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ABSTRACT

The subject for this thesis was the Mohawk Crisis at Oka, Quebec during the summer of 1990. The theoretical framework underlining the study was Antonio Gramsci's concept of a crisis of hegemony or legitimation crisis as applied by Stuart Hall et al. (1978). Within this theoretical framework the media are viewed as an ideological mechanism perpetuating the existing hegemonic relationship.

The research undertook to apply this social theory to the Mohawk Crisis and examine the ideological discourse in the media coverage of the Crisis. Press reports taken from the Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette were analyzed using quantitative content analysis and a qualitative exploratory technique. The following two general theses were examined: firstly, that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and, secondly, that the media supported an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. Further, two more specific hypotheses were tested in individual chapters which present the results of the quantitative content analysis.

The hegemonic crisis resulted from a breakdown of the ideological consent that maintains hegemonic rule. This loss of political legitimacy was evidenced by the public support for the Mohawks' cause despite their use of weapons and violence and media criticism of official attempts delegitimize (criminalize) the Mohawks and their cause. The analysis located three factors that may have contributed to the legitimation crisis. Firstly, the Mohawks had achieved a degree of legitimacy that threatened to undermine the rule of law and in consequence the ideological fabric of the liberal democratic state; secondly, the media criticism of initial attempts by the government to delegitimize the Mohawks; and thirdly, the Kanesatake Mohawks' actions
at Oka crystallized the once fragmented Native peoples' movement into a formidable political force. This loss of consensus caused the state to shift toward more coercive methods of control. This shift in the exercise of control from the mechanisms of consent to those of coercion is a central feature marking a crisis of hegemony. The findings supported the two general theses and demonstrated that the state shift to coercive control was legitimized with a 'law and order' campaign propagated through the media.

The quantitative content analysis found overwhelming support for the hypothesis that official sources would dominate over Native peoples' sources in coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. The theoretical assumption is that the media's reliance on official sources structures the definition of events in terms of the dominant ideology or status quo. Thus, according to the dominant ideology theory, because official sources dominated in press coverage the media supported an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. Moreover, press coverage emphasized violence and impending conflict ignoring underlying causes.

The study also involved a content analysis of characterizations found in the media discourse. Descriptive labels often play a pivotal role in an ideological and definitional struggle for legitimacy propagated through the media during a state-sponsored 'law and order campaign'. In general, the findings supported the hypothesis that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories would originate from official sources. The results supported the general thesis that ideological work would be apparent in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. As well, these findings offered empirical support to the claim that the media function, to some extent, as protectors of the status quo and therefore the second general thesis that the media coverage buttressed an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk
Crisis was proven. This is confirmed because the media relies on official sources and these sources were the principal users of delegitimizing terms and 'law and order' themes.

However, the evidence indicated that the media did not always operate as an ideological mechanism perpetuating the existing hegemonic relationship. One explanation for these contradictory findings was the liberal-democratic nature of the media in capitalist society. The legitimation crisis dissipated with the surrender of the Mohawks to the army and the government enacted solutions that remained within the existing liberal-democratic framework.

The research is limited by problems extrapolating opinion poll data to public attitudes and feelings, determining how much the media affects public perceptions, attitudes, values etc., determining how much more impact an article appearing on the front page has than an item on the inside pages of the newspaper, the subjectivity of content analysis and its inability to discern latent content, a lack of semantic rating of characterizations, the definition of a crisis of hegemony, and the importance of media production routines versus ideology as factors explaining the role of the media in a capitalist society.
INTRODUCTION

The Mohawk Crisis at Oka, Quebec during the summer of 1991 marked the first time in Canadian history that Native people took up arms against the state to defend land they claimed as theirs. It was also the first time since the October crisis in Montreal in 1970 that the government mobilized military troops to deal with a domestic crisis. This mobilization of coercive control often signifies a crisis of hegemony or threat to the nation state. It is during times of political crisis that the state is likely to shift from ideological to coercive control and legitimize this shift through a ‘law and order’ campaign propagated through the media. The political discourse supporting a ‘law and order’ campaign often consists of definitions and labels that are value-based, intrinsically linked to power relations in society and aimed at delegitimizing the opponents threatening the state. Thus, during periods of political crisis the dominant ideologies existing in the media become manifest and easier to read. These periods of political crisis are therefore valuable opportunities for analysis of ideological discourse in the mass media.

The research undertook to examine ideological discourse in the media during a period of intense political and social conflict. The theoretical framework of Antonio Gramsci’s concept of a crisis of hegemony or legitimation crisis as applied by Stuart Hall et al. (1978) is used to interpret the findings. The findings will support or disprove the following two general theses: firstly, that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and, secondly, that the media supported an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. Specific hypotheses will be examined in the research chapters to provide evidence favouring or disproving these two general theses.

The brief overview of the objectives of each of the thesis chapters will now be presented. Following this, a brief chronological overview of the crisis will provide the reader with the
situational context necessary for understanding the analysis. The chronology will also identify the five key events that will serve as a basis for the analysis of sources and descriptors in Chapters Five and Six. For a detailed chronology of major events and news items that epitomized the ideological struggles refer to appendix A.

Chapter I will introduce the theoretical considerations underlying the research. The concept of ideology will be explained and linked with theories of the state and Gramsci’s concept of a crisis of authority or hegemony. The relationship between the media and the state in propagating consensus-building ideologies that perpetuate the status quo essential to this hegemony will be presented. News is not seen as simply a presentation of facts but is a specific (re)construction of reality according to the norms and values of a society. Despite its relative autonomy from the state the media, through its reliance on official sources and its ahistorical sensationalized presentation of complex political issues, allows the dominant ideology to withstand counter-hegemonic definitions.

Chapter II outlines the methodology and procedures employed in the analysis. This research uses a combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques to examine the ideological discourse in press coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. These include content analysis, discourse analysis, and a qualitative approach -- historical contextual analysis.

Chapter III commences the study with a qualitative analysis of press coverage of the Mohawk conflict as a 'crisis of hegemony'. This Chapter provides a qualitative, political and historical analysis of press coverage of the Mohawk conflict as a 'crisis of hegemony'. Media discourse on the Mohawk crisis will be examined in relation to the two general theses that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and that the media supported an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.
The crisis will be located within the political and historical context of the Canadian state. The theoretical framework will involve Gramsci's theory of a 'crisis of hegemony' as applied by Stuart Hall and his colleagues (1978). This allows us to move beyond structural determinism, to superstructural dimensions of the social formation that affect the state (i.e. political, ideological and juridical contexts). The competing discourse of the official (State) and Mohawk sources will be presented in relation to that characterizing a 'moral panic' or 'law and order' campaign, described by Hall et al. (1978) and Cohen (1980). The chapter ends with a discussion on the use of violence to further a cause in a democratic society.

Chapter IV contains a quantitative analysis of the overall patterns of coverage of the crisis across major newspapers in Canada concluding with a specific focus on Canada's national newspaper the Toronto Globe and Mail. This chapter attempts to locate the crisis in time and space vis-a-vis the media. Since historical context is essential to the understanding and legitimacy of complex political issues this chapter ends with an analysis of historical background items found in the Globe and Mail.

Chapters V and VI of the study are based on quantitative data taken from a sample of five major events that made front page news in the Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette during the crisis. These key events will be discussed in the chronology and are outlined in appendices A and B (key event date cluster).

Sources play a primary role in the definitional struggle presented by the media. According to our theoretical considerations, the media's reliance on official sources structures the presentation of an event in terms of the dominant ideology. Thus, Chapter V, which is also quantitative in nature, is devoted entirely to an analysis of sources involved in the crisis, and their representation in the press. It is hypothesized that official sources will dominate over the
Native peoples' voice in coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. If confirmed, the results will illustrate the ideological work in the press and offer empirical support to the claim that the media function, to some extent, as protectors of the status quo.

Labels and descriptors play a primary role in the ideological and definitional struggle within a 'law and order' campaign reproduced through the media. Chapter VI continues the quantitative analysis of data obtained from the key event date cluster. This chapter involves a breakdown of characterizations or descriptors used by sources in the crisis. The analysis is based on research by Crelinsten (1987; 1989) and Rubenstein (1987), who studied terrorism and the importance of definitions and ideologies used by the state to justify intervention and control of deviant activity. The struggle for legitimacy and control is embodied in concepts of 'democracy', 'rule of law', 'crime', or 'warfare'. These inferentially powerful concepts and themes are often found in a 'moral panic' or 'law and order' campaign as discussed by Hall et al. (1978) and Cohen (1980). According to our theoretical assumptions such a campaign is propagated through the political and ideological terrain of the superstructure (e.g. media) and serves to legitimize state mobilization of coercive control techniques. For example, research by Crelinsten indicates that criminal-justice imagery delegitimizes political actors who use violence and legitimizes state intervention.

The legitimization and delegitimization qualities of the discourse will be analyzed in relation to the criminal-justice and war models of coercive control. For this analysis, it is hypothesized that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories (i.e. the Warriors/Mohawks, acts by Warriors/Mohawks, the Mohawk Crisis and Mohawk demands) would originate from official sources. Evidence of legitimation and delegitimation through characterizations will support the thesis that ideological work will be
apparent in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis and may support or disprove the second general thesis that media coverage buttressed an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. The results, if confirmed, may offer empirical support to the claim that the media function, to some extent, as protectors of the status quo.

On March 11, 1990 Mohawks at Kanesatake, Quebec erected a barricade in protest of expansion of a golf course by the municipality of Oka, on land the Mohawks claimed as their own. This land dispute has had a turbulent history dating back over 200 years (see York and Pindera (1991), Wright (1991), Clark (1990), Hornung (1991), Maclaine and Baxendale (1990) and Grant (1984)). On July 11, 1990 over one hundred Sûrete du Québec (SQ) officers attacked the barricade (key event 1). The police were repelled by armed Mohawk Warriors and Cpl. Marcel Lemay was killed in the gunfire. In support, Mohawks at Kahnawake erected another blockade on the Mercier Bridge leading to Montreal. This blockade disrupted access to Montreal for hundreds of daily commuters from the South Shore. Negotiations between the Mohawks and the Quebec Minister of Native Affairs John Ciaccia began immediately but broke off a week later. To date it is undetermined who issued the orders to attack the Mohawks and if it was a Mohawk or SQ bullet that killed Lemay.

On July 17, South Shore commuters, angry over the blockade of the Mercier Bridge battled police in one of many riots that occurred during the crisis. On August 5, Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa delivered an ultimatum to the Mohawks to settle the dispute or face possibility of military intervention. The reality of this scenario occurred a few days later (August 8) when Prime Minister Brian Mulroney announced that more than 4000 Canadian Forces troops were being sent to Oka to replace the Sûrete du Québec (key event 2). Shortly thereafter, on August 12, a deal was negotiated by Federal mediator Alan Gold and government
officials went behind the Mohawk barricade to sign the pre-conditions (signing ceremony; key event 3).

Following the signing ceremony, negotiations between the two sides resumed. However, on August 20, the Mohawks boycotted the talks after army troops and personnel carriers arrived in Kanesatake and Kahnawake. The troops moved closer to Kanesatake a week later and the Federal and provincial negotiators broke off talks after the Mohawks demanded recognition as an independent nation in exchange for removal of the barricades. The factional split among the Mohawks widened as Kahnawake band councillors then began separate negotiations with the governments.

Rumours of an impending military attack increased, and on August 29, white South Shore residents threw rocks at evacuating Mohawk women and children while the Sûreté du Québec looked on -- several people were injured (key event 4). The military advanced onto the Mercier Bridge and the Mohawks agreed to assist in dismantling the barricades.

On September 1, the military advanced through an abandoned barricade and the Kanesatake Mohawks retreated into the alcohol treatment centre. During the first few weeks of September Quebec officials opened the Mercier Bridge to traffic and Quebec Premier Bourassa refused to grant amnesty to the Warriors and rejected the Mohawks proposal for an international tribunal to investigate alleged crimes. The Canadian Forces then took control of the negotiations and again rejected Mohawk demands for amnesty. On September 26, the Mohawks in the treatment centre surrendered to the Military and were arrested (key event 5).

Two years later on July 3, 1992 a jury acquitted a majority (34) of the Mohawks involved in the crisis (Ottawa Citizen July 4:A1, 1992). To date only two Mohawks were found guilty of offenses connected to the crisis and they are currently on bail pending appeal.
CHAPTER 1 - THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Concept of Ideology

If we define things as real, they are real in their consequences (W.I Thomas 1928).

Ideology is understood to be a system of beliefs or ideas widely prevalent in society on which a particular economic, political and social system is based (Abercrombie 1980:3; Mathes and Auer 1989:20). The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines ideology as a "manner of thinking characteristic of a class or individual" (Sykes 1982:495). Karl Mannheim (1936), refers to this manner of thinking as pre-formed patterns of thought and conduct. Mannheim analyzes the meaning of the term 'ideology', by breaking it down analytically into the particular conception and the total conception of ideology.

Particular ideology includes the interests of an individual on the psychological level or level of immediate experience. On this level it is assumed an opponent engages in conscious or unconscious ideas or representations (i.e., propaganda). Disputing these ideas or representations rests on questioning the content of an opponent’s assertions as ideology. The content of the representations is refuted and/or resolved by appeal to mutually accepted criteria. A mutually acceptable procedure for determining the validity of a claim exists within the particular concept. Thus, an argument can be resolved by referring to accepted criteria that discredit or affirm thought-content.

Total ideology, on the other hand, includes the characteristics and composition of the total historical structure of the mind of the group or age. The concept of total ideology is based on the assumption that a manner of thinking exists within every situation and in effect predetermines every individual growing up in a society (Mannheim 1936:3). These pre-formed
patterns of thought, beliefs and conduct determine our frame of reference and interpretation of events or situations. According to Mannheim, social meaning only exists in the individual and it is our frame of reference that determines how we make sense of the material world. These pre-formed modes of thought provide background or commonsense assumptions of the world that are often taken for granted and go unnoticed. Native peoples' spirituality, for example, is a distinct mode of thought and way of interpreting the world. Considering the construction of news in relation to ideology Altheide states,

even the recognition of a 'fact' requires a great deal of prior knowledge and theory about a particular phenomenon. Newsworkers, scientists, and laymen, begin their quest for 'facts' with a storehouse of commonsense and as with most specialists, their training, experience, and purpose lead them to further refine a way of knowing the world (Altheide 1976:176).

Thus, reporters can agree about the 'facts' based on their experience or particular ideology but still distort an event by pursuing an angle influenced by their total ideology and removing the event from the context in which it occurred and would have been more fully understood (Altheide 1976:177).

Such commonsense assumptions are ingrained in an individual's frame of reference or interpretive schema, through linguistic and social institutions. Social meaning is constructed through inner subjective sharing of frames of reference influenced by these institutions. The conceptual framework of a mode of thought, then, is a function of the historical life situation of an individual. Therefore, instead of arguing against an isolated case of thought-content, total ideology refers to fundamentally divergent thought systems with widely differing modes of experience and interpretation (Mannheim 1936:57). This concept goes beyond the thought-content of the particular, questioning the opponents conceptual apparatus on a noological level; that is, it questions forms of thought and interpretation. The error is identified, not in the content, but the mode of thought. Focusing upon the form and conceptual framework of a mode
of thought, noology seeks out the ideological base of the conception through reconstruction of the historical, social and cultural context. Attack on the noological level undermines the validity of an opponent's theory, by showing that it is a function of the prevailing social situation. Eleanor MacLean clarifies the concepts of content and form of thought on a less theoretical level with respect to determining the overall message presented in any given communication. Content is the information, "facts" or theories put forward in support of an idea. Form refers to how something is presented or conveyed. "We shape our information, ideas or feelings: we give them form" (1981:29).

Karl Mannheim assumes reality exists in the individual and that it is our frame of reference or mode of thought that determines how we make sense of an object in the material world. Positivist theorists, on the other hand, often felt the material world was concrete and distinct from the subject or individual. Assuming individuals have divergent interpretive schemes, Mannheim argues that the object actually emerges dialectically from the subject. When the subject focuses upon a specific aspect of the material world, the facts are influenced by the subject's definition, i.e. his/her evaluation, interests and viewpoints (1936:xvii). Augmenting the famous dictum by W.I Thomas (above) Mannheim states, "The world exists only with reference to the knowing mind and the mental activity of the subject determines the form in which the world appears" (1936:66). Elucidating further, Mannheim asks:

How is it possible that identical thought-processes concerned with the same world produce divergent conceptions of that world... is it not possible that the thought processes which are involved here are not at all identical? (Mannheim 1936:9).

This conception appears to be the underlying theme in Boswell's discussion of how the struggle over the definition of facts (criminals versus sovereignty and land rights) behind the cause of the Mohawk Crisis is evident in the "virtually polarized arguments" and "startlingly different
conclusions about the country's Aboriginal peoples" (1991:18).

Although the subject defines the object, based on a dominant frame of reference, a dynamic process exists between the two. The subject is not separate from the object but is an active participant in creating and shaping the object or event. Researchers conducting media analysis operate within this interactionist/interpretive paradigm.

Mannheim argues that the object of study is ambiguous given the divergent interpretations to which it has been subjected (1936:14). To analyze a discourse we must then locate and reconstruct the genesis of thought in the subject not the object. Since the subject finds him/herself in an inherited situation with predetermined patterns of thought, analysis of discourse must involve looking at the historical and social context of the subject. Robin Collingwood recognizes how history itself constitutes the interpretation of individual facts (1922). By locating an individual within a historical situational context, the total ideology can be exposed and scrutinized. By focusing on these conditions in which intelligence and thought emerge, one is able to contextualize and understand the existent total ideology.

Theories of State

The primary categories of theories of State¹ and its relation to civil society² range from a liberal pluralistic (consensus) model to the instrumentalist and structuralist approaches based on a conflict model of society. The differences lie primarily in the degree of 'relative autonomy' of the state from civil society (superstructures) and the degree of significance assigned to the

¹The concept of the state used here includes all those institutions functioning within the 'public space' of the superstructure: government, education, police, courts, corrections and military.

²The concept of civil society refers to all those institutions within the 'private' as opposed to 'public' domain of the superstructure. These include the media, family, church and cultural institutions.
political and economic spheres (Cohen 1985:103).

The pluralist model is the conventional view that "the state is 'above' civil society, neutral and independent of partisan or class interests, as it regulates and mediates the interests of various social groups" (Ericson 1987:21). Power within civil society is distributed equally among various competing interest groups. This view is flawed since it marginalizes important substantive inequalities between class levels and constituencies.

Instrumentalism views the state as a partisan instrument of elites to achieve domination of the subordinate class (Ericson 1987:25). The state functions to sustain capital accumulation and the existing system of domination through protection of private property and ideological control; the institutions of democracy are illusory. According to Ratner, McMullan and Burch, "political and legal forms possess virtually no autonomy from economic processes; they correspond to the needs of the dominant class" (1987:99). The weakness of instrumentalism is that it assumes a homogeneity of ruling-class interests, and fails to explain how their voluntarism is shaped by structural relations. As well, this conspiratorial approach is unable to account for state policies, legislation and reforms that benefit the subordinate class, such as welfare and labour legislation.

The structuralist perspective argues that the functions of the state are determined by the structures of social relations, as opposed to the interests of individual members of the capitalist class. The state and law have "an objective relationship to classes and the productive forces in a society" (Ratner, McMullan and Burch 1987:93). The pivotal role of the state is to function (ideologically and coercively) in a relatively autonomous fashion to ensure capital accumulation and perpetuation of the structural status quo. This is carried out by counteracting labouring-class actions and solidifying capital class fragmentation within a hegemonic faction. The law and
criminal justice components act to mask class relations by displacing collective interests into legal individual ones. Being relatively autonomous from dominant class fractions as well, the state may enact policies contrary to the dominant class in favour of long-term interests of capital. This relative autonomy thesis (Althusser) improves on the instrumentalist theory of the state but has its own weaknesses: it overemphasizes the functional aspect of the state and law in favour of long-term reproduction of capital; it undervalues the power of subordinate classes and those advantages won through 'struggles' from below (Ratner, McMullan and Burch 1987:94); and, being economically determinist, it neglects the impact individuals have on social structures.

Hegemony

The movement of thought is stopped at barriers which appear as the Limits of Reason itself (Herbert Marcuse 1964:14).

For this analysis, the consensual base of pluralist theory and its concept of the 'neutral state' are too simplistic. Also, the instrumentalist approach is too conspiratorial, economistic and reductionist to be useful. The modified structuralism approach used by Hall et al. (1978) is more applicable. Stuart Hall et al. use Gramsci's concept of hegemony and Althusser's (1965) concept of relative autonomy of the state to avoid the problems of the instrumentalist approach and restore the individual to a theory of society. "The economy is not determinant on the state, nor is it considered separate from particular ideological and political contexts" (Ratner, McMullan and Burch 1987:94).

Antonio Gramsci emphasizes the importance of class dynamics and the power of the working-class struggle. While political-juridical ideology plays an important hegemonic role (fragmenting class collectives with the individual legal subject), juridical rights have their origins
in class struggle (Ratner, McMullan and Burtch 1987:102). The state acts as an 'alternative force', with a high degree of autonomy (Ratner, McMullan and Burtch 1987:96). The unique feature of Gramscian theory is the contradictory nature of the state and its dialectical relationship with civil society (political, juridical, and ideological complexes). "This contradictory character has created a political terrain through which class conflict has been fought out..." (Ratner, McMullan and Burtch 1987:104). Historical contextualization is required with this approach in order to understand this dynamic and complex relationship between the state and civil society.

For Gramsci, the state in an advanced capitalist economy performs a pivotal role in the 'manufacturing of consent' or hegemony. The state is "the instrument for conforming civil society to the economic structure" (Hall et al. 1978:201). By shaping social and political consent, the state sustains the dominant-subordinate class relations and the expansion of production required for capital. The political, juridical, and ideological maintenance of the class hierarchy renders the economic aspect of this hierarchy invisible. Hegemonic domination is achieved when the state is successful at engineering 'popular consent' across these levels. "Gramsci used the term 'hegemony' to refer to the moment when a ruling class is able, not only to coerce a subordinate class to conform to its interests, but to exert a 'hegemony' or 'total social authority' over subordinate classes" (Clarke et al. 1975:38). The successful construction of popular consent is achieved by displacing the reality (or essence) of capitalist domination with the appearance of liberal democracy.

It is within liberal democracy that real economic and political concessions are extracted from the dominant block to secure 'consent' without reliance on naked force, which could provoke resistance or rebellion (Hall et al. 1978:204, see also Miliband 1990:347). Hegemony is achieved when consent (direction) is 'won' ideologically 'so that the granting of legitimacy
to the dominant classes appears not only 'spontaneous' but natural and normal" (Clarke et al. 1975:38). This legitimacy gives the "hegemonic culture the power to frame all competing definitions of the world within its range" (Clarke et al. 1975:39). According to David Sallach, the most effective aspect of hegemony is found in the suppression of alternative views through the establishment of parameters which define what is legitimate, reasonable, sane, practical, good, true, and beautiful. A consequence of the hegemonic process is that the majority of the population is largely unaware of alternative values and alternative readings of history....In the absence of visible alternatives, no mass-based opposition emerges and the structure of control is able to continue unchallenged. (1974:41-42).

As the quotation from Marcuse (1964) introducing the concept of hegemony denotes, this ability to define the 'agenda' allows the dominant culture to manage and contain conflict by "defining what sorts of resolution are 'reasonable' and 'realistic' -- i.e. within the existing framework" (Lukes 1974:23-24 quoted in Clarke et al. 1975:38). It is on the terrain of the superstructures - that is, the civil, political, juridical and ideological complexes of the social formation -- that class and group struggles over hegemony are fought out (Hall et al. 1978:218).

The criminal justice system, embodying the rule of law and theory of the legal subject is central to the ideological framework that sustains consent and the explicit assumptions of society and how it works. The egalitarianism embodied in the law embodies distinct assumptions of the consensual nature of society. This consensus assumes that we all have the same perspective on events, that we all have the same interests and an equal share of power in society, that events that threaten this consensus are interpreted within conventional understandings, and that disagreements can be resolved without violence (Hall et al. 1978:54-57).

The ideological mask of legal equality serves to deflect attention away from the substantive economic inequality in a class-based capitalist society. By addressing class subjects as individual persons (the legal subject), the law maintains a specific social order in the service of capital that renders the economic aspect of class relations invisible (Hall et al. 1978:206).
Under the rubric of 'preservation of public order' the law secures, in moments of open class confrontation, the stability and cohesion necessary for the reproduction of capital (Hall et al. 1978:208). This 'ideology of individualization' functions as a deflection mechanism masking the structure of dominance.

It raises social relations -- for example those stemming from the social and sexual division of labour -- to the level of universal norms .... It equalizes, in the formal eye of the law, things which cannot be equal. In the famous words of Anatole France: 'In its majestic impartiality it forbids the rich and poor alike to sleep under the bridges of Paris' (Hall et al. 1978:208).

It is the teleological foundation of the law that substitutes a legalistic conception of morality for a social or philosophical conception that may provide moral justification to acts defined as illegal or immoral. In other words, if the 'law is the law' then action defined as 'criminal' is unjustifiable because it is 'criminal' (Young 1977:293-294). The law does not create social relations but enforces and represents them. "Its 'rule' comes to stand for the social order -- for 'society' itself. Hence a challenge to it is a token of social disintegration. In such conjunctures 'law' and 'order' become identical and indivisible " (Hall et al. 1978:208).

Crisis of Hegemony

Achieving hegemonic domination is not automatic but a process that is subject to crises and therefore must be continually maintained. A fracture in this ideological consensus (stemming from internal contradictions of capital) may result in a 'crisis of hegemony' for the ruling political power. It is the position of minority groups within capitalist society that makes them especially sensitive to the ideological mechanisms of consent. Stuart Hall claims that the emergent forms of political militancy by minority groups "appear at a highly contingent moment, historically, in the evolution of advanced late-industrial capitalist societies" (1974:271-272). They are the product of, and response to a capitalist and consensual political structure. This loss
of consensus causes the state to shift towards more coercive methods of control such as the criminal justice or military institutions (Comack 1987:234). According to John Clarke and his colleagues, one of the most striking features that mark a crisis of hegemony is the shift in the exercise of control from the mechanisms of consent to those of coercion (1975:40). This shift is often legitimized with a 'law and order' campaign propagated through the political and ideological (media) institutions of society. This campaign serves a scapegoating function, redirecting public attention away from underlying structural contradictions. For Antonio Gramsci,

the crisis of the 'ruling class' hegemony ... occurs either because the ruling class has failed in some major political undertaking for which it has requested, or forcibly extracted, the consent of the broad masses ... or because huge masses ... have passed suddenly from the state of political passivity to a certain activity, and put forward demands which, taken together,... add up to a revolution (Gramsci 1971:210).

