## The University of Maine
# DigitalCommons@UMaine

Honors College

Spring 2019

# Terrorism in Context: The Stories We Tell Ourselves

James Brown V

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/honors

Part of the Sociology Commons

TERRORISM IN CONTEXT: THE STORIES WE TELL OURSELVES

by

James S. Brown V

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for a Degree with Honors
(Sociology)

The Honors College

University of Maine

May 2019

Advisory Committee:
    Karyn Sporer, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Advisor
    Stefano Tijerina, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Political Science
    Amber Tierney, Assistant Professor of Sociology
    Holly Schreiber, Assistant Professor of Communication and Journalism
    Christopher Mares, Intensive English Institute, Honors Precept

ABSTRACT

With no universally accepted definition of terrorism, the process by which the media labels an act as *terrorism* becomes inherently variable. In Western media, such variance is unilaterally skewed towards coverage of Islamic terror. This paper examined the similarities and differences in newsprint coverage of two unique terrorist attacks: The Boston Marathon bombing and the Charleston Church mass shooting. Data included 64 articles from *The Wall Street Journal* that were published in the seven days following each attack. Data were analyzed using grounded theory, which revealed three primary themes: *construction of the attack*, *construction of the attacked*, and *construction of the attacker*. Important differences within and across each theme were found in the *Wall Street Journal*'s coverage of each attack. This paper argues that these differences manifest, in part, due to the construction of Islamic terrorists and non-white victims as an "other" while white terrorists and white victims are constructed as "us" or more relatable and sympathetic. This paper concludes with a discussion on the power of media representations of terrorism, and the implications of policy towards such coverage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION


On the evening of September 11th, 2001, as smoke from the still-burning wreckage of the World Trade Center blotted out the New York City skyline, then-President George Bush addressed the American people from the Oval Office. His speech placed the senseless and tragic events of that day in a context of understanding: America was under attack. The attack was a manifestation of forces of evil and chaos, in which America was targeted because "We're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world" (Address to the Nation, 2019). Those responsible looked to destroy goodness and freedom. The result of this narrative was pronounced: National identity was strengthened; trust in the government was restored; and support for the current administration reached an all-time high (Branscombe and Baron, 2017; Economist, 2002; Cigler, 2002). Bush addressed Congress less than two weeks later when he infamously declared a *war on terror*, which would "Not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated" (Story of the Global War on Terror, 2019). As the nation prepared for action, one important question was left unanswered: what is terrorism?

Few phenomena in the social sciences present such immediate resistance to definition as that of terrorism. This is partly due to the political and subjective nature of terror attacks (Ganor, 2002; Hoffman, 2006; Mahan & Griset, 2003). Because definitions of terror depend in large part on the worldview of the definer, many in academia have noted the inherent difficulty in reaching consensus out of subjectivity (Cooper, 2001). Within the literature, hundreds of competing definitions of terrorism exist (Laqueur,

1999). Things are no better across the domestic, international, and global laws and policies (Ganor, 2002; Mitnik, 2017). Even within the United States, differences in our definitions of terror exist between various agencies responsible for addressing and preventing terrorism (Mitnik, 2017). Attempts by the international community to reach consensus on what constitutes terror have been blocked by the refusal of some countries, like Syria and Iran, to acknowledge a definition that includes groups they support. These latter countries, which might label terror organizations as freedom fighters and provide them with both material and political aid, argue the righteousness of the terrorists' cause removes any credence of international culpability. The argument that "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" is fielded against the calls for consensus, using subjectivity as a defense behind which international terrorist organizations continue to receive support from political allies (Ganor, 2002, p. 1). The ability of a legitimate state to lobby for a terrorist group highlights more than anything the need for a universal definition of terror. Confusion and partisanship will reign supreme without a standard by which actions and events are objectively labelled as terrorism.

The need for a globally accepted definition of terror is made doubly important by media representations of terror. The media have long held significant latitude in the manner in which information is presented and the lack of consensus on what constitutes terror produces significant variance in what and how information is presented (Nevalsky, 2015; Pan & Kosicki, 1993; Powell, 2011; Reese, 2001; Gitlin, 1980). By selecting both what is covered and how it is covered, media presentation of information establishes and alters the global narrative. With no single definition of terror, the process by which the

media labels an act as *terrorism* becomes inherently variable. In Western media, such variance is unilaterally skewed towards coverage of Islamic terror.

The focus on Islamic extremism presents a disparate frame of reality that ignores the facts. According to the FBI, 94% of terrorist attacks carried out in the United States from 1980 to 2005 were perpetrated by non-Muslims; a majority of these attacks were perpetrated by white nationalists, Aryans, and other American citizens (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2018). However, the news neglects to report on these attacks: Even the most heinous and violent acts of white terror fail to generate even a tenth of the attention or reports that "Islamic terror" creates. Indeed, a statistical analysis of news reports following terror attacks in the United States revealed that the average act of "Islamic terror" receives five times the amount of media coverage as any other attack, regardless of casualties or impact (Kentish, 2017). The Southern Poverty Law Center has counted nearly 800 active white supremacy hate groups in the United States as of 2014 (SPLC, 2014). Those are astounding numbers yet they are generally ignored by media. Even reports by government agencies have gone relatively ignored by the media, such as the Department of Homeland Security report released in 2009 that declared rightwing extremism to be a growing and serious threat to national security (US Department of Homeland Security, 2009). Indeed, many researchers and government officials have declared right-wing extremism as substantially more deadly than jihadist extremism (Bergen & Sterman, 2014; Simi & Futrell, 2015). The statistics from the FBI make it clear: The biggest threat to the United States, evident even in the early 2000's, was right-wing radicals. Terror attacks from the far right outweigh jihadists by a ratio exceeding 2:1 (Homegrown Terror, 2018). Yet despite this, there is significant differential treatment

between the two attacks by both the government and the news media. Both fail to report and to label white-extremist behavior in America as terrorism.

The purpose of the present paper is to understand this difference in media coverage. Specifically, this paper relies on symbolic interaction and framing theory to compare and contrast media representations of two instances of domestic terrorism: the Charleston Church shooting and the Boston Marathon bombing. I employed grounded theory to analyze 64 articles published in *the Wall Street Journal* within one week following each attack. The findings suggest that media coverage of terrorist attack focuses on the construction of three themes: *construction of the attack*, which considers the facts of the attack itself; *construction of the attacked,* which focuses on the narrative of the victims; and *construction of the attacker*, which develops the identity of the attacker in an attempt to explain the motives of the attack. Together, these themes suggest the quality and quantity of coverage of terrorist attacks varies according to the type of offender and the type of victim(s). Before addressing the relationship between mass media and terrorism, I first turn to a short summary of my theoretical framework.

LITERATURE REVIEW

<u>Background</u>

In order to understand the significance of any single newspaper article, the significance of new stories as a whole must first be examined. The following sections include a summary of symbolic interaction and two major theories of mass media. Next, I outline implications of media bias and conclude with an examination of the relationship between media coverage and terrorism.

<u>Theoretical Framework: Symbolic Interaction & Communication</u>

Symbolic interaction is a theoretical framework for understanding behavior that provides insight into human existence as a state of constant interpretation. This school of thought considers meaning to be the motivating force behind human action (Ritzer, 2008). The three guiding principles behind symbolic interactionism are (1) individual behavior is not the product of a stimuli, but the meaning ascribed to that stimuli; (2) this meaning is generated on a social level as the result of interactions involving the self; and (3) these meanings are flexible and constantly adapted against our current experience (Blumer, 1969a; Ritzer, 2008, Turner, 2014). We learn meaning from interactions with others and the foundation of communication is built through the creation of symbols.

Human communication is the foundation of human civilization. Through communication, we share experiences, exchange knowledge, and coordinate action towards common goals. Communication also facilitates the creation of culture in the form of "traditions, customs, norms, beliefs, values, and thought-patterning which are passed down from generation to generation" (Infante et al., 1990, p. 372). Shared experiences provide individuals with shared understandings of the world. Like many social

5

phenomenon, while a universal definition of communication does not exist, common elements can be found across the definitions. Infante and colleagues (1990) synthesized communication as the "deliberate manipulation of symbols by humans to stimulate meaning in other humans" (pg. 123). Symbolic interaction is a process dependent on communication and is in many ways reliant on the means by which communication occurs (Denzin, 1992).

<div align="center">Mass Media: Definitions and Theories</div>

The media is a critical mediator in the processes established through a symbolic interactionist framework. Media is generally understood to be the "main means of mass communication, especially newspapers, radio, and television regarded collectively; the reporters, journalists, etc working for organizations engaged in such communication" (Oxford, 2015, p. 1). The news media is a specific subset of mass media defined by Gans (1980) as "information which is transmitted from sources to audiences, with journalists...summarizing, refining, and altering what becomes available to them from sources in order to make the information suitable for their audiences" (pg. 80). Given that the mediums of newspaper, radio, and television are limited by both time and space, only the most newsworthy stories are published. The process by which stories are deemed newsworthy is one of exclusion and limitation, and involves several steps from when the information is produced to when it is received by the audience. Gatekeeping theory refers to the process by which information is transmitted to audiences (White, 1950). The news media act as gatekeepers between culture and consciousness, determining what and how information is made available to the public (Infante et al., 1990). Journalists, editors, and

media chiefs select which information is newsworthy, and in doing so filter the information through their individual perspectives and understandings.

