Media Representation and the Case of Tracy Latimer

by

Patrick Burke, B.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
May 19, 2004**

**© copyright
2004, Patrick Burke**

Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-98954-2

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-98954-2

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract:

In this extended research project, I explore the media coverage surrounding the two trials, and the Supreme Court judgement in this popular murder case. I question what it is that makes this case different from the usual stories of child killers. Specifically, I am interested in the inversion of sympathy that occurs in this case - in which the victim becomes less than human, while the perpetrator is hailed as a sort-of folk hero. I found that not only was the media's coverage highly skewed in this case towards pro-defence positions, but also that the themes of blame, pain, mercy, character, and humanity played a significant role in this inversion of sympathy.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank my thesis advisors, Phillip Thurtle, Aaron Doyle, and Joe Hay, as well as my mentor Robert MacKay, for their invaluable assistance (and inspiration) in this project. I would also like to thank my wife, Krs, and my parents, Bill and Dorothy, for their tremendous support and patience.

Table of Contents:

Chapter:	Page
One: Introduction.	1
Two: Literature Review, and Theoretical Considerations.	9
Three: Methodology.	28
Four: Quantitative Analysis.	42
Five: Qualitative Analysis.	69
Six: Summary and Conclusion.	92

List of Tables:

3-1	30
3-2	33-34
4-1	44
4-2	56
4-3	63

List of Figures:

3-1	38
4-1 and 2	43
4-3	47
4-4	48
4-5	51
4-6	52
4-7	53
4-8	54
4-9	58
4-10	59
4-11	60
4-12	61
4-13	64
4-14	66
5-1	70
5-2	72
5-3	73

Appendices:

Appendix One:

104

Appendix Two:

128

Chapter One: Introduction.

Bob, I want you to be fully sure of this before you go further, you could be charged with murder. You understand that?

Yes

How then did you go about it?

Laura went to church before 11. So then I went outside and the hose was in the old tin shed by the barn. I threw it in the back of the truck and went to the shop. O.K. Then, ah, I hooked it up to the truck with some pipes. And I threw a bunch of rags in the back of the truck - two big boxes and hacksaw. Threw the hose and pipes in the back. Drove out to a shed and I threw that stuff out. Then I went and got her. She was in the wheelchair and took her to the shed. I propped her up with rags by the steering wheel. I covered her over except for the face. I had to cut the hose with the hacksaw. Hooked it to the exhaust. Put it in the back window. Had - her propped up and put the hose in the back window. Let it run.

You did what with her then?

I let it run till noon. I was timing all this stuff. There was a tractor tire in the back. I was sitting there watching through the back window.

When did you know that that's what you were going to do?

I don't know what day it was. I was combining. Thought I'd give her some Valium. I'd thought about shooting her in the head.

I. Introduction:

Twelve-year-old Tracy Latimer was killed by her father on October 24, 1993. She had cerebral palsy. After poisoning her with carbon monoxide in the cab of a pick-up truck, Robert Latimer carried her body to the bedroom she shared with her younger brother. He lied to police for eleven days, claiming that Tracy died in her sleep. When confronted with conflicting testimonies he confessed, and was charged with first-degree murder. In November of 1994, he was found guilty of second degree murder, effectively discounting the premeditated element of his crime, and significantly lowering the mandatory sentence he would have had to serve before parole (dropping from twenty-five years to ten).

Latimer, expecting to be let off completely, or in the least to receive a hung jury, told the press that he did not think the jury were being 'human' (VS, 11/17/94;A1).

Latimer's lawyer, Mark Brayford began provincial and federal appeals, while Latimer was freed on bail. In February of 1997, based on the prosecution's pre-questioning of jury members, his appeal was granted. The second trial began in October 1997, and Latimer was again found guilty, but this time the jury recommended a one-year sentence before parole eligibility. On December first the trial judge Ted Noble endorsed the request, and sentenced Latimer to one year in jail, with an additional year on parole. Appealed by the prosecution, the Saskatchewan superior court upheld the ten-year minimum sentence in October 1998.

Brayford subsequently launched a constitutional appeal, claiming a ten year sentence amounted to 'cruel and unusual punishment' under section twelve of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, effectively disregarding section fifteen, which guaranteed Tracy's protection. In January of 2001, the Supreme Court ruled that no exemption should be made, given the gravity of the crime, even though Latimer was credited with having a "good character and standing in the community," due consideration must be given to the accused's initial attempts to conceal his actions, his lack of remorse, his position of trust, the significant degree of planning and premeditation, and T's extreme vulnerability" (Supreme Court 2001; 6). Seven years after killing his daughter, with only a little over two weeks spent in Jail, Robert Latimer was going to begin serving his sentence.

Tracy may be long forgotten, her father refashioned as a victim of injustice, but the case continues. Sympathetic organizations such as the "Friends of Robert Latimer," have assisted Latimer's wife Laura in organizing a number of actions, including a ribbon

campaign, a clemency petition, a trust fund, and a series of candle-light vigils (Friends 2001). In April 2001, top Toronto criminal lawyer Edward Greenspan made a statement indicating that he was representing Latimer, and that he would not pursue an early release for Latimer until after he had served at least two years of his sentence, the amount of jail-time recommended by his second jury.

The case of Tracy Latimer has been afforded a great deal attention by the Canadian media. *The Toronto Star*, and *The Vancouver Sun*, for instance, two papers I am examining, published thirty seven and twenty one case related articles, editorials and letters, including six and five cover stories, respectively between November seventh and twentieth, 1994, and from October twenty-seventh to November ninth, 1997. This is a lot of coverage from papers in two of the country's largest cities, for a homicide in a small farming community approximately 1,200 km from Vancouver, and 2,800 km from Toronto. The first question that needs to be asked then, concerns what it is about *this* murder and related events that have yielded such extensive news coverage?

In general, it could be said that people read newspapers to get a sense of the world around them, from what weather to expect, to what fashions, cars or travel destinations to desire, to insights into the people and events that influence, or help define their lives. The news becomes a source of knowledge, offering an element of collective identity - something to be talked about with others, and to be used in the localisation of the self in society. By engaging the news media, people actively (re)affirm their beliefs and values through a process of negotiated understanding - incorporating what they are being exposed to, with what they already know (e.g. Hall 1973, Hunt 1999).

By celebrating the heights of human accomplishment and potential while decrying the depths of human transgression and demise, news content serves a normative function. From this perspective, murder in general is news, a serious moral transgression that threatens social order. The murder of children, themselves symbolic in the West of a pre-corrupted state of innocence and trust, and reflecting a society's future, are particularly newsworthy.

The social reproach held for child-killers was clearly illustrated in the case of Susan Smith, who at around the same time of Latimer's first trial, was making headlines across the US (and Canada) for her claims that a black man abducted her two children in a car-jacking, close to her home in Union, South Carolina. In an article picked up from 'the Observer,' *The Vancouver Sun* describes the town of ten thousand people as quaint and picturesque, and that neighbours quickly came together to help Susan as the news erupted. Hundreds of yellow ribbons appeared around town in support, search parties were organized, and soon the major networks were showing home video footage of the "adorable" children (VS, 11/19/94;B3). The FBI, with the assistance of scores of state and local police forces, spearheaded a nationwide search for the missing boys, and the silver Mazda they were last seen in. The Sun article described the children as "not just any kids; they were the kind people stare at longingly in the street, .. Alex, grinning with a toddler's relentless delight at the world" (VS, 11/19/94; B3). Quoting town's people, the children were described as "sweet kids, both just as pretty as heck, just as pretty as them pictures" (VS, 11/19/94;B3).

Within a couple of weeks, however, Smith's story began to unravel, and she eventually confessed to having drowned the children, by driving them into a local lake while they

were strapped into their car seats. The strong sympathy that was previously expressed for her, quickly turned rapidly into extreme reproach. Her neighbours now called for her execution, one specifying that "I would have choked her to death .. I'd have put her in that car and let her drown," another stating that "you can't execute the bad part of a split personality, so I'm for executing the whole thing" (VS, 11/19/94;B3). The article's author described the murders as "the most apparently unnatural of crimes, yet another milestone on the nation's lawlessness and moral degeneracy," and portrayed Smith as "frumpy," and as "the women who could design for her children a fate more appalling than any Hollywood scriptwriter, then appeal to God for their safe return" (VS, 11/19/94;B3). She was less than human, a 'cold-blooded' murderer of her "sweet" children. It is noteworthy that although there was no death penalty at the time in South Carolina, this case "prompted an unusually vigorous debate about the death penalty .. for many, it was the only conceivable punishment for someone whose already capital crime had been compounded by betrayal" (VS, 11/19/94;B3).

Although Smith killed two children rather than one as Latimer had, and in a manner that would have involved considerably more distress and suffering for them, there are still a number of similarities between these two cases. Both parents were unremorseful child killers, who initially lied to the police about their crimes, only to confess within a few weeks as evidence mounted against them. They also both lived in small towns, often idealised by city dwellers as offering a simpler more 'wholesome' lifestyle, with a greater sense of community. The two cases also became national media events, acting to crystallise public opinion, emotion, and concern. What is interesting, and tragic, in the case of Tracy Latimer, however, is that somehow the very serious transgression of child

killing has been diametrically inversed - with the media portraying the victim as less than human, while the murderer is bestowed with sympathy and support.

According to Hall's (1980) article on the encoding and decoding of media communications, a child-killer should elicit revulsion, both from media staff that 'encode' the event into newspaper or television stories, and their audiences who 'decode' this content. The case of Susan Smith, fits neatly into what Hall would consider a dominant or 'preferred reading,' resulting in a clearly understood, and near unanimous reaction among the public. This happened at both extremes of her case, ranging from unequivocal sympathy when it was believed a black man abducted her children, to admonishment when it was discovered that she had committed the murders. Hall (1980;204) notes in this same essay, that sometimes there are "problematic or troubling events, which breach our expectancies and run counter to our taken-for-granted knowledge of social life, that must be assigned to their discursive domains before they can be said to make sense.

To a large extent this 'problematic' characteristic appears to be at play in the Latimer case. Tracy's murder represents an act which must be reconciled with existing structures of understanding, knowledge and belief. For observers to consider her death as justifiable, or at least as less significant than that of an able-bodied child, additional effort must be required to avoid appearing immoral and callous. The story, using Hall's logic must be legitimised within an existing and/or emerging discourse. With Robert Latimer this has happened in one way by his defence lawyers and the popular media re-framing his first degree murder as instead a 'mercy killing,' and calling for a less serious class of 'third degree' or 'compassionate' homicide to cover situations such as his. Through Tracy's impairments, and presumed pain and suffering, her life *became* less worth living, her death understandable, and her father a victim of an 'inflexible' and 'cruel' justice system.

The 'effort' in making sense of this case, and the highly biased way it was presented in Canadian newspapers, forces us to reflect on media claims of 'objectivity,' and 'balance.' It will be argued, that behind *The TS's*, *The SP's*, *The CH's*, and *The VS's* biased presentation, is an incipient form of cultural disregard, one that is justified and rationalised in media content in this case, more than it is ignored or disputed.

The research I am presenting here is divided into six chapters. The second chapter provides an overview of the 'social model' of disability, a practical and theoretical approach to studying disability. Advocates of this perspective emphasise how regressive social attitudes, and restrictive physical barriers disable people, clearly shifting the responsibility for disability from the individual to the group. It will be argued that while the 'enlightening' characteristics of the social model are rooted in the late modern period, its antithesis, the 'individual' model, reaches much further back into Western history. Moreover, it is here that we should look for the origins of the contemporary able-bodied bias the social model helps elucidate.

In chapter three, there is a review of the methodology I used in my analysis of the newspaper content surrounding the two trials, and Supreme Court judgement in this case. In chapter four, I present my principle quantitative findings. Using tables and graphic depictions of my data, I will illustrate how coverage in all the papers has been highly skewed towards pro-defence positions. In chapter five, is my qualitative review of case related articles in the SP and the TS. Here, I will be considering how arguments are constructed and inter-related, paying particular attention to pro-defence interpretations of pain, mercy, character and humanity. Chapter six provides a review of my principle findings, and a reflection on how they may relate to my theoretical observations. In this paper, I hope to better understand the inversion of sympathy that has occurred between

Tracy Latimer and her father. I will argue that through a variety of argument techniques, and concepts such as pain, mercy, character and humanity, the inversion of Tracy from victim, to burden, and her father from murderer to liberator, was accomplished.

Interestingly, the coverage afforded this case also draws attention to a contradiction within journalism ethics. That is, although a reporter or columnist may use the appropriate style-guide reference for a person with disabilities, and may only list specific ailments when they are pertinent to a story, these are really only surface features, that overlook more incipient forms of bias or influence. It is a contradiction of newspaper journalism that content should be both balanced and opinionated. Presumably, if events are reported in a 'balanced' fashion, then editors and columnists could be free to write opinion pieces on the straight-news content. Indeed, people want the newspapers they read to take sides on issues - to help them identify and make sense of significant events, and provide them with a collective. The problem in this case, is that a questionable cause was taken up with great enthusiasm and intent by all of the papers in my study. Indeed, pro-defence positions dominated all types of paper coverage, with the exception of letters, which appeared overall as roughly balanced, but highly polarised. Of course, as might be expected, what is of particular interest in the coverage surrounding this case, is not that it was biased, but in the *way* it was biased - in the way different argument techniques were structured and applied.

Chapter Two: Literature Review, and Theoretical Considerations.

Although there is a reasonable body of literature dealing with the cinematic portrayal of those with disabilities, there is very little dealing with their visibility or invisibility in the popular news media. As might be expected, with the exception of a book written about the Latimer case by Ruth

Enns (1999), there have been no other studies dealing with the media attention afforded the killing of a disabled child. In addition, there have not been any studies considering how differently the public may respond to the death of a disabled, rather than an able-bodied person.

In terms of theory, there is a considerable body of work under the 'social model' of disability that is at least indirectly appropriate here. This model positions the responsibility for 'disability' in the attitudes and practices of the able-bodied. The inverse argument, the 'individual model,' emphasises how individuals are responsible for themselves. Both approaches are thought to have emerged in the Modern period. In this chapter, I will argue that the systemic disregard for the disabled can be located within a number of unquestioned dimensions of our social life, and can be extended much further back in time. I will argue that over the last two thousand years or so, an able-bodied bias has developed among white Europeans, and that this bias is a fundamental component of the social and individual models of disability.

In my research, I will show that through historically rooted notions of what constitutes a productive citizen, or of how humans and animals differ, a particular constitution of the self is realised. We may think it is thoroughly modern to valorise the adaptive, self-enhancing productive consumer-citizen, but in fact, it is part of an ancient concern. The

telos of this formative social space is the basis for Tracy's triple-embodiment. She was, after all, not only disabled, but was also a child, and a female - with all three characteristics determining her position within her family and Canadian society. As a child, under the protective care of her parents, she depended on them to make decisions for her by proxy. If she had been a 'normal' young women, Tracy would have been a targeted consumer, then a sexualised subject, and eventually a mother.

I. Trial Coverage.

Ruth Enns (1999) in *A Voice Unheard: The Latimer Case and People With Disabilities*, devotes two chapters, and a summary review, approximately half (82 pages) of her book to the case. The first chapter provides an analysis of legal arguments, assessing the strength of the prosecution in the first and second trials, and outlining defence strategies (Enns 1999; 9-47). She also summarises a number of telephone interviews she made with specialists and other care workers who knew Tracy. Together this evidence reinforces one of her principle arguments, that Tracy's deformed body came to index her pain, and that this was presumed, principally by her mother's and surgeon's testimony, to be unrelenting. Enns outlines an alternative argument, one better presented in the second trial, that Tracy's pain was not constant or unbearable, but intermittent and relative.

In the second chapter, Enns (1999; 48-70) provides some analysis of media content, primarily from the Saskatoon Paper, *The Star Phoenix*, and the industry owned news service, the Canadian Press, which both had reporters at the trial. She argued that headlines linked Tracy with her disabilities or visual appearance, that writers avoided using the word 'murder,' that they presented Robert Latimer as a good father and a

productive citizen, and that defence sources were routinely favoured in media content. What Enns does not provide, is much of an analysis of the content of newspaper articles, or articles in other newspapers. In addition, because Enns had her book published in 1999, there is nothing on the 2001 Supreme Court judgement.

II. The Social Model of Disability.

One of the more popular theoretical motifs in the study of disability is the 'social model,' traceable in part to the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation, and a 1976 booklet that claimed society 'handicapped' the disabled through physical barriers and social exclusion (Barnes et al 1999; 27-28; 78). In line with this perspective, the focus of early disability rights groups was on removing functional barriers, countering discrimination and prejudice, and helping the mentally or physically disabled to move out of institutions into more independent community living arrangements.

This shift in perspective, from exclusion to inclusion, personal to social, and from the individual to the collective, was advanced at a time when 'new social movements' were emerging generally on an international scale, focussing on so-called 'identity issues' such as the rights of blacks, women, gays and lesbians, or indigenous peoples. In the aftermath of the Second World War, attitudes towards the disabled must have been tempered by the return of disabled vets. During the 1960's-70's, particularly in the West, there was an unprecedented expansion in the state's provisioning of social services, in part to facilitate the burgeoning 'baby boom' population, but also as a result of sustained and increasingly vocal public lobbying.

Early in the disability rights movement there had been mounting criticism of the exclusionary, almost quarantining treatment of those with 'chronic' mental impairments. The most significant change for this group likely occurred with the emergence of 'labelling theory,' advanced by Scheff (1966) in *Being Mentally Ill*. In this book, he outlines a conceptual challenge to the established clinical view of mental illness as a maligned *personal* problem. Scheff argues alternatively, that *society* plays a significant role in the manifestation of mental illness, and that the mere process of labelling someone can substantiate cultural stereotypes and performative expectations.

Oliver (1990, 1996), has provided one of the most comprehensive examinations of the social model of disability. Utilizing a historical-materialist analogy, Oliver has emphasized how societies disable people. At the same time the industrial model of mass-production was expanding, according to Oliver (1990; 25-42, 1996; 30-42; 95-109), the medical model of symptomatology and treatment was developing. Unquestioned assumptions of human 'normality' were being built into our industrial worlds of work and play.

It is out of this post-Enlightenment, post-feudal period that the notion of individualism became entrenched in western culture, experienced popularly as a conflicting mix of freedom, and responsibility. This individualism, when mixed with the 'medical gaze,' and the materialist demands and equivalencies of the market, was to Oliver the heyday of what he refers to as the 'individual model' of disability. To Finkelstein, another advocate of the social model, the mechanized rhythm of machines pushed the disabled to the peripheries of society, as a problem to be dealt with, rather than as community members to be included.

In conducting a history of disability, the more materialist accounts of Oliver and others clearly locate the emergence the individual model of disability in the modern period, dating from the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The 'social' model, and the more complex perspective on disability that it implies, is a product of the last fifty years (Abberley 1998, Barnes et al 1999, Campbell and Oliver 1996, Chappell 1998, Corker 1998, Morris 1993, Oliver 1990, 1993, 1996, Watson 1997). A number of researchers, however, most notably Henri-Jacques Stiker (1997), have challenged this belief, arguing that this impulse reaches much further back in time, at least to early Greek and Roman states (Barnes 1996, Edwards 1997a,b, Penick 1997, Winzer 1997).

