nor Norouz [The Persian New Year]. This situation is imposed on us, there is no way out of it. The sense of belonging...My feeling towards Canada is different from any other country, but I do not belong %100 here. Same with Iran! I do not have that sense of belonging there either! That is not the country I used to know!

“So, how do you view yourself when you travel?” I ask.

“Well, I’m Canadian! And if there is any follow-up question, then I would say I’m originally Iranian, but I don’t want to be associated with Iran, so I would say I’m Canadian.” He pauses and then adds:

When you say you are Japanese for example, people would not have a negative feeling about you but when you say Iran, first of all, they mix it up with Iraq, they don’t even know if this country exists! They think we do not have clean water and we travel with camels and stuff. They forgot how developed Iran used to be! They immediately associate you with terrorism and extremism!

Jehan explains that his mom is sick back home and he visits him from time to time. However, visiting his home country has been a challenging experience for him:

Whenever I went for a visit, I thought I might have been in trouble because of my political stance or activism. I never experienced anything on my way in and I always used to think “I might be in trouble on my way out! Cause you never know!” Therefore, I was always very stressed when I was leaving!

“Have you ever experienced anything unpleasant when leaving Iran?” I inquire.

“No, nothing happened but I am always stressed until the very last minute!” He shakes his head and says:

One time my daughter and I were coming back to Canada together. We were waiting at the gate to get onboard when I heard my name being called over the airport PA system. I was like “that’s it! It’s over!” I even said goodbye to my daughter and asked her to leave without me because I had heard of some people who were arrested the very last minute. So, I went to the office they asked me to and the issue was with my Iranian passport! I renewed it last in Ottawa and the officer had forgot to sign my passport. I was kinda relieved that the issue was just the passport!

Jehan giggles and tells me about another stressful experience:

There was another time I visited my mother in Iran. I was alone on my way back and had checked in and dropped off my luggage. I was on my way to the security when I heard my name over the PA. Again, I was like, "This is it! It's over!" But it turned out that one of my cousins just wanted to see me off! So, that's why they called me over the PA! You know, I was feeling relieved and stressed at the same time!

"But you still visit despite the fact that you know there might be consequences?" I question.

"Absolutely! My mom is sick and has nobody around. I know I might be in trouble, but I definitely visit!" Jehan replies.

4.6 John

John is Canadian by birth and has gained his British citizenship a few years ago after living in the UK for almost 11 years. He is in his mid twenties. I interviewed him over Skype since he is living in the UK right now.

4.6.1 A very Arab name

John starts the conversation by saying *"I've never had [a negative border crossing experience] personally, no. I don't think I've ever had been pulled aside to be interrogated. I travelled with somebody who was once"* and the very first experience he shares is his border crossing experience from Vancouver to Mexico with his brother and a friend who held British passport and was of Iraqi descent:

[W]hen we came to Canadian-American border, the three of us got out of the car and walked through, went through the whole process and they asked me and my brother what is your name and show your passport and all, and that's it! And this friend of ours, even though he has a British passport, was stopped and you know questioned because of his name. His name was very Arab, and we were hanging out there for a good half an hour and waiting for him to come through and of course there was nothing wrong and it was just because of his name. We didn't have any other problems.

I wonder: "He was traveling with his British passport, but he was stopped at the border?"

John quickly adds: *"Yes, I mean he didn't have another passport. He has been British for the most of his life. But like I said it was his name that was Arab so... it rings bells or whatever!"*

He pauses for a second and then says: *"I don't think he had any particular issues because he was quite happy in London."*

4.6.2 Swiss Army knife

John articulates that he was stopped at the border for two times.

When I say, "But you said you did not have any negative experiences? John immediately says, "Yes, I have never been interrogated but I have been stopped briefly two times which is quite different from being interrogated."

His first experience goes back to when he was 14 or 15 years old and was travelling from the UK to Canada. John's family lived in Toronto at the time and he had a stop over in Ottawa before flying to Toronto. When he went through the customs to get onto his connecting flight, he was stopped:

...[T]hey saw the [Swiss Army knife] in my bag. [It] was a flip knife or whatever that when you press the button it sticks out and that the blade was about an inch long. A friend of mine had sold it to me and I thought it was a cool thing. [T]hey stopped me, and the first guy was really nice and was like, "Listen, you can have this, but I got to tell my boss." and the boss came and started to lay into me. I was just a kid you know, and it was probably one of the first flights that I was taking by myself and this guy was like "What are you doing with this knife? What are going to do with it?" And the thing was as blunt as a nail clipper! I said, "I don't know, and I'm going camping with it and I don't know what I'm going to do with it!" And he said, "you know it's like -20 outside and you cannot go camping!" and I was like oh... you know I just got nervous and I was like I don't care! Leave me alone... I just want to go! I was just thinking that my parents are going to be like "what the hell!"

"So, did they take it away from you?" I ask. John replies:

Yes! and they didn't give it back to me. As far as I know, the knife that I had was illegal in Canada. I don't even remember how it ended up in my bag. I didn't know it was a big problem. I didn't know anything about it to be fair.

"I see. How about the second time?" I question.

John used to live in Dubai for a few years and explains to me, the second time he was stopped at the border was when he had a connecting flight to Bahrain or Doha on his way to Toronto:

[S]o I got off and went through the border control there and before I went into the terminal building, they x-rayed my bag and there was a security guard sitting there taking my bag, opening my bag, and asking things. [H]e grabbed my bag and said, "what is this?" And I am like "it is a knife". And I completely forgot that I had it and he said, "Oh I don't know if you can take this." and I was like "Listen! I don't want you to take it away from me and is there any way that I can take it on with me?" And he said "um, where are you going?" And I said "London" and he said, No, there is no way and there is no way he can give it as if to say there is any other place that it would have been

fine, you know what I mean? He would have let me through, that would have been a relaxed security."

"So, you think he would have let you take it if you were going elsewhere?" I ask surprisingly.

John immediately replies, *"Yeah, the impression I had was that if I was going somewhere that the security might be a little bit less, then he would have been happy to let me through with it!"* He continues: *"[B]ecause I don't think that he believed that I am going to do something harmful with it. Like he just knew that London, just the way he shook his head is like, London! No way."*

John does not recall which year was this, but he assures me it was post 9/11 since, *"[I]t was one of those situations like you knew that the security in so many places was stronger at that point."* John finds it interesting that no one had realized he was travelling with the knife before his first flight:

[T]he crazy thing about the Abu Dhabi airport is that you go through x-ray scanner twice. I don't think it is the same anymore but when I was there and when I actually entered the airport to go through to the check-in, [I had] to pass through a security check. So, you can go in if you are not flying or if you've been dropped off by somebody, you can go through, but you have to be checked. So, they checked me twice!"

He laughs and adds:

[T]hey are more interested, I think, in stopping people going through than stopping particular things. Because once you passed border control, if you have a visa and you are meant to be in the country, then they'd just thought, "whatever this guy is, this guy is meant to be here." I don't think that I've ever... other than when I had the knife, I never was severely questioned about anything and I've had like before I had my two passports and... when I came into England and I had my visa, they used to ask more questions and try to find out more about me, but for me, nothing unusual, nothing severe, nothing because of I am being from somewhere else I don't think... and you know it might be a bit short sided of me, but I've never seen any difference, other than for example like the example I gave you, when I used to live in Abu Dhabi and it was like I was sort of the white guy! And I was fine to go. They don't really take much as notice of you at least going through the border.

4.6.3 Chalk marks

John shares what he has witnessed in UAE airports when he used to live there and had to make frequent international trips:

[T]hey used to do marks on the bags. So, you'd get your luggage at the carousel and have a little "X" or little mark on your bag. So, if you have that mark on your bag, they would pull you over. But then of course people figured out and started wiping the chalk

off! And as far as I know they switched it around and chalked the bags they didn't want to look at anymore. So, people started to wipe it all off and they stopped a bunch of people! [T]here was always these stories of what to do, what not to do, what they do, what they don't do, more than anything just to avoid hassle. But with border control in general, there was definitely more of a selective process as far as Westerners went and Asian perhaps...

I wonder, "By Westerners you mean...."

John cuts me off, "*white people!*" He coughs a few times and then continues:

I mean there were even things like if you are not white, but you are a Westerner, like African-Americans or things like that. Okay I shouldn't say that because there weren't a lot of African-Americans but if somebody say...like if you were an Indian-Canadian because, there are a lot of Indian and Pakistanis working in UAE, they sometimes had troubles because even if they had a, I don't know... whatever passport, an Indian passport, they would have a little more trouble than others, it wasn't often. It was more passport, um, they go by look first, you know when you see somebody you look at how they look before you find out who they are.

We are both quiet until John breaks the silence:

When I lived in the UK back in the day, I had the visa from my father, because I was so minor at that time all the way until the end. And again, that was the case of... my dad would have gone straight away and probably didn't have to wait up in line. Where these guys actually had to wait and get everything checked before they go through.

"And why do you think that is?" I question.

In reply, he says:

I think maybe... I mean these guys, their job is to judge you, to look at you and pick you out. I've might been lucky, but I've been travelling before I can even remember. So, I think a little part of it is the way that I go through and obviously I have nothing to hide and I've never done anything wrong and I go through border situations very confidently and you know when they ask questions, I have an answer because I am not trying to hide anything. My answers are always the truth and are always direct and when they see that I'm not trying to hide anything or try not to do anything wrong, I don't want to say they give up, but they kinda let it go and say "okay! Cool, done! You're fine."

"I see." I nod and say.

4.6.4 At the Colombo airport

“I told you earlier that there were couple of times I had a different experience, say because I’m a white person, and one of them was in Sri Lanka that I was encouraged to bribe people for certain things.” John asserts and further explains his experience at the Colombo airport:

[I]n Colombo airport you have to pay to get a ticket to get inside the airport. The ticket is like a dollar or something like that, like it’s really nothing. The reason for this is to stop random people entering the airport and hanging around at the airport. So, if you have a reason to be in the airport you can go in. And I went to the guard at the front who is checking these tickets and I said, “where do I get this pass?” And he said “the office is down there but if you put 200 Rupees in your passport, you don’t have to get the ticket.” The thing was what he was asking for was the exact same price as the ticket, so he was just basically trying to take the money for himself, rather than for the airport to take the money.

“And what did you do?” I curiously ask.

“I gave him the 200 Rupee.” John responds and continues:

It’s one of those situations and in a lot of these countries...it’s tough because everywhere you look, in some places, everywhere you look there is corruption and bribery and whatever else like that and in some cases if you look at the normal flow of how things meant to be, say I give the money to the airport and the airport then pays the people and people stay in their jobs and whatever else, you also have this feeling that these guys don’t get their fair share of their wages... And I certainly was a good target for him. There was no doubt that I was a tourist and that I wasn’t gonna be like a police officer who’s gonna crack down the bribe or corruption. So, I think I was a more obvious target for.

4.7 Maya

Maya is an Egyptian-Canadian citizen. She was born in Egypt and immigrated to Canada with her husband and children in 2002 and have been living in Canada since. Maya is in her late forties. I met Maya in her house in Waterloo for the interview.

4.7.1 Countries with the question mark

Maya remembers a time when her husband and children crossed the border to the US with their Canadian passports and she was traveling with an American visa on her Egyptian passport and it took them quite a while before they get cleared and could cross the border.

“So, despite the fact that you were the only one without the Canadian passport in the car, they asked all of you to get out of the car and collected all your passports?” I ask.

Maya nods and says:

It was easy. It wasn't an unpleasant situation or experience. It just took a while, like 45 minutes or an hour because there was a bunch of people upstairs and they wanted to take their turns so there was nothing unpleasant and they weren't treating us in a bad manner or anything like that. It was just you would be waiting there, not knowing why you are waiting. So, when you are crossing the border they would ask you about your nationality so after you answer they would say okay you need to pull over, they take the passport, and somebody would come and walk you inside the building. You go to the second floor and they ask you to wait and then you would wait...and wait till somebody just calls your name and asks you to come in...

“So, you had to give biometrics, right?” I ask.

“Yes! However onetime, my dad was with me and he is above 70 so they didn't ask him questions or get his biometrics.” Maya pauses for a second and adds, *“because of his age probably, and he is such a nice spirit.”*

Maya believes she has never had any negative experiences crossing international borders and mentions she only has *“one significant story”*. Maya's family and two other family friends decided to cross the border to the States over one weekend to go shopping and come back to Canada:

[W]e were crossing the border and [the border officers] asked where are you going? So, we said we are going shopping because really we didn't have any plans. And then they asked how long are you going to stay and we said for few hours. They asked usual questions and we answered everything and we were very honest especially my husband. [H]e was very straight and honest and he gave maybe too much information that you don't really have to give! So, we crossed the border and then we decided to...[pause] yeah there was kind of a park there and I don't recall if it was my husband or the other [friend of ours] that mentioned there was a nice lake or a place that we can just go and, you know, my kids were very young and we thought that they can have fun. And it was an area away from the shopping center so if we're driving this way, we couldn't be actually going to stores or shopping malls and everything was in [the] opposite direction. So, we said okay, let's just go there and then go shopping and maybe have a bite and then go back home. So, we went to this place and we were just like parked our car and went outside and we're having fun and playing with the kids and flying a kite and just basically having fun! And then we realized police officers were coming and they stopped there and asked us what are we doing?

“Were they same officers from the border?” I inquire.

"I can't remember their faces. Most likely... I can't recall...that was 2003 so we are talking about 15 years ago!" Maya replies and adds, "And then they asked what we were doing? So, we said we are just at the park! They said yeah but when you were at the border you said specifically that you're coming to the US to do shopping!"

"Does that mean that they were....?" I whisper.

Maya doesn't let me finish my sentence: *"I have no idea! It is a very small town. And then I had no idea that like flying a kite was something!"* She laughs and then quickly adds:

You couldn't really say they were talking in a bad way or there was something unpleasant, but it was just an awkward feeling! Like "WHAT?!" and my husband said what's the problem of deciding to just stop and have a little fun here and they were like nothing but because you were very specific... and I think my husband even said the name of the store, and the guy said you seem to be very specific knowing where you are going, and you completely changed so we were concerned about you and if anything went wrong... you know they were very nice and pleasant. And we were like if something went wrong we would call for help or call 911. And because of other people and their nationality...maybe... I can't recall...do I have to say their nationality?

"It's totally up to you." I shake my head.

Maya looks away and says, *"From countries with the question mark! Maybe that's why."*

Her answer makes me curious to know which countries she is referring to. "Can you name the countries?" I ask hesitantly.

Maya picks the teapot up to pour herself more tea, and says: *"Umm... I think one was from Palestine and one from Algeria. So, there was maybe issue with Palestine. I don't know... everything went okay, but I really didn't buy that they were concerned about us. But it went okay."* She pours more tea for herself and then continues:

[E]verything went okay but at the beginning we took it like why are you suspecting us but when you think about it and the way you handled it and the way they were talking to us, it just went lightly.