The economic and political turbulence causes a breakdown "in the links between the practical experiences of the masses and the taken-for-granted 'common sense' ideological and institutional arrangements which were grounded on the former pattern of experience" (Ratner and McMullan 1983:34). This fracturing of the ideological cement requires state mobilization toward more repressive social control techniques. The state legitimizes this authoritarian shift by re-directing attention to the 'commonsensical' terrain of authority, discipline and control (Ratner and McMullan 1983:35). This is accomplished by diverting public attention (through the mass media) to one-dimensional 'law and order' issues, such as criminal behaviour and violence (Taylor 1980:293-294). Antonio Gramsci explains that,

A crisis occurs, sometimes lasting for decades. This exceptional duration means that incurable structural contradictions have revealed themselves ... and that, despite this, the political forces which are struggling to conserve and defend the existing structure itself are making efforts to cure them within certain limits', [emphasis added] and to overcome them (Gramsci 1971:178).

---

William Chambliss (1986) provides an interesting model of how states and governments attempt to resolve the conflicts arising from basic contradictions of capitalism rather than the contradictions themselves.
The 'Authoritarian' State: The Canadian Experience

Given the dialectical relationship between the state and civil society, we must analyze these structures historically to gain a fuller understanding of the antecedents of the state reaction to the Mohawk Crisis. According to Ratner and McMullan, a synchrony exists between the shifting of western capitalist states to an 'authoritarian populism', and the domestic and global crisis of capital accumulation. These crises are marked by overaccumulation, overproduction, and reduced rates of profit (1983:31). As Comack notes, a 'crisis of hegemony' is "not simply an event or even a series of events but a process" (1987:234). Discussing the economic basis of an emerging 'law and order state' in Canada during the early 1980s, Comack states, "In short, what we may be witnessing is a hegemonic control that is in the process of breaking down [emphasis added] (1987:235). Thus, the 'economic crisis', originating in the early 1980s, may have cultivated the conditions on which the Mohawk Crisis caused a crisis of hegemony.

The parallel developments of unemployment, political fragmentation, racial tension and anxiety over crime suggest a Canadian crisis similar to that of Britain and the United States (Taylor 1983:4). There is also evidence that "'liberal' Canada is being transformed into one of the most heavily policed of western societies, with one of the highest rates of imprisonment in the West" (Taylor 1983:141). There has, however, been a lack of conspicuous movement toward an 'exceptional state' within the political and ideological spheres of the superstructure. In other words, there is an absence of extensive 'law and order campaigns' and of a substantial political shift to the right during this period. According to Ian Taylor, the domestic and international economic crisis of accumulation had not posed a fundamental challenge to the hegemonic liberal politics in Canada (1983:7).

The enigmatic response by the Canadian state to this significant structural crisis is
explained by Robert Gaucher (1987) and Ian Taylor (1983). They suggest that historical analysis of the Canadian state reveals a 'quintessentially bourgeois social formation'. In other words, the Canadian social arrangement lacks the substantive class distinctions found within the British and American societies. Robert Gaucher explains that the creation of the stable Canadian bourgeois state "was not constrained by the hegemonic problems associated with the transformation of European post-feudal societies into capitalist social orders" (1987:190). Augmenting this view, Taylor argues that the form of the ruling-class hegemony in Canada has not been 'social democratic' as in Britain (1983:10). Indeed, a distinctive feature of the political and ideological formation in Canada is the close relationship among all three political parties (Taylor 1983:10). There is, then, no substantive polarity between parties on the political spectrum. Therefore, Taylor feels that there has been no real need for ruling-class ideologies to construct populist anti-social democratic rhetoric to dislodge the working class from its social democratic commitments. "What working class there is in Canada has simply not developed those commitments in a fundamental or extensive fashion" (1983:16). This uncomplicated bourgeois power is evidenced by the unhesitant state response to social conflicts such as the Winnipeg Strike in 1919 and the 1970 October crisis in Quebec. Taylor argues that "the War Measures Act was a response to the growth of democratic, socialist and separatist political sentiment in Quebec as much as it was a response to the threat of 'terrorism'" (1983:12). Finally, a strong degree of government legitimacy in utilizing coercive control is derived from the nationalistic reverence Canadians hold for the police (RCMP), in contrast to other capitalist societies (Taylor 1980:302). Ian Taylor (1980, 1983) and Robert Gaucher (1987) find no

---

4 It must be recognized that the concept of a "quintessentially bourgeois social formation" or existence of a definitive dominant-subordinate class relationship in Canadian society is a complex and contentious issue.
evidence of a 'hegemonic crisis' in Canada similar to Britain during the early 1980s.\(^5\)

The Media: Structured in Dominance

People think that stories are shaped by people. In fact, it's the other way around. Stories exist independently of their players. If you know that, the knowledge is power (Pratchett 1991:8).

The analysis of an issue presented in newspapers must begin with a basic assumption of the function of the press in relation to the structure of society. The mass media are commonly viewed as an important component in the democratic process. This liberal-pluralist school of thought suggests that the media provide an objective, impartial source of information, independent of the government. Democracy is a system of government by elites whose position of authority is determined, maintained and checked by competing interest groups making up society's majority. The mass media's role within this democratic system is to provide an outlet for a diversity of viewpoints and ideas, "through which governing élites could be pressurized and reminded of their dependency on majority opinion" (Bennett 1982:40).

An alternative conception of the media's role in society is articulated by Gramsci (1971), Hall (1979:318), and Hall et al. (1978). The mass media are seen, not as an objective communicator, but as an ideological mechanism perpetuating the existing hegemonic relationship. This concept is supported by evidence of the highly concentrated structure of media ownership and the fact that the range of variation within the political perspectives of the dominant media is extraordinarily narrow (Miliband 1969:219 quoted in Bennett 1982:41).

The media produce an illusion of themselves as an objective independent facilitator of

\(^5\)Comack (1987), arguing against this suggestion by Gaucher and Taylor, provides evidence that a 'crisis of hegemony' was evident in Canada during the late 1970s and early 80s.
information, by allowing representatives of ‘both sides’ to present their position on an issue. However, this ‘ideology of objectivity’ obscures the narrow range of variation that is actually presented.

What the claim overlooks, however, is the very large fact that it is the Left at which the watchdogs generally bark with most ferocity, and that what they are above all protecting is the status quo (Miliband 1970:223).

Objectivity represents an ideological myth, effectively masking the actual hegemonic role of the media. Operating within established boundaries, discussion of political contradictions is limited to determining which techniques will more effectively manage the system as it presently exists (reformism). Alternative political positions which contradict existing social arrangements are automatically excluded from the terms of reference established by such debates (Bennett 1982:43; see also Altheide 1976:113).

‘Objectivity’, ‘impartiality’ and ‘balance’ are achieved through reliance on authoritative statements from ‘accredited sources’. Research has shown that news organizations rely on bureaucratic news sources, which can colour news accounts and reproduce the status quo (Epstein 1973; Altheide 1976, 1984, 1985; Tuchman 1978; Fishman 1980; Sigal 1986; Chibnall 1977; Brown et al. 1987; Soloski 1989; Stempel 1984; Hall et al. 1978; Gitlin 1980; on the coverage of Native peoples in particular, see Sim 1978 and Vogan 1979). For example, Brown et al. (1987) found that over half of all sources in front page news stories were affiliated with some government body. Similarly, Soloski (1989) and Sim (1978) found that elected or appointed officials were the primary source in 56% of the stories analyzed. The studies concluded that news was heavily anchored in the power structure of society, excluded alternative viewpoints, and determined which issues would be debated. According to Hall et al. (1978),

---

4For a detailed theoretical discussion on the concept of reformism see Cohen (1985). See also William Chambliss (1986).
this institutionalized reliance serves to orient the media in the "definitions of social reality" provided by the official sources who are the 'primary definers' of the event.⁷ This reproduces and legitimizes the existing power structure and status quo (Hall et al. 1978:58). A symbiotic relationship exists between the control culture as primary definers and the media as reproducers (Clarke et al. (1975:75). By relying on facts provided by official sources the media perpetuates an economically (i.e. capitalist) and ideologically biased consciousness or false logic throughout society (Altheide 1984). Schlesinger et al. claim that, "the constant reaffirmation of the official perspective goes hand in hand with the effort to marginalise both the impact and the legitimacy of the alternative to it" (1983:21). Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester term this repetition of the official perspective "habitual access" (1974:127).

In other words, repetition of dominant ideas and explanations ingrains these explanations historically and commonsensually -- they become "deposits of power".⁸ Once established and maintained by society, labels, ideas and stereotypes embody an inferential framework that often goes unchallenged. These images are intrinsically a function of a society's cultural and social history. Akiba Cohen et al. claim that "If one assumes that the media preserve consensus through replication, we would expect privileged groups to be gifted with news presence" (1990:115). On the other hand, those low status groups or individuals will be denied appearance in the news.

---

⁷The term 'primary definers' is defined by Hall (1978:57-59) as those 'accredited sources' whose position within the hierarchy of credibility (Becker 1967) allows their definition of an event to be accepted as 'fact'. This definition establishes the parameters of the debate and alternative definitions are excluded. This concept requires future research to empirically determine if the impact on the public verifies its theoretical presuppositions (e.g. Altheide often examines the impact of news formats).

⁸The term 'deposit of power' is coined and discussed by Stanley Cohen (1985).
Despite the requirements of 'objectivity', 'balance', 'impartiality', etc. the media remain oriented within the framework of power: they are part of a political and social system which is 'structured in dominance' (Hall quoted in Chibnall 1977:11).

The mass media's tendency to support the status quo is not considered instrumental or conspiratorial. Instead, it is derived from the media's deep-seated commitment to the values and institutions of the liberal-democratic consensus. Commitment to a consensual model of society carries the assumption that we all have roughly the same interests, and an equal share of power in society. As well, "whatever disagreements exist, it is said, there are legitimate and institutionalised means for expressing and reconciling them" (Hall et al. 1978:55). "The core value of the political consensus is the adherence to 'legitimate means for the pursuance of interests without resort to open conflict"" (Hall 1973: 152).

This view denies any major structural discrepancies between different groups or between different frameworks of meanings and interpretations (i.e. modes of thought). Stuart Hall suggests that this majoritarian-democratic theory of politics is vestigially retained as an ideologically legitimizing myth while in fact it no longer has relevance as a portrait of the complex modern industrial state (1974:265). From a normative perspective then, all political action which is not expressed by the electoral process and does not follow established procedural norms is, by definition, deviant with respect to politics (Hall 1974:262). Since the form and content of consensus is highly problematic, it has to be powerfully advanced in ideological terms. However, the attempt to advance consensual assumptions and modes of thought promulgates counter-norms, -values and -politics -- the politics of deviance. As Hall states, "Those who engage in conflict-politics or interpret society in conflict terms are powerfully stigmatized" (1974:272).

At the core of this commitment to the status quo "lies a general acceptance of prevailing
modes of thought concerning the economic and social order and a specific acceptance of the capitalist system" (Miliband 1970:221). David Altheide claims that prevailing values, options, and definitions of reality are often explicitly, but usually implicitly, part of news messages. Through concepts of "objectivity" and "impartiality", the media allow institutional authorities to establish the initial definition or primary interpretation of an issue. The important point is that this "inferential structure" then determines the terms of reference in which a topic will be discussed (Hall et al. 1978:58-59). This ideological distortion of reality acts on the consciousness of individuals in a way that is profoundly unconscious to them. Therefore, categories and assumptions which form the unacknowledged impediments to scientific investigation continue to remain unexamined (Bennet 1982:48). On the political level, the democratic state maintains a limited range of plurality. It institutionalizes, absorbs and compromises with powerful minority and pressure groups, ignoring weak, marginal groups. Interests falling outside the acceptable framework receive no attention, and their proponents are treated as 'crackpots', 'extremists', or 'foreign agents' (Wolff 1965:43-44). Thus, the press operate as a relatively independent ideological mechanism perpetuating the existing hegemonic relationship of a particular society.

Limitations of the Dominant Ideology Thesis

Altheide suggests that although news organizations rely on bureaucratic sources which shape news reports, "anti-establishment" organizations also operate bureaucratically and therefore the ideological content of news reports based on these alternative sources will also vary (1984:480). Philip Schlesinger et al. found that the relationship between the television and the state is "an uneasy, often abrasive, relationship ... marked by struggles over the balance between autonomy and control" (1983:161). Thus, the media are relatively autonomous, operating not in favour
of the dominant ideology but as an agent of social change challenging the legitimacy of dominant institutions (Altheide 1984:482-483). This evidence of social change challenges the assumption that the media are an ideological mechanism perpetuating the existing hegemonic relationship. Several authors have provided evidence of the substantial distortion effects of the social organization of the media on the way in which ‘facts’ and ‘events’ are selected and subsequently shaped into news by media production routines (Altheide 1976, 1984; Ericson et al. 1987; Tuchman 1978; Gans 1979; and Epstein 1973). This has helped counter the prevailing argument that the media only reflect official versions of reality (Singer 1982:349).

Altheide (1976) studied the production of news and how news impute meaning and significance to events. He found that it was not so much ideology that matters but rather the "news perspective" (format) -- organizational, technical, economic and personal variables that transform ‘events’ into news. The "news perspective" sets the criteria for ‘importance’. It first removes the event from its significant social and cultural context; this decontextualized and transformed event is then embedded in a news report and presented as reality. Part of this perspective is the routine use of themes (such as violence), or general characterizations of events over a period of time. Edward Epstein (1973) demonstrated how media policy guides the selection and treatment of news. He found that organized news routines lead to the omission of some stories and approaches in favour of others. Todd Gitlin (1980:249-52), R. Ericson et al. (1987) and A. Cohen et al. (1990) examine the relationship between ideological and organizational factors in television and newspapers. The findings suggest the need to try to empirically examine the critical approach to media. For example, Cohen et al. (1990) found evidence to doubt the validity of assumptions that television news simplify, intensify and decontextualize social conflicts. At the same time they offer empirical support to claims that the
media function to some extent as guardians of the social status quo and as social mechanisms of conflict regulation (Cohen et al. 1990:177-181). R. Mathes and A. Auer found that journalist selection, interpretation, and evaluation of an event across western and other countries were influenced by political cultural patterns (ideology) and by the editorial slants of the newspaper (1989). These studies show that while the purely hegemonic explanations of the relationship between the media and the state are overly simplistic, ideology does play an important role, as does the individual newspaper's perspective. The importance of empirically testing the influence of organizational and broader societal structural factors is recognized. However, the examination of organizational factors is beyond the scope of this study.

News Imperatives: Reality Cast Adrift

Social conflict is "actuality without context" (Hall 1973:154)

The theory presented suggests that the mass media operate within a specific frame of reference or ideology. This ideological framework of concepts and values determines what events or situations are newsworthy. According to Chibnall, this framework is an "unconscious construction which structures perception and thought, systematically excluding certain realities and promoting and shaping others" (1977:11). For example, the process of identifying deviance implicitly involves a conception of its nature. This conception, or mode of interpretation, operates within the framework of the dominant interpretive paradigm of the political and social elite. Clarifying this conception further, Fishman states:

news consumers are led to see the world outside their firsthand experience through the eyes of the existing authority structure. Alternative ways of knowing the world are simply not made available. Ultimately, routine news places bounds on political consciousness (1980:138).

The media reproduction of the dominant ideology is also the product of a set of structural
imperatives. Stanley Cohen (1980) and Steve Chibnall (1977) describe specific inventories (themes) and imperatives that guide the construction of news stories. These elements illustrate the composition as well as the underlying theoretical and ideological position inherent within a news article.

A primary imperative of the media is exaggeration and distortion of the seriousness of events (particularly 'deviance' and racial disturbances) (Cohen 1980:31-32). Characteristic of the mode and style of presentation are sensational headlines and melodramatic vocabulary, that exaggerate and distort the seriousness of the event while ignoring the situational and historical context. Often the terms and phrases used lack definition and meaning and carry the connotation of an emotionally charged climate, presenting only a limited range of emotions and causal factors. Thus, Cohen feels media coverage of deviance is flat, one-dimensional and lacking in historical depth.

Rather than reconstructing the motives underlying an event, the media often focus on the imperatives of violence and conflict (Fedler 1973:110). One reason for this is that the ‘frequency’ of ‘dramatic events’ fit media or time frames, whereas complex issues are processual, requiring a long time-span to unfold and acquire meaning (Galtung and Ruge 1973:53). The inferential structure of violence then becomes the dominant issue covered by the press. The Mohawk Warriors’ demands for recognition of historically based claims to sovereignty, constitutional issues of self determination and land therefore become secondary issues to the imperative of "violence". Stuart Hall et al. claim violence in the form of murder, particularly of a policeman, is the ultimate crime against the state and "represents a fundamental rupture in the social order. The use of violence marks the distinction between those who are fundamentally of society and those who are outside it" (1978:68). Stanley Cohen claims that
"acts of violence and vandalism are the most tangible manifestations of what the press regard as hooliganism" (1980:36). Terms such as 'hooligan', 'criminal', and 'terrorist' are often considered as a sign (manifestation) of social malaise. The focus on violence has allowed social control agencies to rationalize development of efforts to contain or inhibit similar situations that may occur in the future. This justifies expansion of social control and reflects attention from underlying ideologically conflicting political and social issues.

The news imperative of violence derives even more impact when linked to minority groups. Often, minority groups are only able to gain attention from the press when their demonstrations become disruptive or violent. David Altheide claims that news often does not include the minority community. "They're not news unless they're opposed to the structure and then they're news" (1976:115). Benjamin Singer (1982) and Heather Sim (1978) found that news coverage concerning minority groups is negative, centred on conflict, disruptions and crime. P. Hartman and C. Husband (1973) point out that the news depicts race related matters in a way that causes people to see the situation as primarily one of actual or potential conflict. They stress that the minority group will always be framed as conflict generating and all other issues involved or social problems surrounding it will generally be reduced. In other words it is not the issue itself which is newsworthy as much as the conflict and debate that surrounds the issue.

It is apparent that structured press imperatives reflect, substantiate and ultimately reproduce the dominant ideology. The reliance on official interpretations of events, and concomitant neglect of competing perspectives, are major factors in perpetuating this ideology. Confirming this, Sallach found that the media presuppose and perpetuate a particular ideology
deficient in alternative viewpoints. Fred Fedler also claims that the press' failure to report causes and consequences of civil disorders and race relations results in the reinforcement and revitalization of the status quo (1973:110).

According to Marx, "without history reality becomes vulnerable to the interpretations of a dominant ideology" (quoted in Chibnall, 1977:24). Lacking historical context, the press provides a one-dimensional image of crime that sustains commonsense assumptions about deviance and crime. These assumptions, combined with emotive symbols, exaggeration of violence, melodramatic vocabulary, magnification and prediction, serve to order otherwise disordered social conditions, confirm stereotypes and reproduce the dominant interpretive paradigm. News ideology is an ahistorical and decontextualized form of communication. Social conflicts are simplified, via media imperatives of sensationalization and titillation, for their entertainment value. According to Gerbner, the media emphasize "personal, emotional and other dramatic aspects of situations" (1988:13). Focus on these manifest qualities and the primary news theme of violence minimizes the presentation of the underlying social situation essential for understanding and providing meaning to complex social conflicts. Corroborating this, Halloran et al. (1970) and Murdock (1973:160-164) found that press coverage of a political demonstration focused on the potential for violence and the immediate form of the event, what happened and who was involved, ignoring the underlying context of the situation. "Because it offers no analysis of the relationship between particular events and underlying structural processes, news is fundamentally ahistorical" (Murdock 1973:164). Atwater (1987), in a study

---

9For a discussion on the impact culture and political socialization have on the perspective of Canadian and Quebec history presented in school texts, see Ottawa Citizen (1992) February 22:B2 (D. Drolet, "Different regions make for different views of Canada's past" and "Perspectives: Three examples of Quebec, Ontario school children getting varying presentations of the same facts").
of network coverage of the 1985 TWA hijacking by Shi’ite terrorists, found limited attention was given to historical, cultural and other factors which may have given rise to the hijacking. Stuart Hall observed that coverage of social conflicts without context feeds our general sense of an explosion of meaningless violent acts "out there" somewhere, in an unintelligible world" (1973:154). Thus, presentation that ignores underlying causes masks the structurally incompatible interests that cannot be bridged while suggesting that conflicts are solvable (Cohen et al. 1990:42; see also Hall et al. 1978:92, and Murdock 1973:164). This is a pivotal point, since it is within the historical and social context that processes of legitimation and delegitimation become visible (Crelinsten 1937b:6). The issue studied here is the Mohawk land claim dispute at Oka, which itself can be traced back over two centuries (see York and Pinder (1991), Wright (1991), Clark (1990), Hornung (1991), Maclaine and Baxendale (1990) and Grant (1984)).

Symbolization is an inventory element referring to the dependence of mass media on stereotypes and the symbolic power of labels, words and images.

Symbolization and the presentation of the "facts" in the most simplified and melodramatic manner possible leaves little room for interpretation, the presentation of competing perspectives on the same event or information which would allow the audience to see the event in context (Cohen 1980:76).

Labels often have pejorative connotations of irresponsibility that serve to delegitimize a person and allow the removal of rights and responsibility. Symbolization is a powerful tool for perpetuating stereotypes through linkages developed between specific words and images. The reporting is distorted by the selection and linking of these concepts to fit already pre-existing or commonsensational expectations. "A sharpening up process occurs producing emotionally toned symbols which acquire their own momentum" (Cohen 1980:43). According to Cohen, the emphasis on images is derived from the tendency towards spurious attribution to which a
putative deviation is developed. Once initial identification takes place, influenced by an established conception of deviance, labels are extended and elaborated. Spurious attribution utilizes emotive symbols such as ‘hooligans’, ‘thugs’, ‘extremists’, or ‘acting illegally’, providing a composite stigma to persons performing certain acts. Such pejorative composites are all-encompassing with a hard core of stable and inferential attributes (irresponsibility, immaturity, arrogance, lack of respect for authority) (1980:54-55). These secondary images evolve from the initial identification label. Spurious attribution also draws on readily available composite images, such as racial stereotypes, to which any new event can be grafted (Cohen 1980:57). By linking the commonsense images of ‘terrorist’ or ‘criminal’ and ‘violence’, the press reaffirms stereotypes, which results in a perpetuation of the prejudices, phobias and negative attitudes inherent within our society. Once an event is initially defined by official sources, ideological closure often prevails. That is, counter-ideologies or explanations of the event have limited access and often must respond in terms pre-established by the primary definers (Altheide 1976:113).

Labels: A Struggle for Legitimacy

One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter.

As the well known dictum illustrates, definitions and labels of behaviour are a matter of perspective. Labels are often value-based, intrinsically political, and linked to power relations in society (Hall 1974:261-262). Philip Schlesinger et al., discussing the mutual relationship between the representation of political violence and the exercise of definitional power view these definitional struggles as "part of wider struggles for the hegemonic domination of given

---

10Stuart Hall (1974) provides an example of the process of symbolization (i.e. signification) on pages 278-279.

One manifestation of a power struggle is that different meanings are attached to the same action, depending upon the particular allegiances held by the definer ... whoever has the power defines the meaning; those labels that prevail are those promulgated by groups with the power to make them stick (Crenstien 1987b:8).

Therefore, the distinction between 'political’ and ‘non-political’ acts (social problems) reflects the structure of power and interest (Hall 1974:262). The powerful inferential deposits inherent in pejorative labels serve to mask the process of mutual interpenetration between political marginality and social deviance. However, the boundaries are not distinct and as Hall notes, the members of 'deviant' groups and of politically activist minorities are often one and the same. This process of coalescence is attested to in the widespread convergence of criminal and ideological labels applied, without much distinction, by labelling agencies to dissenting minorities of both a 'deviant' and 'political' type (1974:264).

The distinction between types of insurrectionary activity is important, but the official view rejects it as irrelevant and focuses on its consequences (i.e. violence, loss of life, etc). The less this definition is placed in context the easier the acts speak for themselves. Stuart Hall explains that the closure of a topic around its initial definition is far easier to achieve against groups which are fragmented and adopt extreme oppositional means of struggle to secure their ends or defend their interests. "Any of these characteristics make it easier for the privileged definers to label them freely, and to refuse to take their counter-definitions into account" (Hall et al. 1978:65).

Labels serve three functions: they advance a basic shared set of assumptions and
interests, they legitimize or delegitimize, and they reaffirm the consensual nature of society by directing attention to that which falls outside this consensus. Within consensual politics, structural inequalities in the distribution of wealth and power do not exist -- therefore there can be no legitimate reason for radical action. As Murdock states, "If radical activity is not generated by contradictions within the system, it must originate outside" (1973:157).

Crelinsten explains that there are two methods of coercive control in society -- the criminal-justice model and the war or military model. These two institutions of social control serve as instruments in the struggles for legitimacy that continually occur between groups competing for resources and power (Crelinsten 1987b:8). The two models are situated at the coercive or violent end of a continuum of control models that range from purely social control (e.g. education and family) to military control. These state activities are mirrored by acts of those the state attempts to control. Social protest mirrors social control while the use of violence mirrors criminal justice and military control (Crelinsten 1989b; 1987b).

Separating both models is a zone of ambiguity where crime and politics become blurred. Here the insurgent or terrorist claims political ends for his/her criminalized actions (Crelinsten 1987b:9). In contrast, by treating political behaviour as criminal the state depoliticizes, individualizes, and trivializes the incident as 'ordinary' crime (Crelinsten 1989b:245, 1987a:442). Ronald Crelinsten (1987a, 1987b and 1989b) in his analysis of terrorism offers a compelling definitional framework for understanding the dialectical relationship between those struggling for and against political and social change and their interrelation to the criminal-justice and war models. This interactive process pivots on legitimization and delegitimization tactics. The degree to which one or the other of the models comes into play depends on the dynamic relationship occurring between the State and the insurgent. The dialectical nature of the
relationship determines the degree of shift in the models. Definitional ambiguities are evident in the switching of strategies and tactics and the shifting from one control institution to another as the state's perception of the phenomenon changes. This is a result of the complex political environment and the diverse strategies and tactics (e.g. violent, non-violent, legal, illegal) of insurgent groups (Crelinsten 1989b:243).

Within the criminal justice model, the state holds the monopoly on the use of violence, which is limited by the rule of law. Philip Schlesinger et al. claim that a liberal democratic state’s legitimacy is founded on its adherence to due process and the rule of law. The state risks undermining its credibility and legitimacy if it breaches the rule of law (state terrorism) (1983:13). The justice system deals primarily with those individual acts that appear to violate consensual rules. Labelling of political actions which challenge the status quo (such as civil disobedience or armed insurgency) as illegitimate and deviant is one of the primary responses of the state to challenges to its authority to rule (Murdock 1973: 156). Once the label of 'criminal' is applied successfully, legitimacy of the dissenter or controlled is lost and closure of the primary definition strengthened. A commonsense assumption about deviance is that the criminality of an act causes forfeiture of the right to negotiate its consensual definitions. According to Hall et al., this stems from the fact that crime is less open than most public issues to competing definitions (1978:69).