III. Ablism:

In the balance of this chapter I will attempt to define how the social and individual models of disability could be thought of as coming together in a general, taken-for-granted able-bodied bias. To conduct this theoretical inquiry, I will be considering five possible dimensions of this bias: the relation between being 'white' and able-bodied, the separation and elevation of humans over other animals, the distinguishing of a separate and enhance-able mind-body-soul, cultural notions of the productive citizen, and the scientific understanding of the body. My reference to 'ablism,' really refers to a take-for-granted preference those with 'normal' human functioning, and an exclusionary disregard for those with intellectual and functional disabilities. It will be one of my objectives in this paper to explore the validity of this 'disregard.' My assumptions will rest on the ability to generalise the continuation of historical cultural features into the present day.

i. White and Able-Bodied.

The same taken for granted privileges enjoyed by whites for so long might exist generally among the able-bodied. According to Richard Dyer (1997), over at least the last six hundred years or so, the colour 'white' has come to hold a special place in the imaginations of Western Europeans. It has come to represent not only the political and economic dominance of white men and women, but has also come to symbolise generally the attributes of purity, virtue, light, and knowledge.

It should be no surprise that notions of ablism are just as historically rooted, and have become equally taken for granted, invisible, and unquestioned a badge of referential normality. Indeed, because the able-bodied cross any number of racial, cultural or class boundaries, their influence on how we perceive and engage the disabled is significant.

Within Christian hermeneutics white and black, as well as light and dark are significant metaphors. In the New Testament, illness, or other impairments, were often equated with the literal or symbolic blindness to God's light and the possession by evil spirits. In Luke (13.10-16), for instance, the author tells of a "woman with a spirit that had crippled her for eighteen years, ..was bent over and was quite unable to stand up straight; .. Satan bound for eighteen long years."

Disability in the Old Testament is similarly indicative of sin or punishment, resulting from disregarding God's will. In Deuteronomy (28.28-34), for example, Moses says that by showing contempt for the Lord, he "shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, .. and thou shalt grope at noonday as the blind gropeth in the darkness; .. (and) the Lord shall smite thee in the knees, and in the legs, with a sore botch that cannot be healed." Through obedience, however, Moses says that the "Lord shall make thee plenteous in

goods, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy ground” (Deut. 28.11).

Unlike the Old Testament, however, where people are routinely 'smitten' by an easily angered God, in the New Testament Christ's emphasis is on healing, and forgiveness, with sin and punishment not always the cause of disability. In John (9.1-4), for instance, one of Jesus' disciples asks him after witnessing the healing of a blind man: “who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?” To which Jesus replied, “neither this man nor his parents sinned, he was born blind so that God's works might be revealed in him.”

ii. The Subordination and Differentiation of Animal-Human Imagery.

As newly literate states emerged around the Near East and Mediterranean, with a history of domesticating and herding animals, there became an increasingly apparent differentiation and domination of *humans* over all other forms of life. In written mythology gods became anthropomorphised projections of their able-bodied creators. In Greek myth, most of the positive characters were depicted as able-bodied, fit and attractive, with specific gods overseeing such realms as youth beauty, athletics, commerce, and war. Eros, the god of love, who had wings and could fly, was one of the only hybrid figures in Greek mythology to be portrayed positively. Pan, a Satyr, with a male torso, horns, and the legs of a goat, while lustful, and frequently found chasing nymphs around the woods, was an expert marksman, and was regarded as a deity for hunters and herders (Hesiod 2000b).

In most of their cosmology, however, animal-human hybrids were looked upon more despairingly. The Cerberus, for example, was a fearful animal hybrid with three dog-like heads, and a mane of snakes that guarded the entrance of the underworld (Cavendish 1977;

96). The Erinyes, who tormented wrong doers on earth, were three hideous looking sisters with snakes for hair. They were similar to the three Gorgons, also ugly sisters with hair of snakes, but with the addition of wings and tusks, would turn mortals into stone. Then there were the Harpies, bird like animals with the heads of old women, that would 'snatch' souls and bring them to Hades (Hesiod [approx. 700BC] 2000a, King 1995; 148-152, Rouse 1965; 93-94). Centaurs, according to Hesiod "were monsters," with "a man's head and shoulders, and a horses body; some were a whole man, legs and all, with half a horse growing out behind" (in Rouse 1965; 60-61). They were, with the exception of one, Chiron who was kind and wise, depicted as mischievous, drunken and lustful followers of Dionysus, not unlike the Satyrs (King 1995; 141-143).

With Judaism and Christianity the domination of humans over other life, and the delineation of animal-human attributes continued, in many ways simplified and made more explicit and dichotomised. The anthropomorphism of a male God in Judaism, and the superiority of humans in general, can be illustrated in the first book of the Torah, Genesis (1; 26, 28), in which "God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish and the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, ... and subdue it." 'Man,' in other words, is clearly above other animals, the earth having been created for *him*, with the spirit realm restricted to a god in *his* likeness.

In his first letter to the Corinthians (15.39-40), Paul adds that "not all flesh is alike, but there is one flesh for human beings, another for animals, another for birds, and another for fish; there are both heavenly bodies and earthly bodies, but the glory of the heavenly is one thing, and that of the earthly is another." Here humans are still separate

and above other animals, but there is now also an allusion to the idea of 'earthly' sin, a suggestion that how we feel as sensual animals, is problematic. Men and women, in other words, became more human by becoming less animal, and more like some other, anthropomorphised, ethereal realm of able-bodied gods.

As in Greek cosmology, angels, or human-like figures with wings, are the only acceptable type of animal-human hybrids presented in the Bible. Like their Greek predecessors, wings enabled to act as intermediaries between heaven and earth. Although mentioned more frequently in the New, than the Old Testament, in neither book are they described physically, although their ability to fly is clearly implied through references to 'descending' (Mathew 28;2), or as literally 'flying' (Revelation 14.6).

The sphinx, a human-lion hybrid has also had a generally positive history as a protector. Appearing originally in Mesopotamia around 3,000 BC as a winged male figure adorning cylinder seals, the sphinx in its most popular incarnation was wingless, male and Egyptian. From the Middle Kingdom onward, Egyptian pharos were the earthly representatives of the gods, so it was conceivable for them to transmute their shape into the form of a lion, imbuing its strength as a protective figure. In this respect the sphinx is an important transitory figure, being both an objectified spirit, and a subordinate subject. With the Greeks, the sphinx became another tricky female hybrid. In the story of Oedipus, for instance, a sphinx blocked the entrance of Thebes, killing all those who could not solve its riddle (Sophocles [429-420BC] 1980). During more recent European history, particularly with increases in contact with Egypt between the 16th-18th centuries, and British colonialism from 1882-1952, sphinxes became an almost purely decorative object, appearing in the designs of a range of items, from fireplaces, to clocks and plates (Howard

1989, McCall 1995; 104-137). To the English and French the sphinx was stripped of any mythical properties, becoming merely a decorative object and a symbol of their military strength and cultural domination.

Nowhere is the allusion of sin with animal or human abnormality, and virtue with normality, made clearer than in Gothic and Renaissance art. In the religiously inspired paintings of these periods, angels became able-bodied white Europeans, enhanced by the wings of doves and bathed in light; God became an older, bearded white man, while Christ became blond and blue-eyed. Artists such as Brueghel, Bosch, Giotto, Fra Angelico, presented Satan and the other fallen angels as dark grotesque demons, with the wings of bats, and confined to a fiery underworld.

The divine separation that occurs between the human and the animal, and the implied renunciation of the body, contrasts significantly from the way many pre-literate groups viewed their spirit realms. In Africa, for instance, hunter-gathering bands have enlisted the notion of *Nyama* to explain the spiritual connection among *all animals*. In a similar way, the Ojibwa of central Canada have enlisted the notion of *Manitou*, to represent a life force existing in *all things*. In both of these examples there is a much greater continuity and overlap between living and non-living entities.

Differences between 'civilized Christian,' and 'uncivilized pagan' societies can be graphically illustrated in their differing uses of animals and their likeness. While Westerners may fashion some animal skin or fur into a coat or hat, not unlike the members of less sophisticated groups, they would certainly not expect these objects to imbue any other properties, besides providing warmth, comfort, and possibly status. Among many folk groups, however, there have been highly ritualistic uses of animals and their imagery.

By including symbolic parts of target animals, a hunter or warrior could literally blur the boundary between it and other animals. By wearing the skin and skull of the buffalo in dance, for example, the Blackfoot Indians would attempt to evoke that animal's spirit, to ensure its continued productivity (Campbell 1988; 75, 1969; 282-298, Wilson 1980; 16-21).

Western civilization, in other words, has moved increasingly from a less differentiated spirit realm, where animal and human spirits were overlapping and equal in important ways, to a strictly delineated perception of animals as base and separate from the potentially divine spirituality of humans.

This is of course not to say that the disabled were not, or are not excluded from tighter knit groups with a less differentiated cosmos. A number of cross-cultural studies, for instance, have indicated that although the disabled have been included in group activities in graduated and multifaceted ways, their inclusion varying with kin resources, the availability of productive roles, their ability to participate in ceremonies, and the groups own spiritual explanation of different disabilities (i.e. Barnes 1999, Ingstad and Whyte 1995). This implies that animal-human differentiation in itself, is not an indication of how the disabled may be perceived of, or incorporated into a given group, that more is needed to explain their varied inclusion or exclusion.

ii. Distinguishing of a Separate Mind-Body-Soul, Unique Among Humans.

Implicit behind our consideration of animal-human differentiation, is the distinguishing of a separate, and enhanceable mind-body-soul. Given the importance of warfare to the ancient Greeks, it should be no surprise that they were concerned with creating the ideal

warrior/citizen. Plato (1973; v. 460) even went so far as to argue for the formation of a 'Guardian' class of rulers, who would be selectively bred from the finest Greek stock, and then raised by unrelated caretakers and nurses. Children born into this program "of inferior parents and any children of the rest that are born defective (would) be hidden away, in some appropriate manner" (parenthesis added).

If the Greeks emphasised the significance of a trained mind and body, for Christians it was the soul, equated with the Holy Spirit, that must be nourished to have it reside *in* the body, and offer any promise of corporeal resurrection. The tempting sins of bodily pleasure are equated with death, and such desires must be subdued by the mind to strengthen the soul. The apostle Paul presents the strongest articulation of this argument in his letters. In Romans (6.22-25, 8.1-11), he writes "delight in the law of God in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind, making me captive to the law of sin that dwells in my members; to set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace" The personal control necessitated to strengthen one's *own* soul, is compared by Paul (Cor. I 9.24), to the will needed by "athletes (who) exercise self-control in all things."

iv. Cultural Notions of the Productive Citizen.

Certainly there is no doubt that in Greece by the 4th century BC when Plato wrote the *Republic*, and Aristotle wrote *Politics*, practical considerations were becoming a central component in the idea of effective 'citizenry.' In the *Republic*, for instance, Plato notes that it is "disgraceful to need doctoring," and then conveys the example of Herodicus, a master gymnast who after losing his health, "combined training and doctoring in such a way to

become a plague to himself, ...and many others, ...by lingering out his death" (Plato, 1973; iii. 406). He continues "that in every well-ordered community each man has his appointed task which he must perform; no one has leisure to spend all his life in being ill and doctoring himself, ...neglecting his proper work" (Plato, 1973; iii. 406). The Greeks were considerably more accepting of their disabled war veterans, however, many receiving small pensions, and for those who could still fight or assist in other ways, a certain reverence as battle hardened soldiers (Plato, 1973; 160, Pearson, 1996; 12, Edwards, 1997).

Paul in his second letter to the Thessalonians, while not signalling out those *unable* to work, does provide a strong warning against idleness. He writes, "keep away from believers who are living in idleness and not living in the tradition they received from us, .. we were not idle, .. and we did not eat anyone's bread without paying for it, but with toil and labour we worked night and day, so that we might not burden any of you; .. anyone unwilling to work should not eat, .. have nothing to do with them, so that they may be ashamed" (3.6-14). Indeed, an argument could be made that the good Christian not only had faith, but was also chaste, hard working, and lived within a patriarchal nuclear family. The disabled in this picture, whether any fault of their own, became an anomaly, dependent on their family, and according to the Bible, possibly embodying the effect of sin and punishment. Still, biblical accounts of the potential causes of disability aside, Christian charity was all that many disabled had for much of recorded European history.

By the 14th century in Italy, a renewed interest in the art and literature of Greece and Rome had emerged, influencing regional politics and culture. Artists such as Botticelli, Michelangelo, and Da Vinci revived the Greek and Roman interest in representing the fit

human figure in full form. This period also marked the beginning of a revolution in science, medicine, and political governance. Thomas Moore reflected some of these mixed interests when he wrote his ethical Latin treatise *Utopia* (1949 [1541]). Under the heading of "Care of Sick and Euthanasia," he notes that:

if a person suffers from a disease, which is both incurable and continually excruciating, the priests and magistrates can urge him .. not to nourish such a painful disease any longer. He is now unequal to all the duties of life, a burden to himself and others, having really outlived himself. They tell him not to hesitate to die .. in confidence of a better life after death, .. to let others release him. To choose death under these circumstances is honourable. But they dishonour the man who takes his own life without the approval of the priests and senate (Moore, 1949; 57).

There are a number of interesting assumptions demonstrated in this quote. One of the most obvious observations is the fusion of the church and the state in governance; linking the ethereal to the practical, and the requirements of emerging mercantile states. The 'priests and magistrates' become sanctioned to judge not only the experience of pain, and the usable value of one's life, but also, and ultimately, to decide on who lives and who dies. This is actually a significant leap in Moore's logic, since he is saying that spiritually and socially sanctioned agents of the state can commit mortal sins without risking damnation, and that they are instead doing the state a favour. It does not take a great leap of imagination to realise this is exactly the sort of world we have inherited today. The disabled are a vulnerable group, continually at the mercy of policy makers and legislators who have a definitive impact on their lives. This spectre of having their humanity or in-humanity judged by social technocrats, is all the more relevant today as many with disabilities find themselves on the 'slippery-slope' of the euthanasia debate.

There is no doubt that as we move into the modern era, as proponents of the social model maintain, a logic of functional normality is built into the industrial model of production and consumption. The disabled became ever more distinctive by what they could *not* do, rather than what they could do. It is my contention that this practical, yet historical demand that citizens be productive and supportive of group industry continues, however subtle or blatant today.

v. 'Scientific' Understanding and the Individual.

There is little doubt that able-bodied preferences grew to fruition, and became increasingly normalised as the medical-scientific model of human understanding developed from the seventeenth century. For the first time, the human body was being minutely dissected described and analysed. While the human body became increasingly de-mystified as a work of divine creation, it became 're-mystified' as a work of biological (and scientific) complexity, in need of a different set of experts to interpret and understand. Sanatoriums and hospitals, which could achieve some efficiency in their operation by accumulating patients and resources, acted as natural conduits for medical knowledge and influence, perpetuating their existence.

The problem was that those with incurable disabilities stood outside the boundaries of accepted medical knowledge, and hence posed a challenge to the definitiveness or usefulness of their profession. At best, those with functional disabilities could hope to be separated from, and ignored by mainstream society, at worst they would be targets of forced sterilisation and even extermination.

Nowhere is the 'knife' edge of this logic the sharpest as in the nineteenth and twentieth century eugenics movement. An American, Canadian and European movement, it represented the pinnacle of pragmatic selection - an explicit and organised intervention of the state in the lives of individuals. Francis Galton, a cousin and contemporary of Darwin's, is credited with founding this movement with a 1865 article, entitled "Heredity Talent and Character," in which he explains how negative and positive attributes are effected by racial affiliation and breeding. In subsequent articles and books including *Heredity Genius* (1869) and *Natural Inheritance* (1889), Galton argued that natural selection would have a dysgenic function, as the masses of inferior breeds would reproduce and multiply faster than otherwise superior European races.

In most countries, eugenic policies came to involve techniques of either positive or negative selection - encouraging the right kinds of marriages and parents, or eliminating undesirable attributes through sterilisation or euthanasia (McGee, 2000; 14-15). Nazi Germany is on record as having the worst eugenics policies, being responsible for the death of almost fifty thousand people, and the forced sterilisation of another quarter of a million people. Still, countries such as Canada were not immune from the movement's misleading appeal, with over fifty thousand people being sterilised, and countless thousands more interned in institutions. While 'community living' movements in Canada since the 1960's have helped reverse the institutional segregation of the disabled, those with disabilities continue to be invisible in the popular imaginations of most Canadians.

Perhaps today, when people may think that the eugenics movement, as a form of biological based social control, is a thing of the past, it has yet to reach its zenith. Already there is a plethora of negative eugenic techniques in use, most involving foetal testing, and

the abortion of defective embryos. In the future this selective knife will be sharpened further with genetic engineering; when perhaps the goal of a 'perfect' population will at last be realised. What is significant about the current eugenics movement is that it has become almost completely taken-for-granted; unquestioned in its underlying assumptions about life and normality, an implicit ideal of what constitutes a perfect human species and member of society. Still, while the dogma of perfection is rampant in the West, the techniques remain blunt instruments, and those with 'incurable' impairments risk being pushed even further to the fringes of mainstream society.

vi. Conclusion: The Popular Media and the Able-Bodied Consumer-Citizen.

If contemporary social attitudes towards ability and disability, normality and abnormality are rooted in Western adaptive, spiritual, and intellectual histories, then this history should be reflected in contemporary mass-media messages.

One popular place social attitudes towards disability have become embodied in 'cultural products,' is in the medium of film. Martin Norden (1994;1) in his book *The Cinema of Isolation*, for instance, argues that over the last century most American and European films have "tended to isolate disabled characters from their able-bodied peers as well as from each other." While he conceded that "the Cinema of Isolation has demonstrated a general sense of progress" over the years, in its presentation of the disabled, there are still numerous productions that present the disabled as villains, or sources of derisive humor (Norden 1994;314).

The presentation of disability in television or print content is not as well studied. One of the clearest pictures we do get of the disabled in the popular media in general, is their

invisibility. Newspapers, like other media, have their own built in schema of normality - this can be easily seen in their sections, sports, business, entertainment, employment ads, and travel. In other words, 'normal' newspaper content focuses on able-bodied politicians, athletes, businessmen, entertainers, vacationers, and job seekers. Indeed, it is productive, able-bodied consumer-citizens that make most newspapers economically viable, and they are the ones that are targeted by advertisers. The disabled, unless newsworthy through the performance of exceptional feats, are generally ignored, visible in their relative invisibility.

This presents a bit of a quandary for the writers and editors presenting the case of Tracy Latimer. Tracy's disabilities are relevant because they index her pain, but they should not appear as a justification for her murder. Her disabilities even serve to highlight her father's good character - including his care for her, and his useful purpose on the farm. All the things *she could not do*, in other words, *he could*. While she was inactive, he was pure activity.

