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Abstract

This study measures and compares the editorial reactions of ten Canadian metropolitan dailies to the FLQ kidnap crisis of 1970, and the specific, important events which occurred within the crisis. Besides comparing the editorial reactions of individual papers, the newspapers are also grouped by language (French and English) and by geographical location, to determine the effect of these two characteristics upon those reactions.

The thesis is divided into four chapters, as follows: Methodology, an account of the crisis, the newspapers, and finally the presentation and analysis of the findings.

The research method used is content analysis. Five categories are devised, into which are classified the editorial content of the newspapers analyzed. A frequency count method is used, with the theme as recording unit and the paragraph as context unit.

Chapter two centers about a short account of the crisis and the selection of important events within the crisis which could be expected to have had some influence upon the editorial reactions of the papers.

Chapter three consists of the selection of newspapers to be analyzed, of newspaper characteristics (language and location) which one might expect to have an effect upon editorial reactions, and finally of deferring 'editorial content' for the purpose of this study.

The presentation and analysis of findings (Chapter four) is subdivided into two parts - editorial reactions to the entire crisis and editorial reactions to important events within the crisis. It was found that the single greatest determinant of how a newspaper reacted editorially to the crisis was geographical location. The papers from Ontario
and Quebec put considerable emphasis upon the dangers of excessive re-
action by the authorities and upon the need for social reform as a
solution to the crisis, whereas the papers from other regions were
generally more concerned with the need for law and order. The French
papers devoted more editorial space to the crisis than did the English
papers but the nature of their reaction was generally similar to that
of the English papers of Ontario and Quebec. The French papers greatly
increased their editorial content about the crisis after the abduction
of Pierre Laporte - the English papers only after the proclamation of
the War Measures Act. Before the War Measures Act was proclaimed, all
English papers had put a strong emphasis upon the need for law and or-
der. After the proclamation, the English papers of Toronto, Montreal
and Ottawa de-emphasized that issue.

A summary of the more important findings of the study is present-
ed as a concluding section of Chapter four.
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INTRODUCTION

The object of this study is to compare the editorial reactions of some established Canadian metropolitan dailies to the crisis engendered by the actions of the Front de Libération du Québec in October of 1970. The research method used to determine the nature of these reactions is content analysis.

It is assumed that different newspapers reacted to the crisis in different ways and also that specific, salient events in the crisis had some effect upon the editorial reactions of the papers analyzed. This analysis may lead to the following types of generalizations: "Newspaper X, when analyzing a situation of type A, can be expected to react in such a way," and "newspaper characteristic X can be expected to influence attitudes towards a situation of type A in such a way."

What follows is a brief outline of the procedures used in order to attain these goals. The technique, as mentioned above, is content analysis, which is "any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages." The basic research outline for this study is drawn from Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities by Ole R. Holsti. The concern of the paper is with the "what?" question of the communications paradigm. Two basic research problems are dealt with:

1) To relate known characteristics of sources to messages they produce; more specifically, to determine how various newspapers reacted to the crisis and secondly to see how specific newspaper characteristics have affected that reaction. The characteristics selected are language and geographical location. Also included as a possible determinant of the nature of an editorial reaction is the amount of editorial content devoted
To determine the effects of salient events during the crisis upon editorial reactions of the papers analyzed. In other words, besides measuring the types of reactions for the entire crisis, it is also intended to measure the editorial reactions to specific, and what are considered to be important, events which punctuated the crisis. The events selected are the abduction of Pierre Laporte and the events of October 16-19, which included the proclamation of the War Measures Act, the invocation of the Public Order Regulations and the death of Pierre Laporte.

A series of procedures is required for the attainment of those two basic goals. For the purpose of "objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages", a set of categories had to be devised which would reflect the objectives of the study. These categories must encompass all the major types of reactions to a crisis of this sort. Into these categories are subsequently classified the individual "bits" of content gleaned from the editorials. These "bits" or recording units must be selected so as to suit the designated research problems and objectives of the study. Also, the range of text from which these recording units will be taken must be specified. If this procedure is not followed, a frequency count, which is the basis for inferences to be made in this study, would be impossible. The assumption underlying a frequency count is that intensity of belief or extent of bias is related to the frequency with which that belief or bias (or attitude) is mentioned within a given message or series of messages. Hence it is important that the range of text to be analyzed for the appearance or non-appearance of a belief or value statement be the same throughout the analysis.

A definition of what is and what is not editorial content for the
purpose of the study must be included. Unless there is consistency in the choice of editorials to be analyzed from paper to paper, a comparison of editorial reactions would be impossible. Also, the initial choice of the type of editorials to be analyzed must be made by a consideration of the objectives of the study.

One section of the paper consists of a short account of the crisis. This serves the purpose of putting salient events of the crisis into perspective and consequently of selecting specific time periods to be analyzed.

The latter part of the paper deals with the analysis of the editorials and a subsequent analysis of the findings for the purpose of making inferences about:

A) reactions of papers, and types of papers, to this type of crisis, and,

B) effect of specific events upon the various newspapers' reactions to the crisis. Also, in order to determine whether newspaper characteristics not included in the original list might have affected the editorial reactions, the findings are classified by similarities in percentages per category. In this way different 'groups' of newspapers, other than the groups originally listed, might appear.
FOOTNOTES - INTRODUCTION


2. Holsti, op. cit.

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGY

Categories

The central assumption underlying this study, as previously mentioned, is that different newspapers will have different editorial views regarding the FLQ kidnap crisis and the subsequent reactions of the Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa governments to the crisis. An unstated assumption may have been that viewpoints are projections of self-interest as perceived by the individuals as groups presenting these views.

Referring specifically to the FLQ crisis, the primary dimensions of analysis will be as follows: the need to protect "democratic processes" (i.e. non-violent processes) from the dangers presented by acts of violence on the one hand, and concomitant dangers of excessive or inappropriate government reactions to those acts of violence on the other. The leading editorial of the Globe and Mail on the 16th of October, in a reaction to the possible invoking of the War Measures Act, quotes Claude Ryan in cautioning against such a move lest "...we will be threatened with anarchy on one side and a police state on the other."

Basically the categories used in measuring the editorial reactions to the crisis are along this dimension. The original intention had been to have two basic categories, reflecting the two expected possible types of editorial reactions - i.e. need for 'law and order' on the one hand and, on the other, the fear of a loss or suspension of civil liberties which an excessive reaction by the authorities to the kidnappings might entail. However, a sampling of the editorial reactions of various newspapers showed that although that basic dichotomy was not unsound
theoretically, for the purposes of making meaningful inferences from the analysis, the number of categories would have to be increased. All editorials sampled had at least in common that they unanimously condemned the methods used by the FLQ to attain whatever goals they had set for themselves. There was much disagreement, however, in how to best eradicate that type of violence. Some editorials advocated a strong government stand in face of the FLQ's demands: "...clearly the security of the province of Quebec and the realm of Canada cannot be bargained away on the kidnappers' terms." Others, while generally conceding that bargaining with the FLQ was no solution to the problem of separatist violence in Quebec, saw that type of violence stemming from social injustice and consequently saw as the ultimate solution to the problem of violence, the righting of these injustices.

Ce que ni la police, ni les appareils de protection, ni les mesures compensatoires faisant suite à des actes destructeurs, ne pourront cependant dissiper, ce sont les situations sociales et économiques intolérables qui alimentent l'activité terroriste à travers le monde.

Such a reaction is not in contradiction of the advocacy of "law and order" but is distinct enough from it to warrant being treated as a separate category.

In summary it could be said that advocating increased police powers or policing activity and/or the advocating of social reform are both preferred as possible solutions to the threat of anarchy which the FLQ acts of violence represented to some.

