Butler University
Digital Commons @ Butler University

Scholarship and Professional Work - Communication

College of Communication

2009

Commemorating the Kent State Tragedy Through Victims' Trauma in Television News Coverage, 1990 - 2000.

Kristen Hoerl
Butler University, khoerl@butler.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/ccom_papers

Part of the Communication Commons

Recommended Citation
Hoerl, K.E. (2009) Commemorating the Kent State tragedy through victims' trauma in television news coverage, 1990-2000. The Communication Review, 12(2), pp. 107-131. Available from digitalcommons.butler.edu/ccom_papers/19/

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Communication at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarship and Professional Work - Communication by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact fgaede@butler.edu.

Commemorating the Kent State Tragedy through Victims' Trauma in Television News Coverage, 1990-2000

Kristen E. Hoerl, Assistant Professor
Department of Communication and Journalism
212C Tichenor Hall, Auburn University
Auburn AL 36849-5211
(334) 844-2768 ─ phone
(512) 796-3510 ─ cell
(334) 844-4573 ─ fax
hoerlke@auburn.edu
Ph.D. University of Texas, Austin

An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the National Communication Association, Miami, Florida, November 2003.

Abstract

On May 4, 1970, the Ohio National Guard fired into a crowd at Kent State University and killed four students. This essay critically interprets mainstream television journalism that commemorated the shootings in the past eighteen years. Throughout this coverage, predominant framing devices depoliticized the Kent State tragedy by characterizing both former students and guard members as trauma victims. The emphasis on eyewitnesses as victims provided the basis for a therapeutic frame that promoted reconciliation as a rationale for commemorating the shootings. This dominant news frame tacitly advanced a model of commemorative journalism at the expense of articulating political critique, thus deflecting attention from public controversy over how citizens should respond to tragedies that occur when state agencies repress contentious dissent.

Keywords: journalistic memory, victim politics, dissent, news frames, Kent State, National Guard

Commemorating the Kent State Tragedy through Victims' Trauma in Television News Coverage, 1990-2000

After May 4, 1970, Kent State University became shorthand for tragedy caused by dissent over the Vietnam War. The tragedy occurred on the heels of protests against the United States' invasion of Cambodia. On the weekend Nixon announced the invasion, Kent State University's ROTC building mysteriously burned down, prompting the state's governor John Rhodes to call in the Ohio National Guard to enforce martial law on the campus. Tensions mounted between students and the National Guard throughout the weekend. That Monday, students gathered in the commons area in spite of the guard's order to disperse. People joined to protest the war and the guard's presence; others stood by out of curiosity. After efforts to break up the crowd failed, several members of the guard simultaneously lowered their rifles, fired into the crowd, and killed students Allison Krause, Jeffrey Miller, Sandra Scheuer, William Schroeder. The shootings injured nine other students, including Dean Kahler who was paralyzed from the waist down.

Although the Kent State shootings occurred over thirty years ago, they have been a haunting presence in public memory of social protest in the United States. A VHI documentary declared that the shootings signaled a "divided nation hurdl[ing] toward civil breakdown" (Kaniewski, 2000). This documentary framed protest as an instigator and embodiment of the social fragmentation that, according to the film, marred the United States during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Writing for the *Washington Post* in 1990, Haynes Johnson (1990) wrote that the events "signaled the end of student activism and involvement and the beginning of a new era of individualism" (p. A2.). Rather than invite renewed public support for student activism, the Kent State shootings have come to signify

a youthful populace withdrawn from political life and a public culture disinterested in rallying for social causes.

Continued attention to the Kent State tragedy suggests that the shootings offer a vivid example of what some scholars refer to as “flashbulb memories,” or individual events with sharp political or emotional impact beyond the people who experienced them first hand (Schudson, 1992; Zelizer, 1992b; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 2003; Edy, 2006). Further, commentaries about the shootings as heralding social fragmentation and private life over an engaged citizenry articulate the memory of Kent State as a public trauma. As Zelizer (2002) explains, public traumas constitute events that “rattle default notions of what it means morally to remain members of a collective” (p. 698). The shootings’ status as a public trauma was established, in no small part, through press circulation of John Filo’s Pulitzer Prize winning photograph of fourteen-year-old Mary Ann Vecchio kneeling in horror before the slain body of Jeffrey Miller moments after the shootings ended (Hariman and Lucaites, 2001). Thus, the news media played a central role in bringing the shootings to national prominence.

Although interest in the Kent State shootings continues, knowledge about events leading up to the shootings remain uncertain and contested. The shootings represented a rare instance in which the militia was deployed against American citizens. In 1970, a Gallup poll indicated that 58% of the public held the students accountable for the shootings, while only 11% faulted the Guardsmen. This statistic prompted Kent State researcher William Gordon (1995) to describe the shootings as “the most popular murders ever committed in the United States” (p. 19). Public support for the National Guard may be understood in the context of news media coverage of the student uprisings and campus

takeovers that occurred on many college and university campuses including Columbia University, the University of California at Berkeley, Yale University, and the University of Wisconsin. As Gitlin (1980) explains, televised images of student protests amplified themes of unruly student disorder and tended to background activists' rational appeals for social justice and an end to the university's complicity in the Vietnam War. Such coverage contributed to a cultural climate that regarded student activism as violent and that heightened expectations that tensions on campus might escalate. This statistic may also be explained by a common but false assumption at the time that the shooting victims were all anti-Vietnam War activists. Actually, William Schroeder and Sandra Scheuer were not there to protest the war or the Guard's presence on campus.

Television news media coverage at the time debated whether attacks at Kent State were justified or not, noting a since discredited rumor that a student sniper instigated the shootings, as well as the notion that students had threatened the guards with potentially lethal rocks (Casale and Paskoff, 1971, p. 12). This early coverage contrasted with the findings of multiple investigations that followed. In October of 1970, the President's Commission on Campus Unrest (otherwise known as the Scranton Commission) concluded that the shootings were "unnecessary, unwarranted, and inexcusable" (Casale and Pascoff, 1971, p. 166). In the following decade, multiple investigations, a state grand jury report, and two civil trials sought to uncover evidence of individuals responsible for the shootings (Gordon, 1995). Despite these investigations, no conclusive evidence showed that anyone directed members of the National Guard to shoot at students; however, some have argued that evidence strongly indicates an order had been given (Davies, 1973; Gordon, 1995; Maag, 2007).

In this essay, I interrogate the cultural significance that television news coverage attributed to the Kent State shootings in the past twenty years. An analysis of this coverage explains how television journalism has encouraged audiences to understand the significance of the shootings in a post-Watergate Era. Controversy over the memory of Kent State is embedded within broader public discourse over the United States' role in Vietnam. Despite national disagreements over the war at the time, foreign policy experts and national media have since characterized the Vietnam War as tragically flawed (McNamara & VanDeMark, 1996). Evidence of the FBI's covert operations to discredit leftist activist movements and the Watergate scandal after the war's end also challenged the public's faith in the credibility of the Presidential office and the justice of the political system (Cunningham, 2004; Schudson, 1992). This analysis offers insights into the ways in which broadcast news media have portrayed this contentious moment of political crisis after broader political controversy surrounding that crisis abated. Television news coverage of contentious and traumatic events from our recent history has relevance to contemporary civic life. By ascribing meaning to this event, such coverage functions rhetorically and ideologically as public resources for understanding what constitutes legitimate and viable forms of civic engagement within a liberal democracy.