Out of this process emerges two of the dominant theories governing media and communications: agenda setting theory and news frame theory (Lecheler & de Vreese, 2012; McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Agenda setting theory addresses the power of the media to determine *what* is important through which topics the media pay attention to (Infante et al., 1990, p. 351; McCombs & Shaw, 1972). The more a story is reported on, the more salient and important it is perceived to be (Scheufele, 2000; Nevalsky, 2015). Similarly, framing theory examines how the context in which a piece of information is reported changes its meaning (Nevalsky, 2015). The context, or frame, determines how you interpret the information. These two theories highlight the importance of the information we receive and the context in which we receive it. You are a product of the culture you are born into, and those cultures shape and are shaped by the stories that they tell. The power of the news media in shaping these stories is twofold. The news determines not only *what* information we receive, but *how* that information is received.

The representation of the world that is presented by the media is inherently biased, serving as a reflection of the dominant culture rather than a reflection of reality. From representations of social identity like sex, race, and ethnicity, to representations of crime, the media consistently fail to accurately portray the world (Zimet, 1976; Hartman & Husband, 1974; van Dijk, 1991; Davis, 1952; Fishman, 1980; Graber, 1980; Brennan & Slakoff, 2017). The vast majority of people rely on news media for information about crime (Chermak, 1994). However, media representations of crime are not related at all to crime statistics, as a study by Davis (1952) revealed in his comparison of FBI crime

reports with newspaper reports (as cited in Howitt, 1982). The tendency of the news to report on extraordinary crimes can drastically influence perceived risk (Fox, Levin, & Quinet, 2008). Despite arguments for the functionality of crime news—that it provides information, serves as a deterrent against future crime, offers entertainment, and reflects the nature of the criminal justice system (Chermak, 1994, p. 106)—the sensationalist nature of news coverage that focuses on attacks can both increase individual perception of crime and increase the likelihood of the crime itself.

<center>Mass Media and Terrorism</center>

No crime is as dependent on media coverage as that of the terrorist attack. Margaret Thatcher, in a speech denouncing terrorism, described media attention as the "oxygen of publicity on which [terrorists] depend" (Thatcher, 1985, p. 29). Some go so far as to assert that terrorists would not exist without media (Dowling, 1986). Indeed, media coverage is so critical to terrorism that an attack that does not receive attention is considered a failure (Mitnik, 2017; Laquer, 1977, Griset & Mahan, 2003; Anderson, 1993). A study by Jetter (2017) showed that coverage of an attack predicted another attack within a week. Examining Al-Qaeda attacks from September 12, 2001, to December 31, 2015, in relation to news articles collected from the Vanderbilt Television News Archives, Jetter calculated the daily percentage of news spent covering an attack. Finally, using an OLS regression model, Jetter derived the predictive strength of past media coverage on future attacks. After excluding such instrumental variables as other disaster deaths around the world, Jetter found that every minute of Al-Qaeda coverage in the 30 minute evening news predicted one additional attack.  Even the "lesser" effects of coverage have been posited to increase anxiety in viewers (Slone, 2000; Slone &

<center>8</center>

Shoshani, 2006). An experimental study (n=237) by Slone (2000) tested the effects of exposure to news coverage of terrorism threats, and found that such exposure was positively associated with anxiety levels as measured by the state anxiety questionnaire.

Of particular interest to the context of America today is the construction of Islam as the enemy of the United States. In the aftermath of September 11th, hate crimes against Muslims rose 1300% (Fox, Levin, & Quinet, 2008, p. 196). Five years later four out of ten Americans admitted prejudice against Muslims. This pattern was not new. Gerges (2003) notes the contentious portrayal of Islam in American culture in media as a byproduct of Arab nationalism during the Cold War. As the War on Terror became a War in the Middle East, news associations with Islam and terrorism became more and more pronounced. A study by Kearns, Betus, and Lemiuex (2017) revealed that, after controlling for target type, fatalities, and arrest, Muslim perpetrators received 357% more coverage than non-Muslim perpetrators. Western news sources preemptively ascribe terrorism to Islamic groups, as was observed in the aftermath of the 1993 Oklahoma City bombing and the 2011 Norway attacks (Gerges, 2003; Alghamdi, 2015). Terrorism and Islamic identity have been inextricably linked in the media (Powell, 2011). The overrepresentation of Islamic extremism in the media is at ends with the statistical reality of white terrorism.

Despite the exponentially increased coverage of Islamic extremism, an examination of terror attacks in the United States not Islamic, but white extremism as the primary threat. A brief from the *Center for Strategic and International Studies* addresses a growing increase in right-wing and white extremism since 2007, backed by arrest and attack statistics from the FBI. (Jones, 2019). Simi and Futrell (2015), who traced the

white power movement in the United States, argues white extremism has flourished in part because of the internet and in response to globalization. Despite the FBI and DHS' declaration of white terrorism as a serious threat to national security, violence by far-right extremists continues to receive substantially different attention than violence by radical Islamists.

This paper adds to the research by Mitnik (2017) and Kearns, Betus, and Lemiuex (2017) by qualitatively assessing the differences in coverage of terrorist attacks in the United States. Through a framework of symbolic interactionism and news frame theory, the power of media coverage on how context shapes understanding offers insight into how differences in coverage and content may shape our present reality. The primary research question guiding this paper is: What are the differences in these coverage? In order to understand the narrative differences governing the presentation of a terrorist attack in the United States across the racial lines of the attacker, coverage of the Boston Marathon Bombing and the Charleston Church Massacre was analyzed using grounded theory.

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to determine how the media reported terrorist attacks by white extremists and Islamic extremists. One major print publication, the *Wall Street Journal*, was selected for its neutral bias as assessed by the Journalism branch of the Pew Research Center (PRC; Mitchell, 2014). PRC is an independent think tank that assesses the quality of media outlets for bias and content through human coding, computer coding, and surveys. In addition to its minimal bias, the *Wall Street Journal* is also ranked highly for factual accuracy, and is equally trusted by conservatives and liberals (Mitchell, 2014). While the *Wall Street Journal* is controversial due to its owenership by Rupert Murdoch, it contains one of the highest ratios of trust to distrust within news publications, and it's equal consumption by members of the left and the right make it a unique source of analysis due to the fact that it bridges the political spectrum (Mitchell, 2014).

Attack Selection and Details

The Global Terrorist Database (GTD), which collects data on terrorist activity around the world, was used to search for successful terrorist attacks within the last 5 years (January 1st, 2012 - December 31st, 2017). The Boston Marathon Bombing and Charleston Church Massacre were selected for comparison from the generated list as exemplars of Islamic and white terrorism. The Boston Marathon Bombing and Charleston Church Massacre were selected for comparison for four reasons. First, both attacks met all three criterion for terror as established by the GTD beyond question, with the message generated by both attackers made explicitly clear in the aftermath of the attack. Second,

11

both targeted symbolic institutions of American society. Third, both attacks were portrayed by the attackers as being in defense of their race. Fourth, the attackers themselves were both captured alive, and were demographically similar despite racial differences; aged 17 and 21, Dzhokhar and Dylann had strained relationships with their families, tenuous affiliations to foreign governments, and similar physical builds.

Boston Marathon Bombing

The Boston Marathon is the world's oldest annual marathon, held every Patriot's Day (Baa.org, 2018). It draws an average 30,000 participants and 500,000 spectators from all over the world, and is the most widely attended sporting event in New England (Web.archive.org, 2014). On April 15th, 2013, at approximately 2:49pm, two homemade improvised explosive devices (IEDs) were detonated at the finish line 12 seconds and 100 yards apart (Library, 2018). The bombs were built out of household materials including a pressure cooker, ball bearings, and nails (START, 2018). Three spectators were killed; an 8-year old boy, a 23-year old Chinese foreign exchange student, and a 29-year old woman (CBSnews.com, 2015). An additional 264 people were injured. Victims were treated at 27 hospitals following the blast, with many requiring amputations. That night, President Obama addressed the nation promising justice. The next morning, he described the event as an act of terrorism. On April 18th, the FBI released images of individuals - later identified as Tamerlan (26) and Dzhokar Tsarnaev (19) - sought in connection with the attack (Library, 2018). That night, 26-year old MIT police officer Sean Collier was shot and killed. Shortly afterwards, the brothers hijacked a car in Cambridge, the driver of which managed to escape. The subsequent police chase and shoot-out (which involved homemade explosives being thrown from the car at pursuing officers) resulted in the

death of Tamerlan, who was shot by police after emerging from the car, and accidentally run over by his brother as he drove away to escape (Library, 2018). At this point the identities of the Tsarnaev's were released by police, and the brothers were identified as Chechen immigrants to the United States. Watertown was placed under lockdown as police go door-to-door searching for the younger Tsarnaev. He was found later that evening, hiding under a boat in a resident's backyard (Library, 2018).

Charleston Church Massacre

The Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church is one of the oldest historically black churches in the South (Weisman, 2015). At 9:05 p.m., on Wednesday, June 17th, 2015, 21-year old Dylann Roof, a white South Carolina native, shot and killed nine people after spending an hour in Bible study with the congregation (Berenson, 2015). The victims ranged in age from 26 to 87; they included church pastor and state senator Clementa Pinckney (Berenson, 2015). Roof was identified to police by his family after images and a description of the suspect were released; he was captured after a large manhunt the following morning (Ortiz and Bruton, 2015). FBI worked with local police to assist with the manhunt; police said they were treating the shooting as a hate crime (Berenson, 2015).