Maya looks at the teapot she is still holding in her hand and puts it away.

4.7.2 I am who I am!

Maya uses her Canadian passport to leave Canada and her Egyptian passport to enter Egypt.

"How, do you think, border officers read you in Egypt or other international borders?" I question.

"I am who I am! I mean a document in your hand doesn't change who you are. So, you are who you are." Maya replies.

"So, how do you think they perceive you?" I ask Maya.

"Oh! As not looking Canadian and having a Canadian passport?!" she answers immediately.

I pause for a moment and ask, "So, how do you think you look Canadian?"

Maya looks me in the eye and explains:

I[[f somebody looks at me, they assume I am kind of Mediterranean and non-white and that might be an assumption, but again I am who I am, and I don't think a document or a title changes who you are!

"So, you think people do not read you as a Canadian? Is that what you're saying?"

Maya raises her shoulders and says:

It never occurred to me and I honestly don't care what they think or what they perceive me as, but I care about who I think I am. This is what really matters to me. But it never occurred to me really if I am standing and carrying the Canadian passport and the person who is in charge... like it never happened to me and I am who I am. This is what matters!

I nod a few times and question, "What is it like to travel back to Egypt for you?"

Maya smiles and says:

You know travelling with kids is always easier, easier to get your boarding pass and stuff! When people find a woman travelling with two kids on her own, they always try to be helpful. and I am always smiling, and I am always nice to people when they are asking me questions. I am not on my phone or talking to others in Arabic, you know by your body language and your gesture [they] can predict who you are. You could seem worried or not comfortable or arrogant if you are talking to them in an arrogant way or you are not giving them enough attention. When I am going home I am always emotional. So, maybe they feel that I am emotional.

Maya thinks to herself for a few seconds and adds, *"Well, I'm sure there are lots of stories, but I personally never went through any difficulties, um, nothing unusual happened."*

I sip on my tea and ask, "How do you mean? Have you seen other people experiencing things that you have not?"

Maya nods and continues:

Yeah, like people being questioned why they're coming in... some airports are not as easy as other airports, I find Heathrow airport a little bit...umm...not difficult but the way they

check the luggage, the way they question... a friend of mine told me that – and maybe she exaggerated – but she said she witnessed at Heathrow airport that they opened the telephone book of somebody asking him who are these people. That’s what she told me but again I don’t know. Stuff like that happens, but I am sure there is a reason for them to do it not just randomly and sometimes it gives a little bit of assurance for the people that it’s safety measures, so some people may get upset when they are over asked or over checked and would take it personally that you look like a criminal or like not a very safe person and that there is something against you. However, when you think about that, um, and they are doing their job and they are making sure that it’s a safe space unless they are being too much on you, or asking questions that are not related to you, you know. It is just to make sure that the borders are safe, the countries are safe, the airports are safe.

“Ok, how do you think they are deciding who to stop if they are not doing it randomly?” I wonder.

She replies:

Names. Some names are like the name of a person who should be questioned. By checking your date of birth for example, and it might take quite a while to make sure you are not that person. So, that’s one thing that you can’t complain about if you carry a name [of] a person who must be stopped and questioned.

I smile and nod a few times.

4.7.3 Just be professional!

During our conversation, Maya explains to me that assuming my border crossing experience would be different from a white Canadian woman or man is “going to be all predictions”. She further clarifies:

[B]ecause my reflection without thinking about it would be like “of course yes!” but then when I question myself why of course?! I don’t know what they are looking for... is it the look? Is it the reason you are passing? What’s their priority list? I have no idea what they are looking for.

“Let me give you an example!” Maya narrows her eyes and continues:

So, a white Canadian who doesn’t have enough reason to go to the U.S. like doesn’t have a hotel reservation and the look is like there is something wrong about them, compared to me, a non-white that [has] confirmation of a hotel or going to a tournament or whatever the reason is and I am not white, um, I think I carry more, um, not credit but I should be...or they would actually let me in before this person, but again it could be assumptions or it could be reality...I don’t really know... I don’t want to say yes for sure, it

might... because we hear stories about things going on in the world but unless it happens to me personally, that me and another white person going through the same procedure or going through the same lane and this person doesn't have enough documents and passing and I have everything, I cannot say yes for sure unless it happens to me.

I nod.

Maya takes her glasses off and starts cleaning them with a piece of cloth, then says, “*Because of all the stories you hear, and again how much of it you believe, because media can just take any situation and project it or present it as racism, but it wouldn't be.*” She pauses.

I'm thinking of a way to better frame my question, “Do you think there will be any difference if you and I cross the border, as opposed to white Canadian women or men?” I curiously ask.

Maya twists her lips and replies:

[...] I would not really confirm or talk about it except it happened to me personally, because the person could be talking to the officer in a nasty way or the way they look. There are things such as my body language and the way I approach and look at the officer, it might actually... I might be starting something that the officer just picks on me. Border people are very professional and very well trained that they can read you. They just need to make sure that this person who is crossing the border is clear and is not going to effect this country so that's the relation between me and this person. Nothing against me or him personally. So, this minute must be as professional and as clear as possible. And that's my approach and I think this reflects on me, this is what I am doing, this is where I am going, this is what I have, and I was never stopped for a second assessment. I was never stopped for another question or I never said something that was not right. I never tried to hide anything. Some people are not very, well, not friendly but I am not expecting them to be joking and laughing and my experience was that they've been always professional. So, I would not try to joke or make it like a fun time because the situation is just me crossing there. And that's it.

She holds her glasses up in her hands, looks at them carefully before putting them back on and adds:

Just to be professional! that's what I do. I mean this person is sitting there for six, seven hours and has been seeing thousands of travellers, some with fake stories, some with undocumented papers, and they're doing their job and want to make sure that they support their borders and... it is not the time to joke and you know to waste their time and to waste my time. Just be professional and be as clear and as transparent as possible. Do not tolerate anything that you should not tolerate. Like they should respect me the same way I am already respecting them. If I am not getting this back, I do not think I should tolerate it because...

“What can one do, do you think, if they are being treated poorly?” I tilt my head and ask.

Maya crosses her arms on the table and says:

Well it never happened to me, but I assume I can just explain to them like listen I am talking to you in a very polite, professional way! My documents are correct and there is nothing wrong with me. Just speak to them the way I am speaking to you now, professionally, slowly without yelling or pointing at them. if this person continues talking to me this way, I would ask him to escalate somebody higher to him maybe... I don't know the rules and the regulations, but me as a passenger I have the right to ask for their supervisors! I don't know. I would just try to use my senses like is there something that's suspicious? Or is there something that happened in a specific country [over the] last days that their measures are a little bit higher? Does this person look really tired and it is the end of the shift?

4.8 Naomi

Naomi was born in Iran. She is in her late twenties and became an Iranian-Canadian dual citizen in 2006. She moved to Canada with her parents and sister in 2003 and has been living in Canada ever since. I interviewed Naomi in her house in Waterloo.

4.8.1 Freedom

Naomi never has her Iranian passport when she travels. She only uses her Iranian passport for travelling to Iran because as an Iranian she has to enter the country with her Iranian passport. Naomi tells me that despite the fact Iranians do not need visas to enter Turkey, she used her Canadian passport and paid \$75 dollars to get the visa.

When I ask her why she made that decision, she laughs and says *"I don't know! This is just how I decided to do it! You know, when I think about being a Canadian citizen, the first thing comes to my mind is one word: Freedom!"*

I nod, "Ok, and is that because of your passport?"

Naomi immediately responds:

Oh of course! The only reason I have been able to travel to so many places in this world is my Canadian passport! And then it is that I can be a citizen in this country that can make a change. I can make my voice be heard! This is so important for me! This would not necessarily happen to me if I migrated to Europe!"

She then tells me her border crossing experiences have been positive for the most part:

My border crossing experiences have been positive. There was only one time that we were stopped at the US border. We went to New York with my sister and two of our friends, one of them is Filipino and the other one is half Canadian and half black. The officer got suspicious and stopped us. We pulled over and they went through our car and trunk. Of course, my friend, the one that is half black, got terrified because of an experience she had prior to this trip. She was cycling on the street and the police stopped her because they thought she has passed the red light whereas she passed at the yellow light. She got handcuffed and beaten by the police and she was very traumatized because of this experience. So, she was very scared, and I think that was the main reason why we were stopped.

Naomi believes people do not seem to be worried or stressed at the borders in general, “*When I am at the borders, I look at people around me and it’s like they are waiting in line at the grocery store, so calm!*”

“I see. So, you don’t think people are worried to be stopped at the borders?” I ask.

She thinks to herself for a few seconds and says:

I don’t think there is any special reason behind why they stop people. My interpretation is that they are all ordinary people like you and me and the officers pick them randomly. I think it’s random. I think if they stop you once, they will likely stop you again.

“Hmmm, why do you think that is?” I question.

Naomi narrows her eyes and replies:

I think media manipulates the truth and it affects the perception of the officers at the border. If you do not educate yourself, you will easily get into the media’s trap. For example, Donald Trump! If you do not know anything about Muslims and hear the things he says, you would believe his non-sense! My sister once went to New York on a bus with schoolmates and she was so worried that they would stop the whole bus because of her and she was so panicked. Of course, nothing happened, and she was not stopped but she was so very worried.

“Was she worried to be stopped because she is a visible minority, or she is Iranian?” I question.

Naomi plays with her fingers and says:

Because she is Iranian! You know, I don’t even remember how many Iranian terrorists were involved in any of the terrorist attacks worldwide. However, I think it is the relationship between Iran and the US that affects how we, as Iranians, are viewed at the borders. You know, axis of evil and stuff like that!

She pauses and smiles, “*But, I’m less stressed compared to others when travel and cross borders. And you know, I think it is easier to cross borders as a woman.*”

“Interesting! How so?” I question.

She laughs and says:

Well, one of my friend’s sisters was stopped once at the US border for some reason and from then on, she had to get her fingerprints taken whenever she travelled to the US. There was this one time that she flirted with the officer and the officer apparently liked her. He told her there is something on your profile and I’m going to remove it so you won’t need to have your fingerprints taken. And she was never stopped after that! Being a girl and flirting with the officer benefited her!

She clears her throat and then says:

Now, back to my own border crossing experience, there were only a handful of times where I did not feel comfortable. I went to Jamaica a few years ago for volunteering and they were going to pick me up from the airport. I was stopped and asked me for the address I am going to stay at and I said, “I don’t know!”. So, they took me to a room at the back and I was so scared! I was like I’m going to die in Jamaica and no one would know where I am, and I might be sent to jail! They were so nice but the things you hear about burglary and gangs and stuff shape your understanding of the country! Interestingly, I had the same feeling when I visited Iran! I only visited once and leaving was such a stressful experience for me because I knew if something happens there would be more serious consequences compared to when something happens here.

“hmmm, interesting!” I say.

Naomi nods a few times.

4.9 Nina

Nina was born in the Philippines. She is a Chinese-Filipino-Canadian woman who moved to Canada in 2010 and became a dual citizen in 2014. Nina has been living in Canada for the past seven years. She is in her late forties. I meet with Nina at a café in midtown Toronto.

4.9.1 They are better than us!

Nina starts the conversation by saying that the Philippines recognizes dual citizenship. She giggles and adds: *“The reason they allow dual citizenship is the politicians who have dual citizenship and US passport, because otherwise they have to give one up. US passport is one of the most common among the politicians.”*

Nina stirs her coffee with the spoon and says, *“The only advantage [of the Filipino passport] is if you are staying more than a month you should use that. Because if you’re staying for more than*

a month and use your Canadian passport, you have to pay something.” She looks up, “And I always enter with my Canadian passport. I would look like a tourist! But obviously they know I am Filipino, so they won’t ask me those stupid questions they normally ask foreigners!” Nina laughs aloud.

I nod. She smiles with face and eyes, *“The moment I start speaking in Filipino they already know I’m Filipino. I mean there is no advantage to use either [passports]. It’s more the status of having that passport. Because in the Philippines they treat foreigners better.”*

“Who do you mean by foreigners?” I curiously ask.

Nina immediately says:

The Western people. We treat them better! But even though they know I am Filipino, the moment that they find out that I have a Canadian passport, they treat me differently. I cannot describe how differently but they do... because even without speaking, I can pretend I am a foreigner. And I don’t really dress like I am from mainland China, so I can pretend that I am a foreigner who lives in the US or, um, without speaking!

Nina leans forward, *“Let me give you an example to make it more clear!”* Then she narrows her eyes and starts telling me about what she calls *“the washroom experience”*:

If I go to the washroom in the Philippines, in the airport, they would immediately assume I’m a foreigner, because there are some attendants inside the washrooms, so this one I experienced personally. I went to the washroom and pretended to be a foreigner and I didn’t talk. They were so polite to me. They gave me the towel and then immediately I spoke Filipino. And then they said “Oh, you are Filipino!” And then just ignored me! I’m not saying all Filipinos are like that. But in general, we really look high on foreigners. I don’t know if it is about the dollars they bring or... I think it is just the colonial mentality, we’ve been colonized by Spain and then US and even Japan. And it is like we think they are better than us. It is such a colonial mentality.

Nina slumps her shoulders and continues:

Just wanted to experience it! I was waiting for my bag, I was like let’s do it! It is always like that. They just treat foreigners higher than us. Our politeness, our courtesy is always related to who we are talking to. That’s how it is in my country! If you speak straight English, or even if you have accent, they would think that you’ve lived in the US for a long time, just pretend that you don’t live in Philippines and they listen to you more, but if you start speaking in Filipino they are not going to pay attention, regardless of you being nice. It is sad, but it is how it is.

She sighs.

4.9.2 Modern heroes

“There is also another reason for why I use my Canadian passport in the Philippines.” Nina says and places her chin on her hands, *“One of the biggest revenues of the country is the [from] Overseas Filipino Workers – OFWs. They send two billion US dollar every month!....Two billion every month!”* She reiterates and continues, *“Because it is a culture in my country to support your family. OFWs...they are kind of respected, they are called the ‘modern heroes’ just to roughly translate it. They are the saviours of the country!”* She crosses her arms and adds:

So, if you are an OFW you are kinda special, you are treated differently from a local, differently in terms of, um [...] that’s different, you know? We appreciate you, something like that. If you are an OFW, it means you have a work permit. Some people, like me for example, they could have gotten the citizenship already, so they don’t need that document. In the [officer’s] mind, the moment you are a Filipino but holding a different passport, or if you still hold the Filipino passport with the work permit, or holding another country’s passport, automatically we would think you are an OFW. Because automatically their mindset is you are in another country working and sending money. So, it’s like we are very grateful to you. That’s how you’ll be treated as opposed to a foreigner who’s blonde, an actual foreigner. For us, it is because we know you’re really smart and you’re prettier than us. You know what I mean? It’s a totally different kind of treatment but it’s definitely much better than if you are a local, like an ordinary citizen.