Newspaper style guides help writers and editors make decisions on how to refer to those with disabilities. A writer in *The Star Phoenix* (SP), for instance, notes how his paper "adheres to the Canadian Press (CP) style guide, which discourages defining people by their disorders" (SP 11/19/1994;A8). In a quote, the CP's bureau chief adds that "we try to use as neutral a word as possible." Claims to professional impartiality help substantiate the impression that the media would not unnecessarily target those with disabilities. Indeed, while the media may not recognise their able-bodied bias, as we will see, it is apparent in the structure of their content.

While women and visible minorities have been increasingly accepted into Western consumer-capitalist societies, those considered disabled remain at the fringe of acceptable, functional normality - often unable to work productively or to participate meaningfully as consumers. In an important way women and minority groups, can still be considered desiring subjects. Although 'visible minorities,' like those with disabilities, are also greatly under-represented in Canadian media content, they are nevertheless capable of emulating dominant ideals of beauty, youthfulness, sexuality, social status, and wealth.

Chapter Three: Methodology.

I. Introduction: The Sample, and Sampling Techniques.

In an attempt to understand the inverted sympathy between the murderer and the victim in this case, I have conducted a content analysis of the coverage afforded the two murder trials (1994, 1997), and the Supreme Court judgement (2001). To facilitate the consideration of possible regional differences in coverage, I have photocopied, reviewed and coded every news item, editorial, feature, column, review article and letter that appeared in *The Vancouver Sun*, *The Saskatoon Star Phoenix*, *The Toronto Star*, and *The Halifax Chronicle Herald*. The date ranges of the study were from November 5 to 30 in 1994, October 25 to November 15 in 1997, and from January 19 to 26 in 2001.

To conduct my analysis, I checked every paper in the combined 52-day study for case related content. While all the 2001 papers were available in hard copy at the main (reference) branch of the Toronto Public Library, most of the remaining dates were available on microfilm. The exception was *The Star Phoenix* for 1994 and 1997, which had to be ordered on microfilm from the National Library in Ottawa. All items were photocopied, then sorted by paper and date.

I conducted all of the content analysis myself, reviewing each item quickly once before photocopying. This 'pre-reading' familiarised me with the range of content available on this case. After this review, and a random re-reading of items in my home, I devised a series of four pertinent variables along which arguments appeared to be structured, with a series of 24 codes contained within them. Theme divisions included: External blame/ responsibility for Robert Latimer's (RL) killing Tracy Latimer (TL); support/ popularity for RL; mercy and compassion for RL; and TL was in constant pain, and less than human.

In a second and more detailed reading of all 327 items, I used a printed guide sheet to mark codes directly on photocopies.

When I finished this coding, however, I was concerned that I was not consistent in my recognition of code examples. Specifically, I found myself adding codes as I went along, and identifying more codes in a given news item. Faced also with the task of having to enter all of my notations into my computer, I decided to re-read the items a third time, simultaneously inputting my findings. A copy of the first page of this form, completed for *The Star Phoenix* in 1994, can be seen in **Table Three-One**. A complete copy of my coding sheets can be found on the supplied 3.5" floppy disc. For this reading I started with 72 codes, and ended up with 104. Although codes were added as I went along, this was generally to include novel arguments as I came across them, and is not a reflection of coding inconsistencies. What it did do, however, was to create slightly different code lists for the papers over the three years, with some papers, such as the SP and the TS, having the greatest number of code (argument) categories.

Among this range of codes, there were two duplicates and several that appeared similar in meaning. This allowed me to collapse the 104 codes, to 88 for my final analysis. This total was divided into seven theme divisions - five related to item 'arguments,' and two related to 'conclusions.' In actuality, the two divisions are more overlapping than distinct. Argument themes include external blame/ responsibility, pain/ effort, humanity, character, popularity, while conclusions include mercy, and sentencing. In this study, I will generally take 'arguments,' to include arguments and conclusions, unless used separately. My original thought was that arguments could act as premises that would lead to certain conclusions. While this is possible to do with some 'conclusions,' such as 'RL's sentence

is too severe,' statements, such as 'TL's death protected her from future suffering,' were not as clearly derivative and could exist as premises leading to *other* conclusions. What I found in practice, in other words, was that there was a great deal of overlap and co-variation between what I was referring to as 'arguments' and 'conclusions,' that did not necessarily imply the existence of causal, chain-like linkages.

II. Position Ratings, Argument Themes, and Coding Categories.

As illustrated in Table Three-One, the data collected in this study is mostly interval or ordinal, and consists of the following categories: sequential number of item, date, page number, type of item, size in paragraphs, and position ranking. The first three of these categories - number, date and page, were the easiest to determine. The *type* of item, however, whether it was straight news, a feature, column, review piece, editorial or letter, was harder to determine, with some ambiguity between what were columns or editorials, and what were straight-news, review pieces, and features. To adjust for this possible error, I have collapsed the most ambiguous article types into two groups - features, straight-news and reviews (F,S,R), and editorials and columns (E,C). Letters (L) appear as the only single category.

The *position* measurement indexes an item's overall pro-prosecution or pro-defence orientation. This ranking is based on a seven-point scale, ranging from D-3, indicating a strong pro-defence argument (or conclusion), to P-3, indicating a strong pro-prosecution argument. There are also 'B' arguments, that present a balanced position. Intervening number designations (D-2, D-1, P-1, P-2) reflect differing intensities of positions, most of these included a mix of pro-prosecution and pro-defence arguments.

I tried to account for a number of factors when making position assessments - including the type of item, the size and position of items, the selection and placement of sources within an article, the number and strength of pro-defence or prosecution statements, and the overall argument orientation of an article. These ratings were assigned twice, during my second and third readings.

In addition to these general ratings assigned at the article level, the bulk of my research has consisted of analysing content arguments at the level of the single argument or statement. As noted above, I have organised my data along seven dimensions, loosely divided into arguments and conclusions. Arguments include external blame/ responsibility; pain, humanity, character, popularity, and conclusions include mercy, and sentencing/ guilt/ innocence. In addition, each coded statement type has been assigned a nominal value depending on whether it has a pro-defence or pro-prosecution orientation. Each theme division, with the exception of 'popular support for RL,' contains statements that are either supportive of defence (D) or prosecution (P) positions.

As with any nominal division of data, there is an almost inevitable risk that there are going to be examples that do not expressly fit one category or another. In my case, I was concerned that there could be 'balanced' or simply more moderate examples of argument (or conclusion) statements, that did not readily fit one side or the other in this case. Although there were a couple of ambiguous statements, that appeared less intensely supportive of one position or the other, overall most statements tended to be fairly polarised.

In Table Three-Two is the summary data sheet for *The Star Phoenix* (SP) in 1994. All three pages of this document are reproduced here. There are seven theme divisions, and

Table 3-2. The SP, 1994.

33.

ST-OUT	Newspaper Coverage:		SP-1994								
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs	
D	1	MED BLM 3A	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	14	
D	2	LEG BLM 33	3	22	1	0	1	0	0	27	
D	3	POL BLM	0	13	0	1	0	0	0	14	
D	4	SOC BLM 30	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	5	
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	0	16	0	0	3	0	0	19	
D Total			11	60	2	1	6	0	0	80	
D-External:			11	60	2	1	6	0	0		
External Blame/ Responsibility:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3		
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	4	0	0	7	0	11	
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	3	2	3	1	0	1	0	10	
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	9	
P Total			3	2	7	1	2	15	0	30	
P-External:			3	2	7	1	2	15	0		
	II	Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs	
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
D	2	T PAIN 55	3	8	0	0	0	3	0	14	
D	3	R PAIN 55	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
D	4	F PAIN 55	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 68	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
D Total			13	33	0	0	1	3	0	50	
D-Pain:			13	33	0	0	1	3	0		
Pain/ Effort:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3		
P	1	DIS NOT PN 58/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	8	
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
P Total			0	0	0	0	1	13	0	14	
P-Pain:			0	0	0	0	1	13	0		
	III	Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs	
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	
D	3	LESS HUM 22	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	6	
D	4	OP=MUT 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
D	7	BTTR DD 6	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	7	
D Total			8	13	0	2	2	1	0	28	
D-Humanity:			8	13	0	2	2	1	0		
Humanity:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs	
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	2	0	2	5	0	9	
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	
P Total			0	0	2	0	2	11	0	15	
P-Humanity:			0	0	2	0	2	11	0		
	IV	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs	
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
D	2	RL CONF 9	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	2	8	0	0	1	1	0	12	
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	7	
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	6	
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	7	5	0	1	0	0	13	

D	9	RL GD 13	1	8	1	0	0	1	0	11
D	10	NICE COMM 1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	6
D	11	RLnt concned abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12	DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	2	5	1	0	4	0	0	12
D Total			12	45	10	0	9	4	0	80
		D-Character:	12	45	10	0	9	4	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	7
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			2	0	0	0	7	9	0	18
		P-Character:	2	0	0	0	7	9	0	
		V Popularity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	24
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
D	3	Family Sup 18F	2	12	2	0	0	0	0	16
D	4	POP 18	1	38	0	0	1	0	0	40
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	7
D Total			5	84	4	0	1	1	0	95
		D-POP	5	84	4	0	1	1	0	
		Leads To:								
		VI Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	2	8	2	0	1	0	0	13
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	0	10	2	2	2	0	0	16
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	2	7	2	0	1	0	0	12
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	4	10	6	0	1	0	0	21
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
D Total			9	37	12	2	5	0	0	65
		D-Mercy:	9	37	12	2	5	0	0	
		Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY crnt comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRCY	1	1	1	1	2	7	0	13
P Total			1	1	1	1	2	10	0	16
		P-Mercy:	1	1	1	1	2	10	0	
		VII Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	9
D	2	God will judge 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	1	19	0	0	16	1	0	37
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
D	7	DIDN'T DO ANYTHNG WRNG	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			12	31	0	0	18	2	0	63
		D-Sentencing:	12	31	0	0	18	2	0	
		Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	1	4	0	1	5	13	0	24
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	0	0	0	14	10	0	24
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	6
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	8
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	5
P Total			1	5	0	1	29	32	0	68
		P-Sentencing:	1	5	0	1	29	32	0	620

codes are distinguished according to their nominal defence or prosecution leaning. The numbers presented in this table are code counts, as they occurred in differently ranked prosecution or pro-defence news items. The summary data sheets for all of the years and papers can be found in **Appendix One**.

External arguments tended to place the blame for Tracy's death outside of RL's responsibility. These included pro-defence arguments such as medical, legal, and political blame, other provinces and/ or doctors allow, and pro-prosecution arguments such as cannot compare cases, and society devalues the disabled. Pro-defence arguments that dealt with *pain*, included references to Tracy's pain, her father's or family's current pain, how looking after her was an arduous task (a form of pain), and how she is now out of pain. Pro-prosecution arguments emphasised how (the experience of) pain is relative, how her death was painful (for her), and how this case has made parents of the disabled angry and scared.

Under the theme of *humanity*, were references to Tracy's humanity, or lack of it. Pro-prosecution arguments mentioned how she was not imminently close to death, that she had pleasures, and that other children with cerebral palsy had problems similar to hers. Pro-defence arguments compared the treatment of Tracy with that of a pet, stressed how her life was deteriorating or not improving, and how she could not express her will.

Arguments under the theme of *character* tended to focus on the personal qualities of Robert Latimer and/or his family. These include pro-defence arguments such as Robert loved Tracy, Robert is/was emotional, that he is not a threat to society, that he, his family and community are good, and that he could serve a practical social and familial role. Pro-prosecution arguments mention that Robert Latimer was not emotional, that he had other

options, that the murder was carefully planned (and hence pre-meditated), and that if he had loved Tracy, he would not have killed her.

A number of pro-defence arguments also referred to the *popularity* of this case, and in particular the extent and breadth of support for Robert Latimer. These included statements such as, the community supports RL, the police and judge supported him, his family supports him, and that he is supported popularly across the country. There were no comparable pro-prosecution arguments under this thematic.

The first 'conclusion' oriented theme in Table Three-Two includes statements that mention mercy. These include statements such as RL needs legal-social mercy, that Canada needs flexible sentencing rules or a third degree of 'compassionate homicide.' Pro-prosecution conclusions stated that this is a murder case and not a mercy killing, and that we should have mercy for the victim and not the perpetrator. The final thematic division relates to statements about Robert Latimer's guilt, and the sentence he received. These codes ranged from pro-defence statements such as, RL had no choice, the sentence is too severe, and that he killed out of love. Pro-prosecution statements included that his sentence is not too severe, that the courts have already been lenient (changing his first degree murder charge to second), that RL had no right to kill TL, and that the Canadian Criminal Code does not need to be changed.

It should be clear from this introduction to coded case arguments and conclusions, and by an examination of Table Three-Two, that six of seven analysed themes, and the codes that represent them, appear as a counter or alternative to each other. This dichotomy appears to be rooted in the oppositional nature of court cases, in the argument techniques used by writers, and in the process of news making itself.

III. Issues of Reliability and Validity.

Although I have not tested my codes for statistical validity or reliability, there are less formal means I have used to check for accuracy. In **Figures Three-One A, and B** are percent totals for the different newspapers in 1994. They present the amount of pro-prosecution (A) and pro-defence (B) arguments and conclusions that appear in news items rated as pro-prosecution or pro-defence. They are also percentage totals, indicating that code counts are relative figures, reflecting their participation in the total statement counts for given year or paper. Percentage figures allow us to compensate for what are large differences between the papers in the number of published case related items.

Using these relative figures, we can see from Figure Three-One, that there is a close fit between the curves of coded statements in the different papers. For pro-prosecution rated codes we can also see a pretty good fit between the coverage in *The TS* and *The SP*. *The Vancouver Sun* (VS) has no pro-prosecution rated codes in 1994, and *The Chronicle Herald* (CH) had very little.

Since these graphs are capturing the amount of coded statements on the Y-axis, and the position of the items they are in, along the X-axis, they provide a simple test of *validity*. Although there is an averaging effect by combining all P or D codes together, if the statements did not correspond with the position of the item they were in, we would expect to see much more variance. As we will see in the next chapter, there are considerable differences in the item ratings of arguments in the different papers, and over the years, but for this year, there is a pretty close correspondence between them. This suggests that my codes are capturing something of what influences the position rating of an item.

1994 D-TTIs ST-Out ADJ-%

Figure 3-1 A

1994 P-TTIs ST-Out ADJ-%

Figures Three-One A and B

Figure 3-1 B

I have also utilised a simple test of *reliability*. As mentioned in the last section, two sets of position rankings were made during different readings of the articles. This has allowed me to compare rankings made independently of each other, and at different times. I did this for the first twenty-five items appearing in *The TS* and *The SP* in 1997. Of these, three items were rated differently between the two readings, two in *The SP* (8% of the total), and one in *The TS* (4% of their sample). Of these, two moved one position rating, one from D-2 to D-3 and one from P-3 to P-2, only one, an item in the SP, moved two spaces, from balanced (B) to D-2.

IV. Adjustments and Refinements to Data.

While I may not have intentionally biased my research, there is always the possibility that unintended effects could have influenced my results. One difference I considered, was the effect of having more pro-defence than pro-prosecution statements. I concluded that these discrepancies reflect actual differences in the number and argument variety found in news items.

Another area of concern centred on my assignment of nominal pro-defence or pro-prosecution orientation of statements. While I rated the position of each news item on a seven-point scale, the codes that appeared in the items were being assigned a bi-nominal position. There remained the possibility that the codes themselves could vary in the strength of their position. While the collapsing of differences between P or D rated statements may involve a loss of potential data, the appearance of codes that may actually be 'balanced' posed a greater difficulty for me. Using the existing data that I had, and examples of how different codes were distributed among differently rated items, I was able

to identify two codes that could be used to make either pro-defence or pro-prosecution statements. The ambiguous codes were 'Need support,' from the P-external theme, and 'arduous task,' from the theme of D-pain.

It also appeared to me, however, that my difficulty in making observations and conclusions could be further restricted by straight news that may either appear biased or balanced, depending on the nature of the events or statements being reported. For my quantitative analysis I have removed articles that reported directly on daily trial events and on the Supreme Court's verdict in 2001. By removing all trial related 'straight news,' I have been able to look at the positioning of more secondary, discretionary coverage in the different papers. A complete list of 'straight' news items removed from my analysis can be found in **Appendix Two**. It is significant to note, that of sixty- three items targeted for removal, none of them were pro-prosecution rated, and only two were rated as balanced. For my qualitative analysis in chapter five, I consider *all* items appearing in *The TS* and *The SP*, without exclusion.

V. Graphic Depictions of Data.

Because of my research design, which is not based on a random sample, and does not have an independent variable to manipulate, I will be emphasising more qualitative, graphic depictions of my data.

In the next chapter, I will consider two broad types of analyses. The first will look at the position of paper items as a factor of their type - features, review articles, straight news, letters and editorials. This process will enable me to look at how the position of arguments may vary by the type of item. The second form of analysis will look at the

relation between codes and their pro-defence, pro-prosecution, or balanced positions, as an indication of argument structure.

In Chapter Five, I will embark on a more qualitative analysis of my data. Chapter Six, will contain a brief review of my principle findings, and will reflect on how my observations - qualitative and quantitative, may relate to my theoretical considerations.

Chapter Four: Quantitative Observation.

I. Newspaper Coverage, Type and Item Position.

There were a total of 327 case related items in the four papers over the three study periods (November 5 to 30 in 1994, October 25 to November 15 in 1997, and from January 19 to 26 in 2001). *The Star Phoenix* presented the greatest amount of coverage, with 141 columns, straight news, editorials and letters, comprising 43% of the total for all the papers. *The Toronto Star* had the next greatest amount of coverage, with 91 case related items, accounting for 27.8% of the total, while *The Chronicle Herald* and *The Vancouver Sun* had 58 and 37 items respectively, representing 17.8% and 11.4% of total coverage.

I will begin this chapter by considering coverage volumes as they varied according to position, rating, and item type. In **Figure Four-One** is the accumulated totals of items for each year, for all types of coverage and newspapers. It is interesting to note that although the coverage quantities vary by year, how similarly shaped the graphs are. Still, while the ratio of pro-defence to pro-prosecution items was fairly uniform between 1994 and 1997 (at between 4.4 to 1 and 5 to 1), in 2001 they were considerably better balanced at 2 to 1. As we will see, however, many of these items were highly polarised, and comparatively short, letters.

If we change the focus from year to item type, as in **Figure Four-Two**, it is possible to see how 'balanced' various item types were in our sample newspapers. Indeed, those items we would expect to be the most balanced, principally the straight news, features, and reviews, are strongly skewed towards pro-defence positions; appearing seven times more frequently than pro-prosecution rated items. Editorials and columns are even more skewed positively, with fifteen pro-defence items for each pro-prosecution rated piece. Letters,

Accumulated Totals-Numbers-1994, 1997, 2001
 Ratios: 1994-4.4:1, 1997-5:1, 2001-2.1:1

43

Figure Four-One

F,S,R; E,C; L-Allyears
 Ratios: F,S,R-7:1; E,C-15:1; L-1.5:1

Figure Four-Two

with a ratio of 1.5:1 are the closest to representing any kind of 'balance' in the inclusion of alternative positions. Letter coverage is not centralised, however, as a normal curve would be, but is highly polarised towards extreme prosecution or defence positions. This suggests either that editors do not want letters that consider alternative arguments, or that readers do not want to write them.