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were obtained using ProQuest Historical Newspaper, an online database of newspaper articles. A general search term was used to gather the first set of articles from the Wall Street Journal from the seven days following the attack ("Boston Marathon", 4/15/13 - 4/22/13: $n = 100$; "Charleston", 6/17/15 - 6/24/15, $n = 34$) with the goal of

collecting as much data as possible. From here, articles were extracted using general

inclusion/exclusion criteria. For an article to be included, it needed to focus on the attack,

the attackers, the investigation, the victims, the motive, or a direct response to the attack.

Articles were excluded not specifically focusing on any of the above; articles which

focused on the response or opinions of political actors; articles which used the attack only

referentially; articles which only use a blurb or quote on the attack ("world news" articles

which summarize several stories generally); or articles talking about other terrorist

attacks (Boston $n = 54$; Charleston $n = 12$). Article excerpts in the results are labelled

chronologically by attack; the Charleston Church articles are annotated as "CC" and the

Boston Marathon articles are similarly "BM."

<u>Data Analysis</u>

This research employed grounded theory for its data analysis. Grounded theory is

an inductive form of analysis that relies on developing a framework based out of the

material, rather than a deductive approach that apply the data to a preselected theoretical

framework (Charmaz,2014).  This flexible approach allows for more comprehensive

datasets which comprehensively represent the analyzed data, rather than using

theoretically inflexible frameworks derived outside the data (Charmaz, 2014). To this

end, data were coded prior to the literature review, so as to increase theoretical sensitivity

and prevent interference from prior research. In line with Charmaz's (2014) grounded

theory approach, the following process was used to promote the emergence of themes.

First, data were analyzed via line-by-line coding. Words, sentences, and phrases

were coded for their meaning at the most molecular level. Next, memo-writing was used

to brainstorm general concepts from the codes and information generated by the first

round of coding, identifying generally emergent patterns and themes. Using these

concepts, the data were coded a second time, focusing on the larger elements and guided

by the concepts developed from the data. After focused coding, memos and categories

were collapsed into themes to develop a conceptual framework. Analysis on every level

was performed until theoretical saturation was reached, at which point no new properties,

codes, or themes emerged. Analysis was performed using pen and paper. Reliability in

qualitative research is a matter of replicability, specifically within the data being

examined (Cypress, 2017). The inductive nature of grounded theory is such that

reliability is attained through the constant comparison of the data against itself, and by

selecting specific data (theoretical sampling) with which to increase the resolution of the

analysis through comparison (Charmaz, 2014).

RESULTS


Three themes emerged from the data analysis: 1) construction of the attack; 2) construction of the attacked; and 3) construction of the attacker. Each theme represents a key component of a terrorist event. Through the development of these themes, the various elements of an attack (who, what, when, where, and why) are established and described. Taken together, these themes serve to construct a narrative that allows a reader to experience the attack through graphic storytelling and first-person anecdotes, before identifying the individual or group responsible.


Construction of the Attack

Construction of the attack begins with the establishment of the basic facts and details of the event itself. These facts are then used to ground a narrative framework through which the attacked and the attacker are later examined. Quantitative information about the attack is balanced by qualitative characterization. The first article published after the Boston Marathon Bombing spends as much time discussing the known facts as it does crafting graphic and visceral imagery of the attack.

> Two bomb explosions rocked the finish of the Boston Marathon on Monday...though much is still unknown about what happened, the [FBI] is responding to the event...police say two people were killed and 23 people were hurt in the explosions, which occurred in the midafternoon (BMB 1.1)

In the aftermath of an attack, there are more questions than answers. This is the first paragraph from the first article covering the Marathon bombing, and it begins by establishing as many of the known details as possible. Because of the large scale of the Marathon and subsequent bombings, many questions regarding the attack would not be

revealed until later in the investigation. The first half of the article addresses the hard facts known at the time; the second half, however, includes subjective narration rather than objective facts.

> ...competitors and race volunteers were crying as they fled the chaos. Bloody spectators were being carried to the medical tent…smoke from the blasts fluttered through the national flags lining the marathon route (BMB 1.2)

Excerpts from runners at the event reveal some of the individual experiences surrounding the attack; among those cited in the article are a New York physician, the third American woman finisher, and a runner from Toronto. These stories, and the imagery surrounding them, provide the foundation for a narrative that places the attack in isolation as an unjustified act of senseless violence against an innocent population. Whereas the first half of the article is neutrally phrased and offers only quantitative and logistical information, the second half emphasizes the emotional devastation of the event, focusing on the "chaos" that ripped through an unexpectant population. The description of "smoke from the blasts flutter[ing] through the national flags" (BMB 1.2) is a subtle but important call to national identity, and reinforces the notion that it was not only the marathon that was attacked, but also the United States. Through the creation and characterization of facts, the overall context of the attack is established. This initial context within which the construction of the attack is presented is critical to shaping the readers' understanding of the facts. This narrative provides the basic structure through which later information and articles are to be integrated and understood.

The manner in which the Charleston Church massacre is constructed closely parallels the Marathon coverage. The initial facts of the event are used to ground a narrative that instructs the reader on how to interpret the attack as a whole. The first

article published after the shooting begins with the information available at the time; details of the attack and apprehension of the perpetrator and the official police and government response dominate the first few paragraphs.

> A 21-year-old white man suspected of killing nine people at a historic black church in an alleged hate crime...was captured [by police]...the victims included three males and six females… (CC1.1)

As with the Boston Marathon, the first article establishes all the major points: what was attacked, who/how many were injured, and the status of the official investigation into the attack.[1] Also, like the Boston Marathon coverage, this article quickly establishes a qualitative framework that characterizes the initial details:

> The Emmanuel AME church, founded in 1816, is one of the most historic African-American churches in the U.S....the killings came two months after the shooting death of Walter Scott, a black man who was unarmed when shot by a white officer….Soon after Wednesday night's shooting, a group of pastors huddled together praying in a circle across the street. Community organizer Christopher Cason said he felt certain the shootings were racially motivated (CC1.2)

The narrative of coverage for the two attacks are similar in two ways. First, they both end with personal anecdotes of those involved in the attack, relating first-hand experience and emotional weight. Second, they both address the historic and cultural significance of the targeted event. They differ significantly, however, in their narrative presentation. Where the marathon bombings contextualize the attacks as being against the nation as a whole, coverage of Charleston instead places the attack as being specifically against the African-American community. African-American ownership of the church, community, and victims are emphasized, and the attack is immediately compared to

---

[1] A notable difference here is that the Charleston shooter was apprehended the morning after the attack

incidents of police brutality. The Charleston coverage is also significantly more ambiguous than that seen in Boston, with words like "alleged" and "suspect" (CC1.1) adding a degree of uncertainty to the narrative. Conversely, coverage of the bombings acknowledge but ultimately ignore the many unknowns of the attack in favor of higher impact language like "rocked" and "occurred," which imply a higher degree of certainty. Ironically, less was known about Boston than Charleston at the time of the first publication.

     *Construction of the attack* begins with the first news reports covering basic info like what, where, and when. From these details emerge a narrative framework that establishes the significance of an attack or a target, and the impact of the event. Several thematic patterns present themselves throughout this narrative construction: (1) establishment of the good, and (2) order and chaos.

## Establishment of the good

     Terrorist attacks are defined by their targets. Larger, symbolic targets provide potential for greater impact, as the significance and scale of an attack is limited by the value of what is being attacked. In this sense, the emergent narrative after an attack is in many ways dependent on *what* was attacked. In order to maximize the impact of a terrorist event, targets of an attack are characterized as positively as possible. Through the use of qualitative description and the provision of emotionally rich backstory, the intrinsic positivity, goodness, and value of a target is developed as much as possible. Virtue and symbolism are emphasized, and emotional imagery and description further the impact of the attack. *Establishment of the good* is established in the initial articles covering each attack, but is only fully developed with publication of additional articles.

The emphasis on the inherent goodness of the target can be seen in the following

description of the Charleston massacre:

> On Wednesday, after securing more foster-care funding at a state budget hearing
> in Columbia, [Reverend/Senator] Pinckney drove two hours to Charleston for
> Emanuel's regular Wednesday supper and Bible study. There, in the Gothic
> Revival-style church, authorities say 21-year-old Dylann Roof sat in on bible
> study for an hour before gunning him down, along with eight other African-
> American worshipers (CM3.1)

This characterization focuses on the virtuous leadership of the Reverend and the visual of

a traditional community supper in a historic church. In only a sentence, the selflessness,

dedication, and efficacy of the Reverend is revealed through his actions. The fact that the

killer was welcomed into the Bible study serves to highlight the welcoming and friendly

nature of the church group. This pattern is also present in the Marathon coverage:

> A marathon is human joy on a grand scale...the energy from the crowd will lift
> you off your feet...what happened in Boston on Monday is a terrible tragedy in
> any context...just steps from what is traditionally the scene of so much personal
> triumph - people pushing themselves to limits they never thought they had - there
> is only madness and horror (BMB7.1)

The race is characterized as more than just a sporting event: It is an opportunity for unity

and happiness, an opportunity for one's full potential to be actualized via personal bests

and accomplishment. The marathon is more than a race, it is a celebration of human

spirit. Thus, the attack on the marathon is nothing other than an attack on all of these

same qualities.

The purity of the target serves as a point of contrast for the attacks. While

Charleston and Boston are presented as attacks on a community or on a country,

respectively, coverage of both emphasizes the innate righteousness of the target. Because

the attack is antithetical to the target, it then takes on the opposite qualities and can be inferred to be as evil as the target is good.

