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While over the water the papers cried
"The patriot fights for his countryside!"

— Rudyard Kipling, The Ballad of Boh Da Throne

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C., have changed attitudes toward terrorist groups, including those that have traditionally enjoyed the romantic sympathies of supporters in the United States. Particularly relevant to this is the Irish Republican Army (IRA), or Óglaigh na hÉireann, a group that originated as the Irish Volunteers during the initial 1916 Irish revolt against British occupation and has existed in one form or another ever since despite statements in October 2001 that it had begun decommissioning. The IRA has historically escaped universal contempt in the United States but may now feel what Jonathan Stevenson called “the chilling effect of September 11” in a *National Review* article.3

If these recent events, involving a terrorist group that pursues no negotiable political objective, chill sympathies in the United States toward a politically motivated group such as the Irish Republican Army, this may spell trouble for the organization. While the U.S. government has historically held to a non-intervention policy regarding the Northern Ireland dispute, there have been recent intervention efforts arguably sympathetic to the IRA’s cause. In 1995-96, President Clinton’s involvement in resolving the conflict exceeded that of previous presidents and employed strategies that upset Britain. Additionally, it is largely conceded that weapons and funds from private sources and supporting organizations have supported the IRA over its considerable life span, though the extent of this support has typically proven difficult to measure.4

Claims that the backlash from the September 11, 2001, attacks has affected sentiment toward the IRA in the United States begs the question: How has the IRA’s image been affected by previous attacks of unrelated terror cabals? Have past terror events more closely tied to the United States similarly caused Americans to question their sympathies toward the often romantically viewed Irish Republican Army? By extension, does this effect change in U.S. media coverage of the organization? This research examines those questions via an analysis of news coverage in the *New York Times* before and after a previous—and, in many ways, similar—terror attack in the United States: the vehicle bombing carried out at the base of the World Trade Center on February 26, 1993.

The IRA, Americans and the Media

In its goal to restore “Home Rule” to British Northern Ireland, the IRA has long enjoyed a close and supportive relationship with many Irish-Americans. An official Irish-American lobby in Washington has existed since almost immediately after the end of World War II in 1945, preceded by less official Irish-American support for Irish nationalists dating back to the 1860s. This is logical for a nation where millions have Irish ancestry: The Home Rule movement in Ireland has relied heavily on emotional appeals to Irish tradition, as well as Catholicism, since the founding of the Irish revolt against Britain in 1916.

Media involvement has also been a crucial issue for the Home Rule movement since its inception; Irish nationalist newspapers and books produced by Frank Gallagher in early years of the Irish revolution earned him the nickname “The Irish Dr. Goebbels.”5 Deliberate control of messages from IRA critics in Britain has also been ubiquitous and significant, from British media efforts to avoid broadcasting television imagery that might evoke sympathy for Home Rule or criticism of the Northern Irish government6 to denigrating images of Irish revolutionaries in British Troubles Fiction.7

Less research has been conducted regarding media coverage of the IRA in the (officially) neutral United States. We do know that the Irish-American press offerings *The Irish World*, the *Gaelic-American*, and *Freeman’s Journal and Catholic Register* were censored by the U.S. government during World War I under espionage law for their criticism of British policy regarding Ireland, though the mainstream Hearst papers escaped similar punishment.8 Research does not, however, extensively describe the nature of more recent press coverage of the IRA in the United States, despite the apparently significant impact of U.S. public opinion upon the organization’s political, military, and financial welfare. Considering the speculation about a chilling effect on sympathy for the IRA after recent unrelated terrorist attacks, an examination of press coverage during similar times is also valuable as an exploration of possible relationships between U.S. terrorist crises and press coverage of other paramilitary groups.
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*International Communication Bulletin*
The 1993 Bombing and the New York Times

In the 1993 World Trade Center attack, Islamic extremists killed six and injured 1,042 when a bomb placed in a truck exploded in the second basement level of the World Trade Center. The attack has since been eclipsed by the destruction of the Center by terrorists on September 11, 2001, but at the time the 1993 attack was called the most destructive terrorist act ever committed in the nation’s history. While it is impossible here to analyze the effect of all terrorist events in U.S. history on coverage of the I.R.A. in all available mainstream press outlets, the 1993 World Trade Center bombing provides a natural analogy to the speculation surrounding a chilling effect with regard to groups such as the I.R.A. from the September 11, 2001 attacks since they share similar prominence and location. Additionally, potential interaction between the 1993 bombing and I.R.A. coverage is an interesting prospect because the attack’s method, a bomb in a vehicle, has historically been a typical I.R.A. tactic.

