

Radical Media, Social Movement Framing and the *Georgia Straight*

by

Cody Willett

B.A., University of Northern British Columbia, 2007

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Political Science

© Cody Willett, 2013

University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

Radical Media, Social Movement Framing and the *Georgia Straight*

by

Cody Willett

B.A., University of Northern British Columbia, 2007

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Dennis Pilon, Department of Political Science
Co-Supervisor

Dr. James Lawson, Department of Political Science
Co-Supervisor

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Dennis Pilon, Department of Political Science
Co-Supervisor

Dr. James Lawson, Department of Political Science
Co-Supervisor

The central goal of this thesis is to direct attention to the underappreciated role that radical media has played in communicating social movement messages, which challenge dominant discourses and politicize youth culture, by helping advance master protest frames, reframe collective identities and promote movement-specific collective action frames. To demonstrate the relationship between radical media and movements, this thesis identifies a gap in social movement research regarding how movements communicate reframed meaning to participants. Furthermore, to address this lacuna, it proceeds to assess the movement-oriented content and discursive master, collective identity and collective action frames found in Vancouver's 'underground' newspaper, the *Georgia Straight*, between 1967 and 1969. The research into these frames supports the argument that *Georgia Straight* in this period did act as a form of radical media, reflecting and reinforcing the broader social movement of youth radicalism in existence at the time.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Acknowledgements	vi
Dedication.....	vii
Introduction	1
The ‘problem’ of apathy	4
Constructed identity.....	6
From apathy to participation in recent history	8
I. Studying Social Movements.....	12
The post-1960s rise and dominance of Resource Mobilization Theory	13
The cultural and identity-based challenge of New Social Movement Theory.....	21
(Re)Framing the study of social movements	28
Master frames and protest cultures	34
Collective identity frames and participants’ self-understanding	36
Collective action frames and mobilization.....	38
Conclusion	40
II. Mediated Movements	44
Critical media theory and praxis	47
Media texts, political economy and active audiences.....	47
Discourse and (anti-)hegemony.....	49
Corporate media and movement tactics.....	56
General patterns.....	57
Local articulations	61
Radical mediation.....	63
General precepts	65
Local specificity	71
Conclusion	74
III. Framing Radicalism in the <i>Georgia Straight</i> (1967-1969)	77
Methodology	79
Master frame aligned content.....	83
Collective identity discursive fields	86
Protagonist frames	86
Antagonist frames.....	92
Corporate media frames	95
Discourses on collective action	97
Anti-colonial diagnostic frames	97
Anti-capitalism and anti-poverty diagnostic frames.....	98
Anti-war diagnostic frames	102
Anti-racist diagnostic frames.....	104
Democratization diagnostic frames	105
Feminist diagnostic frames.....	106
Environmentalist diagnostic frames	107

Prognostic frames	109
Motivational frames	113
Conclusion	115
Conclusions	118
Literature Cited	123
Appendix A.....	137
Appendix B.....	168

Acknowledgements

I would first like to acknowledge and offer thanks to the Coast Salish and Huron peoples, on whose traditional territory I have been a guest while carrying out this project.

I would also like to thank my supervisors, Dennis Pilon and Jamie Lawson, whose reassurance and dedication to solid scholarly work ensured that this thesis would cohere into something useful.

Matt James, Michelle Bonner, Caroline Clarke and numerous other kind and talented staff, faculty and fellow students helped me get this far and I owe them a considerable amount of gratitude.

But without my mom, dad and sister, and the rest of my family, I might never have followed through. In no particular order, thank you Ben, Alix, Dandy, Kim, Jess, Dani, Josh, Jes, Tia, Jesse, Tom, Paul and Corey for your friendship, wisdom, understanding, support and love. I promise you'll never lose me to another thesis.

Dedication

To Ame, Cainan

and

all the other freeqs, hippies and wanderers

out there whose lives inspire others to see why we're here.

Introduction

During the decade or so surrounding 1968, many young people actually felt like their demands for ‘impossible’ changes had a ‘realistic’ chance of being met and they mobilized en masse to transcend what is now often considered the West’s ‘golden age.’ Those youth achieved some important, though partial, advances in the realm of culture, but the neoliberal counterrevolution has left today’s youth in the unenviable position of inheriting discredited systems, deteriorating material conditions and unfulfilled ideals. Despite this relatively disadvantaged starting point, contemporary youth political participation and social movement success are still compared (unfavourably) to the legacy of intense activism that defined the baby boom generation’s coming of age. Myriad examples of today’s youth mobilizing in passionate protest refute corporate media’s oft-repeated claim that young people are apathetic, but their actions seem to change little of substance. It is as if their struggles have not been articulated and framed resonantly enough to build the broad-based momentum that would allow them to claim the agenda-setting initiative the way radical youth arguably did in the 1960s. Was there something going on then — something that enabled them to raise their dissenting voices and activate their powerful agency — that is different now? Radical media in the 1960s communicated messages that helped sustain cultures of protest, nurture youths’ identification with social movements and promote participation in widespread collective action. The messages carried by contemporary social media do not seem to be combined or framed radically enough to carry out these functions, though they do spread information that helps movements emerge, organize and mobilize quickly.

The purpose of this thesis, then, is to offer greater awareness of the relationships between the discourses found in radical media and how youths framed their movements in the ‘long

1960s.’ The motivation behind doing so flows from a desire to reclaim political messages that could arouse wider understanding of — and action upon — the political, economic, security, social and environmental crises threatening human society. Awareness of these crises is today manifested in the recent surge in ‘non-conventional’ political action among youth and other social movement participants. Neoliberal ideology persistently dominates mainstream political discourses such that what dissent can be articulated finds its expression on the margins of formal politics, rendered tangible through phenomena like anti-capitalist globalization protests, anti-war demonstrations, the revolutionary ‘Arab Spring,’ the anti-austerity ‘European Summer,’ the Occupy movement’s ‘American Fall,’ the Québec students’ ‘Maple Spring’ and the anti-colonial Idle No More movement. However, corporate media executes a familiar pattern of social control by first sensationalizing these events, then suggesting participants lack coherent claims, concrete demands and/or unity and finally ignoring those participants who remain mobilized in the wake of misrepresentation and repression by authorities. The predictable lack of analysis in this coverage results in a failure to consider that intensifying collective action among politicized elements of today’s youth cultures may be somewhat analogous to the dynamic found among radical baby boom youth in the 1960s.

Before and since that high tide of agitation, youth have often been caricatured as politically apathetic consumers. The contemporary mobilizations mentioned above, however, signal that this inert characterization is faltering upon mounting evidence that the conditions may exist for a dramatic transformation from quiescent to challenge-oriented political culture among youth. Doug McAdam (1994), a prominent social movement theorist, pointed out that this kind of transition is not well understood and stated that this field of research suffers from a ‘lack [of] any real theoretical or empirical understanding of the processes that shape the ongoing

development of distinctive movement cultures' (p. 46). Since many scholars would agree that movements can cohere and last when they undertake the vital task of forging vibrant cultures and solidaristic identities, this gap in social movement research compels a search for answers to questions such as the following: How do social movements attempt to convince people to reject dominant discourses and share in cultures of protest? What kinds of messages inspire people to demonstrate their affinity with collective identities predicated on engaging in collective action? How are those messages spread given the limitations imposed by direct experience and corporate media's filtered framing? This thesis suggests some answers to these questions by showing that *radical media organizations, particularly the 'underground' publications of the 1960s, have articulated and communicated the master frames and social movement discourses that politicized youth culture, nurtured solidaristic collective identities and encouraged participation in collective action.*

The relationships between the frames articulated in Vancouver's *Georgia Straight* newspaper and that city's radical 1960s youth movement are elaborated upon by first exploring several important contextualizing concepts, then relevant bodies of social movement literature and finally the paper's content and discourses from its inception in mid-1967 to the end of 1969. These relationships are important because movements rely on media to spread awareness of their reframed ways of understanding culture, identity and opportunities for action. Corporate media distort movement messages, so if connections between radical media's discourses and movement-framed messages can be established, researchers might infer that further research into these discourses presents an opportunity to better understand both the messages themselves and the means by which they are transmitted to those for whom nascent movement cultures and identities might resonate.

The task of the remainder of this introduction, then, is to suggest that because the ‘problem’ of youth apathy is one that relies upon a constructed identity, and such ‘youth identities’ have transitioned from apathetic to participatory in recent history, research into the relationships between social movements and radical media in the 1960s can offer clues as to how movement cultures, collective identities and opportunities for action can be reframed and communicated so as to inspire more youth to participate in radicalized social movements. It should be underlined that in using the term ‘youth’ either in the past or the present, this thesis does not mean to suggest that all youth of any period were of one mind about anything, political or otherwise. Though many popular representations of 1960s youth suggest that all were long-haired hippies bent on social revolution, the facts suggest that most youth then, as now, were fairly conformist and seeking to find a place within the status quo. But clearly some kind of youth revolt did occur in the 1960s and 1970s, and a sizeable group was prepared to challenge society’s norms. Therefore, in referring to ‘youth’ in the context of these radical movements and countercultures this thesis refers to those participating or open to participating, rather than society’s youth *in toto*.

The ‘problem’ of apathy

Youth have often been labeled as politically apathetic or cynical given that their likelihood of voting is low relative to older generational cohorts and historic levels of youth participation in conventional politics. It is worth noting, however, that substantial effort to include youth in political life was commonplace by the 1970s, when Canadian youth under 30 years old comprised nearly two-thirds of eligible voters. Today, the shrinking demographic weight of youth relative to the wider population allows politicians to pay less attention to youth-related issues (Adsett, 2003). Feeling they have little to vote for when corporate media portrays

politics as poll-driven and scandalous, youth have turned away from conventional politics and politically relevant media consumption, reinforcing their lack of adequate knowledge of formal politics (Hackett, 2004; Milner, 2005). Many youth feel that cynical partisan politics actively sabotages their future (Gitlin, 1995, p. 234) when government routinely demonstrates a lack of competence, fairness and accountability (Mattson, 2003; pp. 1-2, 49). Inheriting a world in crisis, youth are understandably disillusioned about the possibility for change when media-savvy politicians confine political discourses within the dictates of a disorienting neoliberal globalization (Storrie, 2004, p. 53) that simultaneously spreads austerity and debt-fueled material complacency.

Compared to the more participatory 1960s era, today's youth work more hours at earlier ages in increasingly precarious employment to replace rolled-back or eliminated welfare state supports and to earn disposable income for the consumer goods their advertisement-saturated environment compels them to attain (Mattson, 2003, pp. 15-17). Youth who choose post-secondary education are dissuaded from pursuing liberal arts and social science majors (that can encourage critical thinking about the way power works in society) because post-graduation careers seem more likely with business and information technology training (Mattson, 2003, p. 18). Massive tuition rate increases have forced youths to take on part-time work and/or accumulate crippling debt, which reduces the time they have for collective political mobilization (Hackett, 2004, p. 75) and makes it more difficult for youth to consider working in marginally-paid non-profit or political settings after graduation (Mattson, 2003, pp. 19-20). Thus, contending that non-participation is purely a symptom of apathy, instead of a result of barriers, is a spurious argument. Significant increases in issue-by-issue participation among youth in politically-oriented social media activities, protests, volunteerism and social movement

campaigns (Gauthier, 2003), although reactive, unconventional and not consistently engaged with political institutions on principle, refutes the narrative of political disengagement and can be interpreted as an implicit refusal to endorse flawed forms of conventional participation with their limited free time (Bennett, 2008; Farthing, 2010). That many youth reject the pressure to be dutifully individualistic and atomized consumers, and do so by engaging themselves in informal politics, is a phenomenon which compels an exploration of the social construction of youth identity and analogous shifts within earlier generations.

Constructed identity

Identities are mixtures of biological and sociological factors that begin to solidify when youth 'come of age' at roughly 18-28 years old. Searching for answers to questions of identity are paramount in late adolescence since youth must achieve 'reconciliation' between their 'ascribed roles and new or emergent adult roles' in a socio-economic context that allows for 'intense introspection about who they are' (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, pp. 14-15). However, popular discourses within corporate media and among moralizing politicians offer unhelpful cues, suggesting youth are inherently passive, alienated members of society and a social problem (e.g., juvenile offenders, un(der)employed, pregnant teenagers, drug abusers, pharmaceutical cases) in need of containment (Hackett, 2004, p. 74). Youth combat this marginal social status by forging sub/countercultural identities that reflect the social, political and economic spirit of the time (e.g., hippies, punks, ravers, hipsters, etc.), simultaneously threatening adults' normative cultural dominance while inadvertently extending them trend-marketing opportunities (Garratt, 2004, pp. 145-146; Melucci, 1994, p. 125; Palmer, 2009, pp. 185-186). Identity is thus an important, if complex, cultural resource.

According to Hava Rachel Gordon (2010) ‘youth’ is not a ‘linear period of time to traverse.’ Rather, it is an identity that is ‘multiple and fluid’ (p. 105), allowing youth to alternate between identifying as apathetic or engaged, or even both. Youth can also be said to represent a period of indeterminate, discontinuous lifestyle or a cultural category which questions ‘the roots of the logic of rational instrumentality’ (Melucci, 1994, p. 118). Such age-specific cultural patterns are exemplified by the

popular saying which exists in many forms in many countries: ‘He who is not a radical at 20 does not have a heart; he who is still one at 40 does not have a head.’ This statement ... denotes a social expectation that young people should be radicals and that the older generation believes that youthful radicalism is praiseworthy behaviour (Lipset, 1973, pp. 86-87).

Indeed, young people do participate in radical social movements at rates disproportionate to their demographic size and their interactions with such collectivities often modifies their malleable identities (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 28) such that they begin to feel solidarity with the cause’s other participants and are therefore more inclined to mobilize in pursuit of the movement’s goals (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, pp. 20, 24). However, mobilized youth usually draw reactionary ire rather than praise from corporate media in the name of wider society (O’Neill, 2004, p. 236). For youth who consider themselves radical — that is to say inclined to question the legitimacy of the status quo and to challenge the established order through words or actions intended to change said order (Larkin, 1979, p. 230) — such admonishment may further reinforce their challenge-oriented identities. If movements can radicalize structurally and socially constituted youth identities, exploring another era in which the prevailing discourses about youth participation shifted from apathy to engagement can offer insight into how such transitions might be facilitated.

From apathy to participation in recent history

The post-war expansion of the middle class blunted the earlier political radicalism of labour unions (Kelly, 1972, p. 61) and it was some of their children, the 'Beats' of the 1950s, who reawakened the interwar artistic avant-garde's spirit by cultivating culturally radical bohemian identities in defiance of bourgeois norms surrounding dress, syntax, work ethic, consumption, suburban aspiration, sexuality and emotional repression. Cold War anti-communist hysteria encouraged them to hide their sympathies and disguise their outrage by rejecting mainstream society and leading apolitical lives that implicitly critiqued dominant discourses (Unger, 1974, pp. 17-18). The Beat's alienation within society's repressive tolerance, dehumanizing hierarchy, neo-imperial complicity and the Cold War theater of the absurd corresponded with nascent struggles for civil rights and against nuclear weapons that would radicalize unprecedented numbers of youth in the 1960s (Daniels, 2006, p. 99). While a fairly small proportion of total youth in this period, the Beats arguably had enormous influence precisely because the larger culture appeared so conformist.

The 1960 election of U.S. President John F. Kennedy did, however, bring hope for peaceful change to many, particularly more mainstream youth, in both the U.S. and Canada. Meanwhile, books like Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* and Michael Harrington's *The Other America* (both from 1962) challenged assumptions that a sustainable post-scarcity society had really emerged. Harrington recognized that many suburban youth were choosing material poverty over the spiritual hollowness of the 'Affluent Society' (pp. 86-87). Though he drew attention to the fact that increasing numbers of idealistic middle class youth were rejecting some of their privilege, Harrington's main task was to challenge self-satisfied members of America's growing middle class not to forget about the nation's vast underclass of poor and working class

people. In fact, Harrington estimated the ranks of the American poor were between 40 and 50 million people, who were “maimed in body and spirit, existing at levels beneath those necessary for human decency ... sometimes fat with hunger, for that is what cheap foods do” (p. 2).

Kennedy’s stunning assassination in November 1963 led to bitter frustration, then upheaval and turmoil (Daniels, 2006, p. 54) when political parties subsequently failed to provide youth with resonant ideas about what issues were properly ‘political,’ how politics should be done, what constituted appropriate political discourse and which problems could be solved by the political process. This failure created a crisis of confidence in conventional politics that allowed new definitions of politics to spread (Brodie & Jenson, 1988, pp. 11-13) until social movement activism ‘defined the sixties and seventies’ (Clément, 2008, p. 3). Then as now, the state of the world cried out for youth to intervene.

Although most baby boom youth in Canada ‘followed no rebel road’ (Palmer, 2009, 307), enough of them challenged prevailing values and beliefs that they ‘constituted themselves as a historically specific generation’ that shaped and was shaped by the common experiences of their ‘social moment’ in the 1960s (Clément, 2008, p. 13, 201). Their powerful ‘New Left’ and student movements were mostly led by middle-class male journalists, academics and professionals who initially crowded out women and other marginalized groups (Clément, 2008, p. 202), yet their collective struggle for rights did eventually pave the way for broader participation among many of the formerly excluded. These movements withered as they institutionalized hierarchical and bureaucratic interest group tactics in the mid-1970s (Clément, 2008, p. 32); however, for a time they were indeed radical. As surplus labour in a privileged society that was ineffective at providing them with meaningful work (Gerzon, 1969, pp. 15-16; Kelly, 1972, p. 60), many youth considered scarcity a subjective condition that could be

overcome by reframing human relations around cooperation rather than competition (Kelly, 1972, p. 77). These radical youth felt they had penetrated the false consciousness of society, discovered disguised slavery and subtle existential oppression all around them (Unger, 1974, p. 27-29) and responded by constructing counterculture-supported social movements that, in seeking personal freedom and increased democratization of political communities (Lipset, 1985, pp. 194-195), offered them self-actualization, belonging, excitement and a sense of high purpose (Unger, 1974, pp. 38-40). They took up anti-war and ecological activism (i.e., the politics of ‘secular salvation’ [Carroll & Ratner, 1999, p. 6]), civil/women’s/gay/other minority rights campaigns (i.e., proper recognition of oppressed identities) and anti-capitalist battles. In myriad manifestations and varying degrees of emphasis, participation in radical movements swelled around the world and swept into Canada in the 1960s.

Rather than finding a place in the labour market immediately after graduating from secondary school, unprecedented numbers of youth found themselves in the post-secondary education system. In British Columbia, the glut of students led to the construction of Simon Fraser University, which quickly became ‘a centre for student protest’ and activism after its completion in 1965 (Barman, 2007, p. 320). Around this time, Vancouver’s Kitsilano neighbourhood became Canada’s ‘centre for the youth revolution’ when poets and artists flocked to the city’s equivalent of San Francisco’s Haight Street. Fourth Avenue was where youth went to find ‘head shops,’ other establishments with Che Guevara-postered windows and ‘the old houses turned into “communes” packed with flower children and acid-freaks’ (Bowering, 1997, pp. 323, 327). By the end of the 1960s Vancouver’s Mayor, Tom Campbell, was trying in vain to ‘round up’ the hippies who had begun to fill the area around the city’s as-yet-ungentrified Gastown. Those youth would go on to ‘riot’ there and establish a persistent ‘new alternative

community' by occupying and planting trees at the waterfront park that was slated for development at the entrance to Stanley Park (Bowering, 1997, p. 347). Though expensive condominiums owned by those baby boomers now dominate these strategically rezoned sites, significant remnants of the movements that opposed them and a litany of other injustices fight on despite corporate media's successes at constructing and promoting discourses of youth apathy.

To begin the task of investigating how radicalized 1960s youth overcame such quiescence-reproducing framing, the following chapter reviews subsequent research into how and why social movements manifested as they have since that inspiring time. Because this literature argues that movements mobilize most successfully when they effectively reframe the way participants view themselves and the world around them, it is surprising that the relationships between movements and the media that communicate those frames is understudied. Chapter II explores what connections have been made between media and movements in an effort to situate radical media in relation to the emergence and sustainment of movements. The last chapter of this thesis endeavours to establish relationships between the content and discursive frames found in Vancouver's *Georgia Straight* and those promoted by local 1960s youth movements. In so doing, this thesis draws some tentative conclusions regarding radical media's role as voices for movements and their participants. Movements' interaction with media, whether movement-affiliated or corporate, is considered a critically important factor related to movements' success or failure and the insights gained by studying these relationships more closely may well serve as useful cues for further research on and (re)development of movements' strategies and tactics.

I. Studying Social Movements

This thesis has thus far contended that corporate media curbs youth political radicalism and social movement participation by promoting discourses that frame youth identity as politically apathetic. However, the transition from 1950s Beat ‘apathy’ to 1960s baby boom engagement demonstrates that social constructions of identity are not static; youth challenged such corporate misrepresentation by reframing and communicating their cultural sensitivities, collective identities and increasingly-heeded calls to action through their own radical media. This chapter provides a foundation for further exploration of the relationships between social movements and radical media by first reviewing the development of social movement theory since the 1960s. Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT) is the paradigm that brought the study of social movements into interaction with the wave of youth participation that emerged at the beginning of the 1960s. It will be the subject of this chapter’s first section. RMT has contributed much to organizational- and rational choice-based understandings of *how* social movement organizations mobilize and sustain participation; however, it was met with considerable challenge by what is known as New Social Movement Theory (NSMT).

Scholars of NSMT sought to explain *why* movements manifested as they have since the 1960s and this chapter’s second section therefore explicates the ways in which NSMT acted as a corrective to RMT. Briefly, it contends that RMT gave inadequate attention to the effects that movements’ ideational dimensions have on participants’ identities and culture. NSMT attempts to explain why individuals come to identify with collectivities so strongly that they are compelled to engage in collective action aimed at changing the prevailing cultures that constitute individual identity in the first place. Yet it does not on its own offer a fully formed explanation of the processes by which movements construct the meaning that is imputed to their actions.

Therefore, this chapter sets up the next by ending with an examination of both the discursive framing processes that are thought to strategically link individual consciousness to movement-constructed meaning and the important dimensions of movements' framing acts. There are certainly significant variations within the above-mentioned approaches to studying social movements, as well as other approaches not covered in detail, but this review of social movement literature is not intended to be exhaustive. Rather, this chapter has the more modest goal of identifying relevant debates about movements, some important tools for their further study and gaps in the research on the relationships between movements and media which those tools might address.

The post-1960s rise and dominance of Resource Mobilization Theory

Situated between the individual and the international, movements engage in active or reactive conflict at the social level and consist of multiple episodes of collective action, from holding meetings to voicing grievances to staging marches/demonstrations/sit-ins/occupations to making demands, that challenge the status quo (Oberschall, 1973, p. 31). Before the wave of youth-driven social movements washed over the 1960s, the dominant paradigm explaining this phenomenon, known as 'collective behaviour' theory (Smesler, 1963), hypothesized that movements erupted when social control mechanisms failed to reproduce 'social cohesion' within a 'mass society' facing crisis levels of 'structural strain' from 'over-rapid social transformation' (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 7). This structuralist theory emphasized that the buildup of 'shared grievances' about 'relative deprivation' led to the development of loose ideologies explaining the source of the strain and solutions for redress (McCarthy & Zald, 1987, pp. 16-17). These ideologies and the mass protest they facilitated were seen as symptoms of a sick society that produced collective behaviour among malintegrated, insecure and alienated participants

(Gamson, 1975, pp. 132-134) whose supposed 'deviant' psychological state expressed normlessness, derangement, fragmented social identity and a rejection of self-regulation (Clément, 2008, p. 56). Unsurprisingly, many scholars who had direct knowledge of youth social movement activity in the 1960s objected to this view.

It is perhaps unsurprising that established scholars working within the collective behaviour paradigm would see the radical youth associated with 1960s counterculture as deviants who were acting outside rules merely to gain personal satisfaction. Their symbolic conflicts (e.g., over personal appearance and cannabis use), which were often seen as evidence of moral decadence, unproductive laziness and stability-threatening disorder, rejected adults' cherished right to create and enforce morals and thus seemed more intractable because — unlike changing the apportionment of the resource pie — they were zero sum (Oberschall, 1973, pp. 62-63). At any rate, scholars who were uncomfortable with collective behaviour explanations would come to suggest that youth were unsatisfied with prevailing normativity and in such a situation felt 'forced to challenge the social order through various forms of non-conformity' (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 13). This non-conformity is different than simple deviance because it aims to challenge and replace norms with new moral values (Oberschall, 1973, p. 21). Recognizing that in this way youth were consciously acting politically recast the study of movements from a focus on how social pathologies of deviance flow from the breakdown of social structures to a focus on how protest is mobilized.

Closer study of 1960s youth movements challenged the collective behaviour paradigm. Protest politics, grassroots participation and symbolic challenges came to be recognized as normal, healthy social behaviours that are a permanent part of Western democracies (Clément, 2008, p. 56; Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 1). This change in perception was encouraged by the

mid-1960s emergence of game-theoretic ‘rational choice’ concepts that facilitated the shift away from questions about the structural causes of participants’ orientation toward political protest. The study of social movements came to instead focus on applying mechanistic, instrumental and natural science logics (Mueller 1992, 3-4) to answer the following question: How do movements mobilize individuals to face the risks and costs of protest activity (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, pp. 5-6)? This question presupposes that individuals, who are assumed to have utilitarian preferences, will not participate when they can let others risk repression for engaging in social movement activities and still enjoy the benefits of success regardless of whether they themselves participate. Since there are always enough grievances for movements to create, define and manipulate, the RMT answer to this ‘free rider problem’ is that mobilizational success can be explained by how effectively social movement organizations (SMOs) can marshal and distribute resources that encourage participation (McCarthy & Zald, 1987, p. 18). RMT’s rise to dominance of the study of social movements through the 1970s and into the 1980s was in part borne of methodological convenience; the proliferation of social movements offered scholars many observable, quantifiable, measurable and analyzable outcomes of mobilization, such as ‘counts of events, rates of protest, the formation and membership of unions, political parties, *movement newspapers* and the scale of protests’ (Walder, 2009, p. 399, emphasis added). These dimensions of movement activities are indeed worth examining but, before proceeding with a deeper explanation of RMT, it should be noted that movement newspapers have not yet been adequately studied within this or any other theoretical paradigm attempting to explain social movement activity.

Writing in 1973, Anthony Oberschall posited that social movements compete with forces of social control for the resources that will draw other parties into alliances (p. 28). By rapidly

coming to control resources that it until recently lacked, movements form groups, associations, organizations and then crowds (p. 102) capable of attaining collective goods if they can address the free rider problem with sanctions and incentives for (non)participation (p. 114). William Gamson (1975) applied these ideas to an examination of the relationship between social movements and pluralist democracy. Gamson found that while members with vested interests in the pluralist order have substantial resources to draw upon when bargaining with other members for decision-making power, social movements cannot compete in this contest because they often lack access to resources and are thus compelled to utilize disruptive tactics that are against the rules of the pluralist game. This is why social movements are often met with repressive coercion that would not be used against rule-abiding members of pluralist society (pp. 141-143). Thus, radical youth lacking resources to engage in formal politics form social movements that engage in informal politics to expose the limits of membership in pluralist society, employing a variety of strategies to force their involvement in decision-making processes.

Oberschall (1973) also held that the way authorities react to social movement activity is a key variable determining whether conflict is regulated or intensified (pp. 74-75). A positive public reaction to authorities' response may redouble coercion, but a negative reaction could make authorities ease repression, emboldening the movement, and generate sympathy that could be leveraged into more resources for the movement (p. 115). Social movements also grow when insufficiently flexible institutions are unable to respond to spreading dissatisfaction (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 13) among intellectuals and other shapers of values/ideals to the point where intellectuals and other opinion-shapers openly question the legitimacy that shields those institutions from attack (Oberschall, 1973, p. 251). This loss of ideational resources invites journalists, artists, writers and students — who can act radically and better resist repression

because they often enjoy community supports that marginalized people lack — to offer their own energies to the movement, in turn drawing in other typically active and well-integrated participants until isolated members of an atomized public join the increasingly substantial movement (Oberschall, 1973, pp. 135, 164). The contributions of these early participants can be facilitated by radical media's mandate of giving voice to the contrarian views that corporate media is loath to include in public debate.

Indeed, the early phases of social movements are characterized by surges in communication among groups (Oberschall, 1973, p. 174) that have weak vertical ties to elites in a socially segmented society. This forges horizontal ties among collectivities, associations and organizations, allowing rapid mobilization of blocs rather than individuals (Oberschall, 1973, pp. 119, 125). Demobilization is said to occur when groups begin to fall away, leaders are co-opted, negotiations with authorities lead to at least some kind of attention to grievances and/or the movement's resources become scarce enough that individual participants conclude that the costs of sanctions outweigh the benefits of potential rewards; going home is in their rational self-interest (Oberschall, 1973, p. 29). Although Oberschall suggested that the development of subculture and central organizational structure can counteract demobilizational dynamics (p. 144), his logic nonetheless rested upon the insistence that calculations of risk and reward, necessitating the mobilization of external support and resources to overcome fear of costs, are central to understanding mobilization. Figuring out who makes these calculations and how movements operationalize them became the next task for RMT scholars.