Under the war model, the rules of war replace the rule of law, civil liberties are curtailed, and the use of force (i.e. violence) by the state intensifies and becomes more overt (Crelinsten 1987b, 1989b). In this situation legitimacy is no longer a primary concern because of the perceived seriousness of the threat to the state. However, the war definitional model also signifies that the opponent of the state is a recognizable political threat. This increases the
legitimacy of the opponent's use of violence in the pursuit of political ends. This is especially true in cases where the state is said to have adopted colonial or economic domination (Young 1977:296). According to Schlesinger et al., warfare is a realistic metaphor for insurgents to adopt because it "confers legitimacy upon the insurgent by making their struggle one for territorial self-determination" (1983:28). "The definition of an offensive act as part of a wartime campaign is central to the claim of legitimacy" (Schlesinger et al. 1983:30; see also Crelinsten 1987b:11-12). By treating acts of insurgency as acts of war, "the State recognizes the threat as a serious one and renders it extraordinary" (Crelinsten 1989b:245).

The ability to politicize and morally justify violent acts rests on the capacity to mobilize mass support. "It is about the extent to which a relatively small number of armed fighters 'represents' a much larger group" (Rubenstein 1987:24; see also Crelinsten 1989b:257). Stuart Hall et al. suggest that the production of counter-ideologies depends on whether the collectivity which generates the explanations is a powerful countervailing force in society, represents an organised majority or substantial minority, has a degree of legitimacy within the system, or can win such a position through struggle (1978:64). Collective organization also allows deviant groups to redefine the social stigmas against them in political terms (Hall 1974:264). Richard Rubenstein summarizes this debate well:

To assert that a violent act is essentially criminal is to have concluded that it is not integral to a process of legitimate political transformation. To assert that it is essentially an act of war implies that it reflects the desires or advances the interests of the masses and is strategically rational; hence, that it is integral to the mass struggle (Rubenstein 1987:33).

The use of violence is often the key differentiating feature separating legal dissent from illegal dissent (Crelinsten 1989b:254). The core value of the political consensus is the adherence to legitimate avenues of dissent without resort to open conflict (Hall 1973:152). "A violence
threshold separates crime from politics and criminal justice from government” (Crelinsten 1987b:17). Thus, Crelinsten regards acts using violence or the threat of violence as a form of political communication designed to gain attention (Crelinsten 1987a:419, 1987b:8 and 1989b:244). However, this distinction itself is not concrete, and becomes blurred during periods of political instability that result in armed insurrection, revolution or war. As Rubenstein states, "Where there is political consensus, people speak a common language, and problems of definition seem merely academic. Where there is none, definitions crystallize differences, and descensus can be fatal" (1987:19). During these historical periods the state may shift emphasis from a criminal-justice model of control to a war model of control.

Theoretical considerations explained, it is now necessary to outline the methodology and procedures that were undertaken to analyze media discourse and test the two general theses that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and that the media supported an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. The methodology and procedures are discussed in chapter two.

---

11The threshold of violence is described by Hall as the highest limit of societal tolerance, because the use of violence threatens to undermine the state (1978:225).
CHAPTER II - METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This research employs a combination of several quantitative and qualitative techniques to measure the ideological images found in press coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. These include content analysis, discourse analysis and a historical contextual approach developed by Karl Marx, examined by Sumner (1979), and applied by Stuart Hall et al. (1978) and Stanley Cohen (1972).

This research is heavily influenced by Stuart Hall's critical studies defining the media "as a major cultural and ideological force, standing in a dominant position with respect to the way in which social relations and political problems were defined and the production and transformation of popular ideologies in the audiences addressed" (Hall 1980:117). News is therefore not simply a description of facts, but a specific (re)construction of reality according to the norms and values of a society (Van Dijk 1983:28). Ian Connell and Adam Miles explain discourse as an "active element in social relations, being part of a constitutive process in the objective production of social meanings" (1985:41). Therefore, discourse reflects, reinforces and at times challenges the current relations of power in society. Philip Schlesinger et al. state, "Language matters and how the media use language matters" (1983:1). The work of establishing new kinds of 'knowledge' about problematic features of social and political life is accomplished through the mediation of language. The social production of new definitions in problematic areas produces legitimating 'explanations' and 'justifications' (Hall 1974:276). "Hence, a powerful way of examining ideological structure is through the examination of language" (Kress 1985:27-28) -- in this case, the language presented in newspapers.
Content Analysis

Content analysis is considered one of the most appropriate techniques for examining physical records of communication (such as newspapers). Earl Babbie defines content analysis as the "systematic counting, assessing, and interpreting of the form and substance of communication" (1989:152). Primarily a quantitative method for the analysis of qualitative data, content analysis is a coding procedure for transforming records of social phenomena into numeric form appropriate for statistical analysis. Types of content analysis include word counting, conceptual analysis, semantic analysis, evaluative assertion analysis and contextual analysis. Word counting simply involves the counting of key words in texts (e.g. 'criminal' or 'terrorist'). Conceptual analysis is a more sophisticated counting of words grouped into clusters or ideas. Semantic analysis incorporates intensity weighting of words, allowing for scaling of the findings. Using a complete sentence as the unit of analysis, evaluative assertion analysis classifies sentences in terms of grammatical distinctions between words placed in sentences. The most sophisticated method, contextual analysis, is capable of predicting future verbal communication from past verbal behaviour (Sanders and Pinhey 1983:190-197). Essentially, each type of analysis improves upon the interpretive capability available to the researcher. For example, raw word counting is problematic in that the same word may be used in many different ways. Words must therefore be counted in context. The unit of observation is therefore expanded to include themes, clusters, sentences or complete text. This allows incorporation of modifiers (adverbs, adjectives) and explanatory text that provide context and establish meaning (Manheim and Rich 1986:155).

Content analysis, based on words, themes and whole text focuses on the substantive or manifest content of a communication (Manheim and Rich 1986:156). Contrasting this is
structural content analysis which is concerned more with the amount of time or space devoted
to a given subject in a particular source -- how many words, columns, articles or pages of
newspaper coverage have been allotted to a particular subject. How large a headline
accompanies a news item? Does coverage of a particular subject receive front-page prominence?
Here the researcher is less concerned with subtleties of meaning than with styles of presentation
(Manheim and Rich 1986:159). This type of analysis is simpler to design and implement, less
expensive and often more reliable than substantive content analyses.

A major advantage of content analysis as a research technique is the ability to historically
examine a large number of cases from various environments with minimal cost and maximum
convenience. Its ability to use a large sample size results in a reduction of sampling error and
an increased level of confidence in generalizing from the results (Manheim and Rich 1986:154).
The quantification aspect of content analysis offers the advantage of improved interpretation and
inference quality along with the power of statistical methods, providing a precise and economical
summary of findings (Holsti 1969:09). However, a crucial limitation lies in the assumed
objectivity of coded and statistically analyzed data. This positivistic assumption of objectivity
masks the frequent idiosyncratic subjective interpretations of the data by the researcher. This
limitation became increasingly self evident as the research for this thesis progressed.

Lastly, although repetition indicates a measure of significance, content analysis is
incapable of ascertaining cause and effect. That is, there is no understanding of the interaction
of symbols as patterns of interworking meanings (Hall 1974:278-279). The technique of content
analysis is applied to communicators' denotative or manifest discourse while the ideology of
content analysis focuses on the communicators' connotative or latent thoughts (intentions) as they
are presumed to be revealed in his/her discourse (Sumner 1979:67). The key (contradictory)
assumption being that the repetition of words and phrases is significant and will expose the communicator’s 'consciousness' or ideology. But content analysis of a communicator's motives and intentions will suffer from "low validity' (without direct data on the communicator), 'low reliability' (owing to the likelihood of inter-coder differences of interpretation) and 'circularity' (deducing cause from effect would be followed by inducing effect from cause)" (Berelson 1966:262-263 quoted in Sumner 1979:67). Quantification strips away the contextual material that offers insight into latent content and ideological meaning. Colin Sumner feels content analysis is divested of ideological meaning, "superficial, limited in value, and dubiously founded" (1979:66) -- it is "speculation disguised as science and art" (1979: 59-99). Despite these limitations, content analysis will be used to identify patterns of recurring themes and descriptive manifest content.

**Discourse Analysis**

Although similar to content analysis, systematic discourse analysis has several distinctive elements that make it a more appropriate analytical tool for understanding social reality. Firstly, discourse analysis, evaluative in character, focuses more on the explication of qualitative data than quantitative data. Secondly, instead of simple correlation this technique employs broader cognitive and social theory about the rules and strategies that underlie the production and understanding of media discourse. Finally, while content analysis is based on countable data, discourse analysis, in addition to focusing on surface structures, also attempts to explain underlying semantic or latent structures (Van Dijk 1983:26-27). Acknowledging the general ideological nature of mass communications, discourse analysis gives greater attention to uncovering implied meanings that represent ideological positions (Hall 1980:118). This level
of analysis takes a less mechanical view of communication, recognising the political and ideological role of language and the importance of the context of its use.

The available methods of discourse analysis are classified by "level" or "unit of analysis", ranging from surface structures of phonology (intonation), morphology (word formation), and lexiconic and syntactic analyses (the choice and arrangement of words), to a broader thematic and metaphorical level of language (Van Dijk 1983:23). At the level of surface structures the focus is on linguistic and grammatical characteristics that signify ideological categories. However, the narrow focus on manifest content ignores the social significance of discourse and the inferential framework it invokes as a means of signifying ideology. Thematic or semantic discourse analysis, on the other hand, attempts to determine the overall meaning or macro-structures of words, phrases, sentences, or whole discourses (Van Dijk 1983:23). Analysis of these macro-structures is imperative if the social relevance of discourse is to be understood (Connell and Miles 1985:31). The basis of semantic theory is the interpretation of discourse and the assignment of meaning(s) to the expressions of a discourse. "Hence a first aspect of semantic discourse analysis is to investigate how sequences of sentences of a discourse are related to sequences of underlying propositions and how the meaning of such sequences is a function of the meaning of the constituent sentences or propositions" (Van Dijk 1985:105).

Themes and metaphors function to signify and project specific ideological images and impressions upon the reader. The reader links these images with pre-developed forms of thought, creating a recognizable framework of "reality". This ideological framework simplifies complex political and social phenomena producing objectified 'facts' or deposits of power that give meaning to indiscriminate social events. Phenomena are given specific qualities by the authority figures who disseminate discourses on them. Therefore, the researcher must determine
"why, how, and with what effect" the authority that produced the discourse applied its particular worldview to the phenomenon and changed the image of that phenomenon (Babbie 1989:268). These image changes indicate general ideological positions, and reproduce specific conceptions of society (Van Dijk 1985:106). Signified events become politicized through the convergence of historically and ideologically omnipotent themes conveying specific representations of society. Inferential frameworks of "law and (dis) order", the "violent society", and the "threat to democracy", reduce complex political events to commonsense understandings (Schlesinger et al. 1983: 39). Stuart Hall et al. discuss how the criminalization label, as a thematic ascription depoliticizes and contributes to 'law and order' campaigns (1978: 224).

Discourse analysis incorporates the broader contextual evidence surrounding text allowing an interpretation of the latent or ideological meaning beneath manifest language. Like content analysis, it seeks out recurring patterns that point to latent meanings and allow inference as to the source (Hall 1975:15).\textsuperscript{12} However, these patterns need not be expressed in quantifiable terms, nor do they rely on repetition to denote significance. Instead, discourse analysis employs strategies for taking account of emphasis such as location, imagery or stylistic intensification. "The really significant item may not be the one which continually recurs, but the one which stands out as an exception from the general pattern -- but which is also given, in its exceptional context, the greatest weight" (Hall 1975:15). This broader, more evaluative strategy should uncover the underlying social, cultural framework imbedded in manifest content.

Qualitative Analysis: Historical Materialist Method

Colin Sumner provides an alternative method of determining the forms of appearance of ideology and its social meaning inherent in press discourse. This "historical materialist" method involves the historical comparison and analysis of social structures. Based on Marxist thought this "is one of the most powerful and suggestive ways available to the media analyst for analyzing society and its institutions" (Berger 1982:44). Determining the specific features of ideology inherent in discourse necessitates understanding the historical forms of appearance of the ideology in similarly structured social contexts (1979:238). The first stage in reading ideologies, is to ascertain, historically, the type of social structure and contemporary context that generates a particular ideology in discourse. The second stage involves developing a theoretical understanding and connection of ideology to the political and social structure. The third stage involves bridging and strengthening the connections between structure, context and ideology via historical specificity (Sumner 1979, 238-245). Finally, the contemporary discourse can be analyzed in its complexity -- "as an embodiment of ideology, structure and context" (Sumner 1979:243).

The qualitative analysis conducted on the Mohawk Crisis does not profess to developing a full blown historical materialist method. The complexity and depth required for this is beyond the scope of this study. However, relying on scholarly material, a general socio-structural and contemporary context of Canadian society is developed within which to situate the Mohawk Crisis. It is hoped that this will facilitate a greater theoretical understanding of the dynamics underlying the crisis and augment the quantitative findings.
Quantitative Analysis: Strategy and Procedure

Patterns of Coverage

Two strategies were used to gain a general understanding of the press coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. These analyses will help situate and provide perspective for the five key events selected for the date cluster sample of the *Globe and Mail* and *Montreal Gazette* (discussed later). The period examined for these analyses was July 9 to October 7, 1990; this period was selected in order to include consideration of events occurring shortly before and shortly after the crisis per se (i.e. July 11 to September 26, 1990). The first strategy employed was an analysis of seven Canadian daily newspapers’ coverage of the crisis as listed in the *Canadian News Index* (CNI). The items were grouped into 13 one-week periods beginning Monday July 9 and ending Sunday October 7, 1990. It was decided that each week would begin on a Monday and end on a Sunday. This is consistent with the publishing period of the *Globe and Mail* (the *Globe* publishes six days per week Monday through Saturday).

The second strategy, focused specifically on the *Globe and Mail* in order to provide complete detailed data for both the quantitative and qualitative analysis of press coverage of the crisis. This second strategy involved a more systematic and exhaustive approach -- a page-by-page, manual search\(^\text{13}\) of the *Globe and Mail* from July 9 to October 7, 1990.\(^\text{14}\) The *Globe* published six days a week for 13 weeks, providing a sample total of 78 days.

Editorials, letters to the editor and controversial articles from the *Globe and Mail*

---

\(^{13}\)This search relied on microfilm archives of the national edition of the *Globe and Mail* located at the University of Ottawa, Ontario. This proved to be valuable because there was considerable discrepancy between the number of stories listed in the *Canadian News Index* of *Globe and Mail* coverage of the crisis and the actual amount found through manual search.

\(^{14}\)The *Globe and Mail* opinion items include column articles written by staff writers Michael Valpy, Robert Sheppard, Jeffrey Simpson and guest writers. This is consistent with the articles selected by the Canadian News Index.
Editorial and Commentary\textsuperscript{15} section were also analyzed qualitatively to gain a deeper understanding of the competing ideological positions surrounding the Mohawk Crisis. For purposes of this study these three evaluative items will be referred to as "Opinion" items when discussed as a group.

**Historical Context Sample**

The second strategy also provided materials for the selection of items used in the discussion and analysis of historical context. The object of this analysis was to determine the extent to which the *Globe and Mail* provided historical and analytical context of the Mohawk Crisis to its readership.

This analysis consisted of a manual search of the *Globe and Mail* from July 12 to September 27, 1990. The hard news sample used for this analysis was reduced to 157 from the 192 used in the Patterns of Coverage analysis.\textsuperscript{16} A review of the sample located nine articles under the two by-lines "Background" and "Analysis", and another six under the section headings "Focus" and "Facts and Arguments". These by-lines and section headings flagged the article as containing contextual information. Because additional contextual items without such by-lines or section headings were discovered, a second qualitative search was undertaken for headlines denoting contextualization (e.g. history) and format types that emulated the format of analysis.

\textsuperscript{15}Commentary items are defined as those evaluative articles written from a specific viewpoint and often positioned opposite the editorial and letters to the editor section of the newspaper.

\textsuperscript{16}Opinion columns by Michael Valpy and Robert Sheppard provided some interesting historical contextualization and analysis of the crisis but were excluded for simplification. Exclusion of these items (19) and items published after September 27, 1990 (i.e. those 16 items included in the 13th week of the time line used for the *Globe* coverage analysis) from the 192 hard news items (Figure 9) resulted in a total hard news sample of 157 for this analysis.
articles.\textsuperscript{17} Using this method, additional historical and analytical items were discovered among hard news articles\textsuperscript{18} and in the Commentary section of the \textit{(Globe and Mail)}.

To be selected as a historical item the news story had to be listed under one of the by-lines or section headings discussed above, or discuss the historical background of the Mohawk or Iroquois Confederacy system of government, religion, culture, past conflicts and/or land claims. Items presenting information on social conditions of Native peoples in Canada were also included. To be selected as an analysis article the news story had to contain a detailed analysis of important issues surrounding the crisis. These issues included: land claims, factions existing within the Mohawk community, the government land claims process, sovereignty, media, public opinion, racism, crisis negotiations, and demands.

**Key Event Date Cluster Sample**

The key event date cluster sample provided data for the analysis of sources, descriptors and themes. A content analysis involving the detailed coding of the 28 front page articles chosen from the \textit{Globe and Mail} and \textit{Montreal Gazette} was employed. A coding manual was developed and is provided in appendix C. The sample selected for the key event date cluster is outlined in Appendix B. Appendix A situates the key events with respect to the dates comprising the thirteen weeks of the crisis. The focus was on coding of themes and characterizations used in the sample.

\textsuperscript{17}This format has a distinct layout and style of leader and headline. For example, the leader often provides two to three lines of information summarizing the article.

\textsuperscript{18}Hard news articles are defined as all news stories that attempt to present a report on an issue in an unbiased neutral fashion. These items exclude the more evaluative opinion items such as editorials, letters to the editor, and commentary items.
The sample consists of five date clusters that were chosen for their political and ideological significance. It was assumed that events that make news, especially front page news, are atypical political moments rich in ideology. In other words, it was felt that the key events fulfilled the criteria to meet the various news imperatives and would contain ideological substance useful for analysis. The key events were chosen after an immersion in the material gave a sense of what events were prominent and after reviewing three published chronologies of main events in the crisis (Globe and Mail, September 3, 1990; Hornung 1991:282-290; and MacLaine and Baxendale 1990).

The selection of the sample involved choosing five key media events, i.e. events which were significant in the course of the Mohawk Crisis and were reported in the media. For each event and for each newspaper (Globe and Mail, Montreal Gazette), three front page articles were selected. The first article in each cluster was the article appearing on the day before the event was reported. (Because of the usual time lag in reporting, this was the day on which the event occurred.) Therefore, this sampling enabled analysis of crisis coverage on the day preceding publication of each significant event. The second article included in the cluster was taken from the front pages of the papers on the day the event itself "made news"; the third article was one published on the following day (two days after the event occurred). The first cluster from each newspaper, however, consists of only two stories, because the crisis had not become "news" until the police raid (on July 11, 1990) was reported on July 12. Thus, the sample total included three articles from four key events and two articles from the first key event, taken from each of the two newspapers, for a total of 28 items.

The method employed was to seek out the prominent or key article on the front page of the newspapers that covered each event. Most often this involved coding the headline article
located prominently above the fold on the front page. However, at times this procedure was problematic since clusters of items on the crisis would be found on the front page (particular in the Gazette). In these cases, articles located above the fold were chosen over those below the fold and in cases where two articles ran parallel above the fold the article in the right hand column was chosen. This decision made for consistency and reliability in article selection. The chapters on official sources and characterizations are based on the key event date cluster sample.

Official Sources

This chapter examines the hypothesis that official sources will dominate over the Native peoples' voice in coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. If confirmed, the findings will offer empirical support to the general theses that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and that the media supported an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

Official sources comprise government institutions such as the police, military and various government agencies and spokespersons. The method used for the analysis of sources involved developing a computerized data base of 593 sources taken from the 28-item date cluster sample. The variables were the name attributed to the source, column location, newspaper and date, coding manual affiliation code and whether it was a direct quotation or paraphrase. A source was defined as any person or organization attributed to a specific quotation or paraphrase in the article. A source was counted as a quotation whenever a statement appeared in quotation marks and attributed to the source directly. A source was also counted when the journalist referred to the person or organization and provided a paraphrased statement attributed to it (e.g. 'the
Warrior Society said' or 'Mulroney said').\textsuperscript{19} If a quotation was divided into two or more paragraphs, each paragraph counts as one quote. Conversely, if a paraphrased statement or quotation from one source was split into two parts within a paragraph it was only counted as one quote. This method was developed only after frequent trial runs and discussions by two different coders using various methodologies to arrive at a reliable and consistent source sample. Therefore the reliability of the source sample is considered to be quite good.

The purpose of this strategy was firstly, to obtain a quantifiable measure of frequency of mention or prominence of sources and secondly, to correlate source with column position. The results could then provide an indication of which sources were more likely to be used by the media and which had dominance. It could be inferred that those sources used often or given prominence also had a certain dominance. The correlation of source with column position augments this inference and requires a more detailed explanation of procedure and rationale.

It can be suggested that an indication of dominance is the location of the source within the news story. That is, the dominance of a source can be measured quantitatively if we assume that sources that appear earlier in the story columns (i.e. the first few columns on the front page) have greater dominance (regardless of prominence) than those appearing in columns located on the inner or continuation pages of a newspaper. Therefore, those sources appearing in the first few columns are the primary definers and are able to structure the parameters of the debate for the story. This premise follows similar assumptions that "the length of a headline, and the location of story on the page and within the newspaper are indicators of the probability of a

\textsuperscript{19}Warrior-related sources consisted of media reference to Warrior, Warrior Society and the two primary negotiators: Oneida Chief, Bob Antone (listed as a source 13 times) and Oneida Chief, Terry Doxtator (listed 4 times). The Oneida are sympathetic to the Warriors and the negotiators were sent to help during the crisis (see York and Pindera, 1991:324)
story being read as well as of the prominence readers will attach to it" (Budd et al. 1967:35 quoted in Singer 1982:352). The influence and power of headlines have even been recognized judicially in the United States, where false headlines can be the basis of a civil suit even if the story itself is not libellous. It was recognized by the courts that newspaper readers often read only the headline (McLean 1989:924). Brown et al. found that front page news stories relied heavily on government sources. This exclusion of alternative viewpoints limits the range of diversity and leads to a legitimation of the existing system. True power, then, lies with those who determine which issues will be debated (1987:53-54).

Because they discussed key political events, a majority of the sample articles received front page coverage. If headlines and front page coverage indicate a degree of significance, then sources found in those columns on the front page should have a degree of significance or dominance. Dominance therefore diminishes as a story moves from its location as a main headline above the fold to below the fold and then incrementally further back into the inside pages of the newspaper. Similarly, a source's dominance diminishes the further it is located within the columns of a news story. More specifically, those sources that are quoted or paraphrased within the first few paragraphs or columns (that are usually located on the front page) are the primary definers and have the greatest dominance. It is surmised that the primary definers will be located within the first few columns and that this prominence will be revealed by the column position of the quoted or paraphrased source.

A problem with validity may be the use of columns as a measure of dominance. Since column lengths vary considerably within news reports this may affect the validity of the findings of source variation by column analysis. A more valid measure may have been to analyze the sources that appeared within a given length of column from the beginning of the article. An
additional concern is the simplicity of the methodology that was used to gain a measure of the prominence and dominance of the sources. Andrew Osler and Andrew MacFarlane (1991:23) offers a more complex and valid approach to this task with his Prominence Index.

Characterizations

This chapter will test the hypothesis that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories (i.e. the Warriors/Mohawks, acts by Warriors/Mohawks, the Mohawk Crisis and Mohawk demands) would originate from official sources. Analysis of legitimizing and delegitimizing characterizations will provide evidence for or against the general theses that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and, secondly, that the media supported an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

This analysis considers the characterizations or language used by the media, official and Native peoples’ sources to describe certain subject categories found in the Mohawk Crisis. The data was obtained from the 28 item date cluster sample involving the Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette. The following characterization subject categories are listed in the coding manual (Appendix C): Mohawks/Warriors, acts by Mohawks/Warriors, Mohawk Crisis, police/Military, acts by police/military, government, demands and negotiations, media, other Native peoples, and other (e.g. residents). The analysis documented the most frequently used characterizations and correlated them to their sources.

The study consisted of breaking the characterizations down into legitimizing,

---

20 This analysis is indebted to Picard and Adams (1987) who conducted a similar study of acts and perpetrators of political violence.
delegitimizing and neutral categories based on their situational context in the stories. Neutral characterizations are words that label or describe the various actors, organizations, or act and are generally non-judgmental in their descriptive qualities. Legitimizing and delegitimizing terms are also descriptive in nature but contain a judgemental quality in their denotative or connotative meanings. (e.g. adjectives).

Neutral characterizations of the Mohawk Crisis include words such as "barricade(s)", "armed standoff", "standoff", "dispute" and "conflict". Delegitimizing characterizations of the crisis include words such as "a police matter", "exceptional circumstances", "crime", and "fanaticism". Other terms, such as "crisis" and "tragic" used by the media reveal the dramatistic qualities of media presentation. Neutral characterizations of Mohawks/Warriors involved in the crisis include words such as "Mohawk"(s), "Warrior(s)", "Native(s)" and "Indian(s)". Delegitimizing characterizations of Mohawks/Warriors include words such as "militant", "criminals", "extremist", and "radical". Legitimizing characterizations include "besieged Natives" and "Natives affirming their right to self-government".

In addition to legitimizing and delegitimizing categories the terms were further dichotomized into criminal justice and war model categories. As previously discussed, terms occurring within these models have their own legitimizing and delegitimizing connotations and are therefore separated to highlight their unique nature. Generally, war related imagery originated from the Mohawks and were attempts to politicize and legitimize acts. Criminal justice imagery generally originates from official sources and are attempts to depoliticize, individualize and delegitimize acts of the insurgent. This dichotomization helps illuminate the more latent and contradictory aspects of the struggle for legitimacy.

An important caveat must be noted with respect the limitations surrounding the analysis
of characterizations. The reliability and validity of the results are limited by the subjectivity of the researcher's decisions of what constitutes legitimizing and delegitimizing qualities. For this study, semantic loading was determined from contextual analysis and the use of literature by Picard and Adams (1987), Rubenstein (1987) and Crelinsten (1987a, 1987b, 1989) that examined the subject of characterizations (e.g. criminal justice and war imagery). The classification of terms as either legitimizing or delegitimizing could have been enhanced by using semantic rating scales. This involves the testing of a sample population on their judgements of a series of words before classifying the characterizations. Time and resources prohibit an extensive survey of this type and the results and conclusions are therefore restricted by the lack of an established systematic procedure for classifying the characterizations.

Assumptions and Limitations

Editorials and letters to the editor often exhibit themes that provide insight into public perceptions, attitudes and opinions. However, extrapolation from these to broader public opinion is precarious. According to critics, a typical omission in cultural studies that rely on press cuttings is the assumption that a tight correspondence exists between attitudes in media discourse and attitudes at large. Colin Sumner recognizes that editorials and letters are only one facet in determining the relationship between discourse, ideology and audience interpretations (1979:239-244). While some denotative communications have a wide acceptability, connotative materials are intelligible to some groups or individuals but not to others; and there are various gradations in between (Sumner 1979:66). Stuart Hall recognizes the need for class-based analysis of the cultural orientations of different audience groups to media materials (1980:120). This would be especially important if one accepts Gaucher's definition of the Canadian state as
a "quintessentially bourgeois social formation" (1987).

