Gwynne Dyer   Bonnie Sherr Klein   Jeff Simpson
London, England   *National Film Board of Canada*   *Globe and Mail*

The Media:
Their role in peace studies

Abstract

The media are the great informers in our society. They are also the
great persuaders. And the greatest of them all is television. Political careers
have floundered on an unflattering projection image. News coverage of
domestic unrest and international conflicts has influenced, even altered,
political decisions. Packaged correctly, just about anything can be sold
through televised advertising. What is the role of such powerful influences
on matters of peace and security? Three people actively involved in the
media industry address the question.

Gwynne Dyer
London, England

The Media:
The Citizens' way of talking to each other

I think the media tend to be treated as something rather grander than
they are. And so I think a very simple definition of the media is a good
place to start when you talk about war, peace, and the media. The media
are the ways that we talk to each other, within our society, about the
problems that concern us, and to some rather lesser extent, the way we
discuss them between societies. Now when people talk to each other they
need shared assumptions and so there is no surprise at all in the fact that,
generally speaking, the media will share the assumptions of the society
with which this conversation is held. And that does mean to a large extent
assimilating the orthodoxies about how we run our affairs that prevail in

that society. This includes the orthodoxies about war and peace: why we do it, what we are doing, how we might change the way we behave. The media aren't separate. They are not something out there commenting, in a God-like detached manner, upon what the society is doing. They are, in fact, the transmission belt whereby the society communicates with itself.

When we come to treat issues of war and peace the problem is that the traditional language and assumptions of our society, and of almost all societies, about war and peace, aren't adequate any more, because the context in which these events are occurring has changed. A hundred years ago, you may have disapproved heartily of the phenomenon of war, but you couldn't have said of it what we would say now: "We must give it up or we will destroy ourselves." What was an optional moral judgement about social behavior a hundred years ago is now a pragmatic definition of reality – "you've got to stop doing this." The language and the assumptions that we rely on to deal with war, as a society, are still largely the traditional language and assumptions. These are drenched with beliefs about the necessity of military preparedness, the efficacy of deterrence, all sorts of quite traditional approaches to the subject. We are all conscious at the same time that the context has changed, that this is now a problem which is no longer optional.

This poses a particular problem for the media because the media are communicating in that language with the society. And the tendency of any society, even when it is aware that the context is changed, is to say that war in general is bad but our wars are regrettably necessary. All good journalism is the setting of context. Of course you get the facts first, but in order to give them any meaning at all you have to place them in a context that allows people to understand why these events are occurring, and to draw conclusions about them. If you don't consciously set an alternative context the prevailing social assumptions about this phenomenon will take over. And that is very much what happens with a great deal of the way the media treat issues of war and peace. Most hard news, most evening television news is, normally speaking, filled with reporting that deals with questions of war and peace. Unless an alternative context is set, the traditional reflex assumptions about war and peace will take over.

The problem for journalists is that in trying to set an alternative context they start shifting toward what would be termed, in the quite pejorative way, advocacy. There is this kind of image that journalists have, and it is in a sense necessary, of being impartial. And when you go in for deliberate context setting, then you're getting out in front and dropping to some extent this facade of being an impartial conveyer of facts. Now I think this facade is necessary because you can't trust your media at all if you don't know that you're going to get the facts straight. But, on the other hand, the journalists I know are highly opinionated people, who have strong moral

views. So most journalists actually want to deal with context setting consciously, they want to shift things from the allegedly neutral presentation of fact, which of course falls into the traditional context, into a more specific: "Why is this war happening?", "What does this imply about our behavior?" It is very difficult to do this without veering into advocacy.

I described the problem because it's one that I'm sure any journalist deals with all the time. And it's a very difficult question because, if the media don't set the context differently when dealing with issues of war and peace, then the society has no opportunity of discussing them in that different context. I don't think that the problem, or the handicap, is quite as large as I've described, or implied, because the way the media work is very closely connected with the way society thinks. I am speaking of ours, but I could speak of others as well. The society knows certain things about war. What needs to be done is to remind them, whenever specific events come up, of what they already know and that it also applies to this situation. It isn't as though you were parachuting into some alien country and attempting to proselytize them with a point of view they don't already have. In journalism you can't get too far out ahead of popular opinion, frankly, or you become a propagandist; you become an overt advocate. Then you can still talk in public but you have changed your role. It isn't necessary to get that far out in front in order to remind people what the context is, in which these particular events are occurring. It is not just the political context that must be set, though that's a beginning, but also the general context. The political context would contain things like: here is a war, here is a threat of war, here are arms talks, there is this to be reported about what is happening today, and this to be reported about what is likely to happen next week, these options are available. But the general context would say: this is a war, this is a threat of war, this fits into our general context which says that we've got to stop doing this. So that is the perspective in which it needs to be viewed. That is possible to do without getting too far out in front, without ceasing to be acceptable as a journalist.