Public memory and the politics of commemoration

By attributing meaning to the Kent State shootings some 20 to 30 years after the tragedy, television news reports comprise what Nora (1989) refers to as "*les lieux de memoire*" or sites of memory. Sites of memory provide resources for shared understanding about the relevance and meaning of past events for contemporary public life. Scholars across multiple disciplines including media, rhetoric, and American studies have explained how

public, collective, or social memories are instantiated by a variety of cultural forms including commemorative structures (Blair, Jeppeson, and Pucci, 1991; Sturken, 1997; Blair and Michel, 2000; Bodnar, 1992), speeches (Browne 1993, 1999), museums (Gallagher, 1999; Katriel, 1997), photographs (Zelizer, 1998), literature (Lipsitz, 1990) and films (Sturken, 1997; Biesecker, 2002; Hoerl, 2007; Hasian 2001).[2] Far from representing an objective past, public memories are rhetorical and ideological expressions of cultural knowledge about the past. On the one hand, public memories emerge out of struggles between groups with different investments in how the past is remembered. As Gillis (1994) writes, "commemorative activity . . . is by definition social and political, for it involves the coordination of individual and group memories, whose results may appear consensual when they are in fact the product of processes of intense contest, struggle, and in some instances, annihilation" (p. 5). On the other hand, widely shared understandings of the past also have bearing on contemporary political formations. For example, Biesecker (2002) explains that recent public commemorations of World War II, provide "civics lessons" that call for national unity among "a generation beset by fractious disagreements about the viability of U.S. culture and identity" (p. 394). Foucault (1975) put it poignantly when he noted that "if one controls people's memory, one controls their dynamism" (p. 25).

Although several scholars have attended to the politics of memory, little scholarship has attended to journalism's role in giving meaning to the past (Zelizer, 2008). In this essay, I refer to meanings about the past advanced through news media as journalistic memory. Extant research suggests that news media frequently reference the past to make sense of current events (Lang & Lang, 1989) and that such references shape how a community relates to its past (Edy, 1999). In an early extended study of collective

memory and the press, Zelizer (1992a) explains how journalists established their authority over the past through their coverage of President Kennedy's assassination. In an analysis of journalistic memory of the Watergate scandal, Schudson (1992) concludes that people reconstruct the past, but only under a series of constraints; thus, the past leaves "a scar" that cannot be completely covered (p. 218).

More recently, Edy (2006) has argued that journalistic memory of two social crises from the Sixties in the U.S. (the 1965 Watts riots and the 1968 Chicago Democratic National Convention) crafted meaningful narratives from the fragmented news initially reported by the press. For this scholar, journalists' struggle for a good story is the driving principle for the patterns of messages that attribute meaning to historic social crises. Edy explains that power relations take a backseat in journalistic constructions of the past because journalistic memory cedes greater authority to eyewitness testimony than public officials. "Over time, the power of reporters and average citizens to narrate the past begins to increase even as the power of individual public officials begins to fade" (p. 8). Edy works from Schudson's (1992) observation that the past enables multiple voices to give meaning to the past; thus, "an all-powerful monolithic version of the past will not triumph in a pluralistic society where conflicting views have a good chance of emerging, finding an audience and surviving" (p. 208).

Despite the presentation of multiple and competing voices, journalistic constructions of the past do not necessarily include critical insights about the influence of power relations on historic social conflicts and traumatic political events. As Gitlin (2003/1980) notes, individuals quoted by the press have limited control over how media frame what they say or what they do (p. 3). Indeed, eyewitness testimony routinely deflects

attention from the failures of liberal democracy. Schudson notes that the persistence of conflicting interpretations of the Watergate scandal obscured broader implications of democratic failure, particularly with regard to executive abuses of power in Vietnam. Similarly, Edy observes that the emerging stories of the Watts riots and the 1968 democratic convention overlooked injustices of police misconduct and the limits of American democracy.

Differences across journalistic media coverage of traumatic public events indicate that journalistic memory is not universal, nor can it be contained in any particular text. Instead, different media sources and channels play a contributing role in the processes of public memory formation. However, critical observations also suggest that media interact in patterned ways to make particular issues and observations about the past more salient than others. This analysis develops further understanding of the political and ideological implications of journalistic memories that cede authority to conflicting eyewitness testimony. I contend that several television news reports of the Kent State shootings crafted a coherent narrative account of the tragedy through selective presentation of quotes from survivors and witnesses. This selective use of these quotes points to the ways in which television news media, as a distinct mode of journalistic memory, has contributed to a conservative political understanding of a contentious and traumatic historic event.

Framing Devices in Commemorative Journalism

To elaborate on this point, I conducted a Lexis-Nexis search of television news coverage of the Kent State shootings after 1990, reasoning that coverage after that date would represent efforts to commemorate, rather than present new information about the tragedy.[3] Television news media commemorations to the tragedy coincided with Kent State

University's renewed attention to the memory of the event. In 1990, Kent State erected its first memorial.[4] Five years later, the nine wounded students who survived reunited on campus for the first time since 1970. In 1999, at the urging of relatives of the four students who died in the shootings, the university erected individual memorials for each of the students located on the on the spots where they were killed. I examine television news coverage of commemorations to the shootings, instead of print news coverage, to explore those media texts likely to reach nation-wide audiences; further, television news media provided a more consistent pattern of coverage. Thus, television newscasts comprised those messages what were reinforced broadly in popular culture for audiences and offered a common framework for shared meaning of the Kent State shootings.

Working from Edy's (1999) typology, I identified 23 of the newscasts referencing the Kent State shootings in the Lexis-Nexis database as commemorative texts. Edy (1999) explains that commemorative or "anniversary" journalism foregrounds a past event as worthy of remembrance on its own merits, making "the past live for the audience" rather than provide context for understanding more contemporary events (p. 75). In contrast to other reports that only referenced the Kent State shootings in coverage of a related topic, the texts that I interpret in this study framed remembrance of the shootings as a newsworthy subject unto itself and described the circumstances surrounding the shootings in at least 400 words.[5]

Among these texts, I observed a narrative pattern that ran across a majority of available commemorative news reports, including three half-hour segments about the shootings on evening news programs ABC's *Nightline* in 1990, ABC's *Day One* in 1995, and NBC's *Dateline* in 1998. Additionally, an hour long CNN discussion program

Talkback Live focused on individuals' recollections of events surrounding the shootings in 2000. Seven additional programs shared a similar narrative framework for making meaning of the tragedy, comprising sixty-five percent of the total television coverage of the shooting. While divergent media coverage suggests that mainstream broadcast news coverage of the shootings was by no means monolithic or universal, that a majority of news programs were similar indicates a trend within mainstream news media coverage that created a predominant message about Kent State's significance for public memory. (The salience of this pattern as a central framework for public memory of the shootings is underscored by the lack of similar themes or narrative patterns among the other twelve television reports commemorating the shootings. These reports featured a range of topics including John Filo's photograph, photograph subject Mary Ann Vecchio's more recent recollections of the shootings, and contemporary Kent State students' thoughts about the role of campus dissent since 1970. These more unique reports were between five and fifteen minutes in length, and most frequently aired on cable news network CNN.) The proceeding interpretation merits critical attention, not because it is the only interpretation available, but because this particular framework for understanding the shootings has important implications for democratic public life. The news frame identified here is persistent, widely available for public consumption, and (as I elaborate below) potentially harmful for democratic forms of civic engagement. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the news transcripts I examined, the networks they aired on, the time of day they aired, and the number of words used in each transcript.