Based on this conversation I have with Nina, I realized she never carries her Filipino passport on her even when she travels to the Philippines. Therefore, I ask, “what does your Filipino passport mean to you?”

She giggles and says, *“I couldn’t even think of one advantage of having Filipino passport! The only advantage of that passport is to own property to go the Philippines for more than a month. On my end, for me, both are not applicable.”* Nina pauses for a few second, took a sip from her cup of tea, and continues:

when people ask me why you want a Filipino passport, I say just Nostalgia! And my brother would always tell me there is nothing to lose! I know it’s a dumb answer, but it is just nostalgia. I think it is the only thing that I have which is Filipino.

Nina smirks and says:

So, I guess my conclusion is that Filipino passport is now becoming an accessory! Because as I’ve explained to you during the whole time, you can see the difference of having a non-Filipino passport compared to a Filipino passport.

4.10 Rosa

Rosa was born in Iran. She and her husband moved to Canada in 1996 and became Canadian citizens in 1998. She has been living in Canada for more than 20 years. Rosa is in her early fifties. I meet her in a café in Kitchener.

4.10.1 (Un)Welcoming Neighbour

Rosa leans forward and looks at me with her deep green eyes and tells me about the first time she crossed the Canada-US border after September 11th 2001, *“For Christmas – in 2002 – we decided to go to New York for a few days. I’m trying to remember the name of the place....hmmm”* She pauses for a moment and continues *“Anyways...So, we go through there [the Canada-US border] naturally, very casually like always. That was the first time when we got to the border they asked us have we been anywhere recently.”*

Rosa’s husband was at the US on 9/11 and she was in Iran with the boys: *“when he asked us that question, I suddenly thought so if these dots get connected you can make a story from it. And he did. The officer exactly did that! He said, ‘Okay, go to the customs!’”*

That was the first time ever Rosa and her family went inside the customs building, *“Yeah, it was four months after 9/11 and everybody was very tense, still. Very tense! But we did not realize this until we got to the Buffalo border. We were not thinking about it at all!”* She repeats:

Very tense! I remember that it was at least five or six other couples there. We were the only family...I mean, with the kids. But it was different cultural backgrounds, because I can see that they are talking [in] their own language. Basically, it was all non--, hmmm, I mean non.....”

Rosa pauses for a few seconds when she gets here.

I tilt my head and curiously ask, *“You mean....you mean non-white people??”*

She sips on her coffee and nods, *“Yes, non-white people, or non-American people! Yes! People not from the North America.”* She makes herself comfortable in her seat and continues:

Anyways, so we went there, very casually, we were with our kids. And we were sitting down there. The officer in the window got our passports, so we sit there. Somebody came and said, ‘You’re here, blah, blah, blah, just give us your names.’ I said, ‘ok, here you go!’ And they were like ‘Okay, sit.’ And we did! We sat there, I think, for around four hours!

I look her in the eye and ask: *“And nobody...?”*

She quickly completes my sentence, *“Approached us?! No! No one! I mean to say why we were here with two kids? No! My younger one was about 16-17 months and my older son was around*

four.” She takes a deep breath and tells me they could use the washroom and also get some snacks from the car for the kids during the four hour wait. However, she lost her patience and approached the officers after four hours:

I went to the counter and said ‘Okay! If you don’t have anything against us, let us go back!’ and I really didn’t want to go any further. I was like ‘I want to go back home, I don’t want this experience and I don’t want to go.’

Rosa raises her soft voice a little bit and continues:

One of the girls [officers] that’s sitting back there without-- she didn’t stand over or anything just said ‘We are processing you!’ I asked ‘What kind of processing?’ and she quickly replied ‘Oh we are sending documents back and forth with the government.’ ‘Which government’ I asked, ‘Canadian government’ she said. Because we were going with Canadian passports, right?

“Right!” I say.

“So, I said ‘What do you want to know from the Canadian Embassy or Canadian government?’ And that’s something between the countries - two countries.” Rosa sighs and adds, “All this time she was sitting in the back, didn’t stand up or come forward. Just raising her voice for me to hear. It was after an hour or so that they approached us and gave our passports back.”

I can hear the rage in Rosa’s voice as she continues:

They said, ‘Oh, you’re okay to go, but you have to report and say we are going home now when you come back.’ So, that was just the weekend trip and we had to report that we are passing the border, we are leaving the American soil.

“So, we had to do that!” She restates and pauses for a few moments, then furiously says “Okay! That’s okay! I was so angry! I was so mad! I just grabbed my kids and we walked out the door!” She tries to smile but the smile on her face fades within a few seconds, “So we spent five hours there without any reason why we are there or explaining or saying Sorry that you are just sitting there watching us for no reason!”

She puts her arms on the table and leans more towards me and says, *“The thing that made me - - I don’t wanna say angry, but angry was the way they were looking at us and trying to ignore us completely like you are not there! Coming, going, sitting, joking, eating, having coffee.”* Staring at her plate continues, *“So, we knew it was just two or four of them there, we knew they were waiting for something. But they never approached us to tell us ‘Okay! We are doing this process. We are waiting”* Rosa looks back at me and frowns:

They saw that I had two small little kids. I didn’t like it! We went to Buffalo, had lunch, and went back to Canada! We didn’t go any further! When we were coming just after a couple of hours. The officer said there, he says, ‘Okay, you just went and came back?!’ That’s suspicious!”

I tilt my head to the left and ask, "Oh, did he say that's suspicious?!"

She shakes her head and disagrees with me: "No, no! I mean the feeling. The feeling! I got the impression that he was suspicious because we were going back." And continues:

I think the procedure was done in that other building on the opposite side. So, they sent us there. One of the officers asked why we were coming back so quickly, and I said 'Because of your behaviour! You were before, you were a neighbour to me! A good neighbour! I felt that I'm going from home to somewhere close to enjoy my trip, enjoy whatever you had. We were there zillion times! We went to New York just for a weekend to go to a Broadway show. But now I don't feel like it anymore! I don't feel that you respect my family that much. You didn't respect my time and you just are looking at me and you could ignore me!' The guy just looked at me! And, um, they were not friendly at all! They were not happy even to talk to me, so they just wanted to get rid of me. That was my feeling!

"So, was that the first time you experienced that feeling at the US border?" I asked her.

"Oh yes! I feel they didn't like us there! I felt that they feel that we are not welcome there! But I felt that....that was the first time I felt that I am not welcome to the United States." She replies. We both sit in silence for a few seconds before Rosa says:

I don't blame them that much....at that time, um, I mean I would have been okay to stay there for five hours if they were friendlier, if they acknowledged us, came to us and offered something to the kids, you know.... I don't totally understand them. But if the first officer even told us to go into the building, asking us a few more questions, like where are you going? What's the destination? How many times you were in the United States? Because every time we go, it's a Canadian passport, they didn't used to put any stamps on it. So, they don't know how many times we were there. It was just few more questions to not categorize us in a category, a category that we don't belong to!

I try to comprehend what Rosa tries to say. She moves both of her hands in the air and resumes, "If it was like that, logically I understand. So, something big happened in my country, and two foreign people, one from Iran, one from the United States at the same time, they get there. Logically, I get it." She stops and looks at me.

"So, you don't think-- you don't think you were viewed as Canadian citizens?" I ask.

She promptly responds:

No, no, no! And because in your passport it actually says--where you were born, they knew that. But it was me passing their border, at least I can say-- at least, maybe 10 times, 12 times before, and always greeted -- being friendly. And I had the same passport with the same place of birth. You know what I mean? [pause] Logically, I know the way that they were thinking, and I give them a little credit. The only thing that I

hated was the way that they....I mean, um, their attitude! I categorize myself as a very fair person, and I didn't really think that it should happen to me if the first officer would ask me a few more questions.

Rosa puts her right hand on her cheek and says:

He [the guy at the border] just looked at us. Not even a word! Nothing! A blank face with no emotion. It seems to him that I say 'blah, blah, blah, blah, blah!' And then he got my passport and that was the first time we saw the stamp of the United State in our passports. I always... when I pass the border, after all these years, when we pass the border I still remember that day and I still feel sad even when nothing is happening. It's a beautiful country [the US] with so many different places and we're enjoying it. But every time we pass the border, I still remember that officer's face with that group of people. Whenever we pass Buffalo, I always look at that building. It brings me sadness, that's all.

I nod.

Rosa leans back, *"For two years, I couldn't go. Seriously. For two years, I didn't, I mean I didn't want to."*

4.10.2 Canadians! Real Canadians!

Rosa sits back with arms crossed over her chest and says, *"After that, everything is back to normal. We're going, coming back, we never ever had any other incidents. Not in airport, and not at the border."* She cheers up and includes, *"It's funny! Last year we went to Maine with some friends. It's a beautiful place! We stayed one night in Montreal and then passed the border from there. We didn't go through the regular, formal big border passing."* Rosa laughs when she gets to here, *"We went through somewhere that....it was one of those wooden things [gates] that comes down. It was so beautiful. The officer came and made it to go up and we passed."*

"Interesting! I have never heard of anything like that!" I say surprisingly.

Rosa shakes her head and adds:

Me, neither! But I was so calm. I mean just worried that my friend is waiting outside. When you feel they do it to secure you, to protect you, I totally understand! Do it! you want to open it, open it but don't break it! Open it zillion times! [laughs]

Rosa laughs and says she feels more confident nowadays to cross any international border:

I will be more prepared now, I know after 15 minutes I should go and ask them what's happening. I can handle that. I will offer them more information. I'll go and ask what do you want to know? Ask me!

She also adds, *“I will not be...it’s not something to irritate me anymore, I know, because I feel that this is for my own good. I totally get it and I respect it. They’re doing that for me, Right?”* Rosa pauses and looks at me.

I ask, *“Is that for your own good or....?”*

Rosa jumps in before I can finish my sentence:

Let’s put it this way! It’s a positive thing, it is good for all of us! If I ever pass the Buffalo border and they say go to the building, or ask me more questions, I definitely would do it willingly, because I know that they were trying to protect me. I understand. It’s a crazy world now [pauses] You don’t know what will happen the next morning or the next day.

She pauses for a few seconds and continues, *“But as I said, it’s a sad memory. And whenever we pass that building, it feels sad. But now I feel that, okay, I understand it more and more every time we go. But still, it’s [the feeling] there.”*

I nod and say *“I understand! This is how you felt.”*

Rosa smiles and goes on:

You know if I feel they are doing that to make the trip safer for me, yes. Same thing when I go to Europe, I don’t know if you were in Europe recently, they have a very, very tight security, especially in France.

Rosa explains to me that she was in Paris after the first attack in November 2015 and she had to go through multiple security checkpoints:

I bought a bottle of ice wine for a friend that I was visiting, and every time they opened the damn thing, I’m sorry! [laughs] – I bought it from the Pearson Airport duty free – and they opened the seal every time! They open the seal, check the wine, seal it again. Then you go 200 meters, again they open. I think they checked it at least four times!

“I see! Do the security or immigration officers see you as an Iranian or a Canadian woman when you travel?” I ask Rosa.

She responds quickly, *“I am Canadian!”*

I nod and say *“Ok, what are the characteristic of a Canadian in your point of view?”*

She sits up straight and replies, *“The most important thing is, honestly, so I feel that the Canadian people that I deal with....because now we have different category of Canadians.”*

“Different categories!” I think to myself. I sip on my cold coffee and ask, *“Could you further explain what you mean by this?”*

She clears her throat, *“Okay. So, this is all my feeling, my point of view, right?”*

I agree with her “Of course.”

She exhales heavily and says:

Okay. I love to live in Waterloo because of many reasons, the first one is because I feel that, still, I'm living and working among more real Canadians. The place that I work, the patients that I deal with, they are all-- I feel that they are still Canadian compared to Toronto, basically.

Rosa changes the topic of conversation, “Do you want me to tell you about our experience of crossing border when we visited Iran?”

“Sure!” I reply.

“We just actually had very good experiences with the border there. Even the guy, had a little bit of crush on me [laughs].”

She giggles and adds:

And my husband was standing behind me, so it was funny! It was a very, very nice welcome! A very nice welcome! My kids, especially my older one, are a little taller than me – even six years ago he was taller than me. And he was just joking with him and telling me that “You are a good little sister” It was so fun! It was so sweet! So, sweet!

“Interesting!” I say.

Rosa continues “*Being a lady makes it definitely easier, girl [laughs]! We always joke with my husband. Even when we are together and roll the window down to talk to the officer, the first thing they look at is me!*” Rosa laughs.

“Oh, is it?!” I ask surprisingly.

Rosa nods and says:

They do! He gives [them] the passport and the first thing the officers do is just coming down, looking at me, saying hi. I'm a very cheerful person. I start talking and smiling. I'm a very positive person, so that's the first thing. That's the first impression, It's me.

She clears her throat and adds:

Same thing in Europe. We were in Italy last year and there were two lines. My husband decided to go to one and I went to the other. The boys decided to go to other lines. As I said, we travel a lot, so they know how to deal with the officers. Ryan went to Germany by himself when he was 13. So, it's funny that we approached the officers all at the same time...

“Were they both male officers?” I ask.

“Yes! That’s actually a very good point!” Rosa replies and continues, “So, we are both there at the same time. I gave my passport, he looked at me, welcomed me to Rome and I passed. He passed almost a minute or two later because they were questioning him! There you go!” Rosa laughs aloud.

She also shares her experience of coming back to Canada from Iran. A law was put into place the week before their departure and according to that they needed to pay some fees before leaving the country. Therefore, Rosa’s husband went to the bank in the airport to pay:

He [The immigration officer] came to my husband and said: “No, no! You don't need to pay. Come back. Because you entered before that, so it’s okay.” So, that was very nice! Very sweet! Because he could ignore that and let my husband go and pay for the four of us! So, it was very, very sweet. No, no! No bad experiences!

4.11 Sam

Sam was born in Iran and became a dual citizen in 2015. He has lived in Canada for about seven years. At the time of the interview, he was planning to move to Los Angeles, CA in a few months. He was in his early thirties and I interviewed him over the phone.

4.11.1 The colour of your passport and the colour of your hair

The first thing that comes to Sam’s mind when he thinks about border crossings is how one is being viewed at the border:

[Border officials] actually look differently at people with different citizenships. The first thing they get your passport and if the country that you come from, or you have been the citizen of... if they don’t have [a] good relationship with, you are getting into trouble... They don’t know you, but they know your government and that’s why they judge you I think, based on your government. And when they see, for example, that you are Iranian, they think that you are an Iranian who supports the government...

“So, you think that you are being prejudged?” I ask.