John McCarthy and Mayer Zald are the two scholars most associated with the idea that social movement participants are conscious actors making rational decisions. Although they defined social movements as “a set of *opinions* and *beliefs* in populations representing

preferences for changing some elements of the social structure or reward distribution, or both, of a society” (McCarthy & Zald, 1987, p. 20, emphasis added), they nonetheless focused their attention on how collectivities operate, acquire resources and mobilize support (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 15). Their approach rested upon the assumption that an integral part of social movement mobilization is the development of social movement organizations (SMOs), which McCarthy & Zald (1987) defined as a ‘complex, or formal, organization that identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement those goals’ (p. 20) while remaining embedded in the movement (Gamson, 1987, p. 1). In this articulation of RMT, SMOs act as ‘carriers of social movements’ and institutional fora for mobilizing material (i.e., labour, money, concrete benefits, services, etc.) and non-material (i.e., authority, moral engagement, faith, friendship, etc.) resources (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 15). SMOs are able to leverage these resources to ‘organize discontent, reduce the costs of action, utilize and create solidarity networks, share incentives among members and achieve external consensus’ (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, 15) among social movements. According to McCarthy & Zald (1987), “all SMOs that have as their goal the attainment of the broadest preferences of a social movement constitute a *social movement industry* (SMI) — the organizational analogue of a social movement” (p. 21). This economic analogy draws attention to processes of SMO growth, stability, decline, ‘product differentiation,’ mergers and the regulation effects of social control (Gamson, 1987, p. 3). In this way, McCarthy & Zald’s centrality within RMT began to drive the theory toward economic reductionism.

By focusing on how SMOs and SMIs manage movements’ inputs and outputs, competition for scarce resources, costs and the ‘elasticity’ of issues, McCarthy & Zald ended up missing a category of other factors relevant to mobilizing (e.g., ideological/symbolic

competition, norms, values, principles, political discourse, loyalty, commitment, solidarity, consciousness, meaning of engagement in participants' eyes, etc.) that are best explained by engaging with political culture (Gamson, 1987, pp. 6-7; Perrow, 1979, pp. 199-201). Bruce Fireman and William Gamson (1979) pointed out that McCarthy & Zald's reliance on economic rationale based on utilitarian logic fails even to address adequately the free rider problem that exists when constituents want to enjoy collective goods but do not participate in collective action. 'Selective incentives,' meted out on basis of participation, are supposed to be solutions to this problem of motivation and are thought to be material in nature. But since social movements often have little to offer until they achieve their goals, the question arises: What explains participation when there are no resources to distribute? (pp. 15-19). Fireman & Gamson suggested that relationships, common identity and shared experiences underpin solidarity (pp. 21-22), connecting personal with group interest in mobilizing to acquire or protect collective goods in situations of opportunity or urgency, respectively. To do this, local reality must be connected to the 'system' through appeals to principles (e.g., justice, equity, rights, etc.), political education, ideological development, consciousness-raising and publications (pp. 26-30). Yet as McCarthy & Zald's popularity was at its apogee, cracks were emerging in the RMT camp.

Fireman & Gamson (1979) highlighted the importance of ideational resources and called for further research focus on 'how organizers raise consciousness of common interests, develop opportunities for collective action and tap constituents' solidarity and principles' (p. 36).

Gamson (1987) also charged that McCarthy & Zald often used the 'thin infrastructure' of mass mailing lists when analyzing the organizational infrastructure of professional SMOs, calling them weak forms of communication for transmitting information resources. Instead, Gamson suggested that because SMOs often adapt existing or create their own infrastructures, further

analysis of affinity groups (i.e., decentralized networks of small cells that are loosely linked) would offer better insight into the role that ‘underground’ infrastructure plays in mobilizing resources. Finally, he noted how McCarthy & Zald did not explore the relationship between SMOs and media, and stated that this is unfinished business in the analysis of SMO interaction with other organizations (pp. 4-5). Even when they got close, adherents to RMT failed to rigorously explore the role that ‘underground’ radical media played in raising consciousness and creating the affinity groups that transmitted massive volumes of information resources.

Astoundingly, Jo Freeman (1979) did, in fact, acknowledge that the women’s movement adopted radical media infrastructure to promote its cause, but her insight was not subsequently developed. She compared the relative successes of different SMO structures in gaining and mobilizing adherents by contrasting the older, more institutionalized National Organization for Women (NOW, c. 1966) with the younger, more loosely organized radical feminist groups. NOW’s national association leveraged their superior financial and organizational resources to mobilize professional women in formal, institutionally-oriented campaigns. Participants did not expect much when they used their public relations skills to engage with corporate media, and indeed it was the younger branch of the movement that was more successful in attracting and mobilizing adherents (p. 172). The younger branch was skeptical of corporate media and felt they did not need that kind of publicity, since radical media covered their activities fairly and with interest (pp. 178-179). These radical feminists had over 100 publications within their movement by 1971 and when they did interact with corporate media, they challenged its very structure by refusing to give interviews to anyone but female reporters (Burns, 1990, pp. 132-133). Freeman thus identified a quandary within the resource mobilization paradigm.

If an SMO that has more resources can be less effective than one with fewer, and if it is acknowledged that these SMOs utilize different media formats to mobilize participants, it is puzzling that the opportunity to engage in further research on radical media was missed. Part of the reason for this myopia may be that RMT privileges economics-oriented assumptions regarding individual rationality. By taking individual actors' utilitarian preferences and their experience of 'objective' reality as both given, scholars of this persuasion do not give enough recognition to the fact that actors' grievances and expectations are partly determined by their social location and constructed through their interaction with collectivities (Mueller, 1992, p. 7). Furthermore, the SMOs make for relatively easy study, given the traces they leave behind (e.g., constitutions, minutes, membership lists, records of their activities held by those with whom they have interacted) and the recollections of activists who often claim to speak on behalf of people they have not met, than does the study of important transformations of cultural codes in the 1960s (Clément, 2008, p. 56). This is not to say that RMT did not carry out a successful research agenda; it contributed significantly to explanations of how social movements developed structures with which to carry social movements forward. What remained to be established was an understanding of why these social movements become vehicles of human agency that are tangible enough to necessitate such structure.

The cultural and identity-based challenge of New Social Movement Theory

By the 1980s RMT had yet to satisfactorily answer questions regarding the role that culture plays in social conflict, such as: How do social problems come to be designated as worthy of collective action? How do movements develop solidarity so that the aggrieved identify as a 'collective we'? How can distinct protest events be perceived as part of the same conflict? What generates social movement culture and how do identities, symbols and emotions

relate to the start and persistence of collective action? (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, pp. 5-6).

Attempts to answer these questions led to the development of a rival paradigm to RMT, called New Social Movement Theory (NSMT). Semiotic study (i.e., the study of signs, sign processes, indication, designation, likeness, analogy, metaphor, symbolism, signification and communication) began to shed light on the cultural content of movements, the social construction and psychology of who social movement actors are and how their social context affects their development and transformation of meaning (Mueller, 1992, p. 4). The increased emphasis on ‘culture as a terrain of politics’ after 1968 has focused attention on the cultural impact of movements, the socially construction of challenge-oriented collective identity and the ‘cognitive praxis’ of ‘developing knowledge that would empower the disempowered, challenge arbitrary authority and promote democratic practice’ (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 43). Though NSMT represents an analytical shift toward ideational forces that are less tangible than RMT’s focus on SMOs, it nonetheless reintroduces some much-needed sensitivity toward the structural factors that influence political subjectivity.

The decline of Europe’s traditional political parties by the end of the 1980s, along with the rise of European and North American civil/women’s/gay/animal rights, anti-nuclear, peace, student, nationalist, alternative medicine, fundamentalist religious, New Age and ecology movements (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 3), led European scholars to realize that youth were predominantly drawn by personal relationships into radical movements involving the emergence/upward valuation of identities, prioritization of cultural/symbolic issues over economic grievances, emphasis on sentiments of belonging to differentiated social groups and social construction of ideas about intimate areas of everyday life (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, pp. 7-8; Habermas, 1981, p. 33; O’Neill, 2004, p. 237). Jürgen Habermas (1981)

suggested that “new conflicts arise in areas of cultural reproduction, social integration and socialization ... [and] are manifested in sub-institutional, extraparliamentary forms of protest” (p. 33). Many of these movements eschewed and disdained both the centralized Leninist party/movement structure and the conventional pluralist approach to electoral democracy, favouring more segmented, diffuse, decentralized and autonomous models that offered opportunities for participation in the movement’s decision-making processes (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 8). NSMT scholars, rather than fixing their analysis on how organizations facilitate resource mobilization and apportion selective incentives, instead recognized that movements must also be explained in terms of why their means assume as important a role as their ends.

An important reason why youth were attracted to participating in radical social movements was because post-industrial/modern society’s material affluence and information proliferation were not accompanied by sufficiently structured normative means to choose among myriad cultural options, producing in them a need for an ‘integrated and continuous social self’ (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 11; Mackey, 1978, p. 359). Alberto Melucci (1989) put this simply by stating that, for youth, the “freedom to have which characterized ... industrial society has been replaced by the freedom to be” (pp. 177-178). However, this freedom had to be fought for because, as Habermas (1981) pointed out:

new conflicts thus arise at the seam between system and life-world ... [where] exchange between private and public sphere, on the one hand, and economic and administrative system, on the other, takes place via the media of money and power ... [E]xchange becomes institutionalized in the roles of the employed and the consumer, the client and the citizen. Precisely these roles are the target of protest. Alternative praxis is opposed to the profit-oriented instrumentalization of professional labor, the market-dependent mobilization of labor, the extension of competitiveness and performance pressure into elementary school. It is also directed against the process whereby services, relations and time become monetary values, against the consumerist redefinition of private life spheres and personal life styles (p. 36).

In the above quote, Habermas suggested that new social movements often consciously sought to transcend the imperative of materialistic acquisitiveness altogether. For many radical youth, efforts to *be* more came to occupy a higher priority than struggling to *have* more within system that defined spurious ‘needs’ and produced artificial scarcity.

These movements offered environmental and peace-based critiques of the ‘growth’ imperative that tended to ‘colonize the life-world’ through ‘formal, organized spheres of action’ and ‘unilaterally rationalized praxis’ (Habermas, 1981, pp. 34-36). Youth movements tried to dissolve social roles by offering a democratic, expressive ‘politics of the first person’ in search of secular salvation through retreat from and resistance to the profit-worshipping cultural bankruptcy of dominant capitalist society. From the standpoint of the ‘ascribed characteristics’ of their radical identities, youths endeavoured to ‘contribute to the establishment and delimitation of communities, the *creation of sub-culturally protected communications groups* which further the search for personal and collective identity’ (Habermas, 1981, pp. 36-37, emphasis added). As will be demonstrated in Chapter III, radical media acted as a means of communication for these groups and helped movements construct an adversarial ‘we’ that was informally political because it challenged the ‘logic of complex systems on cultural grounds’ (Melucci, 1989, p. 23). Success at this task of forging and consolidating the cultures that would undergird social movement radicalism therefore depended upon the articulation of new approaches to politics.

New social movements were seen as novel in that they prioritized democratizing civil society ahead of tackling the corrupted political sphere (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 7). In so doing, movements offered a ‘metapolitical critique’ of representative democracy and the social order, challenging assumptions and conventions surrounding ‘doing politics.’ This approach’s critical view of modernity and progress aimed toward a more radical democracy that

would encompass more decentralized and participatory organizational structures, the defense of interpersonal solidarity against bureaucratic intrusion and the reclamation of autonomy instead of the pursuit of material advantage (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 9). These insights challenge RMT's focus on analyzing social movement structures that seek to maximize participants' access to tangible 'selective incentives.' Instead, NSMT is biased toward developing understandings about how ideational factors influence (potential) participants' sense of agency and belonging within movements that are often dedicated to more intangible ends or to means that are ends in themselves.

According to Alain Touraine (1981), the ends that movement participants seek are to ultimately wrest from dominant ruling classes greater influence over the development of the social and cultural bases upon which history is founded. New social movements thus attempt to become 'the fabric of society' in a bid to change its cultural orientation (pp. 25-26). Rather than seeing culture as the normative community-environment relations that conform to the ideology of the dominant, Touraine suggested that culture be regarded as a reflection of social actors' struggles to reject oppression by creating their own social objectives and normativity through symbolic representation and the legitimization of cultures that disrupt imposed community structures (pp. 58-59). Melucci (1989) added a caveat:

Only if individual actors can recognize their coherence and continuity as [collective] actors will they be able to write their own script of social reality and compare expectations and outcomes ... Linking personal change with external action, collective action functions as a new media which illuminates the silent and arbitrary elements of the dominant codes as well as publicizes new alternatives (pp. 32, 63).

In positing the above, Melucci connected his and Touraine's insights to explicate a process whereby culture, individual identity, collective identity and collective action co-constitutively inform each other and are interimbricated within social movement dynamics, which is why culture and identity figure so prominently within NSMT's approach to analyzing why

movements have manifested as they have since the 1960s. This acknowledgement of culture's importance to social movements, however, still needs to be grounded in a more detailed explanation of how identity is connected to action.

Youth who participate in social movements act against 'clearly identified opponents' and 'share a collective identity' (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 20) that reflects an individual's structurally and culturally constituted 'cognitive, moral and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice or institution.' This 'perception of a shared status or relation' can be imagined or experienced directly and represents a significant accomplishment in and of itself if this identity becomes politically recognized (Polletta & Jasper, 2001, p. 285). When participants partly define themselves in terms of the movement's focus, their actions become a complex blend of 'collective and individual confirmations of identity' (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, pp. 7-8). The search for collective identity is fundamental to social movement formation because it allows participants to feel powerful in challenging the dominant culture and defending their right to self-identify as culturally different (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 10). In a sense, 'becoming' an activist is a logical next step for someone whose identity has been politicized.

Interestingly, at least one prominent RMT scholar saw these insights about identity as too important to ignore. Gamson (1992b) agreed that collective action could be explained through social psychology when 'individuals' sense of who they are becomes engaged with a definition shared by co-participants in some effort at social change — that is, with who "we" are' (p. 55). Gamson also asserted that social movement participants find fulfillment and self-realization as their personal identity enlarges through group interaction. The maintenance of the interplay between individual and collective identity can underpin participants' loyalty and commitment to

the movement (pp. 56-57), and individuals gain a cherished status that intensifies their motivation to confirm this part of their identity through further participation (Friedman & McAdam, 1992, p. 169). As an individual strengthens their identification with the collectivity in these ways, emergent movement norms are increasingly likely to shape and constrain their behaviour (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 17) to the point where the movement's culture is reflected in the individual's consciousness. Thus, participants begin to feel threatened when the movement is threatened (Gamson, 1992b, p. 57) and the meaning individuals assign to such social situations more easily 'becomes a shared definition implying collective action' (Gamson, 1992b, p. 55). These insights pave the way for a détente between RMT and NSMT by finding grounds upon which to articulate an identity-based solution to the free rider problem.

When individuals become loyally committed to collective actors they can be said to have developed solidarity (Gamson, 1992b, p. 55). Along with collective identity, solidarity blurs the distinction between personal and group interest, thereby undermining individualist assumptions about actors' utilitarian motivations (Gamson, 1992b, p. 57). Melucci (1989) even allowed that the 'process of constructing, maintaining and altering a collective identity provides the basis for actors to shape their expectations and calculate the costs and benefits of their action' (p. 34). Indeed, the opportunity to share a collective identity can become a selective incentive available to those willing to participate and helps overcome free rider problem (Friedman & McAdam, 1992, p. 169-170). This elegant proposition, that movements with few material resources can address the free rider problem by offering participants the selective incentive of sharing a valued collective identity, represents a rapprochement within the study of social movements.

Marc Howard Ross (2009) synthesized these ideas, suggesting that politics cannot be separated from cultural contexts which connect individual and collective identities, demarcate

boundaries and help determine the relations between groups. Culture also offers interpretive frameworks for understanding the actions and motives of others as well as provides resources for political organization and mobilization. Exploring the culturally-constituted worldview of social movement actors can allow analysts to develop ‘plausible interpretations’ of how youth perceived opportunities for politically-oriented individual and collective action (p. 159). RMT is thus enriched by the acknowledgment that social movements are constantly engaged in the process of making and carrying the meaning that participants attach to their involvement. Analyzing the cultural dimensions of collective action puts emphasis on how social movements frame youths’ understanding of what constitutes a political opportunity and which ‘repertoires of action’ (i.e., which strategies and tactics) are appropriate in different settings. The ability to explain how changing preferences, changing identities and changing responses to resources are manifested in different patterns of collective action flows from the awareness that narrative structuring and symbolic politics are integral elements of social movement functioning (pp. 159-160). From the vantage point of 2009, Ross’s harmonious depiction of the field of social movement research elides the fact that it would take the development of another strain of theoretical tools between the mid-1980s and 1990s to bring RMT and NSMT closer.

(Re)Framing the study of social movements

Following RMT’s insights into *how* social movement organizations carry movements forward, NSMT’s culturally-based explanations for *why* participants take risky actions for little to no tangible reward highlighted the fact that subjective experiences and ‘things’ like meanings, intentions, ideas, values and emotions socially embed loyalties, obligations and identities in such a way that actors are compelled to participate (Mueller, 1992, pp. 5-6). Sidney Tarrow (1992), however, worried that social movement scholarship too often finds itself on the outside looking

in, given the yawning gap between academic knowledge of movement organization and tactics and relatively impoverished understandings of ‘how meaning is constructed in social movements’ (p. 178). In short, NSMT may have highlighted RMT’s lack of sensitivity to the importance of culture and identity within social movements, but it did not offer its own explanation for how movements develop and communicate ideologically-informed messages that would advance their projects. Interestingly, NSMT’s role in reintroducing culture to the study of social movements is not credited with the emergence of what would become known as the ‘frame analysis’ approach to understanding how movements create meaning. It is even ironic how the study of framing processes finds its roots in an early and lonely attempt to analyze relationships between movements and media.

In his acclaimed 1980 book, *The Whole World is Watching*, Todd Gitlin sought to explain why 1960s movements adopted various tactics in response to corporate media’s ‘floodlit’ coverage of the incipient culture of protest. Utilizing Erving Goffman’s (1974) concept of ‘cognitive framing,’ Gitlin ‘quietly’ brought framing into social movement literature (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 3). To ‘matter,’ Gitlin contended, movements adjust their tactics and self-image to become newsworthy, but ‘the forms of coverage accrete into systematic framing, and this framing, much amplified, helps determine the movement’s fate’ (Gitlin, 2003, p. 3). These media frames ossify into ‘persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation and presentation, of selection, emphasis and exclusion, by which symbol handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual’ (Gitlin, 2003, p. 7). Unfortunately, this work on media framing of movements did not lead to further systematic inquiry.

A couple of years later, Gamson and his colleagues (1982) published *Encounters With Unjust Authority*, which ‘switched the emphasis from media to the political actor’ who could

reject or ‘break’ official frames and engage in ‘reframing acts’ to articulate injustices and encourage collective action. From within RMT, Gamson moved to reengage with social-psychological explanations that had become unpopular in the 1970s due to the collective behaviour approach’s assumption that movement participants were irrational. Gamson recognized that RMT threw the baby out with the proverbial bathwater by overemphasizing an ‘impoverished, rational-choice theory of subjectivity,’ largely ignoring psychological blind spots and failing to recognize the importance of struggles over the development of movement cultures, the negotiation of collective identities and the interpretation of political events and experiences (Carroll & Ratner, 1996b, pp. 601-602; Noakes & Johnson, 2005, pp. 3-4). His ‘elaboration’ of RMT (Carroll & Ratner, 1996a, p. 410) stressed the value of coming to understand potential participants’ perspectives and their interpretations of movement-oriented collective action frames, which he claimed are alternately made of identity (we/them), agency (‘we’ can be agents of own history) and injustice (blames ‘them’ and ‘we’ respond) components (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 6). However, Gamson’s redirection of attention toward the interpretive and expressive value of movement frames opened up an opportunity for RMT and political process theorists (e.g., Sidney Tarrow, who helped developed the study of political opportunities) alike to take the initiative away from NSMT by emphasizing the strategic nature of movement framing activities.

Starting in the mid-1980s, David Snow, along with colleagues like Robert Benford, extended Gamson’s work by insisting that successful SMOs combat state and corporate media frames through the strategic construction of their own support-building collective action frames (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 6; Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 78). Snow and Benford were credited for attempting to remedy RMT’s neglect of ideology (Johnson & Oliver, 2005, p. 213) by positioning framing processes as a way of producing and operationalizing the ideology-

derived ‘discursive resources’ that reinforced movements’ strategic rationality. Snow and Benford’s emphasis on strategy allowed RMT to take up an ‘elective affinity’ toward framing processes as a way of addressing the cultural turn in academe and to ‘recast the frame concept from its original interactionist function that *vertically* connected structure with the social-psychological level to one that *horizontally* connected political opportunity and collective action’ (Westby, 2005, pp. 217-218). Snow and colleagues also showed their connection to RMT by advancing the idea that ‘social movement entrepreneurs’ (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 5), who are not venture capitalists but are instead people who demonstrate ‘strategic initiative in spreading the word about their cause and promoting its message ... to current and potential constituents’ (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, pp. 7-8), construct frames that are aligned with ‘various aspects of their target audiences’ cultural stock ... [and] their awareness of regional variation in norms and values’ (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 9). Their success at this task meant that by the mid-1990s, framing processes would become ‘central’ to the study of social movements (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 611; Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 3; Westby, 2005, p. 218). Indeed, many prominent theorists from the major traditions studying social movements helped fully articulate the conceptual framework of frame analysis.

Alberto Melucci’s (1994) contributions to NSMT further underscored the importance of framing processes, as he pointed out that because societies increasingly run on information (p. 102), movements must come to control the production and organization of knowledge, discourse and ideology to politically reorganize individuals’ cognitive frames (p. 65). Reorganizing political consciousness with insurgent information is necessary because by challenging the ‘apparatuses that govern the production of information,’ individuals are induced to question social values and to identify the choices, conflicts and limitations imposed by an instrumental

rationality that ‘hides its power behind claims of neutrality’ (pp. 102-103, cf. Morris, 1992, p. 363). If, as Melucci held, ‘movements are media that speak through action,’ the ‘communicative antagonism’ of their messages functions to subvert the ‘neutrality’ of dominant social codes by exposing the injustice of ‘what a system does not say of itself’ (pp. 125-126). Adopting movement frames is thus a means by which people can challenge the monopoly of dominant discourses and ‘make room for wisdom beyond knowledge’ that is often instrumental (p. 123). However, it is not easy or necessarily desirable to construct frames that are far removed from the culture in which they emerged, given the nebulous and interconnected character of culture, consciousness and identity. This fact requires movements to give special attention to orienting their messages to wider society.

Sidney Tarrow (1992) has contended that interpretations — not necessarily reality itself — guide political action and movements that effectively influence those interpretations must formulate and communicate framed messages that appropriate some of society’s existing ideational materials (p. 174). Doing so make these frames more likely to resonate ‘not only with the culture of the oppressed but with the culture of the oppressor as well’ (McAdam, 1994, p. 38; cf. Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 87). According to Tarrow (1992), media texts contain evidence of society’s cultural codes and can therefore be examined as repositories of the informational resources that serve as foundations for the construction of movement frames (p. 177). To persuade people to adopt oppositional cultures and identities while maintaining an adequate connection to their ‘lifeworld,’ movement participants must construct compelling frames that incorporate some and reject other symbols from contemporary political culture (pp. 186, 191) while also drawing from the oppositional political cultures and identities which sustained the struggles of movements that came before (p. 192; cf. Andersen, 2004, p. 222). A movement that

is successful at framing its activities in this way ‘either transforms quiescent symbols into activist ones or delicately blends oppositional and consensual elements to produce a new synthesis’ (p. 196). Fortunately for the study of social movements, Tarrow’s other insights regarding political opportunity structures were not lost on frame analysis’ sympathizers.

The relative openness of formal politics, degree of political stability, availability of strategic allies and paralysis/ineffectual repression afforded by conflicts among weakened elites represent structural political opportunities (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 16; O’Neill, 2004, p. 237). However, social movements, along with media and authorities, actively contest the ideational construction of ‘reality’ by strategically framing it, so the notion that only ‘objective’ political opportunities determine when movement activity emerges is too structural; people have to ‘free their minds’ before they will take action. By reframing the meaning and significance of events and opportunities, movements encourage potential participants to reinterpret their situation (McAdam, 1994, p. 39) such that they ‘blame the system’ instead of themselves for their problems, recognize the opportunity to effect political solutions and believe they have the capacity to make a difference (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 18). In short, structural opportunities for action are only as useful as participants believe them to be (Hunt, Bedford & Snow, 1994, pp. 203-204). That said, framing and political opportunities do interact recursively by constraining and facilitating — without fully determining — each other; frames emphasizing opportunity may become self-fulfilling prophecies even as some structural constraints cannot be socially constructed away (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 631). Significant ruptures in non-structural factors, like dominant ideology or frames, are said to represent fleeting ‘discursive’ opportunities in which movement framing can be potent ‘in articulating, defining and congealing the opportunity’ (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, pp. 20-22). Indeed, it could be said that the

development of frame analysis presented an opportunity for various theoretical discourses regarding social movements to engage with one another.

Since corporate media effectively circumscribes the range of available information, social movements must challenge and subvert the resultant quiescent political consciousness with reframing acts that show people alternatives to dominant conceptions of reality. Movements selectively appropriate and reconfigure ideational resources like cultural symbols and codes to frame messages that appeal to people's wisdom and sensitivity to injustice. In so doing, movements attempt to induce them to adopt an oppositional political consciousness, see themselves as part of struggles aimed at limiting the reach of or altogether replacing the dominant system and recognize opportunities to reach those aims. Although the contemporary social movement theories introduced so far have found a measure of constructive synthesis within frame analysis, there are important dimensions of this approach that remain unexplained. For this reason, and because frame analysis is an ideal tool with which to probe the relationships between movements and media, this section ends by exploring what the framing literature has to say about the links between 'master frames' and protest cultures, 'collective identity frames' and participants' self-understanding and 'collective action frames' and mobilization.

Master frames and protest cultures

According to Snow and Benford (1992), movements create and convey meaning at the macro level by aligning their efforts with master frames that connect individual and collective political consciousness to wider political culture (p. 134). If collective action frames (which are discussed in more detail below) can be thought of as theories that are used by and derivative of specific movements, master frames are like paradigms that are general enough to be useful to multiple movements. Like paradigms or metaphors, master frames are overthrown not by

negative evidence but by rival explanations that are ‘better at getting their interpretations to stick’ (Gamson, 1992b, p. 70). Put another way, master frames are algorithmic — in that they are like a general formula — vis-à-vis movement- or SMO-specific frames, and only a handful should be considered as such. Benford & Snow (2000) suggest that ‘environmental justice’ can be considered a master frame, as can the more general ‘injustice’ frame, to which work by Gamson and Carroll & Ratner has given considerable attention (pp. 618-619). The rights-based master frame (e.g., civil, human, etc.) represents another discourse that is common among movements (Clément, 2008, p. 29). Indeed, these versatile master frames can be said to inform the emergent political cultures which represent the realigned political consciousness of their many adherents.

These master frames are successful not only because they articulate intolerable parts of reality that corporate media mostly ignores or underplays, but also because their flexibility allows them to extend their relevance to the issues taken up by many different movements. Since master frames function as linguistic codes that provide the grammar and syntax for movement-specific frames, they might undergird movements which assess blame for problems internally and seek change on a personal level, those which attribute blame externally and incite demands for structural changes, or movements which seek both (Snow & Benford, 1992, pp. 138-139). Some master frames are articulated in language that restricts their applicability to a small number of movements, even as the frame touches participants deeply. Other movements, however, offer frames that are inclusive and flexible enough that they can be elaborated in such a way that numerous aggrieved groups might adopt the frame’s discourses on its way to becoming a master frame (Snow & Benford, 1992, pp. 139-140; Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 618). The reach of a master frame is thus partly determined by the fungibility of the language it employs.

That said, the potency of a master frame is also a function of its resonance with the people to which it is meant to appeal.

Master frames — and frames in general — resonate with people when they marshal credible evidence in support of claims that are consistent, culturally compatible with and relevant to their target audience (Gamson, 1992a, pp. 175-176; Snow & Benford, 1992, pp. 140-141; Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 15). Although measuring frame resonance is difficult and has seldom been done (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 16), Snow & Benford (1992) do contend that protest cultures and the movement participation they develop alongside will not emerge in the absence of a resonant master frame, even if structural conditions are ripe (pp. 143-144). Carroll & Ratner (1996a), however, have studied the resonance of ‘rather unexplored’ master frames shared by movements in Vancouver (p. 411) and found that ‘broadly resonant’ injustice-based master frames established grounds for movements to cooperate upon and reduced competition over the advancement of movement-specific frames (p. 429). Gamson (1992b) would agree that comprehensive injustice frames not only apply explicitly normative judgments to authorities’ questionable actions, they also challenge the dominance of quiescent frames by publicly articulating an alternative view that over time allows people to become aware that their master frame resonates with others as well (pp. 72-73). Resonant master frames, like those based upon injustices and rights, develop movement cultures that help the aggrieved transcend their isolation and prepare themselves to participate in various mobilizations. Connecting broad frames to tangible activity, however, requires movements to construct and maintain collective identities.

Collective identity frames and participants’ self-understanding

Scott Hunt joined Benford and Snow (1994) to work out the relationship between framing processes and the ability of movements to construct the ‘identity fields’ of protagonists,

antagonists and audiences. They asserted that SMOs draw people into a movement by articulating collective identity frames that make claims about a group's consciousness (e.g., what kinds of knowledge and values they possess) or their strategic, moral and relational character (p. 192). Framing protagonists' collective identity as desirable is thus important not only because it helps movement participants feel a sense of belonging and solidarity with other participants, but also because it helps participants understand their laudable difference from movements' antagonists and audience. The results of these boundary framing exercises are in/out group — or us/them — distinctions that situate actors on various temporal, geographical, relational, ideological and tactical 'turfs' (pp. 193-194). Since movement struggles often involve contests over the identities of relevant actors, articulating these fields is thus an important task for SMOs.