As we move in on the detail level, and consider differences by item type and newspaper for a given year, we can see clearer how this 'balance' varies. In **Table Four-One** are ratios for each of the three content categories considered in this study - features, straight news and reviews (FSR); editorials and columns (EC); and letters. They are based on the tables and graphs in **Appendix Two**.

F,S,R				E,C			
Paper:	1994	1997	2001	Paper	1994	1997	2001
SP	5.8:1	6.5:1	15:1	SP	6:1	6:0	4:0
VS	5:1	8:1	2:1	VS	2:0	0:0	3:0
CH	12:1	13:1	7:0	CH	1:0	2:0	4:0
TS	11:1	5:1	2:1	TS	2:0	2:0	1:1

Letters			
Paper:	1994	1997	2001
SP	1:1	8:1	2.4:1
VS	5:1	1:1	1.3:1
CH	0:0	.5:1	.5:1
TS	4.1:1	.5:1	1:1

Table Four-One. Ratios for paper coverage, by item type, year and position ranking; based on data contained in Appendix Three.

Looking at the coverage ratios for FSR items, we can see that while *The SP*, *The CH* and *The VS* remained basically unchanged in the proportion of defence to prosecution

coverage in 1994 and 1997, *The TS* became considerably more balanced, with their ratio dropping from 11 to 1 in 1994 to 5 to 1 in 1997. In 2001, there are significant changes in the coverage of all four papers. While *The TS*, *The VS*, and *The CH* all contained more pro-prosecution items in 2001, *The SP*'s coverage actually became considerably less balanced, with their ratio of pro-defence to pro-prosecution items increasing from 5.8 to 1 in 1997 to 15 to 1 in 2001.

Editorials and columns, the most opinionated and argumentative of the coverage types, are, not surprisingly, the least balanced. In fact, there were only two pro-prosecution columns over the study period, one in *The SP* in 1994 and one in *The TS* in 2001.

As mentioned above, letters to the editor were the only coverage type to appear even remotely balanced, but even here it is not a central place where the data fell, but into highly polarised positions. As can be seen in Table Four-One, there was quite a bit of movement in the positioning of letters over the study period. *The SP*, the most balanced in 1994, became the least balanced in 1997 and 2001. Alternatively, *The TS* and *The VS*, the least balanced in 1994 became the most balanced (along with *The CH*) in 1997 and 2001. Indeed, *The TS* and *The CH* in 1997 and *The CH* in 2001 had more pro-prosecution letters than pro-defence ones. For *The CH*, their total number of published letters also increased significantly, from 3, in 1997, to 17 in 2001.

II. Distributions of Content Codes.

i. Arguments: External Blame, Pain, Humanity, Character, and Popularity.

In this section, I will move on to examine arguments used within differently ranked items. This implies a shift in attention from looking at news-item counts, to considering argument

code totals. Since any news item could contain some number of argument codes, it should not be a surprise that the 327 items in this study yielded 3852 coded statements.

As mentioned in the last chapter, to facilitate the comparison of papers with different amounts of coverage, I have calculated relative percentage totals for all five argument-themes (external blame, pain/ effort, humanity, character, and popularity), and both conclusions (calls for mercy, and sentencing/ guilt/ innocence). Divided among these seven themes are a total of eighty-eight argument codes. As outlined in chapter three, I have divided six of the seven themes into codes that appeared either pro-defence or pro-prosecution. This nominal division was adjusted by removing two codes that contained incidence of both pro-defence and pro-prosecution arguments. All of the remaining codes, although they may appear in either pro-prosecution or pro-defence rated items, represent a single, discrete argument. In the graphs that follow it is important to keep in mind that I am charting the distribution of codes in differently rated coverage items. I am not counting items, in other words, as much as I am counting the appearance of different codes in a range of items.

Although I have preserved, and will use the actual code frequencies that appear in differently rated items, percentage totals enable me to more finely compare coverage styles, without having to use ratios. The graphs in **Figure Four-Three A, B, and C**, and **Figure Four-Four A, B, and C**, are average percent totals for the different papers, for the five pro-defence and four pro-prosecution argument themes. It will be recalled from **Figure Three-One**, that I used the defence and prosecution rated figures for 1994, presented for all years here, as a visual test for the validity of my codes. In these graphs, I have removed two 'balanced' codes ('need support' from P-External, and 'arduous task'

1994 D-TTIs ST-Out ADJ-%

47

Figure Four-Three A

1997 D-TTIs ST-Out ADJ-%

Figure Four-Three B

2001 D-TTIs ST-Out ADJ-%

Figure Four-Three C

Figure Four-Four A **Figure Four-Four B** **Figure Four-Four C**

from D-Pain). I have also removed all case related straight news items that appeared during the coverage dates. I have done this to facilitate our viewing the positioning of more derivative content, without worrying about a 'forced' balance entering an item because a writer is obliged to cover opposing trial coverage.

It is interesting to note how closely matched and tightly skewed pro-defence coverage was in all four papers over the three sample periods (Figures Four-Three A, B, C). There were, however, a few differences worth noting. The papers were the closest matched in 1994, then in 2001. In 1997, *The CH* and *The TS* contained a noticeable amount of defence arguments that appeared in prosecution rated items, with *The TS's* coverage appearing the flattest and most extended of the papers.

If we compare the shapes of the graphs in Figures Four-Three and Four-Four, it is clear not only that there is a lot less pro-prosecution rated coverage in each year (as a percentage of a paper's total yearly coverage), but they are also not as uniformly skewed. Indeed, with the exception of 1994, which was dominated by skewed defence and prosecution arguments; the figures in 1997 and 2001 appear more discordant. In 1997, prosecution statements in *The TS's* and *The SP's* appeared the flattest and most extended into defence rated items.

If pro-defence and pro-prosecution codes existed only in items similarly rated, we would expect to see these two sets of graphs strictly polarised, with no inclusion of alternatively rated arguments. My first thought at seeing the extension of arguments into oppositely rated items, was that perhaps some of the codes I had rated nominally as pro-defence or pro-prosecution (with two 'balanced' codes being removed), were in fact more varied in their orientation, and hence ended up in balanced or alternatively ranked items.

This possibility implied a validity issue. It was also possible, however, that the codes were valid, and I was recording them inconsistently - a reliability issue.

A problem with this observation is that it does not explain why the extension of arguments varies from year to year and from paper to paper. If there was a problem with the selection of codes and their nominal assignment of orientation, then we would expect to see a uniform, or at least consistent effect over the data sample. It would similarly appear unlikely that the reliability of my recognising codes and recording them would appear to be accurate for defence and prosecution arguments in 1994, and yet inaccurate for the subsequent years. If anything, because I examined items chronologically, my reliability should have improved each year, rather than decreased. This suggests that differences between pro-prosecution and pro-defence rated items in the tightness and skew of their coded representations are not simply the results of error, but are the result of other measurable effects.

The position of pro-defence arguments, by theme category and for each sample year, can be seen in **Figures Four-Five A, B, and C (SP), Four-Six A, B, and C (TS), Four-Seven A, B, C (VS), and Four-Eight A, B, C (CH)**. Although all of these graphs may look rather neatly skewed, there are note-worthy differences between them. In 1994, the top two themes in *The SP*, *The TS*, and *The VS* included references to external forces, and to RL's good character. They accounted for approximately 26% of *The SP*'s, 34% of *The TS*'s, and 38% of *The VS*'s total coded arguments respectively. In *The CH*, the most frequently occurring arguments in 1994 referred to Tracy's pain, and the popular support her father received. The impression we get from this combined coverage, is that TL's murder was rendered less significant because of failures in the medical or legal

Figure Four-Five A

SP-1997 D-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Five B

SP-2001 D-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Five C

Figure Four-Six A

TS-1997 D-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Six B

TS-2001 D-ST-B-%TTIs

Figure Four-Six C

Figure Four-Seven A

VS-1997 D-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Seven B

VS-2001 D-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Seven C

Figure Four-Eight A

CH-1997 D-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Eight B

CH-2001 D-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Eight C

communities, the 'good' character of Robert Latimer, his popular support, and the pain Tracy Latimer was experiencing.

The extension of pro-defence arguments into pro-prosecution rated news items was modest in 1994. The themes most represented here were D-character, in *The SP* and *The CH*, and D-popular in *The CH*. This implies that the authors of letters, editorials, columns, or straight news made references to Robert Latimer's good character or his popularity in arguments that otherwise advanced a pro-prosecution position.

In 1997, D-external arguments continued to be among the most prevalent themes in the papers, making up approximately forty percent of all coded arguments in *The VS*, twenty percent in *The SP* and *The CH*, and twelve percent in *The TS*. In the latter paper, pain arguments dominated, capturing almost twenty-three percent of total coded items. Other significant themes in this year include references to Robert's character and popular support, and Tracy's reduced humanity.

In 1997, *The TS* presents one of the more disparate looking of the defence graphs, particularly in the depiction of arguments that refer to Tracy's pain - which appear quite dominate, and well extend into balanced news items. Overall, the graphs of this year were not quite as neatly skewed positively, as they had been in 1994, with *The CH* and *The TS* the most divergent. This difference can be seen percentage of pro-defence arguments appearing in pro-prosecution ranked items. While *The TS* had 8.5% of their total coded arguments in this designation, and *The CH* had 6%, *The SP* had considerably less, with only 1.8%, and *The VS* had no representative coverage. In 1994, *The SP* and *The CH* both had almost 5.5% of their coverage in this designation, while *The TS* had only 1.5%, and *The VS* had less than 1%. The overall picture in 1997 is that *The SP* and *The VS* are more

positively skewed than *The TS* and *The CH*, which tended towards a more central position.

While bell shaped graphs are still visible among pro-defence arguments in *The VS* and *The CH* in 2001, *The TS*'s coded coverage appeared flatter and further extended into pro-prosecution rated items. At the same time, *The SP*'s coverage appeared even more positively skewed than it had been in either 1997 or 1994.

In an attempt to better understand the extension of arguments into alternatively rated items, I have summarised these amounts, as percentages, in Table Four-Two.

Paper:	Pro-Defence			Pro-Prosecution		
	1994	1997	2001	1994	1997	2001
SP	48.3	55.2	64.4	4.83	1.83	0
VS	43.2	62.9	66	.8	0	1.46
CH	59	56	58.6	5.46	6	.5
TS	56	46.5	42	1.46	8.5	13.66

Table Four-Two: Percent of pro-defence arguments in pro-defence and pro-prosecution rated items.

From this summary we can see that while *The SP* and *The VS* increased the amount of pro-defence arguments they made in each subsequent year, the percent of these arguments appearing in pro-prosecution rated items declined in *The SP*, and remained at a low level in *The VS*. Pro-defence coverage in *The CH* started at a high level, and stayed there. In *The TS*, coverage started high, then consistently declined over the years - falling from 56% in 1994 to 42% in 2001. At the same time, the percent of pro-defence arguments appearing in pro-prosecution items increased, rising from a little under 1.5% in 1994, to over 13% in 2001. In other words, while total pro-defence coverage moved positively in the case of *The SP*, and to a lesser extent *The VS*, *The CH*'s already skewed position remained fairly consistent, while *The TS*'s coverage moved in the opposite direction -

towards a more central position.

As we move on to consider pro-prosecution arguments in 1994, Figures Four-Nine A, B, C, Four-Ten A, B, C, Four-Eleven, Four-Twelve A, B, C there are a number of observations that can be made. The most obvious, is how much less frequently pro-prosecution arguments were made in the four papers. *The VS*, for instance, didn't even have any recorded pro-prosecution arguments in either 1994 or 1997, although they did have pro-prosecution conclusions appearing in all years. *The CH* had little more, with less than one percent of all case related coverage mentioning pro-prosecution arguments in 1994. *The TS* and *The SP* had the largest representation of pro-defence arguments, each with almost ten percent of their total coded coverage in that year. These papers also had the only extension of pro-prosecution arguments into pro-defence rated items, with *The TS* having a little over one and a half percent, and *The SP* with almost three percent of their total coverage here.

In 1994, the most frequently used pro-prosecution arguments centred on references to humanity, pain, and external responsibility. Although *The TS* had only one-third of one percent of their total coded coverage appearing as p-external arguments in pro-prosecution rated news items, they had almost one percent of their coded coverage in p-external arguments appearing in pro-defence rated items. Similarly, while *The SP* did have a little over two and a half percent of their coded coverage in p-external arguments appearing in pro-prosecution rated items, they also had almost two percent of their coverage in p-external arguments appearing in pro-defence rated items.

In 1997, while *The CH's* pro-prosecution arguments tended to remain negatively skewed, they did increase in frequency, and involved a different mix of arguments -

Figure Four-Nine A

SP-1997 P-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Nine B

SP-2001 P-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Nine C

Figure Four-Ten A

TS-1997 P-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Ten B

TS-2001 P-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Ten C

VS-2001 P-ST-B-%-TTIs

Figure Four-Eleven

Figure Four-Twelve A

CH-1997 P-ST-B-%TTIs

Figure Four-Twelve B

CH-2001 P-ST-B-%TTIs

Figure Four-Twelve C

moving from challenges to RL's good character, to different understandings of pain, and external arguments. The representation of pro-prosecution arguments in *The SP* appeared flatter and further extended into pro-defence rated items in 1997, with the extension of p-external arguments, which dominated in the first year, being replaced by p-references to character, pain, and Tracy's humanity.

The TS has the most disparate looking of the pro-prosecution argument graphs. Indeed, somewhat similar to *The SP*, their coded coverage flattened and shifted positively from their output in 1994. In 1997, the dominant arguments in *The TS* were still centred on humanity, with references to pain, character and external causes each comprising a considerably smaller amount of total coded coverage.

In 2001, pro-prosecution coverage in *The SP* became even more negatively skewed, with almost no extension of pro-prosecution arguments into pro-defence rated items. Critiques of Latimer's character remained a popular argument theme in this year, as well as pro-prosecution references to external responsibility. While *The TS's* coverage was also more neatly skewed in 2001, with little pro-defence extension, their overall percentage representation of pro-prosecution arguments increased, becoming the highest of all papers, for all the years. Dominant themes in this year moved from humanity then pain, to humanity, character, then pain. *The CH*, which had only one pro-prosecution ranked item in 1994, and two in 1997, had eleven in 2001. Graphical depictions of their coverage over these years, moved from skewed in 1994 and 1997, to skewed with an extension of p-humanity and p-character arguments into pro-defence items in 2001.

The percentage of pro-prosecution arguments in either pro-defence or pro-prosecution rated items is presented in Table Four-Three. We can see here that as *The TS* decreased

their representation of pro-defence arguments in each subsequent year, they simultaneously increased the percentage of pro-prosecution arguments they published. In *The SP* an inverse situation is apparent – as their pro-defence coverage increased with each year, their representation of pro-prosecution arguments decreased. For *The CH*, which had basically flat pro-defence coverage over the three years, the percentage of their arguments rated as pro-prosecution increased each year.

Paper:	Pro-Defence			Pro-Prosecution		
	1994	1997	2001	1994	1997	2001
SP	2.58	3.67	.75	9.49	6.48	5.11
VS	0	0	1.5	0	0	5.96
CH	0	0	2	.93	4.8	7.3
TS	1.62	6	.3	9.62	8.53	16.4

Table Four-Three: Percent of pro-prosecution arguments in pro-defence and pro-prosecution rated items.

ii. Conclusions: Mercy and Sentencing.

In the previous section, I focussed the expression of defence, and prosecution rated *arguments* in pro-prosecution and pro-defence rated items. There are two 'conclusion' categories, however, that I have not yet considered. In practical terms, as mentioned under my methodological review, there is not a lot of difference between 'arguments' and 'conclusions.' Still, the 'conclusion' grouping does allow for some interesting observations. In Figures Four-Thirteen A, B, and C are pro-defence summed totals for the two conclusion themes, mercy and sentencing. Statements under the theme of mercy included, 'need flexible sentencing or a new classification of murder,' and 'need social/legal mercy.' Conclusions under the theme of sentencing included, 'sentence too severe,' 'murder not a threat to other disabled,' and 'RL had no choice.' Prosecution rated

Figure Four-Thirteen A **Figure Four-Thirteen B** **Figure Four-Thirteen C**

conclusions under the theme of mercy included 'need mercy for the victim,' and that 'killing TL was a murder, not an assisted suicide or mercy-killing.' Prosecution conclusions under the theme of sentencing included, 'RL had no right to kill TL,' and 'the disabled should be protected equally.'

It is apparent from Figures Four-Thirteen A, B, and C that there is a fair degree of consistency between pro-defence oriented conclusions - each is positively skewed with minimal extension into pro-prosecution items. *The SP* and *The CH* had the most extended coverage in 1994, with d-conclusions appearing in pro-prosecution items comprising almost four percent of *The SP*'s total coded coverage, and three percent of *The CH*'s. In 2001, however, it is *The TS* which had the most extended pro-defence arguments, making up almost three percent of their total coded coverage. *The SP* with 18.6%, and *The VS* with 16.5%, had the greatest amount of coded coverage in pro-defence conclusions.

Compared to pro-defence conclusions, those that were pro-prosecution in orientation were much more diverse (please see **Figures Four-Fourteen A, B, C**). In 1994, *The SP* had the greatest amount of pro-prosecution conclusions, and the most negatively skewed distribution. Conclusions in the other papers appeared more 'balanced,' with almost equal, in the case of *The VS*, or even positively skewed, as in *The TS* and *The CH*. *The CH* had the most polarised and the greatest amount of p-conclusion coverage in 1997, with over fifteen percent of coded statements occurring here. In the other papers, *The TS* and *The VS* in particular, the distribution of codes appears almost flat, with equal, in the case of *The VS*, or almost equal, in the case of *The TS*, distributions. By 2001, pro-prosecution conclusions appear in pro-defence rated items almost as much in *The CH* as in *The SP*. *The TS* and *The VS* have the most polarised distributions, and even here there are

Figure Four-Fourteen A **Figure Four-Fourteen B** **Figure Four-Fourteen C**

significant extensions of pro-prosecution conclusions into pro-defence rated items.

Summary:

From the above discussion, the impression is that none of the papers presented 'balanced' reporting in the sense of there being some sort of normal distribution around a central point. Indeed, the only news items that showed any semblance of balance were letters to the editor, and even here it is two, skewed distributions that we saw, with strongly polarised pro-defence and pro-prosecution positions (Figures Four-Three and Four). When we looked at letter coverage in more detail, it was observed that while *The TS* had the greatest number of pro-defence letters in 1994, and, with *The VS* had the most positively skewed distribution, *The SP* had the most balanced coverage (Table Four-One). In 1997, the positions of letters in *The Sun*, *The Star* and *The Phoenix*, became reversed to some extent, with *The TS*'s and *The VS*'s distribution moving negatively, while *The SP*'s moving positively. In 2001, the number of letters rose to around 1994 levels, and while coverage was exactly balanced for *The VS* and *The TS*, *The SP* remained positively, and *The CH* negatively, skewed.

