UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Nationalism and Media Coverage of Indigenous People's Collective Action in Canada

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2w62q5fc

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 34(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Authors

Wilkes, Rima
Corrigall-Brown, Catherine
Ricard, Danielle

Publication Date

2010-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Nationalism and Media Coverage of Indigenous People's Collective Action in Canada

RIMA WILKES, CATHERINE CORRIGALL-BROWN, AND DANIELLE RICARD

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades indigenous people in Canada have mounted hundreds of collective action events such as marches, demonstrations, road blockades, and land occupations.[1] What the general public knows about these events and their causes overwhelmingly comes from the mainstream mass media. For this reason, media coverage of these events plays an important role in shaping public opinion about the events and indigenous rights.[2] The problem is that the media does not merely mirror events, but rather filter information through a process called *framing*.[3] Framing results from a system of reporting wherein reporters use a particular narrative structure, rely on officials as sources, and invoke public opinion in particular ways that, taken together, serve to marginalize collective actors and their issues.[4] It is not that reporters and editors are consciously seeking to delegitimize collective actors, but rather that the process of creating the news often leads to this result.

Coverage of indigenous peoples' collective action in Canada and the United States has been predominantly delegitimizing: stories overwhelmingly emphasize militancy and violence.[5] However, past work on framing has tended to focus only on how challengers are portrayed in media coverage. By considering nationalism and how it may be embedded in the framing of

Rima Wilkes is an associate professor at the University of British Columbia. Her work focuses on First Nation mobilization in Canada. Along with Catherine Corrigall-Brown, she is researching media photographs of First Nation collective action events. Catherine Corrigall-Brown is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of British Columbia. Her work focuses on social movements, and her book, *After the Protest*, is forthcoming from Stanford University Press. Danielle Ricard worked on the research presented in this article while a graduate student at the University of British Columbia.

these events, the research presented in this article shows that non-indigenous people are also being framed in media coverage. A growing body of literature has shown that the media is heavily involved in creating, promoting, and reflecting ideologies about citizenship and the nation.[6] This form of nationalism occurs when contrasts are made, either implicitly or explicitly, between various groups—the "real" members of society and those who do not belong. We consider the ways in which nationalism is reflected in coverage of multiple collective-action events in Canada. We find that when faced with collective action by indigenous peoples asserting group-based citizenship rights, the media respond by emphasizing individual citizenship responsibilities. These ideologies about citizenship become especially visible when consideration is given not simply to what is explicit or "inside" the frame but also to what is implied or "outside" the frame.

NATIONALISM AND MEDIA FRAMING

A burgeoning literature on collective action by indigenous peoples on both sides of the Canada-US border considers media stories about the American Indian Movement (AIM), as well as of specific events at Ganienkeh, Oka, Ipperwash, and Burnt Church.[7] These and other collective events have their roots in past and present actions on the part of the Canadian and American federal, provincial, and state governments. Key among these actions is the failure of governments on both sides of the border to honor, or even make, treaties.[8] In some cases this failure is the result of a policy of land annexation, although in other cases it is the result of a failure to adhere to the terms of treaties entitling indigenous peoples to ongoing resource rights. Since the late 1960s, indigenous peoples have responded to these injustices by engaging in hundreds of collective-action events.

Much of the existing research shows that media coverage of collective-action events portrays activists and their causes in very negative terms. Mark Grenier and Warren Skea show that frames emphasizing law and order and violence predominated in coverage of the 1990 conflict at Oka in Quebec.[9] Timothy Baylor found that media coverage of AIM could be coded as containing five framings—militant, stereotype, factionalism, civil rights, and treaty rights.[10] Not surprisingly, the negative first three frames were the most commonly used. Nicholas Blomley concludes that events such as blockades are "largely framed by the media . . . as singular and often sensational events, paying little attention to the context within which . . . they are deployed or to . . . their relation to similar tactics."[11]

More recently, a number of scholars have argued that it is also important to consider the ways in which challenging groups such as indigenous peoples must contend with the dominant media's role in creating and reproducing ideologies of race, citizenship, and nation.[12] Historically, mass media such as newspapers have enabled individual readers to see themselves as connected to a larger and more disparate geographic entity.[13] This connection to a larger "national" whole is established through the creation of an identity built in opposition to another supposedly different identity.[14] These discourses, which

essentialize behavior by race, place people from different groups on a citizenship continuum. On one side of this continuum are the "real" (read "white") citizens, while the "problem" (read "nonwhite") citizens are on the other side.[15]

Such contrasts can be found in a number of studies of indigenous peoples' political mobilization. Media coverage of the 1990 Oka conflict "presumed that the reserve was somehow a closed entity into which the Canadian government did not venture (belied by its control of daily life through the Indian Act). They thereby turned the all-present federal government into an external player. This also fed into the myth of the Canadian State as the bearer of peace."[16] Coverage of the 1995 Ipperwash standoff was equally troubling with its overemphasis on frames of First Nation people as troublemakers and First Nations in dispute among themselves compared to First Nations having a "legitimate dispute" frame.[17] Of particular concern was the predominance of the troublemaker frame. This frame suggests that "First Nation people [create] problems for society by making demands upsetting to the social, political or economic order."[18] These academic works show that the media is not merely framing indigenous peoples but also creating an "us" versus "them" dichotomy.