The New York Times is a sensible starting point for analysis of changes in I.R.A. coverage after the 1993 bombing, and for more reasons than its shared location with the event. If changes in both the frequency and nature of press coverage might be viewed as indicators of trends in public opinion and attention toward the I.R.A. after a terrorist event on U.S. soil, the Times’ nationwide circulation and status as a highly regarded peer source among other newspapers make the publication an exemplary subject for this study’s examination of a previously unexplored issue in U.S. press coverage. If indeed the New York Times is viewed, as Herbert J. Gans asserts in Deciding What’s News, as “the professional setter of standards” with regard to story selection and quality, then observations about the Times’ coverage of an issue may be, to a degree, generalizable to other mainstream U.S. press offerings.

Article Frequencies

A cursory glance at coverage of the I.R.A. in the New York Times would suggest that the 1993 World Trade Center bombing had an effect on coverage of the paramilitary group. Items mentioning the I.R.A. rose from 109 in the year preceding the bombing to 184 in the year following it, an increase of 69%. However, trends in coverage over this 24-month period, displayed in Figure 1, do not easily support such a simple conclusion. While the total number of articles after the February 26, 1993, bombing was greater than that before it, the long-term trends in coverage do not appear as clearly linkable to the bombing. Instead, coverage of the I.R.A. in the New York Times fluctuated, often in conjunction with significant developments and events pertinent to the I.R.A.

For example, the notable amount of articles mentioning the I.R.A. in January and February of 1994 cannot be plausibly linked to the New York City bombing of two years previous. This increase is instead owed, at least in large part, to Sinn Fein party head and I.R.A. advocate Gerry Adams’ diplomatic visit to Manhattan, during which Adams was extensively exposed to media via interviews, conferences, and statements. Other increases and decreases in article frequency, especially when separated from the April 26, 1993, attack by some time, appear to follow no apparent pattern in relation to the bombing and suggest that an overall relationship over the two-year span is not likely.

Figure 1
Number of New York Times Items Referencing the Irish Republican Army for the One-Year Periods Preceding & Following the 1993 World Trade Center Bombing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months from WTC bombing</th>
<th>Number of articles referencing I.R.A. (X=1 article)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-11</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-9</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time period measured from February 27, 1992 to February 26, 1994. Number indicates the month’s distance from February 26, 1993 bombing (represented by the “#”), starting with -1 and 1 for the months immediately preceding and following that date. Months measured from the 27th of each month to the 26th of the following month.
Figure 2

Number of New York Times Items Referencing the Irish Republican Army for the Nine Week Periods Preceding & Following the 1993 World Trade Center Bombing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7-day period</th>
<th>Number of articles referencing I.R.A. (X=1 article)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/26-1-1</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2-1/8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9-1/15</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16-1/22</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23-1/29</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30-2/5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6-2/12</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13-2/19</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20-2/26</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

###

| 2/27-3/5     | XXXXXXXX                                          |
| 3/6-3/12     | XXXXXXXX                                          |
| 3/13-3/19    | XXX                                               |
| 3/20-3/26    | XXXXXXXX                                          |
| 3/27-4/2     | XXXXXXXX                                          |
| 4/3-4/9      | XXX                                               |
| 4/10-4/16    | XX                                                |
| 4/17-4/23    | XXX                                               |
| 4/24-4/30    | XXX                                               |

Time period measured as the 18 seven-day periods from December 26, 1992 to April 30, 1993. "###" indicates World Trade Center bombing.