Another major theme among the editorials sampled, and one which could have been expected, theoretically, given the sequence of events in the crisis, was that of the threat of excessive reaction by the authorities to the actions of the FLQ. This fear was voiced more frequently as the
crisis developed, increasing particularly after first mention was made of the possibility of invoking the War Measures Act as a means of combating the apprehended threat of anarchy or insurrection. Two major types of fears were voiced in the editorials sampled. One was a fear of the restrictions of democratic freedoms, the other, and this in the English press particularly, a sentiment that the federal government had not made its reasons clear enough in invoking the War Measures Act. As this type of statement does not necessarily disagree with the government's reaction, it will be included as a sub-category of the category just mentioned. A second sub-category measures a type of reaction which might be expected in the French Quebec press. On the assumption that the focus of political allegiances for many Quebecers is primarily Quebec City rather than Ottawa, one might expect some negative reaction from these papers to the federal government's initiatives in the crisis. This type of reaction is classified under the "outside intervention" rubric.

Another relatively major area of editorial concern in the sampling centered around the possibility of social disruption or polarization as a consequence of the crisis. An analysis of how this might come about was occasionally a variant upon the following theme: One of the tactics of the FLQ is to discredit established authority or, put differently, to show that these who are in positions of authority will do anything to retain their position. If the authorities were to take drastic action in an attempt to eradicate the threat to their power which the FLQ presented, individuals or groups in the general population would then be forced to take a stand either for or against the government action. Thus the process of polarization would have begun.

...le recours à un etat policier que maintes personnes,
Often, however, the reactions were somewhat more nebulous and it became difficult to ascertain whether the editorial was putting the onus of the blame upon the FLQ, the government or simply upon the crisis. For this reason, all reactions dealing with polarization or social disruption, and pertaining to the crisis, are included under one category, with no subdivisions. To do otherwise, would result in forcing data into inappropriate classifications.

One last major theme was apparent in the editorials sampled - this centered around a concern for the safety of James Cross and Pierre Laporte. An attempt was usually made to balance the value of one or two human lives against the price demanded by the FLQ in exchange for their safe release. Any editorial reaction emphasizing the safety of the kidnap victims is classified under the "humanitarian concern" category.

It is necessary at this point to mention that quite often an editorial would present both the advantages and the disadvantages of a certain course of action. Thus Le Devoir at one point saw the pros and cons of bargaining with the FLQ for the life of Cross in these terms:

Les autorités agiront plus sagement, nous semble-t-il, en pesant soigneusement le prix de la vie humaine qui est présentalement menacée, à la lumière de quelques concessions qu'elles pourraient être appelées à faire.

In this case, the editorialist is saying that for the purpose of saving a human life, a certain amount of bargaining with the FLQ is not too high a price to pay. In this case, the statement, though not wholeheartedly supporting bargaining, is still emphasizing the safety of the kidnap victim and as such would be classified under the "humanitarian concern" category. Dealing with the same topic, the Halifax Chronicle-Herald reacted
with this statement: "... clearly the security of the province of Que­
bec and the realm of Canada cannot be bargained away on the kidnappers' 
terms." This statement is ambiguous in that it does not categorically 
reject dealing with the FLQ but yet seems to imply that although the 
safety of one life is important, the disadvantages of bargaining with 
the FLQ outweigh this consideration. Given the context in which this 
statement was made, it would be classified under the 'law and order' 
category. Generally, any statement presenting such ambiguities is class­
ified into that category which seems to most adequately reflect the ed­
itor's attitude on that subject.

To summarize, then, there are five basic categories into which the 
content data will be classified. They are the following:

1) The dangers inherent in the FLQ actions can best be overcome 
   by a forceful, 'law and order' reaction on the part of the authorities.

2) The cause of the crisis lies in social ills. The ultimate solu­
tion to this type of crisis lies in the righting of these ills.

3) Humanitarian concern (for the lives of James Cross and Pierre 
   Laporte).

4) Dangers of excessive reaction by the authorities. 
   4a) "outside intervention"
   4b) federal government should have been given more justi­
       fication for invoking the War Measures Act.

5) Dangers of polarization or social fragmentation.

It should be noted that units of content falling into the fourth category 
will either be classified under the general heading or under 4a, or 4b.
These sub-categories are included under the 'Dangers of excessive reaction' 
category as they reflect a measure of dissatisfaction with the federal 
government's handling of the crisis in the directions of unjustified init­
itiatives or of autocratic behaviour.
The other four categories are not subdivided as this would not greatly either improve the quality or increase the quantity of meaningful inferences to be derived from the data.
Units of Analysis

Inherent in the basic assumption underlying this thesis - i.e., that different papers will have different editorial reactions to the crisis - is the fact that any one paper will probably not restrict itself to one type of reaction, or, in operational terms, not all the content data for any one paper will ever be capable of being classified into one category. Hence, it does not suffice to say that paper X mentioned a specific aspect of the crisis on a specific date. It is probably safe to assume that each one of the papers to be analyzed will have at one time or another during the crisis, made the statement that resorting to violence (i.e., kidnapping, possibly murder) is not an acceptable method of seeking to achieve a goal. Such a finding, because it is so obvious, would be next to meaningless. A finding, to have much value, should be compared to an outside source. As this study is concerned primarily with comparing editorial reactions of certain newspapers to a certain situation, the outside source in this case will be the other newspapers to be analyzed. For this reason, the simple determination of occurrence or non-occurrence of a specific recording event in a newspaper's editorial will not suffice. Some method of determining the relative intensity of views has to be included in the analysis. A cursory glance at the editorial reactions of two newspapers to a certain situation might lead a reader to make a statement that, obviously, one newspaper is more prone to take one view of the situation whereas the other takes a different view. Devising a method of determining with some measure of accuracy how much these papers differ is a more difficult task.

Operationally, two methods may be used, depending partially upon the messages to be analyzed, to determine intensity of attitudes. One is frequency count, the other is evaluative assertion analysis. The justification
for the first method, obviously, is that "frequency of mention would correlate with intensity of expressed attitude."\(^8\)

Evaluative assertion analysis, on the other hand, rather than using relative frequency to measure intensity of attitude, attempts to evaluate intensity directly from the text analyzed. Certain conditions are generally required for an adequate use of the latter approach -

1) the texts must be devoid of any identifying contexts,
2) a scaling method is to be devised.\(^9\)

It is not obvious, however, that the latter method, (i.e. evaluative assertion analysis) through markedly more complex in its implementation than most frequency count methods, is much more accurate than a well planned and executed frequency count. "...the experience of more than one analyst who has tried experiments in measuring intensity has been that nothing much is added by other measures than the frequency one."\(^10\) It is felt that for the purposes of this paper, a frequency count should suffice in determining relative attitudes towards the FLQ crisis.

Frequency measures are quite varied, and, if not properly used, a frequency count may lead a researcher to make inaccurate inferences from his findings. "Different procedures for measuring newspaper content give somewhat dissimilar results."\(^11\) The central question to be asked in determining what sort of frequency count to be used is the following: "What is the theoretical relevance of the measures I am using?"\(^12\) This study is primarily concerned with analyzing editorial content for the purpose of making inferences about the source of the editorial, or the newspaper in which a given editorial appears. Hence what is needed is a frequency count which will most adequately reflect that aspect of the communication paradigm - that is, allow the making of inferences about (expressed) attitudes of
of sources from analysis of content.

Two basic methods of frequency analysis are commonly used, one being the "space/time" measure, the other concerning itself with the appearance, within a certain specified range of content, of predetermined content attributes. Since "the limitations of space/time units derive mostly from a lack of sensitivity to other than the grossest attributes of content"; they would probably not lend themselves to a study of the occurrence or non-occurrence of specified content characteristics. For example, it is not apparent how a "space" analysis of editorials would accurately indicate how a given newspaper perceived the FLQ crisis in terms of its possible repercussions, though it might indicate what importance it ascribed to the crisis as a whole. For a study of specific attitudes towards the FLQ crisis, it would seem that the most apt and most efficient method is the frequency count of specified content attributes.

What remains to be determined is the recording and context units which most accurately reflect the expressed values of the authors of the editorials to be analyzed. The recording unit refers to the specific 'bit' of content which is to be classified within a given category. The context unit is the specified range of text which is to be analyzed for the occurrence or non-occurrence of the recording unit.