“Yes. It is the colour of your passport, and also the colour of your hair.” Says Sam and adds:

But after I got my Canadian citizenship for sure there is still that part of the prejudgement that I don’t have native accent and they find out that “okay, he is not native Canadian” and for sure there are many Canadians who are not native Canadian, and from your passport they realize that for example you were born in Tehran. And they

can find out like what your origin is. So that made it different again even though I've had a dual citizenship.

“Native Canadian? Who do you consider to be a native Canadian?” I question.

Sam thinks to himself for a moment and replies: *“Well, native Canadians are the ones that were born in Canada, their previous generations also lived in the country and the parents were there.”*

I think he is referring to Indigenous peoples but soon after, he says:

Well, the immigrants they always keep the culture for like two generations and after couple of generations then I would count them like as a Native. Because then they would have the same culture as the native Canadians who were born there... like they have the same sort of fun and going to same sort of sport events, so their culture is more similar to a native Canadian you cannot really distinguish them from native Canadians whose parents were born in Canada.

The term ‘native Canadian’ confuses me. Sam further clarifies what he means by native Canadians:

They could be white or, um, if you're a native speaker, then you know the culture and can easily hang out with them. If you hold a Canadian citizenship and your culture is different from a Native Canadian, that's problematic.

Now I realize he uses ‘native Canadians’ to refer to white residents of Canada. Sam exhales heavily and adds:

They don't really accept you in their country and in their community. So, [at] the border, it is the same scenario. Like you may have one officer whose parents are not U.S. Citizens and one that is Native American. They might have different perspective and now they must deal with the person who wants to cross the border. So, for example, if I go to an officer who has black hair, I will be less nervous because I think like okay he can understand. I mean because they have no idea that who could be a terrorist. For example, anyone with hijab...they think that she might be a terrorist, but the point is you can't judge someone upon their appearance. But they don't have that in their mind and I think when they see you as an Iranian, that comes to their minds you know.

“Hmmm, you think this is how the border people perceive us?” I ask Sam.

He replies:

I think for men it is worse. Because the ones who are involved in terrorist attacks are men with black hair. so... there are more questions about the men than women and from my experiences with my wife crossing the borders, it's easier for her. She has a Canadian

passport but doesn't have any of the questionable features...And I definitely expect to answer more questions than her.

Sam replies, and quickly adds, *“Well, I mean the black hair is one thing, and the Middle Eastern man, um, like the colour of your skin, that's another thing. I mean all the features that can distinguish you from Americans at the border.”*

None of us says a word for a few seconds before Sam breaks the silence:

I crossed the Canada-US border with my Canadian passport and it was ok, of course it could be better and easier, but I think now after all these terrorist attacks all over the world they're more cautious. It doesn't matter what passport you have. There is something about you and your purpose.

I think to myself that I have seen Sam's profile picture on Facebook when he messaged me to let me know he is interested to be my participant and I am quite sure he, himself has black hair.

4.12 Summary

This chapter presented the results of the narrative analysis and the analysis of narratives and illustrated the co-constructed narratives of each participant's stories. As I intended to centre the voices of participants and found the language and word choices to be important, I utilized a conversational narrative approach to better show the complexity of each narrative. The narratives illustrated the inequalities in border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens at the intersection of race, gender, and class. In the next chapter, the themes that arose from the analysis of these narratives will be presented and each will be explained thoroughly.

Vignette 5 - A café somewhere in Canada

10 March 2017 – 10:35 AM

Thank God it is not crowded yet. I need to sit down and get a few things done before picking Ali up. I should be focused – No distractions! Ok, a cup of Earl Gray tea and a glass of water with no ice is all I need right now. I look around to find an empty corner seat. I hate to sit in the middle of a café, I feel secure in the corner seats. There it is. Awesome! I put my coat on the chair to save the seat and come back with a mug in one hand and a glass of water in the other. What a cozy spot! I open my laptop and start writing. I write and write. People come and go. None of us are bothering each other, just exchanging smiles every now and then. My phone is vibrating on the table. I take the call and talk to my friend for a few minutes – But not in English, In Farsi. Meanwhile, a guy walks in and sits right in front of my table. I make sure to lower my voice. The guy is tall and is wearing a hoodie. He gets a book out of his backpack and starts reading. He lowers his head and starts reading. I notice all this as I am talking on my cell phone. I say bye and hang up. I'm back to work. The guy with the hoodie is exhaling loudly. I'm deep into reading something but I can feel the warmth of his look on my face. I try to ignore him and not to look back. He leans forward on his table towards me. Maybe he has a question or something. I look back at him. He is staring at me with his big green eyes. Wait! He is holding a book. "See this book!?" He angrily mumbles. I take a peek at the blue cover and quickly look away. I could not read the whole title, but I don't want to look back again! He repeats "Do you see this book, ha?!" I gaze at the screen of my laptop and pretend that I have not heard him. He is still mumbling but I cannot hear him anymore. The Espresso machine is louder than his voice. I put my left hand on my chin and decide to look at the cover one more time to see all the words and

read the exact name of the book. But he gets up before I move my head and I get scared! He grabs his laptop, walks out of the café, and slams the door. I am so angry at myself, I should have said something! Pathetic! I should have said "I sure can. So, what?!" I am so mad at myself! I go to the Amazon website and type in the words I saw on the blue cover of the book: Radicalism, Islam, Terrorism.

5.0 Discussion

In this chapter, I discuss my interpretation of the narratives presented in the previous chapter. I situate my interpretation of the data within the broader literature to provide answers to the research questions as well as to contribute to tourism scholarship and mobilities research. The following themes and sub themes arose from this analysis process: The first theme is ‘surveillance, dataveillance, and the discourse of security’ followed by a sub theme which is ‘embodying the panopticon’. The next theme is ‘hierarchies’ which consists of two sub themes, ‘hierarchical citizenship’ and ‘hierarchical mobilities’. The last theme is ‘bodies and borders’ through which I discuss the following sub themes: ‘risky bodies and nobodies’ and ‘embodying fear at borders’.

Table 2 illustrates how themes and sub-themes that emerged from the process of data analysis are connected to the participants’ narratives.

Table 2. Themes, sub-themes, and narratives

Themes	Sub-Themes	Narratives
Surveillance, dataveillance, and the discourse of security	Embodying the panopticon	-They’re doing their job -Gate keepers -Like cows in a slaughter house
Hierarchies	Hierarchical citizenship	-Canadian! Real Canadians! -Countries with the question mark -My voice is not Canadian -Canadian passport as a white flag -Russian face -Insurgent citizen and the dynamics of authority
		-Just be professional! -Swiss Army knife

	Hierarchical mobilities	-Modern heroes -I am who I am! -A very Arab name -The “special room”
Bodies and borders	Risky bodies and nobodies	-The colour of your passport and the colour of your hair -They’re better than us! -At the Colombo airport -I am not a threat! -We’re just nobodies!
	Embodying fears and borders	-Freedom -Stressful leave -Embodying fear

5.1 Surveillance, Dataveillance, and the Discourse of Security

When describing their border crossing experiences, some participants explained that they feel surveilled when they cross international borders and elaborated on how they regulate their behaviour and actions based on what they assume the border officers would like to see. Since September 11, 2001, mobilities have become increasingly under surveillance in the name of security and safety. Moreover, surveillance itself has become mobile (Germann Molz, 2006). Elaborating on the mobile surveillance regime, Lyon (2003) contended that, “Modern surveillance was from the earliest days a means of keeping tabs on the mobile but today surveillance itself is part of the flow” (p. 3). This new surveillance regime is functioning based on Foucault’s redeployment of Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon model (1962). Foucault viewed the panopticon as an appropriate model to illustrate the ways modern nation states utilized technologies and systems of surveillance to exercise power and control over populations. The panopticon model fully exposed individuals and made them visible to a regulatory gaze, so the nation state could regulate and control individuals and force them to internalize the institutional gaze and discipline (Green, 2002). Thus, gathering information about individuals’

actions, behaviours, bodies, and identities became a useful means through which individuals themselves engage in self-discipline while nation states' practices of surveillance become normalized. As Ribas-Mateos (2015) made clear, "The concept [...] refers, on the one hand, to allowing somebody to observe (optic) and, on the other, for all (pan) the prisoners to be observed without them knowing, thus establishing a type of omnipresent control" (p. 84).

Surveillance technologies are moving towards exclusionary rather than inclusive practices (Wilson & Weber, 2008), thus perpetuating injustices in terms of freedom of movement. Zureik and Hindle (2004) contended that surveillance and control at borders target marginalized groups and sometimes surveillance criminalises the surveilled and creates an environment that reinforces suspicion, denounces innocent individuals, and might persecute those affected by it (McCahill & Norris, 2003). The creation of this environment was frequently described by participants. For example, during our interview, Lutfiya constantly felt surveilled and "under the threat all the time" each time she traveled to Israel and believes she is perceived as a threat to them which makes her feel unsafe: "[T]hey all think that you're about to first of all blow up their plane."

Clarke (1988; 2003) coined the term 'dataveillance', which refers to "the technology and databases that are used to store, verify, and retrieve relevant data about individuals and their everyday lives. Therefore, the individuals are targeted and made visible through digitised traces of movements" (Germann Molz, 2006, p. 380). Conversations with study participants underscore this experience of being targeted. For instance, Lutfiya shared the type of questions she received at the Israeli border about both her religiosity and her teenage brother. Rosa felt targeted the first time she wanted to travel to the United States after 9/11.

Surveillance and dataveillance practices are fundamental components of exclusionary processes. Surveillance data are used for social sorting, in which less privileged populations are disproportionately stigmatized, discriminated against or excluded. It is important to note that it is not always the nation states and institutions that surveil individuals, but “[...] populations are ‘surveilling’ themselves and each other through new, mobile technologies in the course of intimate and interpersonal everyday relations” (Green, 2002, p. 33). This form of surveillance generates a form of power/knowledge practised between people in their everyday use of communication technologies (Germann Molz, 2006, p. 381). This was evident in the conversations I had with my participants. For instance, Maya had a different perspective on surveillance and control at borders. She believed there is always a reason behind why people are under surveillance or are stopped at the borders and denoted securitization, surveillance, and the security approach to mobilities at the borders are necessary to protect the bodies that cross the border.

Ladson-Billings (1998) noted that individuals who belong to minority groups in a society, tend to associate themselves with the stereotypes that are constructed and imposed on them. This was obvious as my participants reflected on their own experiences or as they shared assumptions about what others were going through. For instance, Damian noted that Trinidadians are known in the US because of the “good, bad, and the ugly” things they do in that country. Therefore, he does not blame the border officers if they suspect Trinidadians. Naomi’s experience of border crossing from Canada to the US with her sister and friends also speaks to this as she assumed the border officer stopped them because of her non-white friend. Sam mentioned that terrorists are male with black hair and that is why he might be

stopped and further interrogated at borders. Nina does not want to be viewed as a Filipino, instead she wants to be perceived as a “foreigner” at the Philippines airport because foreigners get more respect and are treated better. In further elaborating on what she meant by a foreigner, Nina stated, “[...] a foreigner who’s blonde, an actual foreigner. For us, it is because we know you’re really smart and you’re prettier than us.”

Considering the notion of “docile bodies” (Foucault, 1979, p. 138), Rygiel (2010) argued that once individuals or groups are under surveillance, they come to internalize the disciplinary gaze and regulate their own behaviour and turn themselves into docile bodies. This speaks to what Maya shared about being “professional” when crossing borders. Damian also noted that he treats border officers as “gate keepers”:

Gate keepers most of the time need to hear certain things, if you get what I mean. So, I am not giving them things to allow them to..., um, so, when they ask [questions], I am just like that’s where I live now, that’s where my parents are, my dad works here, my dad has a job there and there will be like: okay! [...] and such and you can be on your way.

In addition to feeling under surveillance and control, participants noted more specifically how they have embodied surveillance at their border crossing experiences. In the next section, I further elaborate on this issue.

5.1.1 Embodying the Panopticon

When elaborating on how they felt surveilled, participants explained how they embodied the physical space of the airports or checkpoints in their border crossing experiences.

As Adey (2009) argued, “The airport and the process of air travel have almost always been associated with a regressive dehumanisation, although these have normally been reserved for petty class differences, resentments, and minor discomfort” (p. 283). Airports as well as other points of entry are sites of surveillance that allow the eligible and desirable travellers to cross the border while filtering the ineligible and undesirable ones (Lyon, 2003). Racial (and risk) profiling, considering members of certain populations as dangerous or risky, and judging them for the sake of national security is questionable since it results in dehumanization of those populations (Butler, 2004). As is illustrated below, study participants described how they embodied the space at their border crossings.

While Foucault has raised awareness about bodies and the importance of the relations of knowledge and power, he also drew our attention to the centrality of space as a political and analytical issue (Rabinow, 2003). When it comes to the airport spaces, Walters (2002) and Lyon (2004) contended that airports resemble camps and as Lutfiya expressed, she embodied the Tel Aviv airport as “a very clinical, cold, very scary experience” and acknowledged that the “special room” where people are waiting to be questioned by the border officers is physically different from the rest of the Tel Aviv airport. Physical structure and size and familiarity of the airport space also played an important role in how Anne embodied different airports.

When it comes to border crossing, individuals are not always treated as people. Instead, they are being treated as another form of luggage to be transported, inspected, and moved. Sophia raised this issue when she described the checkpoint she crossed and noted it was like an airport because of the high security measures that were in place. In Sophia’s point of view, checkpoints resemble fish bowls and she feels the “total powerlessness” whenever she crosses

the checkpoints. Furthermore, she referred to the border space as a “slaughterhouse”. Sophia’s explanation clearly speaks to the surveillance at the Israeli checkpoints that functions as a Foucauldian panopticon. From what Lutfiya shared, the dynamics of border control and surveillance in Israel is thought provoking as if you are being surveilled even before landing on the Israeli soil:

when you fly to Israel, once you enter Israeli air space you can’t get up! You’re not allowed to stand up on the plane! Sometimes they don’t let you open or close your windows. Really strange rules over Israeli air space that I’ve never experienced in another flight. Really bizarre. Meal, everything stops then. It’s really over the top and I don’t know how that would help.

Surveillance at airports has become key in categorizing travellers (Salter, 2003). Categorizing and sorting practices at international airports adopt risk profiles to constantly differentiate and target ‘suspect’ and risky travellers based on their nationality and religion, thus generating inequality (Wonders, 2006). Damian portrayed airports as places that clearly exhibit power imbalance as well as spaces in which only some constantly feel under surveillance and control.