The "us" versus "them" contrast implies that both groups have particular characteristics. This was pointed out by Sherene Razack in her analysis of the 1993 Canadian military operation in Somalia:

> "We" know about democracy and "they" do not; "we" have values of integrity, honesty, and compassion that "they" do not; that "we" are a law-abiding, orderly, and modest people while "they" are not. As an immigrant to Canada from the Third World, I have long understood that the "we" is a white category and that it refers to people who imagine themselves to be the original citizens (Aboriginal peoples are considered dead or dying and people of colour are considered recently arrived.)[19]

Thus, the "us" versus "them" dichotomy implies that there are particular characteristics associated with being within or outside of the nation. In the case of media framing of collective action by indigenous peoples, there have been few attempts to identify the specific characteristics portrayed in the media as distinguishing "us" from "them." The exceptions are Amelia Kalant's and Lorna Roth's work on the Oka crisis and Robert Harding's analysis of the media coverage of four key legal and social decisions in British Columbia.[20] The question is, are these distinctions based on apparent political, economic, or social differences? Our aim in this article is to address this gap.

We analyze the framing used in newspaper articles about multiple collective-action events in Canada. In our analyses of the framings contained in these articles we pay specific attention to the implicit references made to citizenship. Although citizenship is a legal status that entitles an individual to rights based on nation-state membership, there has also been considerable scholarly debate about the extent to which citizenship entails responsibilities.[21] These responsibilities may include elements such as responsibility for

one's own and one's family's welfare and various forms of political participation in the public sphere.[22] This is often referred to as active citizenship. In the news articles about collective action that we analyze, we find that these individual responsibilities include obeying the law, getting along with others, and paying taxes. Although the "us" component of the binary enacts these responsibilities, the "them" component avoids them.

METHODOLOGY

We collected data for this research from three Canadian newspapers—the *Globe and Mail*, the *Toronto Star*, and the *Vancouver Sun*. The *Globe and Mail* is one of two national newspapers in Canada, the *Toronto Star* is the largest circulation newspaper in the country, and the *Vancouver Sun* is the largest circulation paper in British Columbia. The British Columbia paper was selected because this province had a disproportionately large number of indigenous protest events. We selected articles about events that took place in 1995. The articles selected included reporter-produced as well as editorially produced items and those obtained from wire services such as Canadian Press. Our decision to focus on 1995 was based on the fact that previous studies indicate that this was a year with a high level of diverse collective actions by indigenous peoples in Canada.[23] The year is notable for the occurrence of several major standoffs regarding land, including the Gustafsen Lake standoff between Sundancers and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) in British Columbia, and the Ipperwash crisis in which Ontario Provincial Police killed protester Anthony "Dudley" George.

We conducted keyword searches of these newspapers using the *Canadian Newsstand* database. This is a national database that contains electronic versions of newspaper articles from all major as well as some minor Canadian newspapers. Among the keywords we used to search this database were *Native*, *Aboriginal*, *First Nation*, *Indian protest*, *demonstration*, and *blockade*.[24] Once a skeleton of events was created we used additional keywords such as *Gustafsen* and *Ipperwash* in order to identify any additional articles on these events. Although no approach can guarantee that every single article published about these events will be included, the likelihood that there is a systematic pattern of missing-ness in our data is mitigated by the use of multiple keywords for each individual group. We also restricted the number of articles collected about particular events to those published within the same calendar year that the event took place.[25] We included a few events that started in 1994 but continued into 1995 in our list of events. In cases in which the event lasted for more than one year, we included articles published until the final year of the protest. This led to a data set with 402 articles written about twenty-one collective-action events. The events took place in eight of the ten Canadian provinces: British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec, Ontario, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia. Although some of these events lasted only one day, others spanned weeks or months. The events were varied and included the occupation of a tax office, road blockades, demonstrations, and marches.

We used an inductive method to develop a list of four master frames that appeared in the coverage. This list of frames was transferred into a coding sheet that enabled us to record the order in which each frame appeared within the article as well as in which paragraph in the article each frame appeared.[26] Previous studies have used a variety of approaches to coding frames. Some scholars have coded entire articles as having either episodic or thematic framing while other scholars have treated each reported speaker utterance as distinct.[27] We initially considered coding the overall tone of each article as representing a single frame; however, many articles had multiple framings, making this approach unreliable. An alternative approach that codes each speaker's utterance is more nuanced, but it does not address the fact that the selection of speakers and the parts of their speech that are reported are part of the media's framing process. Furthermore, considering only the words speakers say ignores all other information provided in the article. This includes details about the event and how it and the chosen speakers are described. With these considerations in mind, we coded the framing of speech utterances and the more general descriptions of the events.[28] A frame could be a paragraph, sentence, or, because some sentences contained more than one frame, part of a sentence.

Initially our plan was to include a comparison of differences in framing across events. This would have enabled a consideration of the ways in which event characteristics may be related to the framing an event receives. Ultimately this strategy proved to be unfeasible because a single article only covered several of the smaller events. Comparing the framing of an event that was covered by a single article and an event that was covered by hundreds of articles would not produce any kind of statistically meaningful results. For this reason, we grouped the framing across all events. In so doing, our study provides an analysis of the overall messages sent out to the public about these events, given that some events are more represented than others.

FINDINGS

The overall distribution of the four master frames we identified, and the more specific frames within each master frame, is shown in table 1. In column three of the table, of all the framings we coded we see that the framing of protest as criminal and unlawful appeared in 64 percent, as a threat to race relations in 14 percent of our total, as an economic cost in 5 percent of our total, and as calling attention to social-justice issues in about 18 percent of the framings overall.[29]

Table 1
Major Frames in Coverage of Collective-Action Events

	1	2	3
	N of events frame is mentioned (max = 22)	N articles about these events frame appears	N times within these articles frame appears
Collective Action as a Criminal Behavior			
Militants, terrorists, criminals, fanatics	8	196	400
Breaking the law	14	179	400
Dangerous to police/public	6	63	88
Violence/weapons	15	272	1,098
Out of hand	6	21	25
Need to restore order	7	22	26
Need to intervene	7	32	43
Frustration/anger as mounting	7	44	62
Get to front of the line	6	18	24
Subtotal N and % (of all events/themes)	*18 (81.8 %)*	*352 (87.6%)*	*2,166 (63.6%)*
Collective Action as a Threat to Race Relations			
At war with white people	6	33	43
White victimization	8	36	58
As creating national divisions	4	19	21
Protest makes all indigenous people look bad	5	22	19
Threat to ongoing peaceful negotiations	5	13	33
Protesters are unrepresentative of indigenous peoples	10	77	127
Preferential treatment	8	44	84
Government failure to address protest	6	42	58
Resistance to treaty process	6	55	27
Subtotal N	*16 (72.7 %)*	*192 (47.8%)*	*470 (13.8%)*