The question of which 'unit size' will most satisfactorily reflect the intended expressed values or attitudes of the author has still not been clarified to the satisfaction of most content analysts. The basic consideration is as follows:

The unit counted should be at least as long as the unit in whatever is assumed to be the relevant psychological process in the communicating organism, and not so much longer as to lose sensitivity.

According to Berelsen, "Within a reasonable range, length of unit . . .
may not make too much difference. The more widely used units are symbol, paragraph, three sentence theme and item counts. In each case the occurrence of the unit within a specified context would be registered once within a predetermined category, with the implication that the most frequently used category would indicate the dominant attitude or values on a given topic.

The smallest unit, the symbol, would probably prove too tedious a unit to use for the purpose of this paper. The symbol is never classified without explicit reference to a context in which it occurs. Thus, besides the requirement of making a list of specified symbols which are to be sought out in the document to be analyzed, each symbol must be evaluated in relation to the context in which it appears. In a study of four different ways of coding editorial content the authors found that the symbol-sentence approach (symbol as recording unit, sentence as context unit) took substantially more time than two of the other approaches. In the past, this unit has usually been avoided in mass media research involving a large volume of data. Because of the relatively brief nature of the study, such a choice would be inappropriate for this paper. As it does not logically seem to be an accurate reflection of the author's 'psychological process', the three sentence method seems inappropriate. In other words, one cannot assume that an editor's thought processes are naturally segmented into three sentence units. The use of a three sentence unit might result in forcing widely divergent content attributes within a single category and hence give misleading results. The choice is thus narrowed to a use of the theme, the item or the paragraph as the possible recording unit.

The paragraph method can be relatively quick but has the disadvantage
of not lending itself to classification into single categories. More than one attitude may be evident within any given paragraph and for this reason classification might prove difficult. Also, the paragraph does not seem to reflect a 'psychological process' as it may contain more than one attitude, value or belief or may, conversely, reflect just a portion of an expressed attitude, value or belief. In such a case, possibly a larger range of text might be needed for the purpose of classification.

The item, or, for the purpose of this study, the entire editorial, as recording unit, is probably too large to offer an accurate reflection of attitudes towards the FLQ crisis. As one might expect some editorials to express more than a single attitude towards the crisis, the classification of the item into only one category might give misleading results, (although over a certain time span the frequency count might partially compensate for this anomaly).

The theme, that is, a single assertion about a subject, would seem to be the most appropriate unit for the study of attitudes towards the FLQ crisis. It has the disadvantage of being more difficult to identify in an analysis of text than any of the other units and thus is more time consuming. However, "it is almost indispensable in research on propaganda, values, attitudes, beliefs and the like." It is the most natural unit if one is concerned with finding out about the source of communication from an analysis of text. For this study, then, the theme will be the recording unit.

In the sampling of editorials prior to the actual systematic analysis, it became evident that many, if not most editorials contained a variety of reactions to the crisis or to specific aspects of the crisis. For this reason, the use of the entire editorial as the context unit would not
allow one to differentiate adequately between major and minor themes within the editorial, since each theme, major or minor, would be recorded once for the editorial. Differentiation between major and minor themes would then involve evaluative assertion analysis. On the assumption that frequency of mention is an indication of the importance given to a certain theme, one might expect major themes to occupy a larger proportion of content than minor ones within any given editorial. For these reasons, the paragraph will be used as context unit. Thus a theme of a given type recurring in two paragraphs would be counted only twice. It should be mentioned that a theme will not be categorized more than once for a paragraph — thus the tabulations of results will show the number of paragraphs in which themes, corresponding to one of the five categories, have occurred in any given paper.

The following points provide a summary of this section of the paper.

1) The primary purpose of this study is to make inferences about the sources (or about the characteristics of the sources) of the messages to be analyzed.

2) A correlation between frequency of mention of a content attribute and intensity of belief is assumed.

3) The theme is the most appropriate recording unit for the purpose of this study.

4) The paragraph will be the unit of text analyzed for the occurrence or non-occurrence of a theme. In other words, not more than one theme per category per paragraph will be classified.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER I


2 Categories - The newspapers sampled for editorial content were:
   - Le Devoir, October 6, 8, 14, 17.
   - Globe and Mail, October 7, 12, 16, 19.
   - Winnipeg Free Press, October 8, 20, 24.
   - Vancouver Sun, October 8, 16, 22.


9 Ibid.

10 Ibid.


12 Holsti, op. cit., p. 121.

13 "Time" here refers to the measuring of content in such things as film, radio and T.V. sources, and is used in a manner analogous to space studies for written documents.

14 Holsti, op. cit., p. 121.


16 Ibid., p. 203.

17 Ibid.


22 Holsti, op. cit., p. 117.

23 Ibid., p. 116.
CHAPTER II

THE CRISIS

A Short Account of the Crisis

What follows is a brief chronological account of the salient events in the FLQ crisis, beginning with the abduction of James Cross and ending with the introduction on November 2 in the Commons of a bill to replace the regulations issued under authority of the War Measures Act. This event did not mark the end of the crisis but was the last significant event to occur in the crisis which might be expected to have had much effect upon editorial content. Also, by the first week in November the editors would have had a full month to examine various aspects of the crisis and some of its possible ramifications. The information for this section was obtained from "Canada News Facts", which contained the most detailed available account of the crisis.

On Monday, October 5 at 8:15 a.m., two men identifying themselves as members of the Front de Libération du Québec abducted James Cross, the British Trade Commissioner residing in Montreal. Later in the day, the police received a ransom note making the following demands:

1) The release of 23 'political prisoners',
2) The payment of $500,000 in gold,
3) The broadcast and publication of an "FLQ manifesto",
4) Cessation of police activities,
5) Publication of the name of any FLQ member suspected of being a police informer,
6) Provision of an aircraft to fly the prisoners and money to either Algeria or Cuba,
7) The rehiring of Postal truck drivers previously laid off in a reorganization of the postal trucking services in Montreal.

On the 6th of October, External Affairs Minister Sharp, while rejecting these demands, announced that the federal government was willing to speak with the abductors. In the meantime the abductors set the first of a series of deadlines for the acceptance of these demands, threatening to kill Mr. Cross if the demands were not met.

On the 7th of October, Quebec Justice Minister Jerome Choquette offered to negotiate with the kidnappers. Robert Lemieux, a lawyer who had represented the FLQ in court since 1968, became a prominent figure from the onset of the crisis as a possible negotiator between the authorities and the FLQ. On October 8, the CBC broadcast the "FLQ manifesto" thus satisfying one of the demands of the kidnappers. On the 10th of October, Justice Minister Choquette offered the kidnappers safe-conduct out of Canada in exchange for the release of Mr. Cross. Shortly after what they termed the "last deadline" for the acceptance of their terms, on the 10th of October at 6 p.m. Quebec Labor Minister Pierre Laporte was kidnapped from his home. Police activity intensified and many homes and offices of known FLQ supporters and members were raided. On October 11, Robert Lemieux was charged by the Quebec Justice Department with obstructing justice. He was held in jail and had his files seized. On October 12, Mr. Lemieux, while still in jail, held talks with Mr. Demers, appointed by the provincial government, to deal with the FLQ demands. The discussion proved futile, however, as Mr. Lemieux was unwilling to compromise on the terms of the kidnappers explaining that he was only empowered to deal with the modalities of the demands.

On the 14th of October, 10 prominent Quebecers, including René Lévesque and Claude Ryan, released a statement requesting the government
to go through with the freeing of the 23 prisoners which the FLQ had mentioned. The government did not reply to this statement. On Thursday, October 15, Premier Bourassa announced that he had asked Ottawa to send troops to Quebec to assure "the safety of the people and public buildings of Montreal." Within an hour of this statement, more than 1,000 troops from the Royal 22nd Regiment entered Montreal. Later in the day, the provincial government announced that it was ready to recommend the release on parole of five eligible convicted terrorists from the 23 prisoners whose release was being demanded by the FLQ. The government also offered safe-conduct out of the country to the FLQ members who had participated in the abductions. That same night, about 3,000 French-Canadian students held a rally in support of the FLQ terrorists in the Montreal municipal arena.