When we did *The Defence of Canada* series, we began with the assumption that we were doing something daring in suggesting on prime time television that Canada should leave its alliances, go non-aligned. And in the end it turned out not to be daring at all. The response by the public was not: "My God what are you saying!" It was: "Oh yeah, we sort of knew that." The ideas were already abroad. I think that tells you something about how the media work. If you get a good idea – what you think is an original idea about a new subject, or a new way to treat a subject that is not new at all – within a week or so, you discover that five or six other people have had that idea too, and put their proposals in somewhere else. I don't think that's coincidence. When journalists operate they are picking up the ideas that are already around in the society, and focusing them. The fundamental service they provide to the community is to take those ideas, articulate

them, bring them down to their necessary conclusions, and present them back to the society from which they came. While you've got to speak to people in a language which they understand, people understand a lot more about what is going on in their society than you think. They just don't understand it in the kinds of terms that you'd normally read in a newspaper, or see on television. The job of a journalist is to feed those understandings back to people in a form that they can now respond to intellectually as well as at "gut level." It was our experience with this particular series that, having said these terrible things in public, everybody already knew them. You can't get too far out in front, but you don't have to. I think a lot of people understand what the problems are, though their solutions may differ. But, you can talk in the appropriate terms, you can set the appropriate context in the media in dealing with war and peace without getting too far out, or becoming an open advocate.

Bonnie Sherr Klein
National Film Board of Canada

Illusions and Realities in the Media

> You people sit there, night after night. You're beginning to
> believe this illusion we're spinning here. You're beginning to
> think the tube is reality, and your own lives are unreal. This
> is mass madness! (Newsweek)

Some of you may remember these words of the supposedly mad anchorman, Howard Beale, in Paddy Chayefsky's disturbing film *Network*.

I'd like to look briefly at how the mainstream media define for us what is 'real' and what is 'illusion' – basically that war, violence, competition, greed are reality; and that peace, non-violence, cooperation, collaboration, are 'un-real' illusions. And I'd like to suggest that with a different perspective, we can actually reverse this paradigm. We can begin to validate peaceful alternatives not as illusory, naive, soft, female, but as representing an equally real expression of human experience and human potential.

Let me clarify immediately: I am not suggesting here that we can eliminate conflict, which is inevitable in social organization, especially among nations. We are not talking about a world without conflict, but about our response to conflict. I believe the human repertoire of response to conflict is potentially vast. Violence is only one end of a spectrum which

includes a whole range of other behaviors, both actual and imaginable, with which all of us are familiar.

Let's dispel a common illusion about the media: The media do not merely reflect or report reality, but they create it because they provide so much of the information based on which we make decisions about our lives. They shape our personal and our public agenda. They define our way of seeing. The media are the cultural tools that map our world.

If my own perceptions about life as I experience it are not reflected back to me in the media, I doubt my perceptions. And as I doubt myself, I lose my personal power to act, to change, even to speak. I believe this is at the root of our individual and collective passivity, our profound disbelief in our own power to act upon our world.

Media news defines **reality** almost exclusively in terms of violence and confrontation. We hear about strikes, riots, wars, terrorism. We have no mechanism to see the conflicts that get resolved, the strikes that don't occur because they are successfully arbitrated, the wars that do not break out. These non-events, the evidence of successful peace-making, are perhaps, by their very nature, invisible. But are they less **real**?

Anyone who has been involved in peace movement activities knows what it is like to be considered a "special interest group" by the media. You know the difficulty of trying to publicize simple informational meetings if they are not polarized debates, preferably with "big-name" speakers, i.e., American. And the problem is that if it isn't covered, if we don't make the news, the event is not "real"; it's almost as if it never happened, in the eyes of the public, and even in the eyes of participants. It's hard to sustain organizing energy if you don't experience the impact of your activities, if you are ignored. Moreover, the event does not become part of our collective history. We are deprived of historical antecedents from which to learn and to seek inspiration. Part of the empowering excitement of the current wave of feminism has been the rediscovery of lost women's history.