<div align="center">**Table 1 (cont.)**</div>

	1	2	3
	N of events frame is mentioned (max = 22)	N articles about these events frame appears	N times within these articles frame appears
Collective Action as Expensive/Costly			
Economic cost of the protest	11	64	145
Economic interest as motivator	6	16	23
Subtotal N	*13 (54.6%)*	*73 (18.1%)*	*168 (4.9%)*
Collective Action as a Means for Achieving Social Justice			
Problematic government policies	9	61	93
Colonialism, legacy of	11	39	46
Persecution of indigenous peoples	10	60	87
Aboriginal rights	20	213	377
Subtotal N	*20 (90.9%)*	*266 (66.2%)*	*603 (17.7%)*
Total N	22	402	3,407

The findings in table 1 are clearly in line with previous studies that show a media tendency toward criminalization of protest.[30] However, as we aim to illustrate below, much of the meaning contained in the first three frames—of collective action as criminal, as economic cost, and as a threat to race relations—contains an underlying reference to citizenship and to norms of how good citizens ought to behave. In what follows we describe these meanings, using examples from the articles as illustrations.

Indigenous People's Collective Action as Criminal and Unlawful: "Citizens" as Lawful

The framing of protest as criminal and unlawful was by far the most predominant frame. Examples of frames that were coded within this category include any frame suggesting that protest was a criminal activity or was the work of terrorists, insurgents, fanatics, or others of that ilk; describing events as breaking the law, dangerous to the police, and/or dangerous to the public; describing violence/threats of violence and/or the presence of weapons;

calling for authorities to intervene and uphold the law; and describing indigenous leaders as condoning protesters and illegal activity.

This framing of collective actors as criminal recreates implicit messages that link crime and citizenship. It is through crime that the public is provided with a means of distinguishing "good" from "bad" citizens and that citizenship rights are either bestowed or revoked.[31] Unlike citizens who abide by the law, "criminals" are not invested in the legal structure of the nation. Furthermore, criminals lose their political citizenship rights, such as voting rights in some cases, and thus classifying a political act as criminal serves to negate symbolically the citizenship rights of the collective actors. The use of the word *terrorist* to describe collective actors places them at the extreme end of the citizenship continuum, not merely as people who seek to challenge policies of the nation but more radically as people who seek to overthrow the nation.

For instance, a 9 September 1995 *Vancouver Sun* description of the Ipperwash occupation repeatedly used the term *rebel* to describe the Kettle and Stoney Pointers who were involved: "Rebel members of the Kettle and Stony Point Indian band used bulldozers to dismantle their blockades of wrecked cars and burning tires in what native leaders called a peace gesture."[32] Yet the government's own documents show that the Kettle and Stoney Point Band, rather than the government, had title to the land in question. Because of this, the Canadian government was acting illegally, whereas the indigenous peoples at Ipperwash were within their legal rights. This same frame is invoked by another *Vancouver Sun* article on 25 September 1995, describing the Gustafsen Lake standoff: "The sacred sundance site here looks more like a guerrilla base camp."[33] Nor can it be said that the criminal framing of Gustafsen Lake was merely the result of coverage in a single paper, because the *Toronto Star* also framed the protesters as being misguided ideological fanatics as in this article from 30 August 1995: "The cause of the Gustafsen Lake protesters (and their white environmentalist supporters who are riding the issue for its publicity value) has not been helped by their overheated rhetoric, which is laced with references to conspiracies, tinged with anti-Semitism, and seems imported from the wacko militias in the United States."[34]

In other cases the criminal frame was built through the selected quotations and information provided by sources interested in framing the participants and the events as criminal matters. Politicians, police, and non-Aboriginal people affected by the events all used criminal framings. Furthermore, during the Gustafsen Lake standoff, the RCMP released the criminal records of the actors involved to the media, and newspapers were willing to reprint this information, again serving to frame the event as perpetrated by criminals.[35] The use of personal records meant that we were able to find several examples of very explicit statements linking crime and citizenship. These were largely part of media stories that gave voice to non-Natives attempting to frame the issues by tying worthy citizenship to obeying the law. For example, one *Vancouver Sun* article from 29 August 1995 contained the following quotation from Greg Hollingsworth, a representative of an ad hoc group called the BC Foundation for Individual Rights and Equality: "Our governments are supposed to do everything they can to protect innocent citizens from

criminal elements, yet we have a clear example of failure to do that."[36] On the one hand, this frames the actors as criminal elements. On the other hand, it creates a continuum in which a contrast is made between innocent citizens and criminal elements that are therefore not simply marginalized but placed outside the nation as noncitizens.

Citizenship was similarly reinforced when articles included labeling of protestors as *militants.* A *Globe and Mail* article on 27 November 1995, about the conflict over the road to the Apex ski resort, included the following quotation from the leader of the British Columbia Reform Party, Jack Weisgerber: "A bunch of *militants* [are] building bunkers and threatening Gustafsen Lake-style armed violence, and our governments are doing nothing. As a *Canadian* it makes my blood boil."[37] A 6 September 1995 article in the same paper contained a similar framing: "B.C. Attorney-General Ujjal Dosangh has led a chorus of *public* disapproval for the standoff and called the *militants*' actions criminal acts, as opposed to civil disobedience. The NDP [New Democratic Party] government has tolerated several native road blockades this summer."[38] In both of these articles the contrast is made between militants and the Canadian public, or noncitizens and citizens, the latter group being those whose interests the government should be upholding.