However, the collective identities delineated by these boundary maintenance activities are not static. The negative characteristics that movement antagonists attribute to movements' collective identities must be met with ongoing efforts to strengthen solidarity and maintain alignment between protagonists' individual and collective identities (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, pp. 16, 28). By framing counter-movements and their organizations, unsympathetic institutions, hostile publics and authorities as blame-worthy antagonists (in contrast with protagonists' own relatively virtuous collective identity) movement participants can prepare their strategic and tactical approach with a view to their adversaries' strengths and weaknesses (Hunt, Benford & Snow, 1994, p. 197-199). In turn, antagonists, including corporate media, have a major stake and an advantage in framing movements' projected public identities in unflattering ways so as to influence how participants think of themselves and how audiences think of participants (Friedman & McAdam, 1992, p. 166; Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, pp. 18-19). Since various elements among allied SMOs, media, elites, marginal supporters,

sympathizers and members of the wider public are assumed to be ‘capable of receiving and evaluating protagonist messages in a favorable light,’ perceptive movements will respond by deploying the strategies, tactics, evidence, cultural symbols and narrative frames that resonate most powerfully with their audience. When antagonists impute negative characteristics to protagonists’ collective identity, framers in the movement can also attempt to deftly reframe these imputations as incorrect, as reinforcement of the movement’s collective identity, as a misunderstanding based on the movement’s own impression management failures and/or as a correct assessment of the movement’s identity defects, as the case may be (Hunt, Bedford & Snow, 1994, pp. 199-202). Still, movements must do more than align themselves with resonant master frames and articulate strategically perceptive collective identity frames if they want to motivate people to take issue-specific action.

Collective action frames and mobilization

In order for individuals to be situated within a movement-oriented historical narrative and linked to the actionable characteristics and relations associated with collective identities, SMOs must engage in collective action framing processes (Benford & Snow, 2000, pp. 631-632) that help reshape the public’s understanding of reality. Collective action frames highlight the seriousness of extant injustice and redefine such conditions from tolerably unfortunate to unjust, immoral and in need of rectification (Snow & Benford, 1992, p. 137). Among framing processes, movements’ strategic efforts to align collective action frames with their intended targets are the most studied (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 624). These strategies include bridging previously unconnected frames (e.g., ecology + feminism = ecofeminist frames), amplifying frames with a ‘catchy phrase or slogan’ that conveys the movement’s essence, extending the application of frames to new situations that target audiences find relevant and transforming

frames to change or create new understandings or meanings from older frames. These collective action framing strategies, which were originally articulated by Snow & Benford (1992), are now seen as less-than-useful after sustained research attention found the above-mentioned distinctions to have ‘little empirical support’ and overlap considerably (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 12). It would appear that movements’ collective action frames should have been examined more closely before they were parceled up into too many sub-categories.

That said, collective action frames are a crucial tool in movements’ strategic arsenal. The fact remains that these frames can mobilize people because they identify the causes of and possible solutions to problems before offering the motivating rationale for action (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 5). Effective collective action frames first diagnose a problem as worthy of concern and then attribute blame to whoever or whatever is responsible for the situation. Following this ‘diagnostic attribution,’ a collective action frame articulates a ‘prognostic attribution’ that proposes potential solutions to the problem(s) and outlines what should be done and who should do it (Snow & Benford, 1992, pp. 137-138). For this narrative to be unified, meaningful and interconnected, a collective action frame must also fulfill a motivational function by providing compelling reasons to act upon injustice. It is also worth pointing out that diagnostic framing helps attribute motives and identities to a movement’s antagonists, while motivational framing attributes these to movement protagonists (Hunt, Snow & Benford, 1994, p. 191). Although the diagnostic, prognostic and motivational functions of collective action frames seem clear enough, Benford & Snow (2000) admit that SMOs may engage in ‘rancorous internal conflict’ about who is indeed to blame and what should in fact be done; thus, consensus must come before action that mobilizes people ‘from the balcony to the barricades’ (pp. 615-617). They have also suggested that research into new kinds of collective action frames has

produced ‘diminishing returns’ (p. 618), which is why what follows will instead explore the extent to which localized collective action frames were connected to the more widely shared master and collective identity frames associated with the period of intense movement participation among youth in the 1960s.

Conclusion

When the wave of radical social movements began to ebb after the 1960s, scholars studying social movements faced a deluge of new and unique research targets. Many of them refused to consider these movements to be expressions of deviant mob mentality by masses reacting to the structural strains of rapidly changing societies, as did adherents to that era’s dominant ‘collective behaviour’ approach. Oberschall and Gamson challenged that paradigm by articulating what would become known as resource mobilization theory. Aided by Zald, McCarthy and many others, they would attempt to address the rational choice dilemma of free-riding by investigating how social movement organizations — which aggregate, organize, leverage, direct and apportion resources, including the selective incentives that accrue to participants who mobilize when asked — support movements. Although it dominated the field throughout much of the 1970s and 1980s, RMT’s utilitarian solutions to the free-rider problem were not compelling and afforded too little attention to the role that ideational factors, like ideas and identity, play in the development of solidaristic movement cultures.

The largely unconvinced European counterparts to North American resource mobilization theorists, like Habermas, Touraine and Melucci, connected declining rates of youth participation in formal politics with the emergence of movements that focused on transforming culture and sought to explain why they were able to flourish despite wielding few conventional resources. Research informed by this new social movement theory problematized assumptions of rational

motivation, suggested that movements offered a ‘metapolitical critique’ of conventional politics and focused upon the ways participants reject dominant social codes in favour of self-chosen scripts and identities. Yet NSMT, despite privileging ideational concepts, did not operationalize these insights and it would be scholars affiliated with RMT, such as Gamson, Snow and Benford, who developed a framework for understanding how movements use culture, identity and ideology as ideational resources. Their approach, known as frame analysis, offers students of social movements explanations for how the development of (re)framed meaning enables movements to engage in ‘communicative antagonism,’ generate oppositional consciousness, structure paradigmatic participatory narratives, impute collective identities to various actors and articulate movement-specific invitations to act. Yet this seemingly fruitful scholarly nexus between strategic rationality and prefigurative expression is vulnerable.

Other recent social movement literature reviews (Walder, 2009; Amenta et al., 2010) have claimed that RMT, NSMT and frame analysis focus on mobilization processes without adequately attending to questions regarding the structural factors that help determine movements’ influence and what they are actually about. This criticism of the field of social movement research does sound like structurally-oriented sociologists asking to be brought in from the cold; their approach has been out of favour with social movement theorists since the collective behaviour paradigm was repudiated. Still, their call for frame analysts to show more interest in the social-structural circumstances of those that frames seek to mobilize is one that seems worth heeding, especially since most of the references in Noakes & Johnson’s 2005 edited collection on framing processes do not date past the end of the 1990s. Benford & Snow (2000) themselves offer reasons why work in this vein has slowed, suggesting that there are few studies of discursive articulation processes because such research is ‘highly labour intensive’ and

requires longitudinal access to the discourses that represent framing processes (pp. 623-624). Curiously, Snow & Benford call for more research into ‘the discursive and narrative processes generative of collective action frames’ and ‘methodologies for investigating framing processes and conducting frame analysis’ (p. 633), yet they take Gitlin’s insight that movements have little control over how media covers their frames as all that needs to be said about the relationships between movements and media, even as they call it a key site of research (p. 626). Certainly it cannot be that investigating the frames found among radical media’s content and discourses (which can be compared through time) is too labour intensive to merit the effort.

There is a repeated assertion (Tarrow, 1992, 178; cf. McAdam, 1994, 46; Downing, 2008, 45) within social movement literature that not enough is known about how movements make and spread the meaning and culture that sustains them. Though it is acknowledged that SMOs need media to spread communicate movement frames, few social movement scholars who follow Snow et al. have applied their insights in a sustained and direct way to analyzing the relationships between movements and media, let alone movements and radical media. The rest of this thesis is therefore an effort not only to address this gap in social movement research, but also an attempt to identify the messages that radical movements framed to resonate with the youth they hoped would participate. In the 1960s, youths built radical media organizations that allowed them to speak for themselves when corporate media channels spoke of them derisively. Bypassing corporate media’s filter in this way, growing movements benefitted from radical media’s ability to make millions of youth aware of more just visions of society, the variety of lifestyles they could lead, who and what stood in their way, what was really wrong with the world, what they could do about it and when opportunities to further assert themselves arose. This communication model and its messages were — and remain — fascinatingly relevant

means of linking movements to potential participants among youth who are perpetually dissuaded by corporate media from taking their imperiled futures into their own hands and confronting colonial legacies, capitalist exploitation, persistent poverty, incessant militarism, pervasive racism, perverted democratic institutions, patriarchal oppression and wanton ecological destruction.

II. Mediating Movements

The assumption of inertia, that cultural and social continuity do not require explanation, obliterates the fact that both have to be recreated anew in each generation, often with great pain and suffering. To maintain and transmit a value system, human beings are punched, bullied, sent to jail, thrown into concentration camps, cajoled, bribed, made into heroes, *encouraged to read newspapers* ... To speak of cultural inertia is to overlook the concrete interests and privileges that are served by indoctrination, education and the entire complicated process of transmitting culture from one generation to the next ... *We cannot do without some conception of how people perceive the world and what they do or do not want to do about what they see.* To detach this conception from *the way people reach it*, to take it out of its historical context and raise it to the status of an independent causal factor in its own right, means that the supposedly impartial investigator succumbs to the justifications that ruling groups generally offer for their most brutal conduct. That, I fear, is exactly what a great deal of academic social science does today

Barrington Moore, Jr. – *Social origins of dictatorship and democracy*
pp. 486-487, emphasis added

In this passage from the conclusion of his landmark study, Moore (1966) contended that systemic change is founded upon changes in shared understandings and collective cultural values. Furthermore, he posited that any explanation of these changes in consciousness must consider the context in and methods by which such changes might occur, and suggests that media is an important means by which culture is transmitted. Connecting this insight to social movements, Alain Touraine (1981) has stated that understanding collective action requires analysts to focus on how participants perceive their actions, or ‘what they themselves think they are doing’ (p. 27). Following this idea, this thesis suggests that insights into how movement participants came to understand the world around them, their place within it and how they might make a difference can be gleaned from inquiries into the underappreciated relationships between radical media’s messages and social movement-framed discourses. William Gamson (1992b) argued that since the state has largely retreated from its ‘normalization’ role, social movements often find that it is corporate media that has taken up the role of reflecting, reproducing and purveying the normative cultural definitions that facilitate social control (pp. 59-60). Yet if

corporate media plays such an important role in shaping public consciousness (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 180) through discourses that promote quiescence, the fact that social movements nonetheless actively contest the status quo (Gamson 1992b, p. 71) demands an account of how they communicate messages that inspire young people to identify with their aims so strongly that they choose to participate.

Unfortunately, this demand has not been fulfilled because of an acknowledged lacuna in social movement scholarship. Mayer Zald (1996) has suggested that the structure of the media landscape can help mobilize or suppress movements by affecting their portrayal, but points out that very little is known about how different media formats and styles impact movements. In his own words: “how ... adversarial journalism, as opposed to ‘neutral professionalism,’ impacts on the reporting of movement activity is largely unknown” (p. 274). Could it be that the frame analysis tools subsequently developed within the field of social movement research (Gitlin’s work from 1980 notwithstanding) have been deployed to unravel this mystery? Writing relatively recently, John Downing (2008) answered this question in the negative, claiming that social movement research rarely explores the relationships between media and movements because it simply treats media as ‘technological message channels’ instead of as ‘complex *sociotechnical* institutions.’ Given the multitude of social movement processes that have been analyzed, Downing asked why “the roles of media [are] acknowledged but left dangling as though they alone were crystal clear, unproblematic? And why only, by implication, mainstream media” (p. 41)? Addressing Snow, Benford, Gamson and other frame analysts directly, Downing leveled a polite, instructive yet withering criticism by stating that

it seems distinctly odd that the framing activities of social movements’ *own* media, whether internally or externally directed or both, are so comprehensively off the map ... For how social movement media frame issues and priorities for movement activists, for movement penumbras, for the state’s surveillance agencies, and for metaphorical passers-by, is just as vital to understand as their relation to mainstream media (pp. 42, 45).

That this clearly stated challenge has gone unanswered is as unjustifiable as it is unfortunate.

Casual observers of current events often hear about how social media is facilitating the increasing frequency and intensity of youth political participation even as corporate media predictably frames these mobilizations as disparate and the demands made as incoherent. What might be learned if these contemporary forms of social movement activity were analyzed as if their methods of communication and the discursive frames they advance are comparable to those present in the last wave of intense youth-led social movement activity? Would it not be advantageous for those studying social movements to have a theoretically-informed research model that interrogates how movements interact with the power of discourse, corporate media and radical media from the perspective of the revolutionary 1960s? Rather than letting these questions stand as rhetorical, this chapter attempts some preliminary answers by exploring the (incomplete) critical research on media and its relationships to social movements, starting with an exposition of debates surrounding how audiences interpret media texts and how discourse analyses can function as a tool with which to challenge the hegemony of dominant interests. Once these debates related to critical media theory and praxis have been explicated, this chapter's second section emphasizes how generally quiescence-reproducing corporate media conditions protest tactics by exploiting its asymmetrical relationship with movements and supports the status quo in a localized Canadian context. This chapter ends by articulating the general precepts of a radical media that has played an underappreciated historical role in supporting social movements and specifying ways in which the radical *Georgia Straight* was situated within Vancouver's 1960s social movement scene. In this way, Chapter II not only sets the stage for an overdue analysis of the movement-oriented frames found among the content and discourses of radical media, but also provides glimpses of a relevant new research agenda.

Critical media theory and praxis

Before directly exploring the relationships between corporate and radical media and movements, this section introduces some critical media scholarship as a means of elaborating relevant concepts like ‘texts,’ ‘discourse’ and ‘hegemony,’ and debates regarding the interpretation of media messages and the kind of politics that are worthy of recognition. Critical media theory and praxis does not often make explicit connections to the study of social movements, but both areas of study would benefit from more engagement with the other. One exceptional example of such cross-disciplinary work is Robert Hackett and William Carroll’s *Remaking media: The struggle to democratize public communication* (2006), which rightly acknowledges that media is ‘a pivotal site for broader political and cultural struggles’ as it inhabits the ‘seam’ between the Habermasian system and lifeworld (p. 203). Other scholars suggest that both ‘the political and politics’ are ‘articulated through, and dependent on,’ media that constitutes as much as it reflects social practice (Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, pp. 4-5). So, while this next section does not deal as directly with social movements as the rest of this thesis does, it does endeavour to further develop more sophisticated means for their analysis.

Media texts, political economy and active audiences

Different kinds of media — from music to words to images — are considered to be composed of texts and are among the most potent mediators of how the public perceives itself and its environment (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 180; Duncan-Andrade, 2006, pp. 150-151). Interrogating the content of the texts produced by variously structured media organizations offers insight into how they construct knowledge that is filtered through individual interpretation (Larsen, 2002, p. 117). These interpretations are aligned with the cognitive frames that are, strictly speaking, mental structures possessed by individuals. However, examining samples of

collectively produced texts, such as movement documents, can allow researchers to approximate the content of socially shared frames (Johnson, 2005, p. 240). Because frames can only be inferred and speculated upon when examining behaviour alone, researchers wanting to analyze the substance of frames cannot avoid engaging to some extent with texts. Indeed, some of the best evidence of movement frames, especially those which belong to an increasingly distant past, can be found among media texts, since ‘what is written and talked about influences protest action, which in turn influences what is talked about again’ (Johnson, 2005, pp. 245-246). Still, researchers should be careful to avoid interpreting the impact of texts at face value.

Within critical media studies there is an important debate between those who take a ‘cultural studies’ approach to theorizing individual interpretation of textual materials and those who stress the importance of a sensitivity to political economy. Those who espouse an affinity to cultural studies insist that analyzing media’s impact entails recognizing that intended messages have ‘limited effects’ (Schiller, 1989, p. 136). Audiences use ‘interpretive repertoires’ to fill ‘empty’ texts with meaning that reflects not only the text itself and the context within which it is being used (Jensen, 2002, p. 167), but also their multiple, sometimes contradictory, subjectivities (Riordan, 2002, p. 10). When audiences resist corporate media’s influence in this way they are said to be expressing the ‘subaltern political agency’ that exists beyond formal political struggles and should be given credit for their ability to ascribe their own meaning to framed messages (McLaughlin, 2002, pp. 34-35). In other words, people should not be simply considered as passive consumers of media texts that can have many different meanings.

However, this approach has strident detractors. Political economists claim that media’s source, content and class (un)conscious audience together determine how framed messages are interpreted (Jensen, 2002, p. 167) and audiences’ ‘resistance’ to corporate media’s ‘narcotizing

dysfunction' should not be conflated with being acutely aware of media's social control function and challenging its power to enforce social norms (Johnson, 1971, p. 3; McLaughlin, 2002, p.

37). The fact remains that

media plays a strategic role in 'mediating' deep structural changes occurring in the economy and the social order itself. These produce new attitudes, anxieties, needs and ambivalences in everyone. Pressures of consumer society, inequalities of the wage system necessitating two-job families, extra strain on working women with family duty, minority demands for bigger share of resource pie, obvious degradation of local and global environments, threat of international instability, plant shutdowns and fear of unemployment and many other unresolved social problems, all the result of market forces, are acting on the ways viewers ascribe their own meaning (Schiller, 1989, 152).

In other words, the 'active' audience's ability to ascribe subversive meanings to corporate media texts is itself limited by the ways in which capitalism inscribes itself upon individual worldviews. Hackett & Carroll (2006) further underscore this point by concluding that if people do not 'have access to contrary experiences or discursive resources, they tend to work with the raw material provided' (p. 30). A reasonable conclusion would be that individuals do indeed possess potentially subversive agency yet still find their interpretation of media frames influenced significantly by not only the market forces that structure their material circumstances, but also the discursive power of hegemonic 'common sense.'

Discourse and (anti-)hegemony

In order to understand 'discourse' and its power to both support and undermine dominant, or hegemonic, forces, this thesis builds upon work by those who follow insights formulated in Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*, which was first published in 1985. Their ideas, which are inspired by Marxism, are nonetheless considered post-Marxist in the sense that they reject 'many of the classical assumptions of Marxist analysis, particularly around class essentialism' (Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, p. 2). Their theory of discourse posits that 'articulation' is 'any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result of the

articulatory practice’ and that ‘discourse’ is the ‘structured totality resulting from the articulatory practice’ (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001, p. 105). Discourse, therefore, is not just a synonym for language; it represents the relationships between words and ideas and the actions that flow from them. Indeed, it presupposes that there should essentially be no distinction between action and meaning because ‘both the extra-linguistic and linguistic are material and always already have a constituting effect on each other’ (Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, pp. 3-4). In other words, families of ideas, even at their most abstract, correspond to some kind of tangible experience and should not be considered as entirely isolated from the reality of at least someone’s lived experience.

Since discourse is always somehow inscribed into social practice, critical discourse analysis must reject ‘any neat distinction between discursive and extra-discursive practices.’ The idea that text and context are completely distinct from each other is rendered methodologically problematic because it “often reproduces a reified and static conception of context that demarcates the analysis of narrowly defined textual representations from the wider range of ‘social and cultural practices *which frame* discourse practices and texts”” (Fairclough in Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, p. 10, emphasis added). These ideas would seem rather tautological were it not for the intuitively satisfying possibility that the media people produce is indeed a representation of the lives that people ([do not] want to) live. Radical media’s very existence, especially its popularity, can therefore in itself be seen as evidence of an attempt to represent a community experiencing what they considered a radical reality. Engaging in culturally-based discourse analysis entails recognizing that language — which emerges through interaction with and is reflective of the ‘performative aspects of discourse’ — is ‘inherently conflictual, negotiated and recursive’ (Johnson, 2005, p. 254). Putting it another way, the movement-aligned frames that radical media communicated to millions of youth in the 1960s both were constructed

by and later represented actual frame-aligned practices. Yet these discourses should not be considered a formula for action or a virtual blueprint for conjuring a vibrant movement culture.

The discourses found in any kind of media are ‘radically contingent’ upon their context. Discourses are not ‘self-grounded’ because they, like any other entity, are in some way ‘dependent on relations with other entities.’ Though the contingent nature of discourse should seem logically palatable, one more leap is needed. Because ‘contingency is not simply empirical but logically necessary,’ it is therefore ‘radical’ in the sense that “a fixed identity would effectively mean the end of identity and deny the possibility of new forms of identification ... To presuppose radical contingency means accepting that there is no final, absolute ground, foundation or essence to identity, *except* for contingency itself” (Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, p. 16). Linking these complicated ideas back to movement-relevant concepts, identities form from the ‘contingent and partial fixation of elements’ that have been articulated into a resultant discourse (Laclau & Mouffe in Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, p. 18). This discussion of discourse, although admittedly abstract, helps position discourse analysis as a way to examine media texts as not only descriptive records of events but also expressive provocations to enact the frame. If discourses describe and help reproduce the context of their creation, they become an especially powerful tool for the task of supporting or challenging hegemony.

Antonio Gramsci (1971) proposed that dominant classes are able to maintain their power by framing their way of seeing the world as objective or ‘common sense’ reality. The Gramscian concept of ‘hegemony’ is thus a way of describing how elites utilize an indirect method of ‘uniting persuasion from above with consent from below’ by defining reality and limiting alternative, and especially oppositional, discourses (Gitlin, 2003, pp. 10-11). Following this line of reasoning, the only way to overthrow capitalist hegemony is to displace it with a singularly

coherent and convincing counter-hegemonic vision of how society might organize itself. From a Gramscian perspective, then, politics cannot simply be about protesting for more communication, participation or inclusion. Instead, politics must be about uniting individual wills into a solidaristic collective capable of wielding its power to create transformative institutions that will liberate the oppressed (Fenton, 2011, p. 197). The end goals of this ‘long march through institutions’ are to gain control over oppressive structures like the state, rearticulate their function and thereby expand democracy (Bratich, 2011, p. 171). Although a bloc of counter-hegemonic forces challenges the representative form of liberal democracy, it does not necessarily entail completely rejecting it (Fenton, 2011, p. 182). The hegemony-based battle plan for building oppositional discourses and politics, reliant as it is on controlling and transforming institutions, does not satisfy all critics of the present order.

If those affiliated with counter-hegemonic politics seek ‘unity-in-diversity supporting *an* alternative social vision,’ those who reject such totalizing projects in favour of ‘undoing the local and dispersed powers that routinely keep people in their places as disciplined subjects’ can be said to share an affinity for ‘anti-hegemonic’ politics (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 204, emphasis added). Richard Day (2005) has contended that counter-hegemonic politics reinforces the ‘hegemony of hegemony.’ Rather than trying (as revolutionaries have, unsuccessfully, for a tragically long time) to displace hegemony simultaneously and *en masse*, Day insisted that radicals with diverse interests should instead operate non-hegemonically. He posited that developing ‘non-branded strategies and tactics’ that display an ‘affinity for affinity’ is an antidote to social movement factionalism and challenges the very logic of hegemony, recognizing that attempts to attain and direct state power risk the reproduction of oppressive tendencies within ‘the movement.’ Instead, mutual aid and shared ethical commitments underpin

non-universalizing, non-hierarchical and non-coercive relationships that constitute a model for building ‘a movement of movements’ out of disparate approaches to finding a cure for capitalism, ethnocentrism, androcentrism, anthropocentrism and other forms of oppression (pp. 8-9). Day is not alone in his suspicion of using oppressors’ tools to end oppression.

In a book printed by one of several publishing houses to have emerged from the *Georgia Straight* (Barman, 2007, p. 341), Warren Magnusson et al. (1986) articulated their vision for a new kind of politics following the resignation of British Columbia’s long-serving neoliberal Premier, Bill Bennett. To be sure, their proposals for an ‘authentically democratic society’ included revamping political and economic institutions to empower people to participate meaningfully in decision-making and to ‘take control of their working lives,’ respectively. However, they recognized that the hierarchy, subordinating women, instrumentalizing labour and dominating nature are culturally inscribed into the way people think and relate to one another. They assert that this culture, which subverts democracy and is sustained locally by ‘global mass media and mass education,’ is not going to be eliminated by rearranging institutions alone. Magnusson et al. admit that opting out of dominant structures is no more effective than conquering ‘them by succeeding in the market or bludgeoning them with the power of the state.’ Instead, they propose, people must be ‘daring’ enough to change themselves (i.e., the way they think and act politically, economically and socially in their daily lives) if they really want to change oppressive structures (pp. 14-15). Certainly there is merit to the idea that ‘freeing minds’ comes before fixing problematic institutions, but Gramscians have ready critiques.

Hackett & Carroll (2006) counter that this kind of anti-hegemonic ‘lifestyle politics’ leads to the construction of counterculture ‘as an end in itself’ and degenerates into an ‘abstentionist refusal’ to fight ‘the system.’ Anti-hegemonic politics therefore ‘amounts to a capitulation to the

market liberals' mantra that There Is No (systemic) Alternative.' According to Hackett & Carroll, a truly emancipatory politics should certainly proceed with transforming the lifeworld, but it must also pursue 'system-oriented initiatives' that 'coordinate actions and campaigns to reap the benefits of synergy' while developing a 'coherent political programme and ideological perspective' that engages the 'weighty condensation of social power' that is the state (p. 207). Yet the task of unifying many movements' 'isolated struggles' into a universalizing counter-hegemonic political project of taking the state is simply not feasible according to the 'autonomists' who seek to fragment the state's homogenizing 'oneness' into the immanently self-organized and ungovernable many (Bratich, 2011, pp. 162-164). Gramscians often regard the political commitment to autonomism as a politics that is 'unthinkable,' rather than as a different commitment that focuses on 'constituent' rather than 'constituted' power. Positing that constituted power is a 'necessary condition' for and central to political 'thinkability' is problematic (Bratich, 2011, p. 168). Though this thesis does not aim to settle this lively debate about what constitutes the most effective political strategy, it does seem worth pointing out that radicals (whether they self-identify as progressive, leftist, socialist, Marxist, autonomist, libertarian, anarchist, etc.) spend far too much time disagreeing with each other when they could be recognizing and supporting, when possible, each other's preference for the subversive politics that suits them best.

Even if radical media organizations merely experiment with 'new modes of expressive media culture' and are not connected by much more than affinity, they are not simply 'isolated vertical struggles' because they furnish others with toolkits and inspire others with affinity to spread the tactic (Bratich, 2011, pp. 170-171). Even the Gramscian concept of the 'organic intellectual' — the intellectuals and leaders of the counter-hegemonic bloc — can be thought of

as the ‘communicators/activists’ (Downing et al., 2001, pp. 15-16) who employ the non-branded strategy of producing radical media. Anti-, non- or post-hegemonic politics certainly risks ‘being translated into either a liberal tolerance for difference, or an anarchic, autonomous and ultimately individualistic politics that prevents substantive change from happening,’ but the multiplicity of ‘non-essentialist agonistic politics’ may also ‘signal a break from dominant structures and understandings of power’ (Fenton, 2011, p. 179). The radical contingency of these kinds of politics enables the development of new kinds of potentially radical identity and community through the context-specific act of political participation (Fenton, 2011, p. 181). Hackett & Carroll (2006) found that ‘media activists tend to see their efforts as embedded in or ancillary to larger projects,’ which suggests that radical media projects naturally foster coalition building (p. 205) among people with diverse political commitments. Since there are many different kinds of critically-oriented politics, with more to be articulated as new contexts emerge to produce them, how might they be recognized and accepted more widely?

Corporate media generally will not purposely facilitate incipient forms of radical politics and movements until it is forced to do so, given that it actively regulates discourse by perpetuating gaps, silences and exclusions regarding certain issues and discourses. However, ignoring the ‘surplus elements’ of a heterogeneous reality does not make them go away or prevent them from being articulated into new discourses that can be politically mobilized (Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, p. 24). Still corporate media tries to ‘engineer, or cover up, moments of dislocation’ in discourse to ‘ideologically suppress’ social change occurring alongside ‘discursive rearticulation’ (Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, p. 26). Though it is not simply a ‘space of falsity,’ corporate media does actively naturalize banal hegemonic discourses that lead people to believe that the status quo is less precarious than it really is or that there really are no feasible

and ‘socially recognized’ alternatives to the current order (Dahlberg & Phelan, 2011, p. 27). Were it not for corporate media’s ability to shut multifarious challengers out the hegemonic discourses advanced in its ubiquitous texts, people might see the true diversity of political standpoints one might take. Active audiences might yearn for the opportunity to judge the merits of truly different kinds of politics for themselves, but as the next section will show, the limited media options available to them discourage such adequately informed debate.