When trends are analyzed in the more immediate time period surrounding the World Trade Center bombing, a pronounced increase in articles mentioning the I.R.A. following the event is apparent. Forty-three articles mentioned the group in the two months following the bombing, as opposed to 14 in the two previous months. The immediate fluctuation in reference frequencies for the eighteen weeks surrounding the attack, shown in Figure 2, indicates an obvious and sustained increase in mentions of the I.R.A. in the weeks immediately following the World Trade Center bombing. This unmistakably pronounced change in frequency of coverage could be construed as more powerful evidence that the World Trade Center bombing affected the amount of attention given to the I.R.A. by the New York Times than less apparent long-term trends.

However, such a claim is again made problematic by the possibility that the increase is only an artifact of a coincidental increase in newsworthy activity involving the I.R.A. Activity during the weeks immediately following February 26, 1993, included a March 28 peace rally that drew 20,000 in Dublin, March 20 bombings that wounded over 50 and killed two young boys, and an April 24 I.R.A. bombing of the London city center that was fierce enough to inspire references to attacks on the city during World War II. Additionally, 18 were wounded by a bomb placed by I.R.A. operatives in a garbage can in London only one day after the New York City bombing. By comparison, only one bombing linked to the I.R.A., a London attack that injured four, occurred during the two months prior to the World Trade Center attack. This disparity in the number of prominent events involving the I.R.A. immediately before and after the 1993 New York City bombing may not fully account for the change in the frequency of I.R.A. references in the Times after the event, but it nevertheless casts suspicion upon the conclusion that the visible and obvious increase in New York Times articles can be attributed to the World Trade Center bombing rather than other factors.

Another concern that frustrates conclusions regarding the cause of changes in the frequency of I.R.A. references in the newspaper is the fact that article frequencies provide no indication as to the significance of the references in individual items. The I.R.A. was, of course, a primary subject of some articles, but many other stories contained only passing references to the group in an otherwise irrelevant story. It is also impossible to observe changes in the nature of the Times' actual reportage of the group from a simple reference count. Exacerbating this difficulty is the fact that some articles in these totals were film and book reviews whose references to the I.R.A. were only a manifestation of the content of the work reviewed rather than news or editorial comment.

When those difficulties in distinguishing reaction to the 1993 World Trade Center bombing from other potential contributors to changes in the frequency of New York Times coverage of the group are considered, closer investigation of the content and tone of articles is obviously necessary to more clearly delineate any possible interaction between the 1993 bombing and the nature of the New York Times' coverage of the I.R.A.

Article Content, Context, and Tone

In examining the content of articles dealing with the Irish conflict, a 1981 series of articles by Philadelphia Daily News columnist and senior editor Chuck Stone provides valuable insight regarding the effect of pejorative language and word choice in reference to myriad issues. Stone's five-part series, which ran in the Daily News from November 30 to December 4 after a visit to Northern Ireland, included extensive interviews with paramilitary leaders and victims of strife in the Irish conflict, as well as background and comment on various aspects of the Irish troubles. Although not a primary aspect of the series, some of these items also contained suggestions regarding the impact of such subtleties as word se-
lection and nomenclature upon perception of the conflict's issues.

In addition to his claim that the British press assigned greater significance to slain British and Irish Protestant victims than to Irish Catholics, Stone articulated several less obvious instances where linguistic decisions affect the way the conflict is viewed at various points in his series. Simple examples included the arguably erroneous connotation of "loyalists" often attached to the Ulster Defense Association, a group typically viewed as antagonists to the I.R.A. but not necessarily supportive of British occupation of Northern Ireland, and the "antiseptic" renaming of the Long Kesh prison to "The Maze" by British authorities after the prison stopped granting political prisoner status to I.R.A. inmates.

Less obvious, but exemplary as a reminder of the weight of semantic subtleties in this context, was Stone's descriptions of "wall art" in Northern Ireland. Rebuffing identification of the art as graffiti, Stone stated:

The walls portray. Painted on the sides of commercial buildings and homes are one- and two-story brightly colored revolutionary tableaux of suffering martyrs, military actions and the I.R.A.'s frequently used symbol, the phoenix, to convey that their cause also will rise one day from the ashes.