Framing citizenship as a continuum based on adherence to the law is not simply the result of media reprinting framing by officials and others. Media reports also included this framing without the use of direct quotations. A 1 September 1995 *Vancouver Sun* article, with the title "Violent End to Standoff Could Play into Hands of Indian Radicals," suggests, "Some frustrated Canadians, including Reform party MPs, want authorities to play hardball at Gustafsen Lake."[39] Once again, "Indian radicals" are contrasted with "frustrated Canadians." Similarly, when the Douglas Lake blockade came down, *Vancouver Sun* columnist Denny Boyd wrote on 7 June 1995, "Why was the roadblock, a deliberate, contemptuous thumbing of the nose at the system of laws that most of *us* obey, allowed to continue? . . . Why then did the government of British Columbia, on who *we* depend for law and order and *equal rights under the law*, permit this rogue action to continue, day after stalemated day?"[40] The latter portion of this quotation additionally draws on a discourse wherein the enactment of group-based citizenship rights would necessarily threaten individual citizenship rights.

The framing of the events and participants as criminal is problematic for two key reasons. First, the criminal frame was used without regard for the actual criminality of the event. Several of the events involved no criminal activity on the part of those involved but were still framed as criminal. For example, a band that closes a road on its own reserve land has a legal right to do so and has not committed a crime. Like other citizens, First Nations have the right to protest on Parliament Hill. This is not a criminal act.

Second, many events that were successfully defined as crimes by authorities, such as blockading a public road or occupying private property, would only actually be crimes if other legal relationships were dismissed. Canadian government bodies are signatories to various legal treaties recognizing indigenous peoples' land title. This means that if indigenous people have not

ceded the land, then they (and not federal and provincial governments) still have title to it. This is especially important in British Columbia, where the majority of the province is unceded Aboriginal land and where the majority of the events in our data set took place. For more than a century the provincial government has acted as if Aboriginal land is crown land. It has issued permits to engage in resource extraction on this land to companies. Because these companies have permits to engage in resource extraction, police will not remove them. Thus, other than collective action, Aboriginal peoples' only recourse has been costly legal battles that can take decades or even centuries to resolve. Governments are enabling in what under other circumstances would be considered a "criminal" occupation of Aboriginal land.

In summary, indigenous peoples' collective-action activities range from the clearly lawful (such as permitted protests on Parliament Hill and blocking roads on their own reserve lands) to more questionably legal (such as occupying land that indigenous peoples and the Canadian government claim as their own) to the illegal (occupying government offices). Regardless of these distinctions, we found little evidence that the legality of the act determined whether the criminal frame was invoked.[41] At the same time, the Canadian government and police also engaged in activities that range from clearly legal (such as removing protesters who are illegally occupying a tax office) to the clearly illegal (such as entering reserve land and removing road blockades). Despite the fact that the Canadian government and police did engage in at least some activities that are clearly illegal, they were never framed as criminal. The state and its representatives are virtually immune to this criminal framing regardless of the criminality of their activities.

Indigenous Peoples' Collective Action as a Threat to Race Relations and National Unity: "Citizens" as Maintaining National Unity

The race-relations frame is based upon the ideal of the harmonious and multicultural nation-state in which citizens respect each other's rights as individuals. Within this grand frame, indigenous peoples were presented as being at war with "white" people, victimizing the "white" Euro-Canadian population, receiving preferential treatment or special rights not afforded to citizens of other ethnicities, and disrespecting the treaty process. In short, in this frame indigenous peoples' collective action was treated as threatening the ethnic cohesion of the nation.

In a 20 July 1995 article, collective action at Adams Lake is described by the *Vancouver Sun* as causing racial tensions: "Hostilities and armed confrontation at a nearby roadblock erected by the Adams Lake Indian band are hurting business and dividing the community along racial lines."[42] Another *Vancouver Sun* article, regarding the dispute between the Penticton Band and the government over a road through the Penticton Reserve (which was necessary in order for skiers to access the Apex ski resort), opens with a quotation from a clothing shop owner. "'People are skeptical,' said shop owner Bob Van Os, 'I've had people come in and say: "We're going to buy the kids some skis, but we'll just wait a while".'"[43] The 9 November 1995 editorial goes on

to explain, "What they're waiting for is a resolution of the simmering dispute between the British Columbia government and the Penticton Indian band over who owns the road to the local ski resort."[44] Here we have the contrast between "people" and the "Indian band." An 14 August 1995 article also from the *Vancouver Sun* positions the true victims of the conflict: "'That means they won't discuss treaties unless the governments first acknowledge they have unextinguished title to their traditional territories. The stalemate has swept *innocent victims* into the fray,' said Hollingsworth."[45] The suggestion is that the group rights of indigenous peoples come at the cost of upholding the rights of innocent non-Natives.

A description of the Douglas Lake blockade, in the 2 June 1995 *Vancouver Sun*, initially appears to echo the framing presented by Upper Nicola Band Chief Scotty Holmes: "Holmes, a seasonal employee at the Douglas Lake Ranch, expressed little sympathy for the ranchers who are suffering because of the blockade. 'What about us? Ever since the white man come we've been inconvenienced. Nobody thinks about that.'"[46] Yet his statement is completely undermined by the following sentence, suggesting that band members who were "provincial and federal government employees were collecting pay while sitting at the roadblock."[47] Subsequently, the article focuses on victimization of the non-Native reporters: "Band members continued to harass reporters, heckling, interfering during interviews, photographing their car license plates and trying to intimidate them with video cameras."[48] The implicit argument made in this last quotation is that there are two groups and that Native people are interfering with the freedom of speech rights of (non-Native) citizens in a democracy.