On October 16 at 4 a.m. the Governor-General-in-Council approved proclamation of the War Measures Act "concerning a state of apprehended insurrection". Shortly after 3 a.m. on that day the Montreal and Quebec provincial authorities had asked the federal government to pass the legislation which would allow them to take the measures necessary to eradicate what was claimed to be the danger of "apprehended insurrections". The War Measures Act was the federal government's response to that request.

"The act is emergency legislation that allows the government to proclaim arbitrarily that there is a state of war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended." Once it is proclaimed the government can, without consulting Parliament, make its own laws concerning arrests, deportation and censorship. It can pass any legislation it deems necessary for the security of the country or for the maintenance of peace and order.
within the country. In this instance the government passed the Public Order Regulations, which gave the authorities extensive powers. It allowed the police to search and arrest without warrant and to detain suspects without immediately laying charges. It forbade the advocating of the views or principles of the FLQ and allowed for people advocating such views to be detained in custody without bail pending trial.³

On that same day (October 16) Prime Minister Trudeau, addressing the nation on television made a series of observations about the crisis. He acknowledged the existence of "deep and important social problems" ⁴ to which each level of government was directing a large amount of energy and resources to eradicate and rejected the demands for the release of the 'political prisoners' and for money. He acknowledged the sweeping powers which accrued to the government with the proclamation of the War Measures Act and said that it had not been proclaimed until after it became "crystal clear that the situation could not be controlled unless some extraordinary assistance was made available on an urgent basis."⁵ He said that the government was aware that a process of social polarization could result if the authorities were goaded into 'inflexible attitudes', and stated that Canada was not a country where violence had to be used to accomplish social change. Finally, he reiterated the government's and the nation's intent to stand firm in the face of the crisis.

On October 18, the body of Mr. Laporte was found near St. Hubert air base and a note was subsequently found saying Mr. Laporte had been "executed" at 6:18 p.m. on the 17th of October.

After the death of Laporte, no significant events happened in the crisis until October 27 when it became known that Premier Bourassa and the mayor of Montreal, Jean Drapeau, had received information that a group of
prominent Quebecers was prepared to step in and set up an emergency provisional government. After a flurry of concern by the provincial and municipal authorities, Claude Ryan offered some clarification on October 29 about the nature of this provisional government. He acknowledged that he had discussed the possibility of a provisional government with other prominent Quebecers at the height of the crisis but emphasized that the discussion had not gone beyond the hypothetical stage.

On that same day, Mr. Bourassa revealed a plan by the FLQ to commit an assassination every 48 hours and proffered this as one of the motives which prompted him to ask for the proclamation of the War Measures Act. By the end of October, 419 persons had been arrested in Quebec as a consequence of the crisis, but 281 were quickly released.

On November 2, the federal government moved to replace the Public Order Regulations, 1970 by the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, 1970. This action by the government marked the end of the more intense phase of the crisis.
Salient Events and Their Possible Effect Upon Editorial Reactions

It might be expected that the editorial reactions would change as the crisis developed and as the initial shock of the abduction of Mr. Gross faded. The initial kidnapping was bound to produce editorial reaction in most, if not all, newspapers. Similarly, the demands made by the kidnappers could be expected to have elicited strong feelings among the editorial writers in the country. These initial acts led to a series of other events which in turn generated considerable debate among people during the development of the crisis. Was it wise for the government to have any sort of dealings with the FLQ? Was the government's entering into negotiations with Mr. Lemieux not giving a measure of recognition and possibly legitimacy to the FLQ?

With the kidnapping of Laporte, what might have appeared as an isolated act of terrorism could now be viewed as the first in a series of conspiratorial acts by a relatively large group of people. This second kidnapping could conceivably have had a strong effect upon many editorial writers in the country. Some might have felt that a strong "law and order" reaction was now, more than ever, necessary. Others might have feared that too strong a reaction on the part of the authorities might engender exactly what they felt the terrorists wanted - i.e., polarization. Still others might see the second kidnapping as an added impetus to probe more deeply into the causes of this type of violence. There would also be the safety of a second man's life to be considered.

The next major event in the unfolding crisis was the proclamation of the War Measures Act by the federal government. This governmental reaction was bound to elicit a large amount of editorial comment. Was it too strong a reaction, would it be acceptable to all segments of the
population, might it not unduly endanger the lives of Messrs. Cross and Laporte, might it not portray the federal government as being insensitive to the aspirations of a certain segment of the Quebec population?

Two days after the proclamation of the War Measures Act, the body of Pierre Laporte was found near St. Hubert Airbase, in the vicinity of Montreal. Like the kidnapping of Mr. Laporte and the invoking of the War Measures Act, this event would probably have considerable effect upon how different editors viewed the crisis. Although the FLQ had many times threatened to kill Messrs. Cross and Laporte, the actual carrying out of that threat on Mr. Laporte imparted to the crisis an intensity which it did not previously have. This act, compounded by the invocation of the War Measures Act which very closely preceded it, put the crisis into a new perspective. The authorities were in the process of reacting more strongly to the crisis and the FLQ seemed more bent upon demonstrating the seriousness of its intent. A newspaper editor concerned with civil liberties might have found fault with the strong government reaction to the crisis, whereas a 'law and order' editor might see in the death of Mr. Laporte a proof of the need of a strong reaction on the part of the authorities. Similarly one might see in these two actions an impetus to deepening of social cleavage which some writers had feared might develop at the onset of the crisis.

On November 2, the federal government moved to replace the Public Order Regulations, 1970 by the Public Order (Temporary Measures) act, 1970. Although the actual crisis continued considerably beyond this point, by that date the intensity of the crisis was waning. It was now apparent that the FLQ would not be committing further acts of terrorism in the near future and that the government, by its new proposed legislation, was
de-escalating, somewhat from its earlier position.

In summary three events may have had a marked effect upon the editorial reaction to the crisis. The abduction of Pierre Laporte on October 10, the invocation of the War Measures Act on October 16 and the discovery of Mr. Laporte's body on the 18th of October.

The analysis of the findings will be broken down according to these stages in the crisis. What this should indicate is the changes in the reactions of the various papers as the crisis develops. To gauge the effect of the abduction of Pierre Laporte upon editorial reaction, a comparison of the reactions prior to the abduction, to the reactions of the papers from the 11th to the 15th of October, (the last date prior to the proclamation of the War Measures Act), will be carried out. 8

As it will not be possible to isolate, with any degree of accuracy, the relative impact of the proclamation of the War Measures Act and the death of Pierre Laporte upon editorial content, the inferences to be derived from this comparison will be more in the nature of the effect of a deepening, or a worsening of the crisis, upon editorial content. For this part of the analysis, editorial reactions of October 6 to October 15 will be compared to the reactions from October 16 to Saturday, October 24. Beyond the 24th of October, one would no longer expect these two events to galvanize the attention of the editorialists.
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2. Ibid., No. 18, p. 525.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 527.

6. An editorial on this subject also appeared in *Le Devoir* on October 28 and 30.


8. As the morning papers (*Le Devoir*, the *Globe and Mail*, *The Vancouver Province*) would not carry views of the proclamation of the *War Measures Act* until the 17th, the 16th of October will be the last date analyzed for that comparison.
CHAPTER III

THE NEWSPAPERS

Choice of Papers

The criteria for the selection of the newspapers to be analyzed were the following:

- that they be 1) established
- 2) Canadian
- 3) metropolitan
- 4) dailies.

'Established' refers to the length of time a paper has been in existence and also the quality of the newspaper itself. For example, the term excludes underground publications and the more sensational press. The following ten newspapers were included in the analysis:

- The Halifax Chronicle-Herald,
- The Montreal Star,
- La Presse,
- Le Devoir,
- The Toronto Globe and Mail,
- The Toronto Daily Star,
- The Ottawa Citizen,
- The Winnipeg Free Press,
- The Vancouver Sun,
- The Vancouver Province.