The significance of understanding the impact of ideologies upon culture and class levels is highlighted by Singer who suggests, "It is now a sociological axiom that the way in which members of minority groups learn to perceive themselves and the way in which they are perceived by members of the larger society affects their self-images and future development. Once such images become established and maintained in the larger society, they become self-fulfilling prophecies " (1982:349).

Extensive survey investigation of public opinion and attitudes would be required to determine the impact of press ideology on various audiences exposed to the Mohawk Crisis discourse (Sumner 1981:283). However, interviews and surveys are beyond the scope of this study. It is difficult then to presuppose the extent of hegemonic domination across the audience spectrum. Hegemonic domination is an assumption derived from scholarly epistemological study not empirical study. But, it is expected that dominant ideologies are, to some degree, pervasive historically and across class formations. In addition, discussions of degrees of legitimacy and illegitimacy are corroborated theoretically but their precise significance is contentious. To gain at least some sense of public opinion the study relied upon opinion polls conducted by external research groups and presented in newspapers and journals. This is problematic because it relies on the misguided belief in the power of advertising to influence people. Opinion polls can measure opinion but they are unable to measure peoples emotional response to media coverage. A central concern then, is the inability to determine the impact of media coverage on opinion and perceptions across cultures, groups, and class.

Extrapolation from this study is limited by its sample and range of analysis. Analysis of a larger variety of Canadian and possibly international newspapers would have improved
reliability and validity. In addition, interviews of principal players in the crisis and of a cross
section of the Canadian audience would have provided more insight into the affects of the media
on the public. An intensive qualitative historical materialist analysis, situating concepts of
ideology with political economy would also have produced richer results. All of these
suggestions are of course beyond the scope of this study.

Interviews of the principal players in the crisis (e.g. official sources) would also be
required to determine why specific terms and phrases were used at a particular point in time.
This analysis does not attempt to make inferences of intent. Any inferences of motives,
purposes and other characteristics of the communicator would be purely speculative at this
juncture. Semantic scaling would also be required to improve the validity of the classification
of terms used by sources as either legitimizing or delegitimating.

Finally, this was not an analysis of the press per se, nor an attempt to explain why
certain images and not others are presented to the public by the media. The media was the
vehicle by which representations of competing ideologies and associations of their meanings
surrounding the Mohawk Crisis could be understood. Explanations of why certain images are
presented to the public by the media depend to some extent upon specific internal organizational,
technical and personal factors and broader external structural forces. This study concentrated
upon the external forces and how media routines (re)construct reality in terms of the status quo.
Speculations derived from the findings of this study to what actually occurred during the
Mohawk Crisis in reality are tenuous at best.

The following qualitative analysis will familiarize the reader with the political and
historical context underlying the Mohawk Crisis. It will also provide broader context to the ‘law
and order’ ideologies that manifest themselves during the crisis. This will involve presenting
extended strings of discourse (e.g. quotes etc.) that provide the reader with a broader framework for understanding the latent content inherent in discourse. The intent is to alleviate the limitations of quantitative content analysis in measuring ideological discourse. The sample for the analysis focused primarily on all *Globe and Mail* and *Montreal Gazette* articles published during the crisis. However, various other newspaper stories relevant to the crisis were also included.
CHAPTER III

THE MOHAWK CRISIS: A CRISIS OF HEGEMONY

This Chapter provides a qualitative, political and historical analysis of press coverage of the Mohawk conflict as a 'crisis of hegemony'. Media discourse on the Mohawk crisis will be examined in relation to the general theses: firstly, that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and, secondly, that the media supported an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

The Media Frame

The Mohawks at Oka erected barricades on March 11, 1990 to protest the expansion of a golf course by the municipality of Oka. Controversy over the expansion had been going on since early 1989. In early May 1990, the issue began receiving press coverage in the Montreal Gazette and on the CBC radio programs World Report and Saturday Report. A related incident - violence between pro- and anti-gambling Mohawk factions in Akwesasne, New York -- was receiving coverage in the Globe and Mail, Toronto Star and Ottawa Citizen. The dramatic and speculative nature of the media was evident in the May 3:A5, 1990 Montreal Gazette portrayal of the khaki-uniformed Mohawks as "extras in a war movie" and the quoting of one Mohawk saying that "It might turn into a war here if the SQ comes here". The ambiguity in the media framework was also evident throughout these early stages. The issue was presented variously as an environmental and recreation issue or one of the defence of territory. The environmental angle prevailed into July as a quotation from an Oka resident illustrates: "It's not a bad goal to want to protect that beautiful forest". (Montreal Gazette July 6, 1990). A Montreal Gazette
editorial questioned the Mohawks’ tactics but recognized the land issue and its ecological impact (July 8, 1990:B2). On July 6, 1990, La Presse placed the story on the front page, entitled "Resistance Hardens At Oka" with photographs of masked and armed Warriors.

Although the barricades were erected on March 11, 1990, the Mohawk Crisis did not become national news until July 12, 1990 when Corporal Lemay was killed during the Sûreté du Québec raid on the barricades. The front page headline in the Globe and Mail read: "Armed Mohawks, police in standoff". The Montreal Gazette had as its front page headline: "Defiant Mohawks dig in". The photograph of an armed masked Mohawk standing on an overturned police car made the front page of both papers. Violence was the predominant theme and the shooting was the focus, not the long-standing claim for sovereignty and territory. This is consistent with media imperatives that emphasize the event rather than the issue (Gitlin 1980 and Tuchman 1978). As Landsman notes, "participants in social movements do not have access to media channels and therefore have to portray their actions as potentially violent disruptions of the status quo" (1987:103). Following this disruption, the media’s definition of the dispute as an environmental and recreational issue was redefined as a land claim issue.

**Political and Historical Context**

The Canadian domestic economic crisis in the late 1980s and early 1990s continued to parallel those of the early 80s. Replacing the Liberal Party, Brian Mulroney’s conservative government (following the United States and Britain) enacted similar orthodox economic policies to combat the current economic crisis. These policies contributed in some degree to high interest rates, high unemployment, wage controls, and budget reduction initiatives. Winning a second election in the fall of 1988, the Conservatives introduced free trade with the United States and the
unpopular Goods and Services Tax. In the political sphere, the Conservatives began experiencing record low levels of support in the polls in the early 1990s. The Popularity of the New Democratic Party increased and the conservatives were being challenged by increasing support for the Western-based Reform Party and the Bloc Québécois.

Heightened Quebec nationalism and the failure of the Meech Lake Accord on June 9, 1990 further destabilized Canadian politics. Elijah Harper, the Native member of the Manitoba legislature who is credited by many with blocking the Meech Lake constitutional accord, became an instant national symbol for Native people in Canada. Harper's actions also received substantial support from the Canadian public (many of whom may have used the Native peoples' cause as an outlet for dissatisfaction with the current political climate) and served to expose to the Canadian public the ideological contradictions in the Meech Lake Accord between its special treatment of Quebec and its disregard for Canada's First Nations. This effectively alienated Quebec and dismantled the Canadian nationalistic (i.e. consensus) illusion perpetuated by the Conservative government. The ideological cement supporting the nation-state was beginning to fracture and Native peoples were gaining political legitimacy.

On March 11, 1990, Mohawks from the Kanesatake settlement set up a blockade to prevent the Township of Oka from expanding a golf course on land they claimed was theirs. This land was a part of a larger parcel in the Quebec region that has been disputed over 270 years. In 1696, the Mohawks were asked to leave the Montreal area because white settlers in the neighbouring ville Marie were disturbed by their close proximity. This began hundreds of years of periodic dislocation and oppression by white settlers (Montreal Gazette July 14, 1990:B1). In 1717, the king of France granted the land to a community of Sulpicians (a religious order) despite objections from the Mohawks. In 1975, 1979 and 1986 land claims filed
with the government by the Mohawks were rejected because they could not prove they had been residents of the territory since ‘time immemorial’ as required by federal law (Globe and Mail July 28:A4, 1990). However, the Department of Indian Affairs continued negotiations on the claims until they stalled in 1989 (Ottawa Citizen, August 21, 1990).

For over two centuries the Mohawks of Kanesatake had pursued their claim to land rights through the legitimate, parliamentary established channels of dissent. Finding these channels ineffective the Mohawks resorted to erecting a blockade on March 11, 1990 to prevent expansion of the Oka golf course. On July 11, 1990 a force of over 100 police officers attacked the Mohawk blockade at Kanesatake with assault rifles, concussion grenades and tear gas and were repelled by armed Mohawk Warriors. Corporal Marcel Lemay of the Quebec police force was shot and killed in the resulting gunfight.

On August 8, 1990, after negotiations between the Mohawks and government negotiators had broken down, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney announced that the army was available to the Quebec government (Montreal Gazette August 9, 1990). By August 14 there were over 2,500 soldiers deployed around the Oka area, and they were to remain for the 78 days of the crisis (this is three times as many Canadian troops as were sent to the Persian Gulf conflict) (Subject to Change 1990). The Canadian government had not used military force to solve a social conflict since imposition of the War Measures Act in 1970 to quell the Quebec separatist movement, le Front de libération du Québec (FLQ). The resulting armed standoff between the military and the Mohawks of Kanesatake crystallized Canadian Native peoples’ discontent into a significant political weapon.

It is within the dialectical relationship between the economic structure and the superstructure that we place the state response to the Mohawk situation. It is difficult to
attribute the cause of the breakdown of consent to the declining power of global capitalism, a continued domestic economic crisis or the Conservative government’s anti-Keynesian economic policies. However, these are factors that may be located in the history of a legitimation crisis ‘in the process’ of breaking down and should be recognized in any historical analysis. However, a more evident factor is the Native peoples’ movement as a legitimate and potentially threatening political force. This political force may have been an important factor crystallizing a crisis of hegemony.

Native peoples in Canada had been a marginalized, politically passive group until the Harper/Meech Lake milestone. As Gramsci would say, Native Canadians "have passed suddenly from the state of political passivity to a certain activity, and put forward demands which, taken together, ... add up to a revolution" (Gramsci 1971:210). Recognizing the political potential of Native peoples in Canada, Taylor states "An absolutely key element in the character of ruling class hegemony in the twentieth century has been the effective silencing and/or incorporation of Native culture as a potentially ‘counter-hegemonic’ pole of attraction" (1983:11). According to Sallach, hegemony is limited by the potential for political socialization or ideological control to generate opposition. "When a sugarcoated world view conflicts with subsequent experience and insight, the power of that original world view may be reduced accordingly" (1974:46). Sallach explains that the rise of militant minorities underscores the "demystification of a regulated and fragmented world view imposed in the interest of social control" (1974:46).

Historical analysis suggests that a new movement of the traditionally politically acquiescent Native peoples’ emerged from a shattering of the nationalist illusion caused by Elija Harper’s rejection of the Meech Lake Accord, followed by the inspiration and public support gained from the militancy displayed by the Mohawks at Oka. Public support for the Mohawk’s
cause despite their use of violence threatened to undermine the rule of law as a fundamental component supporting the ideology of the liberal-democratic state. The Mohawk cause signified the emergence of the Native people's movement as a formidable political force that had potential to present a direct challenge to the power and capital held by the state and dominant block. The Mohawk's move to political confrontation became the straw that broke the back of the camel of hegemony. The ideological cement was fractured and the status quo threatened. The Canadian and Quebec governments responded to this crisis of authority with coercive police and military control against the principal crystallizing force of the Native peoples' movement -- the Mohawks at Oka.

'Law and Order' Politics

A predominant theme in the press coverage of the Mohawk Crisis is that of 'law and order.' This essential element in the legitimization of state coercive action was stressed throughout the event by the Quebec and Federal governments. The move to an 'authoritarian populism' represents a decisive shift in the balance of hegemony. The state attempts to construct a consensus around this shift through 'law and order' politics but "legitimizing increased state disciplinary activity will only be possible so long as the public's fear of crime and social disorder can be tapped" (Comack 1987:234; see also Rubenstein 1987:31). The state attempts to legitimize its coercive response within the ideological and political complexes in society. In a modern capitalist society, the mass media is the most effective means of manipulating and constructing public opinion around a 'law and order' issue. The analysis will explore how the state, through 'law and order' politics, attempted to gain legitimacy for the shift to coercive control techniques to solve the crisis of order at Oka.
On July 12, 1990, the day following the police raid on the barricades, Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa stated that the ensuing events were "revolting and intolerable" (Globe and Mail July 12:A1, 1990 and Montreal Gazette July 12:A1, 1990). Warning that Native Canadians cannot expect to break laws and get away with it, Bourassa denied police had invaded Mohawk territory and told reporters:

Everyone is equal before the law. That’s an inalienable and fundamental principle of our democratic system. The law must and will be upheld (Montreal Gazette 1990:A1).

Reproducing this definition of reality, the media assisted in establishing ideological closure of the Oka incident within a liberal democratic framework of society. As a primary definer, Premier Bourassa attempted to reaffirm democratic political ideology and frame the event as a legal ('law and order') issue rather than a political issue. On July 13, 1990 the Montreal Gazette in an editorial supporting Premier Bourassa, accepted this conventional definition, stating: "It is urgent to first clear the roads, then to establish the rule of law in the Mohawk reserves ..."

The struggle for legitimation continued when the federal government entered the conflict. On July 20, 1990 the Globe and Mail reported on Federal Indian Affairs Minister Thomas Siddon's first news conference since the Oka standoff began. Siddon, refusing to engage in negotiations at gunpoint, said that he did not favour amnesty from prosecution for the Mohawks and that the rule of law must be abided by. Mohawk negotiator Ellen Gabriel rebutted Siddon's remarks, claiming that the police attack on the Mohawk barricade was "an illegal invasion. We were forced to defend ourselves and to defend our territory".

The press reported a hardening of positions and increasing of tensions on July 27, 1990. No face-to-face talks had occurred between the two parties since July 15, 1990. An extensive volume of federal government rhetoric condemning the Mohawks use of violence, appeared in
the press on August 9, 1990 in an apparent attempt to legitimize the sending of troops to Quebec (key event 2). The front page headline in the Globe read "Ottawa sending troops to Quebec" and in the Montreal Gazette: "PM agrees to deploy army at bridge." Espousing consensual ideology, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney stated:

Canada is not being led to the bargaining table by the threat of force and violence, and no examples should be drawn from the Mohawk blockade. 'At the end of the day, reason has to prevail over force' he said. 'Anybody can tell you that this is an exceptional set of circumstances and will remain so, because this kind of thing doesn't work....' As Canadians, we must make every effort to settle our differences without violence. (Globe and Mail August 9, 1990)

The underlying theme is that in a democratic society the use of violence, except by the state, is unacceptable. The rhetoric was an attempt to legitimize government use of force or violence (i.e. sending in troops) and reaffirm the ideology of consensual politics. Similarly, the Montreal Gazette quoted the Prime Minister reaffirming the authority of the state to use force (violence): "only duly elected governments are entitled to be in possession of those instruments required to keep peace" (August 9, 1990). This theme is epitomized in the Globe and Mail article entitled "Cannot tolerate anarchy, Justice Minister declares" (August 24:A6, 1990). Justice Minister Kim Campbell declares that Canada could face anarchy if it tolerates the threat of violence and lawbreaking by Indian groups. Campbell states,

It is intolerable that political goals, however legitimate, be pursued by means that employ violence and the threat of violence. ... Violence and the threatened use of violence cannot and will not be accepted .... Firearms can be used in a coercive manner only by those authorized to enforce the law in the name of the public.

The political and ideological rhetoric from provincial and federal levels of government converged on August 28, 1990 (key event 4) after the failure of negotiations. This was necessary to legitimize the army advance to remove the barricades (escalating use of force by the state) and delegitimize the enduring Mohawk demands for sovereignty that were threatening the nation-state. On August 28, 1990 the Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette quoted a variety
of government officials legitimizing mobilization of the army against Canadian citizens. General John de Chastelain, the Canadian Forces chief of defence staff, stated: "Law and order must now prevail ... as the last resource of Canadian law and order ... we cannot fail". Premier Bourassa warned that his government could not tolerate "groups of citizens (who) accept laws which they approve and refuse others". Tom Siddon, federal Indian Affairs Minister criticized the armed Mohawk Warriors as wanting to ‘operate outside the laws of Canada’, adding: This was ‘unacceptable’. The government of Canada and the government of Quebec cannot agree to the balkanization of Canada which would see the first nations become independent sovereign states (Globe and Mail August 28:A1, 1990).

Finally, Prime Minister Mulroney stated: "And if the settlement is elusive and we are getting demands at the table that can only be construed as bizarre, the law of Canada must be applied" (Globe and Mail August 28:A4, 1990, emphasis added). However, the Globe and Mail balanced the story with the competing definition presented by the Mohawks. Joe Deom, a Mohawk negotiator, stated:

Now that war is being forced upon us, we will turn our hearts and minds to war and it, too, we will wage with all our might ... Ours is a just and honorable position. It flows from our laws and our way. Our enemies have no such honour (Globe and Mail August 28:A4, 1990).

Hall et al. explain that by shifting the debate to the more abstract level of law, the structural contradictions of everyday social experience are suppressed. Group or social phenomena are individualized and defined as a non-legitimate aberration of an otherwise ordered society (1978:92). Akiba Cohen et al. would explain that by construing the demands as "bizarre", Mulroney attempts to project the message that all is fundamentally well in society (or would be if sectional interests would only behave sufficiently rationally) (1990:39). The story was balanced, but by failing to provide the historical background to the demands, the Globe and Mail perpetuates and supports the status quo. In this case, the background -- land claims and rights to sovereignty -- were covered by the Globe and Mail but were limited in proportion to the
coverage on violence and manifest issues of conflict. Some degree of legitimacy was accorded the Mohawks inasmuch as their war model definition was presented.

On August 29, 1990, Mulroney stated that the government cannot overlook "the illegal activities of an extremist minority". The ideological connotations of this statement are potently delegitimizing. The terms "illegal activities" depoliticize; the term "extremist" carries connotations of an unyielding and mentally unstable individual with whom negotiation is impossible; the term "minority" connotes a conspiratorial group without political support, trying to exploit the majority. This stereotypes the group and isolates it from the complex structure of historically-based exploitation and colonial oppression.

This delegitimization is appropriate in that federal and provincial negotiators had announced a day earlier that further talks were pointless. When moving away from negotiation (a fundamental dispute-solving mechanism in a democratic society) to the use of force, the government must justify its position politically and ideologically. Stuart Hall explains that the form in which events are signified has the power to legitimize repressive control.

The minority/majority distinction (the defining of active political groups as minorities) serves a latent function of resolving a problematic phenomenon. It has cognitive, evaluative and crystallizing power -- it functions as a deposit of power (e.g. the minorities become 'extremists'). This minority/majority paradigm provides an inferential framework, or map of meaning, that gives order and coherence to discrete events by placing them within a common world of meanings. It has the power to crystallize complex political situations in stereotypical and simplified terms that limit the range of possible new meanings which can be constructed to
explain new and unfamiliar events. Stuart Hall refers to this process of isolation as a rhetorical form assumed by elite power in society to divide and rule (1974:281-289). The minority/majority paradigm has "... become a standard 'deep structure' in the definition and labelling of militant political demonstrations" (Hall 1974:285). An important factor to consider in the government delegitimisation campaign is the divide-and-conquer tactic. Mohawk solidarity appeared to have been diminished due to the various factional divisions among the Mohawks. This allowed the governments to impress upon the public that the crisis was caused by a small radical minority group supported by outsiders operating without legitimate support within the Native community. The 'law and order' rhetoric is epitomized by Prime Minister Mulroney's comments following the Mohawks' surrender to the army on September 26. On September 27, the front page headline of the Toronto Star read, "'Rule of law prevails' PM says as crisis ends". The comments were also published on the front page of the Globe and Mail. Mulroney continued,

There has been no compromise with those who sought change through armed violence (Globe and Mail September 27:A1, 1990).

While the criminal label was ineffective, the new strategy of delegitimization by relying on rhetoric that the Mohawks were undermining the rule of law may have been more potent in undermining the legitimacy of the Mohawks. The appeals by the government, propagated through and by the media, that the use of violence undermines the rule of law may have caused a loss of public support and legitimacy for the Mohawks. This may have been one important factor that weakened public support for the Mohawks' position and allowed the government to increase military pressure on the Mohawks, forcing a surrender and an end to the crisis. However, there is no empirical proof supporting this explanation and further detailed analysis of opinion polls may provide more evidence.
A Struggle for Legitimacy

Many attempts were made to apply pejorative labels to the Warriors at Oka in order to establish the 'law and order' definition. The *Montreal Gazette* editorials were particularly derogatory, using labels such as "a group of marauders", "troublemakers", "the lawless and destructive Warriors faction" (July 13, 1990); "less like Warriors than thugs", "a gang of thugs", and "mafiosi" (July 17, 1990). However, the federal government's attempts to apply a criminal label to the Mohawks were met with strong criticism. On July 24, 1990 Harry Swain, deputy minister of Indian Affairs, received front page coverage in the *Globe* with the headline: "Federal official calls Warriors criminals: Deputy minister charges Oka dispute 'hijacked' by armed Mohawks", and the *Gazette* entitled: "Warriors are criminals, Indian Affairs official says". Swain referred to the standoff as an "armed insurrection by a criminal organization". The relative autonomy of the media was revealed when the *Globe*, due to the serious nature of the allegations, chose to attribute the comments, despite original promises of anonymity. The following day the *Globe* published two articles on the topic. The first was entitled: "Siddon backs his deputy minister: Uproar follows official's allegations of 'criminal organization' among Mohawks" and the second was a rebuttal from Mohawks entitled "Warriors defend role in dispute" (July 25:1990). The *Globe* presented comments by the Warriors, and portrayed them as analogous to a military unit defending their sovereign land and nation. Joseph Norton, Band Chief and fierce critic of the Warriors, was quoted as saying that the Warriors had the full support of all Mohawks and that they were not foreign mercenaries. The cause of the crisis was then attributed to a "politics of desperation" (July 25:A4, 1990) The *Globe*'s 'balanced' approach, reporting the Mohawks' response to Swain's comments, contrasts sharply to the purely official viewpoint given of criminal events (see Hall et al. 1978:69). The statements by Swain
did however gain some support from the *Montreal Gazette* in an editorial published July 26:B2, 1990. However, letters to the editor and subsequent news reports in the *Globe and Mail* and *Montreal Gazette* indicated that overall these labels were ineffective at delegitimizing the Mohawks. The public reacted by ridiculing the deputy minister. (*Montreal Gazette* August 1, 1990 and *Between the Lines*, October 1990).

One of the strongest condemnations of the Warriors came from Parti Quebecois leader Jacques Parizeau, who in advocating a police assault on the barricades referred to the Warriors as "terrorists who should not be tolerated". If negotiations failed, Parizeau continued, the government must be prepared to use whatever force is necessary "in the fight against terrorism" (*Montreal Gazette* July 25, 1990). The comments received little attention or rebuttal in subsequent *Gazette* and *Globe* press reports. The only response appearing in the *Montreal Gazette* came on July 26, 1990 when the Chief representing the Kahnawake band council condemned the remarks, stating "Parizeau should recall how the terrorist FLQ sparked the separatist movement he now leads."

The attempts at delegitimization continued on July 26, 1990. Remarks from New York State's top police officer to the state legislature's public hearings into the gambling-related violence in May at the Akwesasne reserve near Cornwall, Ontario, appeared on the front page of the *Montreal Gazette*. Superintendent Thomas Constantine stated, "I see them as a dangerous group of people with tremendous firepower." He went on to describe the armed might of the Warriors as "worse than that of street gangs in Los Angeles" and greater than anything he had seen in his 31 years of law enforcement. These comments were received with discontent in the letters to the editor of the *Gazette*. Identified as an attempt to inspire fear of the Warriors, the comparison of Warrior armament to that of Los Angeles street gangs was described as
"irresponsible". The letter chastised Mr. Constantine for implying that the situation at Oka was a matter for the police, not of land claims. However, there was substantial impact on the legislature's committee members, who "never realized that a powder keg was waiting to explode in upstate New York, uncontrollable by the state police" (Montreal Gazette July 26, 1990). Arthur Eve, a Democrat assemblyman at the hearing, was quoted as saying, "The governments of Canada, the U.S., Quebec, Ontario and New York are being held hostage ... the description you gave here is absolutely devastating" (Montreal Gazette July 26, 1990).

One of the strongest and most blatant examples of delegitimization through labelling came from the Canadian Police Association, in the form of an advertisement distributed in 18 Canadian newspapers in mid-September 1990. Upset at media coverage suggesting a gunfight occurred between Mohawks and the Sûreté du Québec officers, the association printed an advertisement entitled "We Oppose Terrorism", explaining the police version of events at Oka (Vancouver Sun September 19:A8, 1990). The association was convinced that the police never fired their weapons despite some evidence to the contrary (Montreal Gazette September 20, 1990). The advertisement was first published in La Presse on September 13 and described the death of Cpl. Lemay as "murder" (La Presse September 13:A17, 1990). This prompted the Globe and Mail and Ottawa Citizen to refuse to publish the ad. The wording was later revised to state that the gunfire "resulted in the death" of Lemay (Montreal Gazette September 20, 1990).

Despite these attempts to delegitimize the Mohawks, the labelling was not overly effective, since an opinion poll indicated strong public support in Canada for the Mohawk people's land claim (Montreal Gazette July 15, 1990). This was recognized by Norman Webster, editor of the Montreal Gazette, who was perplexed that "Canadians have reacted in a
remarkably positive manner to the Mohawk cause" (Gazette July 28, 1990). Webster went on to condemn the Warriors as "guerrillas with machine guns" and as "teenagers playing Rambo" and described the Oka situation as "no less than Indian organized crime" (Gazette July 28, 1990).

Sallach would explain this reaction as public experience conflicting with political socialization (1974:46). That is, the government view of the Mohawks as criminals conflicted with the knowledge and experience the public has of the socio-economic conditions and land claim rights of Native peoples' in Canada. Augmenting this view, Gitlin (1969) claims that stereotyped and simplified presentations backfire when the coverage distorts an event one has experienced (quoted in Sallach 1974:46). This explanation of course assumes questionably that a substantial portion of the Canadian public is aware of the socio-economic marginalization of Native peoples in Canada. Another explanation is that the public support of the Mohawks is a reflection of anti-government sentiment. That is, taking a stand against the government by siding with the Mohawks.

The Outsiders

On July 12, 1990 the Montreal Gazette reported that provincial police had blamed the outbreak of violence on the "radicals" from outside Kanesatake. On July 28, 1990 the Gazette quoted a local Oka resident claiming, "Those pointing the gun are all from outside Oka". On August 1, 1990 the Montreal Gazette quoted deputy Indian Affairs Minister Harry Swain describing the Warrior Society's leaders as "Americans with extensive military experience, some with combat experience in Vietnam". This issue became front page news on August 3, 1990 with the Gazette article entitled, "Outsiders holding us at gunpoint: Martin". However, it was relegated to the
inside pages of the *Globe* and failed to make any story title. Within 'law and order' and consensual politics (which assumes that contradictions originate externally) the reference to the Warriors as an "outside force" embodies images of the Warriors as conquerors invading an otherwise peaceful and tranquil nation. This also exploits the image of Americans as unreasonably violent. These images are intended to take responsibility for the Oka situation away from the government, and delegitimize the Warriors' standpoint.