Like checkpoints and other points of entry, airports are surveillance spaces that only allow the movement of some. Thus, the security and surveillance at borders lead to ‘social sorting’ (Lyon, 2003). Again, the notion of panopticon is helpful in this regard. As Ribas-Mateos (2015) made clear, panopticon “[...] refers, on the one hand, to allowing somebody to observe (optic) and, on the other, for all (pan) the prisoners to be observed without them knowing, thus establishing a type of omnipresent control” (p. 84). In line with Adey (2009), I argue that the

control of airport mobilities could also be symbolized as a shift from the 'pan-opticon' to the 'ban-opticon'. Control has become ban-opticon in the sense that such regulations are not necessarily disciplinary and are more associated with control and risk management (Bigo, 2002). Ban-opticon "[...] excludes certain groups in the name of their future potential behaviour (profiling) and [...] normalizes the non-excluded through its production of normative imperatives, the most important of which is free movement" (Bigo, 2008, p. 35). As MacDonald and Hunter (2013) made clear, the ban-opticon functions through allowing the free movement of 'normal' populations within and across borders; while restricting the movement of those identified as 'risky' or posing a 'threat' to society, often being categorized along a continuum that runs from 'immigrant' to 'terrorist'.

The shift of mobilities from pan-opticon to ban-opticon leads to social sorting. Therefore, borders should be seen simultaneously as points of inclusion and exclusion. In the next section, I elaborate on the notions of hierarchical citizenship and hierarchical mobilities.

5.2 Hierarchies

As stated earlier, Germann Molz (2006) argued that hierarchical models of state-controlled surveillance are largely based on the notion of panopticon described by Foucault (1979). In this section, I further elaborate on the notion of hierarchical citizenship and the notion of insurgent citizen. Moreover, I discuss the hierarchical mobilities and that dual citizenship does not necessarily ease the access to international travel but might complicate the process instead.

5.2.1. Hierarchical citizenship

Participants noted how their physical appearance strengthens one of their citizenships over the other when it comes to crossing international borders. In addition, some participants mentioned they were deprived of their citizenship rights despite the fact that they are legal citizens. Moreover, participants' experiences revealed that dual citizenship is a form of hierarchical citizenship that only some can benefit from whereas others cannot.

The rise of the citizen as a national figure was associated with the emergence of the tourist, the wanderer and still today "the citizen continues to be twinned with threatening other." (Creswell, 2013, p. 88). Therefore, there is a binary of citizen and other within the notion of othering. While citizenship seeks to regulate and police certain bodies:

[I]t constructs some identities as being authentic citizen subjects and others as being non-citizen subjects. Thus, in developing a view of citizenship as government, a key area upon which to reflect is the emerging citizenship identities and political subjectivities that are made possible by and through a globalizing regime of governing mobility.

(Rygiel, 2010, p. 37)

Creswell (2013) argued that insurgent citizens are legally citizens but are not treated as such and are deprived of their rights. On the same note, Khosravi (2007) indicated the complexity of his own citizenship status as a Middle Eastern person who is also an EU citizen, "My legal status as an EU citizen is situational, conditional and unconfirmed. I am a quasi-citizen whose rights can be suspended in the state of emergency. I am included and at the same time excluded" (p. 332). Participants in this study shared similar reflections. For instance, Rosa's first border crossing experience to the US after 9/11 speaks to this issue where, for the first time,

she was treated as an insurgent citizen. Lutfiya's detention at the Israeli border despite her American-Canadian citizenship illustrates the complexity of her dual citizenship status since she is not viewed as an American or a Canadian at the Israeli border. Instead, Lutfiya's physical appearance is more powerful than her American or Canadian documentations.

Daynes and Lee (2008) contended that racial hierarchies are forced upon the members of marginalized communities and labels them as outsiders and problem citizens. Moreover, border crossers are increasingly seen as "people who are a problem" (Joly, Kelly, & Nettleton, 1997, p. 35). Lutfiya's experience of detention speaks to this issue as she was treated differently than 'ordinary' American citizens because of her Palestinian heritage, religion, and political activism.

When crossing international borders, Sam is treated as an Iranian citizen rather than Canadian. Sam's racial difference weakens his national identity and instead makes him recognized by his racialized body (Bhandar, 2008) and his physical appearance. In other words, Sam's racial difference strengthens his Iranian citizenship over his Canadian citizenship.

Nina uses her Canadian passport to visit the Philippines as it grants her a higher status:

[E]ven though they know I am Filipino, the moment that they find out that I have a Canadian passport, they treat me differently [...] I don't really dress like I am from mainland China, so I can pretend that I am a foreigner who lives in the US or, um, without speaking!

Elaborating on the citizenship and rights, Ranciere (2004) mentioned that the moment individuals are detained or denied entry because they are seen as a threat is also the moment that they undermine the power of the established system and practice of citizenship by

claiming rights that they do not actually have. This is obvious in Lutfiya's attempts to try to use the power of her American citizenship once again to enter Israel. Based on her documentation, she has the 'right' as an American or Canadian citizen to enter Israel, but she could not benefit from either of her passports. Lutfiya believed that the notion of Canadian citizenship is still associated with whiteness, therefore she is not a 'real' Canadian. What Lutfiya mentioned in terms of hierarchy of Canadian citizenship is also evident in how Sophia pictured her Canadian citizenship, "[I]n Canada, I am white enough that people don't know that I'm an immigrant most of the time." Therefore, she can benefit from the privilege of being a white Canadian citizen. Although Sophia is a Canadian citizen, she does not see herself as one. Instead, she views herself as an immigrant of a "far lower economic class" that has access to fewer opportunities. Sophia's perception speaks to the hierarchy of citizenship and access, which denotes that some citizens are higher in the hierarchies of class and as such may have easier access to enjoy spaces than other citizens (Adey, 2017). To further clarify how racial hierarchies are connected to power, Foucault is helpful:

The discourse of race struggle will be recentered and will become the discourse of power itself. It will become the discourse of a centered, centralized, and centralizing power. It will become the discourse of a battle that has to be waged not between races, but by a race that is portrayed as the one true race, the race that holds power and is entitled to define the norm, and against those who deviate from that norm, against those who pose a threat to the biological heritage. (Foucault, 2003, p. 61)

In line with what Foucault explained in terms of the "race that holds power", being a white Western European citizen gives Anne the power to encounter the officers at the borders in

Europe. Anne's Dutch citizenship brings her a higher status in terms of class, and she is well aware of the privilege. However, when it comes to border crossing in the United States, Anne views herself as being lower than the American officers, or at least she pretends to be lower in the hierarchy of citizenship. Therefore, she is less confident and more submissive when crossing the US border in North America.

Anne's experience of crossing the border from Romania to Moldova also demonstrates the hierarchy of citizenship that exists among the citizens of different countries in the European Union. She perceived herself as being welcomed by the officers at the Moldova border. Anne acknowledged that her Dutch passport and whiteness are playing a crucial role in this encounter. Nevertheless, her Romanian friends were not treated the same and viewed themselves as "nobodies". Her experiences remind us that border crossing is an ontological experience and that identities are not only constructed at the borders and the time of border crossings but are reshaped and reconstructed beyond and within borders (Bhandar, 2008).

Now that I explained the hierarchy of citizenship when it comes to crossing international borders, in the next section I delve more deeply into how the hierarchies at borders are shaped by mobilities.

5.2.2 Hierarchical mobilities

Some participants indicated that dual citizenship and possessing two passports eased access to international travel and provided them with the opportunity to be freely mobile. However, and as noted above, not all participants could benefit from their dual citizenship

status since their mobilities were perceived to be unwanted. Rushdie (2003) has portrayed the border control and what an unwanted citizen might go through at border crossings:

At the frontier we can't avoid the truth; the comforting layers of the quotidian, which insulate us against the world's harsher realities, are stripped away, and wide-eyed in the harsh fluorescent light of the frontier's windowless halls, we see things as they are. The frontier is the physical proof of the human race's divided self, the proof that Merlin's utopian sky-vision is a lie. Here is the truth: This line, at which we must stand until we are allowed to walk across and give our papers to be examined by an officer who is entitled to ask us more or less anything.

(p. 412)

As Rygiel (2010) argued, "Border controls are not just totalizing but also highly individualizing, ensuring that individuals adapt their behaviour, mannerisms, speech, and dress in order to fit in with what is constructed as desirable citizen populations" (p. 134). Nation states regulate their cross-border movements by controlling mobilities, which turns borders into boundaries of inclusion as much as they can be boundaries of exclusion (Sofield, 2006).

As Creswell (2013) argued, the concept of freedom of movement presumes that a normal, abled body has the means and access to the resources to be freely mobile. As he further contended, mobility of the citizen (i.e. wanted mobility) is constructed in relation to the (im)mobilities that are other (i.e. unwanted mobility). Despite holding a Canadian passport, Rosa was stopped, racially profiled, and treated poorly when she crossed the Canadian border to the United States after 9/11, "It was just few more questions to not categorize us in a category, a category that we don't belong to!". Rosa could benefit from her Canadian passport

only to some extent; to the point that her trips to the United States were wanted mobilities prior to 9/11. Lutfiya's detention is another example of unwanted mobilities where her dual citizenship status could not grant her access to visiting Palestine.

Sophia holds an Israeli and a Canadian passport and while is "at the top of the totem pole of rocks", she feels powerless whenever crossing checkpoints in Israel. However, she also admits that if she did not have the Canadian passport, she would not be able to do her job and have access to certain geographical areas.

For Damian, his Canadian passport, brings him the "ability" to access the freedom of movement. He acknowledged that his Trinidadian heritage might sometimes come first when he wants to cross borders especially at the Canada-US border. However, he can benefit from the freedom of movement the Canadian passport brings him and is perceived differently by the border officers when he presents it. Maya also mentioned that her Canadian passport is giving her the privilege to access travel and freedom of movement. Although she is non-white, Maya believed she can benefit from her Canadian passport regardless of how she looks. However, she recognised that she might be read as "Mediterranean and non-white and that might be an assumption".

Hierarchical citizenship and hierarchical mobilities illustrate that access to freedom of movement and international travel is only available to some dual citizens whereas others cannot easily access them. Body is playing an important role in this regard. Therefore, it is crucial to note how different bodies (i.e. risky/non-risky) experience border crossings. In the next section, I elaborate on bodies and borders and discuss borders are outlined on human bodies.

5.3 Bodies and Borders

Conversations with participants revealed that their bodies and physical features are crucial to border crossing experiences. Borders do not only exist in physical territories; they also suffuse “the social body and can pop up at any point where a linguistic, ethnic, or cultural division occurs. The enemy or foreigner is no longer simply on the other side of a fence or wall but circulates among the people” (Nail, 2016, p. 145). In this section, I further elaborate on the notion of risky bodies and that borders are sketched on human bodies.

5.3.1. Risky bodies and nobodies

As described above in some depth, participants noted that their physical appearance has played a significant role in their border crossing experiences. Moreover, their experiences revealed how the notion of risk is connected to the physical features of bodies that cross borders. Chattapodhyay (2018) argued that borders seem to be conceptual lines on a map or structures that appeared as an effort to access the resources in colonized lands, but more than anything they are lines written on human bodies. On the same note, Muller (2010) denoted:

Unlike conventional notions of citizenship that evolve over time and rely on dynamic notions of rights and responsibilities over time, the biometric body never decays, changes or alters but simply lingers in the database, like some boxed cyborg citizen. The risk assessment is ubiquitous, and the border is (in) your body. (p. 95)

Lutfiya evidently experienced this each time she crossed the Israeli border. She has been the cyborg citizen and her body was no longer a holder of rights. Chattapodhyay (2018) further contended that “bodies carry borders” (p. 2). The assignation of risk profiles to bodies at

borders occur based on race, gender, class, religion, etc. Sam perceives his body as a threat regardless of the border he crosses internationally. Exclusion is fundamental to bordering. The notion of exclusion together with risk management and biometric technologies, generate strategies of “preemptive immobilization” (Wilson & Weber, 2008, p. 127) that target certain categories of travellers.

Surveillance technologies develop categories of risk (O’Malley, 2006) and these risk profiles are constructed based on the information about suspect travellers. However, these aggregate techniques of exclusion convey little relationship to “objective” measures of individual risk (Wilson & Weber, 2008, p. 127).

Borders function based on a very powerful interlocking system of control and bordering at checkpoints to harass, organize, incarcerate, detain, and deport. In this sense, physical boundaries enforce a global apartheid, while conceptual borders separate us (Walia 2013). The border ritual reproduces the meaning and order of the state system. It is “a secular and modern sort of divine sanctity with its own rite of sacrifice” (Khosravi, 2007, p. 330) that perpetuates the unbalanced power. Border crossing is an act of performance that challenges and reinforces the political and social status of the bodies that cross borders. Moreover, body performance is central to the border ritual. Anne’s border crossing experiences speak to the notion of body performance and its importance when it comes to border rituals.

In line with Wilson and Weber (2008), I argue that the surveillance regime is an integral part of the punitive system that filters individuals based on the categories of high risk and low risk at the borders. For instance, Lutfiya was perceived as a risky body and was therefore detained at the Israeli border. She was labeled as a threat to the Israel security because of her

Palestinian heritage as well as her physical appearance. Unlike Lutfiya's border crossing experience, when Anne travelled to Russia, she was not perceived as a risky body, "they did not perceive Canadians to [be] threatening at all! We were with a Christian organization". In Anne's opinion, her nationality (Canadian) and religion (Christianity) made her a low risk traveller at the border.

On the same note, Damian believed Canadians are not seen as a threat or risky bodies. However, he acknowledged that his Scottish last name, along with his Canadian passport, and his physical appearance as a Trinidadian confuses people including border officials in a sense that he does not belong to the low-risk category nor can he fit in the high-risk category. Therefore, if Damian travels to the US with his Trinidadian passport, he might be considered a body that needs to be known or measured in order to be controlled at the borders (Epstein, 2007).

Risk profiling systems are constructed based on exclusion and low-risk bodies are the ones with higher economic status, that are often white and male, whose mobilities is encouraged (Rygiel, 2010). Despite holding a British passport, John's friend was stopped and interrogated for half an hour at the US border because, in John's view, his name "was very Arab". Therefore, he was perceived as a risk although he was a British citizen. John himself was never stopped at the borders to be further questioned or interrogated because "[he] was sort of the white guy! And was fine to go". John's experience of travelling with his Swiss Army knife and his encounter with the border officer speaks to how white and male bodies might be viewed as less risky, in surveillance spaces such as airports, even though they possess items that could compromise safety and security at those spaces. John's border crossing experiences

denote that bordering is a “selective process” that benefits the white bodies. Unlike John, Lutfiya had been questioned several times and the questions perpetuated the assumption that she is a risky body.

International control and mobility management of bodies at borders occurs based on dualities such as normal/risky (Salter, 2006), productive/destructive (Epstein, 2007), wanted/unwanted (Creswell, 2013). This is the point where the body is scrutinized and marked as either productive and normal and can pass or the destructive or risky and is stopped for further interrogation. When stopped at the Canada-US border, Naomi associated her half black friend with threat and viewed her as a risky body, whereas she perceived herself and her sister to be low-risk individuals.