These quotations all suggest that protest threatens race relations and make a contrast between "Natives" and "Canadians." A 25 August 1995 *Globe and Mail* article about the Gustafsen Lake standoff reported the nationalistic framing put forth by multiple other newspapers including the *Vancouver Sun*: "It's time, adds the *Sun*, for Canadians to decide what the natives' place is in Canada. And it's time for Indian leaders to stop dangerous situations such as the one at Gustafsen Lake."[49] The contrast between Natives and Canadians is made again in the article's subsequent paragraph:

> This is Canada, where the white man's burden and liberal dithering paralyze us, where we hold each other to ransom again and again because we are incapable of deciding just whose country this is or (whose it) should be. Where is the native Indian leadership right now? Why is it not at Gustafsen Lake, where a native claim to allegedly sacred territory is being perverted by a bunch of hooligans playing Mr. Dress-up-for-combat? . . . This is their issue, and they hold the key to its resolution. They want their *rights*. They have their *responsibilities*.[50]

As the *Globe and Mail* article shows, when Natives frame indigenous peoples as a group deserving group-based rights they are typically expected to show respect toward and to act like individual Canadian citizens. That is, the concept of rights is juxtaposed with the concept of responsibilities. In a 9

June 1995 article in the *Vancouver Sun*, writer Gordon Gibson states, "Do not criticize the natives for this. Congratulate them. They are playing by the goofy rules of our governments."[51] Again the contrast is made between Natives (them/they) and "our" governments. The contrast is maintained and framed as a nationalist issue when Gibson goes on to recommend that people read the book *Our Home, Or Native Land?* The title is a pun on "our home and native land," a phrase from the Canadian national anthem. Gibson tells readers that the book proposes "total respect for legal entitlements (which are far smaller than governments pretend) and equality as Canadians beyond that."[52]

It could be argued that these quotations are simply accepting First Nations' own framing of themselves as a distinct group. However, the race-relations frame also portrays the collective actions of First Nations people as challenging the harmonious multicultural state. By engaging in these actions, First Nations are depicted as attempting to further their own rights by infringing on the rights of non-Natives. Articles frequently discuss how tactics such as road blockades interfere with the freedoms of "regular," non-Native, citizens. For example, reporters will note that non-Native Canadians are restricted from accessing land for recreation, business, and other purposes. The emphasis on the negative effects of the collective-action tactics of First Nations people on non-Natives portrays the First Nations actors as selfishly attempting to gain rights for themselves while restricting the rights of others.

Indigenous Peoples' Collective Action as Expensive: "Citizens" as Economically Responsible

Media reports that fell within this grand frame focused on the economic cost of indigenous peoples' collective action and on the economic "motives" of indigenous peoples, although this latter framing was less common. This frame is well illustrated by these *Vancouver Sun* headlines: "Policing of native sit-in proves costly" (7 January 1995) and "RCMP's biggest, costliest operation [at Gustafsen Lake] ends peacefully" (18 September 1995).[53] As the following examples illustrate, in several instances news writers not only speculated on the loss of revenue but also provided dollar amounts. From the *Vancouver Sun* on 25 September 1995: "Without the participation of the southern-interior bands, the treaty process will fail in its effort to end the costly court battles and blockades that have paralyzed resource extraction in some parts of the province and scared away an estimated $1 billion in investment."[54] In the *Toronto Star* on 7 September 1995: "Carleson worries that a police 'no-go area' encompassing 7,800 square kilometers of prime deer and moose-hunting country could have a severe economic impact on the community."[55] Also from the *Toronto Star* on 25 April 1995: "Shawanaga First Nation—After a 10-month blockade, Ojibwa have opened a cottage road after the provincial government agreed to pay $500,000."[56] As the final quotation illustrates, the actors and the costs of their actions were often contrasted with a statement about who must pay. Invariably the stated costs were borne by "the province" or "the commu-nity" rather than indigenous peoples. That the province (read "citizens") is the assumed payee of the costly court battles is ironic because First Nations

must also pay for these cases and legal representation. Similarly, although the economic impact on non-Natives is considered, little thought is given to the economic costs that First Nations might be incurring as a result of federal and provincial policies directed at them and their lands.

When the policy that forced status Indians not living on reserves to pay income tax incited the occupation of the Revenue Canada building and other supportive protests, the media depicted indigenous peoples as not wanting to pay income tax like the rest of Canadians. One *Vancouver Sun* writer calculated in a 7 January 1995 article that "federal taxpayers are shelling out more than $6,300 a day to keep police at the native occupation of Revenue Canada's downtown office . . . the occupation, which entered its 23rd day today, cost taxpayers $134,190 in policing costs as of Thursday."[57] The same argument was made 2 January 1995 in the *Toronto Star*: "As of yesterday, some 3,000 status Indians working off reserves must pay income tax like everyone else—and they don't like it."[58] The implicit argument made by these kinds of statements is that paying income tax is an integral responsibility of Canadian citizenship. The juxtaposition of the "native occupation" and "federal taxpayers" creates a distinction between those who cost and those who pay.

These articles emphasize the perceived burden of First Nations people and mobilizations, such as the cost of policing events and of land that is returned. At the same time, they portray indigenous people as not living up to a core responsibility of citizenship: paying taxes to the state. Natives are depicted as attempting to shirk the responsibilities of citizenship while being costly for the state and its citizens.

Indigenous Peoples' Collective Action as a Means of Achieving Social Justice: "Citizens" Use Acceptable Means

The above discussions suggest that there were few attempts by news writers to incorporate the views of those mobilizing or to present any favorable framing. This was not always the case and within this final grand frame we grouped any media coverage that favored collective action. This included mentions of colonialism, the persecution of indigenous peoples, and indigenous rights more generally. The framing of collective action as calling attention to social justice issues accounted for about 18 percent of the overall framings.