INSERT TABLE 1

My approach to analyzing commemorative coverage of the Kent State shootings is informed by scholarship on media frames and narrative analysis of journalism texts. A number of scholars have demonstrated how media frames can have important implications for public attitudes and perceptions of troubling events (Goffman, 1974; Tuchman, 1978; Gitlin, 2003/1980; Entman, 1993; Reese, Gandy & Grant, 2001). While diverse scholars have studied framing from a variety of perspectives (see Reese, Gandy & Grant, 2001), I follow an interpretive and critical approach to the study of framing processes to attend to the ideological character of commemorative television journalism. In his analysis of mainstream press coverage of the student New Left during the Vietnam conflict, Gitlin (2003/1980) theorizes news frames as particular principles of selection, emphasis, and exclusion that organize discourse for news audiences through "persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation" (p. 7). Such patterns tacitly ascribe meaning to coverage by foregrounding particular aspects of a news event and backgrounding others. The ideological and cultural function of news coverage may also be understood by looking at news texts in terms of their narrative structure. Television news features that follow a format of introduction, rising action, crisis, falling action, and conclusion construct news in narrative form, thereby privileging particular readings of current events over others (Collins and Clark 1992).[6] By organizing and selecting material as a story, narrative patterns provide overarching structures that reinforce the coherence of framing devices.

As several scholars have noted, the framing function of news media is less a product of individual consciousness or the strategies of particular reporters or editors than of the broader cultural and institutional terrain within which journalism professionals craft their reports (Tuchman, 1978; Gitlin, 1980; Hall, 1981). Herman and Chomsky (2002)

describe how a variety of structuring forces ─including pressure from advertisers and standard newsgathering routines─ interact and reinforce one another to create conditions for the kinds of messages that are circulated as legitimate news in the mainstream press. In this paper I attend specifically to the ideological work that is accomplished through the news convention of juxtaposing contrasting viewpoints. According to Tuchman (1971/1972), the journalistic presentation of conflicting truth claims is one of several "strategic rituals" of objectivity by which news workers operate. From this perspective, ideological news frames routinely emerge through the rules of impartial news reporting, not by a lapse or departure from them.

Remembering public trauma through eyewitnesses' accounts

Television news coverage commemorating the shootings at Kent State followed a conventional structure in which reporters' "voice of God" narration style is supplemented by commentary by from two groups of people who held conflicting accounts. These news segments organized reports around the recollections of individuals who directly witnessed or experienced events that day. Eyewitnesses frequently included John Filo (who took the famous photograph that day), Mary Ann Vecchio (the subject of the photograph), former Kent State students who witnessed or were injured in the shootings, professors who were on campus the day of the shooting; and former National Guard members. Quotes taken from reporters' interviews with these eyewitnesses provided details of their own personal experiences at the shooting scene while reporters' voice-over narration lent coherence to these accounts for the overall structure of the report. Coverage routinely juxtaposed the recollections of former students who protested the National Guard's presence on campus with those of former National Guard members who witnessed fellow guardsmen shooting

at students on campus, thus framing the event as a political controversy with eyewitnesses positioned as the central people embroiled in the conflict. Public and school officials are absent from this coverage, with the exception of former guard officers including Colonel Charles Fassinger who is introduced ─not as speaking in an official capacity─ but as an eyewitness to the violence that took place on the Kent State campus that day. Thus, reports authorized these eyewitnesses as spokespersons for events surrounding the shootings. By foregrounding these individuals as spokespersons, television reports also accorded to them authority to establish the public memory of the Kent State tragedy.

Belligerent student protest as a context for the Kent State shootings

While coverage revolved around eyewitnesses' memories, reports also placed events at Kent State in the context of volatile protest movements against the Vietnam War. *Day One*'s report stated that Nixon's announcement of the invasion of Cambodia "was a thunderbolt on college campuses across America." On the twentieth anniversary of the shootings, Ted Koppel began *Nightline's* report by stating that national divisions over the war cut "like a jagged wound" throughout recent American history. The latter program devoted half of its thirty minute report to contextualizing the shootings within the history of increasing radicalism in the United States during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Referencing movements for black empowerment, reporter Jeff Greenfield contended that the slogan "Pick up the Gun" had replaced the nonviolent civil rights message "We shall overcome." Attention to the Black Panther Party as context for the Kent State shootings advanced a specious connection between the radical black movement and the student protests at Kent State. Although the Panthers espoused armed self-defense and revolutionary social change, the predominantly white student body at Kent State was

largely uninvolved in the movement and had not mentioned black power as a rationale for the May 4 rally. Nevertheless, the report articulates student protest to black power's incendiary politics. Greenfield followed this reference to the Panthers by adding that the combination of the 1960s youth culture with the growing radicalization of activist movements created "a highly combustible mixture, almost destined to explode."

Nightline not only framed the shootings in terms of radical protest; it characterized protest itself as an instigator of conflict. Before its attention to the commemorations at Kent State, the report noted that the events at Kent State led 100,000 demonstrators to protest on the Washington Mall. An image of throngs of protesters carrying signs and of a crowd destroying a city bus accompanied Greenfield's voice-over remarks: "The actions were mostly peaceful, sometimes not. The rhetoric was almost unflailingly harsh." Following footage of Jane Fonda speaking to a crowd, the camera cut to images of protesters burning the America flag and waving a North Vietnamese flag. Greenfield asserted that the impact of the images of the protests "can be overwhelming." Concluding the first half of the special report, Greenfield stated that "rage" over Vietnam drove some of the most passionate protesters to words and to deeds that broke every link to the process of democracy." As the following news segment featured commemoration events on the Kent State campus, this passage framed the Kent State shootings as the tragic consequence of anti-war dissent.

Although the other television broadcast reports commemorating the Kent State shootings did not go to the same lengths as this *Nightline* report, many of them framed the shootings as a consequence of belligerent student activism on the Kent State campus. This coverage portrayed students' as responsible for the destruction of Kent State's ROTC

building by suggesting that students set the building on fire, prevented the fire department from putting out the flames, and celebrated the building's demise. *Day One*'s coverage quoted former student Chic Canfora who told reporters that she "felt wonderful" when she heard the news. A 1998 NBC *Dateline* report attributed the fire to Chic's brother, former student Alan Canfora, and his friends. Describing events on the weekend before the shooting, reporter Dennis Murphy noted that Canfora's "idea of sending a message began with some spray painting of buildings in downtown Kent" and then turned toward the ROTC building. (Canfora has explicitly denied the accusation and no legal office has ever accused Canfora of starting the fire.) Interviews with Alan Canfora and former student Dean Kahler on *Dateline* and *Day One* also suggested that students had taunted the National Guard on the day of the shootings, chanting slogans such as "pigs off campus," "Ho Ho Ho Chi Min," and "Smash the State."

Nightline, *Day One*, and *Dateline* reports also portrayed students as belligerent by noting that the Rolling Stones' song "Streetfighting Man" played on loudspeakers during the days leading up to the shootings; *Dateline* contended that Alan Canfora had misinterpreted Nixon's announcement as "a call to arms;" and *Day One* described the campus as an "armed camp" on the day before the shootings. Both *Day One* and *Dateline* foregrounded remarks by former student Dean Kahler, who recalled that his father said the campus looked "just like Korea" when he visited the university the day before the shootings. In these instances, reports characterized the Kent State campus as an extension of the war abroad – a battleground with students who were eager to fight.