Stone's insight, offered over a decade before the period of interest here, serves as a word of caution regarding the implications of word choice and tone with regard to everything from organization affiliation to street art in the context of the Irish conflict. The illusion that apparently minor distinctions in vocabulary can have significant meaning in discourse surrounding Irish strife suggests cautious scrutiny in evaluating the importance of tone in I.R.A. coverage here.

Such concerns aside, examining the nature of articles in the months preceding the 1993 World Trade Center bombing is challenging simply because of the dearth of actual discussion of the group in the New York Times. Of the 14 Times items referencing the I.R.A. between December 27, 1992, and April 26, 1993, only three featured the group as a primary subject. Features briefly referencing the I.R.A. in more general descriptions of worldwide troubles and similar groups accounted for some of the remaining stories, but nearly as many brief references were in largely irrelevant stories about the success of a film whose plot includes an I.R.A. member and controversy surrounding attempts to bar gays from participating in the New York City St. Patrick's Day parade.

When extensive references to the I.R.A. and relevant concerns did exist in the period immediately preceding the bombing, they were typified by a tone that was somewhat cautious regarding the I.R.A. For example, a January 17, 1993, story about Irish Foreign Minister Dick Spring initially referred to violence in Northern Ireland with a vague even-handedness, describing "civil strife" and "unrest" that had at that time claimed over 3,000 lives since 1969. While the article later des-
marred by domestic terror tragedies.

Of course, this attitude would not endure for long. America, New York, and the Times would be tragically reacquainted with terrorist activity a few days later. Along with the aforementioned change in the frequency of I.R.A. references in the New York Times, the implied relevance of the group’s actions would also change dramatically after the World Trade Center bombing. Many of the New York Times pieces pertaining to the I.R.A. just before the World Trade Center attack require close examination for judgments regarding tone to be made, but most items following the attack do not demand such keen scrutiny. The day after the attack, the I.R.A. was referenced in two items in the February 27, 1993, edition of the Times. One story, reporting a judge’s decision to allow a gay group to march in the St. Patrick’s Day Parade, only mentioned the paramilitary group briefly in historical discussion of other controversies surrounding the parade.\textsuperscript{49} The other, a feature devoted to the history and efficacy of vehicle bombings by terror groups around the world as well as in the 1993 World Trade Center attack, credited the I.R.A. with use of the first car bomb in 1971 and mentioned the group several times.\textsuperscript{43} This immediate association of the I.R.A. with the previous day’s World Trade Center bombing, and terrorism in general, stands out in stark contrast to the Times’ implication six days before that the I.R.A.’s terror acts were a distant phenomenon; the effect of the terror attack on the nature of the I.R.A.’s references in the newspaper is, in this case, blatantly apparent.

Interestingly, this article also mentioned “Irish Republican Army terrorists,”\textsuperscript{46} overtly branding the group with the pejorative term in contrast to articles from earlier weeks that abstain from clearly making the association. A similar May 7, 1993, feature exploring motives behind terror attacks worldwide analogously compared the I.R.A. to Palestinian terrorists in discussing the “crude utility” or overseas terrorism,\textsuperscript{42} and May 8, 1993 reportage of the arrest of five London bombing suspects related the I.R.A.’s administrative connection to “terror cells” in its “21-year campaign of killings and bombings.”\textsuperscript{43}

The nature of many subsequent articles referencing the I.R.A. over the next few weeks was consistent with this theme. In an article voicing speculation about possible perpetrators of the bombing, the Times showed little reserve regarding attachment of negative connotations and speculation to the paramilitary group. The I.R.A. was mentioned among only a handful of terror groups in the article, which offered vague discussion regarding the group’s potential involvement:

\textit{The pioneer in [vehicle bombings], the Irish Republican Army, has shown renewed affection for car bombings as part of its three-decade-old campaign to drive the British out of Northern Ireland. Because Irish nationalists in general bank on political sympathy and financial support from Irish-Americans, the organization has not in the past targeted Americans.}\textsuperscript{69}