<u>Order and chaos</u>

The juxtaposition of attack and target is furthered through the thematic construction of each as being indicative of chaos and order, respectively. From the first articles, this narrative characterizes both attacks with words such as "chaotic" and "madness":

> ...the threat had complicated the initial response to the shooting, creating chaos at the scene for more than an hour… (CC1.1)

> The serene, crisp April day - so ideal for running or watching the country's most prestigious running event - turned violent and terrifying for thousands close to the finish line, and bewildering and chaotic for thousands more who were still trailing along the 26.2 mile course (BMB3.1)

The Boston quote captures both the conversion of a peaceful celebration of athleticism into a scene of violence and destruction, as well as reflecting the very nature of terrorism as an interaction between order and chaos. The established tradition of the marathon, juxtaposed by a sudden transition to disorder is a narrative theme that emerges throughout coverage of both attacks.

Just as the attack is symbolic of chaos, the institutional reaction serves as the boundaries of order. Fundamental institutions such as hospitals and police serve as a demonstration of social triage, juxtaposing order on chaos in a near one-to-one ratio.

> Medical personnel treating victims of the explosions that killed three people and wounded more than 170 others at the Boston Marathon on Monday said many of the survivors had suffered devastating trauma and were losing limbs (BMB6.1)

A 21-year-old white man suspected of killing nine people at a historic black church in an alleged hate crime here Wednesday night was captured Thursday in Shelby, N.C., after authorities used his cellphone to help track him down (CM1.1)

The devastation of the attack is used as a foil against which the strength of society is highlighted. Many are injured in an explosion - but medical personnel save lives. A man murders nine people - but he was caught by the police. Through social institutions such as emergency response, police, and government, the damage and impact of an attack is mitigated. Emergency first responders and subsequent investigation serve as symbolic representations of safety and security, characteristic elements of an ordered society. This tension between an attack and the targeted social structure produces a dialectic that ultimately ends in the strengthening of order.

The initial exploration of an attack demonstrates the fundamental good of the target as the set up for the attack. Order - in the form of tradition, trust, or institution - is replaced by chaos - random and unexpected violence, fear, and madness. The limits of this shift are marked by the presence and strength of the subsequent institutional response and reassertion of order. In this way, the greater the magnitude of the attack, the more faith can be placed in society for its appropriate response.

The first articles published in the aftermath of an attack do more than just establish the facts - they provide the foundation of the narrative through which all details about the attack are understood and interpreted. Despite the presentation of Charleston as an attack on a specific community and Boston as an attack on the country, coverage of both serve to establish a framework that emphasizes the morality of the target against the unjust madness of the attack. This framework is further developed through the construction of the attacked, to which we now turn.

<center><u>Construction of the Attacked</u></center>

Construction of the attacked focuses on first-hand experiences that highlight a range of physical and emotional responses to the terror attacks. Three narrative categories emerge through the development of this theme: (1) victim narratives, (2) heroic narratives, and (3) witness narratives.

The tragic narrative encompasses those killed or injured by the attack, and the friends and loved ones of those killed or injured. These tales emphasize damage done by the attack through description of the suffering resulting from the chaos. Just as the impact of the terrorist attack is best determined by the quality of the good that it targets, the potential and innocence of the victims determines the magnitude of the tragedy that follows. Stories of the tragic emphasize traits of virtue, innocence, and potential.

> A reverend who was a high school track coach. A quiet and industrious recent college graduate. An up-and-coming minister who looked forward to leading her congregants. They were among the nine people gunned down by a lone shooter (CM5.1)

> <u>Boston Bombings: In Close-Knit Neighborhood, Shock at Death of 8-Year-Old...</u>
> "Martin was really jolly," she said, adding, "He was just a cute little boy who looked just like his father" (BMB9.2)

> Cynthia was a tireless servant of the community who spent her life helping residents, making sure they had every opportunity for an education and personal growth (CM5.2)

The greater the potential, the greater the tragedy; and an emphasis on grief begins to replace fear. Individual accounts include specific examples that further the construction of the attack as being against goodness and morality. First-person accounts offer the reader a human to identify with, humanizing the victims and creating a greater emotional impact.

<center>23</center>

These feel-bad victim narratives are followed by a reminder of the capacity for human courage and selflessness. Feel-good stories tell of heroes who risk their own lives to save others, and the strength of human character in spite of adversity.

> Ms. Sanders protected her young granddaughter, Camia Terry, by urging her to lie on the floor and play dead (CM7.2)

> [He]... walked around the fencing and into the blast site, where he and another man helped carry a man who was clearly in bad shape. 'We grabbed him and carried him out to the middle of the road, and then we went back in again,'... he grabbed a belt from another person at the scene and fashioned a tourniquet for a woman who was bleeding heavily from a leg wound, and eventually got her [to the medical tent] (BMB3.2)

Finally, the narrative of the witness emerges. The witness adds another dimension to the description of the attack by serving as a spectator to the chaos and destruction. While not physically damaged by the attack, witnesses provide an emotional or moral judgement on the attack. These following excerpts showcase the emotional damage of the attack as it exists separate from the physical carnage:

> Paul Thompson, a spectator who is a sports cardiologist, has researched and published extensively about the health implications of running the Boston Marathon. Driving away from the bloody scene near the finish line Monday, Dr. Thompson couldn't speak without crying. "For what? For what?" said the 65-year-old. "These people are totally innocent. They're not engaged in combat" (BMB5.2)

These anecdotes offer first-hand accounts of a terror attack. They add a human-interest element to the coverage that add emotional depth. They also allow the reader to vicariously experience the attack first-hand from a number of different perspectives. The likelihood of a reader identifying with any element of the story is increased by constructing the attacked through an amalgamation of individual experiences. Finally, the narrative established by the construction of the attack is fully constructed through the

stories of the attacked, giving examples and primary source information that supports the framework through which the attack is presented. This fundamental narrative is concluded through the construction of the attacker, which serves to provide both an explanation as to why the attack happened as well as a focal point against which to assign blame and condemnation.

<div align="center">Construction of the Attacker</div>

Construction of the attacker includes the perpetrator and explanatory causes of the attack. The attacker is used to explain how and why the attack happened, and is placed as an agent who is external to society. As the damage and impact of a terrorist attack is evaluated through construction of the attack and attacked, the question of who is responsible becomes increasingly prevalent. Unlike the inclusive language governing discussion of the victims of an attack, and the emotional emphasis placed on the overarching narrative, the context in which the perpetrators are placed is one of Othering and difference. An emotionless and clinical assessment of the attackers begins with a focus on group identity. These labels are used to differentiate "them" from "us," and through this description the greatest possible degree of difference is sought. This is made clear in the description of Dylan Roof:

> [Roof] wore patches representing South Africa's apartheid-era government and the former white ruled country Rhodesia…[he] gave his middle name as Storm, which is popular among white supremacists (CM4.3)

While Roof is a white born-and-bred American, his association with another country is used to create distance from his status as a United States citizen. This, along with his middle name, are used to associate him more with white supremacists than with white

people. In contrast, these group differences are more visible in the immigrants Tsarnaev, and is reflected in their description as well:

> The two Chechen brothers accused in the Boston Marathon bombing set about building American lives after coming to the U.S. a decade ago...but a close examination of the Tsarnaev family's life in the U.S. shows a hopeful immigrant trajectory veering off course (BMB44.1)

The above quote showcases the othering of the Tsarnaev's; defined by their status as Chechen immigrants, and characterized as "off course," their degree of distance is significantly higher than Roof's, making the process of creating difference a less difficult one.

Construction of the attacker begins by placing them in an identity separate to that of the group attacked. The differences between terrorist and target are stressed to illustrate the attack as originating from outside rather than within the primary group (i.e., American citizen). Such group differences vary in strength, but ultimately serve the same function of psychologically distancing the motives of the attacker. Showing how the attacker is different from us makes it easier to understand how they could commit the act as a function of group identity. Identifying these group differences provides a starting point for the construction of the attacker on an individual level. *Construction of the attacker* can be further broken down into two subcategories: (1) family and (2) bad seed.

Family

Sociology recognizes the family as the smallest possible unit of study. Human beings do not exist in a vacuum, and are socialized and raised by their family. Understanding the family helps understand and explain the identity and behavior of the attacker. The bond between family members is sacred, and has been since humans first

formed tribes; when an individual is rejected by their family, it validates the invalidation

of that person. When a family member commits an act of terrorism, the family's reaction

is typically that of either acceptance or denial. Both reactions affirm the guilt and

separation of the individual from society. While acceptance shows a family coming to

terms with a heinous action, denial simply devalidates the family along with the offender.

In the case of Dylann Roof, his family's acceptance came in the form of quiet concern:

acknowledgement that something was wrong with their son.

> About a month ago, Dylann Roof's family was concerned. The once-quiet, bright
> boy from a middle-class South Carolina family was espousing troubling racist
> views…'He apparently told people that he was involved in groups, racist groups,'
> said [his former stepmother's mother]...'He turned into a loner in the last couple
> of years and no one knew why...he just fell off the grid' (CM2.1)

The characterization of Roof as a loner is an important one because it shows his

separation from American society. This isolation makes his actions less indicative of the

group to which he belongs and the system in which he exists. In fact, his loner status

indicates an individual defect that can further explain his behavior. The more distance is

created, the easier it becomes to rationalize and integrate his actions. As an Other, the

terrorist does not act on behalf of the group. In this way, fear of the general public's

capacity to commit terror is limited. The attribution of Roof's actions to Roof as an

individual rather than a member of a group is furthered by this description:

> Mr. Roof had lived off and on with his father, Ben Roof, in Columbia, a family
> friend said. He described the father as a hardworking, friendly, churchgoing man
> who had recently expressed concerns about his son's lack of direction. The friend
> described the suspect as a lanky young man who was a loner who rarely smiled
> (CM4.2)

In both instances, the family members express concerns or cast judgements on Roof's

behavior; the information, while second-hand, serves to illustrate the gap between Roof

and family. His actions are to be explained not through a lens of upbringing, but by individual decision making. The distance between Roof and his family, with whom he shares more than just a group identity, can then be extended and amplified to the rest of the country.