John Grierson, known as the father of documentary film and first Commissioner of the National Film Board of Canada (NFB), understood the power of film to "make people love each other or hate each other" (Grierson, 1966, p. 223). Although the NFB began by serving the war effort, Grierson was challenged by the possibility of making peace as exciting and dramatic as war, by making films "about the everyday things of life, the values, the ideals which make life worth living" (p. 226).

And of course we can't confine our discussion of media to news and public affairs. Our television entertainment shows, our movies, our videos, our music – these are all media, the culture of our children, the culture we

are exporting around the world. And they are overwhelmingly violent. Dr. George Gerbner, the dean of researchers on the social impact of television, has said: "If you can write a nation's stories, you needn't worry about who makes its laws. Today television tells most of the stories to most of the people most of the time" (Gerbner, 1982). The statistics about how many murders our children watch on television in the course of a week, combined with the fact that they spend many more hours watching TV than in the classroom, leaves no question about what we are teaching them about "reality".

Gerbner and others have also demonstrated how television reinforces paranoia and prejudice of all kinds – racism, ageism , classism, and sexism. ABC Network produced a major mini-series *Amerika*, which was set in North America after a Soviet take-over, and in which the 'enemies' were liberal 'collaborators'. A major part of the series was filmed in Toronto . . . . At the same time as we pride ourselves on our free press, and defend it, we must ask whose social realities are considered in the business of cultural myth-making. Here's Gerbner again:

> Selectivity and control, which are inherent in any communication, dominate the mass-communication process. The right to acculturate a nation and to shape the public agenda has never been open to all; it is one of the most carefully guarded powers in any society. The real question is not whether the organs of mass communication are free but rather: By whom, how, for what purpose and with what consequences are the inevitable controls exercised? (Gerbner, 1982)

I would like to suggest that there is a link between the goal of peace and the full participation of women in society and in the media in particular. This link has to do with the fact that patriarchy is characterized by hierarchical thinking in which some people matter less than others, and in which power is maintained by violence or the threat of violence – the causes of war and the antithesis to peace. Women, who have been excluded as a class from that system, have become the custodians of alternative ways to solve conflicts without violence, and have an enormous contribution to make. According to a United Nations statistic, women comprise over 70% of the membership of peace and social justice groups world-wide, which contrasts tellingly with the number of women in positions of political power. I hasten to add that I am not talking about biological determinism but rather the accumulated knowledge and experience resulting from culturally-determined gender roles.

Let me be more specific by focusing on two areas I know best: women and film. I work at the National Film Board in Studio D, the women's unit, which was established in 1975 to bring the missing perspective of women to film. We produced *If You Love This Planet*, a film

you probably know. Terri Nash, who had never made a film before, saw
Helen Caldicott give a speech and was incredibly moved. Kathleen Shannon,
Executive Producer of Studio D, agreed it was urgent. The NFB Programme
Committee of the time, however, criticized the idea as un-cinematic – it was
just an illustrated speech, said most of our male colleagues. And besides,
Caldicott was, well, shrill, strident, hysterical – words we'd come to
recognize as feminists because we'd heard them before. (I was called a
'bourgeois feminist fascist' by the *Globe and Mail* film critic for *Not A
Love Story,* an exposé of another manifestation of patriarchal violence.)
Once *Planet* was made (but before it was released), distribution officials at
the NFB said we should remove the clips in which Reagan plays a bomber
pilot in old war movies; they would offend the U.S., and besides, they were
"a cheap joke". What they didn't understand was that we women weren't
laughing at the correlation between nuclear madness, machismo, and media.
We resisted this internal self-censorship and won. *Planet* became one of the
most-used films in Canadian history. It has awakened more people to
personal action, and spawned more grass-roots peace groups, than any other
single event. You know the story of the U.S. Justice Department's attempt
to suppress it by intimidating users – an action later overturned in court and
then brought to the Supreme Court by the Administration. (Since that time
the issue was closed. The Supreme Court sided with the Administration.
Ed.). But you may not know, because our media have little open self-
criticism, that *Planet* was rejected by the CBC because it was considered
biased and one-sided. Nash's response was simple: How do you show the
'pro' side of nuclear war?   It was finally aired on *The Journal* only the night
it won an Academy Award, an American award, with no advance publicity,
and a disclaimer about "advocacy journalism."