These elements form a coherent definition of the situation which serves to label radical activities as an essentially transitory deviation by a small minority of outsiders. Further by segregating and ostracizing these groups and defining them as a threat, the act of labelling prepares the way for controlling action (Murdock 1973:158).

Thus, radical political activity is confined to a marginal group of outsiders, "rather than [presenting it] as the product of historically structured and continuing inequalities in the distribution of wealth and power" (Murdock 1973:164). This approach would be particularly useful within the Canadian situation, given the national respect for police (RCMP) and desire for 'law and order'. It would also disrupt the traditional complacency Canadians hold with respect to their relative immunity from political the violence experienced regularly by other Western democracies. These two factors should have resulted in a strong authoritarian backlash towards the Mohawks' use of weapons and violence to further their cause. However, this backlash never occurred and instead the Mohawks received strong public support for their cause throughout the crisis.

The ideological battle was elaborated further with the Native peoples' demands for sovereignty and amnesty for crimes committed during the crisis. The federal and provincial government negotiations often focused on the subordinate issue of removing the barricades from the Mercier Bridge, while the Mohawks' primary concerns (and reasons for the blockade) were settlement of land claims and rights of sovereignty. While the land-claims issue received
attention, the issue of sovereignty was viewed by government officials as an unacceptable demand. Acceptance of a claim to sovereignty would have meant recognition of independence from Canadian law and the right to take up arms against foreign invaders. The demand for amnesty was also a demand for recognition of the sovereign status of the reserve. The Quebec government refused to accept the possibility of amnesty for anyone found guilty of committing a crime at Oka (Toronto Star, July 14, 1990 and Montreal Gazette July 19, 1990). Acceptance of the demand for amnesty would have allowed interpretation of Lemay's death "as a casualty of war rather than as a victim of criminal violence" (Between the Lines October 1990).

However, the attempt by government officials to establish ideological closure over the issue as one of 'law and order' failed. There was substantial coverage of the Warriors' viewpoint and historical contextualization of the issue as one of land claims and self-government, not 'law and order'. For example, the Globe and Mail provided historical context of the issue in the article entitled "Violence rooted in centuries of dispute" (July 12:A4, 1990). In addition, Konrad Sioui, Chief of the Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador, challenged the Premier's legalistic approach as not addressing the real issue of land ownership. In the front page article entitled "Indians call attack reprisal for Meech" Sioui claims Bourassa is inflaming the situation by attempting to portray the Mohawks as a "group of outlaws" (Globe and Mail July 12:A1, 1990). In its investigation of the dispute the House of Commons Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs recognized the competing definitions of the dispute as 'law and order' versus land rights. The Mohawks appeared before the Committee, asserted their sovereignty, and accused the various governments of invading their land without provocation, and of using the issue of 'law and order' to obscure the fundamental issues of land rights and sovereignty (House of Commons 1990:25-26).
In addition, the media provided analysis of important factors contributing to the dispute. It was recognized early on that the closing off of legitimate channels of peaceful and legal negotiation in a democratic society often provokes groups to seek other, more violent means of redress. *Globe and Mail* Native Affairs reporter Rudy Platiel commented on this issue briefly on July 17, 1990:4: "Oka exploded into violence in part because the government's official land-claims negotiating door was closed and 'a deep' festering Mohawk grievance over land was treated largely with officious indifference". Platiel addressed this issue to a greater degree in the *Globe* article entitled "Policy a 'recipe' for trouble" (July 18, 1990:A4). The article provided evidence from a constitutional law expert who, in 1985, had been a member of a special task force that had recommended broadening the policy criteria for negotiating comprehensive claims. The general acceptance of occupancy by the Europeans of the land as eliminating any basis for a claim was seen to have left the Mohawks at Oka and others with little recourse.  

The recommendation was rejected by the government.

**Public Opinion**

On July 15, 1990 the *Montreal Gazette* published a poll by CROP-La Presse of 446 Montreal adults, of whom 53% supported the Mohawk claim to the disputed land, only 18% supported the municipality's claim, and the rest were ambivalent. The poll indicated that 69% supported Native peoples' pressure tactics to back their land claims and 19% did not. On November 10, 1990, an Angus Reid survey taken during the final week of the Oka Crisis (Sept. 19-27) received front page coverage by the *Ottawa Citizen*. Titled "Poll shows support high for Natives", the
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21The Oka claims failed to meet the government's key criterion for Aboriginal land claims -- occupation of the territory since time immemorial.
article revealed that 73% of the 1,735 Canadians surveyed felt that Canadian Aboriginal people should be constitutionally recognized as founding peoples or as a distinct society (56%). More than two-thirds believed that the government had broken its obligation to Native people, with 62% supporting the settlement of land claims. Native leaders scored a remarkable 70% confidence level on credibility in dealing with Native people's issues, with Brian Mulroney scoring only a 21% credibility rating. It appears that the 'counter-hegemonic' definition presented by the Mohawks and the media prevailed in the ideological battle for closure with the primary definers. More detailed analysis of public opinion before, during and after the Mohawk Crisis would provide for valuable future research.

The important and relatively autonomous role of the media in the outcome of this battle between competing ideologies is illuminated by the reaction to the media by the actors in the battle. On November 17, 1990 the Ottawa Citizen reported on a Defence Department symposium debating media coverage of the standoff at Oka. A high-ranking Canadian Forces officer, commenting on the need to censor the media in future Oka-type situations, described the crisis as "a law-and-order issue" similar to a crime scene. "We suffered for being open", Commodore David Cogdon told those attending the symposium. Similarly, the Director of the Quebec Police told a Quebec legislature committee on February 26, 1991 that the force lost a battle with news media for public support. "We also had trouble putting across the context of the crisis to the media" (Ottawa Citizen, February 27, 1991). Brodeur and Viau note that the Sûreté du Québec (SQ) were extremely frustrated that public support for the Mohawks actually increased in Quebec and Canada despite the killing of a police officer during the July 11 raid (1991:11). A leading factor causing the poor image of the Sûreté du Québec was their long-standing antagonistic relationship with the press whereas the Canadian army, which had a carefully planned media
strategy, fared much better (Brodeur and Viau 1991). Throughout the crisis the *Globe and Mail* editorials criticized the Federal government's and the Sûreté du Québec's handling of the crisis. Although official sources often attempted to define the crisis as a police matter the media instead defined the issue as one of land claims. On the Warrior side, the *Montreal Gazette* announced on August 2, 1990 that the Warriors were expelling their reporters. A Warrior explained that the *Gazette* reporters were "persona non grata behind the barricades" since they were giving the Warriors bad publicity. It was speculated that the Warriors were displeased with both the *Gazette*'s very negative editorials on them and its reports of "cracks in the Mohawks' facade of community unity".

**Violence: A Means To An End?**

The following is a discussion of arguments (taken from Commentary items) justifying the Mohawks' tactics of taking up arms against the state in order to advance a cause.

In his August 7, 1990 opinion piece, entitled, "Does history have a lesson for those using loaded words on Oka?", John McLaren argues that the historical record contains many cases in which persons (e.g. Louis Riel), acting from genuine feelings of oppression, were branded as criminals and traitors and consequently received greater sympathy (the martyr effect), even in cases when they have resorted to violence or the threat of violence. "Often those branded as traitors in the past have become the legitimate political leaders of the present" (*Globe and Mail* August 7, 1990). Simpson, a critic of Warrior tactics, admits that the use of military force will produce martyrs and a radicalization among Native communities leading to future violence (*Globe and Mail* August 29:A12, 1990).

In the August 22, 1990 *Globe and Mail* article, entitled "What Sartre had to say about
Oka", the Mohawks' actions at Oka are viewed as analogous to Jean-Paul Sartre's vision of wartime resistance in France during the Second World War. Equated with French Resistance fighters, the Mohawks see themselves under an occupation against which they cannot mount a decisive military effort. They understand that their losses may exceed their gains, but resistance serves a purpose -- by defying the enemy and asserting independence, it helps the underdogs preserve their humanity as a people and their identity as nations.

The September 11, 1990 Globe and Mail opinion piece entitled "Breaking the rules for a reason" contained the following leading statement that epitomized the debate surrounding the use of violence to advance a cause: "PROTEST / Their tactics may not qualify as classic civil disobedience, but the Mohawks' cause is as legitimate as those of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, so they can be forgiven for resorting to more drastic measures". The author, Arthur Ripstein, suggests that although the Warriors used illegal weapons and refused to submit to punishment (key factors contrary to classic civil disobedience), the legitimacy of their demands and means employed cannot be denied. It is argued that the police went in armed, as if expecting resistance. In so doing they turned an illegal but non-violent protest into an armed confrontation. To accept punishment from a Canadian justice system would undermine the Mohawks' claim to sovereignty and be tantamount to surrendering that issue.

Justification itself comes from a dissatisfaction resting on widely shared standards, and the exhaustion of alternative means. Despite a split into factions, the Mohawks had substantial public support throughout the crisis (Montreal Gazette July 15, 1990). As previously mentioned, the Mohawks had also exhausted the land claims process which had rejected the historical roots of the claim. Robert Young notes that the effectiveness or otherwise of lawful channels and means for expressing and remedying grievances is important. "... protest cannot be dismissed
as unjustifiable unless it can be shown that the lawful means are, in the circumstances, better" (1977:290). Violent or revolutionary acts are often the only realistic means available to groups with little or no political, economic or military power (1977:295). Quoting Aquinas, Young continues,

...there must not be a persistent failure to respect the natural law and the common welfare; there must not be a failure to grant citizens effective means of peacefully gaining redress against tyrannical abuse of power; when these matters are not respected revolutionary activity will be justified... (1977:297).

Rejecting the amalgamation of the concepts of revolutionary activity and crime, Young suggests several additional conditions that would justify revolutionary activity: firstly, self-defence, when used proportionally and in response to persistent exploitation and oppression or state terrorism (1977:296); secondly, justice of the cause being fought for and the prospect of bringing about an improved situation for people in general, (for example, in terms of a greater measure of self-government or in freedom from foreign domination) (1977:297); and thirdly, an understanding of the underlying circumstances within which the activity occurred (1977:292).

The September 11, 1990 Globe and Mail opinion piece quotes Martin Luther King’s (1963) response to the claim that violation of the law to further a cause is unacceptable. This comment sums up the ‘law and order’ debate:

The Negro’s great stumbling block in the stride toward freedom is not the white citizen’s council or the Ku Klux Klan, but the white moderate who is more devoted to ‘order’ than to justice, who prefers a negative peace, which is the absence of tensions, to a positive peace, which is the presence of justice (Globe and Mail September 11:A17, 1990).

Summary

After centuries of dispute over territory and inadequate or blocked channels for expressing dissent, the Mohawks of Kanesatake erected a blockade to prevent expansion of the Oka golf course. The state reacted with a police attack that resulted in a gunfight with the Mohawks and
the shooting death of Corporal Lemay. The Canadian and Quebec governments responded to this crisis of authority with coercive military intervention.

The historical analysis suggests that the Native peoples’ movement as a political threatening force was a key component causing the legitimation crisis. The failure of Meech Lake and the inspiration gained from the Mohawks at Oka contributed to the strengthening of this political force.

The analysis of media discourse revealed that attempts by the federal government to label the Mohawks as criminals was heavily criticized by the media. Thus, the governments’ initial attempts to label the Mohawk Warriors as criminals failed to construct a consensus around the shift to ‘law and order’. Following this initial failure to delegitimize the Mohawks the government strategy shifted to rhetoric suggesting that the Mohawks actions posed a potential threat to the more fundamental tenet of a Liberal democratic society -- the rule of law. This rhetoric received less criticism by the press than the initial delegitimization attempt and may have undermined the legitimacy of the Mohawks and allowed the military to advance on the Mohawks without extreme political consequences.

In summary, the analysis demonstrated the importance of several factors underlining the cause of the legitimation crisis. Firstly, the Kanesatake Mohawks’ actions at Oka crystallized the once fragmented Native peoples’ movement into a formidable political force. This new political force posed a threat to an already politically and economically unstable dominant block, secondly, the Mohawks achieved a degree of legitimacy, evidenced by opinion polls, which threatened to undermine the rule of law and in consequence the ideological fabric of the Liberal democratic state, and thirdly, the media failed to support initial attempts by the government to delegitimize the Mohawks. Thus, the qualitative analysis provided substantial evidence of an
official 'law and order' discourse in the media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis and supported the general theses that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and that the media sustained an official 'law and order'/'rule of law' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

However, the evidence also indicated that the media did not fully support the official view. Throughout the crisis the Globe and Mail editorials criticized the Federal government's and the Surete du Quebec's handling of the crisis. The Globe criticized official definitions of the crisis as a police matter, and instead defined the issue as one of land claims. Official attempts to criminalize the Mohawks were not supported by the Globe and Mail. The Montreal Gazette, on the other hand was more critical of the Mohawks and was more willing to support the official view. The presentation of competing ideological discourse from Mohawk and other Native peoples’ indicates that the Globe and Mail did not act solely as an ideological mechanism supporting the existing hegemonic relationship. The concluding section on the use of violence as a means to an end also demonstrates the extent of the media's de facto autonomy and provides alternative rationales justifying the Mohawks’ actions.

The qualitative analysis provides a broader context for understanding the 'law and order' 'rule of law' ideologies of the Mohawk Crisis. The remaining chapters utilize a quantitative method of sampling and analysis. Chapter Four attempts to provide an understanding of the media presentation of the Mohawk Crisis across seven Canadian daily newspapers. Following this, the analysis focuses specifically on the Globe and Mail, outlining the presentation of crisis events and quantifying stories that provided historical context to the crisis.
CHAPTER IV - PATTERNS OF COVERAGE

Index Descriptors

An important and interesting aspect of media coverage of an event is how that issue is categorized in reference indexes (Crelinsten 1989a). The Canadian News Index (CNI) is a key source, listing issues covered by seven daily Canadian newspapers, the Halifax Chronicle-Herald, Montreal Gazette, Toronto Star, Winnipeg Free Press, Calgary Herald, Vancouver Sun and the Globe and Mail.

The Mohawk Crisis was listed in the CNI under "Native peoples--Land Claims--Quebec (Province)". The detail of the categorization is understandable given that the CNI would have been published after a majority of the coverage of the crisis had occurred.

Another important index is the computerized on-line search, Canadian Business and Current Affairs (CBCA) index. This database corresponds to the Canadian Business Index, Canadian News Index and Canadian Magazine Index. The CBCA used the descriptors "Golf Courses" and/or "Forests and forestry--Quebec (Province)" to reference the Oka conflict during the year before (July 30, 1989 to August 4, 1989) the Quebec police raid on the barricades. The first change to the descriptors did not occur until July 10, 1990, the day before the Quebec police raid on July 11, 1990. At that time the descriptor listing was changed to, "Golf courses; Native Peoples--land claims--Quebec (Province)". Evolving, the July 11, 1990 descriptor list then appeared as, "Native people--land claims--Quebec (Province); Golf courses". Here we see how the event has gradually been redefined from a "golf courses" and/or "forests and forestry" issue to one concerning Native people and land claims. On July 12, 1990, the day after the police raid, "Golf courses" disappears completely as a descriptor. The rapid evolution of the
description of the event as a Native peoples' and land claims issue reveals that there was recognition of the legitimacy around the Mohawks' concerns. However, this legitimacy did not occur until after the Mohawks took up arms to defend their cause and gain media attention.

The indexes do attempt to be culturally and linguistically appropriate in their referencing of the issue as "Native Peoples" as opposed to using the term "Natives" standing alone. Brian Maracle, a Mohawk writer and broadcaster, claims that the word "Native" is laden with images of dark-skinned people as primitive and inferior. "When the media eliminate the word 'people' by describing us simply as 'Natives', they eliminate our humanity" (Ottawa Citizen April 14:A11, 1992). Supporting this view Allemang feels the term "Native" has a "colonist's air of generalized contempt: 'The Natives are restless'" (Globe and Mail July 28:D8, 1990). However, highlighting the contention surrounding politically correct terminology, both authors appear to disagree on the appropriate use of another frequently used term in this debate, "Indian".

Seven Canadian Newspapers

This analysis is based on the Canadian News Index (CNI) and covers a thirteen-week period (July 9 to October 7, 1990). The CNI is comprised of significant articles chosen from hard news stories, editorials, commentaries and letters to the editor. Table 1 indicates that during the thirteen weeks there were 868 articles featured in the seven daily Canadian newspapers and listed in the Canadian News Index. The Montreal Gazette published the highest number of

---

22A breakdown of the thirteen weeks by date (used in this analysis and the accompanying graphs) is provided in Appendix A.
Table 1
COVERAGE OF THE MOHAWK CRISIS BY SEVEN DAILY CANADIAN NEWSPAPERS
BASED ON THE CANADIAN NEWS INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Total Articles</th>
<th>Weekly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Halifax Chronicle Herald</em></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Montreal Gazette</em></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Globe and Mail</em></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Toronto Star</em></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Winnipeg Free Press</em></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calgary Herald</em></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vancouver Sun</em></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N (Total)</strong></td>
<td><strong>368.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

articles (240 or 18 average per week\textsuperscript{23}) and the *Halifax Chronicle Herald* the lowest (49). The *Globe and Mail* published 195 stories (an average 15 per week according to the CNI\textsuperscript{24}), and both the *Toronto Star* and *Winnipeg Free Press* published 108 articles each. The *Calgary Herald* and *Vancouver Sun* published 80 and 88 stories respectively.

In general, coverage declined steadily as one moved eastward and westward from Quebec, suggesting that proximity remained an important factor despite the national importance of the crisis.\textsuperscript{25} According to Galtung and Ruge, cultural proximity is an important factor because readers scan for the culturally familiar, and ignore the culturally distant (1973:54). This

\textsuperscript{23}The *Montreal Gazette* publishes seven days per week while the *Globe and Mail* publishes six days per week (excludes Sundays).

\textsuperscript{24}A manual search of the *Globe and Mail* revealed an actual 291 total published articles on the Oka crisis (99 or 34% more articles than listed in the CNI). More accurately therefore, the *Globe* published an average of 22 articles per week on the crisis. For a more detailed explanation of these findings refer to the section titled "The *Globe and Mail* and CNI".

\textsuperscript{25}The exception to this was that the *Calgary Herald* published a total of 80 items while the most western daily, the *Vancouver Sun* published 88 items.
may explain why emphasis was not reflected equally in the seven Canadian newspapers. On the other hand, the dispute did receive substantial coverage across Canada, throughout its duration. Similarly, Osler and MacFarlane found that all eleven newspapers studied invested substantial resources to cover the story, clearly recognizing the importance of the events at Oka (Ottawa Citizen June 4:A5, 1991). The significance or extraordinariness of this event for Canadians would explain the abundant coverage. The national importance of the Mohawk Crisis was evidenced by the fact that all Canadian dailies (except the Halifax Chronicle Herald) presented on average, at least one news story per day on the crisis during the thirteen weeks.

The analysis of total weekly coverage of the crisis by each of the seven newspapers (Figures 1-7) reveal three distinct peaks at weeks 2-3, 8 and 11-12\(^{26}\); these are separated by periods of significantly lower coverage (weeks 4-7, 9-10, and 13) over the thirteen week timeline.

Five of the newspapers had the highest volume of coverage around the second and third weeks; the Montreal Gazette (Figure 3) and Vancouver Sun (Figure 7) only had considerably higher volumes during week eight. The Vancouver Sun exhibited no substantial surge at all during the first three weeks of the crisis. Highlights during this period were the initial Quebec police raid on the barricades on July 11, 1990, confrontations between the police and South Shore residents, and controversy surrounding Federal Deputy Indian Affairs Minister Swain calling the Warriors criminals. The first key event date cluster occurred during this period.

The events that occurred in those weeks were most remarkable and it is not surprising that they were covered extensively. According to Hall et al. the extraordinary is the cardinal

\(^{26}\) The exceptions were the Halifax Chronicle Herald which peaked in week 9 and the two central papers (Toronto Star and Globe and Mail) which peaked in week 11.
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news value (1978:71). Supporting this idea, Galtung and Ruge claim that the more significant an event the greater the ‘amplitude’ and ability of the event to transcend the ‘news threshold’ and become reportable as news (1973:54). Akiba Cohen et al. studied foreign conflict stories and found that they were only included in domestic news when their level of severity (newsworthiness) was sufficient enough to pass the selection threshold (1990: 180). The Mohawk Crisis is extraordinary because it combines two other important news values, violence and race relations, into a new event, ‘Native peoples’ militancy’. This supports the suggestion that the media focus upon minority groups particularly when violence is involved.\footnote{See Altheide 1976:115, Singer 1982:352 and Hartman and Husband 1973.} The attribution of a ‘new label’ signals the novelty of the issue. The journalist then builds on this skeletal definition; framing and contextualizing the details, and emphasizing its novelty -- a frightening new strain of crime is born (Hall et al. 1978:71).

Following the initial three weeks of the crisis there was a noticeable decline and some flattening out in the volume of coverage between weeks four and seven in almost all seven newspapers. While the volume declined, significance of the event as an important national issue ensured consistency of coverage. While there was a decrease in volume overall and a noticeable flattening out during this period in the \textit{Winnipeg Free Press} (Figure 5), and \textit{Globe and Mail} (Figure 1), four of the dailies registered a moderate surge during weeks five and six. The \textit{Toronto Star} (Figure 4) and \textit{Montreal Gazette} (Figure 3) peaked slightly in week five and the \textit{Calgary Herald} (Figure 6) and \textit{Vancouver Sun} peaked slightly in week six.

Generally, media highlights during this period included the announcement by Prime Minister Mulroney that troops were being sent to Quebec (key event 2), rioting of South Shore residents, movement of the Army, the focusing of attention upon the media and journalists as
actors in the dispute and the signing ceremony (key event 3), which was the agreement (between Mohawks and government officials) to specific conditions for resumption of the stalled negotiations.

Week eight saw an average 50% increase of coverage (from week seven) across all seven Canadian dailies. The Globe and Mail, Calgary Herald and Vancouver Sun registered the strongest rises (64-87%) and the remaining four dailies registered the weakest (20-47%). This surge was most probably related to the Army move to tear down the barricades and the stoning of Mohawk women and children (key event 4). Revealing the cycle of newsworthiness, the extraordinariness of the crisis became ordinary resulting in the lull in coverage during weeks four and seven. However, novelty was replaced by the news value of violence and impending violence in the form of the stoning and military action (which always has the potential to be violent) during week eight. Through repetition extraordinariness becomes ordinary and loses its news value. "At this point in the cycle of a news story, other more enduring news values are needed in order to supplement declining newsworthiness, and so sustain its 'news life'" (Hall et al. 1978:72). Novelty is eventually replaced by violence or impending violence (i.e. military movement) as a news value to sustain its news life. "Violence is increasingly used, as a structuring element, in relation to the life cycle of one particular news theme" (Hall et al. 1978:74). This exposes the cycle of newsworthiness or changing nature of the coverage.

The surge in week eight was followed by yet another immediate decline in volume across almost all dailies in weeks nine and ten. The exceptions were the Halifax Chronicle Herald (Figure 2) which was still at a peak in week nine and the Globe and Mail which only registered a slight decline in week nine. Despite the week delay these two dailies followed the pack, as their publication volume plummeted during week ten. During this period Mohawk demands
were rejected by the government.

Following this decline, the volume in all seven dailies began to gradually increase in week eleven culminating with the third and final surge and ending of the crisis in week twelve. Interestingly, the two central newspapers, the *Globe and Mail* and the *Toronto Star* deviated from the other dailies with a peak in coverage one week prior (week 11) to the end of the crisis and a declining of volume during week twelve when all other dailies were still at a high covering the end of the siege. Week eleven saw the army cutting the telephone lines into the treatment centre and the Canadian Police Association advertisement condemning the Warriors as terrorists. Week thirteen saw a dramatic easing of coverage across all seven Canadian dailies.

In summary, the review of the *Canadian News Index* indicates that a substantial volume of articles were published on the Oka Crisis in seven Canadian daily newspapers from July 9, to October 7, 1990. The valleys or troughs occurring during coverage can be explained by referring to Galtung and Ruge's metaphorical concept of 'frequency'. "By the 'frequency' of an event we refer to the time-span needed for the event to unfold itself and acquire meaning" (1973:53). More specifically, "the event that takes place over a longer time-span will go unrecorded unless it reaches some kind of dramatic climax" 1973:53). This is because events fit media time frames whereas issues are a process requiring context. For example negotiations unfold over a long period of time and are not significant until they reach a specific juncture. The signing ceremony was an example of such a climax (*Globe and Mail* August 13, 1990). However, the tear-gassing of a Mercier Bridge crowd by police still eclipsed the importance of this event, relegating it to the last column in the inner pages of a front page story focusing on
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28The volume of coverage is actually much higher than suggested here (868 items total) because analysis indicates that the *Canadian News Index* underrepresents actual news coverage by 33% (for discussion on this finding see discussion on the *Globe and Mail* coverage)
the police action and violence.

**THE GLOBE AND MAIL**

**Competing for the Front Page**

The first national media image of the Mohawk Crisis at Kanesatake (Oka) Quebec, appeared on the front page of the *Globe and Mail* on July 12, 1990. The headline read, "Armed Mohawks, police in standoff: confrontation continues after corporal killed in raid on Quebec reserve". The crisis maintains prominence (staying above the fold at all times) as one of the primary news stories on the front page, letters to the editor and editorial section of the *Globe and Mail* from July 12 to August 1, 1990. Other front page news issues the crisis competed with during this period were Soviet Union politics, East and West German unification, Newfoundland’s Mount Cashel orphanage sex abuse case, the Tour de France, admittance of the Bloc Quebecois in Parliament, a coup d’etat in Trinidad, Mongolian elections, and, the Palestinian bombing of a Tel Aviv beach. Among these additional events, Germany’s unification and the coup d’etat in Trinidad received the most coverage and competed with the Oka Crisis for above the fold prominence.

The Mohawk Crisis lost front page prominence from August 2, to August 7, 1990 inclusively, when the *Globe and Mail* reported the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Becoming the major news event of the week, the Iraqi occupation dominated the headlines, letters to the editor and editorials. Other issues on the front page during this period were: Trinidad’s coup d’etat; Canada’s Goods and Services Tax (GST); and, the ANC promise to end its 30 year war against Pretoria. The Mohawk Crisis continued to receive coverage but was relegated to inside pages of the *Globe and Mail*, particularly pages four to six.
The crisis returned to the front page on August 8, 1990 when a small article titled, "Oka residents flee, fear battle looming: army has prepared contingency plan for swift, peaceful resolution of crisis", appeared below the fold on the bottom left corner. The next day, August 9, 1990 the Mohawk Crisis regained above the fold prominence with the headline announcing Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's acceptance of Quebec's request to deploy the Army at Oka and the bridge at Châteauguay, Quebec. Thereafter, the crisis received front page coverage (except August 11, 1990) until September 12, 1990. During this period, the crisis continually competed with the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait for headline prominence. Other important issues receiving front page coverage in the Globe and Mail during this period were: the blocking of Canadian National Rail lines in Northern Ontario by Native people demanding federal action on housing, the economy, the GST, the toppling of five hydro towers on a Southwestern Ontario Indian reserve, Ontario politics and the defeat of the Liberal party by the NDP on Sept 6, 1990.