It was also observed generally, that pro-defence rated arguments or conclusions tended to be more discretely polarised than their pro-prosecution counterparts, which tended to have a greater number of their arguments extending into pro-defence rated items (Figures Four-Five-Twelve). Considering differences between the papers in more detail, we saw that while pro-defence arguments and conclusions were fairly discrete and polarised in *The SP*, *The VS*, and *The CH*, *The TS* displayed the greatest variability. While pro-defence conclusions in *The TS* appeared discrete and positively skewed in 1994 and 1997, in 2001,

there was a distinctive rise in the representation of pro-defence conclusions in pro-prosecution rated items. Pro-prosecution conclusions appeared flatter and more extended than defence conclusions, implying that writers of otherwise defence rated items were mentioning prosecution statements. Among arguments, *The TS's* had the flattest and most extended pro-defence coverage. For pro-prosecution arguments, while all of the papers had negatively skewed distributions in 1994 and 2001, in 1997 *The SP* and *The TS* had a noticeable amount of their prosecution statements occurring in balanced or pro-defence rated items.

When we considered shifts in the overall representation of pro-defence and pro-prosecution arguments, some distinctive patterns emerged. With pro-defence arguments, while *The SP's* coverage became larger and increasingly discrete, *The TS's* decreased, and became more extended into pro-prosecution items (Table Four-Two). In terms of pro-prosecution arguments, as *The SP's* coverage became both smaller and more discrete, *The TS's* increased significantly, extending into defence rated items in 1997, then decreasing to below 1994 levels in 2001. In the next chapter I will consider in more detail what these differences may imply, zeroing in on specific statement types while exploring specific examples.

Chapter Five: Qualitative Analysis.

In this chapter, I am only going to review coverage details for *The TS* and *The SP*. These are the largest samples, and illustrate the clearest and most divergent patterns in their coverage. I will begin with a quantitative review of extended defence statements in *The TS*, and extended prosecution statements in the *The SP* and *The TS* in 1997, before moving on to consider the structure of actual news articles. Examples of 'balanced' articles, and different styles of inclusion will then be considered. I will end this chapter by highlighting how the meaning of specific statements, primarily those under the d-themes of pain, mercy, character, humanity, and popularity, became expanded and modulated in their use over the course of the two trials and Supreme Court Judgement in this case.

I. Extended and Discrete Statements.

i. Extended prosecution arguments in *The TS* and *The SP* in 1997.

From the data presented in Figures Three, Four, Five, and Six in the last chapter, 1997 prosecution arguments in *The SP* and *The TS* appeared the flattest and most extended of all the coded coverage, and warrant closer attention.

In 1997, the most extended defence arguments in *The TS* centred on issues of humanity, pain, and character. In **Figures Five-One A, B, and C**, are charted code counts for these arguments, and are based on the paper totals found in **Appendix One**, introduced in the last chapter. It is clear under the theme of humanity, that the most central, and extended codes are those that represented d-statements such as, 'life deteriorating or not improving,' and 'couldn't express (her) will.' Under the argument of pain, the most extended statements referred directly to Tracy's pain, or mentioned that she was out of

TS-97-D-Humanity, ST-Out Actual

70

Figure Five-One A

TS-D-PAIN 97 ST-Out B Actual

Figure Five-One B

TS 97 D-Character ST, B-Out

Figure Five-One C

pain. Extended defence rated codes under the theme of character, included 'family good,' and 'killing TL a strong act by LL.'

Among prosecution items, the same themes of humanity, character, and pain contained the most extended statements. In **Figure Five-Two A, B and C** A are these counts for *The TS* in 1997. We can see under the theme of humanity that the most frequent and extended statement is that 'other disabled were OK or the same (as TL).' The most popular statement under the theme of pain was that 'parents of the disabled were angry and scared.' Extended character statements included "RL self interest (in killing TL)," and "RL had other options."

In *The SP*, their most extended coverage occurred in 1997 for pro-prosecution arguments. Like *The TS*, the most extended arguments in *The SP* fell under the themes of humanity, and character. In **Figures Five-Three A and B** are the graphs for the SP in 1997. Under the theme of humanity, extended arguments included that 'Tracy was *not* less than human,' that she was 'not predicted to die,' and that 'other disabled are OK or the same (as TL). Extended pro-prosecution references to character included 'RL lied first,' and 'killing was carefully planed murder.'

ii. Examples of extended arguments and conclusions.

In this section I will explore in more detail how defence and prosecution rated arguments in *The SP* and *The TS* appear in alternatively ranked news items. From my discussion in the last section, there are a number of codes we can look at to see how overall arguments were made. In an attempt to get some indication of the changes occurring within, and between the papers, I have reviewed every news items (including case related straight

TS-97-P-Humanity, ST-Out Actual

Figure Five -Two A

TS-97-P-Pain, ST-Out Actual

Figure Five -Two B

TS-97-P-Character-ST-B-Actuals

Figure Five -Two C

SP-97 P-CharacterST-Out-Actual

news) in *The TS* and *The SP*, for all three years.

In explaining the occurrence of extended arguments, there are a number of possibilities I will be considering. It is entirely possible that there are articles that include alternatively rated statements, simply by reporting on an event, such as prosecution or defence testimony in this trial. A second possibility is that opposing statements are included by an author as an argument technique: These could include the recognition, then rejection of a argument; the acceptance or assimilation of an argument into a hybrid personal position; and the maintaining of one's own opinion, while modifying the framing of alternative or challenging statements. The final possibility I will consider, is the rhetorical use of alternative statements. These actually represented a blind spot in my analysis. I am referring to items in which a writer may derisively mention an alternative argument, in a way that signals to the reader that the statement should not to be taken seriously. This latter technique is similar to the argument technique in which alternative positions are recognised, then rejected, but differs in that alternative statements could not 'stand-on-their-own' as the expression of a statement.

i. Balanced Articles and Straight News.

Overall, there was very little 'neutral' or 'balanced' coverage. There were articles that contained some measure of argument balance, or at least appeared less extreme in the impression they gave. Two short 'neutral' straight-news pieces, for instance, one in *The TS* (11/06/1997;A25), and one in the *SP* (11/21/1994;A6), mentioned the distinction between MP Svend Robinson's understanding of euthanasia, as wilful intent, and RL's making that decision for Tracy. While these articles were dispassionately reported on, the

impression of balance or neutrality the reader receives is clearly influenced by Svend Robinson's comparatively moderate position in this case.

There were also two articles ranked as 'balanced' that did contain strongly opposing arguments in a fairly balanced way, one of these, in *The TS* (11/7/1997), even graphically separated them into opposite sides of the page. Indeed, the polarisation of defence and prosecution arguments that have been so apparent in my analysis, must reflect this practice of capturing and framing opposing positions. This implies that there must be pleasure in the tension or conflict that appears to be generated around certain events.

In other examples, journalistic practices of selection, placement and description clearly influence the overall position of an article. In a *SP* article (11/15;A121997), for instance, the author argues that the Latimer case differs from the situation of Sue Rodriguez, who took her own life, in that "there is no indication Tracy wanted to die." While this pro-prosecution statement is straightforward enough, and not unlike those made in the other articles, an extended series of quotes from RL's lawyer, Mark Brayford, dramatically changes the overall impression we will get from this article. In one of these, Brayford states that RL "killed his daughter because she was literally in a vegetative state, and was undergoing constant pain," adding that what "superficially might appear to be a crime may not be, once twelve jurors apply their common sense to it."

The author goes on to describe how neighbours have been donating money to help pay RL's legal fees. The prosecution attorney is mentioned for the first time in the final three lines of the article, and is paraphrased as saying only that he planned to call 27 witnesses: There is no rebuttal from him, no pronouncements of strategy, or claims of RL's culpability, not even a direct quote.

What happens in this article through processes of selection and placement, is that the ability and right to kill *oneself*, becomes an index of Tracy's reduced humanity. The reduced value of Tracy's life, and the inherent correctness of RL's actions, became 'common sense,' secured with popular support. What starts to emerge in this article, before the first trial had even begun, is the opening up of a 'slippery slope' argument that will only be resolved with the Supreme Court judgement.

Journalistic bias is also illustrated in two straight news items that were excluded from my qualitative analysis. Both articles, one in *The TS*, and one in *The SP*, came out on the same day (November 4, 1997), and are both reporting on the testimony of LL. In an example of selection and placement bias, both papers privileged LL describing TL's operations, and the pain she experienced - while virtually ignoring prosecution cross-examination that had her read journal entries documenting Tracy's good days, and the activities she enjoyed. In *The TS*, while LL's pro-defence statements made the front page, and comprised twenty-four of twenty-six paragraphs, prosecution cross-examination comprised a mere seven lines, in the second last paragraph of the second part of the article on the last page of the front section.

Descriptions and wordings are also highly skewed in this *TS* article. The author writes about 'extreme surgery' and 'radical medical procedures,' that, according to LL, you "wouldn't do to your pet." The impression is that Tracy was the subject of some cruel experiment. She is described as a girl who "couldn't walk, talk, or feed herself," who experienced "almost constant pain." LL's negative testimony is held up as fact, while her contradictory journal entries, which presented a substantial challenge to defence claims of pain and reduced humanity, are all but ignored.

ii. Argument styles.

By far the greatest number of extended arguments were in 'opinion' pieces - columns, editorials, and letters. Their method of influence was more deliberate and integrated, and often led to the expression of a coherently argued position. This implies that by including opposing positions, an author may be attempting to 'win allies,' so to speak, to appeal to, or persuade another to a particular, expressed, point-of-view. Based on my observation of extended arguments in this case, there appears to be at least three ways the (re)formation of one's own, or another's opinion could be accomplished: By incorporating the arguments of another into a hybrid personal position, by recognising then rejecting an argument, or by maintaining one's opinion and re-articulating and re-framing argument challenges. There are, of course, similarities between these styles, and numerous examples of how they are combined. It is also likely that these styles vary in their persuasive ability, with the inclusion of another's opinion into a hybrid position, the most persuasive. Not surprisingly, the most extended news items tended to be columns, editorials, and letters.

In a 1997 *SP* editorial by Murray Mandryk, for instance, entitled "Imperfections of the Law Revealed," all three of these argument styles are utilised to incorporate pro-prosecution statements into an otherwise pro-defence rated item. From Figure Five-Four, we can see that three prosecution arguments appeared in this otherwise defence rated item: 'RL lied to the police,' 'TL was not less than human,' and that the 'killing of TL was a carefully planned murder.' The first and last of these, and to some extent the second, all participated in the formulation of a hybrid position. The author is arguing that the legal system should show flexibility in this case, particularly in regards to sentencing. He is also arguing that a third category of murder should be introduced, that recognised the "desire

to end pain and suffering." Prosecution arguments that RL lied to police, led the author to concede that while we may "sympathise with his motives, we must recognise his action for the murder it was." It was TL's pain, RL's desire to alleviate it, and his, and his family's good character that the author argues should move us to leniency in this case.

The author's two coded references to Tracy's humanity were based on court testimony from the director of a development centre Tracy attended, and her mother. The director described the fun Tracy had at events such as "sleigh rides, trips to the circus, and a Halloween dress up" the centre had organised. Her mother read almost forty diary entries indicating the pleasures Tracy had in the last year of her life (SP 11/01/1997;A3 SP 11/04/1997;A1andA2). The challenge the prosecution presented to the defence team, was that Tracy had pleasures, clearly contradicting their claims of TL's reduced humanity and constant pain. These challenges are presented in a way, however, that significantly modifies and re-frames their meaning, turning them into almost pro-defence arguments.

For Mandryk, the pleasures Tracy may have experienced became an expression of her parent's love. It was not that she had pleasures, in other words, as much as it is that she 'had love.' He writes that the "Latimer's took her to the circus, lit bonfires for her, had birthday parties and friends over or just sat and cuddled her." To Mandryk all of Tracy's pleasures, even those that occurred through the local development centre, were the result of her parent's love. Tracy's agency in generating human emotions, became "smiles she *gave in return*" (*italics added*). Rather than the journal entries, which the prosecution had LL read in cross-examination, appearing as a glaring contradictions to her and RL's claims that Tracy was in unrelenting and unbearable pain, Mandryk notes how these entries were 'lovingly recorded.' Still, "no amount of family love, however, could mitigate a severe

illness that often wracked the little girl with pain." In this editorial the challenge is not whether Tracy was in unrelenting pain or not, but whether her parent's love could have been adequate to offset the intense pain and suffering she experienced.

iii. Rhetorical inclusion of opposing arguments.

While doing my coding, I became aware of the 'rhetorical' inclusion of opposing arguments or conclusions. In these items, an alternatively rated statement was presented, then immediately disqualified. This combination can still appear as hegemonic, but would not have been counted by me as representing the discrete expression of an opposing argument. This creates a possible oversight in my coding. An example from a column by Rosie DiManno in *The TS* (TS 01/22/2001;A2) should illustrate what I am talking about. In this article, DiManno argues that the pain Tracy experienced was relative, and should not have been open for interpretation by RL. She mentions the pro-defence position, that a third degree of 'compassionate' homicide is needed to deal with cases such as Laitmer's, but in a way, that inherently limits its influence. She states that "*thankfully*, the Supreme Court...*resisted the temptation* to create, universally, a new-category of *non-crime* - the mercy killing rule" (italics added). At the same time she is identifying this possible alternative classification of murder, she is discounting its validity, the Supreme Court 'resisted the temptation.'

III. Continuations and modulations over the years: popularity, humanity, character, pain, and mercy.

In this section I will review some modulations and extensions that occurred among the

themes of popularity, pain, mercy, humanity, and character over the years. My use of 'extension' in this section, refers to the expansion of concept applicability, and does not index an extension of prosecution or defence rated statements into opposite ranked news items. Changes in the applicability of these defence themes played an important part in bolstering support for RL, and reflect an incipient able-bodied bias within Canadian society.

i. Popularity.

It was a routine practice in *The TS* and *The SP* to dismiss those who supported the prosecution as 'advocates,' who represented minority interests. Indeed, such assertions became a means to discount the authority of those who supported the prosecution. Contrary to the wide popular support for RL, in other words, the prosecution's position only really appealed to a minority position. After the Supreme Court decision, for instance, straight news articles in *The TS* and *The SP* wrote of how the decision "thrilled advocates of the disabled" (TS 01/19/2001;A3), and how advocates were "satisfied" (SP/01/19/2001). Rather than the disabled having some insight into the value of those with disabilities, they became "whiners," who "descended" on Battleford (the location of the trials), and "meddled" in the case (SP11/08/1997;D17, SP10/25/1997;A2, TS10/27/1997;A2). One of these items, a letter (SP11/08/1997), notes how "the trouble is that the Voice of the Handicapped, or whatever they call themselves in this politically correct, enlightened age, believe that the world owes them a living." With a clear reference to the sorts of productive-practical issues I reviewed in chapter two, the value of the disabled, and those who support their rights are both discounted.

ii. Pain and Mercy.

Notions of pain mercy imply that because of Tracy's unbearable and unrelenting pain, she was 'mercifully' killed. This was the original form the argument took. It was introduced by one of the arresting officers, Corporal Lyons, shortly after RL was taken into a local RCMP office. After acknowledging that Tracy was "in a great deal of pain," the officer said to RL that "this is something that you felt you had to do out of love for your daughter, isn't it Bob?" RL did not respond. The officer repeated the statement several more times, until RL replied: "my priority was to put her out of her pain," adding later in the day that he was "much happier for her now (SP 1994)."

The pain that Tracy may have experienced while alive, however, became extended and greatly generalised with her death. In other words, the years RL and his family had to spend looking after Tracy became a form of pain in itself. The writer of a letter in *The SP* states that "I feel he has paid for his crime already in the 12 years his little girl was alive; he and his family have suffered greatly watching her suffer, and that's why he committed this crime" (SP 01/20/2001;B6).

Another *SP* letter describes how "a nurse told me she couldn't stand to work with cerebral palsy patients for twelve years," adding that the "Latimer's were not on twelve hour shifts" (11/22/1994;A4). A letter in *The TS* the same year states that RL's "prison term has been served," and that the author "can only imagine what the stress of looking after a severely disabled child for 12 long years can do to a persons state of mind" (TS 11/23/1994;A24).

The trials, appeals and constitutional challenges became another form of punishment. A 1997 straight news piece in *The SP*, for instance, starts by stating that "the cruel and

unusual treatment of Robert Latimer began four years ago when he was charged with first degree murder" (SP 11/08/1997; A21). Articles in *The SP* and *The TS* refer to the case as a "saga," and a "seven-year legal ordeal" for Latimer (SP 01/23/2001;19, TS 01/25/2001;A26). Another *TS* article mentions that "Latimer's judicial saga ended as it had begun - an intense but surprisingly polite media event" (TS 01/19/2001;A1,8).

At the same time, details of the case, and the challenging issues that arose within it, became a painful experience for the public. Jurors found the case 'difficult' and 'troubling,' while 'citizens agonised' over it (SP 11/06/1997;A1,A14). An article in *The SP* (11/28/1994;A1) describes how "Latimer's trial .. rekindled a painful national debate over the issue of mercy killing." According to a 1997 *TS* article, residents in the town where the trials took place, were "dismayed they must endure the trauma of another trial" (TS 10/27/1997;A2).

It was Latimer's lawyer Mark Brayford who introduced the notion of cruel and unusual punishment in 1994, as a constitutional challenge to the legitimacy of RL's sentence. It is also possible that the 'pain' this case may have caused people, is related to the 'effort' required in making sense of unique, problematic events.

A variation of the idea that this case is painful for observers is that we, as members of Canadian society, are promoting cruel medical and legal practices. After he was found guilty for a second time in 1997, for instance, RL is quoted in *The SP* as saying that "it's all about not having to torture someone; if society feels it must promote torture, then I guess I'll be guilty" (SP 11/06/1997;A1). There is the implication with this type of argument, that we are all being targeted as somehow complicit in Tracy's death. Another variation of the extended pain motif, is the painless way RL killed TL (TS

11/23/1994;A24).

Notions of *mercy* also became greatly expanded in their usage during this case - moving from the mercy RL showed for his daughter, to the mercy we should have for RL, to the mercy and justice that is being denied him through the Canadian courts. Both the SP and the TS develop this thematic. With the theme of pain, it is introduced in this case by RL's arresting officers. In a 1994 *SP* article, for instance, one of these officers is quoted testifying about his suspicion that "there may have been a mercy killing" (SP; 08/11/1994;A3). The sub-head of the article reads: "Mercy killing angle .. passed on to pathologist," reflecting the early extension of this motif. Mark Brayford, Latimer's lawyer also developed this theme. In court documents, for instance, he states that Tracy was killed by RL because he "loved her too much to watch her suffer," and that RL was motivated by "love, mercy and compassion." A 1994 *TS* editorial also reflects the expansion of this idea by arguing that "Latimer, out of overwhelming love for his suffering daughter, gave her a merciful release from her pain and deserves leniency - or even a pardon" (TS 11/24/1994;A28). In 1997, another editorial argues that "there are times when a society needs to take risks to demonstrate its fairness and flexibility" (TS 11/07/1997;A26).