Corporate media and movement tactics

A reasonable person might say that not *all* corporate media hides or distorts discourses and that there are a relatively unbiased corporate media sources to counter the Fox News’ of the world. While that qualifier is undoubtedly true, “even at its most objective and professional, journalism cannot escape the need for ‘frames’” (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 31). Todd Gitlin (2003) was writing for ‘underground’ newspapers when he found evidence that corporate media actively distorted its framing of movement activity, leading him to realize that media was partly ‘composing reality’ and affecting participants’ perceptions of who they were and what they were about (p. xiv). Although Gitlin acknowledged its existence, his work explicitly did not deal with social movements’ own media (p. 16), let alone the impact of popular songs, fiction, jokes, films and artists (p. 18). Still, his search for answers to questions about how corporate media coverage affected the ‘floodlit’ movement ecology in the last half of the 1960s (Gitlin, 2003, p. 15) opened up the critical study of corporate media. This section explores subsequent research by the many scholars who have reached damning conclusions regarding corporate media’s general pattern of limiting discourse and misrepresenting social movements, as well as the local articulation of these patterns and the constraints they impose on contemporary movements in Vancouver.

General patterns

In Hackett & Carroll's (2006) words, increasingly concentrated corporate 'media make some futures more likely and other less so' (p. 1). Most people experience events second hand through media, which acts as a gatekeeper to the kinds of discourses and politics that enter the public sphere. This form of control gives the media — and through them the corporate — elite the power to construct definitions of reality by articulating the social concepts that help form public opinion, while at the same time 'muting' critique of intensifying government-corporate 'symbiosis' (pp. 5, 28). Interconnected problems and processes are fragmented or ignored almost altogether, constraining the development of coherent critical discourses and making it 'difficult to criticize what you cannot name' (p. 29). Power is thus subtly mystified by the quiescence-encouraging master frames that articulate what is 'proper' common sense and fabricate consent through political spectacle for passive public audiences (Gamson, 1992b, p. 66). The monopolies on knowledge and influence over society's cultural values that corporate media holds rests on its dominant ability to translate information in ways that are biased toward sustaining political authority and concentrating privilege in society (Heyer, 1988, pp. 115-117). A great many people's livelihoods depend on carrying out this function.

Marketers, editors and communication and public relations specialists perpetually employ their political discourse-limiting techniques (Downing et al., 2001, p. 14; George, 2004, p. 189), manipulating emotions to boost consumerism while sensationalizing trivial events and trivializing ones that are profound (Heyer, 1988, pp. 128-130, cf. Postman, 2006). The longstanding trend whereby corporate interests acquire, consolidate and restructure public communication channels intensifies the broadcast of standardized 'infotainment' that will garner the widest possible aggregate appeal to target markets and reinforce asymmetrical power

relationships (Glavin, 1997, pp. 5-6, Flew, 2008, pp. 106-107; Nesbitt-Larking, 2001, pp. 109-110; Stack & Kelly, 2006, pp. 12-18; Van Loon, 2006, pp. 171-172). In the 1960s, movements that could barely afford it tried to advertise in corporate media and were rebuffed. Taking the issue to court established free speech rights for non-persons and gave deep-pocketed advertisers even more influence over what kinds of discursive frames were to be found competing for space with 'hard news' (Schiller, 1989, pp. 49-54, 131). Of course, most of these frames interpret situations in ways that are in synchrony with the status quo, thus working to discourage collective action' (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 6-7). And yet where would corporate media be without something sensational to report on?

Then as now, corporate media simultaneously increases its viewer/readership by dramatizing social unrest and undermines social movements with derisory coverage and venomously negative representations of radical youth identity (Burns, 1990, pp. 107-108, 132; Osgerby, pp. 2008, 47). Even more than today's state, it has the power to frame movement activities in an 'episodic protest paradigm' that 'trivializes and demonizes' instead of offering thematic expositions of 'the social and historical conditions that gave rise to events, ideological discussion and analysis and detailed articulation of grievances' (Noakes & Johnson, 2005, p. 19). Corporate advertising campaigns have even co-opted the image of hippie idealism to mock cultural conservatism and hype ideas of rebellion that are truncated of their radicalism (Frank, 1998). This kind of media socializes youth to value identities predicated on 'consumptive behaviour, immediate gratification, hedonism, impulsivity, disinhibition and desensitization' (Romer, 2008, pp. 10-13). At the same time, corporate media frames systemic crises in ways that produce in youth

a collective anxiety manifest[ing] itself in stress, depression, ADD, loneliness, obesity, anorexia and apathy ... The doomsday messages [the media] feeds [youth] are more than enough to make [them]

want to put [their] blinders on, make [them] cynical or hopeless, or just turn [them] into hipsters (Cullis-Suzuki et al., 2007, 2).

These pathologies among youth are a direct consequence of the distorted views of reality produced by corporate mediation that today has few formidable challengers.

Yet many youth still fight on. The asymmetrical relationship they have with corporate media requires them to cope creatively by framing their messages to appeal to audiences that likely adhere to master frames that predispose them to not readily agreeing with the movement's cause (Carroll & Ratner, 1999, pp. 26-28). Not only does the way corporate media frames movement activity play a significant role in determining how these actions resonate with the public, the amount of coverage given also helps determine how much of the public even knows the movement exists, which, in turn, affects social movement tactics. To get corporate media coverage, social movements must inspire substantial numbers of participants to engage in particularly novel or radical tactics (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 180). Corporate media's ability to withhold publicity from movements is therefore but one way a movement's best framing efforts can be distorted by the medium through which information travels.

Nonetheless, movements, with their limited resources, will employ tactics ranging from tame petitions and public demonstrations to dramatic marches and street theater to non-violent but disruptive sit/teach-ins to (un)civil disobedience involving occupations or the symbolic violence of destroying property, all of which are aimed at gaining public sympathy or threatening social disorder and disruption (Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield, 1994, p. 8; O'Neill, 2004, p. 237).

Utilizing these kinds of performance-based tactics enables

unmediated visual impact [that] reaches out both to potential allies in the world outside the movement and across the boundaries (cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, ideological) that divide the participants — communicating shared ideas, opening opportunities for further cooperation and enabling other tactics ... [that] were pivotal in the internal evolution of civil rights, peace and labour movements, and they played a transformative role in the counterculture movements of the 1960s (O'Neill, 2004, p. 240).

Even if these tactics did not sway adult opinion, they did capture the imagination of other youths. Movements therefore often employ symbols in their activities that are themselves embedded messages so that if/when corporate media frames its report superficially, the reported image of the activity nonetheless gets the audience thinking about the issue (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 178). Still, corporate media's standards of 'newsworthiness' are often based on a desire for sensationalism and scandal, so protests are usually described in terms of turnout, behaviour and composition rather than the substantive issues movements frame, which are often reduced to slogans (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, pp. 180-181). Because movements need media more than media need movements, movements without effective communication means of their own are stuck in this unfair relationship.

Though news coverage is a resource for movements, corporate media usually frames stories so as to undermine collective action or stops coverage altogether if it thinks its coverage is promoting interests that go against those of the dominant (Molotch, 1979, p. 91). Authorities, sometimes at the level of intelligence agencies, even feed corporate media's journalists less-than-factual information that would embarrass and thwart movement participants by framing their public identity unfavorably before a public audience (Marx, 1979, p. 98). However distorted, corporate media's coverage of youth movements has at least shown their peers that some among them choose to participate, intimating that they might have common interests and problems and providing an initial basis for collective identity to emerge (Kelly, 1972, p. 62). This identity is a social process that is subject to recurring re-elaboration and 'actors' self-representation are, in fact, continuously confronted with images which institutions, sympathetic and hostile social groups, public opinion and the media produce of them' (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, 105-106). This fact underscores the importance attached to movements' ability to find channels through

which they can elaborate their own images and frame their participants' identities in ways that are different from the denigrated caricatures that dominant groups promote through a complicit corporate media (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 106). The relationship between social movements and corporate media is inherently unequal and problematic, from the global right down to the local.

Local articulations

British Columbia's two largest daily newspapers, the *Sun* and the *Province*, are based in Vancouver and recognized for their uncritical support for 'rigid law enforcement' tactics in the 1960s (Clément, 2008, p. 61). Harry Rankin (1975), a longtime leftist Vancouver city councillor, recalled the 'editorial Red-baiting' campaign mounted by these 'merchants of the status quo,' both owned at the time by the Thompson family's Pacific Press, before his first successful election in 1967 (pp. 107-108). Rankin would go on to lose the 1986 Vancouver mayoral campaign to Premier-to-be, Gordon Campbell. In that year, Hackett, Pinet & Ruggles (1986) pointed out that Canadians got less political information from personal interaction than they did from media, with which they spent seven hours per day on average, only behind work and sleep. They claimed that Vancouver's 'objective' corporate media reinforced 'domination by marginalizing and excluding oppositional discourses' (p. 267) and castigated Pacific Press's chained 'cheapskate journalism' for promulgating homogenous American-supplied or inflected world news coverage, reproducing business interests (pp. 268-269) and avoiding issues that would embarrass the rest of the Thompson family's 'corporate empire' (pp. 270-271).

Advertisements comprised half of these papers and hard news copy targeted the 'abstract "average" consumer' while presenting the world outside the West as 'a place of danger and disruption.' Domestically, this West-centric lens constructed a basic 'harmony of interests and

consensus of values' that excluded or derided movements and framed politics as a 'spectator sport' (i.e., emphasizing 'horserace' polling and reactionary commentary); these specimens were not unique (pp. 273-277). Since then, the situation has only gotten worse.

Across Canada, local and national media has been chained together by corporate entities like Pacific Press, Southam, Hollinger, Postmedia, Canwest, Quebecor and Black Press. The 'culture of conformity' found in shrinking newsrooms produces titillating infotainment and 'tabloidized' celebrity-driven sensationalism (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 3) that aids the construction of 'a depoliticized culture of selfishness and consumerism' (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, pp. 3-4). Journalists are made to echo disinformation, cheerlead for war, bias coverage against environmentalism (Winter, 2007), enable patriarchy, embed 'the language and assumptions' of racial and class hierarchies and undermine 'a sense of community' by constructing audiences as atomized individuals at risk of succumbing to the 'mean world syndrome' (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 6-7). Rather than acting as a medium for meaningful deliberation in the public sphere, Canadian corporate media seeks to provide audiences to advertisers (Pilon, 2009). As Hackett & Carroll see it, 'media fare at odds with the consumerist ethos tend to be filtered out; and indeed, advertising functions as a kind of licensing system, determining which media will survive, and which will go to the wall' (p. 25). In an advertisement-saturated media environment public relations becomes a tool with which to drive what 'news' remains and movements ignore this reality at their peril.

Still, Carroll & Ratner's (1999) study of the media strategies employed by Vancouver-based social movements emphasizes that even when media-savvy SMOs like Greenpeace create media spectacles and cultivate long-term relationships with corporate media, their messages are distorted or often ignored altogether, making the benefits of such engagement 'dubious and

insubstantial' (Carroll & Ratner, 1999, p. 29). Excluded from public communications channels, framed as deviant radicals and 'confined to marginalized ghettos' known as 'prefigurative politics,' movements are induced to bureaucratize and moderate to gain access and compelled to break comprehensive critiques into single issues (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 29). This kind of research, which has wide applicability, sheds light on the relationships between Vancouver's contemporary social movements and the city's corporate media while highlighting the necessity of 'challenging and changing the hegemonic public communication system and its nexus with political governance' so as to 'transform the terrain on which all movements contest established power' (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 14). Failing to do so means encouraging 'the degeneration of political debate into the propagandistic manipulation of public opinion' which will enable further slides into 'looming' authoritarianism (Walker, 1986, pp. 334-335). If corporate media, from the global to the local level, is, to put it charitably, generally failing to adequately inform its public audience, how might movements avoid letting their messages be crowded out and distorted by the hegemonic discursive frames broadcast by dominant communication channels?

Radical mediation

Where corporate media treats audiences 'as commodities whose attention can be bought and sold,' radical media's ethos is that they should be treated as a community that shares information reciprocally, making the development of this medium 'essential to building popular democratic movements, without which the hope of progressive social transformation is in vain' (Hackett, Pinet & Ruggles, 1986, pp. 282-283). Like others mentioned before, Hackett & Carroll (2006) decry how little attention social movement scholars have given the relationships between movements and media, let alone 'the emergence of media activism' (p. 43). Movements trying to spread their messages among the public want the media to give them adequate standing, fair

coverage, preferred framing and sympathy (p. 44) but usually find themselves ‘negotiating’ with what they assume is media’s ‘natural’ corporate form rather than demanding a ‘radical redesign’ to suit their needs (p. 45). Hackett & Carroll’s project, then, is to map contemporary ‘democratic media activism’ as its own nascent movement (p. 50) since the ‘media capabilities and sensibilities’ it fosters among subordinated groups can support the emergence of ‘subaltern counterpublics’ that are the ‘lifeblood of social movements’ and act as arenas where oppositional collective identities are constructed (pp. 52-54). Perhaps there is indeed an incipient movement for the democratization of media; it is sorely needed. Yet to be adequately studied, however, is one such movement that was quite healthy and at home in 1960s. In Vancouver, often the focus of work by Hackett, Carroll and Ratner, it was manifested in a newspaper that proudly proclaimed itself to be a member of the ‘Anarchist Press Movement’ in its masthead: that paper was the *Georgia Straight*.

One might justifiably take issue with the politics of anarchism, but the real significance of the *Straight*’s self-identification is that it considered itself part of an extant media activism movement. However, this ‘underground press’ movement certainly had its shortcomings: celebrating the ‘heavies’ that corporate media anointed as the ‘leaders’ of other movements (Gitlin, 2003, p. 164); perpetuating oppressive discourses as it grew ‘wild with revolutionism’ (Gitlin, 2003, p. 174); ‘preaching to the choir’; and ultimately falling prey to the ‘temptation of commercialism’ (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 59). These flaws, combined with authorities’ repression, induced most radical media organizations to fold or, in the *Straight*’s case, to morph into entertainment-oriented ‘alternative’ formats by the early to mid-1970s (Glavin, 1997, p. 3; Pauls and Campbell, 1997, pp. 119-120; Barman, 2007, p. 337). The commonly-used term ‘alternative media’ is almost oxymoronic (and implicitly accepts its position in a pluralist

system) in that everything is alternative to something else (Downing et al., 2001, p. ix). In the 1960s, the motley ‘underground press’ exhibited a critically oriented ‘Do-It-Yourself’ culture that was far more potent than ‘alternative’ scene lifestyles, and would be more appropriately described by various labels like radical, oppositional, citizens’, participatory, autonomous, independent, community, popular or grassroots, each with their own subtly different connotations (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 58). The rest of this chapter is therefore dedicated to explicating the general precepts related to the history, defining features and functions of this kind of media, as well as locating the *Georgia Straight* as Vancouver’s articulation, situated among other movements of that radical era.

General precepts

The cyclical and sequential nature of social movements produces a dynamic whereby various movements are fragmented in latent phases and cluster together during periods of intense public action. In latent phases of the cycle, SMOs facilitate internal communication between movements that are engaged in self-reflection, building solidarity and constructing/innovating the frames and codes that undergird their cultural identity. When mobilized, SMOs engage in external communication to promote movements’ frames and attract participants (Melucci, 1994, pp. 127-128). Historians and political scientists, who often focus their attention on state-oriented political associations, often miss closer inspection of other kinds of SMOs in Canada (Clément, 2008, p. 16). Certain kinds of SMOs, like radical media organizations, are rooted in the traditions of past struggles and can offer subsequent generations strategically effective means of helping movements emerge from latent periods (McAdam, 1994, p. 43). In other words, radical media has a lengthy relationship with movements from the past.

For example, English working-class consciousness emerged and matured between 1790 and 1830 in part through the development, information sharing and agitation of ‘radical newspapers that collectively constituted a radical press.’ Similarly, by 1833 French working-class consciousness had matured partly because their working-class press was promoting ‘autonomous workers’ discourses informed by an authentic working-class point of view, revolutionary rhetoric and class language’ (Morris, 1992, pp. 353-354). Even the young investigative journalists who marshaled facts and data to expose their peers to official malfeasance via political ‘muckraking’ in the pages of 1960s radical media (Johnson, 1971, p. 88) drew upon the muckraking tradition found in the hundreds of autonomous and independent newspapers — which circulated in the millions — that supported the Progressive Era’s Populist and Socialist movements (Gitlin, 2003, p. 2; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, pp. 324-325). Similarly, radical media ‘mushroomed’ in the 1960s, ‘expressing the political and cultural alienation of middle class youth’ (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 92). While it is difficult — and perhaps unnecessary — to establish the direction of causal arrows between movements and radical media, movements surely benefit from sympathetic radical media’s willingness to articulate and spread awareness of the frames that sustain their activities. To better understand these relationships, it is helpful to outline some features and functions commonly associated with radical media.

Radical media organizations typically form as cooperatives or small businesses that are ‘relatively autonomous from corporate capital and the state’ (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 58). This kind of media structure allows de-capitalization, de-institutionalization and de-professionalization, which lowers overhead costs, limits hierarchy and separation from social movement participants and encourages a commitment to publishing the ideas of those without

formal qualifications, respectively (Flew, 2008, pp. 109-110). Producing outspoken — and therefore risky — texts can make those involved feel they need a social support system and radical media's SMO-like structure may come to resemble a solidaristic 'affinity group.' Gamson (1992b) suggests that affinity groups are small (i.e., around 10-20 people), autonomous organizations that can activate their own members, participate as a unit, offer emotional support and provide instrumental needs like food, transportation, shelter, etc. to participants (p. 63) who belong to the 'submerged networks' that 'sustain activist subcultures in the realm of the everyday' (Carroll & Ratner, 1996b, p. 621). Radical youth who chose to 'be their own media' may find that the autonomous nature of this affinity group structure provides a good example of Richard Day's 'affinity for affinity' because radical media organizations have affiliated themselves in a variety of ways, even as they ostensibly 'compete' to reach the same audiences.

When corporate media ignored, sensationalized (Burns, 1990, p. xv; Rorabaugh, 1989, p. 25) and then framed the phenomenal explosion of social movement activity in unflattering and trivial ways (Couldry & Curran, 2003, p. 4), the 'underground' press transformed the media ecology (Schiller, 1989, pp. 142-143) to enable radical youth to speak for themselves and articulate a solidaristic sense of 'we' (George, 2004, p. 188). Radical media's 'organic' connection to social movements (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 58) can encourage peer-to-peer interaction (Flew, 2008, pp. 107-108) in which formerly separate and isolated groups can come into contact through their shared access to the means of cultural production (McAdam, 1994, pp. 53-54). This enables information sharing between wide ranges of sources and fosters 'horizontal dialogue between subaltern groups' (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 58) that can turn audiences into geographically unconstrained communities (Flew, 2008, pp. 107-108; Downing et al., 2001, p. 3). In this way, radical media can 'prefigure more radically democratic ways of communicating'

(Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 58; cf. Downing et al., 2001, pp. 28-30; Couldry & Curran, 2003, p. 7) by both reporting on and participating communicatively in youth political participation (Johnson, 1971, pp. 6-11). Since movement participants could rely on trusted radical media (Molotch, 1979, p. 81), writers for the 'underground press' were more able to communicate with them on their own terms and acknowledge the biases that developed alongside their loosened adherence to strict 'objectivity' (Johnson, 1971, p. 14). Johnston, Laraña & Gusfield (1994) confirmed the importance of this interaction, stressing that

the more intimate, local and personally relevant an informational input, the greater the influence it has on opinion. If media images of a movement can influence personal or collective identity, their influence carries more weight if it comes via people who are close to and who are valued by the movement participant (p. 19).

The existence of close relationships between participant journalists and movement participants afforded radical media a certain credibility and Snow & Benford (2000) suggested that the credibility of framers is key to the resonance of frames (pp. 620-621). At its best, then, radical media could be an integral partner to the youthful social movements that needed a fairer means of communicating their frames.

Radical media is also said to be characterized by its dedication to communicating investigative service journalism content (Benson, 2003, pp. 111-112; Daniels, 2006, p. 104) and progressive advocacy that is 'explicitly opposed to particular axes of domination' (Hackett & Carroll, 2006, p. 58). If corporate media is accused of trying to mitigate or 'cover up' moments of dislocation, radical media works to exploit such opportunities (e.g., contradictions in official ideology, unexpected dramatic events, systemic crises and the emergence of innovative critical master frames [McAdam, 1994, pp. 40-42]) as examples of critical cognition-stimulating radical contingency. By engaging in this kind of 'political disintermediation,' it challenges hegemonic discourses framed by government 'spin doctors' and corporate media (Flew, 2008, pp. 107-108;

cf. Couldry & Curran, 2003, p. 7) and opens space for movement-framed discourses aimed at producing wider social emancipation (Feenberg, 1986, pp. 120-121; Downing et al., 2001, p. 3). Having greater access to the means of producing the frames, images, symbols and codes that they use to politically mobilize youth toward radical ends (Gross, 1986, pp. 105-106; McAdam, 1994, p. 37; Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 220), movements affiliated with radical media can communicate their progress in actualizing the radical social arrangements of the idealized community they consider preferable to the dominant culture they are challenging (McAdam, 1994, pp. 46, 52). Advances in printing methods in the 1960s allowed youth to produce aesthetically sophisticated and attractive publication designs (Johnson, 1971, pp. 14-15) that drew readers to content — characterized by honest personal concern, poetic immediacy and gravitas-producing immersion (Johnson, 1971, p. 53) — that was ‘moving enough to radicalize, temporarily at least, virtually any reader’ (Johnson, 1971, p. 125). Because it functions in these ways, it is little wonder that vibrant radical media has long existed among powerful movements.

Downing et al. (2001) have highlighted how radical media organizations become part of the diverse strategic arsenal that resource-deficient social movements employ and has pointed out that its prominence tracks the ebb and flow of movement activity (pp. 24-26). While radical media organizations have not entirely vanished, they appear to have been more powerful at the height of youth radicalism in the 1960s. Since radical media organizations often go ‘unmeasured, uncounted and poorly known in official circles or outside their localities,’ their study poses difficulties for researchers who are interested in measuring their presence and impact (p. 27). One indirect indicator of radical media’s influence is the fact that authorities actively impeded movements’ means of communication, persecuting radical media by, among a variety of other means, scouring it for articles that promoted sex or drugs and passing what they found

along to corporate media that were eager to discredit the competition (Marx, 1979, pp. 98- 99; Daniels, 2006, p. 104). Indeed, one way of hobbling radical media organizations was the constant threat of legal sanction for ‘obscenity’ and/or libel. Still, these were risks that many young activist journalists willingly took.

These ‘organic intellectuals,’ who produced and rapidly spread the medium throughout the 1960s, were inspired by radical leftist journals, like *Dissent* (c. 1954) and *Liberation* (c. 1956), which endorsed pacifism, nonviolent protest and resistance amid the escalation of U.S. civil rights struggles (Unger, 1974, p. 16). Radical magazines such as Greenwich Village’s *Village Voice* (c. 1955), *The Realist* (c. 1958) and *Ramparts* (c. 1962) (Unger, 1974, pp. 123-124) were soon followed by Canadian examples like *Canadian Dimension* (c. 1963) and *This Magazine Is About Schools* (c. 1966) (Palmer, 2009, pp. 248, 264). These pioneers prompted the founding of over 500 radical publications by the end of the 1960s (Daniels, 2006, p. 104), and their combined paid circulation of five million in the U.S. alone (Benson, 2003, pp. 111-112) was amplified when their young readers passed copies around multiple times, discussing the issues and ideas presented in their pages with their peers (Johnson, 1971, p. 36). Radical newswires, such as the Underground Press Syndicate and Liberation News Service, helped these publications (and hundreds of radical high school newspapers) coordinate the burgeoning social movement counterculture they informed and served (Johnson, 1971, p. 18). In fact, in his vice-president’s report at a 1967 Students for a Democratic Society meeting, Carl Davidson said that the organization’s ‘shock troops’ (comprising about 80 per cent of SDS membership) rarely read anything unless it came from the Underground Press Syndicate (Davidson, 1967). The emergence of radical West Coast newspapers such as the *Los Angeles Free Press* (c. 1964),

Berkley Barb (c. 1965) and *Bay Guardian* (c. 1966) (Benson, 2003, pp. 111-112) further inspired the radicalization of student newspapers and the founding of Vancouver's *Georgia Straight*.

Local specificity

The *Straight* is an important Canadian example of radical media because, aside from *Rolling Stone*, *This Magazine* and *Canadian Dimension*, it is the only (formerly) radical publication from the 1960s remaining in print in North America (Glavin, 1997, p. 4). It was conceived near the University of British Columbia in February 1967 when a poetry reading by Leonard Cohen prompted a discussion about the need to establish a radical press in Vancouver. This discussion led to an open meeting on April 2, 1967, that brought together current owner/publisher Dan McLeod, 'people's poet' Milton Acorn, visual artist Pierre Coupey and writer Stan Persky, among others, who laid serious plans for the foundation of a radical newspaper. According to Coupey, the *Sun* and the *Province* were deliberately creating fear among the public as a cover for police repression of Vancouver's radical youth; the *Straight* would expose this fact, serving as a 'forum for the besieged youth culture and to provide a flag for the resistance' (Glavin, 1997, p. 2; Clément, 2008, pp. 75-76). In McLeod's (more jaded) words:

No one here seems to know (or admit to knowing) any particular reason for the founding beyond a general pervasive desire to annoy establishment institutions in general and established newspapers in particular. Also, if one wishes to be flowery, to provide a local voice for whatever counterculture exists in Vancouver (McLeod in Barman, 2007, p. 336).

As the rest of this thesis will show, the *Straight* of the 1960s made a solid attempt to do just that.

This forum debuted its first issue, which was 12 pages and cost a dime, on May 5, 1967; by October circulation was 60,000 copies every two weeks and by August 1968 it was distributing on a weekly basis (Pauls & Campbell, 1997, pp. 67-69). The swift rise of the *Georgia Straight* reflected the pervasive desire among young radicals for the power to speak for

themselves by framing their own messages. The *Straight*'s commitment to being 'Vancouver's Free Press' provided youth with a means of expressing identities and politics that corporate media ignored or treated as marginal. These young writers drew attention to corporate media's failures by breaking news that papers like the *Sun* could or would not cover, in the process diagnosing underlying issues, reporting on the gay community respectfully and exploring environmental concerns in earnest well before 'mainstream' publications deemed it necessary (Glavin, 1997, pp. 4-5). Critically-oriented Vancouver writers suffered a lack of local outlets through which to publish their work, but "between the mid-1960s and early 1970s the number of small presses based in the province grew from a handful to over two dozen ... [with] Talonbooks, Pulp Press, Douglas and McIntyre, Harbour, Oolichan, Sono Nis and New Star emerging out of the *Georgia Straight*' (Barman, 2007, p. 341). Although impossible to measure adequately, Vancouver's radical local media made its presence very well known.

According to historian George Bowering (1997), the *Straight*, "which might be said to represent the 'new left,' regular socialists, hipsters, dope-smoking poets, environmentalists, rock-and-rollers, anarchist cartoonists and university professors who did not wear neckties," was indeed widely read (p. 327). It also had direct ties to more than one locally-based SMO. In the case of Greenpeace (and its predecessor committees), 'most of the Vancouver office during the first three campaigns had worked for the city's highly successful underground newspaper, the *Georgia Straight*' (Dale, 1996, pp. 17, 76, 81). Cool-Aid, an independent youth services organization that launched the career of former NDP Premier Mike Harcourt, was founded in and operated for some time out of the *Straight*'s office (Pauls and Campbell, 1997, 68). Harry Rankin, the corporate media-derided 'radical' Vancouver city councillor and regular *Straight* contributor, fought city hall and the conservative municipal party alone until the 1968 foundation

of the reformist Committee of Progressive Electors (Rankin, 1975, p. 109). Magnusson (1986) has made a connection between urban protest movements in 1960s Vancouver and the mid-1970s electoral success of other reformers like Rankin (p. 239), which lends further weight to the claim that not only did the *Straight* maintain relationships with important SMOs and their participants, it also helped communicate the discourses that contributed to their successes. In addition to giving activists a voice, the *Straight* was effective at annoying the authorities.

According to Dominique Clément (2008), fighting for the rights of ‘poor drug addicts’ and recreational users was an important dimension of movement activism in Vancouver (p. 14). Youth protests had become so frequent by the end of the 1960s that vitriolic corporate media coverage and police repression led to a tense climax known as the Gastown riot. A public inquiry into the event ultimately blamed the *Straight* for instigating a cannabis ‘smoke-in’ that drew an authority-defying youthful crowd, but it was the police who were chastised for turning the gathering into a riot by initiating a brutal response (pp. 76-78). However, raising the ire of local authorities was nothing new to the *Straight*; it had been banned in New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, North Vancouver, West Vancouver, Squamish and Haney within its first year of publication (p. 68). What is more, the paper had to fight a ‘virtual war of survival’ against ‘official censorship’ (p. 70), leading a Special Senate Committee Report on Mass Media to conclude that

There are tens of thousands of people who think Vancouver’s underground newspaper, the *Georgia Straight*, is a marvelous publication — provocative, funny, thoughtful, courageous, honest and joyous. There are probably hundreds of thousands of people in Vancouver who, whether or not they’ve read a copy, think the *Straight* is obscene, immoral, scurrilous and subversive — an all-around menace to youth. This latter-judgment appears to include most of Vancouver’s municipal and law-enforcement Establishment, for the *Straight* has been subjected to intimidation and harassment, both legal and extra-legal, that we can only describe as shocking (Canada, 1970, p. 98).

Corporate media’s ‘ignorance’ of authorities’ attempts to silence the *Straight* (Canada, 1970; Clément, 2008, 73) may be interpreted as evidence that they felt threatened by the emergence of

new voices that were more credible to growing movement communities than they were. Regardless of whether or not it can be proved that the *Straight* was directly responsible for encouraging youth to participate in a social movement, it can be said with confidence that it tried and touched a great many people through its relationships within the local community and the movement-oriented discursive frames it communicated.