These papers represent a sizable proportion of all the newspapers satisfying the four requirements mentioned above and can be considered to be representative of papers of that description.
Choice of Newspaper Characteristics

The central theme of this study revolves around the idea that different newspapers will have differing editorial reactions to the FLQ crisis. All the papers analyzed were of one type - established Canadian metropolitan dailies. The purpose of this section is to select, within that group of newspapers, specific source characteristics which may be expected to have had some influence upon the nature of editorial reactions to the crisis. Generally, depending upon the perspective from which the papers viewed the crisis, certain types of reactions might be expected. A central point to be kept in mind, in the selection of characteristics, is that papers do not operate in a vacuum - they both affect and are affected by the communities in which they operate.

One obvious factor which might be expected to have an influence upon interpretation of the crisis is location. It would be reasonable to assume that a Montreal newspaper would view the crisis differently than a paper in, say, Winnipeg or Vancouver. Exactly what that difference would consist of is hard, if not impossible, to predict. But the greater sense of direct involvement in the events which a Montreal editor is bound to feel could, for example, incline his attitudes towards those of need for law and order or the need for social reform. On the assumption that editorials are reflections of (perceived) self-interest, it also stands to reason that a newspaper printed in Vancouver would take a different stand on the desirability of the War Measures Act than would a paper printed in French in Montreal or a Toronto daily. The latter papers, because of their presumed greater sense of involvement in the crisis, might be more wary of such a measure and hence might voice more opposition to it. In relation to the
question of possible polarization or social disruption stemming from the crisis, it seems plausible that papers printed in Montreal would be more sensitive to the possibility than would papers printed outside of Quebec. As for the question of humanitarian concern (i.e., concern for the lives of Gross and Laporte) it is not readily apparent how distance from the center of the crisis might affect the stand taken.

Another perspective which could be expected to have an influence upon the reaction to the crisis is that of language. One might expect a French paper to be more attuned to the nature of the crisis and to feel a certain sense of involvement in the outcome which an English paper would not feel. A cursory glance at Le Devoir and the Globe and Mail, for example, shows that the former, and especially its leading editorialist, Claude Ryan, was more sensitive to the social causes of the crisis and tended to underplay the need for law and order while the Globe and Mail seemed to be more concerned with the law and order issue and tended to underplay the need for social reform. These differences might, of course, be at least partially accounted for by differing ideologies or political biases but language, or the identitive bonds created by language, can also be seen as affecting one's view of such a crisis. Similarly, one could expect language to have some effect upon attitudes towards the War Measures Act and the Public Order Regulations, 1970. These measures were invoked in order to suppress a group of French speaking dissidents and it is reasonable to expect a stronger objection to those measures from the French papers than from the English ones. The French papers analyzed, Le Devoir and La Presse, because they are French and because they are produced in Montreal, might also be expected to perceive the possibility of polarization differently from English papers, especially those outside of the
province of Quebec.

Extent of editorial coverage will be considered as a factor which could reflect the type of reaction to the crisis. It is probably not just a statement of bias, for example, to assume that the more any editorial writer goes into an analysis of the crisis, the less likely he is to dwell upon the simple "law and order" theme as the only possible solution to this type of crisis. Also, more extensive editorial coverage might be seen as an indicator of greater awareness of the various facets of the crisis. This might, in turn, affect attitudes towards the federal government's reactions to the crisis (the War Measures Act and Public Order Regulations) or towards social reform as a solution to the crisis.

Several fairly obvious source characteristics will not be considered in this study. One of these is political affiliation (if any) of the papers. Although one might hypothesize, quite justifiably, about the relationship between political preferences and any or all of the five categories used in this study, the ascribing of specific political labels to most of the newspapers is bound to be done more impressionistically than objectively. On the other hand, an analysis of the findings might warrant a statement about the relative ideological orientations of the newspapers studied. For a different reason, the question of independence versus chain ownership as possible determinants of reaction will not be considered. Such a consideration might conceivably affect the quality of reporting but it is not apparent how it would affect the type of editorial reaction in this sort of crisis.
Choice of Editorials

All the papers to be analyzed in this study have a set editorial page, thus greatly facilitating the identifying of editorial content. Occasionally a paper (the Toronto Daily Star, for example) may have a front page editorial, but in such case it is designated as editorial content and poses no problem of identification.

Syndicated columns appearing in the editorial page or elsewhere will not be included. Although it is true that some papers may rely for their editorial content about the FLQ crisis upon a syndicated writer, there is no reason to assume that that column is a reflection of a given newspaper's editorial attitude towards the crisis. As such, to make inferences about a paper's reaction towards the crisis from an analysis of syndicated columns (among others) would be misleading.

For the same reasons, all editorials or articles printed in the editorial page, but originating from sources other than that given paper's editorial staff, will not be included in the analysis. In all the papers to be analyzed all content falling within this description would be identified as such. There is thus no problem in determining what is and what is not editorial content written (or copied from another source) by a given newspaper's editorial staff.

Editorial cartoons will not be included. It is true that a cartoon is a message in the same sense that a written editorial is a message. Therefore one might say that editorial cartoons produced by a member of a given paper's editorial staff is one reflection of that paper's attitude on a given topic. The problem with the inclusion of the editorial cartoon in the analysis is one of method. Specifically, how is one to determine the
extent to which a cartoon is a reflection of attitude, keeping in mind that the measure must be in agreement with the frequency count method used in written editorials? As it is not apparent how these two types of editorial content could be aggregated for the purpose of this study, inclusion of editorial cartoons would give misleading results concerning the reactions of papers to the crisis.

Of any given newspaper's own editorial content, all editorials in which the crisis is mentioned, either as a central or a peripheral theme, will be analyzed for bits of content falling within one of the categories.
FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER III

CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Reactions for the Entire Period Analyzed

The differences in editorial reaction are broken down into two basic types. The first is the difference in the amount of editorial coverage given to the crisis, both for the entire period analyzed, and for specific segments of the crisis corresponding to the time periods between salient events. The second is the number of editorial reactions per category, again for the entire period and for the specific segments of the crisis. These latter findings, for the sake of comparison, are presented in percentage points per category, so as to compensate for the differences in the total 'bits' of data gathered for the different newspapers.

For the purpose of comparing amount of editorial reaction to the crisis, it had originally been intended to simply make a tally of any given paper's editorials dealing with the crisis and compare these findings. However, in the process of analysis, it became evident that a simple dichotomy between editorials pertaining to the crisis and others was not the best indicator of a paper's amount of editorial reaction to the crisis. It would be more accurate to say that there were four basic types of editorials for this purpose: those centrally concerned with the crisis, those dealing indirectly with the crisis (e.g. an editorial relating the Montreal civic election to the crisis) and those in which only a cursory mention of the crisis is made, (e.g. an editorial dealing with the Vancouver mayor's intended uses of the War Measures Act). The fourth type would be any other editorial appearing in that paper.

Rather than taking an editorial count it appeared that a comparison of the total bits of information obtained in the analysis would be suitable for a comparison of amount of editorial reaction. If this procedure
is used, one point should be made clear. What is being compared with this method, given the nature of the categories in this study, is the number of attitudinal statements pertaining to the crisis, rather than the total amount of editorial content in which the crisis is mentioned. Such a statement as, "on October 16 the government proclaimed the War Measures Act", though it may appear in an editorial, is not, strictly speaking, a statement of attitude and hence would not be included in the tabulation. Keeping this fact in mind, one can assume that relative amounts of editorial reactions will be reflected in the relative number of bits of information gleaned from the papers analyzed.

The second type of editorial reaction to be analyzed will be the number of editorial reactions per category per paper. As mentioned above, these reactions will be presented in percentage points per category. Table I summarizes these two types of reactions for the entire period analyzed.