Yet, despite its positive view, we still found evidence of citizenship discourse within the social justice frame. For example, in several instances an article would preface a social justice frame with a criminal frame, suggesting actors are outside the system. Thus, several statements about genocide and land title were preceded by the use of the word *renegade*, such as in this 1 September 1995 article in the *Globe and Mail*: "The petition to the Queen cited by the *renegades* 'accuses her judges and government of treason, fraud and complicity in the genocide of the aboriginal people,' Mr. Clark quoted."[59] This same pattern was also adopted by the *Toronto Star* on 31 August 1995: "Clarks' clients, who have been described by police and the British Columbia attorney-general as *renegades* and *rebels*, have refused to recognize that James has title to the land. They contend that the government never had the right to

sell it since it—like most of the land in the entire province—was never ceded to the authorities through the treaty process as elsewhere in Canada."[60] The watered-down invocation of the social-justice frame in these and other articles emphasizes the importance of examining not only which frames are used but also the ordering of frames. The use of negative terms before the social-justice frame undermines the positive framing by suggesting that "good citizens" do not make these kinds of claims.

CONCLUSION

Over the past several decades the mainstream non-Native media have given extensive coverage to indigenous peoples' collective-action events and, through this coverage, have conveyed messages about indigenous rights in Canada. Although a number of studies have considered media framing of such events, and the "us" versus "them" dichotomy implied in such framing, none have considered the specific characteristics that are associated with each side of this binary. In this article, we show that framing is a process of creating explicit and implicit contrasts. Although touting one group as deviant, a picture is painted of other contrasting groups as model or good. We demonstrate that media framings of collective actors as criminals, threats to peaceful race relations, and expensive are situated within a larger context in which media framing portrays model citizens as law abiding, supportive of multiculturalism, and tax paying. These framings are part of larger discourses about nationalism and citizenship in which journalistic reporting practices constrain the ability of activists to be presented "as citizens, capable of articulating their views and providing an understanding of the forces that shape their lives."[61]

A consideration of citizenship uncovers the ways that media coverage of indigenous peoples' collective action contrasts indigenous actors with a model of "proper" citizenry. For example, the race-relations frame is based upon the ideal of the harmonious, multicultural nation-state, and some citizens are seen as working within the confines of this state, while others are seen as "thwarting" it. Similarly, the criminal frame, which has clearly been used to discuss many other groups, is not just about delegitimizing collective actors. Underlying this frame is the ideology that citizens are law abiding. Thus, actors' concerns are illegitimate, not merely because they are criminals but also because as criminals they do not adhere to the rules of community membership the way other citizens do. Hence they can be placed outside the nation.

The framing of collective actors as incurring a costly expense creates a continuum ranging from those who pay ("real" citizens) to those who cost. Research on the welfare state and citizen access to state benefits shows that entitlement is more often than not dependent on demonstrating that one is an active and economically productive citizen.[62] Thus, one is a less worthy citizen if one is a net drain on the system. The framing of collective action as costly therefore creates a contrast between those who deserve and do not deserve certain kinds of citizenship rights and undermines the legitimacy of individual actors as being able to claim membership within the system that

they are critiquing. Underlying all of this is the understanding that when a challenge is made about rights based on group membership, the counter-framing occurs at the individual level.

Finally, it should be noted that the analyses presented in this article focused on a single year. Some readers may wonder how representative this particular year was, whether coverage has changed since then, and, if so, how. At least 130 events have taken place since 1995.[63] Articles about some of these events show that the framings we found concerning 1995 continue to occur. The headline for a 10 September 1999 article in the *Vancouver Sun* about logging by members of the Westbank First Nation in British Columbia reads, "B.C. cannot accede to militant natives."[64] Another *Vancouver Sun* article from 17 June 2006, about the ongoing land conflict at Caledonia, Ontario, regarding a housing estate, cites a government minister: "'We are spending taxpayers' dollars all the time to settle land claims,' he said. 'The people of Canada have an outstanding liability in all these land claims and over time, as we settle them, there are huge cash settlements with first nations. . . . I guess I would have to say, you've seen nothing yet.'"[65] In the minds of many readers, these kinds of statements will surely create and reinforce the binary of non-Natives as "paying citizens" and indigenous peoples as costing. Still, further research comprehensively examining media reports about these and other indigenous people's collective-action events will certainly be required in order to ascertain more clearly the extent to which these frames remain in force.

NOTES

1. Taiaiake Alfred and Lana Lowe, "Warrior Societies in Contemporary Indigenous Communities." Research paper commissioned by the Ipperwash Inquiry, May 2005; Nicholas Blomley, "'Shut the Province Down': First Nations Blockades in British Columbia, 1984–1995," *BC Studies* 111 (1996): 5–35; John Borrows, "Crown and Aboriginal Occupations of Land: A History and Comparison." Research paper commissioned by the Ipperwash Inquiry, 15 October 2005; David Long, "Culture, Ideology, and Militancy: The Movement of Native Indians in Canada, 1969–91," in *Organizing Dissent*, ed. William K. Carroll (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1997), 118–34; Howard Ramos, "What Causes Canadian Aboriginal Protest? Examining Resources, Opportunities and Identity, 1951–2000," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 31 (2006): 211–43; Howard Ramos, "Opportunity for Whom? Political Opportunity and Critical Events in Canadian Aboriginal Mobilization, 1951–2000," *Social Forces* 97 (2008): 795–823; Rima Wilkes, "The Protest Actions of Indigenous Peoples: A Canada-US Comparison of Social Movement Emergence," *American Behavioral Scientist* 50 (2006): 510–25.

2. J. Rick Ponting, "Canadians' Responses to Native Peoples," in *Images of Canada: The Sociological Tradition*, ed. James E. Curtis and Lorne Tepperman (Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall Canada, 1990), 292–301; J. Rick Ponting and Roger

Gibbins, "The Reactions of English Canadians and French Quebecois to Native Indian Protest," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 18 (1981): 223–38.