Biometric technologies are not neutral forms and discriminate based on race, gender, class, religion, and so on to construct risky bodies (Rygiel, 2010). It is important to note how different individuals internalise the evaluations that are imposed on them at borders. This speaks to the notion of borders written on and into bodies. What follows is a number of examples that reflect this internalisation. Reflecting on an instance at the airport in Germany, Anne noted that the officer at the border did not even check her passport. She believed the way she looks plays an important part in that experience as the officer just needed to look at her eyes. Anne’s words elucidated that “a young white woman” is not perceived as a threat, “whereas they’re always checking other people”. However, the way she elaborated on her experience was different and she connected it to being truthful which implies other people who are nervous at checkpoints or borders are not truthful and that is why they get into trouble.

Similarly, John believed the reason behind why he has never been stopped at borders is his “honesty” and that he has “nothing to hide” and goes through the borders confidently because even if he is questioned, his answers are “truth and direct” since he is “not trying to hide anything or try not to do anything wrong”. Anne and John both recognized the difference in how the border officials treated them. They both consider themselves as low-risk bodies because of their trustworthiness. Based on this perception, they associate risky bodies with dishonesty and therefore put the blame on the individuals. This speaks to the internalisation of the bodies and how bodies carry borders and that risk profiles are assigned on the basis on race, gender, and class. However, they also acknowledge that whiteness is not perceived as a threat and that is part of the reason they are not being stopped and interrogated. Based on Bhandar’s (2008) discussion, this example makes it obvious that border crossing is a “racialised ontological practice” (p. 405) through which individuals are subject to classification and interrogation based on their ontological status.

Sam, one of the Iranian-Canadian participants, indicated that black hair and hijab are two main things that are perceived to be threats. More specifically, in his perspective, being a Middle Eastern man, having black hair and dark skin are characteristics that are perceived to be a threat and distinguishes the individual from others. Sam himself is a Middle Eastern man with black hair and, to some extent, he perceived himself as a threat. What is compelling is how Sam has internalised the discrimination and puts the blame on himself. In this regard, the degree of closeness or distance of an individual “from the ideal white standards” (Ong, 1996, p. 742) play an integral role in excluding individuals and viewing citizens as risky or non-risky. Through using this ‘white standard’, citizens are hierarchically categorized. This is linked to the notion of ‘good

citizenship' discussed by Ong (1990). Sam does his best to regulate his behaviour as he has internalised the gaze (Rygiel, 2010) and consider himself a risky body. Unlike Sam, Maya has not internalised this and sees herself as a low risk body. However, she believed it was the ontological status of their friends that made the officers suspicious. Mobility of Maya's friends was 'unwanted' (Creswell, 2013) as border authorities divide people into desirable/non-desirable groups and regulate their movement accordingly (Rygiel, 2010). Moreover, Fassin (2001) argued that otherness occurred due to the construction of inferior races.

Conversations with participants underscored the objectification of bodies at borders. Lutfiya mentioned going through "processing stages" a number of times which speaks to what Epstein (2007) referred to as reducing individuals to "object[s] of knowledge" at the borders. In addition, when Rosa and her family crossed the Canada-US border for the first time after 9/11 they were stopped and told that they are being "processed". The "processing" Lutfiya and Rosa referred to speaks to what Walters (2002) called the objectification of travellers and reminds us that the mobility regime is not about people but about objectifying the bodies.

5.3.2 Embodying fear at borders

Securitization is reliant on a circulation of fear that exhibits through new border procedures and forms of detainment and control (Bhandar, 2008). Embodying fear is connected to the notion of risk and risky bodies that cross borders. When participants described how and when they embodied fear, gender and physical appearance were key in shaping their experiences.

As Stasiulis and Ross (2006) argued, growing terrorisation and fear of Muslim and Arab dual citizens post 9/11 has led to self-regulation. Lutfiya feels scared whenever she travels to Israel on a plane. She feels that nobody would help her if something were to happen. Her religious and physical appearance as well as her gender play a vital role in her fear of travelling with Israelis on the plane.

Koskela (2012) contended that, "The operation of surveillance is [...] full of male assumptions and assorted gendered dynamics. Focusing on gender relations negotiated under surveillance also helps us come to terms with other forms of power and exclusion" (p. 49). Gender is constantly negotiated and performed (McGrath, 2004) and intersects with marginalization and the act of gathering information. Disciplinary power and control are not only associated with gender but with the intersections of class and race (Koskela, 2012). As a woman, Sophia feels vulnerable whenever she crosses the checkpoints in Israel. She indicated that some of her female colleagues take advantage of their gender and flirt with the soldiers to get through the checkpoints whereas she sees her gender as something that makes her more vulnerable and exposed than privileged in that space. In addition to feeling defenceless at the checkpoints, she embodied fear at the Frankfurt airport since that was the first time she heard the German language outside of the context of a movie about Holocaust.

Securitization is partly dependent on a distribution of terror that is evident at borders in forms of control and discipline and this form of fear is "ontologized" (Bhandar, 2008) in a sense that the ontological quality of the individual is being questioned, which leads to categorization, control, and surveillance. Zureik and Hindle (2004) also argued that today terrorism is no longer only identified based on understanding the context of action but is associated with profiling and

segregating certain groups or individuals based on their race, nationality, and origin. In the context of border crossing, borders are spaces of cultural encounter with the 'other' (Rovisco, 2010).

5.4 Summary

In this chapter, I elaborated on the interpretation of the narratives that were presented in chapter four. I introduced each theme and sub themes and explained each in detail. The themes and sub themes I discussed in this chapter are as follows: 'surveillance, dataveillance, and the discourse of security' followed by a sub theme which is 'embodying the panopticon'. The next theme is 'hierarchies' which consists of two sub themes, 'hierarchical citizenship' and 'hierarchical mobilities'. The last theme is 'bodies and borders' through which I discuss the following sub themes: 'risky bodies and nobodies' and 'embodying fear at border'.

Participants did not only feel surveilled at border crossings and regulated their behaviour accordingly, but constantly surveilled themselves and other people. Borders are simultaneously points of exclusion and inclusion where the movement of abled/low-risk/wanted bodies are encouraged while the movement of disabled/high-risk/unwanted bodies are halted. While dual citizenship seems to ease the access to international travel, it is a form of hierarchical citizenship where only some can benefit from it. Creswell's concept of insurgent citizen reminds us that in spite of being a legal citizen, some citizens are deprived of their citizenship rights and therefore might not have access to freedom of movement within and beyond borders.

In the next chapter, I discuss the implications of this research as well as the theoretical and methodological contributions of this work. The chapter ends with a discussion of limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.

Vignette 6 – Frankfurt Airport

20 May 2017 – 10:15 am

Gosh! This handbag is super heavy! I always have so much to pack when I am traveling back to Canada from Iran. Aside from the thoughtful gifts friends and family give me, and the gifts I buy myself for loved ones in Canada, I always have books. I love to read in my mother tongue and each time I visit Iran, I buy some books to bring back with me to Canada. This time, however, I bought too many that I could not fit them all in my luggage. Therefore, I had to squeeze them all in my handbag.

We just arrived in Frankfurt airport and our next flight is in six hours. Ali and I are both hungry and tired. The line up for security screening is long and we enter the screening checkpoint after 15 minutes. I leave all my belongings in containers to be screened and pass the gate. The alarm did not go off, so I walk to the other side to collect my stuff. I gather them all except for my handbag. I look around and see an officer coming towards me while holding my handbag with both hands.

“Deutsche...English?” He asks.

“English” I quickly reply.

He nods a few times and asks for my passport. Looking at the first page of my passport, he asks:

“Where are you coming from and where are you going?”

“Iran and I’m going to Canada.” I answer.

“Are you going home?” He asks.

“Yes!” I reply.

He says, "There is something in your bag and if I cannot find it using this..." He moves his right hand up, so I can see the small thing that looks like a piece of paper in his hand and continues, "...then, I need to open your bag."

"Sure" I say and think of the things I have in my handbag and wonder what it is that he is looking for. He moves the small thing all over my bag and shakes his head, "I need to open this." I nod and step forward to help, but he says, "no!" so I stay put. He unzips my handbag and empties it quickly.

He looks me in the eye and says, "I'm looking for drugs!"

I am confused but say, "Ok." I look at his hands that are now searching through my books. He opens them one by one. "What language is this?" He points to the books.

"Farsi" I say.

He looks at me and asks, "Are you sure?"

"Yes, it is Farsi." I reply and think to myself, what does this have to do with the drugs? Did he just want to have a small talk? What drugs is he looking for? Why did he think I have drugs in my bag?!

"Why did you visit Iran you said?" He asks and raises his eyebrows.

"To visit some family and friends." I reply.

He tries to squeeze everything back into my handbag, but he gives up and pushes the handbag towards me. He then hands me my passport and while he is looking away says, "You may go now." I get my passport, squeeze everything back into my bag, and slowly walk towards Ali that has been waiting for me.

6.0 Conclusions and Areas for Future Research

6.1 Conclusion

Rooted in my own lived experiences as an Iranian-Canadian woman, as well as the complexity and tensions around being a dual citizen, I embarked on this research. The purpose of this study was to explore the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens post 9/11. This research engaged notions of race, gender, and class, considering institutional inequalities and power relations. Using unstructured interviews as the method, I interviewed 11 dual citizens, both men and women to investigate how dominant discourses of surveillance and dataveillance, hierarchies, and (risky) bodies materialize at border crossings, how these discourses become embodied in individual experiences at the border and how individuals navigate such discourses. Using narrative inquiry as methodology and following processes of narrative analysis and analysis of narratives, I engaged in the re-storying process as a collaborative process of renegotiating or retelling the story between myself, as the researcher, and the participants of the study. The stories of border crossings told by participants were re-storied and presented to illustrate the complexities of the experiences.

Critical mobilities and intersectionality were two theoretical frameworks, as two broader frames for understanding the dominant discourses, which guided this study. I employed critical mobilities, which emphasises mobility as a right while featuring the interplay of (im)mobilities and inequalities, and intersectionality that considers constructed identities of being raced, gendered, and classed intertwined to illustrate the complexity of the individual's experiences. I discussed whether mobility is a right for international travellers and that it is

important to be aware that the right to travel is not a universal notion as well as how freedom of movement and access to travel is defined. At the end of analysis, the following themes and sub-themes emerged: Surveillance, dataveillance and discourse of security (Embodying the panopticon), Hierarchies (Hierarchical citizenship, hierarchical mobilities), Bodies and borders (Risky bodies & nobodies, embodying fear). Through these themes and sub-themes, I discussed the complex border crossing experiences of dual citizens with the intersection of race, gender, and class.

The notion of biopolitics is approached through a Foucauldian lens in this study. Biopolitics is key in how citizenship helps to manage mobilities at borders. Mobilities research “holds the potential (and the threat) to reconfigure the boundaries, methodologies and theoretical lens of sociology” (Sheller, 2013, p. 47). We cannot analyse power dynamics without considering the discourses and knowledges produced and perpetuated by that power (Stone, 2004). Thus, the complex relationship between inclusion and exclusion practices and the use of privilege were key in studying the relations of power in this research (Côté-Boucher, 2010).

As this research elucidated, bordering is “selective and targeted” (Rumsford, 2006, p. 164) and dual citizenship does not necessarily lead to enhancement of citizenship rights but is a form of hierarchical citizenship that only some citizens can benefit from. Border crossing is not necessarily a process for identifying the risky body or the terrorist, instead the aim is to make everyone known first and create “a process of elimination” (Rygiel, 2010, p. 123), which requires dividing the population to low-risk/reliable/valuable/wanted bodies versus others who are high-risk/distrustful/unwanted.

Although differences seem to manifest themselves particularly at border crossings, as this research elucidated, the pervasive border does not exist only in its physical form. The reproduction of borders does not stop at the limits of nation states; it extends beyond political boundaries and indeed impacts the experiences of dual citizens beyond border crossings. This signifies that to study identity and its implications for citizenship, tourism scholarship should do more than just concentrating on borders themselves. As Paasi (2009) noted, if we recognise borders “as social practices and discourses that are impregnated with power and ordering” (p. 216), then they exist beyond physical territories and are spread all over societies.

Borders are socially constructed as well as imagined and bordering processes shape material practices, discourses, and meanings. Borders regulate the mobilities of individuals. However, they are also spaces of “defiance and resistance” (Khosravi, 2007, p. 322). As illustrated in this research, dual citizenship creates points of resistance through which individuals negotiated and/or transformed their identities. As noted in the methodology chapter, the participants, such as Lutfiya and Sophia, viewed participating in this research and sharing their stories as a way of resisting the power imbalance they were faced with in their border crossing experiences. In line with Bauder (2016), Chattopodhyay (2018), and Mudu and Chattopadhyay (2016), I contend that my participants are autonomous beings and political subjects who exercise rights and agency when it comes to crossing international borders.

Theoretically, through use of critical mobilities as one of the broader frameworks, this research accentuates mobility as a right while highlighting the interplay of (im)mobilities and inequalities. In line with Muller (2010), I argue that border crossing is “less and less about the line in the sand and more and more about the bodies that cross it – each and every body” (p.

61). Mobilities are shaped by gender, race, and class and are made manifest through power hierarchies and structures and reinforced or resisted through agency. Salter (2006) argued that:

there is an internationalization of the body: through biometric capture, the assignation of risk profiles according to race, gender, ethnic, national and religious scripts, and the visa system within the institutions of customs and immigration controls. The visa system as an essential component in the attempt of the state to claim a monopoly over legitimate movement classifies mobile bodies as legitimate through the schema of production and Subjection. (p. 179)

It is worth noting that use of Critical Race Theory (CRT) could have been beneficial to this study as it could have allowed me to further investigate the institutional and legal bodies and structures that give shape to the border crossing experiences of dual citizens and more specifically Canadian dual citizens. This is a theory that I intend to use in future research as I strive to delve deeper into the structures and policies that form international mobilities as well as immobilities.

Methodologically, this study used narrative inquiry to present the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizens. I must acknowledge that although this research has shaped by my thoughts, values, assumptions, and questions about the border crossing experiences of Canadian dual citizen post 9/11, the use of unstructured interviews was crucial to letting participants take the lead in our conversations and challenge my ideas. Narrative inquiry was also very helpful in terms of re-centring participants' voices and decentring my own voice throughout the research.

I have learned numerous points about my own identity as an Iranian-Canadian woman throughout the process of this research. As Thrift (1997) noted, since we all belong to more than one community, negotiation of identities, within and across groups, is a critical and complex task. As much as I am interested in the concept of 'border', I was very much involved in the process of 'crossing borders' myself as I adopted different identities at different situations. Reflecting on my own lived experience of a dual citizen, I have come to realize that borders are everywhere and are not limited to physical borders and points of entry. In this sense, regardless of which border I cross as a dual citizen, my body is what carries the border; in other words, I *am* the border.