Conclusion

This chapter began with the assertion that understanding social change requires an explanation of how people come to understand the world around them and what, if any, action they want to undertake based on that understanding. In other words, social movement scholarship, if it wants to explain why participants chose to act, must identify processes that enable actors to perceive opportunities and describe how they see themselves responding. Unfortunately, despite the proliferation of literature on framing processes, this field of research has not been directed to adequately theorize the role that media plays in shaping the perceptions and attitudes of potential participants. Critical media studies, however, does make useful contributions in this regard, offering insights into how media texts might be interpreted subversively by ‘active audiences’ or at face value by commodified media consumers. Although this body of research does not intersect with the study of social movements as much as it should, it does articulate important concepts related to the power of discourse and their relationship to hegemony, counter-/anti-/post-hegemony and corporate media’s masking of the ‘radical contingency’ of reality.

What little social movement research into the relationships between movements and media there is tends to focus on how movements must adapt their strategies and tactics to get corporate media coverage and counter its distortions. Given the asymmetries of power between

movements and this kind of media, participants feel they are forced to use innovative methods that satisfy the media's thirst for novelty and sensation. Unfortunately, movements' carefully constructed frames, even when embedded in visual symbols, are often deliberately ignored by corporate media in favour of superficial (and often inaccurate) reportage on turnout or the scandalous nature of civil disobedience. In fact, corporate media often actively militates against social movements by denying them the ability to speak for themselves and actively caricaturing their participants. One might think that Canadian media, especially on the 'left coast,' might be less apt to perpetuate the kinds of willful myopia and oppressive discourses than, say, American corporate media, but in reality the difference is one of degrees. Research on Vancouver's corporate media consistently suggests that movements do not receive adequate, let alone sympathetic coverage from consolidated newsrooms.

Radical media, however, offers movements a fairer means of articulating and communicating their frames and is actually a time-tested tool that movements have used to build and protect the cultures and identities that they seek to reproduce on wider scales. Its cell-like affinity group structure supports internal solidarity among its contributors and promotes external solidarity through its ability to aggregate and bridge the frames of the various movements its reporters have little difficulty in interacting with. Vancouver's *Georgia Straight* presents a successful and well-connected, if much maligned, example of Canadian radical media and therefore presents an appealing research target. Yet if radical media's contributions to social movements — and by extension to passionate youth political participation — continue to be ignored, how can there be actionable understanding of the messages that inspire youth to join others in acting on their consciences? What might be lost in the discourses of radical 1960s youth that could be of tremendous resonance to youth today, especially since they face the same

persistent crises? To the *Georgia Straight's* radical years, as an exploratory beginning, is where this thesis now turns for evidence of the potent frames that a new generation of youth might use to finish the fights their parents' generation have not.

III. Framing Radicalism in the *Georgia Straight* (1967-1969)

Radical publications had blossomed alongside youth social movement participation throughout the 1960s, but it took nearly until the ‘Summer of Love’ for radical youth on Canada’s West Coast to build their own ‘underground’ newspaper. Vancouver’s ‘Free Press,’ the *Georgia Straight*, began publishing not long after the first Easter ‘Be-in’ at Stanley Park, around the same time as Martin Luther King Jr.’s New York anti-war march and just before the Beatles released their Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band record. Its debut came at a time when social turbulence was increasing daily and the *Straight*’s first months were marked by its difficulties in finding a willing Vancouver-based printer, its publisher being held for ‘investigation of vagrancy’ and Mayor Tom Campbell’s attempt to revoke its business license (Pauls & Campbell, 1997, pp. 67-68). The *Straight* would face a great deal more repression (e.g., “Straight vendor beats rap,” 1967, p. 5; Cummings, 1968g, p. 4; Cummings, 1968h, p. 5; Harding, 1968a, p. 2; Harding, 1968b, p. 3; Sommer, 1968, p. 1; “Free press under siege,” 1969, p. 3; “Not a peep,” 1969, p. 3) for its activities. Official rationale for authorities’ harassment of the *Straight* would cite the paper’s tendency to publish ‘obscene’ content, advocate extra-legal practices (e.g., offering instructions for cultivating cannabis) and launch libelous criticisms of public figures. However, in light of the Canadian Senate Committee Report on Mass Media’s finding that local authorities subjected the *Straight* to ‘shocking’ levels of intimidation, there are perhaps other reasons why the paper was such a target.

Authorities may have recognized that radical media organizations like the *Straight* were important means by which radical youth could engage in the communicative antagonism that helped align youths’ collective identities with countercultural protest master frames. The stories found in the ‘underground press’ may have aided youth in identifying those responsible for their

frustrations, articulating the injustices they witnessed, proposing solutions and motivating their peers to participate in the massive social movements that shook that era's social, economic and political structures. To make this case, this chapter delves into the *Straight*'s archives and conducts a content and discourse analysis of texts found within a sampling of issues published during the roughly two and a half year period between the paper's May 1967 inception and the end of 1969. Although the *Straight* and movements maintained their radicalism into the early 1970s, 1968 is generally regarded as a pivotal year in the wider 1960s protest cycle. The period immediately preceding and following this turbulent year also represents a manageable data set with which to begin what will hopefully be more expansive analyses of the frames found within radical media's content and discourses.

This chapter proceeds by first outlining the methodological approach that undergirds the empirical analysis conducted in subsequent pages. The chapter's next task is to show the extent to which the content found in the *Straight* corresponds with the master frames that are recognized as prevalent among local social movements. Once a relationship between the *Straight*'s content and the frames which resonate with various movement cultures has been established, the following section proceeds to explore how the paper's discourses reflect the collective identity frames that delineate boundaries between movement protagonists, antagonists and corporate media. Finally, Chapter III concludes with an analysis of the various movement-oriented diagnostic, prognostic and motivational collective action frames presented in the *Georgia Straight*. The messages contained in these discourses are striking for their consistent and intensifying radicalism that corresponded with that of youth movements as a whole during the period under analysis. Analyzing these frames thus provides much-needed insight into the importance of the relationships between social movements and radical media.

Methodology

This chapter uses a combination of content and discourse analysis to analyze the frames present in the *Georgia Straight*. Since the meaning of these kinds of analyses are not self-evident, this subsection first briefly describes some conceptual distinctions relevant to these kinds of analyses and then offers methodological rationale for the size of the textual sample chosen as the empirical data for this study. Since Chapter II discussed the concept of discourse at some length, more needs to be said about ‘content analysis,’ which will be employed with regard to master frames in this chapter’s first substantive section, than about ‘discourse analysis,’ which will be employed with regard to collective identity and action frames in this chapter’s second and third substantive sections, respectively. Klaus Krippendorff (2004) suggests that discourse analysis focuses upon ‘how particular phenomena are represented’ within ‘text above the level of sentences’ (p. 16). In this sense, the sections which analyze the collective identity and action frames found in the *Straight* seek to evaluate how these texts cumulatively represent discursive categorizations of the identities ascribed to movement protagonists/antagonists and of the kinds of politics attributed to them. Qualitative approaches like discourse analysis involve ‘the rearticulation (interpretation) of given texts into new (analytical, deconstructive, emancipatory or critical) narratives that are accepted within particular scholarly communities that are sometimes opposed to positivist traditions of inquiry’ (p. 17). Therefore, while the discourse analyses in this chapter will be representative of the sampled texts, they will necessarily be based upon closer readings of fewer texts than is the content analysis.

Generally speaking, media content analyses can be considered quantitative in the sense that a researcher seeks to determine how often a given term or idea is manifested within textual material or qualitative in the sense that a researcher seeks to identify the latent meanings (Zhang

& Wildemuth, 2009, p. 1) represented by ‘important themes or categories within a body of content’ (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 11). Given its statistical orientation, quantitative content analysis is often said to ‘conform to the scientific method and produce reliable findings’ (Macnamara, 2005, p. 5) by testing hypotheses or addressing theoretical research questions deductively (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 1). Conversely, qualitative content analysis is often considered ‘unscientific’ because it involves a more difficult interpretive approach that utilizes smaller samples of content (Macnamara, 2005, p. 5; cf. Krippendorff, 2004, p. 17) to inductively ground ‘the examination of topics and themes, as well as the inferences drawn from them, in the data’ (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 1). Thus, qualitative content analysis can be used to validate existing theories and provide thick descriptions ‘of the social reality created by those themes/categories as they are lived out in a particular setting’ (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 11). In other words, quantitative approaches deduce media’s influence based upon how frequently a term is found in texts while qualitative approaches infer things about society (and about texts) based upon readings of how textual materials might reflect reality.

Krippendorff (2004), however, questions the appropriateness of the distinction between qualitative and quantitative content analysis on the grounds that ‘all reading of texts is qualitative, even when certain characteristics of a text are later converted into numbers’ (p. 16). Indeed, if the purpose of media content analysis is to understand both the deeper meanings of texts and how they are likely to be interpreted by audiences, combining qualitative and quantitative methods ‘seems to be the ideal approach’ (Macnamara, 2005, p. 5). Although some scholars suggest that precise qualitative methodologies are ‘poorly defined’ (Macnamara, 2005, p. 15), that sampling for qualitative analysis is not required to meet the statistically valid formulae of quantitative analysis (Macnamara, 2005, p. 17) and that sampling strategies for

qualitative research should be driven by a conceptual question rather than a concern for ‘representativeness’ (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 29), this thesis will attempt to have it both ways. The fact remains that the hybrid content analysis to follow must ‘define a tangible sampling frame’ from the large population (Wang & Riffe, 2010) of newspaper issues within the period under analysis. Although the ‘spectre’ of sampling bias is quite real, ‘it is possible to collect data by means of sampling plans that minimize such bias’ (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 111). Fortunately, this study can proceed from the insights gained by several attempts to work out what the appropriate ratio is between samples and populations.

Riffe, Lacy & Drager (1996) experimented with different sampling techniques to determine how well a sample represents a population. They randomly sampled one issue per month of a weekly newsmagazine (or 23 percent of the population) and found that it was the most efficient way to represent the year’s 52 issues. Riffe, Lacy & Fico (1998) found that randomly sampling 28 days out of six months of a daily newspaper (or 18 percent) was a statistically adequate approach. Moreover, they found that one constructed week (i.e., one issue from a Monday, one issue from a Tuesday, etc.) of six issues also accurately represented six months of the same daily newspaper. In this case, the sample was only 3.8 percent of the population. Lacy, Riffe & Randle (1998) explored the best sampling strategy for studying five years of dailies and concluded that a nine constructed week sample of 54 issues (or 3.5 percent) was adequate. Finally, Chou, Franke & Wilcox (1987) compared advertising content over a period of 15 years by surveying 12 magazines at intervals of five years and chose one issue of each magazine randomly from each quarter of the year to reduce ‘bias due to seasonality’ (p. 121). These examples suggest that there are many different ways to construct an adequate sample from variously sized and formatted textual populations.

There do not appear to be any studies that attempt to work out the best sample-to-population ratio for a multi-year analysis of a paper that began as a bi-weekly and transitioned to a weekly (which reverted back to a bi-weekly schedule between December and March each year), as did the *Straight*. Fortunately, Robert Weber (1990) maintains that ‘there is no simple *right way* to do content analysis. Instead, investigators must judge what methods are most appropriate for their substantive problems’ (p. 13). Although Lacy and Riffe’s work is helpful, their insights are hard to generalize to other kinds of populations because their recommendations varied depending on what they studied. That said, longitudinal analysis of ‘community-based newspapers or difficult-to-reach media’ that are only available on ‘hard to get non-digitized microfilm’ (e.g., the *Straight*) can be accomplished by randomly selecting from a subpopulation (i.e., one issue from each quarter, month or week), a method which is otherwise known as ‘stratified random sampling’ (Luke, Caburnay & Cohen, 2011, p. 78-79). The empirical data analyzed in this chapter rests on just such a method, which has been slightly modified to accommodate the *Straight*’s somewhat irregular publishing schedule.

Fifteen issues of the *Straight* were sampled for their substantive news and opinion-oriented content. Only the ‘letters to the editor’ and content that was explicitly entertainment-oriented (e.g., film and music reviews, non-political comics, etc.) or commercially-oriented (e.g., advertisements, classifieds, etc.), which typically comprised between a quarter and a third of the *Straight*’s content, were excluded from the content analysis. These fifteen issues comprise a roughly quarterly random stratified sample and represent 17 percent of the 88 issues produced between the *Straight*’s inception and the end of 1969. Three issues from 1967, during which time the *Straight* operated on a bi-weekly publication schedule, were sampled: Vol. 1, No. 1 – May 5-18; Vol. 1, No. 5 – Sept. 8-21; and Vol. 1, No. 8 – Nov. 24-Dec. 8. Six issues from 1968,

during which time the *Straight* shifted from a bi-weekly to a weekly format in early August, were sampled: Vol. 2, No. 10 – Jan. 12-25; Vol. 2, No. 13 – Mar. 8-21; Vol. 2, No. 17 – May 3-16; Vol. 2, No. 25 – Aug. 16-22; Vol. 2, No. 29 – Sept. 13-19; and Vol. 2, No. 32 – Oct. 11-17. Finally, six issues from 1969, during which time the *Straight* operated on a weekly schedule (aside from its regular bi-weekly winter schedule), were sampled: Vol. 3, No. 43 – Jan. 3-16; Vol. 3, No. 50 – Mar. 21-27; Vol. 3, No. 59 – May 28-Jun. 3; Vol. 3, No. 66 – Jul. 16-22; Vol. 3, No. 78 – Oct. 8-15; and Vol. 3, No. 87 – Dec. 10-17. Using this representative sample, the next section proceeds to analyze the ways in which the *Georgia Straight*'s content was aligned with injustice-oriented master frames.

Master frame aligned content

This thesis has repeatedly asserted that there are underappreciated relationships between social movements and radical media. Even though the *Straight*'s publisher and founders explicitly stated that their paper represented the local youth culture and its radical activists, more evidence for these relationships needs to be marshalled to substantiate such claims. Carroll & Ratner (1996a; 1996b) provided an analytical basis for this task when they studied the extent to which Vancouver-area activists and SMOs in the early 1990s shared different kinds of injustice-oriented master frames. Although they studied movements that were active nearly 25 years after the late-1960s period under investigation in this thesis, the geographical location of their study and the historical legacies of movements that oscillate between periods of latency and activity does provide some basis for indirect comparison. In fact, it is not the historical correspondence between the relative prominences of particular master frames that is of interest here. Instead, the master frame typologies that they found rooted among Vancouver's movements are themselves

most helpful for analyzing the extent to which the content in the *Straight* was aligned with the master frames that underpinned the emergence of movement-facilitating protest cultures.

Carroll & Ratner's interviews with activists identified three main ideal-type master frames. The first — and most prevalent in that it was shared by 75% of all respondents — was the political economy injustice frame. In this frame

power is viewed as systemic, institutional, structural and materially grounded, for instance in wealth. The various structures of power — e.g., capital, state, the media — are seen as articulated together. Oppression is mainly a matter of material deprivation, of exploitation, of alienation, etc., which may include the domination of nature in the pursuit of profit ... Counter-power involves resistance in the senses of concerted opposition to domination and of attempts to transform the system (pp. 415-416).

This political economy frame is also said to view power as unjustly concentrated and be broadly aligned with socialist sensibilities (p. 416). This master frame is most useful for counter-hegemonic politics.

For the identity politics injustice frame, in contrast,

power resides in everyday human relations, as agency, an attribute of people. Power is often attached to identity markers such as gender and race, as in the oft-cited case of white males as dominant group. It is often associated with practices that are corrupt, discriminatory, etc., yet there is also the possibility of power shifts as people reject old (e.g., patriarchal) models of human relations ... Counter-power is conceived as empowerment, as sharing power (p. 416).

This identity-based frame, which was shared by nearly 40 percent of respondents (p. 418) and is said to resonate with participants in new social movements, suggests that oppression is a matter of the marginalization and 'othering' that results from cultural socialization (p. 416). This master frame is therefore most associated with efforts aimed at shifting culture.

Finally, the liberal injustice frame, shared by 31 percent of respondents, recognizes the state, parliaments and government as mediators of group-organized conflict in society and suggests that

power involves the strategic mobilization of resources such as money, whose distribution is treated as a given rather than as itself constitutive of power. There is a plurality of groups vying for power, each with its own interests and resources. The liberal frame presents a "realist" (or Hobbesian) view of subjects who act in self-interested ways, reflecting their human nature.

Counter-power is similarly self-interested and can be most effective when exercised through established means (p. 416).

Since the liberal injustice frame views oppression as ‘the denial of rights’ and suggests that solutions would be forthcoming were representative democracy not so flawed, Carroll & Ratner find that ‘its potential as a counter-hegemonic master frame is dubious’ (p. 416). What is not dubious, however, is the connection between these frames and the *Straight*’s content.

Out of the 224 news articles, editorials, opinion pieces, political cartoons and images found in the sample of 15 issues of the *Georgia Straight* between mid-1967 and the end of 1969, fully 76 percent to some extent articulated a political economy injustice frame. The identity politics frame was represented in 61 percent of the *Straight*’s content while liberal injustice frames were present in 46 percent. The reason why these figures do not add up to 100 percent is of course because 68 percent of the analyzed content combined these frames, including 15 percent that featured all three frames, 37 percent that combined political economy and identity politics frames, 12 percent that combined political economy and liberal frames and four percent that combined identity politics and liberal frames. Of the remaining content, 15 percent featured only the liberal injustice frame, 12 percent advanced only the political economy frame and just five percent invoked only the identity politics frame. Article-by-article and issue-by-issue breakdowns of the distribution of these frames can be found in Appendix A on pages 137-167 and Appendix B on pages 168-169, respectively.

Before moving on to study other discursive frames more closely it is worth noting that the master frames found in the *Straight* during this era are not proportionally all that dissimilar to those observed by Carroll & Ratner (1996a; 1996b), especially when taking into account the relatively intense nature of 1960s protest culture vis-à-vis the early 1990s. Furthermore, it should be noted that the *Straight*’s preoccupation with free speech rights and the rights of drug

users — which helps explain the relative frequency of liberal injustice frames present — reflects the paper's commitment to issues that were quite relevant to the youth culture for which it attempted to provide a voice.

Collective identity discursive fields

In representing youthful perspectives, the *Straight* directly and indirectly ascribed many characteristics to the various actors with which its readers interacted. Articulating these characteristics, along with their associated values and motivations, contributes to movements' boundary framing activities and the following section offers discursive examples of the *Straight*'s efforts to delineate the collective identity fields of protagonists, antagonists and corporate media.

Protagonist frames:

At a time when corporate media depicted non-conformist youth as deviants, the *Georgia Straight* actively framed their identities in a way that other youth who were not 'turned on' could find attractive. An example of this can be found in the *Straight*'s fifth issue, from September 1967, where, placed above an article on how to use yoga, meditation and breath awareness to maintain a 'good trip,' photos of long-haired youth in hip clothing appeared above the caption:

We have gathered together in a grassy meadow. We felt its pressure beneath our dancing feet and we have made love and been stoned by the feeling of hundreds of people around us being alive — for we have quietly blown our minds with the forces of nature you taught us to play with — and we have been free (Narad, 1967, p. 3).

This scene captures some of the essence of radical youths' incipient movement culture by framing youthful ideals as extending to nature, active expression, the 'high' of belonging to a community and expanded consciousness, as well as bridging these ideals with the lessons imparted by older generations and Western society's most cherished Enlightenment value: freedom. Yet this collective identity frame did not reflect protagonists' political streak.

In the same issue, Vancouver City Councillor Harry Rankin's (1967) article "What makes a hippie?" recognized youths' insistence that they be free to develop their own identity and suggested that their 'disillusionment' with wider society made them 'unconventional rebels' whose tactics appeared to consist of adopting an 'outlandish appearance,' 'opting out' from society, doing minimal work, following their own interests and helping each other. Rankin implored them to 'chip in' and 'do their share' to 'make society better' because they were part of it 'whether they like it or not' (p. 4). That this critical article appeared in the *Straight* at all is evidence of the paper's intention to convey a motivational collective action frame that followed from a sympathetic member of the public audience's more-or-less correct identity imputation. Indeed, these radical youth were aware that their status as surplus labour afforded them a chance to reflect upon their values and build co-operative communities. Regular contributor Bob Cummings (1968a) recognized this fact and suggested that youths' material freedom was giving rise to demands for moral and mental freedom that extended beyond private attitudes regarding their sexuality and appearance, toward personal conceptions of their moral responsibility to 'help erase social sicknesses such as war, hatred, prejudice and poverty' (p. 10). This article from January 1968 advances a frame that links youths' moral character to their strategic position and suggests that their free consciousness constitutes a motivation to remedy social injustice.

Pierre Coupey (1967) offered suggestions as to how youth might use their very identity as a means of attack upon 'reality' in his article "Il faut vaincre la machine" (The machine must be overcome). Coupey stated that the 'revolution is now' and framed it as an opportunity for youth to think and live as radically free 'integral organisms' instead of as 'labels, words, functions, symbols or tools' that are defined and manipulated by others. He suggested that hippies wearing no shoes, multi-coloured clothes and old army jackets were consciously refusing to be slaves to

symbols of ‘reality.’ Rather, they transformed and subordinated these symbols to their identities, using play, imagination, art and love (but not weapons) to attack the symbolic order and invite people to re-examine reality beyond appearances. This change in consciousness and awareness was said to be produced by the dynamic interchange of energy between human beings (p. 4). While these frames might seem ‘out there’ to some, they nonetheless valorized emotional and relational characteristics of youth identity that could motivated gentle, compassionate, creative and peaceful action. Juxtaposed with the increasing bureaucratization of and intensifying conflict within society, it is understandable that youth would be attracted to sharing in this collective identity and personifying its culture.

In “A letter to my son” from January 1968, Barry Cramer asked his son to recognize that, despite the disapproving frames advanced by corporate media, there were many functional adults in society who were proud that their children were radical and also believed that ‘life is groovy and that there is a place for everyone in this world’ (p. 6). The *Straight*’s editor and publisher, Dan McLeod, extended this sentiment on the cover of the same issue in an article titled “We are all God/You are all God” (1968). McLeod sought to transform religious frames and bridge struggles by suggesting that everyone ‘knows something about how to live’ yet are led to feel separate and lonely when they play by the rules of the ‘game’ instead of participating in the ‘community’ of people who recognize that everyone and everything is a manifestation of god. This awareness allowed those rules to be changed and McLeod predicted that by the summer of 1968 the majority of youth would experience this awareness (with the aid of ‘mind expanding chemicals’ if necessary) and could either wait for the un-aware to ‘die off’ or try to ‘turn on’ the ‘old folks’ (p. 1). Here again, the *Straight* sought to frame movement protagonists’ identity as

one entailing higher consciousness and to extend feelings of solidarity throughout the ‘community’ that was trying to transcend society’s ‘games.’

Despite such efforts, radical youth who were ramping up their political participation at the climax of the 1960s had to struggle to maintain solidaristic collective identities. John Mills wrote a March 1968 article, titled “SFU *is* real – complete with rotten government,” as a response to accusations — despite the administrative struggles, student/faculty strikes, building occupations and scores of student arrests which often put SFU in the headlines — that the student movement was isolated in an ‘ivory tower’ paradise. Mills contended that the university was a microcosm of class-stratified democratic struggle and implored the public to recognize the student struggle as ‘exactly parallel to its own’ (p. 7). Others, like Laurier LaPierre (1968b), wrote that the composition of aggrieved student groups mirrored wider social factions wherein participation in radical movements came more from those oriented toward the humanities and social sciences than those practicing in conservative disciplines like law, medicine and engineering (p.6). Furthermore, a faculty member from the English department at SFU wrote an article suggesting that the struggles of students and faculty were incompatible in light of their failure to develop a united front against the university’s administration (Zaslove, 1968, p. 7). Unfortunately, even the most well-intentioned efforts to bridge the struggles of different groups by framing them as fundamentally aligned were frustrated by differing levels of investment in the status quo and the attendant personal consequences of authorities’ repressive retaliation.

By the time the *Georgia Straight* published an interview with jailed Black Panther Party co-founder Huey P. Newton in October 1968, radical youth had witnessed the assassinations Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert Kennedy and the ‘police riot’ at the 1968 Democratic Party convention in Chicago. Newton’s comments, which were focused on how collective experiences

of repression were affecting ‘the state of the white-black revolutionary nation we are trying to build,’ bridged the civil rights-turned-Black Power struggle with that of the Yippies by drawing parallels between and highlighting the kinds of injustice both groups faced and fought against. According to Newton, oppressed blacks tried to liberate themselves by seeking freedom as a group while whites, as part of the establishment, were merely interested in freeing themselves as individuals with their street theater-based ‘individualist anarchism.’ However, at Berkeley and in Chicago, these tactics led to repressive overreaction (i.e., ‘Yippies were treated like blacks — denied service in restaurants, thrown out of stores, their asses kicked by pigs in back alleys’) that forced whites to defend themselves collectively and led to ‘a sense of real revolutionary community.’ The interviewer underscored that belonging to this community entailed living decently, courageously and with dignity; participants were ‘human beings because they are revolutionaries’ (Albert, 1968, p. 6). In this way, these communities combined their shared sense of injustice with imputations about their collective identity as a means of amplifying their experiences of repression into a motivational narrative frame about the ongoing opportunity for revolutionary collective action.

In the same issue, Eldridge Cleaver’s (1968) article, “Yippanther pact,” proclaimed that the ‘spirit of the people,’ represented by a ‘revolutionary generation,’ was more potent than their adversaries’ technology. Cleaver extended the boundary of this righteousness to the ‘disenchanted, alienated white youth, the hippies, the Yippies and all the unnamed dropouts from the white man’s burden,’ as well as to the youth movement’s allies among the ‘entire anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist world of mankind’ (p. 7). The possibility of such a contagion resulted from a master protest frame that featured flexible codes and resonated with youth because it was culturally compatible with their experience of a world transfixed by revolutionary upheaval,

consistent with their observation of increasing repression and relevant to their perception of the generation gap. In January 1969, Bob Cummings bridged the movement's frame with the American Revolution (along with others, including the progressive sides of the Reformation and the Industrial Revolution) in his article, "We the people in 1969." Cummings said Black Power militants, student activists, revolutionaries and the poor constituted the 'new moralists' who, though revolutionary struggle, would achieve human betterment and the 'dream of equality, humanity, justice and people power.' Although these frames cast a wide net in terms of who was invited to participate in the revolution and claim a share of 'the movement's' collective identity, there was still an explicit recognition that solidarity did not necessitate totalizing unity.

Cummings affirmed that while King and Kennedy's peaceful battle against pervasive violence ended in death, their dreams of 'common equality' connected various revolutionary groups that were each fighting their own oppressors, giving rise to '20 or 100 simultaneous revolutions' that were not formally joined or unified so much as they shared an affinity that allowed them to lend strength and support to each other (p. 5). This effort to create solidarity by identifying shared motivations, bridging struggles and widening participants' sense of collective identity was aided by Ken Lester, who, in May of 1969, tracked the recent trajectory of the youth movement. Lester pointed out that alienated youths' 1967 pilgrimage to Haight-Ashbury was an attempt to use loving, feeling and divine pureness to 'dissolve socio-economic insanity' and 're-weave the fabric of Earth's ecological balance that was hemorrhaging in cancerous mutation.' This vision was 'assassinated' by repression that created 'martyrs' in the streets and led authorities and corporate media to try to limit the extension of movements' collective identity by labeling participants as members of a 'radical minority.' Lester suggested that this vague identity imputation offered participants an anonymity that brought an 'us' together and preserved

the mutually respectful, horizontal, decentralized, interrelated and anarchistic nature of ‘the movement.’ His article ended with the assertion that youth could relate to the consciousness and instant adaptability of street inhabitants because “we are the new beggars ... [and] community means us” (pp. 16-17). These discourses represent sustained attempts to frame protagonists’ collective identity in ways that were positive, attractive and increasingly solidaristic as the scale and costs of repression mounted; the *Straight*’s framing of the antagonist identity field was no less commensurate with the deterioration of youthful attitudes toward authority as their movements exploded in the 1960s.

Antagonist frames:

The front page of the *Georgia Straight*’s first issue featured a short article, titled “The great bus stop bust,” about how the police tried to arrest a group of loitering youths for vagrancy. The article referred to the authorities as the ‘fuzz’ and ‘the Man’ before suggesting that as ‘police harassment increases, the war between the young hip and creeping old fageyism is being escalated’ (1967, p. 1; cf. Acorn, 1967b, p. 4). This ‘war’ between ‘age’ and ‘youth’ reflected what became known as the ‘generation gap’ and made delineating the boundaries between youth-driven movements and their antagonists easy. In August 1968 John Mills wrote that he wanted to write a letter to the editor decrying the use of tax dollars to prosecute the *Straight* and sign it ‘Indignant Taxpayer’ to beat the anti-immigrant, anti-intellectual, conformist, deferential, reactionary ‘bastards’ at their own game (pp. 3, 14). However, not all antagonist identity imputations resorted to such labeling or stayed within strict age categories (e.g. “don’t trust anyone over 30”), as depicted in a May 1969 cartoon of an exchange between an increasingly agitated square dad and his hip son:

Son, life is constant; Dad, life is change / Ambition is a striving for improvement; Ambition is a striving for power / Responsibility is answering the needs of your society; Responsibility is answering the needs of mankind / Order is a hallmark of civilization; Order supports the status quo

/ Patriotism is your country right or wrong; Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel / Duty is an obligation to your nation; Duty is a moral obligation / Obedience is respect for the wisdom of government; Obedience is the mark of slavery / Freedom is not a gift, it must be earned; If freedom is not for everyone, it is not for anyone / Son, rebellion is just a youthful phase; Dad, I'll be forty-one next May ("Generation gap," 1969, p. 18).