September 13, to September 18, 1990 saw the crisis again disappear from the front page and move into the inner pages. During this period the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, bank rates and South African politics dominated the front page of the Globe. Issues covered on the crisis in the inner pages were: an analogy to the FLQ crisis in Quebec in 1970 and the criminalization of a valid social protest, the army cutting off phone lines to journalists behind the barricades and an analysis of the crisis as a media battle fought in living rooms.

Following this gap in coverage the crisis reappeared on the front page of the Globe on September 19, 1990 after a clash between Mohawks and the army. The headline read, "Shots fired during raid on reserve: 100 in hospital after tear gas used against Mohawks trying to stop weapons search". Following this incident the crisis remained primarily above the fold on the
front page of the *Globe and Mail* up to and beyond\textsuperscript{9} the end of the siege on September 27, 1990. Other events covered on the front page of the *Globe* during this period were: the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, Ontario politics, riots in New Delhi, the appointment of five Tories to the Senate, the GST, reconvening of Parliament, sports (baseball) and arts (Phantom of the Opera).

**Patterns of Coverage**

At the inception of this research it was decided that a complete manual search of one Canadian newspaper would be useful. This was done for thoroughness in data collection and analysis. Canada’s national newspaper, the *Globe and Mail* was chosen for its reputation for journalistic integrity and balanced reporting. Ericson et al. claim that "quality" newspapers like the *Globe and Mail* do not sensationalize violence, sex, crime or major disasters to the same degree as popular newspapers (1987:48-49). Heather Sim claims that nationally significant papers like the *Globe and Mail* are more involved in Native peoples’ issues and focus more on legal and political issues (1978:16). In any event, this led to a complete manual search of each *Globe and Mail* published during the thirteen-week period chosen for this analysis.

The most immediate and obvious finding that came to light was the vast discrepancy between the numbers of articles listed for the crisis by the *Canadian News Index* and the actual volume of articles produced by the *Globe and Mail*. The *Canadian News Index* lists a total of 195 articles published by the *Globe and Mail* during the July 9 to October 7, 1990 period (see Figure 1). All these articles were listed under the subject title "Land claims -- Quebec

\textsuperscript{9}Interestingly, despite resolution of the siege when the Mohawks walked away from the barricades on September 27, 1990 the event remained on the front page until September 29, 1990.
(Province)" (Canadian News Index 1990, 624-631). In comparison, the manual search of the Globe and Mail found a total of 291 (96 or 33% more) items published on the crisis (Figure 8). This included all hard news, editorials, letters to the editor and opinion pieces since these are the same categories the Canadian News Index references. This finding suggests that the actual volume of coverage is much higher than the 868 items because the analysis indicates that the Canadian News Index underrepresents actual news coverage by 33%. In proportion to the manual search findings, CNI selection of coverage for each week varied between 17% and 45% of actual coverage in the Globe and Mail. However, the CNI does not claim to reference all articles published in the newspapers. Its newspaper selection policy states that articles are covered selectively based on the items of significant reference value within a given set of parameters (1990:iv). Taking this into account and comparing Figures 1 and 8 we see that the CNI's selection process allows them to present a fairly accurate portrayal of the fluctuation of press coverage during the time line of the crisis.\footnote{However, the Canadian News Index failed to reflect the third peak in week twelve of the Globe and Mail coverage and in contrast registered a decline.}

This analysis is based on the manual search data, not on the CNI. Figure 8 illustrates the complete press coverage of the Mohawk Crisis in the Globe and Mail over the thirteen-week time line chosen for this study. The patterns of coverage closely emulate those found and discussed in the analysis of the Canadian News Index and graphed in Figure 1. Figure 9 illustrates the number of hard news articles produced by the Globe and Mail during the time period of analysis (192). The distinction between Figure 8 and 9 is the inclusion and exclusion of Opinion items, (i.e. editorials, letters to the editor and commentary articles) respectively. Inclusion of the Opinion items caused the variations in coverage to increase in amplitude (12-
GLOBE AND MAIL COVERAGE OF OKA CRISIS
Total Number of Articles by Week

Figure 8
Includes editorials, letters, commentary
291 front and inside items total
GLOBE AND MAIL COVERAGE OF OKA CRISIS
Number of Hard News Articles by Week

No. of Items

Week (July 9-October 7, 1990)

Figure 9
Excludes editorials, letters, commentary
192 front/inside hard news
52%), but did not substantially alter the pattern of coverage. The Opinion items comprise a substantial proportion (34.1%) of the overall Globe and Mail coverage of the crisis, suggesting that the event became an issue of public debate nationally (see Figure 10). Breaking down the Opinion items, editorials comprised 4.5% of overall coverage, letters to the editor comprised 17.2% and commentary pieces 12.4%. Hard news items constituted 66% of overall coverage. Figure 11 illustrates the frequency of Opinion items published each week.

Figure 12 depicts front page coverage of the crisis in the Globe and Mail above and below the fold. Out of the 192 hard news stories published, 69 or 36% were positioned on the front page of the Globe and Mail. Of these, 51 or 74% were placed above the fold and 18 or 26% were below the fold. Thus, during the 78 days\(^{31}\), the crisis remained on the front page (above or below the fold) of the Globe and Mail for 69 days or over 88% of the time. Figure 13 shows that of these 69 front page stories 21 or 30% were placed above the fold as the dominant headline article for the newsday. Comparison of Figures 8, 9, 12, and 13 revealed three correspondingly distinctive peaks in coverage during weeks 3-4, 8-9, and 11-12 (similar to the CNI analysis). It is interesting to note that, when coverage is low (e.g. weeks four to seven), the quantity of items appearing above and below the fold during this period intersect (Figure 12). These findings reveal the significance and newsworthiness of the Mohawk Crisis in the press throughout its duration.

\(^{31}\)Based on the Globe and Mail publishing period of six days per week multiplied by thirteen weeks.
GLOBE AND MAIL COVERAGE OF OKA CRISIS
Breakdown of Hard News and Opinion Items

- Hard News 66.0%  
  192
- Commentary 12.4%  
  36
- Editorials 4.5%  
  13
- Letters 17.2%  
  50

Figure 10
99 Opinion Items
291 Items total
GLOBE AND MAIL COVERAGE OF OKA CRISIS
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Figure 11
Includes editorials, letters, commentary
99 items/291 total

Week (July 9-October 7, 1990)
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Figure 13
21 headlines/69 Front page items
192 hard news items total
Contextualization

It has already been suggested that the media simplifies complex political and social issues by removing them from their context and focusing on titillation themes of violence and conflict. This is because events make better news than issues that are ongoing and have no climax that fits the media time frame.

The search of the Globe and Mail found a total of 29 out of 157 (18%) hard news items concentrating on historical contextualization or analysis of issues in the Mohawk Crisis between July 12 and September 26, 1990. Although these categories were not mutually exclusive, the articles providing historical context differed in some degree from those providing analysis. While both types provided context on the crisis, 'analysis' articles often provided more in-depth or analytical information on current issues of debate and interest in the dispute. For example, 17 or almost 59% of the items selected provided in-depth analysis on important issues in the crisis. Seven (41%) of these latter items focused specifically on the issue of sovereignty, land claims and the Federal government's land claims process, while four (23.5%) centred on public opinion. The remaining issues analyzed included: media, racism, Native peoples' unity, rights of the white residents, and one item on September 21, 1991 which analyzed (on the front page) the image of war surrounding the crisis.

Historical context articles, on the other hand, provided specific information on Mohawk

culture, and more generally on Native peoples' social conditions in Canada. For example, 10 (34%) out of 29 context or analysis articles provided in-depth background information on the history of the Mohawk conflict at Oka and the Iroquois Confederacy. This included background on the Longhouse system of government and religion, the Great Law of Peace, factional disputes between the Confederacy Chiefs and elected council (Traditionalists), and Mohawk culture and society. Two additional articles (for a total of 12 historical-context items) provided analysis of Native peoples' social conditions in Canada. Therefore, 41% of the contextualization articles provided historical background on the Oka Crisis.

Although not included in the original methodology, a review of the Commentary section (opposite the editorial page) was undertaken to determine if any context items would be found. Six historical items and one analytically contextualizing item (sovereignty) were located. Three of these provided historical information on the 200-year-old Oka conflict, two provided background on Native peoples' social conditions and racism in Canada, one discussed the history of the use of words such as 'Native', 'Indian' and 'Aboriginal', and the one analytical item documented how Canadian constitutional law supports Native peoples' sovereignty. Although located in the Commentary section of the Globe the format for the majority of these articles emulated that of the items found within the hard news items (i.e. distinctly similar layout of

---


34The elected council often refers to themselves as traditionalists. This is a contentious issue in the Confederacy since the council operates under the Government of Canada's Indian Act and some factions within the Confederacy do not view this as traditional.

leader and headline). For example, prominence was obvious, with most items appropriating a large portion of the page, having bold headlines, and four items were accompanied by large photographs (two of which centred on Iroquois history).

To summarize, twenty-nine or eighteen percent of articles (out of 157 hard news items) found in the *Globe and Mail* between July 12 and September 27, 1990 provided historical and analytical contextualization of the Oka Crisis. Twelve of these provided historical background on the crisis while seventeen centred on analysis of important issues surrounding the dispute. Therefore, the findings indicate that 15% of the *Globe and Mail* hard news coverage of the Oka Crisis included articles that contextualized the event. In addition, a secondary analysis found another seven contextual articles presented in the Commentary section of the *Globe and Mail*. No items of history or analysis secured front page prominence in the *Globe and Mail*.

Themes of violence and police/military action (potential conflict) dominated over context items in the *Globe and Mail*. This supports the dominant ideology theory because our assumptions are that items appearing on the front page have more political and ideological impact. Contextualization provides alternative definitions of politically significant events and therefore comprises a small percentage of total news and is marginalized to inner pages of the press.

Of course we cannot determine the ideological or attitudinal impact nor the extent to which the 15% of context items were more or less than the norm provided by the *Globe and Mail* in social conflict. We can surmise that 15% of total news is not a substantial amount. However, it may be more than normal and could have contributed to and accounted for the media and public support of the Mohawks' actions. We can only speculate that the media influenced to some extent, the awareness of Native peoples’ social marginalization acquired by
the Canadian public. This awareness in turn contributed to a greater sympathy for the Mohawks than for the Sûreté du Québec. This support countered an entrenched desire for order and support for police by the Canadian public.

The key event date cluster (Appendix B), derived from the Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette furnishes the data for the quantitative analyses undertaken in chapters five and six. This select sample of important events contrasts with the preceding chapters which focused on all articles produced by the Globe and Mail and other newspapers during the crisis. The theoretical assumptions that the media reliance on official sources perpetuates a dominant ideology is the basis for the discussion in Chapter five.
CHAPTER V - OFFICIAL SOURCES

Diversity of Sources

In this chapter, the hypothesis that official sources will dominate over Native peoples’ sources in coverage of the Mohawk Crisis will be tested.

The analysis of sources was conducted by compiling a data base of all sources quoted or paraphrased in each of the 28 front-page Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette articles in the cluster sample. A more detailed explanation of the methodology used can be found in the methodology chapter.

Table 2 shows the percentages of sources affiliated with institutions. The percentage of total source column (%N) indicates that almost one-quarter of all sources in the news stories of the Globe and Gazette were affiliated with the Quebec government. The Army, Federal Government and Mohawk representatives all rank behind the Quebec Government as sources most often used by the press during the Mohawk Crisis. The totals for the other categories vary considerably between the newspapers, but overall the Gazette source totals were slightly higher than the Globe.

Comparing a rank ordering of sources for each newspaper reveals that the first and fourth ranks are reversed in each paper. The Federal Government ranks as the highest source for the Globe and Mail (23% of the total) while the Quebec Government ranks fourth (16% of the total). In contrast, the Quebec Government ranks as the highest source for the Montreal Gazette (31% of the total) while the Federal Government ranks fourth (12% of the total). Thus, the Gazette used Quebec government sources approximately 2.5 times as often as the Globe. The Globe, on the other hand, used Federal Government sources almost 1.5 times as often as the
Table 2
SOURCE AFFILIATION AND LIMITS OF DIVERSITY
Based on Number of Sources Referenced in the Globe and Mail And Montreal Gazette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Affiliation</th>
<th>GM</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%Q</th>
<th>%P</th>
<th>%N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Government</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native People</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Native People</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior Society</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oka/Châteauguay Residents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Government (Oka)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Total)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND: G&M - Globe and Mail; MG - Montreal Gazette; N - Total; %Q - Percentage of total sources that are directly quoted; %P - Percentage of total sources that are paraphrased by media; %N - percentage of total.

Gazette. Thus, in both newspapers Government sources ranked highest but the particular government source changes. Proximity to the source may explain these differences. The separate rank ordering of the newspaper sources also reveals that the army and Mohawk sources tied for second in the Globe and Mail while the army ranked second and Mohawk sources ranked third in the Montreal Gazette.

Although Mohawk spokespersons were prominent in the coverage (ranking fourth overall) they were not dominant. When grouped, 65% of all sources were found to be affiliated with some type of government body (i.e. Quebec, Federal, Municipal, Army, Police). By comparison, only 27% of the sources were associated with Warrior, Mohawk or Native peoples' organizations. The findings therefore support the hypothesis that official
sources would dominate over the Native peoples’ voice in coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. The dominance of official sources was similar to those reported in Sigal 1973 (75%) Brown et al. 1987 (55%), and Soloski 1989 (56.3%).

However, the results differ dramatically from those of Peggy Vogan (1979) who, following up Sim (1978), found the percentage of Native peoples’ definers in newspaper articles had improved from 42% to 50% (1979:9) between 1977 and 1978. Sampling may be an explanation of why the Vogan study had a higher percentage of Native peoples’ sources than this study. Peggy Vogan conducted a random sample of all Native peoples’ articles in newspapers whereas this study focused on front-page articles only. The comparison with the Osler and MacFarlane (1991) study below will elaborate on the issue of sampling differences in more detail.

The findings of this study also differ substantially from those of Osler and MacFarlane (1991), who studied sourcing of hard news on the Mohawk Crisis in eleven Canadian newspapers. They concluded that English-language newspapers gave marked attention to Warrior and other Mohawk sources and ignored non-Native peoples’ sources (1991:9-10; see also Ottawa Citizen June 4, 1991:A5). For example, in the Globe and Mail they found that 17.3% of primary sourcing of hard news was attributed to the Warriors. This contrasts markedly with the 4.5% of Warrior sources found in this study.\(^{36}\) However, combining the Osler and MacFarlane data into official and Native peoples’ categories (as in this study) revealed that 46% of sources in the Globe and Mail were from government bodies and 40% from Native peoples’ sources (1991:Figure #7). While grouping the data still

\(^{36}\)Warrior-related sources included the following: Mohawk Warriors, Warrior Society spokesperson or press release, Oneida Longhouse Chiefs Bob Antone and Terry Doxtator, Warrior ideologue Lewis Hall and Akwesasne spokesperson Francis Boots.
indicates a much lower level of official dominance than revealed by this study, the
differences in results diminish.

Sampling differences are the most likely explanation for the discrepancy between the
findings. Osler and MacFarlane developed a method of selecting the primary source among
many sources appearing within each article in their cluster sample. Their sample also
covered all articles appearing in each of the date clusters. In contrast, for this study a total
compilation of all sources appearing in each front-page article of the sample was examined
and broken down by column position. The analysis of column position (explained later)
reveals that government sources appeared most often in columns on the front-page and were
therefore the primary definers of events during the crisis. Warrior and or Native peoples’
voices dominated more in the inner pages of the news story. Therefore, the difference
between this study and the Osler and MacFarlane findings may be attributed simply to
divergent sampling techniques.

It is suggested that the Osler and MacFarlane method of selecting the primary source
may have imposed a more subjective element into the analysis. As well, they failed to
differentiate between those sources appearing on the front-page (primary definers) and those
relegated to the inner columns and pages. On the other hand, their methodology includes
interesting components that lend credibility to their analysis.\textsuperscript{37} Future research using
various methods of selection and analysis may shed more light on the discrepancies between
these two studies.

The Mohawk Crisis illustrates Molotch and Lester’s definitions of habitual versus
disruptive access. The political figures were quoted often in the media and this repetition

\textsuperscript{37}See discussion on Prominence Index in Osler and MacFarlane (1991).
sustains consensus. Importance was given to what they had to say by the very notion that ‘they’ are saying it (1974:127). Those involving individuals who were not politically important (Mohawks, Warriors, etc.) had to depend on making news by ‘making a scene’. Molotch and Lester explain, "The disruptive occurrence becomes an event because it is a problem for the relatively powerful" (1974:128). The amount of coverage in the Commentary pages on a minority group’s right to the use of violence to advance a legitimate cause gives evidence for this point.

In summary, Table 2 reveals the dominance of official sources in the front-page coverage of the Oka Crisis. Privileged groups are therefore gifted with news presence and low-status groups are excluded unless they are able to disrupt the norm and acquire access to the news making process. Akiba Cohen et al. would therefore claim that the habitual pattern of access of the media has preserved consensus through replication (1990:115).

**Quotation versus Paraphrase: A Matter of Language?**

Eliciting divergent views from spokespersons, are the essentials of good work. If possible, quotes are preferred, since this not only "puts the interviewee in the picture", but also reduces the likelihood that a report might be challenged as "unfair" (Altheide 1976:175).

The image of objectivity and fairness is a primary concern of the mass media, and reporters can use quotations as facts to get at the truth and perpetuate this image. "If a story is opinionated, ‘all the facts’ can be obtained by getting the ‘other side’ and letting both parties be quoted" (Altheide 1976:175). According to Ericson et al., it is the source’s words which constitute the facts of a story (1987:286). Quotations attributed to an official source are accepted as ‘fact’ on the basis of face value. This is because factuality correlates directly to the source’s relative position in the hierarchy of credibility (authorized knowledge) (Ericson
et al. 1987:286-293). Official sources "constitute a select group of normative witnesses to uphold the normative order. More often than we think, news discourse consists of what should be the facts of the matter" (Ericson et al. 1987:292).

Stempel and Culbertson contend that frequency of quotation and frequency of paraphrase should give some indication of dominance and subordination in attribution (1984:672). This section will examine evidence that may assist in confirming or disproving the hypothesis that, official sources dominated in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis.

The high rankings of official sources in Table 2 (column "%N") provides some evidence of the dominance of official sources overall in the Mohawk Crisis based on the frequency of both literary and paraphrased quotations attributed to them.

Table 2 also presents a breakdown of the percentage of quotations versus paraphrases attributed to source affiliation. It is interesting to note that, for a majority of the sources, the use of quotations and paraphrases are divided almost equally. The exceptions to this are the Quebec and Federal governments and the Warrior Society. The findings for the Federal government category indicate an emphasis on quotations (10%) over paraphrased references (6.9%). This is understandable since the Federal government is the ultimate government body in Canada and what it says imparts a considerable degree of authority and therefore dominance. Conversely, the Quebec government is quoted substantially less often than it is paraphrased (10.6% quotations versus 14% paraphrases). This may reflect English-language newspapers tendency to attribute less legitimacy to the Quebec government than to the Federal government. On the other hand, linguistic or translation factors provide a simpler and more plausible explanation for these differences. Quebec sources may have been quoted less, simply because of the language barrier between English journalists and French sources.
That is, English reporters may tend to quote English sources more often or readily than French sources. While the small percentages call into question their statistical significance, Table 2 reveals that the Warrior Society sources were quoted more than paraphrased (3% vs. 1.5%). The only other source more frequently quoted than paraphrased was the Federal government. Since these two sources are primarily English speaking, linguistic factors may explain the findings. However, the army (which was primarily English speaking) was paraphrased slightly more often than quoted and this finding weakens the proposed explanations.

Combining the various groups into official and Native peoples’ categories revealed that 31.1% of all direct quotations are attributed to government bodies and 14.4% to Native peoples’ sources while 33.4% of paraphrased references are attributed to government bodies and 12.2% to Native peoples’ sources. The higher representation of official sources paraphrased rather than directly quoted is most likely caused by the Gazette’s focus on Quebec government sources and linguistic factors discussed above. The higher representation of Native people directly quoted rather than paraphrased may also be explained by linguistic factors or it may indicate that some credibility and legitimacy was accorded to what the Native peoples’ sources had to say. Whatever the cause, the fact that official sources were quoted substantially more than Native peoples’ sources lends support to the hypothesis that official sources would dominate in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis.

In summary, proximity may explain the Montreal Gazette’s heavy reliance on Quebec government sources (Table 2) and linguistic factors may explain why a substantial proportion of these sources are paraphrased and not quoted. The federal government’s position at the top of the hierarchy of credibility may explain why its sources were quoted more often than
they were paraphrased. The higher percentage of quotations attributed to Native peoples' sources may be the result of linguistic factors or the attribution of legitimacy.

The findings revealed that official sources were quoted twice as more often than Native peoples' sources and therefore supported the hypothesis that official sources would dominate in media coverage of the Mohawk crisis.

Source Variation by Column: Dominance versus Balance

Another indication of dominance is the location of the source within the news story. The sources quoted within the first few paragraphs have dominance since they are the primary definers and are able to structure the parameters of the debate for the story. The breakdown of sources by column (Figures 14, 15 and 16) seems to confirm the hypothesis that official sources dominated the coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. The data indicates that government or official sources predominate substantially over Native peoples’ sources as primary definers within the first two columns of news stories contained in the Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette. On average, official sources were used two and a half times more often than Native peoples’ sources in the first two columns of the Globe and Gazette combined (Figure 14). In the Globe and Mail, 80% of the sources used in the first column, and 76% in the second column, originated from government bodies. In comparison, only 20% and 24% (respectively) were Native peoples’ sources (Figure 15). Somewhat lower than the Globe, the Montreal Gazette official sources still dominated 68% of the time in the first two columns compared with only 32% for the Native peoples’ voice (Figure 16).

These findings are significant given that the average number of columns to appear on the front page in the sample articles is 2.1. More specifically, the most frequently occurring
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number (mode) of columns per front page was 2 and 1 for the Globe and Gazette respectively. Government sources dominated in the first two columns which were often located on the front page. As primary definers they were therefore able to structure the parameters of the debate surrounding the Mohawk Crisis.

The Globe and Mail source variation by column discussion illustrates the difference between dominance versus balance. The Globe and Mail had a minimum of three and a maximum of seven columns per story with an average of five and a mode of six. In comparison the Montreal Gazette had a minimum of two columns and a maximum of eight per story with the same average of five but a mode of four. As explained above, the average number of columns appearing on the front pages of both these newspapers was 2.1.

While the percentage of official sources declined steadily from column one to column seven in the Globe and Mail (Figure 15), Native peoples’ sources increased steadily and surpassed official sources in columns five, six and seven. This inverse correlation appears to illustrate the struggle between the institutionalized dominance of official sources in the news and press imperatives of balance and objectivity (i.e. presenting both sides). Native peoples’ sources remain relegated primarily to the inner pages or last columns of a story (which are seldom on the front page and have less prominence and dominance). They are not given the opportunity to define the debate and instead must respond and limit their discourse within the parameters of the debate established by the primary definers.

The source variations by column in the Montreal Gazette (Figure 16) were not as clearly delineated as those of the Globe (Figure 15). Figure 16 reveals several peaks and valleys in the findings for both the official and Native peoples’ sources. On average, government sources clearly dominate to a greater degree across all columns in comparison to the Globe and Mail.
This may be attributed to the *Gazette's* heavy reliance on Quebec government sources. However, in contrast to the *Globe and Mail*, Native peoples' sources surge and official sources decrease dramatically in columns three and seven in the *Gazette*. The surge by the Native peoples' voice in inner columns three and seven are immediately overwhelmed by the official voice in succeeding columns.

**A Matter of Distance?**

The *Globe and Mail* had an average of 18 sources per article, the *Montreal Gazette* 24, and both together 21. The *Gazette's* higher number of sources per article could be a result of relative proximity. That is, since the Mohawk Crisis occurred within the Montreal area the *Gazette* simply had easier access to a greater number of sources. This suggestion is consistent with the *Montreal Gazette's* heavy reliance on Quebec government sources as shown in Table Two. Also, given its closeness to the crisis, the *Gazette* may have provided more detailed coverage of the events, resulting in longer articles which accommodated more sources. The *Globe and Gazette* have the same number of columns (5) per article, but the *Gazette* may have used longer columns than the *Globe*. However, this can not be verified because column length was not considered in this study. Alternately, we may be observing an artefact of the sampling procedure, which selected key events only and may not be representative of overall coverage.

**Key Players**

Table 2 also reveals a low representation (4%) of sources not affiliated with any organizations (located within the "other native", "other non-native" and "Oka/Châteauguay" categories). These results are similar to the findings of Sim 1978 and Vogan 1979 who found that the
majority (90% in the Sim study) of actors quoted in coverage of Native peoples’ issues were members of organizations (e.g. government departments, Native peoples’ band councils, and Native peoples’ associations) as opposed to individuals standing alone (see also Ericson et al. 1989:1). Similarly, Cohen et al., studying social conflicts in television news across five countries, found that a majority of conflict news items focused on organizations (political parties, unions, dissidents) or "individuals representing such groups who opposed one another either regarding goals or the means to obtain them" (1990:176).

Table 3 lists some of the most frequently cited sources found in the sample. The top four key players were Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Quebec Native Affairs Minister John Ciaccia and Lieutenant-General Kent Foster (Mobile Command). Ranking close behind in fifth position was Mohawk Spokesperson Ellen Gabriel. Almost 83% of the above sources were individuals affiliated with a government body. This remains consistent with Gitlin's concept,

Events are portrayed in terms of key individuals involved, and the effects on the individuals of what has transpired...While the news is about organizational life, the organizations are personified by the significant players involved. In the mass mediated version of reality, organizations, bureaucracies, movements - in fact all larger and enduring social formations - are reduced to personifications (Gitlin 1980:146).