While these reports suggested that students fomented confrontation with the National Guard, they excluded details that would have contextualized or qualified students'

belligerence. None of these newscasts noted that several of the students who had been shot were not engaged in protest activities at the time. Nor did they explain why students were outraged by the National Guard's presence on campus. By framing the shootings in the context of an angry, destructive, and confrontational student movement, the press reiterated the message in President Nixon's national address responding to the tragedy in its immediate aftermath that "when dissent turns to violence, it invites tragedy" (Lojowsky, 2000, p. 12). Such messages also marshaled and amplified framing devices during the Vietnam War that characterized anti-war and New Left protest movements as hostile and threatening to the democratic process. In his study of press coverage of the student New Left, Gitlin (2003/1980) identifies multiple deprecatory themes and news patterns that depicted anti-Vietnam War activists as extremists and the anti-war movement itself as "the social problem requiring solution" (pp. 183-185). Although Gitlin states that many radical activists within the movement bore some responsibility for news frames that cast them in a pejorative light, he also notes such media coverage tended to background or ignore moderate activists who did not espouse confrontation or violence as a strategy to end the Vietnam War. Thus, the mainstream press not only highlighted but fomented confrontational protest strategies toward the end of the 1960s. For Gitlin, such coverage pointed to hegemonic processes at work in news coverage of the anti-war movement. By adopting definitions of the situation that legitimized those already empowered, these definitions became naturalized as the common sense understandings about the United States' political role. Consequently, alternative political understandings were discredited. In his study of media coverage of the Vietnam War, Hallin (1994) similarly observes that

the U.S. press typically reflects mainstream political opinion, “excluding from the public agenda those who violate or challenge consensus values” (p. 54).[7]

Commemorations of the Kent State shootings similarly reinforced hegemonic understandings of anti-war protest as irrational and illegitimate. Although this framing device may not be altogether unsurprising, it highlights the intractability of hegemonic news frames; even when remembrance of the killing of unarmed students is the subject, television journalism framed activists as the agents of their own demise. Furthermore, this framing device positioned audiences to understand the shootings of civilians as perhaps an understandable and legitimate response to ostensibly irrational and undemocratic movements at the end of the 1960s. Depictions of hostile students on an embattled campus comprised the beginning of many reports that narrated the Kent State tragedy. Within this story-line, students are characterized as the aggressors early on, thus priming audiences for news portrayals of the National Guard as peace-keepers in a hostile environment. A CBS morning news program tersely set audiences up for a similar expectation by framing the shootings in terms of the National Guard’s mission to contain dangerous antiwar opposition: “At Kent State, university and government officials called in the National Guard to control the unrest, but the violence came anyway.”

The Kent State shootings as a Manichean drama

Television news coverage of the shootings consistently followed discussions of belligerent activism with commentary of former National Guard members. Although none of the guard members who admitted to the shooting appeared on these programs, former commanding officers appeared on camera to speak on their behalf. In interviews with reporters, former guardsmen described the shootings as a regrettable response to unruly

student protest. Through interviews with guardsmen or in voice-overs, reports described National Guard members besieged by students throwing rocks at them. Speaking on CBS's *This Morning* in 1991, Former National Guard Commander General Robert Canterbury told reporters that "these guardsmen considered that their lives were in danger." *Day One* reporter John Hockenberry noted that Alan Canfora had "taunted" the guard with a black flag. The report then cut to an interview with former commanding officer John Martin, who recounted, "One kid threw a rock. Two kids threw a rock. Twenty kids threw a rock. And pretty soon, we realized we were in a bad position." In these reports, voice-overs contributed to the guard's explanation of events that day. For instance, after Martin informed Hockenberry that the guard's protective masks had "disoriented them" to the scene of "indignant" students who gestured at them with upraised fingers and threw rocks, Hockenberry announced that the Guard had "lost control of the situation."

Most frequently, the individual positioned to speak for the guard was Lieutenant Colonel Charles Fassinger who was with the National Guard that day but insists that he did not give the order to shoot. When asked by a CNN evening news reporter what he hoped people might learn from the 1995 commemoration, Fassinger focused on the students' culpability: "I would hope that everyone has learned there's lawful ways to dissent . . . and there are illegal and unlawful ways to do it. And I hope that everybody's learned the difference between those two." In an interview with *Dateline*, Fassinger informed Murphy that he became alarmed when the sentiments of the May 4 rally shifted from "anti-war to "anti-Guard." *Dateline's* coverage illustrates the pattern by which reports "balanced" the recollections of students who were fired on with recollections of former National Guard officers. Speaking for the students' perspective, Murphy's voice-over interceded, "Canfora

insists the students were too far away to hit the guard with rocks," but then Murphy added, "that's not how Fassinger remembers it." Cutting away from footage of the Kent State shooting, the camera focused on Fassinger as he informed Murphy, "The really bold ones would come up behind you and hit you in the knees and make you fall down. Or try and trip the guard and then run away."

By highlighting the National Guard's memories of confusion and frustration caused by angry students throwing rocks at them, reports framed the shootings as the outcome of a situation in which tensions escalated and then spun out of control. In 1999, *Good Morning America* noted that "confusion reigned" on the day of the shooting as "students threw rocks and the Guard threw gas canisters". CNN's 1995 report, *Day One*, *Dateline*, and *Good Morning America's* 2000 coverage similarly described scenes in which both the students and the Guard volleyed whatever they had on hand toward the other side. *Dateline* reporter Murphy commented that in the moments before the shooting, "Things were quickly spinning out of control." Reports contended that amidst the confusion, members of the guard simultaneously lowered their rifles and fired at the crowd.

Although depictions of both students and guard members in the moments leading up to the shootings provided the basis for a narrative in which students caused the shootings, former students' accounts interrupted a seamless narrative by suggesting they were shot without provocation. Every report noted that the shootings came as a surprise to students gathered that day on the campus. Speaking to CNN's *The World Today* in 2000, Canfora described the shootings as a "nightmarish-type situation." Frequently, reports recounted students' feelings of shock, terror, and excruciating pain. Following Canfora's interview on CNN in 2000, former student John Cleary told reporters, "I guess the best

way I describe it is it felt like I got hit in the chest with a sledge hammer. It almost knocked me down. And that's pretty much the last I remember." In 1990, CBS *This Morning* foregrounded Dean Kahler's memories of surprise and horror at getting shot. Eight years later on *Dateline*, Kahler described grisly memories of "four people laying dying on the ground, blood flowing all over the place." Later in the program, Kahler recalled the moment when a bullet paralyzed him from the waist down. "The gunfire lasted only thirteen seconds, but I felt like it lasted, you know, an eternity. . . . My legs got real tight and they relaxed and then I didn't feel anymore. Everything felt weird. I couldn't feel my toes." On ABC's *Day One*, uninjured student Chic Canfora told reporters that events also traumatized students who survived the scene physically unscathed. "It just fell into this sort of hideous silence, you know, and that's the thing I think I remember the most, for the last 25 years, that has been so haunting, was how quiet it was after those thirteen seconds of gunfire." By foregrounding former students' painful memories, these accounts portrayed the shootings as a traumatic instance of state violence against unsuspecting youths. Thus, they offered a contrasting perspective from that of former guard members to understand what happened on the Kent State campus on the day of the tragedy.