This cartoon exposes the basis of some fundamental tensions between the values of youth and their parents' generation. The cartoon also suggests that 'youthful' radicalism is not so much a biological phase as it is an assumed identity. As much as those sharing in these radicalized collective identities were apt to confront perceived adversaries who were in close proximity, their real targets were often explicitly 'the system' and its defenders.

During the period under investigation, the *Straight* was unrelenting in its negative framing of 'so-called' free enterprise society (Acorn, 1967b, p. 4) and the 'hypocritical' establishment which presided over this 'unhealthy' order (Rankin, 1967, p. 4). The first issue's editorial featured a cartoon that depicted Vancouver's Mayor Tom Campbell morphing into Adolf Hitler above its assertion that the mayor, Premier Bennett and Prime Minister Pearson were colonial occupiers without treaty-legitimated jurisdiction in British Columbia ("Editorial," 1967, p. 2). Other articles did not go so far as to frame authorities' identities as implicated in genocidal imperialism, but nonetheless pointed out examples of their duplicity. Laurier LaPierre (1968a) wrote that Justice Minister and federal Liberal leadership candidate Pierre Trudeau was mostly known in English-speaking intellectual circles as a social activist, professor and writer, but many Québécois thought he was a 'turncoat' for joining the Liberals after calling them idiots (p. 6). Politicians that were sympathetic to youth movements were spared such criticism, however, and were sometimes offered space to publish their critiques, such as that of Alderman Harry Rankin (1968a), who published an article, titled "Compulsory arbitration with a vengeance," about a bill in the provincial legislature that threatened democratic rights and civil liberties by curtailing the right to strike (p. 6), and NDP MLA Tom Berger's (1968) assertion

that the “rainy day has come, and the [\$100 million provincial budget surplus] should be spent to help *our* people come in out of the rain” (p. 6, emphasis added). Although these public figures were sometimes permitted to identify with youth movements in articulating their opposition to examples of injustice at the hands of ruling politicians, their ability to communicate with movements through the *Straight* was hindered by intensifying opposition to the structures they represented.

McLeod (1968) said that these ‘heavy game players’ were naturally quite uneasy around ‘hip’ people because, as ‘old folks,’ they had been conditioned to let go of their childhood and convinced that society’s ‘elites’ were Gods. Politicians like President Johnson were seen as confused into thinking they alone were the ‘all powerful, all knowing’ God of the Bible, carefully choosing their ‘disciples’ and trying to make others ‘afraid’ of them. In a charitable passage, McLeod suggested that these politicians were victims of their own ‘conditioning’ because they made no time to see themselves as ‘participants in a living community-organism’; instead they saw themselves as ‘doing a job’ for the community from which they were separate (p. 1). This same issue featured Alan Watts’ (1968) warning that the ‘dangerous swelling of national paranoia’ was leading ‘flower-children’ to consider ‘violent reprisal’ against ‘apoplectic’ police and the ‘uptight establishment.’ This ‘gathering storm of sheer rage’ was a result of each side being ‘fascinated with the forces which it hates’ and could lead to “a total blackout of mankind ... A mutual massacre of scapegoats!” (p. 3). The prediction that authorities would act out the worst of the imputed characteristics of their identities in response to youths’ frustrations turned out to be tragically well-founded.

Even by September of 1967, government, political parties, armies, churches, corporations, ad agencies and universities had been identified as oppressive structures through

which ‘the machine’ demanded human ‘submission’ (Coupey, 1967, p. 4). This list of targets came to include specific reference to ‘enemy’ agents like ‘white honkeys, reactionary conservatives, hard-line leftists, war profiteers, greedy landlords and university presidents’ (Cummings, 1969, p. 5). In fact, a May 1969 issue featured a full spread cartoon of a university’s acting president, sitting in front of a wall-mounted picture of then-California Governor Ronald Reagan, typing several meters worth of paper with the words ‘Bull Shit’ filling the pages (“Presidential address,” 1969, pp. 10-11). The ‘paternalistic’ presidents, prime ministers and premiers that ‘aped’ law and order and dominated the ‘flipped out’ ‘dinosaur’ colonial establishment were considered the modern incarnations of ‘avaricious masters, power lords, feudal princes and ancient God-Kings.’ These ‘stupid, lying, reckless, defiant, aggressive, corrupt, exploitative, mad, murdering and miserable wretches’ represented ‘worldwide traditions of hatred, bigotry, ignorance, intolerance, injustice and slavery,’ but their ‘frantic,’ ‘vicious’ and retaliatory attempt to oppressively extinguish mass dissent by ‘smashing in the skulls’ of youth participants had ‘unmasked’ the power structure, revealed its systemic weakness and aligned humanist forces against its dominance (Cleaver, 1968, p. 7; Cummings, 1969, p. 5; “Earth read out,” 1969, pp. 15-16; Lester, 1969, pp. 16-17; “Wanted: Conspiracy to incite riot,” 1969, p. 21). These vivid characterizations were meant to stir passionate emotions in youth and convince them that these movement antagonists deserved to be overthrown not only because they perpetuated unjust policies, but also because their motivations implied their character itself was abhorrent.

Corporate media frames:

Of course, public audiences were used to respectful and deferential, even if at times mildly critical, treatment of the public figures who represented institutions that underpinned the status quo. This failure of corporate media to hold authorities to full account for their

(in)activity, in addition to their role in supporting repressive action against social movements, made corporate media another perpetual target of the *Straight*'s delegitimizing antagonist framing. The *Straight* castigated the *Vancouver Sun* and *Province* newspapers for spouting 'propaganda clichés,' alleging 'vicious lies' and promoting authorities' harassment of youth and the establishments which catered to them, calling them "illegitimates who go to bed together every night" because they were both published by Pacific Press Ltd. (Acorn, 1967a, pp. 11-12; Acorn, 1967b, p. 4). The *Straight* even suggested that youth should not believe anything they read in the 'Tweedledee and Tweedledum' of corporate media outlets because their 'puppet' reporters variously framed hippies as a 'social problem,' a 'group menace' or a 'cult whose credo is to spit in society's eye' (Cramer, 1968a, p. 6; Cramer, 1968b, p. 6; Cramer, 1968c, p. 7). The *Straight* also singled out individual reporters, like Denny Boyd, who spewed 'insular vomit' in their 'bigoted diatribes' that labeled hippies as an inferior class of citizen and bewailed their presence in the city (Cummings, 1968e, p. 9). Local media was not the *Straight*'s only target.

Corporate media in general was faulted for prematurely announcing the 'death' of the hippie culture (Jenkins, 1968, p. 7) and failing to report on the litany of unsubtle prejudices faced by hippies, homosexuals, Hindus and Jews in Canada (Cummings, 1968c, p. 12). This kind of media was simultaneously framed as irrelevant for making 'news' of what elites wore to privileged garden parties (Cummings, 1968a, p. 10) and as obscene for allowing its thirst for war coverage to dominate the press (Cummings, 1968b, p. 11). The *Straight* acknowledged that its readers read 'the lies, the garbage, the bullshit' found in corporate media's papers (Cummings, 1968d, p. 1) and did its best to frame this medium as a promoter of manipulative illusions that defended 'sterile robot culture,' made the public fear hippies and perpetuated unrestricted resource exploitation (especially in the Third World), corporate-sponsored conspicuous

consumerism, planned obsolescence and the commercial appropriation of hippie culture (Lester, 1969, pp. 16-17). In the eyes of those involved with the *Straight*, the youth culture that nourished social movement participation was most accurately represented by the protagonist identity frames it advanced. Radical media alone could be trusted to expose the biased frames that corporate media used to unfairly denigrate youth and undeservedly flatter authorities. Yet as much as collective identity framing maintained the boundaries between movement protagonists and antagonists, radical social movement media also necessarily constructed and promoted frames that diagnosed the kinds of injustices for which antagonists could be blamed.

Discourses on collective action

The discursive material found in the *Straight* offered an impressive array of diagnostic injustice frames that were often skillfully linked to one another. The following section identifies examples of these anti-colonial, anti-capitalism, anti-poverty, anti-war, anti-racist, democratization, feminist and environmentalist diagnostic frames, followed by those which performed prognostic and motivational functions.

Anti-colonial diagnostic frames:

Long before the Idle No More movement was covered fleetingly and derisively by corporate media, and even before Chief Dan George recited his Centennial “Lament for Confederation” before 32000 people gathered at Vancouver’s Empire Stadium, the *Georgia Straight*’s first editorial declared that as of May 5, 1967, the citizens of British Columbia would no longer be subject to the laws or jurisdiction of the ‘foreign imperialists’ who had never signed treaties with Indigenous peoples. In making this declaration, the *Straight* extended a globally resonant and elaborated anti-colonial master frame to the Canadian situation, transformed authorities’ emphasis on the rule of law into tool which could be used against the government

(e.g., “... the land is legally theirs, according to the laws of your country”) and amplified the plight of Indigenous people by interpreting it as a matter of human rights by asserting that “We now consider ourselves capable of self-government. Therefore, according to the United Nations charter, you must remove your troops and your puppet government from our beloved Indian soil” within 48 hours. Before the editorial closed with a request that chiefs step forward to govern this new ‘Indian Nation’, its author identified with internally colonized Indigenous peoples by lamenting the fact that oppressors had “held *us* for so long in colonial bondage” (“Editorial,” 1967, p. 2, emphasis added). This solidarity with and recognition of Indigenous claims continued with a feature on Indigenous struggles in Washington State (Zatlyn, 1968, pp. 10-11), a cartoon of a family praying before eating their turkey dinner in a house built atop an Indigenous grave (“Thanksgiving,” 1968, p. 2), an article decrying the high Indigenous death rate (“BC Indian deaths highest ... in the whole country,” 1969, p. 17) and the ongoing *Sun* cartoon strip that portrayed First Nations as sadistic, brutal, barbaric and thieving savages (Shrum, 1969, p. 15). A significant part of the population of Vancouver’s impoverished East End was and is Indigenous and the *Straight* was sensitive to poverty the poverty found among them.

Anti-capitalism and anti-poverty diagnostic frames:

From its outset the *Straight* constructed anti-poverty diagnostic frames in articles that offered clear-eyed narrative description of the sad scenes found on East Hastings (Diablo, 1967, pp. 1, 3), advised tenants of their rights vis-à-vis their landlords (McGrady, 1968, p. 4) and accused the City of Vancouver of neglecting to make parks in the East End because of the neighbourhood’s socio-economic demographics (Rankin, 1968b, p. 4). Articles of this kind attempted to explicitly frame the injustice of grinding poverty as an unacceptable consequence of

capitalist society. An article in the *Straight*'s first issue, titled "Diggers put down Haight," made the connection between capitalist exploitation and poverty explicit. In this article, the 'Diggers,' who scarcely had the means to do so, fed, sheltered and took care of the lost and hungry run-away children who had flocked to San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury neighbourhood. The 'hip' capitalist merchants, however, were accused of having the means to help mitigate the spreading 'misery' and choosing to treat those without money as 'invisible.' The author alleged that the merchants, who were said to exhibit an 'irresponsibility' that bordered on 'criminal insanity,' "are The System, playing The System's games in The System's way & they don't give a flaccid fuck about you or me or any of their sheep. They're interested in themselves, money and each other, in that order, and in absolutely nothing else" (Anderson, 1967, p. 3). Here, not only are protagonist and antagonist frames evident, injustice frames and diagnostic blame are laid squarely at the feet of greedy capitalists like the 'hip' capitalist merchants of the Haight-Ashbury neighbourhood.

Another early example of anti-capitalist frames that demonstrate sensitivity to poverty can be found in Milton Acorn's (1967a) "Inaugural column." Acorn was defending a café in Vancouver's Kitsilano neighbourhood, called The Advance Mattress, that was frequented by young radicals and increasingly targeted with spurious inspections and corporate media scorn. He suggested that the Mattress's 'communist' reputation was undeserved (though Acorn did point out that "No one can help it if the arguments of those who go to The Advance Mattress to try to support the Capitalist Establishment turn out to be pretty puerile"), as the Mattress was actually subversive because it was non-profit and helped bind the community together. In a prescient appraisal of the situation, Acorn expressed his fear that the neighbourhood's resident students, artists and hippies would be displaced by the 'real estate plundering' 'millionaires' and

‘bankers’ who wanted to rezone the area for high-priced developments. This would make Kitsilano a “West End type Desert of Souls, where people are filed and forgotten one above the other in high risers — where nobody knows their neighbours — they pass on the street without a nod. And where, more important, everyone pays an exorbitant rent.” Acorn lamented this ‘Society Game’ where ‘everyone is supposed to try to squeeze everyone else for the last cent they have’ and only the people ‘squatted on top of the groaning heap’ are ‘lucky’ enough to make money; everyone else just ‘pays’ (he specifically criticizes how the ‘billionaire nation’ is driven to become a ‘trillionaire nation’ by attacking resource-rich Vietnam and perpetually plundering indigenous resources), which is somehow ‘mysteriously’ fair (pp. 11-12). This article clearly articulates not only anti-capitalist and anti-poverty diagnostic frames, but also bridges its critique of accumulation with burgeoning anti-colonial and anti-war frames.

This critique grew sharper in subsequent issues, as is evidenced by the assertion that young radicals rejected the placated middle class’s hollow culture of status seeking, living beyond its means, ‘vulgar’ materialism and ‘bitter’ competition that forced a person to become ‘a cog in an immense machine’ (Rankin, 1967, p. 4). Youth were said to resent the ‘progress’ that produced “the industrial slums, the smogged skies, the freeways, the piles of mass-produced junk, the continued touting of our constipated cornucopia of useless or unused products.” They had no choice but to ‘tune in, turn on and drop out’ because “materialistic civilization is hypnotized, clobbered, stoned and asphyxiated in a poisonous cloud of pure abstraction of symbols, concepts and institutions that do not relate to material world of nature” and promotes the ‘delusion’ that money is wealth. Yet these were not just exhortations that youth simply ‘don beads and chant mantras’; they were at the same time challenged to ‘liberate’ their heads (Watts, 1968, p. 3). In order to do so, these anti-capitalist frames had to be connected to other diagnostic

frames to coalesce into a master frame that was potent and comprehensive enough to sustain an intense cycle of protest.

The *Straight* featured discourses that framed another world as possible even as they outlined the litany of injustices that permeated society (e.g., ‘all the money spent on war since 1914 could have given every single person on Earth a decent life’). The capitalist ‘obsession’ with ‘scrambling for poker chips mistaken for wealth’ (and the ‘socialist project of robbing rich to pay the poor,’ for that matter) had captured the imaginations of the whole spectrum of political parties. Although a world without the ‘capitalist war-economy,’ fascism, ‘socialist leveling,’ communism, poverty, taxation, overcrowded cities, rush hours and the drudgery of menial work was (and is) technically quite possible, the economy is kept running with a ‘stimulus of terror’ that, to battle the communist ‘spectre,’ frightens the public into accepting the ‘problem’ of unemployment, the ever-inflating national debt and the squander of tax revenue and energy on the construction of ‘ever-more satanic engines of war’ (p. 3). However, other writers feared that ‘fat cat beer-bloated middle class apathy’ in a ‘milieu of corporate cannibalism’ would only turn to ‘revolutionary consciousness’ when the ‘self-destructive economic-military structure topples over on itself in catastrophic financial depression’; that is, of course, unless youth acted first. By ‘draining’ and rejecting the ‘narcotic money system of exchange for labour’ they could hasten the destruction of the ‘vital link in the corporate consumer economic chain of human exploitation and ecological destruction’ (Lester, 1969, pp. 16-17). Though these anti-capitalist frames might be criticized for offering unsophisticated political economy-based analysis without many specific solutions (e.g., advocating coordinated debt strikes), they nonetheless transformed dominant frames of middle class ‘prosperity’ into discourses about apathetic complicity, blamed the entire

political system for perpetuating exploitative war and bridged anti-capitalist frames with those of anti-colonial, anti-poverty, peace and ecology movements.

Anti-war diagnostic frames:

The *Georgia Straight* was quite active in promoting anti-war diagnostic frames that defined war as unjust and attributed responsibility for its perpetuation to those in power and their supporters. Some articles, like one that outlined instances of pro-war rhetoric by Arab leaders in response to a previous article denouncing Israeli provocations leading up to the 1967 Six Day War (Simpson, 1968, p. 2) or one on British and Russian involvement in a conflict in Nigeria (“White officers lead federal troops in Biafra,” 1968, p. 8), were predominantly expository; others were stridently normative. For example, when an article on what sorts of words should be considered ‘obscene’ finished making the case that most ‘dirty’ four-letter words concerned a ‘natural function’ or an ‘act of love,’ it took up three-letter words and concluded that ‘war’ is obscene because it was ‘organized murder for political gain’. Other obscenities included ‘injustice, hatred, intolerance, bombs, prejudice, napalm, torture, guns, killing and infanticide’ and were juxtaposed with a photo collage of army troops in action, a naked woman, Adolph Hitler, Ronald Reagan, a cowboy and a gun (Cummings, 1968b, p. 11). There were also more serious attempts to frame war in a negative light, such as the publication of excerpts from a court transcript in which the popular author of *Baby and Child Care*, Dr. Benjamin Spock, articulately criticized the Vietnam War (“What Dr. Spock said,” 1968, p. 5) and the inclusion of an article on how a U.S. Army colonel had visited Calgary to convince Canadian forces to lobby their government to eject draft dodgers (Venditti, 1968, p. 6). However, the *Straight* was not content to simply frame war as unjust in its diagnoses of social ills; it also attributed explicit blame to the politicians who served capitalist interests.

A piece of creative writing in the first issue of the *Straight*, titled “Poisoned wheat,” asserted that ‘traitorous’ governments were perpetrating ‘needless’ starvation, agony and murder in Vietnam as a means of colonizing yet another nation into the capitalist production and consumption chain. Youth were warned not to accept ‘guilt for the acts of entrepreneurs, capitalists and imperialists’ because doing so ‘smothers, tricks and stupefies the free creature’ into ‘fear, racism and inaction’. The article ended by maintaining that many solutions could be found through thought and action, which required information and energy (McClure, 1967, pp. 6-7); a review of a book on Vietnam was presented on the following page (Grinkus, 1967, p. 8). The *Straight* published articles on and photos of such action, such as the 4000-5000 person strong Amchitka nuclear test protest that closed the Peace Arch (“May these gates never be closed”) border crossing (Brown, 1969a, pp. 5-7) and how GIs engaged in risky ‘underground’ reportage from inside the army (“GI press,” 1969, p. 20). Information was provided by articles that offered reasons ‘why the U.S.’s faithful servants in Ottawa and Victoria should be the real targets of our protest,’ statistics about the U.S.’s military-industrial connection to capitalism and its imperialist ownership of Canadian economy (campus left action movement, 1969, p. 7), research into U.S. Senate spending documents that showed the University of British Columbia and a dozen other Canadian universities were doing research for the Pentagon (“Pentagon would not pay for research unless for military purposes,” 1969, p. 7) and photo essays depicting weeping soldiers, dead children with their faces in the dirt, a GI with his knife in a starving child’s abdomen, another GI holding a large rifle with a cigarette in his mouth as a village burned wildly in background and a body being dragged behind an armoured vehicle alongside the caption:

In the first world war, 95 percent of the fatal casualties were members of the armed forces. In the second world war, 56 percent were from the armed forces. In the Korean war, 88 percent of the

fatal casualties were civilian. To date in Vietnam, 91 percent of the dead have been civilian (“Miscellaneous atrocities”, 1969, pp. 12-13).

Corporate media would not have dared to frame the issue of war so vividly and lay responsibility for such misery and destruction at the feet of those who served the interest of capital, let alone explicitly frame it as deeply implicated with racism.

Anti-racist diagnostic frames:

Again, the *Straight*’s first issue offered stinging critique by publishing the (in)famous illustration of ‘Uncle Sam,’ with Muhammad Ali’s face on his top hat, above the caption:

Uncle Sam wants YOU nigger. Become a member of the world’s highest paid black mercenary army. Support White Power — travel to Viet Nam, you might get a medal! Fight for Freedom ... (in Viet Nam). Receive valuable training in the skills of killing off other oppressed people! (Die Nigger Die — you can’t die fast enough in the ghettos.) So run to your nearest recruiting chamber! (“Uncle Sam wants YOU nigger,” 1967, p. 12).

This particular cartoon uses irony and satire to link the injustice of sending young black men to fight for ‘freedom’ by committing racist atrocities for a country that treated them as second-class citizens, thereby bridging peace and civil-rights frames and transforming a dominant icon into a hideous imperialist frame. Many subsequent articles in the *Straight* communicated anti-racist liberation/revolt frames and called for non-discriminatory coalitions and cooperation between movements (e.g., Brown, 1968, p. 4; Carmichael, 1968, pp. 4-5, 7; Baldwin, 1968, p. 8; Cleaver, 1968a, p. 9). The Black Panthers found space in the *Straight* to proffer their diagnoses of ‘genocidal’ racism, such as Eldridge Cleaver’s (1968b) call for a ‘second Boston Tea Party’ in response to George Wallace’s ‘final solution’ to the Negro ‘problem’ and because his people had been “struggling, dying for these painful four hundred years ... [fighting] for freedom, for liberation, by any means necessary, as Brother Malcolm put it” (p. 7). These anti-racist discourses clearly attempted to amplify the Black Power movement’s frames by likening its antagonists to fascists and bridge its struggle with the American Revolution and centuries of resistance, as reform through democratic means seemed so elusive.

Democratization diagnostic frames:

Radical youth movements in the 1960s were known for their distrust — hostility even — toward formal politics. It is not surprising, then, that the *Straight* did not advocate much for conventional political engagement, or even articulate many specific calls for reform, so disillusioned were radical youth with pluralist liberal democratic politics. This frustration was likely due to feelings that governments largely ‘ignored’ the people’s will because they were consumed by the ‘political confrontation’ between capitalism and communism. The *Straight* was quick to point out the extent to which governments, as well as elements of wider society (like corporate media), actively ‘smothered’ information and dissent. Therefore, radical youth wanted to ‘escape’ politics, which were seen as “theories regarding the speculated laws of power — their applications have never touched men except in shapes of repression — [that were] as dead as the culture they supported” (McClure, 1967, pp. 6-7). Still, the efforts made by students to democratize their universities were said to echo the fact that “more and more people are losing faith in traditional forms of government, of legislation, of political systems [because voting] in a Federal or Provincial election is, to most of us, a farcical and Quixotic bit of lip-service paid to democracy” (Mills, 1968a, p. 7). The *Straight* would go on to offer even more stridently critical diagnostic frames which concluded that the political system was a ‘rigged game of craps’ and attributed blame to the ‘merciless demagogues’ who controlled the political ‘machinery’ of the ‘decadent’ power structure, their ‘pigpen’ legislatures only offering ‘crumbs’ in ‘bull-shit’ four year programs (Cleaver, 1968, p. 7). However, these perceptions of the limits of the political system did not stop youth from politicizing frames regarding the role of women in society.

Feminist diagnostic frames:

Before female staff members occupied the *Georgia Straight*'s office in early 1971 and produced a special feminist issue decrying the paper's limited use of articles by women and its continued use of female nudity to sell copies (Pauls & Campbell, 1997, 72), the paper had a mixed record regarding its promotion of feminist frames. The first issue of the *Straight* published a back page article on a local group, Women Against Soaring Prices, which was protesting how women, who did most of the shopping for their families, were being gouged by grocery stores (Nillan, 1967, p. 12). What little agency or anti-poverty framing this article offered was barely bettered by the content found in "The straight women's page," which praised young women for subverting 'prudish' morality and dictating their own fashion standards by wearing miniskirts (Cummings, 1968a, p. 10), and for seeking gender equality through their sexual liberation (Cummings, 1968f, p. 10). These hetero-normative frames were supplemented by random examples of female nudity that were unconnected to their surrounding content, such as a photo of a naked woman climbing a tree ("Nuditree," 1968, p. 3) and a half page photo collage of naked women over a background of American and British Columbian flags ("Patrioticism," 1968, p. 12). Although it is fair to criticize the *Straight* for perpetuating the objectification of women in its content, the paper was nonetheless a means through which women could articulate frames that were aligned with the feminist cause.

A short article on the changing legal status of abortion was a front page news item in the *Straight*'s March 8-21, 1968 issue ("Abortion legalized in Britain") and was later followed by an article that suggested where information on birth control could be found (Brown, 1969b, p. 11). The paper also made room for a two part feature that questioned whether Canada could consider itself a 'Just Society' when the criminalization of abortion jailed and wrecked the practice of

doctors, forcing anxious and isolated women into the dangerous black market (Sommer, 1969, pp. 8-9). Another article featured an interview with Dr. Margaret Benston, the SFU professor who had articulated a materialist feminism in her globally influential 1967 article, “The political economy of women’s liberation,” as she and the Vancouver Women’s Caucus demonstrated outside the poorly attended first meeting of B.C.’s provincial human rights commission. Benston was ridiculed by a *Province* reporter and passersby as she criticized B.C.’s biased *Human Rights Act* for failing to prevent discrimination based upon sex in the areas of work, housing, admission to public places, educational curricula and media representation. The Women’s Caucus cited achieving parity of representation for women in the media and textbooks as key to preventing ‘bigoted’ images of women, which promoted the ‘illusion’ that they were freer than ever before, from ‘channeling’ women into ‘pre-defined roles’ as underprivileged second-class citizens. Rather than being subservient objects of ‘false chivalry,’ judged by their looks and forced into marriage and motherhood, Benston and the Women’s Caucus tried to ‘raise consciousness’ so that more women would join the movement, not to ‘take over,’ but to achieve ‘autonomy’ (Michaelis, 1969b, pp. 14-15). These early attempts to amplify feminist diagnostic frames by associating the issue with human rights struggles would allow the feminist movement, along with the environmental movement, to motivate increased participation in these movements well in to the next decade.

Environmental diagnostic frames:

By the late 1960s the foundations of a powerful ecology movement were being laid with the help of diagnostic frames found in the *Straight*’s discourses on environmental degradation. For example, one cartoon featured cars driving along a highway that was lined with junk, factory smoke, telephone wires, haphazard developments that were hidden behind billboards of nature

scenes and a road sign that read “Scenic drive next 2 miles” (“Beautiful B.C.,” 1968, p. 2). Other articles shed light on destructive maldevelopment in Montreal (Bowering, 1969, p. 22) and on an American-owned Howe Sound island (Ladner, 1969, p. 8). Burnaby Lake was identified as the site where careless trucking firms cleaned out their oil tanks, creating oil slicks that were killing thousands of birds (including a near-extinct species of duck) as the municipal government looked on ineffectively (Brown, 1969c, p. 2). These kinds of stories prompted a full spread mock-up, titled “Declaration of interdependence” (1969), which was written out and signed like the American Declaration of Independence. This spread advocated protecting species at risk from 10 explicitly articulated human activities that were destroying the environment and outlined the human duties and responsibilities that would reaffirm a way of living that was respectful of nature’s interdependent reality (pp. 12-13). The creativity of this content represents an effort to transform the revolutionary ideal of independence into a reframed recognition of humanity’s connection to material reality, and its resonance with the present was certainly not unique among other articles.

As early as the late 1960s, radical media was publishing articles, backed up by statistics and scientific research, on the dangers posed by an ‘irreversible’ and ‘irreparable’ ‘catastrophe’ that would melt ice caps, raise sea levels and submerge arable land. If the capitalist profit imperative and the automotive industry’s ‘advertising propaganda’ could not be overcome, greenhouse gases would continue to pollute the atmosphere and culminate in a ‘disaster’ that would ‘befall the entire earth’ and ‘seal the fate of the human species’ in the new millennium (“Earth read out,” 1969, pp. 15-16). Christianity’s rejection of pagan beliefs concerning humans’ place in nature, expensive space programmes, non-renewable resource depletion, Western overconsumption, unfair world trade regimes, industrial technology, short-sighted

politicians, overpopulation-inducing social emphasis on the necessity of motherhood, inefficient transportation systems and a lack of communication between scientists and the public were cited as reasons why 60 percent of the world's population lacked adequate access to water, food, clothing, hygiene, doctors, schools, justice, human rights and dignity. The prospect of 'environmental collapse' was underscored by the projection that the world's population would grow to around 6.5 billion by the year 2000, leaving not only future children and grandchildren in a 'terminal situation'; baby boom youth were themselves also in danger (Michaelis, 1969a, p. 6; Galt, 1969, p. 2). These ecology-based diagnostic frames were intended to identify the interconnectedness of a litany of injustices, amplify their importance to existential levels, extend the significance of ecological sensitivity into myriad areas of human activity, bridge the emerging movement with those fighting capitalism/poverty/racism/etc., transform humanity's understanding of its place in the universe and attribute responsibility for looming ecological crises. Fortunately, these radically critical diagnostic frames were often found alongside others that articulated what should be done.