Galtung and Ruge claim that the alternative to 'personification' "would be to present events as the outcome of 'social forces', as structural more than idiosyncratic outcomes of the society which produced them" (1973:57). This is less appealing, because personification satisfies the human need for meaning and identification -- where man "is the master of his own destiny and events can be seen as the outcome of an act of free will" (1973:57). Personification fits the time and technical requirements of news production. Unlike persons, structures are difficult to photograph and orient in time and space (Galtung and Ruge 1973:57).
Table 3
KEY PLAYERS IN THE MOHAWK CRISIS
Based on Frequency of Citation in the Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Players</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister Brian Mulroney</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Native Affairs Minister John Ciaccia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Kent Foster, Mobile Command</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Spokesperson Ellen Gabriel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Public Security Minister Sam Elkas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Native Affairs Minister Tom Siddon</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel Canadian Forces Robin Gagnon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Sûreté du Québec Robert Lavigne</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-Gen. Armand Roy, 5th Mechanized Brigade</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. John de Chastelain, chief of defence staff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahnawake Chief Billy Two Rivers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida Chief (Warrior negotiator) Bob Antone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Assembly of First Nations George Erasmus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châteauguay Resident spokesperson Yvon Poitras</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanesatake Band Council Chief Joseph Norton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Alain Tremblay, C company, 2nd Battalion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 3 are similar to those of Cohen et al. who found that groups of authority and power, whether legitimate or illegitimate in society, are the most prevalent actors in social conflict news. These are: "government and other authorities, political parties, countries, workers, dissident groups, armed forces/police and people. On the other hand, the facilitators of society (i.e., courts, media, and educational institutions) are almost
invisible on newscasts -- at least as far as being portrayed as parties to social conflicts" (1990:117).

In summary, the findings supported the hypothesis that official sources would dominate in media coverage of the Mohawk crisis. The results are consistent with the dominant ideology theory and support the two general theses that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and that the media supported an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

The theoretical assumption that pejorative and favourable characterizations or descriptors perform a legitimizing and delegitimizing function particularly during a crisis of order is the basis for the discussion in chapter six. This chapter relies on data derived from the coding of terms found in the key event date cluster sample (Appendix B).
CHAPTER VI - CHARACTERIZATIONS

A Struggle for Legitimacy

This analysis considers the characterizations or language used by media, official and Native peoples' sources to describe certain subject categories found in the Mohawk Crisis. Descriptors or characterizations play a primary role in the struggle for legitimacy that occurs during a 'law and order' campaign. The analysis documented the most frequently used characterizations, correlated them to their sources and attempted to determine differences. The data are obtained from a coding of articles included in the key event date cluster sample (Appendix B).

The study consisted of breaking the characterizations down into the descriptive categories of legitimizing, delegitimizing, neutral, criminal-justice imagery and war imagery based on their situational context in the stories. Legitimizing and delegitimizing terms are descriptive in nature, containing a judgmental quality in their denotative or connotative meanings. Neutral characterizations are also descriptive in nature, but are non-judgmental in their denotative or connotative meanings.

As previously discussed in Chapter One, terms occurring within the criminal-justice and war models have their own legitimizing and delegitimizing connotations but are discussed separately to highlight their unique nature. Terms are not classified twice, so those that fit the Criminal-Justice and War models will not be simultaneously classified into the other categories even if they have legitimizing or delegitimizing qualities.

Crelinsten's work indicates that war imagery legitimizes, and criminal-justice imagery delegitimizes political actors who use violence. For this analysis, it is hypothesized that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories (i.e. the
Warriors/Mohawks, acts by Warriors/Mohawks, the Mohawk Crisis and Mohawk demands) would originate from official sources. Results from this analysis will be also applied to test the two general theses that ideological work will be apparent in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis and that media coverage buttressed an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

Tables listing the data for subject characterizations discussed below are located at the end of the chapter. Table Eighteen provides a summary of the data breakdown for all subjects and categories of characterizations. For each characterization category, the following format will be presented and then discussed. In the discussion, when the usage of characterizations is given as a proportion, it is in proportion to all uses of characterizations by the same source type on the same subject category.

**Total number:** the total number of uses of characterizations taken from the sample.

**Top 50%:** the most frequently used characterizations which together comprise half (or the nearest possible fraction) of the total number. Their actual proportion of the total number of uses of characterizations is given as a percentage.

**Rank of first non-neutral term:** the rank of the first term whether legitimizing, delegitimizing, criminal-justice or war imagery.

**Legitimizing/delegitimizing terms:** the terms which are regarded as expressing legitimization or delegitimization of that which is characterized. For each of the two types, the frequency of use is given as a percentage of the total number of uses of characterizations for the subject category.

**Criminal-justice/War imagery:** the terms which suggest that the Mohawk Crisis was, respectively, a matter of bringing criminals to justice (delegitimizing) or a war between nations or peoples (legitimizing). For each of the two types, the frequency of use is given as a percentage of the total number of uses of characterizations for the subject category. Terms fitting these categories are excluded from the legitimizing/delegitimizing categories.
Results and Discussion

Characterizations of Warriors/Mohawks (Table 4)
Total number: 293
Top 47%: Mohawk(s)
Rank of first non-neutral term: 9 [heavily armed Warrior(s)]
Legitimizing terms (0.7%): fearing future, Natives affirming their right to self-government
Delegitimizing terms (6.4%): heavily armed Warrior(s), holdouts, gun wielding, militant, warriors, scum, extremist minority, radical Warrior faction, masked Warrior(s), Natives firing semi-automatic weapons, handful of determined hardliners.
Criminal-justice imagery (0.7%): criminals, groups of citizens [who] accept laws which they approve and refuse others
War imagery (1.4%): besieged Native(s), paramilitary Warrior(s)

The two legitimizing terms were used two times -- once by Native peoples' sources and once by media sources. The delegitimizing words were used thirteen times (4.4% of total characterizations) by the media and six times (2.0% of total) by official sources. The two criminal-justice terms originated from official sources.

The differences between these modest percentages becomes more visible when contrasted with the media and official uses of neutral terminology. The ratio of neutral to delegitimizing terms used by the media was 19:1; the ratio of neutral to delegitimizing terms used by official sources was 2:1. Although the totals are modest the data support the hypothesis, indicating that official sources used delegitimizing terms to a much higher degree than the media and were the sole users of criminal-justice imagery.

The term "paramilitary Warrior(s)" can simultaneously legitimize or delegitimize the Mohawks/Warriors. While the war imagery connotation serves to politicize an event (and thereby legitimize to a degree) the paramilitary image falls into a grey zone and can delegitimize because of the violent "Rambo" or vigilante image it communicates. It is understandable, then, that this term was used on two occasions by official sources only.
Characterizations of Acts by Warriors/Mohawks (Table 5)

Total number: 19
Top 47.4%: Threat(s), criminal acts
Rank of first non-neutral term: 1 [threat(s)]
Legitimizing terms (5.3%): Just and honourable
Delegitimizing terms (47.4%): Threat(s), death threat(s), commandeered, destabilization of government
Criminal-justice imagery (36.8%): Criminal acts, illegal activities, murder.
War imagery (10.5%): Armed resistance, [not] apprehended insurrection

The analysis found no neutral characterizations from any source to describe acts by Mohawks/Warriors. Delegitimizing characterizations clearly dominated over legitimizing terms (47.4% versus 5.3% respectively). In this category, the media actually surpassed official sources in the use of delegitimizing characterizations (see Table Eighteen). Criminal-justice imagery originated from five official and two media sources. Sources of war imagery included one official and one media ("armed resistance" and "[not] apprehended insurrection", respectively).

The term "just and honourable" was used by the only Native peoples’ source and contrasts sharply with the official definitions of acts.

The media drew a parallel between the Mohawk Crisis and the 1970 October Crisis when troops were called in to put down an "apprehended insurrection". An agitated Bourassa said no parallels could be drawn because different legislation was being invoked, and individual liberties were not being suspended (Globe and Mail and Montreal Gazette August 9, 1990). Bourassa’s agitation may indicate that he was aware of the delegitimizing potential of this analogy to his government.

The data show that a majority of criminal-justice imagery were attributed to official sources and that delegitimizing characterizations (which comprised 47.4% of all characterizations) originated from both official and media sources. The only legitimizing term
originated from a Native peoples' source.

Characterizations of Mohawk Crisis (Table 6)
Total number: 196
Top 51.5%: Barricade(s)/blockade(s), armed standoff, standoff, crisis
Rank of first non-neutral term: 6 (siege)
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms (4.1%): exceptional circumstances, bungled police raid, intolerable, fanaticism, revolting, armed violence
Criminal-justice imagery (2.0%): police matter, crime,
War imagery (8.7%): siege, fortifications, war, besieged Native settlement, armed battle

Official Characterizations of Mohawk Crisis (Table 7A)
Total number: 51
Top 49.0%: Barricade(s)/blockade(s), armed standoff, crisis
Rank of first non-neutral term: 3 (police matter)
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms (13.7%): exceptional circumstances, intolerable, fanaticism, revolting, armed violence
Criminal-justice imagery (7.8%): police matter, crime
War imagery (7.8%): siege, fortifications, armed battle

The term "police matter" was used three times by official sources and ranked as the first non-neutral term. 21.5% of official characterizations were classified as either delegitimizing or criminal justice related; official sources are proportionally by far the heaviest users of such terms.

Media Characterizations of the Mohawk Crisis (Table 7B)
Total number: 131
Top 52.7%: barricade(s)/blockade(s), standoff, armed standoff, crisis
Rank of first non-neutral term: 10 (bungled police raid)
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms (0.8%): bungled police raid
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery (6.8%): siege, armed battle

A majority of the characterizations (52.7%) have descriptive and dramatistic qualities reflecting
conflict and confrontation: "armed standoff", "crisis", "conflict", "violence", "tense standoff", "dispute", "confrontation", "armed confrontation". This is consistent with the media's tendency to frame events involving minority groups in terms of conflict, to focus on negative images, and to use conflict related words (see Galtung and Ruge 1973, Singer 1982, Hartman and Husband 1973, and Fedler 1973).

The term "bungled police raid" delegitimizes the handling of the crisis by the police. It must be noted that the actual figures presented in the table give the perception that the media surpassed all other sources in the use of war imagery. However, proportionally the media in fact used the least amount of war imagery and the Native peoples' sources used the greatest. This is because the media use a much larger proportion of neutral terms.

Native Peoples' Characterizations of the Mohawk Crisis (Table 7C)
Total number: 14
Top 50.0%: confrontation, war
Rank of first non-neutral term: 2 (war)
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms: none
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery (28.6%): war, besieged Native settlement

8.6% of Native peoples' characterizations of the Mohawk Crisis had war imagery connotations and the term "war" ranked as the first non-neutral term. This contrasts sharply with Table 7A (official sources) where the first non-neutral term was criminal-justice related. The war imagery serves to further legitimize the Mohawks' position by adding a political component. The Native peoples' war definitions and the official criminal-justice definitions of the crisis illuminate the ideological struggle occurring between the two sides. The results are even more striking when compared with the substantially larger volume of terms (primarily neutral) used by the media overall (see Table Eighteen "Summary of Characterizations"). Specifically, the
press quoted Native peoples use of war imagery as often as it quoted official uses of criminal-justice imagery -- four mentions in each case.

Characterizations of Police (Table 8)
Total number: 175
Top 50.3%: police
Rank of first non-neutral term: 8 (threatened)
Legitimizing terms (0.6%): threatened
Delegitimizing terms (2.9%): playing psychological games, vengeful, distrusted, feared, dangerous group
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery: none

The term "threatened" refers in context specifically to police confrontation with South Shore demonstrators. Describing the demonstrators as threatening the police legitimates a police response. Three of the five delegitimizing terms -- "playing psychological games", "vengeful", and "dangerous group" -- were from Native peoples' sources while the other two originated from the media. Proportionally, the Native peoples' voice were the heaviest users of delegitimizing terms when referring to the police. The use of "distrusted" and "feared" shows respect for Native peoples' viewpoint. Interestingly, not even official sources contributed any legitimizing terms in this category.

Characterizations of Police Acts (Table 9)
Total number: 48
Top 47.9%: raid(ed), arrest(ed), forcibly dismantle, assault
Rank of first non-neutral term: 2 [arrest(ed)]
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms (22.9%): forcibly dismantle, stormed, harassment, excessive force, terrorism
Criminal-justice imagery (31.3%): arrest(ed), charge(d), investigating
War imagery (4.2%): armed battle, attack
Native peoples' sources contributed the delegitimizing terms "harassment" and "terrorism", which comprised 27.3% of all eleven uses of delegitimizing characterizations. The media provided all of the other characterizations, including criminal-justice (72.7%). Official sources contributed no characterizations in this category. The term "terrorism" has come to be defined as meaning political and illegitimate violence (see Rubenstein 1987:20). Crelinsten states, "When it is legitimized, it is usually called something other than 'terrorism'" (1989:244). The Native peoples' definition of police acts as 'terrorism' further illuminates the ideological struggle occurring between the Native peoples' and official voice over definitions of the crisis. The preponderance of delegitimizing usage by the media indicates that the media were sharply critical of the police during the crisis. The "Summary of Characterizations" in Table Eighteen displays the large proportion of criminal-justice imagery used by the media to characterize police acts. This may be attributed to semantic difficulties caused by a lack of alternative terminology to characterize acts of police officers.

Characterizations of Army (Table 10)
Total number: 179
Top 46.9%: army, military
Rank of first non-neutral term: 8 [(not) peacekeepers]
Legitimizing terms (1.7%): experts at camouflage, praised, and supports never replaces civil authority
Delegitimizing terms: none
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery (0.6%): [not] peacekeepers

Two of the legitimizing terms were attributed to official sources and one to the media. The term "peacekeeper" originates from an official source and is often associated with United Nations peacekeeping forces assisting two warring nations to maintain a cease-fire, or treaty; as a war image, it helps to legitimate the Native peoples' position, hence the official emphasis on the fact
that the army are "not" peacekeepers. The ambiguity of this definition is evident in the contradictory statements made by the federal and Quebec governments. Premier Bourassa stated that "The military's role in the dispute is strictly to act as peacekeeper because the last thing the people of Quebec want is a bloodbath" (Montreal Gazette August 9, 1990:A1). Possibly being more aware of the legitimizing consequences of this label, Prime Minister Mulroney refused to accept this definition of the army: it would be "inappropriate and misleading" to say the Canadian troops are playing a peacekeeping role in Montreal just as they have in trouble spots around the globe (Montreal Gazette August 9, 1990:A1 and Globe and Mail August 9, 1990:A1). However, the Globe appeared to mock Mulroney's definition of events, stating "Mr. Mulroney said the situation at Oka is 'exceptional', although he noted that provinces have made similar requests for help 109 times in the past" (August 9:A2, 1990).

Characterizations of Army Acts (Table 11)
Total number: 64
Top 48.4%: operation(s), intervention, attack, force, assault(ed)
Rank of first non-neutral term: 2 (force)
Legitimizing terms (10.9%): force, matters of security
Delegitimizing terms (14.0%): harassment, terrorism, aggression, political, brutal action, enemies, intimidate
Criminal-justice imagery (4.7%): law and order
War imagery (20.3%): attack, battle, gunboat diplomacy, [not] peacekeeping, armed invasion

Illustrating the ideological battle occurring in the media, all but two of the terms used to delegitimize army acts were used by Native peoples' sources; the exceptions are "brutal action" (official) and "intimidate" (media) while a majority of the terms used to legitimate military acts originated from official sources. The only criminal-justice related term was used by an official source, but war imagery attribution was much more complex. Of the total 20.3% war imagery,
official sources accounted for 29.5%, media 24.6% and Native peoples 9.8%. The lack of
delegitimizing terms originating from the media contrasts sharply with the media criticism of
police acts in Table Nine.

The term "force" is legitimizing because, as Crelinsten states, "When the level of state
violence escalates, we then tend to use the word 'force' instead of 'violence'" (1987b:16 and
1989b:244). This differentiation establishes moral parameters between the legitimate use of
violence (called force) by the state and the illegitimate use of violence by individuals or marginal
groups within the state (Schlesinger et al. 1983:16). The term "peacekeeping" has legitimizing
(for Native peoples) war imagery connotations of peacekeeping between nations at war. This
explains why the official source preferred not to accept the use of this term. The term
"terrorism" as discussed above has become associated with political and illegitimate violence.
This and the term "political", used by a Native peoples' source for military acts, highlights the
definitional struggle that was occurring. In a democratic society the police and military are
institutions under the strict control of a democratically elected government; they are not
supposed to be operating independently or in a political fashion: the military "supports never
replaces civil authority" (Globe and Mail August 9:A7, 1990).

Finally, the term "brutal action" is somewhat of an anomaly since it originates from an
official source and is delegitimizing of the military. It was used in a statement by Prime
Minister Mulroney in response to allegations that the troops were being deployed to charge the
barricades: "Such a brutal action would have unforeseen consequences" (Montreal Gazette
August 9, 1990). This comment may have been an attempt to allay fears expressed by civil
rights groups and persons concerned with the consequences of escalation of the use of force by
the state.
Characterizations of Governments (Table 12)
Total number: 208
Top 48.3%: Quebec government, premier, federal government, Quebec, provincial government, Prime Minister, Mohawk Nation
Rank of first non-neutral term: 12 (hypocritical attitude)
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms (1.4%): hypocritical attitude, Neanderthal attitude
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery: none

Both of the delegitimizing descriptors ("hypocritical attitude" and "neanderthal attitude") originated from Native peoples' sources and referred to the Quebec and Federal governments.

All other characterizations were considered neutral in nature.

The definition of government included provincial, federal, municipal and Native peoples'.

With respect to Native peoples' government, coding was conducted liberally in order to gain an impression of alternate forms of government discussed in the sample. Native peoples' alternative definitions of their government were used to a substantial degree. The Native peoples' definitions of government were "Mohawk Nation", "Iroquois Confederacy", "self-government", "traditional government" and "Confederacy chiefs". These characterizations were all used by the media and comprised 14.4% of all references to governments.

Characterizations of Mohawk Demands/Terms (Table 13)
Total number: 50
Top 52.0%: Dismantle.lift barricade(s), amnesty/immunity/criminal charge(s)/prosecution, laying down arms/guns
Rank of first non-neutral term: 6 (bizarre)
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms (8.0%): bizarre, unacceptable, unreasonable, Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery (2.0%): balkanization of Canada

All of the delegitimizing terms originated from official sources and referred to the Mohawks’
demands. They comprised eight percent of total characterizations and 26.0% of all characterizations made by official sources. These official characterizations support the hypothesis that delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories would originate from official sources.

The term "balkanization of Canada" suggests a war image and is defined by the Webster’s New World Dictionary as the breakup into mutually hostile political units (Neufeldt 1988:105). The issue of amnesty also functions to politicize and legitimize the crisis and is essentially a demand for recognition of sovereignty. "It was thus a bid to have SQ Corporal Lemay’s death interpreted as a casualty of war rather than as a victim of criminal violence" (Between the Lines 1990).

The five most frequently occurring characterizations reveal some key issues and the ideological struggle between the two governments and the Mohawks. For example, the term "dismantle/lift barricades(s)" ranked highest among official sources and illuminates a central ideological position of the government. The following quotations illuminate this position:

[The priority] is to be able to agree, to sit down at the table and dismantle the barricades, and I'm still confident that it can be done peacefully. (Robert Bourassa, Montreal Gazette August 9, 1990).

Their demands were unreasonable, and they had refused to make the issue of dismantling the barricades a priority. (Alex Paterson, government negotiator Montreal Gazette August 28, 1990).

Mr. Paterson insisted the negotiations could not progress because Mohawk negotiators refused to discuss the most pressing problem — the immediate lifting of the barricades and the end of the standoffs (Globe and Mail August 28 1990).

These quotations suggest that the Government’s priorities were the immediate removal of the barricades and laying down of arms, while the Mohawks’ priorities were the underlying issues of sovereignty, land claims, and amnesty from criminal charges. The two sides diverge ideologically, and therefore cannot agree even on the basis for discussion.
Characterizations of Negotiations (Table 14)
Total number: 173
Top 49.7%: negotiation(s), talks, agreement
Rank of first non-neutral term: 8 (peace proposal/plan)
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms (0.6%): negotiating in bad faith, frustrating, interesting speeches
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery (4.6%): peace proposal/plan, signing ceremony, nation-to-nation negotiations

Of the delegitimizing terms, the media contributed "frustrating", and official sources contributed the other two. The term "interesting speeches" was delegitimizing because its sarcastic nature diminished the importance of the Mohawk demands and rationalized army intervention and the breaking-off of negotiations. The federal government justified the termination of talks by claiming that the Mohawks were wasting time making "interesting speeches" which were not linked to the issue of lifting of barricades (Globe and Mail August 28:A4, 1990).

All of the war imagery came from the media. The signing ceremony was a significant legitimizing event for the Mohawks. On August 12, a deal was negotiated by federal mediator Alan Gold. Ministers Tom Siddon and John Ciaccia then went behind the Mohawk barricade to sign the pre-conditions (key event 3). The governments were harshly criticized for that deal (Globe and Mail August 17:A6, 1992). The willingness to go behind the barricades was viewed by some as capitulation to the Mohawks demands and as contributing to the legitimacy of the Mohawk cause. The war imagery surrounding the signing ceremony was significant. For example, in the photographs published in the Montreal Gazette, the two government officials were flanked by armed Mohawk Warriors in military fatigues with the Canadian and Mohawk Nation flags hanging in the background. As the Globe and Mail reported, "These images did not sit well with the public" (August 15:A2, 1990). This war image also obviously conflicted with the governments' attempts to delegitimize the Mohawks by labelling them criminals, etc.
This political humiliation resulted in the governments' insistence that future negotiations take place away from the barricades (Globe and Mail August 17:A6, 1990).

Characterizations of Media (Table 15)
Total number: 21
Top 38.1%: news/press conference
Rank of first non-neutral term: none
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms: none
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery: none

Characterizations of Other Native People (Table 16)
Total number: 61
Top 41.0%: Native(s)
Rank of first non-neutral term: none
Legitimizing terms: none
Delegitimizing terms: none
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery: none

Miscellaneous Characterizations (Table 17)
Total number: 32
Top 50.0%: crowd, protestors, protest(ing), demonstrators
Rank of first non-neutral term: 4 (innocent citizens)
Legitimizing terms (12.5%): innocent citizens, citizens justifiably frustrated
Delegitimizing terms: none
Criminal-justice imagery: none
War imagery: none

Both legitimizing terms originated from official sources. The miscellaneous characterizations focused primarily on civilians and South Shore residents who became caught up in the Mohawk Crisis because of their geographic location. Consequently, these citizens demonstrated against inconveniences such as the Mercier Bridge blockade and therefore became actors in the dispute.
Summary

Table Four (Characterizations of the Warriors/Mohawks) illustrates the heavy use of delegitimizing characterizations by official sources when compared to uses of neutral terms. Official sources were the only users of criminal-justice imagery in this category. Thus, the findings support the hypothesis that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories would originate from official sources.

Table Five (Acts by Warriors/Mohawks) showed that while a majority of criminal-justice imagery was attributed to official sources the media used more delegitimizing characterizations than official sources. These findings suggest that the media was supporting the official view.

Tables Seven A, Seven B and Seven C provided a detailed breakdown of the characterizations of the Mohawk Crisis listed in Table Six. The official sources’ use of criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms (21.5%) in Table Seven A contrasts sharply with the Native peoples’ use of war imagery (28.6%) in Table Seven C and illustrates the struggle for legitimacy. The results are more striking when compared with the substantially larger volume of neutral terms used by the media (Table Seven C). Also, a majority of media characterizations had dramatistic qualities reflecting conflict and confrontation. The findings support the hypothesis that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories would originate from official sources.

Table Thirteen (Characterizations of Mohawk Demands/Terms) disclosed that while no criminal-justice imagery occurred, all of the delegitimizing terms that referred to the Mohawks’ demands originated from official sources. These official characterizations provided more data supporting the hypothesis that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to the Mohawk-related categories would originate from official sources.
Overall, the findings from Tables Four, Five, Seven A, Seven B, Seven C and Thirteen demonstrate that a significant difference exists in the way official and media sources portrayed the Mohawks, Mohawk Warriors, their acts, the Mohawk Crisis, and demands. A majority of the characterizations used overall were neutral in nature and originated from the media. The media was also found to use dramatistic characterizations and some war imagery. However, proportionately, Native peoples’ sources were the primary users of war imagery. Official sources were the primary users of criminal-justice and delegitimizing characterizations when referring to Mohawk related categories. The exception was evidence in Table Five that indicated that the media actually used more delegitimizing terms than official sources when referring to acts by the Warriors and Mohawks. This exception does, however, suggest that the media supported the official view in characterizing acts by Warriors and Mohawks. With this one exception, the evidence supported the hypothesis that criminal-justice and delegitimizing terms referring to the Mohawk-related categories would originate from official sources. These results provide evidence supporting the thesis that media coverage buttressed an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

The results presented in the tables also support the thesis that ideological work would be apparent in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis and provides evidence that the media did not always support the official view of the Mohawk crisis.

The Native peoples’ use of war definitions (Table Seven C) and the official sources use of criminal-justice definitions (Table Seven A) of the crisis illuminate the ideological struggle that was occurring in the media during the Mohawk Crisis.

Table Eight revealed that the media used proportionately less delegitimizing terms when referring to the police than Native peoples’ sources. In contrast, Table Nine demonstrated that
the media used an overwhelming majority of delegitimizing characterizations of police acts than Native peoples’ sources. The data indicate that the media were sharply critical of the police during the crisis. This finding contrasts sharply with the media’s mild criticism of the army (Table Ten) and army acts (Table Eleven) and reveals the ‘watchdog’ role of the media. This evidence undermines the thesis that the media supported a ‘law and order’ campaign.

In Tables Eight, Eleven and Twelve, but not Nine and Ten, Native peoples’ sources used more delegitimizing terms than other sources when referring to government institutions. Table Seven C demonstrated the Native peoples’ sources used the majority of war related characterizations. Many categories also indicated that the media used war imagery to some extent during coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. The media were also found to be very critical of actions of the police. Evidence of this competing discourse indicates that the media was not always presenting the official view of the crisis.