For the Tsarnaevs' family, acceptance and denial was expressed to varying degrees, starting with a strong denunciation from his uncle:

> "Tamerlan's attitude seemed to sour…'I don't have a single American friend, I don't understand them'...[his uncle] told reporters...that his nephews were 'losers' who were unable to settle into American life 'and thereby just hating everyone who did...this has nothing to do with Chechnya'" (BMB44.2)

Condemnation from a family member carries more weight than that of any friend or coworker. Not only does such condemnation provide insight into the potential motivations of the elusive brothers, it distances them from their Chechen origins by establishing them as loners. Like Roof, their actions are reflective of individual differences, Othered past the point of group identity. Their lack of integration into society suggests that they are the problem, instead of the other way around. Condemnation by a blood relative strengthens this argument. Interestingly, cases in which the family members deny the guilt of the accused only add to the case against them. This is made clear in the reaction of the Tsarnaev brothers' mother and father.

> "'I am really sure, like I am 100% sure, that this is a setup," [the Tsarnaev's mother] said. She also said that she had been contacted by the FBI about her older son, before Monday's deadly attack, as he grew more religious. (BMB44.2)

> Authorities are now trying to determine whether or not they young men had contact with terrorist figures. Last year, Tamerlan traveled to...Dagestan...home to a simmering Islamist insurgency…[the brothers' father] said there is no way his son interacted with Islamic fundamentalists while on the trip. "There are''t even any of those here anymore," he said. (BMB44.3)

Both of these claims come sandwiched in contradictions; while the family's pleas are not directly disputed, it is left to the reader to interpret their statements as the weakest possible defense for innocence. The process of Othering is legitimized on a personal level when the family shows acceptance; when the family shows denial, as the Tsarnaev's parents did, the same thing happens. Personal conviction does not hold weight against evidence and history and such denial simply highlights faults in the family that may contribute to the dysfunctionality of the offender. Through the construction of the attacker's family, more context and insight is given into the attacker themselves. Construction of the attacker finishes by attributing the terrorist act to a quality innate to the individual.

Bad seed

No matter how the offender is constructed on a level of group identity, responsibility for their actions is ultimately understood on an individual level. The further a person is from the norm, the easier it is to rationalize their actions as a function of out-group identity. Stereotypical associations with various identities make certain actions more understandable, such as that of Islam and terrorism. Here enters the bad seed: The attacker acts because it is in their nature to act. Society is blameless because the offender was damaged from the start. When the offender is a member of another group, the social identity is external to the society attacked. In the case of the Tsarnaev's, their racial and religious identity became the ultimate justification for the attack.

Authorities gave no indication of what motivated the brothers. Their <u>family roots</u> stretch to the Russian Republic of Chechnya, which has been a wellspring of terrorism over the years (BMB 187)

By identifying the source of the terrorism as literally stretching from the Caucasus of Eastern Europe, the offender is distanced from the identity of the in-group. This was simple for the distinctly foreign Tsarnaev's. In the case of Roof, his racial identity could not be used to leverage his differences. Instead, his social qualities were highlighted to showcase his distance from society via behavioral patterns.

The friend described the suspect as a lanky young man who was a loner who never smiled. 'You could see that he was troubled' (Charleston 1.3)

His lack of emotion, social isolation, and "troubles" offer causality for his actions. Roof might be white, but his attack is a manifestation of mental problems rather than racial qualities. Interestingly, his physical attributes are still identified, setting him apart as ungraceful and unattractive.

DISCUSSION

The three themes that emerged from analysis of the attack coverage reveal important differences between the treatment of the attacks. First, with *construction of the attack*, the Boston bombing was placed on a national scale, whereas the Charleston shooting was described locally. Despite both acts being terrorism, the Boston bombings were distinctly labeled as such whereas the Charleston shooting was framed in terms of violence and white hate. Second, the *construction of the attacked* mirrored the scale of the attack. In Boston, the victims were generalized to the American public, whereas the Charleston victims were cast as a separate group. Third, the *construction of the attacker* highlighted the use of identity metrics as a suitable explanation for behavior. The foreign Tsarnaev's were easily categorized as *other*, whereas Roof was presented as individually defective. These findings mirror those of Powell's (2011) analysis of terrorist attacks in the United States from 2001-2010, in which she identified key themes such as "victim as good/terrorist as evil," "hero," "good and innocent," and the portrayal of domestic versus international agents. Her findings on the coverage and characterization of victims are directly parallel to this study. Additionally, she notes the identification of mental illness as a justification for the actions of domestic terrorist agents.

The terrorist attacks in Charleston and Boston share several similarities, the least of which are their definitive status as terrorist events according to the criteria outlined by the GTD. There are substantial parallels to be drawn between the Tsarnaev's and Roof, despite their differing nationalities. First, both Dylan and Dzhokhar were captured alive.

Young men motivated by what they saw as intractable grievances associated with a particular ethnic group, both perpetrators had a tenuous association with a foreign government or organization. Additionally, they had relatives and associates who were available to comment on their personality and background, giving the media more information with which to paint a picture of the attackers. Finally, both attackers had strained relationships with their families, specifically with their fathers, which were in some way addressed by the media. These similarities strengthen analysis of the disparate treatment of each of these men by the news. However, substantial differences in the precise nature of the attack must be addressed before discussion of the results can begin.

The quantity of coverage varied significantly from Charleston to Boston ($n = 12$, $n = 54$). Mitnik's (2017) analysis of the factors that contribute to an event being labelled as terrorism revealed that attacks that use bombs are significantly more likely to receive attention as acts of terror. On top of this, the marathon bombing was specifically labelled by President Obama as an act of terror. It is possible these factors contributed to the increased coverage of the Boston attacks. Mitnik also identified the quantity of coverage in an attack as being directly influenced by the novelty of the event. In Boston, the attackers were on the run for four days, generating more fear of another attack and adding to the novelty and newsworthiness of the story. The Charleston shooter, however, was apprehended before the story broke.

The number of fatalities has also been associated with increased coverage. While both attacks were among two of the most successful acts of terrorism in the United States since 9/11 (GTD, 2019), Boston had significantly more injured (179) and more graphic content, whereas Charleston had three times as many fatalities. Interestingly, the focus on

casualties rather than fatalities suggests the relationship with media coverage is a function of the quantity, rather than quality, of victims. Finally, the victim identities varied as well, where the all-black victim pool in Charleston stands in stark contrast to the multinational and more generalizable marathon target.

These differences strengthen the results. Beginning with the *construction of the attack*, themes such as *order and chaos* and the use of the inherent goodness of the target demonstrate the general frame as one of good versus evil. The violence in both cases is described as senseless; both are at least nominally indicated as terrorist events. However, the racialization of Charleston presents itself as an attack on the African American community, whereas Boston is framed as an attack on America. This is furthered by the *construction of the attacked*. The Charleston shooting is localized to the church itself, whereas the marathon attack is an attack on the city of Boston and the citizens of America**.** The emphasis on racialization vis-à-vis nationalization reveals a trend that subtly undercuts the impact of the Charleston shooting by presenting it as an attack on "them" instead of an "us." Boston coverage could have presented the attacked group as "marathoners" instead of "Americans."

The human interest component which emphasizes emotional arcs of the victims of the attack is dominantly present in coverage of both events, and highlights a disturbing trend of sensationalist coverage evident in both attacks. The drawn-out nature of the Boston coverage resulted in the inclusion of more stories, while victims and their relatives were present in coverage of the Charleston shooting.

Three main issues are underscored by these results. First, the media coverage of both attacks illustrates an almost deliberate disobedience of the global recommendations

against journalistic treatment of terrorism. Human interest stories, coupled with graphic descriptions of the attack, spread the fear and terror which the aim of the attackers. Invading the privacy of the victims and families through repeated reporting draws focus away from the real issues of the attack and heightens the emotional response in the public. The microscopic focus on the attackers glorifies and legitimizes their cause and behaviors, potentially inspiring others to do or believe the same.

Second is the media's focus on "international" terrorism over domestic terrorism, specifically at the cost of the other. In line with agenda setting theory, the events covered increase national salience and focus on issues. The significant coverage discrepancy between Boston and Charleston, even in light of the intrinsic attack differences, shows a selective focus on "novel" attacks which fit with a post-9/11, Orientalised narrative.

Third is the differential treatment of Roof and Tsarnaev. Both were apprehended with little question to their guilt. Roof was identified and arrested with the gun still on his person and could be identified by a living witness. The younger Tsarnaev was apprehended following a manhunt in which he engaged in a firefight with the police and was identifiably injured. Yet, Roof is presented as sympathetic, "troubled" (CC1.3), condemned less harshly, and removed from culpability by attributions of mental illness. Dzhokhar is presented as an Other, beyond reproach, and guilty beyond doubt. These differences fit within a contextual framework of media framing, "Othering," and an existing post-9/11 narrative of Orientalisation.