Future Research

As Hall (2010) argued, one of the great ironies of the tourism scholarship today is that despite embracing the concept of mobilities, there is relatively less attention paid to immobilities. To that end, it is crucial for tourism scholars to further push the boundaries of mobilities research within tourism studies by asking the following central questions: Who is immobile? What are the implications of immobilities for tourism mobilities research? Borders, as in-between places, establish a liminal space within which normativities of the tourists' everyday lives are temporarily kept in suspension, allowing them to encounter the 'Other' in a different social setting (Zhang, 2013). As Mountz (2010) noted, the in-between and liminal spaces at which mobilities are slowed, halted, or paused such as borders, airports, detention centers, and refugee camps are crucial and need to be considered in conducting mobilities research. I believe by shifting the focus from mobilities only to both mobilities and immobilities

new doors would open up to further conduct a social justice-oriented research and address the inequalities of the status quo when it comes to international tourism.

Surveillance and dataveillance have become scrutiny of international tourism. The use of surveillance in public spaces such as airports for public safety is seen as a way to secure safety goals. However, there are consequences to bodily surveillance. Referring to the “coded body”, Lyon (2003) argued that a tourist who intends to cross international borders might assume that s/he is welcomed or excluded on the basis of an identity established by the codes (p. 24). Furthermore, in line with Morgan & Pritchard (2005), I contend that in studying surveillance, there is an opportunity for tourism scholars to further the conceptualizations of notion of gaze which goes beyond collective gaze and respond to Hollinshead’s (2004) call “to engage with the many productive and consumptive sorts of gaze which exist in the signifiatory and representational practices of tourism” (p. 130).

Moreover, intersectionality has yet to receive the attention it deserves in tourism scholarship (Mooney, 2018). Indeed, some tourism scholars have taken up this theoretical framework in their research. However, it is important for tourism researchers to consider more than one category of identities such as race or gender when exploring the experiences of individuals, so they can have a more nuanced conversation about the consequences of different aspects of identity in shaping tourism experiences.

As Ribas-Mateos (2015) contended, “there is a construction of a complex in-between where there is a blurring of categories, a blurring of fixed forms of exclusion and inclusion” (p. 160). A critical mobilities framework would be helpful in examining power relations and considering the complex relationship between inclusion and exclusion in this regard (Torabian

& Mair, 2017). To do so, tourism scholars should consider investigating the experiences of individuals who are affected by programs such as NEXUS or US President Trump's travel ban and respond to the following questions in their research: What are the implications of configuring mobilities as threatening and a problem of security and enforcement? What are the implications of human rights and freedom of movement in this regard? How do visible and invisible borders function on travellers' bodies?

In terms of dual citizenship, future studies should further explore the self-identifications of those with dual Canadian citizens and how they experience their duality within their adopted homeland. To that end, the following questions need to be asked, What are the experiences of dual Canadian citizens in Canada and does this in any way have some resonance with their experiences at border crossings? How has the increased securitization post 9/11 affected these dual citizens *within* the Canadian borders and how different is the experience at the border crossings?

This research has set the stage for the future research to answer these questions by providing discussions on the notions of dual citizenship and freedom of movement and their implications for crossing international borders. In addition, it developed an argument on how borders are written on human bodies and that bodies carry borders. Nevertheless, these ideas need to be taken further to address the inequalities of international travel

7.0 References

- Adey, P. (2006) "Divided we move": The dromologies of airport security and surveillance, *In T. Monahan (ed.), Surveillance and society: Technological politics and everyday life*, (pp. 195-208), New York, NY: Routledge.
- Adey, P. (2009). Facing airport security: Affect, biopolitics, and the preemptive securitisation of the mobile body, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 27, 274-295.
- Adey, P. (2017). *Mobility (2nd edition)*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Adkins, L. & Lury, C. (2012). *Measure and value*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Adler, J. (1985). Youth on the road: Reflections on the history of tramping, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(3), 335-354.
- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception*, Translated by K. Attell, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ahmed, S., Castaneda, C., Fortier, A. & Sheller, M. (2003). *Uprootings/regroundings: Questions of home and migration*. Oxford: Berg.
- Amoore, L. (2006). Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political Geography*, 25(3), 336-351.
- Anderson, B. (2010). Morale and the affective geographies of the 'war on terror'. *Cultural geographies*, 17(2), 219-236.
- Anderson, J. & O'Dawd, L. (1999). Border, border regions and territoriality: Contradictor, changing significance, *Regional Studies*, 33(7), 593-604.

- Annus, I. (2011). Tourism, self-representation and national identity in post-socialist Hungary, In H. V. Bonavita, (ed.), *Negotiating identities: constructed selves and others*, (p. 1-23). New York, NY: Rodopi, B.V.
- Anthias, F. (2013). Hierarchies of social location, class and intersectionality: Towards a translocational frame. *International Sociology*, 28(1), 121–138.
- Bach, R. L. (2003). Global mobility, inequality and security, *Journal of Human Development*, 4(2), 227-245.
- Balibar, E. (2004). *We, the people of Europe? Reflections on transnational citizenship*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bauder, H. (2016). *Migration, borders and freedom*. London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bell, M. & Ward, G. (2000). Comparing temporary mobility in permanent migration, *Tourism Geographies*, 2(1), 87-107.
- Benhabib, S. (2004). *The rights of others: Aliens, residents, and citizens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennett C. J. & Regan, P. M. (2004). Editorial: Surveillance and mobilities, *Surveillance and Society*, 4, 449-455.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990). *Nation and narration*, London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*, New York, NY: Routledge.

- Bhandar, D. (2008). Resistance, detainment, asylum: The onto-political limits of border crossing in North America, In Cowen, D. & Gilbert, E. (Eds.), *War, citizenship, territory*, pp. 404-425. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bianchi, R. (2006). Tourism and globalisation of fear: Analysing the politics of risk and (insecurity) in global travel, *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(1), 64-74.
- Bianchi, R. V. & Stephenson, M. L. (2013). Deciphering tourism and citizenship in a globalized world, *Tourism Management*, 39, 10-20.
- Bianchi, R. V. & Stephenson, M. L. (2014). *Tourism and citizenship: Rights, freedoms and responsibilities in the global order*, London: Routledge.
- Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease, *Alternatives*, 27, 63-92.
- Bigo, D. (2008). Globalized (in) security: the field and the ban-opticon. *Terror, insecurity and liberty: illiberal practices of liberal regimes after*, 9(11), 10-48.
- Blanchard, L. & Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2013). A pedagogy of peace: The tourism potential, In L. Blanchard & Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (eds.). *Peace through tourism: promoting human security through international citizenship*, (pp. 19-33). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bosangit, C., McCabe, S., & Hibbert, S. (2009). What is told in travel blogs? Exploring travel blogs for consumer narrative analysis. In W. Hoepken, U. Gretzel & R. Law (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in tourism* (pp. 61-71). Vienna: Springer.

- Brown, H. & Hosking, D. M. (1986). Distributed leadership and skilled performance as successful organization in social movements, *Human Relations*, 39(1), 65-79.
- Brown, K. (2004). The road not taken in “Brown”: Recognizing the dual harm of segregation. *Virginia Law Review*, 90(6), 1579-1599.
- Brown, M. (2012). Gender and sexuality I: Intersectional anxieties, *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(4), 541-550.
- Browne, S. (2012). Race and surveillance. In K. Ball, K. Haggerty & D. Lyon (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*, (pp. 72-80). New York: Routledge.
- Burns, P. M. & Novelli, M. (2008). *Tourism and mobilities: Local-global connections*, Wallingford: CABI.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and subversion of identity*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*, London: Verso.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castles, S. & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chase, S. E. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices, In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The sage handbook of qualitative research*, 3rd ed. (pp. 651-680), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Chattopadhyay, S. (2018). Borders re/make bodies and bodies are made to make borders: Storying migrant trajectories, *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographers*. In press.
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs*, 38, 785-810.
- Chow-White, P. A. (2006). Race, gender and sex on the net: Semantic networks of selling and storytelling sex tourism. *Media, Culture & Society*, 28(6), 883-905.
- Clandinin, D. J. (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry*, Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cole, S. (2017). *Empowered or burdened? Tourism, gender, intersectionality, and emotion*. Critical Tourism Studies Conference VII 2017 book of abstracts. Majorca, Spain: University de les Iles Balears, Copenhagen Business School and Thompson Rivers University.
- Cole, S. & Eriksson, J. (2011). Tourism and human rights, In S. Cole & N. Morgan (eds.), *Tourism and inequalities: Problems and prospects*, (pp. 107-125), Wallingford: CABI.
- Coles, T. (2008). Telling the tales of tourism: Mobility, media, and citizenship in the 2004 EU enlargement, In Burns, P. M & Novelli, M. (eds.). *Tourism and mobilities: Local-global connections*, (pp. 65-81), London, UK: CABI.
- Coles, T. E. and Timothy, D. J. (2004). *Tourism, diasporas and space*, London: Routledge.

- Côté-Boucher, K. (2010). Risky business? Border preclearance and the securing of economic life in North America, In S. Braedley, & M. Luxton, (eds.) *Neoliberalism and Everyday Life*. (pp. 37-67) Montreal, QC, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1992) Whose story is it anyway? Feminist and antiracist appropriations of Anita Hill. In T. Morrison, (ed.). *Race-ing justice, en-gineering power*, (pp. 402-440). New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G. & Thomas, K. (1995). Introduction In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas, K. (eds). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. (pp. xiii–xxxii). New York, NY: New Press.
- Creswell, T. (2001). The production of mobilities, *New Formations*, 43, 11-25.
- Creswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, T. (2013). Citizenship in worlds of mobility, In in O. Söderström, S. Randeria, D. Ruedin, G, D'Amato, Panese, F. (eds) *Critical Mobilities*. (pp. 81-100), Lausanne, Switzerland: EPFL Press.
- Creswell, T. & Merriman, P. (2008). *Geographies of mobility: Practices, spaces, subjects*. London: Ashgate.
- Daly, K. (2007). *Qualitative methods for family studies and human development*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist theory*, 9(1), 67-85.
- Daynes, S. & Lee, O. (2008). *Desire for race*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- De Fina, A. (2009). Narratives in interview – The case of accounts: For an interactional approach to narrative genres, *Narrative Inquiry*, 19(2), 233-258.
- Degen, C. & Tyler, K. (2017). Amongst the disciplines: Anthropology, sociology, intersection and intersectionality, *The Sociological Review Monographs*, 65(1), 35-53.
- Delanty, G. (2000). *Citizenship in a global age: Society, culture, politics*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Dhamoon, R. K. (2011). Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality, *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(1), 230-243.
- Donnan, H. & Wilson, T. (1999). *Borders: Frontiers of identity, nation and state*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Edgell, D. L. (1990) *International tourism policy*, New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Epstein, C. (2007). Guilty bodies, productive bodies, destructive bodies: Crossing the biometric borders, *International Political Sociology*, 1(2), 149–164.
- Faist, T. (2001). *Dual citizenship as overlapping membership*, Sweden: Malmo University.
- Fassin, D. (2001). The biopolitics of otherness: Undocumented foreigners and racial discrimination French public debate, *Anthropology Today* 17(1), 3-7.
- Fekete, L. (2004). Anti-Muslim racism and the European security state, *Race and Class*, 46(1), 3-29.
- Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (2004). *Smart border action plan status report*, Retrieved from <http://geo.international.gc.ca/can-am/main/border/status-en.asp>

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan (1979). New York, NY: Vintage books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Volume I: An introduction*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and punish: The birth of prison*, New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two Lectures. In C. Gordon (eds.), *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge, Selected interviews 1972–1977*, Brighton: Harvest Press.

Foucault, M. (1988). *Technologies of the self*, L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Huthon (eds.), Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, volume 1: An introduction*, New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1994). *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*, edited by Paul Rabinow & Nikolas Rose, New York, NY: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended: Lectures at College du France, 1975-1976*. M. Bertani & A. Fontana (eds.). Translated by D. Macey. New York, NY: Picador.

Gates, K. (2008). The United States real ID act and the securitization of identity, In C. J. Bennett & D. Lyon (eds.). *Playing the identity card: Surveillance, security and identification in global perspective*, (pp. 218-232). New York, NY: Routledge.

Germann Molz, J. (2006). 'Watch us wander: Mobile surveillance and the surveillance of mobility, *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 377-393.

- Gilliom, J. (2001). *Overseers of the poor: Surveillance, resistance, and the limits of privacy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Glover, K. S. (2008). Citizenship, hyper-surveillance, and double-consciousness: Racial profiling as panoptic governance. In M. Deflem & J. T. Ulmer (eds.), *Surveillance and Governance: Crime Control and Beyond*, Sociology of Crime Law and Deviance, Vol. 10, (pp. 241-256). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Glover, K. S. (2009). *Racial profiling: Research, racism, and resistance*. New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Griffin, T. (2013). Gap year volunteer tourism stories: sharing more than memories. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 22(8), 851-874.
- Griffin, T. (2015). *The experience of hosting friends and relatives for immigrants*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo.
- Griffin, T. (2018). Constructionism: The making of meaning in tourism and hospitality research. In R. Nunkoo (ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods for Tourism and Hospitality Management*. (pp. 166-175). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, (pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Guiraudon, V. (2002). Including foreigners in national welfare states: Institutional venues and rules of the game, In B. Rothstein & S. Steinmo (eds.). *Restructuring the welfare state: Political institutions and policy change*, (pp. 129-156). New York: Palgrave.

Hageman, K., Berger, S., Gemie, S., & Williams, C. (2004). *Creating and crossing borders: The state, future and quality of border studies*. Glamorgan: University of Glamorgan.

Hall, C. M. & Tucker, H. (2004). Tourism and postcolonialism: An introduction, In C. M. Hall & H. Tucker (eds.), *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations*, (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hall, C. M. (2005). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*, Harlow, England: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hall, C. M. (2010). Equal access for all? Regulative mechanisms, inequality and tourism mobility, In Cole, S. & Morgan, N (eds.). *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects*, (pp. 34-49). London, UK: CABI.

Hall, D. & Brown, F. (2010). Tourism and welfare: Ethics, responsibility, and well-being. In Cole, S. & Morgan, N. (eds.), *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects* (pp. 143-163). London, UK: CABI.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora, In J. Rutherford (ed.). *Identity, community, culture, difference*, (pp. 222-237). London: Lawrence Wishart.

Hall, S. (1994). Cultural identity and diaspora, In P. Williams & L. Charisman, (eds.). *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader*, (pp. 392-403). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Hall, S. (1995). Negotiating Caribbean identities, *New Left Review*, 7, 349-363.