Overall, although the statistical significance of the data is debatable and some results are inconclusive, these findings provide support for the thesis that ideological work would be apparent in the media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. The findings provided substantial support for the thesis that media coverage supported an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. However, the fact that the media heavily criticized the police (Table Nine), used war imagery and provided the Native peoples’ viewpoint illustrates that the media did not always support the official view and challenges the thesis that media coverage supported an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mohawk(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>46.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Warrior(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Native(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kahnuwake Mohawk(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mohawk negotiator(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mohawk Warrior(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mohawk leader(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Armed Warrior(s)/Mohawk(s)</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kanesatake Mohawk(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indian(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Heavily armed Warrior(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Holdouts</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Paramilitary Warrior(s)</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gun wielding</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Faction(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Militant</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>warriors</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Besieged Native(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Scum</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Criminals</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Extremist minority</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Radical Warrior faction</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Masked warrior(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fearing future</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Natives firing semi-automatic weapons</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Natives affirming their right to self-government</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Handful of determined hardliners</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Groups of citizens [who] accept laws which they approve and refuse others</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>293</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td># of Uses</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Threat(s)</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Criminal acts</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Death threat(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Illegal activities</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commandeered</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Armed resistance</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Just and honorable</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apprehended insurrection</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Destabilization of government</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
CHARACTERIZATIONS OF MOHAWK CRISIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>U% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barricade(s)/blockade(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Armed standoff</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standoff</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dispute</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siege</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Armed roadblock(s)/blockade(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tense standoff</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gunfight</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Police matter</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tragic</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Armed battle</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Intolerable</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Exceptional circumstances</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Besieged Native settlement</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Revolting</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fanaticism</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fortifications</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Impasse</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Armed confrontation</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gun battle</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bungled police raid</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Armed violence</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7A

**OFFICIAL CHARACTERIZATIONS OF MOHAWK CRISIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Number of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barricade(s)/blockade(s)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Armed standoff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standoff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dispute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Police matter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tragic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceptional circumstances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intolerable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Armed battle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fanaticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Revolting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Armed violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siege</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fortifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7B
MEDIA CHARACTERIZATIONS OF MOHAWK CRISIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Number of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barricade(s)/blockade(s)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standoff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Armed standoff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dispute</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Siege</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tense standoff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Armed roadblock(s)/blockade(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gunfight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Impasse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Armed confrontation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bungled police raid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gun battle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Armed battle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>131.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7C
NATIVE PEOPLES' CHARACTERIZATIONS OF MOHAWK CRISIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Number of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barricade(s)/blockade(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Besieged Native settlement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standoff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
CHARACTERIZATIONS OF POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sûreté du Québec</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provincial police</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Police officer(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RCMP(^{38})</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MUC police(^{39})</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tactical squad(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Riot police</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200 shield-equipped</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hundreds of armed police</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Massive police presence</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Playing psychological games</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vengeful</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Distrusted</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Feared</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dangerous group</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 175 100.00

\(^{38}\)RCMP refers to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police

\(^{39}\)MUC police refers to the Montreal Urban Community Police.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raid(ed)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arrest(ed)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forcibly dismantle</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assault (i.e. offensive)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Charge(d)(^4)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dismantle</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Investigating</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Detained</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stormed</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Armed battle</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attack</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excessive force</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deploy(ed)(ment)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\)These characterizations refer primarily to past, present and possible future acts (e.g. police charged a Mohawk with an offence or police plan to "assault" native barricades)

\(^4\)As in charging a Mohawk with an offence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canadian Forces</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Troops</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Forces</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Federal troops</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Security forces</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mobile Command Unit(^{42})</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Canadian Forces troops</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Canadian troops</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[not] Peacekeepers</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Government forces</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experts at camouflage</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Praised</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Supports never replaces civil authority</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{42}\)An army SWAT team.
### TABLE 11
CHARACTERIZATIONS OF ARMY ACTS$^d$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operation(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attack</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assault(ed)</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dismantle</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Battle</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Surrounded</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deploy(ed)(ment)</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gunboat diplomacy</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brutal action</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Enemies</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Matters of security</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Providing armed assistance</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Intimidate</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[not] Peacekeeping</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Armed invasion</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^d$These characterizations refer to past, present and possible future acts (e.g. army plans to "assault" native barricades)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quebec Government</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Premier</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provincial Government</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mohawk Nation</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Iroquois Confederacy</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Native Affairs Minister (Q)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indian Affairs Minister (F)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public Security Minister (Q)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Human Rights Commissions/bodies</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Government officials</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Federal mediator</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cabinet</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provincial authorities/officials</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hypocritical attitude</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Self-government</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Traditional government</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Confederacy chiefs</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City council</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Neanderthal attitude</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td># of Uses</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dismantle/lift barricade(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amnesty/immunity</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Laying down arms/guns</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land claim(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sovereignty</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Observers</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Joint commission/delegation</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bizarre</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Balkanization of Canada</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Economic terms</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td># of Uses</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negotiation(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Talks</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deal</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Negotiating/bargaining table</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Discussion(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meeting(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Feverish/intense/critical/last-ditch/formal/renewed talks</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peaceful settlement/solution</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Peace proposal/plan</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pre-conditions</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Agreement in principle</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Serious discussion(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tentative agreement</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Signing ceremony</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nation-to-Nation negotiations</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Negotiating in bad faith</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Intensive discussion(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gentlemen's agreement</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Three-point agreement</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Interesting speeches</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Return to sensibility</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 15
CHARACTERIZATIONS OF MEDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>News/press conference</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporter(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cameraman(men)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 16
CHARACTERIZATIONS OF OTHER NATIVE PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Native(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Indian(s)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Native leaders</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Native people</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aboriginal people</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canada’s Native peoples</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td># of Uses</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crowd</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protest(ing)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrators</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Angry non-Native demonstrators</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Shore residents</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Angry South Shore residents</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>innocent citizens</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Citizens justifiably frustrated</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Angry crowds</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slogan-shouting crowd</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawks/Warriors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk/Warrior acts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Crisis</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police acts</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army acts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands/terms</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native People</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:** Sources: M = Media; O = Official; N = Native people’s
Categories: Crim. Just. = Criminal Justice Imagery; War = War Imagery;
Legit. = Legitimizing term; Delegit. = Delegitimizing term; Neutral = Neutral term; Sum = Total
CONCLUSIONS

To possess or think a concept is to interpret a fact in terms of it: to possess or observe a fact is to interpret it in terms of a concept. (Collingwood 1922:28)

The research examined ideological discourse in the media during a period of intense political and social conflict, to examine the following two general theses: firstly, that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and, secondly, that the media supported an official ‘law and order’ campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. The theoretical framework of Antonio Gramsci’s concept of a crisis of hegemony or legitimation crisis as applied by Stuart Hall et al. (1978) was used to interpret the findings.

Situating the crisis in its political historical context, the qualitative analysis in Chapter Three suggested that a history of ineffective legitimate channels of dissent (for example, the governmental land claims process) appeared to be a major factor leading to the Mohawk blockade at Oka. The hegemonic crisis resulted from a breakdown of the ideological consent that maintained hegemonic rule. The analysis located three factors that may have contributed to the legitimation crisis. First, the Mohawks had achieved a degree of legitimacy that threatened to undermine the rule of law and in consequence the ideological fabric of the liberal democratic state; secondly, the media criticism of initial attempts by the government to delegitimize the Mohawks; and thirdly, the Kanesatake Mohawks' actions at Oka crystallized the once fragmented Native peoples' movement into a formidable political force. This new political force posed a threat to an already politically and economically unstable dominant block. The Canadian and Quebec governments responded to this crisis of authority with coercive military intervention. This shift in the exercise of control from the mechanisms of consent to those of coercion is considered a central feature marking a crisis of hegemony. The findings supported
the thesis that ideological discourse would be apparent in media coverage of the 1990 Mohawk Crisis and showed that the state's shift to coercive control was legitimized with a 'law and order' campaign propagated through the media.

Chapter Four presented an analysis of the patterns of coverage on the Mohawk Crisis in seven Canadian daily newspapers. Violence and potential violence were important factors influencing the three surges in the media coverage. The shooting of Sûrete du Québec policeman Marcel Lemay, the stoning of Mohawk women and children, and the movement of the Canadian army all involved violence and potential violence and correlated with the peaks in the coverage. For example, the perennial land claims dispute only received national press coverage after the incident became violent with the police raid and shooting of Corporal Lemay. Historical contextualization and background to the negotiations was presented, but their prominence was superseded by incidents of violence. One explanation for this is that complex issues such as negotiations are continually unfolding processes that do not fit the 'frequency' or time-frame imperatives of the media.

The declining newsworthiness of the crisis was one explanation for the low points that occurred later in the coverage. Illustrating the cycle of newsworthiness, these troughs were followed by surges dominated by the more enduring news value of violence or impending violence. Focusing on violence simplifies complex political and social conflicts and supports the prevailing definitions of events and ultimately the status quo. In contrast, historical contextualization provides understanding and illuminates the struggle between competing political definitions and their legitimizing effects. Without historical context, 'official' definitions of social conflict prevail and a truncated view of the world is presented.

The analysis of patterns of coverage and key event date cluster sample found that the
media focused primarily on the manifest stages of violence and conflict or potential conflict, rather than providing context to the crisis. Violence and conflict dominated the front pages of the *Globe and Mail* while coverage of underlying causes was relegated to the inside pages and comprised only 15% of total hard news. These findings paralleled those of Osler and MacFarlane (1991) who also found that the media presentation of the Mohawk Crisis focused on the violence. Because the theoretical literature suggests that items appearing on the front page have more political and ideological impact, these findings demonstrate how the media indirectly supports the status quo. Contextualization is minimal and relegated to the inside pages of the press while violence and conflict is highlighted. This allows the dominant definitions of events to go virtually unchallenged by alternative definitions. Thus, the findings supported the thesis that the media sustained an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. However, more research is required to determine how much more impact an article appearing on the front page has than an item on the inside pages of the newspaper.

The findings in Chapter Five supported the hypothesis that institutional or official sources would dominate over the Native peoples' voice in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis. Sixty-five percent of all sources were affiliated with some type of government body. By comparison, only 27% of the sources were associated with Warrior, Mohawk or Native peoples' organizations. These findings support the dominant ideology theory of the media since our assumptions are that, as primary definers, official sources define the parameters of the debate, and the replication of 'facts' from official sources preserves the status quo.

The findings differed from those of Osler and MacFarlane (1991), who studied sourcing of hard news on the Mohawk Crisis in eleven Canadian newspapers. They found that English-language newspapers gave marked attention to Warrior and other Mohawk sources and ignored
non-Native peoples' sources. This discrepancy was explained by differences in sampling methods. Osler and MacFarlane selected a primary source among many sources appearing within each article in their cluster sample. In contrast, this study examined all sources appearing in each front-page article of the sample and classified them by column position. The findings indicated that government sources appeared most often in columns on the front page and were therefore the primary definers of events during the crisis. In contrast, Native peoples' voices dominated in the inside pages of the news story. The official sources were therefore the primary definers of politically crucial events that appeared on the front pages during the crisis. These finding are consistent with the dominant ideology theory of the media.

The study also correlated quotations and paraphrased sentences and their attributed sources. Quotations attributed to a source are often accepted as "fact" on face value. Thus, the reliance on quotations from official sources imparts a degree of legitimacy to their message. On the other hand, sources that are paraphrased more often are assumed to have less legitimacy or dominance. The results indicated that official sources were quoted substantially more than Native peoples' sources (31.1% versus 14.4%). Thus, the evidence supported the hypothesis that official sources would dominate in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis and therefore the thesis that the media, as an ideological mechanism supporting the existing hegemonic relationship, supported an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis.

The contrast in findings between Osler and MacFarlane and this study suggests a need for future research employing a combination of various sampling techniques and the need to use a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies. For example, the qualitative approach provided richer and superior evidence of the 'law and order' ideologies contained in the media during the legitimation crisis and evidence that the media does not operate solely as
an instrument of the state. The inability of quantitative content analysis to determine the latent content of text is a serious limitation that employment of a qualitative technique can help alleviate.

Labelling of political actions that challenge the status quo as 'criminal' or 'deviant' is a common response of the state to challenges to its authority to rule. Criminal-justice characterizations often depoliticize and delegitimize acts while war-related definitions often politicize and confer legitimacy. Therefore, characterizations play a pivotal role in the struggle for legitimacy that occurs during a 'law and order' campaign. The analysis in Chapter Six documented the most frequently used characterizations and correlated them to their sources.

The findings supported the chapter hypothesis that criminal-justice and other delegitimizing terms referring to Mohawk-related categories would originate from official sources. The results demonstrated an official attempt to delegitimize the Mohawks in a 'law and order'/‘rule of law’ campaign. Evidence of media reliance on official sources suggest, then, that the media buttressed an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. This general thesis was supported further by the findings that the media supported the official view in its own use of delegitimizing characterizations of acts by Warriors and Mohawks. Finally, the data also supported the second general thesis that ideological work would be apparent in media coverage of the Mohawk Crisis.

Overall, there is considerable support for the general thesis that the media sustained an official 'law and order' campaign during the Mohawk Crisis. However, evidence from both the qualitative and quantitative analyses indicated that the media did not always operate as an ideological mechanism supporting the official viewpoint. The findings in Chapter Six showed that apart from references to official sources (i.e. police), the media relied primarily on neutral
characterizations, at times used war imagery that legitimized the Mohawk position and presented Native peoples' alternative definitions. The conclusions in Chapter Three indicated that the Globe and Mail editorials were heavily critical of how the governments and police handled the crisis. The Globe also criticized the official definition of the event as a police matter and instead defined the event as one of historically-rooted land claims, and criticized the initial government attempt to criminalize the Mohawks. The Montreal Gazette, on the other hand, was more critical of the Mohawks than the government suggesting that coverage is governed by more than a single dominant ideology.

One explanation for these contradictory findings is the liberal-democratic nature of the media in capitalist society. The dynamic nature of hegemony requires that counter-hegemonic interests from subordinate groups are taken into account. The need to sustain the ideology of the media as an 'objective' communicator of 'facts' requires, at times, criticism of the official viewpoint, but within acceptable boundaries. Evidence for this was the Globe and Mail's editorial support of the official view that the rule of law as a cornerstone of democracy was being threatened by the Mohawk actions. In addition, while the Native peoples' alternative discourse was presented by the press it was marginalized to the inside pages of the newspapers while official sources received front page coverage and became the primary definers of the events. This attempt at 'balanced' or 'objective' reporting only masks the relative inattention given to Native peoples' competing discourse.

Whether the incorporation of competing interests contributes to formal or substantive change is debatable and beyond the scope of this research. It is hard to determine without a long-term study if the Mohawk Crisis contributed to any substantive change in Canadian society. However, a major systemic change by the government can be used as a measure. In this case,
there were no major concessions made by the government. On September 26, 1990 Mulroney announced a new program aimed at dealing with Native peoples' problems. Over a year later the government consented to establish a Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and provided constitutional recognition of Native self-government in the Charlottetown Agreement. It can be argued that these concessions do not constitute a systemic change because they operate within government-established parameters where dissent is appropriated. In other words, the government enacted solutions that remained within the existing liberal-democratic framework. There is no doubt, however, that the Mohawk Crisis thrust Native peoples' issues to the forefront of the political agenda.

In summary, the dominant ideology theory appeared to be useful in interpreting the findings. However, the study was not designed to test the accuracy of this theory or to disprove other, competing theories.
# APPENDIX A

## CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS (1990)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of weeks by date</th>
<th>Key Event Date Cluster(^5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 July 9 - 15</td>
<td>Key Event 1: SQ raid barricades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 July 16 - 22</td>
<td>Key Event 2: army requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 July 23 - 29</td>
<td>Key Event 3: signing ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 July 30 - August 5</td>
<td>Key Event 4: rock throwing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 August 6 -12</td>
<td>Key Event 5: warriors surrender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6 August 13 - 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7 August 20 - 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8 August 27 - Sept 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9 Sept 3 - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10 Sept 10 - 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11 Sept 17 - 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12 Sept 24 - 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13 Oct 01 - 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chronology of the Mohawk Crisis 1990

**Week 1: July 9 to July 15**

- **July 10**
  - Oka Mayor Jean Ouellette requests Quebec Provincial police to enforce a Quebec Superior Court injunction to remove the Mohawk blockade.

- **July 11**
  - Key Event 1: The Sûreté du Québec raid the Mohawk barricades and corporal Marcel Lemay is killed. This may be seen as the beginning of the 78-day crisis.

- **July 12**
  - Mohawks at Kahnawake blockade the Mercier Bridge near Montreal in support of Mohawks at Oka. Bourassa supports the police action, saying that the events were "intolerable".

- **July 14**
  - The police confrontation with the angry white mob at Kahnawake is first reported (*Montreal Gazette*). A poll reveals disapproval of the Sûreté’s tactics.

**Week 2: July 16 - July 22**

- Negotiations break off during this period.

- **July 17**
  - 4000 South Shore residents battle police in Châteauguay; angered by the extended journey to Montreal, they demand that police remove the barricades. A *Montreal Gazette* editorial is headed "Less like Warriors than thugs: there is no excuse for blocking Mercier Bridge".

- **July 18**
  - First press coverage of troops being put on stand-by.

- **July 19**
  - In Quebec, Federal Indian Affairs Minister Siddon is accused of being "blind, deaf, dumb" with respect to the crisis.

- **July 20**
  - Ottawa refuses to negotiate, "with gun to our head". 150 band council chiefs gather at Kahnawake to demand federal intervention.

---

\(^4\)Discussion of events in this chronology refers to the day of the press release. Therefore the actual date of the occurrence is usually one day previous.

\(^5\)see appendix C for detailed protocol of key event date cluster sample.
Week 3: July 23 - July 29
July 23 Quebec Native Affairs Minister Ciaccia announces his intention to resume negotiations. Pro-Native rallies urge an end to the "war". Siddon enters negotiations and announces a government plan to buy the disputed land and turn it over to the band council.
July 24 Federal Indian Affairs Deputy Minister Swain calls the Warriors "criminals".
July 25 Siddon backs Swain's remarks of "criminal organization" among Mohawks (Globe and Mail).
July 26 Warriors defend their role in the dispute (Globe and Mail).
Rumours spread that the police will attack again.
July 27 Quebec Ministry of Public Safety says that ballistics experts have test results showing that Mohawks killed Lemay. Mohawk chiefs decry the paramilitary Warriors, calling them a "gang of criminals" (Globe and Mail).
July 28 Mohawk Chief agrees that the Warriors are criminals (Montreal Gazette). There is evidence that many Canadians support the Mohawks, in a gesture of what they regard as delayed justice (Globe Mail).
July 29 Montreal Gazette publishes article stating, "Violence is Repugnant Until it Becomes a Matter of Survival".

Week 4: July 30 - August 5
July 30 (19th day) Coverage of reporters themselves as actors in the dispute begins.
July 31 Globe Mail publishes report on how essential public support is as, both sides struggle for legitimacy and discredit their opponents. The involvement of the media in the crisis is discussed (e.g., Montreal Gazette August 1, Toronto Star July 31).
Aug 1-3 South Shore residents continue protests, and make news by calling for the army.
Aug 3 Vancouver Sun publishes report that 14 wanted Mohawks are believed to be at Oka. Shipments of baby clothes are delayed by police (Globe and Mail).

Week 5: August 6 - August 12
Aug 6 Quebec Premier Bourassa gives a 48-hour ultimatum: Resume talks or he will send troops.
Aug 9 Key Event 2: Prime Minister Mulroney announces the deployment of 4,000 troops to replace the Quebec police.
Judge Alan Gold is appointed to negotiate the dispute.

Week 6: August 13 - August 19
Aug 13 Key Event 3: Gold negotiates an agreement, and Siddon and Ciaccia go behind the Mohawk barricades for the ceremony of signing the pre-conditions.
Aug 13-14 3,000 South Shore demonstrators clash with Quebec and Royal Canadian Mounted police at the Châteauguay roadblock.
Aug 15 The army moves closer to the barricades. The Mohawks and government negotiators present proposals to end the standoff.
Aug 16 The police union calls for arrest of "terrorist" Mohawks and rioters. PQ leader Parizeau says governments were "blackmailed" by Mohawk Warriors (Globe and Mail).
Aug 18 1,400 soldiers move in to replace the police at the barricades.

Week 7: August 20 - August 26
Aug 20 Army troops advance and take up position.
Aug 22 Mohawks demand amnesty and recognition as a sovereign nation in exchange for removal of the barricades.
Aug 25 Montreal Gazette publishes article entitled, "Warriors Follow in the Path of the FLQ: Admirable Goals Flawed by Methods".
Week 8: August 27 - September 2
Aug 27  Calling the Warriors' demands "bizarre", Mulroney hints at army action (Montreal Gazette)
Aug 28  Bourassa orders the army to dismantle the barricades; Mercier Bridge blockades are removed with the help of the Mohawks.
Aug 29  Key Event 4: A mob throws rocks at the evacuating Mohawks.
        A Defence department videotape displays the weapons possessed by both sides in the dispute (Globe and Mail).
        The Mohawks' demand for sovereignty is said to have made a settlement impossible (Globe and Mail).
Aug 30  Vancouver Sun publishes article entitled, "Army Wages War of Words".
Sept 2   Vancouver Sun publishes article entitled, "'Rebellion' Compensation Denied After Search for Correct Terminology".

Week 9: September 3 - September 9
Sept 3   The armed forces advance, and the Warriors retreat into the treatment center.
Sept 4   The Globe and Mail reports that however bizarre it seemed to Mulroney, Native self-governance is now on the agenda.
Sept 5   Quebec accuses the Mohawks of mounting a campaign to discredit police (Globe and Mail).
Sept 6   "A Solution at the End of a Rifle is Not a Solution At All" (advertisement in the Globe and Mail).
Sept 8   Sûreté spokesperson responds, "Who are we protecting? It's like the world's gone crazy". (Montreal Gazette).
        The Solicitor General calls the Warriors "armed criminals" and the Halifax Chronicle Herald publishes article entitled, "Illegal Means Still Illegal, Even if the Cause is Just". Vancouver Sun publishes article entitled, "Newspapers Have Edge Over TV Say Experts".

Week 10: September 10 - September 16
Sept 10  Spudwrench is attacked by soldiers who slipped behind the barricades. After 10 hours of negotiations, he is taken to a hospital, where he is arrested by the SQ. Justice Minister Kim Campbell denies the possibility of an amnesty for the Warriors (Vancouver Sun).
Sept 11  The Globe and Mail publishes two articles epitomizing the crisis: 1). "Breaking the Rules For a Reason (tactics may not qualify as classic civil disobedience, but the Mohawks cause is legitimate)"; 2). Justice Minister Kim Campbell is quoted, "The Use of Violence Advances No Cause".
Sept 12  Federal and Quebec governments reject the Warriors' surrender proposal.
Sept 13  The FLQ crisis is compared to Oka: social protest is criminalized (Globe and Mail).
Sept 14  Montreal Gazette reports that, Quebec issues a surrender "ultimatum" and that insurance claims of Oka Residents to be paid even if Crisis is 'rebellion'.
Sept 13-16 The Canadian Forces announce that they are in control of the negotiations and reject all Warrior demands for amnesty and sovereignty.
Sept 15  Erasmus states that the Warriors hurt the cause of all natives (Montreal Gazette).

Week 11: September 17 - September 23
Sept 17  The armed forces cut telephone lines.
Sept 18  Armed forces spokespersons claim that reporters allowed Warriors to censor their articles (Montreal Gazette). Kahnawake Mohawks battle troops and police on Tekakwitha Island.
Sept 19  The Police Association publishes a controversial advertisement concerning the "murder" of Sûreté officer Lemay (Vancouver Sun September 19:A8, 1990).
Sept 20  Some Canadian newspapers refuse to publish the advertisement and the Police Association changes the term 'murder' to 'killed' (Montreal Gazette September 20:A8, 1990).
Sept 21  The Globe and Mail reports a police affidavit saying that "criminals" control the Oka camp
The Globe reports that the army-Mohawk strife is a public relations war. Native chiefs are scornful of the Police Association's advertisement. Some call it "Nazi-style propaganda" (Vancouver Sun). Quebec police concede that they fired shots in a gun battle with Mohawks on July 11 (Halifax Chronicle Herald).

Week 12: September 24 - September 30
Sept 24  Winnipeg Free Press publishes report entitled, "Oka Peace Activists Far from Common Criminals".
Sept 25  Jesse Jackson visits Oka
Sept 26  Warrior lawyer Stanley Cohen walks out of the treatment center and is arrested by the SQ.
Sept 27  Globe and Mail publishes article entitled, "Indians Heros, Government Outlaws".
Sept 27  Key Event 5: The Warriors surrender; Mulroney says that "the rule of law prevails" (Toronto Star)
Sept 28  Mohawks plead not guilty on the basis that they are "political prisoners" (Winnipeg Free Press). Globe reports that the Warriors won the war of the image. The Gazette reports that Natives fear the Warriors tactics eroded support for their cause.
Sept 30  The Calgary Herald reports on media coverage and the Canadian Police Association advertisement calling the Mohawks terrorists.

Week 13
October 01 - October 7
Oct 3-4  Globe and Mail publishes articles on how the Mohawks used the media to win the publicity battle.
Oct 6  Quebec government cool to Mohawk inquiry; police conduct at Oka considered proper.
APPENDIX B
KEY EVENT DATE CLUSTER*

Key Event 1
Week 1
Thursday, July 12, 1990
Friday, July 13, 1990
The St. Paul du Quebec raid on the Mohawk barricade resulting in a gunfight and the shooting death of corporal Marcel L'Emay is reported in this cluster. Quebec Indian Affairs Minister Ciaccia begins negotiations. The barricades were first erected March 11, 1990 but the raid is often taken to signify the start of the crisis.

Key Event 2
Week 5
Wednesday, August 8, 1990
Thursday, August 9, 1990
Friday, August 10, 1990
Prime Minister Mulroney announces that the Canadian Forces are being sent to the barricades.

Key Event 3
Weeks 5 and 6
Saturday, August 11, 1990
Monday, August 13, 1990
Tuesday, August 14, 1990

The government and Mohawks agree to pre-conditions for negotiations and government officials go behind the barricades to participate in the signing ceremony. Also during this cluster, demonstrators at the Mercier Bridge battle with police.

Key Event 4
Week 8
Tuesday, August 28, 1990
Wednesday, August 29, 1990
Thursday, August 30, 1990
In this cluster angry white South Shore residents throw rocks at evacuating Mohawk women and children, and the army begins to remove the barricades.

Key Event 5
Week 12
Wednesday, September 26, 1990
Thursday, September 27, 1990
Friday, September 28, 1990
In this cluster the Warriors surrender to the military.

*The key event date cluster sample includes fourteen articles taken from each of the Globe and Mail and the Montreal Gazette for a total of twenty-eight items.
APPENDIX C

THE MOHAWK CRISIS
CODING MANUAL

Definitions of Terms

Kicker: Introduction to title.
Title: Main article identifier/summary across top of article.
Subtitle: Expansion of title, usually in smaller print.
Streamer: Article cluster title or contents indicator occupying
a band across the full width of the page.
Lead-On: Located at end of article on cover page; provides description or title of related articles on inside
pages elsewhere in the paper.
Internal heading: Heading of a section of the text.
Title continuation page: Title of article fragment on page following cover page article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Themes of Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News Report</td>
<td>Law and Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Analysis</td>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to the Editor</td>
<td>Sovereignty/Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Land Claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Criticism of Mohawks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criticism of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criticism of Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criticism of Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criticism of Quebec Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Troublemakers from Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextualization (history)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police/Military Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criticism of Municipality of Oka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify/see below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject of Photograph &
Affiliation of Sources

| Warrior Society Spokesperson | 1 |
| Mohawk Spokesperson          | 2 |
| Politician (Federal)         | 3 |
| Politician (Quebec)          | 4 |
| Military                     | 5 |
| Police                       | 6 |
| Journalist                   | 7 |
| Oka Officials (Municipal)    | 8 |
| Oka/Châteauguay Residents    | 9 |
| Other Native                 | 10 |
| Other                        | 11 |

Characterization Checklist

1. Warriors/Mohawks
2. Acts by Warriors/Mohawks
3. Mohawk Crisis
4. Police/Military
5. Acts by Police/Military
6. Government (Federal)
7. Government (Quebec)
8. Government (Municipal)
9. Demands/Negotiations
10. Media
11. Natives
12. Other

Themes of Article

Other (999): media, discrimination, assimilation, oppression, civil rights, distinct society; rule of law; public
opinion/sympathy; amnesty; terrorist
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