    All of this brings us to the question of bias and objectivity. Reality
is obviously standpoint-dependent. Objectivity in the media is usually
defined as giving expression to two sides of a controversy. This is the same
either/or, win/lose debate mode of thinking which characterizes our
dangerous political environment. I believe that the objectivity practiced by
the media is a political position, the position of upholding the status quo.
Deriding all those who object to the status quo deprives the public of access
to new information and new ways of seeing and understanding the world.
The rejection of Studio D films for television really means that our films
reflect a bias other than that of those who control the airwaves, a bias that
is so pervasive it is invisible, and is declared not to exist. A bias that calls
itself objectivity. Kathleen Shannon has read this word as a simple
contraction, a code meaning, "I object to your activity." Or, "I'm objective,
you are objectionable" (Shannon, 1985).

    Many popular journalists mask a fear of commitment behind a pose
of amused or cynical detachment. Here is another perspective on objectivity,
from a paper from Studio D at the start of its second decade:

We believe in the films we make. The objectivity we practice is that of not letting one's own set of vested interests interfere with another person's telling of her own truth. But we do not believe there is value, at this time, in the kind of 'objectivity' that pretends detachment when dealing with human well-being.

When John Grierson founded the NFB in 1939, there was a war being fought, and films were made with the passion and commitment appropriate to a war effort. We make our films with the passion and commitment appropriate to fighting the war against sexism, racism, and the other political and economic tyrannies which impact on all ordinary people and on our collective future as a human race. (National Film Board of Canada)

We see emotion and reason as complementary, not contradictory; we see the division between emotion and reason as schizophrenic.

Terri Nash and I undertook to make a film about women, peace, and power because we wanted to go beyond fear and look at the causes of war and the possibility of alternatives. We discovered a long, rich, and complex history connecting women and peace. We found women were asking different – and I think more fundamental – questions. Not who had more missiles, where's the strategic advantage, and where will terrorism stop if we don't retaliate, but what do we have to do to secure a future for the planet. Women were linking domestic and public violence, re-defining peace and true security as freedom from fear and want, and redefining power as power to not power over, the power to foster the development of others to a position of equality. We made the film, and we were overwhelmed by the clarity, the strength, the imagination of the women we met around the world. And we asked ourselves: Where are these voices in the media? Can we afford not to hear them? Why have they not been acknowledged as "experts" on questions of war and peace?

Let me give you examples of some realities we encountered and how they were treated by the media.

Terri and I went to film at the Women's Peace Camp at Greenham Common, England, and were stunned by its power. Now Greenham Common has been news on and off – news of a freakish bunch of women who did outrageous and theatrical actions, like climbing barbed wire fences to dance on the cruise missile silos under a full moon. But as the women became an international symbol and inspiration, they came to be perceived as a serious threat to the status quo. British media coverage became more and more vicious, with lies about the women's personal lives and their hygiene, which helped incite local violence against them. And when that

didn't work to intimidate them, they employed a kind of news black-out which has virtually made most of the world assume Greenham is over. The reality is that an ever-renewing group of women of all ages and classes are still living resourcefully and, even joyfully, together under miserable conditions, and have been for **more than four years.**

In June 1985, there was an **International Women's Peace Conference** in Halifax, initiated by Canadian women, which brought together approximately 300 women from 34 countries, to discuss Alternative Ways to Negotiate Peace. The significance of that event, to anyone who participated, was that for the first time on this scale, white middle-class women, from both West and East-bloc countries, were listening to women of colour, from many of the so-called Third World countries as well as from our own. And because we listened, we expanded our ideas about peace and security, we heightened our sense of urgency, and we changed our agenda. Enormous political conflicts surfaced and were resolved in round-the-clock consensus meetings. It was an amazing event; I would call it life-changing for myself and most of the women who were there. And the *Globe and Mail*, which calls itself our national newspaper, reported all this with a headline which indicated not that we had hungrily listened and learned, but that there had been some sort of confrontation, a nasty cat fight, a "power struggle" between white and black women, in which black women had one-upped previously uppity white women.

And the CBC wasn't there at all.

In a certain sense, and for most Canadians, this important conference never happened, never became part of our history of successful peace-making.