Nothing more was said about the group in the article. The piece did not directly speculate on the I.R.A.’s potential as a suspect in the World Trade Center bombing, but also refused to discount it despite the existence of obvious logical evidence against the possibility of the organization’s involvement. The Times’ apparent willingness to entertain the illogical possibility of I.R.A. involvement in the World Trade Center bombing based simply on the familiarity of the modus operandi represents a marked departure from the newspaper’s hesitance to criticize fundraising for the organization’s affiliates only a week earlier.

Even tertiary references to the I.R.A. that appeared in the weeks following the U.S. bombing seem more critical than those appearing before.

A March 5, 1993, article on evaluating the veracity of bomb threats included a source’s claim that the organization “tried to maximize casualties” with a phone call that erroneously led evacuees nearer to a bomb.\textsuperscript{50} A March 3, 1993 item about Irish Foreign Minister Dick Spring stands in contrast to the aforementioned article written about him weeks earlier. While the second piece, like its predecessor, described the I.R.A. as simply “outlawed,” it also contained several statements from Spring denouncing the group’s “track of violence.”\textsuperscript{51}

While an initial change in the New York Times’ tone toward the I.R.A. is not especially surprising in the immediate wake of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, the critical attitude toward the group was sustained, if not intensified, over several weeks. A March 26, 1993 report asserted that the organization “seems to target more and more ordinary civilians” and that recent attacks “seemed to have been carried out in a way almost calculated to cause harm to ordinary people.”\textsuperscript{52} The item also included a rebuttal from I.R.A. officials blaming needless casualties on inadequate police responses, but this point of view appeared only in the article’s final sentence. A March 29, 1993, opinion piece was much more vehement in its declaration of the “murderers who rob themselves in the name of the Irish Republic,” claiming, “That these killers call themselves Republicans or loyalists trashes decency and meaning.”\textsuperscript{53}

New York Times coverage of the I.R.A. in the two months following the World Trade Center attack was marked by only one item sympathetic to the organization’s aims: “Ireland’s Troubled Sleep,” an April 5, 1993, op-ed piece claiming that “British injustice and human rights violations” and Irish resentment of British occupation were the cause of continued strife.\textsuperscript{54} While the author called the I.R.A. a “shadowy organization,” much of the piece was more supportive of the group:

\textit{But the I.R.A.’s claim, I’m afraid, is not easily dismissed. The group is best understood as the product of two forces: centuries of British colonial oppression and Irish denial of the meaning of that experience ... Many who oppose I.R.A. terror-}
ism privately admit to half-buried feelings of anti-British resentment and to a grudging admiration for the group's resolute defiance.55

This article's forgiving tone regarding the aims of the Irish Republican Army is notable in the context of other items in the Times after February 26, 1993; it was certainly an anomaly among I.R.A. coverage.

If the Times' own offerings were more critical of and attacked more negative connotations to the I.R.A. after the 1993 bombing, letters to the editor authors were markedly more boisterous in their contempt for the I.R.A. The "Ireland's Troubled Sleep" piece received an April 17, 1993, response letter critical of both the article and the I.R.A. and ambivalent toward Irish political strife:

I know of no one Briton, in or out of government, who would not gladly vote in a referendum to wash his or her hands of the Irish problem. Years of losing sons, daughters, fathers and brothers to the bombing atrocities of Irish Republican Army thugs have sickened them to the point of no longer caring about the rights and wrongs of the "troubles."56

A March 24 letter calling for increased crackdowns on violence against abortion clinics also lamented typical attitudes toward the I.R.A., though the sentiment may have been more accurate in describing sympathies toward the I.R.A. before the World Trade Center bombing than after:

The paradox of terrorism is that we prefer to regard some causes as favorites, as a rebellion against oppression, like the acts of the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland, while at the same time religious and legislative leaders comfortably ignore, even condone, America's incessant anti-abortion terrorism.57

Another letter from "an American mother in London," published a week later on April 17, 1993, appealed to U.S. citizens to stop financially supporting the I.R.A. and called the organization's members "evil men."58 The only letter printed by the Times within months of the World Trade Center bombing to voice any sympathy, also published on April 17, 1993, congratulated the author of "Ireland's Troubled Sleeper," and called for "a new direction in dealing with the Irish conflict."59 However, the letter, like the article it commended, stands out as an exception to the rule of heavy I.R.A. criticism in the month following the bombing.