Reporters resolved the contradictions offered by these conflicting accounts by characterizing the shootings as a battle between two mutually opposed camps caught up in the chaos of the moment. Throughout commemorative coverage of Kent State, journalists suggested that these shootings were the tragic outcome of two groups caught up in a Manichean drama brought about by heightened national controversy over the United States' role in Vietnam. Reporting for CNN in 1995, Bruce Morton described the shootings as "an explosion of violence" and an example of "Americans . . . killing one another over

the war." Ted Koppel introduced *Nightline's* coverage of the event by describing the students and the National Guard as "opposed camps . . . each convinced that it was locked in a struggle between good and evil." Ostensibly, neither the students nor the National Guard had intended to hurt anyone; instead, everyone lost control of the situation. Reporting for *Dateline*, Dennis Murphy described both injured students Dean Kahler and Alan Canfora, and Lieutenant Fassinger as "reluctant players in one of the darkest moments in American history." By framing the shootings as a tragedy beyond the control of individuals involved, reports suggest that no one group or individual could be held accountable for the shootings. *Dateline* highlighted the National Guard's innocence directly by closing its half hour segment with a final observation by the program's anchor, Jane Pauley: "Chuck Fassinger, the guardsman, says theories that the shooting was ordered or planned are, quote 'nuts'. He says, if anything, fear and confusion was to blame." By giving Fassinger the last word, *Dateline* reinforced the message that the tragedy may best be understood in terms of the guard's bewilderment.

Framing Eyewitnesses at Kent State as Trauma Victims

Through framing devices that attended equally to former guard members' and students' memories of events, television coverage implicitly positioned both the students and the National Guard as equally responsible for and as similarly traumatized by the shootings. CNN's 1995 evening news report commemorating the shootings provided tacit support for this presumption. In the final quote of the newscast, current Kent State student Tracy Williams told reporters, "I can't imagine walking across campus and throwing rocks at National Guardsman, and I can't imagine just being shot on the campus." This student

concluded the report by acknowledging the incomprehensibility of the event as well as both parties' mutual responsibility for it.

By adopting a point-counterpoint structure for presenting eyewitness testimonies, reports consistently contrasted accounts of former students' troubling and painful memories with the testimonies of former guardsmen who recounted their own psychological injuries. During CBS's 1995 morning and evening news reports, Fassinger complained that he didn't think that the guardsmen "have ever felt that anybody recognized them as people." Speaking to journalists from *Day One* five years later, former commanding National Guard officer John Martin asserted that the people under his command were affected by the shootings even more than the students because they were treated as "somebody different" from the frightened young men that they had been at the time. Martin and Fassinger thus argued for empathetic understanding from news audiences as they suggesting that the shootings had dehumanized the guard, thus cordoning them off from public sympathy in years prior.

Characterizations of the guards as victims of student violence were frequently articulated toward end of segments, usually after students gave their own accounts. In other instances, they were expressed immediately after coverage of individuals who articulated political critiques of the shootings. Toward the end of *Day One's* report, Chic Canfora explained that the day of the shootings was "the first time in my life that I took a good look at all those freedoms they taught me I had and realized it's never the way they told us it would be in the books." Reporter Hockenberry followed Chic's political lesson by turning to former Commanding Guard member John Martin, asking him: "Anything you take away from this place?" Martin ended the news report by replying: "I carried three rocks . . . that

were picked up right here and thrown at us. . . . I think somebody once had said that they just threw some pebbles or something and one of these rocks weighs five pounds. And I guess I did it . . . to convince myself that they were more than just pebbles." Through the contrasting of students' and guard members' accounts, news programs presented both groups as deserving blame and public sympathy.

A half hour segment on CNN's talk show program *Talkback Live* is an extended example of how television journalism framed the memories of Kent State through the presentation of students and guards members as equally persecuted by the shootings. During this episode, host Bobbie Battista interviewed Alan Canfora and Lieutenant Fassinger. Perhaps because this program had less control over the arrangement of participant's remarks, the program was one of a few that broadcast Canfora's critical remarks about the events surrounding the shootings. Canfora highlighted the Justice Department's findings that the guardsmen were not in any imminent danger, and asserted that triggermen had testified in a 1975 civil trial that they had heard an order to fire that day. Canfora also described his ongoing involvement in the grassroots organization, the May 4 Task Force, which formed to discover "the truth" about who was responsible for the shootings. Fassinger consistently refuted Canfora by repeating assertions he had made on previous newscasts that the guardsmen feared for their lives that day. At the end of the segment, Battista gave Fassinger the last word. "My life changed. There's no way I can go back. I feel just as sorry for what happened as anyone else. As I said, a tragedy for everyone, and me included."

Working from the depiction of National Guard members as trauma victims, reports also elicited comments that suggested that guard members had been systemically silenced

in the immediate aftermath of the shootings. Ten years earlier on CBS *This Morning*, Fassinger told news anchor Paula Zahn that he chose to speak with her because "somebody had to tell the Guard's side" of the story." For Fassinger, inclusion in journalistic commemorations provided an opportunity to claim the guard's own victim-hood. Reports that featured guards' and former students' traumatic memories thus framed commemorative journalism as a vehicle for victims to work-through trauma by publicly testifying to their pain.

De-depoliticizing the Kent State shootings through therapeutic discourses

By depicting both students and guard members as victims of circumstance and their own heated passions over the war, the aforementioned framing devices created a basis for characterizing commemoration activities as opportunities for therapeutic healing. According to Cloud (1998), the therapeutic refers to a set of discourses that use the language of healing, coping, and adjustment to encourage citizens to see political issues as individual problems subject to personal amelioration (p. 3). Television coverage frequently engaged therapeutic themes of healing, forgiveness, and working through anger, particularly when coverage attended to the former students who were injured in the shootings. Several reports focused on how Dean Kahler had overcome his physical and emotional trauma after he lost the use of his legs in the shooting. A 1990 CBS *This Morning* newscast introduced Kahler to the program by asking him how he had "worked through his anger." In 1998, *Dateline's* report portrayed Kahler as someone who had "moved on with his life" by learning "how to forgive." Cutting away from photographs of Kahler in a wheelchair toward another image of the guard marching toward students, Kahler averred, "Forgiveness is not something you just turn a switch and you do. It's

something you work at, something you have to learn to do." Two years later, *Good Morning America's* commemorative coverage focused on how another injured student, Robert Stamps, coped with the tragedy in the proceeding years. Responding to Diane Sawyer's question about his opinion of the National Guard, Stamps stated, "Most of us, myself included, have long since passed the point of personal forgiveness with respect to any animosity toward any individual guard." Closing the interview, Sawyer thanked both Stamps and Fassinger for their "healing words."

Journalists most frequently used the language of healing, coming to terms with trauma, and moving on when eyewitnesses or parents of slain students expressed political outrage. In many instances, reporters portrayed individuals who offered political perspectives as damaged goods. After Dean Kahler criticized Governor Rhodes's decision to bring the National Guard to the Kent State campus, CBS *Evening News* reporter Bruce Morton described Kahler as "still angry." Closing the report with images of the candlelight vigil ceremony at Kent State earlier that evening, Morton told audiences that despite "much bitterness here still," it was better to "light a candle than to curse the darkness." Morton concluded the report by framing the ceremony in therapeutic terms. "The healing has started after 20 years." By contrasting Kahler's commentary with the campus's candlelight ceremony that evening, this report implicitly dismissed Kahler's remarks as unproductive and alienating. Furthermore, this report positioned the silencing of political dissent as imperative for overcoming Kent State's traumatic legacy.