The categories used for analysis are the following:

1) Need for law and order,
2) Need for social reform,
3) Concern for the safety of the kidnap victims,
4) Dangers of excessive reaction by the authorities,
4a) Outside intervention in crisis, (Ottawa),
4b) Ottawa should have given better reasons for invoking the War Measures Act and the Public Order Regulations, 1970.
5) Dangers of social disruption.
**TABLE I**

Editorial Reactions of Individual Papers to the Crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Total Bits*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Devoir</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Presse</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe and Mail</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Star</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Star</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Citizen</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Sun</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg Free Press</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle-Herald</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Province</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures compensate for missing issues.

Table I lists the papers in the order of decreasing editorial reaction to the crisis, as gauged by total number of bits of information obtained from each. Keeping in mind the possible limitations of that method of comparison, it is apparent that there is a relationship between geographical location of a paper and the extent of editorial reaction to the crisis.

Generally, those papers published in Ontario and Quebec had more editorial comment about the crisis than those published in other provinces. Also, the two French dailies from Montreal had a markedly greater number of reactions than did the Montreal Star or any other paper. Judging from the difference in the amount of reaction between these two French papers...
and the Montreal Star one could tentatively say that language affects the amount of editorial reaction to the crisis.

A comparison of the amount of editorial content per category between papers indicates that distance also has an effect upon how newspapers view the crisis. Those papers situated outside of Ontario and Quebec put an overwhelming emphasis upon 'law and order' as a means of coping with the crisis (category 1), whereas the papers from these two provinces were more concerned with the dangers inherent in an excessive 'law and order' reaction by the authorities (category 4). Also, the papers from central Canada would more frequently advocate social reform (category 2) as solutions to the crisis than would papers from other provinces, this being particularly so for the English papers of Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa.

Save for Le Devoir, the papers analyzed seemed to have relatively little concern for the safety of the kidnap victims (category 3), and the findings would indicate that there is little correlation between language and/or distance and this consideration.

Fears of social disruption resulting from the crisis (category 5) were more evident in the French papers than in English ones (with the notable exception of the Winnipeg Free Press). Distance does not seem to greatly affect this type of reaction, except insofar as language and distance are correlated.

Finally, most of the English papers were often quite critical of the federal government's publicly stated reasons for the proclamation of the War Measures Act and Public Order Regulations (category 4b) with the English papers from central Canada being somewhat more concerned about this than the papers from other regions. Table 2 compares the editorial reactions of the papers, grouped by geographical location and by language.
**TABLE II**

Editorial Reactions of Papers to the Crisis, Grouped by Language and by Geographical Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Papers Average: bits/paper</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Que.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Ont. Que.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. (other regions)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure I depicts the combined effects of language and geographical location upon the amount of editorial reaction and the nature of that reaction. It would appear that the single greatest determinant of the type of reaction to the crisis is geographical location. This is indicated by the similarities in reaction between French and English papers of central Canada, and the dissimilarities in reactions between the latter and English papers from other regions. Those observations are particularly true of categories 1, 2 and 4.

As mentioned above, all the papers analyzed, save for Le Devoir, only infrequently showed concern for the safety of the kidnap victims, (category 3). It is not apparent which newspaper characteristic(s), if any, would affect how a paper would react on this subject. There was a certain amount of resentment in the two French papers over the federal government's involvement in the settling of the crisis, although in both cases the reaction was slight, (category 4a).

The English papers across the country generally seemed to be in agreement about the inadequacy of the federal government's stated reasons
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Amount and Types of Editorial Reactions to the Crisis, with Papers Grouped by Geographical Location
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for the invocation of the War Measures Act and Public Order Regulations (category 4b). It should be noted that this type of reaction does not necessarily imply a disapproval of the government's action, as it may simply be a demand for greater openness on the part of the federal government in this matter. In the same way Category 5, which records reactions touching upon the dangers of social disruption as a consequence of the crisis, is somewhat ambiguous. As was mentioned before, most of the reactions touching upon this topic were quite nebulous in that they did not specify who was primarily to blame for this danger - the FLQ, the federal government (because of its strong reaction) or some other agent(s).

Categories 1, 2 and 4 are all indications of views on what should be done, or avoided, in trying to solve this type of crisis. In these matters language had little effect upon the nature of the reaction, proximity to the crisis being the determining factor.

Categories 1, 2 and 4 can be viewed from an ideological perspective. Law and order versus social reform as solutions to the crisis (categories 1 and 2) is one way of comparing those two categories. Need for order versus the dangers to individual liberties which excessive governmental reaction might entail is one way of comparing reactions falling within categories 1 and 4 respectively. Granting the ideological dimension of those three categories, one or both of the following observations is warranted:

1) the press of central Canada is more liberal than the press in other regions.

2) the press of central Canada took a more liberal view of the crisis than the press in other regions.

One cannot say off hand whether it is a set liberal attitude on the part of those papers from Ontario and Quebec which conditioned their reactions
to the crisis or their proximity to the crisis which imparted to them a more liberal attitude than they might have had, had this type of crisis occurred elsewhere. To do so would entail a comparative study of the reactions of those papers to this crisis and to a similar crisis elsewhere.

Judging from the findings, it is not quite clear what relationship, if any, amount of editorial reaction has with the type of reaction. What is apparent is that proximity to the crisis affects the amount of reaction. Consequently, it is not possible to isolate the effect which the amount of reaction may have upon the type of reaction.

Reactions to Major Events Within the Crisis

The latter part of the analysis of the findings is broken down into two sections. The first is a measure of the effect of the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte upon editorial reaction, the second a measure of the effect of the events of October 16-19 upon that reaction.

To measure the changes in editorial reactions as a result of the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte, the editorial reactions from October 6 to October 10 will be compared to the reactions following the kidnapping, up to October 15, beyond which time editorial reactions would be conditioned by the proclamation of the War Measures Act. To measure the effect of the latter two events (the federal government's reaction and the death of Laporte) upon editorial comment all editorial reactions prior to these events (Oct. 6 to Oct. 15, or 16 for morning papers) are compared to the editorial reactions in the week following the events, ending on Saturday, October 24. Two types of comparisons are presented in each case: They are:

1) A comparison of the change in the amount of editorial reaction per day, before and after the events,

2) a comparison of the change in the proportion of editorial reactions
per category, before and after the events.

To measure the degree of change in the amounts of editorial reaction as a consequence of the events, the ratio of the average amount of reaction per day after the event of to the average amount of reaction per day before the event is taken. Consequently, any number greater than 1 in the "BITS, AFTER/BEFORE" column in the tables indicates an increase in the average amount of reaction per day after the event, whereas a number smaller than 1 indicates a decrease in the amount of reaction in the same period.

To measure the effect of an event upon the type of editorial reaction, the difference in percentage points per category before and after the event is taken with a plus or minus symbol to indicate whether the proportion of reactions falling within any given category increased or decreased as a consequence of the event.

Besides measuring the effects of these events upon the editorial reactions of individual newspapers, a measure of the effect of the previously mentioned newspaper characteristics upon the changes in reaction is also taken. (Those characteristics are language and geographical location.)

Table 3 indicates the changes in the amount and in the type of reaction for individual papers, as a consequence of the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte. It should be cautioned that except for Le Devoir, La Presse and the Globe and Mail, the amount of editorial reactions either before or in the period immediately following the abduction of Laporte was slight, so that a large shift in percentage points per category, as indicated in Table 3, does not necessarily indicate a significant shift in attitude. To make inferences about a newspaper's views regarding a specific aspect of the crisis from a classification of 4-5 bits of content might be
misleading. What is more significant in Table 3 is the change in the amount of editorial reacting and simply the direction of change in the type of reaction. A large number is not necessarily indicative of very much change in absolute terms.