The use of frames allows the media to present information in an understandable context. The fear generated by terrorist attacks must be resolved; to this end the mechanisms by which the attack unfolded must be explained. This requires the

explanation of the attacker their motives. This is in line with Durkheim's notion of othering and deviance. By attributing an action to an individual's qualities, we understand and alleviate the fear of that action existing on a normative level. The post-9/11 framework of presenting Muslims as an Orientalised other has been well established in analysis of global terrorist attack coverage (Powell, 2011). While the Tsarnaev's individual differences are touched on, their primary "othering" occurs through identity labelling. Roof, who is more similar to the prototypical American, and therefore cannot be Othered by label alone, is attributed to mental illness. This framework shorthand ultimately contributes to more problems than it causes.

By presenting a white supremacist murderer as having a mental illness, his actions and the guiding ideology lessen their culpability. Not only is Roof made sympathetic through discussion of his emotional and social problems and struggles, the resulting narrative is grounded in mental illness rather than white supremacy and racism. By selectively framing issues of ideology as mental illness, the statistically significant issue of white terror remains ignored.

Conversely, the indelible Othering of the Tsarnaev's removes any leeway or potential for understanding them as multidimensional social actors. Labelled as terrorists by the President and media before their apprehension, individual factors - like the older brother's peer pressure - are ignored. Paradoxically, the brothers are placed as non-Americans through focus on their Chechen heritage, while simultaneously presented as just American enough to make their betrayal of the United States more impactful.

Both of these frames - one of empathy and the other of evil - serve the same function in explaining the attackers' motivations. However, the Boston Marathon

narrative offers a unidimensional lens of condemnation whereas the Charleston Church narrative creates a framework of justifiable understanding.

## Limitations & Future Research

This study has several limitations. First, the low number of Charleston articles (*n* = 12) limited the scope of comparison between it and Boston. Second, while the Wall Street Journal is a centrist publication with high circulation, other publications with different political identities such as *National Review* and *New York Times* should be assessed to reveal differences across the political spectrum. In this way, trends not specific to politics such as the seemingly dominant focus on sensationalism can be fairly addressed. Future research should also examine other forms of media, such as online news sources and television news. Third, more attacks - like Orlando and San Bernardino - should be investigated for their potential politicization of the victims/offender as well as their degree of sensationalism. Last, to complete this assessment, a non-US publication like al-Jazeera or BBC should be analyzed to identify potential national biases in US-based media platforms. This study lacks external validity due to its contained scope. By only examining two sets of attacks within the same publication, the generalizability of these findings are strictly limited. However, these results offer higher resolution findings that may offer many directions for future research designed with generalizability in mind.

These results point to the need for a stronger set of guidelines regarding news coverage of violent acts, and a stronger push towards a global definition of terror. Until the ambiguity surrounding what constitutes an act of terror and how it should reported are resolved on an academic and policy level, the variance in how these events are perceived will only continue to grow.

CONCLUSION

Acts of violence in any form, especially those against a civilian population,
should not be tolerated. The news has incredible power over the way information is
understood and acted upon. Citizens' ability to make informed decisions when electing
officials who will shape policy is predicated on their understanding of the political
landscape. With this in mind, the media's disparate treatment of terrorist attacks based on
the quality of the attacker or novelty of the attack rather than the inherent wrongness of
the action, contributes to a lopsided view of the world that allows one form of terrorism
to continue unchecked while another is overrepresented.

Our volatile political climate is inextricably linked with this rise in white
supremacy. Despite this, the current political administration has emphasized a now
outdated narrative which overplays one issue and critically misrepresents another. They
have actively defunded policy centers and law enforcement aimed at addressing them.

Responsibility for a terrorist attack will always fall on the individual committing
the act. However, the coverage of the attack shapes decision making on a public and
political level that sets the stage for future events. In this sense journalists have a massive
responsibility to their readers and their country to fairly and accurately represent events
without skewing the narrative to pander to political or economic interests. The current
market-oriented climate of news media is not conducive to this type of reporting,
however, and until substantial changes occur on a public/policy/political level, it is
doubtful this problem will be fixed overnight.

The guidelines for responsible media coverage of terrorist attacks as established
by Kovacic and Logar offer a good starting point for treatment of violent acts moving

forward (see Cohen-Almagor, 2005 and Parliamentary Assembly, 2005). However, these guidelines cannot be implemented without first reaching consensus on a definition of terrorism. Without an objective measurement for terrorism, notions of moral relativism will continue to dominate the political arena as countries and organizations (United States included) justify their actions through political or religious righteousness.

# WORKS CITED

Address to the Nation. (2019). Retrieved from
https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-the-nation-the-terrorist-attacks

Alghamdi, Emad. (2015). *The Representation of Islam in Western Media: The Coverage of Norway Terrorist Attacks*. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature. 4. 198-204. 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.3p.198.

Anderson, T. (1993). *Terrorism and Censorship: the media in chains*. Journal of International Affairs, 47(1), 127-136. Columbia University.

Baa.org. (2018). *Boston Marathon | Boston Athletic Association*. [online] Available at: https://www.baa.org/races/boston-marathon [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

Bergen, Peter, and Sterman, David. (2014). U.S. Right Wing Extremists More Deadly Than Jihadists," CNN, April 15, 2014, http://us.cnn.com/2014/04/14/opinion/gergen-sterman-kansas-shooting

Berenson, T. (2015). *http://time.com*. [online] Time. Available at: http://time.com/3926112/charleston-shooting-latest/ [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

Blumer, H. 1969a. *Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Branscombe, Nyla & Baron, Robert. (2017). *Social Psychology*. New York. Pearson.

Brennan, Pauline, and Slakoff, Danielle. (2017). *The differential Representation of Latina and Black female victims on front-page news stories: A qualitative document analysis*. Feminist Criminology, 1-29.

Cbsnews.com. (2015). *Boston Marathon bombing victims*. [online] Available at: https://www.cbsnews.com/pictures/boston-marathon-bombing-victims/ [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chermak, Steven. (1994). *Crime in the News Media: A refined understanding of how crimes become news*. Media Process and the Social Construction of Crime, vol. 10, p. 95-129.

Cigler, Allan. (2002). *Perspectives on Terrorism: How 9/11 Changed U.S. Politics.* United States. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cohen-Almagor, R. (2005) "Media Coverage of Acts of Terrorism: Troubling Episodes and Suggested Guidelines", *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 30 (3), 383–409.

Cooper, H.H.A. (2001). *The Problem of Definition Revisited*. American Behavioral Scientist, 44, 881-893.

Cypress, B. S. (2017). *Rigor or Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research.* Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing, 36(4), 253–263. doi: 10.1097/DCC.0000000000000253.

Davis, F. J. (1952). Crime news in Colorado newspapers. *American Journal of Sociology*. 57, 325-330.

Denzin, N. K. (1992). *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The politics of interpretation.* USA: Blackwell Publishers.

Dowling, Ralph E. (1986). Terrorism and the media: A rhetorical genre. *Journal of Communication, 36*(1), pp. 12-24.

Economist. (2002). "What September 11 Really Wrought." *The Economist*. (January 12, 2002): 23-25. Copyright 2002 The Economist Newspaper Group, Inc.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (2018). "Terrorism 2002/2005". 2018. *Federal Bureau Of Investigation*. Accessed February 27 2018. https://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terrorism-2002-2005.

Fishman, M. (1980). *Manufacturing the News*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fox, J., Levin, J., Quinet, K. (2008). *The Will to Kill: Making Sense of Senseless Murder*. United States. Pearson.

Ganor, Boaz. (2002) Defining Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorist another Man's Freedom Fighter?. *Police Practice and Research*. 3:4, 287-304, DOI: 10.1080/1561426022000032060

Gans, H. J. (1980). *Deciding What's News: A Study of the CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek and Time.* New York: Vintage Books.

Gerges, F. A. (2003). *Islam and Muslims in the Mind of America*. The Annals of the
      American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 588. Pp 73-89. SAGE
      Publications.


Gitlin, T. (1980). The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking
      of the new left. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Graber, D. (1980). *Crime News and the Public*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Griset, P., & Mahan, S. (2003). *Terrorism in perspective*. Los Angeles: Sage
      Publications.

Hartmann P., and Husband, C. (1973). *The Mass Media and racial conflict.*
      In Howitt, D. (1982). *Mass Media and Social Problems*. Great Britain: Wheaton
      & Co.


Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside terrorism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Homegrown Terror. (2018). "Interactive: 9 Years Of Homegrown Terror". 2018.
      *Apps.Revealnews.Org*. Accessed February 27 2018.
      https://apps.revealnews.org/homegrown-terror/.

Howitt, D. (1982). *Mass Media and Social Problems*. Great Britain: Wheaton & Co.

Infante, Dominic, A.; Rancer, Andrew S.; Womack, Deanna F. (1990). *Building
      Communication Theory.* United States. Waveland Press.

Iser, Wolfgang. (2000). *The Range of Interpretation.* Colombia University Press.

Jetter, M. (2015). *Blowing things up: The effect of media attention on terrorism*.
      University of Western Australia Discussion Paper 15.28, available under
      http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/ 204506151?selectedversion=NBD57137111.