Indeed, pain and mercy are often presented together, as mutually determining and reinforcing notions. A 2001 *SP* article provides a good example of how expanded uses of these notions can be used together. In a *SP* article, the organiser of a jail-side protest for RL explains that the rally "is not about right or wrong, there has been so much pain and suffering for so long; people are asking for compassion, mercy, forgiveness, love and peace" (SP 01/23/2001;A6).

iii. Humanity and Character.

Notions of RL's enhanced character, and TL's reduced humanity, were significant in the reformation of sympathy in this case. Like the themes of pain and mercy, notions of RL's good character developed early. That RL is a 'good person,' was developed along three principle dimensions: He is not like other murderers, he is a loving father who cared for TL, and he served a productive role on the farm and in the community.

That RL is not like other murderers, is a position strongly advanced by his lawyer. In a *TS* article he claims that the "judicial system has treated the loving father like the 'thugs' that are currently in prison for murder " (TS 01/22/2001;A15). Picking up on the idea that RL is not a 'thug,' Randy Burton argues in a *SP* column that "ten years is what murderous thugs receive, it's clear that Latimer fits neither of those descriptions" (SP 01/22/2001;A15). In another reference to RL's character, Burton adds that "as Latimer's lawyer Mark Brayford notes, 10 years for Latimer compared with eight years .. for Karla Homolka is really indecent." A letter in *The TS* points to the same idea: "As Latimer's lawyer pointed out, how is it that Homolka, who helped kill three able-bodied women has a lesser sentence?" (TS 01/22/2001;A15). That RL is unlike other murders, implies, as a corollary, that he is "not a menace" or threat to society (SP 11/28/1994;B6).

Not only is RL unlike other murders, he is also a good man and a loving father. This is a sentiment his wife was quick to express. In court testimony she described her husband as a "wonderful, loving father" (SP 11/15/1994;A1). In an interview with *The TS*, shortly after RL's first conviction, she contends that "if all dads were as good as Bob, it would be a wonderful world" (TS 11/19/1994;A8). A 1997 *TS* article summarising the trial, mentions that "Latimer had been described by numerous witnesses as a loving father who

cared deeply for his daughter" (TS111/06/1997;A26).

Another type of argument used to bolster RL's character refers to the useful, practical purpose he has served, and could continue serving, in his community. An article in *The SP* (01/20/2001;A11), for instance, asks "who will maintain the family's farm." Often, this argument is linked to the pain his family is being made to suffer. A letter in *The SP*, for instance, puts it this way: "Bob is not a vicious criminal. He is no danger to society. He is a contributing member of society. The family has suffered already," and Bob should be "home with his family and continue his farming operation" (SP 01/19/2001;A1). Another letter, this one from 1997, ties together practical concerns, with expanded notions pain and suffering. "If Latimer goes to prison," the author writes, "we all lose: We, the taxpayers lose; his family loses a husband, father and provider and their suffering is extended" (SP 11/06/1997;D17). The writer of a 2001 letter, also from *The SP*, asks rhetorically: "Do we have the right to punish his children without a father for the next ten years. And what about their financial situation, who will deal with that?"

Interestingly, one of the original formulations of this argument was presented by LL in court testimony. After finding out that RL had killed TL, she testified that she was mad at him, wondering how 'he could have done this to me and the kids.' In a re-framing of this reference to the difficult situation RL put his family in, was the argument that the medical and legal systems, and even the Canadian public, were responsible for RL's and his family's hardship. This re-framing may have been logically necessary for his supporters, as it would have been clearly incongruous to think of a good father putting his family in a precarious situation. Numerous writers who mention RL's confessing to the police, omitting that he lied until confronted by them, also helped preserve notions of his

good character.

The final area of this case I would like to consider qualitatively, centres on issues of Tracy's reduced humanity. A corollary to RL's enhanced personal character, was TL's reduced humanity. If RL was made to seem full of determinate action, responsible for the family farm, acting alone to 'release Tracy from her pain,' then Tracy was pure inaction, dependent, demanding and immobile. Everything happened to Tracy - doctors operated on her, care-workers looked after her and her father put her out of pain.

The distinction, regardless of what pain she may have experienced, was between what she could not, and what her father could, do. Tracy was considered less than human because of her frail and 'twisted' appearance, and her inability to think and function like the 'rest-of-us.' She would always be 'less' of a woman, in other words, a drain of effort, love, and resources, who would never be able to live-up to dominant, able-bodied social expectations.

The killing of TL was also presented as 'humane,' suggesting that even as a murderer, RL was more human than Tracy. A 1994 letter in *The TS*, for instance, referred to Latimer's "actions as humanitarian and carried out because of an unceasing love and concern for his daughter" (TS 11/22/1994;A20). According to a quote of Brayford's included in a 1997 *TS* article, RL's motivation "was humanitarian in nature due to the deceased's pain" (TS 10/28/1997;A8). Indeed, that RL killed TL humanely is reflected in statements that mention his committing a 'compassionate homicide' or a 'mercy killing.'

Notions of TL's reduced humanity were constituted in case coverage in at least three ways: Through descriptions of Tracy's medical condition, through references to her abnormality and reduced functioning, and to comparisons that were made between her and

other, lower order, animals.

Much of RL's defence in this case rested on presumptions of TL's pain. Since conflicting testimony was heard as to how much pain TL was actually in, her physical condition was often used to index the pain she must have experienced. In a 1997 *SP* article, after RL's second conviction, he put it this way:

The jury obviously endorsed the option of cutting off her leg and putting a feeding tube in her, but that was something we could not do. With the combination of the rods in her back, the tube in her stomach, the leg cut off and flopping around and the bedsores, I don't know. Some people think she was a happy little girl. I don't understand these people.

The way RL describes his daughter certainly implied she had no reason to live. Tracy the person, however, is lost, reduced to a list of unpleasant medical conditions. Articles routinely made statements such as she "never progressed beyond the mental level of a 3-month old," or that she was "brain damaged," and "never walked, talked or fed herself and wore diapers" (TS 11/06/1997;A26, TS 11/06/1997;A1). A TS journalist described how "doctors planned to saw off the top of the pain-ridden child's right hip," and that "she had already undergone three painful surgical procedures" (TS 11/05/1997;A2). Another article by the same writer described how "previous operations involved doctors slashing muscles and ligaments to offset the twisting and distorting of the girl's skeletal structure" (TS11/07/1997;A14). There is not much consideration in these articles that maybe the operations helped her, or that others with cerebral palsy may undergo similar procedures, making them appear less extreme or "radical" (TS 11/04/1997;A1). To consider an operation as painful, with muscles being 'slashed,' bone being 'sawed' off, and rods being "wired to her spine," exaggerates the negative impression of the operations, while making

her seem less human, and her reason to live less pertinent (TS 11/04/1997;A1).

Indeed, due to medical failures and then 'heroic procedures,' TL was already considered dead by her parents. After his constitutional challenge was denied in 2001, RL described how "her pulse dropped for some time and that's when we lost her" (SP 01/19/2001;A2). His killing of TL became just "government follow-up." In court testimony reported in *The SP*, LL said "we lost Tracy when she was born," and that "her birth was much sadder than her death." (SP1994;A17). A phone caller to *The SP* a couple of weeks later reflected this same perception of TL, who she described as "born dead at God's will" (SP 11/28/1994;B6). Of course, Tracy was not diagnosed with cerebral palsy until she was six months old, so they could not really have lost her at birth. But having her 'dead' at birth, does make her death later in life seem less significant, and avoids having to ask the question of when she did 'die,' if it was not at birth.

In addition to descriptions of Tracy's surgeries as 'slashing' muscles, and likely to leave her leg 'floppy,' she was also described in court testimony as having a 'twisted' and 'distorted' spine (TS 10/31/1997;A11). In 1994 court testimony, her mother is paraphrased in a *TS* article saying that a proposed operation for Tracy was going to change "her daughter's already contorted body beyond what could be considered acceptable." In LL's words, "they were going to start mutilating our little girl" (TS 11/15/1994;A12). The 'twisting' and 'distorting' of Tracy's body, combined with the medical procedures and implements such as steel rods and feeding tubes used to keep her alive, implied that she was less than human, with a greatly reduced quality of life.

That Tracy was not 'normal' is evident in descriptions that appear to judge her by an able-bodied norm, rather than to others with cerebral palsy. Her medical requirements

became deficiencies, and expensive ones for taxpayers, which took her further and further away from the 'Tracy' the Latimer's wanted. She was not only less of the 'Tracy' her parent's wanted, she was less of a person than most Canadian's would want. TL's reduced humanity implies a reduced 'quality of life' - a perspective that clearly privileges what normal human beings are capable of doing. A *SP* article in 1997, for instance, paraphrases a pathologist testifying that Tracy's "muscles, supple in a normal person, had hardened and became useless" (SP 10/29/97;A3). Another writer in *The SP* quotes a local MP asking rhetorically, "is biological existence enough or do we demand some measure of quality" (SP 08/11/1994;A6). A *SP* letter a few weeks later argues that "in the past non-functioning organisms would not survive, today they are kept alive and sustained by heroic medical measures" (SP 10/11/1994;A4).

Interestingly, RL and others extended the imagery of Tracy's twisted body, and her being less than human generally, to apply to the legal and medical communities. After RL's constitutional challenge of 'cruel and unusual punishment' was rejected at the provincial level in 1994, he is quoted in *The SP* saying "I still feel what I did was right; you people are not being human" (SP 11/17/1994;A1). The writer of a letter a few weeks earlier, argued similarly "that what passed as justice was as tragically twisted as poor Tracy's painfully contorted body" (SP 11/22/1994;D17). After RL's 1997 conviction the *SP* quotes him saying that it is "barbaric, it's tragically twisted, there are some really sick people at work here" (SP 01/19/2001;A2). These analogies have the effect of extending TL's suffering to RL, while becoming metaphors for the inhumanity of the laws and medical procedures that kept Tracy alive.

Of course, if Tracy's mind and body were less than human, then it should not be

surprising that people referred to her as an 'animal,' most frequently the family pet. In 1997 LL expresses this idea in court testimony, describing proposed surgery for her daughter as "obscene," and "something you wouldn't do to your pet" (TS 11/07/1997;A1). Still, she was not the first to put this idea into the heads of readers. A letter appearing in *The TS* in 1994, for instance, argues that "we treat our pets with more compassion" than we did TL (TS 11/25/1994;A30). In *The SP* a reader wrote in 1994 that: "When an animal lover has a pet put to sleep to end its suffering he is not considered to be a callous, cold-blooded, heartless murderer" (SP 08/11/1994;A4). In 2001, a letter in *The SP* asked "when our pets fall victim to disease or injury, we allow them the mercy of being put to sleep, so why do we not allow that same mercy to human beings?" (SP 01/23/2001;A2). Another reader asked a few days earlier: "Why is it that when we put a beloved pet 'to sleep' to avoid its suffering, we call it compassion? Yet, when a human being is put 'to sleep' for the same reason, we refer to it as murder?" In *The TS*, a reader wrote that "it is time .. to grant mercy to a man who would have been prosecuted if he had allowed his animals to suffer, but is condemned" (TS 01/20/2001;K7).

Given all of the effort that seems to have gone into the enhancement of RL's character, and the corresponding reduction of TL's humanity, it was important for writers to make clear that even though they were making a spectacle of Tracy's useless body, they were not devaluing her because of her disabilities, but because of her pain. Many people would add this qualification to otherwise harsh statements that clearly worked to devalue her worth as a living person. They were in effect 'policing the boundaries,' trying to draw a distinction where in reality one was impossible to make. After his second conviction, RL is paraphrased as having "blasted critics who claim he killed his daughter because she was

disabled." RL claims "they missed the point .. insofar as this being a handicapped issue, they are very wrong, it's an issue of torture" (TS 11/07/1997;A14).

The argument alludes to a contradiction, however, as her disabilities were clearly relevant to her pain, and used to form perceptions of her reduced humanity. It is also entirely possible that this contradiction helped stimulate and reproduce the defensive argument that her disabilities were not relevant. Prosecution rated items often stated, alternatively, how the case was not about pain but disability. In reality, the situation was probably more that her disabilities did not always index pain, but that her pain always indexed her disabilities. At the same time, her disabilities and her presumed pain were used to devalue the perception of her worth.

In the end, the two trials and three appeals appear to have not really even been about murder (or pain), as much as they were about what constitutes a human life - on who decides the fate of those who cannot express their own will, and on what constitutes a person worthy of protection under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Chapter Six: Summary and Conclusion.

In this chapter, I intend to review my principle findings, and relate these to my earlier theoretical observations.

i. Review of Findings.

That coverage of this case was heavily skewed to pro-defence positions, was one of my more obvious observations. Editorials and columns were the most positively skewed of all the news types. Surprisingly, this bias extended deep into the structure of straight news, reviews, and features. Even those event-related items that were removed from my qualitative analysis, fearing they may have introduced a 'forced' balance, were heavily biased.

Through accepted journalistic practices involving the *selection* of subjects, sources, and 'facts,' the papers clearly privileged pro-defence positions. This incipient form of preference was also evident in the placement of opposing statements within articles, and articles within papers. Prosecution statements most often ended up at the end of articles and sections. Descriptions of people, events or concepts provided another important form of bias in this case. Argument and conclusion statements often-involved 'descriptions,' or implied particular points-of-view.

Certain themes, such as those centred on issues of humanity and character, or pain and mercy, played particularly significant roles in the reformation of sympathy that occurred in this case. Tracy's pain, became the pain of looking after her, the pain the legal system was inflicting on her father and family, and a painful national debate. The mercy RL showed towards TL, became the mercy we (the Canadian public) should show towards

him, and the mercy that the legal system lacked. The acceptability of RL killing his daughter was extended by statements and framing techniques that worked to enhance RL's character, while simultaneously reducing the impression of TL's humanity.

The most 'balanced' of all the coverage types were letters. This did not mean, however, that alternatively rated statements were included in letters in a balanced fashion, but that highly polarised pro-prosecution and pro-defence positions were presented.

Still, given that newspapers target able-bodied businesspeople, performers, athletes, job-hunters, home-buyers, and vacationers in their content, it should not be surprising to find that they have an able-bodied bias. The disabled are visible in the contemporary media only in their invisibility.

Although all of the papers showed a strong defence bias, there were differences between them over the three sample years. While the ratio of pro-defence to pro-prosecution coverage in *The SP* became increasingly less balanced over the study, *The TS*'s became more so. When we looked at the summary figures for all the papers (Figures Four-Four and Four-Five), it became clear that in 1997 there was a distinctively different shape to the distribution of pro-prosecution arguments. Defence coverage in *The TS* and *The CH*, and prosecution coverage in *The SP* and *The TS* appeared the flattest and most extended into alternatively ranked news items in this year. The most extended defence and prosecution arguments fell under the themes of character, pain, and humanity. Extended defence statements included references to TL's pain, her reduced humanity, and RL's strength and good character. Extended prosecution statements mentioned that other disabled were the same as TL, that parents of the disabled were angry or scared by the popular support RL was experiencing, and that RL was self interested.

As the number and diversity of extended pro-prosecution arguments decreased from 1994 to 2001 in the *SP*, they increased slightly in *The TS*. While extended defence arguments (and conclusions) dropped progressively in *The SP* over the same period, falling from almost five percent in 1994, to zero in 2001, d-extended arguments in *The TS* rose consistently, rising from a little under one and a half percent in 1994, to over thirteen and a half percent in 2001.

What these numbers suggested is that (straight-news-out) items in the *SP* and the *TS* moved in opposite directions in terms of how prosecution ranked articles included defence rated statements. There is also the possibility that these numbers index some form of 'argument hegemony.' From this perspective, *The SP's* pro-prosecution coverage, besides dropping in actual quantity each year in this study, was becoming more exclusive, and less hegemonic. Prosecution items in *The TS*, on the other hand, appear to be reaching out to moderate defence positions, by including their arguments (and conclusions) into otherwise pro-prosecution pieces. With the rise then fall of extended prosecution statements, there is the implication that defence positions in *The SP* and *The TS* became more hegemonic in 1997, before becoming even more exclusive in 2001 than they had been in 1994. This implies that the writers of defence articles in 1994 and 2001, felt less obliged than they did in 1997 to appeal to the opinions of prosecution supporters.

While the amount of prosecution rated arguments in defence ranked items increased in *The TS* and *The SP* between 1994 and 1997, their levels dropped below 1994 levels in 2001. For defence arguments, opposite trends could be seen between defence and prosecution rated items. As the amount of defence arguments appearing in prosecution ranked items increased every year in *The TS*, they decreased in *The SP*.

The overall impression is that *The TS's* coverage became slightly more moderate over the years, with their pro-defence ranked items becoming more inclusive of opposing, prosecution rated arguments. The inclusion of prosecution rated arguments in otherwise pro-defence items suggested that writers were trying to appeal to a broader audience. At the same time, *The TS's* pro-prosecution ranked items became more exclusive in their appeal. While the amount of pro-prosecution ranked items decreased over the study period, they increased in *The TS*. In *The SP* both prosecution and defence items in became more exclusive in their appeal to readers.

ii. Discussion.

In the beginning of this study, I referred to Stuart Hall's notions of encoding and decoding media messages. I suggested that while many events will fit existing frameworks of understanding, some will require extra effort. I mentioned that the case of Susan Smith, who killed her two children around the time of RL's first trial, would fit what Hall referred to as a 'preferred' or 'dominant' reading. When it was thought that her children were abducted by a black man, there was unequivocal public outrage. State and local police from across the US worked with the media to try to find the silver Mazda the children were last seen in. When it was realised that Smith had killed her children, the support that she had garnished within her community, and across the country, turned to extreme reproach. Neighbours now called for her execution: she was rendered less than human - a monster to kill her two beautiful children.

With Robert Latimer, the typical hatred of child killers is reversed. In this case, the perpetrator becomes the victim, hailed as a sort-of folk hero, while the humanity of the

actual victim is challenged. Defence proponents would argue that it was TL's pain that made her death less significant. TL was not killed because she was disabled, in other words, but because she was in 'unbearable' pain. A fundamental problem with this position, however, is that this case appears to be all about disability - on how Tracy's disabilities indexed her pain. Indeed, as Ruth Enns (1999) suggests in her book *The Voice Unheard*, Tracy's *body* was on trial in this case. Descriptions of her operations, even in straight news, included references to bones being sawn, and muscles being slashed. Prosecution testimony that challenged the amount of pleasure and pain Tracy may have experienced were pushed to the back of articles and papers.