3. Robert M. Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication* 43 (1993): 51–8; William A. Gamson and Andre Modigliani, "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach," *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1989): 1–37; Gadi Wolfsfeld, *Media and Political Conflict: News from the Middle East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

4. James K. Hertog and Douglas M. McLeod, "Anarchists Wreak Havoc in Downtown Minneapolis: A Multi-Level Study of Media Coverage of Radical Protest," *Journalism and Mass Communication Monographs* 151 (1995): 1–48; Anastasia G. Stamou, "The Representation of Non-Protesters in a Student and Teacher Protest: A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reporting in a Greek Newspaper," *Discourse and Society* 12 (2001): 653–80.

5. Timothy Baylor, "Media Framing of Movement Protest: The Case of American Indian Protest," *The Social Science Journal* 33 (1996): 241–55; Marc Grenier, "Native Indians in the English-Canadian Press: The Case of the Oka Crisis," *Media, Culture and Society* 16 (1994): 313–36; Sandra Lambertus, *Wartime Images, Peacetime Wounds: The Media and the Gustafsen Lake Standoff* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004); John Miller, "Ipperwash and the Media: A Critical Analysis of How the Story Was Covered." Draft report prepared for Aboriginal Legal Services of Toronto and submitted to the Ipperwash Inquiry, October 2005; Warren H. Skea, "The Canadian Newspaper Industry's Portrayal of the Oka Crisis," *Native Studies Review* 9 (1993): 15–31.

6. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* rev. ed. (London and New York: Verso, 1991); Paul Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation* (London: Hutchinson, 1987); Anthony Hall, "The Mass Media, Cultural Identity and Perceptions of National Character," *Gazette* 62 (2000): 231–49; Frances Henry and Carol Tator, *Discourses of Domination: Racial Bias in the Canadian English-Language Press* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).

7. Baylor, "Media Framing of Movement Protest"; Gail Landsman, "Indian Activism and the Press: Coverage of the Conflict and Ganienkeh," *Anthropological Quarterly* 60 (1997): 101–13; Grenier, "Native Indians in the English-Canadian Press"; Amelia Kalant, *National Identity and the Conflict at Oka: Native Belonging and Myths of Postcolonial Nationhood in Canada* (New York: Routledge, 2007); Lorna Roth, "Mohawk Airwaves and Cultural Challenges: Some Reflections on the Politics of Recognition and Cultural Appropriation after the Summer of 1990," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 18 (1993): 315–31; Skea, "Canadian Newspaper Industry's Portrayal"; Jackie Smith, John D. McCarthy, Clark McPhail, and Boguslaw Augustyn, "From Protest to Agenda-Building: Description Bias in Media Coverage of Protest Events in Washington, D.C.," *Social Forces* 79 (June 2001): 1397–423; Miller, "Ipperwash and the Media"; Henry and Tator, *Discourses of Domination.*

8. Several scholars and activists have also argued that the treaty process is problematic because non-Natives set out the terms of treaties.

9. Grenier, "Native Indians in the English-Canadian Press"; Skea, "Canadian Newspaper Industry's Portrayal."

10. Baylor, "Media Framing of Movement Protest."

11. Blomley, "Shut the Province Down," 6.

12. Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliott, *Unequal Relations* (Toronto: Pearson Education, 2003); Robert Harding, "Historical Representations of Aboriginal People in the Canadian News Media," *Discourse and Society* 17 (2006): 105–35; Henry and Tator, *Discourses of Domination*; Miller, "Ipperwash and the Media."

13. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; John B. Thompson, *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995).

14. Ayla Gol, "Imagining the Turkish Nation through 'Othering' Armenians," *Nations and Nationalism* 11 (2005): 121–39; Elke Winter, "Neither 'America' nor 'Québec': Constructing the Canadian Multicultural Nation," *Nations and Nationalism* 13 (2008): 481–503.

15. Joshua Greenberg, "Opinion Discourse and Canadian Newspapers: The Case of the Chinese 'Boat People,'" *Canadian Journal of Communication* 25 (2000): 517–37; Henry and Tator, *Discourses of Domination*; Isabelle Rigoni, "Media and Minorities in Multicultural Europe," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (2005): 563–80.

16. Kalant, *National Identity and the Conflict at Oka*, 168.

17. Miller, "Ipperwash and the Media," 30–31.

18. Ibid., 30.

19. Sherene H. Razack, *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 13.

20. Kalant, *National Identity and the Conflict at Oka*; Roth, "Mohawk Airwaves and Cultural Challenges"; Harding, "Historical Representations of Aboriginal People."

21. See, e.g., Reinhard Bendix, *Nation-building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Social Order* (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1996); Derek Heater, *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2004); Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman, "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory," *Ethics* 104 (1994): 352–81.

22. Margaret Branson, "Making the Case for Civic Education: Educating Young People for Responsible Citizenship." Paper presented at the Conference for Professional Development for Program Trainers, Manhattan Beach, CA, 25 February 2001; Peter Dwyer, "Conditional Citizens? Welfare Rights and Responsibilities in the Late 1990s," *Critical Social Policy* 18 (1998): 493–517.

23. Ramos, "What Causes Canadian Aboriginal Protest?"; Rima Wilkes, "First Nation Politics: Deprivation, Resources and Participation in Collective Action," *Sociological Inquiry* 74 (2004): 570–89.

24. See also Rima Wilkes and Danielle Ricard, "How Does Newspaper Coverage of Collective Action Vary? Protest by Aboriginal People in Canada," *The Social Science Journal* 44 (2007): 231–51; Rima Wilkes, "A Systematic Approach to Studying Indigenous Politics: Band-Level Mobilization in Canada, 1981–2000," *The Social Science Journal* 41 (2004): 447–57.