By describing expressions of political outrage in terms of private anger, reports redirect attention from the shootings as an act of political injustice. During *Good Morning America's* 1999 news segment, Canfora insisted that a member of the National Guard gave

a command to fire and had not yet been brought to justice. Ignoring the political implications of Canfora's assertions, news anchor Charles Gibson remarked, "This is still such an emotional issue with people," and turned his attention toward another person on the show. After Canfora made a similar statement to Bobbie Battista a year later on *Talkback Live*, Battista similarly dismissed him: "Alan, we're obviously not going to get to the truth of what happened that day. . . . So what is it that you would like? What would make you feel better about that day?" None of the individuals who called in to the program legitimated Canfora's concerns; instead, one caller asserted that the students got what they deserved; another commented that Canfora "still shows so much hate and anger, and he needs to move on." By focusing on Canfora's anger, these programs recast his appeals for political action as an individual psychosis requiring therapy.

CNN's 1995 news coverage of commemoration events similarly pathologized political critique of the shootings. After May 4 Task Force member Stephanie Campbell asserted that the shooting taught her about the high "risks of speaking for what you believe in," the report cut to Kahler, who told reporters, "I'll work at giving forgiveness and having it in my heart because by continuing to be angry and expressing anger regularly would probably eat away at me like cancer." Ostensibly, the problem isn't that the shootings might be a form political repression; the problem is that some victims kept insisting on bringing it up.

CNN's 2000 attention to eyewitnesses of the shooting made this point more directly. Following footage of Alan Canfora's efforts to identify the person responsible for the shootings, the newscast focused on John Cleary, a bystander to the shootings, who, according to reporters, expressed "remarkably little emotion." As Cleary told reporter Joel

Hochsmith, he had learned to “come to terms with it and move on.” He explained, “There are so many things in this world that aren’t right and you’re not going to find true justice in, and if you let yourself dwell on that, and obsess with it, you’re not going to enjoy the other points of life.”

Victim-Politics in Journalistic Memory

Framing strategies that wove together competing voices into a coherent narrative authorized a particular understanding of the Kent State shootings as a collective tragedy requiring a therapeutic response. This dominant framework depoliticized the meaning of Kent State by excluding, muffling and discrediting critics of law enforcement officials involved in policing the protests on the Kent State campus. By privileging both shooting victims’ and National Guard’s accounts of personal trauma as the basis for remembering and making sense of the tragedy, dominant news frames narrowed the scope of the coverage. Consequently, the findings of multiple investigations conducted in the wake of the shootings were virtually nonexistent.

These investigations provided additional explanation for the Justice Department’s condemnation of the shootings as unjust and unnecessary. Indeed, evidence from the Justice Department, an FBI report summary, and two civil trials in the decade following the shootings indicates that guard members’ lives were not in danger, the closest student was 60 feet away when guardsmen fired, and the guard could have easily continued in the direction they were headed rather than face students when they fired. Further, reports reveal that the decision to arm guard members with live ammunition violated army guidelines (Casale and Paskoff, 1971; Gordon, 1995). These findings challenge journalistic framing devices that portrayed the shootings as an outcome of equivalent forces by

suggesting that members of the National Guard were in a far superior position and acted offensively, rather than defensively, against a predominantly peaceful crowd.

Further, broadcast news reports ignored Justice Department conclusions that Governor Rhodes and the National Guard probably did more to instigate conflict than to diffuse it. During a press conference on the morning of May 3, Rhodes characterized protesters at Kent State as “the strongest, well-trained militant revolutionary group that has ever assembled in America . . . worse than the brownshirts and the Communist element . . . [and] the worst types of people that we harbor in America.” A few moments later, Ohio Highway Patrol Chief Robert Chiarmonte noted that he would support the National Guard’s efforts on campus with “anything that is necessary . . . even to the point of shooting” (Gordon, 1995, p. 28). These comments inflamed student outrage toward the guard, and prompted many to rally at the commons that day for students’ rights to assemble. Official commentary derogating students’ confrontational protest provides important insights about how students were politically marginalized, and might have been targeted for violence by public officials when the shooting occurred. By excluding corroborating support for eye-witnesses’ claims, dominant news frames blunted audiences’ ability to develop more nuanced understandings of the circumstances surrounding the shootings.

Prevailing news frames also ignored the social context of the commemoration events on the Kent State campus. These events were led by the May 4 Task force, a grassroots political movement that organized commemoration events to raise awareness of political injustice and encourage solidarity among social justice movements throughout the United States. For organizers, the Kent State tragedy was a profound example of political

injustice (Lojowsky, 2000). This group articulated a different narrative of the Kent State tragedy in which state officials failed to preserve justice for some of its most contentious members, noting contradictions between liberal-democratic models of citizenship and repressive state measures that silenced individuals who have hotly contested U.S. policies (Lojowsky, 2000).

By excluding investigators' conclusions and activists' insights about the broader context for the Kent State tragedy, news articles organized around victims' testimony hindered audiences' abilities to critically evaluate contradictory claims of injustice told by eyewitnesses. In the absence of corroborating information for claims made by guard members and students, commemorative coverage of the Kent State shootings suggested that conclusive information for evaluating either groups' claims was unattainable. Thus, discourses authorizing spokespersons to speak on the basis of their victim-hood discredited former students' statements that were critical of the shootings. These observations provide evidence for Frisch's (1986) observation that "the decision to grant 'experience' sole interpretive authority" tends to deny the existence of independent sources of knowledge about past events, thereby making it difficult to place past operations of power in critical perspective (p. 13).

The victim-politics of journalistic memories of Kent State has broader political implications. As the primary vehicle through which we develop cultural meaning of public trauma, exclusive attention to victim's experiences decontextualizes traumatic events from the socio-political contexts in which they occur. When someone is positioned as a victim of a profound loss or trauma, it becomes difficult to present a dissenting opinion or alternate account of events (Wood, 2003). Consequently, individuals and audiences

positioned as witnesses to victims' testimonies are discouraged from attending to different social and political standpoints in which various individuals experience public trauma. The imperatives of healing thus constrain the obligations of citizenship. Some injuries may be more traumatizing than others, and when public tragedies strike, the imperatives of social justice call upon members of publics to make distinctions between competing claims. The appeal to victims' healing rhetorically silences those who would make such distinctions.

The imperative of therapy in victims-rights discourse thus poses constraints on journalism's ability to raise awareness of imbalances of power and social injustices. Therapeutic rhetorics neutralize politically-charged statements about the past by regarding them as irrelevant to the imperatives of witnessing, healing, and putting trauma in the past. Further, such depoliticized portrayals of public trauma render commitment to a principle or conviction in one's beliefs as the political problem requiring solution.[8] Thus, the mode of proper citizenship for commemorating public trauma is, paradoxically, to disengage from difficult political controversies over who is responsible for and who benefits from politically charged violence.

Discourses of victim-hood are not isolated to commemorative coverage of the Kent State tragedy. Appeals to victim-hood and victims' rights have been articulated in political and legal settings increasingly since the early 1990s to justify public policies and legal decisions that favor prosecutions (Wood, 2003; Wood, 2005; McCann 2007). Berlant (1997) notes contemporary U.S. culture has increasingly represented the citizen as "a person traumatized by some aspect of life in the United States" (p. 1). Berlant suggests that the citizen-as-victim that has its roots in reactionary responses to the New Left's calls for greater social inclusion of marginalized groups, including non-whites, women, and anti-

capitalists. Thus, during the 1990s, groups with privileged status began appropriating discourses of exploitation to articulate their own feelings of vulnerability. For Berlant, the struggle for (and against) political inclusion has led to "public rhetoric of citizen trauma" so pervasive and competitive in the United States that it obscures basic differences among modes of identity, hierarchy, and violence" (p. 1). Berlant's observations point to the troubling implications for public discourses which frame violent social and political conflict in terms of public trauma. By framing political violence or repression in terms of national pain, the notion of public trauma becomes an empty signifier. Likewise, appeals to political and social justice become meaningless ─banal pronouncements of citizenship among a public constituted by a shared sense of wounded attachment to the nation.