Jetter, M. (2017). *Terrorism and the Media: The Effect of US Television Coverage on Al-
Qaeda Attacks.* University of Western Australia Discussion Paper No. 10708, available
under http://ftp.iza.org/dp10708.pdf

Jones, Seth. *The Rise of Far-Right Extremism in the United States*. (2019). *Csis.org*.
      Retrieved 11 April 2019, from https://www.csis.org/analysis/rise-far-right-
      extremism-united-states

Kearns, E.M., Betus, A. & Lemieux, A. (Forthcoming). *"Why Do Some Terrorist Attacks Receive More Media Attention Than Others?"* Justice Quarterly, Forthcoming

Kovacic, M. P., & Logar, N. (2016). *Online News Coverage of Terrorism: Between informing the public and spreading fear.* DOI: 10.22572/mi.22.2.1. Medij. Istraz (god. 22, br. 2), 5-26.

Kentish, Benjamin. 2017. "Terror Attacks Receive Five Times More Media Coverage If Perpetrator Is Muslim, Finds Study". *The Independent*. Accessed February 27 2018.
http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world-0/terror-attacks-media-coverage-muslim-islamist-white-racism-islamophobia-study-georgia-state-a7820726.html.

Laqueur, Walter. (1977). *Terrorism.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Laqueur, Walter. (1999). *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the arms of Mass Destruction.* New York: Oxford University Press

Lecheler, S., and C. H. de Vreese. 2012. "News Framing and Public Opinion: A Mediation Analysis of Framing Effects on Political Attitudes." Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly 89 (2): 185–204. doi:10.1177/1077699011430064.

Library, C. (2018). *Boston Marathon Terror Attack Fast Facts*. [online] CNN. Available at: https://www.cnn.com/2013/06/03/us/boston-marathon-terror-attack-fast-facts/index.html [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

McCombs, M. E., and D. L. Shaw. 1972. "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media." Public Opinion Quarterly 36 (2): 176–187. doi:10.1086/26799.

Mitchell, A. (2014). *Which news organization is the most trusted? The answer is complicated.. Pew Research Center*. Retrieved 1 April 2019, from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/10/30/which-news-organization-is-the-most-trusted-the-answer-is-complicated/

Mitnik, Zachary S. (2017). *Post 9/11 Media Coverage of Terrorism*. Cuny Academic Works. http://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds/9

Nevalsky, Eric. (2015). Developing terrorism coverage: variances in news

framing of the January 2015 attacks in Paris and Borno, Critical Studies on Terrorism, 8    :3, 466-477, DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2015.1096656

Thatcher, M. (1985). *Speech to American Bar Association* - Margaret Thatcher Foundation.Retrieved from https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106096

Ortiz, E. and Bruton, F. (2015). *Charleston Church Shooting: Suspect Dylann Roof Captured in*
*North Carolina*. [online] NBC News. Available at: https://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/charleston-church-shooting/charleston-church-shooting-suspect-dylann-roof-captured-north-carolina-n377546 [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

Oxford English Dictionary (2015). *Mass Media*. OED Online. Oxford University Press, December 2015. Web. 3 April 2019.

Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. Political Communication, 10(1), 55–75.

Parliamentary Assembly, Council of Europe (2005) "Media and Terrorism. Recommendation 1706", http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fi leid=17343&lang=en, July 7, 2016.

Powell, Kimberly A. (2011). Framing Islam: An Analysis of U.S. Media Coverage of Terrorism Since 9/11, Communication Studies, 62:1, 90-112, DOI:10.1080/10510974.2011.533599

Reese, S. D. (2001). Framing public life: A bridging model for media research. In S. D. Reese, O. H. J. Gandy, & A. E. Grant (Eds.), Framing public life (pp. 7–31). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ritzer, George. (2008). *Modern Sociological Theory*. New York City: McGraw Hill.

Scheufele, D. 2000. "Agenda Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication." Mass Communication & Society 3 (2–3): 297–316. doi:10.1207/S15327825MCS0323_07.

Simi & Futrell (2015). American Swastika: Inside the White Power Movement's Hidden Spaces of Hate, 2nd Ed. Rowman & Littlefield.

Slone,M.(2000).Responses to media coverage of terrorism. *J. Conflict.Resolut.* 44, 508–522. doi: 10.1177/0022002700044004005

Slone, M.,and Shoshani, A.(2006a).Evaluation of preparatory measures for coping with anxiety raised by media coverage of terrorism. *J. Couns.Psychol.* 53, 535–542. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.4.535

SPLC (2014). "Hate Map"(2014). http://www.splcenter.org/hatemap

Start.umd.edu. (2018). *Incident Summary for GTDID: 201304150001*. [online] Available at:https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/IncidentSummary.aspx?gtdid=201304150001[Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

Start.umd.edu. (2018). *Incident Summary for GTDID: 201506170035*. [online] Available at:https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/IncidentSummary.aspx?gtdid=201506170035 [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

*The Story of the Global War on Terror: Timeline*. (2019). *HISTORY*. Retrieved 11 April 2019, from https://www.history.com/topics/21st-century/war-on-terror-timeline

Thatcher, M. (1985). Speech to American Bar Association. Retrieved from https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106096

Turner, J. H. (2014). *Theoretical Sociology: A Concise Introduction to Twelve Sociological Theories*. United States of America: Sage Publications.

US Department of Homeland Security, "Rightwing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment" (unclassified assessment, April 2009), http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/rightwing.pdf

Web.archive.org. (2014). *Boston Marathon Facts*. [online] Available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20140811182423/http://216.235.243.43/races/boston-marathon/boston-marathon-history/boston-marathon-facts.aspx [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

Weisman, J. (2015). *Killings Add Painful Page to Storied History of Charleston Church*. [online] Nytimes.com. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/19/us/charleston-killings-evoke-history-of-violence-against-black-churches.html [Accessed 11 Dec. 2018].

White, David. (1950). *The "Gate Keeper"*: *A Case Study in the Selection of News*. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 27(4), 383-390.

van Dijk, T. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge

Zimet, S. G. (1976). *Print and prejudice*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Boston Marathon Bombing Articles

BM1: A Wall Street Journal Roundup. (2013, April 16). U.S. News: Deadly Bomb blasts Hit

Boston Marathon. *Wall Street Journal,* p. 8.

BM2: Helliker, Kevin; Devlin, Barrett. (2013, April 16). Boston Bombings: Tough to Secure

Races. *Wall Street Journal,* p. A7.

BM3: Levitz, Jennifer; Mann, Ted. (2013, April 16). 'What Happened to Those Poor People?'.

*Wall Street Journal,* p. A1.

BM4: Devlin, Barrett. (2013, April 16). Boston Bombings: 'Tripwires' Can Spot Would-Be

Bombers. *Wall Street Journal,* A7.

BM5: Levitz, Jennifer; Helliker, Kevin; Germano, Sara. (2013, April 16). Deadly Blasts Rock

Boston --- 'Act of Terror' Kills at Least Three, Injures About 140 as Bombs Wreak

Carnage on Marathon Crowd. *Wall Street Journal,* A1.

BM6: Fleisher, Lisa; Kamp, Jon; Weaver, Christopher. (2013, April 17). Boston Bombings:

Doctors Try to Save Lives, Limbs --- Patients Suffering Devastating Trauma Flood

Boston Hospitals After Monday's Explosions. *Wall Street Journal*, 4.

BM7: Gay, Jason. (2013, April 17). Sport: Shocking End to This Joyful Day --- There is

Something Utterly Wicked About Tragedy Striking Such an Event. *Wall Street Journal*,

30.

BM8: Anonymous. (2013, April 17). Terror in Boston. *Wall Street Journal*, 16.

46

BM9: Levitz, Jennifer. (2013, April 17). Boston Bombings: In Close Knit Neighborhood, Shock

at Death of 8-Year-Old. *Wall Street Journal*, 4.

BM10: Grossman, Andrew; Levitz, Jennifer; Fleisher, Lisa; Kamp, Jon. (2013, April 17). *Wall*

*Street Journal,* 1.

BM11: Belkin, Doug; Grossman, Andrew; Clark, Kevin. (2013, April 17). Boston Bombings:

Emergency Planning, Speed Saved Lives. *Wall Street Journal*, A7.

BM12: Winslow, Ron; Beck, Melinda; Weaver, Christopher. (2013, April 17). Boston

Bombings: Injuries Resemble Traumas of War. *Wall Street Journal,* A7.

BM13: Boot, Max. (2013, April 17). The Futility of Terrorism. *Wall Street Journal,* A15.

BM14: Dawsey, Joshua. (2013, April 17). Boston Bombings: Targeted City Will 'Play It

Tighter'. *Wall Street Journal*, A6.

BM15: Levitz, Jennifer; Smith, Jennifer; Belkin, Douglas. (2013, April 17). The Face of

Tragedy. *Wall Street Journal,* A1.

BM16: Perez, Evan; Devlin, barrett; Grossman, Andrew. (2013, April 17). Boston Bomb Clues

Surface --- Lethal Devices Believed Built from Pressure cookers; Hotels, Rentals

Canvassed. *Wall Street Journal,* A1.

BM17: Berzon, Alexandra; Hudson, Kris. (2013, April 17). Boston Bombings: Hotels Near Blast

 Zone Served as Safe Haven. *Wall Street Journal,* A6.

BM18: El-Ghobashy, Tamer; Mann, Ted. (2013, April 17). Mayor Sets Precautions --- Jittery

Mood Follows Boston Explosions. *Wall Street Journal,* A17.

BM19: Fleisher, Lisa; Dawsey, Josh; Mann, Ted. (2013, April 18). Boston Bombings: China

Mourns Student Who Died in Boston. *Wall Street Journal,* 7.