Prognostic frames:

The *Georgia Straight* did not waste its time advocating reforms that would merely tinker around the edges of the status quo. Its first editorial outlined several proposals that would constitute a significant reordering of the social and political order upon the ejection of imperialist authorities (e.g., releasing all 'political prisoners' from penitentiaries, mental hospitals and juvenile detention centres who were sentenced under 'foreign imperial laws'; offering those released appropriate food, shelter, community and volunteer care; expelling all 'occupying' troops; granting citizenship under a newly drafted constitution to those wanting to remain in the 'Indian Nation'; surrendering all weapons save for those required by people with demonstrable need and a permit subject to annual psychological evaluation; establishing a government of

chiefs that would name the new land and pick citizens to fill government offices; providing a temporary, rotational, non-violent police force that primarily employed street group therapy; applying for member status at the United Nations; negotiating fair treaties and trade agreements with other countries; and affording all visitors from other countries the same rights as citizens). Naturally, there would be a massive independence celebration in Stanley Park, and citizens of the new nation's former oppressors were invited ("Do not fail to attend this important event") to demonstrate 'generosity of spirit' ("Editorial," 1967, p. 2). Certainly this prognostic frame was predicated on some large assumptions regarding the response of the 'iron heeled imperialist tyrants' and wider public enthusiasm, but it nonetheless articulated a combination of concrete resolutions and 'utopian' visions while making some suggestion of who might enact them.

Some initiatives were more plausible and thus could be acted upon right away, such as the creation of alternative educational centres, like the 'Free School' and 'Knowplace,' for 'freeks' from all over Canada who were 'living in self-imposed isolation to be free of the social-political games so necessary for survival in bourgeois society' and wanted to know that "they are not alone, they are part of a healthy, growing movement" (Cramer, 1968b, p. 6). One contributor to the *Straight* encouraged readers to sustain their movements by simply being in peace and love. By acting non-competitively and refusing to 'play the game' of resisting, youth could deny society its justification for retaliation and repression. Matching hate and violence with love and peace, not infringing on the freedom of others, giving doubters a flower after hearing them out and projecting, rather than defending, movement philosophies would teach people by example. Although hippies were considered 'substandard' by society for not adhering to group norms and pre-constructed identities, they were counseled to give society a clear cut alternative by rejecting the boundaries between exclusive groups (e.g., masters/slaves, city/state, nations), advocating the

abolishment of all moral laws (including the legalization of ‘everything that is between God and the individual’) and teaching what they knew to everyone who might be interested (Jenkins, 1968, p. 7). These prognostic frames might sound idealistic, but they reflect radical youth movements’ initial commitment to peaceful, non-violent action aimed at breaking down society’s rigid attitudes and prejudices. It was up to every adherent to reach out to others and promote the movement’s ideals, yet in practice doing so still led to repression that forced youth to turn inwards and build their own supportive communities.

By the fall of 1968, repression of radical youth movements had intensified to the point where participants felt they needed structural support to continue their revolution. A feature in the *Straight* on how to organize and co-ordinate autonomous programs by affinity group cells spoke to these dilemmas. Although “The post-competitive, comparative game of a free city” (1968) made problematic gender stereotype references to ‘old ladies’ making food and ‘chicks’ sewing, it did offer suggestions about how ‘free families in free cities’ might go about gathering and providing free communication, food, transportation, housing, work space and other necessities to themselves and other movement participants (pp. 10-11). Ken Lester (1969) was even more emphatic about the need for youth to participate in direct actions such as campus shutdowns, sporadic guerilla action, ghetto uprisings and the reclamation of Gastown for the strategic ‘use of all the people.’ He reiterated the need to set up effective, horizontal, ‘free energy exchange’ family-tribal community structures and suggested that the most important aspect of such a network would be a communications centre which would serve to coordinate information and the ‘synapse focus’ of community energies for a ‘total assault on the over-culture.’ Lester implored youth to ‘sacrifice’ their labour, money, comfort and time as a means of totally involving themselves in the project of creating an ‘alternate’ society. This would

require youth to stop “bullshitting about a New Age ... [letting] meaningless sympathy and indulging platitudes run like diarrhea from [their] mouths ... [and] take the revolution out of [their] heads and into the [people’s] streets” (pp. 16-17). These strong words clearly articulated instructions and attributed agency and responsibility to the young bearers of what, given the prevailing spirit of the time, seemed like a real revolution.

Cuba offered but one example of a revolution that had been carried through to fruition. Gerald Sperling (1968), an assistant political science professor at SFU, pointed out that the Soviets could continue to cautiously help support Cuba’s nationalized economy and massive efforts to improve education and health (however, “a socialist regime in, let us say, Venezuela would certainly lessen this dependence”) but could not support revolution in Bolivia or Venezuela or challenge the U.S. in Vietnam because “Kennedy was willing to risk nuclear holocaust over a few missiles.” Therefore, any ‘radical social change’ to the ‘rotten social structures’ that were passively and actively supported by U.S. imperialism was likely to come from ‘violent revolution by guerilla tactics’ exported from Cuba, even in the wake of Che’s murder (p. 5). This kind of prognostic framing, along with intensified repression at the hands of authorities, likely influenced youth movements’ tactical shift away from non-violence as the 1960s drew to a close.

However, many of those who maintained that the ‘entire economic system must be altered’ and advocated a ‘war on pollution’ were uncomfortable with such calls for violent insurrection. Instead, *Straight* contributors like Bob Cummings got involved with new social movement organizations like the Society for Pollution and Environmental Control, which would provide the core group of Greenpeace’s founders (including Cummings). From the pages of the *Straight* they would advocate for shifts in human values and philosophy, like measuring living

standards by freedom from war, nuclear threats, hunger and social injustice rather than by cars, refrigerators and televisions (Michaelis, 1969a, p. 6; Galt, 1969, p. 2). Of course, prognostic frames were only meant to suggest possible solutions to problems and offer some idea as to who might take action to affect their implementation. Motivational collective action frames were the ones that advocated that youth take advantage of opportunities to participate and make a difference.

Motivational frames:

While most of the content and discourses found in the *Georgia Straight* functioned to articulate links between different struggles and impute various characteristics to protagonists and antagonists, some did offer motivational collective action frames. The *Straight* would be credited with explicitly instigating the infamous Gastown Smoke-in that led to a brutal police riot in mid-1971 (Pauls & Campbell, 1997, pp. 72-73; Clément, 2008, pp. 76-78) but its appeals for youth to act were generally made more implicitly. That said, a front page editorial in the *Straight's* first back to school edition, titled "Turn on, tune in, take over" (1967), was a clear call to action. The editorial began by suggesting that drop-outs could look forward to low-paying jobs that they would hate just as much as school, to their parents hassling them if they decided not to get a job, to the weather becoming too cold for them to hitchhike or sleep outside and to getting tired of living on someone else's terms if they lived with friends. The editorial told students to 'make' their school better and more interesting by 'taking it over' if they thought it was a 'drag.' It also asserted that youth 'know more than the elders do about the things that are really important' and that no one had a right to dictate how they should live, so if they were "thinking of leaving school anyway, what's wrong with getting KICKED OUT?" (p. 1). Radicalized youth would surely see this question as an invitation to act accordingly.

The editorial did not stop there. It advocated organizing student unions, circulating petitions advocating the ouster of bad teachers and principals and sending delegations to parent teacher association meetings to present student demands. Students were encouraged to tell adults what they intended to do rather than first asking for permission. They were counseled to fight all age restrictions (“If you want to do something, go ahead”) and appeal to the *Georgia Straight* Defence Fund if they got into trouble because the “‘laws’ are so bad that, nowadays, it is dishonourable not to have a criminal record. Just forget about building a future in *their* society. *You* can do better.” The list of provocations went on, including calls for schoolyard love-ins every noon hour, telling youth that they should ‘insist’ that schools be left unlocked so that they could sleep there if home life was ‘unbearable’ and exhorting students to set up school newspapers, plan their own courses and ask sympathetic teachers to help them teach themselves. The *Straight* even offered to help youth ‘in any way possible,’ invited them pay a visit to the office to watch staffers in action and asked them to send the paper anything they thought could be useful (p. 1). Though the *Straight*’s collective action frames may not have been this explicit on a regular basis, the general prevalence and multitude of participatory opportunities during this period might have led the *Straight* to take it for granted that youth were already mobilized.

This fact did not stop the *Straight* from performing its service journalism functions by publishing various incitements to act, both gentle and forceful. Cool-aid was a hippie-run youth services organization that initially operated from the *Straight*’s office and the paper often advertised its operations, sometimes including short articles that updated readers on its activities and implored youth to donate time and resources to the project (Elmore, 1968, p. 2). One news item informed youth in a deadpan way that they should involve themselves in the ‘very interesting’ plans that were afoot for a Yippie convention to be held in Chicago in the summer of

1968 (“Yippies stir fuzz,” 1968, p. 7). After the police riot at the Democratic Party convention in Chicago, the Yippies took to the *Straight*’s pages to extend their solidarity to participants in all movements (including liberated women) and to spur them to action on Election Day in the U.S. They advocated total disruption and encouraged youth not to vote in the ‘jackass-elephant-cracker circus.’ The Yippies encouraged youth, who were ‘the revolution,’ to organize and participate in all manner of street theater and lively community on that day, further suggesting that since ‘word of mouth communication’ was the ‘basis of all conspiracies,’ youth begin to coordinate information and ideas by writing the Youth International Party, Eldridge Cleaver and *Ramparts Magazine* (Albert, Hoffman & Rubin, 1968, p. 7). Youth movements were so hot that by 1969 the *Straight* could in all seriousness tell youth to take to and defend the streets, ‘overrun’ Gastown, “do what you feel is necessary ... [and] put *your* balls on the line, motherfucker” (Lester, 1969, pp. 16-17). It is possible that this kind of collective action frame was off-putting to youth who were growing weary and afraid of the increasingly harsh repression their movements were facing, but for those who were committed to their radical identities, such baiting may well have been just the kind of provocation they needed to spur further defiant participation.

Conclusion

This trip through the *Georgia Straight*’s archives offers but a glimpse of the master, collective identity and collective action frames it advanced for the radical young movement participants of the late 1960s. Beginning with the methodological approach to examining an adequate sample of the *Straight*, this chapter moved quickly to demonstrate that the paper’s content was indeed aligned with the injustice-based master frames that have been identified as shared by movements in the Vancouver area. Following this content analysis, the chapter

analyzed how discourses about movement protagonists shifted from their ‘peace and love’ orientation toward a necessarily solidaristic confrontation. This discursive transition shows that movements’ collective identity framing increasingly became politicized as ‘the revolution’ intensified. Similarly, movement antagonists’ character, at first framed as ‘uptight’ and ‘illegitimate,’ was quickly imputed to be insidiously hateful and wretched as their repressive policies intensified. Of course, corporate media was routinely singled out for peddling deliberately prejudiced and pacifying frames.

The *Straight*’s content and discourses are also remarkable for their comprehensive diagnoses of social, economic and political injustices. Looking back from this historical vantage point, the *Straight*’s anti-colonial frames appear fairly comprehensive in that they recognize not only the deplorably racist treatment of Canada’s internally colonized Indigenous peoples, but also settler society’s failure to conclude or respect formal treaties. These frames were bridged with anti-poverty frames and, rather than reactively demanding some kind of redistributive scheme, actively promoted the transformative remedy of abolishing capitalism altogether. Capitalism was framed as responsible for the perpetuation of obscene wars, genocidal racism, perverted democracy, intolerable patriarchy and environmental destruction. In fact, the strident clarity of these diagnostic frames, let alone the way they were integrated together and historically situated as a means of linking them to widely resonant cultural ideals, stands up well to the fragmented cynicism that prevails among contemporary opponents of these intensified injustices.

Interestingly, the *Straight* had less to offer in the way of prognostic frames that might offer movement participants a strategic blueprint or laundry list of demands around which to mobilize. There was some indication that the paper’s contributors made demands related to their individual and collective freedom to live as they wanted, but their visions for a new society were

so far-reaching that actionable interim solutions to manifest these ideas were often underdeveloped. Nonetheless, a strong anarchistic streak (as mentioned above, the paper identified itself as a ‘member of the anarchist press movement’ in its masthead) guided many of the solutions advocated in the *Straight*’s prognostic frames (e.g., subsidiarity, autonomy, direct ‘do-it-yourself’ action, rejection of boundaries maintaining hierarchy, etc.). Similarly, the *Straight* offered more implicit than explicit motivational frames meant to promote specific opportunities for action. While there were specific, sometimes jeeringly emphatic, incitements to act found in the paper’s discourses, abundant examples of SMOs requesting youth to take particular actions were less prevalent and usually found in ad-like briefs. As stated above, this could be related to the fact that youth were already mobilized in significant numbers or even the result of the *Straight*’s possible reluctance to suggest specific actions that would be subject to spontaneous or strategic change by movement organizers. At any rate, the frames that the *Straight* offered its readers were powerful enough to make it wildly popular among radical youth and the target of relentless persecution by authorities, which is a testament to its ability to create and spread the messages that helped inform youths’ radical consciousness, collective identity and participatory movement culture.

Conclusions

The research and empirical evidence marshaled thus far has supported the thesis that radical media organizations like the *Georgia Straight* — a successful example of Canada's vibrant 'underground' press in the 1960s — articulated and communicated the master frames and social movement discourses that politicized youth culture, nurtured solidaristic collective identities and encouraged participation in collective action. Substantiating this thesis has involved first establishing that the 'problem' of youth political apathy, as much as it is affected by structural factors related to demographics and youths' material position in society, is at its core a socially constructed phenomenon. Similarly, youth identity, rather than determined simply by biology, is constructed in response to its interaction with adults' cultural expectations (often delivered through media) and with collective experiences in peer groups. Despite mounting contemporary evidence to the contrary, their characterization as apathetic belies the fact that youth are indeed interested in informal political participation. This disjuncture between reality and rhetoric echoes a time when members of the 1950s 'Beat' generation were labeled as apolitically delinquent, only to be re-characterized as intensely political throughout the 1960s when youth-driven social movements flourished.

In order to effectively assess the relationships between social movements and radical media, this thesis introduced different approaches to studying social movements. Resource mobilization theory, which dominated this field of research in the immediate wake of heightened youth participation in the 1960s, focused upon explaining how social movement organizations carried movements forward by allocating the costs and benefits accruing to participants. Although this approach offered useful insights into the organizational bases of movement activity, its assumption of participants' utilitarian rationality and its focus on strategic processes

of marshalling material resources did not lead to adequate answers to questions about why movements emerge and participation persists in the absence of the possibility or expectation of selective material incentives accruing to participants, which was what resource mobilization theorists thought motivated mobilization. New social movement theory, by contrast, was more oriented toward explaining why ideational factors like consciousness, individual/collective identity and culture were central to understanding contemporary social movements that are unique for attracting participants with various backgrounds and their de-emphasis of redistributive goals.

However, neither of these theoretical paradigms offered an adequate explanation of the processes by which movements leverage ideational resources like culture, identity and ideology to further their goals. Once this omission in social movement theory was uncovered, researchers quickly developed a framework for understanding the connections between information, culture, political opportunities and identity, known as frame analysis. In order to analyze the relationships between movements and media — which is ironically both where the study of framing processes entered the social movement literature and where it has been inadequately applied — this thesis examined how movements engage in master, collective identity and collective action framing processes. These processes enable movements to strategically (re)frame information in ways that transform quiescence into oppositional consciousness, undergird participatory protest cultures, align individual identity with movement-affiliated collective identities and invite participants to act upon their grievances. Movements need media to help them communicate these frames widely, yet their messages are often distorted in the process.

Since movement participation is understood to be heavily influenced by actors' awareness of themselves, of opportunities for collective action and of the cultural norms of their society, this thesis next examined what is known about the relationships between social movements and the media organizations that play a significant role in defining and validating 'reality' for their audiences. Understanding the power of media involves recognizing that although audiences are quite capable of interpreting media texts in ways that subvert the intended message, the media source and the audience's material circumstances do play a role in influencing the range of meaning that is ultimately conveyed. Furthermore, the manner in which ideas and their relationships are articulated combine to form discourses that are powerful enough to make the status quo seem inevitable. However, just as discourses can support the hegemony of dominant interests, they can be rearticulated in ways that directly challenge hegemonic forces or ways that reject hegemony altogether. Once again, the means of communicating discourses play a significant role in influencing what kinds of discourses are readily available for audiences to interpret.

Movements have often relied upon corporate media coverage to communicate their discursive frames to those outside their immediate contacts and this frequently results in the distortion of their intended messages. While there may be some truth to claims that corporate media deliberately structures its coverage to impede movement progress, an even more plausible reason why movements are often trivialized, sensationalized and ignored may be that corporate media's main function is less about fostering informed deliberation and more about attracting audiences that can be sold to advertisers. Radical media, in contrast, is not only more sympathetic to movement frames, it is also closer and more accessible to movement participants than is corporate media. Radical media is more apt to see its supporters as a community first and

an audience second. It is for these kinds of reasons that social movements may come to see radical media as an especially effective means of reaching out to and informing current and potential participants. If various movements feel their framed messages receive fairer treatment by radical media, the variety of perspectives represented by such a medium may even combine into shared discourses that could become powerful movement facilitators.

These claims are evidenced by this thesis' empirical analysis of the content and discourses found within Vancouver's *Georgia Straight* from its 1967 inception to the end of 1969. Not only did the paper's content consistently align with the injustice-based master frames that are associated with local movements, the intensity of youth political participation during this period was also reflected in the *Straight*'s messages about the virtues of youths' radicalized identities, the vices of their movements' antagonists and the prejudiced disingenuousness of Vancouver's major dailies, the corporately owned *Sun* and *Province*. The *Straight* also skillfully elaborated the litany of injustices that movements were fighting to rectify, bridging their diagnostic frames regarding colonialism, poverty, capitalist exploitation, war-mongering, racism, defiled democracy, patriarchy and environmental degradation. While the *Straight* offered fewer prognostic frames, those that it did offer matched the radicalism evident in the actions that youth actually did take during that era. Even the motivational frames offered in the paper tracked the evolution of radical social movements in the 1960s, beginning with calls for youth to participate in constructive actions like 'taking over' their schools and subsequently developing into incitements to take 'the revolution' all the way by putting themselves in harm's way. Clearly it was not corporate media that advocated this kind of youth political participation and movement organizers had to communicate their messages somehow; radical media organizations like the *Georgia Straight*, which was only one of hundreds at the time, provided an important link

between youth and the frames that movements hoped would generate increased levels of political participation.

Unfortunately, social movement scholarship has scarcely, until now, taken seriously the significance of the linkages between movement frames and media. Even less appreciated are the relationships between social movements and the radical media organizations that were last successful and popular among youth during the height of social movement activity in the 1960s. Perhaps the most fascinating aspect of the relationships between movements and this kind of media is that the surviving texts offer better evidence of movement frames than can be found in corporate media's archives, let alone those that might otherwise be lost to history. It is time that today's scholars and communicator/activists look to the models and discourses found within that era's radical media organizations for inspiration that can help them reframe movement messages in light of (strikingly familiar) contemporary injustices and crises. Doing so may very well help today's youth counter corporate media disinformation, develop 'co-opportunities' and affinities between their nascent movements and 're-nature' their struggle for a free and just world where 'capitalis'nt'.

Literature Cited

- Abortion legalized in Britain. (1968, March 8-21). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 1.
- Acorn, M. (1967a, May 5-18). Inaugural column. *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 11-12.
- Acorn, M. (1967b, Sept 8). On learning to speak the old country language. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 4.
- Adsett, M. (2003). Change in political era and demographic weight as explanations of youth 'disenfranchisement' in federal elections in Canada, 1965–2000. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6(3), 247-264.
- Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. New York: Crown Business.
- Albert, S. (1968, October 11-17). Yips visit Huey behind bars (UPS). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Albert, S., Hoffman, A. & Rubin, J. (1968, October 11-17). Election Day freek out. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Amenta, E., Caren, N., Chiarello, E., & Su, Y. (2010). The political consequences of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 287-307.
- Anderson, C. (1967, May 5-18). Diggers put down Haight. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 3.
- Andersen, M. (2004). *All the power: Revolution without illusion*. New York: Akashic Books.
- B.C. Indian deaths highest ... in the whole country. (1969, December 10-17). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 17.
- Baldwin, J. (1968, August 16-22). Baldwin on Carmichael: A letter to America. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 8.
- Barman, J. (2007). *The West beyond the West: A history of British Columbia* (3rd ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Beautiful B.C. (1968, August 16-22). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual review of sociology*, 26, 611-639.
- Bennett, W. L. (2008). Changing citizenship in the digital age. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Benson, R. (2003). Commercialism and critique: California's alternative weeklies. In N. Couldry & J. Curran (Eds.), *Contesting media power: Alternative media in a networked world*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Berger, T. (1968, March 8-21). Victoria report: Bennett doesn't spend enough. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Bowering, G. (1969, October 8-15). The quality of life on the concrete isle. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 22.
- Bowering, G. (1997). *Bowering's B.C.: A swashbuckling history*. Toronto: Penguin.
- Bratich, J. Z. (2011). Post-Marx beyond post-Marx: Autonomism and discourse theory. In L. Dahlberg & S. Phelan (Eds.), *Discourse theory and critical media politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brodie, J. & Jenson, J. (1988). *Crisis, challenge and change: Party and class in Canada revisited*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Brown, H. R. (1968, March 8-21). They gon' get it: Letter from Rap Brown in Parish prison New Orleans. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 4.
- Brown, S. (1969a, October 8-15). Some grooved, some listened, some acted: Border closure. *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 5-6.
- Brown, S. (1969b, October 8-15). Birth control handbook free on campuses. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 11.
- Brown, S. (1969c, December 10-17). Careless oil dumping is killing 2000 birds here. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- Burns, S. (1990). *Social movements of the 1960s: Searching for democracy*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- campus left action movement (1969, October 8-15). Amchitka: A symptom only – or explosions don't occur in a vacuum. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Canada, 1970. *The Uncertain Mirror: Report of the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media*.
- Carmichael, S. (1968, March 8-21). Stokely Carmichael speaks. *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 4-5, 7.
- Carroll, W. K., & Ratner, R. S. (1996a). Master Frames and Counter-Hegemony: Political Sensibilities in Contemporary Social Movements. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 33(4), 407-435.

- Carroll, W. K., & Ratner, R. S. (1996b). Master Framing and Cross-Movement Networking in Contemporary Social Movements. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 37(4), 601-625.
- Carroll, W. K., & Ratner, R. S. (1999) Media strategies and political projects: A comparative study of social movements. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 24(1), 1-34.
- Chou, L., Franke, G. R., & Wilcox, G. B. (1987). The information content of comparative magazine ads: A longitudinal analysis. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 64(1), 119-250.
- Cleaver, E. (1968a, August 16-22). Black panther party for self-defense ministry of information black paper: Revolution in the white mother country and national liberation in the black colony. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 9.
- Cleaver, E. (1968b, October 11-17). Yippanther pact (UPS). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Clément, D. (2008). *Canada's rights revolution: Social movements and social change*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Couldry, N. & Curran, J. (2003). The paradox of media power. In N. Couldry & J. Curran (Eds.), *Contesting media power: Alternative media in a networked world*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Coupey, P. (1967, September 8). Il faut vaincre la machine. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 4.
- Cramer, B. (1968a, January 12-25). A letter to my son. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Cramer, B. (1968b, January 12-25). Free schools meet: A magical energy trip. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Cramer, B. (1968c, August 16-22). Crumbs for Cool-aid. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Cullis-Suzuki, S., Frederickson, K., Kayssi, A. & Mackenzie, C. (2007). Introduction. In S. Cullis-Suzuki, K. Frederickson, A. Kayssi, C. Mackenzie & D. A. Cohen (Eds.), *Notes from Canada's young activists: A generation stands up for change*. Vancouver: Greystone Books.
- Cummings, B. (1968a, January 12-25). The straight women's page: Prudes say down with miniskirts. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 10.
- Cummings, B. (1968b, January 12-25). Obscenity. Who really cares, all is phoney. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 11.
- Cummings, B. (1968c, January 12-25). The pain of almost nothing. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 12.

- Cummings, B. (1968d, March 8-21). Don't fink on yourself – & testify! *The Georgia Straight*, p 1.
- Cummings, B. (1968e, March 8-21). Bay day in the hosery department. *The Georgia Straight*, p 9.
- Cummings, B. (1968f, March 8-21). The straight women's page: Come, all ye women. *The Georgia Straight*, p 10.
- Cummings, B. (1968g, August 16-22). Can you dig It? *The Georgia Straight*, p. 4.
- Cummings, B. (1968h, October 11-17). Booked on libel. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 5.
- Cummings, B. (1969, January 3-16). We the people in 1969. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 5.
- Dahlberg, L., & Phelan, S. (2011). Discourse theory and critical media politics: An introduction. In L. Dahlberg & S. Phelan (Eds.), *Discourse theory and critical media politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dale, S. (1996). *McLuhan's children: The Greenpeace message and the media*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Daniels, R. (2006). *The fourth revolution: Transformations in American society from the sixties to the present*. New York: Routledge.
- Davidson, C. (1967, February 3). National vice-president's report: Has SDS gone to pot? *New Left Notes*.
- Day, R. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. London: Pluto Press.
- Declaration of interdependence. (1969, October 8-15). *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 12-13.
- Della Porta, D. & Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Diablo, E. (1967, September 8). Hastings jungle. *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 1, 3.
- Downing, J., Ford, T. V., Gil, G. & Stein, L. (2001). *Radical media: Rebellious communication and social movements*. London: Sage Publications.
- Downing, J. (2008). Social movement theories and alternative media: An evaluation and critique. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 1(1), 40-50.

- Duncan-Andrade, J. (2006). Urban youth, media literacy and increased critical civic participation. In S. Ginwright, P. Noguera & J. Cammarota (Eds.), *Beyond resistance: Youth activism and community change*. New York: Routledge.
- Earth read out. (1969, October 8-15). *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 15-16.
- Editorial. (1967, May 5-18). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- Elmore. (1968, August 16-22). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- Farthing, R. (2010). The politics of youthful anti-politics: Representing the 'issue' of youth participation in politics. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 13(2), 181-195.
- Fairclough, N. (1998). Political discourse in the media: An analytical framework. In A. Bell & P. Garret (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Feenberg, A. (1986). Paths to failure: The dialectics of organization and ideology in the New Left. In A. Reed (Ed.), *Race, politics and culture: Critical essays on the radicalism of the 1960s*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Fenton, N. (2011). Multiplicity, autonomy, new media and the networked politics of new social movements. In L. Dahlberg & S. Phelan (Eds.), *Discourse theory and critical media politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fireman, B. & Gamson, W. A. (1979). Utilitarian Logic in the Resource Mobilization Perspective. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The dynamics of social movements: Resource mobilization, social control and tactics*. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Flacks, R. (1994). The party's over – So what is to be done? In E. Laraña, H. Johnston & J. R. Gusfield (Eds.), *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Flew, T. (2008). *New media: An introduction* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, T. (1998). *The conquest of cool*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Free press under siege. (1969, May 28-June 3). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 3.
- Freeman, J. (1979). Resource mobilization and strategy: A model for analyzing social movement organization actions. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The dynamics of social movements: Resource mobilization, social control and tactics*. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Friedman, D. & McAdam D. (1992). Collective identity and activism: Networks, choices and the life of a social movement. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. London: Yale University Press.

- Galt, G. (1969, December 10-17). The anti-pollution revolution. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- Gamson, W. A. (1975). *The strategy of social protest*. London: Irwin-Dorsey International.
- Gamson, W. A., Fireman, B., & Rytina, S. (1982). *Encounters with unjust authority*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1987). Introduction. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *Social movements in an organizational society: Collected essays*. Oxford: Transaction Books.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992a). *Talking politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992b). Social psychology of collective action. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. London: Yale University Press.
- Garratt, D. (2004). Youth cultures and sub-cultures. In J. Roche, S. Tucker, R. Thomson & R. Flynn (Eds.), *Youth in society* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Gauthier, M. (2003). The inadequacy of concepts: the rise of youth interest in civic participation in Quebec. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6(3), 265-276.
- Generation gap. (1969, May 28-June 3). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 18.
- George, S. (2004). *Another world is possible if...* London: Verso.
- Gerzon, M. (1969). *The whole world is watching: A young man looks at youth's dissent*. New York: Paperback Library.
- GI press. (1969, December 10-17). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 20.
- Gitlin, T. (1995). *The twilight of common dreams: Why America is wracked by culture wars*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Gitlin, T. (2003). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Glavin, T. (1997). Sorry, we're still open. In N. Pauls & C. Campbell (Eds.), *The Georgia Straight: What the hell happened?* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Gordon, H. R. (2010). *We fight to win: Inequality and the politics of youth activism*. London: Rutgers University Press.

- Gramsci, A., Hoare, Q. & Nowell-Smith, G. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Great bus stop bust. (1967, May 5-18). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 1.
- Grinkus, T. (1967, May 5-18). Another Munich in Viet Nam? *The Georgia Straight*, p. 8.
- Gross, D. (1986). Culture, politics and 'lifestyle' in the 1960s. In A. Reed (Ed.), *Race, politics and culture: Critical essays on the radicalism of the 1960s*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981). New social movements. *Telos* 1981(49), 33-37.
- Hackett, R., Pinet, R. & Ruggles, M. (1986). From audience-commodity to audience community: Mass media in B.C. In W. Magnusson, C. Doyle, R. B. J. Walker, & J. DeMarco (Eds.), *After Bennett: A new politics for British Columbia*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Hackett, C. (2004). Young people and political participation. In J. Roche, S. Tucker, R. Thomson & R. Flynn (Eds.), *Youth in society* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Hackett, R. A., & Carroll, W. K. (2006). *Remaking media: The struggle to democratize public communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Harding, J. W. (1968a, August 16-22). EFSM demo Tuesday... *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- Harding, J. W. (1968b, October 11-17). Free speech sing out. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 3.
- Harrington, M. (1962). *The other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Heyer, P. (1988). *Communications and history: Theories of media, knowledge, and civilization*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Hunt, S. A., Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (1994). Identity fields: Framing processes and the social construction of movement identities in new social movements. In E. Laraña, H. Johnston & J. R. Gusfield (Eds.), *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (1968, January 12-25). A positive hip philosophy (UPS). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Jensen, K. B. (2002). Media reception – Qualitative traditions In K. Jensen (Ed.), *A handbook of media and communications research: Qualitative and quantitative methodologies*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, M. (1971). *The new journalism: The underground press, the artists of nonfiction, and changes in the established media*. Wichita: The University of Kansas Press.