The lack of attention to central findings in the investigations of the shootings, or to the individuals who organized the commemorations on the Kent State campus suggests that journalistic memories of public trauma may do more to symbolically reconcile residual conflicts from the past than impart information about historical social injustice. Rather than develop additional understanding about the shootings as a social crisis, as an example of the violent policing of protest, or of having implications for contemporary public life, commemorative coverage of the Kent State shootings depicted the pain of repressive violence as a national tragedy and functioned as a medium for leaving traumatic memories of national division in the past. Reporters' appeals for healing and forgiveness were not only directed at individuals who directly witnessed the shootings on the Kent State campus that day, but to audiences who might also have had a stake in how the Kent State shootings were remembered. As Kahler was positioned in these reports as an

individual who forgave the National Guard and moved on ─despite his paralysis as a result of the shootings─ audiences were positioned by the news coverage to do so as well.

The symbolic role of journalistic memories of Kent State was suggested in news coverage that directly framed the commemoration as a context for coming to terms with the Vietnam War. *Nightline* ended its half hour report at Vietnam War Memorial in Washington D.C.. Ted Koppel explained, “Perhaps this, more than any other place, symbolizes the healing, the reconciliation between those who demonstrated against the war and those who fought it.” The report ended with a quote from Vietnam War veteran Tim Thomas, who remarked, “I don’t understand the war and I don’t understand what we did over there. . . . To make peace, that’s what I came down for, nothing more, nothing spectacular. Just it’s enough now, it’s time to do and go.” The closing segment on CNN’s 1995 news coverage of the commemorations also called upon audiences to leave Vietnam-era conflict in the past. Standing in front of the candlelight vigil on the Kent State campus, Bruce Morton concluded that one lesson from commemoration is that campus activism no longer reflected the “anger of those Vietnam days.” Ending the newscast, Morton asserted that the other lesson was that the Vietnam War “was a terrible mistake that took place “a long time ago.” “The Vietnamese . . . seem to have come to terms with it. Maybe we can too.” By expanding therapeutic imperatives to include Vietnamese people, coverage indicated that citizens within the United States might also do well to put differences over United States’ policy in Vietnam aside. Thus, news coverage symbolically displaced the memory of Kent State as a public trauma that tested the nation’s faith in the justice of the political system. Calling upon victims to reconcile their pain with that of others, the

predominant narrative of the Kent State shootings offered commemorative journalism as a vehicle for restoring national belonging.

Alternative narratives muffled by commemorative news coverage of Kent State tragedy suggest that this appeal to national unity was not without costs; television journalism remembered victims who experienced the Kent State trauma most acutely, but the political tragedy of their deaths was forgotten. Dominant journalistic memories of Kent State contributed to other cultural messages during the 1990s that cast contentious dissent as dangerous and threatening to the national order (Berlant, 1997; Cloud 1998). These messages thus lent implicit support to official discourses that characterized anti-war dissent itself as a national threat and sought expansion of law enforcement power to police protest (Wolf, 2007). By forgetting the political implications of the Kent State shootings, dominant journalistic memories of Kent State diminished avenues for public expressions of outrage when political officials and law enforcement agencies repress speech in the name of national security. This has troubling implications in times of war or political upheaval. In order to assess the fairness and justice of national responses to these crises, democratic public life must foster opportunities for contentious political speech.

Notes

1. Although it is the most widely remembered, Kent State was not the only campus that experienced violence against student protesters. Ten days after the shootings at Kent State, police opened fire on a group of student protesters at predominantly African-American Jackson State College in Tougaloo, Mississippi, killing two students and injuring twelve others. The dearth of media coverage of these shootings illuminates the racism implicit in mainstream media practices.

2. See also Phillips' (2004) edited collection of essay on public memory for further discussion about public memory as a process and product of contemporary culture.

3. Although Lexis-Nexis is one of the most comprehensive and accessible databases for news archives, the availability of transcripts from major network news programs is uneven. Transcripts from NBC newscasts are not available until 1997, and transcripts from CBS are not available until 1990. Further, transcripts of some ABC news programs on particular dates have been removed from the database. Although I cannot attest to a complete reading of all television news coverage of the shootings, I argue that a critical interpretation of available texts is valuable nonetheless. Recurring themes across available texts lead me to an interpretation that has important implications for democratic life, even if these themes are not the only messages that news media provided about the Kent State shootings in the decades after they occurred.

4. Although the university has received the lion's share of credit for the campus commemorations, they are the result of a more than decade's long movement by the May 4 Task Force, a group of former and current Kent State students formed to commemorate the shootings and raise awareness of the tragedy as an act of political injustice. The 1990

commemoration has drawn some criticism by observers who have noted that the memorial itself did not actually mention the shooting victims (Gordon, 1995, p. 17).

5. Other newscasts that referenced Kent State as a context for understanding current events were significantly shorter, and offered limited explanatory detail about who was involved in the shootings and the implications of the shootings for contemporary public life. Typically, these references appeared as simple assertions that highlighted the date of May 4 as the anniversary of the Kent State tragedy. For these reasons, I chose to exclude them from analysis.

6. In an effort to access footage of the reports, I cross-referenced the list of transcripts available in Lexis-Nexis with the Vanderbilt Television News Archive. Only the 1990 *Nightline* news segment was available. In order to explain how visual, audio, and verbal devices functioned to ascribe meaning to the shootings for public memory, I relied primarily on Lexis-Nexis's descriptions of the sounds and images in the transcript. In my discussion of the *Nightline* segment, my analysis is augmented by visual images from the footage of the newscast itself.

7. Patterns across television broadcast coverage commemorating the Kent State shootings share many similarities to news devices that have framed more recent protest movements as well. News content has discredited oppositional social movements by routinely framing them as disruptive, irrational and outside of the bounds of legitimate forms of civic engagement (Cloud, 1998; Husting; 2006; Kellner, 1992; and Reese & Buckalew, 1995).

8. For a different example of how therapeutic framing techniques discourage publics from thinking critically about instances of political violence, see Hoerl, Cloud, and Jarvis (2009).

References

Bennett, W. & Edelman, M. (1985). Toward a new political narrative. *Journal of Communication, 35*, 156-171.

Berlant, L. (1997). *The Queen of America goes to Washington City: Essays on sex and citizenship.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Biesecker, B. (2002). Remembering World War II: The rhetoric and politics of national commemoration at the turn of the 21st century. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 88,* 393-409.

Blair, C., Jeppeson, M., & Pucci, E. (1991). Public memorializing in postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as prototype. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77,* 263-288.

Blair, C., & Michel, N. (2000). Reproducing Civil Rights tactics: The rhetorical performances of the Civil Rights Memorial. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 30,* 31-56.

Bodnar, J. (1992*). Remaking America: Public memory, commemoration, and patriotism in the twentieth century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Browne, S. H. (1993). Reading public memory in Daniel Webster's *Plymouth Rock Oration. Western Journal of Communication, 57,* 464-477.

Browne, S. H. (1999). Remembering Crispus Attucks: Race, rhetoric, and the politics of commemoration. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85,* 169-187.