After April of 1993, mentions of the I.R.A. in the New York Times slowed dramatically, though violent I.R.A. activity continued. However, peaceable efforts increased: John Hume, Northern Ireland's Social Democratic and Labor Party leader, and Sinn Fein party head Gerry Adams began meeting for the first time in five years in an attempt to ensure peace,60 undeterred by sustained I.R.A. bombings.61 The I.R.A. voiced support for a preliminary peace proposal in October of 1993,62 and slow deliberations eventually resulted in the August 31, 1994, declaration of a cease-fire by the I.R.A.63 The truce would endure for over a year. During the short-lived respite from violence, however, the United States would receive another painful reminder of the presence of terrorism with the April 19, 1995, bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, an event the New York Times called "more reminiscent of Beirut than a city in America's heartland."64 To date, terrorism has perhaps never again been seen by U.S. citizens—or the press—as a "thankfully foreign phenomenon"65 to the extent that it was in the days before April 26, 1993.

Conclusion

The effect of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing on U.S. press coverage of a group like the I.R.A. is elusive. There is no doubt that the amount of references to the organization in the New York Times skyrocketed after the attack, but a corresponding and coincidental surge in I.R.A. activity makes ascertaining causality difficult. More interesting is the evidence that the nature of the newspaper's coverage of the group changed along with frequency. In the weeks leading up to the World Trade Center Attack, Times items seem to have portrayed the I.R.A. as a group involved in complex strife, an organization perhaps undeserving of the title "terrorist" with relevance to the United States, its significance in the United States as often as not relegated to movie theaters, novel, and parades. And why not? Terrorism itself, it was implied, was a faraway phenomenon for Americans. After the United States' own uncomfortable reintroduction to terrorism, however, this image changed. Immediately, the I.R.A. became the terrorist innovator of the destructive device used against American innocents, a bloodthirsty cabal thirsty for innocent bloodshed under the guise of patriotism, an organization perhaps even guilty of orchestrating the attack on the World Trade Center in a demonstration of profoundly erroneous and ungrateful strategy.

Such interpretations, of course, are somewhat subjective. The New York Times, an opinion leader and likely the best-known newspaper in the United States, is ostensibly not given to extreme bias or overt advocacy. However, it is difficult to claim that the I.R.A.'s coverage in the Times was not affected by the World Trade Center bombing in the face of apparent quantitative and qualitative changes in coverage of the group after the event. Since other contributing factors cannot be excised from the milieu in which the coverage occurred, it is difficult to make conclusions about such an effect, but one finding appears obvious: the Times viewed terrorism, and the I.R.A., differently after February 26, 1993 than before.

If the New York Times' reaction appropriately represents the perceptions of the American press and people, the implications of this effect are...
profound. Any terrorist attack on a U.S. target may perhaps strike a blow against support for paramilitary groups that otherwise might enjoy sympathy in the United States, regardless of the relevance (or lack thereof) of the attack to the group. When terrorism strikes home, it seems, the romance, myth, and rhetoric surrounding violent campaigns abroad is swept away in a terrible moment of clarity. While that might not be a political boon for groups such as the I.R.A. that have traditionally thrived on support from U.S. sources, it is perhaps to the benefit of Americans understanding and evaluation of strife the world over. However, the increased salience that appears to occur after a terror act might precipitate negative consequences as well. Many political groups with combative histories, for example, might be vilified in the climate that follows an U.S. terror attack. It is also possible that nations experiencing terror crises during periods when the United States has faced no similar recent events might remain relatively ignored.
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