**TABLE III**

Changes in the Amount and in the Type of Reaction, Following the Abduction of Pierre Laporte, for Individual Papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Paper</th>
<th>Bits: Before/After</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Devoir</td>
<td>3.4 0.5</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
<td>-16.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Presse</td>
<td>4.3 -83.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe and Mail</td>
<td>2.4 -50.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Star</td>
<td>0.3 75.0</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
<td>-50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Star</td>
<td>0.4 -12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Citizen</td>
<td>1.9 50.0</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>-33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Sun</td>
<td>1.9 50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg Free Press</td>
<td>0.9 62.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle-Herald</td>
<td>0.8 -50.0</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>-33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Province</td>
<td>1.3 -66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three papers which reacted most to the abduction of Laporte are Le Devoir, La Presse, and the Globe and Mail. The nature of their reactions is also quite similar. They tended to de-emphasize the need for law and
order and to become more preoccupied with the possibilities of excessive reaction by the authorities. They also more frequently alluded to the possibilities of social disruption which the crisis might entail. *La Presse* showed an increase in concern for the safety of the kidnap victims whereas *Le Devoir* de-emphasized that aspect of the crisis. There is very little change on that issue in the *Globe and Mail*. Need for social reform is given less importance than it previously had in *Le Devoir* whereas *La Presse* tended to place more importance upon this. The kidnapping of Pierre Laporte did not affect the *Globe and Mail*’s views on the subject of social reform.

As mentioned above, the amount of editorial reaction shown during this phase of the crisis by the other papers is marginal. A few observations on the nature of their reactions is warranted, however. There was relatively little change in the amount of editorial reaction as a consequence of the second kidnapping. The change in the type of reaction tended towards an increasing emphasis on law and order, with a concomitant decrease in mention of need for social reform and of concern for the safety of the kidnap victims. Very little was made in these papers of the possibility of excessive reaction by the authorities to the initiatives of the FLQ, either before or after the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte.

In general then, those papers showing the greatest increase in the amount of editorial reaction as a consequence of the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte tended to de-emphasize need for law and order and to show increasing concern for the possibility of excessive reaction by the authorities and for the danger of social disruption, whereas these papers showing the least increase in the amount of editorial content tended to put more emphasis than they previously had upon the need for law and order with a
consequent decrease of emphasis in every other type of reaction.

**TABLE IV**

Changes in the Amount and in the Type of Reaction, for Papers Grouped by Language and by Geographical Location, Following the Abduction of Pierre Laporte.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Papers</th>
<th>Bits After Before</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 4a 4b 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French: Que.</td>
<td>3.8 -25.1 -1.8 -4.8 16.3 1.6 0 13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English: Ont.-Que.</td>
<td>1.3 - 4.5 -11.7 -12.9 13.5 0 0 11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English: Other</td>
<td>1.2 37.3 -4.4 -26.1 6.2 0 0 -13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 4 indicates, there was a nearly fourfold increase in the amount of editorial reaction on the average per day, in the French papers, following the kidnapping, compared with a relatively slight increase in the amount of editorial reactions among the English papers of central Canada or of other regions for the same period.

The French papers noticeably de-emphasized need for law and order after the second kidnapping and showed a marked increase in apprehension over the possibility of excessive reaction by the authorities, along with an increasing awareness of the dangers of social disruptions. Their other reactions remained relatively unchanged. The reactions of the English papers from central Canada was similar to that of the French papers when dealing with the question of possible excessive reaction by the authorities and that of the dangers of social disruption but showed only a slight decrease in their emphasis upon need for law and order. For these papers the areas of major decrease in emphasis following the second abduction are those
dealing with need for social reform and humanitarian concern for the kidnap victims.

The English papers from other regions increased by more than one third their emphasis upon need for law and order and showed a slight increase in their awareness of the possibilities of an excessive reaction by the authorities, following the abduction. They consequently tended to de-emphasize any other type of reaction, showing noticeably less concern for the safety of the kidnap victims and placing less import upon the possibilities of social disruption than they had previously.

The English papers from central Canada and the French papers changed in the same direction (plus or minus) in every category, but both types differed in two categories (1 and 5) from those of other regions. Coupled with the similarities in the change in the amount of editorial reactions for both types of English papers, and their difference from the French papers in that respect, it would appear that geographical location has the greater effect upon the quality of editorial reactions as a consequence of the kidnapping. However, as the degree of change in reactions was quite different in some categories (especially in the 'law and order' category) between the French papers and the English papers of central Canada, language can also be seen to have had some effect upon the nature of the change in reactions following the abduction.

Judging from the much greater increase in the amount of editorial reaction in the French papers than in the English papers, it would appear that the former placed significantly more importance upon the kidnapping of Laporte, within the context of the crisis, than did the latter. This of itself, however, does not seem to be the only determinant of how papers changed their editorial views following that event.
Table 5 measures the combined effects of the proclamation of the War Measures Act, the Public Order Regulations and the death of Pierre Laporte upon change in editorial reactions to the crisis. It is a comparison of all the editorial reactions prior to these events to the editorial reactions for the week following the events.

**TABLE V**

Changes in the Amount and in the Type of Reaction, Following the Events of October 16-19, for Individual Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Paper</th>
<th>Bits: Before/After</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Devoir</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Presse</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe and Mail</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-34.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-14.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Star</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-38.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Star</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-28.4</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Citizen</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-44.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>-15.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Sun</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-20.3</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg Free Press</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle-Herald</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Province</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most obvious effect of these two events upon editorial reaction to the crisis is the nearly unanimous shift away from a "law and order" reaction and the concomitant marked increase in emphasis upon the dangers
of excessive government reaction to the crisis. In the English press, this latter reaction was accompanied by statements to the effect that the federal government’s stated reasons for the proclamation of the Act and the Regulations were not sufficient, given the magnitude of the powers inherent in those measures. Also, all the papers analyzed, save for the Vancouver Province, which never mentioned that issue in the first place, put less emphasis upon the humanitarian consideration as a consequence of those two events. There was relatively little shift, looking at the papers as one group, in the other categories.

Among individual papers, Le Devoir reacted the most strongly against the federal government’s initiatives and had proportionately fewer reactions falling into the other categories than it did before the proclamation of the War Measures Act. The reaction of La Presse seemed to be only slightly affected by these events. The English papers of Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa all tended to react in the same way. They showed a substantial increase in the amount of editorial reaction, with the direction and extent of the change being quite similar, but with the following exceptions:

1) The Daily Star and the Montreal Star put somewhat less emphasis upon need for social reform than they had previously, whereas the Globe and Mail and the Ottawa Citizen put increasing emphasis on that topic.

2) There was some variance among these papers over the perception of dangers of social disruption as a consequence of the events of October 16-19.

Generally, all the papers tended to emphasize the dangers of the government’s reaction and to de-emphasize the ‘law and order’ and the ‘humanitarian concern’ reactions.

There was a substantial increase in the amount of editorial reaction
in the English papers outside of Ontario and Quebec. Also, although the shift in their editorial reactions tends to be in the same direction as that of the papers of these two provinces, the extent of the change is generally less pronounced. This would indicate that the events of October 16-19 had less effect upon the editorial reactions of those papers than they did upon the papers of Ontario and Quebec.

**TABLE VI**

Changes in the Amount and in the Type of Reaction, for Papers grouped by Language and by Geographical Location, Following the Events of October 16-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Papers</th>
<th>Bits: After Before</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French-Que.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-21.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.Ont.Que.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-35.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>-15.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.-Other</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the direction of the change in reactions was generally similar for all three types of papers, with the major difference being, as mentioned above, in the extent of the change.

In comparing the changes in the amount of reaction pursuant to the Iaporte kidnapping (Table 4) and later to the events of October 16-19, it becomes evident that the French papers substantially increased their editorial content pertaining to the crisis after the former event, whereas the English papers noticeably increased theirs only after October 16. If one assumes a relationship between amount of editorial reaction and level of
involvement, it becomes apparent that the abduction of Laporte was seen as a much more significant event by the French papers analyzed than it was by the English papers generally. The reactions of the English papers, on the other hand, would indicate that the proclamation of the War Measures Act and the death of Pierre Laporte were the most significant events of the crisis in their eyes. It could be expected that the dramatic death of a political figure could elicit strong reactions throughout the country. Likewise, the proclamation of the War Measures Act was bound to elicit widespread and strong editorial reaction. What is perhaps more surprising in the editorial reaction of the English press generally, is the relative dearth of editorial reaction following the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte.