And the following month came Nairobi, the **End of the Decade of Women Conference.** Over 15,000 women from around the world, hundreds of Canadians among them, struggled to go beyond the divisions of national politics and reached consensus on essential issues for the future of the planet. We learned how little news we have of each other's lives and activities, especially the courageous and creative solutions to life-threatening problems. And the same thing happened. Another reality became illusion.

One of the main ideas of feminism is to acknowledge, respect, and celebrate diversity. White male ownership and control of the media, worldwide, has created an imbalance, a distortion, which prevents us from hearing the multiplicity of voices that make up our world. We must hear the voices of women, of old people and young people, of many colours, classes, faiths, nations, geographies if we are to have an accurate picture of the world and our place in it.

We appreciate that there is no one objective reality, that these different voices all speak their own passionately-held truths. And peace can only be hoped for if we use the media to learn to speak and to hear each other's equally valid realities, and work together for our common survival. So what can you do, if you're not directly involved in producing media, but are merely consumers? You can enter a dialogue with the media, and with our government about the media. Here is a short list of suggestions.

1. Urge the government to increase support for the public media institutions, namely the CBC and the NFB.

2. Urge for support of diversity within these institutions, like Studio D, regional programming, and native programming. (Since these two institutions [CBC and NFB] are not caught up in profit-making, they can, in theory ask the big question. At the present time they are endangered by both the trendy view of Canadian culture as an industry, and the desire for free trade. These forces will make our two Canadian industries farm teams for the American media.)

3. Use your "freedom of the press": write letters to the Editor; call stations; question editorial decisions based on false notions of objectivity; write guest editorials; flood the press with news releases about peace activities, and question when they are not publicized; ask to meet with the editorial boards of newspapers, and the managers of news and public affairs on radio and TV; call when they do something good, too.

It is through the media that new visions and new voices can be heard. We can use the media to get to know each other; to promote understanding and exchange among the people of the world; to begin to understand the complex realities of each other's lives; and to support people, organizations, institutions, and initiatives which promote positive change. We can make peace a reality, and war the illusion it is.

REFERENCES

Gerbner, George. (1972, September). Communication and social environment. *Scientific American*, p. 156. (Quoted in Nash, p. 2).

Gerbner, George. (1982, December 6). Life According to TV. *Newsweek*, p. 136.

Grierson, John. (1966). The film at war. In Forsyth Hardy (Ed.), *Grierson on documentary*, p. 223, & 226. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Quoted in Nash, p. 11).

National Film Board of Canada. The statement from Studio D, "Studio D of the National Film Board of Canada: Starting the Second Decade."

Newsweek. (1982, December 6). Life according to TV, p. 136.

Shannon, Kathleen. (1985, March 2). Address to Women's Network Luncheon at Annual Conference of Centre for Investigative Journalism, Toronto, p. 4. (Unpublished manuscript).

Jeffrey Simpson
Globe and Mail

Public Opinion and the Media

We have by and large a mass market press, which is normally a reflection rather than a substantial leader of public opinion. And it has an obligation to reach as wide an audience as it possibly can. Our interest in defence in the media has been spotty at best and generally indifferent. The media are important ways by which members of a society communicate with each another, and therefore orthodoxies, or the status quo, are often recycled through the media. Why is it that the media, like the country, have been largely indifferent to defence matters, with some exceptions? I think it has to do in great part with the threat perception. Canadians' traditional response to conventional war has been to wait for the war to break out and then make a decision as to whether we will participate or not. And in the case of the First and Second World Wars and the Korean War we did decide to participate; in the case of other wars we decided not to. In the nuclear age there is a kind of helplessness, a kind of frustration among the critics of existing orthodoxies, a sense of what can we do? And there is also a kind of fatalism in the sense that we have opted to place ourselves under the United States nuclear umbrella. (I'm not sure that if we somehow took the decision not to place ourselves under the United States nuclear umbrella, that the Americans would allow us to do so. But that's another point.)