That this case was problematic is evident in the effort required to make sense of it - to fit it into existing structures of understanding and belief. It is my contention that this case challenged the typical hatred of child-killers because Tracy was considered less of a person. Brayford's two attempts to have RL's punishment regarded as 'cruel and unusual, under section seven of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, reflects this contradiction. Canadians with disabilities, however, are expressly protected under section fifteen. Although Brayford claimed that if these challenges were successful, they would not have affected others with disabilities if they were successful, it is hard to imagine how they could not have. If the rights of a perpetrator not to be punished could exceed those of the person targeted with violence, this would set an extremely dangerous precedent: With the rights of the disabled (or pain-ridden) being clearly positioned below those of the able-bodied (or 'pain-free'). It would be an expression of the sort of systemic prejudice the Charter was intended to curtail.

The expression of an ablest bias, which would have been acceptable, even encouraged

sixty years ago in Canada, must now be better nested within a 'politically correct' discourse. This creates a fundamental paradox for many people; as previously acceptable, but derogatory and exclusionary ways of viewing and dealing with disability, have become increasingly problematised by an official climate of social-liberalism. While able-bodied preferences may have been successfully couched in newspaper coverage, their expression in Latimer's constitutional appeals remained too naked and obvious to have succeeded. The Charter is, after all, a fairly recent document, reflecting late Twentieth Century social values, and is intended to shape the development of a 'fair and just society.' In this regard, the Charter reflects an anticipated future, one that may be ahead of the thinking of many Canadians. Raw disclosures of Tracy's reduced humanity, even though reflected in her mothers comparing her to a pet, and her father's lawyer referring to her as being in a 'vegetative state,' were comparatively rare. Most of the coverage in this case was much more complex than that - enlisting references to external blame, pain, character, popularity, humanity, and mercy to re-position our perceptions of Tracy and her father. Letters and editorials, the most unrestrained of the news items, contained the strongest, and least censured pro-defence statements.

The differences I noted above between *The TS* and *The SP* in terms of their prosecution coverage, reflects a movement in editorial position. While *The TS* increased their representation of liberal pro-prosecution statements, they also increasingly appeared in defence rated items, suggesting a greater effort to bring pro-prosecution supporters in-line with pro-defence arguments or conclusions. This hegemony did not extend to defence statements in either paper, implying a reduced incidence of prosecution ranked items appealing to defence supporters.

In chapter two it was suggested that the social-model of disability, which situates 'disability' in the disabling characteristics of modern living, could actually be extended in its applicability much further back in time. Behind the obvious pro-defence bias in the media coverage surrounding this case, in other words, there may be the expression of a historical disregard for those with functional disabilities. Taken-for-granted (cultural) notions that situate humans as distinct and above all other animals, or emphasise the enhance-ability of the mind-body-soul, or stress the importance of productive citizens, work to evince a dominant able-bodied bias. Indeed, while defence statements reflect the individual model of disability, in which disability is considered a maligned personal problem, prosecution statements could be thought of as evoking the social model, in which able-bodied preferences can be identified and problematised.

While the Supreme Court judgement did uphold the rights of the disabled, it kept open the possibility of a pardon, and future changes to the Criminal Code. Indeed, this case leaves us with a number of unanswered questions. If an ablest bias can be successfully disguised within a 'politically correct' discourse, then how far could such a disregard be extended? If it was acceptable for RL to kill his daughter, would it have been OK for someone else, such as a doctor, to have done it for him? When the debate over wilful euthanasia returns, how will people view those who cannot indicate whether they want to live or not? Will they be considered more, or less worthy to live - as more or less human? Then there is always the question of money: To live longer and better is expensive. With increasingly cash strapped medical facilities looking for ways to cut costs, will the needs of the disabled be subordinated to those of the able-bodied? Indeed, while practices of positive and negative eugenics persist, they appear more benignly couched within accepted

medical practices. It is important for us to remain cognisant of the sort of raw disregard that is possible within an ablest bias. It is also important that we maintain a deconstructive analysis of the ways that bias or preference of one form or another can be introduced into texts.

References:

- Abberley, Paul (1998). "The Spectre at the Feast: Disabled People and Social Theory," in Shakespeare, Tom ed., The Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives. Casseeell, London, UK. Page 79-93.
- Barnes, Colin (1996). "Theories of Disability and the Origins of the Oppression of Disabled People in Western Society," in Barton, Len ed., Disability and Society: Emerging Issues and Insights. Longman, London, UK. Page 43-60.
- Barnes, Colin (1998). "The Social Model of Disability: A Sociological Phenomenon Ignored by Sociologists," in Shakespeare, Tom ed., The Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives. Casseeell, London, UK. Page 65-78.
- Barnes, Colin, Mercer, Geof and Shakespeare, Tom (1999). Exploring Disability: A Sociological Introduction. Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Burkitt, Ian (1999). Bodies of Thought: Embodiment, Identity and Modernity. Sage Publications, London, UK.
- Campbell, Jane, and Oliver, Mike (1996). Disability Politics: Understanding our Past, Changing our Future. Routledge, London, UK.
- Chappell, Anne (1998). "Still Out in the Cold: People with Learning Difficulties and the Social Model of Disability," in Shakespeare, Tom ed., The Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives. Casseeell, London, UK. Page 211-220.
- Clogston, John (1994). "Disability Coverage in American Newspapers," in Nelson, Jack ed., The Disabled, the Media, and the Information Age. Greenwood Press., Westport, CT.
- Corker, Mairian (1998). "Disability Discourse in a Postmodern World," in Shakespeare, Tom ed., The Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives. Casseeell, London, UK. Page 221-233.
- Craik, Jennifer (1994). The Face of Fashion: Cultural Studies in Fashion. Routledge, New York, NY.
- Edwards, Martha (1997a). "Deaf and Dumb in Ancient Greece," in Davis, Leonard The Disability Studies Reader. Routledge, New York, NY. Page 29-51.

- Edwards, Martha (1997b). "Constructions of Physical Disability in the Ancient Greek World: The Community Concept," in Mitchell, David, Snyder, Sharon eds., The Body and Physical Difference: Discourses of Disability. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI. Page 35-50.
- Enns, Ruth (1999). A Voice Unheard: The Latimer Case and People with Disabilities. Fernwood Publishing, Halifax, NS.
- Entwistle, Joanne (2000). The Fashioned Body: Fashion, Dress and Modern Social Theory. Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Foucault, Michel (1973). Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception. Vintage Books, New York, NY.
- Foucault, Michel (1988 [1965]). Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason. Vintage Books, New York, NY.
- Hunt, Darnell (1999). O.J. Simpson, Facts and Fictions: News Rituals in the Construction of Reality. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Hall, Stuart (1973). "Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse,"
- Haug, Frida (1987). Female Sexualization: A Collective Work of Memory. Verso Press, London, UK.
- Johnson, Roswell and Popenoe, Paul (1933). Applied Eugenics. Macmillan, New York, NY.
- King, Helen (1995). "Half Human Creatures," in Cherry, John Mythical Beasts. British Museum Press, London, UK.
- McGee, Glenn (2000). The Perfect Baby: Parenthood in the New World of Cloning and Genetics. Roman and Littlefield, Boston, MA.
- Morris, Jenny (1993). "Gender and Disability," In Finkelstein, Vic, French, Sally, and Oliver, Mike eds., Disabling Barriers - Enabling Environments. Sage Publications, London, UK.

- Norden, Martin (1994). The Cinema of Isolation: A History of Physical Disability in the Movies. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Oliver, Michael (1990). The Politics of Disablement. Macmillan, Hampshire, UK.
- Oliver, Michael (1993 [1989]). "Disability and Dependency: A Creation of Industrial Societies?" In Finkelstein, Vic, French, Sally, and Oliver, Mike eds., Disabling Barriers - Enabling Environments. Sage Publications, London, UK.
- Oliver, Michael (1996). Understanding Disability: From Theory to Practice. St. Martin's Press, New York, NY.
- Penick, Martin (1997). "Defining Defective: Eugenics, Aesthetics, and Mass Culture in Early-Twentieth Century America," in Mitchell, David, Snyder, Sharon eds., The Body and Physical Difference: Discourses of Disability. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI. Page 89-110.
- Shakespeare, Tom (1994a). "Cultural Representation of Disabled People: Dustbins for Disavowal?" In Disability and Society, 9(3), page 283-299.
- Shakespeare, Tom (1994b). "Power and Prejudice: Issues of Gender, Sexuality and Disability," in Barton, Len ed., Disability and Society: Emerging Issues and Insights. Longman, London, UK. Page 191-214.
- Stiker, Henri-Jacques (1997). A History of Disability. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Supreme Court of Canada (2001). "R v. Latimer: Supreme Court Ruling."
- Rand, Ayn (1961). The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism. Signet, New York, NY.
- Thompson, Rosemarie (1997). "Feminist Theory, the Body, and the Disabled Figure," in Davis, Leonard The Disability Studies Reader. Routledge, New York, NY. Page 279-294.
- Turner, Bryan (1992). Regulating Bodies: Essays in Medical Sociology. Routledge, London UK.
- Turner, Bryan (1996). The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory. Sage Publications, London, UK.

Watson, Nicholas (1998). "Enabling Identity: Disability, Self and Citizenship," in Shakespeare, Tom ed., The Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives. Casseeell, London, UK. Page 147-162.

Winzer, Margaret (1997). "Disability and Society Before the Eighteenth Century," in Davis, Leonard The Disability Studies Reader. Routledge, New York, NY. Page 75-109.

104

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:		SP-1997							
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A			1	8	0	0	0	0	9
D	2	LEG BLM 33			8	28	3	0	0	0	39
D	3	POL BLM			2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	4	SOC BLM 30			0	2	0	0	0	0	2
D	5	MED SOL 3B			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88			4	14	1	0	0	0	19
D Total					15	53	4	0	0	0	72
		D-External:			15	53	4	0	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E			0	0	0	0	0	0	1
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	SOC devlues dis			0	0	0	0	2	0	2
P Total					0	0	0	0	2	0	3
		P-External:			0	0	0	0	2	0	1
		Pain/ Effort:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8			2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	2	T PAIN 55			1	8	2	0	0	0	12
D	3	R PAIN 55			0	3	0	0	0	0	3
D	4	F PAIN 55			0	2	1	0	0	0	3
D	5	FMly RL PN NOW			0	4	0	0	0	0	4
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66			0	2	1	2	0	0	5
D	7	OUT OF PN 5			1	5	3	0	1	0	10
D	8	FMly ANGRY			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY			0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D Total					4	26	7	2	1	0	41
		D-Pain:			4	26	7	2	1	0	1
		Pain/ Effort:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS			0	0	0	0	0	3	0
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE			0	0	0	0	1	2	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD			0	0	0	0	2	0	0
P	4	Death PAINFUL			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total					0	0	0	0	3	5	0
		P-Pain:			0	0	0	0	3	5	0
		Humanity:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37			0	0	0	1	0	0	1
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21			0	4	0	0	0	0	4
D	3	LESS HUM 22			0	0	1	0	0	0	1
D	4	OP=MUT 11			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	ND TO CONSENT			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6			0	7	0	0	0	0	7
D Total					0	11	1	1	0	0	13
		D-Humanity:			0	11	1	1	0	0	0
		Humanity:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E			0	0	1	0	0	0	1
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME			0	0	0	2	0	0	2
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES			0	0	1	0	0	0	2
P	4	T LOVABLE			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM			0	0	2	0	0	0	4
P Total					0	0	4	2	0	0	9
		P-Humanity:			0	0	4	2	0	0	3
		Character:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMly KNW 25			0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D	2	RL CONF 9			0	1	1	0	1	0	3
D	3	RL LVD TL 7			0	2	1	0	0	0	3
D	4	RL Emot 7B			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F			0	1	1	0	0	0	2
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14			1	1	0	0	0	0	2
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	8	RL NO THRT 17			1	3	0	0	0	0	0

D	9	RL GD 13	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	12	DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	6
D Total			10	17	3	0	1	0	0	31
D-Character:			10	17	3	0	1	0	0	
Character:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
P	5	lied 1st	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	6
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	3	3	0	0	1	7	14
P-Character:			0	3	3	0	0	1	7	
V Popularity:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	10
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	POP 18	4	14	2	0	1	0	0	21
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	3	5	1	0	1	0	0	10
D Total			13	27	3	0	2	0	0	45
D-POP			13	27	3	0	2	0	0	
Leads To:										
VI Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	4
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	18
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			4	18	9	0	1	0	0	32
D-Mercy:			4	18	9	0	1	0	0	
Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cnnt comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	3	0	3	0	1	1	8
P total			0	3	0	3	0	1	1	8
P-Mercy:			0	3	0	3	0	1	1	
VII Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
D	2	God will judge 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	9	10	2	0	1	0	0	22
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	7	DIDNT DO ANYTHING WRNG	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			11	35	2	0	1	0	0	49
D-Sentencing:			11	35	2	0	1	0	0	
Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	4
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	2	0	0	9	0	1	12
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
P Total			0	3	0	0	14	0	3	20
P-Sentencing:			0	3	0	0	14	0	3	345

D	11	RLnt concned abt self	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	12	DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
D Total			18	18	1	0	1	0	0	38
		D-Character:	18	18	1	0	1	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
P Total			0	1	1	0	0	0	10	12
		P-Character:	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	
V		Popularity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	POP 18	20	4	5	0	0	0	0	29
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	6
D Total			26	17	7	0	0	0	0	50
		D-POP	26	17	7	0	0	0	0	
		Leads To:								
VI		Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	11
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	12	5	3	0	0	0	0	20
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			18	17	4	0	0	0	0	39
		D-Mercy:	18	17	4	0	0	0	0	
		Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cnt comp	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	2	3	0	0	2	1	8
P Total			0	2	4	0	0	2	3	11
		P-Mercy:	0	2	4	0	0	2	3	
VII		Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	2	God will judge 12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	28
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	7	DIDNT DO ANYTHNG WRNG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			19	16	1	0	0	0	0	36
		D-Sentencing:	19	16	1	0	0	0	0	
		Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	2	7	0	0	3	1	13
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	6
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	3	9	0	0	8	3	23
		P-Sentencing:	0	3	9	0	0	8	3	395

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:	SP-2001							
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	2	LEG BLM 33	30	19	3	0	0	0	0	52
D	3	POL BLM	15	8	8	0	0	0	0	31
D	4	SOC BLM 30	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	22
D Total			63	38	11	0	3	0	0	115
D-External:			63	38	11	0	3	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	7
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	5	4	9
P-External:			0	0	0	0	0	5	4	
II		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	T PAIN 55	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	9
D	3	R PAIN 55	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	4	F PAIN 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	6	6	3	0	0	0	0	15
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFUL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
D Total			22	17	4	0	0	0	0	43
D-Pain:			22	17	4	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
P-Pain:			0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
III		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	3	LESS HUM 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	OP=MUT 11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	8
D Total			10	5	1	0	0	0	0	16
D-Humanity:			10	5	1	0	0	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
P-Humanity:			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
IV		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	2	RL CONF 9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	12
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	9	RL GD 13	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	12	DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
D Total			18	18	1	0	1	0	0	38
D-Character:			18	18	1	0	1	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
P Total			0	1	1	0	0	0	10	12
P-Character:			0	1	1	0	0	0	10	
		Popularity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	POP 18	20	4	5	0	0	0	0	29
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	6
D Total			26	17	7	0	0	0	0	50
D-POP			26	17	7	0	0	0	0	
Leads To:										
		Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	11
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	12	5	3	0	0	0	0	20
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			18	17	4	0	0	0	0	39
D-Mercy:			18	17	4	0	0	0	0	
		Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cntnt comp	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	2	3	0	0	2	1	8
P Total			0	2	4	0	0	2	3	11
P-Mercy:			0	2	4	0	0	2	3	
		Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	2	God will judge 12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	28
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	7	DIDNT DO ANYTHNG WRNG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			19	16	1	0	0	0	0	38
D-Sentencing:			19	16	1	0	0	0	0	
		Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	2	7	0	0	3	1	13
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	6
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	3	9	0	0	8	3	23
P-Sentencing:			0	3	9	0	0	8	3	395

ST-OUT	TS-1994	Newspaper Coverage:							
Nom I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D 1	MED BLM 3A	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D 2	LEG BLM 33	3	18	2	0	0	1	0	24
D 3	POL BLM	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	9
D 4	SOC BLM 30	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
D 5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D 6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	15
D Total		4	37	14	1	0	1	0	57
	D-External:	4	37	14	1	0	1	0	
	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P 1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P 2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
P 3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P Total		0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
	P-External:	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	
II	Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D 1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D 2	T PAIN 55	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	7
D 3	R PAIN 55	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D 4	F PAIN 55	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
D 5	FMLY RL PN NOW	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	7
D 6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
D 7	OUT OF PN 5	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
D 8	FMLY ANGRY	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
D 9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D Total		8	15	8	0	0	0	0	31
	D-Pain:	8	15	8	0	0	0	0	
	Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P 1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P 2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
P 3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P 4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total		0	0	0	0	0	11	0	11
	P-Pain:	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	
III	Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D 1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D 2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
D 3	LESS HUM 22	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	7
D 4	OP=MUT 11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D 5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	1	6	1	0	0	1	0	9
D 6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D 7	BTTR DD 6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D Total		7	13	5	0	0	1	0	26
	D-Humanity:	7	13	5	0	0	1	0	
	Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P 1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P 2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	8
P 3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
P 4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P 5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P 6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P 7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P Total		0	1	0	0	0	14	0	15
	P-Humanity:	0	1	0	0	0	14	0	
IV	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D 1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D 2	RL CONF 9	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	5
D 3	RL LVD TL 7	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	11
D 4	RL Emot 7B	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D 5	Fmly Gd 13F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D 6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	5
D 7	RL Strg Act 7C	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
D 8	RL NO THRT 17	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
D 9	RL GD 13	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	11

D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12	DN'T KNW WHT THROUGH	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D Total			12	28	3	0	0	2	0	45
D-Character:			12	28	3	0	0	2	0	
Character:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	5
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			1	0	0	0	0	5	0	6
P-Character:			1	0	0	0	0	5	0	
V Popularity:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	Family Sup 18F	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	15
D	4	POP 18	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			8	19	1	0	0	0	0	28
D-POP			8	19	1	0	0	0	0	
Leads To:										
VI Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	14
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	6
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	0	9	5	0	0	2	0	16
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	0	6	5	0	0	3	0	14
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			2	31	11	0	0	6	0	50
D-Mercy:			2	31	11	0	0	6	0	
Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cnnt comp	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC'	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P Total			0	4	0	0	0	4	0	8
P-Mercy:			0	4	0	0	0	4	0	
VII Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
D	2	God will judge 12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	9
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	7	DIDN'T DO ANYTHNG WRNG	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			8	15	4	0	0	0	0	27
D-Sentencing:			8	15	4	0	0	0	0	
Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	7
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	5
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
P Total			0	8	4	0	0	6	0	18
P-Sentencing:			0	8	4	0	0	6	0	326