If one accepts the relationship between amount of editorial reaction and level of involvement, then it would seem that that event was seen by the English press as a primarily French Canadian, Quebec concern and of relatively little impact for the rest of the country.

A comparison of Tables 4 and 6 also shows that whereas the French papers significantly shifted away from the advocacy of law and order after the kidnapping of Laporte, the English papers had a similar reaction only after the War Measures Act and the Public Order Regulations, which affected the entire country, were proclaimed. In other words, it appears that the papers analyzed advocated law and order to the extent that it was seen as applying to a region or group other than the one in which they were operative. After the proclamation of the War Measures Act, which may be seen as essentially a law and order reaction to the crisis, but applying to the entire country, the attitudes of most newspapers towards need for law and order changed, sometimes dramatically, although the change in attitude may also have been conditioned by the death of Laporte.
Finally, it would appear that level of involvement in the crisis, as gauged by change in the amount of editorial reaction, had a slightly positive effect upon the papers' advocacy of social reform as solutions to this type of crisis. As the editorial reaction by the English press to the crisis increased (after October 16) they placed proportionately more emphasis upon need for social reform than they had previously.
Conclusion

The two basic objectives of this paper have been to:

1) measure the editorial reactions of papers and of types of papers to the FLQ crisis, from October 6 to November 2, and,

2) to measure the extent to which the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte on the one hand and the events of October 16–19 on the other, affected the editorial reactions of the papers analyzed.

What follows in this section is a presentation, in summary form, of the salient findings pertaining to those two objectives.

Editorial reactions of papers for the entire period analyzed:

1) The papers from Ontario and Quebec devoted more editorial content to the crisis, generally, than did papers from other regions.

2) The French papers had the greater amount of editorial content about the crisis.

3) Geographical location had a noticeable effect upon some types of reactions.

(a) Papers from outside of Ontario and Quebec put a greater emphasis upon the need for law and order.

(b) Papers from Ontario and Quebec (English and French) were more concerned with the dangers inherent in an excessive reaction by the authorities to the crisis.

(c) Papers from Ontario and Quebec more frequently mentioned social problems as causes of the crisis, with a concurrent advocacy of social reform in order to solve this type of crisis.

4) Geographical location appeared to have little effect upon:

(a) Concern for the safety of the kidnap victims, and
(b) Fear of social disruption as a consequence of the crisis.

5) Language affected some types of reactions.

(a) The French papers from Quebec occasionally showed a slight resentment towards the federal government's involvement in the crisis, whereas, of course, the English papers did not.

(b) English papers frequently mentioned that the federal government should give (or should have given) more justification for its action, following the proclamation of the War Measures Act.

(c) French papers showed more concern for the possibilities of social disruption than did English papers.

If one assumes the ideological dimension of categories 1, 2 and 4, one or both of the following observations is warranted:

1) The press in Ontario and Quebec is generally more liberal than the press from other regions of Canada, or,

2) the fact that the crisis occurred in central Canada imparted to the press of that region a more liberal attitude than it might otherwise have had, had a crisis of the sort occurred elsewhere.

Effect of the kidnapping of Pierre Laporte upon editorial reaction

1) Those papers which most increased their editorial comment about the crisis after the second kidnapping (Le Devoir, La Presse and the Globe and Mail) tended to have similar changes in the nature of their reactions - away from advocacy of 'law and order' and towards apprehension over possible excessive reaction by the authorities.

2) Le Devoir put less emphasis upon the safety of the kidnap victims than it did prior to the second kidnapping.

3) La Presse put greater emphasis than previously upon concern for
safety of the kidnap victims.

4) The Globe and Mail's concern for the safety of the victims was proportionately about the same as previously.

5) The other seven papers analyzed reacted little to the kidnapping of Laporte. Also, they tended to put more emphasis upon need for law and order and to consequently de-emphasize advocacy of social reform and concern for the safety of the hostages.

Grouping the papers by types (language, location), the following observations are warranted:

1) The French papers greatly increased the amount of editorial reaction following the second abduction, the English papers generally very little, if at all.

2) The French papers tended to place less emphasis upon need for law and order and more upon the possibilities of excessive reaction by the authorities and of social disruption than they had previously. The English papers, separated into two groups according to geographical location, had the following reactions:

Papers from central Canada: (English)

3) Showed little change in emphasis upon law and order, compared to reactions before the second abduction,

4) Showed a noticeable increase (proportionately) in concern over the possibility of excessive reaction by the authorities.

5) Showed a relative decrease in advocacy of social reform.

6) Showed a relative decrease in concern for safety of the hostages.

Papers from other regions:

7) Strongly increased their advocacy of law and order, in comparison
to their reaction previously.

8) Occasionally mentioned the possibility of excessive reaction by the authorities, whereas no mention had been made of this previously.

9) Put less emphasis upon all other types of reactions than they did before the second kidnapping.

Effect of the Events of October 16-19 upon Editorial Reactions

1) As might have been expected, after October 16, most of the papers analyzed devoted proportionately more space to the dangers of excessive reaction to the crisis by the authorities than they had previously. The two exceptions are Le Presse, which had already made much of the dangers of such a reaction after the abduction of Laporte, and the Halifax Chronicle-Herald, which maintained a strong 'law and order' stance throughout the crisis.

2) Le Devoir showed the greatest increase in the relative amount of editorial coverage devoted to the dangers of an excessive reaction by the authorities.

3) The English press generally felt that the government's stated reasons for the invocation of the War Measures Act and the Public Order Regulations were not adequate, with the papers from outside of Ontario and Quebec adopting this view somewhat later in the crisis than the papers from those two provinces.

Grouping the English papers by geographical location, the following generalizations can be made:

Papers from central Canada:

4) Sharply increased the amount of editorial coverage of the crisis.

5) Had a marked shift away from a 'law and order' stand and towards fears of excessive reaction by the authorities.
6) Put proportionately less emphasis upon consideration of the safety of the hostage(s).

7) Varied in the directions and extent of their change on the 'social reform' and 'social disruption' issues.

English papers from other regions:

3) Sharply increased the amount of editorial coverage of the crisis.

9) Shifted away from 'law and order' and 'humanitarian concern' and towards 'fear of excessive reaction by the authorities', but not so markedly as English papers from Central Canada.

Finally, in comparing the changes in reactions of the French papers and the English papers during the different phases of the crisis, it would appear that change in the amount of reaction has some effect upon change in the type of reaction. More specifically, the more editorial space a paper would devote to the crisis, the less it would emphasize 'law and order' and the greater would be its concern with the possibility of excessive reaction by the authorities. It is not apparent how amount of reaction further affects type of reaction.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER IV

1 Issues not available for analysis:
   Le Devoir, October 12.
   La Presse, October 12, 20, 26.
   Toronto Daily Star, October 10, 12, 24, 31.
   Montreal Star, October 12, 20.
   Ottawa Citizen, October 12, 28, 21.
   Vancouver Sun, October 12.
   Chronicle-Herald, October 14.

2 For morning papers, the analysis extends to October 16, as editorial
   reaction pursuant to the proclamation of the War Measures Act would not
   occur until the 17th.

3 The average number of bits classified per paper in the period im¬
   mediately following or preceding the kidnapping of Laporte, excluding Le
   Devoir, La Presse and the Globe and Mail.

4 The Toronto Daily Star, for example, increased its average editorial
   reaction per day approximately tenfold in the week following the proclama¬
   tion of the War Measures Act, in comparison to its reaction to the crisis
   prior to that time. There was 23 per cent less emphasis upon need for
   law and order after October 16 and 43 per cent more emphasis upon the dan¬
   gers of excessive reaction by the authorities to the crisis.
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