Casale, O. and L. Paskoff, L. (1971). *The Kent affair: Documents and interpretations.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cloud, D. L. (1998). *Control and consolation in American culture and politics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collins, C.A., and J.E. Clark. 1992. A structural narrative analysis of *Nightline's* 'This week in the Holy Land.' *Critical Studies in Mass Communication 11*, 115-43.

Cunningham, D. (2004). *There's something happening here: The New Left, the Klan, and FBI counterintelligence.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Davies, P. (1973). *The truth about Kent State: A challenge to the American conscience.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Edy, J. (2006). *Troubled Pasts: News and the Collective Memory of Social Unrest*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Edy, J. (1999). Journalistic uses of collective memory. *Journal of Communication, 49*, 71-87.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward a clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43,* 51-58.

Foucault, M. (1975). Film and popular memory: An interview with Michel Foucault. Trans. Jordan, M. *Radical Philosophy*, p. 25.

Frisch, M. (1986). The memory of history. In S.P. Benson, S. Brier, and R. Rosenzweig (eds.) *Presenting the past: Essays on history and the public* (pp. 5-17). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gallagher, V. (1999). Memory and reconciliation in the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs, 2,* 303-320.

Gillis, J. R. (1994). Memory and identity: The history of a relationship. In J.R. Gillis, (Ed.), *Commemorations: The politics of national identity.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Gitlin, T. (2003/1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and the*

making of the New Left. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Gordon, W. A. (1995). *Four dead in Ohio: Was there a conspiracy at Kent State?* Laguna Hills, CA: North Ridge Books.

Hall, S. (1981). The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In G. Bridges & R. Brunt (eds.) *Silver linings: Some strategies for the eighties* (pp. 31-45). Southampton, UK: Camelot Press.

Hallin, Daniel. (1994). *We keep America on top of the world: Television journalism and the public sphere*. Routledge: New York.

Hariman, R. and Lucaites, J. (2001). Dissent and emotional management in a liberal-Democratic society: The Kent State iconic photograph. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 31*, 4-31.

Hasian, M. (2001). Nostalgic longings, memories of the "Good War," and cinematic representations in *Saving Private Ryan. Critical Studies in Media Communication, 18*, 338-358.

Herman, E. S. and N. Chomsky. (1988, orig. published). *Manufacturing consent: the political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon.

Hoerl, K. (2007). Mario Van Peebles's "Panther" and popular memories of the Black Panther Party. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 24*, 206-227.

Hoerl, K., Cloud, D. L, and Jarvis, S. E. (2009). Deranged loners and demented outsiders? Therapeutic news frames of presidential assassination attempts, 1973-2001. *Communication, Culture, and Critique, 2*, 83-109.

Husting, G. (2006). Neutralizing protest: The construction of war, chaos, and national identity through US television news on abortion-related protest, 1991. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 3,* 162-180.

Johnson, H. (1990, May 4). Downhill from Kent. *The Washington Post*, p. A2.

Kaniewscki, T. (Executive Producer). (2000, May 10). Politics. *For the Record*. VH1.

Katriel, T. (1994). Sites of memory: Discourses of the past in Israeli pioneering settlement museums. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 80*, 1-20.

Kellner, D. (1992). *The Persian Gulf TV War.* Westview Press: Boulder, CO.

Kirschenblatt-Gimblet, B. (2003). Kodak moments: Flashbulb memories. *The Drama Review, 37*, 11-48.

Lang, K. and Lang, G. E. (1989). Collective memory and the news. *Communication, 11*, 123-139.

Lipsitz, G. (1990). *Time passages: collective memory and American popular culture.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lojowsky, M. (2000, July/August). Kent State thirty years later: What we're still fighting for. *The Humanist*, 9-14.

Maag, C. (2007, May 2). Kent State tape is said to reveal orders. *The New York Times*, p. 7.

McCann, B. J. (2007). Therapeutic and material <victim> hood: Ideology and the struggle for meaning in the Illinois death penalty controversy. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 4*, 382-401.

McNamara, R., with VanDeMark, B. (1996). *In retrospect: The tragedy and lessons of Vietnam.* New York: Times Books.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: “Les Lieux de Memoire”. *Representations, 26,* 1-6.

Phillips, K (Ed.). (2004) *Framing public memory*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Reese, S. & Buckalew, B. (1995). The militarism of local television: The routine framing of the Persian Gulf War. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 12,* 40-59.

Reese, S., Gandy, O., & Grant, A. (2001). *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schudson, M. (1992). *Watergate in American memory: How we remember, forget, and construct the past.* New York: Basic Books.

Sturken, M. (1997). *Tangled memories: the Vietnam War, the AIDS epidemic, and the politics of remembering.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news*. New York: The Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Tuchman, G. (1971/72). Objectivity as a strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen’s notions of objectivity. *American Journal of Sociology, 77*, 660-679.

Wolf, N. (2007). *The end of America: Letter of warning to a young patriot.* White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Wood, J. K. (2005). Balancing innocence and guilt: A metaphoric analysis of the U.S. Supreme Court’s Rulings on Victim Impact Statements. *Western Journal of Communication, 69,* 129-146.

Wood, J. K. (2003). Justice as therapy: The Victims Rights Clarification Act. *Communication Quarterly, 51*, 296-311.

Zelizer, B. (2008). Why memory's work on journalism does not reflect journalism's work on memory. *Memory Studies, 1*, 79-87.

Zelizer, B. (1995). Reading the past against the grain: The shape of memory studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 12*, 214-240.

Zelizer, Barbie. (1992a). *Covering the body: The Kennedy assassination, the media, and the shaping of collective memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zelizer, B. (1992b). Kennedy assassination through a popular eye: Toward a politics of remembrance. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 16*, 21-36.

Table 1

Articles Cited in Lexis-Nexis that Share News Framing Devices

Program Network	Month/ Year	Time Report Aired (EST)	Name of Program	# of Words in Newscast
CBS	05/1990	7:00 AM	*This Morning*	1671
CBS	05/1990	6:30 PM	*Evening News*	493
ABC	05/1990	10:00 PM	*Nightline*	2855
ABC	06/1995	8:00 PM	*Day One*	2490
CNN	04/1995	9:39 PM	not noted in Lexis-Nexis	1179
NBC	09/1998	7:00 PM	*Dateline*	2381
ABC	09/1999	7:00 AM	*Good Morning America*	1241
ABC	05/2000	2:00 AM	*World News Now*	832
ABC	05/2000	7:00 AM	*Good Morning America*	786
CNN	05/2000	3:00 PM	*Talkback Live*	3089
CNN	05/2000	8:00 PM	*The World Today*	1922

Articles Cited in Lexis-Nexis with Disparate News Frames

Program Network	Month/ Year	Time Report Aired (EST)	Name of Program	# of Words in Newscast
CBS	01/1991	7:00 AM	*This Morning*	676
CNN	05/1995	8:35 AM	not noted in Lexis-Nexis	721
CNN	04/1995	5:00 PM	*Late Edition*	693
ABC	05/1995	6:30 PM	*World New Tonight*	466
CBS	02/1996	10:00 PM	*48 Hours*	1152
CNN-FN	05/1997	1:25 PM	*It's Only Money*	405
CNN	05/2000	9:00 AM	*Morning News*	1262
CNN	05/2000	1:00 PM	*CNN Today*	838
CNN	05/2000	8:00 PM	*The World Today*	496
CNBC	05/2000	7:30 PM	*Upfront Tonight*	954
CNN	05/2000	1:00 PM	*Today*	574
ABC	02/2006	10:00 PM	*World New Tonight*	637