- Johnston, H., Laraña, E. & Gusfield, J. R. (1994). Identities, grievances and new social movements. In E. Laraña, H. Johnston & J. R. Gusfield (Eds.), *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Johnston, H. (2005). Comparative frame analysis. In H. Johnson & J. Noakes (Eds.), *Frames of protest: Social movements and the framing perspective*. Toronto: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Johnson, H. & Oliver, P. E. (2005). Breaking the frame. In H. Johnson & J. Noakes (Eds.), *Frames of protest: Social movements and the framing perspective*. Toronto: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kelly, K. (1972). *Youth, humanism & technology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage: London.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (2nd ed.). New York: Verso.
- Lacy, S., Riffe, D., & Randle, Q. (1998). Sample size in multi-year content analyses of monthly consumer magazines. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75(2), 408-417.
- Ladner, P. (1969, December 10-17). Jim B's island ... an open grave of US civilization. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 8.
- LaPierre, L. (1968a, March 8-21). New Canada. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- LaPierre, L. (1968b, August 16-22). New Canada: Student power. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Larsen, P. (2002). Mediated fiction. In K. Jensen (Ed.), *A handbook of media and communications research: Qualitative and quantitative methodologies*. New York: Routledge.
- Lester, K. (1969, May 28-June 3). Sorting it out from Canada. *The Georgia Straight*, pp 16-17.
- Lipset, S. M. (1985). *Consensus and conflict: Essays in political sociology*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.
- Lipset, S. M. (1973). American student activism in comparative perspective. In P. K. Manning (Ed.), *Youth: Divergent perspectives*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Luke, D. A., Caburnay, C. A., & Cohen, E. L. (2011). How much is enough? New recommendations for using constructed week sampling in newspaper content analysis of health stories. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 5(1), 76-91.
- Mackey, J. (1978). Youth alienation in post-modern society. *The High School Journal*, 61(8), 353-367.

- Macnamara, J. (2005). Media content analysis: Its uses, benefits and best practice methodology. *Asia Pacific Public Relations Journal*, 6(1), 1– 34.
- Magnusson, W., Doyle, C., Walker, R. B. J., & DeMarco, J. (1986). *After Bennett: A new politics for British Columbia*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Magnusson, W. (1986). Local autonomy & community politics. In W. Magnusson, C. Doyle, R. B. J. Walker, & J. DeMarco (Eds.), *After Bennett: A new politics for British Columbia*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Marx, G. (1979). External efforts to damage or facilitate social movements: Some patterns, explanations, outcomes and complications. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The dynamics of social movements: Resource mobilization, social control and tactics*, Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Mattson, K. (2003). Engaging youth: Combating the apathy of young Americans toward politics. New York: The Century Foundation Report.
- McAdam, D. (1994). Culture and social movements. In E. Laraña, H. Johnston & J. R. Gusfield (Eds.), *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. N. (1987). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *Social movements in an organizational society: Collected essays*. Oxford: Transaction Books.
- McClure, M. (1967, May 5-18). Poisoned wheat. *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 6-7.
- McGrady, L. (1968, October 11-17). The bar tender. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 4.
- McLaughlin, L. (2002). Something Old, Something New: Lingering Moments in the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. In E. Meehan & E. Riordan (Eds.), *Sex & Money: Feminism and Political Economy in the Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McLeod, D. (1968, January 12-25). We are all god/You are all god. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 1.
- Melucci, A. (1989). *Nomads of the present: Social movements and individual needs in contemporary society*. London: Hutchinson Radius.
- Melucci, A. (1994). A strange kind of newness: What's 'new' in new social movements? In E. Laraña, H. Johnston & J. R. Gusfield (Eds.), *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Michaelis, S. (1969a, December 10-17). Beside a picture of a starving baby: scrawled graffiti. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Michaelis, S. (1969b, December 10-17). Who gives a damn about human rights? *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 14-15.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. California: Sage.
- Mills, J. (1968a, March 8-21). SFU is real – complete with rotten government. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Mills, J. (1968b, August 16-22). Mills indignant. *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 3, 14.
- Milner, H. (2005). Are young Canadians becoming political dropouts? A comparative perspective. *IRPP Choices*, 11(3), 1-24.
- Miscellaneous atrocities. (1969, December 10-17). *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 12-13.
- Molotch, H. (1979). Media and movements. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The dynamics of social movements: Resource mobilization, social control and tactics*. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Moore, B. (1966). *Social origins of dictatorship and democracy: Lord and peasant in the making of the modern world*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Morris, A. D. (1992). Political consciousness and collective action. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. London: Yale University Press.
- Mueller, C. M. (1992). Building social movement theory. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. London: Yale University Press.
- Narad, S. B. (1967, September 8). Psychedelic yoga. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 3.
- Nesbitt-Larking, P. (2001). *Politics, society and the media: Canadian perspectives*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Nillan, C. (1967, May 5-18). WASP. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 12.
- Noakes, J. & Johnson, H. (2005). Frames of protest: A road map to a perspective. In H. Johnson & J. Noakes (Eds.), *Frames of protest: Social movements and the framing perspective*. Toronto: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Not a Peep. (1969, May 28-June 3). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 3.
- Nuditree. (1968, March 8-21). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 3.

- Oberschall, A. (1973). *Social conflict and social movements*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Osgerby, B. (2008). Understanding the 'jackpot market': Media, marketing and the rise of the American teenager. In P. E. Jamieson & D. Romer (Eds.), *The changing portrayal of adolescents in the media since 1950*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- O'Neill, K. (2004). Transnational protest: States, circuses, and conflict at the frontline of global politics. *International Studies Review*, 6(2), 233-251.
- Palmer, B. D. (2009). *Canada's 1960s: The ironies of identity in a rebellious era*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Patrioticism. (1969, January 3-16). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 12.
- Pauls, N. & Campbell, C. (1997). *The Georgia Straight: What the hell happened?* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Pentagon would not pay for research unless for military purposes. (1969, December 10-17). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Perrow, C. (1979). The sixties observed. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The dynamics of social movements: Resource mobilization, social control and tactics*. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Persky, S. (1969, May 28-June 3). Berkeley: Gassed, gunned & gang banged. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Pilon, D. (2009). Investigating media as a deliberative space: Newspaper opinions about voting systems in the 2007 Ontario provincial referendum. *Canadian Political Science Review*, 3(3), 1-23.
- Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual review of Sociology*, 27, 283-305.
- Postman, N. (2006). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business* (20th anniversary ed.). New York: Penguin Books.
- Presidential address. (1969, May 28-June 3). *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 10-11.
- Rankin, H. (1967, September 8). What makes a hippie? *The Georgia Straight*, p. 4.
- Rankin, H. (1968a, March 8-21). Compulsory arbitration with a vengeance. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Rankin, H. (1968b, October 11-17). East end park creation neglected. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 4.

- Rankin, H. (1975). *Rankin's law: Recollections of a radical*. Vancouver: November House.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Drager, M. W. (1996). Sample size in content analysis of weekly news magazines. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 73(3), 635-644.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. (1998). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Riordan, E. (2002). Intersections and new directions: On feminism and political economy. In E. Meehan & E. Riordan (Eds.), *Sex & money: Feminism and political economy in the media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Romer, D. (2008). Mass media and the socialization of adolescents since World War II. In P. E. Jamieson & D. Romer (Eds.), *The changing portrayal of adolescents in the media since 1950*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Rorabaugh, W. J. (1989). *Berkeley at war: The 1960s*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Ross, M. H. (2009). Culture and identity in comparative political analysis. In M. I. Lichbach & A. S. Zuckerman (Eds.), *Comparative politics: Rationality, culture and structure* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiller, H. (1989). *Culture Inc.: The corporate takeover of public expression*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shrum, L. (1969, December 10-17). Sun's tumbleweeds comic strip is racist. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 15.
- Simpson, B. (1968, January 12-25). Reply to mate. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- Smesler, N. (1963). *Theory of collective behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Snow, D. A. & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. London: Yale University Press.
- Sommer, E. (1968, March 8-21). Georgia Straight banned in New West. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 1.
- Sommer, E. (1969, January 3-16). Abortion. *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 8-9.
- Sperling, G. (1968, January 12-25). Che and the need for revolution. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 5.
- Stack, M. & Kelly, D. (2006). Popular media, education, and resistance. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(1), 5-26.

- Storrie, T. (2004). Citizens or what? In J. Roche, S. Tucker, R. Thomson & R. Flynn (Eds.), *Youth in society* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Straight* vendor beats rap. (1967, September 8). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 5.
- Tarrow, S. (1992). Mentalities, political cultures and collective action frames. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. London: Yale University Press.
- Thanksgiving. (1968, October 11-17). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 2.
- The post-competitive, comparative game of a free city. (1968, October 11-17). *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 10-11.
- Touraine, A. (1981). *The voice and the eye: An analysis of social movements*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Turn on, tune in, take over. (1967, September 8). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 1.
- Uncle Sam wants YOU nigger. (1967, May 5-18). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 12.
- Unger, I. (1974). *The movement: A history of the American New Left 1959-1972*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.
- Van Loon, J. (2006). McLuhan and his influences. In D. Berry & J. Theobald (Eds.), *Radical mass media criticism: A cultural genealogy*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Venditti, V. (1968, August 16-22). Colonel cons Calgary. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 6.
- Walder, A. G. (2009). Political sociology and social movements. *Annual review of sociology*, 35, 393-412.
- Wang, X. & Riffe, D. (2010). An exploration of sample sizes for content analysis of the New York Times web site. *Web Journal of Mass Communication Research*, 20. Retrieved from <http://www.scripps.ohiou.edu/wjmcr/vol20/20.html#author>
- Wanted: Conspiracy to incite riot. (1969, October 8-15). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 21.
- Watts, A. (1968, January 12-25). Get out of our minds and come to our senses. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 3.
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Westby, D. L. (2005). Strategic imperative, ideology and frames. In H. Johnson & J. Noakes (Eds.), *Frames of protest: Social movements and the framing perspective*. Toronto: Rowman & Littlefield.

- What Dr. Spock said. (1968, August 16-22). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 5.
- White officers lead federal troops in Biafra. (1968, October 11-17). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 8.
- Winter, J. P. (2007). *Lies the media tell us*. New York: Black Rose Books.
- Yippies stir fuzz (UPS). (1968, March 8-21). *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Zald, M. N. (1992). Looking backward to look forward: Reflections on the past and future of the resource mobilization research program. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. London: Yale University Press.
- Zald, M. N. (1996) Culture, ideology and strategic framing. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures and cultural framings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaslove, G. (1968, August 16-22). S.F.U: Students, faculty incompatible. *The Georgia Straight*, p. 7.
- Zatlyn, T. (1968, August 16-22). Dick Gregory's fight for life: The last Indian war (UPS). *The Georgia Straight*, pp. 10-11.
- Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science*, 308-319.

Appendix A

Key:

P = Political economy injustice frame

I = Identity politics injustice frame

L = Liberal injustice frame

PI = Political economy and identity politics injustice frames

PL = Political economy and liberal injustice frames

IL = Identity politics and liberal injustice frames

All = All injustice frames

P-only = Political economy injustice frame only

I-only = Identity politics injustice frame only

L-only = Liberal injustice frame only

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Great bus stop bust	uncredited	1	May 5-18, 1967	1	X	X	X				X			
Editorial	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	1	May 5-18, 1967	2	X	X	X				X			

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Obscenity?	uncredited	1	May 5-18, 1967	2	X		X		X					
Diggers put down Haight	Anderson, Chester	1	May 5-18, 1967	3	X	X		X						
Poisoned wheat	McClure, Michael	1	May 5-18, 1967	6-7	X	X		X						
Another Munich in Viet Nam?	Grinkus, Tony	1	May 5-18, 1967	8	X							X		
Inaugural column	Acorn, Milton	1	May 5-18, 1967	11-12	X	X	X				X			
Uncle Sam wants <u>YOU</u> nigger	<i>uncredited</i>	1	May 5-18, 1967	12	X	X		X						
WASP	Nillan, Carol	1	May 5-18, 1967	12	X							X		
3,000 at smoke-in	Underground Press Syndicate	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	1	X							X		

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Turn on, tune in, take over	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	1	X	X	X				X			
Hastings jungle	Diablo, El	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	1, 3	X	X	X				X			
Straight supports Chief Ralph Booth	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	1	X	X		X						
Marijuana petition	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	2			X							X
We reserve the right to discriminate against greasy spoons	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	3		X	X			X				
Psychedelic yoga	Narad, Sri Brahmarishi	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	3		X	X			X				
Il faut vaincre la machine	Coupey, Pierre	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	4	X	X		X						
What makes a hippy?	Rankin, Harry	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	4	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
On learning to speak the old country language	Acorn, Milton	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	4	X	X		X						
Stamp out VAG A	Georgia Straight	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	5			X							X
Straight vendor beats rap	Georgia Straight	5	Sept. 8-21, 1967	5		X	X			X				
Cartoon - Peacenik prison	Cobb, R.	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	2			X							X
My rifle	Georgia Straight	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	3	X	X		X						
Review – Bonnie & Clyde	Georgia Straight	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	3	X							X		

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Confessions of a CYC volunteer	Harriman, Lloyd	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	4	X	X		X						
Welfare discrimination	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	4	X	X	X				X			
Produce for peace	Judes	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	5	X							X		
Beautify False Creek?	Rankin, Harry	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	6			X							X
Requiem for a heavyweight	Latremouille, Fred	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	7			X							X

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
We demand the right to speak and disagree	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	7			X							X
A case of Zionist aggression?	Mate, Gabor	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	8-9	X	X	X				X			
The unified life	Mishra	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	12	X							X		
Another way to jail a kid?	Sommer, Eric	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	13	X							X		
American peace worker speaks out	Sommer, Eric	8	Nov. 24-Dec. 8, 1967	13	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
We are all god, you are all god	McLeod	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	1		X							X	
Cartoon – The Devil’s licence	Cobb, R.	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	2	X	X		X						
Reply to Mate	Simpson, Bernard	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	2			X							X
To get out of our minds and come to our senses	Watts, Alan	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	3	X	X		X						
Attorney-general joins court battle	Cummings, Bob	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	4			X							X
Public housing claim disproved	Rankin, Harry	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	4	X		X		X					
Che and the need for revolution	Sperling, Gerald	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	5	X							X		
C.I.A. recruitment spoof advertisement	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	5	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
A letter to my son	Cramer, Barry	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	6	X	X	X				X			
Free schools meet – A magical energy trip	Cramer, Barry	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	6	X	X		X						
A positive hip philosophy	Jenkins, Jack	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	7	X	X		X						
Iowa city, USA	Harvey, Roy and Karen	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	8-9	X	X		X						
Prudes say down with mini skirts	Cummings, Bob	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	10	X	X		X						
Youth freed in moral revolution	Cummings, Bob	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	10	X	X		X						
Obscenity – Who really cares, all is phoney	Cummings, Bob	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	11	X	X		X						
The pain of almost nothing	Cummings, Bob	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	12	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Help stamp out little old ladies!	Hlookoff, Peter	10	Jan. 12-25, 1968	13		X							X	
Don't fink on yourself & testify	Cummings, Bob	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	1	X	X	X				X			
Georgia Straight banned in New West	Sommer, Eric	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	1-2			X							X
Abortion legalized in Britain	Liberation News Service	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	1			X							X
'LG – Coward power	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	1			X							X
We must catch the design revolution	Fuller, Buckminster	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	3, 12	X	X		X						
Nuditree	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	3	X	X	X				X			
Who killed Gordon Massie?	Cramer, Barry	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	3			X							X

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
They gon' get it	Brown, H. Rap	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	4	X							X		
Teacher fired, tells why	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	4	X							X		
Stokely Carmichael speaks	Carmichael, Stokely	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	4-5, 7	X	X		X						
New Canada	LaPierre, Laurier	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	6	X		X		X					
Compulsory arbitration with a vengeance	Rankin, Harry	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	6	X		X		X					
Bennett doesn't spend enough	Berger, Tom	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	6	X		X		X					
SFU <u>is</u> real – Complete with rotten government	Mills, John	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	7	X	X		X						
Yippies stir fuzz	Underground Press Syndicate	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	7			X							X

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Bay day in the hosery department	Cummings, Bob	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	9	X		X		X					
Come, all ye women	Cummings, Bob	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	10	X	X		X						
Sieg heil!!	Cummings, Bob	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	13			X							X
Cartoon – Police uniform envy	Cobb, R.	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	13			X							X
Biggest mistake in history	Cummings, Bob	13	Mar. 8-21, 1968	13			X							X
The town gossip	Tarasoff, Paul	17	May 3-16, 1968	3			X							X
Ottawa ... Montreal ...	Liberation News Service	17	May 3-16, 1968	3			X							X
Death of the <i>Straight</i>	Cummings, Bob	17	May 3-16, 1968	3	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Cool-aid harassment 'sick'	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	17	May 3-16, 1968	12			X							X
Marijuana leads to politics...?	Cummings, Bob	17	May 3-16, 1968	14	X	X		X						
Cartoon – Beautiful B.C.	Cobb, R.	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	2	X							X		
EFSM demo Tuesday	Harding, John Wesley	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	2			X							X
Mills indignant	Mills, John	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	3	X	X		X						
... and the heat goes on	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	3			X							X
Can you dig it?	Cummings, Bob	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	4	X		X		X					
Help us keep out of jail!	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	4			X							X

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
What Dr. Spock said	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	5	X	X	X				X			
Student power	LaPierre, Laurier	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	6	X	X		X						
Colonel cons Calgary	Venditti, Vince	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	6	X	X		X						
Back to the garden	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	6		X	X			X				
Students, faculty incompatible	Zaslove, Gerald	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	7, 13	X		X		X					
Crumbs for Cool-Aid	Cramer, Barry	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	7	X							X		
Baldwin on Carmichael – A letter to America	Baldwin, James	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	8	X	X		X						
Revolution in the white mother country and national liberation in the black colony	Cleaver, Eldridge	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	9	X	X	X				X			

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Dick Gregory's fight for life - The last Indian war	Zatlyn, Ted	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	10-11	X	X	X				X			
What's the ugliest part of your body?	Zappa, Frank	25	Aug. 16-22, 1968	13	X	X		X						
Cover – Free speech	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	1			X							X
Cartoon – Doves beset by hawks	Cobb, R.	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	2	X	X		X						
Student union ready for change	Kouri, Wanis	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	2	X		X		X					
Almost anonymous	Persky, Stan	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	3	X	X		X						
Free speech be-in – From out of the jaws of despair arises a guerilla theatre	Davidoff; Harding, John Wesley	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	3, 7	X	X		X						
Where does TEAM stand?	Rankin, Harry	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	4	X		X		X					

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
“we are one” – Memories of a Vietnam veteran	Venditti, Vince	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	4	X	X		X						
Summerhill in trouble	uncredited	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	4		X	X			X				
The addled reritwepyt	Cummings, Bob; Ellis	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	5	X	X		X						
Stokely teaches in Watts	uncredited	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	6	X	X		X						
Lane sees little truth in TIME	Lane, Mark	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	8	X		X		X					
The lesbians	Cummings, Bob	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	9-10		X	X			X				
Cartoon – Vietnam	National Students’ Non-violent Coordinating Committee; Lewis, T. G.	29	Sept. 13-19, 1968	13-16	X	X	X				X			
Cover – The body of Che	uncredited	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	1	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Cartoon – Thanksgiving	Cobb, R.	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	2	X	X		X						
Planning a vacation? Visit Oakalla	Mitchell, Allan K.	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	3-4, 9	X							X		
Cop speaks out	Unidentified Vancouver police officer	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	3		X	X			X				
Smut science rhetoric	Bowering, George	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	3	X	X		X						
Free speech sing-out	Harding, John Wesley	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	3			X							X
The bar tender	McGrady, Leo	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	4	X		X		X					
East end neglected	Rankin, Harry	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	4	X		X		X					
The private kingdom	Cummings, Bob	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	5			X							X

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Yips visit Huey behind bars	Albert, Stewart	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	6	X	X	X				X			
Yipanthor pact – 1968 – the year of the pig	Cleaver, Eldridge	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	7	X	X		X						
Yipanthor pact - Come into the streets	Albert, Stewart; Hoffman, Abby; Rubin, Jerry	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	7	X	X		X						
Allen Ginsberg in Chicago	Lipton, Lawrence	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	8	X	X		X						
Hippy back offed	uncredited	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	8		X							X	
White officers lead federal troops in Biafra	Liberation News Service	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	8	X							X		
The post-competitive, comparative game of a free city	The Digger Papers	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	10-11	X	X		X						
Cartoon – Spectacular society	International situationiste	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	13	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
LA police crash children's party	Hoffman, Fred	32	Oct. 11-17, 1968	15			X							X
Cartoon - War religion	Cobb, R.	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	2	X	X		X						
A correctional school Christmas	Ellis, Joe	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	3			X							X
Docs' agree ... things go better with grass	Underground Press Syndicate	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	3		X							X	
We the people in 1969	Cummings, Bob	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	5	X	X		X						
Crumb raps	Glauberger, Stu	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	7		X							X	
Celebrating Mao	uncredited	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	7	X							X		
Abortion	Sommer, Eric	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	8-9	X	X	X				X			

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Patrioticism	Ellis, J; Davidoff, F.	43	Jan. 3-16, 1969	12	X	X	X				X			
Cover - Spoof	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	1	X	X	X				X			
Moccasin miles for Native progress	Hlookoff, Peter	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	3			X							X
The visit	Sommer, Eric	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	3	X							X		
Straight benefit balance	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	3	X		X		X					
Some humble thoughts for would-be revolutionaries	Hlookoff, Peter	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	4	X	X		X						
City taxes band	Rankin, Harry	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	4	X		X		X					
Teacher dismissed	uncredited	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	5			X							X

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
'And on the eighth day'	Cummings, Bob	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	6	X	X		X						
The 'right' kind of convention	Cumming, Bob	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	7	X		X		X					
A visit to Brannan Lake – Our problem community	Chouinard, Ray	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	8-9	X	X		X						
Managing the news for power and profit	Hill, Bert	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	10-11	X							X		
Fool fools fuzz	Cummings, Bob	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	14	X	X		X						
A New York happening in the nude	Rainone, Chris	50	Mar. 21-27, 1969	15	X	X		X						
Cover – Give us back our freedom	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	59	May 28-Jun. 3, 1969	1	X	X	X				X			

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Cartoon – Global defense	Cobb, R.	59	May 28-Jun. 3, 1969	2	X	X		X						
Not a peek – Free press siege	<i>Georgia Straight</i>	59	May 28-Jun. 3, 1969	3	X	X	X				X			
Leary to run	Underground Press Syndicate	59	May 28-Jun. 3, 1969	3	X	X	X				X			
An introduction to some questions about civil liberties	Rowan, Bob	59	May 28-Jun. 3, 1969	4-5	X	X	X				X			
Berkeley: Gassed, gunned & gang banged	Persky, Stan	59	May 28-Jun. 3, 1969	7	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Photo essay and timeline – The people built a people’s park ... and then the trouble started	Alexander, Anita; Goodrick, Susan; Liberation News Service; Crowley, Pat	59	May 28- Jun. 3, 1969	8-9	X	X		X						
Battle for People’s Park	Schoenfield, Eugene;	59	May 28- Jun. 3, 1969	9, 13-14	X	X	X				X			
Presidential address	uncredited	59	May 28- Jun. 3, 1969	10-11	X	X		X						
Photo essay - In cold blood – James Rector 1944-1969	Kathryn	59	May 28- Jun. 3, 1969	12-13	X	X		X						
Collage – Countercultural blues	uncredited	59	May 28- Jun. 3, 1969	15		X	X			X				

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Food is for living	uncredited	66	Jul. 16-22, 1969	14	X	X		X						
Cartoon – Student-Administrator language barrier	Adams, F.	66	Jul. 16-22, 1969	18	X	X		X						
Cartoon – Gaia entombed	uncredited	66	Jul. 16-22, 1969	20	X	X		X						
Cartoon cover – Conspiracy to commit freedom	uncredited	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	1	X	X		X						
Cartoon – Love it or leave it	Cobb, R.	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	2	X							X		
Burnaby teachers preparing for crucial battle	Brown, Stephen	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	3	X							X		
Learning to live without schools	McLeod, Chris	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	3	X	X		X						
Panthers establish international contacts	Liberation News Service	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	4	X							X		

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Death for underground editor	Liberation News Service	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	4	X							X		
8 tons of dope collected by scouts	Liberation News Service	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	4			X							X
Some grooved, some listened, some acted – Border closure	Brown, Stephen; Istanli, Shiekh	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	5-7	X	X		X						
Amchitka – A symptom only – or explosions don't occur in a vacuum	campus left action movement	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	7	X							X		
SFU strike spreads	Istanli, Shiekh	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	7	X		X		X					
Magoo jails jury as conspiracy trial closes first week	Peck, Abe	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	8	X		X		X					
A letter from Cook County Jail Chicago	Rubin, Jerry	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	9	X	X		X						
Pirate radio announcement	Radio *Free* Vancouver	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	10	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Birth control handbook free on campuses	Brown, Stephen	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	11	X	X		X						
Declaration of interdependence	uncredited	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	12-13	X	X	X				X			
Earth read-out	uncredited	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	15-16	X	X	X				X			
Eco-notes	Toronto Daily Star	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	16	X	X	X				X			
The quality of life on the concrete isle	Bowering, George	78	Oct. 8-15, 1969	22	X							X		
Cover – Panther murdered	uncredited	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	1	X	X		X						
Careless oil dumping is killing 2,000 birds here	Brown, Stephen	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	2	X		X		X					
The anti-pollution revolution	Galt, Ginny	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	2	X	X	X				X			

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Police murder Fred Hampton and Mark Clark of Illinois Black Panther Party	Liberation News Service	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	3	X		X		X					
Beside a picture of a starving baby: Scrawled graffiti	Michaelis, Sheldon	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	6	X		X		X					
Keenleyside: 'Pentagon would not pay for research unless for military purposes'	uncredited	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	7	X							X		
Jim B's island ... an open grave of U.S. civilization	Ladner, Peter	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	8	X	X		X						
Cops raid deserters' home: Ransack files, letters	Grauer, James	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	9	X		X		X					
Crossing the line by bus: Standing like so many criminals	Brown, Stephen	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	9	X	X		X						
Presidents snub Agnew	Liberation News Service	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	10	X	X		X						
Miscellaneous atrocities	Liberation News Service	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	12-13	X	X		X						

Article title	Author	Issue	Date	Page	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Who gives a damn about rights?	Michaelis, Sheldon	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	14-15	X	X	X				X			
Sun's Tumbleweeds comic strip is racist	Shrum, Larry	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	15	X	X	X				X			
B.C. Indian deaths highest ... in the whole country	The First Citizen	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	17		X	X			X				
Violence and the commuter protest	Hoffman, Abby	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	18-20	X	X		X						
G.I. press	Unnamed Marine Lance-Corporal	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	20	X	X	X				X			
Head of new pollution council stands to gain \$\$\$	Swanson, John	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	23	X		X		X					
Cartoon – The adventures of Jesus	uncredited	87	Dec. 10-17, 1969	23	X	X		X						
Totals					170	136	103	83	27	9	33	27	11	34

Appendix B

Key: as above

Issue	Number of articles	P	I	L	PI	PL	IL	All	P only	I only	L only
Vol. 1 No. 1	9	9	6	4	3	1	0	3	2	0	0
Vol. 1 No. 5	12	7	9	7	4	0	3	2	1	0	2
Vol. 1 No. 8	13	9	5	6	3	0	0	2	4	0	4
Vol. 2 No. 10	17	13	13	4	10	1	0	1	1	2	2
Vol. 2 No. 13	20	12	6	14	4	4	0	2	2	0	8
Vol. 2 No. 17	21	12	12	11	7	3	0	2	0	3	6
Vol. 2 No. 25	16	12	9	9	5	2	1	3	2	0	3
Vol. 2 No. 29	13	10	9	7	6	3	2	1	0	0	1
Vol. 2 No. 32	18	13	11	7	8	2	1	1	2	1	3

Vol. 3 No. 43	8	5	6	3	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	
Vol. 3 No. 50	13	11	6	6	5	3	0	1	2	0	2	
Vol. 3 No. 59	14	13	14	6	8	0	1	5	0	0	0	
Vol. 3 No. 66	14	10	9	3	5	1	0	1	3	3	1	
Vol. 3 No. 78	18	17	9	6	6	2	0	3	6	0	1	
Vol. 3 No. 87	18	17	12	10	7	5	1	4	1	0	0	
Total	224*	170	136	103	83	27	9	33	27	11	34	
Percent of total	100	76	61	46	37	12	4	15	12	5	15	
								<i>Total combined frames</i>	152	<i>Total single frames</i>		72
								<i>Percent combined frames</i>	68	<i>Percent single frames</i>		32

*Large bolded numbers are those quoted in 'Master frame aligned content' section of Chapter III