- Hall, S. (2002). Race, articulation, and societies structured in dominance, In P. Essed & D. Goldberg (eds.). *Race critical theories*, London: Blackwell.
- Hancock, A. M. (2007). Intersectionality as a normative and empirical paradigm, *Politics & Gender*, 3(2), 248-254.
- Hannam, K. (2009). The end of tourism? Nomadology and the mobilities paradigm. *Philosophical issues in tourism*, 37, 101.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, immobilities and moorings, *Mobilities* 1(1): 1–22.
- Heiner, R. (2002). *Social problems: An introduction to social constructionism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Henson, D. F. (2013). Wrangling space: The incoherence of a long-distance life, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(7), 518-522.
- Heywood, A. (1999). *Political theory: An introduction*, London: MacMillan Press.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an “industry”: The forgotten power of tourism as a social force, *Tourism Management*, 27(5), 1192-1208.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2007). Hostile meeting grounds: Encounters with the wretched of the earth and the tourist through tourism and terrorism in the 21st century. In P. M. Burns, & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Tourism and politics: Global frameworks and local realities*, (pp.309-332). Kidlington, Oxon: Elsevier.
- Hindess, B. (2002). Neo-liberal citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 6(2), 127-143.

- Hollinshead, K. (1999a). Tourism, hybridity, and ambiguity: The relevance of Bhabha's 'third space' cultures. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(1), 121-156.
- Hollinshead, K. (1999b). Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power, *Tourism Management*, 20(1), 7-23.
- Hollinshead, K. (2004). Tourism and new sense: Worldmaking and the enunciative value of tourism, In C. M. Hall & H. Tucker (eds.). *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations*, (pp. 25-42). New York, NY: Routledge.
- hooks, B. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*, Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hosking, D. M. (2008). Can constructionism be critical? In J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.). *Handbook of constructionist research*, (pp. 669-686). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Hosking, D., & McNamee, S. (2007). Back to basics: Appreciating appreciative inquiry as not 'normal' science. *AI Practitioner*, 11, 12-16.
- Huddart, D. (2006). *Homi K. Bhabha*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Isin, E. F. (2000). Introduction: Democracy, citizenship, and the city, In E. Isin (ed.), *Democracy, citizenship and the global city*, (pp. 1-21). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Isin, E. F. & Wood, K. (1999). *Citizenship and identity*, London: Sage Publications.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*, New York, NY: Routledge.

- Joly, D., Kelly, L. & Nettleton, C. (1997). *Refugees in Europe: The hostile new agenda*. London: Minority Rights Group International.
- Khoo-Lattimore, C., & Mura, P. (2016). *Asian genders in tourism*. Bristol, England: Channel View Publications.
- Khosravi, S. (2007). The 'illegal' traveller: An auto-ethnography of borders, *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*, 15(3), 321–334.
- Koskela, H. (2012). 'You wouldn't wear that body': The problematic of surveillance and gender. In K. Ball, K. Haggerty, & D. Lyon (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*, (pp. 49-56). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a *nice* field like education, *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Lahav, g. (2013). Mobilizing against mobility: Immigration politics in a new security world, In O. Soderstrom, S. Randeria, D. Ruedin, G. A'mato, & F. Panese (eds.). *Critical mobilities*, (pp. 123-152), Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge.
- Lamont, M. & Molnar, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 167-195.
- Larsen, J. (2001). Tourism mobilities and travel glance: Experiences of being on the move, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 1(2), 80-89.
- Latham, R. (2010). Border formations: Security and subjectivity at the border, *Citizenship Studies*, 14(2), 185-201.

- Lyon, D. (2003). *Surveillance after September 11*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Lyon, D. (2004). *Surveillance after September 11th*, Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Lyon, D. (2006). Airport screening, surveillance and social sorting: Canadian responses to 9/11 in context, *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 48(3), 397-411.
- Mader, M. B. (2007). Foucault and social measure. *Journal of French Philosophy* 17(1), 1-24.
- Maki, K. (2011). Neoliberal deviants and surveillance: Welfare recipients under the watchful eye of Ontario Works. *Surveillance & Society* 9(1/2), 47-63.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class*, London: Pluto Press.
- Marshall, T. H. (1964). *Class, citizenship and social development: Essays by T. H. Marshall*, New York, NY: Doubleday & Co.
- Marshall, T. H. (1992). Citizenship and social class, In T. H. Marshall and T. Bottomore (eds.). *Citizenship and social class*, (pp. 3-51). London: Pluto Press.
- Mau, S., Brabandt, H., Laube, L. & Roos, C. (2012). *Liberal states and the freedom of movement: Selective borders, unequal mobility*, New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- McBride, A., Hebson, G. & Holgate, J. (2015). Intersectionality: Are we taking enough notice in the field of work and employment relations? *Work, Employment and Society*, 29(2), 331-341.
- McCabe, S. Minnaert, L. & Diekmann, A. (2011). *Social tourism in Europe: Theory and practice*, Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- McCahill, M. & Norris, C. (2003). Victims of surveillance, In P. Davies, P. Francis, & V. Jupp, (eds.), *Victimization: Theory, research, and policy*, Palgrave MacMillan.

- McCall (2005). The complexity of intersectionality, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), 1771-1800.
- McDonald, M. G. (2005). Mapping whiteness and sport: An introduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 22(3), 245-255.
- McDonald, M. G. (2009). Dialogues on Whiteness, leisure and (anti) racism. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(1), 5-21.
- McDowell, J. & Carter-Francique, A. (2017) An intersectional analysis of the workplace experiences of African American female athletic directors, *Sex Roles*, 77, 393-408.
- McGrath, J. (2004). *Loving big brother: Performance, privacy and surveillance space*, London: Routledge.
- Meethan, K. (2001). *Tourism in global society: Place, culture, consumption*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Mezzadra, S. & Nelson, B. (2013). *Border as method, or, the multiplication of labor*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Monahan, T. (2009). Dreams of control at a distance: Gender, surveillance, and social control. *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, 9(2), 286-305.
- Mooney, S. (2016). 'Nimble' intersectionality in employment research: a way to resolve methodological dilemmas, *Work, employment and society*, 30(4), 708-718.
- Mooney, S. (2018). Illuminating intersectionality for tourism researchers, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 72, 175-176.

- Mountz, A. (2010). *Seeking asylum: Human smuggling and bureaucracy at the border*.
Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mudu, P. & Chattopadhyay, S. (2016). *Migration, squatting and radical autonomy*. London:
Routledge.
- Muller, B. J. (2010). *Security, risk and the biometric state: Governing borders and bodies*, New
York, NY: Routledge.
- Nail, T. (2016) *Theory of the border*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nash, D. (1989). Tourism as a form of imperialism, In V. L. Smith (ed.). *Hosts and Guests: The
Anthropology of Tourism*, (pp. 37-45). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Noy, C. (2004). This trip really changed me: Backpackers' narratives of self-change. *Annals of
Tourism Research*, 31(1), 78-102.
- Noy, C., & Cohen, E. (2012). *Israeli backpackers: From tourism to rite of passage*. New York, NY:
SUNY Press.
- O'Byrne, D. J. (2001). On passports and border controls, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2),
399-416.
- Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:
Sage publications.
- Pennell, J. R. & Maher, T. (2015). Whom will sociology serve? Transforming the discipline by
engaging communities, *Humanity & Society*, 39(1), 47-63.

- Pinnegar, S. & Daynes, J. G. (2007). Locating narrative inquiry historically: Thematics in the turn to narrative, In D. J. Clandinin. (ed.). *The handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*, (pp. 3-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis, In J. A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.). *Life history and narrative*, (pp. 5-23). London: Falmer.
- Poudrier, J. (2003). 'Racial' categories and health risks: Epidemiological surveillance among Canadian First Nations. In D. Lyon (ed.), *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy Risk and Digital Discrimination*, (pp. 111-134). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pritchard, A. (2018). Predicting the next decade of tourism gender research, *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25, 144-146
- Rabinow, P. (2003). Ordinance, discipline, regulation: some reflections on urbanism. In S. M. Low & D. Lawrence Zuniga (Eds.), *The anthropology of space and place* (pp. 353–362). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rahimieh, N. (2007). Border crossing. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 27(2), 225-232.
- Ranciere, J. (2004). Who is the subject of the rights of man?, *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 103(2/3), 297-310.
- Ribas-Mateos, N. (2005). *The Mediterranean in the time of globalization: Migration, borders and welfare*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Ribas-Mateos, N. (2015). *Border shifts: New mobilities in Europe and beyond*, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rovisco, M. (2010). Reframing Europe and the global: Conceptualizing the border in cultural encounters. *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space*, 28(6), 1015-1030.

Rojek, C. (1998). Tourism and citizenship, *Cultural Policy*, 4 (2), 291-310.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Rushdie, S. (2003). *Step across this line: Collected non-fiction 1992-2003*, London: Vintage.

Rygiel, K. (2010). *Globalizing citizenship*, Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Sabra, S. (2011). *(Re)negotiated identifications: Reproducing and challenging the meanings of Arab, Canadian, and Arab Canadian identities in Ottawa*, (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*, London: Routledge.

Salter, M. B. (2003). *Rights of passage: The passport in international relations*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Salter, M. B. (2004). Passports, mobility, and security: How smart can the border be? *International Studies Perspective*, 5(1), 71-91.

Salter, M. B. (2006). The global visa regime and the political technologies of the international self: borders, bodies, biopolitics, *Alternatives*, 31(2), 167-189.

- Salter, M. B. (2008). *Politics at the airport*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Saltes, N. (2013). 'Abnormal' bodies on the borders of inclusion: Biopolitics and the paradox of disability surveillance. *Surveillance & Society* 11(1/2), 55-73.
- Santos, C. A., Belhassen, Y., & Caton, K. (2008). Reimagining Chinatown: An analysis of tourism discourse. *Tourism Management*, 29(5), 1002-1012.
- Shamir, R. (2005). Without borders? Notes on globalization as a mobility regime, *Sociological Theory*, 23(2), 197-217.
- Sharma, N. (2006). *Home economies: Nationalism and the making of migrant workers in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Shaw, G. & Williams, A. M. (2002). *Critical issues in tourism: A geographical perspective* (2nd ed.), Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Sheller, M. (2013). Sociology after the mobilities turn, In P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, & M. Sheller (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of mobilities*, (pp. 45-54), London: Routledge.
- Sheller, M. (2014). The new mobilities paradigm for a live sociology, *Current Sociology*, 62(6), 789-811.
- Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm, *Environmental & Planning Part A*, 38(2), 207-226.
- Shields, S. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles*, 59, 301-311.

- Small, J. & Darcy, S. (2011). Tourism, disability & mobility, In S. Cole & N. Morgan (eds.), *Tourism and inequalities: Problems and prospects*, (pp. 1-20), Wallingford: CABI.
- Sofield, T. H. B. (2006). Border tourism and border communities: An overview, *Tourism Geographies*, 8(2), 102-121.
- Söderström, O., Randeria S., Ruedin, D., D'Amato, G. & Panese, F. (2013). Of mobilities and moorings: Critical perspectives, in O. Söderström, S. Randeria, D. Ruedin, G. D'Amato, Panese, F. (eds) *Critical Mobilities*. (pp. v–xxv), Lausanne, Switzerland: EPFL Press.
- Sparke, M. B. (2006). A neoliberal nexus: Economy, Security and the biopolitics citizenship on the border, *Political Geography*, 25(2), 151-180.
- Spracklen, K. (2013). *Whiteness and leisure*, New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stasiulis, D. & Ross, D. (2006). Security, flexible sovereignty, and the perils of multiple citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 10(3), 329-348.
- Stephenson, M. L. (2006). Travel and the 'freedom of movement': Racialised encounters and experiences amongst ethnic minority tourists in the EU. *Mobilities*, 1(2), 285-306.
- Stephenson, M. L & Ali, N. (2010). Tourism, travel and islamophobia: Post 9/11 journeys of Muslims in non-Muslim states. In N. Scott & J. Jafari (eds.). *Tourism in the Muslim world*, (pp. 235-251). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Stone, B. E. (2004). Defending society from the abnormal: The archaeology of bio-power, *Foucault Studies*, 1, 77-91.

- Topak, Ö. E. (2014). The biopolitical border in practice: Surveillance and death at the Greece – Turkey border zones, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32, 815-833.
- Torabian, P. & Mair, H. (2017). (Re)constructing the Canadian border: Anti-mobilities and tourism, *Tourist Studies, Special issue: Moralities & Mobilities*, 17(1), 17-35.
- Torpey, J. (1998). Coming and going: On the state monopolization of the legitimate “means of movement, *Sociological Theory*, 16(3), 239-259.
- Turner, B. S. (1993). *Citizenship and social theory*, London, UK: Sage Publications.
- United Nations. (1948). *The universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>
- Urry, J. (1990). *The tourist gaze*, London: Sage Publications.
- Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming places*, London: Routledge.
- Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies: Mobilities for the twenty first century*, London: Routledge.
- Urry, J. 2004. The system of automobility, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 21(4/5), 25-39.
- Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Van Zoonen, L. (2013). From identity to identification: Fixating the fragmented self, *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(1), 44-51.
- Walters, W. (2002). Deportation, expulsion, and the international police of aliens, *Citizenship Studies*, 6(3), 265-292.
- Walters, W. (2006a). Rethinking borders beyond the state, *Comparative European Politics*, 4(2-3), 141-159.

- Walters, W. (2006b). Border/control. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9, 187-203.
- Walters, W. (2011). Foucault and Frontiers: Notes on the birth of the humanitarian border in U. Bröckling, S. Krasmann & T. Lemke (eds.), (pp. 138-164). *Governmentality: Current issues and future challenges*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Watson, B. & Scraton, S. J. (2013). Leisure studies and intersectionality. *Leisure Studies*, 32(1), 35-47.
- Watts, L., & Urry, J. (2008). Moving methods, travelling times, *Environment & Planning D*, 26(5), 860-874.
- Wilson, D. & Weber, L. (2008). Surveillance, Risk and Preemption on the Australian Border, *Surveillance & Society*, 5(2), 124-141.
- World Tourism Organization, (1991). *Resolutions of the International Conference on Travel and Tourism*, Ottawa, Canada. Madrid, WTO.
- World Tourism Organization, (2013). *Tourism Visa Openness Report: Visa facilitation as means to stimulate tourism growth*, (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.e-unwto.org/content/w2682w/fulltext.pdf>
- Wonders, N. (2006). Global flows, semi-permeable borders and new channels of inequality, In S. Pickering & L. Weber (eds.) *Borders, mobility and technologies of control*, (pp. 63-86), Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zolberg, A. R. (2006). *A nation by design: Immigration policy in the fashioning of America*, New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Zollmann, F., Klaehn, J., Sikka, T., Comeforo, K., Broudy, D., Tröger, M., Poole, E., Edgley, A. & Mullen, A. (2018). The propaganda model and intersectionality: Integrating separate paradigms. *Media Theory*, 2(2), 213-239.

Zureik, E. & Hindle, K. (2004). Governance, security, and the technology: The case of biometrics. *Studies in Political Economy*, 73, 113-137.