The media in the past have taken sporadic interest, but usually only when defence questions or war and peace questions have been brought home to bear, in a direct way, upon their readers, or upon their viewers. Some examples of these events are: the decision that took place in the early 1960s not to participate in the Beaumark missiles; the question that arose in the mid-1960s about the unification of the armed forces; the White Papers on Defence that Mr. Trudeau put out in the early years of his government, and his peace initiative in the last year of his government (1984); Cruise Missile testing of 1983-1984 and beyond. In every case, the media were following, were responding to, were analyzing, government decisions or a *fait accompli* situation. The critical reason for Canadians' indifference to this question was that Canada's decision not to go nuclear would be made, not by ourselves, but in effect by others, principally by the United States. If Canadians had decided, in the early 1960s, to go nuclear, I think you would have seen a much greater interest in nuclear questions in Canada in general and the media in particular. And it's interesting to recall, that the context of the decisions in the early 1960s, about whether Canada should accept the Beaumark missiles and become a nuclear power, was in a majority fashion in favor of Canada becoming a nuclear power.

Public opinion has certainly changed over the past twenty five years in Canada. Abstaining from nuclear weapons, whatever the wisdom of the decision, had the effect of disengaging the country from the nuclear debate. I was very much struck, when I lived in Europe in the early eighties, by the degree to which it was impossible, if you were British or French, German or Italian, to be disengaged from the nuclear debate, because the weapons were either in the possession of your government, or were being stationed on your soil. But Canadians allowed themselves to believe, after taking that decision in the early sixties, that somehow they could disengage themselves from this debate. There were exceptions – academic specialists, journalists, peace and disarmament groups and their supporters, military men, either active or retired – but public opinion surveys consistently confirmed a lack of real interest in defence debates. Even today there are only a hand full of members of parliament with, what I call, a deep and abiding interest in defence questions, and a large information base upon which to draw conclusions.

In this context, the same is true of the media. Very few Canadian journalists have taken an abiding interest in defence and peace matters. There are some exceptions. And in this context of a general disinterest in defence matters, in the media and in the country, defence spending in the 1970s fell, not because there was a national debate directing that this should be so, that this could be a contribution to peace, and so on, but it developed through a series of incremental decisions, or rather lack of decisions. This happened, basically, because of the comfortable but unspoken assumption in Canada, that the Americans will always take care of us because it is in their own strategic interest to do so. And if we didn't rock the boat then we could get away, once we decided to remain within the NATO alliance, with spending a paltry sum in per capita terms, relative to what the other NATO countries were spending.

Moreover, the newspapers, sensing this situation, simply followed public opinion. Their coverage was very hit and miss, as it remains today. Now the critics of the media on this subject, express their disappointment because they believe, that the media shape the status quo, and the status quo irritates them profoundly, whatever the issue – abortion, capital punishment, social policy, fiscal policy, or arms control and defence. They are disappointed generally with the status quo because of its inertia. There is also the sense that there are forces at work, sometimes clandestine, sometimes overt, sometimes invisible, which have the effect of reinforcing the status quo. Feminists say it is because the media are controlled by men. People who are of a Social Democratic bent say its because they are owned by capitalists. People who want a stronger fiscal policy say it's because they are in the hands of left-leaning journalists.

There is always however just the possibility, painful as sometimes it is to accept, that the public, without going into all of the details of all of

the options, has a reasonable sense of what's on offer. It seems to me that on this general question of Canada's defence posture, Canadians do have, broadly speaking, a sense of the options on offer. At some level they are aware that we could take a more robust defence position, that we could spend a lot more on defence, that we could have gone nuclear, in the sixties. We could go nuclear now. On the other hand, we could become a neutral country, either armed neutrality or unarmed neutrality. There is a range of options. It is just possible that our present position is not a function of the dead weight of the status quo, or that there are clandestine forces manipulating Canadians into accepting the status quo, but that they have looked in a common sense way and said: given what's on option, given what it might cost us in terms of spending, given the risks involved in other policies, our present posture is the one that we think gives the best expression to the traditions, demography, geographic position, and the geopolitical realities which Canada faces.

I was struck coming back from Europe in 1984 at the degree to which Canadians were opening up on defence matters. And I think that the Cruise Missile testing decision, and Mr. Trudeau's peace initiative, had the effect of sensitizing Canadians and bringing nuclear questions home to them. The media, in following public opinion, as is usually the case, have picked this up. I have seen reflected in the editorial pages of our major newspapers, both in French-Canada and in English-Canada, more interest in these matters, more critical analysis of what's happening. There is in the media now a greater sensitivity, a greater awareness of these issues. I rather think that they have been brought home to Canadians in the most direct way possible, and that we will see the kind of interest displayed in the media in the coming years that we have seen in the last couple of years.