BM20: Perez, Evan; Devlin, Barret; Grossman, Andrew. (2013, April 18). Boston
Bombings:
        Video Shows Suspect in Marathon Blasts. *Wall Street Journal,* 6.

BM21: Audi, Tamara. (2013, April 18). Boston Bombings: At Hospirals, Ordinary Day
Turns to
        Pandemonium. *Wall Street Journal*, 6.

BM22: Boot, Max. (2013, April 18). The Futility of Terrorism. *Wall Street Journal,* 18.

BM23: Fowler, Geoffrey A; Schectman, Joel. (2013, April 18).Boston Bombings: Citizen
        Surveillance Helps Officials Put Pieces Together. *Wall Street Journal*, A6.

BM24: Helliker, Kevin. (2013, April 18). Boston Bombings: As Its own Marathon
Approaches,
        Oklahoma City Proceed Warily with Heightened Security. *Wall Street Journal,*
A6.

BM25: Devlin, Barrett; Perez, Evan. (2013, April 18). Video Provides Clues to Bomber. *Wall*
        *Street Journal*, A1.

BM26: Fleisher, Lisa; Dawsey, Josh; Mann, Ted. (2013, April 18). Boston Bombings:
Chinese
        Pour Out Grief For Student. *Wall Street Journal*, A7.

BM27: Nicholas, Peter; Favole, Jared A. (2013, April 18). Boston Bombings: Obama
Now Takes     the Lead After Attacks on Americans. *Wall Street Journal,* A6.

BM28: Weaver, Christopher; Smith, Jennifer; Fleisher, Lisa. (2013, April 18). Boston
        Bombings: Amputees Face New Reality. *Wall Street Journal*, A7.

BM29: McWhirter, Cameron; El-Ghobashy, Tamer; Roman, David. (2013, April 18).
Boston
        Bombings: Authorities Hone fight Against Terrorism --- In the Wake of Attacks,
Big
        Cities Across the Globe Use Technology and Other Advances to Prevent and
Investigate
        Plots. *Wall Street Journal,* A6.

BM30: Bratton, William J. (2013, April 19). A Cop's-Eye View of Terrorism. *Wall Street Journal*, 17.

BM31: Helliker, Kevin. (2013, April 19). Sport: Marathon World Ponders Future. *Wall Street Journal,* 30.

BM32: Devlin, Barrett; Perez, Evan; Favole, Jared A. (2013, April 19). Boston Bombings: Obama Vows Resolve in Boston as Videos Get Scrutiny. *Wall Street Journal,* 7.

BM33: Perez, Evan; Devlin, Barrett. (2013, April 19). Manhunt for Bombers Focuses on Two Men. *Wall Street Journal,* A1.

BM34: Levitz, Jennifer; Dawsey, Josh. (2013, April 19). Boston Bombings: Businesses Reeling After Attacks --- With Many stores Closed and Customers Few, Boston's Posh Back Bay Strives to Return to Normalcy. *Wall Street Journal*, A8.

BM35: Burkitt, Laurie. (2013, April 19). Boston Bombings: Parents of China Victim Get U.S. Visas. *Wall Street Journal,* A8.

BM36: Perez, Evan; Gershman, Jacob. (2013, April 20). Boston Bombings: Miranda Laws Have Flexibility. *Wall Street Journal*, A8.

BM37: Sonne, Paul. (2013, April 20). Boston Bombings: A Father Keeps Faith in His Sons. *Wall Street Journal*, A6.

BM38: Murray, Saya; Hughes, Siobhan; Nicholas, Peter. (2013, April 20). Boston Bombings: Attack Impacts Immigration Debate --- Shortcomings of Current Laws Cited by Senate Opponents, Who Say Bill Needs More Security Controls. *Wall Street Journal*, A8.

BM39: Gorman, Siobhan; Fields, Gary; Devlin, Barrett. (2013, April 20). Boston Bombings:
  Renewed Fears on Homefront. *Wall Street Journal*, A8.

BM40: Dawsey, Joshua; Perez, Evan; Devlin, Barrett; Levitz, Jennifer. (2013, April 20).
  Manhunt Ends With Capture. *Wall Street Journal*, A1.

BM41: Belkin, Douglas; Dawsey, Josh. (2013, April 20). Boston Bombings: Before the Capture,
  a Historic Lockdown --- Transit Grinds to Near-Halt as Normally Bustling Streets Go
  Quiet and Workers Check In Remotely; 'It's Very Weird'. *Wall Street Journal*, A7.

BM42: Sonne, Paul; Cullison, Alan; Alpert, Lukas I. (2013, April 20). Boston Bombings:
  Suspects' Family Fled War-Torn Homeland. *Wall Street Journal*, A6.

BM43: Aaronson, Emily Loving. (2013, April 20). Cross Country: On the Front-Lines of
  Battlefield Triage in Boston. *Wall Street Journal*, A13.

BM44: Cullison, Alan; Sonne, Paul; Levitz, Jennifer. (2013, April 20). Life in America
  Unraveled for Brothers. *Wall Street Journal*, A1.

BM45: Anonymous. (2013, April 22). The Brothers Tsarnaev. *Wall Street Journal*, 14.

BM46: Alpert, Lukas I. (2013, April 22). Jihadist Website Claims No Link to Boston Attack.
  *Wall Street Journal,* 6.

BM47: Devlin, Barrett; Fields, Gary; Dawsey, Josh; Perez, Evan; Levitz, Jennifer. (2013, April
  22). *Wall Street Journal*, 7.

BM48: Crovitz, Gordon L. (2013, April 22). Information Age: In Praise of Surveillance
  Cameras. *Wall Street Journal,* A13.

BM49: Kamp, Jon. (2013, April 22). Boston Bombings: Shot Officer Critical but Stable. *Wall
  Street Journal*, A5.

BM50: Jones, Ashby. (2013, April 22). Boston Bombings: Prosecutors Plot Strategic Course.
*Wall Street Journal*, A5.

BM51: Perez, Evan; Devlin, Barrett. (2013, April 22). Boston Bombings: Trip to Rusia Focus of
Probe --- U.S. Authorities Examine Whether Suspect contacted Militants in the Caucasus.
*Wall Street Journal*, A5.

BM52: Cullison, Alan; Sonne, Paul; Troianovski, Anton; George-Cosh, David. (2013, April 22).
Turn to Religion Split Bomb Suspects' Home. *Wall Street Journal*, A1.

Appendix B: Charleston Church Shooting Articles

CC1: Bauerline, Valerie; McWhirter, Cameron; Campoy, Ana. (2015, June 19). Alleged Church

     Killer Held. *Wall Street Journal*, 1.

CC2: Levitz, Jennifer; Kamp, Jon. (2015, June 19). U.S. News: Accused Espoused Racist Views,

     Relative Says. *Wall Street Journal*, 7.

CC3: Calvert, Scott. (2015, June 19). U.S. News: Slain Pastor's Calling Suited Stories Church ---

     Clementa Pinckney was devoted to the poor both as a minister and as a state senator.

     *Wall Street Journal,* A6.

CC4: Bauerline, Valerie; Levitz, Jennifer; Kamp, Jon. (2015, June 19). 'Loner' Held in Church

     Killings --- A 21-year-old white man linked to racist groups shot 9 African-Americans at

     Charleston Bible study. *Wall Street Journal*, A1.

CC5: Koppel, Nathan; Campoy, Ana. (2015, June q9). U.S. News: Shooting Victims Were

     Drawn Together by Their Faith. *Wall Street Journal*, A6.

CC6: McCain, Colleen. (2015, June 20). U.S. News: Tragedy Thrusts Haley into National

     Spotlight. *Wall Street Journal*, A4.

CC7: Bauerline, Valerie; Gay, Mara. (2015, June 20). Victims' Families Confront Suspect – and

     Forgive Him. *Wall Street Journal*; A1.

CC8: McWhirter, Cameron; Gay, Mara; Dawsey, Josh. (2015, June 22). U.S. News: Sunday

     Church Services Honor Shooting Victims. *Wall Street Journal,* 7.

CC9: Anonymous. (2015, June 22). The Charleston Shooting. *Wall Street Journal*, 12.

CC10: McWhirter, Cameron; Dawsey, Josh; Gay, Mara. (2015, June 22). U.S. News: Charleston
     Appeals for Unity --- Parishioners and civic leaders vow to build racial accord after last
     week's slayings. *Wall Street Journal*, A3.

CC11: Seib, Gerald F. (2015, June 23). Families in Charleston are trumping Politicians. *Wall
     Street Journal*, 2.

CC12: Dawsey, Josh. (2015, June 23). U.S. News: Church Looks for Stability, Healing. *Wall
     Street Journal*, A6.

# AUTHORS BIOGRAPHY

James Brown is a senior in the Honors College at the University of Maine who plans to graduate in May of 2019 with a Psychology/Sociology double degree and a Neuroscience minor. With concentrations in Biological and Cognitive Psychology, and Crime, Law, and Justice, he is fascinated by the intersection of biology and the social sciences.

Outside of academia, James enjoys spending time in nature, and plans to begin a south-bound thru-hike of the Appalachian Trail in June of 2019. He enjoys reading and writing, and plans to use the trail as an excuse to do both. His zodiac is a Leo. He would also like to thank anyone misfortunate enough to read this far into the bio, and remind you that true tranquility can always be found within the soul. He invites you now to ignore the news, turn off Twitter, forget about mass incarceration and terrorism and the Kardashians and Harambe, and to instead take twenty seconds to stop; to find your breath, and with it, inner peace.