25. Although there were some articles published in subsequent years, these generally mentioned events in the course of coverage on another topic. Thus, unlike the articles in our data set, these articles would not have focused on the events per se.

26. See also Jurgen Gerhards and Dieter Rucht, "Mesomobilization: Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany," *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (1992): 555–95.

27. For an example of article-level coding, see Smith et al., "From Protest to Agenda-Building"; for an example of speaker-by-speaker coding, see Myra Marx Ferree, "Resonance and Radicalism: Feminist Abortion Discourses in Germany and the United States," *American Journal of Sociology* (2003): 304–44.

28. For a similar approach, see David A. Snow, Rens Vliegenthart, and Catherine Corrigall-Brown, "Framing the French Riots: A Comparative Study of Frame Variation," *Social Forces* 86 (2007): 385–415.

29. We use the term *protest*, acknowledging that *resistance* is also well suited to most cases in our data.

30. See, e.g., Baylor, "Media Framing of Movement Protest"; Michael Welsh, *Flag Burning: Moral Panic and the Criminalization of Protest* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 2000).

31. Wendy Chan, "Crime, Deportation and the Regulation of Immigrants in Canada," *Crime, Law and Social Change* 44 (2005): 153–80; David Lyon, "National ID Cards: Crime-Control, Citizenship and Social Sorting," *Policing* 1 (2007): 111–18.

32. Canadian Press, "Ipperwash Indian Blockade Removed as 'Peace Gesture,'" *Vancouver Sun*, 9 September 1995, A10.

33. Lindsay Kines, "Standoff Site Has Foxhole, Bunker," *Vancouver Sun*, 25 September 1995, B1.

34. "We Don't Need Another Oka," *Toronto Star*, 30 August 1995, A18.

35. See, e.g., Sheryl Yeager and Mike Crawley, "Indians Offered Gifts for Freedom after Talks Fail: Indians: Controversial Lawyer Turned Back by RCMP," *Vancouver Sun*, 29 August 1995, A1, Final Edition.

36. David Hogben, "Vigilante Action by Non-Natives Predicted," *Vancouver Sun*, 29 August 1995, A3.

37. Ross Howard, "Penticton Indians Resume Fight in Court: Road Dispute Seen as Bellwether for Hundreds of Other B.C. Right-of-Way Claims," *Globe and Mail*, 27 November 1995, A1. All italics in this and subsequent quotations have been added for emphasis.

38. Ross Howard, "Tensions Rise between RCMP, Militants: Armoured Military Vehicles Brought in After Gunfire Exchanged around Gustafsen Lake Campsite," *Vancouver Sun*, 6 September 1995, A4.

39. Peter O'Neil, "Violent End to Standoff Could Play into Hands of Indian Radicals," *Vancouver Sun*, 1 September 1995, A7.

40. Denney Boyd, "Roadblocks Not Just a Sign of Dissent, They're an Act of Low-Grade Terrorism," *Vancouver Sun*, 7 June 1995, B1.

41. We did find strong evidence, however, that the legality of an event was highly correlated with the volume of coverage it received.

42. Stewart Bell, "Indians Losing Business over Blockade: Other Bands Don't Want Adams Lake to Continue," *Vancouver Sun*, 20 July 1995, A3.

43. Stewart Bell, "Tourists Afraid to Visit Apex," *Vancouver Sun*, 9 November 1995, F1.

44. Ibid.

45. "Non-Native Residents Discuss Treaty Solutions," *Vancouver Sun*, 14 August 1995, B3.

46. Stewart Bell, "B.C. Could See More Blockades, Chiefs Warn," *Vancouver Sun*, 2 June 1995, A1.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid.

49. Miro Cernetig, "Western Voices Defusing the Armed Stand-off at Gustafsen Lake," *Globe and Mail*, 25 August 1995, A15.

50. Ibid.

51. Gordon Gibson, "Proven, Blockades Work," *Vancouver Sun*, 9 June 1995, A17.

52. Ibid.

53. Mark Hume and Lindsay Kines, "RCMP's Biggest, Costliest Operation [at Gustafsen Lake] Ends Peacefully," *Vancouver Sun*, 18 September 1995, A1.

54. Stewart Bell, "Native Indians Split on Treaty-Talks Process," *Vancouver Sun*, 25 September 1995, A1.

55. Darcy Henton, "Tourists Take B.C. Standoff in Stride," *Toronto Star*, 7 September 1995, A13.

56. Boris Nikolovsky, "Indian Roadblock Ends with Cottage Country Deal," *Toronto Star*, 25 April 1995, A9.

57. "Policing of Native Sit-in Proves Costly," *Vancouver Sun*, 7 January 1995, A8.

58. Rosie Dimanno, "Public Deaf to Squatters' Drum Beat," *Toronto Star*, 2 January 1995, A7.

59. Mark Hume and Kim Pemberton, "Lawyer Says Police Shot at Indians First," *Globe and Mail*, 1 September 1995, A1.

60. Darcy Henton, "Deal Struck in Tense Indian Standoff," *Toronto Star*, 31 August 1995, A1.

61. Charlotte Ryan, Kevin M. Caragee, and William Meinhofer, "Theory into Practice: Framing, the News Media, and Collective Action," *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 45 (2001): 180.

62. Sylvia Fuller, Jane Pulkingham, and Paul Kershaw, "Constructing 'Active Citizenship': Single Mothers, Welfare, and the Logics of Voluntarism," *Citizenship Studies* 12 (2008): 157–76.

63. These numbers are from the first author's own data collection.

64. "B.C. Cannot Accede to Militant Natives," *Vancouver Sun*, 10 September 1999, A22.

65. Wattie Chris and Jeffrey Hawkins, "Ontario Will Buy Land to End Blockade," *Vancouver Sun*, 17 June 1995, A10.