ST-OUT	TS-1997									
Nom	I	Newspaper Coverage: External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	6
D	2	LEG BLM 33	4	1	3	0	1	0	0	9
D	3	POL BLM	1	9	1	1	1	0	0	13
D	4	SOC BLM 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			6	15	4	1	3	0	0	29
		D-External:	6	15	4	1	3	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
P Total			0	0	0	1	1	3	0	5
		P-External:	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	
	II	Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	T PAIN 55	6	6	4	5	1	0	0	22
D	3	R PAIN 55	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
D	4	F PAIN 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	12
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	5
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	9
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
D Total			14	16	13	11	1	0	0	55
		D-Pain:	14	16	13	11	1	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	5
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	1	3	2	0	0	6
		P-Pain:	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	
	III	Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	1	3	1	2	1	0	0	8
D	3	LESS HUM 22	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	5
D	4	OP=MUT 11	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
D Total			7	6	3	3	4	0	0	23
		D-Humanity:	7	6	3	3	4	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	5	4	2	3	0	14
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	4
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
P Total			0	1	5	5	6	3	0	20
		P-Humanity:	0	1	5	5	6	3	0	
	IV	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	RL CONF 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	RL Emot 7B	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	RL GD 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12	DN'T KNW WHT THROUGH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D Total			4	5	1	1	1	0	0	12
D-Character:			4	5	1	1	1	0	0	
Character:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	3	1	1	0	0	5
P-Character:			0	0	3	1	1	0	0	
V Popularity:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
D	4	POP 18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
D Total			7	4	0	1	0	0	0	12
D-POP			7	4	0	1	0	0	0	
Leads To:										
VI Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	2	EUTH MK DEBATE	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	4
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	0	11	5	0	0	0	0	16
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D Total			1	18	10	0	1	0	0	30
D-Mercy:			1	18	10	0	1	0	0	
Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cnnt comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
P Total			0	0	1	1	0	2	0	4
P-Mercy:			0	0	1	1	0	2	0	
VII Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	7
D	2	God will judge 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
D	7	DIDN'T DO ANYTHNG WRNG	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D Total			11	4	8	0	1	0	0	24
D-Sentencing:			11	4	8	0	1	0	0	
Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	0	1	4	3	2	0	10
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	5
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
P Total			0	5	2	4	4	5	0	20
P-Sentencing:			0	5	2	4	4	5	0	245

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:		TS-2001															
Nom I		External Blame/ Responsibility:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs								
D	1	MED BLM 3A		0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3							
D	2	LEG BLM 33		6	6	2	0	0	3	0	0	17							
D	3	POL BLM		2	24	0	0	0	4	0	1	31							
D	4	SOC BLM 30		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3							
D	5	MED SOL 3B		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88		3	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	13							
D Total				11	39	4	2	9	0	2	67								
D-External:				11	39	4	2	9	0	2									
		External Blame/ Responsibility:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs								
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2								
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
P	3	SOC devlues dis		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4								
P Total				0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6								
P-External:				0	0	0	0	0	2	4									
II		Pain/ Effort:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs								
D	1	PNLSS D 8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
D	2	T PAIN 55		5	0	0	0	2	0	1	8								
D	3	R PAIN 55		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2								
D	4	F PAIN 55		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1								
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW		3	1	3	0	0	0	0	7								
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66		7	2	0	0	0	0	0	9								
D	7	OUT OF PN 5		2	5	0	1	2	0	0	10								
D	8	FMLY ANGRY		0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2								
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
D Total				18	8	3	1	5	0	4	39								
D-Pain:				18	8	3	1	5	0	4									
		Pain/ Effort:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs								
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3								
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2								
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD		0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2								
P	4	Death PAINFUL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
P Total				0	1	0	0	1	1	4	7								
P-Pain:				0	1	0	0	1	1	4									
III		Humanity:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs								
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37		0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2								
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2								
D	3	LESS HUM 22		1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3								
D	4	OP=MUT 11		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1								
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL		1	2	0	1	1	0	0	5								
D	6	ND TO CONSENT		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
D	7	BTTR DD 6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
D Total				3	3	2	1	3	1	0	13								
D-Humanity:				3	3	2	1	3	1	0									
		Humanity:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs								
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1								
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME		0	0	0	0	1	6	2	9								
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES		0	0	0	0	3	4	2	9								
P	4	T LOVABLE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2								
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM		0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5								
P Total				0	0	0	0	6	12	8	26								
P-Humanity:				0	0	0	0	6	12	8									
IV		Character:		D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs								
D	1	FMLY KNW 25		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1								
D	2	RL CONF 9		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1								
D	3	RL LVD TL 7		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1								
D	4	RL Emot 7B		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1								
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F		2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3								
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14		2	3	0	0	1	0	0	6								
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C		0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2								
D	8	RL NO THRT 17		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2								

D	9	RL GD 13	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	5
D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12	DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	5
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
D Total			5	8	2	0	12	1	1	29
D-Character:			5	8	2	0	12	1	1	
Character:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	5
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	4	3	10	17
P-Character:			0	0	0	0	4	3	10	
V Popularity:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	4
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	POP 18	8	13	1	0	3	0	0	25
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	7
D Total			12	17	1	1	5	0	0	36
D-POP			12	17	1	1	5	0	0	
Leads To:										
VI Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	9
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	5
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	3	5	1	0	1	0	0	10
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	1	4	1	0	5	0	0	11
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			7	19	2	0	7	0	0	35
D-Mercy:			7	19	2	0	7	0	0	
Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cnnt comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
P Total			0	0	0	0	2	4	2	8
P-Mercy:			0	0	0	0	2	4	2	
VII Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
D	2	God will judge 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	5
D	7	DIDN'T DO ANYTHNG WRNG	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			6	5	2	0	3	0	0	16
D-Sentencing:			6	5	2	0	3	0	0	
Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	7
P	2	PROTECTION =	1	0	1	0	4	5	4	15
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			1	1	5	0	6	7	8	28
P-Sentencing:			1	1	5	0	6	7	8	327

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:	VS-1994							
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	2	LEG BLM 33	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	16
D	3	POL BLM	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	4	SOC BLM 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
D Total			13	14	0	0	0	0	0	27
VS-94-ST-Out-D-External:			13	14	0	0	0	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-94-ST-Out-P-External:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	T PAIN 55	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	3	R PAIN 55	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	4	F PAIN 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			6	11	0	0	0	0	0	17
VS-94-ST-Out-D-Pain:			6	11	0	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARENTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-94-ST-Out-P-Pain:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	LESS HUM 22	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	4	OP=MUT 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
D	7	BTTR DD 6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D Total			3	6	0	0	0	0	1	10
VS-94-ST-Out-D-Humanity:			3	6	0	0	0	0	1	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-94-ST-Out-P-Humanity:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	RL CONF 9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	RL GD 13	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4

D	10 NICE COMM 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	11 RLnt concmed abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12 DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	13 RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14 PRC CNSNS 38	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D Total		7	16	0	0	0	0	0	23
	VS-94-ST-Out-D-Character:	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	
	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1 RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2 RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3 THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4 HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5 lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6 CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7 RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8 IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	VS-94-ST-Out-P-Character:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
V	Popularity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1 Comm Sup 18C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2 Police-JUDG Sup 18P	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3 Family Sup 18F	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4 POP 18	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	5 LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total		1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
	VS-94-ST-Out-D-POP	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	
	Leads To:								
	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
VI	Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1 ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	2 EUTH Mk DEBATE	2	5	0	0	1	0	0	8
D	3 COMP-MRCY 54	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	10
D	4 Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5 UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total		7	11	0	0	1	0	0	19
	VS-94-ST-Out-D-Mercy:	7	11	0	0	1	0	0	
	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1 EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cntnt comp	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	3
P	2 MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3 COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4 MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
P Total		0	2	0	0	1	2	0	5
	VS-94-ST-Out-P-Mercy:	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	
	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
VII	Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1 No Choice 6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2 God will judge 12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	3 SENT TOO SEV	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	7
D	4 MRDR MISTK	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	5 NT RISK TO VULN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6 KLD OUT OF LV	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	7 DIDNT DO ANYTHNG WRNG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	8 MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total		9	5	0	0	0	0	0	14
	VS-94-ST-Out-D-Sentencing:	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	
	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1 RL NO RHT 20	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4
P	2 PROTECTION =	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
P	3 ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4 RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5 SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6 DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total		0	3	0	0	0	3	0	6
	VS-94-ST-Out-P-Sentencing:	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	126

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:	VS-1997							
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	2	LEG BLM 33	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
D	3	POL BLM	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	8
D	4	SOC BLM 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
D Total			20	0	3	0	0	0	0	23
VS-97-ST-Out-D-External:			20	0	3	0	0	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-97-ST-Out-P-External:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	T PAIN 55	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	R PAIN 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	F PAIN 55	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			5	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
VS-97-ST-Out-D-Pain:			5	0	2	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-97-ST-Out-P-Pain:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	LESS HUM 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	OP=MUT 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-97-ST-Out-D-Humanity:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-97-ST-Out-P-Humanity:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	RL CONF 9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D	9	RL GD 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:	VS-2001							
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
D	2	LEG BLM 33	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
D	3	POL BLM	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	8
D	4	SOC BLM 30	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
D Total			8	25	0	0	0	0	0	33
VS-01-ST-Out-D-External:			8	25	0	0	0	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VS-01-ST-Out-D-P-External:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	2	T PAIN 55	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
D	3	R PAIN 55	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	F PAIN 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	6
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			5	14	0	0	0	1	0	20
VS-01-ST-Out-D-D-Pain:			5	14	0	0	0	1	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
VS-01-ST-Out-D-P-Pain:			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	3	LESS HUM 22	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	4	OP=MUT 11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D Total			5	4	0	0	0	1	0	10
VS-01-ST-Out-D-D-Humanity:			5	4	0	0	0	1	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
VS-01-ST-Out-D-P-Humanity:			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	RL CONF 9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	9	RL GD 13	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12	DN'T KNW WHT THROUGH	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D Total			8	10	1	0	0	0	0	19
VS-01-ST-Out-D-D-Character:			8	10	1	0	0	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTis
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
P	5	lied 1st	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4
VS-01-ST-Out-D-P-Character:			0	2	0	0	0	2	0	
		Popularity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTis
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	POP 18	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	9
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D Total			3	9	0	0	0	0	0	12
VS-01-ST-Out-D-D-POP			3	9	0	0	0	0	0	
Leads To:										
		Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTis
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			3	10	0	0	0	0	0	13
VS-01-ST-Out-D-D-Mercy:			3	10	0	0	0	0	0	
		Calls for Mercy:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTis
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cnnt comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
VS-01-ST-Out-D-P-Mercy:			0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
		Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTis
D	1	No Choice 6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	God will judge 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	7	DIDNT DO ANYTHNG WRNG	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			7	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
VS-01-ST-Out-D-D-Sentencing:			7	3	0	0	0	0	0	
		Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTis
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			1	2	0	0	0	2	5	10
VS-01-ST-Out-D-P-Sentencing:			1	2	0	0	0	2	5	141

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:	CH-1994							
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	2	LEG BLM 33	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	3	POL BLM	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
D	4	SOC BLM 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			0	10	1	0	1	0	0	12
CH-94-ST-Out-D-External:			0	10	1	0	1	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CH-94-ST-Out-P-External:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	T PAIN 55	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
D	3	R PAIN 55	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	4	F PAIN 55	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	5
D Total			0	17	2	0	1	0	0	20
CH-94-ST-Out-D-Pain:			0	17	2	0	1	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CH-94-ST-Out-P-Pain:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	LESS HUM 22	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
D	4	OP=MUT 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D Total			0	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
CH-94-ST-Out-D-Humanity:			0	3	5	0	0	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CH-94-ST-Out-P-Humanity:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	RL CONF 9	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

D	9	RL GD 13	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12	DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D Total			0	8	4	0	2	0	0	14
CH-94-ST-Out-D-Character:			0	8	4	0	2	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
CH-94-ST-Out-P-Character:			0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
V	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3
D	4	POP 18	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	7
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
D Total			0	10	4	0	2	0	0	16
CH-94-ST-Out-D-POP			0	10	4	0	2	0	0	
Leads To:										
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	8
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	0	10	0	0	2	0	0	12
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	11
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			0	24	4	0	3	0	0	31
CH-94-ST-Out-D-Mercy:			0	24	4	0	3	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cnnt comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
P Total			0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
CH-94-ST-Out-P-Mercy:			0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	God will judge 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	DIDNT DO ANYTHNG WRNG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
CH-94-ST-Out-D-Sentencing:			0	2	0	0	0	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
CH-94-ST-Out-P-Sentencing:			0	0	0	0	1	0	0	107

ST-OUT		Newspaper Coverage:	CH-1997							
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	MED BLM 3A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	LEG BLM 33	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	11
D	3	POL BLM	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
D	4	SOC BLM 30	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Totals			4	9	3	0	0	0	0	16
CH-97-ST-Out-D-External:			4	9	3	0	0	0	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
CH-97-ST-Out-P-External:			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	T PAIN 55	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	4
D	3	R PAIN 55	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	F PAIN 55	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			4	3	0	0	2	0	0	9
CH-97-ST-Out-D-Pain:			4	3	0	0	2	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
CH-97-ST-Out-P-Pain:			0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	3	LESS HUM 22	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	7
D	4	OP=MUT 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			5	2	1	0	1	0	0	9
CH-97-ST-Out-D-Humanity:			5	2	1	0	1	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CH-97-ST-Out-P-Humanity:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	RL CONF 9	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	RL GD 13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

D	10	NICE COMM 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	11	RLnt concerned abt self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	12	DNT KNW WHT THROUGH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	13	RL WL adjusted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	14	PRC CNSNS 38	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
D Total			6	3	0	0	0	0	0	9
CH-97-ST-Out-D-Character:			6	3	0	0	0	0	0	
Character:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NT EMOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	RL SLF INT 16E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	THT SHOOT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	HD OTHR OPTIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	lied 1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	CRFLY PLANED MRDER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	RL'S med fears motive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	8	IF LVED wouldn't hve killed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CH-97-ST-Out-P-Character:			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Popularity:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	Comm Sup 18C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	Police-JUDG Sup 18P	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	Family Sup 18F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	4	POP 18	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	5	LN PRO-DIS 4 (a minority)	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	7
D Total			1	6	0	0	2	0	0	9
CH-97-ST-Out-D-POP			1	6	0	0	2	0	0	
Leads To:										
Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	ND LGL-SOCL MERCY 54C	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	2	EUTH Mk DEBATE	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
D	3	COMP-MRCY 54	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
D	4	Nd 3rd Deg FLEX SENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	UNETHICAL KP ALIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			3	7	1	0	0	0	0	11
CH-97-ST-Out-D-Mercy:			3	7	1	0	0	0	0	
Calls for Mercy:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	EUTH DBT NOT CLEMENCY cntnt comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	2	MRCY-VCTM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	COMP-MRCY MISGUIDED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	MURD NT ASST SUIC 54B OR LVE MRC	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
CH-97-ST-Out-P-Mercy:			0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
D	1	No Choice 6B	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	2	God will judge 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	SENT TOO SEV	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	4	MRDR MISTK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	NT RISK TO VULN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	KLD OUT OF LV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	DIDNT DO ANYTHNG WRNG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	8	MRDR = PROTECTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
CH-97-ST-Out-D-Sentencing:			2	2	0	0	0	0	0	
Sentencing/Guilt/ Innocence:			D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTIs
P	1	RL NO RHT 20	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
P	2	PROTECTION =	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P	3	ALRDY LEN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	RHT TO LIFE-ALL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	SENT NT TOO SEVERE	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
P	6	DNT NEED LEGAL CHNGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	4	6	0	10
CH-97-ST-Out-P-Sentencing:			0	0	0	0	4	6	0	84

ST-OUT	Newspaper Coverage:	CH-2001								
Nom	I	External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTI
D	1	MED BLM 3A	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
D	2	LEG BLM 33	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	16
D	3	POL BLM	1	11	4	0	0	0	0	16
D	4	SOC BLM 30	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
D	5	MED SOL 3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	OTHR PRV DCS, MRDRS 88	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	10
D Total			10	25	12	0	0	1	0	48
		CH-01-ST-Out-D-External:	10	25	12	0	0	1	0	
		External Blame/ Responsibility:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTI
P	1	MEDIA DEHUM 22E	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
P	2	CNNT COMPARE CASES	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	3	SOC devlues dis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
		CH-01-ST-Out-P-External:	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
	II	Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTI
D	1	PNLSS D 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	T PAIN 55	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
D	3	R PAIN 55	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	F PAIN 55	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	5	FMLY RL PN NOW	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	9
D	6	PAIN NOT DIS 66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	OUT OF PN 5	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
D	8	FMLY ANGRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	9	PNFULL/TRGC/EMOT DEBATE-STRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D Total			8	10	3	0	0	0	0	21
		CH-01-ST-Out-D-Pain:	8	10	3	0	0	0	0	
		Pain/ Effort:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTI
P	1	DIS NOT PN 56/ NOT PAIN, DIS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
P	2	PAIN RELATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	PARNTS OF & DIS ANGRY SCRD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P		Death PAINFUL	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
P Total			0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
		CH-01-ST-Out-P-Pain:	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
	III	Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTI
D	1	ANI-VEG COMP 37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	LIFE DET OR NOT IMP 21	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D	3	LESS HUM 22	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
D	4	OP=MUT 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	5	COUDNT EXPRESS WILL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	6	ND TO CONSENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	BTTR DD 6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
D Total			0	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
		CH-01-ST-Out-D-Humanity:	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	
		Humanity:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTI
P	1	NOT PRED D 21E	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
P	2	OTHER DIS OK OR SAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	3	T HAPPY HAD PLEASURES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	4	T LOVABLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	5	ND TO BRNG ABILITY OUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	6	TL HAD FNCTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	7	NOT LESS THN HUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Total			0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
		CH-01-ST-Out-P-Humanity:	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
	IV	Character:	D-3	D-2	D-1	B	P-1	P-2	P-3	TTI
D	1	FMLY KNW 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	2	RL CONF 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	3	RL LVD TL 7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	4	RL Emot 7B	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	5	Fmly Gd 13F	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	6	RL NT CLD MURD 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	7	RL Strg Act 7C	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
D	8	RL NO THRT 17	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
D	9	RL GD 13	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4

Actual and Normal Distribution of Newspaper Positions-1994, F,S,R
Ratios: CH-12:1, SP-5.8:1, VS-5:1, TS-11:1

Position of Editorials and Columns-1994
 Ratios: CH-1:0, SP-6:1, VS-2:0, TS-2:0

Position of Letters, 1994
 Ratios: CH-0, SP-1:1, VS-5:1, TS-4.1:1

Actual and Normal Distribution of Newspaper Positions-1997, F,S,R
 Ratios: CH-13:1, SP-6.5:1, VS-8:0, TS-5:1

Position of Editorials and Columns-1997
Ratios: CH-2:0, SP-6:0, VS-0, TS-2:0

Positions of Letters-1997
 Ratios: CH-.5:1, SP-8:1, VS-1:1, TS-.5:1

133

Actual and Normal Distribution of Newspaper Positions-2001, F,S,R
 Ratios: CH-7:0, SP-15:0, VS-2:1, TS-2:1

134

Position of Editorials and Columns-2001, F,S,R
 Ratios: CH-1:0, SP-4:0, VS-3:0, TS-1:1

Position of Letters-2001
Ratios: CH-5:1, SP-2.4:1, VS-1.3:1, TS-1:1

136

Number